

THE GATES OF SLEEP IN *AENEID* 6: FALSENESS, POETRY, AND HISTORY

Abstract: Since falsehood, following Hesiod's tradition (Theog. 26–28), is linked to poetry – as the Muses can utter *ψεύδεα πολλὰ* capable of being believed as truth (i. e., plausible, *uerisimilia*) –, the gate of *falsa insomnia* crossed by Aeneas hesiodically suggests that the speech of Anchises, the history Virgil chooses to represent in Book 6, is in the realm of false things, though in a literary sense: that is, in the realm of plausible things, of poetry. At issue is history as poetic construction, emphasized especially by: 1. Anchises' use of the word *dicta* to make explicit the *fata*; 2. *fertur*'s allusion to Homer and the Varronian derivation from *fari* of the word *falsus*; 3. the fact that at the very beginning of the book, an artist, Daedalus, sculpts some gates introducing the artistic interpretation for the final image of the gates (continued in the Shield of Vulcan); 4. the use of the word *uates* in the sense of 'poet', vicariously applied to the mythic poet Musaeus in the *catabasis* and, immediately (7,41), in the prelude of the 'historic' *horrida bella*. What is a construction to the reader is, for the character Aeneas, a revelation known only in general terms.

Keywords: *falsus*, poetry, history, *uates*, *catabasis*

1. Brief (critical) *status quaestionis*¹

After the thorough parade of heroes Anchises shows and interprets to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 6, Virgil adds an ambiguous passage about two gates, one of which will allow Aeneas, with the guidance of his father, to return to the upper world:

1) The most thorough (and recent) *status quaestionis* are found in Setaioli 2010, Cairo 2013 and Horsfall 2013. Still useful, however, is Austin 1977, who concludes (276): "The matter remains a Virgilian enigma (and none the worse for that)." Likewise, Horsfall's *status quaestionis* (1995, 146–147) is exhaustive and accurate as to the veracity of the vision of Rome's history and its meaning in the work, as well as in relation to the difficulty of interpreting it as a mere illusion or dream. In his edition of Book 6, Horsfall 2013, 617 affirms: "Should the honest reader conclude that (s)he is not expected to reach a neat answer? Is the mystery of the Gates perhaps so impenetrable because that was just the degree of honest perplexity into which V. has wittingly led the careful reader? Certainly, I have no neat, general answer to offer." And, as always, Fletcher's comments (ad 893–896) are very astute.

*Sunt geminae Somni portae, quarum altera fertur
cornea, qua ueris facilis datur exitus umbris,
altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes.
his ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna,
ille uiam secat ad nauis sociosque reuisit.²*

Aen. 6,893–899

There are twin gates of dreams, of which one is reported as being of horn, where true spirits are granted an easy passage, the other is formed all gleaming of bright ivory, but the Manes send through it false dreams to the heavens. With these words, Anchises then saw his son upon his way, and along with him the Sibyl, as he passed them out through the gate of ivory. Aeneas cut a route to his fleet and rediscovered his comrades.

(transl. Horsfall)

The passage has led to an endless controversy, herewith briefly summarized:³

2) Translations from Latin and Greek are mine unless otherwise noted. All quotations from the *Aeneid* follow Mynors's 1969 OCT, in preference to Conte 2019, who suggests that 893–896 is Anchises' direct speech (explanations in Conte 2019b, 253–255). Translations from the *Aeneid* are taken from Horsfall 2013, and the Loeb version of Rushton Fairclough.

3) Some commentators, starting with Ribbeck (who emended *eburnea* to *auer-na* in 6,898), have suggested corrections to the passage. Cockburn 1992 suggests that, like Homer, Virgil has considered etymology, but that this circumstance would have led him to apply crisscrossed, in relation to the traditional text, the adjectives *uerae* and *falsa*, because in Latin *cornu*, according to a wrong interpretation by Varro (Ling. 7,25), derives from *curuus* (presumably associated with falsehood), and *candens* and *perfecta* are adjectives compatible with truth. An ancient editor would not have understood these differences and would have ordered the text according to the Homeric criterion, adding *sed* (896) where there would probably be *hac* or *qua*. O'Hara 1996 has objected that the Varronian derivation does not mention falsehood (it is limited to associating *cornu* with *curuus*) and that there is no evidence to support the association of *curuus* with *falsus*. Kraggerud 2002 considers that line 896 is the interpolation of (probably) an ancient editor who, without appreciating the Virgilian novelty (for Kraggerud *Somni* does not refer to dream but to the state of death characteristic of the *catabasis*), judged the distancing with respect to the Homeric model as an omission or loss. It would have been, nevertheless, a skillful interpolator, because he included a word probably coined by Virgil: *insomnia*. Kraggerud also suggests the displacement of lines 893–895 after 897–898. Criticisms in Horsfall 2013, 612.

a. As an heir to Homeric epic, Virgil alludes to the *πύλαι ὄνειρων* mentioned in the dialogue between Penelope and Odysseus in his beggar's disguise (Od. 19,559 ff.); the verb *fertur* references the tradition.⁴ The correspondence, however, is not strict, since Virgil employs the noun *somnus*, which matches ὕπνος, not *somnium*, which would match ὄνειρος. In addition, Virgil, unlike Homer, does not make use of etymology.⁵

b. Through the gate of horn, apparently, the real spirits (*uerae umbrae*) of the dead come out, in light of the work perhaps to communicate with the living, possibly in dreams. Both the Sibyl and Aeneas, then, could not get out through it because they are alive.⁶

c. Through the ivory gate, the Manes send deceptive visions to the Earth's surface. According to one line of criticism, rejecting an old technical solution of temporal nature,⁷ Aeneas' exit through that gate (which for some critics would surprisingly lie in the *uesti-*

4) Conte 2019b, 255.

5) Cf. Cairo 2013, 25–26, who summarizes a discussion in which it was concluded that, despite Servius' opinion, it would be *Portae Somni* and not *Portae Somniorum*. Regarding the Homeric etymology, while the dreams that pass through the ivory gate (διὰ πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος) “deceive” (ἐλεφαίρονται), those that come out through that of horn (διὰ ξεστῶν κεράων ... θύραζε) “comply” (κράίνουσι) true things.

6) Thus, some have concluded that Aeneas and the Sibyl emerge from that gate *faute de mieux*. Heyne 1832, Exc. 15,1043: “incidit poeta in Portas Somni. Iam eae duplices sunt, altera per quam ueris umbris exitus datur; per hanc Aeneas et Sibylla, quae non erant uerae umbrae, dimitti nequibant; restabat itaque ut per alteram portam dimitterentur.” Duebner 1866 ad loc. (quoted in Reed 1973, 313) makes the same suggestion. In a variation of this idea, Paratore 1961, 353 (ad 893) argues that Virgil alludes to the Pythagorean theory of dreams and *imagines*. Reed's solution (1973, 315) is more complex: through the gate of horn *uerae umbrae* leave, that is to say *uera insomnia* (this term indicates things or people seen in dreams); by the ivory gate, *falsa insomnia* leave, that is to say *falsae umbrae*, not ‘really’ shades (being ‘false’ not in the sense of ‘deceptive’): “Aeneas and the Sibyl are real people and thus ‘false shades’. As such, they take the departure from the ivory gate.” Criticisms in Setaioli 2010, 17 n. 23. Heyne's interpretation is recently supported by Conte 2019b, 256.

