

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies
Department

Classics and Religious Studies

2017

Hercules, Mummius, and the Roman Triumph in Aeneid 8

Matthew P. Loar

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub>

Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), and the
[Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics and Religious Studies at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

HERCULES, MUMMIUS, AND THE ROMAN TRIUMPH IN *AENEID* 8

MATTHEW P. LOAR

BOOK 8 OF THE *Aeneid* opens with Aeneas finally reaching the future site of Rome, where he meets Evander and the Arcadians sacrificing to Hercules in a grove near the banks of the Tiber. Evander invites the Trojans to share the Arcadians' feast, and after he sates his guests with food and wine he recounts the origins of the Arcadians' ritual, relating how Hercules vanquished the robber-monster Cacus, erstwhile landlord of the Aventine. Evander's initial description of Hercules reveals a triumphant hero, a *victor* arriving in Rome with the *spolia* from his prior conquest in tow (8.200–204):¹

attulit et nobis aliquando optantibus aetas
auxilium adventumque dei. nam maximus ultor
tergemini nece Geryonae spoliisque superbus
Alcides aderat taurosque hac victor agebat
ingentis, vallemque boves amnemque tenebant.

Time brought to us in our time of need the aid and arrival of a god. For there came that mightiest avenger, the victor Hercules, proud with the slaughter and the spoils of threefold Geryon, and he drove the mighty bulls here, and the cattle filled both valley and riverside.²

Interpreters predominantly read the spoils of threefold (*tergeminus*) Geryon as a precursor to the triple triumph Vergil envisions Augustus celebrating at the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, depicted on the shield of Aeneas at the book's conclusion (*at Caesar, triplici invectus . . . triumpho*, 8.714).³ The textual bond between Hercules and Augustus finds historical support in the "chronological flattening" of Book 8: Aeneas first encounters the Arcadians celebrating the feast of Hercules Invictus at the Ara Maxima on August 12, the same date

This paper was originally conceived during a 2011–12 fellowship with the Advanced Seminar in the Humanities, hosted at Venice International University. The paper subsequently benefitted from participants' feedback at two conferences: "Texts and Monuments in Augustan Rome," held in Rome, Italy in 2014, and "Augustus from a Distance," held in Sydney, Australia also in 2014. Special thanks to Jennifer Trimble, who tirelessly read and commented on numerous drafts of the article. Thanks, too, to Alessandro Barchiesi, Dan-el Padilla Peralta, Grant Parker, and the two anonymous readers for the journal, whose suggestions strengthened the argument markedly.

1. Cf. *Aen.* 7.661–62, 8.362–63. The conjunction of *spolia* and *victor* in these lines contributes to Hercules' triumphal characterization, as these two terms often accompany descriptions of *triumphatores* in Livy (e.g., 2.7.3, 4.32.2, 8.30.9); cf. *Sen. Ag.* 802–4. Gransden (1976, ad loc.) similarly labels Hercules a *triumphator*.

2. The Latin text of Vergil is from Mynors 1969. All translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

3. For the sake of simplicity I will use the name "Augustus" to denote the emperor throughout this paper, even when referencing events prior to his assumption of this title. On the triple triumph itself, see Gurval 1995, 19–85. The claim that Hercules is intended as a positive exemplar for Augustus is widely supported: see, e.g., Galinsky 1972, 142–46; Feeney 1991, 155–62.

on which Augustus arrived in Rome in 29 BCE before beginning his triple triumph to commemorate his Actian victory.⁴ Given Mark Antony's own prior connections with Hercules, this synchronization has been read as part of Augustus' efforts to appropriate Hercules from Antony. As such, interpreters have argued that Vergil similarly highlights Augustus' ties with Hercules in order to punctuate the emperor's triumph over Mark Antony.⁵

Alternatively, I propose that Vergil uses the image of a triumphant Hercules as a way to tap into a rich layer of Republican triumphal history that is instantiated in Rome's monuments, portraying Augustus ultimately as one more in the long line of notable Republican *triumphatores*.⁶ In other words, Vergil's triumphant Hercules serves less as a proxy for Augustus' ideological battle with Antony and more as a critical link between Augustus, his Republican predecessors, and the pre-Actian monumental landscape of Rome. Central to this argument is the fact that Hercules' associations with the Roman triumph predate the Augustan period by more than two centuries, and, more importantly, these associations are visibly reified in the many Republican victory temples dedicated to Hercules in Rome. When Evander narrates the arrival of Hercules in Book 8, he evokes Hercules' triumphal associations by alluding to one of these extant victory temples: the Forum Boarium's second-century Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam*. As I will argue in this paper, this allusion operates in two complementary ways, each answering the questions of how and where Vergil situates Augustus and his victory monument, the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, in the narrative of Rome's triumphal history. First, within this allusion Evander also recalls the temple's possible dedicator, L. Mummius Achaicus (cos. 146 BCE), who celebrated a triumph in 145 BCE for his previous year's victory over Corinth. The allusion to Mummius and his temple to Hercules at the beginning of Book 8 therefore offers a provocative triumphal pendant for Augustus and his temple to Apollo at the book's end. By this reading, Mummius and his temple encapsulate the Republican triumphal tradition onto which Vergil grafts Augustus.

The second interpretation of this allusion, on the other hand, takes a more panoramic view of Rome, its triumphal history, and the role of Hercules' monuments in shaping the contours of that history. Since Mummius' temple to Hercules is only one of a number dedicated to the god in Rome, I suggest that we can read a further level of allusiveness in Evander's original allusion to the temple: the physical structure itself, by its appearance and location, alludes to other similar victory temples and so evokes the memories of other famous Republican *triumphatores* from the second and first centuries BCE. With one allusive passage centered on Hercules at the beginning of Book 8, Vergil

4. Feeney 2007, 161–63. See also Grimal 1951, 51–55; Binder 1971, 42–43; Galinsky 1996, 223; Mueller 2002. Cf. Welch 2005, 112–32.

5. See, e.g., Galinsky 1972, 131–49; Morgan 1998. On the alleged role of Hercules in the mud-slinging campaigns between Augustus and Antony in the 30s and 20s BCE, with sources for Antony's connections to Hercules, see Zanker 1988, 57–65. For a rebuttal of Zanker's claims, see Hekster 2004.

6. Itgenshorst (2004) similarly suggests this type of relation between Augustus as triple *triumphator* and his triumphal Republican predecessors; her argument, however, has nothing to do with the *Aeneid* and more to do with Augustus' self-presentation as continuator of a Republican tradition by means of the *Fasti Triumphales* and the gallery of *summi viri* in the Forum Augustum, both of which postdate the *Aeneid*.

activates a thick network of Republican triumphal associations embodied in Rome's pre-Augustan monumental landscape. Accordingly, while Hercules facilitates Vergil's efforts to position Augustus within Rome's existing triumphal tradition, he also speaks to how Vergil negotiates the visible reminders of Rome's Republican history in crafting his vision of Augustus' Rome.

