

ENNIUS' 'CUNCTATOR' AND THE HISTORY OF A GERUND IN THE ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION¹

This paper explores the use, primarily in Book 22 of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, of one of Ennius' best known formulations: *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* (*Ann.* 363).² The line famously describes the tactics of Fabius Maximus 'Cunctator' against Hannibal in 217/216 B.C.E. Livy's reconfigured uses of it in Book 22 are so frequent that it almost appears to take on a life of its own in his hands. It functions as a means of articulating a central fault line in Roman military strategy and of expressing the competition both amongst Romans and between Romans and their enemies for those characteristics that would guarantee Rome's ultimate success.³ Livy's method for negotiating this contestation of identity has a history, on the one hand, in Sallust's *Jugurtha*; but it is rather in the fragments of Sallust's *Histories* that we may discern embryonic use of the Ennian trope. While precious little evidence of the infusion of Ennian language in texts of the prose historiographical tradition survives, the history of *Ann.* 363 in Livy and in the interplay between Livy and Sallust gives us a glimpse of an active and complex engagement, one arguably on a level comparable to that of Virgil.⁴ Here in Book 22, we see Ennius' powerful formulation pressed into new service as a focus for the interrogation of the Roman ethic his work had come to embody.

From the start Livy frames Book 22 in terms of a struggle between two opposite modes of behaviour: military prudence and perseverance, a strategy provocatively summarized as *cunctari*; and a glory-seeking and potentially deluded boldness, which

¹ I am grateful to Joseph McAlhany for discussing the gerunds of Livy 22 with me before this paper was conceived and to him, Dylan Sailor and Chris Kraus for reading and advice about the argument below.

² All references to the *Annals* are to O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985).

³ Cf. C.S. Kraus, '“No second Troy”: topoi and refoundation in Livy Book 5', *TAPhA* 124 (1994), 267–89, esp. 273–82.

⁴ If no significant tradition formed around the prose historians' use of Ennius as it did around Virgil's, that is liable to be due to the susceptibility of our sources to influence by such incidental factors as that the works of the historians do not share the formal features of the *Annals* as Virgil's works do. Livy in particular has long struck scholars as far richer in Ennian material than we can reliably discern; see e.g. H. Hagen, 'Ennius und Livius', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 109 (1873), 271–3; M.H. Morgan, 'Hidden verses in Livy', *HSPh* 9 (1898), 61–6; W. Lundström, 'Nya Enniusfragment', *Eranos* 15 (1915), 1–24; W. Aly, *Livius und Ennius* (Leipzig, 1936). S. Stacey made the first systematic attempt to trace Ennian phrases in Livy, in 'Die Entwicklung des livianischen Stiles', *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* 10 (1898), 17–33. His account is cogently criticized, however, by K. Gries, 'Constancy in Livy's latinity' (Diss., Columbia, 1949). E. Norden for his part is generally sceptical; see *Ennius und Vergilius: Kriegsbilder aus Roms grosser Zeit*, (Leipzig, 1915), 54, n. 1 and 157, and *Aeneis, Buch VI*, (Stuttgart, Leipzig, 1927), 371. He attributes Livy's Ennianisms to his use of Ennianizing predecessors in the prose annalistic tradition rather than to direct use of the poet. For Sallust's engagement with Ennius, see E. Skard, *Ennius und Sallustius; eine sprachliche Untersuchung* (Oslo, 1933). The fact that even the little-admired author of the *Bellum Hispaniense* is capable of twice spontaneously quoting and naming Ennius (at 23.2 and 31.7) shows the extent to which Ennius influenced Roman imagination and descriptive language, at any rate through the first century B.C.E.

its proponents call *audere atque agere*. For much of the course of Book 22, however, the proper description of these two strategies is up for grabs; and the terms *cunctari*, *audere* and their synonyms are variously appropriated and contested by different parties: by Q. Fabius Maximus as dictator and by M. Minucius Rufus, his Master of the Horse, as well as by Hannibal and by the young Scipio (to be Africanus). At the heart of this protracted debate is the question of how Fabius' delaying strategy can be understood as integral to the Roman identity that, by all accounts, it helped preserve. For while Fabius' strategy is ultimately vindicated and treated by Livy as no less crucial to Rome's survival than Camillus' intervention against the Gauls in Book 5 (a significant parallel, as we shall see), it is very much at odds with the more conventionally Roman approach to the battlefield proposed by Minucius and is easily presented by its opponents as inglorious, deceitful and little other than simply lazy. Furthermore, Fabius' approach appears to have a great deal in common with Hannibal's tactics, and the text alternates between Fabius and Hannibal in repeatedly ascribing this strategic delaying to each of them in turn as their proper preserve. This effectively constitutes a signal to Livy's readership of how close a match there was between Fabius and Hannibal, of how nearly balanced their chances for success were, and above all of how slight a tilt in the ethical scales would have stripped Rome of her integrity of character, which Livy constantly advertises as crucial to her continued success.⁵

Livy negotiates this contest with great economy in Book 22 by adopting *Ann.* 363 as a central motif. To judge by its resonance in later literature, its description of Fabius and his unconventional strategy was in antiquity as it is today one of the best-known lines of Ennius' epic.⁶ It is in fact the only line of the *Annals* (or indeed of any Roman poet) that Livy admits to knowing, at least in what survives of his work (Livy 30.26.9: *unum hominem nobis cunctando rem restituuisse, sicut Ennius ait*).⁷ In particular, it was the ablative gerund that was the hallmark of Ennius' expression and its most vital word: altering the verb on which the gerund was based while keeping the form allowed the line to be rewritten in multiple contexts. Thus, for example, Suetonius has Augustus, in a letter of commendation to Tiberius (*Tib.* 21.5), quoting the line as *versum illum* and changing *cunctando* to *vigilando* in the clear expectation that readers know the reference and note the manipulation:⁸

⁵ Cf. the antithetical pairing of Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's third decade and the cost, to Scipio and to Rome, of the growing resemblance between them, as described by A. Rossi, 'Parallel lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's third decade', *TAPhA* 134 (2004), 359–81.

