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ABSTRACT

Cicero, Quintilian and the anonymous author of the ad Herennium each describe the art and practice of using an artificial memory system to help aid remembrance. Each of the authors’ respective treatises offers an exploration of how both loci (places) and imagines (images) were used to facilitate remembrance of both res (things) and verba (words). The methods delineated by each author provide valuable insight into the visual process, used by educated Romans to retrieve and recall information stored in their memories. The goal of this paper is to look at the rhetoricians’ discussions of the art of memory and posit that Virgil uses the artificial memory system features of sequential order, discriminability, and distinctiveness when describes the way his characters look at various images in the Aeneid.
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Introduction

Δώρον τοίνυν αὐτὸ φῶμεν εἶναι τῆς τῶν Μουσῶν μητρὸς Μνήμησύνης, καὶ εἰς τούτο ὅτι ἂν βουληθῶμεν μνήμης—μονεύσαι ὅτι ἂν ἴδωμεν ἢ ἀκούσωμεν ἢ αὐτοὶ ἐννοήσωμεν, ὑπέχοντας αὐτὸ ταῖς αἰσθήσεις καὶ ἐννοίαις, ἀποτυπώσαται, ὥσπερ δακτυλίων σημεία ἐνσημαίνομενον· καὶ ὃ μὲν ἂν ἐκμαγηθῇ, μνημονεύειν τε καὶ ἐπιστασθῇ ἔως ἂν ἐνῆ τὸ ἑίδωλον αὐτοῦ· ὃ δὲ ἂν ἐξαλείψῃ ἡ ὑπὸ σίον τε γενήται ἐκμαγηθῇ, ἐπιστήμηθαι τε καὶ μὴ ἐπιστασθῇ.

Let us, then, say that this is the gift of Memory, the mother of the Muses, and that whenever we wish to remember anything we see or hear or think of in our own minds, we hold this wax under the perceptions and thoughts and imprint them upon it, just as we make impressions from seal rings; and whatever is imprinted we remember and know as long as its image lasts, but whatever is rubbed out or cannot be imprinted we forget and do not know.

(Plato, Theaetetus 191D-E)

Memory is the “ability to retain important information or a representation of past experience, based on the mental processes of learning or encoding, retention across some interval of time, and retrieval or reactivation of the memory”. ¹ According to Daniel Schacter, author of the book The Seven Sins of Memory, humans today have a false idea of how our memories work. There is a general misconception that memories are visually imprinted in our minds like snapshots from the family photo album and, if properly stored, can be retrieved in exactly the same condition as when they were originally contained.² Nevertheless, we have come to realize that our memories do not function in the same way that a camera works. We consolidate our memories from the key elements of our experiences rather than retrieve copies of them. In the process of consolidating and reconstructing, we attach to these memories feelings, beliefs and knowledge which we obtained after the event and in this way we bias and distort our own memories.³ Tom Harrisson, author of Living through the Blitz,

¹ VandenBos (2007) 565

² There are examples of people, eidetikers, who do have ‘photographic’ memories, see Stromeyer 77-80 who discusses this type of memory.

³ Schacter (2001) 9
provides examples which clearly demonstrate this phenomenon. When interviewing survivors of the World War II Blitz, he discovered that people not only remembered their memories, which they thought were clearly imprinted in their minds, incorrectly, but also that people could totally forget memorable events. For example, a Stepney girl who was playing the piano missed Chamberlain’s words and the first air-raid siren on 3 September 1939:

>[a]t eleven-fifteen, I was playing the piano in the front room, when suddenly my mother burst in, shouting: ‘stop that noise!’ and then flung open the windows, letting in the scream of the air-raid siren, and the scuffling noise of neighbours in a hurry. Immediately, my father assumed the role of the administrative head-of-the-house, issuing commands and advice: ‘All get your gas masks! Steady, no panicking! Every man for himself! Keep in the passage’.

years later, not only writes in recall:

>[w]e were gathered in our little living room and it was very crowded, with six of us (parents and four children) all together for once. But weren’t there also visitors? I have the notion that this was a special kind of gathering; something a bit formal: aunts, uncles, or neighbours, perhaps, all listening to the wireless, which, those days, was on almost all the time, in anticipation of more bad news,

but also remembers Chamberlain’s speech and hearing the air-raid siren which had supposedly ‘shaken her to the roots’ (both of which according to her original documents she had never heard). Furthermore, she rewrites her remembrances, without remembering her Father’s pivotal role:

>[e]veryone was in a panic. Nobody knew what to do. Nobody, that is, except my mother who had read somewhere that the fumes of urine neutralized the effect of poison gas. To be honest, I’m not sure whether it was on that particular day or during the following week that she put her anti-gas plan into operation. But it makes a better finale to my recollections (and may be accurate) if I relate that we were all solemnly made to pee into our chamber pots, which were then placed beside every door in the house, and that, fortified by this safety device, our

---

4 *Living through the Blitz* is based on reports written and filed during the World War II Blitz. The reports now constitute the Mass-Observation Archive in the University of Sussex, England. The Mass-Observation project was initiated in 1937, “as a several-pronged reaction to the disturbed condition of western Europe under the growing threat of fascism” (Harrisson 11). This project sought to study the everyday life and the real moods of the people living through the Blitz. It is an anthropology and a mass-documentation about the daily and ‘normal’ life of the British people which, at that time was not adequately considered by the media, politicians, arts, or social scientists (Harrisson 11).

5 Harrisson (1976) 45-46

6 Harrisson (1976) 46
family was now ready to face the war.\textsuperscript{7}

Thus, her recollections make it clear that memories can be completely transformed. Another man, Richard Fitter, also demonstrates how memory can be distorted. When questioned about his visit to Coventry he did not remember ever being there and was later shocked when shown his hand-written accounts of a long visit to the place, which included conversations with officials to discuss after-measures.\textsuperscript{8} From these two examples, it is obvious that both the Stepney girl’s and Richard Fitter’s memories had been changed, distorted, or even erased.

The Ancient Romans were the same in this regard except for members of the elite who had trained their memories to remember visual impressions. These trained persons were confident that memories could be visually imprinted and that fixed impressions could be held in the mind\textsuperscript{9} and then later recalled without being subject to distortion by emotions, thoughts, or events. The Roman process of artificial memory, structured around the premise that remembering retrieved information stored in the mind, involved preserving backgrounds where the past could be securely stored. It is this technique of memorizing, by impressing places (loci) and images (imagines) on the memory,\textsuperscript{10} which illustrates that those who knew how to fluently use this system could rely on recalling memories in the exact same condition as when they had been originally stored. By using their training, the Romans were able to preserve and retrieve memory ‘snapshots’, thus illustrating that the idea of visual imprinting is possible. Since we neglect and do not train our memories in a similar fashion we have a different idea of what memory can do and how our memories work. Because the ancient Romans could control memory artificially, they were able to store information as it was presented to them and then read off the material they had visually imprinted on their minds. Thus, as this passage from the \textit{de Oratore} illustrates, a trained

\begin{flushleft}
\texttt{\textsuperscript{7} Harrisson (1976) 326}
\texttt{\textsuperscript{8} Harrisson (1976) 327}
\texttt{\textsuperscript{9} Thanks to Dr.Gordon Shrimpton for this point.}
\texttt{\textsuperscript{10} This is called the architectural mnemonic system.}
\end{flushleft}
memory could hold on to a mass of material and then reproduce it in a precise and clear format:  

\[q\]ui sit autem oratoris memoria fructus, quanta utilitas, quanta vis, quid me attinet dicere? tenere, quae didiceris in accipienda causa, quae ipse cogitaris? omnis fixas esse in animo sententias? omnem descriptum verborum apparatum? ita audire vel eum, unde discas, vel eum, cui respondentum sit ut illi non infundere in aures tuas orationem, sed in animo videantur inscribere?

[but what business is it of mine to specify the value to a speaker and the usefulness and effectiveness of memory? of retaining the information given you when you were briefed and the opinions you yourself have formed? of having all your ideas firmly planted in your mind and all your resources of vocabulary neatly arranged? of giving such close attention to the instructions of your client and to the speech of the opponent you have to answer that they may seem not just to pour what they say into your ears but to imprint it on your mind? (tr. E.W. Sutton).]

This is not to say that humans today cannot or do not use a system of artificial memory. The Russian mnemonist Solomon Veniaminovich Shereshevskii, whom I discuss in Chapter Two, is an ideal example of a man whose memory was based on using places (loci) and mental imagery. Everything he saw and heard would be committed to memory and could be recalled, regardless of the amount of time that passed, in precisely the same format as when the information was originally presented to him. For most of us the nature of memory is imperfect and forgotten encounters, misplaced eyeglasses, and failures to remember the names of familiar faces regularly occur in today’s busy world. Like Shereshevskii, a Roman who was versed in the art of artificial memory, visual imprinting and fixed impressions, was furnished with a reliable way of remembering since the mind controlled the storage locations of where the information was kept and controlled how the information was eventually re-aggregated into a coherent memory. This is an important notion to keep in mind throughout this thesis. When Virgil presents specific images to his characters,

---

11 Yates (1966) 12
12 *de Oratore* 2.86.355
13 Schacter (2001) 2
14 For further explanation on remembering and memory modules see Jacobs (1998) 1110-1134.
discussed in Chapter Three, these images are typically described as being both physically seen in and visually imprinted in the characters’ minds. This suggests that the memories of Virgil’s characters were not meant to be consolidated from key elements of their experiences and prone to distortion, like our memories, but were intended, in the manner of elite mnemonic training, to be retrieved and viewed like a photograph and then translated into a form of verbalized expression.

In the chapters that follow I examine how this idea of visual imprinting was important to the Roman people, not only in Virgil’s nationalistic epic, the Aeneid, but also within the Roman state proper. In Chapter One, I look at the way places and monuments are used to provoke memories and remembrance and how these memories were meant to be visually imprinted on the mind, likely, by all Romans. Voluntary imprinting, used by upperclass Romans in their mnemonic system, is contrasted with a look at how one, such as an emperor, could use monuments to impose involuntary imprinting by forcing people to remember particular events or individuals in specific ways. This construction of memory fabricates a specific past because it influences how and what an individual remembers.15

Chapter Two involves an examination of the Roman art of artificial memory through an analysis of Cicero’s de Oratore, Quintilian’s Institutio Oratoria, and the Rhetorica ad Herennium. To illustrate the practicalities behind the Roman artificial memory system and to understand how the system used visual imprints and fixed impressions I discuss Matteo Ricci’s memory palace, A.R. Luria’s case study of Shereshevskii, a modern practitioner of mnemotechnics, and Francis Bellezza’s recent cognitive perspective of how mnemonic techniques work.

In Chapter Three, I turn to Virgil’s Aeneid and look at how Virgil’s use of memorable images finds expression in the imagery that is rooted in the culture of the Roman place memory system. In this chapter I discuss how Virgil’s characters are portrayed as using the artificial memory system. Because the loci and imagines which the characters see before them are presented as though they

---

15 See Gowing especially Chapter 5.
are meant to be visually imprinted and fixed in their minds, this can be viewed as being similar to how an orator or any other user of the system would be expected to remember information. I will contrast some of the major scenes with their Homeric counterparts in order to fully illustrate that the mnemonic practice of visual imprinting and fixing impressions on the mind are special to the *Aeneid*. By doing so, I show how Virgil truly follows the pattern of the Roman art of memory and renders his characters as doing the same.

This thesis will show that memory was a cultural artifact, in that the process of remembering and recollection, manifest in nearly all facets of Roman existence, provides information about Roman culture and its elite users, that related to the Roman way of life and education. By understanding how remembering and recollection were inherently important to the Romans the modern reader can apprehend how Virgil, as a member of the Roman elite, either consciously or subconsciously, would portray his characters as being familiar not only with the system of artificial memory, but also with the Roman process of using different spaces and places to stimulate remembrance.
Chapter One

Rome’s buildings and monuments served as prompts for memory and as ‘pages’ from which memories could be erased. Places\(^1\) were especial reminders of past episodes and individuals, and pedestrians passing by the different spaces, which constituted the Roman cityscape, could view and read the messages embedded in the physical environment. As repositories for both personal and national memories, places not only served as vehicles which offered a direct connection to the past, but they also formed the basis for the Roman art of memory since physical places could be used as architectural figments to facilitate the recollection of personal memories. This idea that physical places could facilitate the retrieval and recollection of memories is the underpinning of this thesis. I not only examine how memory revolves around specific spaces, but also how Virgil in his epic, the *Aeneid*, constantly employs physical localities and space to evoke the personal memories of Aeneas and his other characters. My study in this thesis draws on research in five particular areas: sociology of memory, cognitive psychology, linguistics, and both Virgilian and Roman Rhetorical studies. In this introductory chapter I shall discuss how memory, being manifest in nearly all facets of Roman existence, played a role in some form in the everyday lives of all Romans; and how physical spaces are an integral part of a Roman’s memory process. To begin I will lead the reader on a topographical walk through the cityscape of Augustan Rome to show how it was an archive which ordered memories and made them accessible to people from all social strata, while showing how places had the power to visually imprint themselves upon people’s memory.\(^2\) I will examine memory as a significant component of political authority as well as Roman educational practices and Roman celebrations of the dead in order to show how these were contingent upon the use of places and space. In summation I will explain that because memory and the process of

---

\(^1\)When using the term place I am generally talking about a specific space that is occupied by or assigned to something, like monuments, buildings or physical localities, which are used to trigger memories and remembrance.

\(^2\) I am examining the cityscape of Augustan Rome rather than that of the Republican Rome because Virgil himself was writing the *Aeneid* circa 23-19 BC, during Augustus’ reign.
recollection figured prominently in the life of both the elite and in the lower classes, literate Romans would have easily recognized the visual memory and mnemonics which occur in the *Aeneid*.

I. THE CITY OF ROME—MEMORY AND REMEMBERING

Traveling to Rome via the Appian Way, in the late first century AD, would quite literally involve a walk through a Roman mnemonic gallery, which housed a sequence of images invoking memories of the past. In close succession, passers-by would witness tombs and monuments commemorating families, such as members of the Horatii, Curiatii and Metelli *gentes*, and individuals, like Messalla Corvinus or the Scipios, who had lived in and in some instances helped build the great city that loomed before a traveler on the road (figs.1a,b). The prominent and public location claimed by these Republican monuments ensured that the memories of their respective dead would be kept alive in the minds of all who passed. Petronius’ Trimalchio, amid the celebrations of his *convivium*, asserts that it was of the utmost importance to have a funereal monument which would be recognized by all who saw it as belonging to him. He declares that the tomb’s embellishment was to include a sundial, in the middle, so that whoever read the time would also read his name.

Trimalchio’s concern echoes that of the Romans in general. Maternus in Tacitus’ *Dialogus* also declares his hope that his statue will be set up near his tomb: *statuarque tumulo non maestus et atrox, sed hilaris et coronatus..., “[a]nd my prayer is that my effigy may be set up beside my grave, not sorrowful and*

---

3 Gowing (2005) 13

4 The Sepulcrum Eurysaces (figs.2a-d), located at a major intersection just before the Porta Maggiore in Rome, shows how important self-memoralization was. The master baker Eurysaces announces his professional success with a large cylindrical tomb, reminiscent of a baker’s granary. The figured friezes celebrate how he manufactured bread with the latest technology. This massive and ostentatious monument clearly illustrates that how one was remembered was of the utmost importance, Zanker (1988) 15.

5 *Satyricon* 71.
gloomy, but cheerful and wreathed with garlands...” (tr. Sir W. Peterson, adapt.).

By setting up his own particular effigy Maternus is able to control how he is remembered by those at his funeral and by posterity. For the Romans being remembered was of primary importance. In the case of both Trimalchio and Maternus a public and prominent reminder of who they were was especially important. For prominence meant memorability, and for the Romans, as for us today, something distinct meant it would likely be remembered and imprinted on one’s mind. Whether at the level of the state or of the individual, to a Roman, forgetting the past meant the loss of identity and even extinction.

Encountering the monuments that designated the graves of the deceased was both a visual and cultural experience, and one in which both text and image were used to perpetuate memory. Through the end of the late Republic to the end of the first century A.D., many funeral monuments employed both text and image in their commemoration of the dead. Cicero, in his *de Senectute*, emphasizes what I believe to be the value of reading both images and text on tombs, as vehicles through which a person can retreat into or revive the memory of the deceased:

*e*quidem non modo eos novi, qui sunt, sed eorum patres etiam et avos, nec sepulcra legens vereor, quod aiunt, ne memoriam perdam; his enim ipsis legendis in memoriam redeo mortuorum.

I, for my part, know not only those people who are living, but also their fathers and grandfathers; I do not fear, as I read what their tombs say, that I shall lose my memory; for, by reading them, I call back the memory of the dead (William Armistead Falconer, adapt.).

Cicero states that he does not worry about forgetting the deceased as long as he

---

6 *Dialogue* 13.6

7 *ad Herennium* 3.22.37

8 Gowing (2005) 2. The importance of remembrance can be further noted in the use of Roman wills. Frequently a will would name an heir who was responsible for maintaining and upkeeping the deceased’s tomb and allocate funds for the observance of the necessary rituals. For example, in one inscription a man left a sum of money to the college of naval engineers of Pisae so that they would celebrate annual festivals at his tomb, Davies 120-121. For this inscription see Appendix II, *ILS* 7258; and for other examples *ILS* 8370, 8373 see Appendix II. See Davies (2000) 217, n.8 for this information.

9 *de Senectute* 7.21
can read their grave markers. Since monuments typically had both inscribed texts and portraits along with architectural and sculptural imagery, a monument was ‘read’ in two different ways. First, the viewer could literally read the epitaph/words (*elogia*) inscribed on the monument proper,\(^{10}\) as the passage from the *Satyricon* aptly illustrates; and second, he or she could ‘read’ the *imagines* (images) carved on the tombstone itself.\(^{11}\) Trimalchio, in the same section of the *Satyricon*, clearly illustrates that he understands the importance of sculptural imagery as a vehicle to revive the memory of the dead in those still living. For he describes in great detail the ostentatious array of sculptural imagery that he wishes carved on it. This bombastic barrage of images meant that the tomb was intended to be a public affair, and Trimalchio expected and wanted it to be recognized and remembered.\(^{12}\)

Trimalchio, in setting up this elaborate tomb, expected visitors from all social strata to view his monument and understood that it was important to make the tomb accessible to passers-by with all levels of education and literacy. For many Romans were incapable of reading monument inscriptions and would likely incorporate their understanding of past and current events with the monument’s visual clues to understand its intended impact.\(^{13}\) Therefore visual images rooted in Roman traditions and a monument’s relationship with its architectural and topographical settings were important keys for an illiterate’s understanding about what a monument meant to convey, his or her experience of them,\(^{14}\) and whether it would remain impressed in one’s memory. For this reason, Trimalchio set his tomb in a huge and luxurious park and portrayed himself on a ceremonial dias

\(^{10}\) Normally these inscriptions contained information about the deceased’s career and his position in the family group. *Flower* (1996) 159.

\(^{11}\) Similar to tombstones are the death masks or *imagines* which are usually found in the atrium of the house. The death masks themselves were mnemonic reminders of the deceased ancestors and were worn by family members during funerals. The *tituli* which accompanied the *imago* were labels that, like the *elogia*, displayed the deceased’s name and likely offered an outline of his career, *Flower* (1996) 180ff.

\(^{12}\) For the information on text and image on funeral monuments see *Koortbojian* (1996) 210-233.

\(^{13}\) *Kuttner* (2000) 143

\(^{14}\) *Koortbojian* (1996) 213
wearing a purple-striped toga. As Koortbojian notes, “[i]n most cases, the inscriptions, by their simplicity, brevity and placement, suggested their correspondence with the portraits above them, and these conventions of form as well as the funerary context surely granted to the basic formula of *imago* [portrait] and *nomen* a fundamental, if rudimentary, comprehensibility”. This is well documented in the Tombs of Roman freedmen along the Via Statilia in Rome (figs. 3a-c). The *imago* of the deceased, set in a frame relief as if in a window, surmounts the biographical inscription; so the viewer could easily connect the *imago* with the *nomen*.6

Any viewer could comprehend the representation of Roman values and other symbolism inherent in the images, for the Romans were experienced readers of non-verbal texts and people from all classes could likely read messages embedded in their surroundings. As Diane Favro tells us in her book *The Urban Image of Rome*, “artwork conveyed information of diverse types and every level of complexity. Based upon a shared religious pantheon, common ancestry, and familiar iconographic vocabulary; pictorial representations provided legible documents”. Monumental tombs did exactly this. Through various types of imagery they conveyed the biographical content of a deceased individual. Many reliefs displayed the implements of the deceased’s profession, such as ironmonger’s tools or a shipwright bending over a boat he is constructing; others illustrate certain Roman values, such as the depiction of an aged *paterfamilias* which signifies the accomplishment and fulfillment of values like *gravitas*, *dignitas*, and *virtus* that were central to the idea of *Romanitas*. The arrangement of a woman’s hair in a variation of the *nodus* style, fashionable in the early Imperial court, suggested the aspirations of both the middle-class and freedmen to

---

15 Koortbojian (1996) 219
16 Zanker (1988) 15
17 Koortbojian (1996) 210-233
18 Favro (1996) 6
19 Favro (1996) 6
the standards prescribed by the elite. Associations were also made between
traditional figures and certain poses; for example a woman with her hand raised to
her chin and a veiled head alluded to the traditional personification of *Pudicitia* or
modesty.\(^{20}\)

The motifs to be carved on Trimalchio’s *statua* also conveyed information
which would have likely provided legible documents for the reader. Since
Trimalchio was establishing such a large and unique monument it was probable
that he wanted his tomb to be read and remembered by as many people as
possible. Therefore he would have constructed it to be legible by people of all
educational and literacy levels. For example Trimalchio requests that ships be
shown *plenis velis euntes*, going with full sail. A reader would probably not only
interpret this as a biographical detail about the success he had in the shipping
business, but also interpret it as the funerary figure which had a specific meaning
attached to it depending on the heading of the ship. Arriving ships conveyed the
meaning of death as a return to a safe port, to a place of eternal rest, while ships
setting out treat death as a departure (fig.4).\(^{21}\) Since ships, according to
Whitehead, were a very common funerary figure it was probable that he did not
expect anyone to have difficulty interpreting his message.\(^ {22}\)

Romans were accustomed to reading the content of images, not unlike
today’s modern society where people of all ages and educational backgrounds are
able to read and understand a majority of the visual images which dominate their
own cultures. For example, there are few people in North America who do not
understand what the MacDonald’s ‘M’ stands for. Even if a person has not
visited a MacDonald’s restaurant, he or she is likely to understand the meaning
inherent in the big yellow ‘M’ looming before them on the street, on television, or
in a magazine. Each culture has its own visual symbols that are used to trigger

\(^{20}\) Koorbojian (1996) 219-223

\(^{21}\) Figure 4 depicts a relief from a sarcophagus in the Praetextatus Museum. The departing ships,
loaded with amphorae, flanking a lighthouse are treating death as a departure. These ships are
probably quite similar to those depicted on Trimalchio’s funeral monument.

\(^{22}\) For further information on the *Cena Trimalchionis* and biographical narration see Whitehead
certain meanings and memories and act as a mode of communication. Roman funeral monuments operated in just this way. They, however, were not the only places to offer an urban narrative. When Augustus came to power in the late first century B.C., he set about restoring the war-torn city of Rome. By the end of his reign, Augustus had created his own engrossing and orderly urban narrative which not only told the story of Augustan Rome, but also triggered memories of the past. The Campus Martius, which I discuss in the next section, provided a clear proemial chapter to the Augustan text. \(^\text{23}\)

Before I talk about the monuments of Augustan Rome and how they promoted specific memories, I am going to analyze Roman educational practices in order to show how the Romans were trained to read the physical environment and therefore understand the messages in monuments and buildings. Upper-class Romans received specific training in the reading of physical environments as a part of their education in rhetoric in preparation for their public careers. Three Latin rhetorical authors of the first centuries B.C. and A.D., the anonymous author of the *ad Herennium*, Cicero, and Quintilian all describe the art with which an orator could improve his memory and deliver his long speeches infallibly. Each author instructed the reader to impress on his mind a series of physical places or *loci*, which are then marked with distinctive and sharply outlined mental images or *imagines* which represent the various concepts that the orator is trying to remember. Cicero, in his *de Oratore* explains the specific attributes of the *loci* and *imagines*:

...*locis est utendum multis, inlustribus, explicatis, modicis intervallis; imaginibus autem agentibus, acribus, insignitis, quae occurrere celeriterque percutere animum possint.*

...one must employ a large number of localities which must be clear and defined and at moderate intervals apart, and mental images that are effective and sharply outlined, and marked distinctively with the capacity of encountering and speedily penetrating the mind (E.W. Sutton, adapt.). \(^\text{24}\)

---

\(^{23}\) Favro (1993) 249

\(^{24}\) *de Oratore*, 2.87.358
To put it another way, in order for the orator to perfectly and precisely recall a long speech he would imagine walking through a chosen locus (space, place, or background), which might be a house, an intercolumnar space, a recess or perhaps an arch. While mentally journeying through his space he sees the images he has set up in a series inside or along the locus. As the orator comes across the imprinted mental pictures he merely reads off the contents secured by each custodial image. This method of memory training reminds us how important visual images and spatial order were to the Romans as organizers of objects, thoughts and experiences. Not only were visual images and spatial order important in daily life and in the reading of non-verbal texts, but they were also important in the art of oratory. Thus the experience of moving through different physical spaces and seeing places and images stored on the places both describe how the Romans interacted with their landscape and the techniques used by upper-class Romans as a mnemonic aid.

Even Romans with little formal education could be experts in environmental reading. The lower classes developed excellent visual mnemonic skills on their own. Living in metropolitan Rome with its convoluted byways and little in the way of street names, numbers, or signposts, residents of the city had to learn how to move about and orientate themselves in relation to specific visual landmarks. This type of information relied on a good visual and spatial memory. The second century B.C. playwright Terence, with comic exaggeration, illustrates how essential good environmental memories were for navigation:

Syrus: *at nomen nescio illius hominis, sed locum novi ubi sit.*
Demea: *dic ergo locum.*
Syrus: *nostin porticum apud macellum hac deorsum?*
Demea: *quid ni noverim?*
Syrus: *praeterito hac recta platea sursum: ubi eo veneris, Clivos deorsum vorsum est: hac te praecipitato; postea est ad hanc manum sacellum: ibi angiportum propter est.*
Demea: *quodnam?*
Syrus: *illi ubi etiam caprificus magna est.*
Demea: *novi.*

---

26 Favro (1993) 233-234
Syrus: *hac pergito.*
Demea: *id quidem angioprtum non est pervium.*
Demea: *scio.*
Syrus: *ubi eas praeterieris, ad sinistram hac recta platea; ubi ad Dianae ueneris, ito ad dextram: prius quam ad portam uenias, apud ipsum lacum est pistrilla, et exadvorsum fabrica: ibist.*

Without the knowledge of these notable urban features Syrus would not have been able to give Demea the directions he required and Demea would not have been able to follow them. This passage well illustrates how moving through an urban environment was a powerful way to learn and remember as the physical features present within the cityscape could be used as visual mnemonic cues for residents and visitors.

Romans with limited formal education also used the oral medium of story-telling, which relied upon visual images as organizational cues, to hone their visual mnemonic skills. As Diane Favro states, “familiar locales grounded the storyline in long epics; descriptions or environmental ambience set the tone for...”

---

27 *Adelphoe* 573-585
events to come‖. 28 Like the readers of painting and sculpture, the listeners of spoken stories had to fix images in their mind. When a story is presented in fixed visual images, as in physical works of art, the listeners must be able to read them together in order to understand the narrative that is being related. The visual images used to relate the story to the listener are not unlike the visual images seen on buildings and monuments. Both the viewer and listener must experience the images in a certain sequence in order to understand and remember the message that is being conveyed.29 If the viewer and listener do not understand the sequence of images it is difficult for them to interpret their meaning and change them into a form of verbalized expression.30 Thus people of all social strata learned to read, in some form, the images embedded in their surroundings even if they could not draw upon rhetorical training.

Whether they were educated in the art of memory and relied on their rhetorical training to associate images from around the city or did their best to draw connections between urban projects with similar visual traits or meanings, it was necessary that Romans of all classes were able to read content in buildings. For it was in the physical environment of the city that observers learned about politics, religion, and cultural norms imparted on physical objects. Patrons realized that people associated ideas with the images presented in the city and consequently incorporated clear and unambiguous messages on monuments and public as well as private displays of artwork, decorations and architecture to inform the citizenry. Different styles, textures and materials conveyed meanings which could be read by passers-by. For example, a sculpture of exotic-coloured marble would have suggested wealth and prompted links not only with the country of origin, but also with different works employing the same material. Likewise, moving through different physical spaces conveyed meanings, for example a sequence of dilapidated buildings vividly communicated municipal

28 Favro (1996) 7

29 According to the Auctor ad Herennium, in order to be able to accurately recall and properly remember information a sequence is of the utmost necessity (3.18.31).

30 Brilliant (1984) 15-20
poverty and lack of public pride, while clean and safe streets conveyed that there was a stable government in power.  

