ROMAN MALE BODIES: LIVY AND THE FIRST LEGENDS OF ROME

Cătălina POPESCU
University of Bucharest

Résumé : L'article suivant traite de la comparaison entre le corps humain et le corps politique dans l'ouvrage historique *Ab urbe condita* de Tite-Live. Si les travaux scolastiques antérieurs portaient sur le rôle des personnages féminins dans la dissolution du royaume et la création de la république romaine, mon article s'attarde sur le rôle des hommes. Si les femmes apparaissent comme des symboles du siège inviolable de Rome, les hommes ont joué un rôle très distinctif. Après la période du royaume pendant laquelle les rois symbolisaient la « tête » de l'État, les hommes de la république romaine furent associés à ses « bras », membres utiles, mais souvent voués au sacrifice pour sauver la « santé » du corps. On peut considérer les légendes de héros tels que Manlius Torquatus, Mucius Scaevola et Horatius Cocles.

Mots-clés : corps, bras, mâle, tête, roi
Keywords: body, arms, male, head, king

Throughout centuries, the idea of comparing human anatomy with architectonic or social bodies has a long and interesting history. Finding similarities between the intricacies of bodies and those of lands or cities is not uncommon. From physical cities to the abstract networking of political entities, the comparison continues in modern political philosophy which shows the same anthropocentric perception of the world[1]. Thus, human bodies are the model to political bodies, and even more, human inhabitants represent intricate organs within the complex world of socio-economic organisms. Thus, in her article "Body Politic" Joëlle Rollo-Koster asserts that the bodily metaphors carried on from Aesop, Demosthenes, and Plato to Cicero and Livy, and well into the Christian texts of the Roman Empire, including

[1] The regretted Prof. Alexandru Barnea from the Department of History at the University of Bucharest was present in the audience while I was discussing this subject and suggested that I investigate the theological and political texts of the Middle Ages to see the same equation between the king and the state, in terms of body. Indeed, there are many correspondences as visible in the page above and in note 2.

Paul's *Corinthians* I, 12: 12–27, *Colossians*, 1: 18 and *Ephesians*, 5: 23–30, and Augustin's *City of God*, Book IV, Chapter 12. This metaphor flourished in medieval times. Rollo-Koster specifies (2017):

> Early theologians continued the use of bodily metaphors. Their notion of the body politic was a mystical Christian body united in the sharing of Christ, the Eucharist or transubstantiation (the substantial change of the bread and the wine of the mass into the body and blood of Christ). The metaphor took on a theocratic connotation, implying divine leadership.

Livy himself is not exempt from such temptation. He even picked up a legend from Aesop and associated the aristocracy of early Rome with a belly, while the plebians were linked to working limbs capable of feeding its entrails (2, 32, the parable of Menenius Agrippa)[2]. Not only the social class but also the gender of those involved plays a role in their association to various organs. When it comes to Livy's work, S. R. Joshel discusses in her article, "The Female Body and the Body Politic" (2002), the importance of the feminine body in early Roman legends, as representation of the integrity and wholesomeness of Rome's core itself. According to Joshel, the eternal city is linked to human bodies, but more importantly, appears as a chaste seat of femininity which needs to be kept away from *stuprum* or unlawful access from enemies (whether from outside or within)[3]. Joshel believes not only that the feminine body functions as a buffer area to preserve untouched the core of the city (occupied in her view by the men), but also that it is the duty of women to keep their body (and their city) unavailable to penetration from outside. Thus, women represent a guarded border, men being somehow cocooned by these delineating females (2002: 175):

> The association of male honor and female chastity makes a different kind of sense when we observe the narrative role of other women in Livy's early books. Women function as obstacles or embody spaces, often between

[2] This is in *Fable 130* in the Perry's *Index*. The limbs rebel against the belly because they think that this apparently idle organ eats all the food while they do all the necessary work, without having any of the delights. Nevertheless, they later notice that, when the belly is no longer fed by their work, they all become limp and weak, since the "lazy" belly was quietly distributing food to all of them. As noticed also by Joëlle Rollo-Koster in her article for the 250th birthday of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2017 (https://www.britannica.com/topic/body-politic), Livy re-takes this fable to compare the senatorial class to the proverbial belly and the plebians to those limbs, during their rebellious secession.

[3] See Sandra R. JOSHEL, "The Female Body and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia", *in Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World* (ed. L.K. McClure), Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2002, pp. 175–179. However, this 'protection' of the feminine core takes at times violent forms of cleansing of those defiled, lest their impurified bodies might affect the 'body politic' (p. 175): "The Sabines put their bodies between their battling fathers and new husbands, offering to take on the anger they would inflict (I, 13, 1–4). Tarpeia fails to use her body in this way. Bribed by the Sabine king when she fetches water outside the city wall, the girl admits Rome's enemies into the citadel (I, 11, 6–9)".

