

Chapter 2

The Battle in the Forum

Sanguinis autem coniunctio et benevolentia deuincit homines <et>
caritate. Magnum est enim eadem habere monumenta maiorum,
eisdem uti sacris, sepulchra habere communia.

[The blood tie binds men together through goodwill and affection.
For it is a great thing to share the same reminders of ancestors, to
employ the same rites, and to have ancestral tombs in common.]

—Cicero *De officiis* 1.55

As one of Rome's great foundation myths, the story of the Sabine women has been told by many authors, with variations in detail.¹ According to Livy's version, after neighboring peoples refused to grant the Romans rights of intermarriage, Romulus and his fellow Romans invited them to Rome for a festival in honor of Neptune.² The guests came with their families, including their nubile daughters. When their visitors' attention had been diverted by the horse races, the Romans seized and carried off the young women. The women's families departed in anger; their fathers returned in arms. The Sabines, the last of the wronged peoples to attack, captured the citadel on the Capitoline and held their own in battle against the Romans, until their daughters, now Roman wives and mothers, intervened to prevent their husbands and their fathers from killing one another. The Romans and the Sabines made peace, and the two peoples became one.

It has been suggested that this story associates Roman imperialism with rape and that here, as in accounts of other exemplary women, Livy makes women's bodies into disputed space, the setting for a crisis in

1. Authors who relate the story include Livy (1.9–1.13.8), Cicero (*Rep.* 2.12–14), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.30–47), Ovid (*Ars Am.* 1.101–34; *Fasti* 3.167–258), and Plutarch (*Rom.* 14–19).

2. The connection between this festival, the Consualia, and the theft of the women is unclear, as is that between the Consualia and Neptune. See Ogilvie, 66–67.

Roman history.³ Recent work on this legend has tended to focus on the role of the women and on the story's implications for Roman marriage.⁴ Yet the women's bodies are not the only kind of space disputed in this section of the *Ab Urbe Condita*: the landscape, including citadel and Forum, is another, and the metaphorical space of the narrative is yet a third. No one of these can be understood without considering how it relates to the others. Accordingly, this chapter places less emphasis on the women so that it can give due attention to the other contested spaces and thus show how the text, by manipulating traditional ideas about historical causation, including the abduction of women, weaves a close and reciprocal network of relationships between landscape, monuments, and historical narrative.

Several features of the episode make it a useful starting point for an inquiry into these relationships. First, it presents a common aetiology for two landmarks that stood some distance apart: the Temple of Jupiter Stator (Stayer of Flight) and the Lacus Curtius (Curtius' Lake). The site of the Temple of Jupiter was somewhere at the base of the Palatine, near the Porta Mugonia, the Old Gate of Livy's narrative, while the Lacus Curtius was part of a swamp at a low spot in the Forum near the location of the Column of Phocas.⁵ Second, although each of these monuments has more

3. Especially those of Lucretia and Verginia. See S.R. Joshel, "The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia," in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, ed. A. Richlin (Oxford, 1992), 112–30.

4. See, e.g., J. Hemker, "Rape and the Founding of Rome," *Helios*, n.s., 12 (1985): 41–47. Miles (*Reconstructing Early Rome*, 179–219) adopts an anthropological approach and analyzes this story as an account of an enemy's co-option into the community via bride theft.

5. The ancient sources agree that the Temple of Jupiter Stator was on the Palatine, at the lowest part of the slope, just outside the Romulean settlement (Livy 1.12.1–8; Dion. Hal. 2.43.1–5, 50.3; Ovid *Fasti* 6.793–94 and *Trist.* 3.1.31–32; Plut. *Cic.* 16.3; Pseudo-Cic. *Or. priusq. in ex. iret* 24). F. Coarelli (*Il Foro Romano*, 2 vols. [Rome, 1983, 1985], 1:26–33) places it along the Via Sacra, on the site of the so-called Temple of Romulus, but convincing arguments for the traditional location are made by A. Ziolkowski (*The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context* [Rome, 1992], 87–91) and Vasaly (*Representations*, 41 n. 3). On the temple, see S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Rome* (Oxford, 1929), 303–4; E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 2 vols. (London, 1968), 1:534; L. Richardson Jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, 1992), 304. On the Lacus Curtius, see J. Poucet, *Recherches sur la légende sabine des origines de Rome* (Kinshasa, 1967), 241–63; idem, "Le premier livre de Tite-Live et l'histoire," *LEC* 43 (1975), 342–434; and, in the books already cited in this note, Platner and Ashby, 310–11; Nash, 1:542–44; Coarelli, 1:116–19; Richardson, 229. According to Ogilvie (75), it was the *mundus*. For a survey of relatively recent work in the Forum area, see N. Purcell, "Rediscovering the Roman Forum," *JRA* 2 (1989): 156–66.

than one aetiology, the story of the battle with the Sabines is the only one that links the two.⁶ And of the many aetiologies in the early chapters of Book 1, these are the first for items called *monumenta*. The word draws attention to their mnemonic function and links them together in the written text, just as the action in the story links them topographically. This raises a question: to what degree is this episode significant for its uniting of the two monuments?

When Livy's contemporaries looked around the Roman Forum, they saw a landscape quite different from the setting for this episode. There was in Livy's time a temple of Jupiter Stator that, of course, did not exist when the battle took place.—Livy says later that, although Romulus vowed the *templum*, the temple was not built immediately: the land alone was set aside after Romulus' prayer; the building was not constructed until after the consul M. Atilius Regulus made a similar vow in a battle with the Samnites.⁷ A person looking for the Lacus Curtius in Livy's time would not see even the vestiges of a swamp: the Forum had been drained by the end of the sixth century, and the creek that ran through it went underground by the Cloaca Maxima.⁸ Although the sight of a flooded Forum was not unknown in Augustan times, the place contained nothing that could be called a *palus* or *lacus*, except by courtesy.⁹ The Lacus Curtius was a small polygonal area surrounded by a balustrade; it had been paved over in Sulla's time.¹⁰ In the crowded and developed Forum of the late first century B.C., it would be difficult to imagine an unimpeded dash from hill to hill, except perhaps along the narrow and regularized route of the Via Sacra. Otherwise the Temple of Castor, the Regia, the House of the Vestals, the Julian Basilica, and the Temple of Julius Caesar all

6. We have seen that the Temple of Jupiter Stator has two aetiologies. The Lacus Curtius had three, two of which Livy relates: (1) the conflict with the Sabines (Livy 1.12–13, as well as Varro *LL* 5.148–50, Dion. Hal. 2.42.5–6, and Plut. *Rom.* 18.3–5); (2) the opening of a chasm in 362 B.C., in response to which portent, M. Curtius, armed and mounted, rode his horse into the pit (Livy favors this as the correct aetiology at 7.6.1–6); (3) a lightning strike in the place in 445 B.C., after which it was fenced off and marked with a stone enclosure by the consul C. Curtius (Varro *LL* 5.150). Whatever its origin, this monument was very old and had associations with the underworld. See Ogilvie, 75; J. Bayet, ed., *Tite Live, Histoire romaine*, vol. 1, Budé series (Paris, 1985), 23 n. 1.

7. 10.36.11, 37.15–16.

8. Ovid *Fasti* 6.403–4.

9. J. Le Gall lists the known instances of flooding in *Le Tibre, fleuve de Rome dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1953), 29–35. Note also that in Plutarch's version of the battle the swamp is the product of a Tiber flood.

10. See Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary*, 229; Poucet, *Recherches*, 241.

stood in the way. Instead of picturing the contemporary Forum as the setting for these events, or even starting with an image of the Forum and stripping it bare of buildings, it would be more natural to conjure up a vision of an empty landscape and then add the buildings and landmarks as they appear in the narrative. Livy describes the battle taking place in a setting that no longer exists, one that he himself has of course never seen, as he is writing seven hundred years after a legendary event.¹¹ Thus whether or not the reader knows the precise topographical details of the Roman Forum is not as important as that he or she knows that it is a low-lying area between two hills and that there is a historical temple to Jupiter Stator and a Lacus Curtius. The reader who knows this much can follow Livy's general argument aptly.

