Transactions of the American Philological Association 120 (1990) 221–41

HEROIC EPITHETS AND RECURRENT THEMES IN *AB URBE CONDITA*

FRANCESCA SANTORO L'HOIR
The University of Arkansas

Livy uses epithets repeatedly in *Ab Urbe Condita* to delineate characters that he does not otherwise develop.[1] Epithets allow the reader to know exactly where a character stands within the historian's moral scheme. There are many such appellations appended to the names of both heroes and villains;[2] however, only several heroic epithets recur throughout the history. These employ the nouns *vir* or *iuvenis* plus the adjectives *impiger, fortis ac strenuus, acer* and *unus*.[3] All describe men who utilize their energies to achieve the highest success. Each respective epithet, furthermore, is applied to specific categories of men. Both continuity of theme and the repetition of these epithets suggest that Livy, whose "interpretation of the past" is said to be based upon "historical recur-

[1] P. G. Walsh regards Livy's characters as simplistic rather than complex, *Livy, His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge 1961) 82–109; cf. T. J. Luce, *Livy, the Composition of His History* (Princeton 1977) 232.

[2] Walsh notes that moral principles are the true protagonists of *Ab Urbe Condita* (above, note 1) 66; cf. Luce (above, note 1) 231–32. Among the many epithets are honorifics, such as *vir clarissimus, vir fortissimus, vir prudens*, etc., and pejoratives, such as *homo popularis, improbus homo, pravae mentis homo*, etc. D. W. Packard, *A Concordance to Livy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968) s.v. *homo*; *vir*.

[3] T. J. Moore, *Artistry and Ideology: Livy's Vocabulary of Virtue*, Athenaeums Monografien Altertumswissenschaft 192 (Frankfurt 1989) treats the adjectives *fortis ac strenuus, strenuus, acer*, and *impiger* on pp. 15–16, 7–19, 23–26, 26–29, respectively. Moore draws conclusions about the thematic continuity of *impiger* and *fortis ac strenuus* similar to those elaborated below. Although he cites Livy's employment of the modifiers with *vir* and *iuvenis*, he has not considered their importance as heroic epithets. The following study should, therefore, complement his work and shed further light upon Livy's vocabulary in relation to the broader social and political climate of the late Republic and the Augustan era. This article developed from my doctoral dissertation, *Gender and Rhetorical Topoi: Masculine and Feminine Terminology in Latin Prose*, written in Rome, 1986 (University of Missouri-Columbia 1988). The study of Livy's heroic epithets was given as a paper at the 1989 convention of the American Philological Association at Baltimore. Until the appearance of Moore's book, Livy's vocabulary was a neglected subject, despite publication of Packard's concordance, according to H. Aili, "Livy's language, a critical survey of research," *ANRW* 30.2 (1982) 1122–47. This study's criterion for selection of epithets was their repeated use with the gender terms *vir* and *iuvenis*, which, because of their aristocratic associations, have heroic connotations. One notes a contrast when Livy uses *adulescens* and *homo* together (2.18.10; 28.40.7). Context, as well as comparison with Cicero's employment, reveals that *homo adulescens* is the antithesis of heroic; Livy's *adulescentes* are *feroces* (e.g. 8.30.4) and *adulescentia* is *ferox* (e.g. 23.40.4; 28.43.2). For Ciceronian usage: H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero mit angabe sämtlicher Stellen* (Hildesheim 1962) vol 1 s.v. *adulescens*.

rence,"[4] may have had a preliminary concept of their place within the moral pattern of his history.

1. Livy's Martial *Vir Impiger*

Livy constantly uses the adjective *impiger* and the adverb *impigre* in military contexts. The *vir impiger* is therefore usually an officer, who exercises industry in the execution of his duties.[5] The martial overtones of the epithet, so apparent in Livy, are also evident in Cicero. The orator indicates that his client, M. Fonteius, is a *vir impiger*, and places him into the same category as Marius, Cinna, Sulla, and Crassus, whom he designates as *belli gerendi peritissimos* (Font. 43).[6] Ciceronian usage is echoed when Livy employs *vir impiger* as an epithet for Q. Naevius Crista, who leads a contingent of *socii* on a dangerous mission during the second Punic War. A *vir impiger et peritus militiae*, Crista is chosen by M. Valerius Laevinus to head a covert operation against Philip V on the Macedonian front (24.40.8). His assignment is to slip into Apollonia under cover of darkness in order to kidnap the king from his tent (24.40.9–11). With vigilant leadership, he moves a thousand men into the sleeping city.[7] Although Crista is by no means in the same category as Cicero's *imperatores*, he has nevertheless executed his duties with the alacrity required of a Roman officer. Of similar stamp is Livy's C. Persius, an *impiger vir*, whom M. Livius dispatches with 2500 men under orders to search the countryside for escaping Tarentines (26.39.21). Both Crista and Persius had to exercise the utmost watchfulness in the performance of their commissions. *Impiger* especially implies vigilance in the face of an enemy threat, and *impigre*, describing Flaminius' last stand at Trasimennus, indicates that the consul went down fighting (22.6.2).

[4] G. Miles, "The Cycle of Roman History in Livy's First Pentad," *AJP* 107 (1986) 2.

[5] Moore notes that in sixty-one out of seventy instances, Livy employs *impiger* and *impigre* in military contexts (above, note 3) 27. The military status of the *viri impigri*, Ettritus and Epicadus, is unclear. Gentius, King of the Illyrians, must murder them before dispatching his brother, Plator, who hopes to usurp the throne. Livy does not elaborate upon the episode; however, since he uses *impiger* to connote vigilance, the pair's designation as *viri impigri* suggests that they may have been Plator's bodyguards, or, perhaps, henchmen who aided him in his plans for usurpation (44.30.3).

[6] "Quae si diligenter attendetis, profecto, iudices, virum ad labores belli impigrum, ad pericula fortem, ad usum ac disciplinam peritum, ad consilia prudentem, ad casum fortunamque felicem domi vobis ac liberis vestris retinere quam inimicissimis populo Romano nationibus et crudelissimis tradere et condonare maletis."

[7] Unfortunately, the slaughter is undertaken with a maximum of noise, and the king, roused from his slumbers, flees, *seminudus*, to his ships (24.40.12–13). Valerius, however, has meanwhile blockaded the river, forcing Philip to scuttle his fleet and march overland to Macedonia (24.14.16–17). Naevius, the *vir impiger*, whose scrupulous attention to duty has paid off to a point is never heard of again. Naevius' raid seems to have been part of what E. S. Gruen sees to have been a restricted campaign of an undeclared war against Philip, designed to ensure that the king did not cross the Adriatic into Italy. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley 1984) 377.

Similar connotations are evident when Livy employs *impiger* with *iuvenis*.[8] For instance, when the military tribunes of 423 learn of a Volscian invasion, they leave an *impigrum iuvenem*, Appius Claudius, in charge of the city's defenses (4.36.5). Another *impiger iuvenis*, Pontius Cominus, must face tremendous danger, crossing enemy lines to deliver the Senate's message recalling Camillus from exile (5.46.8); and the brothers of the tribune Icilius are *impigri iuvenes* as they ride posthaste into the midst of the battle of Algidus, to deliver their urgent message to Verginius (3.46.5). Q. Fabius Maximus deploys *impigros iuvenes* as scouts to search for survivors of Cannae and question them about Hannibal's plans to invade the city of Rome (22.55.6); and when the praetor Quinctilius Varus leads a charge against Mago and his army, he is accompanied by his son Marcus, an *impigro iuvene* (30.18.5). Here the epithet implies the watchfulness needed for the opportunity to break through the ranks of elephants and rout the Carthaginians. In each example, *impigri viri* and *iuvenes* have contributed significantly to Roman victories.[9]

Livy, however, does not confine *vir impiger* to Roman officers, who, his epic history demonstrates, do not always display the diligence needed to check Rome's adversaries. A *vir impiger* may occasionally be found in the enemy ranks, and when he is, the Romans will be hard-pressed for a victory. Such is the case when *impigri duces* rush into the power vacuum left by the assassination of Hieronymus in Syracuse (20.21.1). An even greater threat is the *vir impiger*, Hasdrubal, who, Livy notes, has been given the Carthaginian command of Spain in response to Roman attempts to win over Spanish chieftains (21.22.1). *Vir impiger* connotes the alertness and enterprise that Hasdrubal must exercise to maintain order with Roman infiltrators at large subverting the local population. *Impiger* emphasizes Rome's vulnerability when Hasdrubal subsequently crosses the Alps: Hasdrubal, the *vir impiger* of book 21, becomes the *impiger dux* of book 27. Livy notes that Hasdrubal's descent onto the Italian peninsula was swifter even than that of his brother—so swift, in fact, that, for a time, it seemed as though there were two Hannibals in Italy (27.44.6).