⁶ Cf., besides the examples to be discussed below, e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.84, *Sen.* 10, *Att.* 2.19.2; Livy 10.29.8, 22.39.15, 44.22.10; Sen. *Ben.* 4.27.2; Pliny, *NH* 22.10; Jer. *Ep.* 77.2, *adv. Ruf.* 3.29; Virg. *Aen.* 6.845–6 with Servius ad loc. and Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.23; Ov. *Fast.* 2.240; Val. Max. 7.3.7. On *Aen.* 6.845–6, see E. Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart, 1927), 334 (cf. 438–41). On the fame of the line generally, see id., *Ennius und Vergilius* (Leipzig, 1915), 119, n. 1, 157, n. 1; G.R. Stanton, 'Cunctando restituit rem: the tradition about Fabius', *Antichthon* 5 (1971), 52–6; J. Pinsent, 'Livy 6.3.1 (*caput rei Romanae*): some Ennian echoes in Livy', *LCM* 2 (1977), 15–16; and Skutsch (n. 2) ad loc..

⁷ So Stanton (n. 6), 53, on the authority of Morgan (n. 4), 62, and W.B. Anderson, *Livy: Book IX*³ (Cambridge, 1928), 162. Livy mentions Ennius again at 38.56.4: ... *Romae extra portam Capenam in Scipionum monumento tres statuæ sunt, quarum duæ P. et L. Scipionum dicuntur esse, tertia poetæ Q. Ennii*.

⁸ Cf. Stanton (n. 6), 53. Other examples, also cited by Stanton, include Varro's ironic *Romanus sedendo vincit* (*Rust.* 1.2.2), again mock epic after the open allusion to Ennius at 1.1.4 in the invocation, and Silius' *sat gloria cauto | non vinci pulchra est Fabio, peperitque sedendo omnia cunctator* (16.672–4); cf. n. 15, below. At Livy 8.13.16, Camillus' words *volitis exemplo maiorum augere rem Romanam victos in civitatem accipiendo* use Ennian phrasing (both *Ann.* 363 and *Ann.* 494–5) to propose an alternative policy for achieving exemplary success; cf. Pinsent (n. 6), 16.

Ordinem aestivorum tuorum ego vero < . . . >, mi Tiberi, et inter tot rerum difficultates καὶ τοσαύτην ἀποθυμ[ε]λίαν τῶν στρατευομένων non potuisse quemquam prudentius gerere se quam tu gesseris existimo. [h]ii quoque qui tecum fuerunt omnes confitentur versum illum in te posse dici: unus homo nobis vigilando restituit rem.

The prominence of the ablative gerund in Ennius' version of the line, as reflected in the various reuses of it, was not least the result, I suggest, of its quasi-ironic use of *cunctari*: by adopting a polemical term suited to Fabius' detractors and inserting it into a heroizing description of the man's resilience and right-mindedness, Ennius was effectively converting the term into one of approbation and using it to reproach Fabius' critics. It was perhaps thus that it became part of the legend around him.⁹

Ablative gerunds enter the scene with a vengeance in chapter 14 of Livy's Book 22, where Fabius' initial refusal to engage in full-scale battle with Hannibal in the early stages of their encounter provokes an extended harangue from Minucius. This sudden explosion of ablative gerunds is due, I suggest, to Minucius' heavy engagement with and renegotiation of Ennius' original *cunctando* at *Ann.* 363.¹⁰ As a preliminary to Minucius' speech, Livy briefly sketches his character and the nature of his attack on Fabius, in a passage where a concentration of language that points to Ennius already begins to build: *ferox rapidusque consiliis ac lingua immodicus, primo inter paucos, dein propalam in vulgus, pro cunctatore segnem, pro cauto timidum, adfingens vicina virtutibus vitia*,¹¹ *compellabat, premendoque superiorem, quae pessima ars nimis prosperis multorum successibus crevit, sese extollebat* (22.12.12). Here, the trigger term *cunctator* and the archaizing *compellabat* combine with the ablative gerund *premendo*, a term strongly favoured by the opponents of Fabius' *cunctando* policy as the proper course of action, to signal Ennius' relevance.¹² The gerunds of the speech proper carry the full force of Minucius' outrage: the sarcasm with which he treats the Ennian description of Fabius is expressed by his replacing Ennius' *cunctando* with synonyms

⁹ Cf. Skutsch (n. 2), 531: 'we must consider the possibility that the sobriquet (which became a surname only much later [cf. Stanton (n. 6), 49–52]) owed its origin to Ennius' *cunctando restituit rem*.'

¹⁰ J.B. Greenough and T. Peck, *Livy, Books XXI and XXII* (London, Boston, Ginn, 1894) on *indignando* at 22.14.7 note the profusion of ablative gerunds in this chapter without offering an explanation.