In fact, this episode's moral message lies less in the specific records it preserves than in the vantage point it creates for the reader. The narrative constructs an audience that watches this battle from the sidelines. The reader adopts this audience's perspective so that he or she becomes aware of both the spatial structure of the narrative and the shape of its setting. As the reader does so, he or she gains insight into a critical moment in Roman history, when foreign war becomes civil war, as well as into the important dichotomies in Roman society: Romans versus foreigners; men

11. On the Latin authors' sacrifice of specificity to typology, see N. Horsfall, "Illusion and Reality." Topographical selection and abstraction may have its origin in the rhetorical handbooks (Horsfall, 201). Menander Rhetor (350.26–29) provides a late but illustrative example. When listing ways to praise a city, he points out: "In the most general terms—for it is impossible to cover all the individual patterns—every city lies either entirely on a mountain or a hill, or entirely on the plain <or partly on a mountain and partly> in the plain" (D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson, eds., *Menander Rhetor* [Oxford, 1981], 41). It is normal, then, to describe a city in terms of hills and plains, and the rhetor praising a city can expect to praise either of these qualities, or both, as Camillus does at 5.54.3: . . . *quotienscumque patria in mentem ueniret, haec omnia occurrebant, colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum sub quo natus educatusque essem*. Such abstraction is also consistent with the suggestion made by writers on the *ars memoriae* that the orator memorize a relatively deserted landscape (*Ad Herennium* 3.31) or imagine loci if suitable real ones are not available: *Cogitatio enim quamuis regionem potest amplecti, et in ea situm loci cuiusdam ad suum arbitrium fabricari et architectari* (*Ad Herennium* 3.32). See Vasaly, *Representations*, 100–102. For another instance of typology influencing the representation of a place, see M. Jaeger, "Reconstructing Rome: The Campus Martius and Horace, *Ode* 1.8," *Arethusa* 28, nos. 2–3 (1995): 177–91.

While a discussion of Roman drama is not within the scope of this work, note that the clean lines of this setting would make a nice backdrop for a play like Ennius' *Sabinae*. T.P. Wiseman (*Remus: A Roman Myth* [Cambridge, 1995], 129–50, esp. 140) has suggested that the Romulus myths took shape in the politically tendentious performances of the *ludi scaenici* in the late fourth and early third centuries. If so, the nature of the space on a stage might have had some influence on the structure of the story.

versus women; and, most important of all, those who see things from a historical perspective versus those who comprehend only the present.¹²

To understand how the narrative constructs landscape, audience, and point of view alike, we must monitor the way it maps space in all dimensions and track movement within it. First, Livy's account of the fighting displays to a heightened degree the symmetry inherent in the ebb and flow of the typical battle narrative.¹³ This symmetry receives reinforcement from the setting in which the fighting takes place, the area between the Capitoline and Palatine that eventually becomes the Roman Forum. (I shall call it the Forum for the sake of convenience.) A close relationship between setting and event was part of the tradition Livy inherited, for the fragment of Calpurnius Piso's account preserved in Varro displays a bilateral symmetry of both action and setting.¹⁴

Piso in Annalibus scribit Sabino bello, quod fuit Romulo et Tatius, uirum fortissimum Mettium Curtium Sabinum, cum Romulus cum suis ex superiore parte impressionem fecisset, in locum palustrem, qui tum fuit in Foro antequam cloacae sunt factae, secessisse atque ad suos in Capitolium recepisse; ab eo lacum [curtium] inuenisse nomen. (Varro *De lingua latina* 5.149)

[Piso writes in his *Annales* that in the Sabine war between Romulus and Tatius, Mettius Curtius, a most heroic Sabine, after Romulus and his men had charged from a higher position and had made an onslaught against the Sabines, retired to what was a swampy area in the Forum then, before the sewers were made; after that he withdrew to his own men on the Capitoline. From him the pool acquired its name.]

12. On the male/female dichotomy, see, e.g., Hemker, "Rape and the Founding of Rome"; Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome*, 179–219.

13. On this battle, see esp. Poucet, *Recherches*, 187–213; Ogilvie, 75–79. The story's spatial symmetry is more pronounced in some versions than in others: it is evident but not as obvious in Dion. Hal. 2.41–46, because of the episodic nature and greater topographical complexity of Dionysius' version. It is even less apparent in Plutarch's account (*Rom.* 18.2–19.2), which begins with the Sabines on the citadel, then tells of Curtius and the swamp. Plutarch next relates Hostilius' fall, the Roman retreat toward the Palatine (πρὸς τὸ Παλάτιον), and, finally, Romulus' vow. According to Plutarch, the two sides met shield-to-shield near the site of the Regia and the Temple of Vesta.

14. On the relationship between Piso's version and Livy's, see Poucet, *Recherches*, 197–98.

According to Piso, Romulus charges the Sabines from higher ground (*ex superiore parte*), and Mettius retreats through the swamp and uphill to his men on the Capitoline. The story's symmetry comes from its movement to and fro in a simple setting comprised of the higher ground under Roman control, the low swampy ground of the future Forum, and the Capitoline, a topography easily schematized as hill-Forum-hill.¹⁵

Livy extends the symmetry already apparent in Piso's simple schema to include the situation, a conflict between two groups of men over one set of women, which we can schematize simply as men-women-men. He extends it further to include even the monuments that commemorate the fight. His account represents the Forum valley as a minimalist landscape defined by a few famous landmarks.¹⁶ When the conflict begins, the Roman army gathers in a place described as a level area bordered by two hills: *quod inter Palatinum Capitolinumque collem campi est* (1.12.1). Then the battle turns within narrower parameters marked off by two *monumenta*, the Temple of Jupiter Stator (1.12.3–4) and the Lacus Curtius (1.12.10). After this, husbands and fathers first resume fighting and then make peace in a place that Livy does not identify specifically, but which he describes precisely in abstract terms as the middle of the hollow between the two hills (*in media conualle duorum montium*, 1.12.10). The attacks and counterattacks, represented vividly as movement through this landscape, enhance the symmetry in the topography, while the topography in turn enhances the symmetry inherent in the battle and in the very conflict between the Romans and the Sabines. The result is an impression of complete reciprocity, as if these events were made for such a landscape and this landscape for such events.

The passage preceding the battle places the first restrictions on the audience's knowledge of events and, at the same time, determines the time and place from which the reader views them. The Sabines captured

15. Since Varro quotes Piso to explain the origin of the Lacus Curtius, he preserves the description of only this phase of the battle. We do not know if or how Piso described the initial Roman attack and the Sabine thrust that pushed the Romans back to the Palatine. Nor, for that matter, do we know how he related the women's intervention. Still, this brief fragment conveys the story's symmetry. See also Dion. Hal. 2.41.2 and 2.42.1.

16. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in contrast, sketches the topography with less economy (2.37.5–38.1). At the beginning of his account, he locates the Roman and Sabine camps by their positions on the hills they occupy: those of Romulus and Lucumo are on the Esquiline and Quirinal, that of Tatius on the plain between the Quirinal and the Capitoline. Later, he situates the fighting in "the plain between the camps" (τὸ μεταξύ τῶν στρατοπέδων χωρίον). Livy, however, uses the hills to orient the episode.

the citadel during the night before the battle, as coolly and deliberately as the Romans had stolen their women: *nihil enim per iram aut cupiditatem actum est* (1.11.5).¹⁷ A young woman named Tarpeia betrayed the citadel to the Sabines, who killed her for her treachery, although Livy says it is not certain which side was its target. The account of the battle follows immediately after the narrator discusses the variant versions of her death (1.11.9). It is remarkable, given the frequency of aetiologies in the account of Romulus' reign,¹⁸ that the narrator draws no overt connection between the ancient fate of Tarpeia and the famous Tarpeian Rock. Rather, by discussing the variants, he reorients the account of the capture of the citadel so that it looks back into the past rather than forward into the reader's present. Livy's authorial comment about uncertainty in the tradition represents the past as something obscure and unrecoverable, whether one locates the source of obscurity in the secrecy of the night attack, the death of the one Roman witness, or the variants in the tradition.¹⁹ The Sabine possession of the citadel cannot be accounted for completely. The reader, then, is forced to wonder, along with the Romans gazing up at their occupied *arx* in the light of day, How did this happen?

