Livy and Augustus

Ronald Syme

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. 64 (1959), 27-87.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0688%281959%2964%3C27%3ALAA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology is currently published by Department of the Classics, Harvard University.

LIVY AND AUGUSTUS

By Ronald Syme

I. The Plan and Structure. II. When Did Livy Begin? III. The Reign of Augustus.

THE historian Livy led a quiet and regular existence. Not much material for a biographer, and no temptation for research or invention. Though Livy was a classic in his own lifetime, he escaped the fate of Virgil, whose writings became a prey to scholarly exegesis and were diligently scrutinised in the search for clues and allusions. That is all to the good. None the less, various questions have to be asked if an attempt is made to approach the author as a person, not merely as a classical text, to appraise his design and purpose without being content to exploit what survives of his writings as a repertory of fact or fable, as an excuse for erudite investigation into historical sources and lost historians. The questions concern Livy's origin and time of life, his education, character, and pursuits.

An estimate of the historical qualities of Livy is impaired by the hazard that has transmitted only a quarter of his great work. What has survived is singularly vulnerable to criticism. In the first Decade the author takes leave of legend only to plunge into fiction. Aware of his plight, he has no principle or method to guide him — and none was available. Later, arriving at a period which offered a reliable and contemporary record, he must submit to confrontation, for accuracy and insight, with the formidable Polybius.

Livy has been doubly unfortunate in what chance preserves. The Roman found consolation in ancient annals, and repose from the recent era of tribulation. But, as he says in his *Praefatio*, he was intending to go on and narrate the history of his own time. Livy enjoyed length of days, and was able to complete an enormous task in one hundred and forty-two books. He went on after the war of Actium and the triumph of Caesar's heir, terminating the work at 9 B.C. A friendly view of what lies within the scope and power of a historian might suppose the later books to be Livy's prime achievement. He cannot be judged by it. Tacitus was more lucky. Apart from his annals of Rome under Julii and Claudii, the arbiters of praise and blame may appeal, if they so wish, to

the *Historiae* in which Tacitus narrated events within his own time and knowledge.

Born in 59 B.C. and living until A.D. 17 (on the standard and conventional assumption), Livy was closely coeval with Caesar Augustus. The historian is the shining glory of Augustan prose, and its solitary survivor (if one omits a technical writer like Vitruvius, or the declaimers of whose performance the elder Seneca transmits a number of samples). Style or sentiment, how far can Livy be regarded as typical, and a safe guide to anything? Livy's picture of the Roman past is patently schematic and wildly anachronistic, not to say fraudulent. Some take it to reflect the Augustan colour and atmosphere, with Livy as a perfect embodiment of the ideals prevalent or advertised in that epoch, comparable to what Virgil and Horace disclose. Hesitations might be felt. The beliefs about religion, patriotism, and morality discoverable or subsumed in the writings of Livy may have an earlier origin. Livy was a grown man long before the new dispensation came into force. And indeed, what is meant by "Augustan"?

That is a large problem, and important. The present enquiry is restricted in scope. It will put three questions. First, Livy's plan, with consequent remarks about the chronology of his life and the rhythm of his operations. Secondly, how early did Livy make a beginning (that touches "Augustan" influences or tendencies)? Thirdly, how did he manage the history of his own time, and especially the reign of Caesar Augustus?

I. The Plan and Structure

Livy dominated subsequent historians — at least for the period of the Republic. Hence something can be discovered. For the last generation of the Republic and the time of Caesar, the use of Livy by Cassius Dio can be presumed — and proved. But the indications of such use grow slighter and slighter, to vanish after the Battle of Actium.[1] For the rest, various scraps and vestiges in late compilers.

The investigation of the stages by which such Livian material was transmitted to those writers is an intricate and controversial pursuit.[2] At one time it was the fashion to refer almost everything to a single *Epitome* of Livy, composed as early as the reign of Tiberius. Some recent studies have attempted to invalidate that theory. Klotz argued that certain items supposed to be Livian really come from collections of *Exempla*, deriving from sources employed by Livy; and, instead of invoking an original *Epitome*, he suggested that from time to time

different lists of contents, separated from the parent work, passed into independent circulation.[3] In his latest formulation, Klotz spoke of such summaries enlarged to form an elementary manual of Roman history.[4] However that may be, the existence of a genuine *Epitome* can be established beyond doubt. It was used, for example, by Florus and by Orosius in their detailed and more or less concordant accounts of Augustus' Cantabrian campaign of 26 B.C.[5]

One list of contents in fact survives, the *Periochae*, as they are called. A production of limited utility, based on an *Epitome*. The editor had his idiosyncrasies in the choice and arrangement of his material. The summaries can vary in length from three lines to over thirty. Nor does he always keep to the strict order of events in individual books, but often appends a brief comment on the contents of a book, as though by an afterthought, using the phrase *praeterea . . . continet*. The triumph of Pompeius Magnus (September, 61 B.C.) is put after Caesar's first campaign in Gaul, at the end of Book CIII. Livy cannot have post-dated such a striking event by three years. Again, at the end of Book CXXXIII, after Octavianus' triumph (29 B.C.), comes the conspiracy of the young Lepidus, which occurred in the previous year. The *Periocha* of Book CXLI (10 B.C.) mentions the restoration of military standards by the Parthians — which certainly belongs to 20 B.C. The editor in a cursory glance at an epitome of CXLI had probably seen a reference to Parthian submissiveness — but it was the surrender of the four sons of Phraates as hostages in 10 B.C., an event later than and quite distinct from the *signa*.[6]

Moreover, the editor's industry flagged and failed. The summaries of the latest books become very meagre. The *Periochae* of Books CXXXVIII–CXLII inclusive take up less space than is allotted to single books at earlier stages; certain names and events mentioned there, out of all historical importance, seem to reflect personal interests of the writer, for example, the identity of the first Gallic high priest of the Altar of Rome and Augustus at Lugdunum and the names of two noble Nervii who fought on Drusus' side in the invasion of Germany.[7] When he made his summaries, two books (CXXXVI and CXXXVII), covering (it appears) the years 24–17 B.C. inclusive, had been lost from the manuscript he worked on.[8] Hence the *Periochae* give a miserable idea of the last section of Livy, the nine books (CXXXIV–CXLII) covering the Principate of Caesar Augustus from 28 to 9 B.C.

Brief and defective, the *Periochae* still provide information — and provoke speculation — about the plan and structure of Livy's work.

Artistic design should certainly be looked for; but the more elaborate reconstructions, such as that of Nissen, based on rigid divisions and subdivisions, on intricate correspondences between groups of books and totals of years, will be rightly suspected;[9] and the variety of schemes that can be proposed is a deterrent.

A division of the work by decades is attested in late antiquity by the letter of Pope Gelasius.[10] Furthermore, the historian appears originally to have contemplated the division by fives and tens — at least the first five books are a definite unit, marked by the occurrence of a new preface with Book VI. But the end of Book X in 294 B.C. seems devoid of any significance. The historical break surely came a little later, in 290, with the two triumphs of M'. Curius. Indeed, Books VI to XV form a decade and have a unitary subject — Rome resurgent after the Gallic catastrophe and achieving the conquest of Italy. Book XVI, with an excursus on the origins of Carthage, introduces the First Punic War; the decade of the Second Punic War (XXI–XXX) is a unit; and perhaps the next ten books also, though the death of a foreign king, Philip V of Macedon, and the accession of Perseus, recounted at the end of Book XL, is not necessarily a significant date for the writer of Roman annals.

From the end of the Second Punic War to the tribunate of Livius Drusus in 91 B.C., decades appear undiscoverable. The events permit different subdivisions; and those most plausible to a modern critic might not have commended themselves to a historian in antiquity.[11] Perhaps there is an end with Book XLVIII, a new beginning at Book XLIX, namely the outbreak of the Third Punic War, with a new preface.[12]

Yet surely it is Book LII that is the end of an epoch. It contains the triumphs of Aemilianus, Metellus, and Mummius, the winding up of the Roman wars in Africa, in Macedonia, and in Hellas (145 B.C.). Internal dissensions were soon to usurp the central interest hitherto belonging to the foreign wars against Rome's rivals for the empire of the Mediterranean. Here Polybius made an end — and left the point where later historians might take up the story, Posidonius and Strabo. A patriotic repudiation of Greek influences or an abnormal passion for originality might have tempted a writer to demolish the established categories and construct the history according to a new design. He would not find it easy or remunerative. The view that the fall of Carthage introduced a change in the development of Roman politics and a decline in Roman morals had become an established truth.

The *Periocha* of Book LII ends with the triumph of Mummius. From this point to Livius Drusus and the *Bellum Italicum* in 91 B.C. — the

latter the beginning of the age of civil wars — there is no clear indication of plan. A modern writer would probably work up the Gracchan seditions into a recognisable historical unit. There is no sign that Livy did. Nor do the disturbances in the sixth consulate of Marius justify a break at the year 100 B.C. (Book LXIX).

The following general plan may have suggested itself to Livy. The period from the end of the Second Punic War to the *Bellum Italicum* (Books XXXI to LXX or LXXI) divides into two large halves, the break coming before or after the Third Punic War (i.e., at the end of Book XLVIII, or the end of Book LII), The second half presents no obvious point of subdivision. Perhaps, in the author's scheme, the year that witnessed the death of Scipio Aemilianus (129 B.C., Book LIX) was a convenient halfway house.

If Livy began his work with decades in mind, they cracked and broke under pressure of the matter. And, in the revolutionary age, the surge of history grew ever more swift and turbulent, bursting the barriers of the annalistic design. The historian could no longer make the end of a book coincide with the end of a year. This is evident from the *Bellum Italicum* onwards.

That event is the turning point in Roman history between the Battles of Zama and Actium. The war against the Italici was a kind of civil war.[13] As such Livy can hardly have failed to narrate it, himself a citizen of that extended *Italia* of the North, only recently incorporated in the Roman Commonwealth, but a vital element in the new Italo-Roman patriotism of the unified nation.[14]

Modern historians, following the precedent of Appian, commonly lead off the history of the revolutionary age with the actions of the tribune Ti. Gracchus, which sowed the seeds of dissension — and first caused blood to flow in the streets of Rome. Yet it was the tribunate of Livius Drusus that quickly and sharply provoked the series of wars which ended only with Actium. Their termination brought not only peace to Rome but the union of Italy.

Livy appears to be hurrying forward to Drusus and the *Bellum Italicum*: he compresses the events of seven years (98–92 B.C. inclusive) into one Book (LXX). It is not at once clear whether Book LXXI or Book LXXII should mark the beginning of his history of the Revolution. Book LXX, ending with the year 92 B.C., contains the origin of Drusus' proposals in the desire of the Senate to regain control of the law-courts, and a first indication of the programme of the aristocratic demagogue — *perniciosa spe largitionum plebem concitavit.* Book LXXI proceeds with the details, *leges agrariae frumentariaeque*, the *lex*

iudiciaria, and the offer of citizenship to the Italians; further, the meetings and plots of the Italian leaders and the assassination of Drusus. Book LXXII plunges into the action: *Italici populi defecere: Picentes Vestini Marsi Paeligni Marrucini Samnites Lucani. initio belli a Picentibus moto*, etc.

Harmony of numbers would indicate Book LXXI as the beginning of a new series, Book LXX as an end — forty books from the second Punic War.[15] Decades may have been a convenience for publication; but, as has been shown, the material could no longer be properly disposed according to decades. There is no break between Books LXX and LXXI. Drusus' programme lies athwart them; and in Drusus are summed up and united the political contentions of the preceding forty years. The proper and dramatic beginning of the revolutionary wars might therefore seem to be the actual revolt of the peoples of Italia, narrated by Livy at the beginning of Book LXXII. Yet the annalistic principle of arrangement was probably dominant after all. The first act of the *Bellum Italicum*, the rising at Asculum, took place before the end of the year 91 B.C. For this reason it is perhaps preferable to suppose that the new section of Livy's work began not with the actual outbreak of hostilities but with the calendar year 91 B.C., that is, with Book LXXI. This theory is confirmed by the evidence of Eutropius and of Orosius, in which the year of the consuls Sex. Caesar and L. Philippus is given emphasis as the beginning of a new series of events.[16]

If the narrative from this point onwards were not to reproduce all too faithfully the chaos of events, it was desirable for the author to adopt some plan or other for arranging and subdividing his matter. It will be presumed that Livy was not content to be carried on — and carried away — by the stream of events; and one indication of his design survives. Books CIX–CXVI, taking the story from the outbreak of the war between Pompeius and Caesar down to the assassination of the dictator, form a unit: they are described in the *Periochae*, one by one, as Books I–VIII of the *bellum civile*.

It is by no means easy to establish other subdivisions. Yet it is expedient to investigate in more detail the structure of the rest of Livy's work, for the better understanding of the last portion, the contemporary history down to 9 B.C. The most recent theory, that of Bayet, disposes it into nine groups, varying in length from five to seventeen books.[17] This arrangement is open to criticism on several counts. Instead, an easy, organic, and harmonious grouping can be proposed.

The story of the Revolution from the outbreak of the *Bellum Italicum* to the triumph of Octavianus in 29 B.C. falls itself into three large

divisions, sharp and inevitable: the Ten Years War, the generation of precarious or fraudulent peace, the Twenty Years War.

First of all, the *Bellum Italicum* and the wars of Marius and Sulla. The latter blended inextricably with the former. The amnesty accorded to the insurgents was of limited effect; large parts of Italy remained beyond the control of the Roman government; even Sulla's victory at the Colline Gate (82 B.C.) did not mean the end, for Volaterrae and Nola still held out, until 80 B.C. The subject forms a unit, and it had already commended itself for such treatment. The *Historiae* of L. Cornelius Sisenna began with the *Bellum Italicum* and went as far as 82 B.C., perhaps a little further.[18] Also, one section of the historical works of L. Lucceius, the friend of Pompeius and of Cicero, embraced the two wars, as Cicero clearly states: *Italici belli et civilis historia.*[19] The propriety of treating the first epoch of civil strife as a single whole is evident. The only question is, where was it to end? with Sulla's ordering of the constitution, with his abdication, or with his death? Or would the annalistic principle pass over each of these dates and begin with the consuls of 78 B.C., M. Lepidus and Q. Catulus?

It is a remarkable fact that no ancient source registers the precise date of Sulla's abdication. Some scholars would put it in 79 B.C., even as late as the summer.[20] That is not likely. Perhaps Sulla divested himself of dictatorial powers when he laid down his second consulship on the last day of December, 80 B.C.[21] That would be a highly appropriate ending for a book, a new period to open with the consuls of the restored Republic, Ap. Claudius Pulcher and P. Servilius.

Two compilators are here of value, Orosius and Eutropius. Orosius begins a new section with the words *creatis itaque P. Servilio et Appio Claudio consulibus visus est tandem Sulla privatus. hoc fine conclusa sunt duo bella funestissima, sociale Italicum et Sullanum civile. haec per annos decem tracta*, etc.[22] Thus a war of ten years ends with 80 B.C. Orosius proceeds to narrate the four great foreign wars that from 78 B.C. confronted the restored oligarchy. As for Eutropius, his fifth book ends with the Ten Years War, designated as such; and the sixth opens with the series of foreign wars (under the consuls of 78 B.C.).[23]

This may be the conception of Livy — and it is highly acceptable. The last events in the *Periocha* of Book LXXXIX are the reduction of Nola and Volaterrae (and Mytilene): no mention, however, of the abdication of Sulla. The *Periocha* of Book XC opens with the death and funeral of Sulla (spring, 78 B.C.). The first section of the age of the Revolution may therefore be described as the "First Civil War" or the "Ten Years War"; it was told in nineteen books, LXXI–LXXXIX.

On this hypothesis the second section begins with the year 78 B.C. That was in fact the point where Sallust began — *res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae et domi gestas composui.*[24] The style and the sentiments of Sallust were repugnant to Livy. But history was a highly conservative art; and the historian regarded it as a convenience, if not as a duty, to follow the grouping of events — and even the proportion and emphasis — of his predecessors. This important consideration is ignored by those who make Book XC the end, not the beginning, of a group of books.[25]

This, the next portion of Livy, fills nineteen books (XC–CVIII). The beginning was recommended by convenience as well as by the example of Sallust. The end was determined by the artistic propriety — not to say necessity — of making a new start in 49 B.C. with the recurrence of an epoch of civil wars. Book CIX is entitled *civilis belli primus*; it may well have had a separate preface; and it begins with *causae civilium armorum.* The influence of this introduction can clearly be discerned in later writers, especially in Florus and in the *Pharsalia* of the poet Lucan.[26]

Books CIX–CXVI form a separate unit. But the end of Caesar did not mean the end of the civil wars — that period terminates only with the victory of Caesar's heir, consecrated by the triple triumph of 29 B.C. (Book CXXXIII). That, not 31 or 30, is the date. The period had lasted for twenty years, as the *Periocha* of Book CXXXIII states — *imposito fine bellis civilibus altero et vicesimo anno.*[27] The third section is therefore made up by Books CIX–CXXXIII (49–29 B.C.).

Such are the three large sections dictated by the history of the years 91–29 B.C., namely the Ten Years War, the Restored Republic, and the Civil Wars. Groups of twenty, nineteen, and twenty-five books respectively. They carry sixty-three years of history, which, by a close coincidence, are narrated in sixty-three books (LXXI–CXXXIII).

These are large groups. Each of them, however, admits further subdivision, so as to produce, without Procrustean methods, shorter and more convenient sections, like the Caesarian unit (eight books) mentioned above, of from eight to ten books in length.

The military history of the Ten Years War baffles bisection.[28] But the end of C. Marius provides a break. The *Periocha* of Book LXXX records his decease and his character — *vir cuius si examinentur cum virtutibus vitia, haud facile sit dictu utrum bello melior an pace perniciosior fuerit. adeo quam rem p. armatus servavit, eam primo togatus omni genere fraudis, postremo armis hostiliter evertit.* Marius died on January 13, 86 B.C. The events of those weeks made it impossible to terminate a book with the last day of December. The Ten Years War therefore falls into

two manageable units, one of ten books, the other of nine (LXXI–LXXX and LXXXI–LXXXIX).

