Introduction

Summary

In this dissertation I describe and analyze a selection of Ovid's representations of barbarians in the sequence of poems that spans his writing career: *Amores*; *Ars Amatoria*; *Metamorphoses*; *Fasti*; *Tristia*; *Epistulae Ex Ponto*. I intend to show how these representations are integral to Ovid's concern with other themes: the use and abuse of women, the relationship of the mortal sphere to the divine, the dynamic of political control over society in the emerging imperial structure of the Augustan age; and especially how the barbarian as social and psychological other serves as a foil for the delineation (articulation) of Roman identity within Ovid's historical moment. My examination will focus upon patterns of differentiation between barbarity and cultural normalcy as these emerge from recurrent actions and character types. The theoretical background for this study derives from recent writings in post-colonial theory which show how processes of domination and subjugation create cultural hegemony to such an extent that cultural expression of the subjugated is only possible through manipulation of modes of communication extant in the dominant culture. As a result, the process of self-expression by a subjugated population, because it must necessarily use the cultural referents of the dominant culture, serves the self-justification of that dominant culture to solidify and expand its political and cultural power. Accordingly, with attention to these principles and ideas, I will attempt whenever possible to place Ovid's representations within a cultural and political context whereby I may suggest that mispresentation has occurred.

Paradigm: The Semiotics of Triumph

The triumphal procession was an important and frequent occurrence in Rome. H.S. Versnel points out that the historian Orosius counted at least 320 triumphs from the founding of Rome to the reign of Vespasian (Hist. 7.9.8).[1] An integral part of the triumph, as witnessed by Roman writers and artists of the imperial era, was the spectacle of the spoils: precious metals, towns in effigy, and prisoners of war. These prisoners were the barbarian enemy, captured and displayed to reveal the effort that the Roman army had expended to secure victory. Images of the barbarian in chains, parading to his execution or slavery, served to strengthen the Roman idea of what was accomplished, as it also intended to ward off further rebellion.

The concept of "barbarian" was solidified in the Roman imagination as a threat to Roman society, to be understood, anticipated, and defeated. This perception may have been different for the Roman soldier or tradesman, who spent years at a time on the frontier, and who mixed frequently with foreigners for various social functions.[2] But to the Roman citizen, the barbarian was a figure marked for defeat and humiliation; a pre-condition to slavery within the Roman system--the only system through which the barbarian could attain some semblance of humanity and dwell among the civilized.

We see these marked men in the triumphal celebrations, in the battle narratives of successful generals, in the arenas and circuses and in the monumental sculpture that dignified the Italian landscape. Poetry, too, played its own role in distinguishing what was familiar from the foreign, what was beautiful from the irregular, and what was appropriate from the unacceptable. In spite of its exaggerations, poetry can add much to

---

[1] Versnel 1970, 1.
[2] Woolf 1998, 244.

our understanding of Roman societal standards. In those brief, measured narratives, one will discover much about the expectations, the beliefs, and the attitudes of the ancient Romans.

In *Tristia* 4.2, Ovid dramatizes a spectacle of barbarian humiliation in a military triumph that celebrates Tiberius' defeat of Germany. The poem presents all the major elements of the triumph, including the display of the barbarian captives, whose facial expressions and attitudes act as signifiers for the viewing crowd to interpret and understand, 19-24:

> ergo omnis populus poterit spectare triumphos
>   cumque ducum titulis oppida capta leget,
> vinclaque captiva reges cervice gerentes
>   ante coronatos ire videbit equos.
> et cernet vultus aliis pro tempore versos
>   terribiles aliis inmemoresque sui.

Ovid uses the verbs *spectare*, *leget*, *videbit* and *cernet* to continue the transitive act of looking, reading, and understanding as the prisoners of war come into view.

The poet continues to depict particulars that epitomize the scene in his mind's eye (*mente videbo*, 4.2.57): the kinds of processions that he had seen in Rome before his exile, and before the composition of his somber *Tristia*.[3] The focus here is on the facial expressions and attitudes of the barbarian captives. The kings wears chains, some prisoners look away in humiliated resignation, others look wildly about, angry at their capture. A dichotomy of representation is offered, in which the barbarians are either humiliated or defiant. Like the binary outcome of battle, with its winners and losers,

---

[3] Vasaly 1993 (esp. chapter 3) demonstrates the importance of oratorical ability to place events in the listener's mind's eye. Ovid's poem thus satisfies the image he holds in memory, while it also stimulates in the reader's mind an image grounded in his own cultural experience.

Ovid's triumph presents the barbarian in the two possible extremes that are easily recognizable to the crowd, 27-36:

> **hic**, qui Sidonio fulget sublimis in ostro.
>   dux fuerat belli, proximus **ille** duci.
> **hic**, qui nunc in humo lumen miserabile fixit,
>   non isto vultu, cum tulit arma, fuit.
> **ille** ferox et adhuc oculis hostilibus ardens
>   hortator pugnae consiliumque fuit.
> perfidus **hic** nostros inclusit fraude locorum,
>   squalida promissis qui tegit ora comis.
> **illo**, qui sequitur, dicunt mactata ministro
>   saepe recusanti corpora capta deo.