Since the causes of the occupation are obscure, the occupation itself is a historical first principle. The Forum battle continues and concludes the series of episodes that began with the theft of the women, but occurring as it does the day after the inexplicable capture of the citadel, it opens a new epoch *ab arce capta*, "from the capture of the citadel." The series of reciprocal thefts links this narrative to the greater historiographical tradition by reenacting the series of reciprocal thefts that opens Herodotus' account of the Persian Wars (1.1–5). In Herodotus the abductions of Io, Europa, Medea, and Helen, and the consequent movement between East

17. See Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome*, 186–87.

18. Cf. 10.6–7 on the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius and the *spolia opima* (*haec templi est origo quod primum omnium Romae sacratum est. . . bina postea, inter toto annos, tot bella opima parta sunt spolia*); 13.5 on the Lacus Curtius (*Curtium Lacum appellarunt*); and 13.6, which gives the names of thirty curiae and those of three centuries of *equites*. On the fifty temporal references that are linked to topography in the first decade (of which 10.6–7 is one), see Haehling, *Zeitbezüge des T. Livius in der ersten Dekade seines Geschichtswerkes*, 164–65. He attributes their frequency in Book 1 (there are seventeen such references there) and their subsequent falling off to the book's introductory character.

19. The comment reads: *Sunt qui eam ex pacto tradendi quod in sinistris manibus esset directo arma petisse dicant et fraude usam agere sua ipsam peremptam mercede. Tenuere tamen arcem Sabini* (1.11.9–12.1). On the use of the variants as rhetorical gestures, see Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome*, 20–38. According to Miles, the multiple explanations of the Lacus Curtius raise questions about the possibility of knowing with any certainty what happened in the past.

and West, account for hostilities between Greece and the "barbarians" in the murky period before Croesus, whom the historian identifies as a firm starting point for an explanation of the war.²⁰ The Sabines, of course, do not reciprocate for the theft of their women by stealing the women back. They take the Roman citadel instead, and the reciprocal actions that follow involve the capture and recapture of space. Indeed, the Sabines use the seizure of the woman as an excuse to seize territory, while on the Roman side male desire shifts from the women to the landscape.²¹ Even though it recalls the opening passages of Herodotus, this tit-for-tat behavior does not lead to a great war between the two sides, partly because the Sabine women divert the men's anger into an alternate channel, and partly because the confined landscape does not have room to allow any escalation in the violence.

Moreover, the episode's isolation from what has gone before allows the reader to focus on events taking place in a fully schematic and symmetrical landscape free from distractions. And these events begin in a static but unstable condition.

Tenuere tamen arcem Sabini, atque inde postero die, cum Romanus exercitus instructus quod inter Palatinum Capitolinumque collem campi est complisset, non prius descenderunt in aequum quam ira et cupiditate recipiendae arcis stimulante animos in aduersum Romani subiere. Principes utrimque pugnam ciebant ab Sabinis Mettius Curtius, ab Romanis Hostius Hostilius. Hic rem Romanam iniquo loco ad prima signa animo atque audacia sustinebat. Ut Hostius cecidit, confestim Romana inclinatur acies fusaque est ad ueterem portam Palatii.²² (1.12.1–3)

20. Hdt. 1.6. Herodotus' opening remarks display part of what J. Cobet, calls a "rudimentary typology of war," which consists of (1) simple robbery; (2) destruction of a city; (3) defeat, subjection, removal of autonomy, and reduction to tributary status in relation to the conqueror. All of these levels are compressed into the account of the conflict between the Sabines and the Romans, although the second is represented by the capture of the citadel and the killing of Tarpeia. See Cobet, "Herodotus and Thucydides on War," in *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, ed. I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart, and A.J. Woodman (Cambridge, 1986), 5–6.

21. Miles (*Reconstructing Early Rome*, 205–11) discusses Livy's use of desire (*cupiditas*) and points out that a susceptibility to passions characterizes the Romans in this episode. On the force of the passions in Livy, see M. Ducos, "Les passions, les hommes et l'histoire dans l'oeuvre de Tite-Live." *REL* 65 (1987): 132–47.

22. I print here the text of the Oxford Classical Text but with a full stop after *ad ueterem portam Palatii*. (See Ogilvie, 77.) Thus the reader's attention is drawn immediately from the Capitoline right to the Palatine.

[However that may be, the Sabines held the citadel. On the next day, when the Roman army had been drawn up and had filled what level ground there was between the Palatine and the Capitoline, they did not descend from it to the level ground until the Romans, their anger and desire to retake the citadel goading their spirits, approached from below. The heroes on each side were stirring up the battle, Mettius Curtius on the Sabine side, and Hostius Hostilius on the Roman. The latter, at the foremost standards, upheld the Roman side in its unfavorable position by his courage and daring. When Hostius fell, the Roman line quickly gave ground and was routed and fled right up to the Old Gate of the Palatine.]

In the first phase of the fighting, the Sabines and Romans press against each other across an imaginary horizontal axis, with the Sabines above it and the Romans below. The opening and closing clauses of the historical period reflect the symmetry of the arrangement: *tenuere tamen arcem Sabini; . . . in aduersum Romani subiere*. The Sabines, the subject of the dramatic initial verb *tenere*, occupy the higher ground. The passage includes no unusual diction, but the cumulative effect of Livy's words is to underscore the role played by gravity. Translating tendentiously, one could say that Hostilius "supported the Roman side from below" [*sustinebat*], "in an uneven position" [*iniquo loco*]. When he "fell" [*cecidit*], the Roman line quickly "was moved out of the horizontal" [*inclinatur*] and "was poured out" [*fusaque est*]. Even the balanced reference to the two champions (*ab Sabinis Mettius Curtius, ab Romanis Hostius Hostilius*) reflects the static condition produced by the two men applying force, each on his own side. Yet until he fell, Hostilius countered the Sabine pressure by meeting it from below and, therefore, applied more force than Mettius. The verb *sustinere*, which emphasizes his inferior position, recalls, in contrast, the advantage enjoyed by the Sabines, who held (*tenuere*) the citadel from above.

The emphasis on the relative positions of the two armies implies that merely the force of gravity stands behind Sabine success, success that is, consequently, not based on superior valor. The Romans have placed themselves at a disadvantage by ascending the Capitoline; therefore their inferior position helps to account tactfully for their initial retreat. After Hostilius falls, the force of gravity remains in play, and the height of the Capitoline provides the momentum that drives the Romans, and with them Romulus, back to the Old Gate, the Porta Mugonia, on the Pala-

tine. Livy describes the flight across the Forum briefly: "and [the Roman line] fled right up to the Old Gate." The narrative reflects the speed of the Romans' flight by shifting the scene immediately to the other end of the Forum.

Romulus et ipse turba fugientium actus, arma ad caelum tollens, "Iuppiter, tuis," inquit, "iussus auibus hic in Palatio prima urbi fundamenta ieci. Arcem iam scelere emptam Sabini habent; inde huc armati superata media ualle tendunt; at tu, pater deum hominumque, hinc saltem arce hostes; deme terrorem Romanis fugamque foedam siste. Hic ego tibi templum Statori Ioui, quod monumentum sit posteris tua praesenti ope seruatum urbem esse, uoueo." Haec precatus, ueluti si sensisset auditas preces, "Hinc," inquit, "Romani, Iuppiter Optimus Maximus resistere atque iterare pugnam iubet." Restitere Romani tamquam caelesti uoce iussi; ipse ad primores Romulus prouolat. (1.12.4-7)

[Romulus himself, swept along by the mass of fleeing soldiers, raised his weapons to the sky and said: "Jupiter, it was here, on the Palatine, that, at the bidding of your eagles, I set down the first foundations for the city. Now the Sabines hold the citadel, after buying it by treachery. From there armed men have already passed the middle of the valley and are making their way here. But you, father of gods and men, keep the enemy away, at least from this place. Remove fear from the Romans and put a stop to their shameful flight. In this place I promise to build a temple to you, Jupiter Stayer of Flight, as a reminder to posterity that the city was preserved by your immediate and effective aid." Having made this prayer, he said, as if perceiving that it had been heard, "From this point, Romans, Jupiter the Best and Greatest commands us to resist and to renew the fight." The Romans resist, as if ordered by a heavenly voice; Romulus too flies forth toward the soldiers fighting in the front.]

