

Chapter 1

The History as a Monument

The idea of the *monumentum* is a particularly useful tool for studying space and memory in a literary text, because its meaning embraces space and memory in a complex way.¹ Varro's definition of the word provides a convenient starting point for an analysis of *monumenta* in their spatial and cognitive aspects.

Meminisse a memoria, quom in id quod remansit in mente rursus mouetur; quae a manendo ut Manimoria potest esse dicta. Itaque Salii quod cantant: Mamuri Veturi, significant memoriam . . . ; ab eodem Monere, quod is qui monet, proinde ac sit memoria; sic Monumenta quae in sepulcris, et ideo secundum uiam, quo praetereuntis admoneant et se fuisse et illos esse mortalis. Ab eo cetera quae scripta ac facta memoriae causa Monumenta dicta. (Varro *De lingua latina* 6.49)²

[*Meminisse*, “to remember,” comes from *memoria*, “memory,” since there is once again movement back to that which has stayed in the mind; this may have been derived from *manere*, “to remain,” like *manimoria*. And thus the Salii when they sing “O Mamurius Veturius” signify a *memoria*, “memory.” . . . From the same word comes *monere*, “remind,” because he who reminds is just like memory; so are derived *monimenta*,³ “memorials,” which are in burial places and for that reason are situated along the road, so that they

1. For a full discussion, see H. Häusle, *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms: Eine Studie zu einem Motiv in lateinischer Inschriften*. *Zetemata* no. 75 (Munich, 1980). See esp. “*Monumentum* und *Memoria*” (29–40) and “*Das Denkmal* und sein Leser” (41–63).

2. For the text printed here, see L. Spengel and A. Spengel, eds., *M. Terenti Varronis de lingua latina libri* (New York, 1885; reprint, 1979).

3. The spelling *monimentum* is less common than *monumentum*, which I shall use except when quoting Latin passages that use the alternate form. On the orthography, see *TLL* 8.1461.

can remind those who are passing by that they themselves existed and that the passersby are mortal. From this use other things that are written or produced for the sake of memory are called *monimenta*, “reminders.”]

According to Varro’s definition, *monumenta* occupy a middle ground. They remind people here and now of events and persons that are remote in space and time. They stand between—between their maker and their viewer; between an exploit, *res gesta*, and the viewer or reader whom the commemorated exploit inspires.⁴ By naming the person who has died, sometimes even by speaking in the first person for the dead, Varro’s exemplary grave marker preserves a particular fact about the past: that the person it commemorates existed (*sic Monumenta quae in sepulcris, et ideo secundum uiam, quo praetereuntis admoneant et se fuisse et illos esse mortalis*; notice the conflation of the two subjects in . . . *admoneant* . . . *se fuisse*—the *monumenta* speak both for and as the person commemorated). In addition, the *monumentum* points out a truth pertinent to every passerby: that he or she is mortal too.⁵ Thus it recalls the past and provides information to the present.

Both of these functions can become more complex. In pointing to the past, a *monumentum* like Varro’s grave marker can recall not only its dedicatee but someone else as well, perhaps the person who dedicated it. This multiplicity of reference expands when, pointing to two or more persons, the *monumentum* also commemorates a relationship like parenthood, for example, or marriage. The second, admonitory, function is inherently complex, for the universal truth communicated by a monument contains an implied challenge, one that extends the force of the *monumentum* into the future (e.g., “Claudia was mortal and so are you. This monument praises her because she was a dutiful wife; you should be dutiful too, if you want to be remembered in a positive way;” or “L. Cor-

4. See T.P. Wiseman, “Monuments and the Roman Annalists,” in *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, ed. I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart, and A.J. Woodman (Cambridge, 1986), 87–100. He points out that the physical *monumentum* stands between the *res gestae* and their literary celebration, so that two layers, the monumental and the literary, come between event and reader.

5. I take *se fuisse* absolutely (as does the entry for *monumentum* in Lewis and Short) instead of with *mortalis*. If *se fuisse* is taken with *mortalis*, the monument would make the redundant point that a dead person is mortal, which hardly needs to be made by a tomb, instead of reminding the viewer that the dead person existed, one purpose of a tomb.

nelius Scipio was aedile, consul, and censor. Therefore his elogium is worthy company for those of his ancestors; try to top his *cursus honorum*).⁶ As Cicero said, a *monumentum* ought to have more regard for the memory of posterity than for favor in the present.⁷ The word *monumentum*, then, denotes a reminder, but one that also exhorts. Present temporally as well as spatially, Janus-like in pointing back to the past and forward into the future, from the viewer's perspective *monumenta* link together all of time.