7) See e.g. Everett 1900, 154, accepted by Norden ad 893 ff. as “die richtige Deutung”: “After midnight, the gate of horn is opened for true dreams, or rather in Virgil's words, ‘truth-telling shades’; before midnight, therefore, only the ivory gate, through which deceitful dreams pass. When, therefore, Aeneas and the Sibyl are dismissed by the ivory gate, it is because their departure is taken before midnight.” For a refutation, see inter alios West 1990, 232, and Tarrant 1982, 52.

bulum)⁸ either points out, recalling a passage of Cicero, that the *catabasis* has been a dream,⁹ or, in a pessimistic reading of Rome and Augustanism, decrees the falsehood of the vision of Rome's future,¹⁰ or in any case implies that the supernatural knowledge ac-

8) For instance, Highbarger 1940, who identifies *falsa insomnia* with the monsters of the *uestibulum Orci* (273) as symbols of the incarnated soul's passions. Steiner 1952, 91–92, on the other hand, explains that in the vestibule there is the elm of the *Somnia uana* (283) and that, as the gate of horn furnishes an easy departure (*facilis ... exitus*), one would deduce a difficult one from the gate of ivory: i. e., to retrace the path. Such an identification is already in Servius, ad Aen. 6,282: *intellegimus hanc esse eburneam portam per quam exiturus Aeneas est.*

9) According to Cicero, Diu. 1,43, Fabius Pictor had recounted a dream of Aeneas in which his fate was revealed to him. See Michels 1944, 147–148, who insists on the Lucretian influence of the *catabasis*: “The Aeneas of the underworld is a dream dreamed by the true Aeneas. The introduction of the tree of dreams at the entrance to Hades and its association with the theory of images must have been meant as the clue to the interpretation.” Steiner 1952, 95–96 thinks that resorting to the device of the *Somnium Scipionis*, an explicit dream, would not have matched the epic style of the poet; that is why Virgil used that of the gate of dreams, which, as the ending of a *catabasis* associated in addition with a place (the elm of the *Somnia uana* announced at the beginning) has a deeper meaning: “Weil Unterwelt und Traumwelt auf gleicher Ebene liegen, kommt den Unterwelterlebnissen ein traumhafter Charakter zu.” Otis 1959, 17 and 1964, 304, and Williams 1983, 57 support the oneiric interpretation. Kilpatrick 1995, 64–67 insists on the opacity of ivory; he concurs with Otis and points out (69) the inability to remember that dream, corroborated in the differences between Aeneas and Odysseus, who speaks about the *nekyia*, and between Circe and the Sibyl, who disappears from the scene. For a more exhaustive interpretation in oneiric terms, see Setaioli 2010, 29 ff., who, after contradicting Tarrant 1982, 53 by arguing that the technique of “not said” or innuendo, in the case of a dream, was possible in antiquity, suggests, following Aen. 7,89 ff. and Philostratus' *Imagines* (1,27), that Aeneas has awakened from an *incubatio*. Recently, Quint 2018, 88 n. 12 accepts the dream-interpretation.

10) This view is refuted by Plessis / Lejay, ad loc. (“mais ce qui passe par la porte d'ivoire, c'est Enée, et non pas sa vision des enfers”) and outlined in Clausen 1964, 147, although strictly speaking (unless it refers more to the mythical content) it comes from Servius himself, ad loc. (*uult autem intellegi falsa esse omnia quae dixit*): “but I have a sense, which I cannot quite put into words, that Virgil was not merely telling the time of night.” Likewise Edgeworth 1986, 157 ff., Öberg 1987, 108–109, and Maleuvre 1996, 94 ff., although the idea that Virgil resorts to the *cacozelia* to denigrate Aeneas and, through him, Augustus seems unsubtle. Its clearest and most conspicuous version is O'Hara 1990, 172: “Vergil gives eloquent voice to his people's hope that the civil wars of the last decades would not be repeated, that Rome would prosper under Augustus, and that life would somehow be better than it had ever been before. But close reading of Vergil's prophecies shows his painful awareness ...

quired in the *catabasis* is ultimately withheld from Aeneas.¹¹ These are the main conclusions, though of course there are others.¹²

that this could be just an illusion, just a fantasy (like the other more obvious fantasies in Augustan poetry), just a false dream”; and in Molyviati–Toptsis 1995, 650, who points out that, unlike his direct (or through characters) favourable judgment about other prophecies, the poet, in the passage of the two gates, pronounces negatively on the misleading prophecies of Anchises, ciphered in suggestive *dicta*, on Aeneas’ offspring (arguments in 646 ff.). Dominik 1996, 134 interprets the passage as a misunderstood allusion to the imposition of reality on the ideal things. Fratantuono 2007, 635 offers a reformulation in philosophical terms, noting that, although Lucretius is not mentioned in Anchises’ discourse because Epicureanism is opposed to the idea of an afterlife, the language of the passage is Lucretian, and concluding: “but overshadowing all concerns about the place of Aeneas and his family in the vision ... there is Lucretius, reminding us that beyond the splendor of elegant dactylic hexameters, death awaits us all, and the hopes to the contrary raised by Anchises’ discourse on reincarnation are, in the end, false dreams.” Fratantuono follows Verstraete 1980, who affirms that dream character is only suggested in the plot and that Virgil follows the Lucretian tradition according to which dreams lack revelation and are therefore essentially illusory; his conclusion (page 10) is less radical than that of Fratantuono. The consideration, with different reworkings, of the Lucretian influence, refers to Michels 1944 and Hirst 1912. For a look into the Lucretian theory of dreams, see Holowchak 2004.

11) The first to hold this thesis, even without being quoted, was Brignoli 1954, 65–66. This ‘artistic’ hypothesis has been followed, with different nuances, by German scholars, especially Christmann 1976, who highlights the absence for Aeneas of reliable information in the vision, and Pollmann 1993, who maintains that this circumstance responds to the poet’s avoidance that Aeneas become an automaton in the second part of the work. In all three cases, insistence on forgetting, which for Setaioli 2010, 18 would have no relation to false dreams, is emphasized. Among English-language critics, Gotoff 1985, 40 states: “the ascent from the Underworld, then, is a dramatic contrivance created to deny Aeneas – but not the audience – retention of what he has just witnessed, knowledge of the future of Rome. The device is impressionistic, dealing with Aeneas’ perception, rather than with the ‘truth’ of the vision.” Likewise Goold 1992, 123: “but why must Aeneas not retain beyond his sojourn in the underworld the knowledge he has learned there? Because Virgil is determined to keep him strictly limited to the condition of a mortal: he is not to enjoy superhuman knowledge of the future.” Michels 1981, 145–146 mixes this conclusion with the idea that the word *insomnia* (gr. *enypnia*) refers to a special type of dream which, according to Macrobius, Somn. 1,3,2 ff. and Artemidorus (1,6), is produced by distressing states, such as those experienced by Aeneas, and fades upon awakening.