It was in this way that Augustus was able to communicate his specific intention to restore the Republic. During the early imperial period, a person strolling through the Roman cityscape would see buildings and monuments associated not only with men whose memories were kept alive within the exempla tradition, but also with the political traditions of the Roman Republic. Augustus used the city as a way to enforce what and how people remembered the past. The Campus Martius and the Forum of Augustus, which I discuss in the next section, were two important spaces which were designed and constructed in order to promote Augustus himself and his lineage. In both spaces Augustus as the architect controlled how an individual would read the urban narrative and what particular associations with historical events and personalities someone was introduced to. In the introduction to this thesis I suggested that the emperor could impose involuntary imprinting on people by controlling what one saw and thus remembered. By constructing and manipulating memories Augustus decided, similarly to how an individual’s tombstone functioned, what memories someone could and would imprint on his/her mind. This is important to understand because when I examine the art of artificial memory, what one decides to impress and imprint on his own mind is deliberately chosen and voluntary. 

In short, Rome was a landscape full of buildings and monuments which testified to the events of the past. Different buildings represented different points of time in Rome’s history, as the various triumphal arches represented specific campaigns and the Curia recalled the Republican age. Walking through Rome,

---

32 Gowing (2005) 132
33 Gowing (2005) 132-146
34 This is not found in the case of Aeneas. Although Virgil portrays him as using the architectural mnemonic system to remember, all his memories are specifically imposed on him, see Chapter 2 of this thesis.
35 Hales (2003) 55
strollers not only would see public monuments, such as the Circus Flamininus and Porticus Metelli which preserved the names and *memoriae* of great military heroes, and could trace the political presence of certain leading families, such as the Scipios, through the topography of their dedications, but also strollers could see the elite *domus*, which acted as mnemonic prompts for the inhabitant’s public significance. A Roman’s house supplied a permanent visibility within the political landscape and gave the owner not only a place from which to see and to be seen but also a place to record family history and political successes. Buildings and monuments were meant to be advertisements of past achievements and to evoke memories of past events and individuals. This is underscored in Cicero’s *de Finibus*, as Piso is made to comment about how the sight of the senate house called up thoughts of Scipio, Cato, Laelius and his grandfather:

Equidem etiam curiam nostram—Hostiliam dico, non hanc novam, quae minor mihi esse videtur, posteaquam est maior—solebam intuens Scipionem, Catonem, Laelium, nostrum vero in primis avum cogitare; tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis; ut non sine causa ex iis memoriae ducta sit disciplina.

For my own part, even the sight of our senate-house at home (I mean the Curia Hostilia, not the present new building, which looks to my eyes smaller since its enlargement) used to call up thoughts to me of Scipio, Cato, Laelius, and chief of all, my grandfather; such powers of suggestion do places possess. No wonder the scientific training of memory is based upon locality (tr. H. Rackham).

Thus, buildings and monuments, which were observed on a daily basis, served as a stimulus for memories of certain events and particular people from the past.

II. THE CITY OF ROME—AN URBAN NARRATIVE

Walking into Rome along the Via Flaminia, in the late first century B.C., a traveler would have discovered an extensive urban narrative which was meant to interact with the viewer and relay a wealth of information about Rome and the People.  

---

36 Hales (2003) 46-47 and 56-57, not only was the atrium used to house the *imagines* and spoils from past battles which reminded visitors about the status and pedigree of their host but also, the entrance was a place to record special honours accorded by the people and record political successes and family events.


38 *de Finibus* 5.2
emperor himself. The Augustan narrative first becomes legible at the point where the Flaminia crosses the Tiber River. In order to commemorate his reconstructing and lengthening of the Flaminia in 27B.C., Augustus erected an arch on the Mulvian Bridge with a representation of himself situated on top, looking at all who approached Rome.\textsuperscript{39} Visitors or residents arriving at Rome would see the leader who now held power and had “restored the Republic”. This arch surmounted by Augustus’ \textit{imago}, in my opinion, served not only to educate travelers as to who had initiated the new set of imagery and who the urban author was of the features they were about to see and read, but also who intended to renew religion and custom, \textit{virtus}, and the honour of the Roman people.\textsuperscript{40}

Passing through the doorway into the capital, travelers walking along the Flaminia would see the major features which Augustus and his supporters had built (fig.5). This road, acting as a platform from which viewers could read the urban narrative, ensured that most observers would read the text in the same order. In this way Augustus illustrated his control over the urban narrative. Analogous to the Via Appia where observers witnessed a series of Republican tombs, travelers on the Flaminian road similarly encountered tombs dating from the Republican era. After having paused to look at the elaborate tombs and their imagery, travelers would then see the Mausoleum Augusti, which dominated the natural landscape between the Tiber and Via Flaminia, on the northern edge of the Campus Martius. Augustus had erected this in 28B.C., likely in demonstration of his great power, which had culminated with his ‘restoration’ of the Republic, conquest of Illyricum, victory at Actium, and his annexation of Egypt.\textsuperscript{41} From afar the Mausoleum adhered to the principles, which Cicero cites in his \textit{de Oratore}, regarding the type of places and images which facilitate remembrance:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Favo (1993) 238
\item Favo (1993) 238 and Zanker (1988) 98-102
\item Favo (1993) 239. The reason this is all speculative is that we do not know for sure what associations the ancient Romans actually made when looking at these different monuments and buildings, and second scholars have long conjectured over the prototypes Augustus used when he had the Mausoleum built.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
...locis est utendum multis, inlustribus, explicatis, modicis intervallis; imaginibus autem agentibus, acribus, insignitis, quae occurrere celeriterque percutere animum possint.

...one must employ a large number of localities which must be clear and defined and at moderate intervals apart, and mental images that are effective and sharply outlined, and marked distinctively with the capacity of encountering and speedily penetrating the mind (E.W. Sutton, adapt).  

The Mausoleum’s simple and natural shape and massive dimensions gave it a clear and defined quality, which could be described from a great distance (figs.6a, b). A viewer would easily have recognized its two concentric cylinders, both sheathed in marble or travertine, between which trees were planted. Even if an observer did not draw closer to inspect the more detailed text, which I will discuss in a moment, the monument itself, a locus for memory, would have easily been imprinted on the mind; for the sheer size of the monument made it an artifact memorable to all who saw it. Erected after the three major victories of Augustus, a viewer would have not only seen this as a triumphal monument celebrating his successes and as a statement that Augustus’ power was the greatest and that he alone was capable of returning order to the war-torn Roman state, but also as a proclamation of the dynasty he had founded, since the Mausoleum was meant to contain his ashes and those of his ancestors. It also suggested links between Augustus and the great men of Rome’s past, since burial in the Campus Martius had been previously restricted to summi viri, such as Sulla, Julius Caesar and his daughter Julia, and the consuls A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa who died at the battle of Mutina in 43 B.C. fighting against Antony.

On closer observation of the tomb an educated reader would probably have noted allusions drawn to different precursors and the associations made between the princeps and other great leaders, thus evoking memories of diverse forerunners. Since different styles, textures and materials conveyed meanings

---

42 de Oratore 2.87.358

43 Strabo 5.3.9, offers a description of the Mausoleum.


45 Davies (2000) 137-142
which could be read by passers-by, Roman viewers likely would see, as Davies suggests, “...the masonry articulation dividing the slopes, as well as the prominent base wall...[as maybe having] found its inspiration in the Republican tombs of modest size lining the roads into Rome”.\footnote{Davies (2000) 52} Viewers also would, in all probability, have noted that its architectural quality as well as its sheer size, recalled the dynastic tombs of Asia Minor, such as the Mausoleum at Halicarnassos (fig.7); and elements, such as the pair of small, uninscribed red granite obelisks set off from either side of the entrance, (see fig.6b), featured in the Mausoleum’s decoration likely triggered memories of Egypt since Egyptian style obelisks made of exotic red granite obtained from Syene flanked the entrance (figs. 8, 9).\footnote{Davies (2000) 15, 60}

Observers may also have gathered that Augustus’ tomb style was derived from the glorious tombs of princes of Troy, who were important figures in the founding of the Roman state and the ancestors of the Julii;\footnote{Holloway (1966) 171-173 describes the tomb of Augustus and its association with the princes of Troy and provides information on the references to tombs in the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Aeneid}.} the royal Lydian mounds of Anatolia; the famous circular tomb of Alexander the Great; and the Etruscan tumuli of Italy, which were associated with the ancestors of the Republic that Augustus claimed to restore (fig.10).\footnote{Favro (1996) 117-118 and Davies (2000) 51-67 for a fuller discussion. Cf. also Reeder (1992) 265-307, who focuses on the circular form of the Mausoleum of Augustus.}

As a traveler continued south along the Via Flaminia he would have seen a collection of new monuments. First a tall Egyptian obelisk in red granite served as the gnomon of Augustus’ colossal sundial (the Solarium or Horologium Augusti) (fig.11). Directly north of the tall stone needle lay an expansive travertine paved area, inlaid with bronze lines that traced the dovetail shaped outline associated with solar timepieces (fig.12). On a clear and sunny day observers would see the obelisk’s shadow pointing to the bronze lines and words marking the hours of the day, months, signs of the zodiac and the seasonal winds
Upon seeing this immense obelisk and timepiece in Augustus’ funerary complex, a Roman would understand the image of eternity that Augustus was trying to communicate. While the shadow of the giant gnomon forever retraced its own course as years, months and seasons repeated themselves, Romans would not only be mindful of the notion of eternity through the ceaseless repetition of time and in the infinite symbols of the circular zodiac and celestial bodies, but also interpret this monument as being a confirmation of infinite time and that Augustus as its commissioner, like the sun-god Apollo, was the regulator of time. The image of eternity juxtaposed with the dynastic imagery of the Mausoleum and the Ara Pacis, the monument I will talk about next, marked the revival of the Julian line, through which Augustus would end the civil war and order the chaos of Rome, and to which Rome’s own eternity was inextricably linked. The smaller obelisks outside the Mausoleum echoed the sundial’s pointer to ensure the connection between the sun and the Julian dynasty and affirming Augustus’ immortality, since his divine characteristics would be reborn in future generations. This specific place is a vehicle for memory, as it not only reminded viewers of Augustus’ and Agrippa’s annexation of Egypt and triumph over Marc Antony and Cleopatra at the Battle of Actium in 31B.C., but also because it reminded the viewer that time, like the everlasting reign of Augustus and his progeny, was perpetual and cyclical.

After having taken in the details of the Mausoleum and Horologium Augusti, observers would have noticed a small building to the east. This

---

50 Favro (1993) 241

51 Davies (2000) 93-94. To further emphasize that Augustus was the regulator of time and that his rule was predestined from the time of his birth, he had the Solarium Augusti constructed so that the shadow from the gnomon would point directly at the Ara Pacis Augustae on his birthday, Zanker (1988) 144.

52 Davies (2000) 93-94

53 This obelisk not only triggered memories because it was an object traditionally found in Egypt, but also because this specific obelisk had its base inscribed with a proclamation declaring Augustus’ subjugation of Cleopatra’s Egypt that had happened twenty years prior (CIL.6.702), and it was the actual obelisk which Augustus carried from Egypt, Zanker (1988) 144, Favro (1993) 243 and Clarke (2003) 23.

54 Clarke (2003) 23
monument which, when viewed from afar, appeared as a rectangular solid with an embossed exterior wall. Again, like the Mausoleum of Augustus, the simple shape gave it a clear and defined quality which would allow the monument to be visually imprinted on the mind. Only upon closer inspection did it reveal a world of carved reliefs and new types of imagery. This monument was the Ara Pacis or Altar of Peace (13-9 B.C.). Dedicated on the birthday of Augustus’ wife Livia, it celebrated his triumphant return from Spain and Gaul, and inaugurated his victory since he had declined the traditional triumphal procession. This new altar portrayed the union of Augustus’ family with the official priesthoods at the time of the altar’s dedication, rather than presenting the moment of triumphal procession. The altar had two horizontal registers of carved reliefs: the lower consisted of stylized nature and acanthus tendrils, while the upper was decorated with figural processions (figs.14a, b). The south and north sides of the Ara Pacis were embellished with two processional friezes which readers could interpret twofold: as commemorating the inauguration of the altar itself or as a tribute to Augustan religious piety (figs.15a, b, 16a, b). On the east and west side of the monument viewers could enjoy the mythological reliefs celebrating Rome’s origins, her illustrious history, and the divine lineage and achievements of the Julii (fig.17). The lower register with its stylized nature frieze offered an array of possible interpretations as flora and fauna were vehicles through which different meanings were communicated to the ancient reader. While viewers looking at the different friezes would likely have been unable to interpret everything they saw before them, the elite as well as the non-elite would have been able to

---

55 This was the first time that children appeared on any major public monument. Even the dress of some of the characters was unusual: little girls are dressed in the toga, normally limited to free male citizens and two of the male children wear barbarian garments, Clarke (2003) 24-25.

56 The date of the altar remains uncertain, Favro (1993) 254 n.38.

57 Clarke (2003) 24

58 I have not shown the whole of the north and south side friezes. To see the rest of the reliefs see the plates at the back of Zehak.

interpret some of the vast array of imagery. For example ordinary viewers would have connected Aeneas’ sacrificial offering, seen on the west side, with the ritual that took place annually at the Ara Pacis (fig.18). They also would have been able to interpret the significance behind the presence of the small children, who walked in the procession with Augustus to celebrate the dedication of the altar (fig.19): exemplifying their (the children’s) education in the virtue of piety (*pietas*) and therefore providing an exemplum of what all parents should emulate when raising their children; they stood for the future of the Julio-Claudian dynasty as their bodies were vehicles for the blood and seed of the future generations, and for the new Romans who were to carry on the Republic. A more perceptive viewer, however, may have linked the image of Aeneas sacrificing with Augustus, who has his head veiled with his toga (*capite velato*),\(^{60}\) and appears closest to the panel of Aeneas on the south side of the processional frieze.\(^{61}\) Whilst the Ara Pacis contributed to the urban narrative, as did the Mausoleum and Horologium Augusti, it also was an important place for memory. Even if a viewer could not understand the imagery present on the altar proper, it was likely that he or she could understand that this monument was a memorial commemorating Augustus’s triumph in Spain and Gaul, the peace that Augustus brought to Rome and her Empire, and how the past, present and future of Rome was tied to Augustus and his family.\(^{62}\)

Each of these visual images acted as prompts to force the viewer to establish a connection between the past and the present. For the literate, this could also be accomplished in a literary context. Poetry and prose often established a link between the present and past. Virgil’s *Aeneid* not only establishes the divine heritage of Rome’s new *princeps* and his family, but also makes characters and moments from the Republic, especially in Book Six and on the Shield of Aeneas in Book Eight, which Aeneas sees and is meant to remember

---

\(^{60}\) Augustus’ toga is pulled over his head (*capite velato*) which indicates that he is about to sacrifice, Rehak (2006) 122,123.

\(^{61}\) Clarke (2003)25-26 and 256

\(^{62}\) Favro (1993) 241
(discussed in Chapter Three) a part of the foundation epic and the destiny of Rome.\textsuperscript{63}

While the monuments in the Campus Martius were archives for specific memories, the Augustan composition and arrangement of these monuments drew upon the rhetorical principles of the art of memory. The author of the \textit{ad Herennium} advises orators to carefully organize their \textit{loci} (places) set moderately apart so they can be easily perceived by the natural memory,\textit{[l]ocos appellantus eos qui breviter, perfecte, insignite aut natura aut manu sunt absoluti, ut eos facile naturali memoria comprehendere et amplecti queamus...}.\textsuperscript{64} “[w]e call places those things which by nature or by artifice are for a short distance, totally, and strikingly complete so that we can comprehend and embrace them easily with natural memory” (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small).\textsuperscript{65} The layout of these monuments corresponds precisely to the author’s advice. Augustus established his Mausoleum so it could be easily sighted from a distance, as travelers passed over the Mulvian Bridge, 3,300m to the North; whilst the Ara Pacis and Horologium Augusti, each had their own spacing which allowed them to be viewed at distances appropriate to their scale and easily remembered. To further facilitate the remembrance of these monuments, Augustus as \textit{conditor} (author) encouraged a dynamic urban narrative with distinguishing features. The author of the \textit{ad Herennium} instructs an orator to use strange and novel things to aid remembrance since the mind is able to hold onto them for a longer time, \textit{nec hoc alia de causa potest accidere nisis quod usitatae res facile e memoria elabuntur, insignes et novae diutius manent in animo}, “[n]or could this be so for any other reason than that ordinary things easily slip from the memory while the striking and novel stay longer in mind” (tr. Harry Caplan).\textsuperscript{66}

Augustus, likewise, used many memorable images and decorations in the Campus Martius, partially, in my opinion, so he could create something unique

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{63} Gowing (2005) 19
\item \textsuperscript{64} \textit{ad Herennium} 3.16.29
\item \textsuperscript{65} Small (1997) 98
\item \textsuperscript{66} \textit{ad Herennium} 3.22.35
\end{itemize}
and distinct which set him apart from all other builders, and also so he could make sure that his structures stuck fast to the minds of all who observed them: the Mausoleum’s extraordinary size, the obelisk’s and Horologium’s scientific precision,\textsuperscript{67} the Ara Pacis’s new and exquisite imagery, and the Diribitorium’s (the building in which votes were cast by the people) unique construction,\textsuperscript{68} all made their structures distinctive and truly memorable. As a member of the elite, Augustus was probably trained in the rhetoric of oratory and thus learned the fine art of mnemotechnics. He knew that \textit{memoria} was both the power or faculty of remembering and the action of remembering or remembrance and therefore he understood that unique structures would help secure his place in the collective memory of the Roman people; for like an historian he was handing down memory of the past to the future.\textsuperscript{69}

Before I turn to memory and political authority I want to present one more illustration that demonstrates how places were storehouses for memory. I am going to move from the Via Flaminia to the Forum Augustum, a place where memory was visually organized and prominently showcased. Situated to the northeast of the Forum Iulium, the Forum Augustum, at right angles to Caesar’s Forum, either faced or joined the Forum Iulium’s north wall.\textsuperscript{70} This close proximity not only established a physical proximity between kin, but also created a physical connection between the Republic and Imperial Period. Situated in the center of the city, Augustus created an exhibition of illustrious figures centered around the temple of Mars Ultor (fig.20). Visually and structurally the statues and sculptures of Rome’s past were organized according to Quintilian’s advice on how to organize places and objects in order to easily facilitate the assimilation and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[67] Every year on the afternoon of Augustus’ birthday (September 23) the shadow of the obelisk pointed to the west entrance of the Ara Pacis, Clarke (2003) 23.
\item[68] The Diribitorium was probably the largest building over which a single roof had been ever constructed. It could only have been built with advances in truss construction, Favro (1996) 187, 269. For a description see Cassius Dio’s \textit{Roman History} 55.8.
\item[69] Favro (1993) 248-249
\end{footnotes}
recollection of information.71 As a visitor walked through the main entrance of the forum, flanking the entrance were two long colonnades, into the walls of which rectangular niches were cut. The walls toward the end of the forum curved outwards to create a semicircular shape and were also carved with niches (figs.21a,b). These niches housed the statues of seminal figures, the *summi viri*, from Rome’s past. Where the walls curved outwards to form semicircles, the central niche of the left hemicycle portrayed Aeneas and Anchises with members of the *gens Iulia* on either side, and Romulus and more *summi viri* in the right hemicycle. Each niche was labeled with an identifying *titulus* (inscription) and a brief *elogium* (epitaph) regarding the figure’s achievements; and thus both image and text interacted to memorialize the memory of many great men from Rome’s past (fig. 22).72 As an observer wandered through the forum he or she would have a chance to look at each figure one after another. Each statue was presented with the conditions necessary to commit each person and their deeds to memory: they were set off from one another on a small scale, complete and conspicuous.73 Regardless of education, most Romans would have seen and understood that this gallery of men was a way for Augustus to situate himself in proximate distance to those with whom he most wished to be associated. Men such as Cicero, Brutus or Cassius, who were not seen as contributing to the “rise of Rome”, were not displayed among this group whose memory was forever to be memorialized in conjunction with Augustus.74 As Quintilian states:

[n]am cum in loca aliqua post tempus reversi sumus, non ipsa agnoscimus tantum sed etiam quae in iis fecerimus reminiscimus, personaeque subeunt, nonnumquam tacitae quoque cogitationes in mentem revertuntur.

[If]or when we return to a place after considerable absence, we not merely recognize the place itself, but remember things that we did there, and recall the

71 *Instituto Oratoria* 11.2.17-22

72 Gowing (2005) 138-145

73 *ad Herennium* 3.16.29

74 Gowing (2005) 145 and Zanker (1988) 211. In essence this was a form of *damnatio memoriae* which will be the subject of my next section.
persons whom we met and even the unuttered thoughts which passed through our minds when we were there before (tr. H.E. Butler),\textsuperscript{75}

Augustus realized that people, in their memories, would forever connect him with Republican heroes and the gods once they had seen him situated among them in the space of the Forum Augustum.\textsuperscript{76} For images worked to “convey meaning or evoke recognition and response by the way in which the subject was rendered, through attributes, costume, posture, and so on.”\textsuperscript{77} The whole forum, similar to the monuments along the Via Flaminia, worked to memorialize and remind the viewer of Augustus’ divine ancestry and to place him in the center of the viewer’s memory together with the other summi viri who had contributed to the making of the Republic and the awesome city of Rome.\textsuperscript{78} Horace tells his reader in the \textit{Ars Poetica} that, \textit{segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem, quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus et quae/ ipse sibi tradit spectator,} “things received through the ear stir the emotions more slowly than those which are exposed to the trusty eye and hence conveyed to the watcher” (tr. Niall Rudd, adapt.).\textsuperscript{79} Augustus himself physically accomplished this by using visual images as a medium to effectively convey ideas to the populace.

In sum, Augustus rewrote Rome’s urban text in order to communicate the objectives of his rule and create a legible text about his role as princeps of the Roman state. He realized that “[i]mages drew their meaning not only from who or what they represented and how they represented them, but also from the context in which they were placed;”\textsuperscript{80} and that places, resonant with memories of the past, had the power to imprint themselves upon people’s memories. Therefore

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Institutio Oratoria} 11.2. 17
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{76} The pedimental statue on the temple of Mars housed the figures of Mars himself, Fortuna and Venus, and Roma and Romulus, Gowing (2005) 145.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{77} Gregory (1994) 84
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{78} Gowing (2005) 145
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Ars Poetica} 180-182
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{80} Gregory (1994) 85
\end{flushright}
Augustus used them to advance his political agenda.\textsuperscript{81} Thus, as we have seen, memory is about visual prompts and the reading of the physical environment and an orator’s training in the art of memory is a microcosm of the way remembrance was employed by people of all classes and backgrounds in the Roman landscape.

III. PLACE, SPACE, AND ROME-- A CITY OF REMEMBERING AND FORGETTING

The Romans employed a variety of penalties that were intended to either limit or destroy a member of the senatorial aristocracy who had ‘fallen from grace’. A deliberately imposed ban on remembrance was considered to be the severest penalty which could be imposed upon a member of the elite. The punishment of\textit{ damnatio memoriae}, a modern term, is the (usually) symbolic and paradigmatic posthumous erasing of someone’s memory and misdeeds by obliterating all manifest traces of them from public and private life: a way to impose a limitation on their remembrance. This penalty, ultimately directed at the reputation of the accused, was meant to change the way people and society remembered that individual\textsuperscript{82} and aimed to change the picture of the past either through erasure, redefinition, or through both.\textsuperscript{83} A person’s symbolic obliteration would make remembering difficult and painful and therefore new memories would be created to replace the old. These new memories, in turn, would become a part of history and what was remembered.\textsuperscript{84}

In this section I am going to show how memory was a significant component of political authority by analyzing the\textit{ Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre}. Examining the Senate’s six imposed posthumous penalties, what the penalties meant in terms of the destruction of Piso’s reputation and memory, and why they were employed, will allow me to show how places and space were very important to memory in the Roman world. Furthermore I will expand upon

\textsuperscript{81} Edwards (1996) 43


\textsuperscript{83} Flower (2006) 2

\textsuperscript{84} Thanks to Dr. Gordon Shrimpton who suggested this point.
Roman celebrations of the dead and funerary practices, domestic architecture, and the spectacle of the Roman triumph to show how the Romans could create their own space within the public sphere to commemorate themselves and remind others of their personal achievements and vivify the memory of their ancestors.

Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, the former legate of Syria and consul of 7 B.C., committed suicide just prior to his formal condemnation before the Senate. In lieu, the Senate imposed six posthumous penalties upon Piso in order to punish him for his crimes: which initially were high treason and the murder of Germanicus Caesar, but also included insubordination, fomenting civil war, corrupting military discipline and violating the divinity of Divus Augustus. These penalties were duly recorded in the senatus consultum of 10 December AD 20 (see Appendix I for the full version of the S.c. de Pisone):

1) The senate forbade the public mourning of his death by the women of his family.
2) All statues and portraits of him were to be removed
3) Members of the Calpurnian family by either blood or marriage were told not to carry the portrait mask of Piso among the other imaginés at funerals or that his portrait be placed among the other portraits of the members of the Calpurnian gens.
4) Cn. Piso’s name was to be erased from the inscription on the statue of Germanicus Caesar in the Campus Martius next to the Altar of Providentia.
5) Piso’s property, with the exception of the saltus or wooded land in Illyricum, which was to be returned to Tiberius Caesar Augustus, was declared public property. It was, however, returned to his two sons and grand-daughter on the condition that the elder son changed his praenomen from Gnaeus.
6) The structure Piso built above the Porta Fontinalis to connect his private residences was to be removed and destroyed.

Before I discuss how these penalties symbolized and/ or actualized the destruction of Piso’s reputation and memory, I think it is important to understand what these imposed punishments meant in the terms of memory and history.

---


Copies of the *senatus consultum* document, which not only contained the penalties imposed upon Piso, but also the senate’s actions and judgments concerning him, his immediate family members and those who were viewed as accomplices in the crimes, were inset with orders that the decree “be affixed in the most frequented city of every province and in the most frequented place of that city; and likewise that this decree of the Senate be affixed in the winter quarters of each legion near the standards” (170-173) (tr. Cynthia Damon). This proves interesting, because, while the Romans were trying to suppress the memory of Piso and erase him from all facets of public and private life, they also did their utmost to make sure that his offences were not forgotten in any corner of the Roman Empire. As a result the memory of Piso was indirectly reinforced.

Why would the Romans carry out two seemingly contradictory motions, in other words why would they try to erase the memory of an enemy whose memory would nonetheless be reinforced, since the continuance of memory was essential to the success of repression?  

*Damnatio memoriae* is derived from the normal process of memorialization in which reminders of past episodes and individuals use narratives and representations/visual prompts to trigger memories. When the memory of a public enemy is being attacked, repression is directed against his representation; the representation which is normally used to memorialize an individual. Having a person’s representation removed from public and private space meant that his means to be properly commemorated and remembered was also obliterated. Commemoration was a badge of identity for the politically elite rank. If commemoration was banned or limited, the class of officeholders, who were defined in terms of recognition during life and in terms of memory after death, would lose their identity and status.

---

87 Flower (1998) 156-157

88 For this idea that *damnatio memoriae* reinforces the memory of the public enemy see Hedrick (2000), 114.

89 Flower (2006) 9. Memory sanctions, designed to remove or prevent the commemorative strategies that were important to a Roman, can be likened to that of exile. Both forced a person to move outside the territory of the city, to a place that was not Roman, Flower (2006) 5.
from a public monument, the erasure would always be a reminder to passers-by of what lay beneath and was a marker of the individual’s disgrace. Even bans on both mourning and on using the name of a traitor had the effect of keeping his memory alive because an individual has to remember whose name is not to be used. So damnatio memoriae uses the normal process of memorialization and transforms it into memories which are not to be commemorated.\textsuperscript{90} To put it another way, when a public enemy was removed from commemorative installations, such as monuments or inscriptions, he was essentially being removed from historia. The Roman conception of historia had the generalized notion of being any attempt to transmit the past. Therefore, if an individual was removed from sources which relayed historical information, he was in fact being deleted from public memory. For it was through historia that memoria was given life and rendered immortal. Cicero, in his de Oratore, clearly outlines the interrelationship between both and illustrates the connection between the living and the dead in Roman thought: [emphasis] historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia nisi oratoris immortalitati commendatur?, “[a]nd as History, which bears witness to the passing of the ages, sheds light upon reality, gives life to recollection and guidance to human existence, and brings tidings of ancient days, whose voice, but the orator’s, can entrust her to immortality?” (tr. E.W. Sutton).\textsuperscript{91} Thus, even though a public enemy may remain in peoples’ memories, as long as an individual is not commemorated, he becomes consigned to oblivion since commemoration, which was crucial to Roman society, was the only way to enjoy an existence in or influence the events of the present.\textsuperscript{92} So while Piso would remain in the memories of people, because the senators meant his deeds to act as exempla for posterity

\textsuperscript{90} Hedrick (2000) 113-114 and thanks to Dr. Gordon Shrimpton for his valuable insight on this point.

\textsuperscript{91} de Oratore 2.9.36

and serve strong statements to the provinces and to the armies, he would not be commemorated, rather he would lose the distinguishing mark of the politically elite rank, and therefore would only be remembered in terms of disgrace and no longer a part of the sacred community of the dead that was an important part of Rome’s culture. Therefore memoria does not mean memory so much as positive commemoration, while damnatio ensures the memory of an individual in terms of disgrace and the denial of commemoration.

