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ABSTRACT

Already in the *Praefatio* of Livy’s work the metaphor of the importation of foreign influence is apparent. Livy chooses the annalistic narrative style as the most Roman form possible and a self-construction as an author who valorizes traditional Roman values. These authorial decisions on the modality of the narrative are intimately linked to tropology and the manufacturing of the metaphors and ironies that frame Livy’s text in books 31-45.

Roman control in Thessaly is asserted by manufacturing communities in its image. These collapse miserably when the guiding Roman metaphors are questioned. The failure of Roman institutions is depicted as evidence of the restless nature of the Thessalians. A representative image of Thessaly is given in the character of Theoxena, a Thessalian exile who kills herself at a festival of Aeneas. Her story allows Romans to form an emotional bond with the Thessalians, although it maintains their essential alterity.

The Galatian campaign of Manlius Vulso shows the dangers of Rome’s encounter with Hellenism. The Galatians are presented as Gallic-Greek hybrids who are no longer the great Gallic warriors of the past. Manlius defeats them, but the anecdotes of extortion and rape show that the Roman general is corrupted by his encounter with Asia. In the end, his methods are indistinguishable from those of his Galatian opponents. These themes are
emphasized in the speech of the Commissioners against Manlius’ request for a triumph.

The Bacchanalia shows Hellenism as a contamination that spreads through Italy and infects Rome. Throughout the narrative, Hellenism is depicted as a virus that threatens Rome. Its source is an ignoble Greek, and it eventually infects the Roman nobles. Eventually the consul reasserts Roman control in Italy through a bloody purge. The story shows the close connection of home and abroad or city and empire. Similar themes of infectious Hellenism are described in the story of Cato’s censorship and the discovery of Numa’s books on the Janiculum.

These metaphors of Hellenism as an infectious hybridity culminate in the Macedonian ironies of book 40. The description of Perseus and Demetrius involves an implicit contrast to the rivalry of Romulus and Remus. Their antagonism is placed in a ritual context that invites comparison to Roman customs. The story conveys differences between Rome and Macedon, as if to dissolve the hybridities that threaten Roman purity. These are particularly shown as a threat to empire in the career of Marcus Philippus, whose deceptive foreign policy is depicted as embodying Hellenistic rather than Roman values.

This reading shows the unity of Livy’s narrative of the Macedonian wars. Its theoretical use is shown in an examination of a Livy’s story about a lunar eclipse before the battle of Pydna and the defeat of Macedonia.
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CHAPTER 1

ANTIQUE SOUL: LIVY’S HOME REMEDIES

Now I imagine myself like those wading in the shallow water near the shore who are drawn into the sea, since howsoever much I shuffle forth, I am carried into a deeper depth and even as the deep sea is crossed the work almost seems to grow, although it seemed to be diminishing when I had completed the first parts.¹

When Livy turned from the theme of the second Punic War to the Second and Third Macedonian Wars at the beginning of his thirty-first book, he visualized the narrative as a sea spread before him. He, as the writer, was wading into this sea. He uses the image as a metaphor for the expansion of his narrative, which expanded in detail as it progressed towards his own time, the era that is of the most interest to Livy’s prospective reader, as he himself acknowledges in his preface.² This narrative expansion is a result not only of its movement towards more recent events, but its mimesis of imperium itself in the course of narrating it. As the empire grows, Livy’s narrative slows and grows in detail. The image of the sea also mimes the coming narrative—Rome itself must cross a sea and establish its imperium in Greek lands. Livy’s narration of the Macedonian wars

¹31.1.5: Iam provideo animo, velut qui proximis litori vadis inducti mare pedibus ingrediuntur, quidquid progrederior, in vastiorem me altitudinem ac velut profundum invehi et crescere paene opus, quod prima quaequeae perficioing minui videbatur.

² Praef. 4: et legentium plerisque haud dubito quin primae origines proximaque originibus minus praebitur volupitas sint, festinantibus ad haec nova, quibus iam pridem praevalescentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt.
terminates in the organization of northern Greece into four units. Roman administrative space is imposed on Macedonia.

Yet on a more mythic level, the sea suggests unformed matter, or matter lacking content. Livy’s goal is to provide form to the content of this stage of Roman imperium. This is accomplished by the enframing rhetoric of Livy’s tropes, especially the synecdoche of the annalistic method, which shows human experience as the Roman experience.³ Nor are the Others, the marginal and the defeated Greeks, effectively Romanized (or Hellenized) in a comfortable multi-ethnic humanitas, but they retain their difference in the domination of Roman discourse. Their difference becomes their essential attribute in Livy’s tropes.

The hybridity of the other represents a dangerous contagion, which is controlled by the inscription of the text in a purifying ritual similar to that of the recording of prodigies by the pontifex maximus, Livy’s ultimate predecessor and model (the rest of the annalists are a mere turba scriptorum). Livy’s sea in a sense is history, which must be rendered as a Roman narrative. The sea is unformed matter, a place of dangerous mixing, clear and filthy. Therefore the sea is the tomb of the hermaphroditic births recorded by Livy in the prodigy lists, which precede the second Macedonian wars. In Livy’s list of unfavorable prodigies, he writes:

There were seen all manner of foul and deformed things, the alien offspring of nature gone astray. Loathed above all were the hermaphrodites (abominati semimares) and orders were immediately given that they be thrown into the sea, just as recently

³ That is, contra Galinsky (1996) 280: “He viewed the Roman experience in terms of the human experience” But the annalist in fact views human experience in terms of the Roman experience.
when Gaius Claudius and Marcus Livius were consuls a similar ominous birth was banished.\(^4\)

Like Livy, here we may find a precedent as well as an exemplum. The hybrid as an error of nature is banished to the sea (repeatedly), the receptacle of hybridity whose content itself is formless. Plato and Cicero connected the sea “with moral decline and racial mixture”.\(^5\)

By crossing this sea Livy masters- and contains- the dangerous hybridities, which threaten his construction of Roman identity. Yet Livy’s cosmogonic act is compromised by irony, perhaps even loathing. The author shows an odd reluctance to begin his narrative, as he wades into the water, waving or drowning. He quickly resolves this irony by a comparison of the Greek conquests to the Punic wars, thus resolving both conflicts in a synecdoche of Roman history, itself understood as gloria, the metonymy that replaces destiny for agent.\(^6\) A similar use of the metonymy is title for man, a technique used by Cato in his Origines. The office has replaced the man whose entire being is now authoritative, even though the metonymy has erased the individual personality. Furthermore, this anonymous marking may be transformed into epiphany by the

\(^4\) 31.12.5-10: *Foeda omnia et deformia errantisque in alienos fetus naturae visa: ante omnia abominati semimares iussique in mare extemplo deportari, sicut proxime C. Claudio M. Livio consulibus deportatus similis prodigii fetus erat.*

\(^5\) The conception of the sea as a receptacle of the hybrid is related to the pouring of ritual remnants and waste into a body of water. A related aspect is the function of water as a dividing medium, “a religious notion which developed into a juridical concept”. Gabba (1981) 57, also notes that Plato and Cicero (*Laws* 705a; *Rep.* 2.4) believed “that contact with the sea led to moral decline and racial mixture: with foreign goods come foreign ideas, which corrupt and confuse.”

\(^6\) 31.1.6-7.
transfiguration of the consul into Africanus, Numidicus, Germanicus, or Asiagenes, but only after victory and its official recognition (triumph).\footnote{These thoughts concerning the displacement and anonymity enforced by metonymy are germane to the pathology of Manlius Vulso in Livy’s 38\textsuperscript{th} book, the topic of my second chapter.}

Another way that the contaminating hybridity can be overcome is by interment in the earth. This was the method employed by the Romans when Hannibal was threatening an invasion of Rome after the battle of Cannae. Livy describes a remarkable scene of human sacrifice in Book 22.57. In conjunction with the defeat by Hannibal, two Vestal Virgins had broken their vows of chastity. One was beaten to death and the other killed herself. Interpreting this and the defeat of Cannae as a crisis of state, the Sibyline books were consulted and they advised the live burial in the forum of a Gallic couple and a Greek couple.\footnote{For a recent discussion and review of the scholarship see Beard, North and Price (1998) 80-2. For them the human sacrifice is a recent innovation and they are unable to explain the presence of the Greek couple. In some ways, this dissertation may shed some light on this second issue.}

Although Livy describes the sacrifices as \textit{extraordinaria}, the burial is at a place previously used for human sacrifice. Here the alterity of the Gaul and Greek are combined in a ritual that clearly uses the couples as synecdoche for the entire race. As markers of alterity, the dangerous “others” are inhumed in a sacrifice that is not only cathartic but also apotropaic, in that it is meant to protect the city in some way from the Punic hordes.

Livy’s narrative can be seen as endless confrontation between purity and hybridity, or mimesis and alterity, virtue vs. vice, Roman against the foreign. The eventual outcome is far from determined. This in fact caused Livy to prolong his
narrative. Livy’s preface warns us to be aware of a mounting hybridity, represented as the importation of foreign vices. The emplotment of the foreign enacts the Augustan anxieties of the author.

By emplotment, I here imply the tropological narrative strategies discussed by Vico and further elucidated by Hayden White. The four master tropes are metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony. Vico believed metonymy and synecdoche to be variations of metaphor, whereas irony was in opposition to metaphor. The first three define the different as similar, whereas irony defines the similar (familiar) as different. The tropes are invested with similarity and difference, or mimesis and alterity. Metaphor utilizes similarity while maintaining difference. It represents the unusual or even unique as the familiar, such as a Homeric pastoral metaphor in the midst of war. Metonymy reduces the different to the similar, thunder becomes Zeus, and Demeter becomes grain. The similar here may be understood as a politically and culturally normative sign. Metonymy therefore proposes a greater level of abstraction and often a hierarchy between its terms. Synecdoche is the part used for the whole or the whole for the part.

---

9 The issue of the end of Livy captivates Henderson (1989). In fact, the lack of an end motivates the narrative itself, and as Henderson notes, the lack of an end must be at the center of our interpretation. Livy, for all his tidiness, does not add up.

10 Luce (1977) 294 argues that “Livy, with his belief that Rome had been corrupted from without, probably thought that the building <i.e. empire>, like a good Roman house, should look inward, walled off from the world. Augustus had a more ecumenical perspective.” Yet one should consider Suetonius’ references to Augustus’ expulsion of non-Romans, his reluctance to grant citizenship, and his persistence stress on a pure adherence to Roman traditions (in culture if not in politics). Who has inspired whom? I do however share Luce’s sentiments at p. 286: “To this writer, Livy’s failure to appreciate non-Romans is one of the most disappointing features of his work.”

Here similarity is asserted, and difference is ignored (although at the same time the difference must constitute the totality). Difference exists only to be eliminated or subordinated. For Vico, it is a move from the particular to the universal: the head (caput) signifies the entire man. A further development of the idea would be the figure of Camillus as the caput of Rome, or Augustus as the princeps, which contains a double synecdoche. As these three tropes all derive from metaphor, they retain their quality as rhetoric of difference that utilizes similarity.

As vehicles of speech and the discursive process, these three tropes form the basis of knowledge. The tropes are figurative speech, but by their application as literal truths there is a split between reality and figure. This leads to the development of the fourth trope, irony, which subverts reality rather than defining it. Rather than a movement towards building knowledge, the ironic shows the vanity of knowledge, such as when Lucretius demolishes the arguments of his imagined interlocutors by showing the absurd results of their presuppositions. Ironic speech exploits the dichotomy between the literal and figurative in the other three tropes.

Quintilian notes that there was a debate between the grammarians and philosophers regarding the forms and types of the tropes. Unfortunately, he does not go into the nature of this theoretical dispute (inexplicabilis pugna). For Quintilian, the tropes do not appear as only decoration, but also for the sake of signifying (qui significandi gratia adhibentur).\textsuperscript{12} He is emphatic in his insistence that tropes are greater than mere words, for the tropes operate not only on the

\textsuperscript{12} Quintilian 8.6.1-3.
forms of word, but also the forms of sentence and paragraph (formas non verborum modo, sed et sensuum et compositionis). If we take his words in a more general sense, the tropes may be seen to operate on the forms of meaning (sensus) and organization (compositio).

These tropes would therefore affect several aspects of rhetoric. Not only is their influence found in diction or style, but also in content (inventio) and arrangement (ordo). Therefore, the content or inventio of Livy’s narrative is supplied as required, not for verisimilitude, but as demanded by the trope. The type of story the historian is telling elaborates the content. Similarly, White sees the tropes operating on several layers in historiography. On the level of aesthetics, the tropes are employed as a narrative strategy. Their function is epistemic insofar as they propose specific explanations of the text. On the level of ethics, the tropes reveal ideological markings that suggest their application to social issues of the historian’s own time.

White has pointed out that the best authors utilize all the tropes and all may be found in Livy, as shall be shown. Livy’s narrative of Rome’s ‘liberation’ of Greece, particularly in the eighth pentad (books. 36-40), shall be approached as tropic discourse on the level of theme and episode. By showing Livy’s utilization

---

13 I use rhetoric here for the standard definition of the term by Russell (1967). Two further aspects of rhetoric are specifically concerned with performance: delivery (actio) and mnemonics (memoria). In discussing rhetoric, I refer to its compositional features (inventio, ordo, dictio) rather than these performative aspects.

14 Woodman (1988) 88, discusses ancient views of inventio as the art of saying what is required for a given situation. But required by what? Surely the spirit of the narrative, the force that drives the narrator, the momentum of the trope.

15 White (1978) 70.
of the tropes, the unity of the pentad is revealed, as well as Livy’s narrative mastery. This pentad is particularly suited for such a reading, for it offers what Claude Levi-Strauss would call a soft chronology. 16 That is, there is very little occurring in these years, and therefore Livy is provided an opportunity to fill in his narrative through expansion of his themes. Although this pentad has often been described as the war against Antiochus, that war is completed in book 37. The exact nature of this pentad and its unity is rather more complex, since it shows a movement of metaphor (Thessaly) through synecdoche (Galatia) and metonymy (Bacchanalia) and concludes in irony (Macedonian power struggle). 17 Certainly these may seem separate episodes and themes in Livy’s pentad, but in my analysis (a synecdoche) they show the motivation of Livy’s narrative, as well as a narrative unity. The specific theme of foreign corruption details the threats posed to Rome itself by its expansion and unifies the pentad. It is a narrative focused more on vitia than virtus.

The dominant theme, purity and contagion, is enacted through the Roman confrontations with other Greeks, or Greeks who dwell on the margins of the


17 My arrangement of the tropes is perhaps idiosyncratic but not unprecedented. Most writers on the tropes have placed metonymy before synecdoche, rather than after it. Yet, as Burke notes, the metonymy and synecdoche are very closely related. “Metonymy may be treated as a special application of synecdoche”, he writes. Indeed, since they are both extensions of metaphor, one may distill the tropes to only two, metaphor and irony, as Nietzsche does in the most succinct discussions of tropology (his early essay “On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense”). There he writes of

a mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms- in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are. (Translation from The Portable Nietzsche, Walter Kaufmann, trans. and ed., New York, 1954).
Greek world. These Greeks signify a threatening hybridity towards the Roman identity which it is Livy’s task to identify. Threats to Rome are presented as others who themselves are hybrid. In the following four chapters I shall focus on passages of narrative emphasis, usually determined by the length of episodes, but also by the circulation of recurrent themes, such as the disorder of Thessaly as a catalyst for Roman imperialism in Greece and Macedonia.

**Home Remedies for the Old Soul: Livy’s Augustan Restoration**

Livy’s History is a meaningful narrative reconstruction of Roman identity at a crucial point in Rome’s history. Although Livy (the auctor and book, the auctor as a book) has been appreciated as a narrative that resonates with Augustan preoccupations, much of the recent scholarship has been restricted to specific themes, such as the spectacle or exempla. In a way, Vasaly’s and Jaeger’s work on the (re)construction of Roman space as an act of (narrative) imperium informs my analysis. Vasaly shows non-Roman space as alien, even fantastic, whereas Jaeger shows how it becomes familiar through the operation of conquest. These two ideas may be reconciled by reading Livy’s presentation of Roman imperium as variations on a theme, as a turn of phrase, imperial tropes

---

18 For the relevance of Livy’s history to Augustan concerns, see Kraus and Woodman (1997), esp. 70-74, for a useful discussion with bibliography. On spectacle: Feldherr (1998); on exempla: Chaplin (2000).