HERCULES AND THE ROMAN TRIUMPH

To appreciate how readily Vergil could use the figure of Hercules as a metonym for Rome's Republican triumphal past, it is worth briefly outlining Hercules' historical and material associations with the Roman triumph. According to Livy (9.44.16), already by 305 BCE Romans were commemorating military victories by erecting statues to Hercules. Pliny the Elder backdates Hercules' triumphal significations all the way to the time of Evander, crediting the Arcadian king with erecting a statue in the Forum Boarium of Hercules Triumphalis, notable because it would be clothed in triumphal garb during triumphal processions.⁷ In the second and first centuries BCE, Hercules insinuates himself even more deeply into the Roman triumphal tradition: he begins to appear regularly on triumphal coinage; a number of victory temples are dedicated to him along the triumphal route; and the precincts of some of these temples hosted the Lucullan feasts that would conclude the triumphal celebrations.⁸

Modern scholars agree that anywhere from five to seven temples to Hercules would have been extant in Augustan Rome.⁹ We can fairly certainly connect five temples to known Republican *triumphatores*, though not all were necessarily triumphal dedications, *per se*. Two temples were located in the Campus Martius, where the triumphal procession would first assemble: the Temple of Hercules Musarum, dedicated between 187 and 179 BCE by M. Fulvius Nobilior and renovated shortly after 33 BCE by L. Marcius Philippus, Augustus' stepfather; and the Temple of Hercules Custos, likely renovated by Sulla in the 80s BCE.¹⁰ Most significantly for *Aeneid* 8, the other three known Republican temples cluster in the Forum Boarium, where Aeneas and his men make landfall and find the Arcadians sacrificing to Hercules at the Ara Maxima (8.101–6): the temples of Hercules Aemilianus, Hercules Pompeianus, and Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam*. Each of these temples was affiliated

7. Plin. *HN* 34.16. We might assume that Pliny has read his Vergil and interpreted Hercules in Book 8 as a *triumphator*, because historically this claim seems anachronistic. Rome's first *triumphator*, at least according to the *Fasti Triumphales*, was Romulus. Pliny likely means that Evander dedicated a statue to Hercules that has since acquired the title "Triumphalis" because it has been incorporated into triumphal celebrations: *Hercules ab Evandro sacratus, ut produnt, in foro boario, qui triumphalis vocatur atque per triumphos vestitur habitu triumphali*.

8. On coins, see Ritter 1995, 44–47. For recent work on the triumphal route, see Favro 1994; Beard 2007. On triumphal feasts, see Marzano 2009.

9. On the temples and ancient sources for their existence, see *LTUR* 3: 11–26. See also Haselberger 2002, rev. 2008; online at <http://digitalaugustanrome.org> (accessed 25 September 2015).

10. In the course of his renovations to the Temple of Hercules Musarum, L. Marcius Philippus added a portico to the temple, named the Portico of Philippus. See *Ov. Fast.* 6.801–2; *Suet. Aug.* 29.5. On the *Fasti* passage, see Barchiesi 1997, 266–71; Littlewood 2006, 229–35. On the temple and the portico, see Richardson 1977; Heslin 2015, 197–254. On the Temple of Hercules Custos, see *Ov. Fast.* 6.209–12. Ovid's passage is the only text that definitively references the temple. Livy at two points alludes to an unspecified temple of Hercules that may be connected with the Temple of Hercules Custos (21.62.9, 38.35.4). See Ziolkowski 1992, 50–56.

with an elite Roman general of the Republican era. P. Scipio Aemilianus likely dedicated the Temple of Hercules Aemilianus in 142 BCE.¹¹ Pompey the Great most likely renovated the Temple of Hercules Pompeianus in the first half of the first century BCE.¹² And the *triumphator* L. Mummius Achaicus probably dedicated the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemina* (on this question, see below), putting its beginnings around 142 BCE as well. Even the Porta Trigemina, which was incorporated within the course of the old Servian walls encircling the Forum Boarium, may have displayed iconography associated with Hercules.¹³ Add to these five monuments the statue of Hercules Triumphalis, and the Forum Boarium begins to emerge as the space in Rome most richly evocative of Hercules' Republican connections to the Roman triumph.

It should be noted, however, that we have no surviving record—either in inscriptions, coinage, the *Res Gestae*, or even post-Augustan literature—to indicate that Augustus' capacious building program aided the construction or renovation of any of these monuments to Hercules.¹⁴ Nor is there evidence to suggest that Augustus altered the feast day for any of the Hercules temples, as happened with more than a dozen of the thirty-five temples known to have been constructed or renovated between 38 BCE and 17 CE.¹⁵ Although the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, it is suggestive that none of the Hercules monuments are linked explicitly in the Augustan or post-Augustan period with either Augustus or any other members of the imperial family, as so many other structures are. These are, in other words, monuments that continued to recall Rome's Republican past, not its Augustan present. Not only that, but the historical figures behind these temples—M. Fulvius Nobilior, P. Scipio Aemilianus, L. Mummius Achaicus, Sulla, and Pompey—occupy exceptionally prominent places in the annals of Roman history, and we know that at least some were included in the gallery of *summi viri* erected in the Forum Augustum. Hercules' longstanding monumental associations with such important Republican *triumphatores* accordingly engenders the thick triumphal atmosphere that Vergil taps into in Book 8.

11. Coarelli notes that the only true textual evidence for a temple of "Hercules Aemilianus" comes from Scaliger's emendation of a passage from Festus (282 L): *Pudicitiae signum in foro Boario est ubi amiliana aedisset Herculis*, for which Scaliger proposes instead, *Aemiliana aedis est*. The existence of such a temple might explain a reference in Plutarch to Scipio's dedication of a temple to Hercules (Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 816C). On the temple, see *LTUR* 3: 12–13, s.v. "Hercules, Aedes Aemiliana."

12. Vitr. 3.3.5; Plin. *HN* 34.57. See Coarelli's comments in *LTUR* 3: 20–21, s.v. "Hercules Pompeianus, Aedes."

13. This claim is based on a drawing included in the sixteenth-century *Codex Coburgensis*. Coarelli (1988, 402–5) argues convincingly that the portal featured in the drawing is the Porta Trigemina, not the Porta Triumphalis, as others have contended. On the codex and the drawing, see Pfanner 1980; Wrede and Harprath 1986. Latham (2016, 143) notes the enduring Republican resonances of the portal, as "the late antique regionary catalogs recorded its republican name, porta Trigemina, and not those of its imperial 'restorers' [P. Lentulus Scipio and T. Quinctius Crispinus Valerianus]."

14. Peter Heslin (2015) has recently written about the addition of the Portico of Philippus to Fulvius Nobilior's Temple of Hercules Musarum. He argues in favor of putting "the Portico of Philippus back into its rightful place as part of the building program of Augustus," suggesting that "it was convenient [for Augustus] to have someone else's name on the rebuilding of Rome's de facto Museum" (p. 199). What Heslin seems to be emphasizing, though, is more the place of the added portico, and not so much the place of the existing temple, in this building program.

15. For a table listing the thirty-five temples with their old and new feast days, see Gros 1976, 32–33.

TEMPLE OF HERCULES VICTOR *AD PORTAM TRIGEMINAM*

With this monumental backdrop lurking just on the other side of Evander's Rome, we should not be surprised to find traces of it seeping into Vergil's narrative. When Evander describes Hercules' triumphant advent at the beginning of Book 8, he alludes to one of the Forum Boarium's Republican temples to Hercules: the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam*, which stood near the Porta Trigemina.¹⁶ Three terms in Evander's description reveal the allusion (8.201–4):

nam maximus ultor
tergemini nece Geryonae spoliisque superbus
Alcides aderat taurosque hac *victor* agebat
 ingentis

For there came that mightiest avenger, the *victor Hercules*, proud with the slaughter and the spoils of *threefold* Geryon, and he drove the mighty bulls here.

