

# Livy's Camillus and the Political Discourse of the Late Republic\*

JAN FELIX GAERTNER

The early Roman statesman Camillus is not only the main protagonist of the dramatic events of the fifth book of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, especially the Roman sieges of Veii and Falerii and the Gallic Sack, but his deeds and his speech in Liv. 5.51–4 also play a central role in modern interpretations of Livy's historiographical methods and studies of his relation to the Roman emperor Augustus. In his influential book *Die Erzählungskunst des Livius* (1933), Burck interpreted Livy's presentation of Camillus, and particularly the religious arguments which Camillus uses to persuade his fellow citizens not to abandon their destroyed city, as a reflection of typically Augustan *pietas*.<sup>1</sup> This view has been taken up by Stübler, Momigliano, Syme, Hellegouarc'h, Miles, Stevenson, and others,<sup>2</sup> and it would perfectly suit Momigliano's important observation that, generally, 'in Rome the relationship between historiography and government seems always to have been closer than in Greece'.<sup>3</sup>

\* Versions of this paper were read at the Universities of Leipzig and Wrocław. Visits to Zurich, Washington State University, and Yale (the latter two generously funded by the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung) gave me the opportunity to discuss my ideas with Hermann Tränkle, Alain Gowing, and Christina S. Kraus. I am grateful to all three scholars for their advice and for their detailed comments on drafts of this paper. The final version has been greatly improved by Stephen P. Oakley, whose suggestions have made my argument more precise and nuanced.

<sup>1</sup> cf. E. Burck, *Die Erzählungskunst des Livius* (1933; 2nd edn 1964), 109–36, especially 135: 'Deutung der Geschichte aus Augusteischem Geiste, aus Augusteischer Religiosität heraus'; Burck later repeated his views in several articles (cf., e.g., 'Die Frühgeschichte Roms bei Livius im Lichte der Denkmäler', *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), 74–110, at 75, 92 with n. 34; 'Die Gestalt des Camillus', in idem (ed.), *Wege zu Livius* (1967), 310–28 (originally in *Gymnasium* suppl. 4 (1964), 22–30, 41–5); and 'Livius und Augustus', *ICS* 16 (1991), 269–81). A. Momigliano, 'Camillus and Concord', in idem, *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (1960), 89–104 (originally in *CQ* 36 (1942), 111–20), at 96 n. 17, and E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 268, have drawn attention to the fact that Mommsen thought that the debate of moving the capital to Veii in 5.51–4 must have been particularly meaningful to an Augustan audience (cf. T. Mommsen, 'Festrede am 24. Januar 1889', in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze* (1905), 168–84, at 175–6: 'Horaz wie Livius sprechen im Sinne des neuen Augustus'). K. Thraede, 'Ausserwissenschaftliche Faktoren im Liviusbild der neueren Forschung', in G. Binder (ed.), *Saeculum Augustum* 2 (1988), 394–425, at 411–13 and 419, rightly accentuates that — apart from the moralizing interpretation — Burck's analysis does not constitute any analytical progress with regard to the perceptive study of W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924), 351–69, and that the moralizing interpretation of Livy by Burck and other German (and Italian) scholars of the 1930s and '40s reflects the influence of fascist ideology (on this point see also P. G. Walsh, 'Livy and Augustus', *PACA* 4 (1961), 26–37, at 26). Likewise, Mommsen's statement of 1889 belongs to a speech on 'Der römische Principat und die gegenwärtige Monarchie' in honour of the German emperor's anniversary and must be seen in this historical context.

<sup>2</sup> cf., e.g., G. Stübler, *Die Religiosität des Livius* (1941), 93; Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 1), 89 (with further literature in n. 1); R. Syme, 'Livy and Augustus', *HSPb* 64 (1959), 27–87, at 48, 55; J. Hellegouarc'h, 'Le Principat de Camille', *REL* 48 (1970), 112–32, especially 120, 129; M. Bonjour, *Terre natale. Études sur une composante affective du patriotisme romain* (1975), 472–4; G. B. Miles, *Livy. Reconstructing Early Rome* (1995), 88–94; C. Edwards, *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City* (1996), 47–9; G. Forsythe, *Livy and Early Rome* (1999), 90: 'historicity [sacrificed in Book 5] in order to satisfy the needs of patriotism and morality'; T. R. Stevenson, 'Parens Patriae and Livy's Camillus', *Ramus* 29 (2000), 27–46, at 28, 38; M. Coudry, 'Camille', in M. Coudry and T. Späth (eds), *L'Invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique* (2001), 47–81, at 60; J. von Ungern-Sternberg, 'Camillus, ein zweiter Romulus?', in Coudry and Späth, op. cit., 289–97, at 294; U. Walter, *Memoria und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom* (2004), 402–3.

<sup>3</sup> cf. A. Momigliano, 'The historians of the Classical world and their audiences: some suggestions', *ASNP* 8 (1978), 59–75, at 69, with reference to Plin., *Ep.* 9.19 and the cases of Timagenes (cf. Sen., *Con.* 10.5.22; Sen., *Dial.* 5.23.4–8), Cremutius Cordus (cf. Tac., *Ann.* 4.34–5; Quint., *Inst.* 10.1.104; Suet., *Tib.* 61.3; Cass. Dio 57.24.2–4), and Hermogenes of Tarsus (cf. Suet., *Dom.* 10.1), and to Flavius Josephus' seeking the emperor's approval of the publication of his *History of the Jewish War*.

When looked at more closely, however, such an ‘Augustan’ interpretation of Livy’s Camillus does justice neither to the Roman historian’s text nor to the complexity of the Republican and Augustan political discourse. First of all, we have no reliable evidence of a particularly close relationship between Livy and the imperial court,<sup>4</sup> and there is no explicit, positive comment by Livy on the new order established by Octavian/Augustus;<sup>5</sup> secondly, the interpretation of certain titles (e.g. *pater/parens patriae*), institutions, and concepts (primarily *pietas*) as implicit, pro-Augustan comments ignores the fact that many Augustan institutions and titles have Republican precedents and that the Augustan political discourse is very much indebted to traditional Roman values and shares many of its key concepts with the *Wertesystem* of the Late Republic;<sup>6</sup> thirdly, the hypothesis of typically Augustan traits in the figure of Livy’s Camillus ignores the possibility that central features of Livy’s account may have been preshaped by the accounts of earlier historians;<sup>7</sup> and fourthly, a strictly ‘Augustan’ reading of Livy’s Camillus does not take into account the possibility that in a society which was as much concerned with moral *exempla* as the Roman,<sup>8</sup> an historical figure like Camillus may not only have been refashioned to legitimize later governments and rulers but may itself have influenced the self-representation of statesmen such as Cicero, Pompey, Caesar, or Augustus.

<sup>4</sup> cf. E. Badian, ‘Livy and Augustus’, in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius. Aspekte seines Werkes* (1993), 9–38, at 11–16: the three passages commonly adduced as evidence only prove that Livy was not prosecuted for his writing (cf. Tac., *Ann.* 4.34), that he encouraged the future emperor Claudius to devote himself to historiography (cf. Suet., *Cl.* 41.1), and that he had been present at an occasion where Augustus communicated what he had read about Cossus on the linen breastplate (cf. Liv. 4.20.5–11; Badian’s claim (p. 14) that the omission of *dicentem* in Liv. 4.20.7 points to second-hand knowledge is unconvincing: cf. *TLL* s.v. *audio* 1269.32–4: ‘audire aliquem vocem edentem, vel omisso participio’; Cic., *Att.* 15.11.2; Quint., *Inst.* 6.3.73; Plin., *Ep.* 7.24.5; and E. Mensching, ‘Livius, Cossus und Augustus’, *MH* 24 (1967), 12–32, especially 25–6).

<sup>5</sup> The critique of *avaritia* and *luxuria* in Livy’s *praefatio* is not only a topos of Roman historiography that ultimately goes back to Cato’s *Origines* (cf. Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 90) but also predates Augustus’ moral legislation: cf. Badian, op. cit. (n. 4), 17–19. Badian rightly contrasts the complete silence of the first pentad with Liv. 9.19.17: ‘modo sit perpetuus huius, qua vivimus, pacis amor et civilis cura’, but even there the focus is on *concordia* and not on the Principate, and Augustus is not explicitly mentioned as the guarantor of lasting peace (see S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy. Books VI–X* (1997–2005), on Liv. 9.19.17, for the rather conventional nature of Livy’s wish for *concordia*, and cf. the imitation of this passage at Curt. 10.9.3–6). Moreover, cf. also Badian’s intriguing, but speculative suggestion (pp. 25–8) that Livy may have criticized Augustus’ involvement in the proscriptions and may have stopped publishing after Book 120 (published c. A.D. 10–11, see Badian, op. cit., 25) precisely because of the less liberal climate of the later years of Augustus’ rule (contra Syme, op. cit. (n. 2), 75); on the change in political climate see, e.g., R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (1939), 487; M. H. Dettenhofer, *Herrschaft und Widerstand im augusteischen Principat* (2000), 190–8; S. H. Rutledge, *Imperial Inquisitions. Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian* (2001), 89–90 and 137–8; and M. R. McHugh, ‘Historiography and freedom of speech: the case of Crematius Cordus’, in I. Sluiter and R. M. Rosen (eds), *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity* (2004), 391–408, especially 393–4, 406.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Section III below with nn. 60–1.

<sup>7</sup> This also applies to the approach of H. Peterson (‘Livy and Augustus’, *TAPhA* 92 (1961), 440–52), who has tried to find implicit ‘further’, i.e. critical, ‘voices’ in Livy’s work. On H. J. Mette’s attempt (‘Livius und Augustus’, *Gymnasium* 68 (1961), 269–85) to use Cassius Dio to reconstruct Livy’s account of the Civil War and thereby establish Livy’s critical attitude towards Augustus, see the objections in Badian, op. cit. (n. 4), 19–23. More nuanced treatments of Livy’s relation to Augustus are, e.g., Walsh, op. cit. (n. 1); J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, ‘The religious position of Livy’s history’, *JRS* 57 (1967), 45–55, especially 48, 55; T. J. Luce, ‘The dating of Livy’s first decade’, *TAPhA* 96 (1965), 209–40, at 238–40; J. Deininger, ‘Livius und der Prinzipat’, *Klio* 67 (1985), 265–72; E. Lefèvre, ‘Die unaugusteischen Züge der augusteischen Literatur’, in G. Binder (ed.), *Saeculum Augustum* 2 (1988), 173–96, at 181; Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), vol. 1, 378–9; J. D. Chaplin, *Livy’s Exemplary History* (2000), 192–6.

<sup>8</sup> cf. especially H. W. Litchfield, ‘National exempla virtutis in Roman literature’, *HSPb* 25 (1914), 1–71; T. Hölscher, ‘Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst’, *MDAI(R)* 85 (1978), 315–57, at 354–7; W. Eck, ‘Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period’, in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (1984), 129–67; K.-J. Hölkeskamp, ‘Exempla und mos maiorum: Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität’, in H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (eds), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (1996), 301–38 (reprinted in K.-J. Hölkeskamp,

Whereas the first two objections are already well documented and need not be rehearsed here (cf. nn. 4, 5, and 6), the third and particularly the fourth points have been largely ignored in recent discussions of Livy's fifth book and the Camillus story.<sup>9</sup> A close examination of the latter two questions will shed new light not only on Livy's historiographical methods but also on the construction of political identity and self-fashioning in the Late Republic and the Early Principate. As we shall see, Camillus must have been a powerful political paradigm from at least the late 60s B.C., and both Livy's portrait in *Ab Urbe Condita* and the Augustan settlement must be viewed in the context of the exploitation of Camillus in Cicero's post-exilic rhetoric and in the propaganda of the Civil War between Caesar and Pompey.

To discern these connections we must first of all take a closer look at the development of the Camillus story and the relation of our extant sources (Sections I and II). This will allow us to reconstruct the historiographical representation of Camillus in the 60s and 50s B.C. (Section III), and on this basis we will then be able to analyse Livy's fusion of traditional, historiographical elements with features of the Late Republican political discourse (Section IV) and to trace the exploitation of the Camillus paradigm from Cicero to Pompey, Caesar, and eventually Augustus (Sections V–VII).

### I THE TWO LAYERS OF THE CAMILLUS LEGEND

As has been seen already by Mommsen, Hirschfeld, Duckett, Klotz, Momigliano, and Tränkle,<sup>10</sup> our five main sources for Camillus' life — i.e. Polybius, Diodorus Siculus,

---

*Senatus Populusque Romanus. Die politische Kultur der Republik — Dimensionen und Deutungen* (2004), 169–98; Chaplin, op. cit. (n. 7), 11–29, *passim*; Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 63–70; C. S. Kraus, 'From *exempla* to *exemplar*? Writing history around the emperor in Imperial Rome', in J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. Rives (eds), *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (2005), 181–200, at 186–8; F. Bücher, *Verargumentierte Geschichte. Exempla romana im politischen Diskurs der späten römischen Republik* (2006); A. Gowing, 'The Roman *exempla* tradition in imperial Greek historiography: the case of Camillus', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography* (forthcoming); and the contributions to B. Linke and M. Stemmler (eds), *Mos maiorum* (2000).

<sup>9</sup> Even T. Späth, 'Erzählt, erfunden: Camillus. Literarische Konstruktion und soziale Normen', in Coudry and Späth, op. cit. (n. 2), 341–412, who very much focuses on the reception and exploitation of the Camillus paradigm has largely ignored the explicit and implicit uses of Camillus in the Late Republican discourse (cf. Späth, 387). Coudry, op. cit. (n. 2), 56–9, Ungern-Sternberg, op. cit. (n. 2), 291, W. Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid. Decorum, Allusion and Ideology* (2002), 135–9, Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 396–8, and Bücher, op. cit. (n. 8), 180–2, 191–2 concentrate on Cicero's explicit references to the Camillus story and ignore both his implicit self-fashioning and the close relation between the Late Republican discourse and Livy; because of these limitations they necessarily underrate Camillus' presence in the Late Republic, cf., e.g., Coudry, 50–9, especially 56: 'place modeste'; Ungern-Sternberg, 291: 'überraschend wenig'; Clausen, 136: 'in the 20s, Camillus becomes almost suddenly, it seems, important'; and Bücher, 182: 'Von Cicero und dem politischen Diskurs seiner Zeit wird . . . aus Camillus keine große Figur der römischen Geschichte konstruiert'. Most other treatments of the story have been preoccupied with the interpretation of the historical accounts. On the neglected question of Livy's sources cf. n. 10 below.