19 See for instance Vasaly (1993) 133 on cultural mythology: “For each culture, the world outside the home ground is viewed as a series of concentric rings in which one’s own habitation occupies the center, while people and places lose reality (or at least everyday reality) as one travels outward from the center.” Jaeger (1997) 9 supports this and shows how the act of imperialism is concerned especially with redefining alien space as familiar.
of an aggressive (mis)understanding, which utilize similarity and difference to construct Roman identity in contrast to the many versions of Greece. Greeks come to be understood as hybrid, whereas Rome is shown as pure.

Before Luce’s monumental study of Livy, scholars were often reluctant to discuss Livy’s narratives of the Macedonian Wars in Books 31-45. Promised discussions often degenerated into an analysis of Livy's sources: Polybius for the Hellenist, Claudius Quadragarius or Valerius Antias for the esoteric Latinist. It seemed the fate of Livy to have analysis of his own discourse postponed by discussions about the scriptorum turba who served as his authorities (auctore). For some time Livy’s text constituted the script, which obscured the greater rewards of the earlier writing below it, like a palimpsest.

Now, as scholarship on Livy’s narrative is slowly emerging from an emphasis on Quellenforschung and stylistic autopsy, it seems fitting to consider the relation of the fourth and fifth decades to Livy’s earlier programmatic statements. These books, as artifacts of the Augustan era (rather than mere

---

20 Luce’s monumental work on Livy signals the culmination and the transcendence of Quellenforschung. This work reached such precision that Luce could confidently state that of Livy’s 740 chapters in books 31-45, roughly 411 are “Polybian” (181, fn. 99), despite the loss of much of Polybius’ narrative for these sections. Livy’s Roman sources for these books are universally condemned. Luce (1977) describes them as “based on an abbreviated, incomplete native tradition characterized by pervasive falsification and appalling ignorance” (180). This comment shows how source criticism may defend the author in the midst of ignoring him. Walbank (1971) 56 was more kind in his characterization of the writings of Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerias Antias as “truth completely obscured by falsehood” in contrast to the “reliability” of Polybius, an opinion shared by Livy himself. In that way this opinion is part of Livy’s narrative, and part of the reading of history. The interpretation rests on a distortion of the function of the author and his use of sources, compounded throughout the course of Quellenforschung.

21 The strongest dismissal of Livy as a mere parrot is delivered by Walsh (1970) 144: “A clear and somewhat damning picture emerges of a mind rapidly and mechanically transposing the Greek, and coming to full consciousness only when grappling with the more congenial problems of literary presentation.”
sycophantic propaganda) can tell us much of Augustan attitudes towards empire. Livy’s history in these books relies on a rhetoric invested with alterity and mimesis, realized by tropes that dramatize the differences of Romans and others, especially marginal Greeks, as purity and contagion. Rome obtains an existential priority as well as narrative emphasis. Notions of Greco-Roman *humanitas* seem foreign to Livy’s sympathies. In these books (31-45), even as Livy narrates the Roman rescue of Greek culture, especially Athens and Pergamum, from the aggressions or transgressions of Hellenistic Others, Livy emphasizes the importance of defending Rome from that very culture, and to avoid any sympathies for it other than those of a patron for a client. This Roman conservatism seems to represent an Augustan attitude towards the empire and its subjects, even in the midst of the cultural appropriation of Hellenism that defines the era. Livy presents a narrative of cultural purity in the midst of hybridity. As Luce writes, “Livy’s failure to appreciate non-Romans is one of the most disappointing features of his work.”

By his own admission, Livy’s central topic is the expansion of empire. This concern informs his project from the thematic to the structural level. Therefore, his narrative is organized into units of imperial expansion. At the beginning of book 31, he explicitly states that he shall turn from the topic of the Punic wars to

---

22 See Suetonius *Aug.* 48 for the attitude of the *princeps* towards client states. Brunt (1990) 454 n.49 writes “Augustus and his contemporaries conceived of the empire as an Italian dominion over subject peoples. . . Augustus would not have envisaged” the political advancement of easterners (Greeks) and northerners (Gauls).

23 Luce (1977)286.
the Macedonian wars, thereby clearly distinguishing the wars as narrative units.\textsuperscript{24} His first forty-five books can easily be divided into three fifteen books segments, each defined by wars that increased Roman \textit{imperium}.\textsuperscript{25} These are the conquest of Italy (1-15), the Punic Wars (16-30), and the Macedonian Wars (31-45). Livy’s history is the story of the Roman Empire. Furthermore, as the staging of empire, Livy’s narrative expands as the Empire expands. The individual books contain less and less time as the size of the Roman \textit{imperium} and the number of completed volumes increases. A complete set of Livy’s 142 volume \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} is a graphic illustration of Roman empire.\textsuperscript{26} One might say that Livy displays his literary mastery in the emplotment of Roman mastery.

Livy follows the dictum given by Romulus in his posthumous manifestation to Proculus Julius.

\textit{“Go,” Romulus said, “Announce to the Romans that the gods (\textit{caelestes}) wish my Rome to be the head (\textit{caput}) of the world; Then let them practice and learn warfare so they may teach to future generations (\textit{posteris} tradant) that there are no human resources able to resist Roman arms.”}\textsuperscript{27}

Romulus’ statement may be seen as programmatic. It calls not only for action, but also a narrative of those actions. The divine seal is given to Roman

\textsuperscript{24} 31. 1. 6: \textit{Pacem Punicum bellum Macedonicum exceptit.}

\textsuperscript{25} Luce (1977) repeatedly makes this argument throughout his book.

\textsuperscript{26} In this way Livy’s history plays a similar role to that of Agrippa’s map, discussed by Nicolet (1991) 95-122. Just as Agrippa’s map shows the world as Roman space, history becomes Roman time. See the discussion of Kraus and Woodman (1997) 54.

\textsuperscript{27} “\textit{Abi, nuntia,” inquit, “Romanis, caelestes ita velle ut mea Roma caput orbis terrarum sit; proinde rem militarem colant sciantque et ita posteris tradant nullas opes humanas armis Romanis resistere posse.”}
imperialism in the epiphany of Romulus. Livy’s narrative is validated as the realization of Romulus’ dictum, the militant demand for a Roman historical memory in the midst of (inferior) others. The identity of Rome as the head of the world reduces its power to an anatomical metonymy that shows Roman superiority over its subjects as natural.

The connection of Livy’s history to Roman *imperium* runs throughout his *Praefatio*, where he enunciates the motives and goals of his writing:

9. Let each for himself sharply direct his attention towards my work and towards the sort of life and character, the sort of men and skills at home and abroad that obtained and increased empire; and then let him follow in his mind, as discipline was slackened and as customs deteriorated, how then they lapsed more and more and afterwards began to collapse, until we have arrived at our times, in which we are able to endure neither our vices nor their remedies. 10. In the investigation of events it is especially healthy and fruitful that one contemplates the records of every sort of example, placed on an illustrious monument. From that one may take what he would imitate for himself and his republic and what he would shun as foul in the beginning and foul at the end. 11. Perhaps either the love of my project deceives me or there has never been a greater republic nor one more blessed or richer in good examples. Nor have greed and luxury ever migrated so late into any state, nor has such great honor for poverty and thriftiness existed anywhere. 12. Insofar as possessions were less, there was less desire. Recently wealth has brought in greed and abundant pleasures have brought in a longing for death and destruction through luxury and lust. 28

---

28 (*Praef. 9-12*): 9. *Ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit; labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentes primo mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora, quibus nec vita nostra nec remedia pati possimus, perversum est.* 10. *Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre et frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitare capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vitas.* 11. *Ceterum ut me amor negotii suscipit fallit aut nulla uquam res publica maior nec sanctior nec bonis exemplis ditior fuit, nec in quam civitatem tam serae avaritia luxuriaeque immigraverint, nec ubi tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit.* 12. *Adeo quanto rerum minus, tanta minus cupiditatis erat; nuper divitiae avaritiam et abundantes voluptatates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem perseundi perdendique omnia invexere.*
Here Livy emphasizes the merits of historic exempla to civic life. Livy asks his reader to each judge for himself the life, habits, men and skills at Rome and abroad used in the exercise of imperialism. These civic virtues are subordinated to empire; they are nationalistic and political, rather than strictly ethical. They are defined in their relationship to the acquisition and increase of Rome’s imperium. Therefore, since there has been no republic greater than Rome, there is none with more good examples. These are the examples that the reader (presumably Roman) should follow, although Livy will show others that should be shunned. History, for Livy, is always a narrative that inspires mimesis and alterity.

Such a history is particularly required at the current time, Livy assures us, for the contradictory purposes of escapism and social activism. There has been a gradual lapse in discipline that has grown steadily worse over time. Livy constructs his narrative in the shadow of social crisis. Rome cannot endure its vices or the remedies.

These vices are the result of the immigration of avarice and luxury. Wealth brings in greed, just as abundant pleasures bring in the desire and lust for annihilation. The specific character of these vices is imported, a foreign

29 Praef. 9: Ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium.

30 Praef. 11. Livy’s Roman exempla may be contrasted to the Roman and Greek writers of exempla of Cicero in P. Arch. 6.14.

31 Praef. 10: Inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites.

32 Praef. 9.
commodity rather than a homegrown product of Rome. Therefore, in book 39, there is the Bacchanalia, not the Liberalia. Furthermore, wealth precedes greed, and pleasures precede lust. The logical relationship of these terms has been reversed. From such contradictions the theme of Roma victrix victa is constructed. Rome conquers the world and then blames it for Rome’s degeneration. Therefore, Rome’s own strength destroys itself. The necessary expansion of imperium leads to its own crisis.

It has been suggested, even taken for granted by some, that Livy’s remedies are the Augustan legislation on marriage. This view, although often argued with ingenuity, proposes too narrow of an understanding of Livy’s text. Certainly the broader reference is to Augustus and its vague language would seem to underwrite all Augustan legislation. Whether the words were written in 25 or 29 B.C., their endorsement of Augustus’ program is obvious.

______________________________

33 Praef, 11: avaritia luxuriaque immigraverint. 12: Nuper divitiae avaritiam et abundantes voluptates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdendique omnia invexere.

34 I disagree with Woodman’s statement (1988) 131-2 that Livy believed Rome carried the seeds of its own decline. Rome’s collapse for Livy was the importation of vices, as if the infiltration of a destructive parasite.

35 Galinsky (1981) presents a review of these arguments. Badian (1985) argues persuasively against this interpretation, and even denies the existence of the specific legislation in 28 B.C.. Woodman (1988), 132-3 discusses both views, but sides with the latter. He is however mistaken in a similar way by accepting the vitia as civil war and the remedia as a constitutional dictatorship. Syme (1959) 42 argued the vitia and remedia referred to the “general condition of the Roman people”. This places Livy’s words in the existential context which they require, and allows us to understand their programmatic and multivocal context as more than a mere partisan political allegory.

36 For a presentation of various views on the date of the introduction, see Badian (1985) 17-19, or Luce (1965), which forms the basis of Badian’s discussion. The question of the exact date of the Praefatio is almost as contentious as the precise length of Livy’s history.
Livy’s rhetoric tells us much of Roman attitudes and common beliefs, as well as anxieties, of the Augustan age. As a contemporary product of its time, it can be read for what it tells us about Rome under Augustus, rather than a mere report on events in the Roman Republic. Livy’s narrative carries the ideological markings of its era in its style and rhetoric. Livy will always tell these events within a narrative of alterity and mimesis, as defined by the *imperium* and the needs of his own time for *exempla*.

Not only is Augustus’ social and imperial program the remedy, but so is Livy’s narrative (in fact, the two are of course linked). The contemplation of these *exempla* is medicinal-healthy and advantageous. The recording (*perscribo*) of *exempla* is part of the remedy, and therefore prescriptive insofar as Romans are expected to imitate or avoid certain characters, habits, lives, and skills of previous Romans (*maiores*) and thereby correct destructive behavior in the

37 Kraus and Woodman (1997), 73-4, provide a discussion and review of scholarship on Livy’s “insecurity and doubt”.

38 For “ideology” and “ideological” I note the definition (and problems) written by Spivak (1987) 118: “Ideology in action is what a group takes to be natural and self-evident, that of which the group, as a group, must deny any historical sedimentation. It is both the condition and the effect of the constitution of the subject (of ideology) as freely willing and consciously choosing in a world that is seen as background. In turn, the subject(s) of ideology are the conditions and the effects of the self-identity of the group as a group. It is impossible, of course, to mark off a group as an entity without sharing complicity with its ideological definition. A persistent critique of ideology is thus forever incomplete.”

39 Although Oglivie (1965) 24 and Frier (1979), 203, fn. 5, argue Livy does not show the downfall of “Roman morals”, the dominant approach in recent scholarship has been to treat Livy’s *exempla* as an ethical manual in the characteristic aspect as *monumenta* (see Kraus and Woodman 1997, 55-6). Often the *monumenta* are emphasized as if they were statues or *imagines*, which gives priority to virtus and *remedia* in Livy’s history, while ignoring *vitia* which have in fact inspired Livy’s narrative display of *monumenta* (*annalium*), according to his preface. Here I am attempting to understand the *monumenta* as written signs as well as visual images.

40 Praef. 9-11.
present. One could easily go further and characterize the behavior of
contemporary Rome as deviant insofar as it differs from the *bona exempla* of the
past, in spite of the obvious paradox in the impossibility of implementing a literal
imitation of Republican glories in the Augustan times.

The narrator himself experiences the salubrious (remedial) effect of the
narrative, and displays at the same time the significance of his medicine for
contemporary Roman society. In book 43 Livy precedes his listing of prodigies
with a defense of the reporting such events.\(^1\) He acknowledges the current lack
of belief, noting they are no longer publicly announced or recorded in annals.
However, in writing of ancient things his soul has become antique (*antiquus fit
anima*), and a religious scruple forbids him to hold as unworthy of his annals the
things that the most prudent men considered must be accepted as true.\(^2\) Livy
here proudly proclaims his personal transformation through his writing of the
past. This condition allows him to make authoritative statements on the status of
prodigies in Roman society. They must be accepted or received (*suscipienda*)
as true, or so the religious prohibition directs (*religio tenet*), as well as the most
prudent men, no doubt the magistrates who received them, and the pontifex
maximus who recorded (*perscripsit*) them. The prodigies, the fantastic, are
preserved by the antique mind as normative discourse.

---

\(^{1}\) (43.13.1-2): *Non sum nescius ab eadem neglegentia qua nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque
nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicam neque in annals referri. Ceterum et mihi vetustas res
scribenti nescio quo pacto antiquus fit animus et quaedam religio tenet, quae illi prudentissimi viri publice
suscipienda censuerint, ea pro indignis habere, quae in meos annales referam.*

\(^{2}\) 43.13. *Ceterum et mihi vetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto antiquus fit animus, et quaedam
religio tenet, quae illi prudentissimi viri publice suscipienda censuerint, ea pro indignis habere,
quae in meos annales referam.*
This movement to the *antiquus* never brings the past back to us in its simple or originary condition, but the past is changed in its present setting as artifact. The quality of the antique is the displacement of the past into the present. The object becomes a curiosity piece, an anomaly in a museum or personal collection. However the artifact has a demonstrative force, for it signifies the past for us in such a way that we conceive and even interact with it. As *antiquus* the object has lost its original force along with its originary condition, and exists now in and for the present as the sign of the past in its various ideological forms. The artifact is a product of an artifice that shows its mastery as objective.

Livy’s soul, through writing about the past, has become an artifact. This status allows a stance for qualitative statements about the present. This antiquarian psychology is the medicine of Livy’s rhetoric. In the *Praefatio* Livy instructs the reader to turn his attention to the life, customs, and skills that obtained and increased *imperium*. However, to translate as “turn his attention’ is perhaps too otiose. The Latin text refers to a tension of the soul (*pro se quisque acriter intendat animum*) directed towards these things of the past (i.e. artifacts). *Animus* is used four times in the *Praefatio*: for the writer himself (*scribentis animum*; 5), for the submissive attitude of the imperial subjects (*gentes humanae patiuntur aequo animo*; 7) and for the prospective reader (*intendat animum*; 8; *sequatur animo*: 9) in his attention to the spectacle of the acquisition of empire and the decay of *mores*. In some way Livy hopes to engage the prospective reader in a process that internalizes and reverses this latter decadence by
(re)Romanizing history. This, Livy tells us, is healthy and advantageous. This reception of the past as artifact in order to cure the present is the keynote of the Augustan restoration. The antique was widely displayed in restorations throughout the Rome of Livy’s era. Livy’s antique soul is the ideological sediment of the Augustan rebuilding of Rome. 43

Livy’s antique soul validates Livy’s words, a thorough accounting or perscriptio of the past, as a prescription for the present. Furthermore, his recording of prodigies, including in this case a talking cow,44 marks his annals as authentic (a true artifact), as opposed to the other annalists (perhaps a scriptorum turba) who disregard them. Indeed the cow is a significant prodigy. There is a similar cow, different in gender, in book 35, which tells Rome to beware before the start of hostilities with Antiochus (Cave, Roma, tibi). Like the later feminine cow, it was housed and fed at the expense of the SPQR by order of the haruspices. 45 These talking cows are utterly ridiculous in “true” history, but integral to Livy’s antique display of Rome’s peril, and suitably enigmatic concerning the content of the threat. The talking cow shows the danger of the

43 In this way Suetonius’ many references to antiquus must be considered. For example, consider the ‘antiquarian’ activities of Augustus; at 24: In re militari et commutavit multa et instituit, atque etiam ad antiquum morem nonnulla revocavit; at 31: Nonnulla etiam ex antiquis caerimoniis paulatim abolita restituit; and at 32: Collegia praeter antiqua et legitima dissolvit.