Hasdrubal's entire portrait exemplifies the *vir impiger*. For instance, he displays mettlesome foresight at the battle of Metaurus, reconnoitering before the confrontation, observing the minutest details about the enemy in order to plan his strategy to the greatest effect (27.47.1–4).[10] Livy's portrayal of the general is entirely sympathetic, and he is *impiger* to the very last:

> Ille pugnantes hortando pariterque obeundo pericula sustinuit; ille fessos abnuentesque taedio et labore nunc precando nunc castigando accendit; ille fugientes revocavit omissamque pugnam aliquot locis restituit. (27.49.3)

[8] Moore observes that Livy uses *impiger* with *iuvenis* (in either singular or plural) eight times (above, note 3) 26–27.

[9] Moore also cites 5.34.3; 25.37.2; 43.23.2 (above, note 3) 27.

[10] Livy also credits Hasdrubal with an innovative, enterprising, and humane method of putting the elephants out of commission when they have run amok (27.49.1–2). Moore, (above, note 3) 28–29, observes that Livy uses *segnis* as the opposite of *impiger*, and *impiger* of non-Romans 32 times.

Livy makes it clear that fortune, not inferior leadership, caused Hasdrubal's defeat; the reader is left with a vivid image of the Carthaginian defying death, spurring his horse into the midst of the Roman ranks: "Ibi, ut patre Hamilcare et Hannibale fratre dignum erat, pugnans cecidit" (27.49.4).

Another *vir impiger* who almost routs the Romans is Muttines, a Libyphoenician officer from Hippo Diarrhytus. A *vir impiger*, who has mastered military strategy under the direct tutelage of Hannibal (25.40.5), Muttines very nearly defeats M. Claudius Marcellus. Muttines demonstrates energetic ingenuity as he and his Numidians scour the surrounding territory for allies:

> ut brevi tempore totam Siciliam impleret nominis sui, nec spes alia maior apud faventes rebus Carthaginiensium esset. (25.40.6)

When used of enemy generals, the epithet serves both to magnify Rome's victories and to mitigate her defeats. For instance, the triumph at Metaurus becomes even greater since the Roman army had to overcome an enemy led by such an enterprising and shrewd general, the *vir impiger*, Hasdrubal. Similarly, Marcellus' near rout at Agrigentum becomes explainable, since it was inflicted by Muttines, a *vir impiger* who had learned all the arts of war from Hannibal, himself. Livy intimates that the Romans were eventually victorious only because Muttines was recalled to quell a Numidian revolt, and because Hanno, envious of Muttines, whom he considered a racial inferior, disobeyed orders and played into Marcellus' hands (25.40.12–13; 41.1–4). Had the battle been left in the command of the *vir impiger* instead of jealous *duces*, its outcome might have been much different. Livy presents the *vir impiger* as a prototype of vigilant leadership to be emulated by Roman generals; and, significantly, Horace employs *impiger* to commemorate Tiberius as general in his victory over the Raetians in 14 B.C.[11] *Impiger* always connotes alertness and industry, essential qualities for the successful *imperator*.

2. The *vir fortis ac strenuus* of the Plebs

Livy's *fortis ac strenuus vir* is a Roman politician; the epithet is used repeatedly of politically active members of the plebeian order, particularly tribunes of the plebs. For instance, Gn. Manlius Volso, in an oration, alludes to plebeian tribunes as *viri fortes ac strenui* (38.47.5). Likewise, Livy uses *fortis ac strenuus vir* as an epithet for Q. Minucius Thermus on two occasions (38.41.3; 49.8). Consul of 193, Thermus began his career as tribune of the plebs in 201 B.C.

Moore observes that in Livy's first decade, only plebeians use the word *strenuus* in their speeches, confirming the adjective's identification with the lesser order.[12] It should be noted, however, that *strenuus* must be accompanied

[11] *Carm.* 4.14.13; 22; K. Quinn, *Horace, The Odes* (Basingstoke 1983) 323.

[12] Moore (above, note 3) 17–18. Note the pejorative overtones of *strenuus adulescens* when Livy uses the epithet of L. Sextius, whose political ambitions have been thwarted because he lacks patrician birth. Sextius is apparently not also *fortis*, because he is unsuccessful (6.34.11). K. M. Ziegler regards the concept indicated by *strenuus* as a Livian ideal: "Strenuus bei Cicero," *RhM* 12 (1969) 30.

by *fortis* to have this plebeian-political connotation. *Strenuus* by itself has no such overtones and may even be pejorative. For instance, *strenui viri*, in reference to the soldiers of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, implies that they have been overzealous in the performance of their duties. Furthermore, Gracchus' troops are not plebeians, but slave-volunteers (24.14), who have been wasting precious battle-time cutting off the heads of Carthaginian corpses instead of persevering with the battle. Gracchus, who has promised them liberty after a successful conclusion of the engagement, informs them that they have exceeded their responsibility; his remark, "claram satis et insignem virtutem esse nec dubiam libertatem futuram strenuis viris" (24.15.7), is ironical.

A political context for *fortis ac strenuus* is suggested by Horace, who cites L. Marcius Philippus as "strenuos et fortes causas...agendis / clarus" (*Epist.* 1.7.46). Marcius, a plebeian consul of 91 BC, was tribune of the plebs ca. 104 B.C.[13] Livy similarly places *fortis ac strenuus* into a plebeian political setting. *Vir fortis ac strenuus* is a salient component of tribunician rhetoric in the struggle of the orders, as when the tribunes declare that it is time to test whether a *fortis ac strenuus vir* of the plebs can be elected to high office (4.35.9); or when they fan the flames of patrician wrath, urging the people to guarantee *libertas* by wresting the consulship from the patricians, and presenting it to *viros fortes ac strenuos* of the plebeian order (5.12.8).

When the tribune, Canuleius, promotes intermarriage between the orders, he reminds the senate that it is possible for a *vir fortis ac strenuus* to come from the plebs and cites Numa, Tarquin, and Servius Tullius as examples (4.3.16). All, he says, rose to pre-eminence through *ingenium* and *virtus* (4.3.12). *Fortis ac strenuus* symbolizes the courage and persistence entailed in their elevation. Canuleius, furthermore, assures the *patres* of continued plebeian support if only hope of office be given to *viri strenui ac fortes* of the lesser order (4.5.5). Similarly, the consul P. Decius Mus uses the epithet *vir fortis ac strenuus* of the tribune, Ogulnius, who has proposed a law that members of his caste be admitted to the pontificate and the college of augurs (10.8.3–4). The epithet suggests the effort that must have gone into the enterprise in face of patrician intransigence.

Vir fortis ac strenuus may have eventually become part of the lexicon of factional politics. Livy repeats the epithet in the context of tribunician rabble-rousing, and a factional context is suggested when Q. Fabius Maximus uses it to indicate that P. Cornelius Scipio (not yet Africanus) had been resorting to *popularis* methods in order to get the African command. Fabius insinuates that his fellow patrician, Scipio, had been over-eager in soliciting support:

> Ego autem primum illud ignoro, quemadmodum iam certa provincia Africa consulis, viri fortis ac strenui, sit, quam nec senatus censuit in hunc annum provinciam esse nec populus iussit (28.40.4).

Livy remarks that rumors were circulating in advance that the command had already been awarded to Scipio, who was eager to augment his reputation with

[13] T. R. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 2 (London 1952) 588, s.v. Marcius, #75. Moore notes that *fortis ac strenuus* is a "prerequisite for holding office" (above, note 3) 15.

the consulship and a decisive victory (28.40.1). Given its demonstrably tribunician overtones, *fortis ac strenuus vir*, used by Fabius of the patrician Scipio, may represent a veiled insult, since there is at least a shade of suspicion that Scipio started the rumors himself. In light of Livy's other examples, Fabius may have been using *vir fortis ac strenuus* to imply that Scipio had been hustling for the appointment in a manner unworthy of a patrician. If being *fortis ac strenuus* were a typically plebeian virtue, *vir fortis ac strenuus*, when used of a patrician, would constitute political vituperation.

