

## XXXIII. Livy and Augustus

HANS PETERSEN

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

It has been recognized for some time that Livy not only refers now and then explicitly to his own times, but that in certain passages of his narrative he merely alludes, in a somewhat veiled manner, to contemporary, or at any rate near-contemporary, events. Thus, when he says in his preface that the Romans of his own times could endure neither their own corruption nor its corrective,<sup>1</sup> he seems to allude to the law concerning marriage which Augustus had proposed in the year 28 B.C.<sup>2</sup> Livy's discussion of the *spolia opima* of A. Cornelius Cossus<sup>3</sup> is agreed to be connected somehow with Augustus' refusal to allow them to M. Licinius Crassus, who had with his own hands killed the Bastarnian chieftain Delldo in 29 B.C.<sup>4</sup> The speech in which Camillus urges his fellow-citizens not to desert Rome and migrate to Veii<sup>5</sup> would recall to the reader Antony's alleged purpose to transfer the seat of empire to Egypt.<sup>6</sup>

From these doubtlessly correct observations it has been inferred not only that Livy in certain passages expressed his approval of Augustus' aims and methods,<sup>7</sup> but that throughout Livy wrote his *History* paying close attention to Augustus' views, and in fact with the purpose of promoting the emperor's policies,<sup>8</sup> even though admittedly the historian's allusions to the present are quite

<sup>1</sup> Liv. *praef.* 9: donec ad haec tempora quibus nec uitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus peruentum est.

<sup>2</sup> H. Dessau, "Die Vorrede des Livius," *Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds sechzigstem Geburtstage* (Berlin 1903) 461-66. Less definite the statement by R. Syme, "Livy and Augustus," *HSCP* 64 (1959) 42-43. The law is mentioned only by Propert. 2.7.

<sup>3</sup> Liv. 4.20.

<sup>4</sup> Cass. Dio 51.24.4. The connection was observed by H. Dessau, "Livius und Augustus," *Hermes* 41 (1906) 142-51; it is accepted by Syme, *HSCP* 64 (1959) 43-46.

<sup>5</sup> Liv. 5.51-54.

<sup>6</sup> Cass. Dio 50.4.1. Cf. R. Syme, *Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939) 305; *HSCP* 64 (1959) 47-48. Note that Livy has Camillus refer to the *casa Romuli* (5.53.8), which was important to Augustus (Cass. Dio 53.16.5).

<sup>7</sup> Dessau, *Festschrift für Hirschfeld* 464; *Hermes* 41 (1906) 142, 151.

<sup>8</sup> Syme, *Roman Revolution* 317, 463-64. Syme's view that Livy colluded with Augustus in promoting the latter's policies has been rightly rejected by P. G. Walsh, *Livy* (Cambridge 1961) 10-14.

subtle.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, Tacitus has it that Augustus called Livy a *Pompeianus* because the historian praised Pompey highly.<sup>10</sup> This epithet would not be a fitting one for the emperor's convinced followers, as Tacitus himself implies when he says that the matter did not lessen the personal friendship between Augustus and Livy.<sup>11</sup>

The problem, therefore, is to reconcile Augustus' judgment with what Livy wrote and with Livy's intentions. For this purpose a larger number of such allusions should be discovered in his *History*, since the more such passages are recognized and interpreted, the easier it is to analyze their general tenor. The present investigation deals only with Book 1 for three reasons: in the first place, of all books preserved, it is, because of its contents, especially favorable to such allusions, since it deals with monarchy; secondly, Book 1 may be thought to have set the tone in this matter for the whole work; and finally, it is likely that Book 1 was published separately.<sup>12</sup>

In Book 1 Livy mentions expressly the *gens Iulia*<sup>13</sup> and Caesar Augustus,<sup>14</sup> but he has Augustus in mind also where he does not mention him explicitly.

Augustus writes in the *Res gestae* (34.3, where the restorations of the Latin text are confirmed by the Greek version): post id tem[pus a]uctoritate [omnibus praestiti, potest]atis au[tem n]ihilo ampliu[s habu]i quam cet[eri qui m]ihi quoque in ma[gis] tra[t]u conlegae f[uerunt]. This was the official interpretation at a later time; it may in fact have been current much earlier. For Livy, describing Evander's rule, says (1.7.8):

Euander tum ea, profugus ex Peloponneso, auctoritate magis quam imperio regebat loca, uenerabilis uir miraculo litterarum, rei nouae inter rudes artium homines, uenerabilior diuinitate credita Carmentae matris . . .