Because a *monumentum* presupposes an audience to remind, Latin writers generally use the word for reminders that are exposed to the public view.⁸ These range from buildings to place-names; from items made for the purpose, like inscriptions and statues, to acquired marks, like scars and mutilations; and from published versions of speeches to trophies and spoils.⁹ As enduring material tokens of the past, *monumenta* exist in physical space (or as toponyms, they distinguish a place from its surroundings) and themselves produce hybrid places where natural space and time intersect with what might be called "monumental space." When a person moving through natural space encounters a *monumentum*, his or her thoughts move back through this monumental space to the person, place, or event that the *monumentum* commemorates, and the *monumentum* projects them forward into the future.¹⁰ Varro's exemplary *monumenta* are "in burial places" (*in sepulcris*) and "along the road" (*secundum viam*). Their purpose is to inform "the passersby" about death. The person who pauses before the

6. For these particular inscriptions, see *CIL* 1.2.1211 (= *ILS* 8403) and *ILLRP* 310.

7. *Quae monumenti ratio sit, nomine ipso admoneor: ad memoriam magis spectare debet posteritatis quam ad praesentis temporis gratiam* (Nonius 32.17).

8. Vergil's minotaur hidden in the labyrinth (*Veneris monumentum nefandae*, *Aen.* 6.24–27) is an exception that proves the rule. Daedalus constructed the impenetrable and inescapable labyrinth precisely to hide the offspring that preserved the evidence of Pasiphae's shameful passion. The labyrinth itself is an enormous reminder built to counter and block the unforgettable product of bestiality.

9. For usage, see *TLL* 8.1460–66. The following catalog is intended not to be exhaustive but simply to illustrate the range of items called *monumenta* and of the writers and contexts in which they appear: temples, *Livy* 1.12.6, 1.55.1, 2.40.12; poems, *Cat.* 95 and *Hor. Carm.* 3.30.1; *elogia*, *Cato Orig.* (*HRR* 83.10); statues, *Plaut. Curc.* 140, 441, and *Cato Orig.* (*HRR* 83.10); places, *Livy* 1.13.5, 26.41.11; place-names, *Livy* 1.48.7, 4.16.1; mutilations, *Verg. Aen.* 6.512; published versions of speeches, *Cic. De off.* 3.4.3; shields, *Livy* 25.39.17.

10. On spatial representations of time in Latin, see M. Bettini, *Anthropology and Roman Culture*, trans. J. Van Sickle (Baltimore, 1991), 113–93.

monumentum experiences a sympathetic death before resuming his or her journey and life.¹¹ Then, by moving past the stones, the passerby participates in the monumentalization of the dead person, for his or her presence at the tomb juxtaposes life and death, moving viewer and static reminder, the flow of time passing and the detritus left behind. The overlap of monumental and natural space means that location—that of the *monumentum* itself as well as that of the person it reminds—influences the meaning and impact of this cognitive journey. Thus the *monumentum* controls and directs the viewer's thoughts as they move from the present to the past, then back to the present and into the future.

Finally, to look on a *monumentum* is to experience a psychological distance between oneself and the *monumentum*, the consciousness of being separate from, contrasted with, or measured against it. Varro's passerby, reminded of his mortality, has a heightened awareness that he is alive and has challenges to meet. In sum, we can assume of all *monumenta* some common characteristics: an absent person or thing commemorated; a present audience reminded; a memory or an exhortation that is socially relevant; and a meaning determined jointly by the reminder, its physical context, and the circumstances of each viewer. An encounter with a *monumentum*, then, is more than just looking on one; the experience is essentially spatial and dynamic, one in which the viewer's point of departure, path, and destination all play a part.

Livy's history offers us an opportunity to consider space and monuments in one author's lengthy, if incompletely preserved, work, a coherent and continuous representation of reality. The *Ab Urbe Condita* presents the reader with a written Rome, one that refers to the world outside yet, through its own organization, controls the reader's perception of that objective world.¹² This is particularly evident in Livy's portrayal of the

11. On the passerby, see R. Lattimore's fundamental *Themes of Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1942), 230–37. The elegists, of course, exploit this topos through sepulchral poems addressed to the reader as passerby (*uiator*). See, e.g., Prop. 1.21, 1.22, 2.11; Ovid *Trist.* 3.3.