There seems no obvious and inevitable point of division in the next group, the Restored Republic. It can be argued that in Livy's conception the figure of Pompeius Magnus dominated these books; and it has been proposed to divide them at Book XCVI, with the reconquest of Spain, and at Book CIII, with the triumph of Pompeius.[29] The history of these years and the order of events in the *Periochae* yield little support to this theory. An easier break can be found. Nor does Livy follow Pollio and make the consulate of Metellus and Afranius the beginning of a historical period. He cannot help, however, reflecting Pollio's conception of the conspiracy of the three *principes*, Pompeius, Crassus, and Caesar.[30]

The *Historiae* of Sallust ended in 67 B.C. The date appears accidental, the historian having died before his work was completed. None the less, the year 67 was a cardinal date in the decline and fall of the Sullan oligarchy.[31] That was certainly the subject of Sallust's history, whatever the limit he had set himself. Not Caesar, he could argue, but Pompeius was the destroyer of the Republic. The *Lex Gabinia* granted military power described as "monarchic".[32] If Livy follows Sallust in opening a new period at 78 B.C., a suitable ending for it was indicated at 67 B.C. Livy would now have to turn to other sources. The next proposal in favour of Pompeius was the *Lex Manilia*, brought forward in January, 66 B.C. Book C opens with the *Lex Manilia*. The last generation of the Republic therefore forms two units of ten and nine books respectively, namely the twelve years covered by Sallust (Books XC–XCIX) and the *libri a fine Sallusti Crispi* (Books C–CVIII) — not that Livy would have wanted to call them by that name.

Thirdly, the Civil Wars, in twenty-five books (CIX–CXXXIII). The subject can be divided into three units, approximately equal in length. The first comprises eight books (CIX–CXVI, see above), narrating the Caesarian wars and the Dictatorship. The second unit opens inevitably with the coming of Caesar's heir to Rome — and concludes, just as inevitably, with the Battle of Philippi (Books CXVII–CXXIV). Both Appian and Cassius Dio put Philippi at the end of a book.[33] They could hardly do otherwise. That battle signed the death-warrant of the Republic; and it was honoured in the traditions of the Roman aristocracy as Pharsalia was not. Livy had an amiable propensity for narrating the deaths of famous men.[34] Such obituaries often came in handy to conclude a book or a series of books (for example, Livius Drusus, Marius, and Caesar). Philippi meant the extinction of a party as well as

a cause. The Battle of Pharsalia had been comparatively merciful to the Roman aristocracy. At Philippi there fell not Brutus and Cassius only, but a host of illustrious men. Many a noble family was cut off. As Velleius observes, no other war was so murderous — *non aliud bellum cruentius caede clarissimorum virorum fuit.*[35] No doubt but that Livy recounted their names and their lineage. After a gap in the text the *Periocha* of Book CXXIV ends with *inter quos Q. Hortensius occisus est.*

Eight books for Julius Caesar, eight more till Philippi, and nine from Philippi to the triumph of Octavianus fill the tale of the Civil Wars in twenty-five books. Finally, as the appendix, nine books on Augustus, or rather on *res publica restituta.* The latest event mentioned in Book CXXXIII is the triumph of 29 B.C. The brief summary of Book CXXXIV open with the words *C. Caesar rebus compositis et omnibus provinciis in certam formam redactis Augustus quoque cognominatus est.* It may be presumed that those words cover Augustus' restoration of "normal" government, which was proclaimed as complete at the session of the Senate on January 13, 27 B.C. It was not, however, a single act but a series of measures carried out, as Augustus himself says, in the course of his sixth and seventh consulates (28 and 27 B.C.).[36] The process was initiated (it can be affirmed) early in 28 B.C. The citizens of Rome then saw the consular *fasces* handed over, after the proper and Republican fashion of monthly alternation, from one consul to his colleague, from Caesar's heir to Marcus Agrippa.[37] That is to say, presumably on the first day of February, 28 B.C.[38]

Book CXXXIII closed with the climax of the triumph. Roman domestic transactions of 28 B.C. belong therefore to the beginning of the next book, to the new section. That book (CXXXIV) has plenty of room for the constitutional settlement of 28–27 B.C., for, apart from that, it appears to have contained only Augustus' sojourn at Narbo on the way to Spain and the campaigns of M. Licinius Crassus, the proconsul of Macedonia (29 and 28 B.C.) postdated; and those campaigns even overflow into Book CXXXV.[39]

From the outbreak of the *Bellum Italicum* a series of seven sections varying from eight to ten books in length and arranged in three large groups emerges, supplemented by a final nine books on Augustus. Smaller subdivisions may from time to time have been made, according as the nature of the material and the convenience of the author demanded. For example, the second section of the Civil Wars admits a division after the Proscriptions (Book CXX); and the third can be approximately halved with the suppression of Sex. Pompeius, 36 B.C. (Book CXXIX), a date which Octavianus at the time professed to

regard as the end of the Civil Wars.[40] Thus the two units covering the period 44–29 B.C., Books CXVII–CXXIV and Books CXXV–CXXXIII, fall easily enough into the subdivisions CXVII–CXX, CXXI–CXXIV, CXXV–CXXIX, CXXX–CXXXIII, each ending at a point where the history provides a break. But it is not desirable in such matters to postulate systems of undue harmony — or complexity. It is enough to demonstrate the existence of three large groups, namely the Ten Years War, the post-Sullan order, and the Civil Wars, comprising seven units approximately equal in length, with an appendix of nine books. The scheme is as follows:

LXXI–LXXX	The *Bellum Italicum* to the death of Marius.
LXXXI–LXXXIX	To the end of the war in Italy.
XC–XCIX	The years 78–67 B.C.
C–CVIII	The years 66–50 B.C.
CIX–CXVI	The Civil Wars to Caesar's death.
CXVII–CXXIV	To Philippi.
CXXV–CXXXIII	To the triumph of Octavianus.
CXXXIV–CXLII	The Republic of Caesar Augustus.

Further questions now arise. When did Livy draw up his plan; what term and limit did he set; and when did he complete the latest portion of his history?

Livy, it can be argued, wrote his *Praefatio* about 27 B.C., probably after the completion of Books I–V, as an introduction to the first instalment of the work.[41] He announces an intention of carrying the narrative down to his own time, to the Civil Wars, *haec nova*. The preface of Book XXXI confirms the plan as "the whole of Roman history".[42]

When and where did he intend to stop? It has been assumed by Nissen, and by most scholars since, that Livy intended to go on to the death of Caesar Augustus; that the year 9 B.C., which he reached, is in fact an unsuitable or inexplicable termination; that the author left his work unfinished when he died in A.D. 17.[43]

It will be observed on the contrary that Livy did not estimate in advance the duration of Augustus' life — or his own chances of survival. A high expectation of life might, it is true, be conceded to a studious citizen of Patavium, an exemplar of the regular habits which conferred so wide a notoriety upon that virtuous *municipium*; and no

contemporary in his wildest hopes or fears could fancy that the heir of Caesar (born in 63 B.C.), fragile and often ill, would live on and on, enduring until the year we call A.D. 14. But that would be a frivolous argumentation. It misses the point. Livy, despite all his predilection for the great and the good, all a patriot's gratitude towards the author of the present happy dispensation, was not writing a biography of the First Citizen. He was writing *res Romanae*.

In Livy's original plan the goal was evident: Actium, the end of the Civil Wars, and the triumph of the young Caesar,

> at Caesar, triplici invectus Romana triumpho
> moenia, dis Italis votum immortale sacrabat.[44]

Reaching that limit in the composition of his histories, he decided to go further (one may conjecture). He added the supplement of nine books (CXXXIV–CXLII). In the preface to one of his late books Livy said that though he had earned glory enough, the spirit drove him on.[45] Perhaps he was referring to those books, the last section of his work.

It remains to discuss briefly the grounds for the prevalent opinion about the conditions in which Livy ended his life and his work. It has been suggested by Klotz, in all gravity, that Book CXLII is unfinished.[46] He argues from the brevity of the *Periocha*. But that is a characteristic which it shares with other books of this group; and it is not nearly the shortest. Books CXXXIX–CXLII recount the events of 12–9 B.C., one book a year. It was the triumphant culmination of the great wars of conquest in Illyricum and beyond the Rhine. The military operations of 9 B.C., the death of Drusus in Germany, and all the fuss about his obsequies gave matter and scope enough.

One problem remains. Not only did Livy die, so it is held, with the pen in his hand (for that is the consecrated phrase).[47] In three years or less (A.D. 14–17) he had written no fewer than twenty-two books (CXXI–CXLII). The manuscripts of the *Periocha* of Book CXXI bear the superscription *qui editus post excessum Augusti dicitur*. What does this statement mean?

Klotz argues that Livy himself, in the *exordium* of that book, affirmed that he was now writing after the death of Augustus. Klotz interprets *dicitur* as *dicitur a Livio*.[48] That is not the only explanation available. The redactor of the *Periochae*, as is known, did not refrain from making additions or comments of his own. The superscription may be merely an inference. It has been suggested that the redactor found in Book CXXI some statement or other that could hardly have been made public in the lifetime of Augustus.[49] That notion is plausible only at

first sight, and at short sight. Book CXXI seems mainly devoted to the operations of Cassius against Dolabella. Where is the matter for offence? Octavianus had revoked the decree of the Senate outlawing Dolabella. A trifle in those times. The preceding book told of the Proscriptions: for a historian the most delicate episode in all the versatile and unedifying career of the young Caesar.

It will be observed that the superscription does not say *scriptus* but *editus*. Hence no warrant for the hasty assumption that Book CXXI (and the twenty-one books following thereupon) were indited after A.D. 14. An easier hypothesis would be preferable: Books CXXI–CXLII, composed towards the end of the reign of Augustus, were held back for some reason or other and not given to the world till later.

It has been shown that the large group of books comprising the twenty-one years of the Civil Wars (CIX–CXXXIII, from 49 to 29 B.C.) falls naturally into three units. They end with Caesar's death, with the Battle of Philippi, and with the triumph of Octavianus. These three units were followed by the nine books of the *Res publica restituta*, all four units being of equivalent length and bulk. This grouping was imposed by the history itself. It does not follow, however, that the instalment published by the author corresponded exactly with the units into which he disposed his material for convenience of composition — and for necessities of structure. Livy began with exact decades, but could not keep it up. Yet decades perhaps suited scribes or publishers; and the division of the whole work into decades is attested in late antiquity.[50]

If the superscription of Book CXXI is to be accepted and utilised (and that is a large question), it could be conjectured that Livy had stopped publication for a time: Book CXX, containing the Proscriptions, in fact provides a break.

In any event, the assumption that Livy took only three years (or less) to write the last twenty-two books is bold — and fragile. Many theories about the composition of Livy's work suppose a fairly equable rate of production, on an average something like three books a year.[51] In itself nothing would forbid the assumption that the old man was writing steadily to the end. Varro set about his *Res Rusticae* at the age of eighty.

But there is nothing to explain the swift acceleration at the end, enabling him to polish off the crowded epoch from the Proscriptions to the death of Drusus (43–9 B.C.) in three years — or less. Livy had acquired greater facility, we are told.[52] Perhaps. His task had now become easier.[53] Not at all. The contemporary period was both more arduous and more dangerous. Livy was a pioneer.

It is a fanciful picture, and nothing more — the veteran devotee of Clio, tired but insatiable, lashing himself into a feverish activity that only death can arrest. The reality may be more sober — and more instructive. Livy (there is nothing against it) may have quietly laid aside his pen several years before death supervened. Nor is it likely that he ever hoped or aspired to anticipate the decease of Caesar Augustus. Furthermore, the year 9 B.C., so far from being unsuitable for termination, was unavoidable — and in fact felicitous.[54]

It is time to look at the ostensible data about the duration of Livy's life. According to the *Chronicle* of Jerome, the historian was born in 59 B.C.[55] That is the canonical date. It is registered in most of the handbooks of Latin literature, large or small, with never a sign of doubt or word of warning. It happens to be insecure.

Scholars dutifully intent on one author at a time and reluctant to abandon a fixed point of reference have neglected to question the general validity of those items concerning Latin authors which Jerome took from Suetonius, *De viris illustribus*, to provide supplementary annotation in his translation of Eusebius. Jerome, it is clear, operated in a casual and careless fashion. Where there are facts to check him, he can be convicted of gross errors: thus Catullus dying in 58 B.C., or Asinius Gallus in A.D. 14.[56]

Now Jerome brackets Livy with the orator Messalla Corvinus under 59 B.C. Messalla, to judge by his role at the Battle of Philippi and the date of his consulship (31 B.C.), can hardly have come into the world as late as 59 B.C. It is reasonable to postulate 64 B.C. or thereabouts. Thus Borghesi long ago, and most scholars concur. Jerome is wrong. How and why did he go wrong? Perhaps (it has been suggested) he found a consular date in his authority, *Caesare et Figulo*, and misread it, hastily assuming the notorious *Caesare et Bibulo*. That is to say, 59 B.C. instead of 64 B.C.[57]

So far, and satisfactorily, Messalla Corvinus. It is surely illegitimate to accept the change of date for Messalla and not admit it for Livy. Yet few have drawn the inference and ventured to posit 64 for Livy.[58] Synchronisms of this type were a device that appealed to the researchers of antiquity, often facile or fraudulent. Thus the birth of Cornelius Gallus was conveniently assigned to Virgil's year, 70: Jerome puts his death in 27 B.C., *XLIII aetatis anno*.[59] Gallus, however, may have been a few years older than Virgil. As for Livy, let the year 64 be taken as approximately correct — if only for the reason that there is nothing else to go by. And there can be advantage in that date.

That is not all. Jerome also furnishes the date of Livy's death, which he puts in A.D. 17: *Livius historiographus Patavi moritur.*[60] Is this any good? Again, Messalla Corvinus is relevant. Jerome indicates A.D. 12 or 13 as the year of his decease (A.D. 12 in the best manuscript).[61] Some therefore, for various reasons, have been disposed to accept A.D. 13.[62] But there is a strong reason against. Jerome gives the age of Messalla as seventy-two. If one reckons from 64, not 59, that points to A.D. 8 as the year of his death. Which is welcome. It accords with evidence in Ovid which implies that Messalla died before the poet's departure into exile.[63] Therefore A.D. 8 ought to be accepted.[64] Not but what there are some recalcitrants.[65]

It has become evident that no reliance can be put on Jerome's date for the decease of Livy. The historian might have prolonged his life beyond A.D. 17. Hence consolation and support for those who wish to believe that Livy wrote no fewer than twenty-two books subsequent to August 19, A.D. 14. But that does not have to be taken seriously.

There is another line of argument. If Messalla's death is to be placed four or five years earlier than the calculation based on 59 B.C., why not Livy's death also? The solitary and ultimate datum about Livy's time of life, found by Suetonius and transmitted by Suetonius, might have been his decease at the age of seventy-five. An assumption (or a mistake) putting the date of his birth in 59 B.C. would give A.D. 17 for his extinction. But if in fact 64 B.C. was the true (or approximate and estimated) date of his birth, his death would then fall in or about A.D. 12.

If that be so, namely a span of life from 64 B.C. to A.D. 12, the period of Livy's writing takes on a different aspect, and various assumptions will have to be challenged.

Postulating a continuous period of regular labour for nearly forty-five years (from about 27 B.C. down to A.D. 17) some scholars have deduced an average output of about three books a year. But the author's rhythm may not in fact have been steady or unbroken. Nor is there anywhere a sign to show that he spent as much as four months on any single book. To take an example. His sources can be divined, and his methods of work, in the period from the aftermath of Hannibal's War to the final defeat of Macedon (Books XXXI–XLV). It would be a bold man who argued that Livy needed more than two or three weeks to produce Book XXXI.

Nothing therefore forbids the notion that Livy, going to work about 29 B.C., had reached Book CXXXIII and with it the end of the Civil Wars by A.D. 1 — if not some years earlier. A pause may have ensued. After which, the turn of events in A.D. 4 (Augustus' adoption of

Tiberius) may have encouraged him to go on and produce his epilogue, covering the years 28 to 9 B.C. Those nine books could have been terminated by A.D. 10 or 12 — whether or no the historian be deemed to have lived on and survived Augustus.

A new date for Livy's birth having been proposed and rendered plausible (64 B.C. instead of 59), the question must be faced: how soon is the historian likely to have discovered his vocation and begun his vast enterprise?

II. When Did Livy Begin?

Livy's first book provides a clear date. In his reference to the closing of the Temple of Janus in 29 B.C., after the War of Actium, he describes the victor by the solemn appellation which the Senate conferred on January 16, 27 B.C. — *quod nostrae aetati di dederunt ut videremus, post bellum Actiacum ab imperatore Caesare Augusto pace terra marique parta.*[66] But Livy does not mention the second closing of Janus, after the Spanish campaigns of 26 and 25 B.C. The passage was therefore written between 27 and 25 B.C.

There is also the *Preface*, its grave and gloomy tone implying that the salvation of Rome is not yet assured. And perhaps a definite indication to justify pessimism — *haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus.*[67] What does this refer to? It has been argued that as early as 28 B.C. a beginning had been made with legislation for moral reform, but it came to nothing. Propertius in an early poem alludes to the abrogation of a law which had menaced his extra-marital felicity —

certe gavisa es sublatam, Cynthia, legem.[68]

Perhaps the law had never been passed, only proposed. However, Propertius can be used to date the *Preface*.[69]

Caution is in place. It is far from clear that Livy conveys a reference to any legislative enactment of any year. What the author has in mind is the general condition of the Roman People over a tract of years. His words might apply to a time before the War of Actium.[70] Or a time subsequent. Or even both. Livy speaks of *vitia nostra*, interpreting a political crisis in terms of morality. What then are the *remedia* that are so hard to accept? Presumably order and concord. That is to say, in political terms, the acceptance of centralised government as the only guarantee of Rome's salvation. Compare the formulation adduced by men of understanding at the obsequies of Caesar Augustus — *non aliud discordantis patriae remedium quam ut ab uno regeretur.*[71] If such is the

remedium, it cannot be expected that an imperial people with the tradition of the Republic can feel eager or happy in acquiescence.