44 43.13.3: bovem feminam locutam; <eam> publice ali.

45 35.21.4: Quod maxime trebat, consulis Cn. Domiti bovem locutum ‘Roma, cave tibi’. For the care and feeding of the cow, see 35.21.5.
prodigies becoming ridiculous and thereby neglected, an effect not of the prodigies themselves, but the conduct of the annalist. The neglect of the prodigies is a lapse in *mores*.

Livy adheres to the tradition of recording prodigies, since they were a feature of the original *tabula dealbata* of the pontifex maximus, although the practice had been abandoned for some time. Livy’s authorial voice implicitly mimes this imagined script of the pontifex maximus. In some way, Livy seeks to restore this pontifical script to the reader, and even to impress its authority (auctoritas) upon his annals. This is less impious or marvelous than it seems, and in some way fulfils a spiritual need of the Augustan age. The office of pontifex maximus was vacant in spirit if not in fact due to the banishment of Marcus Lepidus, who retained the title until his death in 12 B.C. Augustus’ *Res Gestae* speaks of popular support for Augustus to take the title before the death of Lepidus. Rather than a mere reflection of Augustus’ charisma or empty propaganda, this perhaps reflects a psychological need to fill an absence in religious (civic) life. Livy’s anachronistic mimesis fulfils a personal expression of public (Augustan) desire.

This grounding of narrative validity in mimetic artifice is an innate aspect of the *auctor* as *auctoritas*, or writer as authority. Vico perceived this, in his

---

46 Levene (1993) 22-3 and 115-16 similarly argues that Livy’s recording of prodigy lists is not an argument for their empirical validity but a defense of what Livy perceived as Roman (annalistic) tradition.

47 Cicero (*De Or.* 2.52) writes that the public display of *tabulae* ended when Scaevola became pontifex, c. 130 B.C.; Frier (1979) 179. For a review of the major sources for the *tabulae dealbatae*, see Frier (1979) 83-87.

48 R.G. 10.
discussion of *fundum fieri* (“to become ground of”) in Roman law as equivalent to

*auctorem fieri* (to become the author of, to ratify). Vico continues

The explanation being that, as the ground supports the farm or soil and that which is sown, planted, or built thereon, so the ratifier <auctorem> supports an act which without his ratification would fail; and he does this by quitting the form of a being moving at will, which he is, and taking on the contrary form of a stable thing. (*The New Science*, 411).

In the mimetic artifice Livy finds an authorial voice as Roman artifact. From henceforth Livy’s name stands as the symbol for this act of ratification and quickly becomes an artifact itself, subject to reverent citation, epitomes or neglect. This ratification of Livy’s authorial seal dispels the *scriptorum turba* as the phantoms they are meant to be, rather than the giants of *Quellenforschung*.

The annalistic frame of Livy’s history masks and discloses its display as a Roman artifact or artifice. Insofar as the annalistic setting of the narrative conveys an official and therefore factual tone, Livy’s tropes are masked as history. Yet at the same time the annalistic frame discloses the Augustan position of the text. The old annals of the Pontifex Maximus were displayed in the forum; in Livy’s time, one could go to the forum to gaze upon the statues of men notable for their efforts and success in increasing Roman *imperium*.49 Livy’s text is a mimesis of the perfect forum: the words of the annals and the figures of great men (Yet let us not forget that Gallic and Greek couples were buried there as human sacrifices; as apotropaic charms intended to protect and purify Rome).

49 This connection of statues and imperium is found in Cicero *Rep*. 3.24: *illa laus in summorum imperatorum incisa monimentis: “Finis imperii propagavit.”
Often Livy’s history has been seen to either realize or violate the doctrines of historiography expounded by Cicero in *De Oratore*. There and elsewhere the master condemned annals as tedious exercises. He believed that history needed to show the rise and fall of great men (like himself). The annalistic format prohibited the portrayal of a man’s life and therefore failed to engage its audience. Therefore the annalists were criticized for a lack of decoration and as mere narrators. History was for Cicero a rhetorical exercise that showed the mastery of its author while it provided entertainment for its audience. The master’s perfect historian maintained verisimilitude rather than documented veracity.\(^{50}\)

Cicero, like many ancient historians from Herodotus onwards, endorsed a historiography based on grand themes. History became a vehicle to show rise and decline in empires and men. On the other hand, the annalistic tradition evolved in the Roman imagination into a system uniquely oriented towards the simple statement of nationalized objectivity enshrined in sanctified discourse. From the simple list of the pontifex maximus the annalist seemed to elaborate a method for recording the history of Rome, in a style which could be as close to the (imagined) *tabulae dealbatae* as the author desired.\(^{51}\) Of course Roman annalistic historiography never lacked elaboration nor what Cicero would call

\(^{50}\) For more detailed discussions of *De Oratore* 2.52-4 see Frier (1979) 69-82 and Woodman (1988) 70-116.

\(^{51}\) Frier (1979) 21 grudgingly notes a relationship between the annals and the *tabulae dealbatae*. He also notes that Cicero has transformed the pontifex maximus into a “historical archivist” (198). The *tabulae* change from a paradigm (an antique model) to a precursor (outdated method) of the annalists. Livy seeks to reestablish the earlier relationship.
ornamentation. Yet it retained the pretense of plain style. Moreover, it had become the specific style of Roman historiography grounding Roman identity due to its own recognition of its pontifical roots. The annals, as an antique vehicle, preserved the past as Roman artifact.

Livy unifies these two modes of expression, he writes ornamented annals that maintain and even assert their qualitatively Roman setting. By focusing his narrative on the rise and decline of Rome, the annals become a descriptive mode of historiography. The tragedy of this great epic is the internal decline that blights Rome’s external rise. Yet as we have seen, the narrative maintains its prognosis for recovery in the midst of its dire diagnosis. The very act of reading the annals is salubrious. The reader plays an active role in this reconstruction of Rome by interacting with it as artifact. We all play our part in finishing the story, for it ends with us walking through the forum gazing at the statues of great men who increased Roman imperium. Livian text is the narrative blueprint for a forum, the representation of Roman identity defined in time and through time like weathered statues. Rome for Livy is an organic essence created and evolving, subject to sickness and healing. What better way than the annals to narrate the span of the elaborations of this essence in time? And what display could be more pathetic for the Roman reader than the annals of a destiny he shared?

Livy’s text is a profound (re)creation of Roman identity. By unifying the divergent narrative styles of annalistic organization and rhetorical elaboration,

52 Although Sempronius Asellio (fr. 1-2=Aulus Gellius 5.18.7-9) felt he had to apologize for providing explanations of events in his annals, he also criticized the bare listing of events without explanations was “telling stories to children, not writing history.”
Livy is able to cast aside Cicero’s strictures against the annalistic format. Yet Livy could do this only by elaborating a narrative that sought Roman identity as the basis of every event. Livy repeatedly refers to this thematic focus, and shows impatience with Greek material that Polybius included in his account of the Macedonian and Aetolian wars:

Greek matters unmixed with those of Romans have delayed me for a moment, not since these events themselves are worthy of recording, but since they were the causes of war with Antiochus. (35.40)

If I went on to set forth the causes and chronology of that war, I would be neglecting my principle to not deal with foreign matters, unless in some way they were connected to Roman affairs. (39.48.6)

Livy presents this abstinence from Greek matters as narrative purity. The narrative focus is always on Rome, even at the margins of its imperium. In fact since Livy’s story is the expansion of Rome, it is precisely here that Rome is found. The foreign, the non-Roman, becomes a moment in imperium, whose existence is framed and founded on its defeat to the superior Roman virtus. A Roman statue marks and (re)places the foreign in the narrative. In Book 38 the conquest of the Galatians is the story of the consul Manlius Vulso, not Galatia.

Insofar as the other, the foreign, finds its being grounded on its lack of Romaness, it is caught up in the narrative as the phenomenon of deviance or

53 Therefore, Livy’s story of Roman imperium shows an evolution of Roman space and Roman time. Cf. Kraus and Woodman (1997) 54: “In a sense the Roman imperium defined time as it defined space; from Livy’s perspective, history, from the very beginning of the historical period, that is from the Trojan war, was Roman history, as the civilized world was Roman territory.” In this way for Livy Roman history comes before Greek history, in both its ontological and existential priority.
pathology (to use the medical metaphor favored by Livy’s *Praefatio*). Therefore, deviance at Rome and abroad become associated forms. As the narrative expands with the empire, the distinction between home and abroad become blurred. Livy represents images of Rome’s enemies that are manifestation of deviant Rome (*vitia* - the corrupt things to be shunned). As such, they present the very threats to *imperium* that the consuls, the Senate, the Roman people and Livy must encounter and defeat by a display of true Roman *virtus* at home and abroad. *Virtus* is mimetic, it is manlike masculine manliness. *Vitia* are invested with alterity, as the detested and defiled (*vitiare*); like the prodigious hermaphroditic half-men (*semimares*) who are destroyed in the prodigy lists of Livy’s narrative, they are things to be shunned (as if *vitium* was from *vitare*).

Livy’s narrative is in fact founded on a number of paradoxes. First there is the monolithic tone of the Roman annalist, projecting a tone of cultural identity onto the events that he solemnly records with pontifical purity. The Others, the objects of the narrative, are encased in the enframing Roman discourse. Their identity as difference is certified by the *stilus* that refuses to write of their affairs, for his specific project is the *Romana Res*. Yet these other Greeks are part of the Roman story. They must become parts in a narrative synecdoche that imposes difference as it asserts the totality of purity (itself the metonymy of abstractions and personifications). Therefore, opposition to Rome is prefigured as plebeian. Livy shows the turns of phrase implicit in the
“intellectual cannibalism” or the selfish knowledge of imperialism. *Homo non intellelegendo fit omnia*. As Vico writes, “man becomes all things by not knowing them.”

Asinius Pollio characterized Livy’s writing as “*Pativinitas*”. This statement has had a remarkable lifespan, yet the content of Pollio’s criticism is limited to a single neologism. Although the remark refers to Livy’s style, the selection of *dictio* is a key aspect of ancient rhetoric, itself informed with the *inventio* and the *ordo* of the narrative. Syme saw the comment as a condemnation of Livy’s project for its provincial naivety, a product of the simple patriotism of Patuvium. On the level of style, for Syme *Pativinitas* indicates the lack of *urbanitas*, and the excess of an “improving publicist”, a product of the “smug, opulent *municipium*” which was his birthplace. Asinius Pollio condemned Livy’s writing as provincial. That is the sweeping nature of Pollio’s reproach, and the reason it has cut to the core of Livy’s rhetoric. Livy in some way conveys the very marginality, the hybridity, which he seeks to cure through his medicinal narrative.

Livy in a sense has anticipated Pollio’s criticism by portraying *Pativinitas* as primordial Romanitas. Both Rome and Padua share a common descent from 

54 Vico 405:”For when man understands he extends his mind and takes in things, but when he does not understand he makes the things out of himself and becomes them by transforming himself into them.” See also Bhabha (1993) 91, which I quote here at length:

The ‘unthought’ across which colonial man is articulated is that process of classificatory confusion that I have described as the metonymy of the substitutive chain of ethical and cultural discourse. This results in the splitting of colonial discourse so that two attitudes towards external reality persist; one takes reality into consideration while the other disavows it and replaces it by a product of desire that repeats, rearticulates ‘reality’ as mimicry.

55 Syme (1959) 76. Cf. McDonald (1957) 172, who wrote of the “historical naïveté or political rusticity on the part of Livy” implied by Pollio.
Troy, Rome’s heroic ancestor. Although this Trojan pedigree is often understood by Romans and contemporary scholars to show Rome’s Greek kinship through Greek literature, the Trojans may also be read as a counterpoint to the Greeks. Trojan identity distinguishes itself in contrast to the Greeks, even as a primordial Greek opponent, even though the assertion is founded on Greek epic. Yet more importantly, Aeneas and Antenor (Augustus and Livy) represent a special relation of Padua and Rome grounded in the heroic past. It is an Italian story, as we can understand that term in the first generations following the Social Wars.

Moreover, Livy shares Padua’s connection to Roman royalty, as more than mere client or freedman, but as a comes, a companion of Aeneas, a count. The Padua story, at the very outset of his narrative, is a radical assertion of the author’s purity, although Livy is modest enough to put the assertion in indirect speech. Some modern scholars have suggested that Livy obtained his citizenship in the course of his lifetime, and therefore his repeated emphasis on purity, which is paradoxical in the midst of the Italic hybridity of the civitas Romana. He shares the enthusiasm of the recent convert. Becoming Roman is presented as a conversion experience. So in Book One Aeneas becomes Jupiter Indiges, the native Jupiter.

Caligula’s criticism of Livy should also be considered, for it reveals an important characteristic of Livy’s narrative. For Caligula, Livy’s history was

56 Luce (1977) 286 argues that Padua, as part of Transpadane Gaul, was offered citizenship after Livy was born.

57 1.2.6.
verbose and negligent. Caligula’s words condemn Livy for the excess of words suggested in Syme’s interpretation of Livy. Yet it is not the mere number of words. The criticism indicates that Livy writes a history that is full of words (verbosum in historia). The fullness of words indicates the criticism is directed in particular to Livy’s inventio, or, as Henderson has written, “Livy’s invention of history”. Livy is verbose in his history since his language is always overdetermined by his methodology. The second part of Caligula’s criticism indicates Livy’s forgetfulness in the midst of constructing Roman history. This forgetfulness is a key aspect of national memory. It is a result of the historical narrative that seeks to equate national identity with truth. It is a function of the synecdoche of the part for the whole. When this trope functions as the literal truth rather than a figurative trope, the ironic critic emerges to denounce it as ignorant and deceptive. The criticism of Livy by Pollio and Caligula defines Livy as artifice rather than artifact.

These interpretations of Pollio’s and Caligula’s criticisms do not seek to weaken the stature of Livy, but rather to appreciate Livy’s narrative strategies as an emplotment of Roman mastery that distorts others when it does not forget them. The exact regions, borders, and names of these others are often unknown or various, they suffer from lack and excess, mobilitas, since they are overdetermined by the shifting interests of the author. As far as Livy’s eye can

58 Suetonius Caligula 34.4.
see and as long as his hand can write, there is Rome. This is why we will never
know the end of Livy’s text, and this is why his text becomes a labyrinth.  

The specific characteristics of Livy’s emplotment in Books 36-40 will be
discussed in the following chapters. The second chapter will discuss the Roman
experience of Thessaly, a liminal region that became a battlefield in the
Macedonian wars. Although in many ways it was the birthplace of Hellenic
culture, it had become increasingly isolated from Greek cultural movements, and
when Rome came upon it Thessaly was a supplier of cavalry for the Macedonian
army. Livy’s rhetoric separates the Thessalians from the Macedonians, and
defines them as disenfranchised Greeks, liberated by Rome. This compels an
attitude of obligation and even obedience towards Rome, which was pressed
more strongly on the Thessalians than the other Greek peoples of the Isthmian
declaration, since Thessaly was represented as freed from a foreign occupation
(which now had lasted some 130 years). Rome felt free to imagine communities
in Thessaly. These communities are modeled on the Roman polity. At the same
time, Roman relations with the new Thessalian communities are modeled on the
patron-client relationship, or even the patrician-plebeian opposition. Livy so
actively applies metaphor in his account of Thessaly that he never acknowledges
the Roman frames he uses to describe historic phenomena. The use of

59 On Livy’s text as a labyrinth, see Jaeger (1999). Her words on page 192 are germane to the
present investigation:

To impose familiar order on unfamiliar space is an inherently imperial act, and for
Livy the leadership that causes Roman expansion includes the ability to
understand the space in which one finds oneself and to shape space according
to one’s will—or at least to change other people’s impressions of that space.
metaphor softens the Thessalians, whose complaints about Philip V serve as a Roman *belli causa*, although Thessalian difference is maintained. Their status as clients to Rome’s patronage is analogous to the relation of plebeian to nobles. Through application of the Roman metaphor Livy emplots a Roman social world while writing Thessaly. Thessaly therefore becomes a metaphor for Rome, which was perhaps its destiny after the battle of Pharsalus. In Thessaly Rome meets itself, but only in deviant forms. By presenting Thessaly in my second chapter in diachronic review, I preserve it as if it were continuous and an entity rather than a site of metaphor, forever “as-if”, shifting.