On grave monuments and memory and on remembering and forgetting as sympathetic experiences, see H.H. Davis, "Epitaphs and the Memory," *CQ* 53 (1958): 169–76.

12. It has become increasingly clear that modern standards of precision are inappropriate for evaluating Roman geographical writing, which scholars now tend to explain in terms of ancient readers' expectations and the limits of ancient geographical knowledge and terminology. As a result, attempts to match literary descriptions to places in the objective world have given way, in many cases, to the study of the conventions that guide such writing. N. Horsfall ("Illusion and Reality in Latin Topographical Writing," *G&R* 32, no. 2

city proper. The hills, river, and plains of the city impose their own shape on the narrative of events, even as the record of those events fills the landscape with significance. The narrative produces a schematized urban topography, one that is all the more meaningful for its abstraction.

While memory, landscape, and narrative have a long-standing association in the idea of the *monumentum*, they also meet in the *ars memoriae*, the mnemonic system preserved in the Roman rhetorical handbooks.¹³ This technique for recollecting the substance of a speech entails first memorizing a series of places (*loci*) to create a mental topography and then stocking them with a series of images (*imagines*) that signify each point of the speech to be remembered. The sequence of places can be a real landscape, which the orator memorizes, or an imaginary one, which he creates and then memorizes. As the orator delivers his speech, he mentally traverses this landscape, recalling each point he wants to make when he reaches the image that represents it. The *imagines* that fill the *loci* should be striking (*imagines agentes*, according to the author of the *Ad Herennium*, at 3.37) and made even more memorable by ornament or disfigurement. They should also be relevant to the topic to be remembered—an anchor, says Quintilian (*Inst.* 11.2.19), to signify a

[1985]: 199) has observed that “no expectation existed in Augustan Rome that the geographical information contained in a work of literature should be precise.” Horsfall (203) also says that “it would never do to underestimate at least in Livy the subversive influence of the demands of dramatic narrative and of the necessity of achieving a correct moral balance upon topographical exactitude.” T.P. Wiseman (*Clio's Cosmetics* [Leicester, 1979], 43) points out Livy's sacrifice of topographical exactitude in the story of Manlius Capitolinus for the sake of dramatic effect. A particularly useful discussion of the use of conventions in topographical writing can be found in R. Thomas, *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition* (Cambridge, 1982). When applied to the study of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, these developments suggest not that we ignore the objective world but that we consider Livy's use of the urban landscape and its monuments less as a set of references to that world and more as a carefully designed stage setting, as it were, for a historical drama.

13. Since others have described it fully, I shall only sketch it here. The ancient sources are *Ad Herennium* 3.16–40; Cic. *De orat.* 2.86.351–87.360; Quint. *Inst.* 11.2.1–52. For modern discussion, see F. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago, 1966), 1–26; H. Blum, *Antike Mnemotechnik* (Hildesheim and New York, 1969); E.W. Leach, *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome* (Princeton, 1988), 75–79; Vasaly, *Representations*, 100–102. J.F. Miller (“Ovidian Allusion and the Vocabulary of Memory,” *MD* 30 [1993]: 153–64) discusses Ovid's use of words like *memini*, “I remember,” and *recordor*, “I recall,” as markers signaling acts of poetic allusion. Such markers generate a text between the first text and the one to which it alludes. In a similar manner, Livy's references to monuments create a metaphorical place between the text and the physical city.

naval matter, or a weapon for military affairs. This mnemonic technique may lie behind the practice of vivid representation (*enargeia*) in Latin literature, for it is but a small leap from the rhetorical *ars memoriae* to the orator's use of familiar and significant place-names in his speeches or his creation of a compelling imaginary topography as a means of leading his listeners' minds through his argument.¹⁴ The use of mental mapping in rhetoric may have moved from the realm of mnemotechnics to that of persuasion and then, because of the pervasiveness of rhetorical training in the classical period, from oratory to other genres of literature. Landscape and monuments together comprise a versatile sign system, one that an orator, poet, or historian can use either to guide his audience's perception of a place it actually sees or to conjure up a vivid and memorable image of a place as a setting for action.¹⁵