First, the patronymic *Alcides* stands in for *Hercules*, which is not scannable in hexameters. Second, the epithet *victor* disambiguates this iteration of Hercules from the Hercules worshiped at the Ara Maxima, who is apostrophized with the epithet *invictus* ninety lines later (8.293).¹⁷ Third and finally, the adjective *tergeminus*, used here as an anomalous descriptor for Geryon, is the poetic form of *trigeminus*.¹⁸ Since Aeneas finds the Arcadians sacrificing to Hercules in the Forum Boarium, the conjunction of *Alcides*, *victor*, and *tergeminus* over the span of two lines suggests that Evander is alluding to the Forum Boarium's Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam*.¹⁹

16. Literary evidence for the temple comes from Serv. *Aen.* 8.363 and Macrob. *Sat.* 3.6.10. We also find a reference to the Porta Trigemina in the Hercules-Cacus narrative in Sol. 1.8. A recently discovered fresco from the *domus dei Bucrani* in Ostia, dated to the first century BCE, may also incorporate the Porta Trigemina into the iconography of the Hercules-Cacus episode, possibly by way of visualizing the connection between Ostia and Rome that the Porta Trigemina represents (Moret 2012, 109, with fig. 28). I have doubts, however, about the identification of the scene depicted in this fragmentary fresco, not only because of the near indecipherability of the images, but also because it would constitute the earliest representation of the Hercules-Cacus episode by almost two centuries. The other two representations exist on a pair of nearly identical Antonine medallions: *LIMC* 3, s.v. "Cacus," nos. 1–2.

17. On the differences between Hercules Victor and Hercules Invictus, see Weinstock 1957.

18. As a descriptor for Geryon, *tergeminus* finds little precedent, appearing elsewhere only at Lucr. 5.28. In Hes. *Theog.* 287, Geryon is τρικέφαλος (three-headed), whereas in Aesch. *Ag.* 870 he is τρισώματος (three-bodied). Earlier in the *Aeneid*, when Aeneas encounters the shade of Geryon in Book 6, Vergil presents the ghost differently as a *forma tricorporis umbrae* (the figure of a three-bodied shade, 6.289). Sil. *Pun.* 3.422, 13.201 also describes Geryon as *tricornus*. Prop. 4.9.10 refers to Geryon's three separate mouths (*per tria partitos qui dabat ora sonos*). Sen. *Ag.* 841 uses the term *triformis* (three-formed) in his description. Claud. *in Ruf.* 1.294 offers *Geryon triplex* (triple Geryon). Aside from its appearance in Servius' commentaries on the *Aeneid* (*ad* 4.551, 7.662, 8.202), *tergeminus* appears only once in prose, at Plin. *HN* 7.33, where Pliny mentions the Horatii and Curiatii brothers. More frequently, however, these brothers are described with the prosaic form, *trigeminus*, as in Livy 1.24–26 (*trigemini fratres*). The Curiatii, in fact, would adopt the cognomen *trigeminus*: Livy 3.32.1; *RRC* 223/1, 240/1a; Ogilvie 1965, 109–17. The only times *trigeminus* appears in verse are in Plaut. *Capt.* 90 (*portam Trigeminam*); *Mil.* 717; Sen. *Oed.* 278; *Ag.* 14.

19. On the Porta Trigemina, see *LTUR* 3: 332–33, s.v. "Murus Servii Tullii; Porta Trigemina." The correlation between "threefold" Geryon and the Porta Trigemina is strengthened by the likelihood that the latter was so named because of its triple openings, on which see Lyngby 1968, 88–89; Coarelli 1988, 47–50. Based on the surviving evidence, it seems that at least one other gate in the Servian Walls had more than one opening: the Porta Carmentalis, which may have had two openings (Livy 2.49.8; Ov. *Fast.* 2.201). We have no evidence, however, for other gates with multiple openings.

Today, a round temple stands extant on the banks of the Tiber, approximately 100 meters northwest of the likely site of the Porta Trigemina. A peripteral temple that was once faced with expensive Greek Pentelic marble, it was long identified as a temple of Vesta, though it is now more commonly recognized as the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemina*.²⁰ The temple's original dedication is dated to circa 143–132 BCE, a time of intense construction in and around the Portus Tiberinus. The question of who dedicated this temple and for what purpose remains unresolved. Two opinions prevail: Adam Ziolkowski credits the second-century consul and *triumphator* L. Mummius Achaicus with the temple's dedication, while Filippo Coarelli attributes its construction to the *mercator* M. Octavius Herrenus (late second century BCE).²¹ Coarelli's hypothesis has been most widely adopted. Since my own argument hinges on tying this particular temple's construction to Mummius, I will briefly summarize and assess the strengths and weaknesses of both positions before proceeding.

Ziolkowski's claim relies on an intact inscription that commemorates Mummius' dedication of a manubial temple and statue to Hercules Victor following his triumph over Corinth in 146 BCE. The inscription, discovered during eighteenth-century excavations on the Caelian, is etched into a slab of travertine limestone (*CIL* 6.331 = *ILS* 20):

1	L(ucius) Mummi(us) L(uci) f(ilius) co(n)s(ul) duct(u)
2	auspicio imperioque
3	eius Achaia capt(a) Corinto
4	deleto Romam redieit
5	triumphans. ob hasce
6	res bene gestas quod
7	in bello voverat
8	hanc aedem et signu(m)
9	Herculis Victoris
10	imperator dedicat.

Lucius Mummius, son of Lucius, consul, returned to Rome in triumph after Corinth was destroyed and Greece captured under his leadership, auspices, and *imperium*. On account of these successes, as *imperator* he dedicates this temple and statue of Hercules Victor which he had vowed in war.

Based on its find-spot, scholars tend to assume that the inscription accompanied a shrine located on the Caelian. Ziolkowski notes, however, that no traces of a temple dedicated to Hercules have been found on the Caelian, and we have no evidence to indicate that the cult of Hercules Victor was celebrated anywhere outside the Forum Boarium. Nor would it make much sense for Mummius, a celebrated *triumphator* whose triumph over Corinth was widely considered to be particularly sumptuous and responsible for introducing all variety of Greek art to Rome, to construct his victory temple on the Caelian instead of in the

20. See, e.g., Coarelli 2007, 316–18. Wiseman (1990), reviewing Coarelli 1988, nonetheless calls into question the location of both the Porta Trigemina and the associated temple. Ancient sources record that temples to Hercules in Rome were typically round: Livy 10.23.3; Serv. *Aen.* 9.409.

21. Ziolkowski 1988; Coarelli 1988, 92–105.

Forum Boarium.²² Nonetheless, that the inscription is written on travertine and not the expensive marble that once adorned the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam* has likewise led most scholars to discount the possibility that the inscription could be affiliated with the Forum Boarium's temple. Ziolkowski answers this concern by suggesting that this inscription may have been attached to some other lesser piece of *Mummiana* on the Caelian. We do know that Mummius' dedicatory inscriptions were prolific—with the quantity of inscriptions currently ascribed to Mummius exceeding that of any other Republican general—so Ziolkowski's suggestion is not entirely infeasible.²³