¹¹ J. McAlhany points out to me how, with this phrase in particular, Livy creates a relationship between Minucius' account of Fabius and Sallust's of Catiline (cf. *BC* 5.1–6, 61.1–6; also Jugurtha in his 'Scipionic' phase [see *BJ* 7.4–6, quoted in n. 26, below, with bibliography]). The difference is that, where Sallust had attributed to Catiline fundamentally vicious characteristics that nevertheless gave him a veneer of virtue, Livy's Minucius paints as vices what are actually, from the author's perspective, virtues of Fabius. At any rate, the general theme here is the Thucydidean-Sallustian one of the corruption of language as the harbinger, or indeed constitutive element, of general social corruption and collapse (with an afterlife in the Roman tradition at e.g. Tac. *Hist.* 1.37).

¹² *Compellare* is commonly a term of the epic tradition, stemming, in the record as we have it, from *Ann.* 43 (*exim compellare pater me voce videtur*) and *Ann.* 286 (*hunc inter pugnas compellat Servilius sic*); see R.G. Austin, *Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1964) ad *Aen.* 2.280 on its connotation and uses in the *Aeneid*, where there are 11 instances overall. Of the eight times Livy uses the term, he uses it twice, including in the instance here in question, of verbal abuse (at 4.32.12 and 22.12.12; *TLL* s.v. 'compello', II B), twice in the sense 'to summon (to trial)' (34.2.8, 43.2.11; *TLL* *ibid.* I), and four times in the Ennian/epic sense of 'to address' (9.40.17, 10.28.12, 23.47.2, 25.18.12; *TLL* *ibid.* II A). Here at 22.12.12, even though the word is not primarily used in its epic sense, the Ennianizing context slightly reveals that other sense. As with *cunctando*, it turns out that, much as Minucius would like to control the sense in which words are used (whether of or by him), the matter is not entirely within his grasp (cf. e.g. nn. 14 and 15, below). In *premendo*, we have a term for the more aggressive policy favoured by that policy's proponents (see e.g. 22.14.12).

that have no Ennian history and are consequently devoid of the heroizing connotations that had accrued to the word as a result of its use in context in the *Annales*, and that instead crudely exhibit the negative connotations always originally inherent in it. Thus, after making plain his understanding of *cunctatio* by coupling it with *socordia* at 14.5,¹³ Minucius recharacterizes the Ennian gerund as *peragrando* (14.9), *perlustrando* (14.12) and *sedendo* (14.14), opposing it to his favoured policy, which he describes with a host of gerunds naming the aggressive acts of traditional Roman heroism: *premendo obsidendoque et lacessendo* (14.12).¹⁴ With the phrase *sedendo aut votis* (14.14), he ridicules Fabius' piety along with his caution – an obvious signal of the danger Livy associates with Minucius' mindset, especially as it comes so soon after Flaminius' exhibition at 22.3.4–5 of a disastrous combination of rashness and impiety.¹⁵ Minucius ends with a flourish: *audendo atque agendo res Romana crevit* (14.14),¹⁶ a phrase that mingles with *Annals* 363 another Ennian highlight, Manlius Torquatus' enunciation of the principle that the Roman ethic lies at the root of Roman political and military success, *moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* (*Ann.* 156). The very obviously Ennianizing phrase with which Minucius ends retrospectively confirms the presence of Ennius in the speech and the idea that Minucius' preceding gerunds take direct issue with the original heroizing use of *cunctando* to describe Fabius' activity in the *Annals*. At 14.9, the *unicus* of the phrase *nobis dictator unicus in rebus adfectis quaesitus* mocks Ennius' *unus homo*,¹⁷ while holding up for ridicule the idea that Fabius' stature was in any way comparable to Camillus' or that his delaying had anything in common with the former dictator's stay at Veii prior to his being summoned to save Rome – while in fact, this tacit comparison is recurrently made throughout Book 22 (see further below).

The question of the proper definition and rightful ownership of the two divergent strategies summarized by *cunctari* and *audere* runs as a leitmotif through Book 22. Thus, for example, as Hannibal begins to engage with Fabius, his realization of the difficulties he will face is expressed by the idea that Fabius has appropriated the abilities (biding one's time and, by exercising caution, wearing one's enemy down without risking any real loss oneself) that he, Hannibal, originally counted as his own:

¹³ Cf. Minucius' in *cunctatione ac segnitie* at 22.27.4.

¹⁴ Fabius is later given the opportunity to return Minucius' compliment: at 22.18.9, he confidently rephrases Minucius' *audendo atque agendo* policy (22.14.14) as *movendo atque agendo*, pointing to the thoughtlessness and futility of the showier approach as Minucius practises it and suggesting that his opponents' position was as vulnerable to reinterpretation as his own.

¹⁵ With *sedendo* as a recharacterization, Varro had already shown the way, having ironically appropriated Ennius' phrase to a new context in the *De Re Rustica* (cf. n. 8, above), where it is the heroic farmer who triumphs in place of the heroic general. Fabius himself follows suit, in the speech in which he addresses Aemilius Paulus as the latter sets out with his colleague Terentius Varro on the campaign that was to lead to the disaster at Cannae: *dubitas ergo quin sedendo superaturi simus eum qui senescat in dies, non commeatus, non supplementum, non pecuniam habeat* (22.39.15). As he exposes his thinking, Fabius is not afraid to reappropriate a term used humorously (by Varro) or polemically (by Livy's Minucius), confident in the right-mindedness of his policy, regardless of externals; cf. e.g. *contemnendo potius quam appetendo gloriam* (22.39.9). By the time Silius reuses the Ennian moment (again, see n. 8, above), *sedendo* had become just as heroizing as the original *cunctando*.