Several features of the *ars memoriae* suggest it as a likely model for Livy's conception of Rome's past. First, as Christina Kraus has pointed out, Livy uses the metaphor of traversing space to describe both his tasks of research and composition and the reader's act of reading: the author is among a crowd of writers (Pref. 3); his audience hastens to contemporary material (Pref. 4); events in the past are obscure, like things seen from a distance (6.1.2); the historian takes a byway (9.17.1); he begins to drown in his work (31.1.5); at one point he claims that Greek matters have led him off course (35.40.1).¹⁶ We can extend the parallel: Livy divides his enormous project into manageable units by breaking it into pentads and decades, just as the author of the *Ad Herennium* recommends dividing the loci into manageable segments by placing a distinguishing mark on every fifth locus (3.31). Moreover, the series of loci has to be simplified, so that the speaker can remember it and reconstruct it in his mind. In an analogous way, Livy's Rome does not contain all the real city's monuments and significant places. Rome is too large and its space too complex

14. Both Leach (*The Rhetoric of Space*, 78) and Vasaly (*Representations*, 100–102) make this point.

15. Vasaly's *Representations* is the most thorough study of references to topographical features and monuments in Latin literature. On memory and place, see esp. 89–104. On Livy's rhetorical use of one place, see M. Jaeger, "Custodia Fidelis Memoriae: Livy's Story of M. Manlius Capitolinus," *Latomus* 52, no. 2 (1993): 350–63. On the manipulation of landscape and topography, see Zanker, *The Power of Images*.

16. Kraus ("No Second Troy," 268–69) points out the metaphor of the byway and observes apropos of 31.1.5 that the image is not coincidental, since the Macedonian wars, the topic introduced at 31.1, are moving Rome's interests overseas.

to “represent fully.”¹⁷ Instead, Livy represents it selectively, by referring repeatedly to the places he considers important. In doing so, he draws a schematic, easily comprehensible and easily memorable portrait of the city. Finally, according to the author of the *Ad Herennium* (3.30–31), the orator who has remembered his loci well can repeat what he has committed to them by starting from any locus he pleases and proceeding in any direction, just as Livy’s account of events moves in annalistic fashion from events in the city to events abroad and back again.

Extending the parallel still further, we can say that remembering the history of the city entails both memorizing the loci themselves, in this case the city’s schematized topography, and remembering the *imagines*, the particular monuments that prompt one’s recollection of specific events. One can reconstruct Rome’s past either by contemplating the physical urban landscape or by picturing it in the mind’s eye. In addition, the loci, here the hills, river, and plains of the urban landscape, can be used again and again, just as waxed tablets can be reused when what was written on them has been erased. While the specific facts of Roman history reside in specific monuments, patterns of thought, which are also part of a people’s collective memory, consist of movement in the landscape between them. To remember a sequence of events, one must recollect the right way to move through this remembered landscape. Thus, remembering the city involves learning how to picture the urban landscape and how to move through it by particular routes, a technique demonstrated by episodes in the *Ab Urbe Condita* and practiced by the reader through the very act of reading.

The remembered landscape brings together historiography and the trained memory in a suggestive way, for the sense of sight is crucial both to the *ars memoriae* and to the inquiry expected of the historian. Whether the orator’s loci are places he has seen or places he has imagined, he views them in his mind’s eye as he delivers his speech. When he uses topography rhetorically, either by referring to the visible or by cre-

17. J. Fentress and C. Wickham (*Social Memory* [Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1992], 32) argue: “There is always a tendency towards simplification and schematization in memory. Conceptualization means that memory is stored in some ‘conceptual’ form, as concepts are easier to remember than full representations. The simplification that results from conceptualization can be drastic. Spatial relations in a visual image are apt to be modified so as to make temporal or logical relations of consequence appear more clearly. Occasionally, the spatial arrangement of the figures in the images is even reconstructed so as to manifest relations of cause and effect that were not originally present.”