As Livy represents it, the very landscape suggests that the Romans, unlike the Sabines, do not need to make their counterattack from higher ground. First, the Sabine countercharge drives the Romans back to the Old Gate of the Palatine. The reference to the gate offers tangible proof that Romulus can choose between two actions. He can go through the

gate, thus retreating back into the original city and then up the Palatine.²³ But since to do so would be to give ground, Romulus turns directly upward instead. When he raises his weapons to the heavens, prays, vows a temple, and commands his men to make a stand, he makes an appeal that reaches higher than the Palatine or any *arx*, and he does so from a position where valor and divine favor, not gravity, will be decisive. The etymological play of *arcem . . . Sabini habent; inde . . . hinc . . . arce hostes* helps draw the connection between the place Romulus stands and the citadel, while at the same time, the fact that the Romans take their stand at a point lower than the Sabine-occupied *arx* provides evidence of their superior martial valor. In addition, the phrase relating the Romans' response, *resistere Romani*, with its dramatic initial verb, recalls the Sabine position at the opening of the episode: *tenuere tamen arcem Sabini* (1.12.1). After this point, the Romans recover lost ground in more ways than one, for while they resist and retake, they also repeat—redoing and thus undoing—the past. After Romulus' prayer, Livy repeats the verb *restitere*, placing it in the emphatic initial position.²⁴ The sense of repetition is also conveyed by the verb *iterare* (to repeat) and is further emphasized by the repetition of *Romani*. All this repetition implies that the narrative is going to tell substantially the same story as it did before, but in the opposite direction. The Romans must recover, in the sense of "cover again," the ground that the Sabines have taken: *superata media ualle*. When they do so, the Roman narrative of success prevails over that of the Sabines.

First, however, the narrative leaps backward in narrative time, so that it reports what Mettius Curtius did before Romulus prayed.²⁵ This analepsis directs attention back to the other side of the Forum, up to the high ground of the citadel on the Capitoline.

23. On the Porta Mugonia, see Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano*, 1:26–38, esp. 27. He identifies it as "the boundary between the Sacra Via and the Palatine. See also Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary*, 304. Vasaly (*Representations*, 45) points out that if Romulus retreated any further, he would reenter the fortifications of his original settlement.

24. The prefix *re-* itself denotes movement back or in reverse, withdrawal, reversal of a previous process, restoration, response or opposition, separation, or repeated action. (See *OLD*, s.v. "re-.") On *re-* verbs, see D. Daube, "Withdrawal: Five Verbs," *CA* 7 (1974): 93–112. On the spatial connotations of other compound verbs, those prefixed with *trans-*, see J.E. Phillips, "Form and Language in Livy's Triumph Notices," *CP* 69, no. 4 (1974): 271–72.

25. Vasaly (*Representations*, 44–45) points out that Livy tells the story twice.

Mettius Curtius ab Sabinis princeps ab arce decurrerat et effusos egerat Romanos toto quantum foro spatium est. Nec procul iam a porta Palati erat, clamitans: "Vicimus perfidos hospites, imbelles hostes; iam sciunt longe aliud esse uirgines rapere, aliud pugnare cum uiris!" (1.12.8)

[Mettius Curtius, the first man on the Sabine side, had run down from the citadel and had driven the Romans who were scattered throughout the entire area of the present-day Forum. He was now not far from the Palatine gate, crying out, "We have vanquished the treacherous hosts, the unwarlike enemy; now they know that it is one thing to steal maidens and a far different thing to fight with men!"]

The description of Mettius Curtius' attack draws the audience's gaze from the citadel back down into the Forum and across it to the Roman position at base of the Palatine, where like a pendulum the action pauses again and Mettius' speech offers a boastful counterpart to Romulus' prayer. The narrative has related the rush from the Capitoline to the Palatine twice, for the account of Mettius' actions covers the very events related by the words *confestim Romana inclinatur acies fusaque est* (1.12.3); but this rout never appears as a whole. Livy has split the story in half and has told each part separately: only the Roman flight is apparent in the first version, while the second describes not Mettius' pursuit but the state of affairs after it, in a sentence couched in the pluperfect (*decurrerat et . . . egerat*).

Such manipulation of tenses has several functions. First, it represents the Sabine action unemphatically. Expressed in the pluperfect, Mettius' *impetus* ceases to be the main subject of the narrative and becomes the background for the Roman counterattack. This, in turn, produces a curious reversal of roles: after all, the agents of the action should be the main subject of the narrative. Instead, Livy depicts the Roman rout as if it were something that happened without Sabine agency, and he reintroduces the Sabines now so that the Romans have someone to resist. Moreover, by splitting the story, Livy separates the Romans and the Sabines to focus more narrowly on the Romans. Because the narrator has treated the Romans first, the audience hears Romulus' prayer for the future before it hears Mettius' boast about the accomplished (as he thinks) past. While Romulus prays that his city and its history will not cease to exist, that, as

it were, the narrative will not stop here, or that it will not stop being a Roman narrative, Mettius, in contrast asserts that the story is over, the lesson learned: "We have vanquished . . . ; now they know. . . ." Romulus vows the temple in the narrative; Livy's contemporary reader knows that it exists in the present and therefore can interpret Mettius' actions and his boast in the correct way. By recounting Romulus' prayer first, the narrator allows the reader a glimpse into the future before returning to Mettius' unfulfilled past, which is now recognizable as such. The end of the Sabine pursuit turns into yet another given, like the capture of the citadel, but with Mettius at the base of the Palatine and Romulus and his men in the advantageous position. The story is about to begin again.

This part of Livy's account matches the fragment of Piso's version quoted earlier.

In eum haec gloriantem cum globo ferocissimorum iuuenum Romulus impetum facit. Ex equo tum forte Mettius pugnabat: eo pelli facilius fuit. Pulsum Romani persequuntur; et alia Romana acies, audacia regis accensa, fundit Sabinos. Mettius in paludem sese, strepitu sequentium trepidante equo, coniecit; auerteratque ea res etiam Sabinos tanti periculo uiri. Et ille quidem, aduentibus ac uocantibus suis fauore multorum addito animo, euadit; Romani Sabinique in media conualle duorum montium redintegrant proelium; sed res Romana erat superior. (1.12.9–10)

[Against him, as he made these boasts, Romulus charged with a throng of the keenest youths. Mettius happened to be fighting from horseback at the time. For that reason it was all the easier for him to be driven off. When he had been, the Romans [with Romulus] pursued him, while the rest of the Roman line, fired by the king's daring, routed the Sabines. Mettius, his horse panicking at the noise of his pursuers, leapt into the swamp, a matter that distracted the attention of the Sabines because of the danger it posed to such a man. Mettius, on his part, with his own side urging him on and calling him, and encouraged by the help of many, passed through to the other side. The Romans and Sabines renewed the battle in the valley between the two hills, but the Roman side had the upper hand.]

Livy's account reverses the landscape of Piso's to show other forces at work. In fact, Piso's account of the Romans driving Mettius from the

higher ground of the Palatine to a specific position on the Capitoline does not resemble this passage as much as it resembles Livy's account of the Sabines driving the Romans from the higher ground of the Capitoline to a specific position on the Palatine. Piso's Romulus charges from higher ground (*ex superiore parte*), which is where Livy places the Sabines (1.12.1), only on the Capitoline. The place where Romulus stops, however, at the base of the *clivus Palatinus*, is clearly not the "higher position" of Piso's narrative. Piso's Mettius Curtius retreats up the Capitoline (*in Capitolium*), after making his way through the swamp; Livy, in contrast, does not say where Mettius went after he escaped. Livy locates the point from which Romulus attacked quite specifically at the Old Gate of the Palatine, while Piso simply calls it the "higher position." Finally, while one would expect the Romans to retreat high up the Palatine to regroup, Jupiter, rather than a position higher on the hill, supplies the force to match the momentum of the Sabine downhill rush. The Romans are pressing back, movement that mirrors the Sabine action of pressing down.