¹⁶ Chris Kraus points out to me that the phrase *res Romana crevit* is also related to Sallust, *BC* 10.1, *ubi labore atque iustitia res publica crevit*.

¹⁷ Cf. Minucius' again sarcastic *unicum ducem* of 22.27.3. On the history of the expression *unus vir* in Livy, including its probable origin in Ennius' *unus homo* and its close association with the Fabii, see F. Santoro L'Hoir, 'Heroic epithets and recurrent themes in *Ab urbe condita*', *TAPhA* 120 (1990), 230–2; examples also at Pinsent (n. 6), 15.

nec Hannibalem fefellit suis se artibus peti (22.16.5). As the text progresses, those initially Hannibalic competencies begin to be described by Livy as inherent properties of Fabius instead: at 22.23.1, it is the *sollers cunctatio Fabi* that has created a hiatus in disasters suffered by the Romans; at 22.32.1, the success of the consuls Atilius and Geminus Servilius, who take over command of the war from Fabius, is described as due to their use of expressly Fabian tactics (*Fabi artibus ... bellum gesserunt*); and they are taken to task for the same by Baebius Herennius, the tribune of the people, at 22.34.7 (*consules ... Fabianis artibus ... bellum traxisse*). This series culminates in the description of Hannibal's strategy at 22.24.10, when, in Fabius' absence, Hannibal faces Minucius alone in the field: *iamque artibus Fabi sedendo et cunctando bellum gerebat*. That phrasing implies a recognition of Fabius' and Hannibal's joint mastery of rationality and self-control, a mastery that places them alone, in counterpoise to each other, in a position to determine the outcome of events.¹⁸ Furthermore, the application to Hannibal of the *cunctando* so strongly associated with Ennius' Fabius constitutes a signal of how dangerously close Hannibal had come to what Livy's audience, as readers of Ennius, knew to be an archetypal form of Roman heroism – and so expresses how close Rome was to yielding to the Carthaginian.

The precarious balance Livy thus sets up between Fabius and Hannibal is in certain respects analogous to that he orchestrates between the Romans and the Gauls in Book 5: there, as Luce has shown, the Gauls gain moral authority and characteristics appropriate to the Romans, even as the Romans lose them, until the moral and military tide turns to give the Romans final victory.¹⁹ In Book 5, Rome's ethical integrity is temporarily compromised when the community send into exile the exceptional individual who holds the key to Roman military success (33.1), tied as it is to that individual's sensitivity to the sacrosanctity of Roman ritual and its connection to the soil on which it had grown (24.4–10, 52). This brings the city to the brink of disaster. Similarly in Book 22: there too, the salvation of Rome rests on an exceptional individual, who finds himself quasi-ostracized from the community (15.1, 23.3–7). Again, that man's respect for the gods is closely linked to his ability to bring success and contrasted with his opponents' disaster-boding lack of piety (22.9.7–10.10, where extensive restitution of due religious observance inaugurates Fabius' activity as dictator;²⁰ 18.8, cf. p. 535, above). In general, Camillus is fairly steadily present in the background of Book 22, in a way that in the long run plays out very much to Fabius' advantage: for, though other figures place themselves or are placed in relation to Camillus, it is only the Camillus–Fabius comparison that is ultimately allowed to stand. Flaminius, for example, rejects caution at 22.3.10 by characterizing the possibility of any delay on his own part as merely a caricature of Camillus in exile: '*Immo Arreti ante moenia sedeamus*' inquit, '*hic enim patria et penates sunt. Hannibal emissus e manibus perpopuletur Italiam vastandoque et urendo omnia ad Romana moenia perveniat, nec ante nos hinc moverimus quam, sicut olim Camillum ab Veiiis, C. Flaminius ab Arretio patres acciverint.*' Minucius for his part, with his policy of

¹⁸ Santoro L'Hoir (n. 17), 231, points out the parallel between Fabius and Hannibal likewise established by Livy's reference to them respectively as *unum hominem* and *unus hostis* at 30.26.7–9.

¹⁹ T.J. Luce, 'Design and structure in Livy: 5.32–55', *TAPhA* 102 (1971), 265–302, esp. 269–71; developed by Kraus (n. 3), esp. 279–82.

²⁰ See D.S. Levene, *Religion in Livy* (Leiden, 1993), 42–3. Ctr. the barbaric measures taken to appease the gods, without Fabius' involvement, at 22.57.4–6; there, the narrator's parenthetical comment on the placation (*placatis satis, ut rebantur, deis ...*; *ibid.* 7) rather undermines our confidence in their efficacy.

straightforward aggression (as expressed e.g. at 22.14.12; see above), arguably makes a bid to replicate such exemplary Camillian moments as Camillus' insistence at 5.27.6–9 (the episode of the Faliscan schoolmaster) on straightforward military courage rather than subterfuge as the Roman means to victory. Camillus' speech there culminates with the words *ego Romanis artibus, virtute opere armis, sicut Veios vincam*: as we have seen, the term *artes* is key in the semantic warfare between the contending parties of Book 22, and co-option of Camillus' unambiguously termed *Romanae artes* with their superficial similarity to the boldness/rashness Minucius proposes would serve the latter's purposes well. However, it is Fabius who, with a little competition from Scipio (see below, on *fatalis dux*), claims the abiding association with Camillus in Book 22 via his steadfast adherence to traditional Roman religious practice and his ability to keep the city safe.²¹ In addition to these various comparisons to Camillus, Livy several times suggests to his readers similarities between the situation in Book 5 and that in Book 22: thus, at 22.50.1, the *pugna Cannensis* is described as *Alliensi cladi nobilitate par*, while at 22.59.7, the speaker for the survivors of Cannae suggests that their ransoming is parallel to the idea of Rome's redemption with gold from the Gauls. If, at 22.59.8, Livy contrasts the Allia and Cannae by describing the problem at the former (as well as at Heraclea) as *pavor* and *fuga* but that at the latter as the actual *clades*, it remains that there too the two represent each other's most significant comparandum in Livy's thought.