22 *Livy's Written Rome*

ating an imaginary landscape, he relies on his audience's visual imagination.¹⁸ At the same time, the standards for evidence that Livy received from earlier historians placed vision at the top of the hierarchy of the senses: informed firsthand observation provided the best evidence, according to Polybius (12.4c–d, 24); interviews of witnesses and written accounts, as information that came through the ears, were less reliable.¹⁹ The ideal historian, according to Polybius, actually travels and gains personal experience of warfare and politics. If he cannot experience in person the events he reports, at least he knows how a soldier carries out his duties (12.25.g–h).²⁰

In the case of the city and its monuments, the element of autopsy moves from the realm of research to that of representation much as the mental mapping of the *ars memoriae* moves from the realm of mnemotechnics to that of persuasion. The ideal historian witnesses events in person and, through the use of specific details, transmits to his reader the impression of being present at events. To a certain degree the ancient historian shares the orator's purpose in referring to the concrete details of the physical world: both aim to achieve *enargeia*, vivid representation, or *subiectio sub oculis*, putting a picture in the mind's eye.²¹ And the goal of this vivid representation is to move the reader or listener emotionally (*mouere*). Livy achieves this verisimilitude in part through references to specific landmarks and monuments.²² Yet his references to monuments place them in new relationships with one another or juxtapose monuments that are otherwise unrelated, thus producing new, compound reminders and a tension between objective reality and the reality

18. According to Cicero (*De orat.* 2.87), the Greek Simonides, whom the Latin sources credit with having invented the art of memory, first discovered that vision is the strongest of the senses. See Yates, *The Art of Memory*, 4.

19. On ancient standards for evidence, see C.W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983), 47–90. On vision in Livy's predecessors, with discussion of these passages see Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome*, 9–14; in Polybius, J. Davidson, "The Gaze in Polybius' Histories," *JRS* 81 (1991): 10–24; in Cicero, Vasaly, *Representations*, 89–104; in Livy, Feldherr, "Spectacle and Society," 3–7.

20. As Miles points out (*Reconstructing Early Rome*, 19), Polybius' criticism of Timaeus is invaluable for understanding Livy's "conspicuous and repeated difficulties." On this criticism, see K. Sacks, *Polybius on the Writing of History*, *Classical Studies* 24 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981), 21–95.

21. On the potency of images, Feldherr ("Spectacle and Society," 308) says, "spectacle is such a powerful tool in Livy's text that in some cases it can substitute for, or even generate, reality."

22. Vasaly (*Representations*, 26–39, esp. 29–30) discusses the ability of places, especially those that bear traces (*vestigia*) of the past, to move (*movere*) people.

created by the text. The new reminders point back to complex relationships between stories and produce vantage points from which the reader can see a new reconstruction of the past. While vision aids the orator's recollection, while it helps both orator and historian persuade an audience, for the historian and his reader it is but a step toward intellectual insight and understanding.

The famous sentence in Livy's preface acknowledges this.

Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptum, foedum exitum, quod vitas. (Pref. 10)

[It is this that is particularly healthful and profitable in the study of history: you look on examples for a variety of experience set forth in a clear record. From there you may choose for yourself and your state what to imitate and what, shameful in its conception and shameful in its outcome, to avoid.]

Livy does not explicitly call his own written history a monument, though the implication is there in his later references to some written sources as *monumenta* (e.g., 6.1.2) and to others as *monumenta litterarum* (38.57.8).²³ Instead, he says that to look on a *monumentum* is a benefit of studying affairs (*in cognitione rerum*). And one does not even look on the *monumentum* itself except as space, a context for the *documenta*. Unlike Horace's famous metaphor "I have constructed a memorial more lasting than bronze," *exegi monumentum aere perennius . . .* (*Odes* 3.30.1), which emphasizes the size, solidity, and durability of the poet's achievement and draws attention to his building activity (*exigere*), Livy's words stress the active role that his audience must play to comprehend the past. The reader's study illuminates the record and makes the clear vision possible. The idea of vigorous personal effort is also conveyed in the preface when Livy says: "I call on each man for himself to pay careful attention to these things . . ." [*ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum . . .*] (Pref. 9). Livy's hypothetical student of history aims at seeing, but at seeing as a metaphor for understanding. Studying history

23. On Livy's history as a *monumentum*, see Moles, "Livy's Preface," 146. On history as monument in Herodotus and Thucydides, see H. Immerwahr, "Ergon: History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides," *AJP* 81 (1960): 261–90.

24 *Livy's Written Rome*

allows one to look on a *monumentum*, but a clear view is only part of this experience: the encounter with a *monumentum* that produces insight also entails the viewer's awareness of his or her own position in space (that of the *uiator* on the road passing by). While the narrative maneuvers the reader into a position that allows him or her to receive an instructive vision, the ideal student reaches the ultimate goal of understanding the past, at times through vision, at times through determining his or her own position relative to events recorded on the textual "monument," and at times through perceiving the structure and movement of a particular episode.