These are two forms of representation that consistently stereotype the barbarian in Roman art and literature. The humiliated barbarian, on the one hand, is a captured being explicitly marked as one who may have known power, and may have wielded it with a heavy hand against his foes, but once captured, becomes merely the powerless and the humiliated, who faces the consequences of his capture--slavery or the executioner's block. The defiant barbarian, on the other hand, represents a threat to Roman society; his raging, as Ovid says, is *inmemor* (24), "unmindful" of the reality that he has no power over the situation and must eventually succumb.

The passage above is spoken by a know-it-all in the crowd who reports to those standing near him everything he knows about the figures that pass before them. From the general in his Sidonian cloak to the murderous priest of a German god, the crowd knows whom these figures represent, what roles they played in the barbarian society--and in battle--and how that authority and the threat of their power has been stripped away. Interestingly, all but one of the figures in the list display humiliation in the face of their imprisonment. The contrast of "hic" in line 29 with "ille" in line 31 points out the antithesis between the humiliated, broken man, and the defiant, deluded barbarian.

This type of humiliation, this loss of agency, is one we can track readily in Roman accounts of what ancient Romans considered valuable and how they measured *humanitas*. The same thing could happen to a Roman after all, as we see in the life of Cicero, who frequently expresses in letters to friends and family his disillusionment with the powerful men at Rome, alarm at the gradual dismemberment of Republican power, and dismay at his own loss of agency and dignity.[4] As Carlin Barton points out, honor was, for the Romans, "synonymous with 'being'," and "also an emotion, the paradoxical *emotion of sacredness*, a compound of vitality and fragility, vulnerability and aggressiveness.[5] Loss of honor, to some, was grounds for suicide, as we see in the case of the poet Gallus.[6] Others expressed their bitterness in literature, such as the satires of Juvenal or the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca, where pessimism and disillusionment abound.

In the case of the barbarian, especially the barbarian king, the contrast between his former self and his current, captive status makes him a spectacle for the crowd. He represents the reversal of fortune that the Romans, like the Greeks, celebrated in theatrical tragedy.[7] In the minds of the Romans, the barbarian's surrender was his new beginning, his introduction to a civilizing force that would either kill him or make him better. The situation was very different for a citizen than it was for a slave or non-citizen, as Jonathan Walters has illustrated in his study of bodily inviolability as an implicit right of citizenship.[8] For the non-citizen, particularly the slave, the body was available to

---

[4] *Fam.* 1.7 and 1.8.
[5] Barton 1993, 186.
[6] On the suicide of Gallus, see Suet. *Aug.* 66. In addition, Tac. *Ann.* 6.4 reports the suicide of a Sulpicius who lost the opportunity to obtain a proconsulship of Asia or Africa, a political office that had been assigned to members of his family for generations.
[7] See Hall 1989 for an extensive study on the way theatrical dramas utilized sentiments regarding the barbarian, and how they in turn cemented popular opinions about particular ethnicities.
[8] Walters 1997.

invasive and sexual violations. Thus, in the spectacle of the barbarian body, there exists

an implicit understanding that whatever his status before his capture, he has now lost his

agency and power, and will now receive the treatment of a slave with all its permutations

of physical and psychological assault. The eyes of the Roman spectators are the agents of

the prisoners' passive submission. Under the gaze of the Roman throng, the barbarian

man becomes a passive object whose former identity has been swept away, and with it his

masculine credibility as ruler, commander, father, or husband. He can no longer include

himself inside any familiar economy. If he escapes execution, he will soon enter Roman

slavery. The spectacle, then, is a process of emasculation where the barbarian body,

impermeable perhaps to the weapons of warfare, now enters a state of permeability.

But what do we make of the defiant barbarian? In Ovid's poem, he struggles in

vain against his bonds, and is a marvel to the gaze of the Roman spectator. All who

watch the struggle know its futility, yet for a brief, fascinating moment, they are allowed

to witness the virility and forceful pride of the man who has just been brought from the

remote regions of Rome's influence. In his savage glory, the defiant barbarian makes

manifest the ultimate power of Rome which preserves societal structure by eradicating

the threat of the fierce and wild barbarian, whose exhibited virility threatens to overturn

the stability that Romans appreciate. Surely such a man, left unfettered, loose in the city,

would rape women, corrupt children, and assault men.

The poet also includes the personification of the conquered province of Germany,

depicted as a woman under the feet of the conquering general; the centerpiece of the

triumph, 43-46:

> crinibus en etiam fertur Germania passis,
>   et ducis invicti sub pede maesta sedet,
> collaque Romanae praebens animosa securi

vincula fert illa, qua tulit arma, manu.