Camillus had in Book 5 exhibited dangerous behaviours that had led to problems in the first place for himself, although also for Rome, in that the consequences of those behaviours had deprived Rome of his leadership. Rome's exposure to the Gauls was, however, for its part more significantly due to the compromised, non-Roman behaviour of the sons of Fabius Ambustus (36.1). First the senate and then the people subsequently take on responsibility for that behaviour by refusing to condemn it;²² yet it remains that, in the sons of Fabius Ambustus, Book 5 has an expendable scapegoat. In Book 22, the situation is complicated by the fact that no one other than Fabius so conspicuously engages in a dubiously Roman sort of behaviour, redolent of the deceitful Carthaginian; and this ultimately needs to be rectified. At the same time,

²¹ Fabius' association with Camillus in Book 22 is anticipated in Book 6, via Ennius. At 6.22.6, we find: *Volscum bellum M. Furio extra ordinem decretum; adiutor ex tribunis sorte L. Furius datur, non tam e re publica quam ut collegae materia ad omnem laudem esset et publice, quod rem temeritate eius prolapsam restituit et privatim, quod ex errore gratiam potius eius sibi quam suam gloriam petiit* (with 30.26.9, quoted above). Thus both Camillus and Fabius are portrayed by Livy in Ennian language as saviours of the state in his summation of their careers (cf. P.G. Walsh, *Livy: his Historical Aims and Methods* [Cambridge, 1961], 85; Santoro L'Hoir [n. 17], 231). Furthermore, at 6.23.5, L. Furius refers to Camillus as *cunctator* and, at 6.23.8, to his activity as *cunctando*. The reference to Camillus as *unus vir* at 6.23.1 (cp. *imperatoris unici* at 22.9, *cede unus omnibus* at 23.8 and *unius auspicio* at 23.9) allude just as openly to Ennius' *unus homo*; see nn. 17 and 18, above, and cf. Pinsent (n. 6), 15, and Kraus (ed.), *Livy, Ab Urbe Condita*, Book VI (Cambridge, 1994) ad loc. The association of Camillus with the Fabius of Book 22 (and thus more indirectly with the Ennian Fabius) is also written into the language used to describe his policy of delay and restraint at 6.23.1, *iuvandarum ratione virum trahendo bello*: cf., besides the ablative gerundival form, e.g. 22.23.1, where Hannibal recognizes Fabius as *eum ... qui bellum ratione non fortuna gereret*. Parallels also exist in that L. Furius' speech alienates the troops from Camillus (6.23.8) just as effectively as Minucius' speech at 22.14 alienates the troops from Fabius (22.14.15); and in that this outcome provokes an identical reaction of alertness and equanimity in both men: Camillus *edito loco spectator intentus in eventum alieni consilii constitit* (6.23.12), while Fabius *pariter in suos haud minus quam in hostes intentus, prius ab illis invictum animum praestat* (22.15.1).

²² Cf. Luce (n. 19), 273.

even though his strategy is consistently presented as a product of his individualism, his choices nevertheless have moral implications for the Romans as a whole. They as a group are presented as the authors of the choice of Fabius as leader and preceptor, as emerges clearly when the situation is summarized from Hannibal's external perspective. Hannibal is described as made nervous by his realization that *tandem eum militiae magistrum delegisse Romanos qui bellum ratione, non fortuna gereret* (22.23.2). Unlike the Fabian ambassadors of Book 5, Fabius is not, as it turns out, wrong to act in a manner associated with the barbarian invader.²³ But it is also not unproblematic that he does so; thus Livy, for all his heroization of Fabius, is careful at least to begin to redress the moral balance by the end of Book 22, in preparation for ultimate Roman victory.

Livy does this in the first place by wresting from the deluded Minucius the policy of bold action and entrusting it to a Roman who could, as Livy has him, be better trusted to safeguard the Roman character and Roman military interests. This is the young Scipio: as Romans themselves begin to despair of Rome in the wake of Cannae and *nobiles iuvenes quosdam* plan to abandon Italy altogether, Scipio takes action and stops them in their tracks by his sudden and unexpected appearance among them.²⁴ His immediate reaction to the news of their defection is described in the following terms: ... *negat consilii rem esse [Scipio] iuvenis, fatalis dux huiusce belli: audendum atque agendum, non consultandum ait in tanto malo esse* (22.53.6–7). The appellation *fatalis dux* itself casts Scipio as a saviour of Rome in the Camillian mode.²⁵ Furthermore, Scipio's phrase, *audendum atque agendum, non consultandum ... esse* (ibid. 7) closely echoes Minucius' resonant Ennian expression, *audendo atque agendo res Romana crevit, non his segnibus consiliis quae timidi cauta vocant* (22.14.14). The difference is that Scipio has the sensibility to use the precept aptly, not to devalue it in the pursuit of personal glory and unsound policies. His moral superiority is reflected in the fact that his words lack the slur that Minucius' imply, and his right-mindedness is borne out for Livy's readers by the subsequent course of the narrative. With Scipio, towards the end of the book, the *audere atque agere* policy is back in the right hands, and final victory, though still a long way off, begins, in Livy's scheme of things, to seem morally once more possible.

