Introduction

In the last surviving book of his history of Rome, the *Ab Urbe Condita*, Livy describes how the proconsul L. Aemilius Paullus, after defeating the Macedonian king Perseus at Pydna, traveled through Greece, visiting sites famous in history and literature (45.27.5–28.6). Livy says that these places are more impressive to hear of than to see, since report (*fama*) has increased their renown.1 His account of the tour fosters a sense of Roman ascendency in a Greece whose greatness belongs clearly to the past. Paullus made his way first through Thessaly to Delphi, site of the renowned oracle (*inclutum oraculum*), where he requisitioned for his own use two columns originally intended to hold statues of the Macedonian king.2 Then he went on to Lebadea, to Chalcis, and to Aulis, with its harbor, famous (*inclutum*) for once (*quondam*) harboring Agamemnon’s fleet of a thousand ships. Here the proconsul visited the Temple of Artemis, where Iphigenia was said to have died. Moving on, he came to Attica, “where a prophet of ancient times [*uates antiquus*] is worshiped as a god, and where there is an old [*uestustum*] sanctuary, pleasant for

1. “It was now almost autumn; Paullus decided to use the early part of the season to travel around Greece, and to visit those places that, made famous by reputation, have been believed to be greater by hearsay than they are when one makes their acquaintance by sight” [*autumn fere tempus erat; cuius temporis initio ad circumuendam Graeciam,uisendaque *<quae>* nobilitata *fama* maior auribus accepta sunt quam oculis noscuntur, *uti statuit*] (45.27.5). All citations from Books 41–45 are from *Titii Livii Ab Urbe Condita*, *Libri XLI–XLV*, ed. J. Briscoe (Stuttgart, 1986). On Livy’s use of *fama*, *fabula*, and the distinction between hearing and seeing in ancient historiography, see G. Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca, 1995), 14–20. For a reassessment of Paullus’ philhellenism, see W. Reiter, *Aemilius Paullus: Conquerer of Greece* (New York, 1988). On Paullus’ appropriation of Hellenic culture, see E.S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, 1992), 141–45, 245–48.
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the springs and rills all around.”3 His next stop was Athens, a city replete with ancient tradition (uatusta fama) but still, Livy concedes, one with many sights worth seeing: the Acropolis, the harbors and long walls, monuments of great generals, and statues of gods and men remarkable for artwork of all kinds.4 After sacrificing to Minerva on the Acropolis, Paullus went on to Corinth, a city that was lovely then, before its destruction (urbs erat tunc praeclara ante excidium). From Corinth he moved on to Sicyon, to Argos, and to Epidaurus with its Temple of Aesculapius, a place that Livy describes from the perspective of the narrative present: now it bears only the traces of its plundered offerings, but when Paullus saw it, it was richly adorned with the offerings themselves (nunc uestigiis reuolsorum donorum, tum donis dines erat). Paullus went next to Sparta, which was memorable (memorabilis) rather for its severity and its customs than for the splendor of its buildings.5

On the last and climactic stop of the tour an attraction finally lived up to its fame: Paullus entered the Temple of Jupiter at Olympia and looked on Phidias’ chryselephantine statue of the god. According to the Greek historian Polybius, who is probably Livy’s source for this travelogue, Paullus, greatly impressed, said that Phidias alone appeared to have made a likeness (μεμιμηθανεί) of the Zeus of Homer.6 (Plutarch tells us that the remark was famous.)7 Paullus went on to add, although his expectations had been high, the reality of the statue far exceeded them. Livy agrees that the statue did not disappoint: he says that Paullus was deeply

3. Briscoe prints: < . . . . . > Oropum> Atticæ unctum est, ubi pro deo uates antiquus colitur, templumque vestustum est fontibus riuisque circa amoenum (45.27.10).
4. Athenas inde, plenas quidem et ipsas uetustae famae, multa tamen uisenda habentes, arcem, portus, muros, Piræum urbi iungentes, naualia, <monumenta> magnorum imperatorum, simulacra deorum hominumque, omni genere et materiae et artium insignia (45.27.11).
5. Inde Lacedaemonem adit, non operum magnificentia sed disciplina institutisique memorabilium † ac silentiam † (45.28.4). Cf. Thucydides’ observation that buildings and ruins do not necessarily give a precise measure of a city’s former greatness (1.10.1–4).
7. “Much spoken of” [πολλητάλη] (Plutarch Aem. 28.2); see also Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, 3:433.
moved, as if he were gazing on Jupiter himself (*louem uelut praesentem intuens motus animo est*). And so, adds Livy, Paullus ordered a particularly honorific offering to be prepared, just as if he were about to sacrifice on the Capitoline: *itaque baud secus quam si in Capitolio immolaturus esset, sacrificium amplius solito apparari iussit* (45.28.5).

