

## FORM AND LANGUAGE IN LIVY'S TRIUMPH NOTICES

JANE E. PHILLIPS

MANY scholars have discussed the annalistic style of Livy, especially the way he and his predecessors developed and expanded the bare records of the Roman past in accordance with the principles of rhetorical historiography.<sup>1</sup> It has often been pointed out how marked a stylistic distinction there is between the historian's elaborate accounts and the curt, bald notices with which he begins and ends each consular year—elections, the inauguration of new magistrates, provincial and troop allotments, prodigies, and the like. And the conclusion is generally drawn that the notices in the plain manner faithfully reproduce the official *Annales Maximi* in style as well as in substance.<sup>2</sup> However, students of Livy, preferring to concentrate on the rhetorically more interesting sections, have had little or nothing further to say about the stylistic features of the annual notices. Consideration of them from an artistic point of view has confined itself to explanations for their inclusion in the history. Reasons suggested are Livy's desire to give an impression of authenticity, or to establish an effective contrast with the more ornamental passages, or to show his love for the traditions of the Roman past.<sup>3</sup>

Yet it would seem that more might be said. Granted that the annual notices reflect

the style of the pontifical annals, is this similarity only because their ultimate source is the pontifical annals? It is hard to believe in a Livy who was merely a copyist (and that sporadically), and who exercised not even editorial control over his material. It seems more reasonable to assume that as a serious writer Livy was capable of controlling what he wrote at all times, not just when he faced the composition of an important speech or the narrative of a critical battle. True enough that the annual notices are written in a flat, rather monotonous fashion; we may still ask by what means this monotonous effect is achieved and to what degree it is done deliberately. A second question is how "official" Livy's language in these reports actually is; how far does he maintain the linguistic appearance of state records?

The following essay will give a close examination of repetitive elements and technical vocabulary in one of the kinds of annual notices, the triumph reports. Triumphs, of course, do not necessarily occur annually, but they do occur frequently enough to have a regular place in the annalistic material in Livy, and triumph reports are drawn from the same ultimate source as the strictly annual material, the *Annales Maximi*.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, for one part of the triumph reports, we possess a

1. Most important, E. Burck, *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius* (Berlin, 1934); A. Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1940–41); cf. also P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 110 ff., esp. pp. 120 ff.; E. Badian, "The Early Historians," in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London, 1966), pp. 11–23.

2. H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin, 1863), pp. 89–91, 101; C. Cichorius, s.v. "Annales," *RE*, I (1894), 2256; W. Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk: Seine Komposition und seine Quellen* (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 27–28, 85–86; H. Bornecque, *Tite-Live* (Paris, 1933), p. 72; Walsh, pp. 30–31, 121. For the

style of the pontifical annals, Cic. *De or.* 2. 52–53, *Legg.* 1. 6. Cf. also Quint. *Inst.* 10. 2. 7.

The belief that Livy's annual notices substantially reproduce the content of the *Annales Maximi* has been recently challenged in the case of prodigy reports by E. Rawson, "Prodigy Lists and the Use of the *Annales Maximi*," *CQ*, XXI (1971), 158–69, but her conclusions, even if accepted, do not affect the stylistic question.

3. Walsh, pp. 30–31; A. H. McDonald, "The Style of Livy," *JRS*, XLVII (1957), 155–57.

4. Sempronius Asellio *Frag.* 2P; cf. Cichorius (n. 2) and col. 2250; Soltau, pp. 27–33, 85–97.

parallel official record, the *Fasti Triumphales*, as comparative material.

Discussion will be limited to a review of the triumphs reported in Books 21–45. The accounts of Livy's predecessors for the period covered by these books would have been much fuller than for the period of the first decade. And the earlier historians themselves would have had much more complete documentary material as their source. The consequence for Livy of this relative abundance is that he had much more freedom of choice: he could develop, concentrate, omit, or emphasize as he saw fit, within the relatively wide bounds set by the material available. We have no cause to assume that he would merely have accepted the judgment of previous writers in these matters, instead of making his own decisions. What he did in fact do when the possibility was before him is the question that concerns us here.

In these two and a half decades, then, Livy reports the celebration of thirty-eight triumphs or ovations, in thirty-seven separate notices.<sup>5</sup> His treatment covers the whole range, from a sparsely written notice only one or two sentences long (e.g., 40. 16. 11) to detailed accounts of political conflicts attendant on some general's request for permission to triumph (38. 44. 9–50. 3, 39. 4. 2–5. 6, 45. 35. 4–39), or lengthy descriptions of especially impressive displays of captured wealth (34. 52. 4–10). Broad as the scope of treatment is, there are regularly recurring

elements that give structural definition to the triumph notices.