> and separating men. [...] once invaded, the buffer zone becomes harmful to what it/she once protected. If women are boundaries, rape, which assaults an orifice, a marginal area of the body, creates a special vulnerability for the 'center', that is, men.

If the female *sanctum* needs to be a blockage point for political and human health, my paper suggests that the male protagonists of the early legends of the Roman republic represent the opposite of this concept. In my view, Livy's association with human physiology and anatomy will show unexpected intricacies, given the military destiny of this city and the fact that its men are treated at times of growth as central cerebral entities, and at times of crisis, as expendable organs of motion. If Lucretia and Virginia's bodies needed to be impenetrable in terms of sexual violence in order for the city to maintain its integrity, or if a Roman woman (like Cloelia) needs to return intact from a hostage situation in order for the city to survive, male heroes are worthy of Rome only if they are willing to sacrifice their limbs and embrace a destiny of expendability. Their bodies must be opened to swords, ready for wounding and mutilating if they wish to maintain the integrity of Rome's immortal *corpus*.

In my view, during the first years of the city, the body of Rome is somewhat ambiguous, as it slowly grows into a more mature and specialized organism. The specific functions of various organs are not yet distinguishable within this growing core which initially has at its center the body of a king. In Book 1 there is no Rome without Romulus, no sacred enclosure without his capable, building hands. His body, once consecrated, is an extension of the city, endowed with *insignia* that make it special and mark it for authority (1, 8: *se ipse* ***venerabilem insignibus*** *imperii fecisset*)[4]. He constructs Rome as the sacred impenetrable enceinte, as the regretted Eugen Cizek observes in Livy 1, 7, 2 (*Mentalités et institutions politiques romaines,* 1996: 20), a core later associated by Joshel with corporal inviolability[5]. He even punishes his brother for trying to leap over its walls, in violation of their *penetralia* (1, 7: *Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea*). Not only is Romulus the one who contours Rome's sacred core, but also the one who enhances its limits and imprints its vital rhythm and ability to grow. He also raises its body by literally enlarging its "live core" through import of people and through territorial extension (1, 8: ***Crescebat interim urbs*** *munitionibus alia atque alia appetendo loca, cum in spem magis futurae multitudinis quam ad id quod tum hominum erat munirent*).

[4] For the Latin text, I am using and quoting the online sources described in the bibliography.

[5] Eugen CIZEK (*Mentalités et institutions politiques romaines*, Paris, Fayard, 1990; in Romanian, *Mentalități și instituții romane,* trad. Ilieş Câmpeanu, București, Editura Globus, 1996, p. 20) notices that deceased human bodies could not have been deposited in the enceinte, unless under special circumstances, precisely to avoid pollution of all sorts. Thus, we can notice a link between the purity of bodies and the purity of the space of Rome. The description of foundation rituals by Eugen Cizek (*ibid.*, p. 20) also testifies for the fact that correspondences between living bodies (albeit of animals), enclosures, and sacred tellurian geometry were constantly present in the architectonic efforts of the first settlers.

As Livy suggests, he creates a *body* of law in order to contour the bustling citizen *body* (1, 8: *Rebus divinis rite perpetratis vocataque ad concilium* ***multitudine quae coalescere in populi unius corpus*** *nulla re praeterquam legibus poterat,* ***iura dedit***). He is the one who sets the necessary frames of the city and even enhances it with 'prosthetics' on which its new 'flesh' can be grafted: even fallen adversaries and their paraphernalia/armors (which are nothing more than imprints and molds of their former bodies) are agents of growth and 'bodily' development, worth adding to its architectonics: 1, 10 ***spolia ducis hostium caesi suspensa*** *fabricato ad id apte ferculo* ***gerens in Capitolium*** *ascendit*. As Joseph Campbell asserts in *A Hero with a Thousand Faces: The Monomyth* (2008: 35), fallen heroes or foes create *loci memoriae,* places of significance and even new institutions[6]. According to the assertions of Georges Dumézil in *Mythe et épopée* I (1968: 292), Romulus draws out bodily extensions to this architectonic *corpus* of Rome, *donnant ainsi à sa création un corps spécial fort* (robur, *8, 6;* vires, *8, 7*), *puis dans ce corps considérable, par le choix de cent sénateurs, il a formé un organe de jugement et de direction* (consilium, *8, 7*)[7].