<sup>10</sup> cf. T. Mommsen, 'Die Gallische Katastrophe', in idem, *Römische Forschungen* 2 (1879), 297–381 (originally in *Hermes* 13 (1878), 515–55), at 344; O. Hirschfeld, 'Zur Camillus-Legende', in idem, *Kleine Schriften* (1913), 273–87 (originally in *Festschrift zum 50. Doktorjubiläum L. Friedländers* (1895), 125–38), at 274; E. S. Duckett, *Studies in Ennius* (1915), 44; A. Klotz, 'Zu den Quellen der Archaologia des Dionysios von Halikarnassos', *RhM* 87 (1938), 32–50; idem, *Livius und seine Vorgänger* (1940–1), 280–1; idem, 'Zu den Quellen der Plutarchischen Lebensbeschreibung des Camillus', *RhM* 90 (1941), 282–309; Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 1), 90–3; and H. Tränkle, 'Gebiet und Schimmeltriumph des Camillus. Einige Überlegungen zum fünften Buch des Livius', *WS* 111 (1998), 145–65. These analyses have been ignored in almost all recent treatments of Livy's fifth book, e.g. those by Burck, Hellegouarc'h, Miles, Coudry, and Ungern-Sternberg cited in nn. 1 and 2 above, and also by, e.g., C. Peyre, 'Tite-Live et la férocité gauloise', *REL* 48 (1970), 277–96; D. S. Levene, *Religion in Livy* (1993); and M. Jaeger, *Livy's Written Rome* (1997). Späth, op. cit. (n. 9), merely juxtaposes the corresponding passages in the various ancient sources; he does not analyse their relation.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Livy, and Plutarch<sup>11</sup> — basically fall into two groups: on the one hand, there is an older layer<sup>12</sup> of the transmission, represented by Polybius and Diodorus, a kind of ‘historical core’,<sup>13</sup> which only includes Camillus’ participation in the Roman siege of Veii, the capture of the city by means of a tunnel, and Camillus’ later exploits against the Volsci, Aequi, and Etrusci; on the other hand, there is a younger layer<sup>14</sup> of the transmission, which is reflected in the accounts in Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Plutarch, and which includes many details that are absent from or incompatible with the older layer of the transmission, e.g. Camillus’ prosecution by the Roman *plebs*, his voluntary exile and return,<sup>15</sup> and his central role in the liberation of Rome from the Gauls, particularly his intervention before the handing over of the ransom money.<sup>16</sup>

These discrepancies between the older and the younger layers of the transmission are not accidental but reflect a systematic, extensive refashioning of the events between the third and the first centuries B.C. On the one hand, the younger tradition has combined the Roman success at Veii and the Gallic Sack to form a single, quasi-epic plot of human

<sup>11</sup> One of the key events of the Camillus legend, viz. the invasion of the Gauls, is also recorded by Heracleides Ponticus (fr. 102 Wehrli = Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 22.3), Aristotle (fr. 610 Rose = Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 22.4), and Theopompus (*FGH Hist* 115 F 317 = Plin., *Nat.* 3.57); none of these authors, however, mentions Camillus, and Aristotle even names a certain Lucius as the saviour of Rome (cf. Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 147 n. 8; on this Lucius as the saviour of Rome see Peyre, op. cit. (n. 10), 282; T. J. Luce, ‘Design and structure in Livy: 5.32–55’, *TAPhA* 102 (1971), 265–302, at 291; R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy. Books I–V* (1965), on 5.40.7–10 (p. 723); N. Horsfall, ‘From history to legend: M. Manlius and the geese’, *CJ* 76 (1980–1), 298–311, at 298 and cf. n. 19 below). The accounts and references in *ILS* 52, Memnon (*FGH Hist* 434 F 18 (25)), Valerius Maximus, Florus, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Appian, and Dio are rather fragmentary, but (as far as we can tell) based on the same tradition as Livy, Dionysius, and Plutarch: see Mommsen, op. cit. (n. 10), 344–9; Hirschfeld, op. cit. (n. 10), 274–5. The Byzantine fabrications discussed by Mommsen, 349–52, are of no interest for the present analysis.

<sup>12</sup> For reasons of chronology, the source used by Polybius is likely to belong to the third century B.C., and Mommsen (op. cit. (n. 10), 301, *passim*), F. Schachermeyr (‘Die Gallische Katastrophe’, *Klio* 23 (1930), 277–305, at 281–2), F. W. Walbank (*A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (1957–79), on Polyb. 2.18.2), Tränkle (op. cit. (n. 10), 147), and others have plausibly suggested Fabius Pictor. More complicated is the question of Diodorus’ sources. Momigliano (op. cit. (n. 1), 90–1) has shown that Diodorus ‘has nothing which can be proved or made likely to be later than the Second Punic War’, but this does not prove that his account is exclusively based on sources of the third century B.C. Moreover, the fact that Diodorus narrates some events in great detail, but treats others in a fairly summary fashion or not at all shows that he cannot have relied exclusively on brief, early accounts and may often have abbreviated his sources: cf. K. J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Punischen Kriege* (1926), 107–32; A. Klotz, ‘Diodors römische Annalen’, *RhM* 86 (1937), 206–24; and Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), vol. 1, 107.

<sup>13</sup> cf. Hirschfeld, op. cit. (n. 10), 286; F. Münzer, ‘Furius (44)’, *RE* 7.1 (1910), 324–48, col. 348, ll. 4–13; Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 151. On the highly fictionalized character of all historical accounts of Camillus’ life and deeds, see Mommsen, op. cit. (n. 10), *passim*; idem, *Römisches Strafrecht* (1899), 1018 n. 2; Münzer, op. cit., 348; and more recently, T. J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome* (1995), 317; C. Bruun, ‘What every man in the streets used to know: M. Furius Camillus. Italic legends and Roman historiography’, in idem (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400–133 BC* (2000), 41–68, at 41–4; Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 384–96. Statements such as Burck’s claim ‘an dem historischen Charakter dieser Kämpfe ist kaum Zweifel erlaubt’ (op. cit. (n. 1, 1968), 92) seem over-confident.

<sup>14</sup> A secure attribution of this younger layer to a particular annalist is neither possible nor necessary for the present argument. Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 149–50, points to Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, and Aelius Tubero; Oakley (*per litteras*) emphasizes that much of the refashioning of the Camillus story could go back even further, e.g. to Gnaeus Gellius at the end of the second century B.C.

<sup>15</sup> cf. Liv. 5.32.6–33.1; D.H. 13.5; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 12.1–13.2. These events have no parallel in the older layer of the transmission.

<sup>16</sup> cf. Liv. 5.48.9–49.7; D.H. 13.6, 13.9; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 28.5–29.6. Whereas in these passages Camillus prevents the handing over of the gold to the Gauls, the older layer of the transmission mentions that Camillus seized the gold from the Gauls near the (so far unidentified) city Οὐδέσκιον and thus presupposes that the gold was actually handed over to the Gauls (cf. Diod. Sic. 14.117.5). Obviously, the author(s) of the later stage of the Camillus legend refashioned the episode in order to render it less humiliating for the Romans (cf. Hirschfeld, op. cit. (n. 10), 283; Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 150–1).

success,<sup>17</sup> *hybris*, and divine *nemesis*.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, it has fleshed out the scarce historical material with numerous motifs borrowed from other events of Greek and Roman history.<sup>19</sup> Thus Camillus' prayer after the victory over Veii (cf. Liv. 5.21.14; D.H. 12.14.2; V.Max. 1.5.2; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 5.6; Zonar. 7.21) is modelled on the similar prayer of Aemilius Paullus after the victory at Pydna in 168 B.C.;<sup>20</sup> the bad omen of Camillus' fall (cf. Liv. 5.21.16; D.H. 12.16.4–5; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 5.7) and the misinterpretation of this omen (cf. D.H. 12.16.4–5; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 5.7) resemble similar anecdotes about Epaminondas (cf. Front., *Str.* 1.12.7), Scipio Africanus (cf. Front., *Str.* 1.12.1), and Caesar (cf. Suet., *Iul.* 59; Front., *Str.* 1.12.2);<sup>21</sup> the trial leading to Camillus' voluntary exile evokes the trial of the Scipiones;<sup>22</sup> several details of the Gallic Sack (e.g. the name of the Gallic chieftain Brennus) may come from accounts of the Persian attack on Delphi (480 B.C.), the Persian occupation of Athens (480 B.C.), or the Gallic Sack of Delphi (279 B.C.);<sup>23</sup> the

<sup>17</sup> Like Homer's Achilles, the Camillus of the younger layer of the transmission does not receive the gratitude he deserves, asks the gods to avenge this injustice (cf. n. 82 below on Camillus' 'Achillean' prayer), leaves his community, and finally has to be recalled in a situation of extreme danger. For further Iliadic motifs, see Momigliano, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 90; C. S. Kraus, 'No second Troy: topoi and refoundation in Livy, Book V', *TAPhA* 124 (1994), 267–89, especially 272. Interestingly, there may also be linguistic traces of epic refashioning: Livy's choice of words in 5.15.10: 'divino spiritu instinctus', 5.22.5: 'spiritu divino tactus', 5.43.8: 'nec secus quam divino spiritu tactus' has no close parallels in the rest of Livy and resembles typical expressions of Greek epic such as *Od.* 19.138–9: φάρος ... ἐνέπνευσε φρεσὶ δαίμων ... ὑφαίνειν (cf. also E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (1950), on Aesch., *Ag.* 106 (pp. 64–5); R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought* (2nd edn, 1954), 53–6, especially 56; and M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony* (1966), on Hes., *Th.* 31). Unfortunately, it is impossible to prove that this epic colouring must go back to Livy's sources and it is equally possible that Livy himself has added the epic flavour.

<sup>18</sup> cf. F. Klingner's review of Burck, *op. cit.* (n. 1, 1933), in *Gnomon* 11 (1935), 577–88, at 585, and Stübler, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 53–63.

<sup>19</sup> The displacement of motifs from one historical figure to another is, of course, typical of the late annalists; for similar cases of expansion of historical accounts, see, e.g., Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1940–1), 284–8 (on the wars against the Aequi). Tränkle, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 160–1 and Walter, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 386–96 give plausible reconstructions of the gradual expansion by the late annalists and of the motives underlying it. A comparison with Arist. fr. 610 (Rose), where a certain Lucius is named as the saviour of Rome, suggests that originally there may have been several key protagonists on the Roman side (cf. also Manlius' *aristeia* at Diod. Sic. 14.116.6–7; Liv. 5.47; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 27.4–5) and that Camillus' role may have been expanded at the expense of these other characters.

<sup>20</sup> cf. Aem. Paul. fr. 1 Malcovati (vol. 1, 101) = V.Max. 5.10.2 (cf. Cass. Dio 20.66/Zonar. 9.24): 'cum in maximo proventu felicitatis nostrae, Quirites, timerem ne quid mali fortuna moliretur, Iovem Optimum Maximum Iunonemque Reginam et Minervam precatus sum ut, si quid adversi populo Romano immineret, totum in meam domum converteretur' ~ Liv. 5.21.15: 'ut si cui deorum hominumque nimia sua fortuna populique Romani videretur, ut eam invidiam lenire quam minimo suo privato incommodo publicoque populo Romano liceret' (~ D.H. 12.14.2, 12.16.4–5; V.Max. 1.5.2). Tränkle, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 163–4 further compares Diod. Sic. 31.11.2–3; Liv. 45.41.7–12; Vell. 1.10.4; Plut., *Vit. Aem.* 36.6–9; and App., *Mac.* 19.3 and draws attention to the fact that the later tradition also inserts the emotive detail that just before going into exile Camillus also lost one of his sons; like the prayer, the loss of one of his sons has a close parallel in the life of Aemilius Paullus (Tränkle, *op. cit.*, 163–4 compares Liv. 5.32.8–9; D.H. 13.5.1–3; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 11.2–13.1; and Zonar. 9.24). Older scholarship had compared Camillus' prayer to the sentiments of Aemilius Paullus' son Scipio Aemilianus after the destruction of Carthage (cf. Polyb. 38.22.1–3 and Münzer, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 327; Duckett, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 45; Momigliano, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 92), but this, too, is influenced by the prayer of Aemilius Paullus.

<sup>21</sup> cf. Tränkle, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 162.

<sup>22</sup> See Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 281–2; Momigliano, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 92; Tränkle, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 160 n. 36; and compare Liv. 38.60.9 with Liv. 5.32.8; D.H. 13.5; App., *Ital.* 8; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 12. A comparison with Scipio Africanus may also be underlying the qualification of Camillus as a 'fatalis dux' at 5.19.2: 'fatalis dux ad excidium illius urbis servandae patriae'. Cf. the later use of this expression in the context of Scipio's leading role during the Second Punic War (22.53.6, 30.28.11).

<sup>23</sup> The name of the chieftain is absent from the accounts of Polybius and Diodorus of the Gallic Sack of Rome and first occurs in Livy (5.38.3, 5.48.8–9) and Plutarch (*Vit. Cam.* 28–9; cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 303; Tränkle, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 153 n. 23; and the accounts of the Gallic sack of Delphi at Just. 24.6; Paus. 10.19.8–9). For the parallels with the Persian invasion see G. Thouret, 'Über den Gallischen Brand', *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* suppl. 11 (1880), 95–188, at 139–41; Ogilvie, *op. cit.* (n. 11), on Liv. 5.39.1–43.5 (p. 720); and Horsfall, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 307, to whose material two further similarities can be added: firstly, the parallelism between Aristides coming back from exile in Aegina to fight the Persians at Salamis (cf. Hdt. 8.79) and Camillus returning from exile in Ardea to drive out the Gauls; secondly, the renown of Aristides (cf. e.g. Hdt. 8.79; Cic., *Tusc.* 5.105, *Off.* 3.16, *Sest.* 141; V.Max. 5.3.ext.3; Sen., *Ben.* 4.27.2) and Camillus (see Section III below) for their justice. Interestingly, Dionysius (14.2) even explicitly compares motifs of the Persian occupation of Athens and the Gallic Sack.



rivalry between Camillus and Medullinus (cf. Liv. 6.22.6, 6.25.4; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 37–8) seems to be modelled on the rivalry between Q. Fabius Cunctator and M. Minucius in the Second Punic War;<sup>24</sup> and finally, the extension of Camillus' dictatorship after the expulsion of the Gauls and the idea that Camillus (as dictator) re-established the constitutional order have no historical parallels in the fifth and fourth centuries, but closely resemble Sulla's dictatorship *rei publicae constituendae causa* and therefore 'can hardly date from before the time of Sulla'.<sup>25</sup>

## II THE *TERMINUS ANTE QUEM* OF THE YOUNGER LAYER

What is important for the interpretation of Livy's account and for our picture of Camillus as a paradigm in the political discourse of the Late Republic is the fact that the greatly expanded younger tradition must have existed at least one generation before the Principate. Admittedly, the common dating for the accounts of Livy, Dionysius, and Plutarch could suggest that the later stage of the transmission goes back to Livy or Dionysius and only developed under the Principate. This, however, is excluded by the relation between the three sources.

When Dionysius started to write his *Antiquitates Romanae*, he was probably aware of the existence of Livy's first pentad, which had been composed and published a few years earlier.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, in his catalogue of sources (1.7.3) he only refers to the pre-Livian Roman historians Porcius Cato, Fabius Maximus Servilianus, Calpurnius Piso, Gnaeus Gellius, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, and Aelius Tubero. Although we cannot be certain whether in addition to these authors, Dionysius occasionally also used Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, this is highly improbable. First of all, given the scale of his work and his fondness for historical details, Dionysius is likely to have found Livy's comparatively short account of early Roman history a much less appealing and useful source than the far more extensive and detailed accounts of the pre-Livian historians to which he explicitly refers in 1.7.3;

<sup>24</sup> cf. Münzer, op. cit. (n. 13), 342 and Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 1), 92. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 6.22.6 (p. 581), accepts this argument 'in outline', but rightly accentuates that some of the shared motifs 'were part of the stock-in-trade of the annalistic tradition' and that the comparison with Polyb. 3.102–5 suggests that Livy may deliberately have presented the rivalry between Fabius and Minucius in a way that evokes the earlier controversy between Camillus and Medullinus.

<sup>25</sup> Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 6.1.4 (p. 387), with reference to E. Täubler, 'Camillus und Sulla', *Klio* 12 (1912), 219–33. Täubler lists a number of further parallels, e.g. the motif of the hero's return from afar, the decisive battle just outside Rome, the antagonism to the *plebs*, and the restoration of burned down sanctuaries. The view that the later form of the Camillus story has been influenced by chronicle plays by Naevius, Ennius, or Pacuvius — recently revived by, e.g., T. P. Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History* (1998), 2; Bruun, op. cit. (n. 13), 67 (cf. originally O. Ribbeck, 'Ein historisches Drama', *RhM* 36 (1881), 321–2, and idem, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung* 1 (1887), 191) — is not supported by hard evidence (thus already Duckett, op. cit. (n. 10), 22). Moreover, Livy's remark (5.21.8–9): 'haec [i.e. the *fabula* of the *exta*] ad ostentationem scenae, gaudentis miraculis, aptiora [sc. sunt]' does not imply that Livy 'thought [the respective episode] had been invented for a play' (Wiseman, op. cit., 2). Rather, it is part of a reflection on historiographical methods and refers to emotive, tragic Hellenistic historiography, cf. *OLD* s.v. *fabula* 4 and Asel. fr. 2 (Peter and Beck/Walter): 'id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere'; Cic., *Fam.* 5.12.6: 'hanc quasi fabulam rerum eventorumque nostrorum'; and D.H. 1.84.1: ἕτεροι δὲ οὐδὲν τῶν μυθοδεστέρων ἀξιούντες ἱστορικῆ ἡγραφῆ προσήκειν ... τῆς λυκαίνης τὸ τιθασόν [i.e. the legend of Romulus and Remus] ὡς δραματικῆς μεστὸν ἀτοπίας διασύρουσιν. Just as unwarranted is the hypothesis that Ennius' *Annals* contained a speech by Camillus: see n. 68 below.

