



PROJECT MUSE®

Response

Andrew M. Riggsby

Arethusa, Volume 40, Number 1, Winter 2007, pp. 93-99 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: [10.1353/are.2007.0006](https://doi.org/10.1353/are.2007.0006)



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/are/summary/v040/40.1riggsby.html>

RESPONSE

ANDREW M. RIGGSBY

GENERAL

The modest ambit of this panel was “space, time, and memory.” To try to get a little bit of a handle on this topic, I will restrict my remarks to space.¹ For the most part, in fact, I want to treat a single spatial motif that strikes me as implicitly or explicitly important to all of the papers: the container. Now what I’m speaking of here is not a specific space, but a spatializing scheme. George Lakoff (1987), in particular, argues that there are a number of such schemata (also, e.g., source-path-goal, part-whole) which are used to structure understanding of a variety of domains, spatial and otherwise. While the schemata appear to be human universals, their specific applications are essentially metaphorical and thus subject to considerable cultural and individual variation. So, for instance, the cases I will discuss below all employ the container notion to set up an “us versus them” distinction, but the same scheme could also be used as part of a folk “physics” of anger: anger is heat acting on fluid inside a person (= the container) as they grow angry, applying pressure, and, perhaps, eventually bursting out.² Hence: “She got all steamed,” “He was bursting with anger,” “She blew up at me,” “He just erupted.”³

One piece of evidence for this kind of systematic use of basic metaphors, and also one of the most important consequences of their existence, is the fact that different metaphors generate different sets of entailments.

1 I’ve stayed fairly close to the form and content of my original remarks.

2 See, especially, Lakoff 1987.271–73.

3 A vast collection of further examples with analysis is to be found at Lakoff 1987.382–89.

So, for instance, figuring “us versus them” in terms of battlelines is inherently conflictual; using a container schema is not, though, of course, it can be made so. (The metaphorical scheme may also be elaborated further, generating additional entailments. Thus there is a difference between a “mere” container and one that is imagined to be locked.) Therefore, the choice of scheme will be significant for anthropological and/or rhetorical analysis. In the comments that follow, I will move roughly from the “smallest” container discussed in the papers to the largest.

AUGUSTAN MARRIAGE LAWS

Milnor, Ramsby and Severy-Hoven, and others (including myself in other contexts) have described these laws as an “intrusion” or “incur-sion” on some private or domestic realm. If this is a correct interpretation, then one might expect metaphorical expressions of the home-as-castle or privacy-of-the-bedroom type—or at least some obviously parallel Roman version. Sure enough, Milnor is able to point to this in *omnis domus . . . subverteretur* (Tac. *Ann.* 3.36; see Milnor p. 12). Each house is being threatened individually. In this light, it is interesting how differently Livy figures a closely parallel situation, when plebeians are forbidden intermarriage with patricians. In Canuleius’s speech, plebeians are not being dragged from their homes, but excluded from the common spaces of the city, the streets and Forum. Houses appear only relationally, as destinations in the exchange of women. “Ut in quam cuique feminae convenisset domum nuberet, ex qua pactus esset vir domo, in matrimonium duceret” (4.4.10; see Milnor pp. 17–18). Thus Livy’s version of marriage is inherently public in some respects, that is, it is always already politicized. In terms of specific policies, Livy is not clearly taking a position on Augustus’s legislation. At the time he is writing, he was likely not even aware of any specific proposals. But Livy does cut off at the knees one of the major lines of anti-Augustan attack. If marriage is ancestrally a public matter, then Augustus’s legislation is not (distinctively) intrusive.

The appearance in Livy of walls (*intra eadem moenia*, 4.3.1; see Milnor p. 17) as the container that separates us (citizens) from them (non-citizens) seems almost inevitable in retrospect. Ramsay MacMullen (2001.44) points out the symbolic and juridical importance of town walls to city-formation across the empire. In the illustrations in surveyor’s manuals, cities are often represented by nothing but their walls. Thomas Habinek (1998.73–74, 85) shows how transgressive was the image of bandits

lurking within the walls of Rome, as Cicero suggests in the *Catilinarians*. This is all just to say that membership in an urban community is strongly figured in terms of who is inside the walls and who is outside. The explicit argument in Livy for the *lex Canuleia* is very similar to one offered for the repeal of the *lex Oppia*. If Latin women are entitled to wear gold and other ornaments, then surely Roman matrons, citizens of the most powerful state, should be allowed the same (34.7.5–6). A geopolitical distinction (citizen vs. non-citizen) is offered as more salient than caste (patrician vs. plebeian) or gender (male vs. female). The difference here is that the power of the wall metaphor in the *lex Canuleia* discussion makes the former, geopolitical perspective almost obligatory on the Roman audience and makes that side of the argument all the more persuasive.