The reason for her placement with the conquering general must be that the provincial representation itself bore authority and validity to the claims of the triumph. The presence of the subjugated personification-as-female symbolized in a tangible way the power of Rome and the removal of the threat of danger and violence from the barbarian territory she represented. This personified representation of provinces in the triumphal motif is common, and we see in *Tristia* 3.12, another reference to Germany in a similar posture, 1-2: *teque, rebellatrix, tandem, Germania, magni / triste caput pedibus supposuisse ducis*. The role of the female, personified province is different from the male barbarian. She rides in the chariot with the *triumphator*, she submits yet still maintains an element of pride (*rebellatrix, animosa*). Her status seems poised between the possibilities of domination and cooperation.[9]

The female representation of provinces, I argue, symbolizes more than the mere artistic rendering of their feminine grammatical gender; it is, of course, a trophy of Roman success, while her femininity, with its concomitant sexual passivity, fertility and domestic capability, is symbolic of her future relationship with Rome as a cooperative force in the furthering of the imperial regime. One may think of the relief of Claudius and Britannia from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias (Fig. 1, *ad finem*), begun under Tiberius and finished under Nero.[10] This analysis demonstrates use of the female body in Roman imperial propaganda: as barbarian she is torn, disheveled, weak, and under the control of

---

[9] Brown 1988, 153-4: "For ancient men tended to regard women as creatures less clearly defined and less securely bounded by the structures that held men in place in society. The woman was a 'gateway.' She was both a weak link and a bridgehead. . . . The immediacy of the bonds of which women were considered capable was valued by a community that desperately needed loyalty."
[10] Kleiner 1992, 158.

the principal male figure who represents her domination. The posture of the personified province of Britannia in this rendition is positively abject and the scene readily suggests the act of rape. Her face expresses her complete devastation while the emperor's face shows detachment combined with confident determination as he digs his knee into her back and holds her by the hair. As Iain Ferris points out, the placement of such a depiction in the province of Caria in Asia Minor surely must have driven home the message, to those who saw it, that the Roman empire could be merciless to those who challenged its authority.[11] We may account for the ferocity of this attack upon Britannia if we recall that Boudicca's rebellion took place in 60 AD during the reign of Nero, and may have pre-dated this monument's final artistic touches.

Poetic invention and official propaganda also work together in creating the products of the literary imagination of the barbarian body. In *Tristia* 4.2, we are witness to the reactions of the crowd at a triumphal procession. Given the indicators Ovid provides, we can infer what was identifiable and popular among Roman spectators at a triumphal procession. Popularity bears the value of normative assumptions and the standards of common cultural experience, thus the symbols we see in the procession become powerful communicators as to how Rome conceived itself and its enemies. This is the topic of my dissertation.

---

[11] Ferris 2000,57.

Ancient Ideologies

To the Romans, barbarians were not so much a specific people as a state of existence anywhere outside the civilizing influence of the Roman sphere.[12] Romanization, as Greg Woolf has adeptly defined it, is "the process by which the inhabitants came to be, and to think of themselves as, Romans."[13] The Roman system of imperialism (domination and the furthering of Romanization) corresponds adequately with the theoretical conception of imperialism that this paper employs, because essentially *every* empire manipulates social and cultural traditions to make subjugated peoples dependent on the dominant systems; not merely for the sake of cultural unity, but for the sake of continued control. This dependence entails not merely an adaptation of cultural traditions on the part of the subjugated, but a devaluation of the native systems of cultural expression, until they appear to vanish ("appear" because, as we shall see, there are cases where native traditions continued to thrive, often contiguous to Roman institutions). This devaluation of native cultures, in turn, is reflected in the way that the dominant culture formulates its own identity, articulating it in light of and in opposition to cultures deemed inferior. I seek to establish continuity between the attitudes of the ancient world and the modern, with regard to otherness within an imperial context.

It has been the tendency of apologetic classical scholars to highlight the cultural diversity of Rome, the open-mindedness of its culture, and the tolerance that played an important role in day-to-day life. And indubitably, to some extent, this was true. As

---

[12] Woolf 1998, 62-3, refers to Cicero's *Pro Fonteio* as evidence how "Roman notions of civilization might form the basis of discrimination. . . . Only when Gauls acquired cultural competence In Roman standards could these misunderstandings be avoided, and only when they were avoided could Gauls be depended on by Romans. . . . Culture could thus offer Gauls a chance to enter the empire of friends."
[13] Woolf 1998, 4-7.

Galinsky puts it, "multiculturalism was alive, but the race issue, which is so explosive

today, has no counterpart in classical antiquity."[14] Indeed there is evidence enough for

Galinsky's assertion in the fact that Latin lacks any word that approaches a racial slur.

There are no epithets equivalent to the ugly words that mar our society with their racial

hatred. The absence of racial or color discrimination that Galinsky asserts does not

negate the fact, however, that ethnic identity was an important and defining factor that

determined one's place in the social hierarchy. Ethnic identity was essential to forming a

sense of nationalism that dominated the political and cultural interactions of the classical

Greek and Roman worlds. Slurs did exist in relation to sexuality, gender, ethnicity, and

occupation, and such words denoted difference or behavior that transgressed the

boundaries of what was considered appropriate or expected. Thus, to simply dismiss the

notion of prejudice in the ancient world is to deny that discrimination takes many forms,

and applies to many more aspects than race--a simplistic and blindly privileged position.