Livy’s version of the tour omits the famous remark about Phidias and Homer and replaces the reference to Greek art and poetry with one to the Capitoline Hill, so that, in contrast to the sculptor, Phidias, who is credited with lending concrete reality to the Zeus represented in the lines of Homer, the proconsul Paullus imposes a distinctly Roman stamp on the god. Paullus travels to the famous Greek towns, starting with Delphi, the center of the Greek world; but when he concludes his trip, he honors Jupiter by acting as if he were at the religious and military center of Rome.\(^8\) Time may have increased the renown of these tourist attractions, but by placing consistent emphasis on their role as reminders of a lost and greater past, Livy’s version of the tour indicates how far Greece has declined. Olympia, the one place where reality lives up to expectation, most clearly reflects the new world order: the pantheon conceived by the Greek poet has given way to the one that occupies the site of Rome.\(^9\) Paullus’ other actions after Pydna convey clearly a sense of Roman ascendency, and Livy’s description of his trip asserts that Rome is now the cultural center of the world. The narrative, therefore, reflects some fundamental convictions about the organization of space: Rome is the center of the empire it rules, and the Capitoline, the fixed center of Roman religion and home of the gods who are the source of Rome’s supremacy, is the center of Rome.

The ex-consul M. Servilius voices these convictions a few chapters later, when he argues in support of Paullus’ request for a triumph:

Maiores uestri omnium magnarum rerum et principia exorsi a dis sunt, et finem statuerunt. consul proficiscens praetorue paludatis lictoribus in prouinciam et ad bellum uota in Capitolio nuncupat:

---

\(^8\) While the Polybian account is fragmentary, it contains the remark about Homer, which Livy so conspicuously omits. In addition, Polybius says that Paullus took note of the solidity of Sicyon’s fortifications and the strength of Argos, whereas Livy simply calls them *nobiles urbes*. On Aemilius Paullus’ display of Roman cultural supremacy, see Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 245–48.

\(^9\) This comes out clearly in Camillus’ famous speech against the proposed move to Veii (5.51–54).
Servilius’ speech and Paullus’ tour appear in the last surviving book of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, yet the worldview they reflect at this moment of Roman triumph is entirely consistent with the one promoted by the history from the beginning. Although Romulus founds his original settlement on the Palatine, the Capitoline is where he dedicates the first temple, the shrine of Jupiter Feretrius (1.10.7). Here he deposits spoils taken from an enemy general killed in single combat, thus making the place the religious center of the city in its military capacity. By the end of Book 1 the discovery of the human head during the construction of the Temple of Jupiter confirms that Capitoline is truly “head” and center of Rome (1.55.5); Roman generals set out for their provinces after making vows on the Capitoline—disaster befalls the city when they fail to do so early in the Second Punic War (21.63.5–15)—and they return from the field with spoils to dedicate there (e.g., 25.39.17, 42.49.16). In the large cycle of the first pentad, which takes the *Ab Urbe Condita* from the destruction of Troy to that of Rome, the Capitoline alone remains intact and provides topographical continuity during the transition to the rebuilt city of Book 6.11 For Livy, space, time, Roman national memory, and the cultural practices that reinforce national identity all start from this center, move outward, and then return, as action oscillates annually between events at home and in the field, and as the city expands, collapses, and

10. There are problems with the text, but Servilius’ point is still clear. For the text printed here (Madvig’s) see Briscoe, *Titi Livii Ab Urbe Condita*, Libri XLI–XLV, p. 383. In his main text, Briscoe prints: *victor perpetrato < . . > eodem in Capitolium triumphans ad eodem deos quibus uota nuncupauit merita dona portans redit.*

grows back stronger than before in Books 1–6. The Capitoline, then, is both the center of Roman space and a Janus-like beginning and ending point for temporal cycles.12