A full triumph or ovation notice falls into two halves with a total of five standard parts; all the parts do not necessarily appear in every notice (see Table 1).<sup>6</sup> The first half describes the preliminaries to the celebration, and begins with the formal report to the senate made by the returning general and his request for a triumph. The announcement of the senate's decree follows, with any discussion that may have accompanied the decision. The second half concerns the triumphal ceremony itself, in which the actual statement of the triumph is given, followed by the list of booty carried in the triumphal procession or, what amounts to the same thing, deposited in the treasury; there may be additional details about the spoils, the captives, or other extraordinary features of the procession. Finally any bonus or donative given to the soldiers and officers as part of the celebration is reported.<sup>7</sup>

The general's report to the senate and request for a triumph is handled with only a moderate amount of substantive expansion. Livy may summarize points that the general was supposed to have made in his speech (26. 21. 2, 37. 58. 3), or specify the location of his campaigns (39. 4. 2, 41. 13. 6, 42. 21. 7), or subordinate the fact of the request proper to the questionable motives of the person making it (31. 47. 6). But such additions are not frequent nor always very striking when they

5. Triumphs: 26. 21. 1–10, 28. 9. 7–20, 30. 45. 2–5, 31. 47. 6–49. 3, 33. 22. 1–23. 9, 33. 37. 9–12, 34. 10. 6–7, 34. 46. 2–3, 34. 52. 3–12, 36. 39. 4–40. 14, 37. 46. 1–6, 37. 58. 3–5, 37. 58. 6–59. 6, 38. 44. 9–50. 3 and 39. 6. 3–7. 5, 39. 4. 1–5 and 17, 39. 42. 2–4, 40. 34. 7–8, 40. 38. 8–9, 40. 43. 4–7, 40. 59. 1–3, 41. 7. 1–3, 41. 13. 6–8, 42. 21. 6–7, 45. 35. 4–40. 5, 45. 42. 2–3, 45. 43. 1–8. Ovations: 26. 21. 1–10, 31. 20. 1–7, 33. 27. 1–2, 34. 10. 3–7, 36. 21. 10–11 and 39. 1–2 (a repeated notice), 39. 29. 4–7, 40. 16. 11, 41. 28. 1–3 and 6.

6. Table 1 shows the division into parts, as defined here, for each notice. Examination of the chart will give an idea of the regularity with which the several parts recur. Text

references to all the items in each category will be found in Table 1 rather than in the notes; irregularly or rarely appearing items are reviewed in the main body of the paper.

7. Livy refers to two triumphs without actually reporting them. The naval triumph of Q. Fabius Labeo is mentioned at 37. 60. 6 and again at 38. 47. 5; the report proper may have been overlooked as Livy changed from one source to another. He also quotes a dedicatory inscription put up by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus in which Gracchus mentions a triumph not reported in the extant text of Livy (41. 28. 8–10); the report evidently was in a now lost part of the text, since it is mentioned in *Per.* 41.