It follows that Livy's words ought not to be tied and restricted to a precise date. His remarks would fit the aftermath of Actium when Caesar's heir stood supreme, *potentiae securus*; but they do not (it can be claimed) preclude a date subsequent to the settlement of 28 and 27 B.C. Disquiet lurked beneath the surface, stability was precarious.[72]

The common assumption is that Livy began to compose his history between 27 and 25 B.C.[73] It is a little premature. The *Preface*, by reason of its character and amplitude, is not merely the preface of Book I, but the author's general introduction, published at the head of a large section of the work (Books I–V at least). Similarly, the invocation of Octavianus at the beginning of the first book of the *Georgics* is the proem of the completed work, all four books. Such prefaces are commonly the latest portions to be composed. Moreover, there is no warrant that the name *Augustus*, perhaps even the whole sentence about the closing of Janus in 29 B.C., is not a later insertion, added at some time subsequent to the original composition of the narrative.[74]

Nor, another point, does the historian's use of *augustus* as an epithet furnish a clue. The word occurs, in the comparative form *augustior*, in relation to Hercules and to Romulus.[75] Hence the notion that Livy was writing Book I subsequent to January, 27 B.C.[76] Like other archaic and venerable words, *augustus* may now have been in fashion, otherwise it would not have been annexed for Caesar's heir on the proposal of the senior consular, the alert Munatius Plancus.[77]

So far guess and argument, much of it negative or inconclusive. Nothing forbids the conjecture that several books, say the first five, had been written before 27 B.C. Strong confirmation is furnished by an episode in Book IV. Livy narrates in vivid language the famous exploit of A. Cornelius Cossus, the *tribunus militum* who killed with his own hand Lars Tolumnius, the King of Veii, and consequently dedicated the *spolia opima* in the Temple of Juppiter Feretrius. Then comes a digression.[78] The author states that he had followed the consensus of the annalists, who described Cossus as a military tribune. But there was documentary evidence, the *titulus ipsis spoliis impositus*, which proved that the dedication was made by Cossus as consul.

Livy was apprised of the facts by Caesar Augustus himself, who had gone into the temple and read the inscription of Cossus, on a linen corselet. Livy bows to this authoritative pronouncement. As he says, it would be almost sacrilege not to.[79] He then proceeds to register a

difficulty: not only the annalists in concert but also the *libri lintei* cited by Licinius Macer put the consulship of Cossus a decade later. But that year (428 B.C.) could not be suitable for an exploit of war — there was indeed a whole *triennium* of inactivity because of plague. Finally, referring to commands held by Cossus still later, he deprecates speculation — *vana versare in omnes opiniones licet* — and ends on a firm and ironical note of confidence: Cossus cannot have perjured himself with a mendacious inscription in the sight of Juppiter and Romulus.[80]

The historian did not go and look for himself; and in the course of his narrative, when he reaches the consulate of Cornelius Cossus, he makes no modification.[81] The antiquarian digression is probably a later insertion by the author.[82]

The question of the *spolia opima* was irrelevant to Livy. Not so to Caesar Augustus. Nor was the master of Rome moved by a generous impulse to rescue from error a deserving but uncritical historian: high politics were involved.[83]

In 29 B.C. M. Licinius Crassus, proconsul of Macedonia, defeated the Bastarnae in battle and slew their chieftain, Deldo. Crassus claimed the *spolia opima*.[84] That honour had been earned by no Roman general for two centuries and was all but forgotten, save by antiquarians.[85] The spirit of the times and the policy of the government encouraged the revival of ancient practices. This manifestation, however, was most distasteful to the young Caesar, who monopolised for himself all military glory and who, precisely in these years, aspired to the renown — and even to the name — of Romulus. A way was found.

According to Cassius Dio, Crassus could have dedicated *spolia opima* — if he had been the holder of full and paramount *imperium*.[86] That is to say, consul not proconsul. Dio (it is true) attests no claim presented, no debate, no disallowance. But what he registers is instructive. The passage in Livy permits a step further: dispute and the mooting of historical precedents. The inscription of Cornelius Cossus is sharply relevant. It demonstrated that only a consul qualified for the *spolia opima*.

It is not clear that the official argument against Crassus was above reproach, let alone the *pièce justificative*. Was the inscription authentic? On a document of the fifth century B.C. the holder of the supreme *imperium* would surely have been designated as *praetor* rather than as *consul*. Hence a suspicion of forgery somewhere.[87]

Or was Octavianus the victim of an honest mistake? Most modern accounts postulate his good faith, an assumption that would have startled most contemporaries of that young man, whatever their political

allegiance. One scholar has in fact devised an explanation. The *cognomen*, *Coso*, he suggests, was barely legible: Octavianus read it as *cos*. But here too a question arises. Would *cognomina* have occurred on early documents?[88]

Despite these objections, scholars have been found to accept the inscription as "certainly contemporary" and as "conclusive evidence".[89] Hence large assumptions, not only about the veracity of Octavianus but about the preservation of fragile documents through long centuries.[90]

All manner of venerable objects were kept in temples. They tend to survive, whatever the fate of the edifice — conflagration or ruin and collapse. For example, the augural staff of Romulus was found undamaged when the Chapel of the Salii was destroyed by fire.[91] Or again (and most significant), the statue of Fortuna and its vestments in the shrine in the Forum Boarium. The vestments were nothing less than the toga woven by Tanaquil for Servius Tullius (the learned Varro vouched for it), and they survived intact, defying worm and decay, for five hundred and sixty years down to the catastrophe of Sejanus. So far the elder Pliny.[92] Another authority (Dionysius of Halicarnassus) affirms that the original Temple of Fortuna had burned down; the statue itself escaped (being gilded), but everything else was the product of restoration.[93] The fire happens to stand on record. It occurred in 213 B.C.[94]

The sixth King of Rome is only a century earlier than Cornelius Cossus. Garment for garment, there is not much to choose. But motive intervenes. The opportune discovery of important documents in sacred edifices tends to happen when political morality — and paleographic science — are at a low level. Caesar's heir was no novice — suspicion must attach to the extracts from the last will and testament of Marcus Antonius, produced at the proper time and recited with the proper effect, before the Roman Senate, a few years earlier.[95]

The restoration of the temple of Juppiter Feretrius was undertaken at the suggestion of Atticus, so his friend and biographer, Cornelius Nepos, records.[96] Atticus, a sound scholar, was the most learned student of prosopography in that age. The objects preserved in the temple may have excited his personal curiosity. Atticus died on March 31, 32 B.C.,[97] therefore a certain time had elapsed since operations began. Not only the fabric but perhaps the dedications required and received the attentions of the restorer. Such works were not always carried out in any spirit of superstitious reverence for ancient materials. The shrine itself was in a sorry condition — roofless and falling down, according to Cornelius Nepos.[98] Indeed, Augustus in the *Res Gestae*

does not name it on the list of buildings repaired but reckons it among his own new constructions;[99] and Livy describes Augustus as *ipsius templi auctor*.[100]

When did Augustus visit the temple? Perhaps in the company of Atticus, before the rebuilding. That is to say, four or five years before the revelation made to Livy. The original inscription may no longer have been in existence when its tenor became a matter surpassing antiquarianism.

Crassus was voted a triumph in 29 B.C., but this is not necessarily the date of his uncomfortable demand and its official rejection. The proconsul of Macedonia fought another campaign, in the next year. It was perhaps not until late in 28 B.C., on Crassus' return to Italy, that the manner in which he proposed to stage his triumph became a political issue, namely not merely the procession to the Capitol, but the dedication of the spoils stripped from Deldo the Bastarnian. Crassus was a *nobilis*, grandson of a great political dynast, rival in military glory and coeval with Caesar's heir. The armed proconsuls were the greatest menace to his primacy.[101]

The unseasonable ambitions of Crassus (it has been suggested) were one of the things that constrained the heir of Caesar to publish his Restoration of the Republic on January 13, 27 B.C.[102] An attractive notion, recalling history from doctrine or propaganda to facts and personalities. On the other hand, it was easy for the new Romulus to discern, without that incident or incentive, the utility of a *res publica* (not sentimental but practical); and the process of advertising a return to normal government had begun quite early in 28. No sooner was the process deemed and proclaimed complete than the ruler took special powers, namely a vast *provincia* for ten years, abolishing proconsuls in the territories of main military importance and danger. That solution could have been devised without M. Licinius Crassus.

Livy (it can be divined) benefited from a helpful admonition of Augustus after 28 B.C., after he had recited (or even published) Book IV. The inception of the work therefore lies a few years back. How far? A recent theory, that of Bayet, dates the completion of Books I–V before the years 31–29 B.C.[103] Bayet suggests that Book I was first of all published separately; then Books II–V; then, in 27–25 B.C., a second edition of Books I–V, along with Books VI–X. Further, by 19 B.C., Livy had finished Books XI–XXX.

That is an earlier dating than any hitherto advocated. In some ways it is attractive. To be in a position to issue Books I–V in the period

31–29 B.C., Livy must surely have made a beginning in 34 or 33 B.C. He needed time and practice to find his method and his style.

The arguments, it must be admitted, are not altogether cogent. Livy, giving in Book I a solemn account of the dedication of the shrine of Feretrius by Romulus, makes no mention of Augustus' rebuilding — or of the rebuttal of Crassus' claim.[104] Hence Bayet argues that this book, and probably the following books as well, down to Book IV at least, were written before 31–29 B.C.[105]

That is logical but not convincing. Juppiter Feretrius was only one among the numerous constructions of Augustus — *templorum omnium conditor aut restitutor.*[106] Still less was the historian of regal Rome bound to mention the failed pretensions of Crassus. Livy was not really interested in the precise qualifications for the *spolia opima*; he only inserted a note in Book IV after being admonished by Augustus; and he probably regarded the whole business as a vexatious perturbation in a smooth and satisfactory narrative, which had been guaranteed by the consensus of the written sources. It was nuisance enough when annalists were discrepant. Observe his remark three chapters further on — *Licinio libros haud dubie sequi linteos placet; Tubero incertus veri est. sit inter cetera vetustate cooperta hoc quoque in incerto positum.*[107]

Nor should the general question of artistic propriety be omitted from any discussion of what an ancient writer ought, or ought not, to say.

In Book I the historian paid an adequate tribute to the unique quality of the *spolia opima.* His observations were not rendered obsolescent by an abortive incident in his own day (the claim of Crassus). He says *bina postea inter tot annos, tot bella opima parta sunt spolia; adeo rara eius fortuna decoris fuit.*[108]

Livy did not want to disfigure the annals of early Rome, poetic and legendary, by the continual obtrusion of modern names and modern incidents. The closing of Janus he could hardly avoid; and the antiquarian note in Book IV was forced upon him. Livy's technique in reflecting or suggesting the present is careful and subtle. Observe, for example, the speech of the tribune Canuleius in Book IV.[109] The orator expounds doctrines of some political moment. Not only the claim of merit against pedigree, adducing Kings of Rome who were *novi homines.* He argues that, since the City is destined to endure for ever, and will grow all the time, new forms of authority, *nova imperia*, can be expected to emerge. That formulation suits the avowed monarchy of Caesar's heir — it does not have to be assigned to the primacy of Caesar Augustus in the restored Republic.

Again, the firm stand of Camillus against a proposal to take the seat

of government from Rome to Veii.[110] It has a certain relevance to history, propaganda, or fiction about the time of the War of Actium. Scholars have not been slow to fix on the rumour reported by Suetonius that Caesar the Dictator intended to transfer the capital to the eastern lands.[111] Some take the notion very seriously and exploit it with conviction.[112] Too much has been made of this item. But it will be recalled as relevant that Antonius for long years had been ruling from Alexandria the eastern dominions of Rome.[113]

It was not left for Livy to be the first to produce an oration by Camillus. The legend had a long past. It had taken tone and episode from various epochs and individuals, including the Scipiones and Sulla.[114] Livy may owe much of his colour and emphasis to a writer thirty or forty years earlier.[115] Camillus, the Second Founder of Rome, is a link between Romulus and Augustus, to be sure.[116] But it does not follow that Livy, extolling Camillus, had his eye on the present all the time — or even very much.

In further support of an early dating, Livy's attitude towards the traditions of the *gens Iulia* is invoked — scepticism about Ascanius, an unfriendly portrayal of certain Julii. So much so that the pair of fulsome references to Augustus looks like a palinode or palliative.[117]

Mentioning Aeneas' son by Lavinia (Ascanius, the founder of Alba Longa), Livy states that it is uncertain whether this Ascanius is the same person as the Ascanius son of Aeneas and Creusa, also known as Iulus, whom the Julii claim as their ancestor.[118] What else could he say? The discrepancy existed. Once the Julii had identified Ascanius, son of Aeneas and Creusa, as Iulus it was hardly possible for them to have the advantage both ways, to claim descent from the Kings of Alba Longa as well, but they did their best. One form of the legend, presumably that current in the time of Julius Caesar, is preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[119] It is highly instructive: Ascanius-Iulus founds Alba Longa, it is true, but not the dynasty, for that had to come from the union of Trojan and native blood. The next King is Silvius, son of Aeneas by Lavinia. Ascanius-Iulus takes a priesthood instead, so the Julii were able to assert a sacerdotal legitimation, not unwelcome to Caesar the *pontifex maximus*.

For Livy, a full discussion of such traditions, combinations, or fictions would be tedious and inconclusive. As he sensibly remarks, *quis enim rem tam veterem pro certo adfirmet?*[120] If, however, Livy be held lacking in respect towards the traditions of the Julian House, what shall be said of the conduct of the irreproachable Virgil? In the first book of the *Aeneid* he regards Ascanius-Iulus as the founder of Alba

Longa and ancestor of a line of kings.[121] In the sixth, however, not a word of Ascanius-Iulus; it is Silvius, son of Aeneas and Lavinia, who heads the regal pedigree.[122]

Livy's observations about certain Julii turn out to be harmless enough. Cn. Julius Mentho (*cos.* 431 B.C.) dedicated a temple of Apollo without waiting for the lot to decide between him and his colleague.[123] Both consuls, though otherwise on bad terms, had previously opposed the Senate's insistence that a dictator be appointed — Livy speaks of their *pravitas*.[124] In 408 B.C. two military tribunes with consular powers, C. Julius Iulus and P. Cornelius Cossus, were likewise recalcitrant.[125] It was not the habit of Livy to suppress or distort the accounts transmitted by the annalists; and there is no evidence that Augustus (or anybody else) bothered about the Julii of the fifth century B.C. Nor was his wife, Livia Drusilla, likely to take offence at Livy's account of the behaviour of her ancestor Salinator in his censorship, especially his *foedum certamen* with his colleague.[126]

Ascanius and the Julii can be dismissed. No unequivocal evidence demands the completion of Books I–V as early as the period 31–29 B.C. Their publication in 27–25 B.C., however, remains a reasonable assumption. Was it a second edition, supplemented by a further instalment, Books VI–X? Bayet appeals to certain indications in these books which appear contemporaneous in tone and feeling with the *Preface*. They are general references to the pernicious effects of wealth and luxury and to the Civil Wars.[127] They prove nothing. Official optimism is misleading. The memory of the Civil Wars did not fade all at once — nor did the dangers of their recrudescence. Peace had been proclaimed, but insecurity subsisted; and the moral regeneration of the Roman People had not become in any way manifest. Stability was guaranteed only by the leader of the Caesarian party. The health of Augustus was precarious. In fact, he nearly died, more than once. The tone and sentiments of the *Preface* might even have been in harmony with the contemporary situation, had it been composed as late as 23 B.C., the critical year that witnessed the conspiracy of Varro Murena and a rift in the Caesarian party.[128] The age was still *haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus*. Similarly the second ode of Horace's first book, though probably written in 28 B.C., is not out of date in 23 B.C., but highly relevant and worth quoting to illustrate the political situation.

There is no indication about the second Decade. A passage in the third, however, has arrested the attention of scholars. In Book XXVIII

Livy refers to the pacification of Spain, *ductu auspicioque Augusti Caesaris*.[129] That was not finally and properly achieved until Agrippa's campaign in 19 B.C. Hence it is often argued that the publication of Books XXI–XXX falls after that year.[130] Not necessarily. In the official conception, Spain was conquered by Augustus in 26–25 B.C. A loyal writer reflects it. Thus Velleius Paterculus, who suppresses all mention of the subsequent campaigns.[131] Augustus' ostensible conquest of Spain was the justification for the second closing of Janus in 25 B.C. Subsequent operations are irrelevant. The phrase of Livy, *ductu auspicioque Augusti Caesaris*, admits a precise interpretation — the *Bellum Cantabricum* conducted by Augustus in person (26 B.C.), and the campaigns of his legates in the next year while the *imperator* lay ill at Tarraco.[132] It is perfectly open for anyone to assert that the third Decade was written before 19 B.C. — and to deny it, if reason be shown.

It cannot be said that Bayet's case has been proved. Perhaps the strongest plea is the tone of the *Preface*, encouraging an early date, before the years of peace. For the rest, most of the positive arguments are singularly fragile. But something is gained. At the very least it can be taken that the years 27–25 mark, not the beginning of Livy's work, but the actual publication of a substantial portion, Books I–V. Perhaps some of those books had been completed two years earlier. When Octavianus returned to Italy, Virgil recited before him in Campania the four books of the *Georgics*.[133] The victor of Actium may also have been gratified in the year of his triumph by a first acquaintance with the newest historical compositions. But that notion is over-hazardous.

If Livy began his work about the time of the War of Actium — or, rather, shortly after it — certain conclusions emerge, of great moment for the history of Latin literature. It is a matter that far transcends the mere biography of Livy or the rhythm of his production.

According to the *Chronicle* of Jerome, both Livy and Messalla Corvinus were born in 59 B.C. Too late for the one, that date should also be too late for the other.[134] Even if born in 64, not 59, Livy by Roman standards was still youthful for a historian — history had normally been written by senior statesmen, as pastime or consolation. On the other hand, his character and tastes were already formed.

What preparation did Livy bring to his task? Some may toy with the notion that he discovered his vocation in youth and spent the years from twenty to thirty in historical studies.[135] Nothing in his writings lends any support. On the contrary.[136]

What then was his training and equipment? The Transpadane zone

of Italy could furnish a good education, as witness Catullus and Virgil; and Livy belonged (it is tempting to assume) to the "better sort" at Patavium.[137] Livy may have come late to Rome. Whatever be thought of the reproach of *Patavinitas*, there might be good cause for reckoning him provincial, not metropolitan, in his outlook.