²³ This is not least because the behaviour of the Fabian ambassadors is characterized by *ferocia* and *audacia*, while Fabius Maximus, as is constantly emphasized, allows himself to be guided by *ratio* and *consilium* (cf. Pinsent [n. 6], 15–16, on the 'lexical constellation' established between *audeo*, *audacia*, *ago* and *consilium*). Both behaviours are problematized by association with hostile non-Romans; but Fabius' behaviour gravitates towards the Roman and Stoic virtue of self-restraint, while the ambassadors fail in self-control. The respective success and failure of these parties ultimately confirms Fabius' policy as virtuous and the ambassadors' actions as vicious, even though different possible interpretations are temporarily available for both sets of actions, especially Fabius'.

²⁴ The response of the *nobiles iuvenes*: they were *haud secus pavidum quam si victorem Hannibalem cernerent* (22.53.13). Scipio has effectively usurped Hannibal's place: he ensures that the life-threatening attack comes only from one who has Rome's best interests at heart. At the same time, as Chris Kraus points out to me, Scipio's likeness to Hannibal is also a frightening attribute, and one not redeemed by his ultimately winning the war; cf. Rossi (n. 5).

²⁵ Scipio is again so termed at 30.28.11. Otherwise, it is only used of Camillus at 5.19.2; cf. R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965), 671, who suggests that both the expression and the conception behind it go back to Ennius. On the significance of the appellation in Book 5, see B. Mineo, 'Camille, dux fatalis' in G. Lachenaud et D. Longrée (edd.), *Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire: représentations, récits et idéologie*, Vol. 1 (Rennes, 2003), 159–75.

Conversely, Hannibal's delaying after Cannae, which was to rob him of final victory over Rome, shows that he is not the proper master of the *cunctando* policy after all, for he lacks the ethical intuition that allows only Fabius to use it successfully. At 22.51, the relationship in terms of *cunctari* and *audere* as it exists between Fabius and Minucius is briefly reproduced between Hannibal and his prefect Maharbal: the latter urges swift action on Rome in the wake of Cannae, but Hannibal insists on the need for reflection: ... *voluntatem se laudare Maharbalis ait* [sc. Hannibal]; *ad consilium pensandum temporis opus esse* (51.3). Maharbal then observes: *vincere scis, Hannibal; victoria uti nescis*, while the narrator himself concludes: *mora eius diei satis creditur saluti fuisse urbi atque imperio* (51.4). Fabius' delay puts into action a policy of well-advised restraint, and his lieutenant is wrong to challenge him; when Hannibal commits to the same course, against his lieutenant's advice, it deprives him of his goal. The fact that similar actions bring the one success and the other failure highlights the moral inconcinnity between them in Livy's scheme. It is in fact Fabius and Scipio alone who, as *virī ac vere Romani*, to borrow a phrase of Minucius' (22.14.11), can bring about moral and military victory for Rome by proper control of both ends of the spectrum, as it were, of possible strategic modes of behaviour.

There is a partial prototype for the kind of tactical and moral reciprocity Livy sets up between Fabius and Hannibal in a series of relationships between Jugurtha and his Roman counterparts as they appear in Sallust. The Sallustian set of relationships has already been discussed by Kraus, Levene and Paul, so that I shall here simply refer to them in brief with the aim of pointing out the analogies between those relationships and that between Fabius and Hannibal as created by Livy. Early in the *Jugurtha*, at 7.4–6, we learn of Jugurtha learning to mirror Scipio (Numantinus) to the extent that he is able to act as an extension of or substitute for Scipio in his military and strategic endeavours.²⁶ Sallust has at this point already acquainted us with the youthful Jugurtha's innate talents (*BJ* 6.1), but he here makes it clear that it is in acquiring a Scipionic habit that Jugurtha becomes a true asset to his friends and redoubtable to his foes.²⁷ Just so, it is the affinity between the approaches of Livy's Hannibal and his Fabius that make them mutually dangerous to each other and that makes Hannibal, at least temporarily, a viable victor of Rome.²⁸ As the text progresses, we see that Jugurtha is able to withstand all his Roman counterparts, even the sagacious Metellus, before he finally meets his match in Marius, in whom once again he finds an antitype.²⁹ Just so long as Jugurtha's interests are aligned with those of Scipio and of Rome, he is possessed of a moral adeptness that prevents his ability to think ahead

²⁶ Kraus, 'Jugurthine Disorder', in ead. (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography* (Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1999), 226. *BJ* 7.4–6 itself runs: *Jugurtha ... ubi naturam P. Scipionis, qui tum Romanis imperator erat, et morem hostium cognovit, multo labore multaque cura, praeterea modestissime parendo et saepe obviam eundo periculis in tantam claritudinem brevi pervenerat ut, nostris vehementer carus, Numantinis maximo terrori esset. ac sane, quod difficillimum in primis est, et proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio, quorum alterum ex providentia timorem, alterum ex audacia temeritatem adferre plerumque solet. igitur imperator omnis fere res asperas per Jugurtham agere, in amicis habere, magis magisque eum in dies amplecti, quippe quoque neque consilium neque inceptum ullum frustra erat.*

²⁷ Cf. D.S. Levene, 'Sallust's *Jugurtha*: an "historical fragment"', *JRS* 82 (1992), 59–60.

²⁸ Cf. G.M. Paul, *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum* (Trowbridge, 1984), 31 (ad 7.5), where Paul points out the similarity between Sallust's characterization of Jugurtha here and Livy's of Hannibal at 21.4.3–8, in each author's ascription of traditional Roman virtues to these North Africans.