When Romulus and the Romans make their counterattack, the action moves from the Palatine back toward the center of the Forum. Once again Livy's account shortens the arc of its swing, for after Curtius escapes from the swamp, the narrative does not follow him up the Capitoline, as Piso's version does. Instead it directs the audience's attention back to the center of the valley, where the fighting resumes. The two sides meet, face-to-face (*Romani Sabinique*), in the middle of a landscape that is symmetrical (*in media conualle duorum montium*).²⁶ Yet, as we have seen, within this symmetrical physical landscape, the narrative has been working to invert the original imbalance of power and has been shaping a moral landscape in the process. When the battle begins for the second time, the Sabines, who were fighting to retake their women and exact retribution (according to Mettius' boast), have been defeated, while the Romans, who were fighting to retake their citadel and defend their city (according to Romulus' prayer), now prevail.

To understand how and when this inversion happens, let us review the spatial symmetry displayed by the narrative up to this point. That Livy credits the rise of the *res Romana* to Romulus' bargain with Jupiter is clear: the prayer to Jupiter, in a sense, raises the base of the Palatine to an elevation religiously as high as that of the Capitoline.

26. Plutarch, whose topography is less economical than Livy's, locates the fighting near

Romulus' attack on Mettius Curtius continues to "tilt" the landscape: in elevating one end of the Forum, the base of the Palatine, it "sinks" the other and with it the main prop upholding the Sabine side, so that Mettius Curtius' escape into the lowest point in the Forum, the swamp, both repeats Hostus Hostilius' fall and forms a mirror image of Romulus' raising of his armor. Unlike Piso, who implies that Mettius crossed the swamp and escaped to the Capitoline, and unlike Dionysius (2.42.5–6), who says he swam across it and then escaped to his own camp, Livy says only that Mettius Curtius passed through it; then he immediately directs attention back to the middle of the Forum area. At the end of the episode, Mettius Curtius comes out of the depths of the swamp (*ex profunda . . . palude*, 1.13.5). The reader is left with the impression that, instead of crossing this body of water and returning to his own side, Mettius casts himself down into it, disappears from view, and emerges from its depths.²⁷

The spatial relationships may be summarized as Palatine up versus Capitoline down and Curtius and Hostilius down versus Romulus' arms up; in Livy's version, Curtius is down for the duration of the battle. Thus the physical superiority of the Sabine position on the Capitoline corresponds to the divine impetus behind the counterattack led by Romulus, the fall of Hostus Hostilius corresponds to the flight of Mettius Curtius, and the momentum of the Roman retreat down the Capitoline Hill corresponds to that of Mettius' horse as it flees from the Palatine down into the swamp.²⁸ Mettius disappears from the narrative just as Hostus does after his fall. With the Sabine prop fallen, the fighting settles into the middle of the space that was originally described as separating the two hills (*quod inter Palatinum Capitolinumque collem campi est*, 1.12.1) but now is said to join them (*in media conualle duorum montium*).²⁹ The two

the Regia and the Temple of Vesta. Livy, in contrast, limits himself to the hills, and to the landmarks made significant by the story.

27. The other aetiologies of the place suggest this vertical orientation. See Varro *LL* 149; Livy 7.6; Dion. Hal. 2.42. The late third-century relief that once adorned the balustrade around the Lacus Curtius is possibly the copy of an archaic work and clearly shows the horse plunging downward. On the relief, see E.S. Strong, *Roman Sculpture from Augustus to Constantine* (New York, 1907; reprint, 1969), 324–27.

28. Piso does not say whether Mettius Curtius was mounted or not, while Dionysius implies that he was on foot (2.42.1–5). Plutarch has the horse. Its presence may be a result of conflating this story with the other aetiologies of the *lacus* (e.g., Livy 7.6).

29. This space is, in fact, where Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.42.5) places the Lacus Curtius.

hills and the Forum now form a unified and symmetrical landscape, at the center of which Sabine confronts Roman and Roman Sabine.³⁰

At this point Livy has brought the two sides face-to-face in a symmetrical landscape. The story of defeat has been told once in one direction (from the Capitoline toward the Palatine) and repeated in another (from the Palatine toward the Capitoline). When the fighting starts anew, repetition in one place (*redintegrant proelium*) replaces the previous oscillation. In renewing the battle, both sides act as one: both are the subjects of *redintegrant*. They now reflect each other as two halves of a symmetrical design.³¹ Seeing this symmetry, a viewer could easily conclude that any fighting between these Romans and Sabines in this landscape would be an internal conflict between two halves of a whole.³² By manipulating Rome's topographical features, Livy has created an image that shows two armies at war becoming two warring factions in one city, one that shows the blurring of the boundary between foreign war and civil war.

The symmetry of this image is apparent to a viewer watching from the sidelines, and Livy has maneuvered the audience to this point by manipulating its gaze. The first sentence of the episode (1.12.1), which alternates main clauses that relate Sabine action and temporal clauses that relate Roman action, introduces an oscillation that is sustained throughout. This alternation of clauses first directs attention to the Sabines atop

30. For a useful contrast that highlights the reciprocity between narrative and landscape in this episode, cf. the account of the combat between the Horatii and the Curiatii in 1.25.1–14. See Feldherr's discussion in "Spectacle and Society" (23–36) of the use of the visual and the functions of the various audiences of the episode in making the narrative an account of the separation of two kindred peoples, Roman and Alban. Feldherr (30) points out that "Livy has made the spatial depiction of the fight a metaphor for his motif of discrimination" and that the tombs of the five slain—the two Roman tombs together, the three Alban far apart—reinforce the metaphor (1.25.14). While the placement of the tombs commemorates Horatius' tactics, the narrative does not convey the impression that the landscape changes during the events so that it actually influences them as they happen, the way it does in the story of the Forum battle.

For a discussion of the way a people's myths can shape its landscape, see M. Kahn, "Stone-Faced Ancestors: The Spatial Anchoring of Myth in Wamira, Papua New Guinea." *Ethnology* 29 (1990): 50–66.

31. For a general discussion of doubling in Book 1, see Konstan, "Narrative and Ideology in Livy."

32. Miles (*Reconstructing Early Rome*, 162) points out that Ovid (*Fasti* 3.201–2) portrays this event explicitly as the prototype of civil war. For a discussion of repetition, ideology, and the representation of civil war in the *Aeneid* that is germane to Livy as well, see Quint, *Epic and Empire*, 50–96.

the citadel (*tenuere tamen arcem Sabinae*), then draws it down to the Romans on the plain (*cum Romanus exercitus instructus quod inter Palatinum Capitolinumque collem campi est complisset*), back up to the Sabines (*non prius descenderunt in aequum . . .*), and back down to the Romans again (*prius . . . quam . . . in aduersum Romani subiere*). The range of oscillation in the audience's line of vision decreases as the two sides draw closer together, but it continues to move to and fro even as its focus is transferred from the opposing armies, to the contested space bordered by the hills, and finally to the women, who are contested space of another kind. When the reader encounters the phrase *sed res Romana erat superior*, the audience's line of vision enters the picture at the center of the landscape (*in media conualle*) and meets the image at a ninety-degree angle.³³

This is the direction from which the women enter.

