

Results of doctoral dissertation

Takács Levente

**The Image of Camillus in Livy' Book 5 and 6.
Values, history, politics**

Tutor: Prof. Dr. Havas László

University of Debrecen
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
2007

I. Aims of the dissertation, defining its theme

The paper examines the presentation of M. Furius Camillus in Livy's book 5 and 6. Livy's account of Camillus, who in Roman tradition is regarded as the conqueror of Veii, saviour and second founder of Rome, is the earliest continuous description that survived in its entirety. Only fragments survived from the annalists' works, and hardly any of these fragments deal with Camillus. The account of Diodorus from Sicily, who wrote somewhat earlier than Livy, is seldom detailed, it mainly presents the facts about Roman history as mere data. Plutarch's biography of Camillus was written almost a century later than Livy's books, on which it probably even relied.

So far, research (Mommsen, Cornell, etc.) has reproduced the lifeless image of Camillus that is mainly based on the well-known and also above mentioned events from book 5. They examined the presentation of Camillus as an ideal Roman citizen with source criticism, i.e. by having a closer look at the time and the circumstances in which the individual motifs appeared (e.g. Täubler). Most of the special literature omits to make a careful study of book 6, although it contains valuable data on Camillus. That is why the paper first deals with the possible connections and structural relations between book 5 and 6. One of the aims of the paper was to tinge this simplified, seemingly ideal picture of Camillus by taking into consideration all the elements of the portrait made by Livy. Thus on the one hand the paper examines the sources to be considered in connection with the given period. On the other hand it considers the historical context, with the help of which we can find the real historic core in Livy's presentation. The paper reveals the layers of Livy's presentation from inside, relying on so-called categories of values.

According to the aims of Roman historiography, Livy always held the past as a mirror to his contemporaries. This consideration formed the basis for most research on Camillus and also Livy in general, that is searching for the role of Augustus' politics in *ab urbe condita* or, in a narrower sense, in Camillus' presentation (e.g. Syme, Petersen, Burck). The dissertation adds a new element, Caesar's influence, to be considered for a more nuanced image of Camillus.

The paper tries to reveal some aspects of the genesis of the Camillus image in Livy by examining the above mentioned connections.

II. Methods of research

My research starts with the analysis of text of Livy's book 5 and 6. The positioning of the two books in the whole work is of paramount importance as they constitute the end of a structural unit and the beginning of a new one. Relying on former research (Walsh, Stadter, Luce, Burck), the paper first explores the contradictions of different subsequent divisions. After that the analysis of the two books' text, mainly word statistics and the analysis of the given speeches on the basis of ancient theories of rhetoric makes it possible to set up a new scheme.

Following the structural analysis the dissertation uses source analysis to reveal what sources can modern research rely on and what sources Livy used. The excessively negative image of Quellenforschung, which considered Livy an individual historian only with respect to his style, has been discredited since Luce's and Tränkle's basic works. Nevertheless, both scholars stopped at the question of sources. They, however, assign some originality to Livy regarding the structure and the literary aspect of his work. For the purposes of this paper, the main question to be answered is how reliable Livy's sources are. Criticising source criticism because of its often mechanical methods recent research (e.g. Cornell, Oakley) assumes that Roman historical tradition was based on authentic pieces of information. Relying on this

hypothesis the paper examines all of Livy's possible sources that range from narrative to fine arts works in order to reveal the origin of Livy's pieces of information.

Naturally the analysis of sources also involves the historical examination of Camillus' age. Besides the data gained from *ab urbe condita* we make use of archeological findings (Holloway, *Tiber Valley Project*). The importance of the conquests in South Etruria is presented from the aspect of economic history, statistics and the nature of Roman conquests. When presenting the Gallic sack we took into consideration the theories on cultural memory, and its consequences were examined from the aspect of economic history and archeology. To present Licinius' rogations, which are most widely dealt with in special literature because of their controversial nature, we relied on earlier special literature that based its arguments on the position Rome had due to the above mentioned events. To present Camillus' role we also took into account the results of modern research (Martin, Oakley).