Factional connotations are similarly suggested when Cicero uses *vir fortis ac strenuus, amicus meus* of his political enemy, Q. Fufius Calenus (*Phil.* 8.11). Fufius, a consul of 47, was tribune in 61, and Cicero is at pains to present him as *popularis*. Since Fufius, an *amicus* of Antony, is otherwise *inimicissimus* to Cicero (*Att.* 14.8), there is every reason to assume that the orator has used *vir fortis ac strenuus* sarcastically, just as he has the adjectives *fortis* and *strenuus* (without *vir*) of Antony, whom he portrays as Fufius' partner in *dominatio* (*Phil.* 8.12). The orator, hinting that Antony had persistently pestered Caesar for the consulship, sneers that even if Antony were not particularly *fortis*, he was, at least, *strenuus* (2.78).[14] Both Fufius and Antony are termed *populares* (e.g., 8.19), and Livy similarly demonstrates that *vir fortis ac strenuus* may have evolved into a term of political abuse for persons envisioned to be *popularis*. This is illustrated in an episode where the epithet *vir fortis ac strenuus* is put into the mouth of Pacuvius Calavius, a character the historian depicts employing *popularis* methods.[15] In a passage loaded with Ciceronian invective, Livy describes the renegade Capuan senator, who wants to betray Rome to the Carthaginians, as a *nobilis idem popularis homo*; Pacuvius panders shamelessly to the *licentia* of the plebs, encouraging them to dissolve the legitimate Senate and to appoint a new one (23.2.2). Pacuvius, an *improbus homo sed non extremum perditus*, whose goal, like that of Fufius and Antony, is *dominatio*, (23.2.4), urges individual Capuans each to select a *virum fortem ac strenuum* as a new senator (23.2.6). Since Pacuvius is characterized as a demagogue, reminiscent of one of Cicero's hostile tribunes, *vir fortis ac strenuus*, evident in the Republican orator's diatribe against two of his most virulent political enemies, may have been intended to reflect *popularis* rhetoric.

Fortis ac strenuus complements *impiger* when Livy applies both epithets to Lucumo, who by diligence ascends to the top of the political ladder. Lucumo is introduced in an episode that portrays Rome as a City of Opportunity, where even plebeians, municipals, and foreigners can rise to the top—if they work persistently. Lucumo, a *vir impiger et divitiis potens*, journeys to Rome *cupidine maxime ac spe magni honoris* (1.34.1). *Impiger*, in this instance, implies that Lucumo is on the alert for the right opportunity to succeed. Although Lucumo, who advises King Ancus on war (1.34.12), might qualify as

[14] *Strenuus* is only used twice in Cicero's speeches, (*Phil.* 2.78; 8.11) and, as Ziegler notes, the orator employs it ironically on both occasions (above, note 12). J. Hellegouarc'h cites the association of *strenuus* with *fortis*; *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (Paris 1963) 250. For Fufius' career: Broughton (above, note 13) 567.

[15] On the term *popularis*: R. Seager, "Cicero and the Word *Popularis*," *CQ* n.s. 22 (1972) 328–38.

a military expert, Livy is clearly using *impiger* to imply extreme ambition in the advancement of Lucumo's career. Such connotations are apparent in Horace's use of the adjective in an Ode of 27–26 B.C.: *impiger*, an epithet for Hercules, refers not only to his famous labors, but also to the fact that, by hard work, he has attained Olympian heights, as have Castor and Pollux, Bacchus, and Augustus (*Carm.* 4.8.30).[16]

Lucumo weds the well-born Tanaquil, who, aware of her *humilior* husband's limited opportunities in Tarquinia, urges him to move to Rome where, she says, there is room for a *forti ac strenuo viro* (1.34.6). Once in Rome, Lucumo settles down to urban living with a new house and *carpentum*, raises children, spends money and wins friends in high places. As a foreigner of humble birth, Lucumo had to be *fortis ac strenuus* in order to succeed in politics. Factional terminology of the late Republic is evident as Livy depicts Lucumo canvassing for votes and making *popularis* speeches designed to win over the plebs (1.35.2). Livy demonstrates that due to persistent effort, the *impiger* and *fortis ac strenuus* Lucumo, whose political horizons are unlimited, has achieved the highest honors available in Rome at that time: the kingship. Lucumo is an exemplum of the indefatigability responsible for the Roman success story.[17]

3. *Vir acer* : the Avenger

Vir acer may apply to either soldiers or politicians; the epithet itself is, therefore, protean in nature. While *vir impiger* and *vir fortis ac strenuus* carry their own respective military or political connotations (e.g., 24.40.8; 28.40.4), *vir acer* is defined only by context.

Acer implies both shrewdness and mercilessness, as when Livy uses it of Appius Claudius Caecus.[18] A candidate for consul, Appius is also a *vir acer et*

[16] Comparable assertions are made in another ode (3.3.9–12), which contemplates Hercules sharing the same celestial table as the deified Augustus. *Impiger* can have negative connotations if ambition is carried to an extreme. Livy calls Alcibiades an *impiger ac nobilis iuvenis*, and implies that ungovernable ambition drove him to undertake the disastrous Sicilian expedition (28.41.17). Moore notes that *impiger* is "especially appropriate to youths" (above, note 3) 26. See below, Marcius, pp. 213–14.

[17] Lucumo's rise to the top: Liv. 1.34–35. It is in a literal sense that Livy employs *impigros iuvenes* of the Gallic king's two nephews who cross the uncrossable Alps well before Hannibal and the *impiger dux* Hasdrubal (5.34.3). Political ambitions are thwarted when Livy notes that after Trasimennus the magistracies had to be prorogued due to the war, and that a number of *fortes ac strenui viri* were, consequently, passed over (22.35.7).

[18] Appius is also called a *vehementis ingenii vir* (2.13.15). The *vir acer* seems to be first cousin, as it were, to the *vir asper ingenio*, an epithet for M. Popilius Laenas who meted out implacable punishment to the Rhodians collaborators of Persius (45.10.8). L. Bantius, who, out of gratitude to Hannibal, hands Nola over to the Carthaginians, is termed a *iuvenis acer* (23.15.8). Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, the *acerrimus iuvenum* of his day, is sent on a surprise visit to Pella in order to discover whether Philip V is plotting treachery (37.7.11). Sharp-wittedness of a literal nature is evident in Livy's description of the hand-picked vanguard who accompanied Hannibal to the summits of the Alps, as each is an *acerrimus vir* (21.32.13). As is illustrated with Bucar, *acer* can have pejorative

ambitiosus, an epithet that suggests unscrupulous pursuit of high office. Although Livy insists that Appius was acting in patrician rather than selfish interests, *vir acer et ambitiosus*, nevertheless, implies cutthroat factional politics; that Appius would use any means—no matter how unprincipled—to get elected; also that his political ambitions were without bounds (10.15.8).

Acer indicates similar implacability when Livy adds it to *impiger* in the epithet, *vir acer et impiger*, describing the bounty hunter, Bucar (29.31.12). Sent by the treacherous Syphax to bring back Masinissa dead or alive, Bucar seems to have been cut from a mould similar to that of Achilles, whom Horace describes as *impiger*, *iracundus*, *inexorabilis*, and *acer* (*Ars Poet.* 121). Masinissa and his horsemen have headed for the Mauretanian hills. Since he is an *acerrimus iuvenis* (27.5.11) of great innate ability, in Hasdrubal's opinion (29.31.3), a *vir acer et impiger*, is essential for the task of catching him. *Impiger* implies the necessary vigilance, and *acer*, the ruthlessness that Bucar will exercise in the execution of his assignment. In a tradition that was to bridge the chasm of centuries and pass into the lore of the Old West, Bucar drives Masinissa and his cavalry into a box-canyon where all but the prince are slaughtered. The foxy Numidian makes a last-minute escape through a secret gulch (29.32.4), but he cannot shake off the *acer* and *impiger* Bucar and his posse who pursue him to a cliff; the only escape is to plunge his horse into the raging torrent below, which Masinissa does without hesitation; and Bucar, assuming that the Numidian has been swept away, goes back to Syphax and collects the reward (29.32.5–10). The epithet *vir acer et impiger* has established Bucar's relentless character; furthermore, just as *vir impiger*, used of formidable enemies, suggests, by contrast, the valor of Rome's generals, so *vir acer et impiger* emphasizes the cunning nature of Bucar's adversary, Masinissa.