Tum Sabinae mulieres, quarum ex iniuria bellum ortum erat, crinibus passis scissaque ueste, uicto malis muliebri pauore, ausae se inter tela uolantia inferre, ex transuerso impetu facto dirimere infestas acies, diremere iras, hinc patres, hinc uiros orantes ne se sanguine nefando soceri generique respergerent, ne parricidio mac-

33. This is not unlike the effect of Jacques-Louis David's painting *The Rape of the Sabine Women*. David presents the most dramatic as well as the most obviously symmetrical moment of the story, the moment when the women separate their warring husbands and fathers. The eye lights first on the figure of Hersilia, which splits the composition; behind Hersilia, a red-clad woman throws her arms before her face at the real center of the canvas. Her arms mark a horizontal axis dividing the canvas and her upright torso marks a vertical. The Sabine women—striding, tumbling, and falling—divide Romulus and the Sabine king, the statuesque male combatants who occupy prominent positions in the foreground. The way in which the painting directs the viewer's gaze draws attention to another symmetrical arrangement. Romulus' shield, its convex side turned outward, demarcates the surface that the viewer's gaze cannot penetrate, while Hersilia's right arm, reaching toward the concave surface of Tatius' shield, leads the viewer's gaze into the picture. Hersilia's left palm seems to push Romulus' shield out toward the viewer, while her right pushes the shield of Tatius further into the picture. The effect is to draw the viewer into the scene and to ward him or her off at the same time. Hersilia, then, is the vertical axis around which the composition revolves in three-dimensional space, while the torso of the woman in red is its axis on the two-dimensional plane. Hersilia divides the warring kings, Romulus and Tatius; yet the group of women around her—the woman in red, the old woman baring her breast, and the woman kneeling before the infants in the foreground—comes between Roman husband and Sabine wife. Thus the composition conveys the message that this is a story of strife and intervention, but it is not clear who is set against whom. On the social and political implications of the composition, see E. Lajer-Burcharth, "David's Sabine Women: Body, Gender, and Republican Culture under the Directory," *Art History* 14, no. 3 (1991): 397–430.

ularent partus suos, nepotum illi, hi liberum progenium "si adfinitatis inter uos, si conubii piget, in nos uertite iras: nos causa belli, nos uolnerum ac caedium uiris ac parentibus sumus; melius peribimus quam sine alteris uestrum uiduae aut orbae uiuemus." (1.13.1–3)

[Then the Sabine women, from whose wrong the war had arisen, with their hair in disarray and their clothing torn, their feminine fear conquered by evils, dared to enter the area filled with flying spears, to rush from the flank into the space between the hostile armies. They parted the hostile combatants, their fathers on one side, on the other their husbands, and begged them, fathers-in-law and sons-in-law not to splash themselves with abominable bloodshed, not to stain their own offspring with the murder of kin, grandsons of one side, sons of the other. "If your relationship—if our marriage—is hateful to you, turn your anger against us! We are the reason for the war, we the cause of wounds and slaughter for husbands and fathers. It would be better for us to perish than to live widowed or orphaned!"]

The only indication of the women's position comes from the topographically vague but geometrically precise indication of direction (*ex transuerso*).³⁴ Until now Livy has not even mentioned that the women are watching the battle. The reader has been aware of viewing the action through the eyes of an audience on the sidelines, but only when the

34. Livy uses the phrase *ex transuerso*, always literally and always in military contexts, to describe attacks from the side. One example occurs at 2.20.3 (the description of the death of Valerius in pursuit of Tarquinius): *Valerium temere inuictum in exsulum aciem ex transuerso quidam adortus transfigit, nec quicquam equitis uulnere equo retardato . . .* (note that the attack does not slow the horse at all). See also 3.62.8, 10.41.5, 22.18.18, 37.42.5 (it is a good way to attack elephants). It is also used figuratively to mean "unexpectedly" or "by surprise" (*e transuerso*, once in Cicero—at *Luc.* 121.2—and at Petron. *Sat.* 55.3.1 and Sen. *De uita beata* 15.6 and *Ep. mor.* 117.21.4). Lucretius uses *e transuerso* to describe the movement of atoms to fill a void (6.1018: they can move in from above, *superne*, or from the side, *e transuerso*). It is not found in any historians or military writers besides Livy, but much later it comes to mean "from the collateral line" in Gaius (once) and Justinian (frequently), in contexts dealing with marriage. One would expect the Sabine women to be watching the fighting from within the fortifications of the Palatine and to make their way around and past the Romans to intervene from the sides. Yet in Livy's account the women appear out of the blue when they rush into the area between the lines of fighting men. The abstract phrase aptly describes a movement that is (a) tactical (an assault on the flanks) and (b) unexpected.

Sabine women enter the fray does the reader become aware of seeing it from their point of view. This set of viewers, part of an audience that up to this point appears to have been created by the narrative, actually has an independent existence and acts to influence the course of events. Livy has split the audience: the reader sees, but the Sabine women react, entering the text as dramatically as they enter the midst of the conflict. From this position on the sidelines, both the reader and the women can see the situation clearly and can comprehend the awful symmetry of a war between husbands and fathers. By directing the mind's eye as it follows the turning and returning of a symmetrical story in a symmetrical landscape, the narrative creates a point of view sufficiently distant that the viewer can take in the fighting and the landscape as a coherent whole. At the same time, the vividness of the fighting in 1.12 gives the reader the impression of being present at the very event; and it is but a small step from sharing this peripheral but involved point of view with the women to sharing the emotions that launch them on their dangerous course of intervention.³⁵

After the fighting resumes in the middle of the Forum valley, the audience's attention, which has moved to and fro between the two hills, now oscillates within the narrowest confines, the area between the battle lines, space that is quickly occupied by the Sabine women themselves.³⁶ And yet, while the audience looks from side to side, following the trajectories of the weapons flying to and fro, the entrance of the women produces another boundary. The use of anaphora (*diremere . . . acies, diremere iras; hinc patres, hinc uiros; ne . . . respergerent, ne . . . macularent; nepotum illi, hi liberum progeniem*, 1.13.2) produces the impression that half of the women are turning one way, toward the Sabine fathers, and half the other way, toward the Roman husbands.³⁷ The two sides still mirror one another. As they divide the men by turning to and fro, the women offer themselves as alternate space where Roman and Sabine blood can intermingle and as a way out that does not violate the boundaries

35. See Vasaly, *Representations*, 89–104. On the emotional involvement of spectators, see Feldherr's discussion in "Spectacle and Society" (13) of Thucydides' account of the battle in the harbor at Syracuse (Thuc. 7.71.3–4). On the position of the reader relative to other spectators in Livy's battle, see Feldherr, *op. cit.*, 23–35.

36. E. Burck (*Die Erzählungskunst*, 144) points out that the denouement unfolds in three parts: first the entrance of the women, then their plea in indirect speech, and finally their plea in direct speech.

37. See J. Wankenne, "Le chapitre 1.13 de Tite-Live," *LEC* 43 (1975): 350–66. Note also the idea of boundaries in the word *adfinitas* (*ad + finis*), which literally means "situated or lying next to."

imposed on the landscape by the restricting hills.³⁸ They deflect the men's attention by uniting the warring sides against a single common foe (*in nos uertite iras*).³⁹

After the women's intervention, the two sides move in harmony: silence falls; the leaders on both sides come forward; both sides together make one city out of two; both join the rule; both confer all the imperium on Rome. Only then does Curtius return to the narrative.

Movet res cum multitudinem tum duces; silentium et repentina fit quies; inde ad foedus faciendum duces prodeunt. Nec pacem modo sed civitatem unam ex duabus faciunt. Regnum consociant: imperium omne conferunt Romam. Ita geminata urbe ut Sabinis tamen aliquid daretur Quirites a Curibus appellati. Monumentum eius pugnae, ubi primum ex profunda emersus palude equus Curtium in uado statuit, Curtium lacum appellarunt. (1.13.4–5)

[This event stirs both the masses and the leaders; there is silence and sudden stillness; then the leaders come forward to strike a treaty. They make not only peace but also one state out of two. They unite the government, but locate all the power in Rome. The city thus having doubled, so that some concession might be made to the Sabines the people were named Quirites, from the town of Cures. As a reminder of that battle, they named the spot where his horse brought Curtius out of the depths of the swamp and into the shallows Curtius' Lake.]

As joint subjects of the verbs *prodeunt*, *faciunt*, *consociant*, and *conferunt*, the Romans and Sabines continue to mirror each other. The city has been moving toward doubling (*Ita geminata urbe*) all through the course of the battle.⁴⁰ The verb *geminare* means to double by addition or by rep-

38. Menander Rhetor (351.1–3) points out that one of the disadvantages of a hill site is "confined spaces" [στενοχωρία].

39. Miles (*Reconstructing Early Rome*, 179–219) sees this as an explanation of a fundamental hostility within Roman marriage.