The value categories were examined through philological methods, starting from the virtue catalogue of Greek philosophy and its Roman adaptations, and some inner intertextuality was also used to position Camillus' figure in the course of Roman history. Intertextuality was the starting point in examining whether Caesar and his career had an influence on Livy at Camillus' presentation in a narrower sense. In the field of military affairs we can encounter close correspondences in textual terms and numerous similar motifs – it is their philological exploration that forms the methodological basis for the last chapter of the paper.

III. Results of the research

a. Modern research has set up different schemes to sketch the structure of *ab urbe condita*. These theories took pentads and decads as a basis, and made attempts to define the structure of Livy's work based on these units or some sort of a combination of theirs. Stadter argued for units made up of ten books, Luce accounted for a system of fifteen-book-units made up of a pentad and a decad. All attempts at division bear basic contradictions since the *ab urbe condita*'s 142 books finished cannot be divided either by five or ten. Although the problem could be solved if we assumed that the work is unfinished, other observations reinforce it. For example book 1 is a monographical unit that is clearly separated from the rest of the work by the praefatio at the beginning of book 2; the end of book 10 is absolutely characterless, furthermore the ending of the third Samnite war is transferred into book 11; and the *periochae* regard Caesar's civil war as an individual unit consisting of eight books.

On the basis of Syme and Scafuro's analysis it can be assumed that besides the units of five books and their multiples Livy might have formed further smaller or larger individual units. Book 5 and 6 can be looked at as two halves of a diptych. Book 5 concentrates mainly on foreign affairs while book 6 deals with domestic affairs. Nevertheless, their structure is symmetrical (Veii, the Gauls – Manlius, Licinius) and Camillus himself also connects the two books. Camillus' appearance and disappearance in book 5 noticed by Burck is similar to that in book 6.

The two books are framed by two speeches delivered by Appius Claudius Crassus, to which his opponents, the tribunes' speeches are paired. Appius' two highly effective speeches make use of the argumentative structures presented in Roman rhetorical literature (Cic., *Rhet. ad Her.*) thus showing deliberate structuring by Livy. The speech opening book 5 reaches its aims with a five-part argumentative structure considered to be more effective by classical authors. The *oratio* ending book 6 is unsuccessful and, according to the less advisable structure, it can be divided in three parts. While the speech in book 6 is an organic part of its context (shown by the concentric circle structure of chapters 36-41), the speech at the beginning of book 5 is strikingly less embedded in the narrative. It might as well be presumed that Livy wrote the latter only for the sake of frame structure to connect the two books more

closely. Meanwhile book 5 and 6 surely belong to two different structural units, too (Camillus' speech; the *praefatio* of book 6). This phenomenon of connection and separation might be explained with the Romans' view of history, which is linear and cyclical at the same time.

b. Only fragments remained from narrative sources written before the *ab urbe condita* that deal with the historical period treated by Livy in book 5 and 6. Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, C. Acilius' fragments give the impression that these authors did not write anything about the given period. It is hard to imagine that these historians did not mention at all the conquest of Veii, the first encounter of Rome and the Gauls, or the laws proposed by Licinius and Sextius. Epic and later annals can be considered more informative. Ennius writes about the solar eclipse which can be dated at 400 and the Gauls' siege of the Capitolium. L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi mentions the *lectisternium* of 399 while Cn. Gellius, Cassius Hemina and Lutatius Daphnis present several religious antiquities that belong to this period. As regards Licinius Macer and Valerius Antias, they are similar to the first historians, but Claudius Quadrigarius' fragments make it clear that he dealt with the Gauls' sack thoroughly. Even dramas (e.g. *Vae victis*) may have played a role in the formation of Camillus' legend.

Of non-narrative sources it is the pontifical records and *fasti* that must be mentioned first. Only some reports remained about the records, thus their content and the time of their origin are equally controversial. They recorded the price of cereals, solar and lunar eclipses (Cato), and probably put down religious festivals and magistrates who gave name to the particular year. On the basis of Cic. *de orat.* 2.12.52 it can be assumed that they included the most important political and religious events of the year as well.