This model does more than reflect political and religious Romanocentrism: it plays an important role in organizing the narrative.13 Faced with the real events of the past—a mass of particulars that, as it has been said, “do not offer themselves as stories”14—the historian must either supply

12. On the Capitoline as the beginning and end of temporal cycles, see also the description of the consul’s departure at 42.49.16. A.M. Feldherr (“Spectacle and Society in Livy’s History” [Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1991], 5–7) points out that by evoking anxieties for the future (will this consul return in triumph?) as well as memories of past consuls, the sight “provides a direct link to the progress of the state through time.”

The present study can be read as complementary to Feldherr’s, which focuses on the use of ritual and spectacle in Livy, including its effect on the reader. While, like Feldherr, I am interested in the visual, I am concerned more with the way references to the physical city and its monuments interact with the organization of the narrative, and less with the impact of appearances on events.

13. The idea of the “shape” of Roman history has begun to receive attention. C. Nicolet (Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire [Ann Arbor, 1991]) calls for geographical readings of authors who are not writing geography per se—poets and especially historians. He suggests “a sort of spatial and temporal spiral,” beginning with Rome’s expansion in increasingly distant defensive and offensive wars. According to Nicolet (8–9), in the Augustan Age geography begins to influence history. Nicolet sees Livy’s growing interest as a result of contemporary interest in the subject. (As evidence, he points to Agrippa’s map on the Porticus Vipsania [100–101].) On contemporary geographical knowledge and exploration, see Nicolet’s discussion (57–94). His sympathetic discussion of Livy is in sharp contrast to the views of the critics who call Livy an indifferent geographer at best on the grounds that he did not travel much and includes few geographical excursuses in his work. On Livy and geography, with examples of errors, see P.G. Walsh, Livy, His Historical Aims and Methods (Cambridge, 1961), 153–57; M.R. Girod, “La Géographie de Tite-Live,” ANRW II.30.2 (1982): 1190–1229. Girod (1192–93) defends Livy by pointing out that this appearance of indifference is partly the result of accident, since the epitomes of the later, lost Books 103 and 104 refer to descriptions of Gaul and Germany. Girod also points out that Livy was writing Romanocentric, not universal, history. Therefore, what did not matter to Rome would have been irrelevant digression, while Italian geography was something that Livy would have expected his audience to know. Judging Livy as a geographer is complicated by the lack of evidence for his life and travels. He was familiar with the area around his native Patavium. He lived in Rome at some point, but there is little evidence to tell how long; he claims to have seen the tomb of Scipio Africanus at Liternum. E. Badian (“Livy and Augustus,” Xenia 31 [1993]: 31 n. 12) underscores the dearth of evidence for Livy’s travels.

14. H. White (The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation [Baltimore, 1987], 4) writes: “Narrative becomes a problem only when we wish to give to real events the form of story. It is because real events do not offer themselves as stories that their narrativization is so difficult.” See also S. Bann, “Analysing the Discourse of History,” Dalhousie Review 64, no. 2 (1984): 376–400. An interesting study of the way literary experience influences the perception and interpretation of events is P. Fussell’s The Great War and Modern Memory (Oxford, 1975). Although Fussell’s subject is modern, his
from his imagination or find in his sources patterns that make these events elicit a sympathetic response from his audience. The reader of Livy’s preface, for example, comprehends Rome’s entire past in the organic and medical metaphors of growth, disease, and decline, as well as in the architectural metaphor of the construction and collapse of a massive edifice.\(^{15}\) In addition, while adopting the chronological framework of his annalistic predecessors, Livy organizes sections of the history around such central themes as the power struggles between different segments of Roman society, and presents particular episodes as dramas divided into discrete acts.\(^{16}\) Finally, the books, pentads, and decades of his narrative correspond to historical epochs.\(^{17}\) A Romanocentric worldview is, then, one of several ordering devices, some traditional and some unique, that give shape to Livy’s narrative and distinguish significant particulars within it. Combined, these devices place a distinctive stamp on discussion is useful for anyone interested in literary convention and historical events (especially pertinent are chaps. 3, “Adversary Proceedings”; 4, “Myth, Ritual, and Romance”; and 5, “Oh What a Literary War”).