Like a young organism, the city and its land also perform reproductive functions: the king understands the importance of *proles* and the political implications of claiming autochthony (literally, "birth from Earth", 1, 8: *natam e terra sibi prolem*). Enclosure of foreigners in a political asylum and abduction of Sabine women for confinement within its budding families are also part of this masterful growth plan. Rome appears to grow new flesh over its initial skeleton, with women and *opes* only adding to its natural development. Not surprisingly, women are closer to its gestating core and appear as flesh-and-blood *opes*, resources or riches. Fasciano and Kesner (1996: 19) testify for this interpretation, explaining that the Sabine women are registered together with other third function resources as *richesses héréditaires.* As I mentioned in one of my previous papers on indigenization, the abduction of the Sabines is perceived both as flesh grafting and blood renewal[8]. Rome itself now appears as a mound of flesh, even resembling a tumoral growth to its concerned neighbors who refuse to let their daughters mix their blood with the Romans, for political and

[6] Campbell specifies in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces, Prologue: The Monomyth,* Chapter 4. "The World Navel", p. 35, Novato, California, New World Library, Third Edition, 2008, p. 35: "Here and there, furthermore, are special shrines. Wherever a hero has been born, had wrought, or has passed back into the void, the place is marked and sanctified. A temple is erected there to signify and inspire the miracle of perfect centeredness; for this is the place of the breakthrough into abundance. Someone at this point discovered eternity". Also: "The one who enters the temple compound and proceeds to the sanctuary is imitating the deed of the original hero. His aim is to rehearse the universal pattern as a means of evoking withing himself the recollection of the life-centering, life-renewing form". A similar view appears in my "*Ta Klea Andron* – (Dis)embodiment and Heroic Peregrination at Ovid", *in Aproape, departe, pretutindeni, nicăieri. Glose perpetue la tema exilului*, eds Theodor Georgescu and Alexandru M. Călin, Bucharest, Bucharest University Press, 2021, pp. 115–146.

[7] Georges DUMÉZIL, *Mythe et épopée* I, Paris, Gallimard, 1968.

[8] The paper is titled "Indigenizarea 'Celuilalt' – Cazul romanizării lui Asclepios la Ovidiu", *in Pontica* 51 (2018), a volume curated by the Museum of National History and Archaeology of Constanța and dedicated to the anniversary of 2000 years since Ovid's death.

eugenic fears (1, 9, 8–10: *Nusquam benigne legatio audita est: adeo simul spernebant, simul tantam in medio **crescentem molem** sibi ac posteris suis metuebant*).

As Rome's symbolic 'head', the king appears indispensable to the well-being of his pulsating city, since he is a constant caretaker of its corporeal well-being (1, 16: *sui **corporis** creari **regem** volebant;* two lines after, the king is named *caput: Et esse igitur **aliquod caput** placebat, et nemo alteri concedere in animum inducebat*). The king simply cannot be separated physically from his space of action[9]. It is so fused with Rome, that his eventual bodily disappearance (1, 16: *nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit*) is enough to cause fear of civic dissolution. The mere absence of his *corpus* on his land raises suspicions of bodily dismemberment (1, 16: *Fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos qui **discerptum regem patrum manibus** taciti arguerent*) combined with fears of chaos, fact which begs the question whether there is not a genuine interchangeability between the physical integrity of the king and the wellbeing of the *body* politic, the way Michel Foucault believed[10]. Only when reassured of Romulus' intactness in the ethereal spheres, can the citizens think about succession: it becomes obvious that the city will survive without the capable body of Romulus, as the king and his city are no longer fused.

The city receives new blood through a successful transmission of power. Alexandr Koptev (2005: 386–387) analyzed the royal succession after Romulus and concluded that the kings did not only descend from other stocks and other cities, but also brought in foreign blood through marital relations:

> Thus, this seems to suggest that, according to tradition, the succession of regal power followed a certain rule. The rule can be described as a system of kinship links among the royal families of neighboring communities, by which a mature royal son of one community was betrothed to the royal daughter of another community, most often where his grandfather had ruled[11].

According to the work of Dumézil (1958: 86, see also Fasciano-Castor 1996: 15), Romulus and his brother cumulated all the three Indo-European functions, including

[9] Cizek points out (1996: 21) that later on, during the empire, this *caput* is further and further away from the citizens: *Chiar dacă glorificau Roma, 'căpetenia imperiului',* caput imperii, *cetățenii romani ai Imperiului nu mai vedeau, cel puțin cu ochii minții, hotarele Cetății lor, adică Roma sau orașele lor natale, că se aflau în Italia sau în provincii.*

[10] Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, New York, Pantheon Books, 1980, pp. 55–59, believes that the inviolability of the king's body was visible also in the way the law punished those who attempted and succeeded in the assassination of the king. Their torment was a multiplication of whatever the king's body endured at their hands.

