

Luca D'Anselmi

10 Metaphorical word order

Abstract: Following the seminal work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), cognitive linguists have theorized that visual forms, or “image schemata,” and the metaphorical interpretations of these forms constitute the basis for much of the structure and organization of language. In this paper, I argue that image schemata provide and constrain the underlying structures that naturally govern metaphorical word order in Latin. Following a review of scholarship, I review and describe these constructions across genres and authors and compare them with image schemata to suggest that the image schemata theorized in cognitive linguistics conceptually motivate metaphorical word order constructions in Latin.

Keywords: image schema, mimetic syntax, word order, word position, visibility, metaphor, imagery, poetry, iconicity, Virgil, Horace, Seneca

10.1 Introduction

Latin frequently expresses meaning through the spatial arrangement of words. This “metaphorical” word order, as I term it, reinforces, illustrates, or mimics the lexical denotations of words. Metaphorical word order also conveys content of its own – meaning apart from and in addition to lexical meaning. In contrast to the previous approaches of Lateiner (1990) and Dainotti (2013; 2015), I argue that the spatial arrangements of words in Latin are derived from experientially based image schemas metaphorically mapped onto the linear word order of a line or linguistic expression. Metaphorical word order in Latin is ubiquitous. Groups of Latin words surround, embrace, entrap, and consume one another. They sneak away, band together, and shatter apart. In fact, many Latin words can be said to live meaningful visual lives apart from their entries in a dictionary.

A few examples will best illustrate how metaphorical word order expresses meaning. In Horace’s famous ode to Pyrrha, the word order creates an image that visually represents an amorous embrace. A slender boy (*gracilis . . . puer*) surrounds or embraces Pyrrha (represented in the text by *te*) in the word order of the line. The roses, in turn, surround the lovers (*multa . . . in rosa*):

- (1) *quis multa*_{ABL.SG} *gracilis*_{NOM.SG} *te*_{ACC.SG} *puer*_{NOM.SG} *in rosa*_{ABL.SG}
perfusus liquidis urget odoribus. (Hor. *Carm.* 1.5.1–2)
 ‘What slender boy, doused with liquid perfumes, urges you, in many a rose’.⁵⁸

In the next line, we visually see Pyrrha within the pleasing grotto:

- (2) *grato*_{ABL.SG} *Pyrrha*_{NOM.SG} *sub antro*_{ABL.SG}? (Hor. *Carm.* 1.5.3)
 ‘**Beneath a pleasing grotto, Pyrrha?**’

Although the words in (1) do not semantically designate an embrace,⁵⁹ we are made to understand that the boy is holding Pyrrha because we see the action visualized in the order of the words. In his translation of these lines, Rudd (2004: 35) in fact chooses to express this implied embrace verbally: ‘Pyrrha, what slender youngster, soaked with perfume, **holds you in his arms**, lying on a heap of roses in a delightful grotto?’. Mackail (1938: 65) also verbalized the embrace: ‘The picture, the *chose vue*, is a couple in a rose-arbour, just seen; a slim boy **with his arms clasped tight round a girl**, who sits knotting back her hair’. In Horace’s Latin, however, this embrace is only communicated in the visual arrangement of the words, rather than through their semantic meanings.

Another example of metaphorical word order can be found in Statius’ epithalamium for Stella and Violentilla, where a visual “tangling” of the words expresses the entrapment of Venus and Mars when they are caught *in flagrante*:

- (3) *Lemnia*_{NOM.P} *deprento*_{ABL.SG} *reperunt uincula*_{NOM.PL} *lecto*_{ABL.SG}. (Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.60)
 ‘**Lemnian chains** snaked over the entrapped bed’.

While *reperunt* expresses the creeping movement of the chains, the imbricated (abAB) word order of the nouns and their modifiers pictures the net-like entangling of the chains about the bed. These examples show how the visual word order of a linguistic expression can convey meaning at a level different from the merely semantic.

A few scholars have examined the visual aspects of word order in Latin. However, one major deficit of their studies is that they do not suggest an underlying mechanism for visual word order, nor do they provide a motivated account of the typology of visual orderings of words that tend to characterize Latin texts. Instead,

⁵⁸ All translations are my own unless otherwise specified. I wish to extend special thanks to William Michael Short, whose patient guidance with a non-specialist was invaluable throughout every aspect of this project. Furthermore, I wish to thank Charles Kuper for the examples from Jerome and Lucretius and Collin Hilton for a number of suggestions and corrections.

⁵⁹ The verb *urgere* typically means to ‘press (down); push; exert pressure’ or ‘urge’ (*OLD*), rather than ‘embrace’ or ‘hold’.

they assume that the visual ordering of words is a technique refined and practiced by a few highly skilled poets. By contrast, I suggest that the conceptual forms, known in cognitive linguistics as “image schemas,” govern visual word order throughout Latin literature, and not only in poetry. Thus, the embrace pictured in Hor. *Carm.* 1.5 is the result of the image schema of CONTAINMENT transferred to linear word order. Similarly, the imbricated word order in Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.60 is the result of the application of the MERGING schema. An image-schematic approach explains the visual aspects of Latin word order coherently and describes metaphorical ordering effects within a consistent, systematically defined, and psychologically realistic semantic framework. My study thus builds upon – and extends to an entirely different level of symbolic expression of – the kind of approach to meaning in Latin that has been staked out by scholars like Short (2013). In this paper, I review previous classical scholarship treating word order visualizations in Latin. I then go on to provide an overview of the cognitive-linguistic approach I adopt in explaining this phenomenon. Finally, I survey and describe selected arrangements in Latin literature and correlate them with image schemas, in order to suggest that the image schemas theorized in cognitive linguistics conceptually motivate and constrain word order constructions.

10.2 Previous approaches to “metaphorical” word order

Although individual word order effects such as those in Hor. *Carm.* 1.5 have been recognized, the visual ordering of words in Latin has received relatively little scholarly attention, especially as a widespread semantic (or, rather, supra-semantic) phenomenon in Latin (see Knox, 2013: 539–540). Young (1933) christened the phenomenon as the “pictorial arrangement of words”; however, he mistakenly attributed it to Vergil exclusively: “Since this practice of depicting in the order of the words something of the meaning of the verse is, by and large, particular to Virgil, it constitutes . . . a touchstone of his craft”.⁶⁰ Wilkinson (1963) briefly touched on “metaphor from word-order” in Latin and English poetry and claimed “The flexibility of Latin word-order lent itself to such effects”.⁶¹ Holtsmark (1987: 130–132) remarked on “logotactic iconicity” in Catullus, asserting that, in *Carm.* 1 and 47, the “physical placement of words is at least as important as their lexical denotation”.

⁶⁰ Young, 1933 provided several examples from Vergil that demonstrate CONTAINMENT through metaphorical word order.

⁶¹ Wilkinson, 1963: 65–66 chose an example from Cicero to support Young’s examples of CONTAINMENT from Vergil: *publice me praesidio* (Cic. *Catil.* 1.5.11). I have found no other discussion of metaphorical word order in Latin or Greek prose, an indication of the study still to be undertaking on this topic.

A dizzying array of *ad hoc* or specialized terminology – from West’s (1975) “syntactical onomatopoeia”⁶² to Dainotti’s (2013) “visual iconicity” – poses a significant challenge for a unified treatment of this subject.⁶³ I have decided to use the term “metaphorical word order” since it describes the phenomenon without the use of overly technical vocabulary.

