SELEVCIA

AD CALYCADNVM

SAYI III -2013

OLBA KAZISI YAYINLARI

Selevcia Ad Calycadnvm III

Olba Kazısı Yayınları

Olba Kazısı Yayınları

Selevcia Ad Calycadnvm III

Seleucia ad Calycadnum, hakemlidir ve her yıl Nisan ayında bir sayı olarak basılır. Yollanan çalışmalar, giriş sayfalarında belirtilen yazım kurallarına uygunsa yayınlanır, çalışması yayınlanan her yazar, çalışmanın baskı olarak yayınlanmasını kabul etmiş ve telif haklarını *Seleucia ad Calycadnum* yayınına devretmiş sayılır. *Seleucia ad Calycadnum* kopya edilemez ancak dipnot referans gösterilerek yayınlarda kullanılabilir.

Seleucia ad Calycadnum
Olba Kazısı Yayınları
Sertifika No:

Sayı: 3

ISBN: 978-6055-668-33-4
Mayıs 2013, İstanbul

Kapak Tasarım
Tuna Akçay

Yazışma Adresi
Okt. Murat Özyıldırım
Mersin Üniversitesi Fen - Edebiyat Fakültesi
Arkeoloji Bölümü, Çiftlikköy Kampüsü, 33342,
Mersin - Türkiye
Tel: 00 90 324 361 00 01 - 4735
e- posta: ozyildirimmurat@gmail.com

Adres
Homer Kitabevi ve Yayıncılık Ltd. Şti.
Yeni Çarşı Caddesi, No: 12/A
Galatasaray, Beyoğlu, 34433, İstanbul
Tel: 0212 249 59 02
www.homerbooks.com
e-mail: homer@homerbooks.com
Sertifika No:

Baskı ve Cilt
Yaylacık Matbaacılık San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti.
Litros Yolu, Fatih Sanayi Sitesi, No: 12
197-203, Topkapı - İstanbul
Tel: 0212 612 58 60
Sertifika No:

Dağıtım
Homer Kitabevi ve Yayıncılık Ltd. Şti.
Yeni Çarşı Caddesi, No: 12/A
Galatasaray, Beyoğlu, 34433, İstanbul
Tel: 0212 249 59 02

Seleucia ad Calycadnum | Sayı 3 | Nisan 2013

Kitap Tanıtımı

PRAEFATIO

Olba Kazıları'nın süreli yayını *Seleucia ad Calycadnum*'un 2013 yılında üçüncü sayısını sunarken, dergimizin yayın yaşamına aralık vermeden devam etmekte olmasının mutluluğu içinde olduğumuzu belirtmek isteriz. Öncelikle, bu yeni sayıda yayınlanmak üzere çalışmalarını bize göndermek nezaketinde bulunan değerli meslektaşlarımıza, yayın kurulu üyelerimize teşekkürlerimizi sunarız. Onların katkılarıyla ortaya çıkan bu sayının, eskiçağ uygarlıkları ve dilleri, tarihi konusunda çalışan akademisyenlerin ve bu alanlara ilgi duyan okurların yakından tanıdıkları Homer Kitabevi tarafından yayınlanması, yayın ekibimiz için ayrı bir sevinç kaynağıdır. Bizimle çalışmayı severek kabul eden değerli dostumuz, Homer Kitabevi sahibi Ayşen Boylu'ya ve *Seleucia ad Calycadnum*'un bu sayısının grafik düzenlemelerini büyük bir titizlikle gerçekleştiren Sinan Turan'a şükran borçluyuz.

Arkeoloji, Eskiçağ Dilleri ve Kültürleri, Sanat Tarihi konularında çalışan uzmanlara dergimiz kapılarının hep açık olduğunu ve gelecek sayılarımızda onların değerli çalışmalarına yer vermekten mutluluk duyacağımızı belirtiriz.

Editörler:
Prof. Dr. Emel Erten
Prof. Dr. Diane Favro
Murat Özyıldırım (Klasik Filolog, MA)

PREFACE

We are pleased to present volume 3 of *Selucia ad Calycadnum* which has been continuously published since 2011. First and foremost, we would like to thank all our colleagues for their scholarly contributions and our editorial board for their valued input. Due to their expert participation, we are this and subsequent volumes will be published by Homer Books, widely recognized by those who study ancient civilizations and languagues. We are grateful to Ayşen Boylu, owner of Homer Books, who kindly agreed to work with us, and Sinan Turan, who meticulously designed the graphics of this volume.