Athens he perhaps knew not at all. A young man's visit would have fallen in the troubled period that interrupted the studies of Messalla, of Cicero's son — and of Q. Horatius Flaccus. Perhaps he went there in later life, in the season of his established fame.[138] But no clear sign can be discovered of travel anywhere else.[139]

Livy studied in the schools of rhetoric — and may have taught there. A professor, a certain L. Magius, married his daughter.[140] Further, Livy compiled for the use of his own son a treatise on style in the form of a letter.[141] This work was probably written after the beginning of his *Histories*. But that question defies certainty — and matters little. Livy came to history not from a career of politics, not from antiquarian pursuits, but from rhetoric.

Of the prose authors of Augustan Rome, Livy is the sole survivor. He is not altogether easy to estimate. The writing of history had its own requirements, also certain traditions and characteristics.[142] But the theory and practice of oratory can be invoked, on a sane and temperate view of Cicero's pronouncement that history is *opus . . . unum oratorium maxime*.[143]

The oratorical style in vogue in that age is well known from the specimens of declamations preserved by the elder Seneca, by his own comments — and his own practice. The new style was a development of the Asianic tendency; it aimed at swiftness, splendour, and point; it employed poetical and elevated vocabulary; and it often degenerated into bombast and preciosity.[144] Yet it had attractive qualities, such as that *vigor* which Seneca praised in T. Labienus, the orator and historian.[145]

Fashions changed rapidly in the revolutionary age, and the tyranny of the Triumvirs, by banishing oratory from the Comitia and the Senate, drove it into the schools. The prevalence of declamation dates from this period.[146] The restoration of the Republic was powerless to check the trend (how could it?); and the growth of despotism confirmed its sway. Declamation and the new style are inextricably bound together.

Livy stood by Cicero. He urged his son to read Demosthenes and Cicero, to esteem other writers by their approximation to the classic pair.[147] The eloquence of Cicero had quickly lost favour. Something

of it, however, was inherited by Messalla, to judge by descriptions of his oratory — elegant and ornate, but somehow lacking in force.[148] Of the orators after Cicero, Messalla should have been most to the liking of the young Livy; but Messalla was much at the wars; and no evidence reveals what friends, guides, and patrons the man from Patavium found in Rome of the Triumvirs.

There were various patrons of literature. Asinius Pollio had been the friend of poets, both of Catullus from Verona and of Helvius Cinna from Brixia (*tr. pl.* 44 B.C.).[149] He was also the first patron of Virgil.[150] If his interest in the rising talent of the towns of Transpadana directed his attention to Livy, their relations were not likely to be close or cordial. The elderly Cornelius Nepos, himself a Transpadane, was no doubt more accessible. He had been a friend of Cicero — and he was writing history (of a kind). The book *De viris illustribus* appeared about 35 B.C. Further, Nepos was on intimate terms with Atticus, who still survived, his vitality unimpaired.[151]

Now as later, Livy's life flows in a hidden stream. Nothing connects him with any of the great senatorial patrons of letters in Augustan Rome. The circle of Maecenas knows him not. His only attachment appears to be with the imperial family.[152] The paucity of anecdotes about one who acquired fame so early and lived so long is a remarkable fact. Of some half-dozen Livian opinions on questions of style preserved by the elder Seneca and by Quintilian, not one bears the stamp of verbal tradition. All of them look like quotations from his treatise on rhetoric.[153] Perhaps he was never long or frequently at the metropolis.[154] Were there enough books at Patavium? Enough, it should seem, for Livy's needs and methods as disclosed in what survives. But the narration of Augustus' reign would present problems of another order.

Livy set himself to write history in the manner enjoined by Cicero for that art, ample, smooth, and balanced — *genus orationis fusum atque tractum et cum lenitate quadam profluens.*[155] He did not achieve it all at once. The earlier books have an archaic and poetical colouring, especially Book I. That is due in large measure to the subject — but not entirely. A careful study of the development of Livy's prose style shows an increasing classicism.[156] As he goes on, the author drops certain vulgarisms, restricts the employment of frequentative verbs, and regularises his usage. Book I may be described as "modern" in execution as well as in style.[157] Subsequently there is a reversion to Ciceronianism, especially in the structure of sentences.

Livy was not only against the innovators. The Atticist tendency,

strongly "anti-Ciceronian", continued to enjoy high credit. Pollio, retiring from war and politics after his campaign in Macedonia (39 B.C.), soon became the most powerful literary influence in Triumviral Rome. The advocates of the plain severe style appealed to Attic models — Lysias for the orators, Thucydides for the historian.[158] Also to Roman tradition and Roman qualities. Atticism tended to imply archaism, with its vices as well as its virtues — deliberate harshness, concision pushed to the extreme of obscurity, broken jerky rhythms and a predilection for old-fashioned words.[159] Livy in the epistle to his son spoke with distaste of the orators who affect *verba antiqua et sordida* and succumb to obscurity in the pursuit of austerity;[160] and he criticised one of Sallust's adaptations from Thucydides.[161]

Livy's enthusiasm for Cicero was political as well as literary. The *municipia* were in general held to be the firm strongholds of the old Roman morality — the Transpadane region especially, with Patavium first in repute.[162] Republican loyalties were emphatic. In the War of Mutina, Patavium stood by the Senate against Antonius;[163] and when Pollio held the Cisalpina for Antonius he imposed severe requisitions on that wealthy city.[164] All in all, Livy, the pride and glory of Augustan letters, should perhaps be claimed as the last of the Republican writers.[165]

The impact of change and revolution produced a lively interest in the study of history and left a permanent impress on the manner of its writing. Sallust is the supreme and convincing document. Contemporary or recent history exercised the strongest attraction. Sallust died in 35 B.C., leaving his two monographs and his unfinished *Histories* covering the years 78–67 B.C. Another retired politician, Pollio, inherited Sallust's literary adviser, the learned Ateius Philologus.[166] And Pollio soon took up the tale, narrating the fall of the Republic from the consulate of Metellus and Afranius (60 B.C.) The earliest and most vivid echo of Pollio's *Historiae* is the famous ode of Horace, *motum ex Metello consule civicum*.[167] That poem admits of no close dating — yet it may be as early as 28 B.C.

Livy in his debut can also be claimed for the "Triumviral Period" if the term be extended to cover the years in which the heir of Caesar no longer bore the name and title of Triumvir, down to the return of "normal government" in 28 and 27 B.C. If that be conceded, those fifteen years emerge as the most vital epoch in all the literature of the Latins.

Livy, in his *Preface*, enounces the justification for telling once again

the story of the past — superior accuracy or a style surpassing the ancients in elegance.[168] An adequate defence. But men are impelled by a variety of motives, among them discontent with the times — and discontent with history as it is written.

The style of Sallust was repellent to Livy.[169] Not less the man and his opinions — the turbulent politician expelled from the Senate but restored by Caesar and enriched by civil war; the comfortable author of a depressing history; the austere moralist of equivocal conduct.

Nor did Pollio inspire esteem everywhere. The profession of Republican sentiments had not prevented him from espousing the cause of Caesar and of Antonius; and his fine spirit of independence did not counsel retirement from affairs until he had accumulated the handsome gains of a successful career. Wealth, station, honours, and security, all were his. Yet Pollio was a harsh and bitter man. His hostility towards Cicero was maintained beyond the grave; and he scorned the panegyrists of the great orator.[170] Pollio was later to express disapproval of Livy, denouncing him for *Patavinitas*.[171] No evidence survives of any retort from Patavium to Teate of the Marrucini. Livy's earliest experience of the methods of Pollio cannot have created a friendly predisposition — if, as may well be, his family was among the good citizens of Patavium penalised by the proconsul. No tradition, fable, or false erudition produces calamities in or after the Proscriptions such as are alleged to have befallen Virgil. The reason is clear. The poet attracted scholiasts, but not the historian.

Repulsion from Sallust and Pollio, the enemies of Cicero, may have reinforced Livy in his sentiments and helped to determine the tone and colour of his writing; and Livy in his turn may have served as foil to later historians. The ex-consul L. Arruntius (*cos.* 22 B.C.) narrated the First Punic War in a manner that was fanatically Sallustian.[172]

The deeper interest in history was not confined to recent events. It touched also the remote past. Varro had compiled massive stores of antiquarian erudition. Caesar, who had an expert's taste for ritual, encouraged such studies, for personal and for political reasons.[173] With Caesar's heir, the government intervenes deliberately to revive ancient practices and institutions. The policy antedated by many years the systematic Augustan programme of a moral and religious reformation — it goes back before the War of Actium.

Various tendencies converged — scholarship, romanticism, official exploitation. While the dynasts paraded like monarchs in the theatre of the world, emulating Alexander and the rulers in his succession, it

could be foretold, in the narrower sphere of Rome's history, that the age of the Kings was coming back. Etruscan predictions or theories of cosmic cycles corresponded with the facts.

On a conventional view, *rex* and *regnum* were names of abomination. A friendlier estimate was not excluded.[174] Not all of the Seven Kings had been tyrannical. Some, indeed, were irreproachable — Numa the Sabine, who ordained the religion of the early state, Servius Tullius, the author of a timocratic constitution, and also the friend of the Roman plebs. They could suitably be commended as virtuous *novi homines*.[175]

It would be strange if the young Caesar did not annex and exploit the myth of Romulus the Founder.[176] When he seized the consulate on August 19, 43 B.C., the omen of the twelve vultures was seen in the sky, so it was alleged (how soon, it is not clear).[177] An odd and neglected item registered under the year 38 might have some significance. The hut of Romulus on the Palatine caught fire as the result of some ritual operations (unspecified) that the *pontifices* were there performing.[178]

It is asseverated that the victor of Actium would have liked to have *Romulus* for *cognomen*, but in fact adopted *Augustus*. That choice, according to Florus (who may be reproducing Livy) was *sanctius et reverentius*[179] — and it also conveyed a strong suggestion of Romulus who founded the City *augusto imperio*.[180] The name, it could have been added, was also *tutius*. The Founder, in favour with soldiers and populace, was not altogether liked by the Senate. Livy, reporting the Assumption of Romulus, discloses a rumour: the Founder had been massacred by the *patres*.[181]

That was only, so Livy comments, a *perobscura fama*. The Romans loudly acclaimed their ruler as *deum deo natum regem parentemque urbis Romanae*. Similarly Camillus, the second founder. Like Romulus, he foreshadows the third, who is *Caesar, divi filius*.[182] Camillus was hailed as *Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis*.[183]

The formula applied to Romulus by Livy is solemn and even liturgical. It will be noted that early in the year 29 the name of the victorious *Divi filius* was added to the hymn of the Salii, the priests of Mars.[184]

Rome in the years before and after Actium furnished an abundance of spectacles to incite and inspire a historian — the triumphs, the ancient monuments rebuilt, the old rituals revived. In 28 no fewer than eighty-two temples were restored.[185] That is the claim of Augustus. Yet there had been considerable activity before that year. The generals of the Triumvirs had devoted war-booty to the embellishment of the City; and the interest in the Temple of Juppiter Feretrius also lies some years back.[186]

When war was declared against a foreign enemy, the Queen of Egypt, in 32, the thing was advertised as a *bellum iustum piumque* through the ritual of the *Fetiales*.[187] That venerable confraternity had not been heard of for more than a century. Then, after victory, Janus was closed in 29 (that had happened only once before since Romulus). And the *Augurium salutis*, a ceremony recently in abeyance, was brought back.[188]

Livy was no antiquarian — he lacked the passion for facts or the collector's mania. Nor did he exploit, as he might have, the rich stores of Varronian learning.[189] But the earliest history demanded a certain veneer of antiquarianism — and a style in keeping, with archaic formula here and there to suggest the immemorial past. There were also curious or picturesque episodes to be exploited, and legends that adhered to certain of the Roman monuments, such as the story of the Curiatii. Livy adduces the formula of trials for *perduellio*.[190] Also the ritual of the *Fetiales*, now of contemporary interest.[191] Cataloguing the institutions of Numa, however, he reveals no trace of the *Fratres Arvales*. They had not yet been resuscitated by the ruler.[192]

In one of its aspects, Book I is a colourful and eloquent guide-book. Perhaps the first intention of Livy was to satisfy the growing public interest in the Roman past by producing what was beyond the capacity of professional scholars, a readable and lively account of early Rome.[193] Perhaps Book I in its original form was composed and published separately, some years before the books on the infant Republic, success inducing the author to conceive a larger design, and, as he was later to realise, much more than he had bargained for.

Yet it is likely enough that the plan of a general history of Rome, down to his own time, was present to him from the outset. In the *Preface* Livy acknowledges his affection for the most ancient history: it enables him to turn aside from contemplating "the calamities which for so long our time has witnessed". But, he adds, the public will be impatient for the recent and ruinous history.[194] Despite the protestations of historians, such disturbed and deplorable periods offer the widest scope for their talents — and they sometimes avow it.

Livy proposed to sweep the annalists off the board; to transcend mere antiquarianism; to honour famous men, but not as a biographer; and to assert a nobler view of human nature than was found in the pages of Sallust. His *Res Romanae* were to be moral, patriotic, and edifying, an exhortation, supported by the examples of the glorious past, to that rebirth of Rome which, when he wrote his *Preface*, was not yet even a programme but only an aspiration.

The significance of the Triumviral Period for Roman historiography

becomes evident, both in general and with reference to three men, Sallust, Pollio, and Livy. The eldest, Sallust, is in certain respects the most modern, for all the archaism of his vocabulary. The youngest is an anomalous figure. Sallust and Pollio were bitter and pessimistic; but Livy seems comparatively untouched by the era of tribulation. The Ciceronian features of his style make him something of a stranger in his own generation. His mind was formed before the Battle of Actium, his history begun before *pax et princeps* was firmly established.[195] Yet that history turns out to be the enduring monument of the spirit and the majesty of Augustan Rome. As with Virgil, Augustus was very lucky.

Ancient legends and the new monarchy — both Virgil and Livy illuminate their age. Virgil, who might have composed epics about the Kings (Alban or Roman) or a verse panegyric on the life and exploits of Caesar's heir, found in the *Aeneid* a subtle and superior device for linking the origins and destiny of the imperial city to the glorious present; and Livy narrated the annals of Rome from the beginning to their culmination with the establishment of the monarchy.

Did either influence the other? It appears not. They are independent, using the same material in much the same spirit.[196] Moreover, by time of writing the priority belongs to Livy, with Book I at least to his credit while Virgil was still completing the *Georgics*.

Livy (it has been said) is a kind of prose Virgil. A helpful conception. But the legends and fictions of regal Rome and of the early Republic are only a small portion of his achievement. A large question remains: how did Livy manage the history of his own time, the *municipalis eques* taking up the challenge of the senators Sallust and Pollio?

III. The Reign of Augustus

When the historian, having brought to completion the narrative of the Second Punic War, paused for a moment and looked ahead, he was filled with dismay. An ocean threatened to engulf him.[197] His apprehensions were well grounded. He had found his style, hence ease of composition, once the material had been grasped and digested. But the material kept expanding. Livy was slow to distinguish a good from a bad historian. His account of the period from Zama to Pydna does not reveal a master's hand in the manipulation of historical sources, or any gift for structure.

His predicament got worse and worse as he advanced towards his

own day. The record became abundant and intricate, perplexing and hazardous. It was no longer enough to stand by a single annalist, noting the more important variants, or, using several, to strike a mean of general probability and glide with graceful scepticism over the harmonies or discordances of fable and invention. The safe and venerable annals of the Roman past gave place to real history, alive and recalcitrant.

Such was Asinius Pollio's history of his own time. It was acclaimed by Horace with due sense of the peculiar hazards attendant on the task. It was in truth *periculosae plenum opus aleae.*[198] Pollio was promenading his Muse across the ash and lava of a recent eruption — *per ignes/ suppositos cineri doloso.* The ground was firmer when Livy, some twenty years later, came to tell of the fall of the Republic.

Many of the traps and pitfalls had been removed, or at least explained away. The professions of the victorious party underwent a rapid metamorphosis. Having abolished the Republic, Octavianus pretended to restore it; and Caesar's heir came to terms with Caesar's enemies. There ensued a certain rehabilitation of Pompeius — and even of Cato. It was therefore possible for Livy to write as a *Pompeianus* without fear of any reproach from Caesar Augustus.[199] The Princeps himself could approve of Cato as a good citizen who (like himself) did not wish the law and the constitution to be subverted.[200] Caesar was the "divine" parent of Octavianus, avenged and honoured by the *pietas* of his son. Hence a double advantage. The deification of Caesar rendered it easy to depersonalise him, to dissociate *Divus Julius* from *Dictator Caesar.* Of Caesar the Dictator there is scant mention in Augustan literature: blame rather than praise.[201] Livy debated whether Caesar's birth were not a greater curse than blessing to the world.[202] The testimony of Virgil is parallel — and convincing. No place for Caesar in the ancestry of Caesar Augustus. He is thrown out of that context and introduced later, only to be exhorted in solemn tones to disarm before Pompeius. Neither is named, but they are designated as *socer* and *gener* in a political and matrimonial compact that had lapsed.[203]

Pompeius and Cato were conveniently out of the way before Octavianus appeared on the scene. Therefore freedom of treatment was not merely permitted but encouraged by Augustus. Very different was the history after 44 B.C. What was to be said of the career of Caesar's heir — treachery and violence, proscription and murder? Many of the actors in that tragedy were still alive.

A member of the imperial family was incited to the study of history by the example and the counsels of Livy. It was the young Claudius,

the son of Drusus.[204] Unfortunate, however, in his first choice of a subject. He wanted to write about the Civil Wars. His mother, Antonia, and his grandmother, Livia, frightened him off, so he fell back upon the years of peace, the reign of Caesar Augustus.