Coarelli, on the other hand, makes his case for the *mercator* M. Octavius Herrenus based on two sets of evidence. First, he adduces a partial inscription from a Severan-era statue base discovered near the Forum Boarium's temple, which reads]o *Olivarius opus Scopae minoris* (CIL 6.33936). Based on a line in the reginary catalogues for Regio XI that lists an unspecified monument to *Hercules Olivarius*, he reconstructs the inscription as [*Hercules Victor cognominatus volg*]o *Olivarius opus Scopae minoris* ("Hercules Victor, called Olivarius, the work of Scopus Minor—for the people"). Considering Hercules' connection with Italian *olearii* on Delos, Coarelli suggests that the monument to *Hercules Olivarius* must be affiliated with an oil merchant from the second century BCE, since that coincides with the *floruit* of the younger Scopas. Coarelli then identifies this merchant as the M. Octavius Herrenus whom Servius and Macrobius, in their commentaries on *Aeneid* 8.362–63 (*Alcides / victor*), name as the dedicator of a temple to Hercules Victor in Rome (Serv. *Aen.* 8.363; Macrobius *Sat.* 3.6.10). There are, however, three potential issues with Coarelli's hypothesis: first, while the two ancient commentators are attempting to explain the presence of two temples to Hercules Victor in Rome, the one *ad portam Trigeminam*, the other *in foro boario*, they do not indicate which is Herrenus'. Second, Servius and Macrobius lose some of their authority since they are writing more than five centuries after the dedication of the Forum Boarium's temple, and they are likely working from the same fourth-century source, perhaps the commentator Donatus or a lexicographer like Festus, as Ziolkowski proposes.²⁴ Third, the sobriquet *Olivarius* attached to Hercules is likely a later addition, which might make sense since the statue base itself is dated to the Severan era; the adjective *olivarius* does not appear in Latin literature until the early first century CE, and it is attested in only one other inscription—also on a statue base—which is dated to the middle of the second century CE.²⁵

22. On Mummius' triumph, see Livy *Per.* 52; Plin. *HN* 37.12; Tac. *Ann.* 14.21.

23. Miles 2008, 73–75. For accountings of the known spoils and inscriptions ascribed to Mummius, see Nenci 1978; Graverini 2001; Yarrow 2006. Cf. Pietilä-Castrén 1982.

24. Ziolkowski 1988, 319 n. 37.

25. A possible later addition of *Olivarius* to the statue may parallel what happens with Hercules Triumphalis: a statue of Hercules, over time, acquires new meanings and possibly even new titles. The earliest attested use of *olivarius* comes from Columella *Rust.* 12.49.11; see *TLL* 9.2.566.32–45. On the other inscription, recently discovered in Caieta, see Arnaldi, Cassieri, and Gregori 2013, 56–67.

Ultimately, it seems that there are three points on which everybody agrees: (1) L. Mummius Achaicus dedicated a temple to Hercules Victor somewhere in Rome; (2) there existed a temple to Hercules Victor near the Porta Trigemina—that is, even if the origin story that Servius and Macrobius forward is apocryphal, the temple prompting the story is probably real; (3) a round temple stands extant near the Tiber in the Forum Boarium that was most likely dedicated to Hercules. By the criterion of Occam’s Razor, Ziolkowski’s argument in favor of Mummius as the dedicator of the extant Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemina* seems most plausible. Through my analysis in the following pages, moreover, I will suggest that we can mobilize Vergil’s allusion to the temple in Book 8 as further evidence in support of Ziolkowski’s identification.

HERCULES, MUMMIUS, AUGUSTUS

L. Mummius Achaicus actually makes an important appearance in the *Aeneid*, as Anchises includes him and his Corinthian triumph in the parade of heroes in Book 6. And when Anchises announces Mummius’ triumph, he does so in language familiar from Mummius’ triumphal inscription discussed above (6.836–37):

ille *triumphata* Capitolia ad alta *Corintho*
victor aget curram caesis *insignis Achivis*.

He [sc. Mummius], *triumphant over Corinth and famed for his Greek slaughter*, will drive his chariot to the lofty Capitol.

In particular, the three terms *triumphata*, *Corintho*, and *Achivis* appear in different forms in Mummius’ inscription from the Caelian (3–5), though Anchises here substitutes the etymological relation *Achivis* for *Achaia*. Additionally, Vergil’s adjective *insignis* echoes the *signu(m)* mentioned in the inscription.²⁶ This does not mean that Vergil is necessarily quoting Mummius’ triumphal inscription; rather, he may be alluding to the language that elsewhere characterized Mummius’ triumph and triumphal dedications.²⁷

More suggestively, Vergil replicates elements from Anchises’ description of Mummius when Evander narrates the arrival of Hercules, and alludes to Mummius’ temple, in Book 8 (8.203–4):

26. I must thank Christopher Krebs for pointing this out to me.

27. The language of Mummius’ triumphal inscription accords well with known conventions for commemorating such events. Although no single source identifies the definitive “formula” for earning a triumph, general consensus favors the tetrad elements *imperio auspicio ductu felicitate*, of which Mummius’ inscription includes the first three: see Livy 40.52.5; Pittenger 2008, 25–31. Furthermore, the note that Mummius is making his dedication on account of his successes (*ob hasce res bene gestas*) aligns with literary accounts of triumphs: see, e.g., Cic. *Planc.* 61.5; Livy 4.20.1; Val. Max. 2.83. Lastly, the close conjunction of *aedes* and *signum* commonly appears in inscriptions recording *ex voto* dedications: see, e.g., *CIL* 3.5533, 5.412, 6.679; cf. Pliny’s recording of the inscription accompanying a temple of Minerva dedicated by Pompey (*HN* 7.97). None of this more generic triumphal language, however, appears in Vergil’s account. Other Mummiian dedicatory inscriptions replicate certain elements from the triumphal inscription, such as *CIL* 1.630 ([*Corintho*] *capta*), 1.631 (*Achaea* *capta*). Livy *Per.* 52 describes Mummius’ triumph in language familiar from both Vergil and Mummius’ inscription: *L. Mummius de Achaëis triumphavit, signa aerea marmoreaque et tabulas pictas in triumpho tulit*.

Alcides aderat taurosque hac victor agebat
ingentis

Hercules *Victor* came and drove the mighty bulls here.

Just as Anchises pictures Mummius as a *victor* driving (*aget*) his chariot, Evander envisions Hercules as a *victor* driving (*agebat*) his bulls, and in both cases the words appear side-by-side. Notably, the pairing of *victor* with the verb *agere* appears only in one other instance in the *Aeneid*, when Anchises depicts the triumphant Liber as a *victor* driving his yoke of tigers (*agens . . . tigris*, 6.805). Suggestively, Liber is here offered as a matched pair with Hercules, and the famed travels of both deities are presented as paradigms that Augustus himself is prophesied to surpass (6.801–5).²⁸ The proximity of Liber’s triumph to Mummius’ in Book 6, and its relation to Hercules in the preceding lines, may also work to subtly link Mummius and Hercules.

A further bond between Mummius and Hercules lies in their similar triumphs over Greek opponents. Just as Mummius merited fame for slaughtering Greeks (*caesis insignis Achivis*), Hercules will ultimately earn the Arcadians’ devotion in Book 8 for triumphing over Cacus, the Latin transliteration and embodiment of Greek *κακός*.²⁹ All of this is not to say that Vergil intends Hercules as an avatar for Mummius, but rather that the figure of Hercules evokes memories of Mummius’ triumph. When Evander alludes to the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemnam*, these evocations therefore encourage the reader to think not just of the temple, but also of Mummius, its dedicator.

By recalling Mummius’ triumph through the image of the *victor* Hercules, Vergil fashions a triumphal frame for Book 8 that now has as its bookends two historical Roman *triumphatores* and (allusions to) their triumphal monuments: Mummius and the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemnam*, and Augustus and the Temple of Apollo Palatinus. That Mummius and Augustus should be read as triumphal pendants is already suggested by the fact that they are the only two Romans in the *Aeneid* who are pictured explicitly in triumph (6.836–37; 8.714–16):³⁰

ille triumphata Capitolia ad alta Corintho
victor aget currum caesis insignis Achivis.