12) See e. g. Fletcher 1962 ad 893–896, who follows Servius’ interpretation of the symbols: “there may be also, I suggest, an allusion to the belief, symbolized by the two gates, that things seen are more to be trusted than things reported. The gate of horn is the eye: the ivory gate represents the teeth. Virgil is telling, not

Karl Galinsky, in a study on the speech of Pythagoras in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, accepts the reasonable interpretation of Antonie Wlosok:

In *Aeneid* 6, Vergil had to make up for the incredibility of myth by infusing it with a heavy dose of serious philosophy. We know from Cicero, Propertius, and others that credence in the actual mythology of the underworld, such the ferryman, the frogs, and swamps, was at a low ebb among the Roman *intelligentsia*. Hence Vergil drew heavily on various philosophical traditions to make Hades meaningful while providing another hint at the very end, through the conundrum of the Gate of False Dreams, that not all of his account, and especially the less spiritual *θαυμαστά*, was to be taken literally.¹³

Rather than on the greatness of Rome, according to this view, the ivory gate would cast doubts on the myths attached to the underworld and, especially, to the universe of punishments, which

what his own eyes have seen, but what he has heard from others. *Audita loquitur* (266)." Rolland 1957, 186 concludes that Anchises sends the Sibyl and Aeneas to earth through the gate of false dreams so as not to arouse suspicion (and perhaps censure) in the authentic shadows that wander in the vicinity. In our opinion, the poet would have made that meaning explicit if it were so. Tarrant 1982, 53–55, following Haarhoff 1948, 38 in his suggestion of a Virgilian Platonism, though not in the interpretation of *ad caelum* as "in relation to the material world" (89–90), suggests that, beyond the importance of the historical mission, the Platonic content of Anchises's first discourse (Aen. 6,730–734, Plat. Phaed. 66b–c) about the supremacy of the soul over the corporeal and world prison of the blessed spirits on the earthly world, would explain Aeneas' departure by the gate of false dreams towards a world that, in Platonic terms, is less real (a similar interpretation can be found in Borges, who cites a "comentador anónimo" [1997, 224]: "para Virgilio, el mundo verdadero era posiblemente el mundo platónico, el mundo de los arquetipos. Eneas pasa por la puerta de marfil porque entra en el mundo de los sueños – es decir, en lo que llamamos vigilia"); for criticisms, see Horsfall 1995, 147, who sees an anticlimax in the fact that the explanation occurs precisely in that place. The interpretation in terms of astral afterlife proposed by Brenk 1992, 282–283 would suppose in Virgil a knowledge hardly widespread in his time (Setaioli 2010, 28): the two gates, according to this view, would be identified – thanks to Noumenios' (fr. 35), Porphyrios' (Antr. Nymph. 28), and Macrobius' (Somn. 1,12,1–4) association of the Gates of the Sun with the cave of the Nymphs in *Odyssey* 13 – with the constellation of Cancer, whence souls descend to reincarnate, and with that of Capricorn, by which they return to heaven. Since *cornu* in Vergil would suggest the latter constellation and therefore a return to the origin instead of to the world of the living people, as Aeneas and the Sibyl must do, Virgil would have chosen to have them pass through the other gate.

13) Galinsky 1998, 328, citing Wlosok 1990, 386. See also Setaioli 2010, 33–34.

Wlosok, less skeptically than Galinsky, considers “als Bestandteil theologischer Offenbarungsliteratur oder religiöser Mysterientradition”.¹⁴ There would be, in terms of Macrobius (Somn. 1,9,8),¹⁵ a philosophical truth imposed on the poetic fiction, suggested by Virgil in several points of the *catabasis* (*largior hic campos aether et lumine uestit / purpureo, solemque suum, sua sidera norunt*, 640f.; ... *sic tota passim regione uagantur / aeris in campis latis atque omnia lustrant*, 886f.) provoking in the interpretation a constant double meaning with an allegorical solution.¹⁶

To any learned Roman, however, the underworld’s myths had a literary truth:¹⁷ even though Virgil insisted on introducing philosophy, one could hardly – and Plato’s *Phaedo*, in the Greek

14) Wlosok 1990, 387; Solmsen 1972, 36. A more emphatically skeptical view, which links the passage with Lucretian ideas, is that of Hirst 1912, 83: “Is it, perhaps, Virgil’s way of hinting that to him this lower-world of gloom and torture was also mere legend?” Cf. also Horsfall 2013, 615: “V.’s educated readers may have wished to take comfort in the employment of the gate of ivory to distance the myths related by V. from their sophisticated outlook ... or as learned doubt expressed towards the account given of the souls of the dead ..., but Caesar, Pompey and Marcellus are no myths and V. offers his readers (interpreted) familiar historical (and legendary) facts.”

15) Macrobius (Somn. 1,9,10), commenting on Aen. 6,640–641, writes: *hoc et Vergilius non ignorat, qui, licet argumento suo seruans heroes in inferos relegauerit, non tamen eos abducit a caelo sed aethera his deputat largiorem et nosse eos solem suum ac sua sidera profitetur, ut geminae doctrinae obseruatione praestiterit et poeticae figmentum et philosophiae ueritatem.*

16) Wlosok 1990, 385–387. In Brenk 1992, 293 n. 49 we find summarized all the ways in which the falsehood of vision can be understood: 1. with regard to the reality of Aeneas and the Sibyl’s visit to Hades; 2. in regard to the mythical conception of the underworld; 3. on the survival of the soul with rewards or punishments; 4. regarding the affirmation of history and the Roman Empire, in spite of personal losses and suffering.

17) Gadamer 1993, 126–127 is a good exploration of the dilemma of credibility and poetic nature of myths, which he interprets as “eine falsch gestellte Frage”. For the idea of credibility, particularly that of certain expressions of apparent uncertainty, see also Martínez Astorino 2017a, 310, esp. n. 40 and, more specifically, Sinton 1976, 65: “Of course I am not saying that Virgil did believe in such stories of the supernatural, but simply that he is not, as an epic poet – even as a philosophical epic poet – concerned to deny them. ‘Si credere dignum est’ is a story-teller’s device for heightening the discourse, like ‘mirabile dictu’. For a genuine expression of disbelief in the supernatural, contrast Horace’s robust rejection of faked miracles in *Satires* 1.5.100 ‘credat Iudaeus Apella, / non ego’.”

cultural context, is proof of this – do without such myths in the representation of the underworld. More than being an additive or traditional element, they made up a paradigmatic way of representation. David West¹⁸ quotes, precisely on the interpretation of this passage, one from Plato's *Phaedo* (114d):

τὸ μὲν οὖν ταῦτα δισχυρίσασθαι οὕτως ἔχειν ὡς ἐγὼ διελέλυθα. οὐ πρέπει νοῦν ἔχοντι ἀνδρί· ὅτι μέντοι ἢ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἢ τοιαῦτ' ἅττα περὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς οἰκήσεις, ἐπεὶ περ ἀθάνατόν γε ἡ ψυχὴ φαίνεται οὐσα, τοῦτο καὶ πρέπει μοι δοκεῖ καὶ ἄξιον κινδυνεῦσαι οἰομένῳ οὕτως ἔχειν – καλὸς γὰρ ὁ κίνδυνος.

Now it would not be fitting for a man of sense to maintain that all this is just as I have described it, but that this or something like it is true concerning our souls and their abodes, since the soul is shown to be immortal, I think he may properly and worthily venture to believe; for the venture is worth while.

(transl. H. N. Fowler)

West also adds the following passage from the *Republic* (2. 382d), where the final question demands the answer “Yes”:

καὶ ἐν αἷς νυν δὴ ἐλέγομεν ταῖς μυθολογίαις, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι ὅπη τᾶληθές ἔχει περὶ τῶν παλαιῶν, ἀφομοιοῦντες τῷ ἀληθεῖ τὸ ψεῦδος ὅτι μάλιστα, οὕτω χρήσιμον ποιούμεν;

So too in the myths we have just been talking about, since we do not know the truth about ancient times, when we make the false as like the truth as possible are we not doing something useful?

(transl. West)

And Macrobius himself seems to agree with this idea when he rejects the Epicurean criticisms against the Platonic myths, concluding that:

Sciendum est tamen non in omnem disputationem philosophos admittere fabulosa uel licita; sed his uti solent cum uel de anima uel de aeris aetherisue potestatibus uel de ceteris dis loquuntur. (1,2,13–14)

We should not assume, however, that philosophers approve the use of fabulous narratives, even those of the proper sort, in all disputations. It is their custom to employ them when speaking about the Soul, or about spirits having dominion in the lower and upper air, or about gods in general.