[11] Thus, according to this author a lot of their power also lied in their ties to their wives. See "'Three Brothers' at the Head of Archaic Rome: The King and His 'Consuls'", *in Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 54, H. 4 (2005), pp. 382–423, Koptev (*op. cit.*, pp. 386–387) even sees a *hieros gamos* within the relationship between early kings and their wives, even when it comes to potential couples of a royal daughter and usurper, if we were to trust the parallel tradition where Rhea Silvia was raped by Amulius himself, dressed as Mars.

the providing function: *jusqu'à leur départ d'Albe et à la fondation de Rome, ces derniers sont mis en relief par leur côté rustique et pastoral*[12]. As Cizek mentioned in his *Mentalități și instituții romane* (1996: 30), Numa Pompilius finally brings about a partition in the Roman functions: *Astfel, Romulus ar fi ilustrat prima funcție indo-europeană, cea a regelui, pe când Numa Pompilius a simbolizat cea de-a treia funcție, cea de preot-organizator*. In my view, a similar partition is also visible in the divisions Numa operates in the sacred geography of Rome and does this in a quasi-anatomical way. The idea of architectonics following the symmetry of human bodies is visible also in the later works of Vitruvius. In *De Architectura* (III, 1, 3) he compared various sacred architectural structures with the fine organization of a human body. If body is building, then buildings are bodies, as a sacred geometry reunites the human sinews and the marble arches:

> *Similiter vero sacrarum aedium membra ad universam totius magnitudinis summam ex partibus singulis convenientissimum debent habere commensus responsum. Item corporis centrum medium naturaliter est umbilicus. Namque si homo conlocatus fuerit supinus manibus et pedibus pansis circinique conlocatum centrum in umbilico eius, circumagendo rotundationem utrarumque manuum et pedum digiti linea tangentur. Non minus quemadmodum schema rotundationis in corpore efficitur, item quadrata designatio in eo invenietur. Nam si a pedibus imis ad summum caput mensum erit eaque mensura relata fuerit ad manus pansas, invenietur eadem latitudo uti altitudo, quemadmodum areae quae ad normam sunt quadratae.*

Through his esoteric knowledge, king Numa brings in a sacred partition (using bodily dismemberment of sacrificial animals as well as celestial divisions), a new 'anatomical' arrangement which takes away the king's pressure of being the only cerebral piece. Numa simply cuts out new bodily segments for Rome. As Campbell (2008: 35) mentioned, sacred and civic geographies mix their contours[13]: "Ancient cities are built like temples, having their portals to the four directions, while in the central place stands the major shrine of the divine city founder. The citizens live and work within the confines of this symbol". In this situation, the king is still *caput* and his physical head is held fast by the priest's right hand while the monarch receives the proper consecration: (1, 17) *si est fas hunc Numam Pompilium cuius* ***ego caput teneo regem Romae esse***.

The new arrangement differentiates particular organs, such as the reclusive womb-like chamber of Vesta (1, 20) and the limbs of the city, the 'left hand' and the 'right hand' (1, 17): ***dextras*** *ad meridiem partes,* ***laevas*** *ad septentrionem esse dixit.* This distribution is also gender conscious. Female priests are consigned to the sacred

[12] Fasciano and Castor ("La trifonction indo-européenne à Rome", *in Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale,* Vol. 38, No. 1, gennaio-giugno 1996, p. 19) believe that in Plutarch's version of Romulus' biography, the king is closer to the second, warrior function.

[13] Regarding secrecy at the beginnings of Rome, feminine confinement, and sacred objects which should not be touched by men, see also Michel SERRES, *Rome: The First Book of Foundations,* tr. Randolph Burk, New York, Bloomsbury, 2015, "The Black Box," pp. 9–33.

enclosure of the city hearth – a sacred womb of perpetual chastity – as they are in charge with the life-generating source of Rome[14]. Male priests are entrusted a delicate commerce within the realm of sacred femininity (the temple of Fides), provided they carefully watch the purity of their touch (1, 21). It is one of the first moments in Livy when the men of Rome are associated with hands and handling. Numa adds a particular specification for the etiquette of the Flamines' hands, which are to be covered "up to the fingers" for purity (1, 21): *iussit* ***manuque ad digitos usque involuta*** *rem divinam facere, significantes fidem tutandam sedemque eius etiam* ***in dexteris sacratam esse***[15]. It is not surprising, given that in the ritual of investiture for the Vestal Virgins (see also Livy's 1, 20 for the importance of their bodily purity) the hands of the Pontifex Maximus were performing crucial gestures of taking under possession by hand, a ritual which would seem sexual, if one ignored that this precise "marriage" consecrated the young girl to her Vestal virginity. Joseph Campbell specifies in his book *The Mask of the God: Occidental Mythology* (1964: 321):

> The dress of the Vestal Virgins resembled the gown of a Roman bride; and on assuming her vow, the dedicated nun was solemnly clasped by the Pontifex Maximus, the chief priest of the city, who said to her: *Te, Amata, capio!* 'My Beloved, I take possession of thee!' The two were symbolically man and wife. And if the Vestal broke her vow of chastity, she was buried alive.