²⁹ On the affinities and equivalence between Marius and Jugurtha, see Kraus (n. 26), 224, 239–41, with further bibliography.

from tipping over into cowardice and his courage and energy from turning into an ill-considered rashness.³⁰ Again, this looks like a blueprint for the sort of ethical control that Livy's Hannibal is able to simulate and that gives Livy's Fabius and Scipio, the only ones able to maintain it, ultimate control of the action in *AUC* 22.

Jugurtha's strategy in dealing with his Roman foes is largely one of evasion and subterfuge.³¹ Livy portrays Fabius as reproducing Jugurtha's actions so closely in response to Hannibal's early attempts to test his mettle (attempts that themselves mirror Metellus' efforts to provoke Jugurtha to rash action) that it is as if Fabius has intuited North African mental resilience and the value of dilatory tactics from Sallust's text.³² Moreover, both Sallust's Jugurtha and Livy's Fabius are identically aware of the psychological benefits and dangers of their strategies for their own men and for their respective enemies.³³ This similarity of approach between the two generals is reflected in verbal echoes between the texts in which they are described. Just as Jugurtha's strategy vis-à-vis the Roman consul designate, Spurius Postumius Albinus, is termed *ludificare* at *BJ* 36.2, so Fabius exhorts Minucius to appreciate the accomplishments that could be achieved *per ludificationem hostis* (*AUC* 22.18.9). Also, both Sallust's Jugurtha and Livy's Hannibal come to realize the reciprocity between their own actions and those of their respective Roman enemy, who have successfully studied North African tactics and are able to put them to use in the service of Roman success. At *BJ* 47–8, Metellus manages to keep Jugurtha in suspense, neither denying nor promising him the peace he requested. Jugurtha's realization that he is being hoist with his own petard is expressed in the words *se suis artibus temptari animadvertit* (48.1).³⁴ Livy's Hannibal notices the relation of Fabius' tactics to his own in words that clearly recall that moment in Sallust's text: *nec Hannibalem fefellit suis se artibus peti* (22.16.5). The similarity in conception of the relationship between Jugurtha and Metellus and that between Hannibal and Fabius is captured in the similarity of the two expressions.

³⁰ Paul (n. 28), 31, notes the probable influence of Thuc. 2.40.3 here.

³¹ See e.g. *BJ* 38.1: *at Jugurtha cognita vanitate atque inperitia legati subdole eius augere amentiam, missitare supplicantis legatos, ipse quasi vitabundus per saltuosa loca et tramites exercitum ducere*.

³² e.g. at *AUC* 22.12.8–10 (*Fabius per loca alta agmen ducebat, modico ab hoste intervallo ut neque omitteret eum neque congrediretur. castris, nisi quantum usus necessarii cogerent, tenebatur miles; pabulum et ligna nec pauci petebant nec passim; equitum levisque armaturae statio, composita instructaque in subitum tumultus, et suo militi tuta omnia et infesta effusis hostium populoribus praebebat; neque universo periculo summa rerum committebatur et parva momenta levium certaminum ex tuto coeptorum, finitimo receptu, adsuefaciebant terrium pristinis cladibus militem minus iam tandem aut virtutis aut fortunae paenitere suae*) and 22.18.6 (*tum per Samnium Romam se petere simulans Hannibal usque in Paelignos populabundus rediit; Fabius medius inter hostium agmen urbemque Romam iugis ducebat nec absistens nec congrediens*).

³³ See again *BJ* 38.1 (quoted in n. 31, above); also 36.2 (*at contra Jugurtha trahere omnia et alias, deinde alias morae causas facere, polliceri deditionem et deinde metum simulare, cedere instanti et paulo post, ne sui diffiderent, instare: ita belli modo, modo pacis mora consulem ludificare*) and 55.8 (*eo tempore Jugurtha per collis sequi, tempus aut locum pugnae quaerere qua venturum hostem audierat, pabulum et aquarum fontis, quorum penuria erat, corrumpere, modo se Metello interdum Mario ostendere, postremos in agmine temptare ac statim in collis regredi, rursus aliis, post aliis minitari, neque proelium facere neque otium pati, tantummodo hostem ab incepto retinere*), with E. Koestermann, *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Iugurthinum* (Heidelberg, 1971) ad loc., on the comparability of Jugurtha's tactics here to those of Livy's Fabius vis-à-vis Hannibal; and Livy 22.12.10 (*... adsuefaciebant terrium pristinis cladibus militem minus iam tandem aut virtutis aut fortunae paenitere suae*).

³⁴ Cf. Levene (n. 27), 61, on the matching of Scipio and Metellus at *BJ* 48.1, 52.1 and 61.3; *ibid.* 59–62 on the comparability of their moral careers over the course of the narrative.