(transl. Stahl)

18) West 1990, 237.

Among these texts, which in his opinion are fabulous narratives and not mere fables, he includes the Hesiodic texts.

There is then, related to this type of representation, something like ‘true lies’. On the other hand, some critics have thought that philosophy in such passages serves as a propaedeutic speech, as a temporal or spatial cosmological prelude. That would give it a more specific function than counteracting myth’s lack of credibility or defining its genuine interpretation.¹⁹ Lastly, what is in the Virgilian passage – and it is not a minor point, insofar as a criticism of historicist views is implied – is not, strictly speaking, serious philosophy, but a literary representation of philosophical ideas.

2.a. The ‘falseness’ of history

What is important about Wlosok’s and Galinsky’s views,²⁰ nonetheless, is their stress on the revelation’s content without implying an inadequate (and perhaps anticlimactic)²¹ pessimistic con-

19) Hardie 1986, 66–67. Norden 1976, 46 reduces this propaedeutic character to that of a mere introduction that would serve as preparation for what is to come.

20) Despite the new arguments of Setaioli 2010, 28 ff., who quotes Philostratus (Imag. 1,27) in favor of the interpretation of the *catabasis* as an *incubatio* and, therefore, as a dream, some objections persist that prevent a satisfactory response to Tarrant’s rejoinder (1982, 53): “it is inconceivable that Virgil, or any other ancient writer, would reveal the status of an episode of this kind only in its closing words.” In the first place, as for Philostratus, who, although quite later than Virgil, refers to Homer, his passage has the clarity that Virgil lacks: he speaks of Amphiarus’ place of meditation where he would perform the *incubatio*. There are not as many “unsaid” elements as Setaioli claims. It rather resembles that passage of the *Aeneid* which can clearly be interpreted as an *incubatio*: the passage of Latinus (Aen. 7,85 ff.) quoted by Setaioli himself. Besides, why would Virgil be so clear as to refer to the same practice of *incubatio* in Book 7 and so enigmatic in the immediately previous one? Moreover, Ausonius’ testimony reflects (perhaps, though not surely) the author’s interpretation of the Virgilian Gates of Sleep passage, but, unlike Virgil, Ausonius is much clearer than Virgil in defining Cupid’s *catabasis* as dreamlike: Auson. Cup. cruc. 101–103 *quae postquam multa perpessus nocte Cupido / effugit, pulsa tandem caligine somni / euolat ad superos portaque euadit eburna* (emphasis mine).

21) Surprisingly, it is not accepted by Öberg 1987, 109, who sees in this anticlimax a proof of Virgil’s literary dexterity.

clusion about such a central issue to the *Aeneid*'s structure.²² However, those who stand for a pessimistic view argue that Anchises' discourse is a false invention (*falsa ... insomnia*) that hides the true history of Rome. Obviously, they reach such a conclusion because Aeneas, the recipient of that revelation, comes to earth through the gate of false dreams. Is it feasible to pick up that sense of invention or fabrication, possible, in short, as a metaphorical interpretation of the term *insomnia*, to shed light on a literary interpretation of the passage? At issue is whether Virgil, when letting Aeneas out through the gate of false dreams, could not be alluding, not so much to the history of Rome, as to his own creation of the history of Rome, so that what would be considered false, in a sense that we will soon clarify, would be his version of that history. If it is taken into account that Virgil refers more discreetly than Ovid to his creative work in the *Aeneid*,²³ the allusion device chosen in this case could be interpreted as a model of poetic discretion. However, discretion should not prevent sense from being made evident in some way; several factors would help to it: first, the fact that that mark appears at the end of a book, as a closure; second, the fact that one of the meanings of *insomnium* (OLD 2: "a vision, dream")²⁴ suggests a work of invention or fabrication (building up

22) For an interesting polemic against the pessimistic reading, see Holt 1982, who uses for the prophecies the concept of "dual perspective", according to which the Roman recipient of prophecies is always taken into account, and in relation to Books 6 and 8 concludes (313): "This shows Vergil's awareness of suffering and loss, an awareness which has been so much emphasized (sometimes overemphasized) in recent criticism of the *Aeneid*, and which Vergil carefully balances against his poem's appreciation of the triumph of order and national destiny."

23) Kenney 2009, 152–153 recalls the two *Aeneid* passages that refer to poetry: a direct one, the apostrophe to Nisus and Euryalus (Aen. 9,446–449), and the indirect reference to his poetic immortality through Aeneas' immortality, which appears before Dido as *fama super aethera notus* (Aen. 1,379). He concludes, alluding to Virgil's discretion (153): "What Virgil had been content to imply, Ovid proudly proclaims."

24) Cairo 2013, 128–132 critically summarizes a very complex topic discussed by various interpreters. The OLD's second definition is "an apparition seen in a trance or dream, a vision, dream", which assimilates the term to the Greek word *enypnion*, according to Macrobius in his *Commentary on Somnium Scipionis* (1,3,2–6). If this meaning is taken and the isolated view of Getty 1933, 6, 12, 26–27 is dismissed (which, appealing not quite accurately to Aen. 4,4–5, suggests that *in*

something that is not reality, or that at least is not the reality of wakefulness), which in the passage is assigned to the Manes;²⁵ third, that the character who crosses that gate is the same character who, at the end of Book 8, will carry on his shoulders a work of art: the shield of Vulcan (in this case there would be a regressive influence of that passage in the reading of Book 6). Later we will deal with an additional element.

2.b. Falseness and Hesiodic Muses' ψεύδεα πολλὰ

There is, however, an interesting background that Virgil seems to have considered and that confers an allusive literary value on the use of the adjective *falsus*, *-a*, *-um*.²⁶ It consists of the first (strange) words that the Muses address to Hesiod, before infusing him with a divine voice capable of celebrating past and future and of singing the lineage of the immortal gods (*Theog.* 26–28):²⁷

somnia should be interpreted as waking visions), one should still decide “si existe o no una diferencia clara entre los *insomnia* de la segunda puerta y las *umbris* de la primera” (Cairo 2013, 131); that is, if the *insomnia* are *umbrae* which appear in dreams (Reed 1973, 14) or “si se interpretan las *umbrae* de la primera puerta como los espíritus que se presentan en sueños y a los *insomnia* de la segunda como los sueños en que dichos espíritus aparecen”. In that case, “... la única diferencia entre las puertas radicaría en la oposición *uerus / falsus*, sin que exista una distinción entre las entidades que salen por una y otra (Cairo 2013, 131–132)”. However, as Cairo points out, there are dream visions in the *Aeneid* in which no *umbrae* appear.

25) “Servio, en su comentario a 6.896, explica el término *insomnia* diciendo ‘*id est somnia*’. Asimismo, en el comentario a 5.849 dice que *insomnia* es *quod uideamus in somnis*. En el comentario al verso 4.9 diferencia *insomnia* de *insomnium* y afirma *insomnia uero generis neutri numeri pluralis ea, quae per somnium uidemus, ut ‘sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia manes’*.” (Cairo 2013, 131 n. 28).

26) An accurate summary of the interpretation of this adjective in criticism on this passage is Cairo 2013, 132–134. Cairo observes that a large part of critics interprets the adjective in the sixth meaning of the OLD (‘misleading, deceptive, delusive’), while others interpret it according to the third one (‘not genuine, sham, spuriously, false’), the first (‘erroneous, untrue, false; incorrect, wrong’) and the fourth (‘improperly so called, pretended’).

27) The influence of the passage of Hesiod in this of Virgil is not analyzed in the exhaustive chapter by Rosati 2009, 343–374.

ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
 ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
 ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρῦσασθαι.

Shepherds of the wilderness, wretched things of shame, mere bellies, we
 know how to speak many false things as though they were true, but we
 know, when we will, to utter true things.

(transl. Evelyn-White)

Falsehood, following Hesiod's tradition, is linked to the realm of poetry. The Muses can proclaim truth, but when they do not, they can say ψεύδεα πολλὰ capable of being believed as truth, that is to say, plausible, *verisimilia*. For poets, who compose works, this division may be so inextricable that it is possible to think that what they receive most normally (the first thing Hesiod names and what seems to be more usual, since the second option is subordinated to the will of the Muses) are lies that seem true, i. e., the verisimilitude, to use an expression that reflects the Greek words ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα. Further precision, however, can illuminate the passage, since ψεύδεα should perhaps not be interpreted as 'lies' but as 'fictions' and, in turn, ἐτύμοισιν as 'realities' rather than as 'truths'. While these fictions are similar to reality, the Muses point, in some way, to truth.²⁸ In mythic fictions, as Pirenne-Delforge affirms, "both plausible fiction and truth may potentially be present, unless truth strays far from the standards of plausibility".²⁹

With regard to the relation between poetry and history, Aristotle (Poet. 9. 1451b) argues that they do not differ, as one might think, in terms of the respective use of verse and prose, since history could be written in verse; they differ because, while history tells what happened, poetry focuses on what may happen (οἷα ἂν γένοιτο). Poetry, Aristotle adds, is more philosophical and universal than history and is governed by the criterion of the plausible / probable or necessary (κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον). The Aristotelian interpretation of poetry clearly derives from Hesiod's ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα; ἀληθέα is consigned to the realm of the mysterious things.

28) Pirenne-Delforge 2009, 40–44 n. 10. Cf. also West, ad ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, who cites as examples of similar passages Od. 19,203, Thgn. 713 and Hor. Ars. 338: "In these places the meaning is 'plausible', the sort of fiction that can be believed in."

29) Pirenne-Delforge 2009, 40.

To return to the *Aeneid*: the gate of *falsa ... insomnia* crossed by Aeneas allusively suggests that the speech of Anchises, the history that Virgil chooses to represent in Book 6, is in the realm of false things, though in a literary sense; that is, in the realm of plausible things, of poetry. It has been assimilated by poetry in such a way that it may be regarded as poetry of history; in other words, it is a poetic construction.³⁰ This is especially emphasized by Anchises' use of the word *dicta* to make explicit the *fata* (*fata docebo*, 759; *expediam dictis*, 759; *his ... dictis*, 897–898),³¹ by the literary value of the word *fertur*, which links the passage with Homer; as it has been suggested,³² and, most important, by the Varronian derivation from *fari* (Ling. 6,55), wrong but applicable to the *Aeneid*, of the word *falsus*.³³ As Horsfall says, in addition, “the word-order lends strong prominence to *falsa*”.³⁴

Virgil chooses this discreet ending, this subtle allusion to his poetic work (and not the anticlimax of a false vision or the awakening of a dream never announced) at the moment when Anchises reveals, and Virgil invents, the history of Rome. Yet one might ask why he does so at this precise moment, taking into account that all of the work deals with history. Has the whole *Aeneid* not been regarded by contemporary readers as equally ‘historical’ material treated by a potentially ‘fictionalizing’ *uates*? The answer lies in the

30) We will come back to the meaning of this theoretical term in the conclusion.

31) This aspect is pointed out by Molyviati-Toptsis 1995, 646, who adds a related conclusion but in the pessimistic line (650): “By reordering Jupiter’s *fata* and tampering with the details, Anchises rises to a level above of mere prophet, messenger of god’s will, to that of a ‘maker’, *poeta*, of the *fata*. But since he is not Jupiter, his rendition of the future is unreliable.” She seems not to have sufficiently considered the special (military-political) function of Anchises, who undoubtedly is obliged to persuade his son. On the other hand, this focus on the character makes us overlook the poet’s construction of Anchises’ discourse, in the aforementioned sense of the “dual perspective”.

32) Conte 2019b, 255.

33) *Ab eodem falli, sed et falsum et fallacia, quae propterea, quod fando quem decipit ac contra quam dixit facit* (“From the same, *falli* ‘to be deceived’, but also *falsum* ‘false’ and *fallacia* ‘deceit’, which are so named on this account, that by *fando* ‘speaking’ one misleads someone and then does the opposite of what he has said” – transl. R. G. Kent). Cf. Ernout / Meillet, DÉLL ad “*for*”.

34) Horsfall, ad loc.

special status of the ‘parade of heroes’, which is a crucial point of the work, indeed a highly special historical *locus* which, as was well recognized, bears a striking resemblance to the Forum Augustum’s statues of the *gens Iulia* and other Roman leaders, an important Roman (Augustan) monument built between circa 20 and 2 B. C., although perhaps conceived much earlier.³⁵ This resemblance, beyond the terms of direction of influence (who influenced whom),³⁶ which in both cases outlines its historical character, would have been particularly noticed by the original readers. But even without this cultural support, the literary representation itself highlights the passage as a prominent historical one because of its structural position (the center of the work) and the framework of a Roman revelation. The literary allusion of the gates appears, then, at the end of the hitherto ‘most deeply historical’ part of the work (and semantically very profound, since it is a revelation), which, at the same time, is structurally the central one. In addition, it occurs at the end of a passage which perhaps influenced a historical (Augustan) monument.

This allusion makes more sense if one thinks that, just at the beginning of the book, an artist, Daedalus, sculpts some gates that, besides anticipating through Icarus the final pain of Marcellus’s death, introduce the possibility of the artistic interpretation for the final image of the gates.³⁷ Thus, Hades (and the book) show a ring composition.

2.c. The Hesiodic allusion and Servius’ and Macrobius’ interpretations

The Hesiodic allusion helps resignify or reorient the interpretations of the passage proposed by ancient commentators like Servius and Macrobius, who insist precisely on the sense of false-

35) Cf. Zanker 1988, 195, Geiger 2008, 49–51, and especially Pandey 2014, 92 ff., among others.

36) Pandey 2014, 94: “More recently, Zanker (1990, 195) has suggested that Augustus ‘borrowed’ his schema from Vergil, and Geiger (2008, 51), that he tried to ‘outdo’ the poet.”

37) Quint 2018, 14: “The temple gates at Cumae and the death of Icarus depicted on them at the opening of Book 6 (13–32) correspond to the premature death of Marcellus and the gates of ivory and horn at its end.”

hood. For Servius, in regard to physiology, ivory alludes to the mouth for its ability to create fantasies: *per eburneam uero portam os significatur a dentibus, et scimus quia quae loquimur falsa esse possunt* (Serv. Aen. 6,893) (“through the ivory gate, from teeth, certainly mouth is pointed out, and we know that what we say may be false”). In regard to dreams, Servius maintains that the ivory gate alludes to dreams that, like the brilliant ivory, are too rhetorically ornate and therefore deceptive: *ea uero quae supra fortunam sunt et habent nimium ornatum uanamque iactantiam dicunt falsa esse: unde eburnea, quasi ornatioꝝ porta, fingitur falsa* (Serv. Aen. 6,893) (“they say that, that which is beyond fortune and has excessive ornament and vain boasting, is false; whence that of ivory, as the most ornate gate, is modelled as false”). Macrobius maintains that the deceitful character of ivory lies in its density and opacity, which does not allow one to distinguish truth: *cum autem (uelamen) a uero hebetat ac repellit optutum, ebur putatur, cuius corpus ita natura densetum est ut . . . nullo uisu ad ulteriora tendente penetratur* (Somn. 1,3,20) (“When the veil dulls the vision and prevents its reaching the truth, it is thought to be made of ivory, the composition of which has been made so dense by nature . . . that no gaze directed inside can penetrate it”; transl. Stahl, with some changes). The interpretations of both authors have been frequently dismissed by critics,³⁸ but both the misleading character to which Servius refers and the inability to discover truth which Macrobius points out are contained in the Hesiodic verses, except that the misleading character, ascribed to Hesiod’s poetic light is but similar to truth, and what hides truth, something that Muses can reveal when they want it, allows us, even precariously, to approach truth.