15. On the body/state analogy, see J. Béranger, Recherches sur l’aspect idéologique du Principat (Basel, 1953), 223–30. For Livy’s use of medical terms, see E. Dutoit, “Tite-Live s’est-il intéressé à la médecine?” MH 5 (1948): 116–23. Livy mixes architectural and metaphors twice, first when he describes Rome’s decay (Pref. 9): \textit{labente deinde paulatim disciplina ululat desidentes primo mores} [sc. the reader] \textit{sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora quibus nec utita nostra nec remedia pati possemus peruentum est}. He does so a second time (Pref. 10) when he points out that the healthful (\textit{salubre}) thing about studying history is looking at evidence set out on a record/monument (\textit{monumentum}).

While these images are immediately clear to the reader of the preface, the loss of the last two-thirds of the history prevents us from knowing whether or not Livy organized the entire history around them. On the effects of this loss, see J. Henderson, “Livy and the Invention of History,” in History as Text, ed. Averil Cameron (London, 1989), 64–85, esp. 76–83.
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Livy’s version of the received tradition. Scholars have long appreciated Livy’s skill at arranging material as a facet of his style; more recently they have come to realize that it is one way in which Livy conveys his conception of historical change and that his masterful organization of a long and heterogenous narrative demonstrates his sophistication as both artist and historian.18

In writing history ab urbe condita, Livy describes both the Roman world extending through space and the life of the city extending through time.19 As it recounts the events of Rome’s early history, Book 1 introduces the major topographical features of the city proper: the Tiber, the Aventine, the Palatine, the Capitoline, and the Forum.20 Then, the opening passages of Book 2 link the expulsion of the Tarquins to the origin of the Campus Martius and the creation of Tiber Island.21 After the destruction of the city in Book 5, Camillus’ great speech weaves topographical references into a coherent and significant landscape that the Romans find they cannot abandon. In the first half of Book 6, the Capitoline represents the city by synecdoche when it becomes the spatial and rhetorical center of a debate concerning political supremacy in a reborn and outward-looking Rome. The city’s physical changes correspond to institutional changes and are, at the same time, historical events in their own right. Thus they both provide material for the narrative and give it its shape.

This book examines Livy’s use of the Roman world, particularly the city Rome, as one of his primary organizing devices. It argues that a great deal of evidence for Livy’s complexity and sophistication as a thinker lies in his presentation of Roman history as a story of space and memory, of the landscape and its acquisition of meaning, and of the

18. On historical order, development, and change, see esp. Luce, Livy, 230–97; Miles, Reconstructing Early Rome, 75–109.
20. E.g., Tiber: 1.3.8, 1.4.4; Aventine: 1.3.9, 1.6.4; Palatine: 1.5.1, 1.6.4, 1.7.3; Capitoline: 1.10.5; the future Forum: 1.12.1. On the development of the landscape in Book 1, see M. Griffe, “L’Espace de Rome dans le Livre I de l’Histoire de Tite-Live,” in Arts et Légendes d’Espaces: Figures du Voyage et rhétoriques du Monde, Communications Réunies et Présentées par Christian Jacob et Frank Lestringant (Paris, 1981), 111–22.
21. 2.5.2–4. The Tiber Island was created from the Tarquins’ grain crop, which was cut from the Campus Martius and thrown into the river. Other constructive destruction in Book 2 includes Valerius Publicola relocating the site of his new house from a “regal” to a “republican” location (2.7.5–12) and, in the next year, the destruction of the Pons Sublicius to defend the city from the Etruscan army on the Janiculum (2.10.1–10).
monuments that attempt to preserve that meaning. Accordingly, this book is concerned with the representation of space, monuments, and memory in the *Ab Urbe Condita* and also, in converse, with the idea of the *Ab Urbe Condita* as a spatial entity, a monument, and a lengthy act of remembering. In claiming that Livy writes originally and profoundly about the past by writing originally and profoundly about space, monuments, and memory, this study joins a body of recent critical work on Livy that reconsiders previous assumptions about Livy’s methods, goals, and merit as a historian. In particular, these are the assumptions made by source criticism (*Quellenforschung*), which seeks to identify what writers Livy followed in each part of his history. This is not to deny the usefulness of source criticism to Livian studies but to move beyond seeing it as an end in itself. For example, in recent years the study of the rhetorical devices that ancient historians use when they criticize other historians or when they write about themselves, their goals, their sources, and their methods has emerged as a promising subfield of historiographical studies in general. Consequently the question has arisen as to whether or not the metaphor of the historian *following* his sources is apt. The image of Livy lost in the records of Roman history and dogging the tracks of the annalist Valerius Antius in one direction before turning aside to follow Claudius Quadravigarius in another has given way to one of Livy as a Roman Daedalus constructing a monument from the rubble of the ages and leaving broken edges visible as reminders that any coherent account of the past is, at best, contrived from ruins.