We would also like to state that our journal is open to scholars of fields of archaeology, ancient languages and cultures and history of art. We would always welcome their works in the forthcoming volumes.

Editors:
Prof. Dr. Emel Erten
Prof. Dr. Diane Favro
Murat Özyıldırım (Classical Philologist, MA)

Olba Kazısı Yayınları

Selevcia Ad Calycadnvm

Makale Başvuru Kuralları

Seleucia ad Calycadnum, Olba Kazısı yayını olarak yılda bir sayı yayınlanır. Yayınlanması istenen makalelerin en geç Şubat ayında gönderilmiş olması gerekmektedir. *Seleucia ad Calycadnum*, arkeoloji, eskiçağ dilleri ve kültürleri, eski çağ tarihi, sanat tarihi konularında yazılan, daha önce yayınlanmayan yalnızca Türkçe, İngilizce çalışmaları ve kitap tanıtımlarını yayınlar.

Yazım Kuralları

Makaleler, Times New Roman yazı karakterinde, word dosyasında, başlık tümü 12 punto büyük harf, metin 10 punto, dipnot ve kaynakça 9 punto ile yazılmalıdır. Çalışmada ara başlık varsa, bold ve küçük harflerle yazılmalıdır. Türkçe ve İngilizce özetler, makale adının altında 9 punto olarak ve en az iki yüz sözcük ile yazılmalıdır. Özetlerin altında İngilizce ve Türkçe beşer anahtar sözcük, 9 punto olarak "anahtar sözcükler" ve "keywords" başlığının yanında verilmelidir.

- Dipnotlar, her sayfanın altında verilmelidir. Dipnotta yazar soyadı, yayın yılı ve sayfa numarası sıralaması aşağıdaki gibi olmalıdır.
  Demiriş 2006, 59.

- Kaynakça, çalışmanın sonunda yer almalı ve dipnottaki kısaltmayı açıklamalıdır.
  Kitap için:
  Demiriş 2006 Demiriş, B., Roma Yazınında Tarih Yazıcılığı, Ege Yay., Istanbul.
  Makale için:
  Kaçar 2009 Kaçar, T., "Arius: Bir 'Sapkın'ın Kısa Hikayesi", Lucerna Klasik Filoloji Yazıları, Istanbul.

- Makalede kullanılan fotoğraf, resim, harita, çizim, şekil vs. metin içinde yalnızca (**Lev. 1**), (**Lev. 2**) kısaltmaları biçiminde "Levha" olarak yazılmalı, makale sonunda "Levhalar" başlığı altında sıralı olarak yazılmalıdır. Bütün levhalar, jpeg ya da tift formatında 300 dpi olmalıdır. Alıntı yapılan levha varsa sorumluluğu yazara aittir ve mutlaka alıntı yeri belirtilmelidir.

- Makale ve levhalar, CD'ye yüklenerek çıktısı ile birlikte yollanmalıdır.

Genius Loci: Towards a Roman Understanding of Carthage

Jessica L. Ambler*

Özet

Scipio Aemilianus'un önderliğinde Roma güçleri MÖ 146 yılında Kartaca'yı fethettiklerinde, bu olay Üçüncü Pön Savaşı'nın sona erişini yansıtmakta; kent de yerle bir duruma gelmekteydi. O yerin ruhu ya da *genius loci*, tahribatın yapıldığı anda kentin fiziksel varlığını terk etmekte, bundan sonra artık Roma'nın bir temsilcisi ve belleği haline gelmekteydi. Romalı izleyiciler için Kartaca'nın görünümü sadece zafer tören alaylarında canlandırıldığı biçimiyle vardı. Bu törenler, İkinci ve Üçüncü Pön Savaşları sonrasında kutlananlar ya da M. Valerius Messala ve L. Hostilius Mancinus'un anılarına adanan resimlere yansıyanlarla sınırlıydı. Roma'nın Kartaca'ya duyduğu hayranlık, kentin Augustus Dönemi'nde yeniden inşa edilmesini sağladı. *Colonia Concordia Iulia Karthago* adı ile yeniden kurulan kentte Augustus sadece sıradan bir Roma koloni kurmuyor; ya da onun Pön geçmişini silip atmıyordu. Aksine, Vergilius'un *Aeneas Destanı*'ndan aldığı mitolojik esinle, İmparator kendi efsanevi atası olan Aeneas tarafından başlanan bir görevi tamamlamaktaydı. Roma'nın yeni Kartaca kenti bir *genius loci* merkezinde gelişiyor, Roma belleğini asırlar boyunca yaşatıyor ve tarihsel paralelleriyle bütünleşiyordu.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kartaca, Roma, Augustus, *Genius loci*, Roma Belleği, Yerleşim Tarihi.