For, even if ancient attitudes were somewhat more inclusive than those of recent

centuries, the study of these ancient cultures has influenced the burgeoning concentration

in the last two hundred years upon European history and the rise of the white race. The

West has benefited much and justified much through its knowledge and appreciation of

the Greco-Roman past.[15] Therefore, in examining the ancient attitudes, we may find the

roots of some of the more recent, false assumptions about race, ethnicity, and class that

plague our modern societies.

---

[14] Galinsky, 1992, 150.
[15] See Bernal 1987, v.1, chapter 14, on the hostilities of European sensibilities toward any conception of the Bronze Age as a period of movement, mixture and amalgamation; and any conception of Egypt as essentially influential upon the development of everything Greek.

The Romans inherited a tradition of perceptions and attitudes about foreigners from the Greeks, but adapted it in order that the Roman system of continual expansion might derive benefits from the cooperation of foreign peoples. The dichotomy of the Hellene and the barbarian provided the basis for self-identification of Greek culture; according to Edith Hall, "it was the Persian Wars which engendered the polarization of Greek and barbarian. . . . [T]he Greeks' sense of the importance of an ethnicity which went beyond individual city-states increased enormously around the beginning of the fifth century BC, a change which precipitated the invention of the barbarian."[16] To the Greek mind, linguistic differences were as much a part of cultural identity as appearance, hence the origins of the word "barbarian" appear to derive from the Greek βαρβαρόφωνος, "of foreign speech," as in *Iliad* 2.867. The earliest examples of βάρβαρος to denote foreigners are seen in the sixth century writings of Anacreon of Teos and Heraclitus of Ephesus.[17] I do not wish to ignore thousands of years of social history in which, clearly, tribal organization distinguished otherness as anyone outside one's own tribe, and therefore the idea of otherness, or barbarity in the strictly foreign sense, has always been an aspect of human social relations. I concur with Hall, however, that there is an institutional aspect to the Greek determination of barbarity that spreads because of the wide-spread influence of Greek thought and social organization in the ancient world and (more importantly) ever since.[18] Greek philosophical tenets continue to shape modern notions of society, as Page duBois maintains.

---

[16] Hall 1989, 6.

[17] Ibid, 10.

[18] Ibid., 12: "If it were the case that the idea of the generic barbarian was an element of archaic ideology, it would be likely that it would be found at an implicit level, and it is extremely hard to find any sign of a homogenous category 'non-Greek' before the fifth century." Dench 1995, 35, offers a useful consideration of Bickerman ("*Origines Gentium*," *Classical Philology* 1952, 65 ff.) who argues that the tales of

Hierarchical ideas of difference formulated by Plato and Aristotle continue to define relations of dominance and submission in Western culture and in philosophical discourse today. . . . Historians of the Western intellectual tradition tend to ignore what preceded Plato and Aristotle, to define these philosophers' formulations as Urtexts which give innocent expression to certain problematics which remain at the heart of Western philosophy.[19]

It was the literary explosion of the fifth century, and more specifically the tragedies of Athenian playwrights, that provided the first systematic rhetorical distinction between the civilized and the barbarians. Not only did the tragedians set out to differentiate the barbarian in linguistic terms, but they also made barbarians uncouth, culturally separating them from the Athenian audience who readily accepted these characterizations as artistic generalizations of the barbarians who lived in their very own city and homes--the slaves. As Hall notes, "'free' was synonymous with 'Hellenic,' 'servile' with 'barbarian.'"[20] It did not take long for tragedians to provide, in performance, characters that embodied inferior qualities of behavior, and to do so "the poets altered altogether the ethnicity of heroic figures or the setting of the story."[21]

An example of this is the story of Tereus and Procne. Originally Tereus was a Greek, a Megaran according to Pausanias (1.41.9). However, in Sophocles' play *Tereus* the monstrosity of his behavior is attributed to his Thracian lineage, providing material for the assessment of Tereus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as a man whose lusts were innate.[22] Roman borrowing and adaptation of Greek literary culture certainly carried some of these incipient attitudes into the milieu of Roman cultural ideologies.

---

wandering heroes "represented nothing more than the ethnocentrism of historical Greeks. . . . [Bickerman] impressively challenged the hitherto prevalent notion that myths of colonization by heroes were somehow 'objective' statements about the ethnicity of native peoples. . . ."
[19] duBois 1991, 9.
[20] Hall 1989, 101.
[21] Ibid, 103.
[22] *Met.* 6.458ff: *sed et hunc innata libido / exstimulat . . .*

Romans held a skeptical view of Greek society itself, however, and turned a critical eye to the practices and assumptions of the culture they simultaneously emulated. We see this in Cato the Censor of the second century BC who resisted many forms of the Greek philosophical and political heritage, but "by no means resisted the allure of Greek learning."[23] The Roman political system was one that demanded some degree of cooperation with people initially outside the Roman sphere. From the recorded events of their early kings, it is clear that Romans adopted a policy of expanding their territories by bringing other towns into alliance and participation with them.[24] The attitudes with which Romans regarded newly dominated groups depended upon their willingness to cooperate and, "share all the fortunes of Rome, all the privileges of the community."[25]