---


24. See in particular the excellent chapter titled “History and Memory,” in Miles, *Reconstructing Early Rome*, 8–74. In much of the theory of monuments and history that underlies this study, I am in agreement with Miles. His focus, however, is on Livy’s rhetorical use of the seeing/hearing dichotomy, not on matters of space.
Livy’s account of Aemilius Paullus’ tour reflects what is probably a universal tendency to view one’s own city as the center of the world. The *Ab Urbe Condita* (Christina Kraus and others note that the title has spatial as well as temporal significance) is nothing if not Romanocentric. In an ethnocentric view of the world, places and peoples are interesting or uninteresting to the degree to which they are connected to or impinge on this center. They are also interesting if they occupy the other feature of a whole, the edge. Livy’s narrative journey through Roman history, a long and circuitous trip, takes author and reader through a model of Roman space that emphasizes its center, Rome, and periphery, the various frontiers. In addition, Livy organizes particular episodes around other spaces that emphasize center and edge: the city with its outer walls and inner citadel; the camp with its central meeting place and peripheral fortifications. Various degrees of distance, familiarity, and importance between center and edge can be expressed by a series of concentric circles representing boundaries—for example, those of the city, of Italy, of the territory under Roman control, and then of the known world.


26. For Romans in the late first century B.C., the known world was circular; they called it the *orbis terrarum*. Roman ethnocentrism reached its logical extreme in the idea that the *urbis* was not just the center of the *orbis terrarum* but was identical with the *orbis terrarum* itself, an idea that was particularly important in the Augustan Age, as is suggested by the popularity of the collocation *urbis et orbis*. See E. Bréguet, “*Urbis et Orbi: Un cliche et un thème,*” in *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, ed. J. Bibauw (Brussels, 1969), 1:140–52; Nicolet, *Space, Geography, and Politics*, 31–34; J. Romm, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (Princeton, 1992), 46–48.

27. In some cases the center of the space/narrative analogue is not topographical but a charismatic and powerful man radiating authority to those around him. For it is easy and natural to superimpose such a simple and versatile model onto other categories. For example, the Stoic philosopher Hierocles (writing a hundred years after Livy’s death) arranged human relationships in a series of concentric circles. A man is the center point, his intimates and family occupy the inner rings, and less intimate connections take up the outer orbits. The wise man, according to Hierocles, seeks to bring those who occupy the outer orbits closer to the inside, to draw them nearer to himself by treating them as if they were close connections (Stobaeus 4.671.7–673). As A.A. Long and D.N. Sedley point out (The Hellenistic Philosophers, 2 vols. [Cambridge, 1987], 1:349–350), a similar model appears in Seneca’s letters (*Ep.* 12.6–9). Seneca arranges a person’s lifetime in a series of concentric circles, with a day occupying one of the inner rings, a month the ring around it, a year the ring around that. On his description, see T. Habinek, “Seneca’s Circles: *Ep.* 12.6–9,” *CA* 1 (1982): 66–69. For more discussion of this model, see chapter 5.
In addition, a spatial model of personal identity requires both a fixed and solid center (something of one’s own that establishes identity positively) and sufficiently impermeable boundaries (something that establishes identity negatively by separating a person from others). A nation requires public centers, whether they are places, leaders, or ideals, as well as boundaries, both physical and cultural, that distinguish it from other nations. It relies on public institutions and public monuments to preserve this identity over time. On the one hand, Livy’s representation of Rome focuses on the city center—especially the Forum, where factions argue about the nature of the city, and on Arx and Capitoline, which epitomize Rome in its religious and military capacities. On the other hand, it directs attention to the edge of the republican city, the city walls with their gates, through which good and evil influences enter and leave.