Movement through space is an essential part of the experience of Livy's *monumentum*. The closer one is to the *monumentum*, the clearer one sees it. However, the viewer who stands too close cannot take in the *monumentum* in its entirety.²⁴ Finding the right position, close enough to see clearly, far enough away to see comprehensively, is crucial. It is not, though, the end of the process. A clear and comprehensive vision from the appropriate distance produces insight, and insight produces movement. The reader is expected to act after establishing his or her spatial coordinates, to continue on in the direction indicated by the monument by choosing what to imitate and what to avoid (*unde, exitus, and uitare* all imply movement).²⁵ Thus the *monumentum* is a goal that paradoxically comes into view as one nears it; at the same time, it holds the viewer at a certain distance and provides a starting point for future conduct.

This quality of being at once spatial, visual, and mnemonic, of attracting the observer's gaze and then directing his or her memory and subsequent actions, makes the idea of the *monumentum* useful for an analysis of Livy's narrative technique. *Monumenta* provide opportunities for examining what Gérard Genette calls the "focalization" of a narrative, that is, for analyzing it by asking the question, Who sees?²⁶ Genette identifies types of discourse used to present a story (direct speech,

24. Cf. Livy's use of vision and distance at 6.1.2, a passage discussed in Jaeger, "*Custodia Fidelis Memoriae*," 362–63, and in Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome*, 57–61.

25. Vasaly (*Representations*, 30) points out that places with historical associations were able to "move" people emotionally and that this was also one of the three chief goals of rhetoric (the others were to please [*delectare*] and to teach [*docere*]). The metaphor is particularly appropriate for *monumenta*, which first convince the passerby to pause and then move him or her on down the road into the future. As a metaphorical *monumentum*, the history gives moral direction to this movement.

26. Gérard Genette's theory of narrative breaks it down into the grammatical categories of tense (the relationship between the narrative and the set of narrated events in terms of order, frequency, and duration), mood (the types of discourse used to present the story and the degrees of narrative representation they entail), and voice (which discusses the act of

reported speech, third-person narrative) and the degrees of narrative representation they entail. He monitors the way information is filtered and narrowed by various perceptors as it passes from narrator to reader. As concrete evidence that reaches from the past to the narrator's present, *monumenta* guide and restrict knowledge of the events they commemorate. And the historian's representations of the monuments restrict it further.

Genette explains that he uses the abstract term *focalization* for this narrowing because it indicates the restriction of knowledge more precisely than terms that involve metaphors of sense perception: one can know without seeing.²⁷ Still, I think that it is necessary to restore the visual metaphors when we analyze issues of perception and knowledge in ancient historians.²⁸ *Monumenta* require both vision and memory. As we have seen, ancient historiography emphasized the visual, from ranking eyewitness testimony higher than oral reports, written documents, or rumor, to holding up as an ideal the historian's presence at the events he recounts. Vision also plays an important role in historical narrative. Andrew Feldherr has demonstrated the potency of spectacle in Livy's histories, and James Davidson, who applies some of Genette's ideas to Polybius' *Histories*, writes that "lines of sight form their own structures, linking the protagonists and the readers of the *Histories* together in the act of looking."²⁹ For this reason Davidson prefers the term *gaze* to Genette's *focalization*.³⁰ Yet although Livy uses visual metaphors programmatically (e.g., *intueri* in the famous passage from his preface, quoted earlier),

narrating and the traces it leaves in the text). His discussion of mood includes the theory of focalization, which he applies to the field of knowledge of both narrator and characters. See Genette, *Figures III* (Paris, 1972), translated by J.E. Lewin as *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca, 1980). See also Genette, "Boundaries of Narrative," trans. A. Levonas, *New Literary History* 8 (1976): 1–13. M. Bal ("The Narrating and the Focalizing: A Theory of the Agents in Narrative," *Style* 17 [1983]: 234–69) identifies some of the problems that arise from Genette's terminology and clarifies his discussion. There is a useful summary in the *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*, ed. Irena R. Makaryk (Toronto, 1993), s.v. "Genette, Gérard."

27. Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, 189.