The first prescribed penalty, forbidding the public mourning of Piso’s death by the women of his family appears to have had one main function—to deny Piso the public spectacle to which as an office-holder he was entitled. Women were a vital aspect of the mourning process because they acted as important visible public reminders of the men they mourned. Women normally signaled their bereavement for a year through wearing distinctive headdresses and avoiding jewelry and white or colored clothing. Thus the public, by means of the women of the household, would have been visually reminded of the deceased. By preventing women’s public mourning, Tiberius not only imposed a ban on Piso’s remembrance as he was refused the traditional display of public mourning, which would have been a visual reminder to all those living in Rome about who he was and what his socio-political status was, but he also prevented Piso’s family from moving his memory into public space, a venue for remembrance. By not being allowed to enter the public domain, Piso’s memory was silenced through the absence of his representation. What would only be remembered was his public disgrace, symbolized by the absence of his funeral and procession before the entire community. Piso would not be commemorated, and while he would remain in the memories of people, as a disgraced figure, he would no longer be a

93 Bodel (1999) 44

94 Men mourned only until the end of the burial rites wearing the toga sordida, (normally the ninth day after the inhumation of the body) Bodel (1999) 46.

95 Hedrick (2000) 122
part of his *domus* or wider *gens* since he was no longer to be remembered or celebrated by his family or community.\(^96\)

The second penalty, which involved having all statues, portraits, and any inscriptions accompanying these portraits removed, was meant to specifically suppress Piso from public memory.\(^97\) For monuments, structures or objects were designed to evoke memories of past events and individuals. By ordering Piso’s portraits and statues to be damaged and inscriptions with his name to be erased, public reminders of him disappeared and he was no longer meant to be remembered in his previous capacity as consul or legate. The visual denigration which appeared in Rome and across the Empire served as reminders of his dishonour and expressed the abstract concepts of *iniuria* (insult and injustice) and *infamia* (disgrace and shame) with which he was posthumously associated.\(^98\) Deprived of the visual public prompts and the public and private spaces which had previously communicated his position and his past glories, Piso was essentially removed from Rome’s history and his link with society was severed.

The third measure ensures that Piso’s *imago* did not appear in public, in the family line at funerals or in the atria of family members. A person’s *imago* was particularly important because it served as visual memory prompt not only to family, but also to visitors of the *domus* and to the public when it was carried during family funereal processions. Polybius clearly illustrates that for a man like Piso his *imago* was a vital part in maintaining his position within his *gens*, for it would always be a reminder, since it was meant to be visually displayed, of the contributions he had made and the reputation he had held while he was alive:\(^99\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{μετὰ δὲ ταύτα θάψαντες καὶ ποιήσαντες τὰ νομίζόμενα, τὴν ἑικόνα τοῦ μεταλλάξαντος ἐις τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον τῆς οἰκίας, ξύλινα ναίδια περιτιθέντες. Ἡ δὲ ἑικών ἐστι πρόσωπον ἐις ὁμοιότητα διαφέροντος ἐξειργασμένον καὶ κατὰ τὴν πλάσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑπογραφὴν. ταύτας δὴ τὰς ἑικόνας ἐν τε ταῖς δημοτελεῖσθαι θυσίας.}\end{align*}\]

\(^96\) Flower (1998) 159 and Bodel (1999) 46

\(^97\) Flower (1998) 160-161

\(^98\) Varner (2004) 3

\(^99\) Flower (1996) 29-31
With the removal of his *imago*, which would have been labeled with a *titulus* that recorded his name and offered an outline of his career, Piso was removed from his place in the family in image, text and domestic ritual.\(^{101}\) Again, the absence of his representation in both the private and public sphere meant there was no longer a visual reminder about who had died and his achievements and no way for Piso to promote his *Romanitas*.\(^{102}\) All that remained, in his absence from the pageants of familial self-advertisement, was the memory of his disgrace.

The fourth penalty required Piso’s name to be erased from the statue base of Germanicus, erected by the *sodales Augustales* (priests of Augustus concerned with cultivating the *numen* or will of Augustus). This erasure was meant to be a symbolic statement, illustrating the severed link between Piso and Germanicus and between Piso, Augustus, and members of the ruling house. By promoting this erasure, Tiberius was removing specific aspects of memory that were considered significant by the political elite—a connection with the Imperial household and public recognition of respected posts; which he had previously achieved by his status as a *sodalis Augustalis*.\(^{103}\) As mentioned above, monuments were places which communicated details about past events and individuals. Thus Germanicus’ statue base prior to the condemnation of Piso’s memory would have served to

\(^{100}\) *Historiae* 6.53.4-7

\(^{101}\) Flower (1998) 172

\(^{102}\) For the information on *Romanitas* see Hales (2003) 48.

\(^{103}\) Flower (1998) 162-163
remind people of the important position that Piso had held; with the inscription’s removal, however, only a reminder of Piso’s dishonour remained.  

The fifth measure, which dealt with Piso’s property, served the main purpose of destroying his reputation. The estate given to him by Augustus was repossessed and once again became imperial property. This functioned not only to sever the material connection between Augustus and Piso, but also since a house and property were physical reminders to the general public of one’s previous successes, by having this segment of Piso’s land revoked which Piso had gained through his association with Augustus, Tiberius openly illustrated Piso’s ignominy. Furthermore, with the rest of the property having been reclaimed, Piso was not able to bequeath his estate to his family members. This allowed the senate and princeps to make the land a gift to Piso’s heirs, thus underscoring that Piso no longer held a respected position within his family, circle of friends or within the general community. 

The last penalty ordered the obliteration of the structures Piso had built above the Porta Fontinalis to connect his private residences. First, there are two ways to interpret this decree since the Latin is ambiguous about the position of the structures. The text reads, *uti Cn. Piso pater supra portam Fontinalem quae inaedificasse...*, “that which [the structures] the elder Cn. Piso had built above the Fontinal gate...” (tr. Cynthia Damon, adapt.) (106). This line can be either interpreted as Piso had built his structures above the Porta Fontinalis so they physically spanned a public gate in the Servian wall or he had built his structures above it meaning that they were only visible above the public gate. Tacitus’ description of Piso’s arrival at Rome gives a brief account of Piso’s *domus*, which he states was, *domus foro imminens*, “looming over the forum” (tr. A.J.

---

104 An example of an inscription where Piso’s name is erased is ILS 95, found on a marble base in the Campus Martius in 1547 together with ILS 88. It records the ludi votivi he celebrated as a consul in both his and Tiberius’ name when Augustus returned from Germany, see Appendix II. Cf. also Dio 55.8. See Flower (1998) 162 n.45 for this information.

105 Flower (1998) 163-169, 173

106 Thanks to Dr. Greg Rowe who pointed out this fact to me.
Woodman). In either case the structures’ imposition on a public place demonstrated his elite and powerful status within Rome as he was able to overtly and abusively combine public space within his private domain.

The house of an elite member of society was of particular importance because it was a way for the individual to construct himself into the cityscape of Rome while also allowing the Roman populace to experience the residents inside. The elite domus (house) was meant to interact with the public and therefore supplied a permanent visibility within the political landscape. A visitor to the city of Rome would find these domus visually accessible. For the view, which was of incredible importance, gave the owner not only a place from which to see and to be seen, but also a place to record family history and political successes; thus the domus functioned as public mnemonic for the individual’s significance and status. Cicero clearly expresses the importance that aspect and an unimpeded view held for members of the elite:

nam cum aedes L. Fufio venderet, in mancipio lumina, uti tum essent, ita recept; Fufius autem, simul atque aedificari coeptum est in quadam parte urbis, quae modo ex illis aedibus conspici posset, egit statim cum Buculeio, quod, cuicumque particulae coeli officeretur, quamvis esset procul, mutari lumina putabat.

For, on the sale of a house to Lucius Fufius, he [Marcus Bucculeius] made a reservation in his conveyance of all rights to light ‘as then enjoyed’. Fufius however, the moment that any building began in some part of the city of which as much as a glimpse could be caught from that house of his, immediately launched action against Bucculeius, because he conceived that his rights to light were affected, if any scrap of his view was blocked, however far away (tr. E.W. Sutton).

The restriction of Fufius’ view and subsequent loss of light was viewed, in his eyes, as a reduction of his loss of authority, illusory as it may be. Because an owner of a domus saw his realm extending as far as his view allowed. Cicero also

---

107 Hales (2003) 44-46

108 Not only was the atrium used to house the imagines and spoils from past battles which reminded visitors about the status and pedigree of their host but also, the facade was a place to record special honours accorded by the people and record political successes and family events, see Hales (2003) 46-47.

109 de Oratore 1.39.179
presents readers with a friend who created a direct view from his house to the theater.\textsuperscript{110} His aspect which included the theatre allowed him to believe that this public space was a part of his private house and thus allowed him to believe he had a phantasmal authority over a public space.\textsuperscript{111}

Piso’s house, whether it physically or visually spanned the gate, would have provided a commanding aspect of two critical zones of the Augustan building programme and would have situated his house next to those of Tiberius and Germanicus. In this way Piso demonstrated his authority in Rome not only because he was neighbours with the Imperial family, but also because his view included a vast amount of the Augustan programme of dynastic building and monumentalization.\textsuperscript{112} While the view and the juxtaposition with Tiberius’ and Germanicus’ houses probably contributed to removing the structures, it was likely that the destruction was of symbolic purposes: to show that Piso was no longer associated with Augustus and the Imperial \emph{domus}, and to show that the state took away Piso’s prominence and authority within Rome because they obliterated structures which he himself had built and in turn the view which illustrated his position and power. Thus Tiberius left a visual reminder to passers-by of his disgrace as his houses still stood but were now unconnected. Most Romans would have understood what this destruction meant and thoughts of Piso’s disgrace would continually be brought to mind each time they walked by.

Houses were important as places for evoking memories. Spurius Maelius, who was accused of treason in 438B.C. and had his house razed to the ground, was forced to endure the punishment of having his plot of land left empty. This penalty was especially terrible because the destruction of the house not only eliminated his physical presence in Rome, but also his way to be remembered. With only rubble, ashes, and an empty lot, which became known as the Plain of Maelius, Maelius’ name would only survive in future generations with the

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{ad Familiares} 7.1.1

\textsuperscript{111} Hales (2003) 44-45

\textsuperscript{112} Bodel (1999) 59
accompanying notions of deviance and disgrace. For a barren site was not only a permanent reminder of an individual’s disgrace, but it also only triggered memories of a name as the structure which had housed the memories behind the man were gone.\footnote{Hales (2003) 49-50} Cicero, similarly, having been driven into exile, had to suffer the razing of his house on the Palatine and the building of a temple to Libertas on his site. This act was meant to be a symbol of the elimination of Cicero and all that he stood for since Cicero could never rebuild in that area. This was especially hard for Cicero who had perceived his house to be \textit{in conspectu prope totius urbis} “in sight of nearly the whole city” (tr. N.H Watts, adapt.).\footnote{de Domo Sua 37.100} His utter humiliation stemmed from the realization that everybody would look to the Palatine and know he had been erased from both the cityscape and the political map of Rome. This was especially hard for Cicero since the \textit{domus} functioned as a monument to his prestige and achievements and his memory and reputation.\footnote{Hales (2003) 42}

Looking at these six penalties two themes are noted. First, all of these prescribed penalties are intended to impose a limitation on Piso’s remembrance and second, these punitive measures concentrate the condemnation of his memory on the city of Rome proper as each penalty centered on the capital. These penalties not only show that there was value attached to memory by a man like Piso, a member of a traditional office-holding family, and that it was the venue that ultimately mattered, when it came to suppressing memory was Rome, but also the visual prominence afforded to a citizen of Piso’s standing was extremely important. Taking away the objects that linked him with society and family meant Piso’s memory was silenced through the absence of his representation because there would be no visual prompts representing him either at home or in public. Furthermore, places and space were very important to memory in the Roman world as these punitive measures demonstrate. First, the civic center was an important place for mourning as it allowed everyone in the public milieu to remember both the deceased and his deeds. Second, statues and portraits and their
accompanying texts were set as places designed to evoke memories of past events and individuals. Third, the *imagines* not only had their own space in the private atria of houses so visitors and family could be reminded of the deeds and successes of the deceased, but also in the public sphere as they (the *imagines*) were processed through the streets on funeral days, reminding spectators of their past accomplishments and political stance. Fourth, houses and property were places that conveyed meanings to passers-by and brought forth memories of the resident’s past honours.

In sum, memory figured prominently in the life of both the elite residents of Rome and in the lower echelons of society. People were familiar with seeing memory in different places and expected it in every part of life and culture. They knew that memory was at the heart of Roman funeral rites and festivals of the dead, and that at an aristocratic funeral the main purpose was to vivify the memory of a Roman’s ancestors’ achievements that might otherwise be forgotten, while also linking the family with famous deeds and episodes from Rome’s past. The wax portraits or *imagines* of the deceased, usually set up in the atria of Rome’s political elite, were paraded through the streets on funeral days. As the procession proceeded to the Forum, spectators, as Polybius tells his reader, would be prompted to remember Rome’s leading figures from the past and their achievements, as they witnessed each ancestor dressed in costume and equipped with attributes associated with his different offices and achievements:

> Ὅταν γὰρ μεταλλάξῃ τις παρ’ αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν, συντελουμένης τῆς ἐκφορᾶς κομίζεται μετὰ τοῦ λοιποῦ κόσμου πρὸς τοὺς καλουμένους ἐμβόλους εἰς τὴν ἁγορὰν ποτὲ μὲν ἐστώς ἐναργῆς, στανίσας δὲ κατακεκλιμένος, περίξ δὲ παντὸς τοῦ δήμου στάντος, ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐμβόλους, ἀγ μὲν ύιὸς ἐν ἡλικία καταλείπεται καὶ τύχῃ παρὼν, οὕτως, καὶ ὃς μὴ, τῶν ἄλλων εἰ τίς ἀπὸ γένους ὑπάρχει, λέγει περὶ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος τὰς ἁρετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπιτετευγμένας ἐν τῷ ζῆν πρᾶξις. δι’ ὧν συμβαίνει τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀναμιμηκομένους καὶ λαμβανοντάς ὑπὸ τὴν ὁμίλη τὰ γεγονότα, μὴ μόνον τοὺς κεκοιμηθέντας τῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἔκτος, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γίνεσθαι συμπάθεις ὡστε μὴ τῶν κηδευόντων ἵδιον, ἀλλὰ κοινὸν τοῦ δήμου φαίνεσθαι τὸ σύμπτωμα.

---


117 Flower (1996) 91-127
Whenever any illustrious man dies, he is carried at his funeral into the forum to the so-called rostra, sometimes conspicuous in an upright posture and more rarely reclined. Here with all the people standing round, a grown-up son, if he has left one who happens to be present, or if not some other relative mounts the rostra and discourses on the virtues and successful achievements of the dead. As a consequence the multitude and not only those who had a part in these achievements, but those also who had none, when the facts are recalled to their minds and brought before their eyes, are moved to such sympathy that the loss seems to be not confined to mourners, but a public one affecting the whole people (tr. W.R. Paton).  

Even witnessing a triumphal procession, spectators would have realized that the booty taken from the enemy, the captives themselves, the statues, paintings and other representations were meant to be visual reminders of what the individual general had achieved on his campaign. Ovid, in his *Ars Amatoria*, makes it explicitly clear that the triumphal procession was a visual prompt for the victorious general:

\[\text{a} \text{que aliqua ex illis cum regum nomina quaeret, Quae loca, qui montes, quaeve ferantur aquae, Omnia responde, nec tantum siqua rogabit; Et quae nescieris, ut bene nota refer, Hic est Euphrates, praecinctus harundine frontem; Cui coma dependet caerula, Tigris erit. Hos facito Armenios; haec est Danaeia Persis; Urbs in Achaemenis vallibus ista fuit; Ille vel ille, duces; et erunt quae nomina dicas, Si poteris, vere, si minus, apta tamen,} \]

And when some girl among them asks about the names of the monarchs, or what places, what mountains, what rivers are conveyed along, answer everything, not only if she asks you; and even if you do not know, reply as if you know them well. That is Euphrates, his forehead encircled with reeds; he with the dark blue locks hanging down, he will be Tigris. Introduce these men as Armenians, here is Persia, sprung from Danae; that was a city in the Achaemenian valleys. That man, and even that man are generals; and you will say what their names are, if you can, but if not, give names that are fitting (tr. J.H. Mozley, adapt).

Even though Ovid is commenting on the daunting task of trying to interpret an array of topographical paintings and allegorical and notable figures passing by in a triumphal procession, this passage clearly demonstrates that visual representations of conquered rivers, mountains, or battles scenes were a large part

---

118 *Historiae* 6.53.1-4

119 Gregory (1994) 84. Also see Peter J. Holliday (1997) 130-147 and his article entitled *Roman Triumphal Painting: Its Function, Development, and Reception* for an in-depth look at the development of the triumph and the use and reception of triumphal paintings.

120 *Ars Amatoria* 1.219-228
of the procession.

Moving through the physical Roman environment illustrates a powerful way to learn and remember as visual prompts that could be visually impressed on the mind facilitated the recalling, receiving and retaining of information. The Romans were experienced readers of non-verbal texts and people from all social strata could read messages embedded in their surroundings. While the experience of moving through different physical spaces and seeing places and images stored on the places describes how the Romans interacted with their landscape, it also describes the techniques used by upper-class Romans as a mnemonic aid in preparation for their public careers. Therefore with all of these storehouses for memory in the Roman cityscape, Romans would have been familiar with the fact that memories and their visual prompts were stored in and meant to be accessed from all facets of their culture. Hence, educated Romans, I believe, would have recognized the visual memory prompts and the fact that Virgil in the Aeneid describes his characters’ remembrances in a manner analogous to the way the artificial memory system worked, see Chapter Three. With all this in mind I will now proceed into the second chapter of this thesis which discusses the Roman art of memory.
Chapter Two

The second chapter of this thesis will involve a systematic exploration of the Roman art of artificial memory\(^1\) by looking at the three Latin rhetorical texts: Cicero’s *de Oratore*, Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*, and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. To begin this chapter I am going to explain how the architectural mnemonic system worked by studying the three chief sources, which I have listed above, and then examine the modern practitioner of mnemotechnics and recent experiments in cognitive psychology to illustrate the practicalities of the classical authors’ discussions.

The idea that physical places could be used as architectural figments to facilitate the retrieval and recollection of memories is made explicitly clear in the texts of Cicero, Quintilian and the Auctor ad Herennium.\(^2\) Each author explains how *loci* (backgrounds, places and spaces) and *imagines* (mental images) were used to aid the restoration of information stored within a person’s memory. In the beginning of the fifth century B.C. Simonides of Ceos is attributed with having invented mnemotechnics or an artificial memory system which uses a place system and orderly arrangement to recall specific information: *gratiamque habeo Simonidi illi Cio quem primum ferunt artem memoriae protulisse*, “and I am grateful to the Simonides of Ceos, who, people say, is the first to have invented the art of memory” (tr. E.W. Sutton, adapt.)\(^3\); *[ex hoc Simonidis facto notatum videtur, iuvati memoriam signatis animo sedibus, idque credere suo quisque experimento potest*, “it appears well-marked from this deed of Simonides that it helps the memory if places are impressed upon the mind, which anyone can

---

\(^1\) Artificial memory is memory which the introduction to art (art of training the mind) and a system of instruction strengthens, versus natural memory which is situated in our minds and born simultaneously with thought, *ad Herennium* 3.16.28. In other words artificial memory is a system which uses mental techniques to train the mind in order that large amounts of information may be remembered without using extensively written notes. This type of disciplined, well-trained and constantly practiced memory was called artificial memory, Bolles (1988) 5-8.

\(^2\) Cicero’s *de Oratore* was finished early in the winter of 55 B.C. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, dates ca.88-85B.C.. This discussion once thought to be written by Cicero is now labeled as ‘pseudo-Cicero’ or as the Auctor ad Herennium (after the author who wrote to C. Herennius). Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* was written nearly two centuries later and likely published in 96A.D. prior to the death of Domitian, Small (1997) 98.

\(^3\) *de Oratore* 2.86.351-352
believe with their own test” (tr. H.E. Butler, adapt.). Simonides, as both Cicero and Quintilian assert, gave rise to the observation that localities could facilitate memory, if these localities were sharply impressed upon the mind. According to both authors, Simonides was summoned forth from a feast by two young men. Once outside, however, he saw no-one. Scarcely had he crossed the threshold when the banqueting hall fell and completely crushed the guests inside. Since family and friends could not identify the mangled bodies, Simonides recalled the place and the order in which each guest had been sitting and thereupon succeeded in returning the appropriate body to respective family members and friends. These actions not only introduced Simonides as the master practitioner of artificial memory, but also gave the Romans a point of origin from which to trace the beginnings of the place memory system. Using Simonides as a model, the Romans developed an architectural mnemonic system of loci which used the concrete imagery of physical loci, such as colonnades or elaborate houses, to remember heterogeneous information.

With this in mind, I will now consider what the Roman contribution to mnemnotechnics was. I will explain the general principles of the Romans’ artificial memory system, by first using the Rhetorica ad Herennium to give an overview of the system, and second by looking at the treatises of Cicero and Quintilian and offering a commentary on their discourses. I will use sections from the three Rhetorical texts to fully illustrate the rules and precepts for improving memory. Then I will examine modern psychological literature to explain the practicalities of the Roman system and how it likely worked.

I. THE ROMAN ART OF ARTIFICIAL MEMORY AND THREE LATIN SOURCES

Constat igitur artificiosa memoria ex locis et imaginibus, “artificial memory is composed of physical places and mental images” (tr. Harry Caplan,

---

4 Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.17

5 Cicero *de Oratore* 2.86.352-353 and Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.11-13

6 Small (1997) 93-97
adapt.) begins the Auctor ad Herennium. This concise and brisk statement which inaugurates the Auctor’s section on artificial memory, announces the two vital components of the Roman mnemonic. When an orator needed to recall a long speech from memory, he would choose a physical place which could be easily grasped by the mind:

\
\[\text{l}oc\text{o}\text{s} \text{app}e\text{l}e\text{m}a\text{mus} \text{e}o\text{s} \text{qui} \text{b}r\text{e}v\text{i}t\text{er}, \text{p}r\text{e}f\text{e}c\text{t}e, \text{i}ns\text{ign}i\text{t}e\text{e} \text{a}u\text{t} \text{n}\text{a}tu\text{r}a \text{a}u\text{t} \text{m}a\text{n}u \text{s}u\text{n}t \text{a}b\text{sol}u\text{t}, \text{u}t \text{e}o\text{s} \text{f}a\text{c}i\text{e}\text{l}e \text{n}a\text{t}\text{u}r\text{i} \text{m}e\text{m}\text{o}r\text{i}a \text{c}o\text{n}p\text{r}e\text{h}e\text{n}\text{d}e\text{r}e \text{e}t \text{a}m\text{p}l\text{e}c\text{t}i \text{q}e\text{a}\text{m}u\text{s}: \text{u}t \text{a}e\text{d}e\text{s}, \text{i}n\text{te}r\text{c}o\text{l}u\text{b}l\text{n}\text{i}u\text{m}, \text{a}n\text{g}u\text{l}u\text{m}, \text{f}o\text{n}\text{r}i\text{c}e\text{m}, \text{e}t \text{a}l\text{i}a \text{q}u\text{e} \text{h}i\text{s} \text{s}i\text{m}i\text{l}i\text{a} \text{s}u\text{n}\text{t}.\]

[w]e call places those things which by nature or by artifice are for a short distance, totally, and strikingly complete so that we can comprehend and embrace them easily with natural memory—like a house, an intercolumniation, a corner, an arch, and other things which are similar to these (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small).

Then on specific spots inside the chosen locus he placed images, formae (figures), notae (marks), and simulacra (likenesses), of the information which needed to be remembered: imagines eorum locis certis conlocare oportebit, “it will be necessary to set the mental images of them [the different information which needs remembering] in specific places” (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.). By doing so orators could then mentally wander through their loci and see the different superimposed imagines, which served as visual mnemonic prompts for the information they stored securely inside, and recall the knowledge represented by the images.

According to the account of the Auctor, loci are like wax tablets or papyri and the imagines like letters; the arrangement and placement of the images are like script while the subsequent recitation of these images is like reading aloud. The loci must be kept in order, ex ordine, in order to avoid any confusion when following the sequence of the images. An order is especially important so that an

---

7 ad Herennium 3.16.29
8 ad Herennium 3.16.29
9 Small (1997) 98
10 ad Herennium 3.16.29-30
11 Small (1997) 98
individual might be able to proceed and ‘read off’ the stored information from start to finish, backwards, or from the middle of any of the *loci*.

Special care and precision must be taken when forming *loci*, *ut perpetuo nobis haerere possint; nam imagines, sicut litterae, delentur ubi nihil utimur; loci, tamquam cera, remanere debent,*¹² “so that they can cling to us permanently; for the images, just like letters, will be wiped clean when we do not use them; the places, like a wax tablet, ought to remain” (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.).¹³ To avoid any confusion in order when using a large number of places, it is useful to place a mark on every fifth *locus*—such as a golden hand on the fifth and the face of an acquaintance whose first name is Decimus on the tenth. When memorizing *loci* it is more advantageous to avoid crowded places because having too many people wandering about will weaken the marks of the images while solitude keeps the shapes of the likenesses sharp and distinct. *Locci* should be different in both appearance and composition so they can be clearly distinguished from each other. They ought to be medium-sized places of a moderate extent because if they are too large or too small they cannot support the images properly, *nam et praeter modum ampli vagas imagines reddunt, et nimis angusti saepe non videntur posse capere imaginum conlocationem,*¹⁴ “for if excessively large they return vague images, and if too small often they do not seem to be able to take the placing of the images” (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.).¹⁵ *Locci* should also be well-lighted: not be too dim so the images become hidden amongst the shadows or too glaring whereby they blind the ‘reader’ with their brilliance. Furthermore, they should be situated moderately apart so an individual can easily discriminate between them:

> [i]ntervalla locorum mediocria placet esse, fere paulo plus aut minus pedum tricenum; nam ut aspectus item cogitatio minus valet sive nimis procul removeris sive vehemeter prope admovertis id quod oportet videri.¹⁶

---

¹² *ad Herennium* 3.18.31
¹³ Small (1997) 99
¹⁴ *ad Herennium* 3.19.31-32
¹⁵ Small (1997) 99
¹⁶ *ad Herennium* 3.19.32
[i]t seems best that the distance between places be moderate, approximately a little more or less than thirty feet. For, in the same way that the range of vision is less powerful if you have moved back too far or if you have moved excessively close to that which needs to be seen, so is the mind (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.).

Having discussed the topic of loci, the Auctor turns to the subject of imagines and describes their theory in detail. Images are of vital importance when one wants to recall certain things/subject matter (res) or words (verba). Easier to remember and more permanently retained than abstract ideas, images, especially visual ones, act as a mnemonic in the form of visual-verbal puns or pictures. To be remembered, images must be as striking as possible for everyday and common things are generally forgotten. Things that are exceptionally base, dishonourable, extraordinary, great, unbelievable or laughable will likely be remembered for a long time:

...si non multas nec vagas, sed aliquid agentes imagines ponemus; si egregiam pulcritudinem aut unicam turpitudinem eis adtribuemus; si aliquas exornabimus, ut si coronis aut veste purpurea, quo nobis notatior sit simulitudo; aut si qua re deformabimus, ut si cruentam aut caeno oblitam aut rubrica delibutam inducamus, quo magis insignita sit forma, aut ridiculas res aliquas imaginibus adtribuamus, nam ea res quoque faciet ut facilius meminisse valeamus.

...if we set up images that are not many or vague, but are doing something; if we bestow extraordinary beauty or singular ugliness on them; if we dress others as if

---

17 Small (1997) 100. There is much debate regarding intervalla. Some authors, such as Mary Carruthers 72-73, believe that intervalla do not refer to the distances between loci but between viewer and locus. Small, as we can see from the adapted translation above, believes that intervalla refer to the space between loci. Thierry of Chartres’ Latin commentary, edited by Karin Fredborg, notes that [i]ntervalla, id est locorum distantias, 305, 3.19.32n.. I am inclined to agree with both Thierry and Small that this word in its context must be translated as meaning distance or the space between places since there is no mention of a viewer being at a distance from anything, in these lines. Moreover, it is my opinion that, the Auctor is making an analogy to further emphasize what characteristics make loci mentally suitable to move through and how they should be constructed. In other words, the distance between loci should be moderate in order to be able to distinguish between them clearly, just as a moderate distance is needed to clearly see the entire facade of a building and all its parts. Thus the Auctor is only stressing that there is need for distance between loci. He is not emphasizing the principles of perspective or what the viewer’s stance should be in relation to the place.

18 The use of images in the form of visual puns can also be witnessed in the rebus game of Petronius’ Trimalchio. In section 56 of the Satyricon, Trimalchio offers a combination of objects which are meant to act as physical representations of the different series of words. This is like a peg-word mnemonic, where images of familiar objects are used as cues to aid memory and remembrance rather than using images of physical locations as mental cues, Bellezza (1996) 348.
in crowns or purple cloaks so that the likeness may be more distinct to us; or if we disfigure them somehow, as if we presented one stained with blood, covered with mud, or smeared with red ochre, so that its appearance is more distinguished, or if we assign to the images certain funny things, these things will ensure that we will be able to remember them more readily (tr. Harry Caplan, adapt.).