What follows will concentrate on episodes in the *Ab Urbe Condita* that involve monuments (in Latin *monumenta*, “reminders”) commemorating important persons or events. These are monuments that Livy has located precisely by reference to a permanent landmark, such as a hill, a gate, or the Forum. Such precision has a universalizing function: a reader at Rome could see the *monumenta* or, if not the *monumenta* themselves, the places where they once were; a reader who was not in the city or had never seen it could imagine them in a generic urban setting, near the citadel or Forum and therefore at the city center, or near a gate and therefore at the periphery. I have narrowed this study further to focus on reminders that for various reasons fail to point unambiguously back to a particular person or event. With one exception (see chap. 2), they are *monumenta* that Livy represents as lost, decayed, or broken and that the text restores. Such ruins can bear a great deal of interpretive weight for two reasons. First, Rome itself is the product of a lost city, Troy, whose destruction still resonates in Livy’s history, particularly in the first pentad. This raises the possibility that instances of loss and ruin at Rome throughout the *Ab Urbe Condita* have thematic significance. If the

28. A good example of cultural boundaries reinforcing physical ones is Rome’s religious development during the reign of Numa: *Et cum ipsi se homines in regis uelut unici exempli mores formarent, tum finitim etiam populi, qui ante castra non urbem positant in medio ad sollicitandum omnium pacem crediderant, in eam uerecundiam adduci sunt, ut ciu- tatem totam in cultum uersam deorum uiolati ducerent nefas* (1.21.2).


30. Kraus (“No Second Troy,” 270–82) argues that the references to the Trojan War, first in the victory over Veii and then in the Gallic sack of Rome, assimilate the destruction of
destruction of Troy released regenerative forces that founded Rome, and if Rome’s own Troy-like destruction in Book 5 caused the city to grow back stronger in Book 6, then even piecemeal destruction, disintegration, and loss merits examination to see what alternate Rome it might generate. Second, the main thrust of Livy’s narrative is forward and outward; Rome’s accumulation of land, buildings, and spoils provides evidence for an account of increasing wealth and power. The references to deteriorating monuments offer a narrative that runs counter to this litany of accumulation. The mention of renamed places, destroyed buildings, and lost spoils reveals that the present is not simply the sum of the past, that the past is different for what it had as well as for what it did not have. Livy’s reader contemplates the evidence for Rome’s irretrievable loss, much as Aemilius Paullus viewed the famous sites of Greece.

The monumenta restored by the author perform the same dual function of reminding and advising that other monumenta do, but their messages are more complex. While intact monumenta point back to exempla and draw moral lessons from them, these reminders draw attention to themselves as well and convey a second set of lessons. When monuments fail and the text restores them, reminders of stories give way to stories about reminders. By drawing attention to the author’s reconstructive activity, the restored monuments commemorate his recollection of that past. Here Livy’s history becomes didactic on two levels: while the contents of the narrative teach lessons about the past, the narrative related by the lost and restored monuments conveys lessons about ways of remembering the past through the present. In addition, destroyed monuments draw attention to the fallibility of memory and the traditional ways of preserving it, because they indicate that the loss of the past is permanent, and because they hinder access to the past with all its original lessons. Consequently, they emphasize the arbitrary and insecure
nature of lessons drawn from such an imperfectly recollected past. This artificial landscape, not a mirror of the city but a handful of the mirror’s broken shards, reminds the reader that a coherent account of real past events is not a reproduction but a reconstruction.

In his preface Livy says that it will be a pleasure for him “to have taken thought for the memory of the deeds of the foremost people on earth” [rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populi . . . consuluisse] (Pref. 3). We can understand this expression, as we can many expressions in the preface, to be a double entendre. Here the meaning of “the memory of the deeds of the foremost people on earth” slips between the objective and the subjective: Livy writes for the memory of Rome’s achievements as well as for the ability of Romans to remember their past.34 The lesson of the history, then, is about both the contents of the past and the importance of remembering the record.