28. These lines are the *locus classicus* for reading Hercules as a model for Augustus. See, e.g., Schnepf 1959, 256–68; Galinsky 1972, 136; Marinčič 2002, 147. Contrarily, Fordyce (1977, 223–27) summarily dismisses the political reading as “fantasy.”

29. Serv. *Aen.* 8.190. Morgan (1998, 176) sees “West v. East” as one of the dualities mapped onto the battle between Hercules and Cacus. One of the strongest arguments in favor of reading Cacus as a cipher for “Greek” comes from the close parallels between Cacus and Turnus, a point elaborated by Galinsky (1966). The teleology of the *Aeneid*, we should remember, is a reversal of the outcome of the Trojan War: this time, the Trojan Aeneas will overcome the Greek Turnus, fulfilling Jupiter’s prophecy from Book 1 (*victis . . . Argis*, 1.285). Turnus, whose Greek lineage was flagged in Book 7 (7.371–72, 789–92; cf. 7.794, where Turnus’ soldiers are called *Argivis pubes*), appears again at the very beginning of Book 8 with the Greek Diomedes (8.1–17). The quick movement from Turnus in 8.17 to Aeneas, the *Laomedontius heros*, in 8.18, thus foregrounds a Greek vs. Trojan conflict before the narrative turns to Hercules and Cacus. On the prominent thematization of this conflict in the latter half of the *Aeneid*, see Rebggiani 2013a.

30. The only other individual imagined explicitly in triumph—that is, with forms of *triumphus* or *triumphare*—is Helen (*partoque ibit regina triumpho*, 2.578), though this is in the disputed section of text found only in Servius’ commentaries. Liber’s triumph in Book 6, mentioned above, lacks these specific triumphal words.

He [sc. Mummius], *triumphant* over Corinth and famed for his Greek slaughter, will drive his chariot to the lofty Capitol.

at Caesar, triplici invectus Romana *triumpho*
moenia, dis Italis votum immortale sacrabat,
maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem.

But Caesar in his triple *triumph* passed the gates of Rome and dedicated to Italy's gods three hundred temples throughout the city for grateful offering and immortal praise.

Vergil further singles out the triumphs of Mummius and Augustus by presenting the two men similarly as the inheritors of a triumphal tradition that dates back to the origins of Rome itself. Earlier in Book 6, twenty lines before predicting Mummius' victory, Anchises foretells how Rome's third king, Tullus Hostilius, will awaken Roman armies long unaccustomed to triumphs (*desueta triumphis / agmina*, 6.814–15). Likewise in Book 8, while the ekphrasis of Aeneas' shield culminates with Augustus' triumph, it begins ninety lines previously with the observation that the shield is engraved with the history of Italy and Rome's triumphs (*illic res Italas Romanorumque triumphos*, 8.626). These are the only other moments in the *Aeneid* where Vergil refers to Roman triumphs.³¹ The parallel setups to Mummius and Augustus' triumphs, coupled with the fact that Mummius and Augustus are the only two Romans in the *Aeneid* shown in triumph, suggests that Vergil is intentionally forging a bond between these figures.

Mummius, then, affords Vergil the means of situating Augustus himself within Rome's triumphal history. Additionally, we can point to an important monument in Rome's triumphal landscape that shares both Mummian and Augustan associations in the *Aeneid*: the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline. When Anchises describes Mummius' triumph in Book 6, he envisions Mummius ascending the lofty Capitoline (*Capitolia ad alta*, 6.836), the traditional terminus of the triumphal procession. This is notably the Capitoline's first appearance in the *Aeneid*.³² The Capitoline appears for a second time in Book 8, when Evander is guiding Aeneas on a tour of the future site of Rome and takes him to the Capitol, the seat of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (8.347–48):

hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit
aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis.

From here he leads him up to the Tarpeian rock and the Capitol, golden now, though once thick with bristling brush.

Based on the narrative aside that the Capitol is "golden now" (*aurea nunc*), scholars overwhelmingly interpret the golden temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as emblematic of the golden age that Augustus ushers in, not least because the temple was one of the most prominent beneficiaries of Augustus' famed

31. One might read a veiled reference to Roman triumphs in Book 4 when Vergil characterizes Africa as a land that is rich in triumphs (*despectus Iarbas / ductoresque alii, quos Africa terra triumphis / dives alit*, 4.36–38).

32. On the Capitol and the Capitoline in the *Aeneid*, see Harrison 2006, 174–78.

rebuilding campaign (*RG* 20). As such, the Capitol evokes one of the central themes of the Augustan period and therefore redounds to Augustus' legacy. I would suggest, however, that we should be careful not to read the Capitol only as an index of Augustanism, especially in the triumphal context of Book 8. On the contrary, the Capitol already, by virtue of its prominent role in the Republican triumphal tradition, carries strong Republican resonances, and Vergil underscores these resonances in Book 8.

In the first place, despite the ideological significance of his renovations, Augustus was not the first to gild the Capitol; that distinction belongs to Mummius, who bedecked the mighty temple with golden roof tiles during his censorship in 142 BCE.³³ To speak of the golden Capitol, then, could call to mind either Mummius or Augustus—or both. Secondly, after Evander points out the temple to Aeneas, he tells the Trojan hero that “the Arcadians believe they have seen Jupiter himself” (*Arcades ipsum / credunt se vidisse Iovem*, 8.352–53). Though this is widely considered a reference to the Temple of Jupiter Tonans dedicated by Augustus in or after 22 BCE, Evander could also be alluding to the statue of Jupiter in a quadriga adorning the apex of the Capitol—an image with rich symbolic meaning for the Republican Roman triumph, as it was in the quadriga that a *triumphator* would parade through the streets of Rome on his way up to the Capitoline.³⁴ Lastly, in the ekphrasis of Aeneas' shield, one of the most elaborately inscribed scenes records a pivotal moment in Rome's Republican past that centered on the Capitoline: Manlius Capitolinus' defense of the Capitol when the Gauls were besieging Rome in 390 BCE (8.653–54).³⁵ Consequently, for as much as we may be tempted to read the Capitol as an emblem of the new Augustan golden age, Vergil seems equally, if not more, invested in propounding its longstanding Republican associations.

My insistence on drawing a sharp line between “Augustan” and “Republican” triumphal traditions reflects the historical evolution of the Roman triumph at the end of the first century. By the time of Vergil's death in 19 BCE, Augustus had not yet rebranded the triumph as a uniquely Augustan honor reserved only for himself and the imperial family, nor had he shifted the *terminus* of the triumphal procession to the Temple of Mars Ultor in the new Forum Augustum; the triumph was still recognizably a Republican tradition.³⁶

33. Plin. *HN* 33.57. It should be noted, however, that Mummius and Augustus gilded different iterations of the same temple, since the Capitol had burned down in 83 BCE. We know from Dionysius of Halicarnassus that, after the temple burned in 83, it was rebuilt under Augustus according to the same plan, only with “costlier materials” (*Ant. Rom.* 4.61.4). For discussion, see Edwards 1996, 69–95.

34. On Jupiter Tonans, see Grimal 1951; Eden 1975, ad loc.; Gransden 1976, ad loc. For the quadriga atop the Capitolia, see Livy 10.23.12; Plin. *HN* 28.16, 35.157. I must thank Dan-el Padilla Peralta for pointing this out to me.