Throughout the war times of Tullus Hostilius, the idea that the men of Rome are its trusted limbs (particularly arms and hands) becomes even more limpid. Nevertheless, unlike in the times of Numa, these hands are no longer appendages that need to be concealed and abstinent from touch, but appear in their most aggressive forms, ready to bear arms, to suffer wounds and even kill in order to protect the sacred enclosure of Rome. The story of Horatii and Curiati vouches for that idea. This clash of clans starts with their hands clasped under a pact. They do not only represent themselves, but are representative of their cities, their nations, their blood ties (see Koptev 2005: 386–388). They walk and talk as the city's empty vessels acting on its behalf (1, 24: *Fetialis ex arce graminis herbam puram attulit.*

[14] For sexuality and agriculture, but also for architectonics and femininity, Page duBois has an extensive discussion (*Sowing the Body, Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1988, pp. 46–47, 65–66, 107). In her analysis of the evolution of Greek myth, duBois believes that the feminine womb represents a special gestational enclosure. In her view, in early legends the feminine body links itself rather with fertile agricultural soil, and even with developed architecture, citadels, temples, and sacred chambers. Earlier on, Eva Keuls made a similar comparison in her work, *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1985, pp. 122–123. In the last two major chapters of *Weaving Truth: Essay on Language and Female in Greek Thought*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, Harvard University Press, 2002, "Weaving in Architecture: The Truth of Building. 10. Female Fetish Urban Form; II. The οἶκος 'house' as the Female's Architectural School", Ann Bergren compares women with architectonical features, particularly with private realms, opposed to the much more masculine public edifices. Nevertheless, the scholar also emphasizes the creative and technical potential of the first goddesses and feminine characters of Greek myth.

[15] Dumézil (1957: 150, also quoted by Fasciano and Castor, 1996, p. 22) sees there an Indo-European survival of rite related to ancient triads.

Postea regem ita rogavit: "Rex, ***facisne me*** *tu regium* ***nuntium*** *populi Romani Quiritium,* ***vasa comitesque meos****". Rex respondit: "Quod sine fraude mea populique Romani Quiritium fiat, facio"*). Their bodies are extensions of the vital city-body, ready to dismember or be dismembered. Their anatomies fuse once more with the contour of the city, when they take grass turf and touch their heads with it (1, 24: *verbena caput capillosque tangens*).

More than anything, both the Horatii and Curiati act as arms (see the description of their fight: *illorum tunc* ***arma,*** *illorum intueri* ***manus***). Their bodies are defined as extensions, limbs, or their opposites, namely gashes, holes, or wounds (1, 25: ***Alterum intactum ferro corpus*** *et geminata victoria ferocem in certamen tertium dabat: alter fessum* ***volnere****, fessum cursu trahens* ***corpus*** *victusque fratrum ante se strage victori obicitur hosti*). These two units of *trigemini* coming from two different cities act as if they are one body (*corpus*); dead brothers appear as wounds (*volnere*) or missing limbs of a much larger body. Even in death their tombs are lined up with the coordinates of their cities, as if they are excrescences of their land (1, 25: ***Sepulcra*** *exstant quo quisque* ***loco*** *cecidit, duo Romana uno loco propius Albam, tria Albana Romam versus sed distantia locis ut et pugnatum est*). A fusion with the land through sacrifice awaits them. The idea that Rome's men are at times sacrificial offerings rather than its protected center appears stronger through this example[16]. Koptev (2005: 383) compares initially this story with the tripartite Indo-European functionality and the myth structure, "as the Roman reflection of an ancient Indo-European myth involving a successful fight of one against three, the killing of a woman by a triumphant champion, and the ritual expiation of murder". Also, quoting James Frazer's authority (1920: 274–275) Koptev (2005: 387) underlines that the kings were usually taking the throne according to myth through a duel which also symbolizes a human sacrifice.

The city was a new-born, a hungry *foetus* in need of tender care (2, 1). Yet, like with any other growing organism, the hunger of one body means the dissolution of another which ends up as prey (1, 30: *Roma interim* ***crescit*** *Albae ruinis*). If the death of Romulus at 1, 2 brought Romans the fear of dissolution of the body politic, this was because they perceived Rome as fused and therefore dependent on his physical body and any *sparagmos* of him by the Roman people seemed autophagic. With Mettius, the tearing apart of an enemy body proves "nourishing" to the city growth. It is emblematic that his body is spread all over the Roman land, although the show is horrific:

> *Dissipatae res nondum* ***adultae*** *discordia forent,* ***quas fovit*** *tranquilla moderatio imperii* ***eoque nutriendo perduxit*** *ut bonam frugem libertatis* ***maturis iam viribus ferre possent****. Exinde duabus admotis quadrigis, in currus earum* ***distentum inligat Mettium****; deinde in diversum iter equi concitati,*

[16] James G. Frazer in *The Magical Origins of Kings*, London, McMillan and Co., 1920, pp. 274–275, precisely discusses the way the ancient kings took control of power via duel which in turn results in human sacrifice. Also, Koptev (*op. cit*., p. 387) refers to this practice in the duel of Horatii and Curiati.