<sup>26</sup> cf. E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (1991), 95: 'it is natural to assume that he [i.e. Dionysius] knew it [i.e. Livy's work] well enough'. The composition of the first pentad is commonly dated to 30–27 B.C., cf. Ogilvie, op. cit. (n. 11), 2 and Badian, op. cit. (n. 4), 17–18 (with further material and literature). Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae* were published in 7 B.C. (cf. D.H. 1.7.2), and Dionysius may have started to work on this project as late as c. 20 B.C.: Badian (op. cit., 20) persuasively argues that Dionysius' account of the story of Servius Tullius and the rather original idea that the young Tarquin children may be the old king's grandchildren may reflect Augustus' abdication in 27 B.C. and his adoption of Gaius and Lucius Caesar in 17 B.C. (contra Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10), 1938), 48–9).

secondly, a number of significant differences between Livy and Dionysius reveal that on many occasions Dionysius was evidently unaware of Livy's account; and thirdly, there are, of course, similarities between the narratives of Livy and Dionysius, but these cannot prove Dionysius' dependence on Livy because in these cases both authors could simply be using the same late annalistic sources.<sup>27</sup> All this strongly suggests that Livy and Dionysius are independent of each other and that those bits of the Camillus legend which they share cannot be Livian inventions but must already have featured in pre-Livian historiography.

Unfortunately, Dionysius' treatment of Camillus' life and deeds in his *Antiquitates Romanae* has come down to us only in fragmentary form, and often we can compare Livy's account only with Plutarch's *Life of Camillus*. If Plutarch's *Life of Camillus* was independent of Livy and exclusively relied on Dionysius or a late annalistic source,<sup>28</sup> then material shared by Livy and Plutarch would automatically have to go back to pre-Livian historiography. This, however, is far from certain. Dionysius is certainly not Plutarch's main (let alone only) source, for Plutarch often gives a version of the events which agrees with Livy but is at odds with Dionysius' account.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, Plutarch explicitly refers to Livy in *Vit. Cam.* 6. A comparison of Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 6.2: Λίυτιος δὲ φησιν εὔχεσθαι μὲν τὸν Κάμιλλον ἀπτόμενον τῆς θεοῦ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ... ('Livy, however, writes that *Camillus* touched the statue and prayed and asked the goddess ...') and Liv. 5.22.5: 'dein cum *quidam* seu spiritu divino tactus seu iuvenali ioco "Visne Romam ire, Iuno?" dixisset ...' ('then, when *someone* — either because he was divinely inspired or because he was making a youthful joke — had said: "Do you want to go to Rome, Juno?", ...') reveals that Plutarch misquotes Livy, but even if Plutarch had read Livy only superficially or had drawn the quotation from an intermediary source,<sup>30</sup> he would still have had access to

<sup>27</sup> cf. E. Schwartz, '113) Dionysios von Halikarnassos', *RE* 5.1 (1903), 934–61, coll. 946–9; H. Tränkle, 'Der Anfang des römischen Freistaats in der Darstellung des Livius', *Hermes* 93 (1965), 311–7, at 312, 316, 318, and Gabba, op. cit. (n. 26), 95–6.

<sup>28</sup> H. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographien der Römer* (1865), 17–28; Mommsen, op. cit. (n. 10), 346 n. 91; Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10, 1941), 309, and others have come very close to viewing Plutarch's *Life of Camillus* as independent of Livy. For the opposite view cf., e.g., Schwartz, op. cit. (n. 27), 945; Schachermeyr, op. cit. (n. 12), 294–5, and Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 50 n. 24.

<sup>29</sup> cf. the different reasons given for the Gauls' willingness to enter into negotiations with the Romans (Liv. 5.48.1; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 28.1, against D.H. 13.8.1); the different accounts of Camillus' trial and voluntary exile (cf. D.H. 13.5.1 with Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 13.1; Liv. 5.32.7, and see Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10, 1941), 293 n. 6; Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 149 n. 15); the different figures for the fine imposed on Camillus (cf. D.H. 13.5.1 with Liv. 5.32.9; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 13.1) and for the money claimed by the beleaguering Gauls (cf. D.H. 13.9.1 with Liv. 5.48.8; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 28.4); and finally Dionysius' omission of the neglected *Feriae Latinae* (cf. D.H. 12.10–13 with Liv. 5.17.1; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 4.6) and of the dogs in the episode of the Gauls' climbing the Capitol (cf. D.H. 13.7.2 with Liv. 5.47.3; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 27.1). Whether Plutarch has used Dionysius at all for his *Life of Camillus* cannot be decided with certainty. The fact that Plutarch quotes Dionysius at *Vit. Rom.* 16.7; *Vit. Alc.* 41.4; *Vit. Pyrrh.* 17.7; 21.13 and that Dionysius is likely to have been Plutarch's main source for the *Life of Coriolanus* (cf. D. A. Russell, 'Plutarch's *Life of Coriolanus*', *JRS* 53 (1963), 21–8, with further literature) does not prove that he was also a source for the *Life of Camillus*.

<sup>30</sup> cf. Mommsen, op. cit. (n. 10), 346 n. 91; Münzer, op. cit. (n. 13), 925; Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10, 1941), 284; Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 148. Of course, Plutarch also cites Livy several times elsewhere, and some scholars believe that in most, or even all, of these cases Plutarch had 'conoscenza di prima mano' (C. Pelling in *Plutarcho: Filopemene. Tito Flaminio. Introduzione e note di C. Pelling. Traduzione di E. Melandri* (1997), 263 n. 36). However, Plutarch's own remarks about his limited knowledge of Latin (*Vit. Dem.* 2.2; cf. also *Quaest. Plat.* 1010D with C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (1972), 82) should warn us not to over-estimate his familiarity with Roman sources, and the clustering of references to Livy in only a few of Plutarch's *Lives* (only *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 17.5, *Vit. Flam.* 18.9, *Vit. Cam.* 6.2, *Vit. Marc.* 11.8, 24.5, 30.5, 31.8, *Vit. Luc.* 28.8, 31.9, *Vit. Caes.* 47.3–6, 63.9; cf. also *Quaest. Rom.* 269E, *De Fort. Rom.* 326A) suggests that Plutarch has not used Livy systematically (thus also e.g. Jones, op. cit., 81–7 and C. Theander, *Plutarch und die Geschichte* (1951), 70–8 (who, however, assumes direct use of Livy at *Vit. Cam.* 6.2)).

either Livy himself or a source which had used Livy's account.<sup>31</sup> Hence, where Plutarch agrees with Livy he may merely be following (directly or indirectly) Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and we cannot be certain that the respective pieces of information go back to a pre-Livian historian.

This does not mean, however, that Plutarch's *Life of Camillus* is completely irrelevant as a source. Plutarch often presents a more detailed account than either Livy or Dionysius<sup>32</sup> or gives a version of the historical events which is incompatible with Livy's narrative and absent from the extant remains of Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae*.<sup>33</sup> Much of the material peculiar to Plutarch (e.g. precise dates and names) is more likely to have been omitted by Livy and Dionysius than to have been invented by a post-Livian historian or Plutarch himself, and on many occasions the differences between Plutarch and the two Augustan historians are such that Plutarch obviously gives a 'cruder' or more traditional account than Livy or Dionysius.<sup>34</sup> This shows that, regardless of how extensively Plutarch may have used Livy or Dionysius, he certainly also had access to material which was not contained in the two Augustan historians and goes back to a pre-Livian source.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> cf. also the close similarities between the accounts of Livy and Plutarch at Liv. 5.19.6: 'ludos magnos . . . novit se facturum aedemque Matutae Matris refectam dedicaturum' ~ *Vit. Cam.* 5.1: εὐχὰς ἐποιήσατο . . . τὰς μεγάλας θέας ἄζειν καὶ νεῶν θεᾶς, ἦν μητέρα Ματούταν καλοῦσι . . . καθιερώσειν, and Liv. 5.21.8–9: 'immolante rege Veientium vocem haruspicias dicentis, qui eius hostiae exa prosecuisset, ei victoriam dari exauditam in cuniculo movisse Romanos milites, ut adaperto cuniculo exta raperent et ad dictatorem ferrent . . . haec ad ostentationem scenae gaudentis miraculis aptiora quam ad fidem' ~ *Vit. Cam.* 5.6: ἐνταῦθα λέγεται τυχεῖν κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ τὸν ἡγεμόνα τῶν Τυρρηγῶν ἐφ' ἱεροῖς, τὸν δὲ μάντιν εἰς τὰ σπλάγχνα κατιδόντα καὶ μέγα φθεγζάμενον εἰπεῖν ὅτι νίκην δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς τῷ κατακολουθήσαντι τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐκεῖνοις. ταύτης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ὑπονόμοις Ῥωμαῖοις ἐπακούσαντας ταχὺ διασπᾶσαι τὸ ἔδαφος, καὶ μετὰ βοῆς καὶ ψόφου τῶν ὀπλῶν ἀναδύντας, ἐκπλαγέντων τῶν πολεμίων καὶ φυγόντων, ἀρπάσαντας τὰ σπλάγχνα κομίσει πρὸς τὸν Κάμιλλον. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἴσως εἰκέναι δόξει μυθεύμασιν.

<sup>32</sup> Plutarch may occasionally leave out details that are irrelevant to his biography of Camillus (e.g. the defeat of the Romans mentioned at Liv. 5.8.7–12, but missing at *Plut.*, *Vit. Cam.* 2.3–4) and he occasionally tightens up less central episodes — e.g. the wars against the Faliscans and Capena more fully described at Liv. 5.12.5, 5.14.7 (contrast *Plut.*, *Vit. Cam.* 2.10) or the transfer of a golden bowl to the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi (cf. Liv. 5.28.1–5 and *Plut.*, *Vit. Cam.* 8.4–5) — but on the whole Plutarch has not followed too strict a definition of the term 'biography' and often gives more details than required (see Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 285–7 and cf., e.g., the dispensable episode of Lucius Albinus helping the Vestal virgins at *Vit. Cam.* 21). In particular, Plutarch gives accurate dates for the beginning and end of the Gallic siege (cf. *Vit. Cam.* 28.2, 30.1; *Serv. auct.*, *Aen.* 8.562, and contrast Liv. 5.48.1–4), mentions persons omitted by Livy and Dionysius (e.g. the three ambassadors sent to Delphi in 4.6; the *princeps senatus* L. Lucretius and the unnamed senators in 31.3–32.1), and provides more details about clothing, equipment etc. (e.g. in 25.1 (Pontius Cominius), 40.4 (new weapons of the Romans)). Moreover, he mentions the tribunes' proposal for resettlement in 7.3 (omitted in Liv. 5.24.5) and treats more extensively Camillus' loss of his son (11.2–3) and the slaughter near Ardea (23.7). Finally, at *Vit. Cam.* 33.3–10 / 34.1–35.5 he also gives a second, more fantastic account of Camillus' exploits which has parallels at Varro *apud* *Macr.*, *S. 1.11.36–40* and *Plut.*, *Vit. Rom.* 29.3–10, but is absent from Livy (cf. Liv. 6.2.1–3.10 and see Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 302).

<sup>33</sup> The most obvious case is Livy's discussion of Claudius Quadrigarius' account of a battle between Romans and Gauls in 367 B.C. 'circa Anienem flumen'. With reference to other more reliable sources ('pluribus auctoribus magis adducor'), Livy refutes this account (6.42.5–6), but Plutarch gives a rather extensive description of the battle at *Vit. Cam.* 41.1–6 (cf. Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 308 and Oakley, *op. cit.* (n. 5), on Liv. 6.42.4–8 (pp. 716–17)). Less striking, but nevertheless significant are a number of further discrepancies: e.g. Livy omits Camillus' illness (mentioned at *Plut.*, *Vit. Cam.* 37.4) and condenses the dramatic battle against the Volsci at 6.24.1–11 into a single day (cf. *Plut.*, *Vit. Cam.* 37.5: τῆ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ and see Oakley, *op. cit.* (n. 5), vol. 1, 580). Moreover, at Liv. 6.38.8, Camillus only threatens to make a draft, whereas at *Plut.*, *Vit. Cam.* 39.3 he actually makes a draft.

<sup>34</sup> cf. the material in the two preceding notes and see Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 288, who emphasizes that Dionysius and Livy also offer a more artful and therefore probably more recent version of the episode of the Veientian soothsayers. A further example is the different accounts of the events after the Battle of Clusium. Livy's remark (5.36.8): 'omissa inde in Clusinos ira receptui canunt minantes Romanis. erant qui extemplo Romam eundem censerunt. vicere seniores ut legati prius mitterentur . . .' is clearly aimed at combining two contradictory traditions, i.e. that of the embassy mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (14.113.5) and Dionysius (13.12.1) and that of the direct assault on Rome mentioned by Plutarch (*Vit. Cam.* 17.9). Thus, here too Plutarch gives a version of the events which must go back to a pre-Livian historian.

<sup>35</sup> This is generally accepted: cf., e.g., the literature cited at the beginning of n. 28 above.



Summing up the preceding argument on the relation between Livy, Dionysius, Plutarch, and pre-Livian historiography, we may say that (a) wherever Dionysius and Livy offer the same historical information, this information comes from pre-Livian annalistic sources and that (b) wherever Dionysius' account is lacking and Plutarch offers a 'cruder' or more traditional version of the events than Livy, Plutarch's version is likely to go back to pre-Livian historiography. On this basis, not only the broad outline of the younger layer of the Camillus legend and key events such as Camillus' prosecution by the Roman *plebs*, his voluntary exile and return, and his central role in the liberation of Rome,<sup>36</sup> but also quite a few minor details<sup>37</sup> can be safely traced back to late annalistic sources and must have been established before the composition of Livy's first pentad in 30–27 B.C.

This first rough *terminus ante quem* can be pushed back even further. Since Livy and Dionysius are known to have consulted several late annalistic sources and tend to record and discuss historical variants,<sup>38</sup> it is sensible to assume that most elements of the younger layer of the Camillus legend not only stood in Livy's and Dionysius' youngest source, viz. Aelius Tubero's *Historiae* (composed in the 30s B.C.), but also featured in the earlier works of Licinius Macer, Valerius Antias, and Claudius Quadrigarius and were generally accepted from the 60s B.C.<sup>39</sup> This approximate dating is corroborated by two details in the accounts of Plutarch and Dionysius. At *Vit. Cam.* 7.1–2, Plutarch remarks that Camillus was the only Roman ever to celebrate a triumph in a chariot drawn by four white horses (οὐδενὸς τοῦτο ποιήσαντος ἡγεμόνος πρότερον οὐδ' ὕστερον); this statement is obviously incompatible with Cassius Dio's mention of a very similar triumph celebrated by Caesar in 46 B.C. (cf. Cass. Dio 43.14), and the inconsistency suggests that at least some of the material which Plutarch is using must go back to before 46 B.C.<sup>40</sup> A similar argument can be made on the basis of the different figures given for the ransom money that was to be paid to the Gauls at the time of the Gallic Sack. While Livy (5.48.8) and Plutarch (*Vit. Cam.* 28.4) write that 1,000 pounds had to be paid to the invaders, Dionysius (13.9.1) speaks of 25 talents, i.e. 2,000 pounds. Given that this ransom money was later deposited in the base of the statue of Jupiter on the Capitol and given that in 52 B.C. not 1,000 but 2,000 pounds of gold were found on that site,<sup>41</sup> Dionysius' testimony is probably based on the find of 52 B.C. Since the round sum of 1,000 pounds is unlikely to have been invented after the 2,000 pounds had been found, Livy and Plutarch here almost certainly follow an older tradition than Dionysius and use material that must go back to the time before 52 B.C.<sup>42</sup>

### III THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF CAMILLUS IN THE 60S AND 50S B.C.

The discussion in the preceding section has shown that the younger layer of the transmission of the Camillus legend must have been established at least one generation before the

<sup>36</sup> cf. nn. 15 and 16 above for the references to the relevant passages in Livy, Dionysius, and Plutarch.