Acer, a modifier with a checkered past, like *fortis ac strenuus*, belongs to the lexicon of factional politics. Cicero uses *acer* in vituperation against ruthless *duces*, *hostes*, *imperatores*, and, on one occasion, a "nimium acer, nimium vehemens tribunus plebis" (*Leg. Agr.* 3.7).[19] Sallust, similarly, employs *vir acer* of a tribune, G. Memmius (*BJ* 27.2). Since Sallust, however, writes from a different political perspective than does Cicero, *acer* has none of the pejorative overtones evident in the orator's usage.[20]

overtones. Livy uses it in a negative sense when he comments that, as the Second Punic War dragged on, the plebs placed the blame squarely upon M. Claudius Marcellus and M. Valerius Laevinus: *consules bellicosos ambo viros acresque nimis et feroces*, who, because of selfish interests, were prolonging the war at the expense of peace (26.26.11). *Vir acer* is used in a positive sense of the man who acts as vindicator of a just cause. L. Pinarius, a *vir acer*, exercises preventive vengeance, as it were, by thwarting the town fathers of Henna, who are about to hand the mountain citadel over to the Carthaginians. Requesting the city magistrates to meet him at the amphitheatre, Pinarius orders his troops to put them to the sword (24.37–39). Moore, who also cites Pinarius and Gracchus, equates *acer* with extremism, and notes that Livy applies the adjective to both patricians and plebeians (above, note 3) 24.

[19] For Cicero's pejorative use of *homo acer* : *Quinct.* 30; *Verr.* 5.8; *Cluent.* 67; *Leg. Agr.* 2.82; *Cat.* 3.17.

[20] Sallust, furthermore, employs *acer* in contexts of military valor: *BJ* 7.4; 28.7; 94.6; 98.2; 101.7; 58.4; and the adjective's martial overtones are preserved

Sallust implies patriotic ruthlessness in the epithet. The historian, furthermore, sets *vir acer* into the context of vengeance as Memmius, inciting the people to declare war on Jugurtha, urges them *ad vindicandum* (27.2). Livy, likewise, iterates *acer* in the context of vengeance. For instance, he introduces Brutus as the guardian of the consular rods, remarking: "non acrior vindex libertatis fuerat quam deinde custos fuit" (2.1.9), and the *acer* Brutus, as consul, sees vengeance exacted upon his own sons (2.5). When he dies, Brutus is mourned by the matrons as the avenger of Lucretia's rape: "tam *acer* ultor violatae pudicitiae" (2.7.4). Both epithets represent thematic statements to prepare the readers for the second avenger of *pudicitia*, the tribune Icilius, a "*vir acer* pro causa plebis expertae virtutis" (3.44.3–12). Icilius promises Appius, the current violator of *pudicitia*: "me vindicantem sponsam in libertatem vita citius deseret quam fides" (3.45.11).

Livy often applies *vir acer* to the tribune of the plebs,[21] who is the ultimate vindicator of the people's rights. The historian identifies *provocatio*, appeal to the tribunes, as *una vindex libertatis* (3.56.6); and *vindex libertatis* recurs as a plebeian slogan in the conflict between the orders (6.14.10). The epithet *vir acer* plays a significant part in this ongoing struggle. *Acer* suggests that the tribune is ready to go to any lengths, including violence, to achieve his purpose. For instance, the three Icilii, all elected to the tribunate in the same year, are *acerrimi viri generosique* (4.55.3) who come from an anti-patrician family (4.54.4); and plebeian leaders worry that there is no *vir acer* to contest the patricians for the military tribunate (6.34.4). Another tribune, M. Sextius, a *vir acer nec infacundus* (4.49.12), wields the cudgels against M. Postumius Regillensis in one of Livy's Ciceronian passages.[22] Postumius possesses an arrogant nature and an unbridled tongue, which can be turned against him and put to tribunician advantage (4.49.12); *saevus* and *inhumanus* (4.49.13), he has broken his word to his army by keeping all the booty himself (4.49.9). The *vir acer*, Sextius, in a sizzling oration, puts him in his place with one of Cicero's more mordant terms of abuse: *belua* (4.49.14).[23] Like *vir fortis ac strenuus*, Livy continually links *vir acer* with tribunician rhetoric.

in Vergil's *Aeneid* where it is used dozens of times in heroic passages. H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu Vergilius mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen* (Leipzig 1912) s.v. *acer*.

[21] Moore comments upon the especially *acer* character of Livy's tribunes of the plebs (above, note 3) 26.

[22] A. H. MacDonald notes Ciceronian influence upon Livy, "The Style of Livy," *JRS* 47 (1957) 159–64. Postumius, to whom Livy gives a typical Ciceronian epithet, *pravae mentis homo* (4.49.8), seems to be a composite of Verres, Catiline, Piso, Clodius and Antony.

[23] I. Opelt associates animal imagery with the criminal, *Die Lateinischen Schimpfwörter mit verwandten sprachlichen Erscheinungen: eine Typologie* (Heidelberg 1965) 144; 209.

4. The Advent and Triumph of *Unus Vir*

The expulsion of the Etruscan Kings, according to Livy, ushered in an era of *libertas*.[24] *Libertas*, in fact, is the author's theme for book two, where in the very first chapter, he contrasts it to regal *superbia*.[25] Rome's freedom, however, has been hard-won; it is a constant struggle to maintain it against the baneful forces, domestic and foreign, that threaten it. At times, in fact, the situation becomes so perilous that SPQR cannot deal with it; at such critical moments, *unus vir* takes charge, and, by his own initiative and extraordinary ingenuity, he neutralizes the threat and restores the equilibrium so necessary for the preservation of *libertas*.

Although not an epithet in its strictest sense, *unus vir* is, nevertheless, the most important of Livy's recurrent heroic expressions, for *unus vir* represents the highest compliment that the historian can bestow on one of his characters. In fact, a passage in Tacitus' *Histories*, in which the people vote Antonius Primus the title, *unum virum ducemque*, suggests that *unus vir* may have been an honor granted by acclamation for valor on the battlefield (3.3.5). *Unus vir*, as far as Livy is concerned, may be a soldier or a magistrate exercising his military authority. He, however, stands apart from all others, because, against all odds and despite all opposition, *unus vir* singlehandedly saves the State. Often *unus vir* is hindered by lack of support or even outright opposition from his own men. Used over a dozen times throughout the extant history, *unus vir* refers to legendary figures; to heroic dictators; and to historical personages. Livy uses variations of the words *rem restituisse* in conjunction with the "epithet," and he describes the foe of *unus vir* as *unus hostis*, the latter designation being either stated specifically, or else implied. *Unus hostis*, who repeatedly displays *ferocia* or *superbia*, may be an entire Etruscan or Gallic force, a disgruntled Master of Horse, or an opposing general.

Unus vir is first encountered upon the Pons Sublicius in the person of Horatius Cocles (2.10.2), who, while his comrades retreat from the Etruscan advance, plants himself firmly upon the wooden structure and battles the enemy unaided until *pudor* finally rallies his faint-hearted men (9). Livy remarks that but for *unus vir* Rome would have succumbed to the Etruscans (10), and *servitia regum superborum* would have destroyed *libertas* (2.10.8). Horatius' courage finally shames his men into engaging *unum hostem* (2.10.9–10), before he hurls himself from the flaming, collapsing bridge—a prayer to Father Tiber on his lips—and swims, fully armed, to safety (2.10.10–11). Livy acknowledges this tale to be fabulous; and, as Quintilian was to observe, the introduction of a fictitious character or story as well as the repetition of words were rhetorical devices used to emphasize a particular point (*Inst. Orat.* 9.3.31; 33). Livy, introducing Horatius as *unus vir* who saves the State, has made a thematic statement, the refrain of which will recur as the history progresses.

[24] 2.1.1–7; R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5* (Oxford 1965) 233–34.
[25] 2.1.2; Luce (above, note 1) 231.

It is Rome's good fortune that *unus vir* is not only present in 386 B.C., but that he is a lighter sleeper than the dogs and guards as the Gauls inch their way up the escarpment of the Capitol in a sneak attack. M. Manlius is awakened by the flapping and cackling of Juno's geese, and, being a former consul and *vir bello egregius* (5.47.4), he does not wait for his sleep-befuddled companions-at-arms, but rushes single-handedly into the fray. Yet again has one man saved the State, and, when Manlius' vigilance and courage are rewarded with a lifetime supply of flour and wine, Livy assures his readers that everyone was happy to make do with less *ad honorem unius viri* (5.47.8–9).

The expression *unus vir* is closely identified with the Fabii, and perhaps the Fabian family historian perpetuated it. Fabius Pictor, one of Livy's many sources, embellished his history with memorable deeds and accomplishments of the *gens Fabia*.[26] Pictor's work, however, was written in Greek. The words *unus vir*, therefore, may have been inspired by Ennius' lines about the great Fabius Maximus, paraphrased in the historian's obituary of Hannibal's adversary: "sic nihil certius est quam unum hominem nobis cunctando rem restituisse, sicut Ennius ait" (30.26.9). Livy establishes a parallel to *unum hominem*, by citing Hannibal as *unus hostis* (30.26.7–9).