> ***lacerum*** *in utroque curru* ***corpus****, qua inhaeserant vinculis* ***membra****, portantes. Avertere omnes ab tanta foeditate spectaculi oculos.*

This fight for political supremacy is in fact a fight for a mutually exclusive survival. In the fight between older Alba and younger Rome, Mettius will have a similar fate: torn limb from limb by wild horses in order to expiate through his sacrifice the faults of his Alban nation, he will feed with his own pieces of flesh the body of Rome turned cannibalistic (1, 28: *inter Fidenatem Romanamque rem ancipitem gessisti, ita iam* ***corpus*** *passim distrahendum dabis...*). Limbs receive in war the highest significance: Horatius is spared an execution (although he killed his sister, 1, 28) on the account of the great services his valiant arms have done for the city. His *manus* and *caput* are valuable extremities of the city protective extensions against the invading outsiders (1, 26: *I, lictor,* ***colliga manus,*** *quae paulo ante armatae imperium populo Romano pepererunt. I,* ***caput obnube liberatoris urbis huius***).

In Book 2, a brief information is given over the physiology of the city, particularly during the time of the republic (2, 1)[17]. It is composed of alien branches, perhaps sutured together, and allowed to form a new corporeal unity: this unity is described both in genealogical, physiological, and emotional terms (souls and bloodlines united through marriage and new cohabitation). Previous blood relationships are replaced by new political alliances to form a new unity, a family, a new body. For the women who were enclosed in this new arrangement, the blood ties that link them to Rome are sacred. They are not meant to bridge out, to show affection for an outsider, but remain loyal to the sacred core of the city. (This is why even earlier on, at 1, 26, Horatius killed his sister for abandoning her family's allegiance to cry for a fallen Curiatus). For the men who must spend their time forming alliances and protecting the outer limits of this delicate political organism, being blocked by blood ties is a handicap that they must overcome. The consul is first and foremost father to the fatherland (***patriam liberatam, patrem liberatorem***) and only secondly, is he father to his biological children: thus, his sons are acceptable casualties when violating the boundaries of this body politic (2, 5: *eminente* ***animo patrio*** *inter publicae poenae* ***ministerium***). Like good defenders of the city, men act here as natural extension of its growth, ready to amputate or disable their own flesh and blood for its sake. Manlius Torquatus (8, 5–10) kills his sons, because his physical ties to them appear naturally superseded by his emotional, non-corporal ties to his city.

[17] Koptev (*op. cit.*, pp. 382–423) suggests that a further reduction from the three functionalities happens once the republic is installed, p. 419: "At the beginning of the Republic, social duality came to the forefront over the former sacred tripartite structure". Also: "The secular republican constitution […] transferred sacred institutions to civil magistracies and ritual competitions into the struggle between the patricians and the plebeians. To increase of the circle of successors, the old order of triads at the head of Rome became impossible". While Dumézil believes in three Indo-European functions at the basis of Rome, Koptev believes the triadic elements of the time of the kings left place to a dual system once the consuls were installed. At page 423, Koptev notices the change in mythical terms: "The Dioscuric idea came into the historical tradition in the late fourth and early third centuries, when the twin brothers Romulus and Remus were officially accepted as founders of Rome".

Any troublesome disintegration of this order is perceived as a sign of disease and read in terms of weakness and bodily dissolution, or even *discordia intestina* (2, 44: ***discordia intestina dissolvi rem Romanam posse***), with a term that sends the reader thinking to bowel pathology (according to Victoria Rimmel's *Anatomy of Fiction*)[18]. In this analogy, where the city functions like a large organism, men represent the metaphorical equivalent of limbs ready to be amputated for the better health of the upper body, in a situation when war and strife are ultimate diseases. Similar views were held by Tullus Hostilius (1, 31), although, the king exaggerated the equation between civic health and warfare: *Haud ita multo post* ***pestilentia*** *laboratum est. Unde cum pigritia militandi oreretur, nulla tamen ab armis quies dabatur a bellicoso rege,* ***salubriora etiam credente militiae quam domi iuvenum corpora esse****, donec ipse quoque longinquo morbo est implicitus.*