Abstract

In 146 BCE, Scipio Aemilianus and his Roman forces conquered Carthage at

* Dr. Jessica L. Ambler, Curatorial Assistant Santa Barbara Museum of Art 1130 State Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 - USA. E-mail: jessicalambler@gmail.com.

the conclusion of the Third Punic War and laid waste to the city. The *genius loci*, or spirit of place, that had emanated from the physical site transitioned at the moment of destruction and became a production of Roman representation and memory. One means of portraying Carthage to a Roman audience was through triumphal processions, such as those of the Scipii following the Second and Third Punic Wars or commemorative paintings such as those of M. Valerius Messala and L. Hostilius Mancinus. The Roman fascination with Carthage led to the city's ultimate rebuilding under Augustus. In re-founding the city as *Colonia Concordia Iulia Karthago*, he did not simply build another Roman colony, nor did he wipe away any trace of the Punic past. Rather, aided by the mythological narrative provided by Vergil's *Aeneid*, Augustus completed a task begun by his legendary ancestor, Aeneas, and built a new Roman Carthage, centered around a *genius loci* growing in Roman memory for centuries and complete with historical parallels to Rome.

Keywords: Carthage, Rome, Augustus, *Genius loci*, Roman memory, Urban history.

In the process of colonizing the previously Punic cities of the North African coastline, the Romans were able to transform already existing Punic structures into functioning Roman monuments with little effort. Carthage, however, presented a unique exception to this rule as the capital city of the Phoenicians in the West and thus the power center of Rome's great rivals over the course of three major wars; the First Punic War ranging from 264 to 241 BCE, the Second Punic War from 218 to 201 BCE and the Third Punic War from 149 to 146 BCE. At the conclusion of the Third Punic War, Carthage was summarily destroyed by the forces of the Roman general Scipio Aemilianus and burned to the ground much like Corinth had been earlier that same year. After this act of urban destruction, the city lay dormant for just over a century, despite a failed Gracchan attempt at settlement. In the mid first century BCE, Octavian (later to become Augustus) discovered the decree to refound Carthage among the papers of his murdered adopted father, Julius Caesar and decided to go ahead with the project, rebuilding the city as *Colonia Concordia Iulia Karthago*. The project did not rise on fallow ground, but on a place with a well-established, evocative *genius loci*, or spirit of place. Over centuries of contact between Rome and Carthage, ancient writers (Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo and Appian), triumphal im-

ages, and the complex mythological narrative developed in Vergil's *Aeneid*, all reinforced a highly directed notion of the site.

In *Genius Loci: Towards A Phenomenology of Architecture*, Christian Norberg-Schulz adopts Heidegger's phenomenological theory and applies it to architecture and the built environment, arguing that the *genius loci* has historically emanated from concrete elements of the physical locale and buildings[1]. A *genius loci* produced from the immediacy of the physical location was not the only way that the spirit of place took shape in the Roman world. When the place referred to was at a distance, or even destroyed, the *genius loci* became a Roman social production, manufactured collectively in a myriad of imagery including depictions of the captured city in triumphal processions and commemorative paintings as well as in the texts that record these images and events[2]. The multitudes of Romans gathered to view triumphal imagery of Carthage in Rome had most likely never traveled to Carthage, especially since after the Third Punic War the city was destroyed. As a result, they did not have the luxury of a direct image on hand to conjure up at a moment's notice. Yet the significance of Carthage in Rome's history made them curious. The *genius loci* of Carthage was developed over the course of centuries and resulted from the Romans' desire to know more about their rival for the role of *caput mundi* in the Western Mediterranean. The nature of the works representing Carthage in Rome often highlighted the best of Carthage, even in the wake of a war, creating a complex and nuanced understanding of the Punic capital.

The textual sources, when read together, provide a cursory sketch of the physical city. More importantly they create a continuous narrative emphasizing the importance of the physical city of Carthage and the theme of Punic bodily self-sacrifice in order to preserve the city. The texts that describe Carthage focus on a few major monuments within the town and supply a picture of the city's defenses. Carthage is presented as both an ideal site for a city as well as a formidable fortress. The texts all share the fact that none were written by Carthaginians, they were produced by either Greek or Roman writers, as records of the author's observations of a neighboring Mediterranean city.

Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo and Appian all describe for their Greek

1 Norberg-Schulz 1980, 10-11.

2 De Certeau 1984, 115. "Stories could also take this noble name (*metaphorail*): every day, they traverse and organize places; they select and link them together; they make sentences and itineraries out of them. They are spatial trajectories."

and Roman readers the physical layout of Carthage. Not surprisingly, they make particular reference to the city's military defenses like the walls, harbors, barracks and fortifications as well as the other impressive sights such as the Byrsa where the famed temple of Asclepius was found[3]. Appian also incorporates Carthage's mythical foundation by Dido into his description of the city; "The Phoenicians, cutting the hide round and round into one very narrow strip, enclosed the place where the citadel of Carthage now stands, which from this affair was called Byrsa (a hide)"[4]. Already the city has a civic center with a name that is symbolic of its legendary foundation as well as hinting at the type of trickery the Carthaginians would become famous for in Roman stereotypes. The story also makes apparent the priorities of the Carthaginians, the foundation of a city in their new land. Once this has been established, Appian states that they used the Byrsa "as a base and getting the upper hand of their neighbors in war, and engaging in traffic by sea, like all Phoenicians, they built the outer city round Byrsa"[5]. In this way, the Byrsa was not only the first part of the city to be built, an essential element of the urban legend, but also the physical center of the city from which the rest of the town radiated out, using the high point and citadel as a visual focal point and power center.

Although the physical descriptions of Punic Carthage in the primary sources are comprised of relatively few concrete details and focus on the basic elements of the city, the texts also provide a larger narrative on the meaning of the city to the Carthaginians and their Roman rivals. Within the texts, a theme is developed centered on the importance of the physical city and the desire to maintain the city's inviolability. Part of this narrative in the texts consists of stories surrounding Punic people willing to die to defend their city, offering their lives in exchange for the protection of their city.

Between the Second and Third Punic Wars, a Roman envoy, including Cato, was sent to Carthage to arbitrate between her people and Masinissa who was infringing upon Carthage's territory. After seeing that the payment of heavy reparations to Rome was not hindering the growth of the city in this period, the envoy returned to Rome and "declared that Carthage was to them an object of apprehension rather than

3 Polybius *The Histories*, 1.73.4, Diodorus *Diodorus of Sicily*, 32.9.14, Strabo *Geography*, 17.3.14, Appian *Roman History*, 8.14.95, 8.14.565-67, 8.19.128, 8.19.629.

4 Appian *Roman History,* 8.1.1.

5 Appian *Roman History,* 8.1.2.

of jealousy, a great and hostile city, near at hand, and growing thus easily. Cato especially said that even the liberty of Rome would never be secure until Carthage was destroyed"[6]. This passage implies that the city, although now represented as a threat and a tangible element in need of destruction, was once considered worthy of jealousy by the Romans. According to Appian, the Romans required three demands of the Carthaginians in order to forgo a third war: the relinquishing of three hundred noble children sent as hostages to Sicily, the surrender of all weapons and engines of war, and the abandonment of the city with residents moved to another location at least ten miles inland and Carthage itself razed to the ground[7]. While the Carthaginians gave in to the first two requests, the third led to a great outcry that shocked the Roman ambassadors. According to Appian, Banno Tigillas, a noble Carthaginian pled for his city saying "spare the city's hearth, spare our forum…spare the city which has done you no harm, but, if you please, kill us, whom you have ordered to move away. In this way you will seem to vent your wrath upon men, not upon temples, gods, tombs, and an innocent city."[8]. Banno offers the entire human population of the city in return for urban sanctity and the sanctity of the *genius loci* embodied in the physical city. Appian underscores the importance of the physical city in Punic life, making the ultimate destruction of Carthage more tragic because neither Banno's plea, nor the Carthaginian defense of the city in the ensuing Third Punic War was effective.

The Roman response to Banno's plea is also telling of sentiment concerning the importance of physical cities. Censorinus, the head of the Roman embassy answers Banno that "Carthage should have her own laws if you would obey our commands. We considered you to be Carthage, not the ground where you live"[9]. This is a diplomatic notion and certainly makes the argument for moving the city sound reasonable, yet it hardly justifies why the Romans then feel the need to subsequently burn the city[10]. What Censorinus is attempting to say here is that the Carthaginians can be the new, peaceful and subdued version of themselves that the Romans want them to be in another city, but if they