Livy echoes Ennius' words in a passage that lauds an honorable Fabian ancestor, K. Fabius, *unus ille vir, ipse consul*, who, despite the hostility of his own troops, *rem publicam sustinuit* (2.43.6). As R. M. Ogilvie observes, the tribulations of K. Fabius foreshadow those of Q. Fabius, who, despite the hostility of his own troops, *rem restituisse* (30.26.10).[27]

Unus vir constantly exercises the wisdom and *imperium* of a consul, while his adversary continually displays *ferocia*. For instance, when a *ferox* Etruscan cuts down an earlier Q. Fabius, a consular who leads his army into battle in 479 B.C., Livy notes that the death of *unius viri* was felt throughout the ranks (2.46.4–5). The pattern recurs when the military tribune, M. Furius Camillus, is disparaged, not by his troops but by his own kinsman and colleague, L. Furius, in front of the entire army. Livy contrasts *unius viri* [Camilli] *consilium atque imperium* with the recklessness of Furius, who is *ferox* and puffed up by the expectations of the mob. As Furius taunts Camillus as a superannuated *cunctator*—an ex-*acerrimus bellator* who has lost his punch (6.23.5)—so Q. Minucius Rufus, attempting to subvert Fabius Maximus' authority in 217 B.C., jeers that the great *cunctator* is a "novus Camillus, nobis dictator unicus" (22.14.9). Both Camillus and Fabius Maximus are portrayed as saviors of the State.[28] (6.23.1–5). The refrain is likewise heard when Papirius Cursor, as dictator, has his *imperium* flouted. Livy bestows the epithet, *ferox adulescens*, on Cursor's insubordinate *magister equitum* (8.30.4).

Papirius Cursor, like Fabius Maximus, overcomes his anger against his master of horse (a black-sheep Fabius) despite the utmost provocation. Livy again reflects the *unus hostis* motif, noting that although Papirius would like to

[26] Walsh notes the propagandistic nature of Fabius' history (above, note 1) 36.
[27] Ogilvie (above, note 24) 351.
[28] Walsh (above, note 1) 85. Aili (above, note 3) 1144, citing E. Dutiot in *Latomus* 15 (1956) notes Livy's use of *unicus* in the sense of "unique" as an epithet for generals, great Romans, and virtues.

vent his wrath on the tribunes, the centurions, and everyone else who had participated in Fabius' illicit campaign against the Samnites, he instead concentrates his ire *in unum* (8.31.6–7), who has defied both military discipline and *imperium*. Like his Fabian and Papirian predecessors, Cursor's cousin, Papirius Crassus, gets no cooperation from his troops, either, in the Samnite war of 325 B.C., and Livy, replaying the theme, states that matters had become so critical that *unus vir* could have turned the tide in favor of the Romans—had he been given the proper support (8.36.3).

Every now and then, *unus vir* (like the *vir impiger*) appears on the enemy side, and when this happens the Romans must be especially wary, for a seemingly easy victory might well turn into a sudden defeat, especially if there is dissension in the Roman ranks. Such is the case when the Volscian, Vettius Messius, a *nobilior vir factis quam genere* (4.28.3), rallies his band *fortissimorum iuvenum*, just as they are surrounded and about to be slaughtered by the Romans. Invoking *virtus*, he shouts: "Ite mecum!" and bursts through the Roman lines. Livy remarks: "uni viro Messio fortuna hostium innititur." (4.28.7).[29]

Time and again, *unus vir* combats *unus hostis*. In each case, *virtus* is pitted against *ferocia*, and, just as the latter seems about to triumph, *unus vir* restores the precious equilibrium of the State.

5. Livy and Augustus

When the consuls of 495 B.C., confronted by tumultus, declare that they need *unum...virum* like Appius Claudius, who would not hesitate to use his consular authority to coerce the mob (2.28.4), Livy defines *unus vir* as "id enim plus esse quam consulem." The definition resembles other clarifications of Augustan terminology, as when Livy notes that Evander ruled *auctoritate magisquam imperio* (1.7.8), or the several occasions when he contrasts matters august to those human. L. R. Taylor has suggested that Livy is defining the term *augustus* for those readers who may be unfamiliar with it.[30] Livy's similar

[29] An even greater threat to Roman military successes is Archimedes, whose anti-ballistic weapons bring the Roman siege of Syracuse to a halt. Livy gives Archimedes the epithets *unus homo* and *unicus spectator caeli siderumque* (24.34.1–2). *Unus homo* foreshadows Livy's praise of Fabius Maximus (30.26.9). *Homo* in both instances connotes human being. Livy's choice of *homo*, with its humble associations, over the heroic *vir* seems deliberate. In both cases, one individual, by using his intellect, has thwarted a mighty military force. Archimedes, like Fabius, is a delayer; he and his confounding machines have prevented Marcellus from taking Syracuse, as Fabius and his gadfly tactics have prevented Hannibal from taking Rome. On *homo* and the humble, H. D. Jocelyn, "Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto (Ter. *Heaut.* 77)," *Antichthon* 6 (1972) 14–46.

[30] L. R. Taylor cites the following passages, noting their religious overtones: justification for combining *fabulae* with *res gestae*: "Datur haec venia antiquitati, ut miscendo humana divinis primordia urbium augustiora faciat" (*Praef.* 7); on the divine appearance of Hercules: "habitum formamque viri aliquantum ampliorem augustioremque humana intuens" (1.7.9); on the Gallic invaders, awe-struck by Roman nobles in their courtyards: "sedentes viros praeter ornatum habitumque humano augustiorem maiestate etiam quam voltus gravitasque oris prae se ferebat

clarification of *unus vir* as well as his insistance upon its use as an epithet for those who save the state from *unus hostis* at the critical moment, suggests that he may be commenting not only upon Augustus' singular position in relation to the Roman constitution, but also upon his role as savior of the State.

Consideration of another *unus vir* suggests that the author's agenda may, indeed, have been *paulo maiora*. The scene is Spain; both Scipios have been killed; the country is about to fall to the Carthaginians (25.37.2).

> Cum deleti exercitus amissaeque Hispaniae viderentur, *vir unus* res perditas restituit. Erat in exercitu L. Marcius Septimi filius, eques Romanus, *impiger iuvenis* animique et ingenii aliquanto quam pro fortuna in qua erat natus maioris.

Once more, when disaster threatens, one man intervenes and sets matters right. But where Fabius and Camillus were old foxes, Marcius is an *impiger iuvenis*, and Livy, perhaps unconsciously, has changed the emphasis by reversing the word order from *unus vir* to *vir unus*.[31] Like Lucumo, a *vir impiger*, Marcius, an *impiger iuvenis*, has compensated for a stunted family tree by diligent work. An example of Roman persistence at its best, Marcius has learned the arts of war from the late Cn. Scipio (25.37.3). As a result, Marcius not only raises an army of Scipio's veterans, but he also accumulates so much *auctoritas* that he is elected general by his new troops despite his tender years (25.37.5–6). When Hasdrubal's approach terrifies Marcius' troops, he upbraids them for their *muliebres et inutiles...fletus*; through persuasive oratory, he converts their tears to rage, and they rout the enemy (10–11). Subsequently, Marcius conceives a plan which, Livy assures his readers, is *temerarius* rather than *audax* (25.37.17): to take the battle into the enemy's own encampment—but not until he has exhorted his troops, invoking *pietas* to *imperatores* both living and dead (25.38.1–2). His bold action plus his willingness to adopt Punic tactics (39.2) not only saves the day, but also breaks Carthaginian supremacy in Spain and pacifies that province for the duration of the war (25.39.18). Livy notes that *miracula* were attributed to Marcius, and that the Senate voted him a shield which was hung on the Capitol.

Livy has interspersed this account with a series of fortuitous coincidences that the reader might well associate with another *iuvenis*. Like Marcius, young Octavian learned the arts of war from a late general (Suet. *Aug.* 8); compensated

simillimos dis" (5.41.8); on Decius preparing himself for *devotio*: "aliquanto augustior humano visus" (8.9.10). "Livy and the Name Augustus," *CR* 32 (1918) 159.