Remembering *res* and *verba* involve committing to memory a series of vivid mental descriptions. In other words, in the event of being required to remember the elements of a court case (*res*), the Auctor recommends that a series of different scenes be constructed. Each stage of the case must be set in its own scene, each scene recording all the facts in one notation. For example, should a defendant be required to remember that the prosecutor has charged him with poisoning a man, he might place in his first *locus* an image of the whole matter:

...in primo loco rei totius imaginem conformabimus; aegrotum in lecto cubantem faciemus ipsum illum, de quo agetur, si formam eius detinebimus; si eum non agnoverimus, at aliquem aegrotum non de minimo loco sumemus, ut cito in mentem venire possit. Et reum ad lectum eius adstituemus, dextera poculum, sinistra tabulas, medico testiculos arietinos tenentem. Hoc modo et testium et hereditatis et veneno necati memoriam habere poterimus. Item deinceps cetera crimina ex ordine in locis ponemus et quotienscumque rem meminisse volemus, si formarum dispositione et imaginum diligenti notatione utemur, facile ea quae volemus memoria consequemur.

...we shall in the first place form an image of all the facts. We shall make the one about whom the case is being pled a sick man lying in bed, if we retain his appearance [in memory]. If we do not know him, we shall yet take someone else to be our invalid, but not from the lowest class, so that he might quickly come to mind. And we shall place the defendant at his bedside, holding a cup in his right hand and writing tablets in his left, and holding rams’ testicles on his fourth finger. In this way we are able to record the memory of the witnesses, inheritance and of the men who were killed by poison. In like fashion we shall set the other counts of the charge in backgrounds successively following their order, and whenever we want to remember a fact, if we use an arrangement of the forms and a careful notation of the images, we shall easily follow what we want in memory (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.).

When an individual needs to use images to represent the words of a text or a speech (*verba*), a series of images, according to Small, are likely used to stress the

19 *ad Herennium* 3.22.37
20 *ad Herennium* 3.20.33-34
21 Small (1997) 114-115
superficial resemblances between the sounds of the words rather than their meanings. To demonstrate this use of imagery, the Auctor offers the following exemplum:

\[ \text{si volemus [Iam domum itionem reges Atridae parant.], conveniet primo in loco constituere manus ad caelum tollentem Domitium cum a Regibus Marciis loris caedatur—hoc erit “Iam domum itionem reges;” in altero loco Aesopum et Cimbrum subornari ut ad Iphigeniam in Agamemnonem et Menelaum—hoc erit “Atridae parant.” Hoc modo omnia verba erunt expressa.} \]

[i]f we wish to remember this verse [And now the kings, the sons of Atreus, prepare their return home.], in the first place it is appropriate to put Domitius, raising his hands to heaven while he is struck by whips of the Marcii Reges—this will represent ‘Iam domum itionem reges’; in the second place, Aesopus and Cimber, being dressed up as for the roles of Agamemnon and Menelaus in Iphigenia—this will represent ‘Atridae parant.’ In this way all the words will be represented (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.).

The images chosen here to help facilitate remembrance of the specific chunks of text appear to be visual puns which, according to Carruthers, depend on contemporary allusions—references, on one hand to two celebrated Roman families, the Marcian and Domitian gentes, and on the other hand to two well-known actors, Aesopus and Cimber. Harry Caplan, the Loeb translator, comments that this scene is likely the author’s own creation. It is difficult to comprehend why using the image of Domitius being whipped helps aid remembrance of the first half of this line, “except,” as Carruthers suggests, “as an instance of the general principle of forming images related to one another through violent activity.” The second half offers the image of Cimber and Aesopus preparing themselves for their roles as Menelaus and Agamemnon in the play

---

22 In this system certain words, such as conjunctions, and in this case the adverb *iam* are omitted, Small (1997) 114.

23 *ad Herennium* 3.21.34

24 Small (1997) 113-114

25 Carruthers (1990) 140

26 Caplan (1981) 217 n. b

27 Carruthers (1990) 140
about Iphigenia. While it is difficult to fully understand how the images truly functioned in the rhetorical practice of *memoria verborum*, what is important is to realize that the series of full scenes, in either representing *res* or *verba*, resemble a continuous narrative, much like a modern day comic strip, which an orator could ‘read off’ seriatim. By dividing the different stages into separate scenes, they become easier to remember since the larger whole has been broken down into manageable-sized chunks. Therefore, analogous to *loci*, *imagines* are clearly demarcated from each other so that the memory is able to easily visually imprint and embrace all the needed information as well as reel it off in order when needed.

Much of the same advice is found in Cicero’s *de Oratore*, but in an abridged format, *ne in re nota et pervulgata multus et insolens sim*, “so that I may not be long-winded and excessive on a subject that is well-known and common” (tr. E.W. Sutton, adapt.). Cicero states that sight is the most important of the senses, because it is through the eyes that something tangible can be perceived. Even if something is perceived by the ears or by consideration, it will be more easily retained in the mind if it is also conveyed to the memory through the eyes (for then it can be given a tangible form). Images are retained more easily than abstract thoughts because they can be visually perceived while abstract thoughts need to be attached to visual perceptions. In other words, when using images to represent things or words it is best to be able to use images which have been relayed through the eyes, rather than those that have been only heard or thought up, because they will better adhere to the memory since they have been given a physical and material form. Something tangible, however, takes up space and cannot exist without a place in which to reside. Therefore, the images which an orator uses must also have a physical location since they themselves occupy a real

---

28 Carruthers (1990) 140
29 Small (1997) 115
30 *de Oratore* 2.87.358
Cicero describes how one must employ a large number of *loci* that are distinct, clear, and at moderate intervals apart, and *imaginaires* that are effective, sharp, and marked distinctively, with the ability to pierce and hasten into the mind. He divides his attention between two types of memory association: using *loci* and *imaginaires* to recall both *res* and *verba*. Cicero makes it quite clear that a memory for words is less essential, while a memory for things is the proper skill belonging to the orator. He ends his section acknowledging this, and that *loci* and *imaginaires* are fundamental for organizing ideas: *eam singulis personis bene positis notare possumus ut sententias imaginibus, ordinem locis comprehendamus*, “we are able to mark this [an orator’s memory for things] by skillfully placing several characteristics so that we are able to take hold of thoughts with images and their order with places” (tr. E.W. Sutton, adapt.).

Quintilian follows in the footsteps of Cicero and the Auctor and expresses the need for distinctive and sharply-cut images, remarkable places, sequential order, and appropriate intervals. His discussion provides a detailed description of how the Roman mnemonic system functioned. He writes that places are appropriate mnemonic prompts because they trigger remembrances in people. When people return to a place after an absence, they not only recognize the place, but also remember what they did there, the people whom they met, and the unuttered thoughts which passed through their minds. Places of the largest extent, whether real or imaginary, should be chosen with the utmost possible variety, such as a spacious house divided into a number of rooms. Everything inside must be accurately imprinted on the memory so that the thought can hasten through all details without any hindrance or delay. Next, specific *signa* (marks or symbols) are applied to the material which needs to be remembered. These symbols or

---

32 *de Oratore* 2.87.358
33 Fantham (2004) 291-292
34 *de Oratore* 2.88.359-360.
images, “words [voces] by which we distinguish the things which must be learned by heart” (tr. H.E. Butler, adapt.), serve as visual memory prompts. The symbol used, quod esse vel ex re tota potest, ut de navigatione, militia, vel ex verbo aliquo, “can be either from the whole subject matter, as from navigation, or warfare, or it can be from some particular word” (tr. H.E. Butler, adapt.). As an example, Quintilian suggests that an anchor and weapon be used as symbols. These symbols are arranged as follows: primum sensum vestibulo quasi adsignant, secundum, puta, atrio, tum inpluvia circumeunt, nec cubiculis modo aut exedris, sed statuis etiam similibusque per ordinem committunt, “they assign the first impression [an impression consequent on perception by the senses], as it were, to the entrance; the second, for instance, to the atrium, then they encircle the impluvia, and they are not only entrusted to bedrooms and sitting rooms, but even to statues and the like, in order” (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.). Then, when the memories need to be called to mind again, ...inciπunt ab initio loca haec recensere, et quod cuique crediderunt reposcunt, ut eorum imagine admonentur, “... they [those using the system] begin to go over these places from the beginning and what was entrusted to the places is demanded back, as the information is called back to mind by their [representative] image” (tr. H.E. Butler, adapt.). Consequently, however, when using a large number of loci and imagines it is important to keep them in sequential order, “linked one to the other like dancers hand in hand” (tr. H.E. Butler), so that the stored information can be reeled off seriatim.

After describing the general principles of the artificial memory system for res, Quintilian focuses on his skepticism about using images to accomplish

---

35 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.21

36 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.19

37 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.20

38 Small (1997) 109

39 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.20

40 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.20
memory for words. I am not going to explain his criticisms or the devices he suggests to employ when trying to remember a speech, since my thesis is based on Virgil’s use of *memoria rerum*, but he does offer some interesting suggestions which include devising a method of shorthand symbols and embedding cues to stimulate the memory in hard to recall passages. Following his suggestions on memory work, Quintilian concludes his section on *memoria* with a skeptical assessment of reported feats of prodigious memory, two of which are Cyrus who is believed to have known every soldier’s name in his army, and Theodectes who was said to have been able to repeat any number of verses after a single hearing.

In sum, the modern reader can generally understand, from these three authors, how artificial memory for things or subject matter (*res*) functioned: images of a sequence of physical places were envisioned and prememorized in the mind; next, the subject matter to be memorized was reduced to a series of scenes/visual images which represented the various stages of the matter; each scene was assigned to an area within the *locus* and through visual-imagery mediation was kept connected to its corresponding location; then the information stored by the visual images would be ‘read off’. The important point is that the physical places were used as vehicles for organizing information by providing ready-made memory structures for it; and within the structures were a number of images (prememorized extrinsic cues associated to the material to be learned), which acted like distinctive containers, for information to be stored; thus presenting the information in specific order for recall.

To further illustrate the practicality of the Roman mnemonic system and how it likely worked, it is useful to introduce some of the recent psychological literature which offers a demonstration of this system.

III. MEMORY AND THE MODERN PRACTITIONER

41 Carruthers (1990) 74

42 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.50-51

43 Bellezza (1996) 348, 349
To give another overview of the mnemonic system, I will offer a modern-day description of the method of loci,\textsuperscript{44} the mental cues and their properties. To do so I will focus on the work of Francis S. Bellezza, a psychologist who specializes in the basic cognitive mechanism’s retrieval of information from memory. From here I will present the memory palace system of Matteo Ricci, a 16\textsuperscript{th} century Italian Jesuit who taught mnemonics to the scholarly Chinese, and the Soviet neuropsychologist Aleksandr Romanovich Luria’s case study of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century Russian journalist, Solomon Shereshevskii, whose prodigious memory was based on using places and mental imagery.

Integral to the method of loci is the formation and association of mental representations which aid recall of the to-be-remembered information. These mental representations include images which act as the referent of a word or subject matter (i.e. the Battle of Saratoga is used here) and the images of the different background loci. First the image of the locus is mentally created which will provide a mental cue for the words or subject matter to be learned. The image of each locus is then combined with the visual image of the word or subject. In other words, if a mnemonist placed an image of a dog in a room with an impluvium, then each time he or she arrived at this room and saw the cistern, the image of the dog would be envisioned because this specific room is immediately associated with its corresponding referent of the word or subject matter (in this case the dog). “For recall, the mnemonist mentally reviews the images of the loci so that the cognitive context surrounding the original learning of each list word can be accessed though the use of these location images.”\textsuperscript{45} In order to remember accurately what has been encoded, the context and processes defining the event in which the items were originally embedded must be recreated and in recalling the image of the locus, the context accompanying the learning is thus activated. Therefore, as the three classical authors have clearly demonstrated, both the image of the \textit{locus} and the referent of the subject matter were associated: for the

\textsuperscript{44} Loci is not italicized in modern textbooks so in this section I will keep it in regular typeface print unless I am writing about classical loci.

\textsuperscript{45} Bellezza (1996) 352-353
locus housed the *imagines* and helped prompt the recall of the *imagines* and in turn the *imagines* prompted the recall of the to-be-remembered subject matter. Furthermore, the authors also realized that the original context of the background *locus* and its specific referents of the to-be-remembered subject matter needed to be kept the same for the information to be properly recalled. The Auctor makes this especially clear by stressing the necessity for keeping the original *locus*: 

> *ed illud facere oportebit, ut identidem primos quosque locos imaginum renovandarum causa celeriter animo pervagemus,*

(b)ut it will be necessary to do this, to again and again, quickly wander over in the mind the original places for the sake of renewing the images” (tr. Harry Caplan, adapt.).

Bellezza notes that there are four properties which are vital to support learning and remembering mental cues. First, if mental cues are well-organized during the learning process then at recall cues can be systematically fashioned in the same way. This is essential because according to the principle of encoding specificity, mentioned above, mental cues must be the same at both learning and recall to serve as visual prompts for the recall of the necessary information. The classical authors recognized this, because all three expressed the need for both *loci* and *imagines* to be well-organized so that stored information could be easily revived. Second, mental cues must be associable to the information which requires learning. “The greater the number of features, attributes, and associations activated in memory as part of the mental cue, the more associable the cues will be....” Clearly the classical authors realized this, because they constantly stressed the importance of using vivid visual images to facilitate remembrance. Third, in order to facilitate recall, distinct and separate visual backgrounds are required. Each classical author described the necessity of using diverse *loqui* in order to prevent confusion when attempting to remember their order or discriminating between the different backgrounds. Finally, visual images

---

46 *ad Herennium* 3.22.37

47 Bellezza (1996) 353-355

48 Bellezza (1996) 353-354
must be able to function in two directions: subject matter, during the learning process, must be transformed into a mental cue from its original meaning (i.e. the Battle of Saratoga→ Sara wearing a toga), and then at recall the image of Sara wearing a toga must be transformed back into the words the Battle of Saratoga (i.e. Sara wearing a toga→ the Battle of Saratoga). The Romans were fully cognizant of the need for bidirectional associations. They realized that memory for verba needed both images/ mental cues which could offer a likeness for a word and a likeness that could be used to prompt the memory for the required word: for example, ... *Aesopum et Cimbrum subornari ut ad Iphigeniam in Agamemnonem et Menelaum—hoc erit “Atridae parant,”*49 Aesopus and Cimber, being dressed up as for the roles of Agamemnon and Menelaus in *Iphigenia*—this will represent ‘Atridae parant’(tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.).50 Here Aesopus and Cimber’s likenesses are employed to prompt the memory for the words *Atridae parant*, but also the words *Atridae parant* use the images of Aesopus and Cimber to represent the words proper.

Having presented a contemporary account of the method of loci, I will use Jonathan Spence’s account of the memory palace of Matteo Ricci to reinforce the advice offered by the three classical authors and illustrate how physical spaces and mental imagery were used in the Jesuit memory palace system; a mnemonic system used by the members of the order to remember all things which we presently remember by mechanical means. The memory was to be thought of as a palace which existed in the mind. In the different rooms and corridors which comprised the palace, one would place a series of images/ referents of the different concepts that needed to be remembered.51 Ricci told the Chinese that the size of the palace would depend upon the amount of information which needed to be retained. The larger the construction (i.e. one that would consist of several hundred buildings of various sizes and shapes) the better it would be. But one

49 *ad Herennium* 3.21.34
50 Small (1997) 113-114
51 Brook (1986) 831
would not have to start with such a grandiose structure. He could start with a modest palace or a temple compound, a cluster of government offices, a public hostel, or even smaller still—a reception hall, a pavilion or even an altar or a wardrobe. All of these physical spaces were mental structures or figments of the imagination that were to be kept in one’s head. Ricci offered three options from where these mental constructs could be drawn: from reality, the imagination, or from a combination of half real and half fictive. The purpose of these constructs was to provide storage space for every datum of knowledge that is contained in human memory. Every concept which needs to be remembered is assigned an image and every image in turn is assigned a position within the physical space where it can rest until its information is demanded. The memory system, however, can only work properly if the images remain in their assigned positions and if an individual can remember where they have been stored.52

Ricci describes in his memory book the rules for employing images (i.e. how they should be formed, placed, and lighted). He explains that the images should be lively and not too static, they must arouse strong emotions, and that figures must wear clothes or uniforms which mark their social station and the nature of their work. In an image which uses more than one figure, each figure must be kept separate and distinct and must be exaggerated—either with their features distorted in pain or joy or rendered as laughable or ridiculous. As for the location of the image, the place should be spacious and not crowded so that images do not get lost—a magistrate’s yamen, a busy market, or a school jammed with students were unsuitable locales. The spaces must be kept clean and dry, for images would be ruined if they should become streaked with rain or dew. They should be accessible to the naked eye, and therefore be kept at ground level or just above. If they were to be perched on the roof or balanced on a beam they would become inaccessible.53 So that the mind’s eye is able to move easily from one

52 Spence (1984) 1-2

53 This idea of something being inaccessible because it is perched on a roof or balanced on a beam is not explained. But I opine that it is because the object would be too far away and would make it difficult to be clearly seen.
image to the next, they should never be in proximity closer than three feet or farther than six feet. Images should always be properly grounded and not placed where they could be susceptible to sudden movements—for example they should not be hung from a pulley or balanced on a wheel.54

Another demonstration, which reinforces the praxis of the ancient system, is found in the case of Shereshevskii. A.R. Luria observed on first introduction to Shereshevskii that he was able to repeat and recall any material presented to him. Whether Shereshevskii was presented orally or in writing with a series of meaningful words, nonsense syllables, numbers or sounds, he never had any trouble reproducing the series regardless of the length. Luria noticed that Shereshevskii would convert words he had heard into stable visual images, each corresponding with the object that the word denoted for him. Because Shereshevskii did this on a word by word basis, he needed, especially with a long series of words, to find some way to distribute the mental images in a row or sequence. Most often he would distribute the images along a particular roadway or street from his home town or from the streets of Moscow where he lived. “Frequently he would take a mental walk along that street—Gorky Street... beginning at Mayakovsky Square, and slowly make his way down, ‘distributing’ his images at houses, gates, and store windows.”55 Being able to convert a series of words into a series of vivid mental images, explains how Shereshevskii was able to reproduce a whole series from beginning to end, in reverse, or from any point in the series; or identify a word’s neighbour (the word that preceded or followed a word that was randomly selected from the series). To do this, Shereshevskii would simply take a mental walk from the beginning, end, or from some other point on the street. He would then find the image of the word that was specified and look at the flanking images.56

The method of presentation was extremely important to Shereshevskii.

54 Spence (1984) 24-26

55 Luria (1968) 32

56 Luria (1968) 32-33 and Carruthers (1990) 75-76
The series of words had to be read clearly and distinctly, for he required time to translate the words into images. If someone reeled off words too quickly, and did not allow for sufficient pause between them, or if there was a crowd or stray noise, Shereshevskii’s images would fuse into a muddle of chaos or ‘noise’ from which he had trouble mentally recognizing anything:

[s]ometimes if there is noise, if another person’s voice suddenly intrudes, I see blurs which block off my images. Then syllables are liable to slip into a word which weren’t there originally and I’d be tempted to say they really had been part of the word. It’s these blurs which interfere with my recall....

Once I had the word omnia. It got entangled in noise and I recorded omnium... and the more people talk, the harder it gets, until I reach a point where I can’t make anything out.

While the presentation of words was extremely important so was the way that images were used. For if images were not set up properly (i.e. were not clear, were not in contrast with their background, could not be isolated from the background, or were not well-lighted), then Shereshevskii would have difficulties perceiving them, and when revisiting his places he would fail to notice an image or would see one badly. This happened a few times in his reproduction of series of words: once he missed the word pencil, another time the word egg, on another occasion he omitted the word shuttle, and from another series the word blimp.

Shereshevskii describes how this happened:

I put the image of the pencil near a fence... the one down the street, you know. But what happened was that the image fused with that of the fence and I walked right on past without noticing it. The same thing happened with the word egg. I had put it up against a white wall and it blended in with the background. How could I possibly spot a white egg up against a white wall? Now take the word blimp. That’s something gray, so it blended in with the gray of the pavement.... Banner, of course, means the Red Banner. But, you know, the building which houses the Moscow City Soviet of Workers’ Deputies is also red, and since I’d put the banner close to one of the walls of the building I just walked on without seeing it.... Then there’s the word putamen. I don’t know what this means, but it
is such a dark word that I couldn’t see it... and, besides, the street lamp was quite a distance away...\textsuperscript{61}

His solution to the problem was to make sure that he eliminated the circumstances that would make it difficult for him to ‘read off’ his mental images:

I know that I have to be on guard if I’m not to overlook something. What I do now is to make my images larger. Take the word \textit{egg} I told you about before. It was so easy to lose sight of it; now I make it a larger image, and when I lean it up against the wall of a building, I see to it that the place is lit up by having a street lamp nearby.... I don’t put things in dark passageways any more.... Much better if there’s some light around, it’s easier to spot then.\textsuperscript{62}

By comparing both Shereshevskii and Ricci, the modern reader can better understand the differences between how \textit{memoria verborum} and \textit{memoria rerum} likely functioned in the ancient world. Ricci specifically focused on remembering concepts or things, such as main words in quotations, the main theses of an argument, or the pivotal elements of a story, by using a series of strategically placed visual images to act as reminders of these things.\textsuperscript{63} Shereshevskii, on the other hand, demonstrated that everything he recalled was in either the form of words (such as numbers, nonsense syllables, or unfamiliar words) or that he responded to hearing words by converting them into a series of stable visual images.\textsuperscript{64} As Luria states, “…when he [Shereshevskii] heard or read a word it was at once converted into a visual image corresponding with the object the word signified for him”.\textsuperscript{65} Unfamiliar words, while they were registered with some sort of corresponding visual impression, the impressions were related to the phonetic qualities of the word, rather than its meaning. The sounds of words were also transformed into images that consisted of coloured splotches, lines or splashes.\textsuperscript{66} Looking at these two cases in comparison with the exempla the Auctor used when

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{61} Luria (1968) 36
\item \textsuperscript{62} Luria (1968) 41
\item \textsuperscript{63} See Carruthers (1990) 73 for this definition of \textit{memoria rerum}.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Carruthers (1990) 75
\item \textsuperscript{65} Luria (1968) 30
\item \textsuperscript{66} Luria (1968) 31
\end{itemize}
explaining how and what images to use for *memoria rerum* and *verborum*, it is evident that recollection is achieved through association and that specific visual-verbal puns or pictures helped to link image with idea.\(^\text{67}\) *Memoria verborum*, while it is more complicated according to the rhetoricians, requires images to be employed that are based on the sound of words, their phonetic qualities, and the general principle of forming images which are related to one another, while *memoria rerum* requires images to be based on specific concepts or things.

In sum, what is truly interesting about both Ricci and Shereshevskii’s systems is that they use the process of perception which the classical authors expound upon at length. Both Ricci and Shereshevskii could mentally walk through places and look at what was there. This use of perception explains why the ancient authors were constantly stressing how *loci* and *imaginæ* should be prepared: places must be properly lighted, moderate in size and extent, different in physicality so they would not be confused with another, and deserted; the images should be of moderate size (not too large or too small), and clearly distinguishable from their background. Because if one’s perceptions became clouded or disorientated, as Shereshevskii clearly demonstrated they could be, then the system would become muddled and recall would be difficult.\(^\text{68}\)

Shereshevskii’s problem of being overwhelmed when words were presented to him too quickly, or when he tried to remember a lengthy passage as a whole, helps understand why Cicero, the Auctor and Quintilian all expressed their doubts about how images could grasp a whole series of connected words.\(^\text{69}\) For Shereshevskii each word would conjure up an image and this would result in his seeing all the details of what others were describing, even if these details were not relevant to what was being described:

> [I]ast year when I was chairman of a union organization I had to investigate whatever conflicts came up.... Once they were describing some speeches that had been given in a circus tent in Tashkent, and others that were delivered at a

\(^\text{67}\) Carruthers (1990) 73

\(^\text{68}\) Carruthers (1990) 79

\(^\text{69}\) Carruthers (1990) 79
meeting in Moscow.... I saw all the details.... Mentally I transported myself to 
Moscow and Tashkent. But this is just what I have to avoid doing. It's 
unnecessary. It doesn’t matter whether the negotiations were held in Tashkent or 
elsewhere. What is important are the conditions they’re describing”. 70

Quintilian realized that if an image for each individual word had to be 
memorized then there would be considerable difficulty when trying to express the 
words in connected speech: nonne impediri quoque dicendi cursum necesse est 
duplici memoriae cura? Nam quomodo poterunt copulata fluere, si propter 
singula verba ad singulas formas respicendum erit?, “ [b]ut will not the flow of 
our speech inevitably be impeded by the double task imposed upon our memory?
For how can our words be expected to flow in connected speech, if we have to 
look back at separate symbols for each individual word? (tr. H.E. Butler). 71 In 
other words Quintilian, like Shereshevskii, realized that too many images would 
result in envisioning too many details and would hinder the individual when they 
tried to remember what was being described. Furthermore, Shereshevskii’s ability 
to recall different series of words, rather than long connected passages, illustrates 
the importance of the classical authors’ instructions to learn long passages in 
small and manageable chunks. Any long work can be broken up into a series of 
scenes joined together. By doing this, a limitless amount could be kept stored in a 
trained memory. 72

The case of Shereshevskii and the precepts taught by Ricci reinforce the 
advice of the classical authors. Both demonstrate that images used in the method 
of loci are subject to all the favourable circumstances and prejudices which 
influence a person’s physical vision. If we cannot see something clearly, because 
it is either set up on a rooftop or is a white object placed against a white wall, then 
we will not remember it. If there are too many distractions present (i.e. there is a 
large throng of people present or too much noise), then whatever a person is 
trying to find physically or mentally call back to mind will be lost in the

70 Luria (1968) 66
71 Institutio Oratoria 11.2.26
72 Carruthers (1990) 79
confusion. Therefore, as both Shereshevskii and Ricci have demonstrated, mental images obey the same rules and function in the same way as visual images.\textsuperscript{73} In short, if a row of intercolumnar spaces confuses the eye in reality, then it will confuse the mind’s eye when used as a mnemonic image.

Cicero, Quintilian and the anonymous author of the \textit{ad Herennium} describe the art and practice of using an artificial memory system to help aid remembrance. Each of the authors’ respective treatises offers an exploration of how both \textit{loci} and \textit{imagines} were used to facilitate remembrance of both \textit{res} and \textit{verba}. The descriptions delineated by each author provide valuable insight into the visual process, used by educated Romans to imprint, retrieve and recall information stored in their memories. With this discussion of how method of loci worked, its components, and the language that describes it in mind, I will now proceed into the third chapter and argue that Virgil incorporates the memory techniques used for remembering \textit{res} (things or subject matter) and visible signs of remembering within his text proper.

\textsuperscript{73} Small (1997) 105
Chapter Three

In Chapter One of this thesis, I showed how Augustus used monuments and building projects, such as the Forum Augustum, as visual prompts to link the past and present. Like physical monuments, poetry can also induce remembrance in people. The *Aeneid*, the Roman nationalistic epic which concerns the founding of the Roman people, can be viewed as a literary monument in that Virgil constructs a connection between the figures of the past and contemporary Rome, and makes moments from the Republic important to the ordained plan of Augustan Rome in order to stimulate specific remembrances in his readers. In order to establish that he is creating the *Aeneid* as a literary monument, Virgil uses language and descriptions similar to the rhetoricians’ discussions of the art of memory when they talk about memory and remembrance. This is important, because the art of memory relies on using places, such as monuments and buildings to, help aid remembrance. Virgil presents his characters’ recollections, the way memories are called to mind, and even the visions of future events in a manner analogous to the rhetorical discussions of Cicero, Quintilian, and the Auctor ad Herennium. He uses the features of the memory system, not only because this was how Romans, trained in the art of memory, traditionally remembered and recalled information, but also because it was a way to remind the reader that memory was physical in the sense that it had to do with places and architecture. Thus, Virgil writes using the mnemonic principles that he, his contemporaries, and nearly all Romans to some degree were familiar with. This section of my thesis will offer evidence from the *Aeneid* which illustrates Virgil’s poetic exploitation of artificial memory.