40. This joint action is particularly appropriate for events that may have taken place on the site where Livy later places the Temple of Janus Geminus (*ad infimum Argiletum*, 1.19.2). Some sources say that the temple was built to commemorate the doubled people (Serv. *ad. Aen.* 12.198). According to Coarelli, (*Il Foro Romano*, 1:97), the account of the Forum battle is the aetiological myth establishing the cult of Janus in his capacity as *Patulcius* and *Clusius*, since the ideas of opening and closing can be perceived in the activity of the Sabines, occupants of the Capitoline and the Quirinal.

etition. Here Rome does both: the city's population doubles through addition, its landscape and history through repetition.⁴¹ The topography and narrative alike reflect the superimposition of city on city over time by superimposing story on story, that of the Roman advance and Sabine retreat on that of the Roman retreat and Sabine advance. While the fighting began as a conflict with a people outside Romulus' original settlement, the movement between the hills shows the battle turning into a conflict between kindred enemies, as the landscape becomes more and more coherent and symmetrical, and as the people within it come to mirror one another.⁴²

The conflict itself is reflected in the doubled space. The initial opposition between Romans and Sabines is reflected by their opposing strongholds on the Palatine and Capitoline. As they come into conflict, it appears in other polarities, those of hill and valley, sky and swamp. Finally, the women's physical intervention collapses the distinction between Roman husbands and Sabine fathers by replacing it with another dichotomy, that between men and women. This too is reflected in the way events and space unfold before the various audiences, as well as before the reader, who sees through the audiences' eyes.

The account of the Forum battle demonstrates the beginning of a reciprocal process by which the landscape influences events while events, in turn, give meaning to the landscape, in the form of *monumenta*. A pair of *monumenta* like the Temple of Jupiter Stator and the Lacus Curtius produce a self-validating system, in which the monumental complex produced by the story is proof of the story that unites them.⁴³ Thus the account of the battle shows that the relationship between the narrative and the objective landscape is complex and reciprocal: the story ties the monuments together, and the monuments tie the story together. The war with the Sabines generates more than an increased population and an expansion of Roman imperium: it allows Roman history, both the *res gestae* themselves and accounts of *res gestae*, to continue in the very land-

41. Konstan's "Narrative and Ideology in Livy" is invaluable here. Like the first book of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, the story of the Forum battle opens with loss. The Romans are keen to retake their citadel (*reciperandae*); in this they share the impulse of Romulus, who Livy later says showed his divine nature in his recovery of his ancestral kingdom (*in regno auito reciperando*) from his uncle.

42. There is a trace here of the antiquarian tradition, preserved in Tacitus (*Ann.* 12.24.3), that the Sabines originally were settled on the Capitoline and that Titus Tatius brought it into the city.

43. See Gabba, "True History and False History," 61.

scape that generates them. Although the Romans themselves are not indigenous to the place, their *res gestae* are.

What effect would this dramatic narrative have on the Roman reader's perception of the objective landscape? First, it would link together places whose interrelationship was otherwise unclear. Amid seven centuries' accumulation of physical monuments, it would be difficult to conceive of any relationship between the Temple of Jupiter Stator and the Lacus Curtius without a reminder in ritual or story, especially since their other aetiologies make no connection between them. Moreover, without the story, one would not know what was important about the relative positions of the monuments in the landscape. Was it significant that one monument stood at the place where the Forum sloped upward at the base of the Palatine and that the other was near its lowest spot?

As it brings together the monuments, the narrative guides the reader's attention to other connecting features in the urban landscape. Commentators point out that this story joins the aetiologies of two monuments in the Forum, on the assumption that the Forum is the topographical link between them.⁴⁴ But as we have seen, for Livy as for Piso, Dionysius, and Plutarch, the hills play the defining role in this episode. They mark off the original space of the Forum, and they provide the termini for the action.⁴⁵ The Roman army filled the plain between the two hills; the Romans were driven from the Capitoline to the Palatine; the Sabines pursued them from one to another (*inde huc*); Mettius ran down from the Capitoline, crossed the entire length of the future Forum, and then, Livy says, approached the Palatine gate, where he made his boast; the fighting resumed not *in medio campo* but *in media conualle duorum montium*.⁴⁶ By redefining this place as the hollow between two hills, Livy does two

44. See Vasaly, *Representations*, 43. Vasaly (41–49) gives a good account of the monuments and points out that the story ties together two etiologies. Ogilvie (75) comments, "As the legend of Tarpeia was to account for the name of the Tarpeian rock, so the prominent features of the Forum, the temple of Juppiter Stator and the Lacus Curtius, supplied the material for the present episode."

45. I agree with Coarelli (*Il Foro Romano*, 1:26–27), who focuses on the relationship between this story and a more specific part of the Forum, the Via Sacra. He points out that the story—not just Livy's version, but those of Plutarch and Dionysius as well—touches on the archaic monuments along the road. Coarelli's argument is that the Via Sacra was terminated by the hills; that it began at the base of the Arx and ended at the Porta Mugonia fits Livy's narrative, which is so clearly limited by the hills.

46. Plutarch emphasizes that this is a difficult place for retreat or pursuit, because it is encompassed (*περτεχόμενος*) by a ridge of hills.

things: he throws emphasis on the vertical components of movement in the episode, and he suggests that the place is a container. Although the two monuments are in different parts of the Forum, the hills exert a constricting pressure that draws them together. The effect is to join the disparate topographical features—the Forum, the two monuments, and the two hills—into one coherent design.⁴⁷

The doubling of the city, with the *res Romana* having the advantage, creates an image in which the *monumentum* to Jupiter's celestial interference is superimposed on the earthy Lacus Curtius. Romulus seems to communicate with the heavens in the place where he vows a temple (*Romulus . . . armā ad caelum tollens; Restitere Romani tamquam caelesti uoce iussi*); the Lacus Curtius may have been the *mundus*, a place of communication with the world below. Thus the configuration of monuments commemorates the outcome of the conflict. As far as the Romans are concerned, the Temple of Jupiter Stator commemorates the point where the Romans turned from flight to pursuit and where they rewrote, as it were, a story of defeat as one of success. Yet the Temple of Jupiter Stator on the Palatine (rather than the *arx* on the Capitoline) also commemorates the high point of Sabine success in battle. Joined to the Lacus Curtius, a hollow in the ground, the temple commemorates the lost imperium of the Sabine people.⁴⁸ Together the two *monumenta* mark a single turning point, from city to twinned city, in the history of *one* people, whose story is told from the point of view of the dominant half. The word *monumentum* functions topographically in the written episode, because it marks out points of return, one for each side: the place where Romulus and Jupiter together turned the battle and the place where Curtius emerged from the swamp. Action turns and returns between the first two items called *monumenta* in the text, as the city doubles. Romulus'

47. The landscape may even become a metaphor for the narrative. Although Livy does not use the words *coniunx* and *iugum* in this episode, it is tempting to see this episode as a *monumentum* that marks out the city in the shape of a *iugum*, which is both a ridge of hills and also a yoke, thus commemorating the *coniuges*. As the population is doubled, the city doubles; as the two peoples are joined by marriage, the hills are joined in a landscape.

48. This was the lowest and most difficult part of the Forum to drain. The draining of the Forum area is a motif that unites the account of the regal period: the Tiber leaves Romulus and Remus at its high-water mark (1.4.4–6); the representative Sabine disappears into the Lacus Curtius (1.12.10), itself dried up by Livy's time; and Tarquinius Priscus builds the sewers that drain the low-lying areas around the Forum—and the *conualles* (1.38.6). Poucet (*Recherches*, 241) observes that the Mettius Curtius episode quite precisely reflects the topographical conditions of early Rome.

prayer reinforces the impression of turning and of doubling in size, population, and history, for it defines the present, in which Jupiter's *praesens ops* plays the decisive role, as the turning point between a past and a future that reverses this past.⁴⁹

Coarelli points out that the annalists may have modeled their narrative of this story on the ritual dance of the Salii, which crossed the city moving from the Forum to the Capitoline in a responsive and mirroring movement (*amptruare/redamptruare*).⁵⁰ The ritual would have commemorated the battle between the Romans and the Sabines. If Coarelli is right, each reading of Livy's text follows the ritual movement through the landscape. The narrative traverses the permanent features of urban space (hills, valley) and ties them together. Yet it also stops at places that are significant for specific historical associations (Temple of Jupiter Stator, Lacus Curtius), and in placing the temple above the Lacus Curtius in the written landscape, it leaves behind a *monumentum* that in its historical specificity complements the ritual repetition, for it signifies not the fighting but the permanent peaceful settlement and the transition from the first city to the doubled city.