<sup>9</sup> Syme *HSCP* 64 (1959) 47.

<sup>10</sup> Tacit. *Ann.* 4.34: T. Liuius, eloquentiae ac fidei praeclarus in primis, Cn. Pompeium tantis laudibus tulit ut Pompeianum eum Augustus appellaret; neque id amicitiae eorum officit.

<sup>11</sup> Syme, *Roman Revolution* 317, note 5; 464, note 2, referring to his own statement "The allegiance of Labienus," *JRS* 28 (1938) 125, assigns to the word *Pompeianus* the weakened meaning "Republican," a view which will hardly be accepted.

<sup>12</sup> Book 2 has its own preface (2.1.1-6). Cf. Syme *HSCP* 64 (1959) 56.

<sup>13</sup> Liv. 1.3.2.

<sup>14</sup> Liv. 1.19.3. Syme *HSCP* 64 (1959) 43 considers the possibility that the name of Augustus in this passage was interpolated "later." This would make no difference to the present argument.

The contrast between *auctoritas* and *imperium* neither is called for by the context, nor does it seem to have been part of the historical tradition; it is clearly meant to allude to Augustus. Like Evander, Augustus also lived on the Palatine;<sup>15</sup> like Evander, Augustus also claimed divine origin. Livy emphasizes that men merely believed in the divine descent of the ancient *ktistês* Evander; consequently a reader may well infer that the divine origin of a contemporary founder of the state is even less likely. It seems as if disbelief in Augustus' divine origin has here led Livy to express a doubt also in Evander's case, although the latter doubt has been connected skilfully with its context. The phrase in the Livian passage, *miraculo litterarum*, need not be applied to Augustus; if it is to be so applied, which seems doubtful, it would in his case not so much mean that he could read and write, but might refer to Augustus' not very successful literary endeavors.

In the year 29 B.C. Augustus decreased the size of the senate by removing from it one hundred and ninety persons.<sup>16</sup> In the year 27 he began to select sixteen senators to be his *consilium* for six months at a time, and often preferred to transact official business, and even sit in judgment, with them privately rather than to refer the matters to the senate.<sup>17</sup> Cassius Dio, who mentions this, proceeds directly to imply that the emperor exercised almost always the right to declare war, make peace, and conclude treaties without consulting the senate.<sup>18</sup> Livy, speaking of Tarquinius Superbus, says (1.49.6-7):

praecipue ita patrum numero imminuto statuit nullos in patres legere, quo contemptior paucitate ipsa ordo esset minusque per se nihil agi indignarentur. (7) hic enim regum primus traditum a prioribus morem de omnibus senatum consulendi soluit; domesticis consiliis rem publicam administravit; bellum pacem foedera societates per se ipse, cum quibus uoluit, iniussu populi ac senatus fecit diremitque.

Livy does not go out of his way to make clear the allusion to Augustus, but his intention is clear because private council and monarchical control of war and peace are juxtaposed both in Livy's account of Tarquinius Superbus' rule and in Dio's account of Augustus' procedure. Consequently, the motivation which

<sup>15</sup> Evander on the Palatine: Liv. 1.7.3 and 8; Dionys. Halic. *Ant. Rom.* 1.31.4 and 89.2; Verg. *Aen.* 8.51-54. Augustus on the Palatine: Cass. Dio 53.16.5.

<sup>16</sup> Cass. Dio 52.42.1-3.

<sup>17</sup> Cass. Dio 53.21.4-5.

<sup>18</sup> Cass. Dio 53.21.6.

Livy assigns to Tarquinius Superbus in decreasing the number of senators casts an unfavorable light on Augustus' similar action, and incidentally preserves for us what in 29 B.C. must have been the reaction of a large number of senators.

It was surely a commonplace of the Republican opposition that Augustus had gained, strengthened, and preserved his rule by winning over the soldiery by donatives, the people by cheap grain, the senators by gifts of money and of offices, and all by the attractions of security.<sup>19</sup> Similarly Livy describes how Sextus Tarquinius, after causing the leading citizens of Gabii to be killed or exiled, came to control the city (1.54.10):

largitiones inde praedaeque; et dulcedine priuati commodi sensus malorum publicorum adimi, donec orba consilio auxilioque Gabina res regi Romano sine ulla dimicatione in manum traditur.