6 Appian *Roman History*, 8.10.69.
7 Appian *Roman History,* 8.12.81.
8 Appian *Roman History,* 8.12.84.
9 Appian *Roman History,* 8.12.89.
10 Laurence "Ritual, Landscape, and the Destruction of Place in the Roman Imagination", 115-116 in Wilkins 1996.

continue to live in Carthage, they remain a threat. This is evidenced in a following passage when Censorinus tells Banno that the "sea reminds you of the dominion and power you once acquired by means of it. It prompts you to wrongdoing and brings you thus into disaster."[11] Appian thus explains the ultimate necessity of the destruction of Carthage since the city itself acted as a site of memory making, a physical well of inspiration for the Carthaginians to draw their power and rivalry from in order to challenge the Romans. Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo and Appian all paint a picture of Carthage not only as a physical site, describing for their readers what they considered the city's most important elements, but also as part of an established narrative concerning the import of the city's existence for the Carthaginians and the Romans. When Carthage was destroyed following the Third Punic War, its *genius loci* was no longer generated from the physical city, but it did not cease to evolve in the Roman collective memory over the centuries to come. Rather, it was produced from imagery representing Carthage such as triumphal plunder and paintings on view in Rome and transitions from a tangible place to a practiced space in a foreign land before it is ultimately rebuilt under Augustus[12].

At the close of both the Second and Third Punic Wars, the triumphant Roman generals returned to Rome and paraded the collected spoils of war through Rome's streets. As Roman viewers stood in the streets and watched the triumphal processions of the Scipii marching past, they were confronted with much of the cultural production of their great rival city as well as captured Carthaginian soldiers and leaders. While the triumph was undoubtedly a highly charged event, designed to celebrate the conquering of a rival, in the case of Carthage, it was certainly a worthy foe, and while observing the procession it would be impossible not to appreciate the parallels to Rome.

According to Appian's *Roman History*, at the conclusion of the Second Punic War, Scipio Africanus celebrated a triumph of grand proportions. "Towers were borne along representing the captured cities, and pictures showing the exploits of the war; then gold and silver coin and bullion, and whatever else they had captured of that kind…White oxen came next, and after them elephants and the captive Carthaginian and

11 Appian *Roman History,* 8.12.86.

12 de Certeau 1984, 117. "In short, *space is a practiced place*."

Numidian chiefs"[13]. Appian provides a clear picture of the impressive sight but he does not tell us where the spoils of war were ultimately housed. Josephus does mention that the spoils of war carried in Vespasian and Titus' triumph in 71 CE were placed on permanent view in Vespasian's Temple of Peace and this also seems to be the function of Augustus' Portico of the Nations[14]. It seems that the later Roman emperors were following earlier precedent that allowed habitants of Rome to view hard-won bounty at will, thus simultaneously educating themselves about the culture on display. If some of the objects carried in the triumph were retained and displayed afterward, as later authors like Josephus leads us to understand, Romans continued to develop Carthage's *genius loci* by participating in a continuously emergent conversation about the city and her people.

The towers Appian mentions are what Latin writers refer to as *simulacra*, representations of the conquered cities that were most likely three-dimensional models carried in the procession[15]. In order to be seen by the vast number of eager viewers along the processional way, the model of Scipio's conquered Carthage must have been reasonably large, but would have lacked detail. It is logical to suggest that the model of Carthage would include the Byrsa Hill which was the city's most famous and visible landmark as well as the two harbors and city walls, making reference to Punic defenses. The *simulacrum* of Carthage was constantly on the move as a part of the larger triumphal procession and it did not travel alone as Appian notes. Rather, it was surrounded by a multitude of other Carthaginian objects and people on the parade through Rome. The gold, silver and other riches were meant to impress viewers with the wealth gained by the recent conquest; the elephants left a striking impression of power in captivity and the captured Punic prisoners brought a human face to the entire affair. All of these elements allowed the Romans present at the triumph to envision Carthage as a place and gave form to Carthage's *genius loci*.