In this situation of aggression from outside, male stories are even more associated with amputation of faulty members (Mucius Scaevola) or sacrifice of eyes and even whole bodies, as is the case of Horatius Cocles (*"Tiberine pater" inquit, "te sancte precor,* ***haec arma et hunc militem*** *propitio flumine* ***accipias****"*). Horatius' name betrays a permanent damage to one eye, yet his story is one of unquivering bravery since he represents the armed and armored limb of Rome ready to detach itself for the well-being of his city. His supposed last words before his leap of faith into the river are heavy with religious significance, as Horatius Cocles performs a conscious human sacrifice, regarding himself as meat for slaughter, for the acquisition of a higher good: the deliverance of the city. Willingly isolated on a bridge, Horatius asks the Romans to cut it down while he engages the enemy (2, 10)[19]. Another story of brave amputation of limbs is that of Mucius Scaevola (2, 12). While Horatius' offering of his body is never explicit, Mucius is firmly aware that Roman men are fully expendable in bodily terms in order to repel their enemies (2, 12: *ut sentias quam* ***vile corpus*** *sit iis qui magnam gloriam vident;* ***dextramque accenso ad sacrificium foculo*** *inicit. Quam cum* ***velut alienato ab sensu*** *torreret* ***animo****, prope attonitus miraculo rex cum ab sede sua prosiluisset amoverique ab altaribus iuvenem iussisset*)[20]. Like in the case of Manlius Torquatus, his right hand, while

[18] Victoria Rimmel in her work *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2002, pp. 77–97, equates *bella intestina* with actual intestinal disturbances, in a novel where playfulness is key. However, the pun existed before Petronius.

[19] Professor Gabriela Creţia was kind to point to me the beautiful work of Dumézil who compares Horatius Cocles to Caucus, a Cyclops or even to Ondin in his blindness: he loses an eye in order to attain a higher form of awareness. See DUMÉZIL, *Mitra-Varuna*: *An Essay on Two Indo-European Representations of Sovereignty*, tr. Derek Coltman, New York, Zone Books, 1988, pp. 139–161, Angelo BRELICH, *Le variazioni romane sul tema delle origini*, Roma, Ateneo, 1955, pp. 38–40; also, Marie DELCOURT, "Romulus et Mettius Fufetius", *in Hommage à G. Dumézil* (Latomus 45), Bruxelles, 1960, pp. 77–82. Koptev (*op. cit*., p. 415) points out that Horatius Cocles might be a form of priest, a *pontifex* or even a representative of the 1st function ("a potential successor to the throne"). The references above are also offered by Koptev (*ibidem*).

[20] Georges Dumézil in *Myth et épopée* I, Paris, Gallimard, 1968, p. 268, discusses the importance of parallels between the Norse mythology and the early heroes of the Romans in Livy's work. According to him, Romulus and Numa Pompilius could be considered former gods while there is a similarity between Horatius Cocles and Odin, in terms of their loss of vision in one eye for the

physically linked to Mucius, is felt as emotionally alien, foreign, up to the point of short-circuiting any form of sensitivity, both at the sensorial and emotional level. Moreover, the hand itself appears as a consecrated object, or a sacrificial animal since the sacrifice-bearer renounces it both spiritually and physically, for the higher gain of a much more precious boon.

When discussing Horatius and Mucius, both Delcourt (1957: 169–180) and Koptev (2005: 416) notice the similarities between the two heroes. The latter underlines their leadership and sacrificial potential under a unitary image of warrior-leader:

> The other hero of this war, Mucius Scaevola, obviously was connected with Cocles. [...] The narrative of Scaevola's attempt to kill Porsenna is similar to the notorious story of Romulus by Celer and the first Celer seems to be a prototype for both heroes of the early Republic, Cocles and Scaevola. Cocles appears like a *tribunus celerum* together with two other centurions of the corps of *celeres*, while Scaevola seems to be the same *tribunus celerum* at the head of the whole corps.

In conclusion, the male citizens of the early republican times were dividing their tasks and duties without the intervention of an all-knowing *caput-rex*. In this partition of roles, they often ended up sacrificing their physical limbs or bodies in order to ensure the growth of their young body politic. This is quite the opposite of the original times of Romulus when the city-body could only grow by acquisition of living *corpora* of people. With Mucius Scaevola, the organism of Rome extends beyond its fleshy part, into a stronger, ethereal *corpus* of laws and principles. Rome's body politic is finally more durable than the average flesh of those who are willing to die for it.

This whole ideology comes in sharp contrast to what Augustus will do later on while in power and particularly to what would be due to him in death through deification. Augustus slowly and surely identifies the body of Rome once more with his own body. As we can see from Campbell's perception of his apotheosis (1964: 333), "Augustus, after his death, was elevated to the circle of the gods of the Roman state, in which role the murdered Julius Caesar had preceded him, to whom a temple had already been erected in the Forum". If we see the way he was worshipped in the provinces, even before his death, we understand that he simply attempted more and more to identify himself to the spirit of Rome, his bodily image becoming somewhat a receptacle for its *genius*. If Rome is a numinous power, her first citizen is her body or, "the vehicle of the spirit of the Roman state" (Campbell 1964: 333). The monarch is once more a representation of the healthy body of his city.