To delve into Virgil’s poetic exploitation of artificial memory requires a review of the vocabulary Virgil typically uses when he describes how different images are presented to and perceived by the characters. Creating visual images based on imagination is an important aspect of mnemonic learning. When Virgil

---

1 Gowing (2005) 19
2 Bellezza (1996) 346
uses verbs which imply that characters not only see the images in their physical sight, but also in their internal eye, it suggests that his characters form mental images based on what they visually perceive. The verbs, *video*, *agnosco*, *occurro*, *cerno*, *conspicio*, and *aspicio* are frequently used to suggest that the visual images seen by the characters are not only physical, but are also imaginative and part of their inner vision.\(^3\) As the Auctor puts it both the external and the mind’s eye match in their abilities. For this reason *loci* and *imagines* are subject to the advantages and disadvantages of physical vision.\(^4\) The ancient Romans believed that vision and mental processes were not separate things; what one physically saw was also a way to imprint the mind and so to remember.\(^5\) When Aeneas enters Carthage and comes upon the grand temple of Juno, he sees, *videt* (1.456), images of the battle of Ilium. These images are physical reminders of the Trojan War and are presented in the manner necessary for remembrance. The images on the temple of Juno are set in order, *ex ordine* (1.456), and properly juxtaposed, like the *summi viri* in the Forum Augustum, mentioned in Chapter One. In the Forum Augustum each statue was set off from one another on a small scale, complete and conspicuous, in its own niche, so that a passer-by could be presented with the conditions necessary to commit each individual and their deeds to memory. Lucretius, a contemporary of the Auctor, illustrates in Book Four that both visual and mental images function in the same way:

```
nam certe ex vivo Centauri non fit imago,/ nulla fuit quoniam talis natura animantis;/ verum ubi equi atque hominis casu convenit imago,/ haerescit facile extemplo, quod diximus ante./ propter subtilem naturam et tenvia texta/...ut prius ostendi, facile uno commovet ictu/ quaelibet una animum nobis subtilis imago;/ tenvis enim mens est et mire mobilis ipsa./ Haec fieri ut memoro, facile hinc cognoscere possis./ quatenus hoc simile est illi, quod mente videmus/ atque oculis, simili fieri ratione necesse est./ nunc igitur docui quoniam me forte leonum/ cernere per simulacra, oculos quaecumque lassunt,/ scire licet mentem simili ratione moveri/ per simulacra leonum et cetera quae videt aeque/ nec minus atque oculi, nisi quod mage tenvia cernit.
```

\(^3\) All of these verbs and the rest of the vocabulary will be fully explained in the section’s subsequent paragraphs.

\(^4\) Small (1997) 100

\(^5\) Thanks to Dr. Luke Roman for this idea.
[f]or certainly no image of a Centaur comes from one living; since there never was a living thing of this nature; but when the images of man and horse meet by accident, they easily adhere at once as I said before, on account of their fine nature and thin texture. …as I explained before, any given one of these fine images easily bestirs the mind by a single impression; for the mind is thin and wonderfully easy to move. That this happens as I say, you may easily recognize from what is now to be said. Since this is like that—what we see with the mind like what we see with the eye—it must come about in a like way. Now therefore, since I have shown that I perceive a lion, it may be, by means of images which in such a case assail the eyes, we may be sure that the mind is moved in a like way, seeing the lion and all else it sees by means of images, equally and no less than the eyes do, except that it perceives what is more thin (tr. W.H.D. Rouse).

By using the verbs *video* (4.750, 755) and *cerno* (4.756) to describe the fact that both the physical eye and the mind’s eye see and perceive in similar ways, Lucretius demonstrates that, like the Auctor, vision and mental functions were believed to operate in a like manner, as if they were not two essential parts of one process.

When Virgil describes the visual images that his characters see, he not only uses the ‘seeing’ verbs to suggest that the process of perceiving is carried out by both the external and mind’s eyes, but he also uses descriptions, of images set in a series, of the spatial relationships between images and objects, and of the distinctiveness of the images involved. As I progress through my examination of the different passages of the *Aeneid*, which show the architectural memory system being used, these four key elements of the memory system will be stressed. When images are being looked at, their proper order, with words like *in/ex ordine, ab origine*, will be stressed. Locative phrases, such as *nec procul, procul, deinde, proximus, tum*, will be employed to emphasize the spatial distinction between each scene or image. Furthermore the different images are made recognizable and memorable by specific markings. These features, sequential order, distinctiveness, and discriminability, are the main fundaments, according to the rhetoricians, behind the artificial memory system. By using vocabulary which is suggestive of mental perception, and stressing the importance of a sequential order and proper

---

6 *de rerum Natura* 4.739-756
arrangement of the scenes, Virgil demonstrates that he is using the same principles necessary for employing the architectural memory system.

Ovid in one of his letters from the Black Sea illustrates the way his memory works as he mentally moves from the city center of Rome to the Campus Martius:

nam modo uos animo, dulces, reminiscor, amici,/ nunc mihi cum cara coniuge nata subit,/ [aque domo rursus pulchrae loca uertor ad Urbis/ cunctaque mens oculis peruidet illa suis./] nunc fora, nunc aedes, nunc marmore tecta theatra,/ nunc subit aequata porticus omnis humo,/ gramina nunc Campi pulchros spectantis in hortos/ stagnaque et euripi Virgineusque liquor,

for I call back to mind you, my dear friends, at one moment; at the next my daughter together with my dear wife suggest themselves to my mind, [and I return from my house again to the places of the beautiful city and my mind sees with its eyes all those things,] now the market-places, then the temples, then the theatres covered with marble, then every portico with its leveled ground, then the meadows of Campus that looks towards beautiful gardens, and the pools and the canals and the water of the aqueduct Virgo suggest themselves to my mind (tr. Jan Felix Gaertner, adapt.).

As Ovid recalls to mind/ recollects the images of his friends, indicated by the verb reminiscor, an immediate flood of mental images come bounding back to him. In the Roman system of artificial memory one image is connected to the next as each image links what precedes to what follows. As Ovid thinks about his friends suddenly the image of his wife and daughter suggest themselves to his mind, as do different places of the city, indicating that all of these images are in some way linked together. Now one might suspect that these images, which come to his mind, are an aimless set of recollections and not the artificial memory system being employed. But Ovid himself makes it clear that he is using the second definition of the verb (see note 9 below) and that the images he recollects are recalled as if he were traveling through a series of his own mental loci. As he moves through each place in a steady succession, each of the different images that

---

7 Epistulae ex Ponto 1.8.31-38
8 Institutio Oratoria 11.2.20
9 Subeo when referring to mental images or apparitions, can mean to suggest itself to a person’s mind (OLD s.v. 12). Subeo, however, can also be defined as to come next or succeed in order (OLD s.v. 8).
he sees, *pervidet* (1.8.34), in his mind’s eye are introduced by the locative *nunc*, which can be used as a vehicle to introduce the next item in a series.\(^{10}\) By using the locative, Ovid not only emphasizes the use of an orderly sequence, but he also shows that there is spatial distinction between each image. This means that each image is clearly articulated from the next so they cannot become muddled and hinder recall of the specific details associated with each image. Furthermore, each image he sees in his mind’s eye appears to be firmly impressed on his mind. There are no “fade-ins” which would suggest to a reader that he is mentally drifting through a series of aimless recollections. Similar to Virgil, Ovid uses the images he sees in his mind’s eyes to remind himself of the past. His mental perusal of Rome is possible because he has carefully imprinted the images on his mind and thus can easily call back to mind, by using the principles of the artificial memory system, what he wishes to remember. The fact that his recollections conform to the rules of the rhetoricians illustrates that Romans other than Virgil were familiar with the principles of the artificial memory system and made use of it to illustrate remembrance and recollection within a literary context.

I. MEMORY AND REMEMBERING IN VIRGIL’S *AENEID*: THE PAST

In Book 1, as Dido leads Aeneas into the palace for the first time and prepares a feast for the evening activities, Virgil provides a brief description of the splendour with which the palace is decorated for the banquet: *arte laboratae vestes ostroque superbo,/ ingens argentum mensis, caelataque in auro/ fortia facta patrum, series longissima rerum/ per tot ducta viros antiqua ab origine gentis*, “there are tapestries of splendid purple produced with skill; on the tables there is a huge silver plate, and engraved in gold are the brave deeds of her forefathers, a very long series of exploits, traced from the ancient beginnings of the race up through the many heroes” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.).\(^{11}\) This silver plate which houses the deeds of her doughty ancestors is not only a part of

---

\(^{10}\) OLD s.v. 9

\(^{11}\) *Aeneid* 1.639-642
the stately display, but also a description of Dido’s memory system, a vehicle by which she remembers her ancestors and their past deeds.\textsuperscript{12} Like Livy, who inscribes in his characters qualities which are used to show how one should act, what characteristics are becoming of a Roman, and what is proper decorum, in order to remind his contemporaries about what qualities should be emulated and remembered, this display of Dido’s ancestors’ deeds was probably meant to serve as exempla which would remind Dido and others about, \textit{quae vita, qui mores fuerint}, “what the way of life and proper conduct were like” (tr. B.O. Foster, adapt.).\textsuperscript{13} Augustus accomplished the same thing when he established the new and highly ordered display of \textit{summi viri} exhibited in the Forum Augustum. These statues, as I described in Chapter One, served as silent exempla which prompted emulation, offered reminders of past great deeds and of excellent service to the state, and served as austere judges of all actions.\textsuperscript{14} Just like ancestral portraits set up in a Roman atrium to inspire family members and impress visitors, the images on Dido’s plate likely function in the same way. When Dido looks at the visual images on the plate, she is reminded of the \textit{exempla virtutis} of her ancestors. Thus the images on Dido’s plate likely correspond to the images that an orator would use to remember details of a speech, because as she ‘reads’ each one she is prompted to remember information that has been mentally stored away.

To further substantiate that Virgil has laid out the images and represented them on the plate in a manner that is reminiscent of the Roman artificial memory system, it is important to remember the three major features which comprise the place memory system: sequential order, distinctiveness, and discriminability. These engraved images, which are arranged in a long series, follow the theory proper to the memory techniques used by the rhetoricians for remembering \textit{res} (things). To pause for a moment, I want to explain what the connotation behind \textit{series} is. The Oxford Latin Dictionary states that \textit{series} can be defined as a series

\textsuperscript{12} Yates (1966) 206

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{ab Urbe Condita Praef.} 9

of objects coupled to one another to form one continuous line, a continuous series of non-material things, or even a line of ancestors or descendants.\(^\text{15}\) Now while it may seem that Virgil is using the word *series* because a line of ancestors is being discussed, I opine that he is also using this word to draw attention to the fact that he wishes the reader to see that Dido uses the plate in the same way as an orator would mentally link a series of images together in order to accurately remember the contained information.

For remembering *res*, the rhetoricians recommend committing to memory a series of vivid mental descriptions that record the details of what needs to be remembered. Cicero states that memory for things is based upon the arrangement of *persona*\(^e\) (personal qualities or characteristics),\(^\text{16}\) *eam singulis personis bene positis notare possumus ut sententias imaginibus, ordinem locis comprehendamus*, “we can mentally note this [memory for things] by a skilful arrangement of the several characteristics that represent them, so that we may grasp ideas by means of images and their order by means of localities” (tr. E.W. Sutton, adapt.).\(^\text{17}\) Personal characteristics, which prompted memory of who the person was and what his achievements were, were used frequently in the Roman world. Ovid in the *Fasti* provides a short description of two of the *summi viri* in the Forum Augustum: *hinc videt Aenean oneratum pondere caro/ et tot Iuleae nobilitatis avos:/ hinc videt Iliaden humeris ducis arma ferentem,/ claraque dispositis acta subesse viris*, “on this side he [Mars the Avenger] sees Aeneas laden with his dear burden, and many an ancestor of the noble Julian line. On the other side he sees the son of Ilia [Romulus] carrying on his shoulders the arms of the conquered leader, and their famous deeds inscribed beneath the statues.

\(^{15}\) OLD s.v. 2 and 3

\(^{16}\) The *persona* in this case are, I believe, the specific personal characteristics used to make the image more memorable. The *persona*, in Dido’s case are the brave deeds associated with each individual. This would ensure their remembrance more readily. The *persona* would be important because with relatives often having similar praenomen their distinctive characteristics would keep them differentiated. This is why Dido’s ancestors are recorded based on their past deeds.

\(^{17}\) *de Oratore* 2.87.359-360
arranged in order” (tr. Sir James George Frazer, adapt.). What is important here is not only that the memory of who Aeneas and Romulus were relies on their distinguishing features, but also that the statues were arranged in a specific order spaced at regular intervals. Because the *summi viri* were meant to be visual reminders of the glorious Roman past, the fact that Ovid notes personal qualities and a specific sequence suggests that this was to facilitate remembrance. Since Dido’s ancestors are arranged in a *series longissima rerum* on the plate and representations which record the details of each individual’s feats are used, it seems likely that the plate was to have a mnemonic function. Remember, distinctiveness was an important feature of the place memory system. If an image was not notable or distinct then it would fail to remind the user of the mnemonic system of the information associated with it. Because Dido’s ancestors are portrayed based on their deeds, which act as their badges of identity, when Dido looks at each image she would be reminded of who each of her sires were by their achievements. To reiterate, because the images on the plate are laid out in a series, and they are made distinguishable by the characteristics of each deed, the images can be assumed to have a mnemonic function, as those in the architectural memory system did.

To fully establish that Virgil thinks of his plate as a vehicle to prompt Dido’s memory, just as the artificial memory system would an orator’s, it will be helpful to draw some comparisons with Homer. There are two Homeric descriptions, the tapestry of Helen and Odysseus’ tunic, which serve to underscore Virgil’s singularity in the way he describes Dido’s decorated paraphernalia. In Book Three of the *Iliad*, Iris arrives in Helen’s chamber to find her weaving a great robe with embroidered images: πολέας δ’ ἐνέπασσεν ἄθλουσι τρώών θ’ ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων, οὕς ἔθεν ἔνεκ’ ἐπασχοῦ ὑπ’. Ἀρης παλαμάων, “and thereon she wove as patterns many struggles of the horse-taming Trojans and the brass-clad Achaeans, that for her
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18 *Fasti* 5.563-566. Preserved fragments of the *summi viri*, which include figures in cuirass or toga, would have reflected the individual’s principle accomplishments and thus aided in his recognition, Zanker (1988) 211.
sake they had suffered at the hands of Ares” (tr. A.T. Murray, adapt.).¹⁹ As we have seen the images Dido looks at are all arranged on a plate, a *locus* in an orderly sequence and are presumably distinguished by personal characteristics. Thus the figures are not only organized in a pattern that facilitates remembrance, but also each is meant to stimulate a specific recollection in Dido’s mind. Helen’s images, on the other hand, while they reflect the Trojan War, the tribulations of the Greeks and Trojans, and the omnipresence of war,²⁰ do not spark any specific memory of a past event or individual. The way they are presented on the fabric does not correspond to the way Virgil has presented any of his images—there is no sequential order, distinguishing marks, or focus on the spatial relationship between images. What is made clear by comparing these two sets of images is that Dido’s plate conforms to the place or artificial memory system by providing a sequence of prompts while the tapestry of Helen serves to focus the listener or reader on the battle between the Trojans and Achaeans.

In Book Nineteen of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus returns to Ithaca in the guise of a beggar. As he sits and talks with Penelope, revealing that he had once met her husband, Penelope questions Odysseus, perhaps unaware it is him, about what he was wearing at the time he and the beggar met. Odysseus describes in detail the brooch pinned to the wooly mantle she had weaved for him:

*χλοίιναν πορφυρήν οὐλὴν ἐξῄ διὸς Ἄδωνσεύς, / διπλήν ἐν δὲ ἄρα οἱ
περόνης χρυσίθοι τέτυκτο ἀπὸ λοίδοις διδύμοις: πάροιχοι δὲ βαίδαλον ἦν ἐν
προτέροις πόδεσι κυών ἐξῄ ποικίλον ἠλλόν, / ἀσπαίροντα λάσσων τὸ δὲ
θαυμαζέασκον ἀπαντές, / ὡς οἱ χρύσεοι ἐντεῖν ὣς μὲν λαῖς νεβρῶν ἀπάγχοι, /
αὐτὰρ ἐκφυγέειν μεμαλὼς ἔπασαρ πόδεσι.*

[a] woolen cloak of purple did god-like Odysseus wear, a cloak of double fold, but the brooch upon it was fashioned of gold with double clasps, and on the front it was cunningly wrought: a hound held in his fore paws a dappled fawn, and pinned it in his jaws as it writhed. And at this all men marveled, how, though they were of gold, the hound was pinning the fawn and strangling it, and the fawn was writhing with its feet striving to flee (tr. A.T. Murray, adapt.).²¹

---

¹⁹ *Iliad* 3.126-128


²¹ *Odyssey* 19.225-231
The images which decorate this brooch are first presented as a self-contained scene in which a dog ensnares a young deer and then again in line 229 the brooch is seen through the eyes of the admiring onlookers who turn it into a little story. Like the static images which adorn Dido’s plate, Homer’s images are meant to offer a story in order to prompt recollection. The brooch is meant to act as a ‘token of recognition’, prompting Penelope to remember Odysseus and perhaps help her recognize him beneath his beggar’s guise. But Homer differs from Virgil in that Homer does not use a series of images set on a background, marked with individual distinguishing features. While Dido reads through a continuous narrative on her plate and recalls specific information about the past, the reader of Homer’s brooch does not read a consecutive narrative but reads one set scene which seems to foreshadow future events. Since Virgil has focused on creating a locus upon which different images are placed in a series, it is likely that the way Dido remembers is meant to be based on using imagines and loci like a Roman would, who was trained in the mechanics of the artificial memory system.

Immediately preceding lines 456-494 in Book One, Aeneas enters Carthage veiled in a cloud sent by his mother Venus. As he walks through the city he marvels at the massive buildings, gates and paved roads. He comes to a mighty temple which Dido, the queen of Carthage, is constructing in honour of the patron deity Juno. On this temple he sees the battles of Ilium being fought in order, *videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnas* (1.456). To a modern reader, unfamiliar with Roman mnemonic methods, this line may not appear to offer any explication regarding memory or mnemonics. To one, however, familiar with the mnemonic system, the descriptive series of images Aeneas sees on the temple not only reminds the reader of the series of images on Dido’s plate earlier in Book One, but also signals a mnemonic reminder to the reader, using the same phrasing as

---

22 de Jong (2001) 471, 228-231n. Virgil is also interested in tracing past ancestry because he is writing a kistic epic which focuses on the founding of a new city, and this is not the goal of the Iliad or Odyssey.

23 In the Odyssey the suitors are compared to fawns (4.335-9, 17.126-30), while Odysseus is compared with a dog at 20.14-16, and therefore this scene appears to relate Odysseus’ slaying of the suitors, de Jong (2001) 471, 228-231n.
the Auctor ad Herennium, about how it is important to organize material in a series. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* clearly states that it is important to arrange *loci* in order, *ex ordine* (3.17.30, 3.18.30/31, 3.20.34) so that the rememberer can start from any of the *loci* in the series and move forward or backwards from it. It is clear that these pictures are set in a series because Virgil uses locative phrases like *hac* (467/468,), *nec procul* (469), *parte alia* (474), *interea* (479), and *tum* (485) to emphasize the spatial distinction between each tableau. By creating clear, separate, and self-contained scenes Virgil demonstrates that he recognizes the importance of discriminability. In short, distinct visual backgrounds acting as mental cues help keep the different tableaux discriminable in memory. For mental cues, like physical cues in the environment, support recall while too much resemblance between *loci* causes confusion. Therefore, when Virgil uses these locative words he means to show, in a manner analogous to the rhetoricians, that these distinct tableaux can be easily imprinted on the mind and then later recalled. For example, the Auctor ad Herennium suggests using different *loci* when explaining how to mentally record the different facts from a court case: *in primo loco rei totius imaginem conformabimus... [i]tem deinceps cetera crimina ex ordine in locis ponemus...* “we shall in the first place form an image of the all the facts... [i]n like fashion we shall set the other counts of the charge in backgrounds successively, following their order...” (tr. Jocelyn Penny Small, adapt.). By instructing the reader to set specific images in each background the Auctor informs us that information which is ordered and properly organized will facilitate remembrance. In this way, both Virgil and the Auctor illustrate that set scenes are meant to be transferable to memory. Thus by using a serial

---

24 Quintilian also states at 11.2.20 that symbols must be placed in order, *per ordinem*. I do not believe that it hinders my argument that Virgil uses *ex ordine* and Quintilian uses *per ordinem* because Virgil at 8.629 uses *in ordine* to introduce the description of the shield of Aeneas. In each case, a serial order is being stressed.


26 *ad Herennium* 3.20.33-34

27 Small (1997) 113-114
composition and locative words, as Small points out, Virgil reveals his
dependence on literacy and the art of memory.  

To further stress that this series of scenes is meant to be understood as an
exploitation of traditional Roman mnemonic practices, Virgil marks his loci with
images that are striking and/or in the process of doing something. To show the
extent to which Virgil uses notable images I will quote this passage in full:

namque videbat, uti bellantes Pergama circum/ hac fugerent Grai, premeret
Troiana iuventus,/ hac Phryges, instaret curru cristatus Achilles./ nec procul
hinc Rhesi niveis tentoria velis/ adgnoscit lacrimans, primo quae prodira
somno / Tydides multa vastabat caede cruentus,/ ardentisque avertit equos in
castra, prius quam/ pabula gustassent Troiae Xanthumque bibissent./ parte alia
fugiens ammissis Troilus armis,/ infelix puer atque impar congressus
Achilli;/ furtur equis, currusque haeret resupinus inani./ lora tenens tamen; huic
cervixque comaeque trahuntur/ per terram, et versa pulvis inscribitur hasta./
interea ad templum non aequae Palladis ibant/ crinibus Iliades passis peplumque
ferebant,/ suppliciter tristes et tunsae pectora palmis;/ diva solo fixos oculos
aversa tenebat./ ter circum Iliacos raptaverat Hectora muros,/ exanimumque
auro corpus vendebat Achilles./ tum vero ingentem dat pectore ab
imo,/ ut spolia, ut currus, utque ipsum corpus amici,/ tendentemque manus
Priamum conspexit inermis./ se quoque principibus permixtum adgnovit Achivis./
Eoasque acies et nigri Memnonis arma./ ducit Amazonidum lunatis agmina
peltis/ Penthesilea fures, medisique in milibus ardet,/ aurea subnectens exsertae
cingula mammae,/ bellatrix, audetque viris concurrere virgo.

[for he saw how, as they fought round Pergamus, here the Greeks were in rout,
the Trojan youth hard on their heels; there fled the Phrygians, plumed Achilles
in his chariot pressing them close. Not far away he discerns with tears the snowy-
canvased tents of Rhesus, which betrayed in their first sleep, the blood-stained
son of Tydeus laid waste with many a death, and turned the fiery steeds away to
the camp, ere they should taste Trojan fodder or drink of Xanthas. Elsewhere
Troilus, his arms flung away in flight— unhappy boy, and ill-matched in conflict
with Achilles— is carried along by his horses and, fallen backward, clings to the
empty car, yet clasp the reins; his neck and hair are dragged over the ground,
and the dust is scored by his reversed spear. Meanwhile, to the temple of
unfriendly Pallas the Trojan women passed along with streaming tresses, and
bore the robe, mourning in suppliant guise and beating breasts with hands: with
averted face the goddess kept her eyes fast upon the ground. Thrice had Achilles
dragged Hector round the walls of Troy and was selling the lifeless body for
gold. Then indeed from the bottom of his heart he heaves a deep groan, as the
spoils, as the chariot, as the very corpse of his friend met his gaze, and Priam
outstretching weaponless hands. Himself, too, in close combat with the Achaean
chiefs, he recognized, and the Eastern ranks, and swarthy Memnon’s armour.
Penthesilea in fury leads the crescent-shielded ranks of the Amazons and rages
amid her thousands; a golden belt binds her naked breast, while she, a warrior queen, dares battle, a maid clashing with men (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough).\textsuperscript{29}

In each scene the different characters are marked with specific attributes and actions, like those on Dido’s plate, that make them distinct and memorable to the viewer: Achilles is plumed while driving his chariot, the son of Tydeus is stained with blood, Troilus has let his weapons fall while being dragged by his horses, the band of Trojan women are grieving suppliants with hair flowing everywhere, Priam has outstretched hands, and Penthesilea is decorated with her golden belt, fighting among men. By making each of the images recognizable and memorable by specific markings, Virgil follows the advice of the Auctor ad Herennium:

\begin{quote}
...si non multas nec vagas, sed aliquid agentes imagines ponemus; si egregiam pulcritudinem aut unicum turpitudinem eis adtribuemus; si aliquas exornabimus, ut si coronis aut veste purpurea, quo nobis notatior sit simuludo; aut si qua re deformabimus, ut si cruentam aut caeno oblitam aut rubrica delibutam inducamus, quo magis insignita sit forma, aut ridiculas res aliquid imaginibus adtribuamus, nam ea res quoque faciet ut facilius meminisse valeamus.
\end{quote}

...if we set up images that are not many or vague, but are doing something; if we bestow extraordinary beauty or singular ugliness on them; if we dress others as if in crowns or purple cloaks so that the likeness may be more distinct to us; or if we disfigure them somehow, as if we presented one stained with blood, covered with mud, or smeared with red ochre, so that its appearance is more distinguished, or if we assign to the images certain funny things, these things will ensure that we will be able to remember them more readily (tr. Harry Caplan, adapt.).\textsuperscript{30}

To further underscore that this specific section was written based on the principles of the artificial memory system a look at the ekphrastic description of the bowl of Theocritus is useful. In \textit{Idyll One} there is a description of the images which decorate a kissybion or ivy bowl. Divided into three registers, the sets of images are separated from the other by the words, ἐντὸσθεν (within, 1.32), τοῖς δὲ μετὰ (beside these, 1.39), and τυτθὸν δ ὀσσου ἀπωθεν (scarcely far away 1.45). Now while these words resemble the locative words Virgil uses to create spatial relationships between his series of images, what Theocritus does not stress is any type of sequence. A sequence or series was one of the most important

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Aeneid} 1.466-494

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{ad Herennium} 3.22.37
features of the memory system. If loci and imagines were not kept in proper order, one would not be able to properly recall the stored information. Therefore, Theocritus’ lack of series or images arranged in an orderly sequence, further suggests that Virgil is likely organizing his images according to the tenets of the artifical memory system. Furthermore, when Virgil describes both Dido’s figural plate and the battle scenes on the temple of Juno, he makes sure that the figures are recognizable to their viewer. Dido can recognize her ancestors by the representations of their brave deeds and Aeneas recognizes the portraits of his former kinsmen and the Greek enemy by distinctive clothing, accessories, or actions. Distinctiveness is an important element of the Roman mnemonic system because without distinct features, things and individuals would not be easily remembered. Theocritus describes the figures which decorate his bowl without any identifying characteristics or traits, as we can note in his description of the first register:

[ɑ]nd within is wrought a woman, such a thing as the gods might fashion, bedecked with cloak and circlet. And by her two men with long fair locks contend from either side in alternate speech. Yet these things touch not her heart, but now she looks on one and smiles, and now to the other she shifts her thought, while they, long hollow-eyed from love, labour to no purpose (tr. A.S. F. Gow).31

Because Theocritus has omitted using a series and notable personae, it seems that his ekphrastic description was either not meant to be memorized or act as a mnemonic prompt for the viewer or perhaps respond to a different mnemonic system.32

---
31 Gow (1952) 32-38
32 Narrative works of art need order and discipline. Therefore, it seems likely that Theocritus’ images have nothing to do with rhetoric and memory, but are simply descriptions of imaginary works of narrative relief. Because Virgil maintains order and discipline in his narrative works of art, it suggests that the subjects of memory and rhetoric are likely at the forefront of his mind. Thanks to Dr. John. P. Oleson for this point.
In further contrast with Theocritus, when Virgil writes that Aeneas witnesses the battles of Ilium being fought, he is not only telling the reader that Aeneas physically sees these pictures before him, but *videt* is also being used as a zeugma to suggest that he sees the pictures in his mind’s eye.\(^{33}\) Theocritus, in comparison, tells his readers that the bowl is a wondrous thing to the goatherds and that it strikes (\(\alpha\tau\omega\xi\alpha\iota\)) their hearts with amazement (1.56). By using the verb (\(\alpha\tau\omega\xi\omicron\alpha\iota\)), which, according to Liddell and Scott, does not imply the definition of either seeing with the physical or mind’s eye, Theocritus suggests that the object was solely meant to be marveled at.\(^{34}\) Because Virgil frequently uses verbs which intimate that seeing is both a mental and physical process,\(^{35}\) he implies that what Aeneas observes, is also what he commits to memory.\(^{36}\) Cicero in his *de Oratore* states that:

> ...ea maxime animis effingi nostris, quae essent a sensu tradita atque impressa; acerrimum autem ex omnibus nostris sensibus esse sensum videndi; qua re facillime animo teneri posse ea, quae perciperentur auribus aut cogitatione, si etiam commendatione oculorum animis traderentur...,  

the most complete pictures are formed in our minds of the things that have been conveyed to them and imprinted on them by the senses, but that consequently perceptions received by the ears or by reflexion can be most easily retained in the mind if they are also conveyed to our minds by the mediation of the eyes... (tr. E.W. Sutton).\(^{37}\)

Thus, it is clear that the ancients believed that information which was received by the eyes went hand in hand with what was retained in the memory. So when

---

\(^{33}\) The Oxford Latin Dictionary translates the verb *video* as to obtain a mental picture of, or see with the mind’s eye, OLD s.v. 7.

\(^{34}\) Gow (2005) 13 56n.

\(^{35}\) Seeing is both a mental and physical process because you see with both your external and your mind’s eyes.

\(^{36}\) In line 466 Virgil uses the verb *video* to describe one of the images Aeneas recognizes on the temple, in lines 470 and 488, Virgil uses the verb *agnosco*, which can mean to recognize by mental apprehension, to give an account of what Aeneas sees (OLD s.v. 1), and in line 487 Virgil uses the verb *conspicio*, which may be translated as to perceive mentally or discern, to describe one of the scenes witnessed by Aeneas (OLD s.v. 6).