28. Here, I am following Davidson, who makes this point in "The Gaze in Polybius' Histories," 10–11.

29. Feldherr, "Spectacle and Society," esp. 1–22, 152–91; Davidson, "The Gaze in Polybius' Histories," 11.

30. According to Davidson ("The Gaze in Polybius' Histories," 11), "'focalization,' as a term formulated for the analysis of fictional texts, a complement to 'narration,' is problematic when applied to history, which must participate in what Hayden White has called 'a discourse of the real.'" Davidson also points out that, "'gaze' has the advantage of reflecting the visual metaphors which are used consistently by Polybius, though rejected by Genette as a naive view of narrative."

and although he often indicates a character's field of knowledge by what that character sees, I will not use the term *gaze* very often. Livy's constructive metaphors are different from those of Polybius, just as his project is different, and they require terminology adapted to them.

We have seen that Livy's text occupies physical space and creates metaphorical space, that author and reader traverse these spaces, that a *monumentum* is situated in space and gives meaning to the space in which it stands. We need terminology that extends beyond the visual to include the entire spatial experience of encountering a monument. While the term *gaze* captures the act of seeing, the terms *point of view* and *perspective* connote distance and movement through space better than *gaze* does. *Point of view* throws weight on the position a person takes to adopt their stance, and it implies the movement involved in taking up that position. In a like manner, *perspective* retains the idea of a particular direction and a particular stance that is lost in *gaze*. Therefore, although this study will occasionally use *gaze* to indicate a line of vision, and while it will use the more abstract term *focalization* to discuss the abstract issue of what a given character knows, it will rely heavily on the old metaphorical terms *perspective* and *point of view* to illustrate how space and movement through it, control of it, or simply the ability to see or comprehend it act as physical correlates to cognitive states.

The *Ab Urbe Condita* unites two extended narratives: a story of Rome's history told by an omniscient narrator and an account of writing Rome's history told from a first-person point of view that appears intermittently in asides, discussions of sources, and references to the present (e.g., in the preface).³¹ The relationship between these two narratives is most easily understood in terms that are spatial as well as visual, as movement between internal and external points of view relative to the *res gestae populi Romani*. The history's changes in perspective often occur at the monuments, because the monuments endure from the time of the narrated events to the present of the historian's writing. In addition, they sometimes occur at book ends and draw attention to parallels between the space of the physical text and the metaphorical space of the narrative.

These two narratives also reflect two perspectives on the city. Seen from the outside, it appears as a defined shape, space separated from the surrounding land by its religious boundary (the *pomerium*), pro-

31. In Genette's terms these are, respectively, a nonfocalized and an internally focalized narrative.

tected physically by its walls, and divided by social, political, and moral polarities—high and low, central and peripheral, public and private. From the inside, to a person on the street, the city appears as a miscellany of details, of landmarks, and of monuments that have specific associations.³² Thus, on the one hand, a view of the city as conceptually coherent usually entails seeing it from outside or above, from the mapmaker's perspective, just as seeing events as part of a coherent pattern entails adopting the objectivity of an omniscient narrator.³³ A view of it as a miscellany of details, on the other hand, entails seeing it from inside, or from a subjective position. The *Ab Urbe Condita* combines these abstract ideals and documentary particulars in such a way that the monuments, with their specific and often emotional associations, compel the reader to reconsider the abstract polarities that shape the community as well as the landscape, while the schematized landscape rearranges the monuments so that they elicit organized patterns from a hodgepodge of events.

Movements between these points of view are of particular interest, because some of Livy's exemplary characters, by acts of will, change the focalization of the very narrative in which they appear. Characters move from the inside to the outside of their own stories, adopting perspectives from which they determine the historical significance of their own actions. Sometimes the narrative expresses these changes in perspective as movement through space. And sometimes the narrative uses movement through space to maneuver the reader into a new perspective. As a

32. E. Gabba ("True History and False History in Classical Antiquity," *JRS* 71 [1981]: 50–62) describes the role of the city as a repository of information. He writes (61): "It seems clear that monuments, statues, toponyms, whose significance was for various reasons unclear, were at first invested with fantastic meaning of different kinds, but always related to legendary episodes or episodes of earliest Roman history; this took place in the context of an antiquarian and guide-book tradition aiming to explain and expound the monuments involved. In a complete reversal of roles, the monuments then became the document which guaranteed the historicity or credibility of the legends or stories which had grown up."