The government was unable to suppress the entire truth about the revolutionary period. Too many of the opponents of Octavianus, both Republicans and Antonians, were extant, some of them occupying positions of profit and eminence in the new order. As was pertinently remarked, the victor recruited his friends and allies from the ranks of his adversaries.[205] The national and patriotic front that won the War of Actium was a peculiar conglomeration. Many of the adherents of Octavianus had a past to live down; traitors to every cause, such as Munatius Plancus. Some kept silent. Others were not ashamed of the part they had played. The eloquent and patrician Messalla Corvinus was proud to have fought at Philippi, under Brutus and Cassius.[206] And rightly. Men of lesser station would be no less eager to affirm that they had been there, when *Virtus* was shattered and the Republic went down before the Caesarian armies. If Messalla (and other Republicans) had not written their memoirs and recalled their loyalties, there was the redoubtable Pollio, Caesarian and Antonian in allegiance, Republican in spirit, and, before all else, ferociously independent.

Furthermore, despite victory, peace, and restored Republic, the new dispensation was precarious and insecure. Caesar Augustus could not rule without the consent and support of the nobility. Some rallied to the government. Hence, in a year of crisis (23 B.C.), Cn. Piso, a Republican, appointed consul, and L. Sestius, once quaestor of M. Brutus. At the same time, the heroes and the ideals of the Republic were accorded especial honour by the heir of Caesar. It is easy enough for a government to filch and furbish up the forms and phrases of its adversaries, and Caesar Augustus operated with dexterity. There was also a genuine and tangible revival of the Republic — the old houses came back, to public honour and perhaps to hopes of power. The emergence of the *nobiles* is significant. Not for some time after Actium, despite certain aristocratic partisans already in the alliance of the victor, such as Messalla Corvinus and Paullus Aemilius Lepidus. Twelve or fifteen years elapsed; and, a little later, several families became very important in the period when, Agrippa dead and Tiberius in exile at Rhodes, Augustus, frail and decrepit, needed the alliance of the aristocracy to safeguard the dynasty and to secure the succession for his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius.[207]

For these reasons a historian might, if he chose, fortified by illustrious examples — and perhaps by the favour of families in the *nobilitas* — narrate the history of the Civil Wars from a Republican or Pompeian point of view, without risk or censure. Ostensible independence might well be profit and advantage. There was an easier path. The Republican and the Caesarian versions might be combined. Why not? The heir of Caesar blended Caesarism with the Republic in his *novus status*.

Livy was able to benefit from the official version of Triumviral history. It can be recovered in various ways. On epigraphic record, the *Res Gestae* of Augustus preserve the outline. The *Autobiography* of the Princeps was more explicit. Its influence can be traced in many details, surviving in subsequent historians, where the actions of Octavianus called for apology. Livy, and later writers, whether they drew on Livy or not, provide adequate evidence.[208] The general argument of the *Autobiography* can be summed up — *pietas*, *necessitudo rei publicae*, and *clementia*. The claims of *pietas*, neglected by Antonius (the disloyal Caesarian who was ready to come to terms with Brutus and Cassius) enforced the duty of revenge against the assassins of Caesar. There was no alternative to armed action; it was justified by patriotism; and the victor was merciful.[209]

Further, to save the faces of old enemies — and new associates — various scapegoats were available. Sex. Pompeius was displayed as a pirate, Lepidus as a decayed and pretentious relic, Marcus Antonius as a voluptuary, the slave and victim of the strange woman. The War of Actium was not a civil war but a crusade against a foreign enemy. *Nefas*, *Aegyptia coniunx*.[210]

The blame for the proscriptions might be laid upon the other Triumvirs, Antonius and Lepidus. Yet the murder of Cicero was most awkward. Young Octavianus had flattered and honoured him, had called him by the name of "father".[211] The cardinal virtues of *pietas* and *clementia* ought to have intervened to save the great orator. They did not avail. Cicero perished. Caesar Augustus might revive, from interested motives, the memory of Pompeius Magnus and of Cato. Cicero, like Brutus, remained under a cloud, a fact which should perplex those who prefer to see their Roman history through the eyes of both Cicero and Augustus, with no thought of all the Romans who distrusted both of them. The style of Cicero quickly became unfashionable. Nor is it easy to believe that his political ideals were studied, admired, and adopted by Caesar's heir and his associates in power. There is cited, to be sure, an improving anecdote. "A great writer and a great patriot", so Augustus said to one of the young princes, his

grandsons.[212] That is not enough. More instructive is the cool judgment which Livy, who was a fervent admirer of Cicero, passed on the last actions and tragic end of his hero. Cicero (he pointed out) suffered from his enemies only what he would have done to them had he prevailed.[213]

An official version of recent history thus facilitated the task of Livy. The paths of duty and of inclination coincided, for the victorious cause, by liberating Rome from the threat of foreign domination, by establishing peace, order, and concord, had shown itself to be the "better cause".

Unfortunately, the material difficulty subsisted. The story was rich and complex — and so was the written record. The chief history available was that of Asinius Pollio. No doubt sound on facts, but not of a suitable "tendency". The *Historiae* of the eminent consular, which probably ended with the Battle of Philippi, were critical and subversive. As for memoirs, the Princeps' *Autobiography* led the field. Dominant all through for the interpretation of events, it was perhaps the sole available source for such matters as the campaigns in Illyricum in 35 and 34 B.C. Further, Agrippa, Messalla, the ex-Antonian Q. Dellius — and no doubt many other authors — had their contributions to make. Biographies were also written of illustrious Romans in the recent past — friends, relatives and clients left their memorials of Marcus Brutus.[214] Again, it might be necessary to consult letters, speeches, or despatches for information not otherwise available. For example, the oration which Sallust composed for the great Ventidius may have been an important source for the eastern wars in 40–38 B.C.[215] Above all, the literature of propaganda and abuse, ranging from the missives interchanged between Octavianus and Antonius to such *curiosa* as Antonius, *De ebrietate sua*, or the erotic correspondence between Q. Dellius and the Queen of Egypt (entertaining but not perhaps authentic).[216]

Patent partisans and the grosser fabrications need not have given much trouble. But there was room almost everywhere for slight and subtle misrepresentation, especially in the order and interaction of events. The years 44 and 43 B.C. were especially complex, if they were to be narrated as political history (and not, as happens so often in modern times, as a part of the biography of Cicero). Even now it is difficult to disentangle the truth about such matters as the allotment of provinces before and after Caesar's death, though here (it must be admitted) some of the confusion may be due to the errors or misrepresentations of historians later than Livy.[217] The actors were numerous, their evolutions

intricate. For example, when was the important meeting of the Senate to have occurred about which Cicero was informed at Leucopetra (near Rhegium) early in August of 44: on the first day of August or on the first day of September?[218] Or, when did Brutus decide to take possession of Macedonia? After Octavianus' march on Rome (he entered the city on November 10), or after the session of the Senate on November 28?[219] To avoid error, perpetual vigilance was necessary, a steady consultation and comparison of documents. It would not look well for a historian with a world-wide reputation to confess doubt or ignorance about facts which could be ascertained by the exercise of care and diligence.

Livy narrated the story of the years 44 to 29 in great abundance of detail. From the advent of Octavianus to the Battle of Philippi no fewer than eight books were needed (CXVII–CXXIV); and nine more down to the triumph of Octavianus (CXXV–CXXXIII). Not the easiest, but, along with the appendix on the reign of Augustus, surely the most difficult section of the whole work.

It remains to examine the last nine books (CXXXIV–CXLII), the guiding theme of which was presumably *res publica restituta*. From the outbreak of the war between Pompeius Magnus and Caesar, the history of Livy was the history of his own time: he now had to deal with events that had occurred since he began his work.

At first sight, a welcome change of subject after the long years of confusion and calamity. The dangers that threatened to destroy Rome and shatter the *imperium* of the Roman People had been arrested; certain unsatisfactory persons had been eliminated; others were converted to political sanity. Morality returned to public life — or at least a firm and central control. The *res publica restituta* was a blessing for a historian. History itself, like the Roman State, had been brought back into the right and traditional path. In the briefest of Roman definitions, the Republic consisted in the government of annual consuls, chosen by election. And the Republic subsisted until such election was abolished, in fact until A.D. 14. After long labours and wanderings Livy could revert to the annalistic method — *annos a consule nomen habentes*.[220]

The material now grouped itself around the proper activities of Senate, People, and magistrates. Free elections returned, but managed (one presumes). There were some electoral contests (in 22–19 B.C.), until such an exercise of *Libertas* was seen to be pernicious or futile. Comitial legislation came back, dignified by a Princeps bringing before

the sovereign People a programme of moral reform and social regeneration. The majesty of the Roman name was advertised when ambassadors brought gifts and homage from distant peoples, from the Scythians, from the lands towards the Caucasus, from India; the *patres* heard with pride the reports of victorious proconsuls and voted them honours; and petitions from the Hellenic cities recalled the grants and dispositions of the imperial Republic that had broken and abased the monarchs in the succession of Alexander.

Above all, the antiquarian operations of the government provided rich material for an annalistic record of the accepted scope and content — games and ceremonies, temples dedicated or restored, ancient observances brought back to life. The celebration of the *Ludi Saeculares*, or the choice of a *flamen Dialis* (the first for seventy-five years), demanded learned digressions, combining, for an artistic historian, the claims of tradition and variety. Further, the installation of Augustus as *pontifex maximus* and the dedication of the *Ara Pacis* were important acts of public policy.

The private beliefs of the educated were irrelevant to the ritual and the fabric of the state religion. They cannot still have believed in portents and prodigies. But such manifestations had not abated in the last age of the Republic. A shower of bricks fell from the heavens when Milo was prosecuted; and a mule giving birth foretold civic dissensions.[221] Livy, it is true, deplored the fact that faith had vanished in his own day, that there were no more *prodigia* on official record or in the pages of historians.[222] His regrets disclose his ignorance, or a thoughtless reverence for pious antiquity. When he came to narrate the reign of Augustus, he was not disappointed. Portents continued duly to be reported, as is shown not merely by Cassius Dio but by a writer who took his examples from Livy.[223] Fire, flood, and pestilence were not infrequent visitations.[224] With the record of such matters, and with the deaths of illustrious men (loyal servants of the Republic and the dynasty), the annals of each year might find a suitable termination.[225]

So far the structure. The rest was not at all easy. A later writer, Cassius Dio, reveals the truth about imperial history.[226] Hitherto, he says, the more important transactions came to public notice and passed into historical record; the truth, even though deformed by favour or prejudice, could more or less be ascertained. Now, however, secrecy began to envelop the acts of the government, and the published account of events was naturally suspect, as being the official version. The facts were unknown, fiction and variants everywhere rampant. In any case the very magnitude of the Empire and the complexity of its

government tended to debar from exact knowledge anybody not directly concerned.

When Livy began to set down in writing the annals of *res publica restituta* (perhaps towards A.D. 6),[227] he had few, if any, predecessors. Livy appears to have the field largely to himself. His previous achievement was enough to deter competitors from encroaching; and it had earned him the rank of the official Roman historian.

What other writers were there? Despite the interest in history aroused by the revolutionary age, the Principate of Augustus can show few historians. Apart from Livy, they are little more than names, and hardly any of them seem to have dealt with the years of peace and order after the end of the Civil Wars.

The consular historians L. Arruntius (*cos.* 22 B.C.) and C. Clodius Licinus (*cos. suff.* A.D. 4) dealt with an earlier period, perhaps in emulation of Livy.[228] A certain Cornutus has been disinterred, who appears to have written about the Civil Wars: surely of slight importance.[229]

For the rest, in the list of historians contemporary with Livy (apart from mere biographers or scholars), only three names deserve any consideration, and they can quickly be dismissed. The *Historiae Philippicae* of the learned Narbonensian, Pompeius Trogus, reached the reign of Augustus in two of its sections, the Spanish wars and Parthian history. The latest event to be mentioned was the surrender of prisoners, military standards, and hostages by the King of Parthia.[230] Trogus' work was universal in scope, and it conceived history from the Macedonian, not the Roman, point of view. The date of its publication is uncertain, perhaps before 2 B.C.[231] It is doubtful whether Livy needed, or cared, to use it. When Trogus wrote, something (and perhaps a lot) of Livy had already been published, for Trogus criticised Livy's practice of inserting speeches in direct discourse.[232]

T. Labienus, a *Pompeianus* of a very different breed from Livy, was not only a famous speaker. He wrote histories, parts of which he refused to make public.[233] Labienus was an irreconcilable adherent of the defeated cause: surely of no use to Livy, even had he narrated the later years, of which there is no evidence. The same tendency was represented, perhaps in a milder form, by A. Cremutius Cordus, prosecuted in A.D. 25 "because he had praised Brutus and called Cassius the last of the Romans".[234] Further, Seneca, in a treatise to his daughter, asseverates that he damned the authors of the Proscriptions to eternal infamy.[235] However, it is stated that Augustus had been present at recitations of his work.[236] Cordus dealt also with the beginnings of the reign. He is quoted by Suetonius for an incident in 18 B.C., hardly of a

kind to commend itself to Augustus: on the occasion of the *lectio senatus*, senators were only admitted to the Curia one by one, and after bodily search.[237] The completed work may not, in fact, have been given to the world before, or much before, A.D. 25. It may — or may not — have been an important source for later writers.[238] In any case, there is no evidence that Cordus' account of the years after Actium was composed before Livy's epilogue.

Nor would Roman pride descend to the use of Greek sources if it could be helped. Livy had not, it appears, consulted Posidonius for the Gracchan period.[239] Nor is it likely that he drew upon certain inferior competitors or successors of Polybius for contemporary affairs — Strabo, Nicolaus, and Timagenes. As for Strabo's *History*, it probably ended at 30 B.C. when Alexandria fell, the last of the Ptolemies perished, and the last of the Hellenistic kingdoms lapsed to the empire of the Romans.[240] Nicolaus, however, fluent in 144 books, went down to 4 B.C.[241]

Nicolaus and Strabo were of about the same age as Livy. Timagenes of Alexandria was a little older. The influence of his work, invoked by some scholars for another section of Livy, the geographical digressions on Gaul and Germany in Books CIII–CIV, is not easy to ascertain.[242] Timagenes was an objectionable fellow, anti-Roman in spirit — *felicitati urbis inimicus*.[243] Cast off by the Princeps, he was harboured by Pollio. If his name lurks under the disdainful plural of the *levissimi ex Graecis* in an early book of Livy, who extolled the fame of Alexander and favoured the Parthians against Rome, it is irrelevant to the present enquiry.[244]

Livy was therefore compelled to collect, digest, and shape the material for himself — official documents, verbal information, and his own reminiscences. That useful guide, the *Memoirs* of Caesar Augustus ended very soon, with the campaign of the Spanish wars which was conducted by the Princeps in person, namely the *Bellum Cantabricum* of 26 B.C.[245] That fact had a perceptible effect on the tradition. Augustus in the *Autobiography* narrated only his own exploits.[246] Therefore the operations of the column of invasion commanded by the Princeps in 26 B.C. were recorded in detail.[247] Little or nothing was said about the other two columns of the army of Hispania Citerior, or about the other army, that of Hispania Ulterior.[248] For the campaigns of the next year, historians had to use other sources — and were probably guilty of a serious error about the order of events, namely the capture of the town of Lancia by P. Carisius, Augustus' legate in Hispania Ulterior. That action is narrated at the end of 25 B.C. It clearly belongs to the beginning of a campaign, probably that of 26 B.C.[249]

The *acta senatus* provided the kind of material that Livy needed, a pretty full account of official business. One of the ruler's earliest acts had been to suppress the publication of this record.[250] Yet access would not perhaps have been denied to an approved person such as Livy, although he was not a senator. In the Senate's archives stood, among other things, the speeches of Augustus and other pronouncements of significance for public policy. About military events, provincial governors in their despatches furnished detailed evidence, often with an eye to honours. According to Cassius Dio (under the year 19 B.C.), many proconsuls not only aspired to triumphs but celebrated them, for no other merit than suppression of brigandage or the establishment of internal order in the cities of the Empire.[251] That is an exaggeration. After Sex. Appuleius (January, 26 B.C.), the only proconsuls to be voted triumphs were Sempronius Atratinus and Cornelius Balbus, both from Africa (21 and 19 B.C.). Nor was the Princeps silent about the successes achieved in the wide territories of his own *provincia.* Later, however, as the imperial system developed, the Senate came to learn less and less about the provinces of Caesar; and certain military operations, failing to find public record, might easily escape the notice of history. For the time of Augustus, certain geographical information goes back to the *acta senatus*, for example the full record of towns and tribes traversed by Balbus in his march to the land of the Garamantes, in the far south, in Fezzan.[252] Similarly, curiosity is excited by Pliny's brief notice about the tribe of the Homonadenses in the Taurus, Homana their capital and their forty-four *castella.*[253] This may well derive from the record of grant of *ornamenta triumphalia* to the legate P. Sulpicius Quirinius for his successful campaign (of unknown date).[254]

To supplement or elucidate official documents, it might be expedient for an historian who was not a senator to question those who knew. Livy was on terms of amity with the household of the Princeps, as witness Augustus' decisive revelation about the *spolia opima*, and the interest shown in the historical studies of young Claudius. Otherwise there is a singular absence of evidence about patrons and friends.

Without the *acta senatus*, he would have been in a sorry plight. The case of Strabo is in point: the city or cities where he wrote (and revised) his *Geography* seem to have put him out of touch with information about contemporary wars. One example will suffice. Balbus' march to the land of the Garamantes was sheer delight for a geographer. Strabo knows nothing of it.[255]

Livy may have had access to the *acta senatus.* A large part of his narrative was devoted to wars — from choice, for it recalled an earlier

and happier period, and from necessity, to avoid awkward topics and fill space. Whereas the two books of which the *Periochae* are missing (CXXXVI and CXXXVII) appear to have covered the years 24 to 17 B.C. inclusive, and the next carried the record to the beginning of 12 B.C. (CXXXVIII, mentioning the death of Agrippa), the last four books embrace the four years of Tiberius' and Drusus' campaigns in Illyricum and Germany (12–9 B.C.). A splendid theme. As a later historian was mournfully to remark, his Republican predecessors had all the luck — *ingentia illi bella, expugnationes urbium, fusos captosque reges.*[256] Livy on the campaigns of the two Claudii did his best to put himself back in the atmosphere of the foreign wars in the great age.