\(^{37}\) *de Oratore* 2.87.357
Aeneas looks at each of the different panels and he sees their contents, it strikes an uncanny resemblance with the way an orator would move the through the different loci of his mind and read off the contents stored by the imagines.

As Aeneas looks at these images and is reminded of the past, the temple, on which the scenes are recorded, is transformed into a monument deliberately designed to provoke memories. The Roman memory system, as we have seen, was based upon physicality in that ancient Roman memories were trained by an art that reflected the architecture of the surrounding environment. When Aeneas looks at the Temple of Juno and is reminded of Troy, Virgil is announcing that he (Virgil) is using the monument tradition as a way to assert specific memories and his own personal commentary that he wants Aeneas and his readers to remember. As I mentioned, in Chapter One of this thesis, monuments were used to preserve and stimulate specific memories of the past, for those currently living and for posterity. Horace, too, in Carmen 3.30 uses the monument tradition to preserve his memory as a poet. The initial lines, \textit{exegi monumentum aere perennius/ regalique situ pyramidum altius}, I have perfected a monument more lasting than bronze and loftier than the structure of the royal pyramids (tr. C.E. Bennett, adapt.), well illustrate how the poet links abstract memory to a concrete, physical structure. By describing his poem as a sepulchral monument, Horace makes it clear that the memory of him as a poet, the creator of this poem, will live on in posterity, as a Roman would through his tomb. In the same vein, if we compare the ending of Virgil’s epic with Daedalus and Daedalus’ sculptures at the beginning of Book 6, there is a clear parallel between both. Daedalus’ series of tableaux highlight moments from his life after his arrival in Italy on the doors of a temple dedicated to Apollo. His tableaux reflect his own memories and how he remembers his past. He cannot complete the scene which depicts the death of his

---

39 Yates (1966) 4
40 Carmen 3.30.1-2
41 Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 368 In.
son because he cannot recreate the grief he feels over the incident. The end of Virgil’s epic is similar. Virgil constructs the ending of his poem to reflect his feelings about the incompletions he believes there to be in human life. As Michael Putnam writes, “Aeneas cannot fulfill his father’s idealizing, and therefore deceptive, vision of Rome, and Virgil, the artisan of the tale, cannot show him doing so”.

By creating a parallel between his poem and Daedalus’ tableaux, Virgil demonstrates that he is thinking in physical terms. His poem, like Daedalus’ sculptures, is a monument meant to trigger specific recollections and memories. In Horace’s case, his monument is meant to stimulate the memory of how he wishes to be remembered, in the generations to come, for his literary achievements, and in Virgil’s case, he wants both Aeneas and his readers to remember the Roman past in a certain way. Both Horace and Virgil wish to be remembered as creators of literary monuments. Therefore, Virgil not only stimulates the memory of Aeneas through the use of a monument, but he also writes the description of how Aeneas views the images in a manner that is reminiscent of the artificial memory system. In short, Virgil is evoking the place memory tradition to show how memory was preserved on a physical and mental level.

The fact that Aeneas sees the deeds before him on the walls of the temple offers a striking point of contrast with Homer. The picture of past events and Aeneas’ tears at being made to recall them, are reminiscent of Odysseus listening to Demodokus’ song of the Trojan War and his tears in Book Eight of the *Odyssey*. What is different between both scenes is that while Aeneas looks at images that prompt his memories, Odysseus’ memories are stimulated by hearing about past deeds (44ff.). By making Aeneas physically see the deeds, Virgil supplants the Homeric *kleos* tradition or heroic song, spoken tales used for remembering deeds, for the monument tradition. Because a bard is the essential

---

42 Putnam (1998) 95. For further reading on the parallels between Daedalus’ sculptures and the ending of the *Aeneid* see Chapter 3 in Putnam’s book *Virgil’s Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*.

43 Williams (1972) 192 418-493n.
ingredient to the *kleos* tradition, in that through him the listener is reminded of past individuals and events; since Virgil, in his epic, has replaced the bard with physical monuments, he illustrates that memory is physical and it has do with architecture. This clearly fits in with the way Romans traditionally remembered information. Therefore while Homer makes his remembrances based on *kleos* and verbally carried memory, Virgil uses physical objects to spark remembrance.\footnote{Thanks to Dr. Luke Roman for this point.}

Before I proceed into a full analysis of how we can see the memory system being used in Virgil’s underworld I believe that it is important to emphasize how Virgil has created a completely unique situation by comparing it to the underworld scenes in Homer’s *Odyssey* and Aristophanes’ *Frogs*. By looking at these other two texts the reader will clearly see that what he or she looks at in Virgil’s underworld is markedly different from what is experienced in either the *Odyssey* or *Frogs*. As the Sibyl accompanies Aeneas on his journey through the underworld in Book Six, he meets various people from his past (450-547). He first comes across Dido wandering in the great forest of the Mourning Fields, then further on in the farthest fields he meets Tydeus, Parthenopaeus, Adrastus, and passes and laments the Dardan chiefs who stand in a long line, and then among the Trojan ghosts he meets Deiphobus, son of Priam. While this journey might appear to be a kind of pilgrim’s progress through the underworld it seems to me, however, there is more than what is observed by the modern commentators. Virgil has composed this passage as if he has followed the instructions of the Auctor *ad Herennium*. The Auctor suggests that *loci* be set off on a small scale, complete, and conspicuous (3.16.29). When Aeneas physically walks through the different *loci* of the underworld he comes upon complete and conspicuous scenes or backgrounds that are set off, as noted by the use of specific locative words, from each other. In the artificial memory system each background houses an image, such as a figure, mark, or portrait of the object that needs to be remembered (3.16.30). When an orator wanted to remember a long speech he would sequentially move through the various backgrounds that he had formed in his mind and then use the imaginal memory prompts he had placed in
the individual backgrounds to recall the information he needed. In each of the backgrounds that Aeneas wanders through, all are marked by one or more figures who have specific characteristics distinguishing them and prompt the recollection of memories from Aeneas’ past. What is important here is that Virgil has arranged for Aeneas to come upon a series of souls one after the other, each of whom appears to him separated by short intervals. Each of the images Aeneas both physically and mentally discerns are, for the most part, distinguished by some identifying characteristic. Thus, as I further describe below, Virgil describes the way Aeneas sees and remembers the characters in the underworld in the same way an orator would be expected to see and remember a speech.

Both Simonides and Aristotle advise using a permanent set of places, *loci* or *topoi*, in which various sets of information can be stored for remembrance; each piece of information has its own array of visual images, associated with the *loci* or *topoi*, which are meant to cue recall of stored information. The idea of using the same set of places over and over, according to Small, has led to the idea of the ‘common places’, ‘*loci communes*’ or ‘κοινοὶ τόποι’. These (common) places into which one gathers information-to-be-remembered, act like containers in storehouse as both have contents and structure. Every *locus* or *topos* in this sense is a mnemonic because they are structures of memory and recollection. This is extremely important when comparing Aeneas’ descent into the underworld with Dionysus’ *katabasis* in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*. As Dionysus and his slave Xanthias make their way to the underworld in order to bring back one of the great Athenian poets their journey simply involves going into the underworld and looking for them. In their travels Dionysus runs across the typical chthonic figures of Charon, Cerberus, Aeacus, and Hades, figures normally seen in the

---

45 The backgrounds are the Mourning Fields, the farthest fields, Tartarus, and the Blissful Groves. In each of these *loci* are images of figures that are set apart from one another as if they were acting as mnemonic prompts because they remind readers and Aeneas of past events and people.

46 Small (1997) 90

47 Carruthers (1990) 34

48 Thanks to Dr. Gordon Shrimpton for this point.
underworld; but not with any character personally associated with himself. The past defines Aeneas’ ego. Aeneas is a creature of memories who will eventually have to become a different person with different memories if he is to go on and found Rome. Dionysus, however, is not defined in the *Frogs* by his past memories, he is merely looking to decide which poet’s spirit he is going to bring back to Athens. Therefore the places and figures found in Aristophanes’ underworld are entirely different. The places do not house images which store past memories and the images are not meant to reflect specific information. Aristophanes even introduces an unexpected scene of a chorus of frogs, not traditionally a part of the underworld, which illustrates that he adds his own elements which are not meant to be suggestive of any type of remembrance. Virgil, however, uses figures from either Aeneas’ past or from Trojan history. Each of these figures is recognizable either by Aeneas or by someone who knows something about the foundation myths of Rome. In this way Virgil is playing with the idea of the *locus communis*. He uses different *loci* in which he sets the information he wants Aeneas and his readers to remember and uses the characters as images to evoke the Roman mnemonic practice.

Homer offers a further comparison that helps to illustrate the unique presentation of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. In Book Eleven of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus is confronted with his past and his future, with Ithaca and Troy, with his family and comrades in arms, similar to Aeneas in Book Six. Unlike Aristophanes in the *Frogs*, Homer portrays people, such as Antikleia, Achilles, Agamemnon, who would be expected to be seen by the readers and Odysseus himself. As a result Homer creates a type of *topos* because each character that comes up to the entrance of Hades’ entrance is meant to facilitate a specific memory and/or recollection. What separates Virgil from Homer is that Aeneas walks through the underworld while Odysseus does not. Moving through different mental *loci* is key to using the Roman mnemonic system.

Virgil creates an underworld that resembles the series of backgrounds a

---

49 de Jong (2001) 271
user of the artificial memory system would mentally prepare, throughout which
different memory prompting images are set. Because Odysseus never directly
walks through the underworld or through various loci, it becomes obvious that
Homer’s underworld scene is not meant to respond to the same mnemonic system
that Virgil is using. As Cicero states, in his de Oratore, the most complete
pictures formed in one’s mind are conveyed to it and imprinted on it by the
senses, with the sense of sight being the keenest of all. Since Aeneas wanders
through the underworld and perceives everything around him by sight, everything
he sees must be tangible. What is tangible, furthermore, must take up space and
cannot exist without a physical location. Each image an orator uses and
perceives takes up space in his mental construct. When Virgil has Aeneas walk
through the underworld the images have their own individual place and each take
up their own physical space, while the images in Homer merely rise to the
opening of Hades and Odysseus sees them there. Homer’s images are not given
their own space or physical location which is a necessary requirement for the
images of the memory system to function properly. Because Virgil makes Aeneas
physically walk through a space which is suggestive of the way an elite Roman
would mentally move through his own personal mnemonic construct and each
image is given its own physical place, while Homer has his souls drawn up to
Odysseus by blood, suggests that Virgil is doing something entirely different
with his underworld scene.

In the Mourning Fields, which are nec procul hinc from the region of sad
souls, Aeneas comes across Dido wandering in a great forest with her wound still
fresh. Her fresh wound, indicative of the distinguishing marks used by orators in
order to aid remembrance, is suggestive of Virgil’s exploitation of the artificial
memory system. When Aeneas sees Dido, his recognition of her is described with
the verbs agnosco (6.452) and video (6.454), both of which, as I have mentioned
above, suggest that what Aeneas perceives is also what he remembers. Thus,
when he sees her shade and he remembers the announcement of her death, we can

50 de Oratore 2.87.357
51 Small (1997) 96-97
see how the visual and mental processes, fundamental to the art of memory, coincide.

In the farthest fields, an area removed from the Mourning fields, Aeneas meets images of people from the past: Tydeus, Parthenopaeus, Adrastus, and the Dardan chiefs who stand in a long series, longo ordine (6.482). The first that come are three of the Seven Against Thebes. To Aeneas, these men would represent the most famous war in ancient Trojan history before the Trojan War proper. As each man presents himself to Aeneas, Virgil uses the verb occurro (479), which can mean to become visible to a person, his eyes, his memory etc., to describe the way in which they appear. By using this verb, Virgil suggests that these men are meant to remind Aeneas of Trojan history. Following these men Aeneas sees, cernens (6.482), the series of Dardan chiefs. The verb cerno used to describe Aeneas’ perception suggest they are meant to be seen in his mind’s eye. Therefore, this mini procession of Dardan heroes may be recognized as a visual prompt which enables Aeneas to remember the past. As if to emphasize the mnemonic function of these individuals, Virgil describes them as being arranged in a long series, longo ordine (6.482).

This mini procession of Dardan heroes is meant to establish a connection with the parade of heroes at lines 6.752ff. By establishing a mini funeral procession whereby Aeneas mourns the fallen chiefs, Virgil is setting the scene for a parade that will force Aeneas to look toward the future rather than back into the past. Each previous image has evoked some past event or person in Aeneas’ mind. Even when he sees, videt (6.495), Deiphobus in the next locus, amid the Danaan princes and Agamemnon’s battalions, marked with a mangled frame and face, memories of the Trojan past are evoked. It takes a warning from the Sibyl to move Aeneas, from reminiscing on scenes of the Trojan past, towards the scenes of the future. Aeneas’ movement into the Blissful Groves will provide a transition

52 Austin (1977) 479ff. n.

53 OLD s.v. 8. Livy uses the verb occurro to describe what becomes visible to the eyes of the gods and to their memory/ thoughts, quidquid deorum oculis, quidquid animo occurrit, 2.49.7.

54 OLD s.v. 5d, cerno can be defined as to see in one’s mind’s eye.
for him. He will see Dardanus, Troy’s founder, and others from the noble line of Teucer, but Anchises will show Aeneas the spirits of future Rome. Now a new series of imagery and visual prompts will force Aeneas to forget his past and make him realize that the past is dead.\textsuperscript{55} Thus, Aeneas’ memory of those who performed noble deeds for Troy will be left behind and Aeneas will be prompted to remember the leading men, events and the places of Rome’s future.

In short, Virgil presents Aeneas’ \textit{katabasis} as both a reflection of the Roman system of artificial memory and as a poetic monument. First, each of the features necessary for the memory system to work, sequential order, distinctiveness, and discriminability, are all employed. By using vocabulary which is doubly suggestive of seeing and mental perception, Virgil makes it clear that Aeneas and the readers of the \textit{Aeneid} are presented with information the way an orator or another user of the mnemonic system would remember; by seeing images which would prompt recall of the stored information. Second, like physical monuments which are meant to induce remembrance in people, Virgil creates his own \textit{monumentum} which communicates how the Trojan past played an important role in the ordained plan of Rome and reveals how Virgil wants the Roman past to remembered and who he wants remembered.

\textbf{III. MEMORY AND REMEMBERING IN VIRGIL’S \textit{AENEID} - THE FUTURE}

After Aeneas meets Anchises in the Blessed Fields, Anchises takes his son and the Sibyl to see the glory that will follow the Dardan line, the progeny of Italian stock that awaits Aeneas. From a mound the three of them watch the men who will build the glory of Rome walk \textit{longo ordine} (6.754). The words used to describe the long series of Italian men are the same as the ones used to describe the series of Dardan chiefs (6.482). These words suggest that the presentation of Roman heroes, like that of the Dardan chiefs, will be depicted in the orderly arrangement favoured by the rhetoricians to facilitate recall of information. Even though the arrangement of heroes does not follow a strict consecutive chronology,

\textsuperscript{55} Williams (1972) 494f.n.
what is important is that the souls come to Aeneas and Anchises by one, in an orderly series, and each time one comes toward the mound, Anchises uses the figure as a visual prompt to articulate the role each character plays in the founding and building of the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{56}

The procession begins with the two words, \textit{ille, vides} (6.760).\textsuperscript{57} Both words are important because while the \textit{ille} indicates that a specific person is being introduced, the verb \textit{video} implies that Aeneas sees the images in both his external vision and in his mind’s eye. For the information that he is about to receive from his father is presented in a series, complete with images of his future descendants, many of whom are marked with distinguishing features or characteristics. For example Silvius, who is first in the procession, is made to lean on a headless spear and hold places (\textit{loca}) closest to the light (6.760-761).\textsuperscript{58} Thereby using images and distinguishing features/devices which will allow the image to adhere longest in the memory, Virgil indicates that Aeneas will be able to absorb the procession into his memory; further illustrating that Aeneas’ memories and recollections will now be focused on the Roman future rather than on the Trojan past. \textit{Proximus} (6.767) which can be translated as next in the situation illustrates that there is a separation between the second and first figure. Following the first two figures there is a list of three men, arranged in one scene, whom Aeneas is told to behold, \textit{aspice} (6.771). By using this verb Anchises not only orders Aeneas to notice the scene with his eyes, but also to mentally perceive it or to picture it in his imagination.\textsuperscript{59} Thus the reader can recognize that Aeneas is being told to properly imprint the information on his mind while being given the appropriate

\textsuperscript{56} What is interesting here is that before Aeneas had to wander through the different \textit{loca} and look at the images. Now the images are directly moving toward him as though they were on a conveyor belt and the future is coming directly toward him.

\textsuperscript{57} Lines 6.760-761 read, \textit{ille, vides, pura iuvenis qui nititur hasta;/ proxima sorte tenet lucis loca}....

\textsuperscript{58} I will talk more about the distinguishing features as I proceed in my analysis of the procession.

\textsuperscript{59} OLD s.v.8
presentation to do so.\(^{60}\)

_Quin et_ (6.777), introduces the next major figure in the sequence. To call attention to the facts, introduced by _ut_ (6.779), Anchises uses _uiden_ (_videsne_)(6.779)\(^{61}\) to ask if Aeneas sees, both physically and in his mind’s eye, the twin plumes and how the father of the gods marks, _signat_ (6.780), Romulus with distinction. Both elements can be understood as defining features which will allow Aeneas to easily remember Romulus and the information associated with him. Following the description of Romulus’ great exploits, Anchises orders Aeneas to focus on and mentally perceive another scene, _huc geminas nunc flecte acies, hanc aspice gentem/Romanosque tuos_, “hither now turn both your eyes: visualize this race, your own Romans” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.).\(^{62}\) This scene is obviously offset from the previous one because Anchises must tell Aeneas to turn his eyes to another area in order for him to see Augustus Caesar. When Anchises finishes narrating the deeds of Augustus, he takes up the tale that was interrupted at 788, and reveals information pertaining to the future Kings of Rome.\(^{63}\) He asks, _[q]uis procul ille autem ramis insignis olivae/sacra ferens?_, “who is he far off, marked distinctively with olive-sprays and bearing the sacrifice?” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.).\(^{64}\) This line is interesting because it not only illustrates that this man is set apart from the others, but it also shows that he is distinctively marked like _imaginines_ are meant to be, in order to facilitate their recollection: _imaginibus [est utendum] autem agentibus, acribus, insignitis_, “one must employ mental images that are effective, ...sharply outlined, and marked

---

\(^{60}\) The procession of heroes resembles a Roman funeral procession. The _pompa funebris_ was meant to offer visual representations of deceased family members in full view of a public audience so that the viewers would remember the newly deceased, his ancestors, and their past glories. See Flower (1996) 91-127 and especially 109-114.

\(^{61}\) Fletcher (1955) 779 n.

\(^{62}\) _Aeneid_ 6.788

\(^{63}\) Austin (1977) 808ff. n.

\(^{64}\) _Aeneid_ 6.808
distinctively” (E.W. Sutton, adapt.). 65 The succession of figures continues, underscored by the words deinde “next” (6.812) and iuxta sequitur “he follows immediately after” (6.815). 66 Anchises continues his narration and asks Aeneas if he wishes to see, vis...videre (6.817-818), the Tarquin kings and the soul of avenging Brutus. By asking if Aeneas wishes to see the images of these men Anchises is asking whether Aeneas wants to be able to remember this information; for if Aeneas does not see them, he will not remember them. Since the Tarquins are distasteful characters to mention and the story of Brutus is shocking, Anchises permits Aeneas the option of retaining information about these men. 67

The Republican heroes, the Decii and Drusii and Torquatus and Camillus, are next, procul (6.824), to pass by. As they walk by Anchises explicitly orders Aeneas to mentally perceive and notice the scene with his eyes, quin...aspice (6.824-825) so that he will not forget these men. The list of Republican heroes is then interrupted as Anchises turns his attention to Julius Caesar and Pompey. The verb used to inform Aeneas about whom he (Aeneas) sees is cerno (6.826). By using this word to describe what Aeneas is seeing, Virgil implies that Aeneas is again discerning the images of these men with both his physical and mind’s eye. At line 6.836 Anchises now turns back and begins pointing out a new series of individuals who were either distinguished in civil or military achievement. 68 One follows the other, ending with Q. Fabius Maximus at line 6.846. But before the procession ends, Anchises orders Aeneas to call attention to, aspice (6.855), the penultimate figure of the series, M. Claudius Marcellus. Anchises narrates Marcellus’ biography until Aeneas espies the final figure of the procession. Aeneas himself must point out this character, because it appears Anchises does

65 de Oratore, 2.87.358

66 The series of figures is reminiscent of those on a monument proper, except here the figures move and come to life while Aeneas stands still.

67 Austin (1977) 817n.

68 Austin (1977) 756-853 n.
not want to talk about the youth’s tragic situation.\footnote{Austin (1977) 860ff. n.} Virgil uses the imperfect \textit{videbat} (6.860), to describe the action of Aeneas seeing the young Marcellus. The imperfect tense can denote an action as beginning and it is my opinion that Virgil uses this tense to imply that Aeneas can only begin committing the young Marcellus to memory because he (Marcellus) will die before his life truly begins, \textit{ostendent terris hunc tantum fata, nec ultra/ esse sinent,} “him the fates will but display to the earth, nor longer allow him to stay” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt).\footnote{A\textit{eneid} 6.869-870}

In sum, Virgil has clearly organized the procession of Roman heroes in the same way that an orator would organize information that needs to be memorized. The images in the Blissful Field \textit{locus} are all set up in a sequence and spatially arranged so they are set apart from one another. Most of the figures have some type of identifying mark so they can be easily distinguished and recognized. As the characters march by Aeneas, he forms a mental picture of them; made evident by the use of the zeugmatic verbs. With these features made so prominent, Virgil intends for the reader to realize that Aeneas, because he has been presented with information in such a fashion, will be able to recall what Anchises has taught him as he requires it. As if to underscore that the underworld is set up for mnemonic purposes, Virgil, just prior to Aeneas’s departure from the underworld, writes, \textit{quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit / incenditque animum famae venientis amore/ exin bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda}, “[a]nd when Anchises had guided his son through every scene, and fired his mind with love of fame that was to be, then he tells him them of the wars he must thereafter wage...” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.).\footnote{A\textit{eneid} 6.888-890} Thus, Virgil illustrates that Aeneas’ memories are now truly turned from the past toward the future.

The description of the palace in which King Latinus receives the Trojans is represented as containing both a sequence, \textit{ex ordine} (7.177), of ancestors and a
sequence of the other kings, *ab origine* (7.181), who have been supplanted by the Latini. The sequence of ancestors and kings are meant to act as visual memory prompts, as the engraved figures did on Dido’s silver plate. When the Latini look at these effigies or likenesses carved from old cedar, they are reminded of their ancestors’ past deeds. This is similar to the way Romans were meant to remember when Augustus transformed the Forum Romanum, 29 B.C., after his triumph over Illyrium and Egypt and his victory at Actium. He outfitted both the Temple of Divus Iulius and the new Curia with Egyptian trophies, which were meant to act as victory monuments. Captured plunder decorated the temple of Caesar and the newly erected speaker’s platform (*rostra*). Even the prows of captured Egyptian ships were mounted on the façade of the *rostra*. These monuments and others I have not mentioned served as symbols of victory. Wherever one looked around the Forum Romanum they were reminded of Augustus’ military victories from the Republic. Like the Forum Romanum, which was full of mnemonic cues reminding the public of Augustus’ triumphs, Latinus’ palace offers mnemonic reminders to guests and family about the past. The images are set in order, as were Dido’s, to provide an appropriate schema so the respective information could be properly recalled and a continuous narrative could be carried out. Because these images were also likely stored in a viewer’s mind, vivid mental descriptions which record the details of what needs to be remembered, was extremely important. The effigy of father Sabinus guards a curved scythe close up to his image, *sub imagine* (7.179). While this line has been widely contested as to its meaning, I believe that if the reader looks at it

---


73 The effigies seen in the hall of Latinus are also rendered like the Roman *imaginex* which stood in the atrium of the *domus*, since they similarly stand in a vestibule, *adstabant vestibulo* (7.181), and serve as mnemonic reminders of the past to family, visitors of the palace, and even contemporary Roman readers. While these reminders, however, are of the past for the Latini and contemporary Romans, to the Trojans they are visual mnemonic reminders of the past for a city that is still yet to be.

74 Zanker (1988) 80-81

through the lens of mnemonics it makes sense. The likeness of Sabinus, who was a planter of the vine, guards the scythe close up to his image because this is his distinguishing mark which acts as a visual reminder of who he was and what he did: it is the same with Dido’s ancestors who were distinguishable based upon their individual exploits. The use of notable features, as I have mentioned before, is very important because they help to facilitate recall of the information stored within each image. When viewers see the scythe, they would immediately connect this figure with the practice of viticulture and be reminded of Sabinus’ personal history. Therefore, by looking at Latinus’ palace and the manner in which the images decorate the hall, one can see the similarities between how Virgil has portrayed the way the Latini remember and how an actual Roman, like Augustus, would prompt remembrance and how he would expect people to remember.76

In Book Eight, as Evander leads Aeneas around Pallanteum offering him a narrated tour of the city, Aeneas marvels at all that he sees, ...*capiturque locis et singula laetus/ exquiritque auditque virum monumenta priorum,* “he is taken with the places and happily seeks and learns, one by one, about the memorials of the men of long ago” (tr. H. Rushton Faireclough, adapt.).77 What is interesting in these lines is that Virgil appears to be alluding to the Roman art of memory. First, he writes that Aeneas is taken in by the different *loci.* Here the *loci* house the memorials of the men and other structures from the distant past. In the Roman mnemonic system the background or *locus* was the place used to store the visual prompts which would facilitate recall of stored facts. Evander’s *loci* store the visual prompts needed to remind him of past individuals and events. Aeneas learns about the memorials one by one. By showing Aeneas the reminders of the

76 Using visual memory prompts to aid remembrance can also be found in the Buthrotum episode of Book 3. When Aeneas discovers Andromache offering libations to a makeshift tomb for her deceased husband Hector (3.301-305), it appears that his tomb acts a visual reminder which enables her to properly remember him. Also the little Troy, the copy of great Pergamum, the dry brook that takes its name from the Xanthus, and the doors of the Scaean gate (3.349-351) all act as mnemonic prompts to remind Aeneas, Andromache, and others of Troy that once was, cf. James Tatum (1995) 167ff.

77 *Aeneid* 8.311-312. *Audio* can also be defined as to learn (OLD s.v.8).
past in a series, it can be assumed that Virgil has the precepts of the artificial memory system in mind and he is providing Aeneas with the proper presentation to be able to imprint the information associated with the different monuments and places. The use of the word *singula* underscores this notion further, because it is reminiscent of Anchises leading Aeneas through the different scenes of the underworld just prior to his departure, *quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit*. The word *singula* suggests that Evander, who is leading Aeneas on a guided tour of Pallanteum, is doing the same thing as Anchises was, when he showed Aeneas the various scenes which offered him a look at what and who will be a part of future Rome; that Evander is providing him with information about the future in a manner that can be easily taken into the mind.

The verb *video*, which has been used so abundantly in previous passages, is used only twice in lines 337-360. In the first instance, it is used when Evander tells Aeneas that what he (Aeneas) sees are the relics and memorials of the ancient men, *reliquias veterumque vides monumenta virorum* (8.356). Second, Virgil uses the verb to describe a physical sight that both Evander and Aeneas see, *...passimque armenta videbant/ Romanoque Foro et lautis mugire Carinis*, “...and [they] saw cattle all about, lowing in the Roman Forum and the brilliant Carinae” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough). By using this verb Virgil makes it clear that what Aeneas sees is what he is meant to remember.

Line 8.356 recalls Anchises’ thoughts, *tum genitor, veterum volvens monumenta virorum* (3.102), when the Trojans try to interpret the oracular response of Apollo and seek out their ‘ancient mother’ (3.84ff.). While Anchises had turned over in his mind the memorials of old men, to ascertain what land the ‘ancient mother’ would be, Aeneas is now being educated by the founder of Rome’s citadel, about the old men of Latium who will eventually comprise the history of Rome. Therefore, Aeneas is learning

---

78 *Aeneid* 6.888

79 *Aeneid* 8.361-362

80 Even though in all the previous passages, Aeneas (and Dido) has been looking at *imagines*, I do not believe that it makes any difference to my argument here because in the artificial memory system images are frequently taken from everyday life. Quintilian suggests using an anchor, or a symbol from warfare (11.2.19).
and mentally recording facts about the men whom Anchises had originally been thinking.

As Evander takes Aeneas from one place to the next, which gives Aeneas the opportunity to properly absorb all the information that Evander tells him, Virgil repeatedly uses the verb *monstro*. By doing so Virgil makes it clear that Evander points out and teaches, *monstrat* (8.337, 343, 345), 81 Aeneas about the specific landmarks which anticipate later history. 82 This use of the verb is quite interesting because it is reminiscent of the way Augustus taught the Roman people the history he wanted them to remember. For example the portrait galleries which housed the *summi viri* in the Forum Augustum offered a version of history that was meant to teach, by *exemplum*, the history that suited the objectives of Augustan Rome.83 Even Livy showed Roman readers, through a concise set of images from the past, how the past should be remembered and what should be remembered. In this way Virgil, as he did in the procession of heroes in the underworld, imposes the memories he wants Aeneas to remember about the future.