Besides the pontifical records there also was an oral tradition, some elements of which can be dated far back in time. *Carmina convivalia* might as well have influenced historical tradition. These songs performed with a didactic aim used the examples of the past to warn and teach the present. Their main characters may have been members of clans with a leading political role, these *summi viri* who appear in the numerous enumerations of literary works. Their spread as motifs must have originated in the oral tradition represented, among others, by *carmina convivalia*. Recording deeds of famous people in verse remained in fashion (Varro: *De imaginibus*), and as a result of their fixed form they were able to conserve authentic information.

As regards non-literary sources related to Camillus, we have knowledge of 3 inscriptions and 2 or 3 statues in Augustan Rome. Their age and authenticity is questionable. Clans' ambitions as reason for falsification cannot be proved in the case of the Furii. The only event which is highly questionable in the form presented by Livy is the Gallic sack. Its literary presentation was formed with therapeutic methods and aims by the Roman's patriotic pride. As the chapter argues, it was possible for authentic pieces of information concerning Camillus and his age to reach Livy through the first generations of historians.

c. In Roman tradition Camillus played a decisive role in the conquest of Veii, and this fact has not been questioned by modern research either. The fact that Camillus was designated as leader of the Roman troops in the South Etrurian military area several times increases the probability of Camillus' role as a general. Furthermore, including Falerii, Sutrium and Nepete in the Roman sphere of interest is also linked with the name of Camillus (Liv. 5.12.5; 5.19.7; 5.26-27; 6.3-4; 6.9-10). The story of the Gallic sack (390 or 387) was formed rather by cultural memory. Tradition reshaped the shameful defeat of rising Rome therapeutically by weaving the legend of Camillus' relief of the city into the story. Some minute elements (the defeated army flees across the Tiber; Aristotle's remark; a sentence by Polybius), however, suggest that the Romans were only able to make modest attempts to relieve the besieged *arx* and they succeeded in retaining most of their army's staff safe.

The Gallic sack did not shake the foundations of Rome's military power, but it did increase the severe tension in its social life. Several attempts were made to solve some interrelated problems like running into debt and possession of the land. The fact that as a result of conquests in the given period there was enough land to satisfy demands must have encouraged the strata limited in gaining land, i.e. the former clients and plebeians to try to have their share in the *ager publicus*. After the conquest of Veii Rome doubled her territory, and the battle *ad Maecium* (Liv. 6.2.8) fought south of Rome meant a successful step in breaking into the Pomptine plain. Camillus had a decisive role in both military areas. While Veii and the expansion in South Etruria were most important scenes of Camillus' actions as a general before the Gallic sack, the southern battles against the Volsci and Aequi were similarly important scenes after the relief of the city.

The scarce distributions of land mentioned by Livy affected a narrow strata only and involved little land. In book 5 and 6 Camillus opposes all the attempts trying to solve the problem of land distribution by sharing out the one-time territory of Veii. Camillus possessed all opportunity to benefit from the territory he conquered both on the basis of the gentile warfare and the subsequent distribution of booty. By rejecting the proposals he meant to preserve that kind of authority.

His role in suppressing the Manlian rebellion is dubious because of the inconsistency between sources. In Livy Manlius starts organising because he envies Camillus. Camillus holds the position of military tribune with consular power when Manlius is sentenced, but Livy does not mention his name even once while presenting the trial. In Plutarch's view, however, it is Camillus who takes the decisive step that makes Manlius' conviction possible (moves the scene of the trial; cf. *Cam.* 36). Camillus' role in convicting the hero who saved Rome would hardly have done him honour, thus Plutarch's version might stand closer to historical truth than Livy's, who rather tries to protect Camillus from getting his honour stained by his dubious act. His action against Manlius can also be linked with the problem of land of Veii (Liv. 6.14.10).