3. Vates, history, and revelation

Our proposal may, however, seem a concession to pessimistic interpretations, since it is to be expected, in the case of a work where Aeneas’ and Augustus’ apotheoses are foreshadowed, that the history of Rome will be a true revelation, will be – as it were –

38) Molyviati-Toptsis 1995, 645–646 has pointed this out, adding her opinion that they are essential for the understanding of the passage.

a prophetic, religious truth about the future of Rome, and this ending, somehow, would break that mood and pretension. There is, however, a literary explanation for the problem. If Virgil had not introduced this author's mark towards the end; if, in general terms, we did not have a passage which would raise a question, could the 'Heldenschau' – beyond its poetic achievement and even with the complex reflection on pain in the personal note about Marcellus' *mors immatura* – not seem somewhat conventional or even rhetorical?³⁹ Ambiguity is a strategy to focus on the artist and his composition, a way for the artist to appropriate history and for readers to remember that it is his history. As if Marcellus' passage had not been enough to make it notice, the poet chooses this sort of seal. In short, Virgil plays the revealing *uates* of the history of Rome, but what he gives us is his fabrication, or, to put it another way, it is the revelation of a *uates* understood as a poet. It is not by chance that, in this book, the term *uates* is used in the *Aeneid* for the first time in the sense of 'poet', applied to the mythical poet Musaeus (669), and that, after the famous (literary) exit of Aeneas, Virgil uses the term *uates* again to refer to poetry and to his *maius opus* (Aen. 7,37–45).⁴⁰

39) On Marcellus' passage see Martínez Astorino 2014, 346–348. Holt 1982, 304 points to that conventional or rhetorical character when he observes that for a learned Roman each of the appearances of historical characters in the 'Heldenschau' made up a sort of riddle, a game of questions and answers in which he would largely succeed: "In this case, the obscurity is deliberate, because the passage is a sort of erudite riddle aimed at the Roman reader who did not mind mixing his poetry with a quiz on mythological and historical trivia: What is it that carries sacred objects, has gray hair, comes from the Sabine country, and establishes laws? Answer: Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome and the founder of its earliest religious institutions. The Roman reader who got the answer could congratulate himself on his knowledge, and perhaps feel one up on anyone who missed. In the same way, Caesar, Pompey, Mummius, and Paullus are given long, sometimes riddling, descriptions, and their names, like Numa's, are withheld so that the reader can guess (VI.826–840). The passage is a game which might be called Name That General. The *Aeneid*, like most other imperial poetry, contains a certain amount of learned play of this sort."

40) Newman 1967, 34–35, 38, esp. 35: "Now, after his great work of rehabilitation, which is crowned by the sixth book of the *Aeneid* in which the religious and poetic aspects of *uates* become intermingled in an Apolline context, he claims himself to be a *uates* (VII, 41)."

*Nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora, rerum
 quis Latio antiquo fuerit status, aduena classem
 cum primum Ausoniis exercitus appulit oris,
 expediam, et primae reuocabo exordia pugnae.
 tu uatem, tu, diua, mone. dicam horrida bella,
 dicam acies actosque animis in funera reges,
 Tyrrhenamque manum totamque sub arma coactam
 Hesperiam. maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo,
 maius opus moueo.*

Awake now, Erato! Who were the kings, what was the tide of events, how stood ancient Latium, when first that stranger host beached its barques on Ausonia's shore – this will I unfold; and the prelude of the opening strife will I recall. Thou, goddess, do thou prompt thy bard! I will tell of grim wars, will tell of battle array, and princes in their valour rushing upon death – of Tyrrhenian bands, and all the Hesperia mustered in arms. Greater is the story that opens before me; greater is the task I essay.

(transl. Rushton Fairclough)

This vicarious assumption of the character of *uates* (... *medium nam plurima turba / hunc habet atque umeris exstantem suspicit altis*, 6,667–668; ... *optime uates*, 6,669) occurs precisely in a context of revelation, and that is why this sense is not annihilated for the character Aeneas, although it is more emphatically subordinated to poetry in the work. Likewise, his poem's *maius opus* associates *uates* with some gates, those of the temple of Janus, which evoke the gates at which he had previously hinted in his poetic seal: *Sunt geminae Belli portae* (7,607) / *Sunt geminae Somni portae* (6,893). The parallelism and the similarities suggest continuity, as if the construction of history began, in a sense, precisely in book 7, with the representation of the war.⁴¹

Let us now turn to the revelatory aspect in regard to Aeneas as a character. Many critics doubt whether Aeneas goes through that gate with knowledge of the future or if that knowledge, according to what has been called a “dual perspective”, is only reserved to the

41) For a totally opposite interpretation, see Edgeworth 1986, 153–154, esp. 153: “If one looks at the other places in the *Aeneid* in which Virgil uses *gemini* in reference to a doorway or threshold, the contexts are all found to be ominous and destructive.” He quotes, among others, this passage.

Roman and his future readers. That doubt would be strengthened by the end of Book 8, where Aeneas carries Vulcan's shield joyfully but ignorant (even though he has already had a first revelation) of the deeds it represents: *rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet* (8,730). It has been argued that this first revelation has been reduced to oneiric memories in Aeneas' mind.⁴² But it is not impossible to think that Aeneas, unlike the reader (hence the "dual perspective"), is unable to remember that revelation, which consists of a detailed catalogue about future, except in a general way or in its most important aspects: glory, pain, a descendant that will be deified. To generalize, Virgil says in Book 8 that Aeneas "ignores the deeds" not only because their representation through images could exceed his understanding, but also because what his mind has retained during the speech about the parade of heroes in Book 6, confirmed again more equivocally through the *ekphrasis* of the shield, is the security of a glorious destiny associated with some central points and characters. He does not remember the details, which understandably remain for the readers.⁴³

4. Conclusions

In this article, we have tried to prove that a focus on compositional procedures is able to offer, for a passage with a great historical and Augustan significance, an alternative reading to the pessimistic views of the *Aeneid*; a reading that, inscribed in the poetic work, is intended, if we are allowed the pretense, prior to an ideological interpretation.⁴⁴ Likewise, this reading makes it possible to avoid resorting to the controversial reduction of the vision of Rome to oneiric terms, an aspect that, unlike what we have proposed, could not appear as mere allusion or suggestion without becoming anticlimactic. If we are granted, with George Steiner, to appeal to an author as a critic, we may say that it is difficult for

42) Cf. n. 11 *supra* for Gotoff's, Goold's, and Michels' views.

43) Cf. Cairo 2013, 142–143.

44) O'Hara 1996, 333 argues that some emendations illustrate the attitude of one who refuses to face the controversial words that Virgil actually wrote. Similarly, we believe that some critical solutions produce an unacceptable '*emendatio*' of the literary sense of Augustanism in the work in a way that seems to ignore the complexity of its representation.