In Galatia Rome meets the other as the same, and this shall be our topic in chapter three. In book 38 Livy describes the expedition of Manlius Vulso as he trekked into the hinterlands of Asia Minor in search of fugitive Galatians, whom he eventually killed with their families, after laying siege to Mount Olympus. Livy’s narrative is unusual, even strange. At times it is a travelogue, with lapses into anecdotes of extortion and rape, as a sort of comic relief. Speeches play a key role. The consul does battle against an opponent first depicted as a hybrid, the Gallograecians, but they increasingly become simply displaced Gauls. Manlius is therefore able to represent his aggression against them as his ancestral inheritance. At the same time, like his ancestor’s contention with Camillus, this Manlius tries to surpass the glories of his consular predecessor, Scipio, who took the cognomen Asiagenes after the defeat of Antiochus. Although Manlius fights corrupt Gauls, the end result of his campaign is the corruption of Rome, especially the army. The dominant mode of Livy’s narrative
here is synecdoche-Manlius’ corruption of Rome serves as a representative anecdote for the threat of hybridity. Manlius is infected and henceforth conveys his contagion to Rome.

In chapter four I shall discuss the crisis in Roman religious practice, especially the affair of the Bacchanalia in book 39, as well as the discovery of Numa’s Greek books in book 40. In Livy’s narrative the Bacchanalia is portrayed as Greek corruption, just as what Manlius brings from Greek lands corrupts Rome. In both cases the corruption comes from the borders of the Greek world. South Italy is a site of cultural hybridity, especially notable for its religious innovations or, for Livy, deviations, since he was no Neopythagorean. The Bacchanalia comes to serve as a metonymy for Greece and for the antithesis of Roman culture. Yet there is good reason to understand the Bacchanalia as a Roman phenomenon rather than as a Greek importation. Our analysis of the Bacchanalia and Numa’s books will focus on the narrative distortion of hybridity as foreign corruption. I use the word distortion to indicate that the motif of corruption displaces the phenomenon it seeks to describe-suddenly events which occur in Rome are no longer Roman. Nor are they narrated in the traditional Roman way, as we shall see in our discussion of the Bacchanalia.

In chapter 5 the topic shall be Livy’s depiction of Macedonia, especially the dispute of the brothers Perseus and Demetrius. Here the tropes of metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche are replaced by an ironic portrayal of Macedonian events. Livy has been criticized for departing from Roman matters here, so part of my task is to show how this portrayal of the house of Macedon matters to
Rome. Livy depicts the Macedonians as others even as they do very Roman things, such as celebrate rituals inaugurating the military season and watch adolescents play a competitive cavalry contest much like the Troia game of young Roman nobles. More ominously, but equally Roman, brothers fight against each other for life and death, while the king plots imperial conquests. In all these scenes, the deviant and ultimately futile nature of Macedonian actions is shown. Throughout book 40 there is mimesis (similarity), but throughout the narrative alterity (difference) receives special emphasis. Similarity is used to emphasize difference. Irony rather than tragedy is the narrative tone; it is a parody rather than tragedy. I will further discuss Livian irony in his account of the eclipse that both signifies and doesn’t signify the defeat of Perseus at Pydna and the fall of Macedon. This eclipse provides the epilogue with its title, but Livy’s irony acts as an eclipsing of the problems raised by incongruities inherent in the passages (and the tropes) discussed in the previous chapters. The history is not false, but in some way it may be read as the history of a falsehood- the purity of Roman culture conveyed through litotes.
CHAPTER 2
THESSALY DEFINED

When Livy considers the expansion of Roman power in the East, Thessaly is a crucial region for his narrative. The final battle of the second Macedonian war is at Cynoscephalae and much of the third Macedonian war would be fought in Thessaly. Thessaly was a border region that connected mainland Greece and Macedonia, and had been occupied by Macedonian armies for over a century. It was also a starting point for sailing expeditions farther East to Asia Minor and beyond, as shown by the familiar traditions of the Argonauts’ voyage from Iolcus. Throughout the second and third Macedonian wars it was a battlefield. Yet although Thessaly is frequently discussed in the fourth and fifth decades of Livy’s history, the Thessalians themselves are strangely absent from the narrative until the Roman organization of Thessalian constitutions after the Isthmian declaration of Greek freedom, and it is then that the Thessalians reveal their “restless nature” (*inquietum ingenium*). This aspect will remain a characteristic feature in Livy’s portrayals of Thessalians throughout his narrative of the Macedonian wars.

Here I wish to investigate this depiction of the Thessalians under the trope of metaphor, although this trope drifts easily into metonymy, synecdoche and irony, since in some ways it also contains them. I follow Burke in considering metaphor as perspective, or naming one thing in the terms of another. Burke
notes the “incongruity” implicit in this approach “because the seeing of something in terms of something else involves the ‘carrying-over’ of a term from one realm into another, a process that necessarily involves varying degrees of incongruity in that the two realms are never identical”. In fact apologists for imperialism are remarkably attached to metaphor in their rationalizations of empire. In this Livy is no exception. For instance, consider the following astute analysis of Livy’s historiography by Jaeger:

To impose familiar order on unfamiliar space is an inherently imperial act, and for Livy the leadership that causes Roman expansion includes the ability to understand the space in which one finds oneself and to shape space according to one’s will- or at least to change other people’s impressions of that space.

The process Jaeger describes I would characterize as the master trope of metaphor. Throughout the following chapter I will examine various attempts by various powers to define Thessaly and Thessalians in Livy’s narrative. First I shall examine the Roman mediation of the conflicting claims to Thessaly voiced by King Philip of Macedonia and the Aetolian envoys. This led to Romans inheriting the notion of the “three fetters” and the central place of Thessaly in this conceptualization of geographical bondage. Next I shall discuss Thessaly as a charnel field subject to the counterclaims of Philip of Megapolis. He had pretensions to the Macedonian throne and used the symbolism of

\[\text{60} \text{ Burke (1969) 503.} \]
\[\text{61} \text{ Jaeger (1992) 192.} \]
Cynoscephalae to advance his claim. Next I turn to Roman encounters with Thessalians. Flamininus attempted to structure Thessalian communities in the image of the Roman constitution. Eurylochus of Magnesia distrusted the Romans and sought greater autonomy from them and King Philip. His protests culminate in a insurgency that demonstrates for Livy the restless nature of Thessalians. This crisis of imperial goals in a crucial Thessalian community, one of the fetters, leads to an end to negotiations between the occupied and occupier. This breakdown in communication vividly presents the incongruity of the previous metaphors. I end by presenting a representative anecdote of Thessaly, that finally resolves the crisis of metaphor marked in the preceding episodes. Thessaly is conceptualized in the form of a woman’s sufferings. She is Theoxena, the divine guest-friend, whose death forever links Thessaly and Rome.

**The Roman Creation of Thessaly; Stabilization or Balkanization?**

Macedonia was not the first state to show imperialist intentions in Thessaly. Leaving aside the Persians, Sparta had founded a colony in Heraclea in 426. Although located just south of Thessaly as identified by modern historians and geographers, it was subject to the control of Thessalian oligarchs when they were not feuding. From the base of Heraclea Sparta was able to spread its influence through Thessaly as far away as Pharsalus in the next few generations. After this Lacedaemonian land grab, other Greek states and

---

62 Thucydides 3.92-93.
leagues would seek their own possessions in Thessaly and its environs, including the so-called “Perioeci”. This was largely due to the lack of synoecism in Thessaly. The communities of Thessaly were separate entities controlled by rich aristocracies that would unify under a tagos only during wars. Although Jason of Pherae sought to unify the state during his tyranny in the early fourth century, his attempt ended in failure due to his premature death.

Much of the confusion over the boundaries of Thessaly is focused on the status of Magnesia, Perrhaebia, Phthian Achaea (the three Perioeci), and Dolopia. Each is defined by their mountain range and direction. Magnesia in the east with Mt. Ossa, Perrhaebia in the north with Mt. Olympus, Achaea in the south with the Othrys mountains and Dolopia in the west with the Pindus range. Livy retains the distinction of these regions. They had been historicly subject to direct Thessalian control due to a lack of internal organization and are largely defined as regions only by geographers and historians. Throughout the poets and mythographers, they remain Thessalian. For instance, Iolcus is located in Magnesia, but often is easily identified by Roman authors as Thessalian.

In fact, in the separation of these regions from Thessaly, even in the name of liberty, the territorial motive of the imperialist powers is shown. Macedonia and Rome define these territories at the same time as they seek to control or influence them. Not powerful or organized enough to define themselves in the midst of competing ambitions, their autonomy is defined by others-a donation which takes the very thing it gives.
This conception of Roman policy not only follows Benedict Anderson’s theories in *Imagined Communities*, but also retains the definition of Roman imperialism by Harris that maintains a conception of *imperium* as commanding influence as well as annexation. He writes

> They <the Romans> usually thought of it <the empire> not as being the area covered by the formally annexed provinces but rather as consisting of all the places over which Rome exercised power.\(^6\)

This embodies an attempt by Romans to control regions on a local level, sometimes by the organization of governments or the manipulation of dynastic successions, often by the installation of Roman partisans who would protect Rome’s interests abroad. This emphasis on a measure of local control subordinated to Roman interests remained the model of the Roman order until the time of Diocletian. One way to maintain Roman influence in local regions was the creation of states and assemblies, as Flamininus attempted to do in Thessaly following the second Macedonian war. A similar practice also followed by Philip II in the fourth century B.C.E., but his primary instrument of control was the reorganization of the Thessalian League. He effectively separated the Perioeci from the rest of Thessaly by granting them representation in assemblies at the same time as he granted himself unprecedented powers over the same communities. Philip’s ability to define the regions and their representation in the Thessalian League did not conceal his power over them.

\(^6\) Harris (1979)105. For the theory of Anderson (1993), consider his pages 52-3 “to see how administrative units could, over time, come to be conceived as fatherlands.”
However, these very definitions of the regions became the source of grievances against the Macedonian occupation of these areas. Such complaints were often based on expanding definitions of Greece as a nation of poleis unified by culture whose politics were defined by membership in various leagues struggling for dominance of Hellas. Therefore, in conferences with the Aetolians and Romans, Philip V was confronted with their demands for the freedom of these very regions that had been defined by the Macedonian crown. Thessaly, a region marginalized by its geographic isolation from the major currents of Hellenic culture, was to become a proud member of Greece (for the benefit of the Aetolian league) through the rhetoric of Aetolian ambassadors with the support of Flamininus. The war that began as the defense of Athens from Philip V became the fight for Aetolia to define Greece. Later it would be seen as beginning of Roman control of Greece, to be defined as the Roman province of Achaea, which would not include Thessaly, the Perioeci or Dolopia; these would remain in Macedonia, in its realization as a Roman province. This is perhaps the ultimate irony in the series of Roman perspectives on Thessaly. In the end it shall be liberated from the Macedonians only to become part of the Roman province of Macedonians. Augustus would also maintain the façade of autonomy in the guise of Thessalian amphictionies.

The dispute for Thessaly between the Aetolians, Macedonians and Romans is given a dramatic setting in the narratives of the two peace conferences that bookend the battle of Cynoscephalae in Livy’s narrative. The first, taking place behind the barricade and monument of Thermopylae in the
Malian gulf near Nicea, is set firmly in Hellas, as defined by the allies opposed to Philip. This is what underlies Philip’s refusal to leave his boat at the conference. He fears he will be murdered if he walks on Greek soil. The second conference at Tempe, a key strategic position in Thessaly, offers a dramatic setting for the dispute for Thessaly’s place in the expanding notions of Hellas proposed by the Aetolian League. The central issue in the dispute between the Aetolians and Philip was whether Thessaly was liberated Greece or occupied Macedonia.

Livy follows Polybius’ account closely, choosing to abbreviate at certain parts of the narrative. The conference at the Malian gulf occurred in spring of 198. Like the later negotiations at Tempe, all the major participants took part: Amynander, king of the Athamanians, Dionysodorus, a representative of King Attalus of Pergamum, Acesimbrotus the Rhodian, the Aetolians, the Achaeans and the Romans. All of the participants in the battle of Cynoscephale were there—except for the Thessalians.

Although the narrative provides an expression of the complaints of the Athamanian king, as well as the envoys of Pergamum, Rhodes, and the Achaean League, the bulk of the space is given to the complaints of the Aetolians and Philip’s response to them. Phaeneas, the Aetolian envoy, begins his speech after the demands of the other allies. Phaeneas seeks to align the Roman demands for Philip’s withdrawal from Greece with Aetolian expansion in Thessaly. The Aetolian orator further develops the theme. He places special

64 Livy 32.32, Polybius 18.1.
emphasis on the plight of Thessalians, saying that Philip has treated them worse than any enemy although they are his allies. He describes Philip’s practice of burning and pillaging Thessaly as he retreats. Alexander pleads the cause of Lysimachaea and Cius, both cities formerly controled by the Aetolians, and concludes with Thessalian towns: Phthian Thebes, Echinus, Larisa and Pharsalus, a list that steadily creeps northward through Thessaly. Alexander demands that Philip withdraw from Thessaly since it is part of Greece. This interpretation of Greece beyond Thermopylae scarcely conceals the assertion of the Aetolian League to these northern towns.

Philip answers with scorn. After noting that the brutality of Aetolians had already shown towards member cities, his defense attacks the assumed definition of Greece. He questions the Greek ethnicity of some Aetolian members, such as the Agraei, Apodoti and Amphilochi. He responds to the Aetolians, by mirroring the organization of the Aetolian accusations, and thereby questioning the validity of their claim to protect Thessaly.

Philip’s approach to the Romans is different. He asks Flamininus whether the consul wishes him to abandon only those territories that he has conquered, or also those he inherited. The offer is not as generous as it seems, for Philip is asking Rome not to define Greece, but to state the terms for lawful imperium.

---

65 Livy 32.33.8: Praetor Aetolorum Phaeneas cum eadem fere quae Romani ut Graecia decedeturur postulasset redderenturque Aetolis urbes quae quondam iuris ac dicionis eorum fuisse. Exceptit orationem eius princeps Aetolorum Alexander, vir ut inter Aetolos facundus. Compare Polybius, 18.3.1

66 Livy 32.33, Polybius 18.3.

67 Livy 32.34, Polybius 18.4-5.
Certainly any rules Flamininus set in this area could hurt not only Philip, but future Roman claims to foreign lands, inherited by the Roman Senate and People.

The following day, Philip arrives late and demands to offer his concessions to Flamininus alone. The king concedes to the allies most of what they wish, but he resists some of the Aetolian demands in Thessaly. He will grant Larisa and Pharsalus but not Phthian Thebes. Rather than accept Thessaly as Greece, he views it as territory distinguished by strategic points and locations.

Flamininus, perhaps uncertain, but in Livy merely to buy time to prepare for future confrontations, tells Philip to consult the Senate. Ambassadors are sent from the various participants. One might consider the presentations before the Senate as the middle act of this drama that leads to the bones of Cynoscephalae. The Thessalians are still absent, for they are again unrepresented before the Senate which shall decide their fate.