The second half of book 6 consists of the debate of the proposals made by Licinius and Sextius. The dissertation considers the law on land genuine and does not reject the limitation of the size of landed property to 500 iugera. The proposals to solve the problem of debts and bring the question of land under regulation were supported by large crowds, but a patrician group including the Fabii, Manlii and Sulpicii also backed Licinius. The attitude of the clans mentioned can be explained with the loss of prestige they suffered during the Gallic sack and later because of Manlius Capitolinus' conspiracy. In the one and a half decade after the passing of the proposals most patrician consuls come from these three clans, which shows that it is them who mostly benefit from the changes. In Livy's presentation Camillus stands by those who oppose the proposals. He had held several positions one after the other in the decade before the introduction of the proposals. He persisted in preventing any division of Veii's land. The proposals dealing with the order of position-holding or questions on land were not in his interest, thus we can agree with Martin's remark that Camillus is a consistent representative of the patricians' and his own interests' and therefore he must have been one of the leaders of the group opposing the efforts of the people.

d. Romans defined the characteristic features of an ideal citizen, general and politician with concepts borrowed from Greek philosophy on one hand, and concepts drawn from their own social relations on the other hand. These notions are called value categories, thus the Romans used them for characterisation as well. Research does not consider characterisation Livy's strength; what is more, the use of moral categories caused only harm to the individuality of the characters.

Its traces can be felt in connection with Camillus too. As a general he can be characterised by *consilium*, *ratio*, *virtus*, *fortuna* and *felicitas*. *Moderatio* and *patientia* are his most

important features in contrast to his fellow generals. Against the enemy he is a real representative of *fides Romana*. He embodies *pietas*, he is a *diligentissimus cultor religionum*. Word statistics, nevertheless, arouse doubt in connection with this over-idealisation. In book 5 and 6 we can find the word *pietas* only once, while *religio* occurs 39 times. The number seems large only in itself, as *ira* can be found 37 times in the two books.

Camillus is a man of *ira*, he both triggers it and serves as a target for it (e.g. Liv. 5.22.1; 5.26.8; 6.38.5-8). His anger and menaces are most characteristic of his behaviour in connection with booty or the plebs' efforts. Thus not only virtues but at a smaller extent flaws also appear in his character. Livy's general remark of *princeps pace belloque* is surprising even if we do not consider Augustan connotations. The domestic turbulence developed around Camillus questions the word *pace*. Livy did his best to keep Camillus' flaws in the background and using the expression *princeps pace belloque* as if he had forgotten the flaws he tried to put Camillus in the line of those Roman historical figures (Romulus, Numa, Valerius Publicola, Scipio Africanus), who did a lot for the survival of the Roman state both in war and peace.

The source of Camillus' negative characteristics that appear despite the idealisation might have been an authentic historic core which had survived, or the historian might as well have formed some of Camillus' characteristics in a way that he could keep a mirror to Rome and its new leader.

e. In the last century of Roman republic most political leaders tried to establish some connection between themselves and their activity and Romulus in order to strengthen their position in an ideological sense. The role of Rome's refounder came up in connection with Marius, Sulla, Cicero and Caesar alike. As Romulus was a king who was murdered, tradition formed a second Romulus to sketch a hero to whom all the self-appointed reinforcers of the order of *libera res publica* could refer. It was Camillus who seemed suitable for the role, who showed both Romulus-like (i.e. royal) and republican aspects (Martin, Havas). Marius, Sulla, Pompeius (fewer data) and Caesar equally tried to incorporate the elements of Camillus' re-foundation into their propaganda. (Cicero seems to be less interested in the second foundation connected to Camillus). Therefore the politicians' propaganda and actions influenced Camillus' presentation too.

Owing to his age and place of birth Livy must have paid attention to Caesar's actions. The books of *ab urbe condita* on Caesar have been lost and secondary tradition tended to abridge heavily and often concentrated on facts only (analysed by Strasburger). Livy's presentation of Caesar was, in all probability, influenced by the question of Augustus' legitimacy, but the *princeps* was hardly in need of it when Livy's books on Caesar were being written. Octavianus-Augustus relied on Caesar's memory mainly in the civil war and the early 20's. On the basis of the two observations mentioned above it is worth analysing the possible linking points between Caesar and Livy's Camillus.