There was a preoccupation in the Roman mind with distinctions and categories as scholars and writers attempted to define what it meant to be Roman, and to justify the continuing expansion of Roman rule, and this the literature reflects. As stated in a recent post-colonial survey of western civilization, the Roman view of human nature is "the defining civilization against which the degree of wildness, barbarity and savagery is determined through the comparative narration of essential attributes. Behind all the interwoven threads stands the necessity to fashion an ideological dividing line between the civilized and the uncivilized."[26] This is evident, for example, in the way that Sallust philosophically frames his biography of Jugurtha in such a way that innate pride and inferiority undo not only his own virtue, but also his military efforts. In Vergil's *Aeneid*, no overtly philosophical elements are visible, but the theme of journey, as in Homer's

---

[23] Gruen 1991, 56.
[24] Livy *AUC* 1.1.
[25] Ibid 1.9.
[26] Davies, Nandy and Sardar 1993, 33.

Odyssey, results in a list of rejected places where Aeneas could not settle; where divine

sanction (Jupiter's persistent call onward) poetically substitutes for national pride in the

place Aeneas eventually called home, *litora profugus Lavinaque venit* (1.2). The poems

of Horace emphasize repeatedly affirm the pleasures of Italy over any other place in the

world: *laudabunt . . . alii . . . claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen / aut Ephesum* (*Carm.* 1.6),

and *Persicos odi, puer apparatus, / displicent nexae philyra coronae* (*Carm.* 1.38).

Ovid's poems have their own role in reaffirming the Roman vision of political hegemony

and cultural ascendancy through the representations of otherness.

Otherness, in contrast to the term barbarian (which denotes foreign cultural

configurations and characteristics), denotes the distinction made inherently within a

culture concerning what fits into it and what lies outside normalcy. Given the wide range

of variation of traditions in human societies, otherness is necessarily a subjective

differentiation, but one that carries with it social ideologies regarding familial, sexual,

political and religious behavior. There is an apotropaic quality to otherness, such that a

society exiles the undesirable by clearly marking aspects of otherness. A person very

much imbedded within a society can be deemed as a figure of otherness simply by

exhibiting behaviors or ideologies that disagree with those assumed within a culture to be

correct. People who are frequently qualified in terms of otherness are barbarians,

women, and slaves. We will examine how, in Ovid's works, such people are represented

in terms of otherness.

Present Scholarship and Post-colonial Theory

Scholars of imperialism in the modern age have often traced many of our ideas about cultural primacy to classical education, as Richard Hingley demonstrates in his examination of the imperialist nature of British archaeology of the nineteenth century.[27] Norman Vance offers a comprehensive study of Victorian manipulation of Roman rhetoric and the ideologies of the Victorian age that justified imperial action in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[28] Sarah Brown's recent publication on the influence of Ovid through the ages re-confirms what we have known all along, that there is continuity between antiquity and the present and that Ovid's writings are just as vital in their metamorphosized form (via other writers) as they were in his own age.[29]

Post-colonial theorists and novelists focus upon the emerging perspective of colonized populations, making possible fresh interpretations of historical occurrences and demanding re-examination of the semiotics of power and subjugation. Since we deal with the Roman power structure, it must be conceded that little literature exists which can be used to find the voice of the barbarian, a seeming obstacle to a true, post-colonial exploration of Roman literature. However, armed with such methods of scrutiny, we can unearth some of the assumptions appearing in Roman literature and that remain in a position of privilege through the centuries into our own age.

Postmodern and post-colonial theory attempts to undermine the notion of "superior" cultures and "inferior" or "primitive" cultures, and to move attention away from the success of industrialized nations, and to focus rather on indigenous cultures,

---

[27] Hingley 2000, 9-10: "Representations drawn from the classics were used to frame relationships of inequality, intimately related to structures of power and wealth."
[28] Vance 1997.
[29] Brown 1999.

industries, and modes of self-expression that have too often been drowned out by the propaganda and self-aggrandizement of more powerful nation-states. The problem with imperialism, from the post-colonial standpoint, is that it supplants native cultural expression with hegemonic modes of cultural expression whereby two things occur (either distinctly or in succession): first, the dominant cultural voice (eventually) formulates the subjugated experience, and that represented experience is internalized and used by the subjugated population (often in a form of self-loathing) as self-representation (although coded through use of irony, self-satire, or performative exaggeration of one's cultural expression--minstrelsy is a type of this mode of self-representation); second, the subjugated population absorbs the dominant system of cultural expression but manipulates and alters it in a way that creates an entirely new form of cultural expression (even alien and troublesome to the dominant culture) whereby self-representation defies and eventually challenges or overwhelms the so-called dominant form of expression. Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of "polyglossia" depends on this synthesis of cultural forms, and manipulation of dominant forms to give voice to the themes and experiences of the subjugated.