35. Gransden (1976, ad loc.) observes that both references to the Capitol in Book 8 occupy the central space of their respective narratives: in the first case, the Capitol sits at the midpoint of Evander's tour; in the second place, the Capitol sits at the midpoint of the shield's ekphrasis. On Capitolinus' defense of the Capitol, see Livy 5.47; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72.

36. This disjunction between Republican and Augustan triumphs is also apparent in recent scholarship on the topic. Consider the titles of a pair of articles that implicitly underscore the difference between these two triumphal traditions: Tanja Itgenshorst's “Augustus und der republikanische Triumph: Triumphalfasten und summi viri-Galerie als Instrumente der imperialen Machtsicherung” (2004), or Fabian Goldbeck and Peter Franz Mittag's chapter, “Der geregelte Triumph: Der republikanische Triumph bei Valerius Maximus und Aulus Gellius” in the edited volume by Krasser, Pausch, and Petrovic (2008).

Additionally, it seems implausible to suggest that we could read Augustus' triumph in 29 BCE as a "restoration" of a lost practice, as was the case with rites such as the *Ludi Saeculares*, for example (*RG* 22). The so-called *Fasti Triumphales*, though fragmentary for the years 34–28 BCE, nonetheless would have included approximately seventeen lines of text for this period, implying that the years immediately before and after Actium were not without triumphs.³⁷ Indeed, the erection of these *Fasti* in 12 BCE next to the consular lists in the Forum would actually confirm Vergil's reading of Augustus' triumph in 29 BCE: Rome's first emperor was, at least during Vergil's lifetime, one in an exceedingly long line of Republican *triumphatores*.³⁸

It is tantalizing to note that a mere six months before Vergil's death in 19 BCE, L. Cornelius Balbus, a naturalized Spaniard from Gades—home to the Temple of Hercules Gaditanus, one of the most important cult sites to Hercules in the western Mediterranean—celebrated what would be the last triumph awarded to a *privatus* until the triumph of Belisarius in 534 CE.³⁹ Balbus' triumph, more importantly, is the last one listed on the *Fasti Triumphales*; as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill observes, "there was no room for future triumphs, and the arch [on which were located the *Fasti*] closed a chapter in Roman triumphal history."⁴⁰ It is certainly suggestive that, as this chapter in Roman triumphal history came to a close, it was not Augustus who occupied the final line on this stone inscription. Though Augustus does appear among the list of *triumphatores* etched into the *Fasti*, it was Balbus, a man with his own connections to Hercules, who signaled the end of an era.⁴¹

This unexpected conclusion to the *Fasti Triumphales* echoes Vergil's approach in *Aeneid* 8: while Vergil appends Augustus to the same triumphal tradition out of which Mummius emerged, he nonetheless maintains the Republican-ness of that tradition, at least insofar as Rome's triumphal monuments are concerned. Augustus may follow in the footsteps of Rome's Republican *triumphatores* by dedicating a victory temple to Apollo, but his temple on the Palatine is not incorporated into Rome's pre-Augustan triumphal landscape; it occupies its own, newly consecrated space in Rome, separate from the city's established triumphal foci.

In articulating his vision of Augustus' Rome, then, Vergil emphasizes the still live and still resonant influences of the city's Republican triumphal tradition, even with the addition of new Augustan monuments. This explains why Vergil inaugurates his introduction to the city of Rome in Book 8 with the *victor* Hercules arriving in the Forum Boarium: he anchors his narrative in a place that speaks loudly to Rome's pre-Augustan history, a place that is populated with a number of monuments related to Hercules, Rome's first *triumphator avant la lettre*. After all, locating Hercules in the Forum Boarium enables

37. See Degrassi 1954, 110.

38. This point is further elaborated in Itgenshorst 2004.

39. Balbus also carries the distinction of being the first naturalized Roman citizen to earn a triumph: Plin. *HN* 5.36.

40. Wallace-Hadrill 1987, 224.

41. Balbus' uncle, L. Cornelius Balbus Maior, visually linked the Corneli Balbi with Hercules and Gades on coinage issued for Octavian in 41 BCE: *RRC* 518/1.

Vergil to put his reader in mind not only of the Ara Maxima, the one Hercules monument that is named explicitly in Book 8 (8.271–72), but also of the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam* and, by extension, any number of other related Republican monuments.

TRIUMPHAL NETWORKS

With the remainder of this paper, I want to build on this point and offer a second way of understanding how Vergil's allusion to Mummius' temple can operate in Book 8, proposing that Vergil could be working at a much more suggestive level with this reference. Not only can the allusion summon the memory of Mummius, the temple's dedicator, but it can also serve as an enticement to visualize the temple in its physical environment, to contextualize it among its neighboring structures, and to situate it in its historical moment. According to this logic, Vergil's allusion can spur the reader to recollect three categories of related monuments in Rome: other temples dedicated to Hercules, other monuments in and around the Forum Boarium, and other temples dedicated to commemorate the conquests of 146 BCE, the year in which Mummius vanquished Corinth. Additionally, since each monument carries with it memories of its dedicator or patron, recalling other monuments that are like the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam* entails recalling the famed Republican figures behind those monuments.

The value of this second approach is that it resists a strictly 1:1 reading of a monumental allusion (as I have largely done with the first part of this paper), adding a phenomenological element that tries to capture the experience of being in and among the densely built spaces of Rome.⁴² This accords with recent scholarship that similarly challenges taking a "museal vision" of Rome's monuments by instead encouraging us to countenance questions about openness and accessibility, among others.⁴³ In widening the scope of our vision from Mummius' temple, we therefore see how from one allusion at the beginning of Book 8 there spirals out a widening array of other Republican triumphal monuments and individuals who speak to Rome's rich Republican triumphal tradition.

At the beginning of this paper, I enumerated the other Republican temples dedicated to Hercules in Rome, as well as the other monuments affiliated with Hercules in the Forum Boarium—noting that no evidence survives to indicate that any of these monuments benefited from the expansive Augustan (re)building campaigns.⁴⁴ Those Hercules temples outside the Forum Boarium include the temples of Hercules Musarum (M. Fulvius Nobilior) and Hercules Custos (Sulla), both of which resided among the hordes of victory temples erected in the Campus Martius around the Circus Flaminius. In fact, we might even detect an allusion to the latter temple when Evander concludes his tale about Hercules and describes how the Potitii and Pinarii serve as guardians (*custos*)

42. For a similar phenomenological approach to understanding the built environment of Augustan Rome, see Favro 1996. On the visually striking nature of the architecturally innovative Hercules temples in the Forum Boarium, see Popkin 2016, 67–75.

43. In particular, I am thinking about Barchiesi 2005.

44. See above, pp. 47–48.

of the rites of Hercules (*Herculei*) at the Ara Maxima.⁴⁵ Accepting this allusion would essentially give the Hercules episode its own triumphal frame, one that encompasses both Forum Boarium and Campus Martius, two places rich in Republican triumphal resonances.