[31] Livy has foreshadowed Marcius' designation as *vir unus* by applying the same appellation (in the same word order) to another protagonist of the Spanish campaign. Abelux, a Spaniard, is *vir unus* who has turned the tide of the war in favor of the Romans (22.22.6). Abelux, however, is to be contrasted to Marcius, since the Spanish *vir unus*, has broken the bonds of his Carthaginian alliance by changing sides and convincing Spanish warlords to do the same, while Marcius has won the province by legitimate methods. Nevertheless, Livy, although he deplores the changing of sides, grants Abelux the epithet *vir prudens* for his efforts on the Roman behalf (22.22.21). Moore notes Livy's tendency to apply *prudentia* to military leaders (above, note 3) 110.

for a modest family background by diligent work;[32] accrued enough *auctoritas* to raise an army of veterans and lead it, out of *pietas* for its dead commander, later even marching into the enemy's camp[33] (an act doubtless *temerarius* rather than *audax*, since he despised rash action).[34] Like Marcius, Octavian declaimed to his troops on a daily basis during the Mutina campaign (Suet. *Aug.* 84); like Marcius, he saved the State at the critical moment; like Marcius, his exploits were heralded by *miracula*, and the Senate voted him a bronze shield that was duly hung in the Curia (*RG* 34). Livy's citation of three separate sources for Marcius' exploits attests to his belief in their authenticity. He has, however, selected his evidence and vocabulary so that certain events of contemporary significance are emphasized.

Livy's probable purpose for such an arrangement becomes evident if one considers the chronology for his composition of the history. It is commonly agreed that he began the first chapter of *Ab Urbe Condita* between 27 and 25 B.C.[35] Because of a specific reference to Augustus' Spanish victories, book 28 had to have been written after 19 B.C. (28.12.13). It has been conjectured that the historian wrote upon an average of three books per year.[36] At such a rate, book 25 and Marcius' exploits could have been written around 19 B.C., the year in which Spain was pacified, or later. Augustus' successes in that province may well have inspired Livy to note parallels in the career of his *princeps* and that of Marcius.[37] His readers, whom the poetry of Vergil and Horace had accustomed to such laudatory allusions, also being thoroughly familiar with Rome's recent history, would not be hard-pressed to make similar associations.[38] This is not the first time that the events in the lives of Livy's characters have paralleled incidents in that of Augustus. The historian's first success story is that of Lucumo, the *vir impiger* and *fortis ac strenuus vir*, who, by persistent diligence, overcomes his humble birth and ascends the political summit. With his wife at his side for encouragement, Lucumo moves to Rome, enters politics and

[32] As did Lucumo, (1.34–35); see above, pp. 226–27. The overcoming of inherent disabilities is a favorite topos of Livy: e.g., the young centurion, [cited by Moore (above note 3) 18] a *strenuus vir* who fought despite constant suffering from illness (8.8.16), information that seems gratuitous unless Livy is alluding to the notoriously bad health of Octavian during military campaigns.

[33] Velleius recalls an incident when Augustus, as a *iuvenis*, boldly marched under a shower of missiles into Lepidus' camp and out again, stealing an eagle from the standards (2.80.3).

[34] Augustus, who believed in *festinatio* in a military commander (Suet. *Aug.* 25), would have approved of Fabius and Marcius.

[35] Walsh (above, note 1) 5; Ogilvie (above, note 24) 60. Taylor (above, note 30) 159; Luce and Woodman, however, argue for a pre-Actium date: Luce, "Livy's First Decade," *TAPA* 96 (1965) 210; A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London, 1988) 135.

[36] Walsh says that he probably wrote more rapidly, but that assuming that he worked continually until his death, three books a year would have been his average (above, note 1) 8; cf. Luce (above, note 35) 230.

[37] See below, note 43.

[38] Nor would they fail to see the resemblance to Hercules, the *vir augustior* (1.7.9), since Octavian, linked by Horace with Hercules (*Carm.* 3.3.9–12), had also been dubbed Augustus, as Ogilvie notes, some years before chapter one of *Ab Urbe Condita* was written (above, note 24) 60.

changes his name; finally, as an eagle swoops down from the sky to lend the Jovian stamp of approval, Lucumo is elected King Tarquinius Priscus (1.34.8–12). Tarquinius' portrait is fully drawn, and its position at the beginning of the book gives it prominence. By the time Livy's readers arrive at the last 20 books on Augustus,[39] the parallels will be evident: with another man who happened to be from out-of-town, who married, moved to Rome, entered politics, changed his name, and, also with the auspices of an eagle, rose in status, ultimately to rule the country.

One must either attribute the presence of sundry parallel incidents in *Ab Urbe Condita* and the career of Augustus to the long and busy arm of coincidence—an assumption that strains credulity—or, acknowledging that the repetition of words, phrases, or even entire episodes in Roman history is not coincidental, but deliberate,[40] conclude that Livy had some definite purpose in mind. The historian, who repeatedly insists upon *unus vir*—a defender of *libertas*, who battles *unus hostis*, a champion of *ferocia*—may, very likely, be foreshadowing Augustus' entry into Roman history.

H. Petersen has discovered numerous Livian references to contemporary events that allude to Augustus or aspects of his administration, particularly in the first book. He cites, for instance, Evander, who ruled *auctoritate magis quam imperio* (1.7.8), and notes that "the contrast between *auctoritas* and *imperium* is neither called for by the context, nor does it seem to be part of historical tradition."[41] Taylor likewise has remarked upon Livy's repeated use of the word *augustus* in a manner that seems to be "defining the new name" so that its "true significance might be understood."[42]

A. J. Woodman, who notes that it was customary for Roman imperial historians to allude to the reigning *princeps* in order to demonstrate patriotism, assumes that the last 20 books of *Ab Urbe Condita* would have been dominated by the acts of Augustus.[43] His opinion is in accord with that of J. Hellegouarc'h, who believes that Livy intended the deeds of Camillus to prefigure and call attention to the accomplishments of the *princeps*. Camillus, Hellegouarc'h notes, also a new founder of Rome, celebrates a triple triumph

[39] A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus, the Tiberian Narrative* (Cambridge 1977) 37.

[40] J. N. Keddie "Italicus and Claudius: Tacitus' *Annales* 11.16–17," *Antichthon* 9 (1975) 54.

[41] "Livy and Augustus," *TAPA* 92 (1961) 441–51, esp. 441–42 (on Evander); he argues that there are too many such references to be accidental "on the writer's part" or the result of "over-interpretation" on that of the reader. He also remarks that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, like Livy, made contemporary allusions, citing the four cardinal virtues on the *clupeus aureus* when he is writing of Romulus. Petersen notes the need to discover other such allusions so that they might be properly evaluated (444–45).

[42] Taylor (above, note 30) 159.

[43] Woodman (above, note 39) 37; in his latest book, however, Woodman argues for a date earlier than 27 B.C. for Book One (above, note 35) 137–38; he writes that Livy could not possibly have had Augustus in mind when he began writing, but that later, as he continued his history, he "came to see Augustus as the realisation or personification" of the same ideals envisioned for the State. It seems easier to imagine that Livy, perceiving parallels between his moral *exempla* and those of his *princeps*, may have written with forethought.

and is hailed *princeps pace*. Unconcerned with epithets, Hellegouarc'h does not cite Camillus' full designation: *vir unicus...princeps pace belloque* (7.1.9).[44] Again, the emphasis is upon one man who saves the State, and the words *vir unicus* themselves recur, as we have seen, in Minucius' diatribe against Fabius, who also saves the State.

The above-mentioned scholars, however, represent only one side of what appears to be an ongoing controversy.[45] Walsh argues that there are only two overt citations of Augustus, and regards "covert references" to his regime to be "too thin to merit consideration;" and Luce seconds his opinion, noting that "cryptic identifications with Augustus of heroes of legend and history is neither provable nor plausible."[46] R. Syme also warns against reading too much into Livy's text, noting that the historian was not an intimate of Maecenas and therefore could not have been particularly close to Augustus.[47] Ogilvie adds that Livy never achieved any position higher than preceptor of "the invalid Claudius," the implication being, one supposes, that had the historian been engaging in flattery he would have risen to consular status.[48]

As for overt references, modern advertising techniques have demonstrated that it is not open mention that is always the most effective way of selling a

[44] J. Hellegouarc'h, "Le principat de Camille," *REL* 48 (1970) 112–32, esp. 124; cf. Miles (above, note 4) 13–21.

[45] There seems to be a reluctance to acknowledge Livian allusions to his sovereign—as if, having made any, he would have been tantamount to a totalitarian propagandist. This view seems to be founded upon the events of World War II. J. R. Johnson, however, argues that the modern conception of propaganda as official lies designed to change beliefs was unknown to the ancients, and notes the subtlety of Augustan propaganda, which incorporated moral values and prejudices that were already well-established among the Romans: *Augustan Propaganda: the Battle of Actium; M. Antony's Will; the fasti Capitolini Consulares; and Early Imperial Historiography* (Diss. Los Angeles 1976) 6–7.

[46] P. G. Walsh, "Livy and Augustus," *PACA* 4 (1961) 30–31. He nevertheless modifies his opinion somewhat in his book (above, note 1), admitting that Livy may be regarded as an "Augustan historian" in that he probably reacted to the principate in a "new spirit of optimism" (10); Luce (above, note 1) 17.