The opposition of the Aetolians to Philip’s offer is phrased as a geography lesson for the Senate. The presentation emphasized Philip’s possession of Chalcis in Euboea, Corinth in Achaea and Demetrias in Thessaly. In a show of contempt for the Greeks, Philip called these “the three fetters”. The presentation

---

68 Livy 32.37.2 : *Moverunt eo maxime senatum demonstrando maris terrarum regionis eius situm*…
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of the Aetolians was effective in moving the Senate to ask the Macedonian envoys about these cities. When they were unable to respond, the Senate granted full power of war to Flamininus.69

The three fetters would become the basis of Roman policy in Greece, from the slow withdrawal of the Roman garrison in Demetrias (in 194, three years after Cynoscephalae) to the uprising of Andriscus, the sacking of Corinth, and the integration of Thessaly into the Roman province of Macedonia. Livy presents the three fetters as the pivot on which Rome’s foreign policy turned. Demetrias, here acknowledged as in Thessaly, would soon be in Magnesia, the Perioecis liberated and organized by Flamininus, along with Thessaly itself. Yet here, when the Aetolians speak before the Senate about the Fetters, Livy is true to his narrative. Demetrias is in Thessaly since Magnesia for him does not yet exist. It will be created in time as reckoned by the annals, the selection of Roman consuls. Here is clear evidence of an “imagined community” in Roman imperialism.

The Roman acceptance of the importance of the fetters shows the Roman recreation of Greek geography as bondage. This metaphor shows the incongruity of the later loud celebrations of Greek liberation. Even as Flamininus withdraws the Roman garrisons, the narrative is still guided by Roman considerations for the status of the fetters. In this geographic scheme, Thessaly plays a central role since it is the central fetter.

69 Livy 32.37, Polybius 18.11-12. At 38.3, when discussing Andriscus, Polybius refers to the three fetters as the basis of Philip’s slavery of Greece.
Yet in spite of enlisting avid Roman interest and support by the metaphor of the fetters, Livy shows the Aetolians frustrated in their territorial ambitions after Cynoscephalae. Their argument for the significance of Thessaly would guide Roman policy, but ultimately would make Rome an enemy rather than an ally. This is dramatically shown in the conference at Tempe, where Philip trusted himself to firm Thessalian soil even in defeat. The Aetolians argued for the removal of Philip from his throne. Furthermore, they angered Flamininus by their claims for territories in Thessaly: Larisa Cremiste, Pharsalus, Echinus and Phthian Thebes. But only the latter city would become an Aetolian domain. Flamininus argues that the rest had surrendered themselves willingly to Rome, and was therefore hers to dispose of as she wished.\footnote{Livy 33.12-13, Polybius 18.36-38.} The treaty is concluded; Thessaly’s occupation is resolved as the first Roman arbitration in Greek affairs. The Thessalians are still absent.

In fact, Thessaly is soon to be (re)created, as is Greece itself. The declaration of the Isthmian Games established Rome as the keeper of Greek freedom. Lest there be any confusion about who had been granted freedom, the Greek citizenships freed from Philip’s control were carefully listed. Livy says that the Greeks in disbelief asked for the herald to read the declaration again. The names of the communities would be easily drowned out by the shouts of the people. Certainly the noise around the herald continued as he read his list, as each citizen reacted to the naming of his native land, not only as free in Roman eyes, but also as part of Hellas. The noise would drown out the end of the list.
The last four named are the Magnesians, the Thessalians, the Perrhaebi and the Phthian Achaeans. The Perioeci had been acknowledged as separate and independent of Thessaly. One can imagine the disappointment of the Dolopians, who were absent from Roman recognition.  

Despite the freedom of Thessaly and the Roman recognition of Magnesia as a free state, the fetter Demetrias in Magnesia, no longer in Thessaly, remained the home of a Roman garrison for two years following the declaration. There was much work here, as a state was hastily organized. For after the Isthmian games Flamininus and his agents were busy in the organization of Thessaly, which had now become four rather than one, the last named to freedom and the last to realize it, in at least a basic form both concrete and symbolic: the withdrawal of foreign troops (now Roman rather than Macedonian).

This demilitarization of Thessaly was brief. Livy tells us the Aetolians will next bring Antiochus to Thessaly to search for the bones of Cynoscephalae and later, a wife in Chalcis. Yet to the Thessalian, the interest in who held the fetters was only nominal, at best. As Gruen writes

> Most vulnerable of all were the Thessalians. Much of the fighting would take place on their territory regardless of which side they chose...It underlines the nature of the war to the Thessalians: whichever side won, they stood to lose.

---

71 Livy 33.32, Polybius 18.46.
The statement could be applied not only to this conflict, but also to the history of Thessaly from the second Macedonian war to the defeat of Pompey. Oddly, the instability of Thessaly led to the downfall of many who sought to establish their imperium on her plains. Pharsalus was already notable to Aristotle for the size of crows that feasted on bones strewn across the fields after battles.\textsuperscript{73} The birds were a portent for the native and the invader. It is to the perspective of Thessaly as cemetery that I now turn.

**The Bones of Cynoscephalae**

Livy depicts Thessaly as destabilized at the arrival of Roman troops in the second Macedonian War (198 B.C). It had already been the battleground of three armies, as the Athamanians and Aetolians had already arrived to dislodge the Macedonian garrisons. “Thessaly, laid waste by three armies at the same time, was uncertain who to regard as an enemy or ally,” Livy writes. It is at this point the Roman consul arrives with his forces, fresh from victory over Philip V in Epirus (32.14.4-5).\textsuperscript{74} The Roman arrival has the appearance of a rescue mission, and the consul quickly defeats a Macedonian garrison at Phaloria. Yet the Roman dominance in the region would seem to be merely more of the same: “Phaloria was burned and sacked”, Livy writes.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{73} Aristotle *Historia Animalium* 9.31 (618b), Pliny *NH* 10.33.

\textsuperscript{74} *Dum Athamanes Aetolique submoto Macedonum metu in aliena victoria suam praedam faciunt Thessaliaque ab tribus simul exercitibus incerta quem hostem quemque socium crederet vastatur, consul faucibus quas fuga hostium aperverat in regionem Epiri transgressus.*

\textsuperscript{75} *Phaloria incensa ac direpta est* (32.15).
The Roman movement through Thessaly was abrupt and quick, and soon they had engaged Philip for the fateful battle of Cynoscephalae (197 B.C.). The place of Cynoscephalae is the most marked difference in the accounts of Polybius and Livy. In Polybius the battle gives a suitable occasion to describe the remarkable Roman victory over the Greek phalanx. His narrative is oriented towards the past- the decline of Macedon as shown by the methods used to defeat its supreme military techniques. Livy’s account lacks any similar analysis of the “Greek” phalanx and Rome’s ability to defeat it. Instead he focuses the implication of the narrative event for the discontent of the Aetolian allies that would lead the next series of Roman conflicts in Greece. It is important to note in passing that Livy’s annalistic method does not level the significance of all narrative but often emphasizes certain events insofar as they impact or explain a subsequent incident significant for Rome. That is, events become significant if they show the unfolding of Roman imperium. Livy will not give an in depth discussion of the defeat of the phalanx here for the conquest is not total. Livy reserves this account for the battle of Pydna, which eliminated the Macedonian empire and reduced the phalanx to a relic ready to be cataloged as evidence of Roman superiority.

Indeed, there is better evidence in the ancient Greek testimony for the impact of the Macedonian defeat rather than the significance of the Roman victory at Cynoscephalae. Appian, a Roman Greek of the imperial era, preserves


---

76 See Luce (1977) 215 for a comparison of the two narratives.
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Greek sentiment at Philip’s defeat. These authors appeal to the portentous quality of the act by citing the Sibyl’s verses. For such a calamity surely was foreseen:

Macedonian kings boasting Argive blood,
Philip lords over your good and your woe.
One shall give kings to cities and peoples;
While the other, a destructive man destroys
All your honor, subdued by western men.\textsuperscript{77}

The loss of the honor of Macedonia at the hands of a foreign power is emphasized in the epigram. Indeed, part of the reason for the loss of Macedon’s honor seems to be the identity of the conqueror. It is a view of Roman alterity through Greek eyes. Livy’s neglect of this oracle is not due to his objective standards nor his distaste for linking divine machinery to Philip’s fortunes. He is quite willing to do the latter in book 40, as we shall see. There portents and divine machinery mark the approaching end of Macedonian royalty.

Whereas Livy decides to mark the aftermath of the battle as the starting point of Aetolian discontent, and therefore the starting point for a continuation of war with unstable easterners, other authors marked it out as the place of the unburied dead, and therefore a haunting presence for some Greek authors. This is shown in the epigram of Alcaeus, a piece sympathetic to Aetolian resentments and ambitions:

Naked and tombless see, O passer-by,
The thirty thousand men of Thessaly,
Slain by the Aetolians and the Latin band,

\textsuperscript{77} Appian 9.2.
That came with Titus from Italia’s land;  
Alas for mighty Macedon! That day,  
Swift as a roe, King Philip fled away.\(^7\)

The epigram tells us they are Thessalians. No mention is made of Macedonians. A direct appeal is made to the Thessalians by a naming of their ethnicity, while at the same time blame is placed on their commander, Philip. The Thessalian claim to its name is placed between the claims of Aetolians, Latins and King Philip. Plutarch perhaps should characterize the epigram as pro-Thessalian rather than pro-Aetolian. Moreover, the anti-Macedonian tone of the poem is clear. The abandoned state of the Thessalian dead at its first line contrasts strongly to the swiftness of Philip’s escape (abandonment) at its conclusion. Thessalian nationalism here is shown as resentment - the effect of the bones of Cynoscephalae.

Although the number of thirty thousand Thessalians is staggering and surely inflated, a strong Thessalian presence among Philip’s forces may be safely assumed. Thessalian cavalry had been used successfully by the Macedonian crown since the time of Alexander of Great. This Macedonian annexation of Thessalian knights in fact represents the final Macedonian pacification of Thessaly. Plutarch tells us that Bucephalas, Alexander’s horse, was Thessalian. The young man’s ability to tame the wild horse was an omen for his father of his future greatness. Certainly the taming of Thessaly and the

\(^7\) Plutarch Flam. 9. The translation is by Dryden. Philip responded to Alcaeus with a verse of his own:

Naked and leafless see, O passer-by,  
The cross that shall Alcaeus crucify.
exploitation of its cavalry was not inconsequential to Alexander’s conquests.\textsuperscript{79} Thessaly was a land known for its horse raising and training. Thessalians would not take such a massive defeat of their cavalry at the hands of westerners lightly. Blame was placed on the collapse of Philip’s phalanx, and perhaps some even wished for a new opportunity to prove the valor of Thessalian knights. The sun-bleached bones only increased Thessalian resentment and served as a potential catalyst for Thessalian opposition towards her many masters (Aetolian, Macedonian and Roman).

These sentiments from the Greek side can serve as a counterpoint to Livy’s account, since Livy develops the following obscure postscript to Cynoscephalae in some detail. The event occurred in 191, six years after the battle. Philip of Megalopolis was sent with 2000 men to build a mound for the deposition of the bones. The use of a mound is the traditional form of burial for such an occasion.\textsuperscript{80} The response of the Thessalians was ambivalent, but the response of Philip V was an alliance with Rome against Antiochus. This outcome is the reason for Livy’s narration of the event.

King Philip’s anger at Antiochus’ expedition was increased by the pretensions of the man who led it. Philip of Megalopolis traced his lineage back to Alexander the Great. When his sister Apamea married Amynander, king of Athamania, Philip received the favorable attention of the king. It was in

\textsuperscript{79} See Westlake (1969) 222-228, for a summary of the participation of Thessalian knights in Alexander’s eastern campaign.

\textsuperscript{80} Briscoe (1981) \textit{apud} Livy 33.11.
Athamania that Philip was said to have first raised his claim to the Macedonian throne. Far from discouraging the pretender, Amynander even granted him command of the island Zacynthos, which had been given to Amynander by Philip of Macedon in return for allowing his troops safe passage through Athamanian territories during the Second Macedonian War. Interestingly enough, Zacynthos would later become the first Roman possession in Greece.81

Amynander recalled Philip from the island in order for his brother-in-law to test his royal ambitions in Thessaly. Philip accepted the commission, hoping to move from grave digging to the throne. Livy’s narrative is unsympathetic:

He (Antiochus) sent Philip of Megalopolis with two thousand men to gather the bones of the Macedonians around Cynoscephalae, the site of the battle with Philip. He did this because he desired praise among the Macedonians and he knew of the malice felt toward the king on account of the unburied dead, or perhaps he did this because of the inbred vanity of royalty for following a plan with full but empty feeling. A mound was heaped up from the strewn bones, an action which caused no gratitude among the Macedonians, but huge hatred towards Philip (36.8.3-5).

The burial at Cynoscephalae is shown as an act of royal foolishness, rather than the legitimate granting of last rites. Certainly this quality of the act is created by the involvement of Antiochus, a clear adversary of Roman policy in Greece. However, by linking the burial to the fraudulent claims of Philip of Megalopolis, Livy is able to perceive the folly of kings everywhere. Meanwhile, the identity of the dead is changed to Macedonian, an error that clouds the intentions of Philip’s action and its ramifications for Macedonian and Roman policy in Thessaly. The appeal of the memorial is addressed to Thessalians, rather than Macedonians.

81 Philip of Megalopolis’ bloodline: 35.47. Zacynthos: 36.31-32.
Philip’s action seeks to establish a base for his pretensions in Thessaly. Since Rome prevented the Macedonians from asserting claims in Thessaly, another Macedonian claim arose from the Aetolian heartland, seeking possession of the region through the patriot gesture of burying its neglected dead. This is shown in the conference of Antiochus at Pherae with the Thessalian envoys from nearby Larisa. When asked of his intentions, he said that he entered Thessaly not with the purpose of making war but in order to protect and preserve its liberty. Antiochus here mimics the earlier Roman philanthropy. The Thessalians decide to resist the new royal claimant. Pherae is conquered by Antiochus but its people receive gentle treatment from him. Antiochus and Philip of Megalopolis are only the most recent to claim Thessaly for themselves under the guise of civic action and philanthropy. Their claim is an appeal to the ethnic identity of Thessaly, although Livy chose to understand it as an appeal to the Macedonians.

This funerary expedition represents the acme in the career of Philip of Megalopolis. Antiochus assigns him the garrison of Pellinaeum with 500 infantry. Surrounded by Roman and Macedonian forces, he refused to surrender to Philip of Macedon, although he agreed to surrender to Romans or Thessalians. In a concession to his royal ally’s feelings, the consul Baebius refuses the right of the suppliant pretender to make his own terms for surrender. The city is taken. Philip of Megalopolis is captured alive. Philip of Macedon greeted him as brother

82 Livy 36.9.
as he was led away to Rome in chains. The scene is telling. The king is given an opportunity to insult his rival, but the final punishment belongs to Rome. Philip of Megalopolis begins as an enemy of the Macedonian order in his bastard lineage, but ends as an enemy of the Roman order through his territorial ambitions in Thessaly.

It is not difficult to see Philip of Megalopolis as the avatar of future pretenders to the Macedonian throne who became Roman enemies by their claims in Thessaly. Although there were many such claimants after the Third Macedonian War, the most notable was Andriscus of Adramyttion. This pretender was able to capture Macedonia using only his presumed bastard royal lineage and his daimonblabeia (psycho-babble), in the words of Polybius. After he had scarcely legitimized his claims to the throne through his control of Macedonia, he turned aggressively towards Thessaly, which brought direct Roman action. Like the defeat of his predecessor Philip of Megalopolis, his royal aspirations show the vanity of all royalty in Livy’s text.

The pretensions of Andriscus in Thessaly, like those of Philip of Megalopolis before him, led to direct Roman military action in Greece. The actions of the pretenders concern Macedonian definitions of Thessaly, whose territories and politics Roman consuls had sought to create and control.

---

83 Livy 36.13-14.
84 Polybius 36.17.15.
85 Scafuro (1987) 281 notes that the vanitas of Philip of Megalopolis and Antiochus in Cynoscephalae echo that of Philip V in book 35.
Although Livy’s Romans often contested the definition of Thessaly as a Macedonian territory, it would later be integrated into her empire as a part of the Roman province of Macedonia.

*Inquietum Ingenium: The National Character of Roman Thessaly*

Livy tells us that before and after the withdrawal of Roman garrisons, indeed up until the very time of his departure, Flamininus was involved with Thessalian affairs. Livy writes

> In that same year (194) T. Quinctius (Flamininus) passed his time at Elatia, where he had brought his troops for winter quarters. For the entire winter he passed laws and changed things which had been done among the states by the license of Philip or his commanders, since they had deprived the rights and liberty of some while increasing the strength of their own faction.\(^8^6\)

“What Flamininus was in fact doing was restoring power to the upper classes,” Briscoe notes.\(^8^7\) Much of this state reorganization was occurring in Thessaly, as Livy later makes clear. These constructions of Thessalian communities, shaped by Flamininus in the image of Roman social structure, would receive the title of free states (*civitates*). The headquarters of the operations in Elatia, south of Thessaly, indicates Flamininus’ prudent decision to not stir populist tensions by the appearance of Roman troops. In fact, here in Thessaly Rome would assert its interests through the local aristocrats. The Roman categories of Senate and the property census would become the basis of Thessalian government.