Of the few scholars who have considered the visual aspects of Latin word order in any detail, some argue that they are aesthetic effects contrived to mimic lexical meaning for the enjoyment of the reader. In his seminal article on what he calls “mimetic syntax” in Ovid, Lateiner (1990: 206) argued that Latin poets deploy metaphorical word order as one of many “sources of linguistic pleasure”. In Lateiner’s (1990: 204) view, visual word order illustrates lexical meaning: “Syntax pictures sense. The reader synaesthetically experiences, by the spatial relationship of the words, what the lexical denotation of the words describes”.⁶⁴ A typical example from Lateiner (1990: 215) is the “momentary physical separation” expressed by the distance of *manus* and *te* in:

(4) *uix a te uideor posse tenere manus.* (Ov. Am. 1.4.10)

‘I scarcely seem to be able to keep **my hands off you**’.

Even here, it is arguable that the spatial separation of *te* and *manus* does not just “mimic,” spatially, the lexical denotations of the words. Rather, as demonstrated in (1) and (2) above, the separation actually contributes to meaning by expressing the uneasy distance between the hands and the object of their desire. Regardless, Lateiner (1990: 206) rightly argued against those who dismissed “mimetic” effects as “farfetched or inadequately demonstrated” phenomena: “Some critics will wonder whether an effect is calculated or demand poet’s statements about intentions. Accumulation of examples should persuade the wary of the phenomenon’s reality”.⁶⁵ Lateiner’s study demonstrated the pervasive presence of visual word order in Ovid

⁶² Regarding metaphorical word order in Lucr. *DRN* 3.421–424, West, 1975: 96 claims that “This syntactical play is relevant to the sense, indeed a linguistic embodiment of it”. See also Sedley, 1998: 46–48.

⁶³ Besides scattered references in commentaries, cursory treatments of metaphorical word order also occur in Harrison, 1991: 288–290; Freudenburg, 1996: 200; Traina, 1997: 196–197, s.v. *icona* and *ipérba-to*; Califf, 2002: 38–43. For the pedagogical application of “word pictures” see Markus & Ross, 2004: 79–81.

⁶⁴ Lateiner’s analysis includes the following categories: verse positioning of ordered words, juxtaposition and separation, enclosure and concealment, imbrication, balancing and ordering, sequence, interval, enjambment and acceleration.

⁶⁵ Yet this is problematic; an accumulation of examples can certainly demonstrate the *existence* of a phenomenon, but not the *intentionality* of a phenomenon.

and provided compelling reasons for a renewed study of the spatial aspects of Latin word order.

Following Lateiner’s analysis of “mimetic syntax”, however, skeptics continued to insist that the visual arrangement of words was inconsequential to the study of Latin literature. In an introductory sub-chapter on poetic hyperbaton, for instance, Adams & Mayer (1999: 17) admitted, “It seems likely that some Latin poets had, up to a point, a spatial concept in the structure of their verses”. Yet even after reviewing examples of metaphorical word order, they concluded, “It would not do . . . to make too much of spatial symbolism in the structure of verses” (Adams & Mayer, 1999: 18). Their skepticism is perhaps understandable due to the inability of English to engage in similar verbal pyrotechnics; however, their undefended dismissal left an opportunity for a thorough assessment of the phenomenon’s importance in Latin.

Dainotti’s (2013) examination of what he terms “verbal expressiveness” in Vergil and other hexameter poets registers a similar skepticism regarding the spatial aspects of word order. Building on Lateiner’s work, Dainotti initially argued that “iconic word order” was an “elegant stylistic device . . . by which the poet, in order to reinforce the semantics of a word or expression, creates a suggestive correspondence between the sense and the word placement”.⁶⁶ Thus, metaphorical word order does not constitute meaning in its own right, but only elegantly illustrates or reinforces meaning in poetry.⁶⁷ Consequently, in his recent book, Dainotti (2015) focused on Vergil, whose elegant and expressive poetry presumably offered the most promising ground for the collection of poetic devices.⁶⁸ Yet in his introduction, Dainotti (2015: 13) claimed that metaphorical word order is not a visual phenomenon at all: “It is important to specify that iconic diagrams of the visual type in Latin poetry – poetry intended in general to be listened to – are not really ‘visual’ but rather acoustic”.⁶⁹ Furthermore, Dainotti (2015: 13, n. 40) cited Adams & Mayer and similarly admitted that, “[we] cannot . . . completely deny the spatial and typographic value of lines in ancient poetry”. It is

66 Dainotti, 2013: 174 repeated this claim: “I would like to consider [iconic word order] a stylistic device, a deliberate strategy adopted to reinforce the *expressiveness* of a poetic image, an elegant invitation to the reader to engage in the synaesthetic experience of the poetic text”. He more or less followed the reasoning found in Lateiner, 1990: 204: “The reader synaesthetically experiences, by the spatial relationship of the words, what the lexical denotation of the verse describes”.

67 Dainotti’s categories included enclosure, spatial hyperbaton, percolation, separation/opposition, and mixture. Thus, Dainotti mainly employed Lateiner’s categories; however, he renamed them and included an additional analysis of lines that describe snakes and weapons. Neither Lateiner nor Dainotti mentioned work done in cognitive linguistics. Lakoff and Johnson, for instance, are absent from their bibliographies. Adams and Mayer, however, are aware of Lakoff and Johnson.

68 Dainotti, 2015 is invaluable for its perceptive assembly of examples from Vergil and other hexameter poets. See the review by Lee Fratantuono, 2012, *BMCR* 2016.05.42.

69 Furthermore, regarding hyperbaton, Dainotti, 2015: 13 argued: “The reader, in order to join the adjective to its noun, is obliged to ‘listen’ to the line in its entirety and, as a result, perceives it as longer than the other lines in the context”.

difficult to understand how Dainotti could argue that the “visual level” of iconicity is really “acoustic,” while still claiming that the spatial value of poetic lines in Latin cannot be denied. Lateiner (1990: 208) preemptively challenged this view: “Ovid expected his poetry to be read by the eye on the page as well as recited and heard. Mimetic syntax is more commonly visual than aural, although not always a matter for the eye”.

Thus, previous approaches to the visual aspects of word order in Latin have left ample room for improvement in several regards. Although scholars such as Dainotti have gathered and categorized word order effects in individual authors, they have defined the nature of these spatial effects inconsistently or unclearly. Are these phenomena visual or aural? Are they sometimes visual and sometimes aural? The lack of a coherent approach has led to inconclusive statements such as “We cannot . . . completely deny the spatial and typographic value of lines in ancient poetry”. The lack of consistent terminology only makes matters worse: are these effects mimetic, iconic, logotactic, or acoustic? Second, no systematic motivation has been posited that explains the range of visual word order effects. Why do certain meaningful visual patterns of words appear? What constrains their typology and range?

10.3 A cognitive-linguistic approach to visual word order

In contrast to previous approaches, I argue that an image-schematic explanation provides both a precise understanding of the nature of the visual aspects of word order, as well as a systematically motivated account of the typology of effects that appear. In this view, visual word order effects are guided by a metaphorical projection of schematic spatial structures onto the sequence and “topography” of word order. The kinds of metaphorical effects that appear in Latin (and in other languages) are constrained by the range of applicable image schemas. In other words, through this image-schematic approach we can explain what metaphorical word order is, and we can coherently describe (and predict) the range of visual constructions in Latin.

Lakoff & Johnson’s (1980) study of how metaphor gives meaning to linguistic form provides a theoretical foundation for this approach. First, according to Lakoff & Johnson, language is naturally conceptualized in spatial terms. Thus, the spatial concepts that apply to the form of language are not primarily rhetorical flourishes employed by the most expressive poets. Rather, spatial metaphors should occur throughout a language to the extent that the syntax of the language is able to accommodate them.⁷⁰ Second, they argue that “Linguistic forms are themselves

⁷⁰ Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 127 2011 suggest that metaphor gives meaning to form in other languages besides English: “We would expect . . . that some metaphorical spatialization of language would occur in every language”.

endowed with content by virtue of spatialization metaphors” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 126). Hardly an inconsequential or decorative aspect of language, metaphorical spatialization constitutes meaning apart from and in addition to semantic meaning. From this perspective, form and content are necessarily interconnected: they both contribute to the meaning of a linguistic expression. This contrasts with Dainotti’s (2015) “iconicity” approach, which sees such effects as rhetorical devices used to mimic semantic meaning.⁷¹ Third, in contrast to Dainotti’s theory, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) claim that spatial metaphors apply directly to the sequencing of a sentence, whether the sentence is spoken or written; writing only serves to reinforce the application of spatial metaphors to language.⁷² Thus, metaphorical word order should not be seen merely as a set of poetic or rhetorical embellishments.