Coarelli also points out that the Salii had an "initiatory" character, that they were young men entering military service.⁵¹ The dance of the Salii Palatini (who are to be identified with the Romans), with its movement from the inside to the outside of the city (*amptruare*), symbolized the departure of the army for the annual campaign season, while that of the Salii Collini (who are to be identified with the Sabines), with its movement from the outside to the inside (*redamptruare*), alluded to the return of the army and the transition from war to peace.⁵² If the original ceremony symbolized the departure for foreign wars and the return to home and peace, then Livy's reconfigured topography, his constriction of two settlements into the tight configuration of hill-Forum-hill, makes the point that this battle is a paradox: one half of the city cannot fight a foreign war with the other half of that same city. There is no way to resolve this paradox, no way out of the *conuallis duorum montium*, except by

49. Even the infinitive *resistere* in Romulus' exhortation and the perfect *restitere* relating the men's action are partly morphological mirror images.

50. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano*, 2:302. On *redamptruare*, he cites Festus, p. 270M: *redamptruare dicitur in Saliorum exultationibus: 'cum praesul amptrauit,' quod est, motus edidit, ei referuntur inuicem idem motus.*

51. See Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano*, 2:302–5.

52. L. Gerschel, "Saliens de Mars et Saliens de Quirinus," *RHR* 138 (1950): 145–51.

moving through a different space, in this case, the bodies of the Sabine women.

This paradox is apparent to the reader and to an audience far enough from the fighting to take in the landscape as a whole. In fact, this episode is remarkable for the extent to which it makes breadth of vision into a measure of historical awareness. The fighting men on both sides experience events subjectively: the Romans, in their anger and desire to recapture the citadel (*ira et cupiditate recipierandae arcis*), focus their attention on the *arx* alone, look only to the present, and aim only to recoup their recent losses; on the Sabine side, Mettius' boast comprehends only the present moment (*uicimus*, "we have conquered"; *iam sciunt*, "now they know").⁵³ Both Romulus and the Sabine women view events more objectively, although the women are at the edge of society and on the sidelines of the fighting, while the king is at the center of both (he is surrounded by a throng [*cum globo . . .*] when he attacks Mettius). Romulus engineers events, including the theft of the women and the Roman rally, while the women, who at first are powerless, in the end manipulate the fighting men as much as he does. Yet the foreign women and the city's founder share the ability to stand both inside and outside of events, although the women are placed in a marginal position by their origin and gender, while Romulus is a privileged viewer because of his semidivine nature. The women's pleas show that their comprehension of events includes the past (their fathers), the present (themselves and their husbands), and the future (their children). Romulus speaks of the present in a similar way: when vowing a temple of Jupiter, he recalls the founding of the city (*iussus auibus hic in Palatio prima urbi fundamenta ieci*); then he promises a reminder, a *monumentum*, for the future. Both the women and Romulus historicize the critical place and time in which they stand. Yet Romulus places the immediate moment in its wider context to make his way out of a tight spot; the women, having seen the paradox of fathers and husbands fighting, make their way to its center.

The narrator and reader also work together to create meaning. The

53. Mettius misreads even the present. His declaration "now they know it is one thing to steal maidens and quite another to fight with men" is premature, for this is something the Romans do *not* know. Stealing maidens is the same thing as fighting with men for them, at least in effect, since both work toward expansion and the domination of neighboring peoples. According to J. Hemker ("Rape and the Founding of Rome," 43), "[t]he seizure of the Sabine women is, in effect, the equivalent of conquering the entire Sabine tribe. The Roman soldiers' control over the forces of reproduction ensures the strength of the Roman state."

narrator, like Romulus, takes the initiative, while the reader, like the Sabine women, responds to the situation. We have seen that the peripheral point of view from which they watch the ebb and flow of battle gives the women and the reader insight that they could not gain from any other position. Sharing the perspective of the Sabine women incites the reader to plunge into a critical situation just as they do. This complicates the moral lesson offered by the narrative: it is not simply their passionate willingness to dash into the no-man's-land between the Roman and Sabine battle lines that makes the Sabine women an instructive exemplum; it is their deliberate willingness to do so as a result of the insight they have gained from their objective point of view.

Romulus, who is at the center of the fighting and the center of the state, and the women, who stand on the sidelines, both see the past and the future as parts of a larger whole. By endowing these social and political polar opposites with a broad historical vision, Livy expresses the complete inclusiveness of the set of people who can act to save the state in a crisis. Livy has written, as it were, an initiatory rite into his schematized topography, and this rite opens outward to include the reader. Romans and Sabines move to and fro, but others participate: Romulus turns the battle with a prayer to an outsider and an impulsive counter-attack, then the women, who perceive the mirror image of these enemies fighting in this particular landscape, respond to it by entering the battle and, with their own action and speech, deflect the men's hostility from one another (*impetum facit*, 12.9; *impetu facto*, 13.2); the narrative shows movement through space, the reader follows the movements indicated by the narrative. At the critical point in this episode, the historian's achievement in vivid representation exceeds the standard rhetorical goal of placing narrated events before the mind's eye of his audience (*sub oculos subiectio*) and, in fact, goes so far as to place the audience before the narrated events, first pushing it away from and then drawing it into the action. This spatial manipulation produces a paradoxical objectivity: Livy maneuvers the audience into a distant position from which it comprehends the image of war becoming civil war, yet when the women make their emotional entrance into the midst of the conflict, they do so from that same marginal position. There is a moral message here: while Livy's audience can fall anywhere on the sociopolitical continuum, it must be able to stand outside of events and then move to participate in them, like the Sabine women, or to participate in events even while finding his way out of them, like Romulus. Together this narrative and this

landscape produce the crucial vantage point on the threshold between objectivity and engagement. By focalizing the events through an unspecified audience and identifying that audience with the Sabine women, Livy's account of the Forum battle creates a reader who adopts a point of view advantageous to the state and remembers it when he or she looks on the monuments in the landscape or recalls or imagines them in absentia.

Chapter 3

The Rise and Fall of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus

In the story of the Sabine women, Romulus' prayer to Jupiter Stator ties Rome's origins to its future and binds together the captured citadel, the Forum valley, and the original settlement on the Palatine (1.12.4–5). Romulus' words are the first from a Livian character to portray the landscape of legendary Rome. No explicit causal connection is drawn here between his comprehensive vision of the historical landscape and the subsequent rally of the Roman troops; but other characters at other critical moments in the *Ab Urbe Condita* clearly do influence events by means of allusions to the city and its monuments. Camillus' famous speech persuading his fellow citizens not to abandon Rome for Veii after the Gallic sack comes immediately to mind.¹ One effective weapon in his arsenal is the panorama of Rome's historical and religious topography (5.51.1–54.7).² Livy compares him explicitly to the city's founder: Camillus celebrates his triumph over the Gauls shortly before this speech, with his men calling him "Romulus, and father of the country, and a second founder of the city" [*Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis*] (5.49.7). The author considers Camillus' prevention of the move to be as important as his annihilation of the Gauls: "there is no doubt that, hav-

An earlier version of the section of this chapter entitled "The Fall" appeared as "Custodia Fidelis Memoriae: Livy's Story of M. Manlius Capitolinus," *Latomus* 52, no. 2 (1993): 350–63. I am grateful to the editors of *Latomus* for permitting me to reuse some of that material here.

Works of general use for this chapter include I. Kajanto, *God and Fate in Livy*, *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*, vol. 64 (Turku, 1957); Luce, *Livy*; A.H. McDonald, "The Style of Livy," *JRS* 47 (1957): 155–72; Ogilvie; D.W. Packard, *A Concordance to Livy*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); and Walsh, *Livy, His Historical Aims and Methods*.

1. His words produce action: *mouisse eos Camillus cum alia oratione, tum ea quae ad religiones pertinebat maxime dicitur* (5.55.1).

2. Andrew Feldherr has discussed Camillus' effective use of historical and religious topography in "Caeci Avaritia: Avarice, History, and Vision in Livy V" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association, Atlanta, Ga., 1994).