This was the culmination of the grandiose Augustan plan of conquest in central Europe. Many diverse operations had prepared the way; and almost every other region of the Empire had been subjected to a process of methodical consolidation, especially Spain, the Alpine lands and the Balkans. Noteworthy, for example, is the variety of campaigns chronicled by Cassius Dio in resumptive sections, under 25 B.C. and 16 B.C. (the latter covering the events of 19–16 B.C.).[257] It follows that military operations of the period 28–9 B.C., having been recounted in Livy's annals, stood a better chance of surviving in the literary tradition than certain campaigns subsequent to 9 B.C. Later writers, whether they had drawn on Livy or not, tend to be thin and inadequate for the military history of the next dozen years. This is partly, but not wholly, due to the fact that Livy stopped at 9 B.C. It must be recalled that Velleius makes deliberate omissions for political reasons; and the text of Dio is defective in the period 6 B.C.–A.D. 4.[258]

The veteran historian had had plenty of practice at military narration, but the geography should have given him some trouble. In the subjugation of the Northwest of Spain, the legions of Augustus penetrated to regions untouched by the armies of the Republic. New ground was also broken in central Europe. Drusus reached the Elbe; and Tiberius extended the bounds of Illyricum to the Danube. It must be conceded, however, that exact and up-to-date geographical knowledge was not demanded of Roman historians.[259]

Tacitus' account of the campaigns of Germanicus (perhaps designed to recall Livy to his readers) shows how much could be done. Yet even the writing of military history, innocuous theme, could not be entirely free from preoccupation in the time of Augustus. The prestige of Princeps and dynasty was paramount. The official version celebrated the Spanish campaigns of 26 and 25 B.C. as the final conquest, justifying Augustus' second closing of the temple of Janus. Yet there was serious

fighting in 24 and 22 B.C.; and in 19 B.C. Agrippa completed the subjugation of the Northwest. In fact, there is good cause for speaking of a ten years' war in Spain.[260] It was easy enough for a dishonest writer like Velleius Paterculus — profound peace in Spain, not even disturbed by brigandage after Augustus left the peninsula.[261] A scrupulous annalist had to record the detail of the wars in Spain, to the end. At the same time, bright colour and high relief for the Princeps' campaign in 26 B.C.

Nor was it desirable that the exploits of his stepsons should be clouded by a too emphatic commemoration of other generals. All students of the *Odes* of Horace know that the Alpine lands were conquered in 15 B.C. by the swift and convergent campaign of the two Claudii, Tiberius and Drusus.[262] The preliminary and necessary operations have all but lapsed from record. From the side of northern Italy P. Silius Nerva prepared the way for Drusus: one source only records his activities.[263] In Gaul the predecessor of Tiberius was M. Lollius. Partisan history, best represented by Velleius, saddles him with a serious disaster.[264] A milder and better tradition, however, has been preserved.[265] Velleius' version can easily be explained. Lollius was a bitter enemy of Tiberius, if not now, at least later.

Again, Tiberius' conquests in Illyricum (12–9 B.C.) were prepared and facilitated by the operations of M. Vinicius, proconsul of Illyricum (14–13 B.C.), and by Agrippa himself (his last achievement) in the winter of 13/12 B.C.[266] If, as every theory assumes, Livy was narrating these events after A.D. 4, discretion was required of the historian. Agrippa was long dead, but Vinicius was one of the generals employed by high commands during the period of Tiberius' exile at Rhodes — and like others, dropped after A.D. 4.[267]

If the foreign wars of the restored Republic demanded circumspection, what of internal affairs? The truth could not be told, even if it could be ascertained. When Tacitus was composing his *Histories*, civil war and despotism the theme, he professed to reserve for his old age the history of that happy and contemporaneous epoch, the reigns of Nerva and Trajan. He did not carry out his promise (not that it should so be regarded), but turned back to the period of the Julii and the Claudii. For a number of good reasons. A similar difficulty confronted Livy. The new order, the *felicissimus status*, was not all that it seemed to be. What was he to say about such episodes as the alleged conspiracy of Varro Murena in 23 B.C.? A consul had to be discarded and destroyed, one of the leading partisans of Augustus, no less than the brother-in-law of Maecenas. Moreover, there was the whole

dynastic policy of Augustus, his ambitions for Marcellus, and the secret struggle for power in that year when Augustus seemed close to death.

No historian gives a satisfactory account of those transactions — let alone an interpretation. It is a suspicious fact that in the narrative of Dio the conspiracy should be postdated and put in 22 B.C., not 23.[268] Nor does any ancient source explicitly record the grant to Agrippa of a share in the provincial *imperium* of Caesar Augustus. It only emerges indirectly.[269]

By eschewing high politics and keeping anxiously to a dry and annalistic record, it was still possible for Livy to write a history of the years 28–9 B.C. that should not be an uneasy amalgam of adulation and mendacity, like Velleius. But he could not go much further.

The real history is secret history. If that were not implicit in the new dispensation from the outset, it was revealed and demonstrated by the events of the years 6 B.C.–A.D. 4. Tiberius abruptly refused to support and facilitate the dynastic policy of Augustus, insistent for the succession of his grandsons Gaius and Lucius. Then came the scandal and disgrace of Julia, the Princeps' daughter — or rather the "conspiracy of the five *nobiles*"; and the young Caesars, inadequate bearers of a great name and unworthy of their parentage, passed away. Augustus was constrained first to permit the return of Tiberius and then to adopt him, with a share of the imperial powers. The Claudian was now *vindex custosque imperii* (A.D. 4).[270] Internal and domestic politics had suffered a revolutionary change. It was not merely that one plan of succession had failed, to be replaced by another. An important nexus of noble houses, standing behind the dynasty in those difficult years, saw its high ambitions frustrated. The enemies and the rivals of Tiberius were now displaced; and a new group of families came to the fore, some with Pompeian blood, many with Pompeian allegiance.[271] More trouble for the historian, many occasions for giving personal offence, not least if he tried to be impartial. Yet impartiality was out of the question.

It required the peculiar talents of Velleius Paterculus to do justice to these transactions.[272] The departure of Tiberius shook the whole world — the Germans rebelled and the Parthians seized Armenia. His return meant that Rome's rule would be eternal. Peace, tranquillity, security, salvation dawned for mankind; the sanctity of the family and of property was guaranteed. Only loyalty to Augustus had induced Tiberius to go away to Rhodes — *mira quaedam et incredibilis atque inenarrabilis pietas*. He did not want to stand in the way of the young princes, but such was Tiberius' modesty that he concealed the reason. Patriotism brought him back.

On the other side stood the unsatisfactory Julia and her depraved paramours; and, as a scapegoat for the conduct of Gaius Caesar, his guide and counsellor, M. Lollius, who fell from favour and was removed by a providential death, to the general rejoicing. Tiberius was indispensable to the Empire. Nobody else was of any use. Hence, in Velleius, silence about the exploits of Roman generals at this time, with one exception (M. Vinicius, who was the grandfather of his patron). This is one of the most obscure decades of imperial history.

Velleius, it is true, wrote nearly a generation later than Livy. His work reveals the rapid growth of adulation; it is almost a caricature of the methods imposed by the new system of government on the writing of contemporary history. Velleius takes to himself credit for *candor*, that is, a flattering portraiture of the right kind of people.[273] Livy was prone to benevolent appraisals.[274] But Livy is held an honest man, though disquieting signs can be discovered in the earlier books of patriotic expurgations, of the remodelling of incidents for a moral or didactic purpose.[275] How was Livy to proceed? Politics could perhaps be avoided (though only by the exercise of great skill) in the narration of the early years of the Augustan Principate, for the government had been able in a large measure to suppress the evidence of internal discord. The period 6 B.C.–A.D. 4 unfolded a series of terrible revelations. How was Livy to write of these matters? He had to stop. The year 9 B.C. was the ideal date.

The occasion was melancholy — the death of Drusus in Germany, returning from the campaign that took him to the river Elbe. But it called for proud commemoration of Rome's imperial task, of the achievement of the dynasty, of the *virtus* of the Claudii. Funeral laudations were suitably delivered by Augustus and by Tiberius. The poet Horace had celebrated the exemplary qualities of the young Claudii — aristocratic breeding reinforced by moral training. The bright promise had been amply fulfilled; and there were just reasons for acclaiming the *pietas* of Tiberius, who, learning of his brother's mishap, hastened by forced marches to the scene, crossing the Alps and the Rhine.[276] A splendid example of the traditional Roman virtues — and a refutation of the *solita fratrum odia* that tend to disfigure the history of dynasties. The obsequies of Drusus will have provided a subject congenial to the talents of the historian — pageantry, the evocation of generals of the Republic, and the generous comments of sagacious men.

The wars of Tiberius and Drusus in 12–9 B.C. were the high epoch of the Augustan conquests. To advertise the achievement, the *pomerium* of the city of Rome was extended in 8 B.C.[277] Further, in the years 7–2

B.C., a large number of soldiers were released from service and furnished with bounties in money.[278] Janus should surely have been closed — and so the Senate had voted — after the campaigns of 11 B.C., but a Dacian incursion frustrated the proposal.[279] Yet Janus was in fact closed a third time by Augustus. The only indication of date (2 B.C.) comes from the confused narrative of Orosius, which presents considerable perplexities.[280] However, if the third closing of Janus took place subsequent to 9 B.C., it could still have been mentioned somewhere by Livy in his epilogue (and hence have percolated to Orosius). Likewise the disaster of Varus, though much later (in A.D. 9). The manuscripts of the *Periochae* end with the phrase *clades Quinctilii Vari*. It would be easy to suspect an interpolation — and quite unnecessary.[281]

Livy, though not a flatterer and a timeserver, did not write his contemporary annals in utter oblivion of political considerations. His account of the years down to 9 B.C. must have been coloured by the fact that, despite vicissitudes, Tiberius had in A.D. 4 turned out to be the destined successor of Augustus. The catastrophe of Varus was a severe shock. It was expedient to exculpate the government — not so very easy, for Varus was a "political" appointment, being the husband of one of the great-nieces of the Princeps, Claudia Pulchra. It may be conjectured that Livy's brief notice of the *clades Variana* tended to exalt by contrast the successes of Tiberius in Germany — and elsewhere. Varus took the blame. Velleius' narrative duly gives the explanation — the personal incompetence of that corrupt and slothful character.[282] In truth, a better general than Varus might well have come to grief.

The year 9 B.C. therefore appears to be both a necessary and an attractive terminal date. At some time or other Livy had decided to go on after 29 B.C. as far as that year. Perhaps there was a short interval in his activity after he had completed the books on the Civil Wars. Who shall tell? Perhaps by A.D. 1 he had reached the end of Book CXXXIII, a reasonable output for some thirty years of steady labours, though more recently the task had grown more difficult and more complex. The political change in A.D. 4 may have encouraged him to continue, for it indicated what was the proper and safe treatment of the years 28–9 B.C. The composition of the appendix (Books CXXXIV–CXLII) may belong to the years A.D. 6–10.

If the statement attached to the *Periocha* of Book CXXI is to be accorded credence, it could be argued that Books CXXI–CXLII were not published until after the death of Augustus.[283] That is possible.

The writing of contemporary history was delicate as well as laborious. Moreover, the death of the Princeps might provoke a crisis in Roman politics. Anxious rumours were current. In fact, though certain of the formalities at Rome might cause friction, the government was ready for the emergency, being in proper control of provinces and armies. The decision had been made long ago, in A.D. 4. Still a historian might prefer to take no chances.

Despite the fair prospect announced by Velleius Paterculus, the last ten years of Augustus' reign was not a happy period — disasters abroad, insecurity at home, scandal in the dynasty.[284] One symptom was the suppression of offensive literature. Bonfires were decreed by vote of the Senate. The histories of the Pompeian Labienus were among the condemned books. Labienus took the manuscript with him to the family mausoleum and there committed suicide.[285] Livy was in no danger. That very fact may have moved him — it was invidious to publish in security when others were penalised for their freedom of speech.

Another reason might be invoked, of a technical and literary character. Livy's history would contain speeches by Augustus. To insert the original documents would be a sin against the artistic canons of ancient historiography. Instead, he would have to compose orations in his own style and manner. Yet there might be something awkward and incongruous in the publication of speeches attributed to a person still living — especially if he were the head of the State. Sallust had not done so, or, so far as is known, Pollio. A speech was meant not only to expound a policy but to express in a vivid and direct fashion a character; and Roman historians did not insert character-studies of the living.

So far a hypothesis, based on the *dicitur* in the *Periocha* of Book CXXI. The fragility of this testimony will be borne in mind.[286] It might be merely a "tradition", or a scholastic inference, deriving from the notion that the twenty-two books in question could never have been given to the world while Augustus yet lived. It may be, indeed, that the final nine were only published after A.D. 14. But there is something else. Discarding defective evidence, one can argue that Livy himself predeceased the Princeps. He may have died not in A.D. 17 but about A.D. 12.[287] However that may be, it is likely enough that the writing of his epilogue falls in the period A.D. 4–10.

An approximate date for the composition of the last portion of Livy's history has been suggested. It is tempting to speculate about his treatment of the reign of Augustus. What were Books CXXXIV–CXLII

really like? The meagre *Periochae* and other scraps give little guidance. Florus and Orosius are remarkable for their full and concordant accounts of the Cantabrian campaign of 26 B.C., certainly deriving from an abbreviation of Livy and ultimately from the *Autobiography* of Caesar Augustus.[288] Otherwise, however, those authors are an occasion of much perplexity. A brief indication must suffice. Orosius sandwiches the campaigns of Drusus in the Alps and in Germany and the African war of Cossus Cornelius Lentulus (A.D. 6) into the period of Augustus' sojourn in Spain.[289] Then, after Augustus' return, follows a string of anachronistic wars introduced by the words *quibus etiam diebus, multa per se multaque per duces et legatos bella gessit*, ranging from a campaign of Piso against the Vindelici (which may never have happened) to the disaster of Varus, ending with Agrippa's operations in the Black Sea (14 B.C.), the surrender of standards and hostages by the Parthians — and the third closing of Janus.[290]

At first sight Florus appears to preserve a more logical order.[291] He narrates the wars of the period in thirteen sections. Yet his arrangement is peculiar — he begins with the conquest of the Alpine lands (15 B.C.), and, after narrating the Spanish War, concludes with a mention of peace with Parthia, the closing of Janus (apparently that of 29 B.C.), and the conferment of the name *Augustus*. In detail, Florus is confused (as in his account of the Spanish War); the German wars pass at once from Drusus to Varus, with no mention there or anywhere else of Tiberius; and, like Orosius, he mentions several matters subsequent to 9 B.C.[292] The elucidation of Florus and Orosius presents a pretty problem for "Quellenkritik".

Cassius Dio no doubt read Livy to the end; but his account of this period does not appear to reflect Livy in any way after 29 B.C.[293] It could be argued that his full account of the campaigns of M. Crassus in Thrace is Livian. Dio narrates them under 29 B.C. In Livy, however, they do not appear until 27 B.C., after Augustus' departure to the provinces of the West, to judge by the *Periochae*.[294] Crassus' triumph, celebrated in July of that year, was therefore the justification for that arrangement of events — which was skilful. It took Crassus' exploits, and especially his claim to the *spolia opima*, out of the chronological sequence that led up to the "constitutional settlement" of January, 27 B.C. The affair of Crassus was perhaps a factor of some moment.[295]

In fact, Dio can be invoked as negative testimony, to show how Livy did not write — and could not write: secret politics, scandal, anecdote and depreciation of the government. It will suffice briefly to examine a short section of Dio's work, covering the years 18–16 B.C. Take the

following items:[296] incidents in the purging of the Senate, such as Augustus' wearing of a cuirass; the opprobrious treatment of Lepidus, the *pontifex maximus*; Antistius Labeo's spirited and witty refusal to belong to a bodyguard for the protection of the Princeps; awkward episodes in the moral legislation, such as the malicious insistence of senators that Augustus should tell them what rules of conduct he enjoined upon his own consort; the anecdote about the actors Bathyllus and Pylades; the gossip about Augustus' relations with Terentia, the wife of Maecenas.

Livy's treatment of the period 28–9 B.C. was a reversion to Republican annals. Like the Princeps in his public utterances, the historian asserted continuity with the Republican past. It was the fashion. But it was more than that. Livy was following the bent of his own nature and the tradition of his birthplace. But the men from northern Italy had also a strong imperial patriotism. The two loyalties were not inconsistent.[297] Livy, like others of his class and sentiments, the nonpolitical order in society, rescued and preserved by the new dispensation, acclaimed the rule of Caesar Augustus without feeling dishonest. The Romans were conscious of long development in the history of their state, they knew the need for change and innovation. Livy makes the tribune Canuleius state this axiom of Rome's destiny — *quis dubitat quin in aeternum urbe condita, in immensum crescente, nova imperia, sacerdotia, iura gentium hominumque instituantur.*[298] Livy's argument was adopted by his pupil, the Emperor Claudius, to justify a revolutionary innovation in the recruitment of the Roman Senate.[299]

Referring to *nova imperia*, Livy had recent or present developments in mind. To seek to reconstruct Livy's justification for the new political order would not be an idle or ambitious speculation. In brief, three arguments: the Empire is so large that it can only be preserved by a single ruler; the establishment of the Principate had been accompanied by violence — but only such as was inevitable; the result is liberty without licence, discipline without despotism.

Those pleas are put forward by one set of *prudentes* at the obsequies of Caesar Augustus, in Tacitus' presentation.[300] They also occur in the parallel passage in Cassius Dio which (it is plain) derives likewise from one of the earlier historians.[301] Nothing precludes the notion that formulations of this kind went back a long way — even to contemporaries.[302]

Such, in outline, may have been Livy's annals of *res publica restituta*. Some may have fancied that his narrative of those years was destined to

be decisive in its influence on later historians. That expectation is not borne out by the facts. Except for Censorinus, nobody appeals to Livy as the authority for any detail or opinion: that is the only quotation from Books CXXXIV–CXLII that happens to have survived.[303] Dio's procedure is significant. For Augustus he goes to historians who wrote under his successors. They are little more than names. The prosecution and suicide of Cremutius Cordus may have earned a publicity that his work was far from deserving. But impressive testimony asserts the merits of Aufidius Bassus and M. Servilius Nonianus (*cos.* A.D. 35).[304] This is not the place to raise the question of Dio's main source for the reign of Augustus. Perhaps, as some argue, Aufidius Bassus.[305] It may be that these historians disregarded Livy completely or used him only for the outline of events, and for such matters as the campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus. Aufidius also published a separate monograph on the *Bella Germaniae*, which may have been a continuation of the wars after the death of Drusus, embracing the period down to the triumph of Germanicus in A.D. 17. As for annalistic history, Livy's sources were available to Aufidius and Servilius, and they perhaps wished to write a very different kind of history.