---

purpose of obtaining access to truth. Arnaldo Momigliano in "Georges Dumézil and the Trifunctional Approach to Roman Civilization", *History and Theory*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Oct. 1984), pp. 312–330, criticizes Dumézil's view, by stating that Cocles has little to do with godhood and knowledge of truth and besides the loss of an eye, he has little relationship with the myth of Ondin (p. 327). See also, "Dumézil's 'Idéologie Tripartie'", by Gerson SCHADE, *in Hermes* 135. Jahrg., H. 1 (2007), pp. 1–12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

TITUS LIVIUS PATAVINUS, *Ab urbe condita* Libri I–II, eds W. Weissenborn, H.J. Müller. Leipzig, Teubner, 1911, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu and http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/liv.html

LIVY, *Ab Urbe Condita* I–V, ed. R. M. Ogilvie, Oxford (*Oxford Classical Texts*), 1974.

TITUS LIVIUS PATAVINUS, *Ab Urbe Condita*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.

MARCUS VITRUVIUS POLLIO, *De Architectura*, Liber III, ed. Valentin Rose, Leipzig, Teubner, 1899, https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/vitruvius.html

Secondary Sources

BERGREN, Ann, *Weaving Truth, Essay on Language and Female in Greek Thought*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, Harvard University Press, 2008.

BRELICH, Angelo, *Le variazioni romane sul tema delle origini*, Roma, Ateneo, 1955.

CAMPBELL, Joseph, *The Mask of the God*, New York, Penguin Books, 1964.

– *The Hero with a Thousand Faces, Prologue: The Monomyth*, Chapter 4. "The World Navel", p. 35, Novato, California, New World Library, Third Edition, 2008.

CIZEK, Eugen, *Mentalités et institutions politiques romaines*, Paris, Fayard, 1990; in Romanian, *Mentalități și instituții romane*, trad. Ilieș Câmpeanu, București, Editura Globus, 1996.

DELCOURT, Marie, "Horatius Coclès et Mucius Scaevola", *in Hommage à Waldemar Deonna*, Bruxelles, Latomus 28, 1957.

– "Romulus et Mettius Fufetius", *in Hommage à G. Dumézil*, Bruxelles, Latomus 45, 1960.

DUBOIS, Page, *Sowing the Body, Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1988.

DUMÉZIL, Georges, *L'idéologie tripartie des Indo-Européens*, Bruxelles, Société des Études Latines, Latomus 31, 1958.

– *Mythe et épopée* I, Paris, Gallimard, 1968.

– *Mitra-Varuna*: *An Essay on Two Indo-European Representations of Sovereignty*, tr. Derek Coltman, New York, Zone Books, 1988.

FASCIANO, Domenico, KESNER, Castor, "La trifonction indo-européenne à Rome", *in Revista di cultura classica e medioevale*, Vol. 38, No. 1, gennaio-giugno 1996, pp. 7–43.

FOUCAULT, Michel, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1973–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, New York, Pantheon Books, 1980.

FRAZER, James G., *The Magical Origins of Kings*, London, McMillan and Co, 1920.

JOSHEL, Sandra R., "The Female Body and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia", *in Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World*, ed. L.K. McClure, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

KEULS, Eva, *The Reign of Phallus*: *Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993.

KOPTEV, Alexandr, "'Three Brothers' at the Head of Archaic Rome: The King and His 'Consuls'" *in Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 54, H. 4, 2005, pp. 382–423.

MOMIGLIANO, Arnaldo, "Georges Dumézil and the Trifunctional Approach to Roman Civilization", *History and Theory*, Vol. 23, No. 3, Oct. 1984, pp. 312–330.

POPESCU, Catalina, "Indigenizarea 'Celuilalt' – Cazul romanizării lui Asclepios", *in Pontica* 51 (2018), Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie din Constanța, 2018, pp. 495–513.

– "*Ta Klea Andron* – (Dis)embodiment and Heroic Peregrinations at Ovid", *in Aproape, departe, pretutindeni, nicăieri. Glose perpetue la tema exilului*, eds Theodor Georgescu and Alexandru M. Călin, Bucharest, Bucharest University Press, 2021, pp. 115–146.

RIMMEL, Victoria, *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

ROLLO-KOSTER, Joëlle, "Body Politic", 2017, on-line article: https://www.britannica.com/topic/body-politic#ref338363

SCHADE, Gerson, "Dumézil's 'Idéologie Tripartie'", *Hermes* 135. Jahrg., H. 1, 2007, pp. 1–12.

SERRES, Michel, *Rome: The First Book of Foundations*, tr. Randolph Burk, New York, Bloomsbury, 2015.