More broadly, Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 1–6) argue that metaphor is a pervasive aspect of our conceptual system, integral to the way we think and express our thoughts. They provide numerous examples of basic metaphors such as ‘LIFE IS A JOURNEY’ that structure the conceptualization of a target domain (i.e., life) in terms of a source domain (i.e., journey). Furthermore, metaphor has an experiential basis. For instance, the frequent use of containment metaphors throughout language is derived from our experience of inhabiting houses, rooms, cribs, and the other spaces, as well as the lived experience of being a bodily container that holds other objects. Thus, numerous concepts, from emotions to arguments, are metaphorically understood in terms of containment metaphors (e.g., *I’m full of rage!* and *Your argument doesn’t hold water*) (see Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 29–30). Importantly, Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 87–105) insist that metaphors are typically coherent; they form non-random systems arising from our embodied experience of the world. To reiterate, metaphor is an integral conceptual phenomenon, experientially based, and generally coherent.

In *The Body in the Mind* Johnson (1987) develops an aspect of the study begun in *Metaphors We Live By*. He argues that cognitive forms known as “image schemas” and the metaphorical interpretations of these forms constitute the basis for much of the structure and organization of language (Lakoff, 1987; Oakley, 2007: 214–235). These image schemas are natural, in that they arise from the embodied experiences that constitute human life:

[I]n order for us to have meaningful, connected experiences that we can comprehend and reason about, there must be a pattern and order to our actions, perceptions, and conceptions. *A schema is a recurrent pattern, shape and regularity in, or of, these ongoing ordering activities.* These patterns

⁷¹ Dainotti, 2015: 7: “When . . . word order, rhythm, and figures of metre and sound mirror and amplify the sense of a passage, expressiveness becomes iconicity, ‘Form Miming Meaning’”. Dainotti follows Nänny & Fischer, 2006: 462–472, who provide numerous examples of iconicity in English poetry.

⁷² Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 126: “[W]riting a sentence down allows us to conceptualize it even more readily as a spatial object”.

emerge as meaningful structures for us chiefly at the level of our bodily movements through space, our manipulations of objects, and our perceptual interactions. (Johnson, 1987: 29, *his emphasis*)

Johnson provides a partial list of many important image schemas including CONTAINER, BALANCE, COMPULSION, BLOCKAGE, COUNTERFORCE, ATTRACTION, PATH, CENTER-PERIPHERY, PART-WHOLE, MERGING, SPLITTING, MATCHING, SUPERIMPOSITION, ITERATION, and CONTACT (Johnson, 1987: 126).

Finally, Lakoff & Johnson argue that spatial concepts (such as image schemas) metaphorically apply to linguistic forms (such as word order):

We speak in a linear order; in a sentence, we say some words earlier and others later. Since speaking is correlated with time and time is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of space, it is natural for us to conceptualize language metaphorically in terms of space. Our writing system reinforces this conceptualization. Writing a sentence down allows us to conceptualize it even more readily as a spatial object with words in a linear order. Thus our spatial concepts naturally apply to linguistic expressions. We know which word occupies the *first position* in the sentence, whether two words are *close* to each other or *far apart*, whether a word is relatively *long* or *short* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 126, *their emphasis*).⁷³

Lakoff & Johnson provide examples in English using the underlying metaphor ‘LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS’. Since we expect small containers to have little content and large containers to have more content, the length of a linguistic expression can be metaphorically descriptive of amount. A good example of the visual application of the metaphor ‘MORE OF FORM IS MORE OF CONTENT’ expressed through ITERATION is the following:

He ran and ran and ran and ran.

This indicates more running than

He ran.

The first sentence expresses duration through the application of ITERATION directly to the spatial form of the sentence. It is important to note that the ITERATION expressed is not necessarily a highly calculated rhetorical effect, but an everyday application of a spatial metaphor to the form of a sentence. Numerous image schemas can be metaphorically applied to linguistic expressions. In the following section, I examine the presence of several of Johnson’s image schemas represented in Latin word order.

⁷³ It is interesting to note that, in the study of metaphorical syntax, this conclusion renders it largely irrelevant whether a text was originally composed for aural performance or not.

10.4 Image-schematic structuring of word order in Latin

First, I provide a few examples of the application of the simple PATH, CONTACT/SEPARATION, and BALANCE image schemas to Latin word order. Second, I will examine several complex image schemas, such as CONTAINMENT, MERGING, and SPLITTING and their adaptation to two-dimensional linear word order. These complex image schemas cannot be easily expressed in English, due to the limitations of English word order; however, they are frequently expressed through metaphorical word order constructions in Latin.

10.4.1 PATH

The PATH schema (Lateiner, 1990: 209–214) expresses a spatial or temporal sequence. In the basic structure of this image schema, a trajector traces a path from a starting point to an end point, passing through a series of intermediate points. Since we also understand that a linguistic expression has a starting point, an end point, and a series of intermediate points, the metaphorical application of this schema to word order is relatively straightforward. We can see and hear what words come first in a line (as Lakoff and Johnson point out), what words come in the middle, and what words come last. As we read, our eyes pass from one point to another. A particularly clear application of the PATH schema representing spatial sequence illustrates the law of poetic unity in Horace's *Ars Poetica*. The word *primo* stands first; *medium* and *medio* surround the caesura; *imum* is placed last:

- (5) *primo*_{ABL.SG} *ne medium*_{ACC.SG} *medio*_{ABL.SG} *ne discrepet imum*_{ACC.SG}. (Hor. *Ars* 152)

'That **the beginning** is not discordant with **the middle**, nor **the middle** with **the end**'.

In the following example, Lateiner points out the medial positioning of *medias* and the final positioning of *imas*, "with an intentional double pun of placement" (Lateiner, 1990: 213):

- (6) *tum lino medias*_{ACC.PL} *et ceris alligat imas*_{ACC.PL}. (Ov. *Met.* 8.193)

'Then [Daedalus] binds the **middles** and the **ends** of the feathers with flax and wax'.

Lucretius' causes sequentially follow each other in the order of the words:

- (7) *ex infinito ne causam*_{ACC.SG} *causa* *sequatur*. (Lucret. *DRN* 2.255)

'That **cause** may not follow cause from infinity'.

Metaphorical extensions of the PATH schema also structure word order. Frequently, PATH metaphorically expresses temporal sequence via the metaphor 'TIME IS A PATH' through the ordering of linguistic elements. As Short (2013: 386) has recently

argued, “Latin speakers’ conceptualization of time exemplifies . . . image-schematic structuring”. This conceptualization is reflected in Latin and English word order. Consider the different meanings expressed by the following sentences that differ only in their word order:

He stood up and died.

He died and stood up.

In “He stood up and died,” it is understood that the standing up happened before the death; in “He died and stood up,” the opposite is implied. The former might describe a heart attack; the latter, zombification. A famous Latin example of a PATH image schema metaphorically expressing temporal sequence in a linguistic expression is Caesar’s dictum *veni, vidi, vici* (Suet. *Jul.* 37.2).⁷⁴ Similarly, Tacitus expresses the temporal sequence of the rout of the Britons through the PATH schema. The Romans follow, wound, capture, and kill their captives:

- (8) **sequi¹ uulnerare² capere³, atque eosdem oblatis aliis trucidare⁴.** (Tac. *Ag.* 37.2)
 ‘**They pursued¹, wounded², captured³**, and – as others presented themselves – they **slaughtered⁴** their captives’.