RELIGION

While culturally still powerful, this local (i.e., urban) application of the container scheme was by Livy's time also quite nostalgic. It had collided with other sets of facts (or rather descriptions of those facts) on the ground. Who, after years of slow Roman colonization then the mass enfranchisements following the Social War, was a Roman? Juridically, this was not generally a problem,⁴ but the new situation created cultural pressure. It was too hard in the late republic or early empire to equate "Romans" with "the people of the city of Rome." Orlin proposes one Augustan device to unite the potentially disparate "Roman people." Many aspects of Roman religion were, as it were, "rebooted" so that newly Romanized Italians could catch up and become members of, at least, the religious community on relatively equal terms. Such a project would parallel, on a grander scale, the propagation of "least common denominator" Roman values Kate Toll (1997) sees in the *Aeneid* or the attempt to produce a portable version of Latin suggested by Patrick Sinclair (1994) for Caesar's *de Analogia*. In all these cases, Italy (at least) is being made the new container for Romanness. In general outline, this is a compelling description of what Augustus is up to, but it conceals an interesting pair of asymmetries in the finer detail. On the one hand, Rome itself is not simply being simplified; it is being rewritten. It will actually have to change to meet the needs of Italy, even if it is not a

4 This is not to say that there were no problems. Cicero, for instance, has to deal with some of the fallout in *pro Balbo*. See, in general, Sherwin-White 1973.150–73.

question of going fully half way to do so. On the other hand, what is being projected out into Italy is still, in a sense, parochially Roman. The cults and observances being tweaked for Italian consumption are still Roman in the most concrete, geographical sense, and the primary “Italian” audience is apparently encountering this version of Roman religion in Rome.

CIVIL WAR

While the Roman/Italian problem, “left over” from the late republic, may have been the deepest one Augustus and his contemporaries faced in articulating a common Roman identity, it was certainly not the only one. There was also the more immediate problem that there had been two “Roman” sides in the recent civil war. This was a situation much like that in *Aeneid* 12.502: “inque vicem nunc Turnus agit, nunc Troius heros,” “And by turns now Turner, now the Trojan hero attacks,” two parallel but opposed forces in a literal version of the battleline metaphor alluded to above. During the course of that war, it made sense to solve that problem by de-Romanizing the opposition.⁵ Thus conflict was at least naturalized, at the cost of inclusiveness. Afterwards, that approach made less sense, especially in so far as it was useful to recuperate Antony’s old troops and other sympathizers. Yet, as Matthew Roller (1996.322–27) points out, the desired “communitarian” view of the war produced almost insuperable contradictions within the system of traditional Roman ethics. The panelists suggest that Augustus offered multiple models to overcome or avoid the problem.

Many have pointed out that the eventual use of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus pointed to an exterior rather than an interior enemy; compared to Parthians, any Roman could be comfortably “inside.” Moreover, the structure of the complex may be of some relevance here. Augustus’s Forum, like the other imperial Fora, but unlike the original, has a well articulated interior and boundary. At the center was a statue of the emperor in a Roman triumphal pose. This was surrounded by statues of the great men of Rome, establishing a heritage that all could share as well. One might read these as surrounded in turn by the Athenian caryatids and Egyptianizing heads of Zeus Ammon in the attic of the portico on either side of the temple. (The interpretation of this structure is somewhat

⁵ Roller 1996.327–32 describes this as the “alienating” viewpoint.

ambiguous. The *summi viri* are slightly behind the “foreign” images [measuring laterally from the center of the Forum], but are also beneath them. The vertical distance is much clearer than the horizontal, and I think it is not fanciful [though admittedly not necessary] to see the upper level as enclosing the lower. The Roman center is demarcated by the aliens outside, here not threatening, merely serving as a convenient other.⁶)

At any rate, Lesk’s interpretation of the genealogies of the Forum “caryatids” adds another layer of complication to the reading. To the extent that the maidens are virtual *spolia* from the Erechtheion, it is less likely they are to be taken as representations of the “outside”; rather, they are bits of the exterior world brought to Rome to be appropriated and consumed there (see below on Ovid). To the extent that they have already become Vitruvian caryatids, then, the interpretation above holds good.