\(^{86}\) Livy 34.48.2: *Eodem hoc anno T. Quinctius Elatiae, quo in hiberna reduxerat copias, totum hiemis tempus iure dicundo consumpsit mutandisque iis quae aut ipsius Philippi aut praefectorum eius licentia in civitatibus facta erant, cum suae factionis hominum vires augendo ius ac libertatem aliorum deprimerent.*

\(^{87}\) Briscoe (1981) *apud* 34.48.2.
Before the removal of Roman garrisons from the three fetters, Flamininus called a meeting of Greeks at Corinth. There he revealed his intent to bring the troops home in order to show whether it was the custom for the Romans or Aetolians to tell lies, since the Aetolians kept saying that the liberty had been maliciously granted by the Roman people and they had simply changed masters, Romans instead of Macedonians. Flamininus thereby announced the removal of Roman garrisons from Demetrias and Chalcis and that very day from Acrocorinth, before their very eyes. First he instructed the Greeks in the privileges and responsibilities of their new status. They must prove to Rome that they deserve the freedom she has won for them.88 The Greek ambassadors greeted Flamininus’ speech as the word of a parent and an oracle, and called him a savior and liberator.89 Flamininus had begun his tour of the fetters, publicly releasing the Roman garrisons which bound them. After Chalcis he went to Demetrias, then lingered in Thessaly where he awaited the arrival of Romans, liberated or bought from slavery, to exhibit in his triumph.90

88 Livy 34.49.6: Ut omnes scirent utrum Romanis an Aetolis mentiri mos esset, qui male commissam libertatem populo Romano sermonibus distulerint et mutatos pro Macedonibus Romanos dominos. Flamininus’ paternalistic speech follows at 34.49.7-11.

89 Livy 32.50.1-2: Has velut parentis voces cum audirent, manare omnibus gaudio lacrimae, adeo ut ipsum quoque confunderent dicentem. Paulisper fremitus adprobantium dicta fuit monentiumque aliorum aios ut eas voces velut oraculo missas in pectora animosque demitterent. 34.50.9: Imperator secutus prosequentibus cunctis, servatorem liberatoremque acclamantium. On Flamininus as sotera kai eleutheroten see Briscoe on this passage. Walbank regarded the title as Polybian (Commentary ii.613). Weinstock (143) saw the title as the work of Livy or the later Roman tradition. Briscoe (1981) notes that the Roman people is the liberator at 35.17.9.

90 34.50.3-7: Flamininus makes his request to the assembled Greek envoys to gather the Roman slaves, many who had been prisoners in the Second Punic war. At 34.52.12 they are the final objects mentioned in the triumph; Praebuerunt speciem triumpho capitibus rasis seculi qui servitute exempti fuerant.
Yet the delay in Thessaly was caused by more than the gathering of liberated Romans and the hording of loot for Triumph; Livy takes the occasion of Flamininus' trip to Thessaly in 194 as a setting to instruct his readers on the region's national character.

He set out to go to Thessaly, where the states had to not only be liberated, but restored from every kind of impurity and disorder into some tolerable form. These men were disturbed not only by the vices of the time and the violence and license of royalty, but also by the restless temperament of the people. From the beginning to our own time they have taken no part in public elections, assemblies, nor any public deliberation because of the threat of sedition and riot. After a census he chose a Senate and judges. He made more powerful those who would benefit from secure and tranquil circumstances.91

Livy describes social disorganization as inherited, a regional heritage of the Thessalian people. It is significant that Thessaly is not a populus but a gens, a clear reference to the ethnos structure of Thessaly. This term has been developed by historians to describe a social structure that is more focused on family and tribal relationships in a loose confederacy that shared festivals, mythology and even leadership at times of crisis.92 This is often contrasted to the legislative organization of the polis, which governed through assembly. Some might appreciate Livy here for his astute observation of Thessalian politics. Yet here again the Thessalians are missing. This vision of the Thessalians is a relic of their ancestors from a time before the domination of the powerful aristocracies

91 Livy 34.51.5-6 : *Nec enim temporum modo vitii ac violentia et licentia regia turbati erant sed inquieto etiam ingenio gentis nec comitia nec conventum nec concilium ullum non per seditionem ac tumultum iam inde a principio ad nostram usque aetatem traducentis. A censu maxime et senatum et iudices legit potentioremque eam partem civitatum fecit cui salva et tranquilla omnis esse magis expediebat.*

92 See for instance Snodgrass (1980) 42-44.
that gave the Thessalian economy a feudal rather than tribal character. Thessaly itself had been divided since the death of Jason of Pherae and subject to generations of civil war before the annexation of Philip II and Alexander. Livy shrewdly joins *gens* and *ingenium*, two words highly charged in Roman rhetoric, to *inquietum*, and speaks of the restless temperament of the ethnos. Livy uses words charged with Roman values, hopelessly subverted in Thessaly. In doing so he provides an image of social disorder as a national custom.

The form of the current chaos in Thessaly was intolerable— but for whom? Certainly for Rome and Flamininus, whose goal now was to display his liberation of Greece. This area of Greece seemed to lack the political etiquette that characterized the embassies and assemblies. Therefore, Flamininus must reorganize the Thessalian state before he liberates it. This is difficult since they lack the three forms of government known to Romans—public assembly presided over by magistrates (*comitia*), a senate (*conventum*), and a tribunal (*ullum concilium*). Their nature leads to riot, as surely as Roman *ingenium* is shown in its institutions that provide stability. The reorganization therefore proceeds from Roman social organization. Thessaly is Romanized. It is colonized by a mirror.

Flamininus bases his reorganization of Thessaly on a census, the very basis for the Roman assemblies and their voting procedures, as well as the organization of the Roman army. Flamininus’ establishment of government on the basis of a census is an instinctive Roman move. Not only does it mirror

---

93 The wealth of the Thessalian noble was proverbial. See Plato *Meno* 70a, Isocrates 8.117.
Roman institutions, it also serves to justify the rule of the wealthy, those who have the most to gain from stability and tranquility (under the new Roman order of liberated Greece).

Roman imperialism has here appropriated the old stereotypes of Thessaly, bastard region of the north, uncouth and uncultured. Thessaly was geographically and culturally removed from the social currents south of Thermopylae. Westlake writes

Thessaly never became completely Hellenized and was regarded rather as a bulwark against the barbarian north than as a genuine and fully privileged member of the Hellenic world.  

Thessaly remained in a state of *stasis* characterized by foreign involvement in internal conflicts. The inability of the region to assert itself against foreign occupation by Persian, Macedonian, and the Greeks south of Thermopylae led to its stabilization and definition in the Roman order (both in liberated Greece and the Roman province of Macedonia). By making Thessalian social disorder primordial, Livy also recreates it as continual, and thus makes rational the Thessalian haunting of Roman historicism by grounding it in national character.

“*Not a Discussion, but an Argument*”: Speech and Freedom in Thessaly

Communication was not always simple among the Romans and Thessalians. Romans betray an ambivalence towards Greeks and their speech,
which is reflected in their dealings with the Thessalians. “The Greeks are a race more active in speech than deeds”, Livy writes.  

Speech plays a key role in the Roman reaction to populist uprisings that threatened Roman interests. Roman partisans in Thessaly and the Perioeci were expected to publicly support Roman interests in return for their selection for leadership in the native government and assemblies created by Rome. Through the actions of the Roman partisans Rome could know and control the terms of debate. This system of Roman control failed miserably in Demetrias in 192, two years after the withdrawal of the Roman garrison.

Magnesia became a point of strategic interest in the Roman war against Antiochus and the Aetolians. This was mainly due to Demetrias, the central fetter of Greece, formerly considered part of Thessaly, and the major urban center of Roman Magnesia. Although Magnesia had been listed as liberated at the end of the Isthmian declaration, many Magnesians felt themselves threatened by Philip V, especially after his alliance with Rome. The Macedonians claimed Demetrias as part of the Macedonian kingdom, since it had been founded by Demetrius Poliorcetes in 293. Fears of its return to Philip were expressed by a faction of Magnesian leaders already alienated from Rome and considered by Livy to be agents of Antiochus and Aetolians. They were led by Eurylochus, the Magnetarch (the constitutional head of Roman Magnesia, probably modeled on the Thessalian tagus).  

---

95 8.22.8: A Graecis, gente lingua magis strenua quam factis.
Shortly before the war with Antiochus and the Aetolians, Roman ambassadors, led by Flamininus, visited Athens, Chalcis, Thessaly and Magnesia to enlist their support. In Magnesia a gathering was declared to hear the ambassadors. After the Roman reminder \((illa \, commemorata)\) of its gift of freedom to all of Greece, and especially Magnesia, the Roman ambassadors cautioned the Magnesians against accepting a new and unknown king, Antiochus. Livy notes that the Romans were cautious not to anger Philip by their words, since he indeed hoped that Demetrias would soon be restored to him.\(^{97}\)

Already Roman rhetoric has departed from its ideal description by Cato the elder:

> The utterances of Greeks come from their lips,  
> But those of Romans are from the heart.\(^{98}\)

This Roman commemoration of benefits was answered by Eurylochus:

> They called forth the Magnetarch, the supreme magistrate. That was then Eurylochus. Trusting in the power of his office, he denied that he and the Magnesians lied; there was a common rumor about the return of Demetrias to Philip. Magnesians had to dare to try all things so that this didn’t happen. And carried away by the force of his diatribe, he charged that Demetrias was free only in appearance, while in truth all things happened by the nod of the Romans. At these words there was a roar from the diverse multitude, some agreeing and some saying that he dared to speak shamefully. Quinctius was enraged with such anger that he held his hands to the sky, invoking the gods as witnesses to the

---

96 Livy 35.31.4-6: \(Eo \, Magnetum \, concilium \, indictum \, est. \, Accuratior \, ibi \, habenda \, oratio \, fuit, \, quod \, pars \, principum \, alienati \, Romanis \, toti \, Antiochi \, et \, Aetolorum \, erant, \, quia \, cum \, reddi \, obsidem \, filium \, Philipo \, allatum \, esset \, stipendiumque \, impositum \, remitti, \, inter \, cetera \, vana \, allatum \, erat \) \(Demetriadem \, quoque \, ei \, reddituros \, Romanos \, esse. \) \(Id \, \, ne \, \, fieret, \, Eurylochus \, princeps \, \, Magnetum \, factionisque \, eius \, quidam \, omnia \, novari \, Aetolorum \, Antiochique \, adventu \, malebant. \, Here \, novari \, carries \, the \, technical \, sense \, of \, making \, a \, revolution.\)

97 35.31.7: \(Adversus \, eos \, ita \, disserendum \, erat \, ne \, \, timorem \, vanum \, iis \, \, demendo \, spes \, incisa \) \(Philippum \, abalieneret, \, in \, quo \, plus \, \, ad \, omnia \, momenti \, quam \, in \, Magnetibus \, esset.\)

98 Plutarch Cato 12.5. It is ironic that this saying should come to us in Greek in an elegant \(men/de\) construction.
treachery and lack of gratitude of the Magnesians. All were terrified by his words. Then Zeno, alone of the leaders, a man of great authority on account of his elegantly lived life and his unswaying support of the Romans, in tears begged the Romans not to allow the madness of one man to seal the state’s fate. Each man ranted and raved at his own risk. The Magnesians owed the Romans and T. Quinctius Flamininus not only liberty but all the things sacred and dear to men. Magnesians were unable to ask the gods for anything that they did not have from the Romans, and they would more swiftly attack their own body than violate their Roman friendship.

Although Eurylochus seems to be a rebel, he like Zeno must accept the terms that the Romans have given to Magnesia. Both men acknowledge the risk of the situation, both acknowledge the supremacy of Rome in Magnesia and both owe their political power to Rome (for the power of the office of Magnetarch itself was created by the Roman recognition of Magnesia). As far as Flamininus is concerned, the Magnetarch Eurylochus has broken the rules of the game. He addresses the people rather than the Romans. He trusts in the power of an office created by Rome, only to criticize Rome in public. As an official of Roman Magnesia he shows ingratitude, for Rome created his political office. He has broken the oath of fidelity to Rome that Magnesia has taken while existing separate of Macedonia and Thessaly. All of this is contained in Flamininus’ oath. The appeal to the gods is a clear warning of war. Zeno, as a man of culture, is aware of the danger of angering the Romans and allowing them to leave. Zeno therefore obeys the rules. He addresses the Romans, not the crowd. He blames the boldness of Eurylochus on madness. He acknowledges the benefits he has
received from Rome, as an elegant Roman partisan. The rejection of Rome would be suicide for Magnesia, for the civitas owed its creation to Rome.99

Magnesia chooses the cleverness of Zeno over the boldness of Eurylochus. By choosing elegance and flattery over active independence, the Magnesians already resemble Cato’s Greeks, and therefore fit their proper role in the Roman order. They show they deserve the “freedom” Rome has granted them. Eurylochus, no longer trusting in his magistracy, or perhaps understanding its true nature, flees to the Aetolians. He then becomes adept at political theater, a prerequisite for the classical demagogue. His fellow partisans back in Demetrias exhibited his wife and child in poverty and mourning, the widow and orphan of state. Soon he is recalled to Magnesia. He stages a coup with Aetolian assistance, murdering the Roman partisans. “And so Demetrias belonged to the Aetolians, “ Livy writes.100 One is uncertain whether to call this a civil war or an insurrection.

Flamininus seems to have shared this attitude, for he sought to reopen Roman communication with Demetrias.

Flamininus setting off rushed to Demetrias, since he judged that since Chalcis had been freed it would be a suitable time for the Magnesians to consider regaining Roman friendship, and so that the garrison would consist of men from the region he wrote to the Praetor of the Thessalians, Eunomos, instructing him to arm the youth.101

99 Scafuro (1987) 280 believes that the suicide of Eurylochus at 36.33.6 echoes Zeno’s oath. However, one must also remember that throughout Livy’s fourth decade suicide is a frequent response by those who fear capture by Philip V.

100 The conference at Demetrias in 192 and Eurylochus’ coup:34.35.
We may assume the Thessalian praetor to be the *tagus*, head of the Thessalian league. Its “liberty” is here displayed in the ability of Romans to raise its armies to mobilize in special liberated zones, such as the fetters released from Aetolian occupation (Chalcis) or anti-Roman partisans (Demetrias). Flamininus expects the Magnesians to act out of expediency. By bringing in the Thessalians as an occupying power, Flamininus calms their fears of a Macedonian or Roman garrison, while he strengthens his support in Thessaly, by cultivating their connection to land commonly thought to be Thessalian. By all accounts, Flamininus saw a Thessalian army bringing greater stability to the region (although Eurylochus and his separatist partisans would probably scorn it still as a tool of the Thessalian oligarchy and Rome). This plan for the new order would quickly change to a Macedonian occupation, granted by Rome, as punishment of the Magnesians for rejecting Rome’s offer for peace. Here is how it happened.

Livy tells us:

And he sent on <Vilius> to Demetrias in order to test their feelings, to try the matter to see if some part of the people was inclined to respect the previous friendship. Vilius was carried on a quinquireme into the mouth of the harbor. When the entire multitude of the Magnesians came pouring forth there, Vilius asked whether they preferred to come to friends or enemies. Eurylochus, the Magnetarch, answered that Vilius had come to friends but that he should stay away from the harbor and allow the Magnesians to be in harmony and liberty nor should he agitate the multitude by the mere appearance of a dialogue. Then there was an argument, not a discussion, since the Roman shouted that the Magnesians were

101 34.39.3-4: *Quinctius quo profectus erat Demetriadem contendit, ratus Chalcidem liberatam momentnti aliquid apud Magnetas ad repetendam societatem Romanam facturam, et ut praesidii aliquid esset suae partis hominibus, Eunomo praetori Thessalorum scripset ut armaret iuventutem.*
ungrateful and he predicated their imminent destruction, while the multitude yelled abusing the Senate and Flamininus. And so since he saw the undertaking was in vain, Vilius went back to Flamininus. Then, after he had sent a messenger to the praetor <of the Thessalians> instructing him to take his troops back home, Flamininus returned by boat to Corinth.\textsuperscript{102}

The \textit{multitudo} is a disruptive and destructive force in Livy's narrative, and is often used to describe a crowd uncontained by the presence of a magistrate. Yet Eurylochus is present, yet at this point his authority is no longer acknowledged by Flamininus (nor Livy). Vilius makes his voyage to the harbor of Demetrias in order to be present to the \textit{multitudo} as a lawful magistrate. Whereas before Eurylochus broke protocol by addressing the \textit{multitudo}, Vilius wishes to do the same, on Flamininus’ orders. Yet this attempt is denied by Eurylochus, who still bears his constitutional title of Magnetarch, despite his recent history as demagogue and tyrant. Here however the title conveys his separatist motivations rather than his adherence to Roman Magnesia. Eurylochus is accurate in calling on Vilius to grant true \textit{libertas} to the Magnesians, but his liberty is already lost by the mere act of submitting the request and the Roman approved title of Magnetarch. The Roman occupation has created the terms and expectations for the encounter.