Any change in the word order of these examples would distort the meaning.

10.4.2 CONTACT and SEPARATION

The CONTACT image schema transposed to linear word order frequently expresses closeness, similarity, or unity. In a line or linguistic expression this effect occurs when words denoting conceptually or physically close objects, people, or concepts are associated through spatial proximity. Metaphorically, CONTACT can express intensity (‘CLOSENESS IS STRENGTH OF EFFECT’). Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 130) provide the classic example in English, comparing *I taught Greek to Harry* with *I taught Harry Greek*. They argue, “In the second sentence, where *taught* and *Harry* are close, there is more of a suggestion that Harry actually learned what was taught him – that is, that the teaching had an effect on him”. Another well-known example demonstrates how CONTACT implies causation and how increased SEPARATION implies diminishing causation:

Sam killed Harry.

Sam caused Harry to die.

⁷⁴ Scrambling the order of the words in English results in a sexual innuendo.

Sam brought it about that Harry died. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 131)

The progressive syntactic distancing of Sam from Harry indicates a weakening of the causal link between Sam's actions and Harry's death. Importantly, Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 132) remind us that "The subtle shades of meaning that we see in the examples given above are thus the consequences not of special rules of English but of a conceptual metaphor applying naturally to the *form* of the language".

Similarly, CONTACT frequently applies to the form of linguistic expressions in Latin. Dainotti provides several excellent examples of the application of CONTACT in Vergil. As the battle lines of the Trojans and Latins come together, the physical closeness of battle is communicated through the application of the CONTACT schema to word order. The battle lines collide in the line, the feet of the men press against each other, and the men themselves are densely packed together (Dainotti, 2015: 226):⁷⁵

(9) *haud aliter Troianae acies aciesque Latinae*

*concurrunt, haeret **pede**_{ABL.SG} **pes**_{NOM.SG} densusque **uiro**_{ABL.SG} **uir**_{NOM.SG}.* (Verg. *Aen.* 10.360–61)

'Scarcely otherwise did the Trojan **battle lines and the battle lines** of the Latins/charge together; **foot** clung to **foot**, and **men** were densely-packed with **men**'.

Similarly, when Dido prays that everlasting enmity will remain between Carthage and Rome, the close relationship between the two cities is conveyed through the CONTACT schema (Dainotti, 2015: 226):

(10) *litora*_{ACC.PL} *litoribus*_{DAT.PL} *contraria, fluctibus*_{DAT.PL} *undas*_{ACC.PL}
*imprecor, arma*_{ACC.PL} *armis*_{DAT.PL}: *pugnent ipsi*_{NOM.PL} *que nepotes*_{NOM.PL} *que.* (Verg. *Aen.* 4.628–29)

'I call on **shores** to be opposed to **shores**, **waves to waves**,/ **arms to arms**: may **they and their grandchildren** be in conflict'.

In Curtius' *Historiae Alexandri Magni*, the battle lines of Alexander and Darius crush against each other:

(11) *duae quippe acies ita cohaerebant, ut armis*_{DAT.PL} *arma*_{NOM.PL} *pulsarent, mucrones in ora dirigerent.* (Curt. 3.11.5)

'Then the two battle lines were so closely pressed, that **arms** beat against **arms**, and they pointed their blades at each other's faces'.

⁷⁵ See Dainotti's, 2015 sub-section on "significant juxtapositions," for interesting examples, primarily from the *Aeneid*.

In Ennius, the juxtaposition of *uestras* and *meas* expresses Medea's burning desire to take her children's hands physically in her own:

- (12) *saluete, optima corpora,*
cette manus uestras measque accipite. (Enn. *Trag.* 289–90)
 'Good-bye, you dearest little things; there now!/ Give me **your hands** and you take **mine**'. (Warmington, 1956: 322–323)

The physical closeness of Seneca's Orpheus and Eurydice is reflected in the word order:

- (13) *Orpheus, Eurydicen dum repetit suam* (Sen. *Her. F.* 571)
 '**Orpheus**, when he returns to his **Eurydice**'.

CONTACT can also be metaphorically extended to refer to the similarity or "closeness" between concepts or ideas, such as "love" and "desire". When Jerome discusses the difficulty of being virtuous, the metaphorical closeness of virtue and vice is expressed through CONTACT:

- (14) *uicina sunt uitia* NOM.PL *uirtutibus* DAT.PL. (Jer. *Lucif.* 15)
 '**Vices** are similar to **virtues**'.

Jerome would probably disapprove of the physical CONTACT expressed in Lucilius:

- (15) *cum poclo bibo eodem, amplector, labra* NOM.PL *labellis* DAT.PL
fictricis conpono, hoc est cum psōlokopoûmai. (Lucil. *Sat.* 331–32)
 'When I drink from the same cup, embrace her, lay **my lips to her little ones**/
 (the scheming jade!) – that is, when I'm lustful'. (Warmington, 1967: 102–103)

As Pompey marches in haste to reach Dyrrachium, night is joined to day in the visual ordering of the words:

- (16) *quod properans noctem* ACC.SG *diei* DAT.SG *coniunxerat neque iter intermiserat.* (Caes. *Civ.* 3.13)
 'Because in haste [Pompey] had joined **night to day** and had not interrupted his journey'.

In contrast to CONTACT, spatial distance can be expressed through SEPARATION. When Ovid's ghostly Orpheus looks back at Eurydice with impunity, metaphorical word order illustrates the spatial distance between the two. Here, SEPARATION combines with an application of the PATH schema. Eurydice spatially remains at the beginning of the line, while Orpheus has progressed towards the end:

(17) *nunc praeuius anteit*

Eurydicenque suam iam tuto respicit **Orpheus**. (Ov. *Met.* 11.65–66)

‘Now he goes before her,/ and **Orpheus** safely now looks back on his **Eurydice**’.

Martial’s Eurydice sends a bear to get Orpheus from the underworld. The impossible physical distance between the two is expressed by an extreme application of the SEPARATION schema:

(18) **Orphea** quod subito tellus emisit hiatu

ursam inuasuram, uenit ab Eurydice. (Mart. *Sp.* 25.1–2)

‘Earth through a sudden opening sent/ a bear to attack **Orpheus**. She came from **Eurydice**’. (Shackleton Bailey, 2003: 28–29)

Like CONTACT, spatial SEPARATION can be extended metaphorically to refer to the dissimilarity or distance between concepts or ideas, such as “hate” and “love” or “cowardice” and “bravery”. Seneca’s Eurybates shrinks from recalling the storm that befell Agamemnon’s fleet. His mind is separated from the evils he has endured to the maximum extent allowed by the trimeter:

(19) **mens aegra tantis atque inhorrescit malis**. (Sen. *Ag.* 418)

‘My sick **mind** is terrified of such **evils**’.

Lateiner (1990: 215) gives the example of guilt (*nocens*) and innocence (*insonti*) being separated to the greatest extent allowed by the pentameter:

(20) *a, quotiens finxit culpam, quantumque licebat*

insonti, speciem praebuit esse nocens! (Ov. *Am.* 2.19.13–14)

‘Ah, how oft has she feigned a charge, and put on the air/ as far as she could with a **guiltless** man – of **attacking** me!’ (Showerman, 1977: 439)

In poetry, SEPARATION can also be expressed through enjambment, taking advantage of the spatial break between lines (Latenier, 1990: 206). When Creon recounts the necromancy to Oedipus, Pentheus appears as part of the catalog of famous Thebans. The unfortunate king of Thebes is torn from his adjective, visualizing his horrifying dismemberment at the hands of his mother:

(21) *sequitur et Bacchas lacer*

Pentheus tenetque saeuus etaimnunc minas. (Sen. *Oed.* 617–618)

‘And **torn Pentheus**/ follows the Bacchantes, still holding savagely to his threats’.