But we should recall that the greatest density of Hercules monuments is located in the Forum Boarium. Here are found not only the Ara Maxima, the statue of Hercules Triumphalis, and the Porta Trigemina, but also the temples of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemina* (Mummius), Hercules Pompeianus (Pompey), and Hercules Aemilianus (Scipio Aemilianus). Livy tells us, moreover, that M. Fulvius Nobilior, dedicator of the Temple of Hercules Musarum, also left his mark in the Forum Boarium and its surrounding area—a mark that was still remembered in Livy’s day (40.51.4–6):

M. Fulvius plura et maioris locavit usus: portum et pilas pontis in Tiberi, quibus pilis fornices post aliquot annos P. Scipio Africanus et L. Mummius censores locaverunt imponendos; basilicam post argentarias novas et forum piscatorium, circumdatis tabernis quas vendidit in privatum; [et forum] et porticum extra portam Trigemina, et aliam post navalia, et ad fanum Herculis, et post Spei ad Tiberim, et ad aedem Apollinis medici.⁴⁶

Marcus Fulvius [Nobilior] contracted for additional works and of greater utility: a harbour and the piles for a bridge over the Tiber, the piles on which many years later Publius Scipio Africanus and Lucius Mummius in their censorship contracted for the construction of arches, a basilica behind the new shops of the silver-smiths and a fish-market with shops about it which he sold for private use; also a portico outside the Porta Trigemina, and another behind the dock-yards, and near the shrine of Hercules, and behind the temple of Spes on the Tiber, and near the shrine of Apollo Medicus. (Trans. Sage and Schlesinger)

Livy’s passage beautifully illustrates how the Roman landscape itself can collapse time, flattening the temporal distance between monumental dedications. Here we have the Augustan historian Livy relating how M. Fulvius Nobilior erected piles for a bridge on which Scipio Aemilianus and Mummius would erect arches more than three decades later. Nor would this be the only instance of the two censors from 142 BCE constructing a pair of similar monuments in the area around the Portus Tiberinus; indeed, Scipio Aemilianus dedicated his own temple to Hercules in the Forum Boarium that was not only proximate to Mummius’ temple but also constructed according to a peripteral design like Mummius’.⁴⁷

Such visual similarities with Mummius’ temple might prompt readers to think of two other temples in Rome affiliated with prominent Republican *triumphatores*. While Scipio Aemilianus’ temple shared a shape with Mummius’

45. *primusque Potitius auctor / et domus Herculei custos Pinarum sacri / hanc aram luco statuit* (“first Potitius as the founder and the Pinarian household, guardian of the rites of Hercules, built this altar in the grove,” 8.269–71).

46. The Latin text of Livy is from Walsh 1999.

47. It seems as if Mummius and Scipio Aemilianus actively vied with each other through their building programs: Livy 40.51.4. Kendall (2009) argues that, extending beyond the boundaries of Rome, Mummius generally deposited his spoils from Corinth in colonies and cities with ties to the Scipiones and Aemilii, further suggesting that Mummius was engaged in active competition with his fellow censor; cf. Ziolkowski 1988. Even ancient historians commonly paired Mummius and Scipio Aemilianus, though usually to contrast the former’s philistinism with the latter’s refined tastes: Vell. Pat. 1.13.3–5; Cass. Dio 22.76.1.

Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus constructed in the Campus Martius a temple of Jupiter Stator which, like Mummius' temple, was faced with Greek Pentelic marble (Vell. Pat. 1.11.3). Even more remarkably, these three men—Mummius, Scipio Aemilianus, and Metellus—celebrated their own version of a triple triumph in 145 BCE as they each separately commemorated their victories from the previous year: Mummius over Corinth, Scipio Aemilianus over Carthage, and Metellus over Macedonia (Eutr. 4.14). Metellus and Mummius, moreover, have their own fraught relationship with each other, as some ancient historians contend that Metellus led most of the important military engagements during the Achaean War, and Mummius merely arrived on the scene at the end to claim credit (and earn a triumph) for Metellus' victories (Val. Max. 7.5.4; Flor. 1.32.4).

Metellus and Mummius were not, however, the only Roman generals of the mid-second century BCE to adorn their temples with Greek Pentelic marble. To this duo we can add D. Iunius Brutus Callaicus and his temple of Mars *in circo*, which was dedicated sometime after 138 BCE following Brutus' triumph over the Spanish Lusitanians—another similarity he shares with Mummius, as Mummius received his first triumph in 152 BCE for victories over the Lusitanians (App. *Hisp.* 6.10.56–57). The temples of all three generals—Mummius, Metellus, and Brutus—were likely the work of the second-century architect Hermodorus of Salamis (Vitr. 3.2.5). And, as Ziolkowski observes, all three men “commemorated their victories by adopting surnames derived from the names of the peoples they had conquered.”⁴⁸

By starting from Mummius' Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam* and examining the allusiveness of the monument itself, what we have ended up with is a veritable “Who's Who” yearbook of second- and first-century Republican generalissimos. In addition to L. Mummius Achaicus, we find M. Fulvius Nobilior, P. Scipio Aemilianus, Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, D. Iunius Brutus Callaicus, L. Cornelius Sulla, and Cn. Pompeius Magnus. In other words, with one monumental reference planted in Evander's description of Hercules at the beginning of Book 8, Vergil is able to tap into this rich layer of Republican history and activate a wide network of triumphal associations instantiated in Rome's monuments. Though Mummius may encapsulate the Republican triumphal tradition within which Vergil situates Augustus, it is Hercules and his monuments that embody the totality of that tradition.

CONCLUSIONS

The original aim of this paper was to challenge the strictly “Augustan” interpretations of Hercules as a pawn in the post-Actian propaganda wars, whereby in this instance Augustus is seen appropriating a mythical hero who previously had been used by Mark Antony. To do so, I identified an allusion in Evander's description of Hercules to the Forum Boarium's second-century Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam*, proposing that this allusion operates in two ways: on the one hand, it recalls the temple's dedicator, the *triumphator*

48. Ziolkowski 1988, 327.

L. Mummius Achaicus; on the other hand, it summons to mind a whole host of other similar Republican victory monuments and the *triumphatores* behind their dedications. This enabled me to propose that the figure of Hercules, by activating a wide matrix of Republican resonances, telescopes centuries of Republican triumphs, offering a model for Augustus that reaches back not simply to Rome's recently concluded civil wars, but to a point in history when Rome was ascendant, nearing hegemonic control over the Mediterranean.

This article thus adds to a growing body of scholarship that is highlighting Augustan poetry's—and, more specifically, the *Aeneid*'s—engagements with Rome's Republican past, and not just the recent past of the civil wars.⁴⁹ More importantly, it has begun to highlight how Rome's extant Republican monuments shaped Vergil's vision of Augustus' Rome. Although excavating allusions in the *Aeneid* to Rome's monumental landscape has proven an especially fruitful approach in the last decades, almost all of this scholarship has focused on allusions to structures that did or would benefit from the capacious Augustan (re)building program.⁵⁰ Not all of Rome's Republican landscape, however, bore the mark of Augustus' intervention, especially when Vergil was writing. After all, by 19 BCE Rome was still largely a city of brick, and of the marble that did adorn the city, at least some of it belonged to Mummius and Augustus' other Republican predecessors.

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

49. This is best exemplified by Joseph Farrell and Damien Nelis' edited volume on *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic* (2013). See also Rebergiani 2013a; 2013b.

50. See most recently Barchiesi 2002; 2005; 2009; Welch 2005; Harrison 2006; Rebergiani 2013b; Kirichenko 2013; Roller 2013.