TABLE 1

OCCURRENCE OF STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS IN TRIUMPH AND OVATION REPORTS, LIVY 21-45

Report / Request	Senate Proceedings	Celebration	Parade	Donative
26. 21. 1-2	26. 21. 3-5	26. 21. 6	26. 21. 6-10	
28. 9. 7	28. 9. 8-10		28. 9. 11-16	28. 9. 17
		30. 45. 2	30. 45. 3 and 4-6	30. 45. 3
31. 20. 2	31. 20. 3-6	31. 20. 6	31. 20. 7	31. 20. 7
31. 47. 6-7	31. 48. 1-49. 1	31. 49. 2	31. 49. 2-3	
33. 22. 1	33. 22. 2-23. 2	33. 23. 4	33. 23. 4-7	33. 23. 7
33. 22. 1	33. 22. 2-10	33. 23. 8	33. 23. 8-9	33. 23. 9
		33. 27. 1	33. 27. 2	
	33. 37. 9	33. 37. 10	33. 37. 11	33. 37. 12
	34. 10. 5	34. 10. 3	34. 10. 4	
		34. 10. 6	34. 10. 7	
		34. 46. 2	34. 46. 2	34. 46. 3
34. 52. 3	34. 52. 3	34. 52. 3 and 10	34. 52. 4-10	34. 52. 11
		36. 21. 10	36. 21. 11	
		36. 39. 1	36. 39. 2	
36. 39. 5	36. 39. 6-40. 10	36. 40. 11	36. 40. 11-12	36. 40. 13
37. 46. 2	37. 46. 2	37. 46. 2	37. 46. 3-6	
37. 58. 3	37. 58. 3	37. 58. 4	37. 58. 4	
37. 58. 7	37. 58. 7-59. 1	37. 59. 2	37. 59. 2-5	37. 59. 6
38. 44. 9-10	38. 44. 11-50. 3	39. 6. 3	39. 7. 1-2	39. 7. 2
39. 4. 2	39. 4. 3-5. 6	39. 5. 13	39. 5. 14-16	39. 5. 17
39. 29. 4	39. 29. 4-5		39. 29. 6	
	39. 42. 2	39. 42. 2	39. 42. 3	
	39. 42. 2	39. 42. 4	39. 42. 4	
		40. 16. 11	40. 16. 11	
		40. 34. 7	40. 34. 8	40. 34. 8
	40. 38. 8	40. 38. 9	40. 38. 9	
		40. 43. 5	40. 43. 6	40. 43. 7
		40. 59. 1	40. 59. 2	40. 59. 2
		41. 7. 2	41. 7. 2	41. 7. 3
		41. 7. 2	41. 7. 2	41. 7. 3
41. 13. 6	41. 13. 6	41. 13. 6	41. 13. 7	41. 13. 7-8
	41. 28. 3	41. 28. 6	41. 28. 6	
42. 21. 7	42. 21. 7	42. 21. 7		
	45. 35. 4		45. 40. 1-4	45. 40. 5
	45. 35. 4	45. 42. 2	45. 42. 2	45. 42. 3
	45. 35. 4	45. 43. 1	45. 43. 4-6	45. 43. 7

are made. The vocabulary of the report and request is fairly regular. Livy uses the exceedingly common phrase *res gestae* for the "deeds" of the general, a standard usage in military contexts.<sup>8</sup> The verbs used for delivery of the speech are *disserere* (26. 21. 2, 36. 39. 5, 37. 58. 7, 39. 4. 2; *edisserere* at 34. 52. 3) or *exponere* (28. 9. 7, 31. 20. 2, 31. 47. 7, 42. 21. 7), with one appearance of *commemorare* (38. 44. 10).

The word for making the formal request is regularly *postulare*, although *petere* is used twice, and in fact *postulare* seems to be the usual Latin term for submitting a formal request to a governing body.<sup>9</sup> The fullest form of the request itself, as seen at 38. 44. 10, is "ut diis immortalibus honos haberetur sibique triumphanti urbem invehni liceret." The first part, "ut diis immortalibus honos haberetur," is found

8. The use of the phrase in the standard authors is too well known to require documentation; cf. *TLL*, VI, 1944. 31 ff. Other occurrences: *CIL* 12. 626. 6; Sempronius Asellio Frag. 1P; Claudius Quadrigarius Frag. 48P.

9. Cf. *Lex Urs.*, *CIL* 12. 594. 100 and 105; tribunician

decree from the trials of the Scipios, Gell. *NA* 6. 19. 5. Less conclusive are Cic. *Balb.* 34 and *Fam.* 1. 2. 1. For its use in civil and criminal law, A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (Philadelphia, 1953), s.v.

in several other places in Livy (e.g., 37. 59. 1, 38. 48. 16, 41. 17. 3), not always with reference to a triumph, but always in the context of a victory. It cannot be precisely paralleled in documentary material, but its unvarying appearances in Livy suggest that, if it is not itself borrowed from ritual language, it certainly imitates an official style.<sup>10</sup> The second part, "triumphanti sibi urbem invehi (inire) liceret," is also not supported by evidence outside Livy, though it is found often, and usually without the first part.<sup>11</sup> Three times Livy says simply *triumphum postulare* (33. 22. 1, 39. 29. 4, 42. 21. 7), and once *petere ut triumphum decernerent* (39. 4. 2).

Because the decree granting the triumph or ovation concerns the senate and therefore involves politics, this is the place where Livy has the greatest opportunity to apply his rhetorical talents and present his readers with stirring speeches for and against the proposed triumph. More or less full descriptions of the instances, and some of them are very full indeed.<sup>12</sup> In the other reports of senatorial action only the decree is mentioned. The point to note here is that Livy regularly uses the same few

expressions to indicate the decree itself, whether he is writing the extended or the abbreviated accounts. *Decernere* is much the most common, appearing in sixteen reports; Livy also uses *consensus* (*consentire*) and *ex senatus consulto*.<sup>13</sup> All three are familiar from their application to senatorial procedure in the literary sources, but they are also found often enough in documents to substantiate their attribution to bureaucratic language.<sup>14</sup> In three cases Livy avoids altogether the standard words. At 31. 20. 5 he describes the decision thus: *decurrebatur tamen eo, ut . . .*; at 26. 21. 4 he says *medium visum est*; and at 39. 29. 5, *medius tamen honos habitus*. In each case a triumph was requested but only an ovation granted, a situation which may have led Livy to a search for alternate expressions (though *decernere* is used of an ovation at 41. 28. 3). On the other hand, he does not use *censere* or *placere* here, words known from their procedural application in other sources and in other parts of Livy's history.<sup>15</sup>