10.4.3 BALANCE

So far, I have examined two of Johnson's basic image schemas, PATH and CONTACT/SEPARATION, expressed in linear word order. These are relatively simple, easily visualized and constructed in a one-dimensional linguistic form. Other simple effects such as BALANCE occur frequently (Lateiner, 1990: 223–226). According to Horace, in poetry, what is pleasing must be brought together equally with what is profitable; this is mirrored in the balanced expression:

- (22) *lectorem **delectando**_{ABL} pariterque **monendo**_{ABL}*. (Hor. *Ars* 344)
 'Equally **by delighting** and **by teaching** the reader'.

Horace commands the Pisones to study their Greek models. The regularity of his recommendation (that they study both day and night) is represented by an application of the BALANCE schema applied to the line:

- (23) *uos exemplaria Graeca
nocturna_{ACC.PL} **versate**_{IMP,2PL} **manu, versate**_{IMP,2PL} **diurna**_{ACC.PL}*. (Hor. *Ars* 268–269)
 'For yourselves, go over Greek models/ **nightly**, go over them **daily**'

10.4.4 COLLECTION

Similarly, the COLLECTION image schema is relatively straightforward in its application to linear word order. Through asyndeton, the tight assembly of words in a line or linguistic expression demonstrates the close spatial assembly of related objects, people, or characteristics. Venantius Fortunatus lists the paraphernalia of Christ's passion through an application of the COLLECTION schema:⁷⁶

- (24) *Hic **acetum fel arundo sputa clavi lancea***. (Ven. Fort. *Carm.* 2.2.19).
 'Here **vinegar, gall, reed, spit, nails, lance**'.

The numerous awful traits of Virgil's Polyphemus are emphasized through COLLECTION (and further emphasized through elision):

- (25) *monstrum_{ACC,N,SG} **horrendum**_{ACC,SG} **informe**_{ACC,SG} **ingens**_{ACC,SG} cui lumen ademptum.*
 (Verg. *Aen.* 3.658)
 'A **dreadful** monster, **deformed** and **huge**, whose eye was gone'.

⁷⁶ Example taken from Roberts, 1989: 60.

This effect appears frequently in prose as well as poetry. As the inhabitants of Marseilles prepare for the arrival of Caesar, the assemblage of repairs is expressed through the COLLECTION schema:

(26) *armorum officinas in urbe instituerant, **muros portas classem** reficiebant.* (Caes. Civ. 1.34.5)

‘They established workshops for the production of arms in the city, and were rebuilding the **walls, gates, and fleet**’.

10.4.5 MERGING and SPLITTING

As with the PATH, CONTACT/SEPARATION, BALANCE, and COLLECTION schemas, MERGING and SPLITTING provide the conceptual motivation for countless metaphorical word order constructions throughout Latin literature. Interlocking (abAB) word order and its variants often manifest these image schemas, but asyndeton and simple juxtaposition can express MERGING as well. Through its numerous entailments, MERGING expresses mingling, mixing, confusion, weaving, and interlocking. SPLITTING, also frequently expressed through interlocking word order, describes dissolution, splattering, and scattering (Dainotti, 2015: 248–249; Lateiner, 1990: 222–223). Below are several examples of the MERGING and SPLITTING schemas applied to word order in Latin poetry and prose.

MERGING frequently expresses mingling of liquids, people, or objects. In the battle for Massilia, Lucan’s drowning soldiers drink their own blood mixed with sea-water. Within the line, the sea mingles with the blood of the dying soldiers and sailors:

(27) *hauseruntque **suo** ^{ABL.SG} permixtum ^{ACC.SG} **sanguine** ^{ABL.SG} pontum ^{ACC.SG}.* (Luc. BC. 3.577)
‘They drank down the sea mixed with their own blood’.

In a similar line, Manilius describes how those born under the constellation Cetus will become fishermen and taint the waters of the sea with the blood of its own creatures:

(28) *inficiturque **suo** ^{ABL.SG} permixtus ^{NOM.SG} **sanguine** ^{ABL.SG} pontus ^{NOM.SG}.* (Man. Astr. 5.667)
‘The sea is dyed, mingled with its own blood’.

The Parcae foretell the bloody deeds of Achilles at Troy:

(29) ***alta** ^{ACC.PL} tepefaciet permixta ^{ABL.SG} **flumina** ^{ACC.PL} caede ^{ABL.SG}.* (Catul. Carm. 64.360)
‘[Achilles] will warm **the deep rivers** with intermingled slaughter’.

Vergil's ill-fated Halaesus strikes Thoas in the face, mingling the bones of his skull with his brain:

- (30) *ossa*_{ACC.PL} *que dispersit cerebro*_{ABL.SG} *permixta*_{ACC.PL} *cruento*_{ABL.SG}. (Verg. *Aen.* 10.416)
 'He shattered apart **his bones mixed** with the bloody brain'.

The gods have abandoned a world whose moral degradation is expressed by the MERGING schema through imbricated word order and asyndeton:

- (31) *omnia*_{NOM.PL} *fanda*_{NOM.PL} *nefanda*_{NOM.PL} *malo*_{ABL.SG} *permixta*_{NOM.PL} *furore*_{ABL.SG}. (Catul. *Carm.* 64.405)
 'All things, good and unspeakable, mixed together with impious fury'.

Interspersed with poppies, lilies grow in the garden where Hylas meets a watery fate:

- (32) *et circum irriguo surgebant lilia prato*
*candida*_{NOM.PL} *purpureis*_{ABL.PL} *mixta*_{NOM.PL} *papaueribus*_{ABL.PL}. (Prop. *Carm.* 1.20.37–38)
 'And round about lilies were growing in the well-watered meadow, / **white lilies mixed** with dark red poppies'.

The soldiers in Hannibal's battle line are confused and set upon by the enemy in a narrow pass:

- (33) *deinde, ut trepidationem in angustiis suo*_{ABL.SG} *que ipsum*_{ACC.SG} *tumultu*_{ABL.SG} *misceri*
*agmen*_{ACC.SG} *uidere, equis maxime consternatis, quidquid adiecissent ipsi terroris,*
satis ad perniciem fore rati. (Liv. *AUC.* 21.33.3–4)
 'Then, when they saw the helter-skelter in the pass and the battle line itself embroiled **in its own confusion**, the horses especially being frightened, they thought that whatever they could add themselves to the consternation of the troops would be sufficient to destroy them'. (Foster, 1963: 97, adapted)

Frequently, asyndeton can express the MERGING schema, when rapid-fire word order expresses the mingling and confusion of people, objects, or concepts. Jugurtha's Numidians offer Metellus' legionaries a day of confused fighting:

- (34) *dispersi a suis pars cedere, alii insequi; neque signa neque ordines obseruare;*
ubi quemque periculum ceperat, ibi resistere ac propulsare; arma tela equi uiri
hostes atque ciues permixti; nihil consilio neque imperio agi, fors omnia regere.
 (Sal. *Jug.* 51.1)

‘Scattered from their comrades, some retreated, others followed, they observed neither standards nor ranks; where danger overtook each man, there he stopped and resisted; **arms, weapons, horses, men, enemies and citizens mixed together**; nothing done with intention or command, fortune ruling everything’.

The MERGING schema frequently expresses weaving, intertwining, or binding through imbricated word order. Tiresias prepares a necromantic sacrifice, tying up the horns of a bull:

- (35) *tum fera* _{ACC.PL} *caeruleis* _{ABL.PL} *intexit cornua* _{ACC.PL} *sertis* _{ABL.PL}. (Stat. *Theb.* 4.449)
 ‘Then he wove **the fierce horns** with dark garlands’.