33. See J. Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy, and the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1976), 41–71. On conceptual models of the city, see H. Cancik, "Rome as Sacred Landscape and the End of Republican Religion in Rome," *Visible Religion: Annual for Religious Iconography* 4 (1985): 250–65. In *How to Lie with Maps* (Chicago, 1991), M. Monmonier presents an amusing discussion of the abstraction and deception that all mapmaking entails. A journey connects particular places into an even more significant whole. The journeys in Horace's *Satires* 1.5 and 1.9 come to mind. For a study on a related topic, see S. MacCormack, "*Loca Sancta*: The Organization of Sacred Topography in Late Antiquity," in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. R. Ousterhout (Urbana, 1990), 7–40.

result, in addition to the question of who sees, there arises a less personal question: From what point is their seeing? From a succession of changing points of view, Livy constructs a model reader, who does not play a passive role. The outermost of the narrative's many audiences, this reader participates in constructing the meaning of the text and decodes its various rhetorical gestures even as he or she watches others supply meaning to events and interpret them.³⁴

Livy's *monumenta* replace natural time and space with monumental time and space. As *uestigia* marking out direct routes between past and present, they allow the reader to stand outside events, on the threshold between past and present, but they also place the reader on the very edge of events, where representation becomes so vivid that he or she feels the movement of the story and responds to it with an impulsive desire to move in a particular direction. This dual cognitive state is paradoxical. We could call it one of "engaged objectivity." A person watches events from a distance and thus views them with clarity; at the same time, he or she moves in response to the narrative. At the end of her study of place and monuments in Ciceronian oratory, Ann Vasaly concludes that "this constant reliance on the visual and the concrete was but the Roman gateway to the world of ideas."³⁵ Her words are also relevant to Livy, for whom the "visual and the concrete" are directly and reciprocally connected to that abstract world. Livy conveys abstract ideas in a way that gives the illusion of a sensory experience. This sensory experience, in turn, is commemorated by a *monumentum* in the concrete world. While visual and aural memory can be public and social, tactile memory and memory of movement are essentially private and personal.³⁶ Thus, the public memories of Rome's past, when transmitted through the restored *monumenta*, become sensory and personal memories, and because the text acts on every single reader, the sensory and personal act of remembering becomes social again, within the community of readers.

The study of the ideas behind monuments and their place in a narrative economy entails an eclectic approach. Not only must we identify the relationship between a monument in the text and the physical world outside, but we must also recognize the significance of its appearance at a

34. On the many audiences in the history, see Feldherr, "Spectacle and Society"; on the adaptation of exempla in response to changing audiences, see J.D. Chaplin, "Livy's Use of Exempla and the Lessons of the Past" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1993).

35. Vasaly, *Representations*, 257.

36. See Fentress and Wickham, *Social Memory*, 1–40.

particular point in the written text and in the story, each of which has its own internal logic. We need to consider the contexts that give monuments meaning, the people they remind, and the type of event they recall. In addition, we must study the relationship between reminder and context, context and person reminded, reminder and person reminded.³⁷ We must consider the opportunities offered the author and the constraints imposed on him or her by events within the narrative, by topic, and by genre. The rhetorical purpose of the historian, persuasion for the sake of moral improvement, differs, for example, from that of the advocate, which is persuasion for its own sake. So too does his use of landscape and monuments.

The case studies in the chapters that follow describe the location of *monumenta* by their position in the city, in time, in the physical text, and in the story the text tells. Then, since the contexts created for the *monumenta* are both topographically realistic and constructed to support an argument, the various studies ask how particular reminders function in this dual context. From what vantage points in time and space does the reader perceive them? Moreover, Livy presents his *monumenta* as items that have, or at one time had, existence independent of his text; thus they offer material proof of the credibility of his narrative. How, then, does the urban landscape, with its *monumenta*, provide the verisimilar detail that helps the historian to characterize people and events?³⁸ Finally, how does the image of the city that Livy creates both draw on and influence the reader's perception of the landscape external to the text? And what are the moral, political, and ideological implications of this altered perception?

37. See, e.g., R. von Haehling, *Zeitbezüge des T. Livius in der ersten Dekade seines Geschichtswerkes: Nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus* (Stuttgart, 1989). He includes monuments in his catalog of Livy's temporal references.

38. Vasaly (*Representations*, 25) suggests that Cicero used monuments as inartificial or nonartistic proofs, like documents, laws, or the testimony of slaves under torture, all of which were considered to be "discovered," rather than "invented," by the orator.