The core of the triumph and ovation reports is the announcement that the triumph or ovation was held.<sup>16</sup> In the triumph statement (ovations will be con-

10. Cf. R. Laqueur, "Über das Wesen des römischen Triumphs," *Hermes*, XLIV (1909), 215–18, who regards the whole phrase as official; for *honorem habere*, *TLL*, VI, 2922. 83–84.

11. The phrase is found at 26. 21. 2 (*inire*), 28. 9. 7 (*inire*), 31. 20. 2, 31. 47. 6, 36. 39. 5, 38. 44. 10; cf. Weissenborn-Müller's note on 39. 4. 2. Also in a refused request, 35. 8. 9, and Weissenborn-Müller, *ad loc.* H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph* (Leyden, 1970), p. 163, regards it as not only the official request form but also the correct expression for "to triumph," solely on the basis of its frequency in the first decade of Livy. But cf. the discussion below on *triumphare*.

12. Course of the debate reported at 26. 21. 3–4, 28. 9. 8–10, 31. 20. 3–6, 31. 48. 1–49. 1, 34. 10. 5, 36. 39. 6–40. 10, 37. 58. 7–59. 1, 38. 44. 11–50. 3, 39. 4. 3–5 and 6 (with further discussion after passage of the decree, 39. 5. 7–10), 39. 29. 4–5. The conflict over the triumph of L. Aemilius Paulus, 45. 35. 4–39. 20, occurs in the *concilium plebis*, not the senate; nonetheless it is formally a member of this class.

13. *Decernere*: 28. 9. 31, 49. 1, 33. 23. 1, 33. 37. 9, 34. 52. 3, 36. 40. 10, 37. 46. 2, 37. 58. 3, 37. 59. 1, 38. 50. 3, 39. 5. 6, 39. 42. 2, 40. 38. 8, 41. 13. 6, 41. 28. 3, 45. 35. 4. *Consensus* (*consentire*): 33. 23. 1, 33. 37. 9, 36. 40. 10, 37. 46. 2, 37. 58. 3, 39. 42. 4. *Ex senatus consulto*: 31. 20. 6, 33. 27. 1.

14. *Decernere*: *Sc de Bacch.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 581. 6; *Lex Ant. de Termess.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 589. 2. 13; *CIL* II. 1569. 9; *Res gestae div. Aug.* 14. Of a municipal body: *Lex Urs.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 594. 64, 99, 103, 125; *Res gestae div. Aug.* 21. Of a pontifical college: *CIL* X. 8259. Cf. *TLL*, V, 142. 22 ff. *Ex senatus consulto*: e.g., *Sentent. Minuc.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 584. 4; *Sc de Asclep.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 588. 5. For these two expressions, see Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, III (Leipzig, 1887), 994–97. *Consensus* (*consentire*) is usual of the senate only from the time of Cicero on; e.g., *Ad Brut.* 1. 18. 2, *Marcell.* 3; also *Sc* of 11 B.C. *ap. Frontin. Aq.* 100.

15. For *censere* and *placere* in Livy, see D. W. Packard, *A Concordance to Livy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), s.vv.; some examples are (*censere*) 22. 61. 4, 32. 1. 13, 45. 20. 7; (*placere*) 23. 32. 16, 38. 35. 3, 42. 31. 7. Documentary use: *censere*, e.g., in *Sc de Bacch.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 581. 3, 9, 18, 25, 26; *Sc* of 99 B.C. *ap. Gell. NA* 4. 6. 2; *Lex Tarent.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 590. 13, 20, 25. *Placere*: *Sc ap. Frontin. Aq.* 100, 104, 106, 108, 125, 127; *Sc* quoted by Caelius *ap. Cic. Fam.* 8. 8. 6–8.