This book aims to be representative, not exhaustive. After briefly discussing the idea of the monumentum (chap. 1), it examines four episodes in which Livy’s narrative maps the plot of a story onto the Roman landscape, then commemorates the particular enactment of the plot in a monument. These plots are simple, constructed around movement between spatial polar opposites, like the movement to and fro between starting positions that characterizes a battle narrative or the movement between low and high that represents the rise and fall of an assault on a citadel.35 Such movements generate metaphors: for example, the movement between low and high that characterizes an assault on a citadel can also represent a politician’s rise and fall. As plots they convey particular lessons when Livy superimposes them on the unique features of the Roman landscape at critical moments in Roman history.

34. On the “slippage” of other words in the preface, see Moles, “Livy’s Preface,” 142.
35. Kraus (“No Second Troy”) observes that Livy’s text, like Livy’s city, grows “by fitting together locus after narrative locus.” According to Kraus (270), “These commonplace are narrative paradigms with which to construct stories that are both familiar and new. By using them as building blocks which can be indefinitely recombed, the historian can make connections via repetition and allusion. The reader, who recognizes the motifs, understands not only the story being told but also its relationship to past history.” Kraus discusses this topic more extensively in a forthcoming study of formulaic elements in Livy. The spatial plots I am talking about are even more abstract than the literary commonplace to which Kraus refers. (Kraus’ exemplary topos is the capture of a city.) They are simply repeated movements, the stuff of which commonplaces (like the capture of a city) can be made.
The first case study (chap. 2) examines the relationship between an abstract plot, its setting, and its monuments, through a close reading of Livy’s account of the battle over the Sabine women. The second (chap. 3) contrasts Livy’s account of the political career of M. Manlius Capitolinus, hero and demagogue, with that of M. Furius Camillus, hero and exile: by using the Capitoline as the focal point for the events that bridge the gap between Books 5 and 6, Livy shows how one place becomes an ambiguous reminder as it acquires conflicting associations over time. A close reading of the story of Lucius Marcius, who averts a military catastrophe in Spain during the Second Punic War (chap. 4), shows how memory and reminders provide lifesaving boundaries for national identity in a time of crisis. Chapter 5 presents a detailed study of a problematic narrative that stems from problematic reminders: the account of the so-called trials of the Scipios and of Scipio Africanus’ withdrawal from Rome. In addition to treating critical moments in Rome’s history as events shaped by and shaping space, these episodes raise issues about the relationships between *monumenta* and the nature of Roman memory and between *monumenta* and the nature of Roman identity. The conclusion returns to Livy’s preface and asks a series of questions. Livy’s history, it suggests, is an extended representation of space that creates and maintains a sense of crisis. Where is the author and what role does he play in this crisis, and where and who is his ideal reader? How are the relative positions of author and reader crucial to the well-being of the state?

In the decades after Actium, as Romans tried to forget a century of civil war, and as the city underwent a comprehensive program of ideologically motivated construction and reconstruction, Livy produced his own morally charged model of Roman space. Like the Augustan building program, it was massive, comprehensive, and coherent; and like the Augustan program, it reshaped Roman space in a way that aimed to guide the perception, thoughts, and movements of those who entered...
The chapters that follow will show how, in constructing his written city, Livy constructed a reader who made national memory personal by receiving Livy’s interpretation of the past, not just as images in the mind’s eye, but as a heightened and altered awareness of the space around him or her, of his or her own movements through that space, and of the change in perspective this movement produced. This reader’s sense of space contributes to Livy’s definition of Roman historical memory and, in consequence, to his definition of Roman identity.

37. For a discussion of the way in which the Augustan development of the Campus Martius guided the sight and movement of anyone entering Rome from the north, see D. Favro, “Reading the Augustan City,” in Narrative and Event in Ancient Art, ed. Peter J. Holliday (Cambridge, 1993), 230–57. In his chapter titled “Foundation and Ideology” in Reconstructing Early Rome (137–78), Miles points out the strain placed on republican values by the transformation of the city into the capitol of an empire and notes the moral idealization of the countryside that was the result.