The slithering appearance of Erictho’s hair is terrifying:

- (36) *et coma* _{NOM.SG} *uipereis* _{ABL.PL} *substringitur horrida* _{NOM.SG} *sertis* _{ABL.PL}. (Luc. *BC.* 6.656)
 ‘And her **frightful hair** is bound up with entwined vipers’.

The SPLITTING schema is also applied to a linguistic expression through imbricated word order; it represents splattering, sprinkling, and scattering. Following the murder of Clytemnestra in Accius’ *Aegisthus*, Orestes’ hands are splattered with his mother’s blood:

- (37) *cui manus* _{NOM.SG} *materno* _{ABL.PL} *sordet sparsa* _{NOM.SG} *sanguine* _{ABL.SG}.
 (Acc. *Trag.* 12)
 ‘His **hand** was soiled **with spots** of his mother’s blood’.

Octavia bemoans the death of her mother:

- (38) *ora* _{NOM.PL} *que foedo* _{ABL.SG} *sparsa* _{NOM.PL} *cruore* _{ABL.SG}. ([Sen.] *Oct.* 17)
 ‘And **her face** **sprayed** with ghastly gore’.

Poppaea’s nurse describes how the Senate was astonished at her beauty:

- (39) *sacras* _{ACC.PL} *que grato* _{ABL.SG} *spargeres aras* _{ACC.PL} *mero* _{ABL.SG}. ([Sen.] *Oct.* 701)
 ‘[As] you sprinkled the **sacred altars** with pleasing wine’.

10.4.6 CONTAINMENT

Although the image schema of CONTAINMENT (see Dainotti, 2013: 182–185; 2015: 245–248; Lateiner, 1990: 217–223) is derived from experiences of three-dimensional space, a one-dimensional line or linguistic expression can express CONTAINMENT, as Johnson (1987: 21–22) suggests:

The most experientially salient sense of boundedness seems to be that of three-dimensional containment (i.e., being limited or held within some three-dimensional enclosure, such as a womb, a crib, or a room). If we eliminate one or two of these dimensions, we get equally important two- and one-dimensional containment. In these latter cases, however, the relevant experience is chiefly one of differentiation and separation, such as when a point lies *in* a circle or *in* a line segment. Whether in one, two, or three dimensions, physical *in-out* orientation involves separation, differentiation, and enclosure, which implies restriction and limitation.

Thus, although linear word order is unable to express three- or two-dimensional CONTAINMENT, it is possible to express one-dimensional CONTAINMENT in a line or linguistic expression. Most commonly, this occurs when a word and its modifier surround another word or when a word is separated from others. Unlike PATH, CONTACT, and SEPARATION, the limitations of English word order make it difficult, if not impossible, to express CONTAINMENT spatially in the form of a sentence; Latin, by contrast, is ideally suited to express complex image schemas through the flexibility of its word order.

Indeed, CONTAINMENT provides the conceptual motivation for countless metaphorical word order constructions throughout Latin literature, expressing enclosure, desire, consumption, protection, oppression, and other senses of boundedness and limitation. For instance, through metaphorical word order, the physical features of an environment, such as mountains, rivers, streams, or oceans can be surrounded by other features of the environment, such as land or water (e.g., *the river ran through the mountains*). An object or person can also be held within an enclosing environment (e.g., Hor. *Carm.* 1.5.3). This external CONTAINMENT can be metaphorically extended to psychological conditions and abstract situations, such as emotions or an aspect of life or fate (e.g., *I'm held by indecision*). Furthermore, since human beings and other objects are also conceptualized as containers, internal CONTAINMENT expressed in metaphorical word order can communicate pregnancy, wounding, consumption, digestion, and internal emotions.

CONTAINMENT expressed through metaphorical word order is ubiquitous throughout Latin literature and frequently portrays the arrangement of geographical features. Amphitryon recalls how Hercules broke open the land mass that separated the Mediterranean Sea from the Atlantic, resulting in the Straits of Gibraltar. The flowing Ocean (*ruenti Oceano*) lies physically between the broad path (*latam uiam*), and *latam* is separated from *uiam* to the maximum extent allowed by the trimeter:

- (40) *latam*_{ACC.SG} *ruenti*_{DAT.SG} *fecit Oceano*_{DAT.SG} *uiam*_{ACC.SG}. (Sen. *Her. F.* 238)
 ‘[Hercules] made **a broad path** for the rushing ocean’.

CONTAINMENT expresses countless variations of topographical enclosure. A Priapus is constructed within the fruit-bearing garden:

- (41) *pomosis*_{ABL.PL} *que ruber*_{NOM.SG} *custos*_{NOM.SG} *ponatur in hortis*_{ABL.PL}. (Tib. *Carm.* 1.1.17)
 ‘The red-painted guardian is placed **in the fruit-rich gardens**’.

Instead of a feature of topography, CONTAINMENT can express surrounding groups of people, statues, or gods. Statira stands grieving in the midst of a crowd of noble women:

- (42) *ingens*_{NOM.SG} *circa eam*_{ACC.SG} *nobilium*_{GEN.PL} *feminarum*_{GEN.PL} *turba*_{NOM.G} *constiterat laceratis crinibus abscissaque ueste*. (Curt. *Hist.* 3.11.25)
 ‘Around her **a vast crowd of noble women stood** with their hair torn and their clothing rent’.

Seneca describes how Cornelia lost her son to an unknown killer in the midst of the household gods:

- (43) *Cornelia Liui Drusi clarissimum iuuenem iulustris ingenii, uadentem per Gracchana uestigia imperfectis tot rogationibus intra penates*_{ACC.PL} *interemptum*_{ACC.SG} *suos*_{ACC.PL}, *amiserat*. (Sen. *Dial.* 6.16.4)
 ‘Cornelia, the wife of Livius Drusus, lost her illustrious son of outstanding character, who was treading in the footsteps of the Gracchi, and was assassinated among his own household gods, with so many proposed measures still unpassed’.

Although Varius is syntactically departing from the company en route to Brundisium, he is surrounded by a group of his mourning friends in the word order of the line:⁷⁷

- (44) *flentibus*_{ABL.PL} *hinc Varius*_{NOM.SG} *discedit maestus*_{NOM.SG} *amicis*_{ABL.PL}. (Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.93)
 ‘From here unhappy Varius departed **from his weeping friends**’.

Tragedy is like a blushing matron commanded to dance in the company of impudent Satyrs:

⁷⁷ See Gowers, 2012: 210, “Word order wraps Varius in a huddle of grieving amici”.

- (45) *intererit Satyris*_{ABL.PL} *paulum pudibunda*_{NOM.SG} *proteruis*_{ABL.PL}. (Hor. Ars 233)
 ‘Blushing a little, [the matron] will be among **the shameful Satyrs**’.

Although Livius Drusus is surrounded by a great group of friends, he is assassinated by an unknown hand and dies shortly thereafter, to the consternation of the Italians. The vastness of the surrounding crowd is expressed through broad CONTAINMENT:⁷⁸

- (46) *tum conuersus Drusi animus . . . ad dandam ciuitatem Italiae. Quod cum moliens reuertisset e foro, immensa illa et incondita*_{ABL.SG}, *quae eum semper comitabatur, cinctus*_{NOM.SG} *multitudine*_{ABL.SG} *in area domus suae cultello percussus, qui adfixus lateri eius relictus est, intra paucas horas decessit.* (Vell. Hist. 2.14)

‘Drusus turned his attention . . . to granting the citizenship to the Italians. While he was engaged in this effort, and was returning from the forum **surrounded by the large and unorganized crowd** which always attended him, he was stabbed with a knife in the area before his house and died in a few hours, the assassin leaving the weapon in his side’. (Shipley, 1924: 77)

CONTAINMENT can be expressed in combination with CONTACT. As Clytemnestra wavers in her resolve to kill her husband in Seneca’s *Agamemnon*, Aegisthus urges her toward revenge by reminding her of Agamemnon’s past and future infidelity. Metaphorical word order vividly expresses a possible future in which Clytemnestra will share a marriage bed with Cassandra (perhaps at the same time). Both Clytemnestra (*uicta*) and Cassandra (*consortem*) are placed together within Clytemnestra’s bed:

- (47) *feresne thalami*_{GEN.SG} *uicta*_{NOM.SG} *consortem*_{ACC.SG} *tui*_{GEN.SG}? (Sen. Ag. 256)
 ‘Will you, defeated, allow a consort in your bed?’