<sup>37</sup> cf. e.g. the parallel accounts of the prodigy of the Alban Lake in Liv. 5.15.1–12, 5.16.3–17.3; D.H. 12.10.1–13.3; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 3.1–4.7; for further examples see nn. 32–3 above and 44, 47–9, 51 below.

<sup>38</sup> For Livy cf., e.g., Oakley, *op. cit.* (n. 5), vol. 1, 13–16 and 719 (on Liv. 6.42.6: 'pluribus auctoribus magis adducor', with parallels); for Dionysius see Schwartz, *op. cit.* (n. 27), 956–7.

<sup>39</sup> Some of the elements of the younger layer may be much older (cf. n. 14 above). This, however, cannot be proved and is irrelevant for the present argument.

<sup>40</sup> cf. Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 290.

<sup>41</sup> cf. Liv. 5.50.6: 'aurum quod Gallis ereptum erat ... sub Iovis sella poni iussum'; Plin., *Nat.* 33.14: 'Romae ne fuit quidem aurum nisi admodum exiguum longo tempore. certe cum a Gallis capta urbe pax emeretur, non plus quam mille pondo effici potuere. nec ignoro MM pondo auri perisse Pompeii III consulatu e Capitolini Iovis solio a Camillo ibi condita, et ideo a plerisque existimari MM pondo collata. sed quod accessit, ex Gallorum praeda fuit detractumque ab iis in parte captae urbis delubris'; Varro apud Non. p. 338.13–16 L.: 'auri pondo duo milia acceperunt ex aedibus sacris et matronarum ornamentis; a quibus postea id aurum et torques aureae multae relatae Romam atque consecratae'; and Mommsen, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 330; Tränkle, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 152 n. 21.

<sup>42</sup> cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 330; Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 300–1; Ogilvie, *op. cit.* (n. 11), on Liv. 5.48.8 (p. 738).

composition of Livy's first pentad and that by comparing the accounts of Livy, Dionysius and Plutarch we can still reconstruct fairly accurately parts of the historiographical representation of Camillus in the 60s and 50s B.C. Such a reconstruction will allow us to analyse how 'Augustan' Livy's Camillus really is and how the Camillus paradigm was exploited in the political discourse of the Late Republic. With regard to these questions, three aspects of the characterization of Camillus are particularly relevant: his observation of written and unwritten laws and his abidance by standards of decency; his *pietas*; and his role as a refounder of the city. A brief look<sup>43</sup> at our surviving sources shows that all three aspects must already have featured in the late annalistic sources used by Livy, Dionysius, and Plutarch, and are likely to have been well established by the late 60s B.C.

The most illustrative example of Camillus' justice is certainly the famous anecdote that during the siege of Falerii he sent back a schoolmaster who had wanted to betray the city, and that this display of justice and fair-play made the Faliscans capitulate. Since this anecdote is recorded by Livy and Dionysius,<sup>44</sup> it certainly already existed in the accounts of the late annalists, and this suggests that several other details illustrating Camillus' justice (e.g. his reluctance to accept his third dictatorship *iniussu populi*)<sup>45</sup> could be just as old — even if this cannot be proved on the basis of the criteria developed in Section II above.<sup>46</sup>

Likewise, Camillus' piety is certainly a traditional motif. The accounts of Livy, Dionysius, and Plutarch of the *evocatio* ritual,<sup>47</sup> of his famous prayer after the fall of Veii,<sup>48</sup> and of his efforts to restore old sanctuaries and dedicate new temples after the Gallic Sack<sup>49</sup> leave no doubt that the late annalists must already have presented Camillus as a particularly pious statesman.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, several episodes accentuating pious deeds by some of Camillus' contemporaries can be safely traced back to pre-Livian sources.<sup>51</sup> This shows

<sup>43</sup> A detailed analysis of how the three authors reshape the traditional material for their respective audiences and purposes is beyond the scope of this article. Mommsen (op. cit. (n. 10)), Hirschfeld (op. cit. (n. 10)), Klotz (op. cit. (n. 10, 1941)), Tränkle (op. cit. (n. 10)), and now Gowing (op. cit. (n. 8)) make many acute observations on this issue, but a comprehensive treatment is still lacking.

<sup>44</sup> cf. Liv. 5.27.1–4; D.H. 13.1.1–3; further attestations are Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 10.1–8; V.Max. 6.5.1; Front., *Str.* 4.4.1; Polyaen. 8.7.1.

<sup>45</sup> cf. Liv. 5.46.11 and Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 24.3, and see Hellegouarc'h, op. cit. (n. 2), 122.

<sup>46</sup> This is also corroborated by Cic., *Cael.* 39–40 (56 B.C.), where Camillus features as an *exemplum* not only of *robur animi* and *virtus*, but also more generally of moral integrity. Camillus' exemplary justice may be related to the transposition of other motifs traditionally connected with the Athenian statesman Aristides: cf. n. 23 above.

<sup>47</sup> cf. Liv. 5.21.3, 5.22.7, 5.23.7, 5.31.3; D.H. 13.3.1–2; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 6.1–2; see also Verrius Flaccus apud Plin., *Nat.* 28.18 and Serv. auct., *Aen.* 2.244.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Liv. 5.21.10–23.7; D.H. 12.14.1–2, 12.16.4–5; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 5.7–9.

<sup>49</sup> cf. Liv. 5.50.1–8; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 30.2–31.1. Since the two accounts differ in many details (cf. Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10, 1941), 301; Späth, op. cit. (n. 9), 398–9), Livy is clearly not Plutarch's source here and the events must go back to pre-Livian historiography. Given the other religious motifs and the close links with the theme of refoundation (see below), it seems unlikely that Aelius Tubero was the first and only pre-Livian historian to have mentioned these events.

<sup>50</sup> Bruun, op. cit. (n. 13), 53–65 draws attention to the fact that the use of cognomina developed only after Camillus' lifetime and suggests that the cognomen 'Camillus' is a later invention and may have been chosen as a speaking name pointing to 'religious and pious activities'. This hypothesis is supported by TLL s.v. *camillus* 205.25–6: 'i.q. minister iuvenilis sacrorum', but doubts are in place, for *camillus* originally seems to have referred only to the *filii familias* without carrying a specifically religious meaning: cf. Paul., *Epit.* p. 82.16–22 (Lindsay); Serv. auct., *Aen.* 11.543, and the discussion in K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (2nd edn, 1967), 407–8 n. 3 ('Haussohn'). For modern hypotheses on the roots of the name, see Bruun, op. cit., 47–9 (with further literature).

<sup>51</sup> cf. Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 65–7 and the parallel accounts of the prodigies during the siege of Veii (cf. Liv. 5.15–17; D.H. 12.10.1–12.1; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 3–4), of the pious behaviour of the Liparian leader Timasitheus (cf. Liv. 5.28.2–5; Diod. Sic. 14.93.4–5; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 8.6–8), of the *omina* foreshadowing the Gallic catastrophe (cf. Liv. 5.32.6–7; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 14; Cic., *Div.* 1.101, 2.69, and Levene, op. cit. (n. 10), 192), and of the piety of Fabius Dorsuo (cf. Liv. 5.46.2–3, omitted by Dionysius and Plutarch, but clearly traditional, cf. Cassius Hemina fr. 19 Peter = 22 Beck and Walter; V.Max. 1.1.11; Flor., *Epit.* 1.7.16; App., *Gall.* 6; see Stübler, op. cit., 67 and Levene, op. cit., 197). In view of this material, the episode of Lucius Albinus helping the Vestal virgins (cf. Liv. 5.40.7–10; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 21.1–3; V.Max. 1.1.10; see Levene, op. cit., 195) is also likely to go back to pre-Livian historiography.

that, far from being confined to the characterization of Camillus, the focus on religion and piety was a general and fundamental trait of late annalistic accounts of the Gallic Sack.<sup>52</sup>

Just as traditional as the focus on religion must have been Camillus' role as a second founder of Rome. Timpe and Petzold have rightly drawn attention to the fact that Claudius Quadrigarius' *Annals* seem to have begun with the events surrounding the Gallic catastrophe and that this (at first sight rather odd) point of departure can be compared to a similar structuring of the historical events in Polybius and Livy.<sup>53</sup> In 1.6.3 Polybius explicitly links the recovery from the Gallic catastrophe with the 'beginning of the expansion' (ἀρχὴν συναυξήσεως) of the Roman state, thus interpreting the refoundation after the Gallic Sack as a kind of zero-hour of Roman history.<sup>54</sup> Likewise, at the beginning of his second pentad, Livy explicitly refers to the expulsion of the Gauls as a *secunda origo* and a major caesura both with regard to the history of the Roman state and with regard to the availability and reliability of historical sources (6.1.3: 'clariora deinceps certioraque ab secunda origine . . . urbis gesta domi militiaeque exponuntur').<sup>55</sup>

Hence, from at least the second century B.C., the restoration after the Gallic Sack became viewed as a sort of second foundation. Once this view had surfaced, it was only natural to compare Camillus, as the major statesman involved in this refoundation, with Rome's mythical founder Romulus, and it is therefore hardly surprising that we find this comparison several times in Livy and Plutarch (but not in the remains of Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae*).<sup>56</sup> In the light of what has been said above about the relation between the sources, the joint testimony of Livy and Plutarch cannot prove that the concept also featured in the late annalists. However, there is one reference to the similarity between Romulus and Camillus in Plutarch which has no parallel in Livy and is unlikely to have been fabricated by someone writing under the Principate. At *Vit. Cam.* 31.2,

<sup>52</sup> This conclusion squares well with the transformation of the historical core of the Camillus legend into a plot of *hybris* and divine *nemesis* (see Section 1 above) and is further corroborated by the many religious *aitia* connected with the Gallic Sack (on this aspect cf. J. von Ungern-Sternberg, 'Eine Katastrophe wird verarbeitet: Die Gallier in Rom', in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400–133 BC* (2000), 207–22). Given our fragmentary knowledge of the late annalistic accounts of the Gallic Sack, it becomes extremely difficult to determine whether and to what extent Livy may have further developed the religious themes. Hellegouarc'h (op. cit. (n. 2), 118–19), Levene (op. cit. (n. 10), 175–203), and others do not pay enough attention to this problem; for a more nuanced analysis see Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 53–63.

<sup>53</sup> cf. D. Timpe, 'Erwägungen zur jüngeren Annalistik', *A&A* 25 (1979), 97–119, at 104; K.-E. Petzold, 'Zur Geschichte der römischen Annalistik', in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius. Aspekte seines Werkes* (1993), 151–88, at 174–5, and Ungern-Sternberg, op. cit. (n. 2), 289.

<sup>54</sup> cf. Polyb. 1.6.3: πρὸς οὗς [i.e. Γαλάταις] ποιησάμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι σπονδὰς καὶ διαλύσεις ἐδοκουμένας Γαλάταις, καὶ γενόμενοι πάλιν ἀνελπίστως τῆς πατρίδος ἐγκρατεῖς, καὶ λαβόντες οἶον ἀρχὴν συναυξήσεως, ἐπολέμουν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς χρόνοις πρὸς τοὺς ἄστυγείτονας.

<sup>55</sup> Another trace of this caesura is the use of two simultaneous systems of dating — i.e. *ab Urbe condita* and *ab Urbe recuperata* — in Liv. 7.18.1: 'quadringentesimo anno quam urbs Romana condita erat, quinto tricesimo quam a Gallis recuperata'. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on 7.18.1 refers to Ogilvie's note (op. cit. (n. 11)) on Liv. 3.33.1 and to J. Pinsent's discussion ('Notes on Livy 6 (1.1)', *LCM* 13 (1988), 2–6, especially 4–6) of dating in Livy and compares the intermediate dating after the Gallic Sack with 3.30.7: 'tricesimo sexto anno a primis tribunis plebis', 25.36.14: 'anno octavo postquam in Hispaniam venerat', as well as the dating of the Hannibalic War by years; however, the latter passages explain neither the simultaneous use of two different systems of dating nor their striking parallelization in 7.18.1, and particularly the antithetical phrasing suggests that this case of intermediate dating may be more meaningful. Cf. also Fabius Pictor Lat. fr. 6 Peter (= fr. 23 Beck and Walter): 'quapropter tum primum ex plebe alter consul factus est, duovicesimo anno postquam Romam Galli ceperunt'.

<sup>56</sup> cf. Liv. 5.49.7: 'Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis haud vanis laudibus appellabatur [sc. M. Furius Camillus]', 7.1.10: '... titulo tantae gloriae fuit dignisque habitus quem secundum a Romulo conditorem urbis Romanae ferrent'; Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 1.1: κτίστης δὲ τῆς Ῥώμης ἀναγραφεῖς δεύτερος, *De Exil.* 605E: ἡδόξει δὲ Κάμιλλος ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐλαυνόμενος, ἥς δεύτερος κτίστης νῦν ἀναγορεύεται. The comparison is also implied at Plut., *Vit. Mar.* 27.9, where it is said that Marius was called a 'third founder of Rome' (κτίστην . . . Ῥώμης τρίτον) because his deeds were in no way inferior to the expulsion of the Gauls (ὡς οὐχ ἦττονα τοῦ Κελτικοῦ τοῦτον ἀπεωσμένον τὸν κίνδυνον; cf. Ogilvie, op. cit. (n. 11), on Liv. 5.49.7 (p. 739)). Finally, the concept also features in Eutropius (1.20.5, 2.4; certainly based on Livy) and two speeches of Themistius (*Or.* 3, p. 43C and 13, p. 179C; possibly (directly or indirectly) influenced by Livy or Plutarch).

Plutarch informs us that after the Gallic Sack certain demagogues tried to discredit Camillus' plan to rebuild Rome by saying that Camillus was driven by selfishness and that his main objective was to be regarded as the founder of the city and push, as it were, Romulus off the pedestal (ὄπως ... καὶ κτίστης [sc. Ῥώμης] λέγεται παρώσας Ῥωμόλον). While it is easy to see that Livy might have wanted to omit this bit of mean criticism because it would have tarnished Camillus' status and would not have suited the following debate about the rebuilding of Rome with its grand themes and lofty tone, it is more difficult to explain why a post-Livian historian should have invented this detail. Moreover, we know that several politicians of the Late Republic were eager to style themselves as a *conditor alter* or *secundus Romulus* and that these ambitions were often criticized and mocked by their contemporaries.<sup>57</sup> The Roman people's criticism at *Vit. Cam.* 31.2 closely resembles this sort of mockery,<sup>58</sup> and this similarity strongly suggests that Plutarch's account is a retrojection of Late Republican political themes into the fourth century B.C.<sup>59</sup> Obviously, such a retrojection is more likely to go back to a Late Republican historian, attuned to the political discourse of his day, than to someone writing under the Principate.