\textsuperscript{102} 35.39.4-8: \textit{Et <Vilium> ad Demetriadem praemisit ad temptandos animos, non aliter nisi pars aliqua inclinaret ad respectum pristinae societatis rem adgressus. Vilius quinqueremi nave ad ostium portus est in vectus. Eo \textit{multitudo} Magnetum omnis cum se effudisset, quaesivit Vilius utrum ad amicos an ad hostes venisse se mallent. Respondit Magnetarches Eurylochus ad amicos venisse eum, sed abstineret portu et sineret Magnetas in concordia et libertate esse nec per conloquii speciem multitudinem sollicaret. Altercatio inde non sermo fuit, cum romanus ut ingratos increperet Magnetas imminentesque praediceret clades, \textit{multitudo} ostreperet nunc senatum nunc Quinctium accusando. \textit{Ita inrito incepto Vilius ad Quinctium sese recipit. At Quinctius nuntio ad praetorem misso ut reduceret domum copias, ipse navibus reddid.}
For Eurylochus, dialogue with Vilius, like the freedom of Magnesia under the Roman order, is illusory for him. The refusal of dialogue accompanies the denial of Magnesian soil to Vilius. With this rejection of imperium, the terms of Roman hegemony are effectively severed. Altercatio inde non sermo fuit. Although the defiance of Eurylochus would lead to the Macedonian occupation he feared, he has verified his view of the Roman order in a way Livy cannot conceal. This is revealed by the absurdity of his position. Although a constitutional official, he has become a tyrant. By asserting national sovereignty he has become a rebel. By questioning Roman power in Magnesia he verifies it. By rejecting Macedonian and Thessalian annexations of Demetrias, he confronts the power of Rome directly and allows us to hear in Livy, for a moment, the vox deterioris as the shout of the condemned. Eurylochus will later kill himself at the threatening approach of Philip V, now an ally of Rome in the war against Antiochus.¹⁰³

Yet in some way, this tale presents the crisis of language for the Thessalians and Romans. For the Roman liberation of independent Thessalian communities to be successful, the lines of communication with Rome had to be open by an open acceptance of the Roman perspectives on “liberty” and “freedom”, as well as political legitimacy. Eurylochus displays not only the limits of independence, but also the limits of communication with Rome. Vilius required access. Eurylochus errs when he believes the forms of government are what marks legitimacy for the Romans, for they were in fact most concerned with

¹⁰³ 36.33.6.
access to decision-making, and that occurred most often through the assemblies. There the separatist urge was already calmed by its setting in a circle of broader regional interests, creating the détente or balance of powers so highly prized by Republican Rome. The assemblies were also important in fixing the terms of communication, thus eliminating the unruly consequences of Eurylochus’ appeal to the multitude.

Unable to break from the new Roman order nor to properly adapt to it, Thessaly was subject to dissection and marginalization by Rome and Macedon. As a reward for his service of Rome in the war against Antiochus and the Aetolians, Philip was awarded insurgent Thessalian towns, such as Demetrias. Territories occupied by Philip in Thessaly, Perrhaebia and Athamania soon sent ambassadors to seek Roman arbitration. A new conference was set at Tempe, an unpleasant reminder to Philip of his submission to the Romans. This meeting led to a second Roman liberation of Thessaly and the alienation of Philip, the true causes for Livy of the Third Macedonian War.¹⁰⁴

The original dispute had been the Thessalian claim to several cities granted to Philip after the defeat of the Aetolians-Philippolis, Tricca, Phraesia, and Eurymene among others. The ambassadors also disputed the Roman grant to the Macedonian kingdom of other cities in Perrhaebia and Magnesia that had supported the Aetolians. The Thessalian ambassadors complained of Philip’s

¹⁰⁴ Livy 39.23-29.
violent attempts to prevent their appeal to the Romans, “the originators of liberty” 
(libertatis auctores). By preventing the exercise of free speech, Philip had 
robbed them of all their liberty.¹⁰⁵

Livy tells us that Philip responded angrily to these accusations, and 
accused the Thessalians in turn of taking the Dolopian town Menelais as well as 
Petra in the Pieria, as well as their annexation of the Aetolian town Xyniae as 
well as Athamanian Parachelois. Although Livy views this as a rhetorical attack 
on the Thessalians, whom he presents as Philip’s main adversary, it is in fact 
also a direct questioning of the Roman definition of Thessaly and its environs. It 
eventually leads to a diatribe against the national character of Thessaly that 
defines them as slaves:

Insolently and excessively the Thessalians abused the indulgence 
of the Roman people, just as men after a long thirst draining pure 
liberty immoderately. And so, in the manner of slaves who have 
been released unexpectedly, they tried out their license of voice 
and tongue, by arrogantly quarreling and insulting their masters.¹⁰⁶

One may note that Philip does not say previous masters. Philip uses dominos in 
the sense of a social superior who must be obeyed by the deteriores. The social 
inferior therefore retains their servile status even after manumission. The proof 
of this is in their language. By the Thessalian use of language, familiar to 
Romans through their many embassies before the Senate, they show that they

¹⁰⁵ Livy 39.25.11: Procul enim abesse libertatis auctores Romanos, lateri adhaerere gravem 
dominum prohibentem uti beneficiis populi Romani. Quid autem, si vox libera non sit, liberum sit?

¹⁰⁶ Livy 39.26.7-8: Insolenter et immodice abuti Thessalos indulgentia populi Romani, velut ex 
diutina siti nimirum avida meram haurientes libertatem; itaque servorum modo praeter spem 
repente manumissorum licentiam vocis et linguæ experiri, et iactare sese insectatione et 
conviciis dominorum.
are slaves, not a free people, in their very nature (their implicit *inquietum ingenium*). It can be heard in their very voice.

A similar derogatory observation on Thessalian communications is also spoken by Hannibal, the exemplar of anti-Romanism for Livy. When Hannibal is discussing with Antiochus and the Aetolians various strategies for liberating Greece from her liberator and savior Rome, he dismisses the value of Thessalians as potential allies.

If at the time we crossed over into Greece I was asked for my opinion, when the topic was Euoboea, Boeotia and the Achaeans, I gave the same opinion, as I will speak today when the topic is Thessaly… For what applies to Euoboea and the Boetians holds true for Thessaly. For who would doubt that, since the Thessalians have no strength of their own, fawn on those before them, and they use that same dread as a plot to gain kindness; yet as soon as they see a Roman army in Greece they will turn away toward the familiar power over them (*imperium*)…

Although these sentiments regarding Thessalians were spoken by enemies of the Roman order, Livy gives them tacit acceptance in his descriptions of Eurylochus’ truculence, the agitations of the *deteriores* for debt relief during the third Macedonian war, and most tellingly in the Roman organization of Thessaly by Flamininus. Thessaly remained weakly defined as a region after the second

---

107 Livy 36.7.2-5: Si ex quo traelicus in Graeciam adhibitus essem in consilium, cum de Euoboea deque Achaes et de Boetia agebatur, eandem sententiam dixissem quam hodie cum de Thessalis agitur dicam…Nam quod ad Euboeam Boeotosque et Thessalos attinet, cui dubium est quin, ut quibus nullae suae vires sint, praesentibus adulando semper, quem metum in consilio habeant eodem ad impetrandam veniam utantur, simul ac Romanum exercitum in Graecia viderint ad consuetum imperium se avertant…
Macedonian War. Subject to marginalization and conflicts among the disputing powers, Thessaly becomes for Livy a *causa beli* and a justification for Roman *imperium*. Thessaly becomes a Roman burden.

**Theoxena: a Feminine Image of Roman Thessaly**

Since Rome had a tendency to portray subject nations as women, no reader should be surprised to find Livy encapsulating the problem of Thessaly in a feminine form. We may be startled to find a Thessalian woman speak in Livy, after we have seen so many others speak for Thessaly, be it as possession or as a liberated region with distinct boundaries. Even Eurylochus is a very strict Magnesian, no longer Thessalian, as Livy emphasizes by using his foreign title of Magnetarch. Otherwise we have a few names of Thessalian commanders, a testimony to the prowess of their horsemen, and besides that the anonymity of the *multitudo*, the bones of Cynoscephalae. Livy chose to give the Thessalian appeal to Rome as the dying words of Theoxena, the divine foreign lady, the holy guest-friend. Her literary origin is unknown. She does not appear in the epitome of Polybius, but she may be a traditional element from other historians.\(^{108}\) Regardless of her beginning, more important is her end in Livy’s narrative.

In book 40 of Livy’s history, Theoxena kills herself after instructing her family to do the same in order to escape the abuse of King Philip V and his soldiers. Theoxena’s death, no less than the Philip’s execution of his son

\(^{108}\) Luce (1977) 195 n.13 and 222 feels certain that Theoxena was in Polybius, since Livy 40.5.1 seems to “answer” to Polybius 23.10.14.
Demetrius, legitimizes the Third Macedonian War as well as denoting the barbarity of Thessaly in the violence of one woman. Her story serves as a representative anecdote about Thessalian ingenium, the innate character of Thessaly, rather than merely a story about the cruelty of its Macedonian rulers. This story justifies an aggressive policy against Macedonia and helps compels Roman sympathy for the inhabitants of a strategic region of Northern Greece.

Philip’s oppression of the Thessalians was the subject of various embassies to the Roman Senate, and despite occasional Roman indifference Macedonian cruelty could justify war in the lack of other compelling reasons. In fact Philip’s decadence is no greater, nor more loathsome, than any other Eastern royalty in Livy’s history. Philip’s role in the story of Theoxena is dependent on stereotyping eastern royalty in the manner of a Greek tyrant: cruel, self-indulgent, driven by lust, greed and paranoia. The suffering of Theoxena is an enactment of the cruelty of Macedonian rule in Thessaly.

Livy tells us that Philip’s paranoia drove him to issue a decree, for the arrest of the children of those whom he had executed. The tragic effects of this policy are shown in the extinction of a noble Thessalian family. Herodicus, the father of Theoxena and a leader of the Thessalians, had been killed by Philip some years before. Theoxena had lost her husband and then her brother in law in a second round of executions. After the death of her husband, Theoxena resisted marriage, until the (supposedly) natural death of her sister, then she
married her sister's second husband Poris, a man from Aenus. Theoxena raised her sister's children as if they were her own (Theoxena had at least a son from her first marriage).

When Theoxena learns of the decree, she suggested that they kill the all the children rather than let Philip capture them. Poris in turn suggested they seek refuge with his trusted friends in Athens. Before doing this they attend a festival at Aenus in honor of its founder, Aeneas. When trying to sneak away to Euboea in the evening, the refugees are unable to set sail. Philip's men come to arrest them. Theoxena offers poison or a sword to her children, so that they may kill themselves. For her part, she hops from the boat with her husband. And so the entire noble Thessalian house of Herodicus is eliminated.

Thus Livy sets the table for the story of the rivalry between Philip's sons, Perseus and Demetrius, which would lead to the execution of Demetrius, the former hostage to Rome and the Roman preference for the Macedonian throne. Polybius also utilized divine machinery to explain Demetrius' murder. There the agents of the punishment are identified as Tyche and the Erinyes of his dead political opponents. Although Livy relies upon divine agents, they remain anonymous. Whereas in Polybius the divine forces are named but the victims remain unknown, the situation is reversed by Livy. The victim is named: Theoxena, the divine guest friend, but the gods who shall punish Philip remain anonymous.

---

109 Polybius 23.10. This passage may be contrasted with the apparent contradiction of 18.33, where Polybius praises the prudence of Philip from the time of Cynoscephalae to his death.
At the beginning of this episode, Livy condemns Philip’s cruelty in the strongest possible terms:

The slaughter of one family made that cruelty, foul in itself, even more loathsome (40.4.1).\textsuperscript{10}

The foulness of Philip’s course of action, emphasized by \textit{foedum} and its comparative \textit{foediorem}, is reminiscent of some foul things in Livy’s prologue.

It is especially healthy and fruitful in the contemplation of these things (i.e. history) to consider documents of every example, placed on a clear monument. There are those that you should take for yourself and your republic to imitate. There are those that you should shun as foul from start to finish (\textit{Praef. 10}).\textsuperscript{11}

The emphasized presence of \textit{foedum} signals that Romans should reject Philip’s action. Yet Philip shall act very little in the tale that follows. Livy’s narrative shall concern the effect of his regal and abusive power, particularly in the anxiety that it arouses in a single Thessalian family.

Theoxena’s reaction to the decree is a defining moment for her character.

After she had heard the king’s edict concerning the arrest of the children of those who had been executed, she considered an atrocious action (crime), since she expected not only the king’s mockery but also the lust of the guards. She dared to say that she would execute all the children rather than allow them to come into Philip’s power. Poris, loathing the mention of such a foul deed, said that he would carry them off to Athens to faithful friends (40.4.6-8).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Eam crudelitatem, foedam per se, foediorem unius domus clades fecit.}

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Hoc illud est praecipue in cognatione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in industri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde \textit{foedum} inceptu \textit{foedum} exitu quod vites.}
The foulness of Philip’s edict is also present in Theoxena’s reaction to it. Not only is this act of killing the children foul in itself, but it fulfils the foul implications of Philip’s decree by destroying the house of Herodicus. Actions become contagious in Livy’s narrative. Foulness is conveyed from character to character.

Still, Theoxena is not a simple criminal, even if she has criminal thoughts. Although she encourages the action, she still provides the children with free choice as they lay claim to their death.

Meanwhile the savage woman, since for some time she had planned that deed (crime; facinus), mixed the poison and brought forth the sword. When she had placed the cup and unsheathed swords in view, she said “Death alone is our right. These are the ways of death; in whatever way your spirit leads you, escape the king’s arrogance. Come, my youths, first you who are older, take the sword or drain the cup if a slower death pleases you” (40.4.13-14).\textsuperscript{113}

Theoxena merely offers the children cup and sword. She encourages but does not force their suicide. Theoxena mediates death as the receptacle of sharp edges and poisons; she does not cause death. Indeed Theoxena is the

\textsuperscript{112} Postquam regis edictum de comprehendis liberis eorum qui interfeci essent acceptit, ludibrio futuros non regis modo sed custodum etiam libidini rata, ad rem atrocin animum adiecit, ausaque est dicere sua manu se potius omnes infecturam quam in potestatem Philippi venirent. Poris, abominatus mentionem tam foedi facinoris, Athenas deportatum eos ad fidos hospites dixit.

\textsuperscript{113} Ferox interim femina, ad multo ante praecogitatum revoluta facinus, venenum diluit ferrumque promit; et posito in conspectu poculo strictisque gladiis, ‘mors’ inquit ‘una vindicata est. Vae ad mortem hae sunt; qua quemque animus fert, effugite superbiam regiam. Agite, iuvenes mei, primum qui estis maiores, capite ferrum, aut haurit poculum si segnior mors iuvat.’
great mediator. The story concerns three generations, and she is the only surviving member of the middle generation. She also unifies some communities, like the house of Herodicus and the fateful people of Aenus, but her ultimate effect is to set Macedonia and Rome in opposition. Her role as foster mother is the best example of her mediation. The mediating influence of Theoxena makes her a medium for the events. Theoxena becomes the place where the action happens. Without her, the events lack a narrative unity.

The commentators note that female characters are rare but pivotal in Livy’s narrative. Walsh notes the similarity of Theoxena to other tragic women in Livy, most notably Lucretia (1.58), but also Verginia (3.44ff.), Sophoniba (30.12) and Chiomara (38.24). Walsh writes: “These incidents often become watersheds in historical development, and always serve as moral exempla.” In the case of Theoxena we have an example that must be shunned. Theoxena is the shunned, the avoided, the gendered subaltern confronting imperialism in her own death or disappearance.