Livy's style was obsolescent, his sentiments distasteful or irrelevant. The bright promise — or the skilful camouflage — of Augustus faded before the suspicion that *principatus* meant in fact *dominatus*. When it is not adulation, imperial history tends to be an attack, open or covert, on the imperial system. The person of Augustus, the founder of the dynasty of Julii and Claudii, was more or less protected: but the history of his reign gave opportunities for unfriendly portrayal. Livy's annals did not provide the material, for he had not been able to record the real and secret history of the dynasty.

Livy's annals of Augustus were written in joyful acceptance of the new order, in praise of the government and its achievements. Their tone was moral, their colouring benevolent. Unlike most earlier historians, he set out to provide, not only guidance for the politician, but models for the conduct of the common man.[306] The direction which the Principate had taken justified a return to the sombre and pessimistic conception of politics and of human nature that Sallust had made classical. In sentiment as in style, Livy does not fit into the development of Roman historiography that links Sallust to Tacitus.

From that line of succession a further reason debars him. The writing of history was regarded as a proper occupation for the statesman in retirement: it was not a career and a profession in itself. Livy began to write history without having learned how history is made.

If Cassius Dio can be taken as a guide, Livy, canonical for Republican history, was less influential for the history of the Triumviral period — and little regarded for the reign of Caesar Augustus. Indeed, at an earlier stage, when Dio had the choice between Livy and Sallust as sources for the campaigns of Lucullus, he chose Sallust.[307]

The reasons are not far to seek. It will be asked: was Livy at his best in Books CXXXIII–CXLII? May not those contemporary annals have exposed some of his characteristic weaknesses — his docility, his benevolence, his disinclination to grapple with historical problems, his lack of political penetration?

As is natural, the opinions of ancient critics about Livy bear upon his style, rather than his qualities as a historian. Yet the ancients would not have admitted a sharp distinction between form and substance. Certain literary judgments that have been preserved go deeper than style and execution. Pollio, so it is stated by Quintilian, blamed Livy for *Patavinitas*. An enigmatic utterance, and responsible for interminable discussion. What does it mean — style and colour, syntax, vocabulary, or even orthography? The context in which Quintilian records this observation suggests a criticism of words and idiom — Transpadane expressions comparable to the solecisms of Etruria, Praeneste, or the Sabine land.[308]

Quintilian, however, does not seem to be positive or explicit enough. He cites no examples, he neither admits nor rejects the allegation. Perhaps it was "a tradition of the schools". The opprobrious word uttered by the disdainful consular may have been meant to convey much more than a reproof for the use of local idiom. Rather a general lack of *urbanitas*.[309] Or perhaps something deeper. Patavium was a smug, opulent *municipium*. *Patavinitas* might be taken to connote the rich and ample discourse of an improving publicist.[310] In short, all that history should not be.

Caligula, spurning the classics of Augustan Rome and the literary models of his uncle Claudius, declared that Livy was careless and verbose.[311] Caligula is no guide to orthodox opinion. Yet the verdict of a scholarly and authoritative critic is disquieting. Quintilian's description, *lactea ubertas*, "a rich creaminess", was not produced in praise of a historian.[312] In another place, with sensible remarks about the education of the young, he says that Livy is a diet for boys, Sallust for men: Sallust is the *maior auctor*.[313]

NOTES

1. E. Schwartz, *RE* III 1698; M. A. Levi, *Il Tempo di Augusto* (1951), 415ff.

2. See, e.g., O. Rossbach in his edition of the *Periochae* (Teubner, 1910); A. Klotz, *RE* XIII 823ff.; M. Galdi, *L'Epitome nella letteratura latina* (1920).

3. *Hermes* XLIV (1909), 198ff.; XLVIII (1913), 542ff.; *RE* XIII 823ff.

4. *Philologus* XCI (1936), 67ff.

5. Above, p. 65.

6. Strabo XVI 748. M. Titius, the legate of Syria, received the hostages. His tenure probably falls in 13–10 B.C.

7. *Per.* CXXXIX: *sacerdote creato C. Iulio Vercondaridubno Aeduo*; CXLI: *Chumstinctus et Avectius, tribuni ex civitate Nerviorum.*

8. Cf. O. Rossbach, ad loc.

9. H. Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* XXVII (1872), 539ff. Klotz enjoins caution (*RE* XIII 820).

10. *CSE* XXXV 456.

11. The latest attempt is that of J. Bayet in his edition of Book I (Budé, 1940), XIIff. He suggests four groups for the period in question, viz. XXXI–XL; XLI–XLVII; XLVIII–LII; LIII–LXX.

12. Book XLIX seems a better beginning than XLVIII (which Bayet favours). The *Periocha* opens with *tertii Punici belli initium*, etc.

13. Cf. Florus II 6.1: *si verum tamen volumus, illud civile bellum fuit.*

14. A different conception invokes in contrast to Livy the wider and Italian sympathies of Asinius Pollio. Thus E. Gabba, *Appiano e la Storia delle Guerre civili* (1956), 82ff.

15. Thus Bayet, o.c. XIII.

16. Eutropius V 3.1; Orosius V 17.1.

17. Viz., LXXI–LXXVI, the Italian War; LXXVII–XC, to the death of Sulla; XCI–XCVI, Pompeius' reconquest of Spain; XCVII–CIII, from Crassus' victory over the Slaves to the triumph of Pompeius; CIV–CVIII, Caesar's conquest of Gaul; CIX–CXVI, from the outbreak of the Civil War to the death of Caesar; CXVII–CXXXIII, from the advent of Octavianus to the end of the Civil Wars; CXXXIV–CXLII, from the salutation of Octavianus as *Augustus* down to 9 B.C.

18. Cf. H. Peter, *HRR* I² (1914), CCCXL.

19. *Ad fam.* V 12.2.

20. To support a venturesome and vulnerable thesis, Carcopino put the abdication after the consular elections in the summer of 79 B.C., *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (1931), 265ff.

21. As suggested by E. Gabba, commenting on Appian, *Bella civilia* I 103.480 (in his edition of that book, 1958).

22. Orosius V 22.2, cf. 23.1 (four great wars under the consular date of 78 B.C.).

23. Eutropius V 9.2; VI 1.1.

24. Sallust, *Hist.* I 1 M.

25. As Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* XXVII (1872), 546; Bayet, o.c. XIV. The fact that Book XC contained Sulla's death has presumably misled them. But Sulla's abdication would have been a better date for terminatin a period of history.

26. Cf. M. Pohlenz in *'Επιτύμβιον Swoboda* (1927), 201ff.

27. Compare the *senatus consultum* of 8 B.C. concerning the month of August, notable for victories, but especially because *finisque hoc mense bellis civilibus impositus* (Macrobius I 12.35). Also Velleius II 89.3; *finita vicesimo anno bella civilia*, and Tacitus, *Ann.* III 28.1; *exim continua per viginti annos discordia*. For definitions of *bella civilia* in relation to Lucan's plan, cf. R. T. Bruère, *CP* XLV (1950), 217ff.

28. Bayet's division (o.c. XIV) of the history of 91–79 B.C. into two groups, six books and fourteen (LXXI–LXXVI and LXXVII–CX), is not attractive.

29. Thus Bayet (o.c. XIV). Klotz (*RE* XIII 819) also assumes a break at the end of Book CIII and a new section beginning with CIV — *prima pars libri situm Germaniae moresque continet*. Both scholars follow the *Periocha* of CIII which terminates with the triumph of Magnus. But it cannot be believed that Livy neglected to narrate the triumph of Pompeius (61 B.C.) until he had recounted Caesar's campaign against the Helvetii (58 B.C.). The editor of the *Periochae* does not deserve such confidence.

30. *Per.* CIII: *conspiratio inter tres civitatis principes facta est*. Cf. Florus II 13.8ff. (valuable here). Orosius neglects the notion entirely.

31. H. M. Last, *CAH* IX (1932), 349.

32. Plutarch, *Pompeius* 25.

33. Appian's conclusion is notable (*Bella Civilia* IV 137.577ff.).

34. Seneca, *Suas.* VI 21: *hoc semel aut iterum a Thucydide factum, item in paucissimis personis usurpatum a Sallustio, T. Livius benignius omnibus magnis viris praestitit*.

35. Velleius II 71.2.

36. *Res Gestae* 34.

37. Dio LIII 1.1. The passage has generally been misunderstood by constitutional precisians, e.g. in *CAH* X (1934), 123. Or, by others, passed over, e.g. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 306.

38. For this notion, cf. *Tacitus* (1958), 375; 408.

39. Since Crassus was not allowed to celebrate his triumph until July of 27 B.C. (cf. above, p. 44ff, for these transactions), there was perhaps an excuse for narrating his campaigns under 27 (i.e., in CXXXIV). But not under 26.

40. Appian, *Bella civilia* V 130.541f.

41. Above, p. 42f.

42. XXXI 1.2: *profiteri ausum perscripturum res omnis Romanas*.

43. Nissen went so far as to affirm that six more books would be required (*Rh. Mus.* XXVII (1872), 558). Compare also A. Klotz, *RE* XIII 818; Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. der r. Literatur* II[4] (1935), 300; A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung u. Quellenkunde zur r. Geschichte* (1921), 146. Bayet (o.c. XI) hints at "une date plus caractéristique, peut-être la mort d'Auguste". Also M. L. W. Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians* (1947), 80: "Livy's original plan may have been to carry his *History* down to the death of Augustus, an event which he himself only survived by three years."

44. *Aen.* VIII 714f.

45. Quoted in Pliny, *NH, praef.* 16: *satis iam sibi gloriae quaesitum, et potuisse se desidere, ni animus inquies pasceretur opere*.

46. *RE* XIII 818, cf. Bayet, o.c. XV.

47. A. Klotz, *RE* XIII 818: "offenbar hat ihm der Tod die Feder aus der Hand genommen"; Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. der r. Literatur* II[4] (1935), 300:

"wenn ihm nicht der Tod die Feder aus der Hand nahm"; A. Rosenberg, o.c. 146: "der Tod entriss ihm die Feder"; A. H. McDonald, *OCD* (1949), 509: "he probably died pen in hand".

48. *RE* XIII 819. Cf. Bayet (o.c. XVI): "la tradition manuscrite des *Periochae* nous atteste bien que le livre CXXI fut composé après la mort d'Auguste." Also A. Rostagni, *La letteratura di Roma Repubblicana ed Augustea* (1939), 389, cf. 456. Like other scholars, Rostagni suggests that Livy referred to the death of Caesar Augustus in CXXI — and referred to his own continuance in writing (attested by Pliny, *NH, praef.* 16).

49. Thus O. Rossbach in his edition (Teubner, 1910), XXIII.

50. Above, p. 30.

51. Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 299. U. Kahrstedt arrived at an average of 100–108 days per book (*Gesch. der Karthager* III (1913), 143).

52. Bayet, o.c. XXV: "la rapidité croissante du travail de l'historien, attestée pour les derniers livres."

53. Bayet, o.c. XVI: "la rapidité de composition des derniers livers, où l'historien avait moins de questions à développer." Wight Duff assumed the fact but essayed no explanation (*A literary History of Rome to the close of the Golden Age* [1909], 642).

54. Above, p. 70f.

55. *Chron.* p. 164 H (under the Year of Abraham 1958): *Messalla Corvinus orator nascitur et Titus Livius Patavinus scriptor historicus.*

56. For these and other items consult the full and careful study of R. Helm, "Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte", *Philologus* Supp. XX II (1929).

57. H. Schulz, *De M. Valerii Messallae aetate* (Prog. Stettin, 1886), 6.

58. Conspicuous and all but solitary is G. M. Hirst, *CW* XIX (1926), 138f. = *Collected Classical Papers* (1938), 12ff.

59. *Chron.* p. 164 H. Dio, however, narrates the death of Gallus under 26 B.C. (LIII 23.5ff.). It is illicit to combine that date with Jerome's statement of the poet's age and put his birth in 69 or 68, as Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 170. Cf. observations in *CQ* XXXII (1938), 40.

60. *Chron.* p. 171 H.

61. For the evidence, R. Helm, o.c. 46ff.

62. Thus *PIR*[1], V 90; F. Marx, *Wiener Studien* XIX (1892), 50ff. The fact that Frontinus (*De aq.* 102) records under A.D. 13 the appointment of another *curator aquarum* after Messalla was clearly allowed predominant weight — and it is not easy to explain away.

63. *Ex Ponto* I 7.29f., cf. *Tristia* IV 4.25ff.

64. Thus J. A. Hammer, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Panegyricus Messallae* (1925), 10; Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 23.

65. The recent article on Messalla Corvinus (*RE* VIII A 136) asserts that the evidence points "eindeutig" to A.D. 13. R. Helm, discounting the data in Jerome, came to the conclusion that the orator was apparently dead before A.D. 1 (o.c. 51).

66. I 19.3.

67. *Praef.* 9.

68. Propertius II 7.1.

69. This was first suggested by H. Dessau, *Festschrift O. Hirschfeld* (1903),

461ff. His view is generally registered with respect (e.g. Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 300), or firmly accepted (A. Rosenberg, o.c. 147).

70. I owe this point to Mason Hammond.

71. Tacitus, *Ann.* I 9.4. Cf. *Hist.* I 1.1: *omnem potentiam ad unum conferri pacis interfuit.*

72. Above, p. 49.

73. E.g., A. Klotz, *RE* XIII 818; Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 300; A. Rosenberg, o.c. 147.

74. W. Soltau, *Hermes* XXIX (1894), 611ff.; J. Bayet, o.c. XVII. Hammond supports this opinion strongly.

75. I 7.9; 8.2. Observe also *Praef.* 7: *ut . . . primordia urbium augustiora faciant.*

76. L. R. Taylor, *CR* XXXII (1918), 158; G. M. Hirst, *AJP* XLVII (1926), 347ff. = *Collected Classical Papers* (1938), 1ff.

77. Velleius II 91.1, etc.

78. IV 20.5–11.

79. IV 20.7: *prope sacrilegium ratus sum Cosso spoliorum suorum Caesarem, ipsius templi auctorem, subtrahere testem.*

80. IV 20.11: *Iovem prope ipsum, cui vota erant, Romulumque intuens, haud spernendos falsi tituli testes.*

81. IV 32.4 (428 B.C.): *qui priore bello tribunus militum . . . spolia opima Iovis Feretrii templo intulerit.*

82. As suggested by W. Soltau, *Hermes* XXIX (1894), 611ff.; *Livius Geschichtswerk, seine Komposition und seine Quellen* (1897), 18. Bayet claims other insertions in Book IV (Budé, 1946, 125). On Livy's methods of composition in this book see R. M. Ogilvie, *JRS* XLVIII (1958), 40ff.

83. First divined by Dessau, *Hermes* XLI (1906), 142ff.

84. Dio LI 24.4.

85. Dio reports a vote of the Senate that Caesar should have the right to dedicate *spolia opima*, even if he had killed no enemy general (XLIV 4.2). That is a patent anachronism — and instructive for the estimate of certain other honours allegedly voted.

86. Dio LI 24.4.

87. Thus Dessau, o.c. 142ff.

88. O. Hirschfeld, *Kl. Schriften* (1913), 398f.

89. *CAH* VII 507f.; X 125.

90. The difficulty could be got around by supposing that the family restored the inscription in a more recent age. Thus J. H. Bishop, *Latomus* VII (1948), 187ff.

91. Cicero, *De div.* I 30.

92. Pliny, *NH* VIII 197. With this goes the remarkable fact reported by Dio (LVIII 7.2) that Sejanus had a statue of Fortuna in his house — i.e., taken from the Forum Boarium. The vestments perished, it can be assumed, on October 18, A.D. 31. For a reconstruction, cf. *Hermes* LXXXIV (1956), 257ff.

93. Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* IV 40.

94. Livy XXIV 47.15, cf. XXV 7.6.

95. For the problems concerning this document, see now J. Crook, *JRS* XLVII (1957), 36ff.

96. Nepos, *Atticus* 20.3.

97. *Ib.* 22.3.

98. *Ib.* 20.3: *cum . . . vetustate atque incuria detecta prolaberetur.*
99. *Res Gestae* 19.
100. IV 20.7.
101. The triumph had been voted him jointly to Octavianus and to Crassus; and, according to some accounts, says Dio (LI 25.2), it was only the former that took the salutation of *imperator*. It is in fact the seventh, registered in 29 B.C. (*ILS* 81). Crassus, however, was allowed to celebrate a triumph, but not until July, 27 B.C.
102. E. Groag, *RE* XIII 283ff. This opinion is viewed with favour in *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 308f.
103. Bayet, o.c. XVIIff.
104. I 10.6f.
105. Bayet, o.c. XVIII. The lower date depends on his assumption that Crassus' claim and its rebuttal occurred in 29 B.C.
106. IV 20.7.
107. IV 23.3. For Macer and the *libri lintei* see R. M. Ogilvie, *JRS* XLVIII (1958), 40ff.
108. I 10.7.
109. IV 3f.
110. V 51ff.
111. *Divus Julius* 79.4: *migraturum Alexandream vel Ilium.*
112. E.g., E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus*[3] (1922), 521: "zweifellos durchaus zutreffend."
113. Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 305f.
114. F. Münzer, *RE* VII 324ff.; O. Hirschfeld, *Kl. Schriften* (1913), 273ff.; E. Täubler, *Klio* XII (1912), 219ff.; A. Momigliano, *CQ* XXXVI (1942), 111ff.; J. Bayet in his edition of Book V (Budé, 1954, 155).
115. Cf. F. Klingner, *Gnomon* XI (1935), 577ff., reviewing E. Burck, *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius* (1934). Klingner even points to Valerius Antias as perhaps "der Camillus-Historiker" (o.c. 587).
116. Above, p 55.
117. Bayet, o.c. XIX: "si bien que les passages ampoulés où Caesar Augustus est loué finissent par faire figure de palinodie, ou, au moins, de palliatif."
118. I 10.7.
119. Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* I 70f. On which observe the valuable observations of E. Norden, *Neue Jahrbücher* VII (1901), 259; 279ff.
120. I 3.2.
121. *Aen.* I 267ff.
122. *Aen.* VI 763ff.
123. IV 29.7.
124. IV 26.
125. IV 56f.
126. XXIX 37.
127. VII 25.9: *adeo in quae laboramus sola crevimus, divitias luxuriamque*; 40.2: *nondum erant tam fortes ad sanguinem civilem*; IX 19.15: *absit invidia verbo et civilia bella sileant.*
128. Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 335f., where *Praef.* 9 is cited.
129. XXVIII 12.12.
130. E.g., A. Klotz, *RE* XIII 818; Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 300.