Finally, the seemingly typically Augustan titles *parens/pater patriae* and *princeps* which we find in Liv. 5.49.7: 'parens patriae ... appellabatur [sc. M. Furius Camillus]' ('[M. Furius Camillus] was called father of the fatherland') and Liv. 6.1.4: 'M. Furio principe' ('M. Furius, the leading citizen') are unlikely to reflect a deliberate Augustan re-fashioning of the Camillus story. Given that the first founder (Romulus) and the so-called third founder (Marius) were both commonly called *parentes patriae* by the late 60s B.C.,<sup>60</sup> it is probable that Camillus too was known as *parens/pater patriae* by that time and that already Livy's late annalistic sources styled Camillus as a 'father of the fatherland'. Moreover, passages such as Cic., *Red. Sen.* 5: 'virtute, gloria, rebus gestis Cn. Pompeius omnium gentium, omnium saeculorum, omnis memoriae facile princeps' ('Gnaeus Pompeius, because of his valour, his fame, and his deeds easily the most distinguished person of all nations, all times, and all history') or *Dom.* 66: 'Cn. Pompeium, quem omnium iudicio longe principem esse civitatis videbat [sc. Clodius]' ('Gnaeus Pompeius, whom, as he [i.e. Clodius] saw, everyone considered to be by far the leading man in the state') reveal that in the Late Republic *princeps* was commonly used to denote the leading men of the

<sup>57</sup> cf. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 7.1.10 (p. 37).

<sup>58</sup> cf. especially Sall., *Hist.* 1.55.5: 'scaevus iste Romulus' (of Sulla); Catull. 29.5, 9: 'cinaede Romule' (addressed to Caesar); [Sall.], *Cic.* 7: 'Romule Arpinas' (addressed to Cicero); and see Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 7.1.10 (p. 37).

<sup>59</sup> cf. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 7.1.10 (p. 37).

<sup>60</sup> For Romulus as a *parens/pater patriae*, see Enn., *Ann.* 106–8 (Skutsch) and Liv. 1.16.6: "Romulus", inquit [sc. Proculus Iulius], "... parens urbis huius, prima hodierna luce caelo repente delapsus se mihi obvium dedit ..."; for Marius, cf. Cic., *Rab. Perd.* 27 (63 B.C.): "C. Marium, quem vere patrem patriae, parentem, inquam, vestrae libertatis atque huiusce rei publicae possumus dicere". Apart from Camillus, Marius, and Cicero himself (cf. *Sest.* 121 (56 B.C.); Plut., *Vit. Cic.* 23.6), the expression was also used of Fabius Cunctator (cf. Plin., *Nat.* 22.10) and Caesar (cf. Cic., *Fam.* 12.3.1; App., *BC* 2.106, 144; Cass. Dio 44.4.4; Suet., *Iul.* 76, 85; and S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (1971), 220–5). In all these cases, *parens/pater patriae* is an honorific appellation, not an official title — an important distinction not observed by Pliny (*Nat.* 7.117) and Plutarch (*Vit. Cic.* 23.5–6), who wrongly claim that Cicero was the first to receive the official title of 'pater patriae' (cf. A. Alföldi, 'Die Geburt der kaiserzeitlichen Bildsymbolik: 3. Parens Patriae', *MH* 10 (1953), 103–24, at 104–7). In view of the Republican precedents, Hor., *C.* 1.2.50: 'hic [sc. Caesar] ames dici pater atque princeps' does not prove that Liv. 5.49.7: 'parens patriae' must have specifically Augustan connotations, but rather shows the continuity of Republican honorific vocabulary and traditional Roman ethics under the Early Principate (a fact even acknowledged by Burck, op. cit. (n. 1, 1991), 276): cf. V. Ehrenberg, 'Monumentum Antiocheum', *Klio* 19 (1925), 189–213, at 204–5; J. Béranger, *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat* (1953), 31–133, especially 132; F. Bömer, *Publius Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten* (1957–8), on Ov., *Fast.* 2.127; R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace. Odes 1* (1970), on Hor., *C.* 1.2.50; Hellegouarc'h, op. cit. (n. 2), 113–17; Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 416.

state. Thus, a historian of that time might well have used this term with regard to Camillus' eminent role and status in the early fourth century B.C.<sup>61</sup>

#### IV CAMILLUS' SPEECH IN LIV. 5.51-4: TRADITION AND ORIGINALITY

The preceding analysis has shown that Livy has inherited, not invented, the image of Camillus as a saviour and refounder of the Roman state and an icon of justice and *pietas*. A particularly good illustration of how Livy has adapted the historiographical tradition before him — and also a good starting-point for analysing the complex interaction between his account and the political discourse of the Late Republic — is the famous speech which he puts into Camillus' mouth in 5.51-4.<sup>62</sup>

The speech is part of Livy's treatment of a dispute between plebeians and Senate over whether to rebuild Rome after the Gallic Sack or to emigrate to Veii. Livy begins by briefly mentioning the proposal for resettlement by the *plebs* and the opposition of the Senate (5.50.8) and then inserts Camillus' speech in favour of rebuilding Rome (5.51-4). The speech itself, however, is not decisive, and the dispute is only resolved a little later, when a centurion orders his soldiers to stop in front of the meeting-place and his words 'signifer statue signum; hic manebimus optime' ('standard bearer, fix the standard; this will be the best place for us to stay') are interpreted as a portent for remaining in Rome (5.55.1).

A look at the parallel account in Plutarch's *Life of Camillus* (31-2)<sup>63</sup> shows how closely Livy has followed his sources and how carefully he has rearranged their material.<sup>64</sup> Plutarch's version of the events has the same overall structure, but instead of a long speech by Camillus, he mentions a variety of interventions by a number of unnamed senators as well as by Camillus and a certain Lucius Lucretius. Plutarch does not provide any details about Camillus' intervention, but the arguments Plutarch attributes to the unnamed senators closely resemble those which Livy puts into Camillus' mouth at 5.51-4. Camillus' first argument that Rome has been protected by the gods in the past (5.51.4-10) and that it is therefore the Romans' duty to carry on worshipping their gods in their inherited places of abode (5.52.1-17) can be compared to Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 31.3:

[sc. ἡ βουλὴ παρεμυθεῖτο] ἐπιδεικνυμένη μὲν ἡρία καὶ τάφους πατέρων, ὑπομιμνήσκουσα δὲ χωρίων ἱερῶν καὶ τόπων ἁγίων, οὓς Ῥώμυλος ἢ Νομάς ἢ τίς ἄλλος αὐτοῖς τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιθειάσας παρέδωκεν

[the Senate exhorted them], pointing to the tombs and graves of their fathers, reminding them of the sacred districts and holy places, which Romulus or Numa or some other of their kings had consecrated and bequeathed

<sup>61</sup> cf. also *TLL* s.v. *princeps* 1280.67-1281.16. L. Wickert, 'Princeps', *RE* 22.1 (1954), 1998-2296, coll. 2029-41, especially 2037; M. Schäfer, 'Cicero und der Prinzipat des Augustus', *Gymnasium* 64 (1957), 310-35; H. Drexler, 'Principes, princeps', *Maia* 10 (1958), 243-80, especially 261-2, 270-3, 276-8; and J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (1972), 327-61 (all citing further literature) have shown how the Late Republican usage of *princeps* and the aristocratic ideology attached to it prepared the ground for the Augustan Principate and have demonstrated that Pompey's eminent position in the 50s B.C. is in many ways similar to that of Octavian/Augustus (on the latter point see especially Hellegouarc'h, *op. cit.*, 346-9, and cf. also, e.g., A. E. R. Boak, 'The extraordinary commands from 80 to 48 B.C.: a study in the origins of the Principate', *American Historical Review* 24 (1918), 1-25, at 23-5, and W. W. How, 'Cicero's ideal in his *de Republica*', *JRS* 20 (1930), 24-42, at 36-7).

<sup>62</sup> A comparison of Liv. 5.51-4 and its parallel at Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 31-2 with the much shorter accounts of a similar, earlier debate about moving to Veii in Liv. 5.29.8-30.6 and Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 11.1-2 suggests that the episode must have already been regarded as a central event of Roman history by the late annalists. It is unlikely that, historically, the subject was discussed twice, and probably one of the two debates is invented on the basis of the other; however, there is hardly any overlap in arguments or procedure between the earlier and the later debate.

<sup>63</sup> Unfortunately we lack Dionysius' account of these events: cf. Späth, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 399-400.

<sup>64</sup> That Livy is recycling traditional material has already been briefly mentioned by Stübler, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 84; Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 10, 1941), 302; Ogilvie, *op. cit.* (n. 11), on 5.51-4 (p. 742); but is ignored by, e.g., Burck, *op. cit.* (n. 1, 1933), 134-5; Jaeger, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 89-91; Stevenson, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 31, 33.



where the casual remark ἢ τις ἄλλος . . . τῶν βασιλέων ('or some other of their kings') indicates a certain disinterest on Plutarch's part and suggests that he may have considerably abridged a much longer catalogue of religious cults and traditions in his source.<sup>65</sup> Likewise, Camillus' claim that it would be a dishonour if the ruins of Rome were deserted or inhabited by foreign nations (5.53.7–8) has a parallel in the argumentation of Plutarch's senators, cf. *Vit. Cam.* 31.4:

προῦφερον . . . καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἑστίας πῦρ, ὃ μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον ὑπὸ τῶν παρθένων ἀναπτόμενον αὐθις ἀφανίζεῖν καὶ σβεννύναι τοὺς προλιπόντας τὴν πόλιν, ὄνειδος αὐτοῖς ἐσόμενον, ἂν τε ὑπ' ἄλλων οἰκουμένην ὀρώσιν ἐπηλύδων καὶ ξένων ἂν τ' ἔρημον οὖσαν καὶ μηλόβοτον.

They referred . . . also to the fire of Vesta, [saying that] it would be a disgrace for them if, after the fire had been kindled anew by the virgins after the war, they would now leave the city and let the fire die away and go out — regardless whether they would see the city inhabited by alien and foreign immigrants or deserted and grazed by sheep.

The most striking parallel is, however, the close correspondence between Camillus' *conclusio* in Liv. 5.54.6–7 and Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 31.4. At the end of his speech Livy has Camillus refer to the prodigy of a skull found on the Capitol and to the fire of Vesta (5.54.7):

hic Capitolium est, ubi quondam capite humano invento responsum est eo loco caput rerum summamque imperii fore; hic cum augurato liberaretur Capitolium, Iuventas Terminusque maximo gaudio patrum vestrorum moveri se non passi; hic Vestae ignes, hic ancilia caelo demissa, hic omnes propitii manentibus vobis di.

Here is the Capitolium, where once a human head was found and it was said that in that place there would be the capital of the world and the centre of power; here, to the greatest joy of your fathers, Iuventas and Terminus refused to be moved, when the Capitol was cleared with augural rites; here are the fires of Vesta; here the shields that were sent down from heaven; here all the gods are propitious if only you remain.

Markedly, according to Plutarch, the skull and the fire of Vesta were also the foremost arguments used by the unnamed senators to persuade the Roman *plebs* to rebuild the destroyed city (31.4):

ἐν πρώτοις δὲ τῶν θείων τὴν τε νεοσφαγῆ κεφαλὴν προῦφερον ἐν τῇ θεμελιώσει τοῦ Καπιτωλίου φανείσαν, ὡς τῷ τόπῳ πεπρωμένον ἐκείνῳ τῆς Ἰταλίας κεφαλῆ γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἑστίας πῦρ . . .

Of the religious issues, they referred with particular emphasis to the newly severed head that had been found in the foundations of the Capitol and which had shown, as it were, that the place would become the head of Italy; and they also referred to the fire of Vesta . . .

These close similarities between the accounts of Plutarch and Livy can hardly be accidental.<sup>66</sup> Either Plutarch must have used Livy's account, or Plutarch and Livy have drawn from the same or at least very similar source(s) (cf. Section II above). In the first case we would have to assume that Plutarch (a) summarized the long speech of Livy's Camillus by merely saying (*Vit. Cam.* 32.1) 'he [i.e. Camillus] spoke in detail about many things, exhorting them to preserve their country' (πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὸς [sc. ὁ Κάμιλλος] διεξήλθε

<sup>65</sup> Livy, on the other hand, seems to have deliberately refashioned the catalogue of cults in his source to match his own earlier enumeration of Roman cults in 1.20.1–4, thus not only rounding off the first pentad but also implicitly aligning Camillus with another founder figure, viz. Rome's religious lawgiver Numa: cf. Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 84; Kraus, op. cit. (n. 17), 283–4; Stevenson, op. cit. (n. 2), 41–2.

<sup>66</sup> cf. also the similar use of the shipwreck metaphor in the speech of Livy's Camillus (5.52.1): 'e naufragiis prioris culpa cladisque emergentes' and in the lamentations of Plutarch's plebeians (*Vit. Cam.* 31.5): ὥσπερ ἐκ ναυαγίου γυμνοὺς καὶ ἀπόρους σωθέντας (cf. Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 82 n. 131).

παρακαλῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος); (b) expanded Livy's account by inventing the unnamed senators and Lucius Lucretius; and (c) put Camillus' arguments into the mouths of the unnamed senators. By all these changes Plutarch would not only have burdened his account with unnecessary detail, but he would also have systematically reduced Camillus' historical importance and would have deliberately diverted the reader's attention away from the very person standing in the spotlight of his biography. This is obviously highly improbable, and we may therefore assume that Livy and Plutarch are drawing from the same (or at least very similar) source(s) here. While Plutarch represents the common source(s) rather faithfully, transmitting also many irrelevant details, Livy has freely rearranged their account: on the one hand, he has omitted less important characters such as Lucius Lucretius and the unnamed senators; on the other hand, he has condensed and expanded the arguments of the senators in a single speech and has put this speech into the mouth of a more central figure, viz. Camillus.

This reconstruction, which is also supported by a patent inconsistency in the lines immediately following Camillus' speech,<sup>67</sup> sheds considerable light on Livy's historiographical aims and methods in this passage. First of all, it demonstrates that Livy's model for the long speech by Camillus cannot be a Camillus speech in Ennius' *Annals* as has sometimes been claimed.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, the reconstruction shows that Livy has not invented the seemingly Augustan religious themes, which are so prominent in Camillus' speech, and that he generally refrained from embellishing his account with new details or episodes. Instead, he only gently rearranges the traditional material, removes minor details and secondary characters, and elaborates one particular detail, viz. the lengthy speech of Camillus, which was only briefly mentioned in his late annalistic source(s) (cf. Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 32.1, quoted above). Although all these modifications are fairly small and do not affect the historical 'facts', they fundamentally change the focus and effect of Livy's narrative. By suppressing the minor characters and focusing all our attention on Camillus, Livy does not just create a much smoother line of events and condense the historical details in one grand scene. He also casts Camillus as the central figure of the debate about the future of Rome and thereby implicitly attributes to him the prominent role that corresponds to

<sup>67</sup> Chaplin (op. cit. (n. 7), 87) rightly asks, 'If Livy makes the centurion's command the decisive factor, what is the point of Camillus' lengthy and *exempla*-filled speech?' but — unaware of the complexity of Livy's reworking of the historiographical tradition before him — she explains this oddity simply by the fact that 'Book 5 is concerned above all with religion'. The real reason, however, is that Livy had to integrate his elaborate speech into the traditional chain of historical events and was not prepared to suppress the well-known anecdote of the centurion: thus, Camillus' speech had to be without consequences in order to enable Livy to take up the thread of the historical tradition again with 'sed rem dubiam ...' in 5.55.1.