16. A straightforward statement that a general triumphed or had an ovation is omitted only in the elaborate report at 28. 9. 11 and at 39. 29. 5. At 34. 10. 6 the statement is in a subordinate clause (*antequam triumpharet*), but this is the only such example.

sidered shortly), there is a basic full expression of which nearly all the notices are merely variants. An example is 36. 40. 11: "P. Cornelius consul triumphavit de Bois." The information provided is the name of the triumphator, his rank or the note *in magistratu*, the name of the conquered people, and the statement that a triumph was celebrated. The form may be varied by the addition of *in monte Albano* or the day of the triumph,<sup>17</sup> or by the omission of the name, the office, or the conquered people.<sup>18</sup> In the case of omissions, the reader would usually be able to supply the missing parts from the immediate context. In general, Livy achieves a remarkably consistent tone in the statements of the celebration, chiefly owing to the presence of the verb *triumphare*, almost always in the form *triumphavit*. There are four occurrences of a variation on *triumphavit* modeled on the request form, but in two of these *triumphare* appears as a participle (*triumphans urbem est invectus*, 37. 46. 2 and 40. 43. 5; cf. 30. 45. 2, and 34. 52. 10, where *triumphavit* had occurred at 34. 52. 3).<sup>19</sup> Another variation is found at 45. 42. 2, where Livy says *navalem triumphum egit*.<sup>20</sup> The historian here chooses to use one expression almost exclusively, with an infrequent variant deliberately reminiscent of his own language in an earlier stage of the triumphal process. He also chooses *not* to use other common Latin expressions adequately

attested in bureaucratic language and found in other parts of his own history.<sup>21</sup>

A most interesting question is how Livy's celebration statements compare with those of the triumphal *fasti* known from inscriptions. The best known and best preserved of these are the *Fasti Capitolini*, which date probably from between 19 and 11 B.C. Each notice in these lists gives the following facts: the name and filiation of the general, his office, the name of the conquered people, and the day and Capitoline year of the triumph. There is no verb; the very appearance of a name on the *Fasti* is statement enough that a triumph was celebrated. Additional information is given when necessary, such as the number of times a general had held office or celebrated a triumph, whether the triumph was a naval one, or whether it was *in monte Albano*.

Plainly these *Fasti* are more detailed and more standardized in their presentation than Livy's triumph reports. Livy does not usually give the date and, since he writes annals, does not need to give the year. He omits filiations and notations of how often a man had been magistrate or held a triumph. On the other hand we do find in his notices the general's name, his office, and the names of the people he defeated, all with varying degrees of regularity, and the note, where appropriate, *in monte Albano*. The most definitive feature of Livy's reports, the verb *triumphare*, does

17. *In monte Albano* (clearly not a capricious addition): 26. 21. 6, 33. 23. 8, 42. 21. 7. The date: 37. 58. 4, 37. 59. 2, 39. 5. 13, 39. 6. 3, 45. 42. 2, 45. 43. 1; perhaps 40. 59. 3 should be added.

18. Omission of name: 26. 21. 6, 30. 45. 2, 33. 37. 10, 37. 46. 2, 37. 58. 4, 37. 59. 2, 39. 5. 13, 40. 38. 9, 41. 13. 6, 42. 21. 7. Omission of people conquered: 26. 21. 6, 30. 45. 2, 34. 10. 6, 34. 52. 3 and 10, 37. 58. 4, 37. 59. 2, 40. 38. 9, 40. 43. 5, 42. 21. 7. Omission of rank: 26. 21. 6, 30. 45. 2, 34. 10. 6, 34. 52. 3 and 10, 37. 46. 2, 37. 58. 4, 37. 59. 2, 39. 5. 13, 39. 6. 3, 39. 42. 3 and 4, 40. 38. 9, 41. 7. 2, 42. 21. 7, 45. 42. 2, 45. 43. 1.

19. A similarly constructed expression in an alleged votive inscription: *triumphans in urbem Romam redit*, 41. 28. 9. Cf. *Romam rediit triumphans*, *CIL* 12. 626. 4–5 (Mummius inscr.), and Sempronius Asellio Frag. 2P, *quis triumphans introierit*. Perhaps *triumphare* in the bureaucratic language of

the first century B.C. had replaced an older expression; cf. nn. 11 and 24.

20. There is another naval triumph at 37. 58. 4; here Livy simply uses *triumphavit*, but he had just said *triumphus navalis est decretus* in the preceding sentence. *Triumphum navalem agere* is the regular official expression; see, e.g., the *Fast. tr. Cap.* for the years 260, 257, 254, 167 in Degraasi, *Inscr. It.* XIII.1; the *Fasti Urbisalienses* for 167 in Degraasi, *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 339; Plin. *NH* 34. 13.