Yet Livy has in mind not only the present, but also the future, and to an attentive reader he occasionally hints what might happen to Augustus.

Julius Caesar had been deified; so would Augustus be, after his death. Augustus wished to receive the name Romulus,<sup>20</sup> and even after he had accepted the title Augustus he was understood to be the New Romulus. Livy describes how Romulus was declared a god, largely through the efforts of a rather suspect witness,<sup>21</sup> the kind of witness that would almost certainly come forward also when Augustus was to be deified.<sup>22</sup> But Livy did not neglect to record the tradition that the senators had torn Romulus to pieces,<sup>23</sup> a possibility which the New Romulus never forgot, so that while attending sessions of the senate, he would often wear a breastplate.<sup>24</sup>

Livy describes how volunteers were collected to overthrow Tarquinius Superbus.<sup>25</sup> Augustus had established *cohortes uoluntariorum*, which were recruited probably from among citizens, though not through the regular *dilectus*.<sup>26</sup> The reason for this recruitment was perhaps that these men could not meet the usual

<sup>19</sup> Tacit. *Ann.* 1.2.

<sup>20</sup> Cass. Dio 53.16.7.

<sup>21</sup> Liv. 1.16.5-8.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. J. Gagé, "Romulus-Augustus," *Mél. Rome* 47 (1930) 148.

<sup>23</sup> Liv. 1.16.4. The polite Livy calls this tradition a *perobscura fama*.

<sup>24</sup> Cass. Dio 54.12.3.

<sup>25</sup> Liv. 1.59.5, 12.

<sup>26</sup> K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau* (Bern 1951) 87-95. A. Neumann *RE* 9A (1961) 886-90.

requirements for entry into the army, but that in spite of this it seemed advisable to accept them as recruits, give them the usual perquisites, and have possible unruliness among them checked by military discipline. At the time when Livy wrote, some *cohortes uoluntariorum*, pretending to be devoted to the Republic, may even have been guilty of sedition. But it may well be doubted whether in this case Livy intended any allusion to his own times, especially since the origin of the *cohortes uoluntariorum* is not altogether clear.

Livia was thought to have offended against *pietas* by leaving her first husband while bearing his six-months' child and straightway marrying the later Augustus, even though her father had been proscribed by the triumvirs, had fought in the Republican army at Philippi, and had killed himself after the battle.<sup>27</sup> She would surely share her husband's fate, should he be overthrown, and she may well have noticed the story of Tullia, Servius Tullius' savage daughter, who likewise had offended against *pietas* by acquiring for the sake of gaining power and under questionable circumstances, a second husband, and by mistreating her father.<sup>28</sup> With such similarities apparent, Livia would perhaps not have enjoyed reading Livy's description of Tullia's flight (1.59.13):

inter hunc tumultum Tullia domo profugit exsecrantibus quacumque incedebat inuocantibusque parentum furias uiris mulieribusque.

In none of these passages does Livy state explicitly the possible application to contemporary persons or contemporary events; yet an attentive and somewhat pre-disposed reader would understand readily that if Augustus ruled in a way similar to that of certain Roman kings, he might well expect similar reactions. Three facts make it likely that Livy actually intended these insinuations: first, the passages deal with situations that are almost identical with those of Livy's own time; secondly, the passages are sufficiently numerous to preclude accident on the writer's part and over-interpretation on the reader's part; and lastly, all the passages show the same non-committal way of alluding to the writer's own times, the author being courteous enough not to state the application explicitly, but leaving no doubt about the moral to be drawn.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Cass. Dio 48.44.1-2.

<sup>28</sup> Liv. 1.46.4-9; 48.5-7.

<sup>29</sup> The allusions listed in the first paragraph of this article are easily seen to be of the same type, and by no means imply that Livy approved the contemporary acts to which