It is a postmodern, theoretical desire to dissolve the separation between "self" and "other," and to bring into question the notion of authoritative distinction and cultural hegemony. Edward Said and the post-colonial theorists of recent decades point out the intrinsic similarities between the attitudes of the Roman empire and those of modern imperialist states, whereby "right to rule" is legally justified.[30] Thus post-colonialism

---

[30] Said 1993, 7 and 286 (quoting Richard Barnet, *The Roots of War*, 1972).

criticizes the past and present assumptions that bring the idea of the barbarian to life whenever anyone evokes a stereotype.

Today, many classical scholars have recently found links between Roman literature, its literary hegemony, and the persistent rhetoric of power that remains in the dominant national institutions of the modern world. Gregory Nagy displays a keen awareness of the power of constructed terms and of the psychology of structured speech. Feminist scholars like Amy Richlin and Ellen Greene use to advantage the vocabularies of feminist and post-colonial theory to subvert the dominant, hegemonic voice in Roman narratives, and they identify the areas where the female experience lies hidden. The astute cultural and literary observations of Erich Gruen, Mary Beard and William Fitzgerald make it possible for us to begin to characterize Roman society in such a way that the peculiarities of barbarity begin to surface, whether it be through the examination of slavery, religious cults or Republican rhetoric. The groundbreaking Ovidian scholarship of Leslie Cahoon, Elaine Fantham, Sara Myers, Karl Galinsky, Betty Rose Nagle, James McKeown and William Anderson laid the foundation for this reading by explicating Ovid's sources and influences, and examining thoroughly his role in the Augustan age. It was Molly Myerowitz's work on Ovid's games of love that also initially inspired this project, with her classification of the lover's identity in juxtaposition to and in alliance with standards of behavior.

Also useful to this study are the studies of Bakhtin and Michel Foucault on the relationship of power and language. Their analyses question and reconfigure the spaces between words and meaning, between objects and representation, between modes of narrative and voices within the narrative, and between the powerful and the powerless.

Their ideas support the attempt to salvage native narratives from languages of dominant

cultures that have been manipulated to favor dominant races and classes, whereby

subjugated classes might express their experiences of inequality.[31] In this period when

English, like Latin a millennium ago, is the most dynamic and widespread language of

the Western world (current linguistic scholarship predicts its continued spread and

influence on a global level),[32] people have just begun to uncover the prejudices and

biases that have created barriers between races in a single culture.

I am equally indebted to the important work done in the last three decades by

scholars whose concentration upon the provinces and the various roles of foreigners in

the expanding Roman empire has created the analytical tools and vocabularies for

expression of the abstract concepts that underlie and undermine the seemingly earnest

renderings of barbarian peoples in Roman literature. Greg Woolf's extensive

reconstruction of the Gallic peoples and their process of Romanization is indispensable to

this study. Emma Dench's review of Italic peoples and their struggle for recognition

without complete assimilation provides many important insights. Additionally, the

examinations of the provinces that surrounded the Black Sea reveal demographic and

archaeological information that allowed me to approach Ovid's exile poetry with a fresh

outlook; the authors of such works include Gregory Dobrov, András Mócsy and David

Braund. These works are essential in uncovering the material record of thriving and

---

[31] Spivak 1990 combines the fields of semiotics and Marxism effectively so that cultural media begin to be analyzed through the lens of commodification--whatever the powerful (the elite) deem valuable carries the weight of cultural importance: "The whole notion of the creative imagination comes in as literature gets into the circuit of commodity production in the most brutal sense."

[32] David Yee (Internet Book Review, http://dannyreviews.com/h/English_Global_Language.html) on David Crystal (*English as a Global Language*, Cambridge University Press, 1997): "The final chapter looks at the future of English as a global language, focusing on debates about its status within the United States and the possibility of its fragmentation into regional dialects. Crystal suggests these might end up coexisting with some form of 'World Standard Spoken English.'"

culturally rich communities, and they demonstrate that Rome's foreign neighbors were deeply involved in trade and adapted rapidly to the challenges of their environments and communication with the communities that shared the continent of Europe.[33] From archaeological remains, it becomes obvious that the Romans and the barbarians were closely tied to one another from the earliest stages of their respective developments.[34]

Equally valuable to any study of the notion of "barbarian" are J.P. Balsdon's work on Roman aliens, Edith Hall's work on Greek invention of the barbarian, David Noy's analysis of epigraphical information to locate the populations and provenances of foreigners living in the empire, and Iain Ferris' recent compendium of Roman art that depicts the barbarian through the centuries of the Roman empire--all these confirming that writers and artists merit close examination for their part in establishing standards of cultural and racial normalcy.

My work differs from the above scholarship in that I do not focus overall on a specific group of barbarians (in contrast to Dench and the Samnites, Woolf and the Gauls, Braund and the ancient Georgians, etc.); rather my focus is on Roman identity and how it finds expression in Ovid's poetry, which is, I intend to demonstrate, fertile ground for discoveries about the aspect of Roman social psychology that emphatically differentiates what characterizes Roman from non-Roman. The alignment of this dissertation to another scholarly model might best be found in Colin Barton's *Sorrows of the Ancient Romans*, where her theoretical analyses get to the root of sociological and psychological problems that plagued Roman society because of and in spite of Roman imperialism. I

---

[33] This is a fact more readily reinforced by recent excavations at Manching in southern Germany, and many Gallic sites. On Germany see Wells 1999, and on Gaul see Woolf 1998.
[34] The majority of Woolf's research and conclusions on Romanization in the Gallic provinces results from the extensive archaeological discoveries in France.

search for patterns of representation in the works of a poet whom I find to be utterly fascinated with images of barbarism. Throughout the span of his career, Ovid more consistently incorporates barbarity in his work; the ways in which barbarity emerges and how that fits into the historical moment and the cultural context is the goal of this dissertation.