21. E.g., *triumphum agere* not referring to a naval triumph: *CIL* 12. 652. 5; *Res gestae div. Aug.* 4; Cic. *Phil.* 14. 23, *Rep.* 6. 11, *Fam.* 3. 10. 1; Suet. *Aug.* 22. For its use in Livy, see Packard, *Concordance*; some examples are 7. 11. 9, 38. 17. 6, 41. 7. 1, 45. 38. 11. Other ignored possibilities: *triumphum inferre*, *Sc* of 8 B.C. ap. Macrobian. *Sat.* 1. 12. 35; *triumphum ducere*, Plin. *NH* 7. 98.

not appear in the Capitoline *Fasti*; one might well wonder whether *triumphare*, *triumphum agere*, or some other expression is meant to be supplied. On the whole, comparison of Livy's notices with the Capitoline *Fasti* shows only a partial stylistic correspondence between the two.

Livy's practice may also be compared with fragments of two other sets of *fasti*, the *Fasti Urbisalvienses*, from a small town in Picenum, and the *Fasti Barberiniani*, most probably originating in Rome.<sup>22</sup> The remains of the former set preserve material only incompletely covering the years 195 to 158 B.C., and the latter 43 to 21 B.C. The *Fasti Urbisalvienses* contain the name and office of the general, without filiation; the names of conquered peoples and the dates of the triumphs also occur with special notations of naval triumphs and the number of triumphs to each man's credit, but no year is given. The *Fasti Barberiniani* omit filiations, years, and even offices, but they conclude each notice with the words *triumphavit*, *palnam dedit*.<sup>23</sup> The use of *triumphavit* here, as well as its frequent occurrence in other inscriptions and in literary sources, strongly suggests that it is the verb to supply in the *Fasti Capitolini* and *Urbisalvienses*.<sup>24</sup>

Another point of comparison is the way in which Livy on the one hand and the inscriptions on the other refer to the peoples and lands whose defeat was the subject of the triumphs. Livy generally says *de* with the name of a people and *ex* with the names of countries (e.g., *de Gallis*, 31. 49. 2;

*ex Hispania*, 34. 46. 2); the prepositions are occasionally interchanged (*de Aetolis et de Cephallania*, 39. 5. 13; *ex Liguribus*, 40. 59. 1). All the *fasti* show exactly the same pattern: *de* for people and *ex* for places, with a fair number of exceptions (e.g., *ex Parthineis*, *Fast. tr. Cap.*, 39 B.C.; *de Illurico*, *Fast. tr. Cap.*, 42 B.C.).

The Barberini *Fasti*, then, present the closest relationship to the form of Livy's triumph notices; at the same time both they and Livy show ties to the other extant *fasti*. Livy is apparently drawing on a familiar tradition and its accepted variants in the composition of his triumph statements. He displays more variation than the inscriptions do, but with only a few exceptions it is variation on a recognizable model, to be explained by the greater freedom in composition possessed by the writer of books over the writer of inscriptions. Even in the occasional case where Livy discards the dominant form, the departure is patterned on a model he has already established in another part of the whole report.

The situation with the ovation notices is not quite so clear. Nine ovations<sup>25</sup> are reported in Books 21–45 (see note 5), all with essentially the same form: the basic phrase is *ovans urbem ingredi (inire)*. The participle alone appears at 26. 21. 6. The name of the general is omitted only at 26. 21. 6 and 34. 10. 3, but his office never appears. Only two contain the name of the subject nation (36. 39. 1, 41. 28. 6). There are no dates. For variation Livy adds *ex*

22. Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 338 ff. and 341 ff.; for the *Fasti Barberiniani*, see also n. 23.

23. The reference to offering the palm is taken to mean the ritual presentation at the temple of Jupiter O. M. at the end of the parade; from that it is inferred that the *fasti* may come from the temple itself, the only place where anyone would care about a ritual offering. See Henzen in *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>, 76–78; Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII.1, 345.

24. *Triumphare*: *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 763b and c (Scipio inscr.); *Lex Iul. munic.*, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>. 593. 63; inscr. (?) of Pompey ap. Plin. *NH* 7. 98; Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII.3, *elogia* 78, 80, 81; Cic. *Phil.* 11. 18, *Mur.* 15; Sall. *Jug.* 114. 3.

25. The ovation report at 36. 39. 1–2 is a very similarly phrased doublet of the one at 21. 10–11; see Klotz, *Hermes*, L (1915), 500–502, who attributes it to Livy's absentmindedness in changing sources. The differences are slight—a relative clause at 21. 10 is a prepositional phrase at 39. 1, the booty lists diverge slightly (see Klotz, *loc. cit.*, and Weissenborn-Müller for the reading), the verb in the booty lists is *prae se ferre* in the first and *transferre* in the second. These variants are just further indication that Livy is exercising choice in the composition of the notices.