A similar effect describes incest in the *Metamorphoses*. When Myrrha tricks her father Cinyras into sexual intercourse, they lie together, “snugly ensconced in their incestuous bed-frame” (Lateiner, 1990: 21):⁷⁹

- (48) *accipit obsceno*_{ABL.SG} *genitor*_{NOM.SG} *sua uiscera*_{ACC.PL} *lecto*_{ABL.SG}. (Ov. Met. 10.465)
 ‘The father accepted his own flesh in a polluted bed’.

⁷⁸ Compare the CONTAINMENT in SEN. *Dial.* 6.16.4 above, where the tight closeness of *interemptum* within *penates . . . suos* expresses the intimacy of the setting in which the young man was slain.

⁷⁹ See Ov. *Met.* 6.517.

In the *Hercules Oetaeus*, the nurse laments the madness to which Deianira is driven when Hercules returns with Iole. A single house surrounds both Iole (*paelici*) and Deianira (*nuptae*) together:

- (49) *cum patuit una*_{NOM.SG} *paelici*_{DAT.SG} *et nuptae*_{DAT.SG} *domus*_{NOM.SG}. (Sen. *Her. O.* 234)
 ‘When a **single house** lies open for a mistress and a wife’.

Not only incest and potential threesomes, but also the enduring alliance of spirit and mind can be expressed by a combination of CONTAINMENT and CONTACT (further enhanced by elision):

- (50) *hoc*_{ABL.SG} *anima*_{NOM.SG} *atque animus*_{NOM.SG} *uincti sunt foedere*_{ABL.SG} *semper*. (Lucretius, *DRN.* 3.416)
 ‘Spirit and mind are always bound **by this alliance**’.

External CONTAINMENT can express clothing, armor, or adornment. Lucretius describes the headdress of battlements worn by the Magna Mater:

- (51) *murali*_{ABL.SG} *que caput summum* *cinxere corona*_{ABL.SG}. (Lucretius, *DRN.* 2.606)
 ‘They encircled the top of her head **with a crown of walls**’.

In Petronius’ *Satyricon*, we find enclosure used to express clothing or girding. Trimalchio’s porter, for instance, is girded by his flashy belt:

- (52) *in aditu autem ipso stabat ostiarius prasinatus, cerasino*_{ABL.SG} *succinctus*_{NOM.SG} *cingulo*_{ABL.SG}, *atque in lance argentea pisum purgabat*. (Petronius, *Sat.* 28.8)
 ‘Also in the very doorway stood a green-clothed porter, girt with a cherry-colored belt, and he was shelling peas on a silver plate’.

Fear, hope, and other abstract concepts can be conceptualized metaphorically using a CONTAINMENT schema transposed to linear word order. Sallust’s Catiline desperately hopes for victory:

- (53) *cum uos considero, milites, et cum facta uostra aestumo, magna*_{NOM.SG} *me*_{ACC.SG} *spes*_{NOM.SG} *uictoriae tenet*. (Sallust, *Cat.* 58.18)
 ‘When I look at you, my soldiers, and when I consider your deeds, **a great hope of victory** holds me’.

Wilkinson (1964: 66) and Lateiner (1990: 222, n. 22) give the example of Cicero, who has not been secured by the public guardianship:⁸⁰

(54) *non publico*_{ABL.SG} *me*_{ACC.SG} *praesidio*_{ABL.SG}, *sed priuata diligentia defendi*. (Cic. *Cat.* 1.5.11)

‘I defended myself not **by public protection**, but by private diligence’.

Instead he was held by great fear that could only be alleviated by the removal of Catiline from the city:

(55) *magno*_{ABL.SG} *me*_{ACC.SG} *metu*_{ABL.SG} *liberaueris*. (Cic. *Cat.* 1.5.10)

‘You will free me **from great fear**’.

Octavia is held by great sorrow:

(56) *nunc in luctus*_{ACC.PL} *seruata*_{NOM.SG} *meos*_{ACC.PL}
magni resto nominis umbra. ([Sen.] *Oct.* 70–71)

‘Now, preserved in my lamentations,/ I remain, the shadow of a great name’.

Pregnancy is often expressed through internal CONTAINMENT. Seneca’s nurse tries to dissuade Phaedra from her love of Hippolytus. Phaedra must take care lest she too bear a Minotaur. Within the line, the hypothetical chimeric offspring (*prolem confusam*) is surrounded by the impious womb (*impio utero*):

(57) *miscere thalamos patris et gnati apparatus*

*utero*_{ABL.SG} *que* *prolem*_{ACC.SG} *capere* *confusam*_{ACC.SG} *impio*_{ABL.SG}?

(Sen. *Phaed.* 171–72)

‘Do you prepare to combine the bed of your father and son,/ and take a confused offspring in your impious womb?’

Similar CONTAINMENT depicts Pasiphae’s pregnancy in Ovid:

(58) *Pasiphae mater, decepto subdita tauro,*

*enixa est utero*_{ABL.SG} *crimen onusque suo*_{ABL.SG}. (Ov. *Ep.* 4.57–58)

‘The mother Pasiphae, when she submitted to a deceived bull,/ bore a crime and a burden from her womb’.

⁸⁰ This is the only example of metaphorical word order in prose provided in all of previous scholarship.

As Canace prepares to commit suicide, the words and touch of her brother and lover Macareus revived her and encouraged her to bring forth her child:

(59) *mortua, crede mihi, tamen ad tua uerba reuixi:*

*et positum est uteri*_{GEN.SG} *crimen onusque mei*_{GEN.SG}. (Ov. *Ep.* 11.63–64)

‘Believe me, I was dead – but I revived when I heard your voice,/ and the burden and the crime of my womb was brought forth’.

Consumption is also frequently expressed through the application of a CONTAINMENT schema to word order. Tereus unwittingly fills his belly with his own child. Notice the additional effect of the CONTACT schema in the juxtaposition of *suam* and *sua*.⁸¹

(60) *uescitur inque suam*_{ACC.SG} *sua*_{ACC.PL} *uiscera congerit aluum*_{ACC.SG}. (Ov. *Met.* 6.651)

‘He eats, crowding his own flesh into his own belly’.

Atreus plans to feed Thyestes his own children. Within the word order we see that Thyestes “plays . . . in an ugly parody of childbirth, the woman” (Littlewood, 2008: 45).

(61) *totum*_{ACC.SG} *que* *turba*_{ABL.SG} *iam* *sua*_{ABL.SG} *implebo* *patrem*_{ACC.SG}*
(Sen. *Thy.* 979)

‘And then I will fill the father entirely with his own multitude (of children)’.

Tiresias gives the washed-up Odysseus some advice for legacy-hunting:

(62) *crescentem*_{ACC.SG} *tumidis*_{ABL.PL} *infla* *sermonibus*_{ABL.PL} *utrem*_{ACC.SG}*
(Hor. *Serm.* 2.5.98)

‘Puff out the swelling windbag with turgid phrases’.