The second approach (Milnor) offers a rather more complex figure, realized in the strengthening and elaboration of laws on theatrical seating. As she points out, these seating arrangements form a map of Roman society as a whole.⁷ This approach also uses “legitimate” internal divisions to fend off threats to the stability of the whole. The container of the whole itself holds a number of sub-containers: senators, knights, et al. Pierre Bourdieu points out (1991.118) that sometimes the key function of “rites of passage” is less to distinguish those who have gone through them from those who have not, than to distinguish those who will be allowed to go through them from those who are not.⁸ I suggest something of the same here. Aliens are either missing or in the special section for envoys (whose exclusion from the orchestra illustrates that the foreigners are not even to be processed by the normal Roman rules). Such rules take originally juridical categories (citizenship, knighthood, etc.) and make them “real” both operationally (one is one’s self seated according the rules) and visually (one sees others so arranged as well). Instead of a relatively hostile confrontation with the “outside” (as I will point to in the next section), the “inside” is defined primarily by its articulated structure.

6 Galinsky 1996.203 argues that, in a more subtle respect (the use of stones of various origins), the inside-outside relationship is reversed.

7 Gunderson 1996 treats the ideal quality of this mapping.

8 I would like to thank Michael DeBrauw for this reference.

THE EMPIRE

Leaving behind the problem of Romanness in its narrow sense, we may note that the Romanness of the empire as a whole is also figured in terms of a container schema. Peter Rose (1995) points to a simple stereotype at the heart of Roman imperialism in Cicero's speeches. The inside is safe, peaceful, and ordered. The outside is not. This scheme helps justify empire, since it is clearly better to be inside than out. Moreover, it helps justify further conquest as "defensive," since it is easy to slip from the idea that "all danger is outside" to the idea "all outside is dangerous." A similar scheme with similar entailments is appealed to in parts of Caesar's *Gallic War* as well.

But Ramsby and Severy-Hoven's paper raises the question of the relationship between all the previous models. For much of the republican period, this seems to have been simple. The container of "Rome" (whether strictly urban or not) was clearly within that of "the empire." But the very end of the republic and the early empire brought problems with that scheme. Renato Oniga (1995) argues that the interpenetration of city and empire is one of the major themes of both of Sallust's monographs. The expansion of citizen colonies "overseas" and the rise of dual citizenship add to the confusion juridically, as does the transition to forms of exile that are, in a sense, internal (Sherwin-White 1973.291–313). In general, the question seems to be how Imperial Rome affected imperial Rome.

Now, certainly, many of the phenomena Ramsby and Severy-Hoven note are quite at home in the old imperialism. Women are treated as loot, perhaps even the prototypical symbol of conquest (cf. Holliday 1997). Moreover, they are not just seized, but brought to the metropolis for exploitation. The women of *Ars* 1.55–56, for instance, don't just happen to be the profits of imperialism; Ovid explicitly sets them in the context of bringing back booty in the two preceding lines. There are, however, traces of a new world. The Saint-Bertrand woman, for instance, is crucially different from similar images back in Rome. As Ramsby and Severy-Hoven point out, she is both a threat and a promise. But given the location of the statue, the promise must be of protection "out there" in the province. Rome is in some sense reaching out to incorporate the new lands, rather than bringing them back to the city. (The projection of the Erechtheion maidens into Spanish Mérida via the Forum of Augustus must have had a similarly transformative effect, as Lesk seems to suggest.) We might also reread the alien children on the Ara Pacis in this light. Since they are in Rome, they could just be

more pieces of loot. On the other hand, their physical integration into the imperial family (and even more, the eastern boy's continuing connection to his mother, if that is who they are) suggests a more privileged position. Moreover, if they are correctly read as hostages, then they will eventually return to their native lands, their position enhanced there by connection with the empire.

More generally, if alien women and children are figuratively wards, then the entire empire becomes one large *domus*, with Augustus (or later emperors) at its head. Recent research has much to say about the use of very similar figuration in "domestic" politics.⁹ House = Rome = empire, at least potentially. Further close reading is required to see just how far these parallels really become identities, but it is hard to believe that we're dealing here with mere accident. If such a collapse really does take place, then it would be interesting to know why the emperors take such a novel view of the empire.

University of Texas

9 See, recently, Severy 2000.