Moreover, this subtle way of alluding to the present is found not only in Livy. Of contemporary historians, Dionysius of Halicarnassus employs it when describing the institutions established by Romulus.<sup>30</sup> In particular, Dionysius speaks of four cardinal virtues which Romulus tried to secure in his state, namely, *eusebeia*, *sôphrosynê*, *dikaïosynê*, and *andreia*.<sup>31</sup> These virtues correspond to *pietas*, *clementia*, *iustitia*, *virtus*, which were inscribed on the *clupeus aureus* which Senate and People voted to the New Romulus.<sup>32</sup> Horace also celebrated these virtues in his so-called Roman odes,<sup>33</sup> which he wrote perhaps at the time when the *clupeus* was dedicated.<sup>34</sup> It has been supposed that Dionysius, in his discussion of Romulus' institutions, drew upon a previous work which, although perhaps not a pamphlet, yet definitely reflected contemporary concerns; this alleged source has been dated either to Caesar's time<sup>35</sup> or to about 28 B.C.<sup>36</sup> However, it seems more natural, and more correct, not to assume any "Tendenzschrift" as Dionysius' source, but to hold that the allusions to Caesar's time derive from Varro, whom Dionysius cites by name, and that the allusions to the Augustan period as well as the many comparisons with Greek institutions are Dionysius' own contribution.<sup>37</sup> For the present investigation

he alluded. Thus, the word *remedia*, applied in Livy's preface to Augustus' proposed social legislation (above, note 1), may have been Augustus' own expression. Livy's discussion of Cossus' *spolia opima* and of the testimony supplied by Augustus (above, note 3) has led some scholars to believe, perhaps rightly, that Livy, while not convinced by the emperor's testimony, still thought that it should be mentioned (cf. Dessau, *Hermes* 41 [1906] 148). Nor does Livy state explicitly any personal opinion on the question of removing the seat of government from Rome. Similar in manner are the rather noncommittal comparisons of ancient simplicity with contemporary splendor (Liv. 1.55.9; 56.2). The tone of condemnation is much stronger in a later book (7.2.13), where there is found also a comparison of the early *secessiones* with the bloody civil wars of a later time (7.40.2).

<sup>30</sup> Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.7–29.

<sup>31</sup> Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.18.

<sup>32</sup> *Res gestae* 34.2.

<sup>33</sup> Horat. *Carm.* 3.1–6.

<sup>34</sup> J. Gagé in his commentary (1935) on *Res gestae* 34.2.

<sup>35</sup> M. Pohlenz, "Eine politische Tendenzschrift aus Caesars Zeit," *Hermes* 59 (1924) 157–89. Pohlenz' date is accepted by U. Kahrstedt, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 200 (1938) 6, and by L. Wickert, *Klio* 32 (1939) 332.

<sup>36</sup> A. v. Premerstein, "Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats," *Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., philos.-hist. Abt.*, N.F., 15 (1937) 8–12. His view is accepted by E. Kornemann, "Zum Augustusjahr," *Klio* 31 (1938) 81–83.

<sup>37</sup> So Fr. Cornelius, *Untersuchungen zur frühen römischen Geschichte* (München 1940) 27, note 59.

nothing turns on this problem, since intentional allusions to contemporary affairs are beyond doubt.

Allusions to the writer's own times naturally did not have to be of this restrained and courteous type described above. They could be direct and flattering, such as are not uncommonly found in certain poets of the Augustan period. But such allusions could also be of a different sort.

Augustus had, both as triumvir and later as sole ruler, difficulty in finding sufficient funds to maintain a large enough army; although he prides himself on the *praemia* paid at various times to soldiers and veterans,<sup>38</sup> he was forced, in A.D. 5/6, to establish the *aerarium militare*,<sup>39</sup> which implies that in the preceding years the financial difficulties had been especially serious.<sup>40</sup> Ovid wrote his *Ars amatoria* about the year 1 B.C.<sup>41</sup> In this work, after having narrated how Romulus secured for his soldiers *praemia* in the form of the Sabine women, Ovid, at the conclusion of the episode, alludes unabashedly to his own unwillingness to serve in the army and, by stating that the first Romulus had been the only one able to pay his soldiers, also insinuates the difficulties which the New Romulus encountered in this matter (1.131–32):

Romule, militibus scisti dare commoda solus;  
haec mihi si dederis commoda, miles ero.

These verses, not quite appropriate in their context and truly impertinent, are in themselves perhaps sufficient to explain, if not to justify, Ovid's exile; they illustrate how the indirect way of alluding to contemporary events could be made to serve a malicious sarcasm which is a far cry from Livy's polite suggestions.<sup>42</sup>

The above observations not only show how Livy could allude to his own times, but help to explain what is easily one of the most

<sup>38</sup> *Res gestae* 3.3; 15.3; 16.

<sup>39</sup> Cass. Dio 55.23.1; 24.9–25.6.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Cass. Dio 54.25.5 (13 B.C.).

<sup>41</sup> M. Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* 2. 1<sup>3</sup> (München 1911) 271.