Writers of the Roman empire used barbarism, I argue, as a presence empowered with subversive and sub-textual dynamism. By subversive dynamism I mean that the barbarian figure possesses agency so that it is he or she who subverts and perverts social institutions. The barbarian is present and evoked in situations that might otherwise require the identification of Roman inadequacies or failures. By sub-textual dyanamism I mean that the barbarian figure is present to the Roman writer's mind even when the barbrian is not explicitly mentioned. In praising the imperial advancements of the Augustan age, or in the use of triumphal imagery as a metaphorical expression for success, the barbarian and, in addition, the *captured* barbarian are not far from the writer's line of vision. William Fitzgerald's study of Horace's *Satire* 2.7 insightfully reads the power of the omnipresent slave Davus whose continual presence in his master's chamber, and his continual perception of his master's activities, lends him a literary voice, a place in the poet's imagination.[35] Through the "voice" of Davus, Horace is able to make observations about himself, his age, his class, and Rome in general. I believe such agency is projected upon the barbarian by Roman writers in order to formulate a dialogue of power that seems inclusive of the dominated. In the early phases of imperial power, however, the dialogue is a fiction; monologue is all we have from our Roman

---

[35] Fitzgerald 2000, 18 ff.

sources, and such as it is, it cannot but objectify otherness in the attempt to focus attention on the issue of identity, and how Romanness differs from barbarity.

Ovid increasingly refers to barbarians simultaneously as embodied examples of what is *wrong* with Roman society, and what is *right* with it. The dichotomy between the civilized and the uncivilized cannot exist for long, nor can the one-sided narrative of the powerful. As Bakhtin suggests, a dialogue begins and eventually swallows the authoritative text until a new narrative develops that represents both the exposed and the hidden, the acceptable and the shameful, the worlds of the *culti* and the *inculti*.[36] Ovid's works make an excellent study of this process because he writes about Roman culture from so many perspectives: social, religious, mythical, and personal.

Thematic Considerations

Ovid's place in the Roman historical moment, the reign of Augustus and the landmark transition of Roman government to a centralized imperial structure, has always marked him in my mind as a voice reflecting important changes. He focuses on the individual within a society that has always demanded certain standards of behavior, but which, in the Augustan age, faces the challenge of preserving an identity established in the Republic, under the circumstances of imperial reorganization. In addition, Augustus' concentration on the consolidation of power, evidenced by altered provincial administration, affected Roman conceptions of its influence and the reach of its power.[37] Augustus placed his own personal attention upon nations that required a military

---

[36] Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" in *the Dialogic Imagination,* especially pp. 291-6.
[37] Bowman, Champlin and Lintott 1996, 346 ff. Augustus was proconsul (with the power of *imperium maius*) of Gaul, Spain, Syria, Cilicia, Cyprus and Egypt, and maintained the highest level of legionary presence in the provinces of Gaul, Spain and Syria--the border provinces.

presence, and that seemed likely for furth r expansion. These aspects of the Augustan age--greater territorial involvement, the policy of pacification through Romanization of foreign populations--are reflected in the way that Ovid manipulates the idea of barbarity and Roman identity. Therefore I use Ovid's works to investigate the Roman notion of barbarity and otherness and its implications on how the ancient Romans conceived themselves.

By treating Ovid's works in their chronological order, I intend to demonstrate a progression in the representation of the barbaric. In the first chapter I examine the love poetry where barbarity is deviation from acceptable modes of behavior, modes that the *amator* seems to have determined himself; barbarity transfers from one agent to another, now the violent and angry lover, now the greedy girlfriend who seeks gifts in return for love, and now the clever and manipulative advisor to a young lover, whose ideas about fair transactions interfere with the romantic lover's strategies.

In the second chapter, I examine the *Metamorphoses* as the location where barbarity narrows into a structural narrative of progress and movement from the primordial eras of Greece with its aged tales of the conflicts between men and gods to the age of Rome in which harmony between men and gods is instilled and distinctions fade between heroes and ancestors of Roman political importance. Violence dissolves also as Rome rises to establish permanent peace. In the third chapter, I examine the *Fasti*, to find another theme of progress and movement in which movement becomes a physical relocation of gods and heroes of various cultures to Rome.