Dante, who wrote the *Divine Comedy* under Virgil's influence, to have interpreted Virgil's *catabasis* as a dream. Nor is it likely that his vision, like that of Borges' "El Aleph", can be so interpreted.⁴⁵ It also seems that the allusion of the ivory gate has to do with part of the *catabasis*, but not with the underworld's mythology, conventional and necessary for representation: it is related, rather, to the possible emptiness and rhetoric associated with historic panegyric. The underworld's mythology is not an obstacle to Virgil to such a degree that, through the Hesiodic allusion of *falsa insomnia*, he, like the Muses in Hesiod, has turned into lies or fictions similar to truths the very history of Rome. Those lies similar to truths told or revealed by the Muses are myth. By evoking Hesiod, Virgil has made a generic bet against historical epic, which largely preceded the *Aeneid*; only the history that the poet can turn, in some way, into myth, or rather into myth-history, is accepted. This new poetic affirmation is especially emphasized by the allusion to the first poet, an epic poet (Hesiod), who has claimed to have an encounter with the Muses, precisely in a passage that referred to the other epic poet (Homer). Such a poetic affirmation may be compared with another in order to appreciate the literary evolution: in *Georgics* 3, the *princeps*' request to the poet to write an *Augusteid* is recalled.⁴⁶ With great literary intelligence, Virgil turns that request into the mythical writing, in which the history is subsumed, of an *Aeneid*. Finally, the allusion to the gates, which does not go unnoticed by any reader as an ambiguous ending, can be understood in the terms we suggest if we consider that in Book 8 the poet directly chooses a work of art, a shield, to represent history. And it may be remembered that already in Jupiter's discourse in Book 1 (by means of which the three core points of the historical and Augustan representation of the work are configured), the poet had left his poetic stamp through the literary construction (modelled on Naevius) of the passage and through the creation of a hybrid figure: that of Caesar-Augustus.⁴⁷

45) Steiner 1989, 11 ff.

46) Galinsky 2003, 279: "As for Rome, historical epic had flourished and the expectation, adumbrated in the proem of the third *Georgic*, was that Virgil would write an *Augusteid*. He chose not to do so and opted for something more inclusive, while sacrificing none of the contemporary relevance of his poem."

47) Martínez Astorino 2017b, 132–138.

This is possible because poetry is not merely an additional suitable means of representing history for the Romans, but also a special way which involves, therefore, a special transformation of the represented reality, consisting either of an interpretation of history, or of a device, i. e. of the appeal to the game of construction.⁴⁸ At this point in the narrative (which is a key point), in order to appropriate history, to strip it of its rhetoric, Virgil has appealed to the game of construction soon after having shown an interpretation of Roman history in human terms, neither patriotic nor triumphalist, through the reference to the death of Marcellus, which highlights pain as a ‘transtemporal’ human reality of Roman history.

However, the appeal to the device does not deny that there is, in diegetic terms, a revelation. Aeneas receives it and remembers it in its general aspects. To be precise: he is, of course, *ignarus*, at least in those general terms that we have proposed. Virgil’s contemporary readers knew that this revelation is a literary work. They knew it because they were reading it, but, owing to the rhetoric of the passage, they could have forgotten it. The poet reminds them emphatically and discreetly at the same time. It is not the history of riddles and conundrums that he learned. It is Virgil’s history.⁴⁹

48) On poetry as a way of representing history, which means accepting that history in Rome is rather a subject than a genre, see Wiseman 2002, 362 and Gowing 2005, 11. To understand the transformation wrought by poetry, which may be correctly derived from Aristotle (Poet. 9. 1451b), it is necessary to appeal to Gadamer’s idea of “eminent text” (1993b, 289–290). See also Martínez Astorino 2014, 349–350 and 2017b, 130–132. The fact that the poetic construction as interpretation or device fastens on the poetic genres presents as an objection the special case of the Ovidian epic, in which, besides the epic genre subject and its expanded inclusivity, it is necessary to study, associated with it, the specific function of the poet (Martínez Astorino 2017b, 142–144) and his supremacy. It is insufficient then, the idea of “generic ascent” suggested by Harrison 2007 within the framework of his theory about generic enrichment, as well as his idea of epic inclusivity singularly amplified in the *Metamorphoses* – Harrison 2002, 87–89. An accurate approach to this topic includes the study of Virgil’s, Horace’s, and Ovid’s *sphragides*, specifically within the framework of the “generic ascent”, which, unlike Virgil and Horace, coincides in the case of Ovid with a more exalted representation of the self.

49) I thank María Luisa La Fico Guzzo for the invitation to read this paper as a lecture at the Universidad Nacional del Sur (Bahía Blanca) on 19.6.19. I also thank the valuable suggestions of María Emilia Cairo, Gabriela Marrón and the anonymous peer reviewer, which greatly improved this paper, and the kind edition of the English version by Robert Sklenář.

Bibliography

- Austin, R. G. P., *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, Oxford 1977.
- Borges, J. L., *La pesadilla* (Siete noches, 1980), in: J. L. Borges, *Obras completas III*, Buenos Aires 1997, 221–231.
- Brenk, F. E., The Gates of Dreams and an Image of Life: Consolation and Allegory at the End of Vergil's *Aeneid* VI, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, VI, Bruxelles 1992, 277–294.
- Brignoli, F. M., *La porta d'avorio nel VI libro dell'Eneide*, GIF 7, 1954, 61–67.
- Cairo, M. E., *Las puertas del sueño: muerte, conocimiento y revelación en el libro 6 de Eneida*, *Nova Tellus* 31, 2013, 121–144.
- Christmann, E., *Der Tod des Aeneas und die Pforten des Schlafes*, in: H. Görge-manns / E. A. Schmidt (eds.), *Studien zum antiken Epos. Franz Dirlmeier und Viktor Pöschl gewidmet*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976, 251–279.
- Cockburn, G. T., *Aeneas and the Gates of Sleep: An Etymological Approach*, *Phoenix* 46, 1992, 362–364.
- Conte, G. B., *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis*, Berlin / Boston 2019.
- Conte, G. B., *Le porte del sonno. Su Aen. 6, 893–98*, *Hermes* 147, 2019, 252–256. (= Conte 2019b)
- Dominik, W. J., *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: The Gates of Sleep (VI 893–898)*, *Maia* 48, 1996, 129–138.
- Edgeworth, R. J., *The Ivory Gate and the Threshold of Apollo*, *C&M* 27, 1986, 145–160.
- Ernout, A. / A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris ⁴1979.
- Everett, W., *Upon Virgil, Aeneid VI, 893–898*, *CR* 14, 1900, 153–154.
- Fletcher, F., *Virgil. Aeneid VI*, Oxford ²1962.
- Fratantuono, L., *A Brief Reflection on the Gates of Sleep*, *Latomus* 66, 2007, 628–635.
- Gadamer, H.-G., *Zur Problematik des Selbstverständnisses. Ein hermeneutischer Beitrag zur Frage der 'Entmythologisierung' (1961)*, in: H.-G. Gadamer, *Gesammelte Werke. Bd. 2. Hermeneutik: Wahrheit und Methode – 2*, Tübingen, 1993, 121–132.
- Gadamer, H.-G., *Der 'eminente' Text und seine Wahrheit (1986)*, in: H.-G. Gadamer, *Gesammelte Werke. Bd 8. Ästhetik und Poetik I: Kunst als Aussage*, Tübingen 1993, 286–295. (= Gadamer 1993b)
- Galinsky, K., *The Speech of Pythagoras at Ovid Metamorphoses 15.75–478*, *PLLS* 10, 1998, 313–336.
- Galinsky, K., *Greek and Roman Drama and the Aeneid*, in: D. Braund / C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honour of T. P. Wiseman*, Exeter 2003, 275–294.
- Geiger, J., *The First Hall of Fame. A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*, Leiden 2008.
- Getty, R. J., *Insomnia in the Lexica*, *AJPh* 54, 1933, 1–28.
- Goold, G. P., *The Voice of Virgil. The Pageant of Rome in Aeneid 6*, in: T. Woodman / J. Powell (eds.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, Cambridge 1992.
- Gotoff, H. C., *The Difficulty of the Ascent from Avernus*, *CPh* 80, 1985, 35–40.
- Gowing, A. M., *Empire and Memory. The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*, Cambridge 2005.
- Haarhoff, T. J., *The Gates of Sleep*, *G&R* 17, 1948, 88–90.