LITERATURE CITED

- Arnaldi, Adelina, Nicoletta Cassieri, and Gian Luca Gregori. 2013. Procuratele libertine in età adrianea e oltre: Nuovi documenti epigrafici da Gaeta (e non solo). *MediterrAnt* 16.1: 51–86.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- . 2002. Martial Arts: Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum; A Verbal Monument with a Vengeance. In *Ovid's "Fasti": Historical Readings at Its Bimillennium*, ed. Geraldine Herbert-Brown, 1–22. Oxford.
- . 2005. Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, ed. G. Karl Galinsky, 281–305. Cambridge.
- . 2009. Phaethon and the Monsters. In *Paradox and the Marvellous*, ed. Philip R. Hardie, 163–88. Oxford.
- Beard, Mary. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Binder, Gerhard. 1971. *Aeneas und Augustus: Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis*. Meisenheim.
- Coarelli, Filippo. 1988. *Il Foro Boario dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*. Rome.
- . 2007. *Rome and Environs*. Trans. James J. Clauss and Daniel P. Harmon. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Degrassi, Attilio. 1954. *Fasti Capitolini*. Turin.
- Eden, P. T. 1975. *A Commentary on Virgil: "Aeneid" VIII*. Leiden.

- Edwards, Catharine. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Farrell, Joseph, and Damien P. Nelis, eds. 2013. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*. Oxford.
- Favro, Diane. 1994. The Street Triumphant: The Urban Impact of Roman Triumphal Parades. In *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, ed. Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll, 151–64. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- . 1996. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. New York.
- Feeney, Denis. 1991. *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.
- . 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Fordyce, C. J. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII*. Oxford.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1966. The Hercules-Cacus Episode in *Aeneid* VIII. *AJP* 87: 18–51.
- . 1972. *The Herakles Theme*. Totowa, N.J.
- . 1996. *Augustan Culture*. Princeton, N.J.
- Gransden, K. W. 1976. *Virgil: "Aeneid" Book VIII*. Cambridge.
- Graverini, Luca. 2001. L. Mummius Acaico. *Maecenas* 1: 105–48.
- Grimal, Pierre. 1951. Énée à Rome et le triomphe d'Octave. *REA* 53: 51–61.
- Gros, Pierre. 1976. *Aurea Templata: Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste*. Rome.
- Gurval, Robert Alan. 1995. *Actium and Augustus*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Harrison, Stephen. 2006. The Epic and the Monuments: Interactions between Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Augustan Building Programme. In *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition*, ed. Michael Clarke, Bruno Currie, and R. O. A. M Lyne, 159–83. Oxford.
- Haselberger, Lothar. 2002. *Mapping Augustan Rome*. *JRA Supp.* 50. Portsmouth, R.I.
- Hekster, Olivier. 2004. Hercules, Omphale, and Octavian's 'Counter-Propaganda.' *BABesch* 79: 159–66.
- Heslin, Peter. 2015. *The Museum of Augustus: The Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome, and Latin Poetry*. Los Angeles.
- Itgenshorst, Tanja. 2004. Augustus und der republikanische Triumph: Triumphalfasten und summi viri-Galerie als Instrumente der imperialen Machtsicherung. *Hermes* 132: 436–58.
- Kendall, Jennifer. 2009. Scipio Aemilianus, Lucius Mummius, and the Politics of Plundered Art in Italy and Beyond in the 2nd Century B.C.E. *EtrStud* 12: 169–81.
- Kirichenko, Alexander. 2013. Virgil's Augustan Temples: Image and Intertext in the *Aeneid*. *JRS* 103: 65–87.
- Krasser, Helmut, Dennis Pausch, and Ivana Petrovic, eds. 2008. *Triplici invectus triumpho: Der römische Triumph in augusteischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Latham, Jacob A. 2016. *Performance, Memory, and Processions in Ancient Rome: The Pompa Circensis from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Littlewood, R. Joy. 2006. *A Commentary on Ovid: "Fasti" Book VI*. Oxford.
- Lyngby, Helge. 1968. Ricerche sulla Porta Trigemina. *OpRom* 6: 75–96.
- Marinčič, Marko. 2002. Roman Archaeology in Vergil's Arcadia (Vergil *Eclogue* 4; *Aeneid* 8; *Livy* 1.7). In *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, ed. David S. Levene and Damien P. Nelis, 143–61. Leiden.
- Marzano, Annalisa. 2009. Hercules and the Triumphal Feast for the Roman People. In *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empire: Proceedings of the First Workshop, December 16–19th 2007*, ed. Borja Antela-Bernárdez and Toni Naco del Hoyo, 83–97. Oxford.
- Miles, Margaret. 2008. *Art as Plunder: The Ancient Origins of Debate about Cultural Property*. Cambridge.
- Moret, Jean-Marc. 2012. Ostia, Roma, Tibur: *Hercules Victor* e il Pirati. In *Nani in Festi: Iconografia, religione e politica a Ostia durante il secondo triumvirato*, ed. Christophe Bocherens, 109–35. Bari.
- Morgan, Llewelyn. 1998. Assimilation and Civil War: Hercules and Cacus (*Aen.* 8.185–267). In *Vergil's "Aeneid": Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. Hans-Peter Stahl, 175–98. London.

- Mueller, Hans-Friedrich. 2002. The Extinction of the Potitii and the Sacred History of Augustan Rome. In *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, ed. David S. Levene and Damien P. Nelis, 313–29. Leiden.
- Mynors, R. A. B., ed. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Nenci, Giuseppe. 1978. ‘*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*’: Hor. Ep. II 1, 156. *AnnPisa* 8: 1007–23.
- Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*. Oxford.
- Pfanner, Michael. 1980. Codex Coburgensis Nr. 88: Die Entdeckung der Porta Triumphalis. *RM* 87: 327–32.
- Pietilä-Castrén, Leena. 1982. New Men and the Greek War Booty in the 2nd Century BC. *Arctos* 16: 121–44.
- Pittenger, Miriam R. Pelikan. 2008. *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy’s Republican Rome*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Popkin, Maggie L. 2016. *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph: Monuments, Memory, and Identity*. Cambridge.
- Rebeggiani, Stefano. 2013a. *De Danais Victoribus*: Virgil’s Shield of Abas and the Conquest of Greece. *Slit* 11.1: 82–106.
- . 2013b. Reading the Republican Forum: Virgil’s *Aeneid*, the Dioscuri, and the Battle of Lake Regillus. *CP* 108: 53–69.
- Richardson, Lawrence, Jr. 1977. Hercules Musarum and the Porticus Philippi in Rome. *AJA* 81: 355–61.
- Ritter, Stefan. 1995. *Hercules in der Römischen Kunst von den Anfängen bis Augustus*. Heidelberg.
- Roller, Matthew. 2013. On the Intersignification of Monuments in Augustan Rome. *AJP* 134: 119–31.
- Sage, Evan T., and Alfred C. Schlesinger, trans. 1938. *Livy*. Vol. 12, *Books XL–XLII*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Schnepf, Hermann. 1959. Das Herculesabenteuer in Virgils Aeneis VIII, 184f. *Gymnasium* 66: 250–68.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1987. Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*. In *Homo Victor: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie, and Mary Whitby, 221–30. London.
- Walsh, P. G., ed. 1999. *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita*. Vol. 6, *Libri XXXVI–XL*. Oxford.
- Weinstock, Stefan. 1957. Victor and Invictus. *HTR* 50: 211–47.
- Welch, Tara. 2005. *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments*. Columbus, Ohio.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1990. Review of Coarelli 1988. *Gnomon* 62: 730–34.
- Wrede, Henning, and Richard Harprath. 1986. *Der Codex Coburgensis: Das erste systematische Archäologiebuch*. Coburg.
- Yarrow, Liv. 2006. Lucius Mummius and the Spoils of Corinth. *SCI* 25: 57–70.
- Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Ziolkowski, Adam. 1988. Mummius’ Temple of Hercules Victor and the Round Temple on the Tiber. *Phoenix* 42: 309–33.
- . 1992. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context*. Rome.