[47] R. Syme, "Livy and Augustus," *HSCP* 64 (1959) 42 and 52; cf. Ogilvie (above, note 24) 3. It is one thing to make sweeping associations between Livy's moral message and Augustus' legislative reforms, and quite another to isolate coincidental parallels between reported events in the lives of the historian's protagonists and those of his *princeps*. Augustus would hardly be displeased with references to personages whose virtues he himself prized, especially since he claimed to despise open adulation (Suet. *Aug.* 53). As far as Maecenas is concerned, Livy's supposed lack of intimacy with the entrepreneur is irrelevant—an assumption based upon modern ideas of patronage, exploded by P. White: "*Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome," *JRS* 68 (1978) 74–92.

[48] Ogilvie, (above, note 24) loc. cit. One notes a similar failure by Velleius Paterculus to ascend to lofty political heights. If references to one's sovereign constituted a political green light, one would suppose that Velleius, whose adulation of Tiberius is unabashed, would have soared to the summit—but then, Tiberius' detractors would probably attribute the lapse to his devious personality. If Livy made no political mark in a society where the factional struggles of the Republic had been neutralized, perhaps it is because he preferred life as a private citizen, and the leisure to devote himself full-time to the production of a massive work of history.

product, but rather subliminal referral based upon repetition of catchwords associated with that product. Livy's repetitive use of the epithets *vir impiger*, *fortis ac strenuus vir* and *vir acer*—in essentially positive contexts—are cases in point. The adjectives in the epithets play no significant part in the rhetoric of Livy's predecessors; yet they are consciously evoked by his literary contemporaries. *Impiger* and *fortis ac strenuus* are reminiscent of Augustan ideals, as set forth in the poetry of Vergil and Horace.[49] *Acer*, used of Brutus the *ultor*, and tribunes of the plebs, whom Livy repeatedly presents as vindicators of the people's *libertas*, is consistent with the slogan *Libertatis P. R. Vindex*, advertised on Augustan coins and in the *Res Gestae* (*RG* 1).[50] The iteration of moral catchwords, appended as epithets to a procession of *viri* and *iuvenes impigri*, *fortes ac strenui* and *acres*, cannot but hover in the back of the reader's mind only to enter into his consciousness when another personage, who proclaims similar characteristics, arrives on the contemporary historical scene.[51] The same proposition is true for *unus vir*, who perpetually saves the state from *unus hostis*.

It must be reiterated that it is the moral qualities of Livy's heroes, not their individual personalities, that are important. With the exceptions of the coincidental events mentioned above, Augustus bears no resemblance to the respective protagonists or their deeds; he did not, for instance, stand alone at the bridge, invade Italy, or defend maidenly *pudicitia* against patrician priapism. The crucial

[49] See above, note 11. Although Vergil never uses *impiger*, the word is consistent with the work-ethic of the *Georgics*; and Horace uses it of the sturdy Apulian ploughman (*Carm.* 3.16.26). On *impiger* as an epithet for Hercules and Augustus (4.8.30): see above, p. 227. Cf. 3.3.1–12, where the *tenax vir* overcomes adversity and is exalted to the same height as Hercules and Augustus; see T. E. Page, *Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum Libri IV* (London, 1893) 428; 325. Quinn notes that the hero is destined to achieve immortality, and that the "apotheosis of Augustus is confidently predicted as the culmination of a historical process." (above, note 11) 246. On Horace's employment of *acer* and *impiger* as epithets for Achilles, see above, note 11. That *impiger* may have indeed have been an Augustan political catchword is suggested by what M. C. J. Putnam notes to be its singular use by Tibullus as an ironic epithet of Aeneas (2.5.39), *Tibullus, a Commentary* (Norman 1973) 188. The poem, which alludes to Actium, notes that Rome was once an idyllic place in which to live, before the city aspired to universal rule and *impiger* Aeneas battled Turnus and deserted Vesta for Mars. Putnam notes that Tibullus felt no need to praise either Rome or Augustus. The unusual use of *impiger* may be the poet's ironic commentary on the well-known values of the *princeps*.

[50] Livy's epitomator, Florus, perhaps reflecting the terminology of the original work, calls Octavian an *acerrimus iuvenis* (2.15.2). Vergil uses *acer* repeatedly in heroic contexts: it is an epithet for both Aeneas (12.789) and Turnus (10.308) as well as a host of other heroes. See Merguet (above, note 20) s.v. *acer*. On *libertatis P.R. vindex*, R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939–74) 155; 306; on Augustus as *ultor*, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.41–44: "Sive mutata iuvenem figura / Ales in terris imitaris almae / Filius Maiae, patiens vocari Caesaris ultor..."

[51] Miles notes Livy's originality in the "selection and reshaping of traditional material," which he combines "with a synthesis of preoccupations distinctive to [his] own age," and remarks that the synthesis "must have been unprecedented in literary tradition," (above, note 4) 2. Johnson argues that the values of Livy's history, while they might not have constituted official propaganda, nevertheless, reflected a "strong moral consensus" of the Roman people (above, note 45) 11.

factor is the kindred moral characteristics responsible for these individuals' successes. Moreover, the categories of persons to whom Livy applies the epithets is significant, for they could well relate to the several aspects of authority upon which Augustus based his reconstitution of the Republic: his proconsular and consular *imperium*, his tribunician *potestas*, and his singular position as first among equals.

One final example demonstrates how Livy uses the *unus* theme in an episode that seems to foreshadow the Battle of Actium. In book nine, the historian launches into a discourse on Alexander the Great—a digression so intrusive that it has been considered a schoolboy exercise that the author has had the bad judgment to include in the narrative.[52] Livy posits a hypothetical battle of champions which pits a Roman commander, Papirius Cursor, against the Macedonian king.

Livy sets the stage for his rhetorical conflict with familiar motifs. Observing that Papirius went to Apulia to exact vengeance for the Caudine Forks disaster, the historian cites the confusion of his sources about the identity of the victorious general, but opines that Papirius, *ultor...unicus*, should get the entire credit (9.15.10). Noting that the imperator celebrated a triumph in his third consulship, Livy enshrines Papirius among legendary heroes by reminding readers that the *cognomen* "Cursor" means "swift-footed" (9.16.11–13). He observes:

> Haud dubie illa aetate, qua nulla virtutum feracior fuit, nemo *unus* erat *vir* quo magis innixa res Romana staret. Quin eum parem destinant animis magno Alexandro ducem, si arma Asia perdomita in Europam vertisset (9.16.19).

The historian has pronounced Papirius, *unus vir*, a general the equal of Alexander, and, in his lengthy digression on the latter's greatness, Livy notes that the young king was even more illustrious because he was *unus*, and that all Roman commanders, even Papirius, would have had to yield to Alexander (9.17.5–14)[53] In his initial estimation, the historian portrays the ideal Alexander, *iuvenis unus*, to whom even the Roman Senate would have paid heed; the Alexander who looked after his army's interests and who was as yet uncorrupted by Persian pomp:

> Victus esset consiliis *iuvenis unius*, ne singulos nominem, senatus ille, quem qui ex regibus constare dixit *unus* veram speciem Romani Senatus cepit. Id vero erat periculum, ne sollertius quam quilibet *unus* ex his quos nominavi castris locum caperet, commeatus expediret, ab insidiis praecaveret, tempus pugnae deligeret, aciem instrueret, subsidiis firmaret. (9.17.14)

[52] W. B. Anderson, "The Study of the Ninth Book of Livy," *TAPA* 39 (1908) 94. Luce, on the other hand, believes Livy's digression to be part of a planned debate in response to a polemic against contemporary Greek historians, *levissimi ex Graecis* (9.18.6): (above, note 35) 217–27.

[53] Anderson believes the *unus vir* passage to have been inspired by Ennius (above, note 52) 91; and J. P. Lipovski says that its purpose was to "expunge the shame of Caudium (9.17–19)"; *A Historiographical Study of Livy* (New York 1981) 151.

Lest Livy's readers associate this *iuvenis unus* with a more recent *iuvenis unus* whose advice the Senate heeded and who cherished his army's best interests, particularly after the hostilities had ended, the historian supersedes the ideal Alexander with the historical Alexander, whose head had been turned by the gold and purple paraphernalia of Persian royalty. Livy notes that the Macedonian king forgot his homeland, underwent a flamboyant change in dress and demanded adoration; moreover he used carousals as pretexts for assassinations (9.18.3–5).[54] Evoking a Dionysiac image, Livy has enrolled Alexander among the forces of *superbia* and *ferocia*; he makes it perfectly clear in this rhetorical battle between West and East that the *ferox* Macedonian could have easily overwhelmed the defenders of *libertas*.