131. Velleius II 90.4. He is refuted by Dio in 24, 22, and 19 B.C. (LIII 29.1ff.; LIV 5.1ff.; 11.2ff.).

132. For the Spanish wars see further above, p. 65.

133. Donatus, *Vita* 27.

134. Above, p. 40ff.

135. M. L. W. Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians* (1947), 77.

136. K. Witte, *Rh. Mus.* LXV (1910), 419; H. Dessau, *Gesch. der r. Kaiserzeit* I (1926), 540: "ohne ernstliche Vorstudien".

137. The affirmation of A. Rosenberg that he obviously did not belong to the "Adelsgeschlechter" of Padua (o.c. 144) is not supported by evidence or argument. His presumed gravestone, *T. Livius C. f. sibi et suis*, etc., with two sons and a wife, *Cassia Sex. f. Prima* (*ILS* 2919), registers no local magistracy. Laistner (o.c. 67) betrays strange misconceptions about citizenship and nomenclature.

138. There is the inscription *IG* III 594=II² 4141: *ἡ βουλὴ/Λίβιον* (near the Propylaea). It is adduced by P. Graindor, *Musée belge* XXVIII (1923), 135; *Athènes sous Auguste* (1927), 96.

139. It is perhaps a little hopeful to say that "his work reflects knowledge of the Empire, presumably gathered in travel" (A. H. McDonald, *OCD* (1949), 509).

140. Seneca, *Controv.* X *praef.* 2.

141. Quintilian X 1.39. For other writings of Livy, see Seneca, *Epp.* 100.9.

142. The subject is too large to be dealt with in this place. For an acute appraisal of Livy in relation to his predecessors see A. H. McDonald, *JRS* XLVII (1957), 155ff.

143. *De legibus* I 2.

144. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* I (1898), 270ff.

145. Seneca, *Controv.* X *praef.* 5: *color orationis antiquae, vigor novae.*

146. *Ib.* I *praef.* 12.

147. Quintilian X 1.39.

148. *Ib.* X 1.113, cf. Tacitus, *Dial.* 18.2.

149. Catullus 12; Charisius, *GL* 124K.

150. As can be argued from *Ecl.* VIII 11: *a te principium, tibi desinet.* This looks like the original dedication — before the poet was impelled to praise the heir of Caesar (*Ecl.* I). Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 253.

151. According to Pliny, *divi Augusti principatu obiit* (*NH* IX 137; X 60). But he has failed to achieve *PIR*.

152. Suetonius, *Divus Claudius* 41.1.

153. Seneca, *Controv.* IX 1.14; 2.26; Quintilian II 5.20; VIII 2.18; X 1.39.

154. That has been argued by V. Lundström, *Eranos* XXVII (1929), 1ff. Against, Bayet, o.c. VIII.

155. *De oratore* II 54, cf. *Orator* 66.

156. S. G. Stacey, *Archiv für lat. Lex.* X (1898), 17ff. For criticism which corrects but does not invalidate Stacey's view see K. Gries, *Constancy in Livy's Latinity* (Diss. Columbia, 1949).

157. Cf. Bayet, o.c. LXIV.

158. Orators who aped Thucydides moved Cicero to righteous anger (*Orator* 32).

159. E. Norden, o.c. 256ff.

160. Seneca, *Controv.* IX 2.6.

161. *Ib.* IX 1.14. The original was in fact a Demosthenic phrase.
162. Martial XI 16; Pliny, *Epp.* I 14.6.
163. Cicero, *Phil.* XII 10.
164. Macrobius I 11.22.
165. E. Norden, o.c. 234ff.
166. Suetonius, *De gramm.* 10.4.
167. *Odes* II 1.1.
168. *Praef.* 2: *dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt.*
169. Contrast and even aversion is deduced from the *Praefatio* by L. Amundsen, *Symb. Osl.* XXV (1947), 31.
170. Seneca, *Suas.* VI 27.
171. For the meaning of *Patavinitas*, above, p. 76.
172. Seneca, *Epp.* 114.17.
173. At least, Varro dedicated the *Antiquitates* to him (Augustine, *Civ. dei* VII 35). But too much is made of the monarchic motive in Caesar's policy by J. Carcopino, *Histoire romaine* II (1936), 996ff.
174. Cf. A. Alföldi, *Mus. Helv.* VIII (1951), 190ff.
175. IV 3.17 (the speech of Canuleius): *optimis regum, novis hominibus.* For later exploitation of the plebeian King, Servius Tullius, by the *novus homo* Sejanus, cf. *Hermes* LXXXIV (1956), 257ff.
176. Cf. J. Gagé, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* XLVII (1930), 138ff.
177. Suetonius, *Divus Aug.* 95.
178. Dio XLVIII 43.4.
179. Florus II 34.66.
180. Ennius, quoted by Varro, *Res rusticae* III 1.2.
181. I 16.4.
182. Above, p. 48.
183. V 49.7.
184. *Res Gestae* 10, cf. Dio LI 20.1.
185. *Res Gestae* 20.
186. Above, p. 45.
187. Dio L 4.5.
188. Dio LI 20.4. Last recorded in 63 B.C. (XXXVII 24.2).
189. It is not perhaps important that he should ignore that scholar's view of the *spolia opima — M. Varro ait opima spolia esse, etiam si manipularis miles detraxerit, dummodo duci hostium* (Festus p. 204L). But it appears that he was unaware of the cycle of 110 years for the *Ludi Saeculares*, cf. the evidence of Censorinus, who cites *commentarii* and Horace's hymn against Livy (*De die natali* 17.9).
190. I 25.6ff.
191. I 24.4ff.
192. The *Arvales* are not in Dionysius either. Hence a clue to the value of the sources they employ.
193. His account of Numa does not therefore reflect even partially "die Reformbestrebungen des Augustus", as G. Stübler claims (*Die Religiosität des Livius* (1941), 34).
194. *Praef.* 4: *festinantibus ad haec nova quibus iam pridem praevalentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt.*
195. The concept of "Augustan" requires careful definition and restrained

handling. Cf. above, p. 28, and *JRS* XXXV (1945), 404. Also A. Momigliano, *ib.* 124ff. and A. H. McDonald in *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (ed. M. Platnauer, 1954), 397, referring to "the higher interpretation of his Augustan sentiment."

196. A. Rostagni, *Scritti minori* II 2 (1956), 201ff.

197. XXXI 1.5: *iam provideo animo, velut qui proximis litori vadis inducti mare pedibus ingrediuntur, quidquid progredior, in vastiorem me altitudinem ac velut profundum invehi, et crescere paene opus quod prima quaeque perficiendo minui videbatur.*

198. *Odes* II 1.6.

199. Tacitus, *Ann.* IV 34.3.

200. Macrobius II 4.18 (in answer to Strabo, i.e., Seius Strabo).

201. Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 317f.; *Tacitus* (1958), 432ff.

202. Seneca, *NQ* V 18.4.

203. *Aen.* VI 826ff.

204. Suetonius, *Divus Claudius* 41.1.

205. Seneca, *De clem.* I 10.1.

206. Tacitus, *Ann.* IV 34.4.

207. Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 373; 419ff.

208. See the detailed study of F. Blumenthal, *Wiener Studien* XXXV (1913), 113ff.; XXXVI (1914), 84ff. For the fragments, E. Malcovati, *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta*[3] (1948), 84ff.

209. Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* I 9.

210. *Aen.* VIII 688.

211. Brutus to Atticus (*Ad M. Brutum* 25.5 = I 17.5, cf. Plutarch, *Cicero* 45).

212. Plutarch, *Cicero* 49.

213. Quoted by Seneca, *Suas.* VI 22: *omnium adversorum nihil ut viro dignum erat tulit praeter mortem, quae vere aestimanti minus indigna videri potuit quod a victore inimico nihil crudelius passurus erat quam quod eiusdem fortunae compos victo fecisset.*

214. Plutarch, *Brutus* 2; 13; 23; 48.

215. O. Hirschfeld, *Kl. Schriften* (1913), 781ff.

216. For the propaganda war, K. Scott, *Mem. Am. Ac. Rome* XI (1933), 7ff.; M. P. Charlesworth, *CQ* XXVII (1933), 172ff.

217. That was not properly cleared up before the studies of Schwartz and Sternkopf, *Hermes* XXXIII (1898), 185ff.; XLVII (1912), 321ff.

218. *Ad Att.* XVI 7.1; *Phil.* I 8. Cf. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 117f.

219. Gelzer (*RE* X 1000) suggests that Brutus did not move until he learned of that session. Probably too late.

220. Lucan VII 441.

221. Pliny, *NH* II 147; Obsequens 65 (50 B.C.).

222. XLIII 13.1.

223. Obsequens 70 (17 B.C.).

224. Notably in the winter of 23–22 B.C. (Dio LIII 33.5).

225. For Tacitus' practice, cf. *AJP* LXXIX (1958), 18ff.

226. Dio LIII 19.

227. Above, p. 71.

228. *PIR*[2], A 1129; C 1167.

229. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), 261ff.

230. Justin XLII 5.11f.

231. R. Helm, *RE* XXI 2301.
232. Justin XXXVIII 3.11.
233. Seneca, *Controv.* X, *praef.* 4ff.
234. Tacitus, *Ann.* IV 34.1.
235. Seneca, *Ad Marciam* 26.1: *proscribentes in aeternum ipse proscripsit.*
236. Suetonius, *Tib.* 61.3; Dio LVII 24.3.
237. Suetonius, *Divus Aug.* 35.2.
238. Kornemann argued that he was the main source of Appian's *Bella civilia* (*Klio* XVII (1921), 33ff.). Against, W. Ensslin, *Klio* XX (1926), 463ff.
239. E. Meyer, *Kl. Schriften* I (1910), 421.
240. The terminal date of 27 B.C., assumed by Honigmann (*RE* IV A 90) and others, can hardly be correct.
241. Jacoby, *F Gr H* II C 229.
242. For a discussion, strongly negative, see R. Laqueur, *RE* VI A 1063ff.
243. Seneca, *Epp.* 91.13.
244. IX 18.6. For Timagenes, R. Laqueur, *RE* VI A 1063ff.; P. Treves, *Il mito di Alessandro e la Roma d'Augusto* (1953), 39ff.
245. Suetonius, *Divus Aug.* 85.1: *Cantabrico tenus bello nec ultra.*
246. Appian, *Ill.* 15.
247. As is clear from the accounts in Orosius V 21.1–5; Florus II 33.
248. Failure to allow for the second army impairs the value of D. Magie's study (*CP* XV (1920), 323ff.). Cf. observations in *AJP* LV (1934), 293ff. Schulten's elaborate work is very useful (*Los Cantabros y Astures y su Guerra con Roma*, 1943), but contains errors, e.g. his notion that Lucus (Lugo, in Asturia) was in Roman hands before the war (o.c. 177).
249. Cf. *AJP* LV (1934), 305ff.
250. Suetonius, *Divus Aug.* 36.
251. Dio LV 25.1.
252. Pliny, *NH* V 35f.
253. *NH* V 94.
254. Tacitus, *Ann.* III 48.1; Strabo XII, p. 569.
255. Though Cn. Piso (*cos.* 7 B.C.), a former proconsul, told him something about African geography (II, p. 130).
256. Tacitus, *Ann.* IV 32.1.
257. Dio LIII 25.3ff.; LIV 20.1ff.
258. These two factors must always be allowed for when there is obscurity or dispute about the dates of certain military operations. Cf. *JRS* XXIII (1933), 120ff.; *CQ* XXVII (1933), 146; *Klio* XXVII (1934), 138.
259. Some of the information had been supplied previously, in the digression on Germany (*Per.* CIV); perhaps also in the account of Octavianus' campaigns in Illyricum in 35 and 34 B.C. (CXXXI and CXXXII). Fresh knowledge had accrued.
260. Cf. *AJP* LV (1934), 314.
261. Velleius II 90.4.
262. *Odes* IV 4 and 14.
263. Dio LIV 20.1.
264. Velleius II 97.1.
265. Dio LIV 20.4ff. (under 16 B.C.). Obsequens 71 has 17 B.C., presumably the true date.

266. Velleius II 96.3; Florus II 24.8; Dio LIV 24.3 (without any general's name).
267. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 435.
268. Dio LIV 3.
269. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 427.
270. Velleius II 104.2.
271. *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 424f.; 450.
272. Velleius II 100–104.
273. Velleius II 116.5: *neque enim iustus sine mendacio candor apud bonos crimini est.*
274. Quintilian II 5.19: *candidissimus*; XI 101: *mirae iucunditatis clarissimique candoris.*
275. H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der 4. und 5. Dekade des Livius* (1863), 29ff. On "Livy as Scripture" cf. M. Hadas, *AJP* LXI (1940), 445ff.; on improving distortions, P. G. Walsh, *AJP* LXXVI (1955), 369ff.
276. Observe especially the emotional and adulatory expressions of Valerius Maximus, V 5.3: *eodemque tempore et fraternae maiestati cessit et vita excessit. his scio equidem nullum aliud quam Castoris et Pollucis specimen consanguineae caritatis convenienter adici posse.*
277. Dio LV 6.6. Not in the *Res Gestae.*
278. *Res Gestae* 16.
279. Dio LIV 36.2.
280. Orosius' date of 2 B.C. is explicitly, and naturally, that of the Nativity (VI 22.1, cf. I 1.6; VII 2.16). Mommsen argued plausibly for a date between 8 and 1 B.C. (*Res Gestae Divi Augusti* [1883], 50). A third closing of Janus in 13 B.C. has been proposed by I. S. Ryberg, *Mem. Am. Ac. Rome* XIX (1949), 92f. It is attractive at first sight, but not easy to accept.
281. Schanz-Hosius, o.c. 300, assumes an interpolation. O. Rossbach defends the passage in his edition (Teubner, 1910), XV. He appeals to the phrase with which the derivative *Liber prodigiorum* terminates — *multitudo Romanorum per insidias subiecta est.* That is, a reference to the *clades Variana.*
282. Velleius II 117.2.
283. Above, p. 38.
284. Cf. Pliny, *NH* VII 149: *iuncta deinde tot mala*, etc.
285. Seneca, *Controv.* X, *praef.* 5.
286. Above, p. 39.
287. Above, p. 41.
288. Above, p. 41.
289. Orosius VI 21.1–21.
290. *Ib.* 22–29.
291. Florus II 22–34.
292. Of wars subsequent to 9 B.C., Orosius mentions the *Bellum Gaetulicum* of Cossus Lentulus, Tiberius' operations in Germany and Illyricum (taken from Suetonius and Eutropius, erroneously conflated) and the disaster of Varus. Florus has Cossus Lentulus, the Varian disaster, C. Caesar in Armenia, also Vibius in Dalmatia (II 23, presumably C. Vibius Postumus operating in A.D. 9). Further, of uncertain date, Sulpicius Quirinius against the Marmaridae (? c. 14 B.C.), Lentulus (the Augur) against Dacians and Sarmatians (which might be in 9 B.C.).
293. E. Schwartz, *RE* III 1698. At what point did Dio desert Livy? M. A. Levi

suggests a new source in 27 B.C., at LIII 17 (*Il Tempo di Augusto* [1951], 426; 433). The beginning of Book LII, however, in 29 B.C., looks attractive.

294. *Per.* CXXXIV. But they also occur in *Per.* CXXXV, followed by Augustus' war in Spain and the conquest of the Salassi.

295. Above, p. 44ff.

296. Dio LIV 13.1–19.4.

297. Cf. G. E. F. Chilver, *Cisalpine Gaul* (1941), 208ff.

298. IV 4.4.

299. *ILS* 212 (Lugdunum); Tacitus, *Ann.* XI 24. Cf. A. Momigliano, *Claudius. The Emperor and his Achievement* (1934), 17f.

300. *Ann.* I 9.4f.

301. Dio LVI 43f., on which cf. *Tacitus* (1958), 272f.

302. Cf. Florus II 14.5f. (possibly deriving from Livy): *perculsum undique ac perturbatum ordinavit imperii corpus, quod haud dubie numquam coire et consentire potuisset nisi unius praesidis nutu quasi anima et mente regeretur.*

303. Censorinus. *De die natali* 17.9 = fr. 56 Weissenborn.

304. Quintilian X 1.102; Tacitus, *Dial.* 23.4.

305. E.g. F. A. Marx, *Klio* XXVI (1933), 323ff.; XXIX (1936), 202ff. For this historian see now *Tacitus* (1958), 274ff.; 697ff. A proper investigation into Dio's treatment of the reign of Augustus is sorely needed.

306. R. Heinze, *Vergils epische Technik*[3] (1914), 475f.

307. Th. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator* (1890), 449f.

308. Quintilian I 5.56: *taceo de Tuscis et Sabinis et Praenestinis quoque: nam ut eorum sermone utentem Vettium Lucilius insectatur, quemadmodum Pollio reprehendit in Livio Patavinitatem, licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam.* The other passage (VIII 1.12) adds nothing.

309. K. Latte, *CP* XXXV (1940), 56; A. H. McDonald, *JRS* XLVII (1957), 172.

310. As suggested in *Rom. Rev.* (1939), 485f.

311. Suetonius, *Cal.* 34.6.

312. Quintilian X 1.32: *neque illa Livii lactea ubertas satis docebit eum qui non speciem expositionis sed fidem quaerit.*

313. II 5.19: *ego optimos quidem et statim et semper, sed tamen eorum candidissimum quemque et maxime expositum velim, ut Livium a pueris magis quam Sallustium; et hic historiae maior est auctor.*

POSTSCRIPT. For help, and for various improvements, I owe a great debt to Professor Mason Hammond and to Mr. R. M. Ogilvie.