CONTAINMENT can also describe a metaphorical enclosure when applied to word order. An external situation, condition, or emotion can metaphorically surround a subject, enclosing him or her in anger, misery, desire, or paranoia. Although, as the subject, Phaedra syntactically “holds” the “obstinate intention” within the following line it is clear that she also is held in the grips of a situation from which there is no escape:

(63) *tenet obstinatum*_{ACC.SG} *Phaedra*_{NOM.SG} *consilium*_{ACC.SG} *necis*. (Sen. *Phaed.* 854)

‘Phaedra holds to an obstinate intention of death’.

⁸¹ Example from Lateiner, 1990: 220.

10.4.7 Combinations of effects

Frequently, visual constructions combine and complement each other throughout a passage. For instance, metaphorical word orderings add pathos and meaning to the scene of Ovid's departure into exile in *Tristia* 1.3.81–84. In the first line, Ovid's wife clings to him even as he leaves; her embrace is communicated by an application of the CONTAINMENT schema. The mingling of her tears with her words in the following line is illustrated by the MERGING schema. Then, ITERATION expresses the intensity of her desire to depart together with him for Tomis. Finally, the CONTACT of *exulis exul*, expresses her wish to remain by Ovid's side. We even see an additional instance of CONTAINMENT in *coniunx exulis exul*, perhaps expressing another embrace:

(64) *tum uero* *coniunx*_{NOM.SG} *umeris*_{ABL.SG} *abeuntis*_{GEN.M.SG} *inhaerens*_{NOM.SG}
CONTAINMENT
miscuit *haec*_{ACC.PL} *lacrimis*_{ABL.PL} *tristia uerba*_{ACC.PL} *suis*_{ABL.PL}
MERGING
'*non potes auelli: simul ah!* *simul ibimus*', *inquit*, ITERATION
'*te sequar et* *coniunx*_{NOM.SG} *exulis*_{GEN.SG} *exul*_{NOM.SG} *ero*'. CONTACT/
CONTAINMENT
'Then indeed my wife, clinging to my shoulders as I left
Mingled these sad words **with her tears**:
You can't be taken away: together, oh! Let's go together, she said
I will follow you, and I will be an exile, the wife of an exile.

Taken together, the repeated embracing, pleading, and pathetic involvement of tears and words are visually expressed in the word order as much as they are in the semantic meanings of the words.

10.5 Conclusions

This paper has provided a systematic theoretical background for the phenomenon of visual word order in Latin, building on the previous work of Lateiner (1990) and Dainotti (2013, 2015). First, I argued that the spatial relationships between words within a line or a linguistic expression constitute meaning in addition to lexical semantics. Indeed, the positioning of each and every word, whether deliberate or unconscious, impacts meaning. As Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 136) claim, "Almost any change in a sentence – whether a change in word order, vocabulary, intonation, or grammatical construction – will alter the sentence's meaning, though often in a subtle way". Due to the flexibility of its word order, Latin is ideally suited to the communication of sense through the visual aspects of syntax. Going beyond Lateiner's claim that "syntax pictures sense," I have argued that "syntax expresses sense". Returning to

Hor. *Carm.* 1.5, an appreciation of the CONTAINMENT displayed by the concatenated word order is essential for an appreciation of the subtle layers of meaning expressed by the initial lines of the poem.

Second, I posited a psychologically realistic basis for the typology of these word order effects, suggesting that the image schemas theorized in cognitive linguistics provide and constrain the metaphorical patterns of words that appear in Latin literature. In contrast to Dainotti's approach, metaphorical word order in Latin is fundamentally visual and spatial, in line with Lakoff & Johnson's (1980: 136) "spatialization of form hypothesis," namely that "[w]e conceptualize sentences metaphorically in spatial terms, with elements of linguistic form bearing spatial properties (like length) and relations (like closeness). Therefore, the spatial metaphors inherent in our conceptual system . . . will automatically structure relationships between form and content". Throughout Latin literature we see groups of Latin words expressing similar meanings (such as splattering or scattering) through similar constructions (such as abAB word order). These structures, consistently patterned across time periods and genres, have a coherent basis: the metaphorical application of an underlying image schema (such as SPLITTING) governs and constrains these visually ordered patterns of words.

Consequently, I reviewed the application of several conceptual image schemas in Latin word order (ITERATION, PATH, CONTACT/SEPARATION, BALANCE, COLLECTION, MERGING, SPLITTING, and CONTAINMENT), arguing that these image schemas govern visual word order constructions throughout Latin literature. Other image schemas such as COUNTERFORCE, ATTRACTION, LINK, NEAR-FAR, MATCHING, and COMPULSION can be visualized in similar constructions. This study includes visual word order within the same embodied semantic approach that scholars have recently used in their analyses of other aspects of Latin language, literature, and culture (see Short, 2016). In conclusion, it is likely that metaphorical word order effects also operate in "everyday" Latin, not just in highly rhetorical and "literary" texts. This concurs with Lakoff and Johnson's analysis of the everyday structuring of language in spatial terms.

Bibliography

- Adams, J. N. & Mayer, R. G. (1999). Introduction. In J. N. Adams & R. G. Mayer (Eds), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (pp. 1–18). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Califf, D. J. (2002). *A Guide to Latin Meter and Verse Composition*. London: Anthem Press.
- Dainotti, P. (2013). Visual iconicity in Latin poetry. In L. Elleström, O. Fischer & C. Ljungberg (Eds), *Iconic Investigations* (173–190). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dainotti, P. (2015). *Word Order and Expressiveness in the Aeneid*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Foster, B. O. (1963). *Livy: History of Rome, Books XXI–XXII, Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Fratantuono, L. (2012). Review of *Word Order and Expressiveness in the Aeneid* by Paolo Dainotti, Bryn Mawr, *Classical Review*, 2012.05.42.
- Freudenburg, K. (1996). Verse-Technique and Moral Extremism in Two Satires of Horace (*Sermones* 2.3 and 2.4). *Classical Quarterly*, 46 (1), 196–206.

- Gowers, E. (2012). *Horace: Satires I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, S. J. (1991). *Virgil: Aeneid 10*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Holtmark, E. B. (1987). A note on logotactic iconicity (Catullus 1 and 47). *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 12 (9), 130–132.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Knox, P. E. (2013). Language, Style, and Meter in Horace. In H.-C. Günther (Ed), *Brill's Companion to Horace (527–546)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lateiner, D. (1990). Mimetic Syntax: Metaphor from Word Order, Especially in Ovid. *American Journal of Philology*, 111 (2), 204–237.
- Littlewood, C. (2008). Gender and Power in Seneca's *Thyestes*. In J. G. Fitch (Ed), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mackail, J. W. (1938). *Studies in Humanism*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd.
- Markus, D. D. & Pennell Ross, D. (2004). Reading Proficiency in Latin through Expectations and Visualization. *Classical World*, 98 (1), 79–93.
- Nänny, M. & Fischer, O. 2006. Iconcity: Literary Texts. In K. Brown (Ed), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Roberts, M. (1989). *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rudd, N. (2004). *Horace: Odes and Epodes, Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sedley, D. (1998). *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (2003). *Martial: Epigrams, Vol. 1, Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Shipley, F. W. (1924). *Velleius Paterculus: Compendium of Roman History, Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Short, W M. (2013). Latin *Dē*: A View from Cognitive Semantics. *Classical Antiquity*, 32 (2), 378–405.
- Short, W. M. (Ed). (2016). *Embodiment in Latin Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Showerman, G. (1977). *Ovid: Heroïdes, Amores, Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Traina, A. (1997). *Virgilio. L'utopia e la storia*. Turin: Loescher.
- Warmington, E. H. (1956). *Remains of Old Latin, Vol. I: Ennius and Caecilius, Translation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Warmington, E. H. (1967). *Remains of Old Latin, Vol. III: Lucilius, The Twelve Tables*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- West, D. (1975). Lucretius' methods of argument (3. 417–614). *Classical Quarterly*, 25 (1), 94–116.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1963). *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, A. M. (1933). Pictorial Arrangement of Words in Virgil. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 64, li–liii.