*senatus consulto* (31. 20. 6, 33. 27. 1), or *ob rem feliciter gestam* (34. 10. 3), or reports only the decree, not the celebration (39. 29. 5).

None of this is different in principle from the treatment of the triumph notices. The difficulty in discussing the ovations arises from the nature of the comparative material. The occurrences of the expression *ovans urbem ingredi* and its variants are from authors later than Livy.<sup>26</sup> In all the extant *fasti*, including the *Fasti Barberiniani*, ovations are indicated by the participle *ovans* (as in Livy), but with no verb following. The only comparable reference to an ovation in inscriptions appears in *Res gestae div. Aug. 4: bis ovans triumphavi*. There seems to be no reason why the elliptical statements of ovations on the *fasti* could not be understood as the same expression, especially if the notices of triumphs proper are to be completed with this word. G. Rohde states, on the basis of the literary evidence alone, that *ovans urbem* with a verb of entering reflects the formulation of the senatorial decree authorizing the ovation;<sup>27</sup> that may be so, but it does not really explain what word or phrase is intended to complete *fasti* announcements that an ovation was held. Whatever the situation in technical language, however, Livy does select a model for his notices and use it, with minor variations but without serious divergence.

The reports of captives and booty in the triumphal procession are, along with the announcements of the celebrations, the element that appears most consistently in the triumph notices. In a formal sense they are found in every notice but one

(42. 21. 7), for even when there is little or no booty, Livy reports its absence (31. 49. 3, 40. 34. 8, 40. 38. 9, 40. 59. 1–3, 45. 42. 2). There is room here for some rhetorical expansion: some particularly magnificent processions are described in considerable detail, such as that of Flamininus (34. 52. 3–10), or presumably the one of L. Aemilius Paulus, though the text is damaged and the account is not complete (45. 40. 1–4). The spoils of Cn. Manlius Vulso are the occasion for some moralizing remarks on the dangers of luxury (39. 6. 7–9). Sometimes not the booty but other aspects of the procession call for comment: for instance, the unusual double triumph and relative merits of M. Livius Salinator and C. Claudius Nero at 28. 9. 11–16, the African triumph of P. Cornelius Scipio (30. 45), the invidious comparisons made at the triumphs of L. Scipio (37. 59. 2) and L. Anicius (45. 43. 1–4). From time to time there are remarks on the fate of distinguished captives (30. 45. 4, 37. 46. 5, 45. 43. 9–10), or on the attitude of the soldiers or other participants (33. 23. 6, 34. 52. 12, 39. 7. 3, 41. 13. 8).

In the midst of all this variety there is the same underlying consistency noted in other parts. The very presence of the parade description is a constant element, however much it may be varied by the kinds of additions just mentioned. Certain features of Livy's language are also constant. The captives and sacrificial victims are regularly said to be led before the triumphal chariot, *ducere ante currum*, a phrase also found in inscriptions and literary sources.<sup>28</sup> There is one occurrence of *traducere* (36. 40. 11). For the captured

26. E.g., Plin. *NH* 15. 125; Tac. *Ann.* 3. 19 and 47; Suet. *Aug.* 22 and *Tib.* 9; Gell. *NA* 5. 6. 20–21 and 27.

27. G. Rohde, s.v. "Ovatio," *RE*, XVIII (1942), 1891.

28. *Ducere ante currum*: 31. 49. 3, 33. 23. 5, 34. 52. 9 (no verb), 37. 59. 5, 39. 7. 2, 40. 34. 8, 40. 38. 9, 45. 43. 6. *Ducere*

alone: 26. 21. 9, 34. 52. 9, 37. 46. 4, 40. 38. 9. The phrase in other sources: Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII.3, *elogia* 89 and 17; *Res gestae div. Aug. 4*; Cic. *Verr.* 5. 67; Sen. *Brev. vit.* 13. 8; cf. *TLL*, IV, 1521. 11 ff.

treasure of all kinds, Livy much prefers the verb *ferre* (usually as *tulit*), or occasionally *prae (se) ferre*.<sup>29</sup> He may add to *ferre* the phrase *in aerarium*, when the booty is given as money or coin-metal (28. 9. 16, 31. 49. 2, 34. 10. 4, 41. 28. 6). The only other alternative to *ferre* is a surprisingly frequent occurrence of *transferre* or *transvehere*. The choice of *trans-* compounds may have a basis in sacral or official usage; the prefix in these two verbs and in *traducere* seems to refer to the ritual crossing of the *pomerium*, the formal start of every triumph.<sup>30</sup> In any case, it is evident that Livy is once again limiting himself to a few expressions and avoiding other possibilities, even though his dependence on an official model cannot be suggested with certainty.