<sup>42</sup> Syme, *Roman Revolution* 467, has noted that Ovid "made fun of the army" in writing *Amores* 1.9.1–2 (*militat omnis amans et habet sua castra Cupido, Attice crede mihi militat omnis amans*). Here again, Ovid advances an intentionally specious (and humorous) argument to apologize for his unsoldierly character. It may be conjectured that the title of Ovid's *Remedia amoris* alludes flippantly to what is perhaps Augustus' own language (above, note 29), Ovid implying sarcastically that he would fain imitate the emperor, and would try his best to undo, by means of the new poem, the harm which he had wrought public morality through his *Ars amatoria*.

important stylistic peculiarities of Book 1: the intentionally uneven style of narrative, Livy narrating some matters in detail, but according only brief mention to others. This style is quite opposed to that which pragmatic historians of the Hellenistic period, like Polybius, had employed. The latter would make it their special concern to place every single event of the past in its causal nexus, would narrate as fully and with as many details as they could, and would make frequent use of technical terminology, all with the purpose of helping their readers to understand the narrative. As a result, these pragmatic historians of the Hellenistic period came to accord the same care, and often the same circumstantial treatment, alike to important events and to unimportant ones, and their style became cumbersome, repetitive, and in its over-all impression, monotonous.<sup>43</sup> Sallust consciously rejected this style of the pragmatic historians and, partly by employing *brevitas* arbitrarily, elaborated a style of his own which, as it were, alarms the reader by the intentional and exaggerated unevenness of the narrative as well as by the paradoxical element in specific expressions. This is the style which Livy, in spite of his avowed Ciceronianism and in spite of what his practice was to be in his later books, used to a certain extent, at any rate, in Book 1. To this style the reader's attention is directed by the very preface, which shows strong Sallustian color in both style and thought.<sup>44</sup> Livy's general method of narrative is clear: he was intent upon emphasizing certain episodes, and he did so partly by especially full and pathetic narrative, partly by abridging or altogether omitting previous and succeeding events, partly by putting, explicitly or implicitly, events into a causal connection which may have been of his own invention.<sup>45</sup> Because of this method Livy needed for the narrative of the regal period only a single book, whereas Dionysius of Halicarnassus needed four.

Nevertheless, Livy's narrative is influenced also, we must assume, by that in his source or sources, even if the latter are lost. How he employed them, can be seen clearly by his procedure in

<sup>43</sup> Cf. H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin 1863) 21–22.

<sup>44</sup> One should not be surprised at the presence of Sallustian color in the first book of Livy's *History*, since Sallust was Livy's immediate predecessor in writing Roman history. Asinius Pollio was working on his *Histories* in the years 30–29 B.C. (Horat. *Carm.* 2.1.1–8 and 17–36), and thus could hardly have been a model for Livy's Book 1.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. A. Klotz, *RE* 13 (1926) 834.



the fourth and fifth decades, where Polybius was his chief source for the events outside of Rome. On the whole, Livy translated Polybius rather faithfully, but he would abridge or expand the narrative, would re-write the speeches, would turn direct speeches into indirect ones, and vice versa; making these changes in the narrative, as far as the style is concerned, in accordance with the general practice in antiquity, and as far as the changes affect the substance of the narrative, not on the basis of a recognizable principle, but as considerations of the moment directed him.<sup>46</sup> It should be assumed that these changes were not only made after an altogether mechanical fashion, merely in order to vary the narrative of the source, but that they also reflect Livy's personal views and preferences.

It should be possible, therefore, to discover, to some extent at least, how Livy selected and modified his source materials for Book 1. One may either compare Livy's account of some matter or event with his account of a similar matter or event elsewhere in the book, or one may compare Livy's account with the one given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who must have used for his narrative of the regal period of Roman history largely the same sources as Livy, or in any case very similar ones (as the close parallelism of Dionysius' narrative with Livy's narrative shows), though matters are complicated by the fact that Dionysius, while adopting and modifying his sources, must on his part have used methods similar to those employed by Livy.

On the one hand, it is obvious that Livy gave what is within the limits of a single book a rather full narrative of certain episodes, even though they were doubtless narrated fully in his sources, as they are narrated fully by Dionysius. These were stories which Livy, like other historians, felt should not be abridged over-much. In this category belong episodes like the youth of Romulus and Remus, the rape of the Sabine women, the destruction of Alba Longa, and the fall of the latter Tarquin.