Livy obviously borrowed the technical elements of campaigns (e.g. Caes. *Civ.* 3.64.1 ~ Liv. 6.23.12) as no data support the idea that Livy would have had military experience. There are, however, some motifs that are characteristic both of Caesar and Camillus but do not belong closely to the technical side of warfare. Both generals are charismatic leaders, their appearance in the battlefield arouses the enemy's fear and their own soldiers' enthusiasm. Both Caesar and Camillus prove to be extremely brave (e.g. Caes. *Gal.* 2.25.2 ~ Liv. 6.8.1-6). Camillus opposes the *tribuni plebis* several times, he rises to the tribunes' defence twice (Liv. 5.29.8; 6.38.6) true enough, acting in his own interests. Caesar also uses the protection of tribunician power as a pretext to start civil war. We must not ignore the fact that whereas Camillus is against the *plebs*, Caesar uses this weapon against the senate. The common element is the slightly cynical stress they lay on the protection of tribunician power. Being in

conflict with tribunes is a characteristic feature of both politicians' career (in Caesar's case, it is mainly true after he becomes only ruler of the empire).

Special literature (Hirschfeld, Weinstock, Tränkle) has examined the question of the carriage drawn by white horses most times. Presentation of Camillus evoked Caesar's figure in the mind of contemporaries either because the motif of the carriage drawn by white horses got inserted into the Camillus story in Caesar's age or Caesar used some already existing elements of the Camillus-legend for his own propaganda.

Camillus' triumphal procession might have recalled not only the memory of Caesar, but also the triumphal processions of Octavianus-Augustus. Two characteristics of Caesar's triumphal processions appear later in connection with Octavianus' triumphal processions of 29. They are triple processions that are sometimes result of triumphs over civil war enemies. The triple procession of 29, nevertheless, also evoked Camillus, who, after defeating the Etruscans, Volscans and Aequians, *in urbem triumphans rediit trium simul bellorum victor* (Liv. 6.4.1). The same cross-reference system connects the three politicians regarding the capital's removal.

Noticing the appearance of Caesarian elements in Octavianus' politics and the growing number of elements of Caesar's „cult“ (the temple of Divus Iulius; putting the *clupeus virtutis* in the *Curia Iulia*; the temple of Mars Ultor, etc.) Livy tried to warn the *princeps* with hidden references. When Camillus transgresses certain limits, the same happens to him as to Iulius Caesar, who ignores the norms of the republic. Camillus is expelled, Caesar is murdered after the triumphal procession. Octavianus, whose actions recall numerous positive features of Camillus' (Burck, Martin), has to pay attention not to end like Camillus or, in fact, his adopter.

f. The paper successfully reveals that Livy deliberately treats book 5 and 6 as a unit and breaks the *pentad – decad* structure assigned to him. Camillus' figure was reason and means for this treatment. The historian may presumably have had access to sources that bore authentic pieces of information about the first third of fourth century. The examination of Livy's tet highlights an authentic historical core: it is Camillus who carries out the expansion in South Etruria and benefits from it, he defends the patricians' and his own financial and political interests. This observation opposes the lifeless and idealised image that both ancient tradition and modern research support. The observation is reinforced by the analysis of value categories that, on the one hand, present Camillus as an ideal Roman but, on the other hand also a man of *ira*, full of conflicts. Besides historical authenticity the source of Camillus' negative characteristics is Caesar's effect. Livy inserts Caesarian traits and references not noticed by research so far into the depiction of Camillus' actions and thus, according to the tradition of Roman historiography, he sets past as an example to his own present.

IV. List of publications related to the dissertation

Studies:

Livy's 5 and 6 Books. Linked or Separated? ACD 42 (2006) 81-93.

Princeps pace belloque. An Ideal Statesman in Livy. In: Gy. Németh – P. Forisek (edd.): Epigraphica III. Politai et Cives (HPS 13), Debrecen 2006, 67-81.

Róma második megalapítója és a birodalmi "ideológia". (The Second Founder of Rome and Imperial Ideology); Ókor I/1 (2002) 22-29.

Lectures:

Relic Hunter – Hová tűnt a gall arany? Előadás a Közösség és idegenek c. konferencián, Csíkszereda 2005. szeptember 23.

Livius ötödik és hatodik könyvének aktuálpolitikai vonatkozásai. (Livy's Book 5 and 6 and their connections to contemporary politics); Előadás "Az élő antikvitás" c. VI. magyar ókortudományi konferencián, Budapest, 2004. május 27.

Handbook (chapter):

Livius. In: Bevezetés az ókortudományba IV, 277-282. Debrecen 2001.