<sup>68</sup> This view was first voiced by L. Holzapfel, *Römische Chronologie* (1885), 243 and then by E. Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* (1915), 82 n. 2, O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (1985), 314–15, and more recently A. F. Rossi, 'The "Aeneid" revisited', *AJPh* 121 (2000), 571–91, at 582 and is based on an extremely tenuous argument: even if Ennius dated Rome's foundation to about 1100 B.C. and Enn., *Ann.* 154: *septingenti ... anni* indicates that the lines *Ann.* 154–5 were spoken by a statesman of the fifth or fourth century B.C., this still does not prove that the context of such a speech was the refoundation after the Gallic Sack (W. Soltau, 'Roms Gründungsjahr bei Ennius', *Philologus* 71 (1912), 317–19, at 318, also compares Liv. 5.40.2), let alone that the speaker was Camillus and not Lucius Lucretius or one of the other men mentioned at Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 31–2. The verbal resemblance between *Ann.* 154–5: 'septingenti sunt, paulo plus aut minus, anni / augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est' and Liv. 5.52.2: 'urbem auspicato inauguratoque conditam habemus' and 5.54.5: 'trecentisim sexagesimus quintus annus urbis, Quirites, agitur' is not only rather faint (*pace* Skutsch) but also insignificant in view of the fact that the expression *urbem auspicato condere* has at least seven exact parallels in Cicero (*Rep.* 2.16, 2.51, *Leg.* 2.33, *Div.* 1.3, 2.70), Livy (28.28.11), and Tacitus (*Hist.* 3.72).

his traditional fame as a second founder of Rome.<sup>69</sup> In doing so, Livy achieves a more coherent picture than Plutarch and the late annalists, in whose accounts Rome's second founder is (surprisingly) just one speaker among many others. Moreover, Livy's rearrangement also has important consequences for the structure of the first pentad. Camillus' prominence as a second founder and the religious themes of his speech clearly evoke the foundation of the city by Romulus and the institution of Roman cults by Numa in Book 1 and thus are a particularly suitable closure for the first five books of *Ab Urbe Condita*.<sup>70</sup>

Livy's technique of pruning and rearranging the traditional material is obviously determined by literary, not ideological considerations, and his debts to his predecessors leave virtually no room for an extensive and deliberate Augustan refashioning of the role of Camillus. This point can be further corroborated by an analysis of how Livy expands the material of his sources. Once we subtract from Liv. 5.51–4 the arguments shared with Plutarch, what remains as *Livianisches im Livius* is the proem (5.51.1–3), a few practical considerations (5.53.1–3), and Camillus' description of his nostalgia during the time of his exile (5.54.1–5). Camillus' practical considerations could also have been expounded by the senators of Livy's and Plutarch's source(s), and the addition of a suitable proem is not too surprising. More significant is Camillus' description of his nostalgia which is far too personal to have featured in one of the speeches of the senators and must therefore be a Livian expansion. By accentuating Camillus' nostalgia Livy elicits the reader's sympathy and achieves a degree of emotional depth, which neither Plutarch nor (as far as we can tell) Livy's late annalistic source(s) accomplished. This focus on the psychology of historical figures has, of course, many parallels elsewhere in Livy.<sup>71</sup> What makes the present case remarkable, however, is the fact that Livy's insertion and elaboration of the motif of nostalgia owe a great debt to Cicero and come close to a Ciceronian refashioning of Camillus.

In his commentary on Livy's first pentad, Ogilvie remarks that Camillus' description of his nostalgia reminded him of some of Cicero's letters from exile and he compares *Fam.* 2.11.1: 'mirum me desiderium tenet urbis, incredibile meorum atque in primis tui' ('I feel an amazing longing for the city, an incredible longing for my friends and particularly for you'), 2.12.2: 'urbem, urbem, mi Rufe, cole et in ista luce vive; omnis peregrinatio ... obscura et sordida est iis quorum industria Romae potest inlustris esse' ('live in the city, in the city, my Rufus, and enjoy its splendour; all travelling abroad is undistinguished and degrading for those whose industry can attain fame in Rome'), and 2.13.3: 'miroque

<sup>69</sup> This technique has, of course, many parallels in the later books, where we can compare Livy's account with Polybius: cf. K. Witte, 'Über die Form der Darstellung in Livius' Geschichtswerk', *RbM* 65 (1910), 270–305 and 359–419, at 287, 292, 295–6, *passim* and H. Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios* (1977), especially 85–98, 122–8; for a similar analysis of passages in Book 1, see H. Haffter, 'Rom und römische Ideologie bei Livius', *Gymnasium* 71 (1964), 236–50, especially 249.

<sup>70</sup> cf. n. 65 above. In addition, Livy also matches Camillus' speech with the oration of Appius Claudius at 5.3–6, thus creating a symmetry within Book 5 (cf. Luce, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 268). Luce (p. 294) may well be right in saying that Livy 'took a much freer hand [in the early books] than in the later Polybian sections', but his claim (p. 275) that the 'selection, ordering, and emphasis of material' reveal a 'desire to teach a moral lesson' and correspond 'to the programme announced in the Preface' of *Ab Urbe Condita* seems overstated in view of the dramatic and structural implications of Livy's rearrangement and the moralizing emphasis on religion in Livy's sources.

<sup>71</sup> cf. P. G. Walsh, *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods* (1963), 168–72 and 191–2; M. Ducos, 'Les passions, les hommes et l'histoire dans l'oeuvre de Tite-Live', *REL* 65 (1987), 132–47; Oakley, *op. cit.* (n. 5), vol. 1, 120–1; and, e.g., Ogilvie, *op. cit.* (n. 11), on Liv. 2.3–5 (p. 243), 2.10 (pp. 258–9), 3.60–3 (p. 509), 4.18.2 (p. 561), Oakley on Liv. 7.9–10.14 (p. 119), 7.34.1–11 (p. 334), 9.4.1–6.2 (p. 74), 10.35.1–36.19 (p. 362), and J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy. Books XXXI–XXXIII* (1973), on Liv. 32.19.6 (p. 202) and 33.32.6–9 (p. 311).

desiderio me urbs adficit et omnes mei tuque in primis' ('I feel an amazing desire for the city and for all my friends and particularly for you').<sup>72</sup> None of these parallels, however, comes close to the words of Livy's Camillus, and a far closer (and so far ignored) parallel can be found in Cicero's speech *Post Reditum ad Quirites*:

Liv. 5.54.3: cum abessem, quotienscumque patria in mentem veniret, haec omnia occurrerant, colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum sub quo natus educatusque essem; quae vos, Quirites, nunc moveant potius *caritate* sua ut maneatis in sede vestra quam postea, cum reliqueritis eam, macerent desiderio.

When I was in exile, every time I was thinking of my home country, all these things came to my mind: the hills and fields, the Tiber, and the region which my eyes had been accustomed to see, and this sky under which I was born and raised; may these things rather move you, my fellow citizens, now through the love they inspire and make you stay in your home than later torment you with desire when you have left.

Cic., *Red. Pop.* 4: ipsa autem patria, di immortales, dici vix potest quid *caritatis*, quid voluptatis habeat, quae species Italiae, quae celebritas oppidorum, quae forma regionum, qui agri, quae fruges, quae pulchritudo urbis, quae humanitas civium, quae rei publicae dignitas, quae vestra maiestas!

It can hardly be expressed, oh immortal gods, what love the home country inspires, what pleasure it affords, how beautiful Italy is, how famous its cities, how lovely its landscapes, fields, and crops; how beautiful the city, how cultured its citizens, how excellent its state is, how dignified you are!

Context and contents of the two passages are very similar: both speakers have just returned from exile and describe their nostalgia for their *patria*; both stress their attachment to Rome using the word *caritas*;<sup>73</sup> and both give an (admittedly rather sketchy) view of the beauty and the advantages of their home (cf. 'colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum' and 'forma regionum ... agri ... fruges ... pulchritudo urbis'). Even though the motif of nostalgic retrospective also has a precedent in Catullus' Poem 63,<sup>74</sup> the Ciceronian parallel is certainly more important here, for the subsequent lines of Camillus' speech, which describe the advantageous geographical situation of Rome, have an even closer parallel in Cicero's *De Re Publica* (2.5, 10, 11):<sup>75</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Ogilvie could also have compared Cic., *Att.* 5.15.1 (written during Cicero's 'second exile' as proconsul in Cilicia): 'luce[m], forum, urbem, domum, vos desidero'.

<sup>73</sup> On the theme of *caritas soli* in Livy see Bonjour, op. cit. (n. 2), 469–74, especially 472–4 (without reference to the Ciceronian background of Liv. 5.54.2).

<sup>74</sup> cf. Cat. 63.56–60. Later examples are, e.g., Ov., *Pont.* 1.2.47–50, 1.8.31–8.

<sup>75</sup> cf. Stübler, op. cit. (n. 2), 92; Ogilvie, op. cit. (n. 11), on 5.54.1–5 (p. 748); Miles, op. cit. (n. 2), 90–1; Ungern-Sternberg, op. cit. (n. 2), 292 n. 24. Burck's reference (op. cit. (n. 1, 1933), 135) to the *laudes Italiae* in Verg., *G.* 2.136–76 and Jaeger's comment (op. cit. (n. 10), 89) that Livy adopts 'the role of cultural historian' (accepted by Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 394) both miss the point; Stevenson's claim (op. cit. (n. 2), 33) that Livy 'has [merely] used elements from the Roman oratorical tradition more generally' is implausible in view of the close resemblances and Livy's admiration of Cicero (see below).

Liv. 5.54.4: non sine causa di hominesque hunc Urbi condendae locum elegerunt — saluberrimos colles, flumen opportunum, quo ex mediterraneis locis fruges devehantur, quo maritimi commeatus accipiantur, mare vicinum ad commoditates nec expositum nimia propinquitate ad pericula classium externarum, regionem Italiam mediam — ad incrementum urbis natum unice locum.

Not without reason gods and men have chosen this place for founding the city — the most healthful hills; a convenient river, on which crops can be exported from the inland regions, on which goods can be imported from the sea; the sea conveniently close, but not exposed by too great proximity to the threats of foreign fleets, the middle region of Italy — a place uniquely suited for the growth of the city.

Cic., *Rep.* 2.5: Urbi autem locum ... incredibili opportunitate delegit [sc. 'Romulus']. neque enim ad mare admovit ... sed hoc vir excellenti providentia sensit ac vidit non esse opportunissimos situs maritimos urbibus eis, quae ad spem diuturnitatis conderentur atque imperii, primum quod essent urbes maritimae non solum multis periculis oppositae, sed etiam caecis. ... (2,10) qui potuit igitur divinius et utilitates conplecti maritimas Romulus et vitia vitare, quam quod urbem perennis amnis et aequabilis et in mare late influentis posuit in ripa, quo posset urbs et accipere a mari, quo egeret, et reddere, quo redundaret, eodemque ut flumine res ad victum cultumque maxime necessarias non solum mari absorberet, sed etiam invectas acciperet ex terra? ... (2,11) locumque delegit et fontibus abundantem et in regione pestilenti salubrem; colles enim sunt, qui cum perflantur ipsi, tum adferunt umbram vallibus.

He [i.e. Romulus] chose the place for founding the city ... with incredible sense for opportunity. For he did not move it right to the sea, ... but the man perceived and understood with superb foresight that places at the coast are not the most suitable ones for cities which are founded in the hope of continuity and power, firstly because cities at the coast are exposed not only to many dangers, but also to unforeseeable ones. ... (2.10) How could Romulus have embraced the advantages of the coast and could have avoided its disadvantages more wisely than by placing the city on the banks of a river which is flowing all year long and with unvarying current and flows broadly into the sea and by which the city could import from the sea what it needs and export what it abounds in, so that by that very same river it could receive the most necessary things for life and civilization not only from the sea but also import them from the inland regions? ... (2.11) He chose a place which abounds in springs and is healthy, although situated in the middle of an insalubrious region; for there are hills, which not only profit from fresh winds but also offer shade to the valleys below.



Livy's Camillus and Cicero both begin by stressing the care and diligence with which the site for the future city was chosen (Liv. 5.54.4: 'non sine causa di homines hunc Urbi condendae locum elegerunt' ~ *Rep.* 2.5: 'Urbi autem locum ... incredibili opportunitate delegit [sc. Romulus]'); then they both go on to refer to the river Tiber as a means of transportation (Liv. 5.54.4: 'flumen opportunum, quo ex mediterraneis locis fruges devehantur, quo maritimi commeatus accipiantur' ~ *Rep.* 2.10: 'perennis amnis et aequabilis et in mare late influentis ... quo posset urbs et accipere a mari, quo egeret, et reddere, quo redundaret'), to the healthy climate and vegetation of the hills on which Rome was founded (Liv. 5.54.4: 'saluberrimos colles' ~ *Rep.* 2.11: 'locumque et fontibus abundantem et in regione pestilenti salubrem; colles enim sunt, qui cum perflantur ipsi, tum adferunt umbram vallibus'), and to the fact that Rome is not situated on the seashore and is therefore less exposed to the threat of sudden attacks by foreign fleets (Liv. 5.54.4: 'mare vicinum ad commoditates, nec expositum nimia propinquitate ad pericula classium externarum' ~ *Rep.* 2.5: 'sed hoc vir [i.e. Romulus] excellenti providentia sensit ac vidit, non esse opportunissimos situs maritimos urbibus eis, quae ad spem diuturnitatis conderentur atque imperii, primum quod essent urbes maritimae non solum multis periculis oppositae, sed etiam caecis').<sup>76</sup>

These close similarities between Camillus' speech and Cicero are flanked by a clustering of Ciceronian *clausulae*<sup>77</sup> and are certainly not accidental, for we know from Seneca the Elder (*Suas.* 6.17, 22) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.39) that Livy was a great admirer of Cicero's works, particularly his *Philippics*.<sup>78</sup> Thus, it is likely that Livy consciously inserted the Ciceronian reminiscences and deliberately designed Camillus' speech in a way that not only serves structural and dramatic purposes but also reflects his esteem for one of the leading statesmen of the Late Republic.

#### V CAMILLUS AND CICERO'S POST-EXILIC RHETORIC

Apart from Livy's admiration of the politician and orator Cicero, there are at least two further motives for Livy's Ciceronian refashioning of Camillus: the first is the obvious similarities between the two statesmen: their antagonism to the *plebs* and the tribunes, their struggle to preserve inherited religious and political institutions, the shared title of *parens/pater patriae* (cf. n. 60 above), and their experience of exile and return; the second and far more important one is Cicero's own sophisticated use of the Camillus story, which offers a clear precedent for Livy's implicit comparison of Camillus and Cicero in 5.51–4.

For Cicero, Camillus is not just a man of exemplary *virtus* (cf. *Cael.* 39, *Pis.* 58) and a model statesman (cf. *Sest.* 143), but his life and deeds, particularly his devotion to the Roman state and the Roman people's ingratitude, are seen by Cicero as a precedent for his own life.<sup>79</sup> Two passages are particularly significant in this respect. In *De Re Publica* — the very work from which Livy drew some of his inspiration for his Camillus speech (see Section IV above) — Cicero mentions Camillus' exile as the first (and possibly also foremost) of a number of examples that could be used to illustrate the Roman people's

<sup>76</sup> Interestingly, Camillus' reference to the fact that the Capitol and the *arx* were not taken by the Gauls (cf. Liv. 5.51.3) likewise has a parallel in the *De Re Publica* passage, cf. *Rep.* 2.11: 'Urbs autem ipsius nativa praesidia quis est tam neglegens qui non habeat animo notata planeque cognita? Cuius est tractus ductusque muri ... ut ita munita arx circumiectu arduo et quasi circumciso saxo niteretur, ut etiam in illa tempestate horribili Gallici adventus incolumis atque intacta permanserit.'

<sup>77</sup> cf. Ogilvie, op. cit. (n. 11), on 5.51–4 (p. 743): 'the *clausulae* [...] correspond more closely than elsewhere to the practice of Cicero'; the analysis by Peyre, op. cit. (n. 10), 279; and H. Aili, *The Prose Rhythm of Sallust and Livy* (1979), 100–5, who has shown that Livy's use of *clausulae* in the first decade is not generally Ciceronian and that in the later books his usage approaches that of Sallust and is even markedly different from that of Cicero. Less convincing are the Ciceronian expressions which Ogilvie (op. cit. (n. 11), on 5.51–4 (p. 743)) has collected.