- Hardie, P., *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1986.
- Harrison, S., *Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist*, in: P. Hardie, *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge 2002, 79–94.
- Harrison, S., *Generic Enrichment in Virgil and Horace*, Oxford 2007.
- Heyne, C. G., *Publius Vergilius Maro varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus. Editio quarta. Curavit G. Ph. Wagner, II*, Lipsiae / Londini 1832, rist. Hildesheim 1968.
- Highbarger, E. L., *The Gates of Dreams: An Archaeological Examination of Virgil, Aeneid VI, 893–899*, Baltimore 1940.
- Hirst, M. E., *The Gates of Virgil's Underworld: A Reminiscence of Lucretius*, CR 26, 1912, 82–83.
- Holowchak, M., *Lucretius on the Gates of Horn and Ivory: A Psychophysical Challenge to Prophecy by Dreams*, JHPH 42, 2004, 355–369.
- Holt, P., *Who Understands Vergil's Prophecies?*, CJ 77, 1982, 303–314.
- Horsfall, N., *Aeneid*, in: N. Horsfall (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, Leiden / New York / Köln 1995, 102–216.
- Horsfall, N., *Virgil, Aeneid 6. A Commentary*. 2 vols., Berlin / Boston 2013.
- Kenney, E. J., *The Metamorphoses: a Poet's Poem*, in: P. Knox (ed.), *A Companion to Ovid*, Blackwell 2009, 140–153.
- Kent, R. G. (transl.), *Varro, On the Latin language with an English Translation*, Vol. 1, London / Cambridge (Mass.) 1938.
- Kilpatrick, R. S., *The Stuff of Doors and Dreams*, Vergilius 41, 1995, 63–70.
- Kraggerud, E., *Vergiliana (II). What is Wrong with the Somni Portae?*, SO 77, 2002, 128–144.
- Maleuvre, J.-Y., *Porte d'ivoire et rameau d'or: éléments de cacozélie dans le sixième livre de l'Énéide*, REA 98, 1996, 91–107.
- Martínez Astorino, P., *Representaciones de la historia republicana y reciente: Marcelo en Virgilio y Propercio*, Maia 66, 2014, 333–351.
- Martínez Astorino, P., *La apoteosis en las Metamorfosis de Ovidio: diseño estructural, mitologización y "lectura" en la representación de apoteosis y sus contextos*, Bahía Blanca 2017. (= Martínez Astorini 2017a)
- Martínez Astorino, P., *El poeta y la representación de la historia en Aen. 1, 223–296 y Met. 15, 761–842*, AC 86, 2017, 129–147. (= Martínez Astorini 2017b)
- Michels, A. K., *Lucretius and the Sixth Book of the Aeneid*, AJPh 65, 1944, 135–148.
- Michels, A. K., *The insomnium of Aeneas*, CQ 31, 1981, 140–146.
- Molyviati-Toptsis, U., *Sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes (Aeneid 6.896)*, AJPh 116, 1995, 639–652.
- Mynors, R. A. B., *P. Vergili Maronis opera*, Oxford 1969.
- Newman, J. K., *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*, Bruxelles 1967.
- Norden, E., *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, Darmstadt 1976.
- O'Hara, J., *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton 1990.
- O'Hara, J., *An Unconvincing Etymological Argument about Aeneas and the Gates of Sleep*, Phoenix 50, 1996, 331–334.
- Öberg, J., *Some Interpretative Notes on Virgil's Aeneid, Book VI*, Eranos 85, 1987, 105–109.
- Otis, B., *Three Problems of Aeneid 6*, TAPhA 90, 1959, 165–179.
- Otis, B., *Virgil. A Study in Civilized Poetry*, Oxford 1964.

- Pandey, N. B., Reading Rome From The Farther Shore: *Aeneid* 6 in the Augustan Urban Landscape, *Vergilius* 60, 2014, 85–116.
- Paratore, E., *Virgilio*, Firenze³1961.
- Paratore, E. / L. Canali, *Eneide*, Volume III (Libri V–VI), Firenze⁵1995.
- Pirrenne-Delforge, V., Under Which Conditions Did the Greeks ‘Believe’ in Their Myths? The Religious Criteria of Adherence, in: C. Walde / U. Dill (eds.), *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, Berlin 2009.
- Plessis, F. / P. Lejay, *Œuvres de Virgile*, Paris 1963.
- Pollmann, K., Etymologie, Allegorese und epische Struktur. Zu den Toren der Träume bei Homer und Vergil, *Philologus* 137, 1993, 232–251.
- Reed, N., The Gates of Sleep in *Aeneid* 6, *CQ* 23, 1973, 311–315.
- Rolland, L. F., Pourquoi Énée sort-il des Enfers par la Porte d’Ivoire, la Porte des Songes Faux (Énéide, VI, 898)?, *Comptes-rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 101e année, n. 2, Paris 1957, 185–188.
- Rolland, L. F., La porte d’ivoire (Virgile, Énéide, VI, 898), *REL* 35, 1957, 204–223. (= Rolland 1957b)
- Rosati, G., The Latin Reception of Hesiod, in: F. Montanari / A. Rengakos / C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden 2009, 343–374.
- Quint, D., *Virgil’s Double Cross. Design and Meaning in the Aeneid*, Princeton / Oxford 2018.
- Setaioli, A., Le Porte del Sonno nel VI libro dell’ Eneide, *Aeuum(ant)* 10, 2010, 13–38.
- Solmsen, F., The World of the Dead in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*, *CPh* 67, 1972, 31–41.
- Stahl, W. H., *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio by Macrobius*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes, New York 1990.
- Steiner, G., *Real Presences. Is There Anything in What We Say?*, London 1989.
- Steiner, H.-R., *Der Traum in der Aeneis*, Bern / Stuttgart 1952.
- Stinton, T. C. W., ‘Si credere dignum est’: Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others, *PCPhS* 22, 1976, 60–89.
- Tarrant, R. J., Aeneas and the Gates of Sleep, *CPh* 77, 1982, 51–55.
- Thilo, G. / H. Hagen, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*, Hildesheim 1902.
- Verstraete, B. C., The Implication of the Epicurean and Lucretian Theory of Dreams for Falsa Insomnia in *Aeneid* 6.896, *CW* 74, 1980, 7–10.
- West, D. A., The Bough and the Gate, in: S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil’s Aeneid*, Oxford 1990, 224–238.
- West, M. L., *Hesiod. Theogony*. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary, Oxford 1966.
- Williams, G., *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*, New Haven / London 1983.
- Willis, J., *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1994.
- Wiseman, T. P., History, Poetry, and Annals, in: D. S. Levene / D. P. Nelis (eds.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, Leiden 2002, 332–362.
- Wlosok, A., Et poeticae figmentum et philosophiae veritatem. Bemerkungen zum 6. Aeneisbuch, in: E. Heck / E. A. Schmidt (eds.), *A. Wlosok. Res humanae. Res divinae*. Kleine Schriften, Heidelberg 1990, 384–391.
- Zanker, P., *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor 1988.