On the other hand, there are some episodes which are told so fully that they stand out in the single Livian book dealing with the regal period. It seems not amiss to seek a reason for this fact, and the various passages discussed in the first part of this paper suggest that some, at least, of these episodes were narrated fully so that Livy could make clearer the allusions to his own times.

<sup>46</sup> Nissen (above, note 43) 19-27.

The centuriate organization, established by Servius Tullius on the basis of property classes, must always have attracted the interest of historians and antiquarians. Yet Livy's description of it<sup>47</sup> is quite detailed when compared with his description of Romulus' constitution, which latter is, moreover, presented not consecutively, but at different points of the narrative.<sup>48</sup> One may conjecture that the Servian constitution had a special interest at the time when Livy wrote, because of the census which Augustus had held in 28 B.C.<sup>49</sup> During this census Augustus may have justified some of his actions and rulings by referring to Servius Tullius, who had been, it should be remembered, the democrat among the Roman kings.

However, Livy may allude to his own times not only by detailed narrative as such, but also by means slightly different. Thus, not only is Romulus' death told rather fully, but the lengthy witness of Proculus Julius to Romulus' deification is presented as all but fraud, an interpretation which may have been colored by similar testimonies after Caesar's death, and by intimations that such testimonies would also be offered after Augustus' death.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, in pragmatizing the version that Romulus was murdered by the senators, Livy chose to record rather vaguely the tradition that the senators were hostile to the king,<sup>51</sup> thus implying that Romulus' rule was in general unfavorable to the senators. At this point Livy could have indicated the specific instances of senatorial and popular dissatisfaction which Dionysius enumerates;<sup>52</sup> but if Livy had done so, he would have weakened the insinuations which he wished to make.

In Livy's treatment of the marriage of Tarquinius Superbus to the savage Tullia, the moral objections stand out all the more clearly because the narrative is quite brief;<sup>53</sup> consequently the allusion to Livia would not be missed by many readers,<sup>54</sup> as

<sup>47</sup> Liv. 1.42.4-43.13.

<sup>48</sup> Liv. 1.8; also 1.13.6-8. Dionysius of Halicarnassus treats the constitution of Romulus as fully (*Ant. Rom.* 2.7-14) as the centuriate organization established by Servius Tullius (*Ant. Rom.* 4.16-21).

<sup>49</sup> *Res gestae* 8.2; Cass. Dio 53.1.3; cf. 53.17.7.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. above, page 443. In Dionysius' narrative, the episode of Julius' testimony occurs as motivation for the temple built by Numa in Romulus' honor (*Ant. Rom.* 2.63.3-4), and Julius is expressly absolved from the suspicion of fraud.

<sup>51</sup> Liv. 1.15.8 and 1.16.4.

<sup>52</sup> Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.56.3-5.

<sup>53</sup> Liv. 1.46.4-9.

<sup>54</sup> See above, page 444.

perhaps it could be more easily missed in a narrative which, like that of Dionysius, made the situation less general by presenting many additional details and by assigning a speech to Tullia.<sup>55</sup>

Livy may allude to his own times by selecting certain details and placing them side by side, and also by alleging certain motives. So, for example, Dionysius also mentions that Tarquinius Superbus preferred to transact official business at home,<sup>56</sup> but he places this detail among others in such a way as to effect a rather commonplace description of a tyrant's ways; whereas Livy's narrative, being more selective, points more clearly to the contemporary parallel.<sup>57</sup> In the same passage Livy, narrating that Tarquinius Superbus decreased the number of senators, alleges that the king's aim was to weaken the senate and to draw more of the public administration unto himself. This motivation, implausible to anyone familiar with effective senatorial government at a time when the Republic was unimpaired, can hardly have been introduced by one of Livy's predecessors in writing Roman history. The context leads us to suspect that Livy did not find this motivation in his sources, but that it had been alleged as the reason for Augustus' similar action in 29 B.C., and that Livy himself transferred the motive to Tarquinius Superbus. In adding, or changing, motivation, Livy would only have employed a method commonly accepted by pragmatic historians.<sup>58</sup>

Finally, allusions to the present may be made by using certain words with current connotations. Livy employs this method in his account of Evander.<sup>59</sup>

Without doubt, Livy's narrative in the first book of his *History* is quite uneven. He assigns to the reign of each of the four kings Romulus, Tullus Hostilius, Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus about twice as much space as to the reign of Numa or

<sup>55</sup> Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.28.1–30.4. Dionysius' pre-occupations are those of a pragmatic historian, as shown by his intrusion of polemic into his narrative (4.30.2–3). Livy postpones Tullia's speech until after the marriage (1.47.1–5).