<sup>78</sup> See Syme, op. cit. (n. 2), 52–3. According to E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (1898), 235, Cicero is also one of Livy's stylistic models.

<sup>79</sup> cf. Coudry, op. cit. (n. 2), 57; Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 397.

ingratitude towards their greatest statesmen, and at the end of this list of *exempla* he quite self-indulgently adds his own case as an even more moving example of this, cf. *Rep.* 1.5–6:

nec vero levitatis Atheniensium crudelitatisque in amplissimos civis exempla deficiunt; quae . . . etiam in gravissimam civitatem nostram dicuntur redundasse, nam vel exilium Camilli vel offensio commemoratur Ahalae vel . . . nec vero iam meo nomine abstinent et, credo, quia nostro consilio ac periculo sese in illa vita atque otio conservatos putant gravius etiam de nobis queruntur et amantius.

But there is also no lack of examples of the fickleness and cruelty of the Athenians towards their most distinguished citizens; these phenomena . . . are said to have overflowed also into our own most serious state, for people recall Camillus' exile, the disgrace inflicted on Ahala, . . . and now they even do not refrain from mentioning my name also, and, presumably because they believe they have been saved in their life and leisure through my counsel and at my own risk, they lament about my case even more bitterly and with greater affection.

This line of argument has a close parallel in a passage of Cicero's speech *De Domo Sua*, where Cicero compares his exile and return to that of Camillus (*Dom.* 85–6):

et tu [sc. Clodi] . . . eum restitutum negas esse civem quem eiectum universus senatus non modo civem, sed etiam egregium civem semper putavit? at vero, ut annales populi Romani et monumenta vetustatis loquuntur, Kaeso ille Quinctius et M. Furius Camillus et C. Servilius Ahala, cum essent optime de re publica meriti, tamen populi incitati vim iracundiamque subierunt, damnatique comitiis centuriatis cum in exilium profugissent, rursus ab eodem populo placato sunt in suam pristinam dignitatem restituti.

And you [i.e. Clodius] . . . deny that this man is a citizen, who has been recalled and who, while absent, was always considered by the whole Senate not only a citizen but even an outstanding citizen? But, as is indicated by the annals of the Roman people and ancient records, Kaeso Quinctius and Marcus Furius Camillus and Gaius Servilius Ahala, although they had deserved most highly of the Republic, nevertheless suffered the violence and hatred of the people who had been roused against them, and, after they had gone into exile and had been punished by the assembly of the Centuries, they were reinstated in their former dignity by the very same people once it had been appeased.

These and other passages<sup>80</sup> show that, for Cicero, Camillus' life and deeds were a yardstick for measuring and interpreting his own political achievements and setbacks, particularly his suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy, his prosecution by Clodius, his exile, and his return.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>80</sup> cf. also *Tusc.* 1.90, where Cicero draws a parallel between his own devotion to the state and that of Camillus, and *De Orat.* 3.13, where we hear Cicero's brother compare Cicero's exile with previous cases of ingratitude towards Roman statesmen: Camillus is not explicitly mentioned but may well be included among the 'praecipites . . . casus clarissimorum hominum atque optimorum virorum' that suffered from the ingratitude of the Roman people (the view of A. D. Leeman, H. Pinkster and J. Wisse, *M. Tullius Cicero. De Oratore Libri III. Kommentar*, vol. 4 (1996), 122, on *De Orat.* 3.13 that 'eorum casus' refers to the 'Dialogpersonen' seems too strict). Finally, Ammianus Marcellinus (21.16.13) preserves the following lines from an otherwise unknown letter by Cicero: 'feliciorque meo iudicio Camillus exsulans quam temporibus isdem Manlius etiam si (id, quod cupierat) regnare potuisset.' The context of these words is not clear, but in view of *Rep.* 1.5–6 and *Dom.* 85–6 it is probable that here, too, Cicero compares his own exile and his antagonism to the *plebs* and the tribune Clodius with Camillus' exile and his antagonism to the tribune Manlius. Given Cicero's self-indulgent whining in his letters from exile (cf. S. T. Cohen, 'Cicero's Roman exile', in J. F. Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile. The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond* (2007), 109–28, at 110–11 (with further material)), the passage preserved by Ammianus almost certainly belongs to the time when Cicero had returned to Rome and recovered his equanimity. On Ammianus' fondness for Cicero see H. Tränkle, 'Ammianus Marcellinus als römischer Geschichtsschreiber', *A&A* 11 (1962), 21–32, at 25–6.

<sup>81</sup> Späth's view (op. cit. (n. 9), 382) that Camillus is just an *exemplum* for Cicero is too simple. One may compare Cicero's similar use of the paradigms of Marius' exile (cf. *Div.* 1.59 and 2.137) and Decius' *devotio* (cf. *Red. Pop.* 1, *Dom.* 145 with J. M. May, *Trials of Character. The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (1988), 97–9). Generally, on exile and self-fashioning see now J. F. Gaertner, 'The discourse of displacement in Greco-Roman antiquity', in idem, op. cit. (n. 80), 1–20, especially 5 n. 19, 10–11, 17–18.

However, Cicero's use of the Camillus paradigm seems to have gone much further still, and he may not only have explicitly compared their achievements and setbacks, but also may have implicitly styled himself as a second Camillus. This is strongly suggested by the first words of Cicero's speech *Post Reditum ad Quirites*. At the very beginning of this speech Cicero claims that when going into exile he prayed to Jupiter and the other immortal gods and asked them to punish him if he had placed his own well-being before the interests of the state, but to inspire compassion and regretful desire to all of Italy if he had devoted himself wholly to the welfare of the state:

Quod precatus a Iove Optimo Maximo ceterisque dis immortalibus sum, Quirites, ... ut, si meas rationes unquam vestrae saluti anteposuissem, sempiternam poenam sustinerem mea voluntate susceptam, sin et ea quae ante gesseram conservandae civitatis causa gessissem et illam miseram profectionem vestrae salutis gratia suscepissem, ut ... aliquando vos, patresque conscriptos, Italiamque universam memoria mei, misericordia, desideriumque teneret: eius devotionis me esse convictum ... maxime laetor.

Fellow citizens, I prayed to Jupiter Best and Greatest and the other immortal gods, ... that, if I had ever placed my own considerations before your welfare, I should suffer an eternal punishment which I had brought onto myself by my own will, that, however, if I had done what I had done for the purpose of saving the state and if I had accepted my miserable exile only in order to preserve your welfare, ... one day you and the senators and all Italy would remember, pity, and long for me: I am most delighted that this request has been granted.

The context and contents of Cicero's alleged prayer closely resemble a key episode of the younger layer of the Camillus legend. Like Cicero, Camillus allegedly prayed to the gods before going into exile and asked them either to punish him for his selfishness or, if he was innocent, to make the Roman people realize their mistake and long for his return.<sup>82</sup> The similarities between the two prayers are too strong to be coincidental, and, in view of Cicero's use of the Camillus paradigm at *Rep.* 1.5–6 and *Dom.* 85–6, it is highly probable that Cicero deliberately exploited the well-known motif of Camillus' prayer in order to fashion his exile after the Camillus legend and to align himself with the famous second founder of Rome.

This interpretation is supported by a number of further Camillan motifs in Cicero's post-exilic speeches. Cicero's dedication of a statue of Minerva before his departure into exile<sup>83</sup> and his claim to have been recalled 'dis ... immortalibus ... comprobantibus' ('with the approval of the immortal gods', *Red. Pop.* 18) may have been modelled on Camillus' *pietas* and the *nemesis*-plots construed by Late Republican historians (see Section 1 above); Cicero's repeated claims to have sacrificed himself for the Roman state sound very similar to Camillus' attempt to avert evil from the Roman state by praying that any retribution for

<sup>82</sup> cf. D.H. 13.5.2–3. In Livy's and Plutarch's much shorter and less rhetorical accounts Camillus only refers to the possibility that he may be innocent, cf. Liv. 5.32.4; Plut., *Cam.* 12.3–13.1. Interestingly, Livy's use of *desiderium* and Plutarch's use of *ποθοῦντας* in these passages closely resemble Cicero's words at *Red. Pop.* 1 ('desideriumque teneret'). Since Cicero is one of Livy's models for Camillus' great speech at 5.51–4 and since Plutarch had access either to Livy or a source partly dependent on Livy, we cannot decide whether this is yet another instance where Livy fuses traditional elements of the Camillus story with Ciceronian motifs and expressions, or whether all three authors are influenced by late annalistic accounts. The latter may seem more probable, for the motif of Camillus' prayer is likely to have inherited the concept of 'desire' directly from its model, viz. Achilles' prayer at *Il.* 1.240–1 (cf. *Il.* 1.240: *ποθῆν*); the Iliadic parallel has already been observed by Plutarch (*Vit. Cam.* 13.1) and Appian (*It.* 8.5) and possibly even their source: cf. Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10, 1941), 293; Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 150 n. 19; Späth, op. cit. (n. 9), 366 n. 77.

<sup>83</sup> cf. *Dom.* 144, *Leg.* 2.42, *Att.* 7.3.3, *Fam.* 12.25.1, and Cass. Dio 38.17.4–5.

the capture of Veii might fall upon his own head;<sup>84</sup> Cicero's statement that he was not merely recalled, but implored by all of Italy to return in order to save the Roman state<sup>85</sup> resembles Livy's and Plutarch's description of how Camillus was recalled by the Roman people to save the city from the Gauls; and finally, Cicero's dramatic descriptions of the chaos into which the Roman state had fallen during his absence, and his claim to have defended shrines and temples suggest a situation of all out war and destruction that is not too far away from some of the historical accounts of the Gallic Sack, cf. especially *Red. Pop.* 14:

dum ego absum, eam rem publicam habuistis ut aequae me atque illam restituendam putaretis. ego autem in qua civitate . . . vis et ferrum in foro versaretur, cum privati parietum se praesidio non legum tuerentur, tribuni plebis vobis inspectantibus vulnerarentur, ad magistratum domos cum ferro et facibus iretur, consulis fasces frangerentur, deorum immortalium templa incenderentur, rem publicam esse nullam putavi.

During my absence you had such a state that you thought that you had to restore both myself and the state. I, however, thought that a state . . . in which there was armed violence on the forum, where private men sought the protection of their homes and not of the laws, where the tribunes of the plebs were wounded before your eyes, where people marched with arms and fire against the houses of magistrates, where a consul's rods were broken, where the temples of the immortal gods were set on fire, that such a state was no state at all.

and *Dom.* 144:

vos [sc. di immortales] obtestor, quorum ego a templis atque delubris pestiferam illam et nefariam flammam depuli, teque, Vesta mater, cuius castissimas sacerdotes ab hominum amentium furore et scelere defendi, cuiusque ignem illum sempiternum non sum passus aut sanguine civium restinguere aut cum totius urbis incendio commiseri.

I implore you [, immortal gods,] whose temples and sanctuaries I protected against those pestilential and wicked flames, and you, mother Vesta, whose most chaste priestesses I defended against the insanity and crimes of madmen, whose eternal fire I have not allowed to be quenched by the blood of citizens or to be united with the conflagration of the entire city.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>84</sup> Compare *Red. Pop.* 1: 'precatus . . . sum . . . eo tempore cum me fortunasque meas pro vestra incolumitate, otio, concordiaque devovi . . . ut, quod odium scelerati homines et audaces in rem publicam et in omnes bonos conceptum iam diu contineret, id in me uno potius quam in optimo quoque et universa civitate defigeret', *Dom.* 30: 'haurire me unum pro omnibus illam indignissimam calamitatem . . .' with Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 5.8: εἰ δ' ἄρα τις . . . καὶ ἡμῖν ἀντίστροφος ὀφείλεται τῆς παρουσίας νέμεσις εὐπραξίας, εὐχομαι ταύτην ὑπὲρ τε πόλεως καὶ στρατοῦ Ῥωμαίων εἰς ἑμῶν τὸν ἐλαχίστον κακῶν τελευτῆσαι, and cf. also D.H. 12.14.2 ~ Liv. 5.21.14-15: 'dicitur . . . precatus esse, ut, si cui deorum hominumque nimia sua fortuna populi Romani videretur, ut eam invidiam lenire quam minimo suo privato incommodo publicoque populi Romani liceret'. Of course, Cicero's claim to have sacrificed himself for the state (see also n. 80 above) is also influenced by the powerful paradigm of Decius' *devotio*: cf. n. 81 above.

<sup>85</sup> See *Red. Sen.* 10, 16, 18, 24, 39, *Dom.* 57, 75, and especially *Dom.* 5: 'hunc tu civem ferro et armis et exercitus terrore et consulum scelere et audacissimorum hominum minis, servorum dilectu, obsessione templorum, occupatione fori, oppressione curiae domo et patria, ne cum improbis boni ferro dimicarent, cedere coegisti, quem a senatu, quem a bonis omnibus, quem a cuncta Italia desideratum [, cf. n. 82 above], arcessitum, *revocatum conservandae rei publicae causa* confiteris?'

<sup>86</sup> cf. also *Dom.* 5 (quoted in n. 85). One may further compare the similarly dramatic description at *Catil.* 3.1: 'rem publicam, Quirites, vitamque omnium vestrum, bona, fortunas, coniuges liberosque vestros atque hoc domicilium clarissimi imperi, fortunatissimam pulcherrimamque urbem, hodierno die deorum immortalium summo erga vos amore, laboribus, consiliis, periculis meis e flamma atque ferro ac paene ex faucibus fati ereptam et vobis conservatam ac restitutam videtis.' Although all of Cicero's explicit references to Camillus belong to the time after his exile and although it may have been the very experience of exile that aroused Cicero's interest in the paradigm of Camillus (thus e.g. Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 397), Bücher's suggestion (op. cit. (n. 8), 192) that Cicero here exploits the 'Abglanz des Camillus' remains attractive. It can be further corroborated by Cic., *poet.* fr. 12 (Blänsdorf): 'o fortunatam natam me consule Romam', *Cat.* 3.2, and *Flac.* 102, where the idea of '(re)birth' may hint at the refoundation of Rome after the Gallic Sack (cf. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 6.1.3 (p. 386)).

## VI CAMILLUS AND THE CIVIL WAR BETWEEN CAESAR AND POMPEY

Cicero's self-fashioning as a returning Camillus at the beginning of his *Post Reditum ad Quirites* and in other post-exilic speeches shows that the paradigm of Camillus played an important role in the political discourse of the Late Republic and was a powerful model for self-representation at that time.<sup>87</sup> If we had more authentic, first-person political statements by other statesmen of the first century B.C. — e.g. speeches or letters by Pompey or Caesar from the 50s and 40s B.C. or by Mark Antony and Octavian from the 40s and 30s B.C. — we should probably find many more responses to, and uses of, the Camillus story, and the same is likely to be true also of Livy's lost account of these turbulent years in Books 108–33 of his *Ab Urbe Condita*. Lacking these books, we can only speculate whether Livy's Cicero — like the historical Cicero — would have implicitly presented himself as a second Camillus,<sup>88</sup> or how Livy's Pompey or his Roman Senate may have reacted to the invasion of Caesar's 'Gallic' army in 49 B.C.

A reflection, if not of the historical speeches, at least of Livy's version thereof, may have been preserved in Lucan's *Civil War*, which is based mostly on the lost Books 109–16 of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*.<sup>89</sup> In his speech at 2.531–95 Lucan's Pompey emphasizes that his soldiers are the 'vere Romana manus, quibus arma senatus / non privata dedit' ('truly Roman troops, whom the Senate has officially authorized to wage war', 2.532–3) and likens Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon to a Gallic invasion (2.534–6):

ardent Hesperii saevis populatibus agri,  
Gallica per gelidas rabies effunditur Alpes,  
iam tetigit sanguis pollutos Caesaris enses.