In the fourth chapter I examine the exile poetry (*Tristia* and *Epistulae Ex Ponto*), where the barbarian becomes a physical reality to the poet, present in the Scythians and

Getae who surround him at Tomis. The rugged and precarious lifestyle on the outskirts of Roman civilization informs Ovid's plaintive requests for a return to Rome. Loss of his poetic self and the deterioration of his poetic voice become the result of barbarous conditions, hyperbolized to superb effect in Ovid's epistles. Even so, cracks appear in the artifice of the exile poetry, and Ovid seems to come to some level of tolerance, if not appreciation, for the people whose land he unwillingly inhabits. The tension between Ovid's anger at his relegation--disappointment in his fatherland--and between his tactics of survival and his cooperation with the people of Tomis, reveal to us, for once, the man behind the mask of Roman urbanity.[38]

Four themes emerge from this study, and offer interpretative structure to the dissertation. First is the use of the triumphal procession as a prime cultural example of the way that the Romans constructed the roles of barbarians while keeping the fear of barbaric strength alive in the minds and imaginations of Roman citizens: the gaze of the Roman spectator was the citizen's role in further dominating the barbarian, and the showcase of barbarians in the procession becomes a topic of discourse for the spectators.[39] In the first and fourth chapter the use of triumphal imagery shall be examined in greater detail, both within the context of literary representation and within the context of other artistic media in Rome that communicated the role of the barbarian in this system of domination--a role that consigns the foreign man to a role of neutered impotence in the face of Rome's multifaceted virility.

---

[38] Dickinson 1973, 158: "[The exile poems] possess a quality which is unusual in Roman elegiac poetry: the utterance of the author is directly referable to his own experience and he emerges from the poems in his own person."
[39] Specifically *Amores* 1.2, 1.7, *Ars* 1.213-228, *Tr.*2, 3.12, 4.2, *Pont.*2.1 and 3.4.

Another emerging theme that is treated primarily in the first and second chapter is the relationship of women to the barbaric. The idea of the barbaric seems implicitly tied to irrationality and excess, and women's hearts frequently become the site of uncontrollable passions in mythology. I will examine how, on the one hand, women in Greco-Roman mythology frequently bear the psychologically traumatic result of marriage to or influence by a barbaric figure. On the other hand, women are themselves frequently marked as foreign, so any behavior which flies in the face of Roman assumptions about the role of women can be attributed to the realm of otherness, whereby the societal order is not seriously threatened or damaged. In mythology no good end comes to a woman who gives her body to the foreign man (with the most notable exception of Lavinia, who marries Aeneas).[40] In addition, the desolation or madness of foreign women who marry

male members of a civilized society (Medea, Ariadne, Dido) becomes a lesson in the dangers of miscegenation. Behind much of the preoccupation with female madness or defiance in Greco-Roman mythology, is, I believe, a fear of the misunderstood powers of women to control and operate outside of the strictures and constraints that "civilized" (read "male-dominated") society places upon them.

A third theme is the literary versus the literal barbarian, the mythological versus the historical, the imagined versus the real. This contrast surfaces when I compare Ovid's exile literature to all that comes before it. Although steeped in the conventions of

---

[40] Of course it must be noted that "give" is a word with ironic backlash because very often the women in these tales have no choice in the matter, and their union with foreigners is primarily a political decision.

poetry and of exilic literature, as Nagle first pointed out,[41] there exists an element of

ethnography in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Although I must cautiously admit that

any glimpse of Getic life is heavily filtered through Ovid's cultural snobbery and the

purpose of the exilic poetry--to garner sympathy and reverse his relegation--still there are

moments that appear to be sincere appreciation or description of a way of life that had

existed a millennium before the reputation of Rome had wandered outside of Italy. In

chapter four, the Getae and Scythians emerge as a substantial presence alongside the

poet, and their culture eventually seduces the poet to a level of appreciation and

participation that he assumed would be impossible.

A fourth theme is one of progressive, geographical movement of men, gods, and

narrative sources to Rome and Italy. In the second and third chapter I shall examine how

there appears to be a structural and episodic treatment of the idea that Rome is the

appropriate final destination of all cultural and religious symbols. Concerning the

Metamorphoses, I join those who argue that the structure of the epic leads the reader from

the Greek literary canon into the newly established Roman system of gods and leaders

whose romances and battles compete with canonical versions of stories. Ovid attempts to

make old things new again and to impose validity upon Roman cultural narratives by

placing the two traditions in a progression such that the Greek tradition changes gradually

into a Roman one.[42] In the *Fasti*, many gods and heroes find their way to Italy, and

consider it the best place for them to remain.[43] The thematic similarity that exists in these

---

[41] Nagle 1980.

[42] See Myers 1994, 57-60, for the sources and new directions in Ovid's epic.

[43] Hugh Parker, 1990, argues that each of Ovid's representations of Saturn, Ino, Faunus and Hercules change when the god changes location: in Greece each is depicted negatively, but in Italy, each assumes benevolent qualities. See also Fantham 1992 on the importance on Evander as a non-Julian Roman ancestor.

two works helps us to better understand the early imperial attempt of poets like Ovid to establish Roman identity in response to the Greek literary and cultural inheritance that Roman writers prevalently acknowledged.[44]

---

[44] Gruen 1992, chapters 2 and 6, relays a thorough explication of the Roman self-reference through the filter of Greek cultural precedence.