<sup>56</sup> Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.41.3.

<sup>57</sup> See above, pages 442–43.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Walsh (above, note 8) 57, note 3 (motivations not found in his source Polybius); 66–73 (virtues and their lack used as motivation). On the other hand, Dionysius of Halicarnassus states unequivocally that he follows his sources, whether they be written or oral, with all due care (*Ant. Rom.* 1.7), and mentions expressly when his narrative differs from that of the other historians (*Ant. Rom.* 4.6.1).

<sup>59</sup> See above, pages 441–42. By the same method both Livy (above, note 1) and Ovid (above, note 42) seem to have alluded to the possibly Augustan term "remedia."

to that of Tarquin the Elder, while even less space is allotted to Ancus' reign and to the narrative of events before Romulus.<sup>60</sup> Of the four reigns to which Livy has allotted a large space, the account of Tullus Hostilius' reign achieves that length only because Livy has inserted in it a very full account of the combat between the Horatii and the Curiatii; but for the narrative of this combat, the account of Tullus' reign would be no longer than the account of the reign of Numa or that of the reign of Tarquin the Elder. On the other hand, as was shown above, the reigns of Romulus, Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus presented opportunities to allude to Augustus' rule; and even though earlier historians may already have allotted more space to these reigns than to the others, yet Livy seems to have done so quite consciously and partly for the reason that these reigns afforded more parallels to matters of current interest. Moreover, most of the allusions to contemporary matters are naturally found in passages where the narrative of an individual episode is in itself rather full and detailed; and again, Livy may often have given such a detailed narrative mainly in order to be able to allude to his own times.

One may, therefore, be willing to accept the view that Livy, in the first book of his *History*, alluded not infrequently to contemporary matters; for these allusions are plausible in themselves, help to explain a chief characteristic of the narrative style in this book, and agree well with its date of composition.<sup>61</sup> Naturally,

<sup>60</sup> The account of Romulus is already slightly longer than each of the accounts given of Tullus, Servius, and Superbus; this may be the reason why Livy has not treated Romulus' political institutions very fully (see above, page 449). The account of Ancus' reign, of which the tradition had little to tell, is eked out by a detailed description of fetal procedure (1.32.5-14), but even so is by far the shortest account of any reign. The above computations are purposely held to generalities; I disavow any attempt to find exact numerical correspondences.

<sup>61</sup> In 1.19.3 Livy refers to the closing of Janus' temple in 29 B.C. (Cass. Dio 51.20.4), but not to its second closing in 25 B.C. (Cass. Dio 53.26.5), and gives Caesar the title Augustus, which Senate and People voted him in the year 27 (Cass. Dio 53.16.6), so that Livy seems to have written this passage, and consequently the whole book, between 27 and 25. These dates (which lately Syme, *HSCP* 64 [1959], seems to reject on page 43 and to accept on pages 49 and 50) had been confirmed by the allusions recognized previously as referring to these years (see above, page 440), and are now corroborated by the allusions discussed in the present article, especially by the allusion to Augustus' relations with the senate in 29-27 B.C. (see above, pages 442, 450), and by the probable allusion to Augustus' census in 28 B.C. (above, page 449); moreover, the other allusions agree well with the dates 27-25 B.C. assigned to the composition of Book 1.

different readers, with different preferences, different pre-occupations, and different skills, will always hold slightly different interpretations of passages like those discussed above; and in fact such different interpretations must not only have been common in antiquity, too, but seem to have been consciously intended by many authors. The present paper does not so much seek to impose a single exclusive interpretation on all readers, however recalcitrant, but rather seeks to discover and analyze what was in Livy's mind as he wrote certain passages. That he often had in mind his own times, seems now quite clear; it seems not less clear that by many of these allusions he intended to warn his contemporaries, especially Augustus, and that he was anything but the emperor's panegyrist and propagandist, his message being: Romans will not tolerate unmitigated monarchy. Augustus was right in calling Livy a *Pompeianus*; and Livy should surely be numbered among the *decora ingenia* who, according to Tacitus, wrote the history even of the Augustan period without flattering the ruler.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Tacit. *Ann.* 1.1.