The fields of Italy are burning in savage devastation, the Gallic frenzy is pouring across the icy Alps, and blood has already touched and stained Caesar's swords.

The Civil War here becomes a sort of rerun of the Gallic invasion of 390 B.C.: Lucan's Pompey implicitly fashions Caesar as a new Brennus and styles himself as a new Camillus.<sup>90</sup> Pompey's claim to the role of Camillus surfaces again a few lines further down, when he explicitly counters possible comparisons between Caesar and Camillus and claims that Caesar could have risen to become a second Camillus, but as a public enemy will now only become another Cinna or Marius (2.544–6):

o rabies miseranda ducis! cum fata Camillis  
te, Caesar, magnisque velint miscere Metellis,  
ad Cinnas Mariosque venis.

<sup>87</sup> It also corroborates Timpe's view (op. cit. (n. 53), 114–15) that the accounts of the late annalists reflect the traditionalist and patriotic historical outlook of the Roman and Italian upper class and were an important vehicle for 'Lebensorientierung' in the Late Republic; surprisingly, Timpe (p. 117, without evidence) claims that Cicero ignored the late annalists.

<sup>88</sup> If Cassius Dio's account of the 60s and 50s B.C. is based on Livy, then some of the motifs of the consolatory speech by a certain Philiscus at 38.18–29, too, may have had a precedent in Livy and the references to the positive example of the exiled Camillus at Cass. Dio 38.26.3: καὶ ταῦθ' ὁ Κάμιλλος ἐννοήσας ἠδέως ἐν Ἀρδέα κατόκησε and 38.27.3: μέμνησθε μὲν ὄπως ὁ Κάμιλλος ὁ φυγὰς ἕμεινον τοῦ Καπιτωλίνου μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπῆλλαξε might go back to Livy (and ultimately, of course, to Cicero's own self-fashioning).

<sup>89</sup> On Lucan's use of Livy see J. Radicke, *Lucans poetische Technik* (2004), 9–43, especially 39–40 and 42 (stemma).

<sup>90</sup> cf. J. Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile* (1992), 104. One may compare Cassius Dio's account of the chaotic flight from Rome in 49 B.C. (Cass. Dio 41.7), which bears some resemblance to accounts of the Gallic Sack (cf. Liv. 5.40 ~ Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 20.1–3). Cf. also 'Cicero's' later speech at Cass. Dio 44.25.2 where the political climate after Caesar's assassination is compared to fears of an impending Gallic invasion: οἱ μὲν τὸ Καπιτώλιον προκατελήφασιν ὥσπερ τινὰς Γαλάτας φοβούμενοι, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πολιορκεῖν αὐτοὺς παρασκευάζονται καθάπερ Καρχηδονιοὶ τινες ἀλλ' οὐ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες.



Oh what a miserable madness of a general! Although the fates want to add you, Caesar, to the great Camilli and Metelli, you end up being a Cinna or Marius.<sup>91</sup>

The paradigm of Camillus is also linked with questions of legitimacy and self-fashioning in another speech by Pompey. Before the decisive Battle of Pharsalos in Book 7 Pompey explicitly claims that Camillus, if he were still alive, would fight on his side (7.358–60):

si Curios his fata darent reducesque Camillos  
temporibus Deciosque caput fatale voventes,  
hinc starent.

If the fates brought back to life men like Curius, Camillus, and Decius, willing to sacrifice his life, and placed them in our times, then these men would stand on our side.<sup>92</sup>

Implicitly, this claim is also present in a third passage of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. When the Senate in exile convenes at the beginning of Book 5 and discusses the question of their legitimacy, Lentulus compares the situation of Pompey and his followers with that of Camillus in exile, and (like Lucan's Pompey at 2.534–6, see above) he likens Caesar's control over Rome to the Gallic Sack (5.27–34):

Tarpeia sede perusta  
Gallorum facibus Veiosque habitante Camillo  
illic Roma fuit. Non umquam perdidit ordo  
mutato sua iura solo. maerentia tecta  
Caesar habet vacuasque domos legesque silentes  
clausaque iustitio tristi fora; curia solos  
illa videt patres, plena quos urbe fugavit:  
ordine de tanto quisquis non exulat hic est.

When the Capitol had been burned down by the torches of the Gauls and when Camillus was living in Veii, Rome was in Veii. Never has this order lost its legitimacy because it changed its place. Caesar controls the weeping houses and the empty homes and the silent laws and the law courts, closed in grim holiday; the Senate house only receives those senators whom it had expelled before the City was deserted: everyone of this great order who is not in exile is here.<sup>93</sup>

The considerations of legitimacy and exile in this passage have a close parallel in Cassius Dio,<sup>94</sup> and the very same comparison between the Senate in exile and the Gallic occupation is also drawn in a speech by Pompey in Appian's *Civil War* (2.50):

<sup>91</sup> In view of the Ciceronian precedents the choice of Camillus as an 'exemplum to counter the apparent monarchic ambitions of Caesar' may be less 'strange' than Masters (op. cit. (n. 90), 104) suggests, and given the Ciceronian elements in Livy's Camillus, Lucan surely was not 'so careless as to allow Lentulus to conjure a proto-princeps in support of an anti-Caesarian stance' (ibid.).

<sup>92</sup> The coupling of Camillus and Decius in this passage can be compared to the post-exilic rhetoric of Cicero (see nn. 81 and 84 above) and has a further close parallel in the use of Decian and Camillan themes by Livy's Lentulus in Book 9 (cf. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), on Liv. 9.4.11–12 (p. 82–3), who plausibly suggests that this speech may have influenced Luc. 5.27–34). Cf. also M. Leigh, *Lucan. Spectacle and Engagement* (1997), 116–18, who compares the image of Pompey observing the Battle of Pharsalos from a hill (Luc. 7.647–53) to Camillus watching the Battle of Satricum (Liv. 6.23.12).

<sup>93</sup> On possible links between this speech and Livy, see the preceding note; on the irony underlying the comparison between Camillus and the far less heroic Pompey, cf. Rossi, op. cit. (n. 68), 581–2. Masters (op. cit. (n. 90), 105) has rightly pointed out that *Veios* in 2.28 probably results from a blurring of Camillus' exile in Ardea and the fact that some of the Romans took refuge in Veii. Rossi, op. cit. (n. 68), 582: 'gross distortion' overstates.

<sup>94</sup> cf. Cass. Dio 41.18.5: πάντας ... ἐκέλευσαν ἐς Θεσσαλονίκην ἀκολουθήσαι, ὡς τοῦ μὲν ἄστεως πρὸς πολεμίῳ τινῶν ἐχομένου, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἕτε γερουσία ὄντες καὶ τὸ τῆς πολιτείας πρόσχημα, ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ὄσιν, ἔξοντες.

ἡμῶν αὐτῶν οἱ πρόγονοι Κελτῶν ἐπιόντων ἐξέλιπον τὸ ἄστυ, καὶ αὐτὸ ἀνεσώσατο ἐξ Ἀρδεατῶν Κάμιλλος ὀρμώμενος. πάντες τε οἱ εἰς φρονούντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ὅπη ποτ' ἂν ὄσιν, ἡγοῦνται πατρίδα.

At the time of the Gallic invasion our own ancestors abandoned the city, and Camillus speedily came from Ardea and saved it. And all reasonable men think that — no matter where they are — their true home is freedom.<sup>95</sup>

Whether or not these shared motifs go back to Livy, whom Augustus allegedly called a 'Pompeianus',<sup>96</sup> they certainly show that there was a historiographical tradition that presented Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon as a second Gallic invasion and styled Pompey as a second, but less fortunate Camillus. In the light of Cicero's use of the Camillus paradigm, this may not just be a later invention, but could reflect some truth and the historical Pompey, too, may well have exploited the paradigm of Camillus.<sup>97</sup>

The latter possibility is corroborated by — and at the same time sheds new light on — Cassius Dio's account (43.14) of Caesar's triumph in 46 B.C. As has often been noted, Caesar's triumph in a chariot drawn by four white horses has its only known precedent in Roman history in Camillus' similar triumph after the capture of Veii in 396 B.C. (cf. Liv. 5.23.5–6 ~ Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 7.1–2).<sup>98</sup> If Pompey did indeed style himself as a second Camillus, Caesar's triumph would obviously be much more pointed and would almost become an ironic comment on Pompey's unsuccessful attempt to play out Camillus' role.<sup>99</sup> More importantly, however, by voting for this particular form of triumph, the Caesarian Senate in Rome likened Caesar to Camillus, thus presenting him as a potential *conditor alter* and raising, expressing, or responding to, hopes for restoration and concord after the turbulent years of the Civil War.<sup>100</sup>

#### VII CAMILLUS AND AUGUSTUS

Finally, we must briefly return to Augustus and the 'Augustan Livy'. If the main traits of Livy's Camillus were already established in the 60s B.C. and made Camillus such an attractive political paradigm that Cicero, and probably also Pompey and Caesar deliberately modelled their political persona on him, then, evidently, the question to be asked is no

<sup>95</sup> Lucan fr. 11 (Blänsdorf): 'Tarpeiam cum frerit arcem / Brenius' would also easily fit into such a context, but belongs not to Lucan, but to Walter of Châtillon (cf. *Alex.* 1.14): see W. D. Lebek, 'Das angebliche Lucan-Fragment 12 FPL (Morel) und Walter von Châtillon', *MLatJb* 18 (1983), 226–32.

<sup>96</sup> cf. Tac., *Ann.* 4.34.3, and see Walsh, op. cit. (n. 1), 31–3 and L. Hayne, 'Livy and Pompey', *Latomus* 49 (1990), 435–42 (on the characterization of Pompey in the *Periochae*).

<sup>97</sup> cf. Coudry, op. cit. (n. 2), 59.

<sup>98</sup> cf., e.g., Hirschfeld, op. cit. (n. 10), 278; Klotz, op. cit. (n. 10, 1941), 285, and Weinstock, op. cit. (n. 60), 68–75 (with mythical parallels). Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 10), 158–61 has shown that the motif must have been established before 46 B.C. and cannot be modelled on Caesar's triumph.

<sup>99</sup> An interesting parallel to this is Julian, *Caes.* 24, where Alexander the Great converses with Julius Caesar and claims that Pompey has no right to bear the epithet *Magnus* because he has achieved nothing that would be comparable to the deeds of Marius, the Scipiones, or Furius Camillus: ἐκολάκευσαν αὐτὸν οἱ πολῖται καὶ Μέγαν ὀνόμασαν, ὄντα τίνας τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ μείζονα; τί γὰρ ἐκείνω τοσοῦτον ἐπράχθη, ἡλίκον Μαρίῳ ἢ Σκηπίωσι τοῖς δύο ἢ τῷ παρὰ τὸν Κυρίων τουτονὶ Φουρίῳ, ὃς μικροῦ συμπεσοῦσαν τὴν τοῦτου πόλιν ἀνέστησεν;

<sup>100</sup> These points are absent from Weinstock's discussion of the chariot motif (op. cit. (n. 60), 68–75), which concentrates on the religious context and the implicit deification. For Camillus' association with the refoundation of Rome after the Gallic Sack see Section III above; for his association with concord cf. Ov., *Fast.* 1.641–4 and Plut., *Vit. Cam.* 42, where Camillus is said to have dedicated a temple to Concord. This motif has entered the Camillus legend at a fairly late stage (cf. Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 1), 95–9; Ungern-Sternberg, op. cit. (n. 2), 294–5), but Weinstock (op. cit., 260–6) persuasively argues that Caesar's exploitation of the cult and the concept of *concordia* had Camillan resonances. For further, less obvious similarities between the Camillus legend and Caesar's self-fashioning, see Weinstock, op. cit., 164–5 (Caesar as saviour) and 202–3 (Caesar as *pater patriae*). On the whole, the Caesarians and Cicero seem to have exploited the Camillus paradigm in a fairly similar fashion (cf. Section V above).

longer, ‘What are the Augustan traits of Livy’s Camillus?’ but rather, ‘How has Octavian/Augustus responded to the exploitation of Camillus by eminent Republicans such as Cicero and Pompey?’<sup>101</sup> The obvious (but necessarily speculative) answer to this question is ‘by playing Camillus’ role himself’. In view of Camillus’ importance for the political discourse of the Late Republic, the well-known similarities between Augustus’ policy and self-representation and events connected with the Gallic Sack are unlikely to be coincidental. Rather, the rumours about Mark Antony intending to move the capital to Alexandria,<sup>102</sup> the restoration of cults, the (*prima facie*) preservation of inherited political institutions, the triple triumph of 29 B.C., and the ‘clupeus aureus in curia Iulia positus ... virtutis clementiaeque et iustitiae et pietatis causa’ (*Mon. Anc.* 34) may have been deliberately devised by Augustus and his followers to evoke the paradigm of Camillus and exploit its prestige.<sup>103</sup> If so, Augustus would have used the Camillus paradigm in a far more sophisticated fashion than Cicero, Pompey, and Caesar. He would not only have styled himself as a saviour of the state and a guarantor of peace and concord, but he would also have established a link between his principate and the ideology that eminent Republicans such as Cicero and Pompey had used in their struggle to save the Republic. Cunningly, Augustus would have presented himself as a true Republican, devoted to the traditional order, and at the same time he would have effectively silenced the Republican opposition by appropriating one of its most powerful and appealing paradigms.<sup>104</sup>

Universität Leipzig  
jan\_felix\_gaertner@web.de

<sup>101</sup> Obviously, this is not the same as Luce’s statement (op. cit. (n. 7), 240): ‘Instead of searching for Augustan allusions in Livian history, it might be more profitable to investigate to what extent Augustan policy was influenced by the Livian concept of the Roman past’, which implies a direct influence of Livy on Augustus’ policy (as is also suggested by Miles, op. cit. (n. 2), 93–4). It seems more plausible that Livy and Augustus simply ‘had similar views on what they wished to project as ideal Roman behaviour’ (Oakley, op. cit. (n. 5), vol. 1, 379).

<sup>102</sup> cf. Suet., *Iul.* 79; Cass. Dio 50.4.1, and P. Ceaușescu, ‘Altera Roma. Histoire d’une folie politique’, *Historia* 25 (1976), 79–107, at 86–8.

<sup>103</sup> cf. Liv. 6.4.1: ‘in urbem triumphans rediit *trium* simul bellorum victor’ and see Section III above on Camillus’ renown for *virtus*, *pietas*, and *iustitia*. Cf. also Ungern-Sternberg, op. cit. (n. 2), 295, who suggests that the references to a ‘referentem signa Camillum’ (Verg., *Aen.* 6.825) in Vergil, Propertius (3.11.67), Eutropius (1.20.4), and Servius (*Aen.* 6.825) may reflect that the precedent of Camillus’ expulsion of the Gauls was exploited in Augustus’ celebration of the recovery of the standards that had been lost to the Parthians at Carrhae (cf. also R. G. Austin, *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus* (1977), on Verg., *Aen.* 6.825). For further but less convincing analogies cf. Hellegouarc’h, op. cit. (n. 2), 124–5; Burck, op. cit. (n. 1, 1967), 322–8, and idem, op. cit. (n. 1, 1991), 277–80.

<sup>104</sup> cf. Syme, op. cit. (n. 5), 317: ‘in his mature years the statesman [i.e. Augustus] stole their [i.e. the Republicans’] heroes and vocabulary’. On Augustus ‘consciously configur[ing] himself as a convergence of exemplary times, a conduit of Republican *exempla* and the creator of new ones’ (Kraus, op. cit. (n. 8), 194–5) see *Mon. Anc.* 8: ‘multa exempla maiorum ... reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi’ and cf. Chaplin, op. cit. (n. 7), 191–2, 194–5; Walter, op. cit. (n. 2), 408–26, especially 416 (both with further material and literature). As in the case of Caesar, Camillus’ association with Concord may have rendered the *exemplum* of Camillus particularly attractive for Augustus: cf. n. 100 above.