Both Augustus and Livy wanted their ‘readers’ to remember specific details of history and forget about others. Aeneas as he is led through Pallanteum, is given the proper conditions necessary to memorize the places which later make up Rome’s history. He is presented with different monuments and places seriatim, which he takes in by both his eyes and his ears (8.312). Although the sights are not overly distinct themselves, Evander creates a visual narrative for each monument as he tells Aeneas the history behind them. For example, he shows Aeneas the vast grove, *lucum ingentem*, where violent Romulus, *acer Romulus*, restored an Asylum, *Asylum rettulit* (8.342-343). In this way Evander makes it a place that Aeneas can easily recall from his mind. Therefore Virgil has fashioned this section in a way that is not only suggestive of the artificial memory

---

81 *Monstro* according to the OLD s.v. 2, can mean to show by example, demonstrate, or teach.

82 Fordyce (1977) 337ff. n.

83 Zanker (1988) 211
system, but he also imposes upon Aeneas the memories of Rome’s history that he
wants both Aeneas and his readers to remember.\(^8^4\)

From the very beginning of the description of the shield of Aeneas (8.626-
729), Virgil makes it clear that the organizing principle behind the shield, \textit{in
ordine} (8.629) is the same as that used by the rhetoricians in their
mnemotechnical instructions. By stressing this from the start the reader is made
to acknowledge that the layout of the shield will be different from other literary
shields.\(^8^5\) As we have seen, the use of a series is foundational in the art of
memory. Without a series the orator or any user of the system would have
difficulty in keeping the information organized and turning it into an appropriate
form of verbalized expression. Therefore, by rendering the shield in a series, and
using three other features of the memory system, it will be made clear that Virgil
wrote this passage with the system’s principles in mind.

First, the use of locative language can be found. As in the previous
sections, locative language is used to create a distinct articulation between the
different tableaux. Virgil uses the words, \textit{illic} (8.626), \textit{nec procul} (8.635), \textit{haud
procul} (8.642), \textit{in summo} (8.652), \textit{hinc procul} (8.666), and \textit{in medio} (8.675) to
create a sense of space between the scenes. By doing so Virgil ensures that
whoever is looking at the shield will be able to imprint the images and thus easily
picture the scenes in their mind’s eye since everything has been broken down into
manageable sections. The Auctor advises the same thing when discussing how to
record the facts from a court case, see Chapter Two. Each stage of the case’s

\(^8^4\) This passage can also be viewed as a reminder of how the physical environment provided a
powerful way to learn and remember and facilitated the recollection of information. As Evander
shows Aeneas the urban features and monuments, Aeneas is forced to conceptualize the placement
of these features and recognize where he is in relation to these urban features and monuments.
This is important because it demonstrates that Aeneas is being compelled to establish the
environmental memories necessary for navigating the complicated paths and roads of all larger
cities, and “to understand the meaning woven into the urban fabric” by looking at the different
urban features and monuments. Favro (1996) 5-6. Terence \textit{Adelphoe} 573-585 offers an example of
environmental memory, see Chapter 1 of this thesis. For the Romans moving through the physical
environment was one of the most effective ways to learn and remember, and by allowing Aeneas
to familiarize himself with the layout of the future site of Rome, Evander is indirectly giving
Aeneas memories of the future so that his memories of Troy are lessened even further and he is
able to continue moving toward his end goal of founding Rome.

\(^8^5\) I will talk about the shield of Achilles and the shield of Herakles later in this section.
argument has its own distinct scene with all its own elements. Put together the series resembles a continuous narrative whereby an orator could successively move through the different backgrounds and recall the necessary facts by looking at the different images he had imprinted from the case.\footnote{Small (1997) 115 and \textit{ad Herennium} 3.20.33-34. Quintilian 11.2.27 suggests that a speech of some length be broken down and learnt piecemeal so that the mind would not become overburdened.} \footnote{\textit{ad Herennium} 3.18.31} Thus, in both Virgil’s and the Auctor’s case, discriminability facilitates remembrance and aids the recollection of material.

Second, the shield, replete with scenes from Rome’s Regal and Republican Period, the underworld, and scenes from more recent history, is fashioned so that the most important tableaux which decorate its surface are placed in memorable positions. This resembles the Auctor’s advice that every fifth background should be marked with a distinct image.\footnote{Small (1997) 226} \footnote{Hardie (1986) 350} \textit{In summo} (652) marks the figure of Manlius and his defense of the Capitoline against the Gauls, while \textit{in medio} (675) marks the Battle of Actium, Rome’s and Augustus’ greatest achievement.\footnote{\textit{In summo} (652) marks the figure of Manlius and his defense of the Capitoline against the Gauls, while \textit{in medio} (675) marks the Battle of Actium, Rome’s and Augustus’ greatest achievement.} \footnote{\textit{In summo} (652) marks the figure of Manlius and his defense of the Capitoline against the Gauls, while \textit{in medio} (675) marks the Battle of Actium, Rome’s and Augustus’ greatest achievement.} By suggesting that every fifth background be marked, the Auctor is offering a method in which to keep a long series of backgrounds in order by breaking it down into sections. Virgil is doing the same thing by stressing that Manlius is on the top and the Battle of Actium is in the middle. For according to Philip Hardie the description of the shield falls into two major sections. The first is occupied with the \textit{ktisis} or foundation and preservation of the city of Rome, while the second involves the spread of Roman power, under the \textit{imperium} of Augustus, to fill the \textit{oikumene} or inhabited world.\footnote{\textit{In summo} (652) marks the figure of Manlius and his defense of the Capitoline against the Gauls, while \textit{in medio} (675) marks the Battle of Actium, Rome’s and Augustus’ greatest achievement.} Therefore, when Virgil marks these two sections, he is offering a way to keep the series of events into two manageable sections; the Gallic invasion completes the scenes from early history with the miraculous preservation of the Capitol, and the glory of Augustus and the divinely sanctioned achievement of the Roman Empire at the Battle of Actium.\footnote{\textit{In summo} (652) marks the figure of Manlius and his defense of the Capitoline against the Gauls, while \textit{in medio} (675) marks the Battle of Actium, Rome’s and Augustus’ greatest achievement.}
directly concentrates the second part on the success of Augustus. In this way Virgil follows the Auctor’s instructions; he marks the two particular tableaux which are meant to link the series of images on the shield together to make sure that the sequence of events is properly noted.

Third, Virgil sets each background with images which serve to prompt the readers’ recollections of certain events and people from Rome’s history. In each scene there are various individuals and events which can be recognized based on their descriptions. Again this follows one of the important principles of the art of memory— that images must be recognizable in order for the stored information to be properly remembered.

The artificial memory system is a technology used to facilitate the remembrance of information. The way in which Virgil has portrayed the shield of Aeneas suggests that he has followed the mnemotechnical instructions of the rhetoricians. Sequential order, distinctiveness, and discriminability, all the features vital to the workings of the memory system, play an integral part in the layout of the description of the shield. To illuminate the special quality of Virgil’s shield, I want to look at Hesiod’s description of the Shield of Herakles and Homer’s description of the Shield of Achilles. The differences between both will serve to show the extent to which Virgil’s shield description differs from other literary shields.

There are three ways in which Hesiod’s shield (139-318) and Homer’s shield (18.490ff.) differ from that of Aeneas’. In the first place, the layouts of the shields are not organized in a specific sequence. Nowhere does Hesiod or Homer stress that an order or series is part of the construction or layout of the shield’s tableaux. Second, Hesiod only on occasion uses locative language, ἐν μέσσω (in the middle, 144), ὀἱ δ’ ὑπὲρ αὐτέων (and beyond these, 237), παρὰ δ’ (next, 270), παρὰ δ’ αὐτοῖς (next to these, 305), ἀμφὶ δ’ ἑτέρυν (round the rim, 314) to differentiate between different scenes. Normally Hesiod just describes what images are seen on, ἐν δὲ, the shield and does not create spatial relationships.

---

90 Hardie (1986) 350-351. This small description of the shield of Aeneas does not even skim the surface. For further information on the shield and its images see Chapter 8 in Hardie’s book *Cosmos and Imperium*. 
between his images. Homer does the same thing. He generally introduces a new subject with the phrase, ἐν δὲ, to describe the images that Hephaistos put upon the shield. Thus, both Homer and Hesiod form large and involved scenes which are not spaced or differentiated, but all massed together. This differs radically from Virgil’s organization. Virgil has five clearly articulated tableaux which could be drawn out and easily visualized. Hesiod and Homer, however, by creating such complex scenes make it relatively impossible to mentally picture the shield, indicating that it was not meant to be memorized or be used to prompt memories of the past, according to the techniques of the Roman artificial memory system. Virgil sets his characters out piecemeal or one after the other. He carefully organizes his presentation so that a reader is not overwhelmed by the amount of images he is presented with. This is meant to follow the rhetoricians’ instructions that images and backgrounds should be placed at moderate intervals and so they could be easily read by the mind’s eye. Hesiod, however, presents groups of images:

ἐν δὲ Προϊώξις τε Παλίωξις τε τέτυκτο, ἐν δ’ Ομαδός τε Φόβος τ’ Ἄνδροκταινη τε δεδηεὶ, ἐν δ’ Ἐρις, ἐν δὲ Κυδοίμος ἐθύνεοι, ἐν δ’ ὅλης Κηρ/ ἀλλον ζωὸν ἔχουσα νεώτατον, ἀλλον ἄουτον/ἀλλον τεθνηώτα κατά μόθον ἐλκε ποδόην/ἐίμα δ’ ἵμ’ ὑμοὶσα δαφοίουν αἰματι φωτὼν,/ δεινον δερκομένη καναχήσα τε βεβρυχύια.

[upon the shield Pursuit and Flight were wrought, and Tumult, and Panic, and Slaughter. Strife also, and Uproar were hurrying about, and deadly Fate was there holding one man newly wounded, and another unwounded; and one, who was dead, who was dragging by the feet through the tumult. She had on her shoulders a garment red with the blood of men, and terribly she glared and gnashed her teeth (tr.Hugh G. Evelyn-White).]

---

91 Ἐν δὲ can be found at lines 154,155,156,161,168,178,191,192,197,201,207, and 216.

92 Ἐν δὲ can be found at lines 490, 541, 550, 561, 574587, 590, and 607.

93 Both Hesiod and Homer use locative language to describe where certain images are situated within a group of images. These locatives do not help to differentiate between scenes; they just serve to further expand on what else is a part of the tableau. For example, Hesiod describes a harbour and uses the locative, in the middle, to tell the reader that there were also dolphins and fish there (207-215).

94 Shield of Herakles 154-160
as does Homer:

οἱ δ’ ὡς οὖν ἐπύθοντο πολὺν κέλαδον παρὰ βουσίν ἑιράων προπάροιβε καθῆμενοι, αὐτίκ’ ἐφ’ ἵππων /βάντες ἀεραιπόδων μετεκίαθον, αἶψα δ’ ἱκουτο. Ἰστησάμενοι δ’ ἐμάξοντο μάχην ποταμοῖο παρ’ ὅχθας /βάλλον δ’ ἀλλήλους χαλκήρειν ἐγχείσισιν. ἐν δ’ Ἕρις ἐν δὲ Κυδοίμος ὀμίλεον, ἐν δ’ ὅλη Κήρ, /ἄλλον ζώον ἐχουσα νευτατον, ἄλλον άουτον, /ἄλλον τεθηνώτα κατά μόθον ἐλκε ποδοῖν‘ …

But the besiegers, as they sat before the places of gathering and heard much tumult among the kine, mounted forthwith behind their high-stepping horses, and set out thitherward, and speedily came upon them. Then set they their battle in array and fought beside the river banks, and were ever smiting one another with bronze-tipped spears. And amid them Strife and Tumult joined in the fray, and deadly Fate, grasping one man alive, fresh-wounded, another without a wound, and she dragged the dead through the mellay by the feet… (tr. A.T. Murray).95

This makes it difficult for a person to impress the images on his mind because the memory is presented with everything at once and the scenes run into one another, rather than at set intervals apart. When the mind is overwhelmed it makes it difficult to remember. Third, neither Hesiod nor Homer suggest that either Herakles or Achilles looks at his shield. Virgil tells his readers that Aeneas rolls his eyes over each piece of his new armour: …atque oculos per singular volvit/ miraturque interque manus et bracchia versat/…galeam/...ensem, loricam/...tum...ocreas/... hastamque et clipei..., “and he rolled his eyes from piece to piece, admiring and turning over in his hands and arms the helmet…the sword, cuirass,… then the greaves,… the spear and the shield (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.).96 By using the verb volvo, Virgil not only implies that Aeneas allows his external eyes to travel restlessly over the armour,97 but also that he turns over the armour and shield in his mind’s eye.98 This suggests that Aeneas, while looking at his shield and rejoicing in the images (8.730), is committing the images on the shield to memory. Neither Herakles nor Achilles

95 Iliad 18.530-537
96 Aeneid 8.618-625
97 OLD s.v. 8
98 OLD s.v. 11
looks at his shield or rejoices in the images, because neither man is meant to recall them. Therefore, it is clear that Virgil has set up the shield of Aeneas in a way that suggests connections with the way Romans artificially organized information that needed to be remembered. 99

In conclusion, we can see, by looking at the rhetoricians’ discussions of the art of memory, that Virgil uses similar language and features in the way he lays out his descriptions of different scenes. His continuous use of distinguishable loci, imagines which prompt recall of information, a serial composition, and vocabulary which offers dualistic interpretations (i.e. video) makes it clear that he evokes the memory techniques and visual memory prompts, prescribed by the orators, when delineating memoria rerum throughout his epic. Virgil’s frequent usage of these techniques and prompts makes it clear to his modern readers that the system of artificial memory was a common way to remember and recollect information. As we saw in Chapter One of this thesis, memory techniques and visual prompts related to the Roman way of education and life and it is likely that Virgil employed these because it was the way Roman people remembered and how they understood remembrance to work.

Virgil further establishes his connection with the artificial system of memory when he describes the way in which certain characters remember information and how they order others to do so. In Book One, Virgil describes Juno’s reasons for her hatred toward the Trojan remnant:

:id metuens, veterisque memor Saturnia belli, prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis, (necdum etiam causae irarum saevique dolores exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum/ iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae, et genus invisum, et raptiGanymedis honores)—

[the daughter of Saturn fearing this [a race which would overthrow the Tyrian towers] and mindful of the old war which previously she had fought at Troy for her dear Argos; (not yet, too, had the causes of her angers and the savage pains escaped from her memory: the judgment of Paris having been stored away, remain deep in her mind and the injustice of her spurned beauty, the hated race and honours of stolen Ganymede)— (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adpat.) 100


100 Aeneid 1.23-28
What is interesting about this passage is that Virgil describes Juno’s memories as being stored away, deep in her mind. The fundamentals behind the art of memory are dependent upon impressing images on the mind so that the information can be retrieved at any time. When Quintilian writes about revisiting loci and demanding the contents from the custodial images he uses the words, *cum est repetenda memoria...*, “when memories must be recalled...” (tr. H.E. Butler, adapt.). Since these words do not refer to any specific time period it is likely that images could be stored away in the memory when they were not in use and revived when needed. The fact that Juno has stored away her memories suggests that, like an orator who would store his loci and imagines in his mind so he could revive their contents at any time, Virgil, being familiar with the art of memory, has implanted this type of remembrance into his characters.

This storage of memories is further underscored in Virgil’s invocation to the Muse in Book Seven. He writes, *expediam, et primae revocabo exordia pugnae*, “I will explain, and I will recall to mind/ revive the memory of the prelude of the opening strife” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.). By describing what he is about to write in this way, implies that he himself has the information imprinted on his mind awaiting recall.

The practice of storing memories and how characters remember information is portrayed in the commands of both Calaeno and Helenus. When Calaeno orders Aeneas to listen to her prophetic words which confirm that the Trojans will reach their destination and found their city she introduces her speech with the words, *accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta*, “therefore receive and fix these words of mine in your mind” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt.). What is interesting here is that not only does Calaeno suggests that

101 *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.20

102 The verb *repono* can mean to put away for keeping/ store away in the mind, OLD s.v. 9b.

103 *Aeneid* 7.40

104 *Revoco* can mean to recall to mind/ revive the memory of, OLD s.v. 13.

105 *Aeneid* 3.250
memories are meant to be impressed or fixed on the mind,\footnote{106} but also by using the verb \textit{figo}, which is the same word used to describe the action of fixing memorials onto trees or on the wall,\footnote{107} she implies that memory is visual and by fastening her words into memory, Aeneas will be able to see them in his mind’s eye and thus remember them. Similar to Calaeno’s words are Helenus’ as he begins uttering his prophecy to Aeneas, \textit{signa tibi dicam, tu condita mente teneto}, “I shall tell you images, keep them stored in your mind” (tr. H. Rushton Fairclough, adapt).\footnote{108} In this case, following Helenus’ words is a list of images (389ff.) which Aeneas must store in his memory so that he will be able to reach his destination and recognize it when he gets there. Thus, Virgil clearly illustrates that the way in which his characters remember specific episodes, prophecies, or important images, corresponds to how the rhetoricians recommend committing information to memory so that it can later be accurately recalled.

As a point of comparison, Circe’s prophecy in the \textit{Odyssey} (12.37-141) differs slightly. When she tells Odysseus about the perils he can expect to encounter on his journey back to Ithaca she never instructs Odysseus to keep the forthcoming information stored in his mind. She, however, reveals that a god will put it in his mind/ remind him, \textit{οὐς τοι ἐγὼν ἔρεω, μνήσει δὲ σε καὶ θεὸς ἀυτός} (12.38). While Virgil has his characters personally store the information, like an orator or any user of the memory system would, Homer has a god remind Odysseus of the information he is about to acquire. Thus, we can see that Virgil not only portrays how one is meant to remember in a manner different from Homer, but that he also stresses the rhetoricians’ belief that information is meant to be stored in the mind for later recall.

Because Virgil has continuously used features which recall those foundational to the Roman place memory system, it can be assumed that Virgil meant to present his descriptions of things and how his characters recalled the

\footnotetext[106]{\textit{Figo} can mean to fix/ implant in the mind or memory, OLD s.v. 8a.}

\footnotetext[107]{OLD s.v. 3a/b.}

\footnotetext[108]{\textit{Aeneid} 3.388. The use of the verb \textit{teneo} implies that one is able to retain information in the mind, OLD s.v. 24}
past, in a manner analogous to the way educated Romans would remember facts and information. Whether it was a subconscious or conscious effort on his part, Virgil shows the modern reader that he was familiar with the place memory system, and because Virgil sets up nearly all his descriptions in the same way it seems likely that he employed the techniques himself. Although this is circumstantial, by comparing specific sections with excerpts from Greek literature, such as Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey, Theocritus’ kisymbion and Hesiod’s Shield of Herakles, the modern reader can see that there are vast differences in the way the different writers rendered their descriptions and that Virgil truly follows the pattern of the Roman art of memory.
Conclusion

As this paper has demonstrated the Romans ascribed a heightened importance to remembering, which, is omnipresent in nearly all facets of Roman existence—from their funereal celebrations to their basic educational practices, pervading their law, their monuments, their buildings and their literature. As memory suffuses all corners of the Roman landscape and forms an important and vast part of Roman culture, it offers itself as a lens through which a modern reader may examine the Roman world and the process of remembering within the Roman political sphere. It is through this lens that my interpretation of Virgil’s Aeneid is based. I have suggested that the personal experiences of Virgil’s Aeneas extend beyond just being a list of Roman history and past deeds; his experiences, rather, delineate a cultural artifact that has allowed us to see how Virgil as a member of the Roman elite understood remembrance and recollection to work.

Chapter One was presented as an overview of the way the city of Rome and the Roman’s themselves believed memory to work. Places could be used to both impose memories, as Augustus used both the Campus Martius and Forum Augustum to narrate the details of his rule and Rome’s history; and facilitate remembrance, for places served as visual prompts to remind onlookers and passers-by of past individuals and events and as prompts to remind orators and users of the architectural memory system of information previously stored in the mind. Moving through the physical Roman environment provided a powerful way to learn, remember, and in some cases forget as we saw with the damnatio memoriae of Piso and Augustus’ omission of certain people from his version of Republican history in the Forum Augustum. All in all, memory, mnemonics, and the power of visual imagery played a role, in some form, in the everyday life of all Romans.

Chapter Two, involved an exploration, by looking at the rhetorical treatises of Cicero, Quintilian, and the Auctor ad Herennium, of how the Romans trained their minds, through their educational system, by using a visual process.

---

1 Gowing (2005) 2
which facilitated the receiving and retaining of information. A modern cognitive perspective by Francis Bellezza, which looks at how mnemonic techniques can be used to strategically manipulate knowledge to facilitate the way new knowledge is acquired and remembered,\(^2\) was examined alongside Jonathan Spence’s study of Matteo Ricci’s memory palace and A.R. Luria’s case study of the mnemonist Shereshevskii in order to reveal the practicalities of the classical authors’ instructions. It was discovered that the ancient and modern methods for remembering *res* (things or subject matter) both relied upon using sequences, discriminability, and distinctiveness in order to efficiently use the visual images which comprise the ancient and modern mnemonic systems.

As we have seen in Chapter Three, Virgil not only uses his poetry to create a literary monument that is meant to trigger certain remembrances and recollections in his readers, but he also uses the place memory system features of sequential order, distinctiveness, discriminability, and vocabulary suggestive of mental perception when he describes the images his characters look at or are meant to look at. Scenes from Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Theocritus and Hesiod fully illustrate how Virgil’s descriptions are unique; because while each Greek author may use one or two of the features, none of them writes in a manner which suggests that they are employing the memory system used by the Romans to facilitate remembrance. By bringing out the differences between poets, we are able to see that Virgil wrote his descriptions of the way images are looked at and how images are remembered because it was the way he, himself, understood remembrance to work. Whether consciously because Virgil intentionally planned it or subconsciously because it was so ingrained within his social milieu and the elite way of life, in either event Virgil incorporates the memory techniques used for remembering *res* within his text proper. The language and the rhetoricians’ discussion of the art of memory offered a lens through which to examine the way Virgil describes how his characters view the different images they see before them and by juxtaposing Virgil and the rhetoricians, a reader can see that Virgil has poetically exploited the Roman art of memory.

\(^2\) Bjork and Bjork (1996) xxi
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Illustrations

Figure 1a: Rome, Via Appia. Tomb of Caecilia Metella. Ca. 30B.C.

Figure 1b: Rome, Via Appia. Tomb inscription of Caecilia Metella. Ca. 30B.
Figure 2a: Rome, before the Porta Maggiore. Tomb monument of the freedman M. Vergilius Eurysaces, owner of a large bakery. Ca. 40-30 B.C.

Figure 2b: Rome, Close-up of tomb monument of the freedman M. Vergilius Eurysaces.
Figure 2c: Rome, The funerary inscription of M. Vergilius Eurysaces on the north side of the monument.
Figure 2d: Rome, the portraits of Eurysaces and his wife Atistia, found near the tomb.
Figure 3a: Rome, Via Statilia. Tombs of Roman freedmen, ca.100-80 B.C.

Figure 3b: Close-up of Tombs of Roman freedmen. The *imago* of the deceased surmounts the biographical inscription.
Figure 3c: Portraits of the freedmen of the families Clodia, Marcia, and Annia on the east façade of the Tombs of Roman freedmen.

Figure 4: Sarcophagus depicting ships flanking a lighthouse. Rome, Praetextatus Catacomb, fourth century A.D.
Figure 5: Rome, Campus Martius at the time of Augustus.
Figure 6a: Rome, Mausoleum of Augustus, ca. 28B.C.

Figure 6b: Reconstruction of Mausoleum of Augustus.
Figure 7: Reconstruction of Mausoleum of Halikarnassos, ca. 353BC. It was originally built as a tomb for Maussollos, a member of the Hekatomnid dynasty who governed Karia in south-west Asia Minor.

Figure 8: Obelisk from the Mausoleum of Augustus in Piazza dell’Esquilino, Rome.
Figure 9: Obelisk from the Mausoleum of Augustus in Piazza del Quirinale, Rome.

Figure 10: Earthen tumulus in the Banditaccia cemetery, Cerveteri (Caere).
Figure 11: Obelisk in front of the Palazzo Montecitorio in Rome. The obelisk was carried off from Egypt by Augustus and used as the gnomon for his monumental sundial.

Figure 12: Solarium Augusti, excavated section beneath Via di Campo Marzio, Rome, 10-9 B.C.
**Figure 13:** Reconstruction of the Solarium Augusti. The upper register shows the sundial pointing to the Ara Pacis on Augustus’ birthday and the lower register shows the gnomon in relation to the Mausoleum Augusti and Ara Pacis.

**Figure 14a:** Rome, Ara Pacis Augustae, 13-9B.C. Note the two different horizontal registers, the lower with the stylized nature and acanthus tendrils and the upper with the figural panels.
Figure 14b: Close-up of the two different registers on the Ara Pacis Augustae.

Figure 15a: Ara Pacis: south frieze—Augustus at join with flamines (priests).
Figure 15b: Ara Pacis: south frieze—flamines with Agrippa in the middle with veiled head and his wife Julia to the right

Figure 16a: Ara Pacis: north frieze.
Figure 16b: Ara Pacis: north frieze.

Figure 17: Ara Pacis: Tellus relief.
Figure 18: Ara Pacis: Aeneas panel.

Figure 19: Ara Pacis: south frieze—east end with children.
Figure 20: Forum Augustum. Detail of model. The statue niches for the *summi viri* are at the right of the temple of Mars Ultor (the middle building) on the rear side of the colonnades.

Figure 21a: Forum Augustum, north-west exedra with niches for statues.
Figure 21b: Ground plan of Forum Augustum with reconstruction of sculptural programme.

Figure 22: Reconstruction of a *summus vir* complete with *titulus* and *elogium*, in the gallery of the Forum Augustum.
Appendix I

S.c. de Pisone: The Decree against Piso (A.D. 29)


Editorial Conventions

( ) expansion of abbreviation
[ ] restoration of letters written but now missing
{ } deletion of letters written by mistake
[ ] correction of letters considered wrongly inscribed
< > necessary supplements

Translation following text.

1 A(nte) d(iem) IIII eid(us) Dec(embres) in Palatio in porticu, quae est ad Apollinis. Scribendo

2 adfuerunt M(arcus) Valerius M(arci) f(ilius) Lem(onia tribu) Messallinus, G(aius) Ateius L(uci) f(ilius) Ani(ensi tribu) Capito, Sex(tus) Pompeius

3 Sex(ti) f(ilius) Arn(ensi tribu), M(arcus) Pompeius M(arci) f(ilius) Teret(ina tribu) Priscus, G(aius) Arrenus G(ai) f(ilius) Gal(eria tribu) Gallus, L(ucius) Nonius L(uci) f(ilius)

4 Pom(ptina tribu) Asprenas q(uaestor), M(arcus) Vinicius P(ubli) f(ilius) Pob(lilia tribu) q(taestor). (vacat) Quod Ti(berius) Caesar divi Aug(usti) f(ilius) Aug(ustus)

5 pontifex maxumus, tribunicia potestate XXII, co(n)s(ul) III, designatus IIII ad sena– tum rettulit qualis causa Cn. Pisonis patris visa esset et an merito sibi mor– tem conscisse videretur et qualis causa M. Pisonis visa esset, cui relationi ad–
iecisset, uti precum suarum pro adulescente memor is ordo esset, <et> qualis cau–

sa Plancinae visa esset, pro qua persona, quid petisset et quas propter causas,

10 exposuisset antea, et quid de Visellio Karo et de Sempronio Basso, comitibus

Cn. Pisonis patris, iudicaret senatus, d(e) i(is) r(ebus) i(ta) c(ensuerunt). (vacat)

senatum populumq(ue) Romanum ante omnia dis immortalibus gratias agere,

quod nefaris consilis Cn. Pisonis patris tranquillitatem praesentis status

r(ei) p(ublicae), quo melior optari non pote [et] quo beneficio principis nostri frui contigit,

15 turbar[i] passi non sunt, deinde Ti. Caesari Augusto principi suo quod earum rerum omnium, quae ad explorandam veritatem necessariae fuerunt, co–

piam senatui fecerit, cuius aequitatem et patientiam hoc quoq(ue) nomine admirari senatum, quod, cum manufestissuma sint Cn. Pisonis patris scelera

et ipse de se supplicium sumpsisset, nihilominus causam eius cognosci volue–

20 rit filiosque eius arcessitos hortatus sit, ut patris sui causam defenderent, ita ut eum quoq(ue), qui ordinis senatori nondum esset, ob eam rem introduci in senatum vellet et copiam utriq(ue) dicendi pro patre et pro matre ipsorum et pro M. Pisone faceret.