The same is true of the remaining part of the triumph notice, the report of bonuses given to soldiers and officers. Livy says either *dare* or *dividere* for the distribution.<sup>31</sup> There is no evidence to support these words as part of an official vocabulary, but it is clear enough that Livy chooses not to use a wider range of expressions.

To sum up, then: a study of Livy's triumph notices in Books 21–45 shows that he has two main techniques for handling this typically annalistic material. First, there is a basic structure for the standard or "ideal" triumph notice. All the parts together account for the whole constitutional procedure of a triumph, from requesting it through obtaining and actually holding it. Even though all the parts may not appear in every notice, each notice, whatever its individual features as a result of omission, addition, or elaboration,

recognizably belongs to the standard type. The elements of the triumph report, then, are repetitive enough to allow the definition of a standard structure; but they are varied enough by omission or substantive or rhetorical addition to avoid unrelieved uniformity.

Uniformity is imposed on the reports in another way. Livy has a carefully selected vocabulary for reporting the facts of each part of the notice. Insofar as his language can be compared with that of public documents and of literary sources which presumably owe something to such documents, he does choose words characteristic of the bureaucratic style. But he does not use the entire range of bureaucratic language open to him. And even where official models cannot be adduced, his linguistic range is small, much smaller than the Latin language requires: consider, for example, the possible synonyms for and compounds of *ferre* which are not used in the procession reports. This selectivity must be deliberate, and its aim must be the uniformity which is in fact its effect.

If it is accepted that Livy gives his annual notices the character of the pontifical annals by the repetition of certain kinds of information about recurring events, by conscious restriction of vocabulary, and by the employment of technical terms, then perhaps a few more general speculations about the practice of annalistic historiography may be permitted. It is true that a dry, monotonous reporting makes the elaborately composed episodes stand out more impressively; this contrast is effective within the triumph notices as well

29. A form of *ferre* in every report, except when varied as noted. *Prae se ferre*: 31. 49. 3, 36. 21. 11, 37. 46. 3, 39. 42. 4.

30. *Transferre*: 33. 23. 9, 34. 52. 4 and 8, 36. 39. 2, 36. 40. 12, 37. 58. 4, 40. 16. 11, 40. 34. 8, 40. 59. 2, 41. 7. 2, 45. 40. 1, 45. 43. 4. *Transvehere*: 33. 23. 4, 33. 37. 11, 36. 40. 11, 39. 7. 2. Dictionaries and translators invariably understand these verbs as "carry in procession, parade," but cf. my note, "Verbs

Compounded with *Trans-* in Livy's Triumph Notices," *CP*, LXIX (1974), 54–55.

31. *Dividere*: 28. 9. 17, 30. 45. 3, 31. 20. 7, 33. 23. 7, 34. 46. 3, 34. 52. 11, 36. 40. 13, 39. 5. 17, 39. 7. 2, 40. 34. 8, 40. 59. 2, 41. 7. 3. *Dare*: 33. 23. 9, 33. 37. 12, 37. 59. 6, 39. 7. 2, 40. 38. 9, 40. 43. 7, 41. 13. 7, 45. 40. 5, 45. 42. 2, 45. 43. 7.



as between annual notices and other material. It is also true that the flavor of the old *Annales Maximi* would evoke a patriotic piety in the reader. But there is a more positive aspect to annalistic repetitiveness. Livy chose to write annals at a time when the development of Roman historiography and the events of the recent past combined to make his choice hardly inevitable. Annalistic history, even more than history generally, is not only an account of individual events, but of events that are formally similar or even identical. The Roman annalist offers his readers the regular repetition of constitutional processes. Each triumph may have unique features, of course, as may each election,

each allotment of provinces and troops, and so on. But in the end, there remains an impression of uniformity, of a pattern. The reader is invited to contemplate the annalistic framework, not only each stirring speech or each outstanding individual. The yearly pattern—which is the Republican constitution in its continuing operation—is meant by Livy to be seen as subsuming the vicissitudes of men and events to itself. A decision to write annalistic history is more than a matter of style or tradition; it is the choice of an interpretation of history as well.<sup>32</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

32. This essay is a revision of a chapter of my dissertation, Jane Phillips Packard, "Official Notices in Livy's Fourth Decade: Style and Treatment" (Diss., University of North

Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1969; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms 70-12,090). I owe special thanks to Prof. T. Robert S. Broughton for support and advice in its preparation.