Scipio Aemilianus' triumph following the Third Punic War is also recorded by Appian, although without quite as much detail. Appian does note that it was an impressive affair teaming with the gold taken from the fallen city and "crowned with all the statues and votive offer-

13 Appian *Roman History,* 8.9.65-66.

14 Josephus *Jewish War,* 7.5.7, Pliny *Natural History,* 36.39.

15 Östenberg 2009, 199, Beard 2007, 150.

ings that the Carthaginians had gathered from all parts of the world during the long period of continuous victories"[16]. Appian's description of Scipio Aemilianus' triumph emphasizes the material wealth gleaned from the city at its ultimate destruction. The statues and votive offerings that Appian highlights would have impressed upon a Roman audience the fact that the Carthaginians were also appreciators of art and dedicated in their religious practices. The fact that works of art were salvaged and brought to Rome suggests that they were of high quality and were potentially spoils of earlier wars themselves, taken by Carthage from foreign lands. Spectators of Scipio's triumph would understand that the cycle of conquering and capturing cities and their cultural capital had now come full circle with the ultimate destruction of Carthage. At the conclusion the third and final war against Carthage, Scipio's triumph represented not only a major victory for Rome after many arduous battles, but also the accumulated cultural capital of Rome's greatest rival and competitor, something that set this triumph apart from any that had come before. Although the physical city of Carthage was eradicated, the city's *genius loci* continued to develop and thrive in Rome due to the existence of objects, such as the looted Carthaginian statues, over the centuries to come.

Another form of triumphal imagery available to Romans were the commemorative paintings produced to memorialize historic battles with Carthage during the Punic Wars. Pliny records two such images in his *Natural History*, one for M. Valerius Messala during the First Punic War (35.7.22) and the other for L. Hostilius Mancinus after the Third Punic War (35.7.22-23). In both cases, Pliny tells us that the paintings were on view in the Forum Romanum, a highly trafficked area of downtown Rome, suggesting that Messala and Mancinus' commemorative paintings were meant to be viewed near at hand at a stationary post and scrutinized in close detail.

In Messala's case, Pliny states that he was the first to display a painting of a battle on a side wall of the Curia Hostilia[17]. The image depicted the battle in which Messala defeated the Carthaginians and Hiero, the King of Sicily, in 263 BCE, expelling the Carthaginians from Sicily[18]. Pliny does not tell us whether Messala included the painting in the

16 Appian *Roman History*, 8.20.135.
17 Holliday 1997, 135.
18 Pliny *Natural History*, 35.7.22.

triumphal procession he was accorded when he returned from Sicily[19]. What Pliny underscores is that the image appeared on the side of the Curia building, lending it an air of official sanction and import. The location in the Forum guaranteed Messala the maximum number of spectators for his painting since it was a busy urban hub and point of contact in the capital. Although Messala's painting was not a depiction of Carthage, it was a representation of a battle with Carthaginians, reminding Roman viewers that the Carthaginians were a continuous presence in the Western Mediterranean and formidable foes. Messala's painting helped Romans relive an important battle against Carthage every time they stopped to look at it and discuss it, making the Punic city an active space within Rome and developing its *genius loci* each time they did so.

Pliny mentions another commemorative painting in Book 35, commissioned by L. Hostilius Mancinus after the Third Punic War. Mancinus was not granted a triumph on his return from fighting in Carthage, but wanted to commemorate the fact that he was in the first wave to attack the city and did so by "displaying in the Forum a painting of the site of the city and of the attacks upon it and by himself standing by it and describing the events one by one to people watching."[20]. The *situm*, or site, Pliny refers to could be a plan of Carthage or a more detailed drawing including architectural elements. In order to aptly describe the battle for passerby and viewers of his painting in addition to conveying his own heroic stature, Mancinus no doubt invested a fair amount of detail in the image, further enhancing it with his verbal descriptions[21]. They were inscribed images, solitary privileged works that stored information and continued to convey meaning long after the pomp and circumstance of the triumphal procession had ceased[22]. In the case of both the triumphal images and the commemorative paintings, Carthage became an active presence in Rome, a practiced element of everyday life in the city.

The generation of Carthage's *genius loci* did not cease once the city was destroyed, nor did it stop once the city was reborn under Augustus.

19 Messala did celebrate a triumph when he returned from Sicily which is described briefly in Eutropius 2.19, but there is no mention of images being carried in it.

20 Pliny *Natural History*, 35.7.22-23.

21 Pliny goes on to say that these actions won Mancinus the consulship the following year. Pliny *Natural History*, 35.7.22-23.

22 Connerton 1989, 72-73.

As a Roman entity, Carthage's identity maintained many elements of its original Punic manifestation, both physical and in spirit, ensured in large part by the production of Vergil's *Aeneid* (29-19 BCE). The *Aeneid* constructed a cultural history of Rome, personally tied to Augustus which was based on selectively chosen myths and memories[23]. The epic established the historical background and divine sanction for Augustus's current projects by firmly establishing him as the inheritor of the grand tradition of city building and Carthaginian urbanism and empire told in the poem. In the poem, Aeneas and his men travel to the promised land of Italy. On the way they make an extended stay in Carthage under the aegis of Queen Dido. The time spent in Carthage occupies the narrative of Books One through Four and illustrates what the Punic city had come to represent to a Roman writer and his audience by the late first century BCE. Dido's Carthage was a forerunner of the city Augustus would build, a blueprint he could observe and a process he could partake in. Punic Carthage as represented in the *Aeneid* was also a parallel for the Augustan building projects taking place in *Colonia Concordia*, demonstrating precedent and making it clear to an Augustan audience that their leader was completing a project once undertaken by his ancestor and sanctioned by the gods.