Itaque cum per aliquot dies acta causa sit ab accusatoribus Cn.
Pisonis patris et ab ipso
Cn. Pisone patre, recitatae epistulae, recitata exemplaria
codicillorum, quos

25 Germanicus Caesar Cn. Pisoni patri scripsisset, producti testes
cuius(ue) ordinis sint,
a[rbi]<t>rari <senatum> singularem moderationem
patientiamq(ue) Germanici Caesaris evic—
tam esse feritate morum Cn. Pisonis patris atq(ue) ob id
morientem Germanicum Cae—
sarem, cuius mortis fuisse caussam Cn. Pisonem patrem ipse
testatus sit, non inme—
rito amicitiam ei renuntiasse, qui—cum deberet meminisse
adiutorem se datum

30 esse Germanico Caesari, qui a principe nostro ex auctoritate
huius ordinis ad
rerum transmarinarum statum componendum missus esset
desiderantium
praesentiam aut ipsius Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) aut filiorum
alterius utrius, neclecta
maiestate domus Aug(ustae), neclecto etiam iure publico, quod
adle[c]t(us) pro co(n)s(ule) et ei pro co(n)s(ule), de quo
lex ad populum lata esset, ut in quamcumq(ue) provinciam
venisset, maius ei imperium

35 quam ei, qui eam provinciam proco(n)s(ule) optineret, esset,
dum in omni re maius imperi—
um Ti. Caesari Aug(usti) quam Germanico Caesari esset,
tamquam ipsius arbitri et potestatis omnia
esse deberent, ita se, cum in provincia Syria fuerit, gesserit—
bellum cum Armeniacum
[tum] Parthicum, quantum in ipso fuit, moverit, quod neq(ue)
ex mandatis principis
nostri epistulisq(ue) frequentibus Germanici Caesaris, cum is
abesset, Vononem, qui sus–
pectus regi Parthorum erat, longius removeri voluerit, ne
profugere ex custodia
posset, id quod fecit, et conloqui quosdam ex numero
Armeniorum malos et
audaces cum Vonone passus sit, ut per eosdem tumultus in
Armenia excita–
retur ac Vonone<s> vel occiso vel expulso rege Armeniae,
quem Germanicus
Caesar ex voluntate patris sui senatusq(ue) ei genti regem
dedisset, <eam> occuparet,
eaq(ue) magnis muneribus Vononis corruptus fecerit; bellum
etiam civile ex–
citare conatus sit, iam pridem numine divi Aug(usti)
virtutibusq(ue) Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti)
omnibus civilis belli sepultis malis repetendo provinciam
Syriam post
mortem Germanici Caesaris quam vivo eo pessumo et animo
et exemplo re–
liquerat, atq(ue) ob id milites Romani inter se concurrere
coacti sunt, perspecta etiam
crudelitate unica, qui incognita causa, sine consili sententia
plurimos ca–
ptitis supplicio adfecisset neq(ue) externos tantummodo, sed
etiam centurionem
c(ivem) R(omanum) cruci fixsisset; qui militarem disciplinam a
divo Aug(usto) institutam et
servatam a Ti. Caesare Aug(usto) corrupisset, non solum
indulgendo militibus, <ne>
his, qui ipsis praesunt, more vetustissumo parerent, sed etiam
donativa suo
nomine ex fisco principis nostri dando, quo facto milites alios
Pisonianos, a–
lios Caesarianos dici laetatus sit, honorando etiam eos, qui
post talis nominis
usurpationem ipsi paruisse<t>nt; qui post mortem Germanici
Caesars, cuius in–
teritum non p(opulus) R(omanus) modo, sed exterae quoq(ue)
gentes luxserunt, patri optumo et
indulgentissumo libellum, quo eum accusaret, mittere ausus sit
oblitus non
tantum venerationis caritatisq(ue), quae principis filio
debebantur, ceterum
humanitatis quoq(ue), quae ultra mortem odia non patitur
procedere, et cuius
mortem gavisum esse eum his argumentis senatui apparuerit:
quod nefaria
sacrificia ab eo facta, quod naves, quibus vehebatur, ornatae
sint, quod reclu–
serit deorum immortalium templu, quae totius imperi Romani
constantissuma
pietas claserat, eiusdemque habitus animi argumentum fuerit,
quod <eum> dedisse congi–
arium ei, qui nuntiaverit sibi de morte Germanici Caesaris,
probatum sit frequen–
terq(ue) convivia habuisse eum his ipsis diebus, quibus de
morte Germanici ei
nuntiatum erat; numen quoq(ue) divi Aug(usti) violatum esse
ab eo arbitrari senatum
omni honore, qui aut memoriae eius aut imaginibus, quae,
antequam in
deorum numerum referretur, ei r[. . .]ae erant, habeva(n)tur, detracto. (vacat)
Quas ob res arbitrari senatum non optulisse eum se de[b]ite poenae, sed maiori
et quam inmin[e]re sibi ab pietate et severitate iudicantium intellegeba(n)t
subtraxsisse; (vacat) itaq(ue) his poenis, quas a semet ipso exegisset, adicere: ne quis luc–
tus mortis eius causae a feminis quibus {e}is more maiorum, si hoc senatus consultum factum
non esset, lugendus esset, susciperetur; utiq(ue) statuae et
imagines Cn. Pisonis
patris, quae ubiq(ue) positae essent, tollerentur; recte et ordine facturos, qui qu–
andoq(ue) familiae Calpurniae essent, quive eam familiam cognatione
adfinitateve contingerent, si dedissent operam, si quis eius
gentis aut quis eo–
rum, qui cognatus adfinisve Calpurniae familiae fuisset, mortuos esset, lugen–
dus esset, ne inter reliquas imagines, <quibus> exequias eorum
funerum celebrare solent,
imago Cn. Pisonis patris duceretur neve imaginibus familiae
Calpurniae i–
mago eius interponeretur; (vacat) utiq(ue) nomen Cn. Pisonis
patris tolleretur
ex titulo statuae Germanici Caesaris, quam ei sodales
Augustales in campo ad
aram Providentiae posuisssent; (vacat) utiq(ue) bona Cn.
Pisonis patris publicarentur
excepto saltu, qui esset in Hillyrico; eum saltum placere Ti.
Caesari Augusto prin–
cipi nostro, cuius a patre divo Aug(usto) Cn. Pisoni patri
donatus erat, reddi, cum
is idcirco dari eum sibi desiderasset, quod <gentes>, quarum
fines hos saltus contin–
gerent, frequenter de iniuris Cn. Pisonis patris libertorumq(ue)
et servorum
eius questae essent, atq(ue) ob id providendum putaret, ne
postea iure meritoq(ue)
90 soci p(opuli) R(omani) queri possent; (vacat) item senatum,
memorem clementiae suae ius–
titiaeq(ue) <atq(ue)> animi magnitudinis, quas virtutes qu[om]
a maioribus suis acce–
pisset, tum praecipue ab divo Aug(usto) et Ti. Caesare
Aug(usto) principibus suis didicisset,
ex bonis Cn. Pisonis patris publicatis aequom humanumq(ue)
censere, filio eius
Pisoni maiori, de quo nihil esset dictum, qui principis nostri
q(uaestor) fuisset, quem
95 Germanicus quoq(ue) liberalitate sua honorasset, qui
complura modestiae
suae posuisset pignora,
ex quibus sperari posset, dissimillumum eum patri suo
futurum, donari
nomine principis et senatus bonorum partem dimidiam
eumq(ue), cum tan–
to benificio obligaretur, recte atque ordine facturum, si
praenomen patris
100 mutasset; (vacat) M. etiam Pisoni, qu<o>i inpunitatem senatus
humanitati et mode–
rationi principis sui adsensus dandam esse{t} arbitraretur, quo
facilius
inviolatum senatus benificium ad eum pervenire, alteram partem dimi–
diam bonorum paternorum dari, ita ut ex omnibus bonis, quae decreto
senatus publicata et concessa iis essent, n(ummum) (decies centena milia) dotis nomine Calpurniae

105 Cn. Pisonis filiae, item peculi nomine n(ummum) (quadragies centena milia) daretur. (vacat) item placere, uti Cn. Piso pater supra portam Fontinalem quae inaedificasset
iungendarum domum privataram causa, ea curatores locorum publico–
rum iudicandorum tollenda dimolienda curarent (vacat).
Quod ad Plancinae causam pertineret, qu<o>i pluruma et gravissuma crimina

110 obiecta essent, quoniam confiteretur se omnem spem in misericordiam
principis nostri et senatus habere, et saepe princeps noster accurateq(ue) ab eo ordine petierit, ut contentus senatus Cn. Pisonis patris poena uxori [e]ius
sic uti M. filio parceret, et pro Plancina rogatu matris suae depreca[tus] s[it] et,
quam ob rem e[a] mater sua inpetrati vellet, iustissumas ab ea causas sibi ex–

115 positas acceperit, senatum arbitrari et Iuliae Aug(ustae),
optume de r(e) p(ublica) meritae non partu tantum modo principis nostri, sed etiam multis magnisq(ue) erga cui–
usq(ue) ordinis homines beneficis, quae, cum iure meritoq(ue)
plurumum posse in eo, quod
a senatu petere, deberet, parciisse uteretur eo, et principis
nostri summa<e>
erga matrem suam pietati suffragandum indulgendumq(ue)
esse remittiq(ue)
120 poenam Plancinae placere. Visellio Karo et Sempronio Basso
comitibus Cn.
Pisonis patris et omnium malificiorum socis ac ministris, aqua
et igne interdici oportere
ab eo pr(aetore), qui lege{m} maiestatis quaereret, bonaq(ue)
eorum ab pr(aetoribus), qui aerario
praesse<n>t, venire et in aerarium redigi placere. (vacat) item
cum iudic<ar>et senatus
omnium par<en>tium pietatem antecessisse Ti. Caesarem
Aug(ustum) principem nostro
125 tant[i] et [t]am aequali<dolor]is] <eius indicis> totiens
conspectis, quibus etiam senatus ve–
hementer motus sit, magnopere rogare et petere, ut omnem
curam, quam
in duos quondam filios suos partitus erat, ad eum, quem
haberet, converteret,
speraeq(ue) senatum eum, qui supersit, [t]anto maior[i] curae
dis immortalibus
fore, quanto magis intellegent, omnem spem futuram
paterna pro
130 r(e) p(ublica) stationis in uno repos[i]ta<m>, quo nomine
debere eum finire dolorem
ac restituere patriae suae non tantum animum, sed etiam
voltum, qui
publicae felicitati conveniret; item senatum laudare magnopere
Iuliae Aug(ustae)
Drusiq(ue) Caesaris moderationem imitantium principis nostri iustitiam, quos animadvertere[t] hunc ordinem non maiorem pietatem in Germanicum

quam aequitatem in servandis integris iudicis suis, donec de causa Cn. Pisonis patris cognosceretur, praestitisse; ceterorum quoq(ue) contingentium Germanicum Caesarem necessitudine magnopere probare: Agrippinae, quam senatui memoriam divi Aug(usti), qu<o>i fuisset probatissuma, et viri Germanici, cum quo unica concordia vixsis– set, et tot pignora edita partu felicissumo eorum, qui superessent, commendare;

itemq(ue) Antoniae Germanici Caesaris matris, quae unum matrimonium Dru–
si Germ(anici) patris experta sanctitate morum dignam se divo Aug(usto) tam arta propin– quitate exhibuerit; et Liviae sororis Germ(anici) Caesar(is), de qua optume et avia sua et socer idemq(ue) patruos, princeps noster, iudicaret, quorum iudicis, etiam si non contin–
ger{n}t domum eorum, merito gloriari posset, nedum tam coniunctis necessitu–

dinibus inligata femina: quarum aeq(ue) et dolor[e]m fidelissumum et in dolore moderatione<m> senatum probare; (vacat) item quod filiorum Germanici puerilis et praecipue in Nerone{m} Caesare{m} iam etiam iu<ν>ensis dolor amisso patre tali
itemq(ue) <Ti. Germanici> fratris {Ti} Germ(anici) Caesar(is)
non exc[er]sset modum probabilem, iudicare sena-
tum referendum quidem esse acceptum maxume discipliniae
avi [e]orum et
150 patrui et Iuliae Aug(ustae), sed tamen ipsorum quoque
nomin[e] laudandum existu-
mare{t} (vacat) item equestris ordinis curam et industriam
unic[e] senatui probari,
quod fideliter intellexisset, quanta res et quam ad omnium
salutem pietatemq(ue)
pertinens ageretur, et quod frequentibus adclamationibus
adfectum animi sui
et dolorem de principis nostri fili(q)ue eius iniuris ac pro r(ei)
p(ublicae) utilitate testatus sit;
155 plebem quoq(ue) laudare senatum, quod cum equestre ordine
consenserit pietatemq(ue)
suam erga principem nostrum memoriamq(ue) fili eius
significaverit, et cum
effusissumis studis ad repraesentandum poenam Cn. Pisonis
patris ab semet ipsa
accensa esset, regi tamen exemplo equestris ordinis a principe
nostro se passa sit;
item senatum probare eorum militum fidellem, quorum animi
frustra sollicita–
160 ti essent scelere Cn. Pisonis patris, omnesq(ue), qui sub
auspicis et imperio principis
nostri milites essent, quam fidelem pietatemq(ue) domui
Aug(ustae) p[raesta]rent, eam sperare
perpetuo praestaturos, cum scirent salutem imperi nostri in
eius dom[u]<s> custo–
dia posita<m> esse{t} senatum arbitrari eorum curae atq(ue)
offici esse, ut aput eos ii,
qui quandoque e[is] praessent, plurumum auctoritatis
<haberent>, qui fidelissuma pietate
salutare huic urbi imperioque p(opuli) R(omani) nomen
Caesarum coluissent. Et quo facilius
totius actae rei ordo posterorum memoriae tradi posset atque
hi scire<nt>, quid et
de singuli moderatione Germ(anici) Caesa(ris) et de
sceleribus Cn. Pisonis patris
senatus iudicasset, placere uti oratio, quam recitasset princeps
noster,
itemq(ue) haec senatus consulta in {h}aere incisa, quo loco Ti.
Caes(ari) Aug(usto) vide–

retur, ponere<n>tur, item hoc s(enatus) c(onsultum) in cuiusque
provinciae celeberruma{e}
urbe eiusque i<n> urbis ipsius celeberrimo loco in aere incisum
figere–
tur, itemq(ue) hoc s(enatus) c(onsultum) in hibernis cuiusq(ue)
 legionis at signa figeretur. Censu–
erunt. In senatu fuerunt CCCI. Hoc s(enatus) c(onsultum)
factum est per relationem solum.
Ti. Caesar Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate XXII manu mea
scripsi: velle me h<oc> s(enatus) c(onsultum), quod

e<s>t factum IIII idus Decem(bres) Cotta et Messalla
co(n)s(ulibus) referente me scri–
ptum manu Auli q(uaesitoris) mei in tabellis XIII, referri in
tabulas pub<l>icas.

December 10, on the Palatine in the portico adjacent to the
Temple of Apollo. Present at the writing were M. Valerius M.f.
Messallinus from the voting tribe Lemonia, C. Ateius L. f.
Capito from the voting tribe Aniensis, Sex. Pompeius Sex. f. from the voting tribe Arnensis, M. Pompeius M. f. Priscus from the voting tribe Teretina, C. Arrenus C. f. Gallus from the voting tribe Galeria; L. Nonius L. f. Asprenas from the voting tribe Pomptina, quaestor, M. Vinicius P. f. from the voting tribe Poblilia, quaestor.

WHEREAS Ti. Caesar Augustus, son of the deified Augustus, pontifex maxumus, in the twenty-second year of his tribunician power, having been consul three times, consul–designate for the fourth time, referred to the Senate for decision:

how the case of the elder Cn. Piso had seemed and whether he seemed to have taken his life with due cause, and

how the case of M. Piso had seemed (to which item he had added that the senators be mindful of his entreaties on behalf of the young man); and

how the case of Plancina had seemed (for which person he had previously explained what he sought and for what reasons), and

what the Senate’s judgment was concerning Visellius Karus and Sempronius Bassus, members of the elder Cn. Piso’s staff,

CONCERNING THESE MATTERS THEY DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

THAT the Senate and Roman people, before all else, expressed gratitude to the immortal gods because they did not allow the tranquility of the present state of the republic—than which nothing better can be desired and which it has fallen to our lot to enjoy by the favor of our princeps—to be disturbed by the wicked plans of the elder Cn. Piso; then to Ti. Caesar Augustus, their own princeps, because he made
available to the Senate everything necessary for seeking out the truth; and

THAT the Senate admired his fairness and forbearance on this account also, because, although the crimes of the elder Cn. Piso are most manifest and Piso himself had exacted punishment from himself, nonetheless he wanted Piso’s case to be tried, and, when his <<Piso’s>> sons had been summoned, he encouraged them to defend their father’s case, going so far as to be willing for even the one who was not yet of the senatorial order to be brought in to the Senate for this business and to grant each the opportunity of speaking on behalf of their father and mother and M. Piso; next,

THAT after the case was argued for several days by the accusers of the elder Cn. Piso and by the elder Cn. Piso himself, letters and copies of documents that Germanicus Caesar himself had written to the elder Cn. Piso were read out, witnesses of every order produced, <the Senate> deemed

THAT the remarkable restraint and forbearance of Germanicus Caesar were overborne by the savagery of the elder Cn. Piso’s character and

THAT because of this the dying Germanicus (who himself declared the elder Cn. Piso to have been the cause of his death) not without due cause renounced his friendship with a man

WHO, when he should have remembered that he had been given as a special assistant to Germanicus Caesar (who had been sent by our princeps in accordance with the authority of this order to settle overseas affairs that required the presence of either Ti. Caesar Augustus himself or of one or the other of his two sons), ignoring the majesty of the imperial
house, and also ignoring the law of the land—having been attached to a proconsul and indeed to a proconsul about whom a law was put before the people providing that in whatever province he entered he had greater imperium than the province’s proconsular governor, with the proviso that in every case Ti. Caesar had greater imperium than Germanicus Caesar, he conducted himself when he was in the province of Syria as if everything ought to be subject to his decision and control—insofar as it lay in him, stirred up both an Armenian and a Parthian war, in that he was unwilling, despite the instructions of our princeps and the frequent letters of Germanicus Caesar when he was elsewhere, that Vonones, who was viewed with mistrust by the king of the Parthians, be moved further away lest he be able to flee from custody (which he did), and allowed certain wicked and bold persons of the Armenians to speak with Vonones, so that by the agency of these same persons a disturbance would be stirred up in Armenia and Vonones, when the king of Armenia had been either killed or driven out (a king whom Germanicus Caesar had given to that people according to the wishes of his father and the Senate), would seize <it, i.e., Armenia>, and did these things corrupted by the great gifts of Vonones; WHO also tried to stir up civil war (though all the evils of civil war had long since been laid to rest by the divine will of the deified Augustus and the virtues of Ti. Caesar Augustus) by trying to return to the province of Syria after the death of Germanicus
Caesar, a province which, when Germanicus was alive, he had left with the worst of intentions and <<setting the worst>> of precedents. Because of this Roman soldiers were forced to fight Roman soldiers.

Also evidenced was the unexampled cruelty <<of a man>> WHO had inflicted capital punishment on many without their cases having been heard, without the recommendation of his advisors, and crucified not only noncitizen <<soldiers>> but even a centurion, a Roman citizen;

WHO had corrupted the military discipline established by the deified Augustus and maintained by Ti. Caesar Augustus, not only by indulging the soldiers, <so that they would not> obey their superiors in accordance with our most venerable tradition, but also by giving donatives in his own name from the funds of our princeps, after which he took pleasure that some soldiers were called “Piso’s men” and others “Caesar’s men,” and also by honoring those who, after assuming such a name, had obeyed himself;

WHO after the death of Germanicus Caesar, whose demise not only the Roman people but also foreign peoples mourned, dared to send to the best and kindest father a document in which he <<Piso>> accused him <<Germanicus>>, having forgotten not only the reverence and affection owed to the son of the princeps but also human kindness, which does not allow hatreds to persist beyond death.

And that he rejoiced in his death was clear to the Senate from these proofs: because impious sacrifices
were made by him, because the ships in which he sailed showed full colors, because he opened the temples of the immortal gods, which the most steadfast devotion of the entire Roman empire had closed; and it was evidence of the same frame of mind that he was proven to have given a present of money to the man who reported to him about the death of Germanicus Caesar and to have held banquets frequently during those very days in which the announcement reached him about the death of Germanicus;

THAT the Senate also deemed

THAT the divinity of the deified Augustus was violated by him, since all the honor that had been accorded either to his memory or to statues that had been set up to him before he was included in the number of the gods had been withdrawn;

THAT for these reasons the Senate deemed

THAT he did not subject himself to the punishment he deserved, but

THAT he withdrew himself from a greater one and one that he realized was threatening him from the devotion and severity of his judges; next,

THAT to those punishments he had exacted from himself it added

THAT no lamentation on account of his death be undertaken by the women by whom he ought to have been mourned according to ancestral custom if this decree of the Senate had not been made, and

THAT statues and portrait masks of Cn. Piso, wherever displayed, be removed;
THAT those who at any time belonged to the Calpurnius family or who were related to that family by blood or marriage would act rightly and properly if they saw to it, if anyone of that family or any of those related by blood or marriage to the Calpurnius family died and was to be mourned, that the portrait mask of the elder Cn. Piso not be carried among the other portrait masks with which they customarily celebrate the rites of those funerals, and that his portrait mask not be placed among the portrait masks of the Calpurnius family, and

THAT the name of the elder Cn. Piso be removed from the inscription of the statue of Germanicus that the sodales Augustales erected to him in the Campus Martius next to the Altar of Providence, and

THAT the property of the elder Cn. Piso be confiscated, with the exception of the lands which were in Illyricum;

THAT it was the Senate’s pleasure

THAT these lands be returned to Ti. Caesar Augustus our princeps, by whose father the deified Augustus they had been presented to the elder Cn. Piso, since he had desired it to be given to him for this reason, because the peoples whose borders touched those of the lands had frequently complained about injuries at the hands of the elder Cn. Piso and of his freedmen and slaves, and because of this he thought it should be seen to that hereafter allies of the Roman people could not rightly and justly complain; likewise

THAT the Senate, mindful of its own clemency, justice, and magnanimity, which virtues it learned from its forebears and especially from the deified Augustus and Ti. Caesar Augustus its principes, decreed
THAT it was fair and considerate that from the confiscated property of the elder Cn. Piso be given to his elder son Piso (about whom nothing had been said, who was the quaestor of our princeps, whom Germanicus, too, had honored with his generosity, who had given many assurances of his own moderation, from which it could be expected that he would be quite unlike his father) in the name of the princeps and of the Senate, a half share of the property, and

THAT he, since he would be obliged by so great a favor, would act rightly and properly if he changed his first name, that of his father;

THAT also to M. Piso (to whom the Senate, agreeing with the humanity and restraint of its princeps, thought that impunity should be granted), so that the kindness of the Senate could more easily reach him unimpaired, the other half share of his father’s property be given, on these terms, that out of the entire property that by decree of the Senate had been confiscated and granted to them, one million sesterces be given as a dowry to Calpurnia, the daughter of Cn. Piso, likewise four million sesterces as her personal property; likewise

THAT it was <<the Senate’s>> pleasure

THAT the structures the elder Cn. Piso had built over the Fontinal gate for the sake of joining his private houses, the curators of adjudging public places undertake to have removed and destroyed;

THAT, as far as the case of Plancina was concerned, against whom numerous weighty charges had been lodged, since she admitted that she placed all hope in the compassion of our princeps and of the Senate, and since our princeps has often
and with marked attention requested of this order that the Senate, content with the punishment of the elder Cn. Piso, spare his wife as also his son Marcus, and interceded for Plancina at his mother’s request, and received very just reasons, made to him by her, as to why his mother wanted to obtain these concessions, the Senate deemed

THAT both Julia Augusta, who was most well deserving of the republic not only because she gave birth to our princeps but also because of her many and great kindnesses to men of every order—although she rightly and deservedly should have the greatest influence in what she requested from the Senate, she used it most sparingly—and the very great devotion of our princeps to his mother should be supported and indulged; and

THAT it was <<the Senate’s>> pleasure

THAT the punishment of Plancina be remitted;

THAT it was right

THAT Visellius Karus and Sempronius Bassus, members of the elder Cn. Piso’s staff and partners and agents in all of his crimes, be refused water and fire <<i.e., be exiled, in effect>> by the praetor who hears cases under the law of treason and

THAT it was <<the Senate’s>> pleasure

THAT their property be sold by the praetors in charge of the treasury and <<the proceeds>> placed in the treasury; likewise

THAT since the Senate judged that Ti. Caesar Augustus our princeps had exceeded the devotion of all parents, <<evidences of>> a grief so great and so constant having so often been witnessed, by which even the Senate was deeply moved, <<the Senate>> earnestly asked and sought
THAT all the care he had previously divided between his two sons he devote to the one he had; and

THAT the Senate hoped

THAT the one who survives would be all the more an object of the immortal gods’ concern insofar as they understood that all future hope of his father’s guardianship of the state was now placed in one man; and on this account <<the Senate thought>>

THAT he ought to end his grief and restore to his country not only a frame of mind but also a countenance befitting public happiness; likewise

THAT the Senate earnestly praised the restraint of Julia Augusta and Drusus Caesar, emulating the justice of our princeps, and

THAT this order noticed

THAT these had not shown a greater devotion to Germanicus than fairness in reserving their judgments until the case of the elder Cn. Piso was tried;

THAT also of others connected to Germanicus Caesar by personal ties <<the Senate>> had earnest commendation:

of Agrippina, whom <<the Senate says>> that the memory of the deified Augustus, by whom she had been greatly esteemed, and of her husband Germanicus, with whom she had lived in unique harmony, and the numerous children born by a birth most fortunate for those who survived, recommended; likewise

of Antonia, mother of Germanicus Caesar, who, having experienced a single marriage—to Drusus, father of Germanicus—has shown by the integrity of her character that she was worthy of such close kinship with the deified Augustus; and
of Livia, sister of Germanicus Caesar, of whom both her grandmother and her father–in–law and at the same time paternal uncle, our princeps, had a most favorable opinion, persons whose opinions, even if she did not belong to the house, she might deservedly vaunt, and much more so as a woman bound by such close personal ties;

THAT of these women the Senate commended equally both their loyal grief and their restraint in grief; likewise

THAT, as far as the fact that in the children of Germanicus the children’s grief (and in the case of Nero Caesar in particular already even a youth’s grief) at the lost of such a father, and likewise that of Ti. Germanicus, brother of Germanicus Caesar, had not exceeded a commendable limit, the Senate judged

THAT this should be ascribed especially to the discipline of their grandfather and paternal uncle and of Julia Augusta, but

THAT nonetheless on their account also <<the Senate>> considered

THAT it was praiseworthy; likewise

THAT the care and exertions of the equestrian order won the Senate’s special commendation, because it had loyally understood how great a matter, and how greatly relevant to everyone’s safety and devotion, was being discussed, and because by frequent acclamations it bore witness to the disturbance of its own spirit and its grief at the injuries to our princeps and his son and on behalf of the interest of the republic;

THAT the Senate also praised the people, because they have agreed with the equestrian order and signified their devotion
to our princeps and the memory of his son and because, though with a wild outpouring of enthusiasm they had been roused to effect the punishment of the elder Cn. Piso themselves, they nevertheless allowed themselves, after the example of the equestrian order, to be governed by our princeps; likewise

THAT the Senate commended the fidelity of those soldiers whose spirits had been solicited in vain by the crime of the elder Cn. Piso, and

THAT it hoped

THAT all soldiers under the auspices and command of our princeps would forever display the fidelity and devotion that they were displaying to the house of Augustus, since they knew the safety of our empire had been placed in the custody of that house;

THAT the Senate thought

THAT it was their <<the soldiers’>> concern and duty that those who at any time were in command should have most authority who with the most loyal devotion had cherished the name of the Caesars<<which>> preserves this city and the empire of the Roman people; and

THAT in order that the sequence of the entire transacted affair could more easily be handed down to the memory of future generations and they might know what the Senate had thought both about the exceptional restraint of Germanicus Caesar and about the crimes of the elder Cn. Piso, it was <<the Senate’s>> pleasure

THAT the speech our princeps read out and likewise these decisions of the Senate be set up, inscribed in bronze, in whatever place seemed best to Ti. Caesar Augustus; likewise
<<THAT>> this decree of the Senate, inscribed in bronze, be affixed in the most frequented city of every province and in the most frequented place of that city; and likewise <<THAT>> this decree of the Senate be affixed in the winter quarters of each legion near the standards.

They decreed. In the Senate were 301. This single decree of the Senate was passed on the motion. I, Ti. Caesar Augustus, in the twenty-second year of my tribunician power, have written in my own hand that I wish this decree of the Senate, which was made on 10 December in the consulship of Cotta and Messalla, on my motion, written by the hand of Aulus, my quaestor, on fourteen tablets, to be entered into the public record.
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ILS 7258:

d.m. | Venuleia | Pelagia | hic adq., | fil. matr. piiss. | M. Naevius M.f. | Gal. Restituten| mil.coh.X pr.h. aq., | qui reliq. testam. coll. | fabr. naval. Pis. stationi | vetustiss. et piiss. III | n., ex cuius reditu pa | rental. et rosar. quot | ann. at sepulchrum | suum celebrant. Quot | si factum ab eis non | esset, tunc ea ipsa con | dicione fabr. tig. Pis. | accept. pro poena a | fabr.nav. III n. ipsi | celebrare debebunt.

ILS 8370:

ILS 8373:

item dedit coll. | naut. Arilic. ⃔⃔ XII n., | ut ex eius sum. redit. | rosal. et parent.

Iusto f., | Iustae uxori, et sibi om. | an. in perpetuom procur. | Et adiecit Pontia

Iusta isd. | colleg. in memor. Fortunatae | lib. ob eand. causam ⃔⃔ n. DC | et ut

monimentum remund.