Livy's articulation of the relationship between two competent opponents and of the idea of a perfect match and a strategically and morally dangerous reciprocity between a Roman and a North African thus has a partial precedent in Sallust's *Jugurtha*. It is in the fragments of the *Histories*, however, that Sallust shows awareness of the Ennian *cunctando* trope. It is of course much harder to trace the ramifications of its use in a text so fragmentary, but in at least one instance it seems possible to put what little context we have to some interpretive use. In the paired and opposing speeches of M. Lepidus and L. Marcius Philippus, at *Hist.* 1.55 and 1.77, respectively, the terms *cunctari* vs. *audere* and *agere* and their synonyms appear in the same constellations as we have seen in Livy. The difference here in the *Histories* is that, despite the hostility of the speakers to one another, neither of them favours *cunctari* or the restraint associated with it. This would perhaps not be surprising, given the innate negative connotations of the term, except that at least some of the formulations are close enough to Ennian language to make the presence of Ennius' Fabius fairly palpable, in a context where wisdom and selflessness are conspicuously absent. Lepidus urges the Roman people to action against Sulla with the words *agendum atque obviam eundum est, Quirites, ... non prolatandum neque votis paranda auxilia* (*Hist.* 1.55.7). Lepidus' language perhaps represents a partial prototype for that of Livy's Minucius and Livy's Scipio, since it uses the same antitheses and some of the same vocabulary as their slogans do (for Minucius, cf. 22.14.14: *stultitia est sedendo aut votis debellari credere posse ... audendo atque agendo res Romana crevit*; for Scipio, cf. 22.53.7: *audendum atque agendum, non consultandum ... esse*). Philippus, for his part, expresses his frustration against the senate's inactivity in language that not only inevitably recalls Cicero (*Cat.* 1.1) but also Ennius and Fabius: *quo usque cunctando rem publicam intutam patiemini?* (*Hist.* 1.77.17), where the juxtaposition of *cunctando* and *rem* (even fleshed out as *rem publicam*) is especially provocative.³⁵ Given the turmoil of the situation Lepidus and Philippus were addressing, it seems possible that Sallust was using language that had a venerable historical association with a famously successful instance of strategic caution to make such policy present in its absence and thus to insinuate by this means too a sense of the destructive rashness and wrong-mindedness of all parties involved. In this situation, Sallust's language implies, there is no kind of balance; all parties know only haste and violence.

The fact that the antithetical trope makes its appearance in the *Histories* in paired speeches summarizing critical alternatives³⁶ in itself creates a relation to its appearance in Livy, where it was primarily used by hostile speakers to encapsulate strategies that were polar opposites. Sallust also uses ablative gerunds to bring force to the synkrisis of Caesar and Cato at *BC* 54 (*Caesar dando, sublevando, ignoscundo, Cato nihil largiundo gloriam adeptus est*), although here the use directly by the narrator rather than by speakers creates distance from what we have observed in Livy 22 and Sallust's *Histories*. Generally speaking, the use of the gerund to summarize contrasting modes of life or contrasting political policies seems itself to survive for some time in comparisons in the historiographical tradition (in Sallust and Tacitus it

³⁵ P. McGushin, *Sallust, The Histories, Vol. 1* (Oxford, 1992), ad loc. (= his *Hist.* 1.67.17, p. 143) notices the further correspondence to Sallust, *BC* 20.9 (Catiline to his men): *quae quo usque tandem patiemini, o fortissimi viri?* Besides this, there is *BC* 52.29 (Cato): *non votis neque suppliciis muliebribus auxilia deorum parantur: vigilando, agundo, bene consulendo prospere omnia cedunt*. The tripled gerund expresses the urgency of Cato's appeal, just as doubled and tripled gerunds do in the speeches of Livy 22.

³⁶ Cf. McGushin (n. 35), 14, 132.

is of course unsurprising that an ablative gerund tends not to be matched against its formal like but against an equivalent word or phrase): thus, for example, Sallust has *quae illi litteris, ea ego militando didici* (*BJ* 85.13), Livy *pacem vobis ... parare in perpetuum vel saeviendo vel ignoscendo potestis* (8.13.14), and Tacitus *sequuntur virorum inlustrium mortes, Domitii Afri et M. Servilii, qui summis honoribus et multa eloquentia vigerant, ille orando causas, Servilius diu foro, mox tradendis rebus Romanis celebris et elegantia vitae, qua clariorem se effecit, ut par ingenio, ita morum diversus* (*Ann.* 14.19). R. Syme noted that ‘Tacitus on Afer and Nonianus seems cursory or unduly concise’.³⁷ Syme attributes this phenomenon to the unrevised state he postulates for Book 14, but it may instead be that the use of antithetical ablative expressions to express ethical alternatives exists as a sort of shorthand within the tradition.

The most shocking reuse of the Ennian trope in Sallust occurs at the end of the letter of Mithridates to the Parthian king Arsaces, in which he argues the need for co-ordinated resistance to the greed of Rome that was threatening to engulf the world. In what amounts to his *peroratio*, Sallust’s Mithridates uses the hallowed phrase to sum up the Romans’ rapaciousness and perfidy, appropriating the very language in which Ennius before him (and Livy after him) celebrated Roman wisdom and resilience. Where Ennius’ Fabius single-handedly *cunctando restituit rem* (*Ann.* 363), and where Livy would have his Minucius suggest that *audendo atque agendo res Romana crevit* (22.14.14), Sallust’s Mithridates claims that *audendo et fallundo et bella ex bellis serundo magni facti* (*Hist.* 4.69.20) – with Sallust’s archaizing vowels there tacitly reinforcing Ennius’ presence, even as Ennius’ contention of Roman moral supremacy is subverted. Between them, Sallust and Livy illustrate how Ennian epic continued to be a dynamic and generative force in the literature of the Late Republic and Early Principate, and a crucial source for those forms of expression through which authors responsible for the public articulation of the character of Rome invited the ethical engagement and self-evaluation of their readership.

University of Colorado at Boulder

JACKIE ELLIOTT
jackie.elliott@colorado.edu

³⁷ Syme, ‘Obituaries in Tacitus’, *AJPh* 79 (1958), 23, cited by E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus, Annalen, Band IV, Buch 14–16* ad loc.