Although he notes that Alexander's greatness—*unius...ea magnitudo hominis*—was the product of little more than ten years (9.18.8), Livy, nevertheless, concludes that soldier to soldier and general to general the Romans were superior in *virtus* and fortune (9.18.12); their army was also more disciplined and mobile. Had Alexander lived to cross the sea, the Romans would have defeated him in one battle: "Uno proelio victus Alexander bello victus esset" (9.19.9). The Romans would have soon made Alexander wish that he was again fighting unmanly Indians, Persians, and Asiatics (19.10). Indeed, given Roman staying power, Alexander did not live long enough to fight a single war: "vix aetatem Alexandri suffecturam fuisse reor ad unum bellum" (19.13).

Livy has repeated the adjective *unus* throughout the Alexander digression.[55] The episode is clearly presented as a conflict between West and East, and it may well serve as a harbinger for the battle of Actium, which Augustan propaganda touted as an occidental-oriental confrontation, as well as a single apocalyptic struggle (*unum proelium*) between good and evil, personified by its respective commanders Octavian (*unus vir*) and Antony (*unus hostis*).[56] Livy's readers, who were thoroughly *au courant* with contemporary propaganda that portrayed Augustus as the defender of wholesome Roman ideals and Antony as the exponent of filthy Asian practices, could not fail to see the point.[57]

[54] Even should Livy's comments about Alexander be ironical, in response to *levissimi ex Graecis* [Luce (above, note 35) 222], it is not implausible to suppose that Livy may have intended the exemplum to be an admonition to the current *iuvenis* (who, despite his professed morality, as triumvir, had indulged in morally reprehensible acts) not to follow in Alexander's (and Antony's) hubristic footsteps.

[55] Moore notes Livy's tendency to "cluster" words, i.e., to repeat certain words more than three times within a certain episode (above, note 3) 3.

[56] Johnson (above, note 45) xii; 10. The words in parentheses reflect the interpretation of the author of this article.

[57] Johnson (above, note 45) 10. Rhetoric reflective of Alexander's *luxuria*, and libidinous inebriation is given full treatment in book 39, where Livy harps upon the excesses of the Bacchic cult. Florus echoes much of the same imagery in his account of the battle of Actium. Livy's epitomator is likely reflecting the text of the original as well as Augustan propaganda, which presented Antony as an intemperate lecher, enthralled by a *mulier Aegyptia* (*Flor.* 2.21.1–2). Cf. Plutarch, who reflects Augustus' propaganda that Antony (*Ant.* 52), the new Dionysus (24) and extravagant sybarite (28), acted like a youth (30) and was prone to blazing passions (36); that Antony had followed in Alexander's debauched footsteps, and that the triumvir had even gone so far as to make one of

The broader significance of the episode is evident in Livy's words: "Absit invidia verbo et civilia bella sileant..." (9.19.15), and in his implied admonition that future Roman security will depend on peace abroad and harmony at home (9.19.17):

> Mille acies graviores quam Macedonum atque Alexandri avertit avertetque, modo sit perpetuus huius qua vivimus pacis amor et civilis cura concordiae!

The past and future tenses of *avertit avertetque* indicate that Livy's rhetorical battle is a focal stepping stone on a long and continuing path. In fact, the entire gratuitous episode seems to makes sense in relation to the rest of the narrative only if Livy intended it to foreshadow the pivotal battle of his own century. His prayer for eternal peace would certainly have been heartfelt and approved by all of his readers who had survived the civil wars.[58]

Evocations of contemporary events, however, need not constitute a blanket endorsement of Augustus and his policies.[59] They may, rather, reflect a genuine belief that the rule of one man was the only solution to Rome's factional clashes. Livy was not the first to posit such a scenario. Similar assertions had been made by Cicero, who, being thoroughly familiar with the excesses of factionalism, set forth the prospect of government by *unus* in *De Republica.* Cicero writes that the ideal ruler is "bonus et sapiens et peritus utilitatis dignitatisque civilis quasi tutor et procurator rei publicae" (2.51). He further identifies his paradigmatic prototype as *rector et gubernator civitatis* and states "quem virum agnoscitis; iste est enim, qui consilio et opera civitatem tueri potest" (Ib.). Cicero's ideas are reflected in *Ab Urbe Condita.* Livy, who repeatedly cites the need for one man to intercede in times of crisis, be he dictator or an individual of extraordinary courage, echos Cicero's terminology. For instance, when Cincinnatus is appointed dictator, he is designated *rector rei publicae* (4.14.2) (a Ciceronian virtue also assumed by Augustus, according to Woodman);[60] and Fabius Maximus, expressing the need for an ideal ruler in time of peril, evokes both Cicero and Plato, calling for a *vir et gubernator* to pilot the ship of State through the turbulent waters of war into a peaceful haven (24.8.12).

Roman history was didactic. Not only did it instruct the reader in moral values, but, in the manner of Thucydides, it presented the past as a mirror to

his (and Cleopatra's) sons, Alexander, Great King of Persia. He dressed the young Alexander in bejeweled Median dress, and his brother, Ptolemy, in Macedonian costume, complete with boots and broad-brimmed, tiara-crowned hat (53).

[58] Luce believes that the Alexander episode alludes to the "debacles of Crassus in the desert and of Antony in the mountains" (above, note 36) 228. Livy cites the Macedonian wars, and, indeed, all the wars Rome has fought: "nunquam a pedite, nunquam aperta acie, nunquam aequis, utique nunquam nostris locis laboravimus" (9.19.15–16). Since Livy's history is a long compendium of events that foreshadow later events, the lengthy Alexander episode could contain allusions to more than one contemporary battle.

[59] It is not the patent allusions to contemporary events that are unprovable, but rather Livy's motivations for inserting them into his history, which must remain in the realm of speculation.

[60] Woodman (above, note 35) 137.

reflect the present (*Praef.* 9–10). The historian and his contemporaries had survived twenty tumultuous years in the course of which a 500 year old Republic had been overturned by civil war[61] and had been exchanged for the rule of one man. Although that man had played a significant and ruthless part in that internecine conflict, he nevertheless emerged as the victorious savior of the State, which he reconstructed on the foundation of a strong work-ethic, based upon the adherence to time-honored religious and social mores. The permutations of the last two decades must have seemed quite inexplicable to those who had lived through them. The key was in the past, and Livy, as historian, could discover and relate precedents that would explain, for instance, how "an inexperienced boy...raised a private army" (he must have been *impiger*), how he "held offices to which he was entitled, neither by age nor experience" (he had to have been *fortis ac strenuus*), why he "participated in wholesale murders of his fellow citizens" (necessity forced him to be *acer*); and how he had finally vindicated *libertas* by defeating his *ferox* adversary (*unus hostis*), and had emerged as savior of the State (*unus vir*), which he now ruled as one man.[62]

Livy's artistry and careful assembling of his sources make these allusions appear to be entirely coincidental. When the reader has come to the end of the lengthy epic, such references will seem but part of the *exempla* by which the student of history, according to Livy, will profit (*Praef.* 10). The accumulation of coincidental parallels to events of Livy's own day indicates that the historian may well have been establishing a pattern to prefigure Augustus' eventual entry into history, the point having been lost with the last books of *Ab Urbe Condita*. Such a hypothesis holds ramifications for the composition of the history. The consistency of thematic patterns possibly indicates that the historian had a preliminary conception of the work as a whole, and that his epithets served as moral barometers from the past that were intended to forecast and elucidate the Augustan present.

The theme of *Ab Urbe Condita* is moral decline (*Praef.* 11–12). Time and again the Senate and People have been put to the moral test and have been found wanting; their lapses have rendered them vulnerable to enemies both foreign and domestic. Over and over they have been rescued from their follies by the actions of an individual hero. Livy himself had lived through the bloody years when factionalism, carried to its ultimate absurdity, had rent the country asunder; he had also witnessed the restoration of order and the reconstruction of the State by one man to whom he had every reason to be grateful.[63] *Unus vir*, as far as Livy was concerned, may have represented Rome's only salvation.

[61] Gruen maintains that the Civil War brought down the Republic, rather than the opposite. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley 1974) 497.

[62] Johnson notes that Octavian had to consolidate public opinion by presenting himself as champion of Rome's historic and heroic as well as solid religious values, and by portraying Antony and company as the quintessence of all that was foreign (above, note 45) 22–23.

[63] J. W. G. Liebeschuetz, "The Religious Position of Livy's History," *JRS* 57 (1967) 55.