When Aeneas first arrives on the Libyan coast he and his trusted friend Achates climb a hill overlooking the city and observe the work conducted below. Vergil describes the activity like that of bees in summer, with Dido's workers industriously moving about setting up their new city, establishing a senate, excavating a harbor, laying the foundations for a theater and paving streets[24]. The city as described by Vergil is neither the Punic city of Carthage nor the Roman manifestation thereof, it is an amalgam built of myth and that forges connections between the two cities. Despite Vergil's claim, the Punic city did not have a theater; this was a later Roman structure introduced into the city and the Roman city did not have the famed walls of its Punic predecessor. What both cities shared was a common foundation myth, connected by Vergil through Aeneas and his successor, Augustus.

The two comrades wander closer to the city and into the sanctuary of Juno where they "studied everything in that huge sanctuary, marveling at a city rich enough for such a temple, at the handiwork of rival

23 Wightman "The Plan of Roman Carthage: Practicalities and Politics", 38 in Pedley 1980.
24 Vergil *Aeneid*, 1.598-610.

artists, at their skillful tasks"[25]. In the impressive Temple of Juno, Aeneas and Achates first encounter the Tyrian queen Dido. She enters the precinct "dealing judgments to her people and giving laws, apportioning the work of each with fairness or by drawing lots"[26]. Dido is represented by Vergil as a just and compassionate ruler, concerned with the well-being of her people[27]. She is also fair in her treatment of the stranded Trojans, inviting them to settle in Carthage on equal terms with her[28]. The Queen, a refugee from Tyre, recognizes that the Trojans are faced with the same burden as her people - the need to rebuild their society in a foreign land. Although Aeneas and his men do not stay in Dido's city ultimately, Carthage and Rome are united by the very circumstances of their foundation and the necessity to be built in order to perpetuate cultural rites in new lands, or so the myths would have it[29].

Once Dido falls in love with Aeneas, helped along by the gods' interference, she entices the hero to stay on in Carthage, attempting to retain him and make him King. As her focus on Aeneas grows, the diligent pace of construction grinds to a halt: "Her towers rise no more; the young of Carthage no longer exercise at arms or build their harbors or sure battlements for war; the works are idle, broken off; the massive, menacing rampart walls, even the crane, defier of the sky, now lie neglected"[30]. Once this happens, it is Aeneas who takes up the task of directing the various projects underway which is not surprising because this is his ultimate goal and foreshadows what is to come later when he arrives in Italy[31]. Unfortunately for Dido, Aeneas is not meant to reside with her in Carthage, but must forge ahead to Italy, and so Mercury must remind him of his duty: "'Are you now laying the foundation of high Carthage, as servant to a woman, building her a splendid city here?

25 Vergil *Aeneid*, 1.642-646.

26 Vergil *Aeneid*, 1.715-717.

27 Karl Galinsky argues that Vergil's Dido is presented not as a Punic stereotype but as an exemplar of all the virtues of a Roman including *virtus*, *pietas*, *iustitia*, and *industria*. Galinsky "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as World Literature", 348 in Galinsky 2005.

28 Vergil *Aeneid*, 1.805.

29 In Book IV, Aeneas states that his reason for leaving Carthage is so that he, too, may build his capital city in a foreign land: "If the fortresses of Carthage and the vision of a city in Libya can hold you, who are Phoenician, why, then, begrudge the Trojans' settling on Ausonian soil? There is no harm: it is right that we, too, seek out a foreign kingdom." Vergil *Aeneid*, 4.471-476.

30 Vergil *Aeneid*, 4.113-118.

31 Mercury arrives in Libya to find Aeneas "…founding fortresses and fashioning new houses." Vergil *Aeneid*, 4.346-348.

Are you forgetful of what is your own kingdom, your own fate?"[32]. Although Aeneas was getting ahead of himself by directing construction in Carthage, this action does demonstrate his willingness and ability to build a new city. It also allows Vergil the opportunity to demonstrate that Augustus's ancestor had a hand, if only briefly, in building Punic Carthage. For a Roman reader of the late first century BCE, it would appear that since Rome was firmly established and flourishing now under Aeneas's line, it was only right that Augustus complete the job left unfinished when Aeneas fled Carthage. By conflating the two cities, Punic Carthage and Roman Carthage, and by making explicit the connection between Aeneas and Augustus, Vergil helped to establish a mode of connecting the Roman *genius loci* of Carthage, developed before the time of Augustus, with the current rebuilding of the city[33].

When Augustus, made the ambitious decision to re-found Rome's historic rival, Carthage, as *Colonia Concordia Iulia Karthago*, he did not build a city from a *tabula rasa*. Rather, he and his city builders established a colonial capital replete with significant ties to Rome. Augustus was able to accomplish the re-founding of Carthage on a monumental scale because the new Roman city was built around the city's *genius loci* that had developed over the course of centuries in the collective memory of Rome. Carthage's *genius loci* was complex and certainly a multifaceted entity, including elements from both the physical site as well as the practiced space the city had become in Rome in the guise of triumphal processions and commemorative paintings. The *genius loci* represented a Carthage of enviable buildings and city design, a people noble in their devotion to city and state and a shared mythical past between the two cities. Carthage was remembered not only as a worthy foe but also as Rome's greatest rival, a forerunner to Rome in her urban and empire building desires.

To rebuild Carthage was a bold decision, a feat others had tried and failed, but within the city of Rome Augustus was establishing a secure position of power by architecturally aligning himself with historically notable monuments and the re-founding of Carthage was a logical

32 Vergil *Aeneid*, 4.353-357.

33 Although it is unlikely that many Romans at this time had read Vergil's *Aeneid*, they probably would have been familiar with Dido's story because according to the early fifth century CE writer Macrobius, this portion of the *Aeneid* was adapted into a play (5.17.4). Barchiesi "Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers", 282 in Galinsky 2005.

and ambitious extension of his belief in the power of *genii locorum*[34]. In *Carthage Must Be Destroyed: The Rise and Fall of an Ancient Mediterranean Civilization*, Richard Miles argues that the "new city of Roman Carthage managed to proclaim not only the extraordinary powers of concord and reconciliation possessed by the Augustan regime, but also Roman mastery over an alien landscape. Thus Augustus conquered Carthage with the spade and the trowel with a finality that his predecessors had failed to achieve with fire and the sword"[35]. Carthage was anything but an alien landscape to the Roman people in the time of Augustus because the city was an entrenched part of the Roman collective memory in the guise of a *genius loci*, nor was the Augustan rebuilding an act of Roman hegemony. Rather, the foundation of *Colonia Concordia* reflects an Augustan desire to rebuild Carthage based on complex parallels to Rome and a rich historical tradition that connected the two cities.

34 Favro 1996, 141.
35 Miles 2010, 364.

Bibliography

Appian *Appian's Roman History* (translated by H. White). 4 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.

Beard 2007

Beard, M., *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Certau 1984

Certeau, M.de., *The Practice of Everyday Life* (translated by S. Rendall). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Connerton 1989

Connerton, P. *How Societies Remember*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Diodorus *Diodorus of Sicily* (translated by F.R. Walton). 12 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Favro 1996

Favro, D., *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Galinsky 2005

Galinsky, K. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Halbwachs 1992

Halbwachs, M. *On Collective Memory* (translated by L.A. Coser). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Holliday 1997

Holliday, P., "Roman Triumphal Painting: Its Function, Development, and Reception". *College Art Association* 79 (1997).

Miles 2010

Miles, R. *Carthage Must be Destroyed: The Rise and Fall of an Ancient Civilization*. London: Allen Lane, 2010.

Norberg-Schulz 1980

Norberg-Schulz, C., *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, 1980.

Östenberg 2009

Östenberg, I. *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Pedley 1980

Pedley, J.G. *New Light on Ancient Carthage: Papers of a Symposium*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1980.

Pliny *Natural History* (translated by W.H.S. Jones, H. Rackham and D.E. Eichholz). 10 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Polybius *The Histories* (translated by W.R. Paton). 6 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Strabo *Geography* (translated by H.L. Jones). 8 vols., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Wilkins 1996

Wilkins, J., ed. *Approaches to the Study of Ritual: Italy and the Ancient Mediterranean: Being a Series of Seminars Given at the Institute of Classical Studies School of Advanced Study, University of London*. London: Accordia Research Centre, 1996.