Theoxena is a Thessalian Lucretia. She motivates disgust for Macedonian royalty, and by extending the archetypal lust of kings to Philip’s men, its decadence is institutional, and therefore worthy for destruction. Like the virtuous Roman matron, Theoxena defends her honor against the lusts of the royal family by her suicide. In both cases the heroines’ only words of direct speech are their final words. However, there are key differences. Most notably, Theoxena’s action is referred to as a crime (facinus) throughout the narrative.

---

114 Walsh (1996) 128. I shall discuss Chiomara in the following chapter.
Similarly, Theoxena is ferox, an adjective used to describe Sextus Tarquinius, rather than Lucretia herself.\textsuperscript{115} Unlike Lucretia, Theoxena encourages her entire family to kill themselves, including her husband Poris, who is no match in the narrative for his fierce wife. Since the family is dead, outsiders are required to avenge Theoxena. These would be explicitly the gods, but implicitly the Romans, whose \textit{imperium} in Thessaly and Greece (or Macedonia and Achaea) is therefore sanctified as divine vengeance against the Macedonian regime.

At the same time, Theoxena’s suicide mimics the heroism of the archetypal Roman matron Lucretia. A crucial difference is that Theoxena is never actually raped. Therefore, she remains always an object of desire, a moment forever unconsummated. This anticipation of sexual violation gives an intense quality to her character. She lives in the shadow of royal violence, diffused in the foot soldiers of Philip’s regime. Lucretia lives in shame, and Theoxena lives in anxiety. This is the restlessness of Theoxena’s nature.

This anxiety is the instability of Thessaly, which dwells in the shadows of great powers, the Achaean and Aetolian leagues, the Macedonians and Romans. This is a condition that Livy inherits. In Herodotus, Xerxes gazed across the plains of Thessaly and said that the Thessalians were clever to concede defeat to him, since their land would be easy to conquer.\textsuperscript{116} In the years that followed Thessaly would scarcely regain its autonomy before becoming a battlefield again.

\textsuperscript{115} Livy 1.58: \textit{Profectusque inde Tarquinius ferox expugnato decorum muliebri esset.}

\textsuperscript{116} 7.128-130.
Similarly, Theoxena is identified by the men who move through her life: her father Herodicus, her two husbands, and her anticipated rapists. Does Theoxena have her own identity? Or is she hopelessly balkanized? Her resolute suicide does not stabilize her identity, but it merely brings new Roman suitors who shall create a community from her body. Theoxena is Thessaly.

Theoxena’s story gives us a Roman view of the Thessalian family that shows similarities but also differences to the Roman model. Theoxena’s marriage to her sister’s husband follows a suitable pattern for a widow’s life in the imagined patriarchal ethnos structure of Thessaly. The unity of the family is preserved above all else. However, a matriarchal element is shown by her powers of life and death over her children, reluctantly granted by her husband Poris at the critical time, a very unRoman situation of materna potestas. Once again, the similarities are oriented towards arousing Roman sympathies, but the inversion of Roman social order defines the alterity of the Thessalian gens characterized by their inquietum ingenium.

The ultimate result of her action is the destruction of a Thessalian noble line, the house of Herodicus. Her reaction to Philip is like that of the inhabitants of Abydus during the second Macedonian war. They began to slaughter their women and children when they saw the Macedonians advance. Philip halted his troops, and allowed the city three days to complete the massacres and suicides. Livy likens the mass suicide at Abydus to that of Saguntum, when it was threatened by the Carthaginians.¹¹⁷ In Livy’s narrative these mass suicides
become justifications for Roman assistance and ultimately Roman control. Rome comes to defend these people not only from their enemies, but also from their own self-destructive character.

Theoxena’s action may also be seen as a perversion of sacrifice. She brings forth a cup and sword, the proper implements for a blood offering to the gods. Here however the victims are her children. Theoxena is a mix of Medea and Lucretia. For the Roman reader her action is divine but foreign, hence true to her name. Furthermore, Theoxena's encouragement to her children is made at the same time that Poris is calling on the gods. Once again, the gender roles are reversed. The husband calls on the gods in lamentation as his wife performs the sacrificial action. The contrast of the dynamic but destructive nature of the woman and the pleading but ineffectual husband brings to mind Medea and Jason.

We may assume that the gods Poris summons are the Dioscuri, the protectors of sailors. These gods had close ties to the Romans, not only as gods of sailing, but also as helpers in combat. Yet the closest tie to Roman divinities is in the setting of the action at Aenus during the festival in honor of Aeneas. The entire situation could be seen as a pollution of the sacred rites honoring the founder of Aenus and Rome, Aeneas, or Jupiter Indiges, as Livy calls him after his apotheosis in the first book.\textsuperscript{118} Theoxena is a guest-friend of the Roman

\textsuperscript{117} 31.17-18. See also the suicide of Eurylochus at 36.33.6. All three incidents are reactions to anticipated capture by Philip V.

\textsuperscript{118} 1.2.6.
people, and therefore protected by them. The gods that shall punish Philip for Theoxena’s crime are surely those of the Roman state, brought from Troy by Aeneas, and Jupiter Indiges himself.

In the case of Theoxena, as her name suggests, Rome justifies its action by imagining relationships, especially those of hospitium. Certainly any guest of Aeneas deserves the hospitality of Rome. Poris’ faithful guest-friends in Athens fail Theoxena by their absence and their inaccessibility. Poris is left calling on the gods in place of his loyal friends. Those gods are the gods of Rome. Athens would seem to be farther away for the Thessalian than mere map references would indicate.

The violent resolution of Theoxena suggests the barbarity of the margins of the Greek world rather than the ideals of its center. Thessaly’s alterity is displayed in the ferocity of Theoxena’s crime. As a place of despair and terror, it requires a proconsul. The gendered subaltern supports the occupation even if she originates in a doomed moment of Thessalian nationalism.

Theoxena does not exist as a mere analogy. Rather she is a part of that which she represents, the instability that is Thessaly, the object of desire, the anticipation of rape, a strategic region. She stands forth from her environment and expresses it in all of its elegant ferocity. She certainly needs a man to tame her. If her anxieties about violation cannot be controlled, at least she can be protected, or contained.

Theoxena is however uncontained, and drifts across borders as an exile, from a nameless region of Thessaly to Aenus, and off now on a doomed mission
to Athens that ends before it may ever begin. The winds will not move her boat and she dies somewhere in between, in a liminal space, leaving a festival and starting a journey. She drifts among different ethnic groups and traditions, among the Thessalians, the descendents of Tros in Aenus, and the brutal Macedonians. Perhaps she even sails out of time and into the Roman province of Macedonia. Her status in the short tale also changes from daughter to bride to widow to bride to victim of a violation that never occurs, a suicide, a murderer of children who she raised so affectionately. The instability of Theoxena represents the instability of Thessalian life down to the root of the family structure. It is a life and society in chaos, destroying itself.

Like many exiles in mythology, Theoxena connects societies as she drifts among them. Her story connects Thessaly and Rome through her mimicry of Lucretia and her suicidal sacrifice while leaving a festival of Aeneas. Ending the suffering of Thessaly becomes a Roman obligation. By telling the story of Theoxena, Livy seeks an emotional commitment to war on Macedonia. He can only do this with a representative anecdote, whose function is that of a synecdoche. The suffering of the Thessalians becomes the hysteria of the gendered subaltern. She inspires the warriors who will battle to control her. Her story is the climax of the Roman perspectives of Thessaly in Livy’s fourth decade.
CHAPTER 3

MANLIUS IN GALATIA: A NARRATIVE OF HYBRIDITY

Book 38 of the AUC occurs in the middle of the fifteen-book section on the second and third Macedonian wars. Although its action occurs between these two wars, and after the war with Antiochus, the book contains passages important for the thematic development of this section and Livy's history as a whole. Here in the figure of Asia, Livy evolves a synecdoche that allows him to depict the infection of Rome by the hybridity of the collapsing Hellenistic world. In Book 38 Livy develops the theme of the corruption of the Roman army in the narrative of Manlius Vulso's Asian campaign against the Galatians. Manlius mimics his Gallic opponents by his extortion and terrorism, and clearly shows his degeneration in the midst of his attempts to imitate his ancestors. Like his Gallic opponents Manlius is somehow corrupted by his Asiatic environment and is conveyed by his army to Roman society as a whole, thereby setting the stage for the internal crisis of the Bacchanalia.

Early in book 39 Livy notes the significance of Manlius Vulso, the conqueror of Galatia in book 38:

Truly the beginning of foreign luxury was brought into the city by the Asiatic army. (39.6.7)
This states the exemplary role of Manlius Vulso’s Galatian expedition for Livy’s annals. Many scholars have noted the significance of Manlius’ expedition for Livy’s narrative, although they have largely been concerned with proving or disproving its historical basis.\textsuperscript{119} Yet already in 1977, Luce argued that Manlius’ campaign played a large role in the moral decline of Rome that permeates Livy’s narrative of the second and third Macedonian wars.\textsuperscript{120} In 1982, however, Pagnon with greater emphasis noted the literary significance of Manlius’ expedition as a turning-point in Livy’s narrative. He argued that Manlius’ brutal campaign marks the end of Rome’s just wars, and sets the stage for the sack of Corinth and Carthage, thus bringing into question the legitimacy of Roman imperialism.\textsuperscript{121}

Pagnon perhaps merely overstates his argument by seeing a decisive break with the past.\textsuperscript{122} Roman history has a cyclical feel. The Roman crisis of the Second and Third Macedonian Wars will lead to its hero, another savior of the Roman state, Aemilius Paulus. He shall reform the army whose discipline has been undermined by Manlius. He shall fight a just war against the bastard

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{119} See the general discussions of Gruen (1986) 217-9, and Harris 223-5. Lintott (1972) examines the theme of Manlius’ relation to the corruption of Rome, especially 628-31. Grainger (1995) however denies the traditional representation of Manlius and seeks to defend his campaign and the general himself from his critics, beginning with Livy himself.

\textsuperscript{120} Luce (1977) 253-260.

\textsuperscript{121} Pagnon (1982) 127-28. See also Walsh (1993)146, who notes the significance of Manlius for the “moral decline” of Rome in Livy’s history. He traces the decline through the epitome thus:”The summaries of Livy’s lost books suggest that he envisaged a gradual decline, foreshadowed here in 189, but beginning in earnest in 146 and reaching its height following civil conflicts after 91 BC.”

\textsuperscript{122} Pagnon (1982) 128 characterizes the death of Scipio Africanus (38.52.1) as the end of the heroic phase of the Republic in the \textit{AUC}.
\end{footnotesize}
tyrant Perseus, which concludes the fifteen-book section of the Macedonian wars. Aemilius Paulus serves as a contrast to Manlius, or better, as an antidote. For example, Manlius’ ostentatious triumph is unfavorably compared to the moderation of Aemilius Paulus’ triumph. Furthermore Aemilius is also a member of the legati whose speech condemns Manlius’ actions in Asia Minor. Livy’s story is not the innate corruption of Roman imperialism, but its corruption by the intoxicating hybridity of Asia Minor. Furthermore, since Manlius’ conquest is not the seed of the luxury to come, one may suspect a reformation and later avatars of worse corruption, namely the Eastern conquerors Lucullus and Pompey.

Here I wish to concentrate upon the pervasiveness of metaphor in Livy’s language of imperialistic corruption. In this way we should redirect our attention to the famous line:

Truly the beginning of foreign luxury was brought into the city by the Asiatic army. (39.6.7)

This is the first emergence of luxury, and it is carried into Rome. Like the descriptions of contamination and remedy in the Praefatio, Livy emphasizes the external source of the corruption. Its movement into the city is vividly described

\[123\] See Levene (1993) 122, who discusses the implicit contrast of Aemilius’ triumph to that of Manlius. At 45.32.10, Livy stresses the precautions and prohibitions Aemilius placed on his own triumph, culminating in his prudentia. Elsewhere Livy notes the antiqua disciplina of Aemilius as a commander.
with a verb of motion (*invecta est*). Livy’s language is metaphorical. Luxury
migrates or perhaps it is shipped into Rome, like a commodity. The corruption of
Rome is described in physical terms.

Livy’s narrative of Manlius’ expedition is determined by a synecdoche that
seeks to represent the corruption of Rome by the part played by Manlius in Asia.
The use of synecdoche is not unusual for Livy, but rather it is the characteristic
trope of a traditional annalist, who can describe an entire year simply by the
election of the consuls. The tendency of Livy’s rhetoric to utilize synecdoche has
led to discussions of Roman substantialism. Rome has come to be seen as
the hero of Livy’s historical epic. This is because Livy’s narrative emphasizes
men (especially consuls) as representative of Roman *virtus* (or *vitia*). These
parts of Rome represent the whole that is Rome. Similarly, the actions of the
Roman army are often described as those of the consul, thus utilizing
synecdoche which establishes authority, but also underlines the representative
role of the consul, whose election identifies the year (another synecdoche). The
use of synecdoche extends to the identification of the agent with setting, which
the passage above shows, although with ironic effect; the Roman army is still
Asiatic, although they have returned as Romans to Rome. The character of the
army is defined from their previous setting, especially in the different setting of
Rome. It thus may serve to describe similarity and difference. Synecdoche is
used in its most exaggerated form as the identity of part and the whole. Even in

---

124 The concept is developed at some length by Collingwood (1946) 43-44, who remains highly
visible in the scholarship on Livy. For a critique of substantialism in Livy’s history, see Luce
its gentlest enunciations synecdoche utilizes a metaphor of purity by stressing the unity or collectivity of the part and the whole. Likewise for Livy the army is representative of the people as a whole. A threat to the Roman army is a threat to the collective body politic, and Manlius' Asiatic infection will manifest in remarkable ways.

As noted by Burke, the mode of synecdoche is representation.\(^{125}\) The example serves for the type. Its discourse is the representative anecdote. This is the relation of Manlius Vulso to the corruption of Rome.

Nevertheless those things that were seen were hardly the seeds of the luxury that would be later. \((AUC\ 39.6.9)\)

Livy here clarifies the relation of Manlius Vulso to the onset of \textit{luxuriae}. He uses an agricultural metaphor by speaking of seeds. Luxury is described in organic terms. This metaphor of infection is effective since Livy works from an alleged basis of pure or purified Rome. The snare of synecdoche is that this purity need never be defined. It need only be pointed to, it is the monument, or perhaps the monument and its setting.

Livy differentiates between Manlius and the later \textit{luxuriae}, probably those mentioned in the \textit{Praefatio}, requiring remedies in the author's own time. Livy indicates that Manlius Vulso was not the father (i.e. the sower of the seed) of Roman corruption, but he is exemplary of it (an example therefore to shun). Manlius' relation to the corruption of Rome is exemplary rather than genealogical.\(^{126}\)

\(^{125}\) Burke (1969) 507-508.
In other narratives of Roman corruption, Manlius Vulso was placed in a sequence of contaminating luxury. For Pliny the Elder, Manlius Vulso follows the corrupting example of Lucius Scipio, who is a rival to Manlius in Livy’s account but is not blamed for inspiring Manlius’ conduct. Pliny saw Pompey’s eastern conquests leading to a further flow of Eastern decadence. Luce has called this a Senatorial version of the corruption of Rome, in contrast to the viewpoint of Sallust, who blamed internal rather than external forces. Political motivations could influence the fixing of a starting point. It is likely that for Livy Manlius serves as an avatar of the later exploits of another eastern conqueror, Pompey the Great and the final years of the Republic.

Livy does not immediately signal to the reader of book 38 that Manlius Vulso shall corrupt the army and Rome itself. He only makes this assertion in book 39, after Manlius’ military exploits. This follows the tone set by the beginning of the book, which contrasts effects of Liguria and Asia on the Roman army. Again, setting serves to define the agent. Whereas Liguria was able to

---

126 The recent study of Chaplin (2000) considers Manlius’ use of examples (101-105) rather than Manlius himself as an example.

127 Livy in fact emphasizes this by excusing Scipio from blame before condemning Manlius: *Disclinam militarem severe ab eo <Sc. Scipione> successorem ipsum omni genere licentiae corruptisse fama adtulerat* (39.6.5).

128 Pliny *NH* 37.12: *Victoria tamen illa Pompei primum ad margaritas gemmasque mores inclinavit, sicut L. Scipionis et Cn. Manli adceletum argentum et vestes Attilicas et triclinia aerata*. Luce 275-77. Grainger (1995) 41-42 mounts much of his defense of Manlius on this charge by emphasizing the opulence of Scipio’s conquests, whose loot seems to have surpassed that of Acilius, Fulvius and Manlius together, as based on Grainger’s tabulation of Livy’s own numbers. The representatives of the Senatorial tradition are Polybius, Cato, Piso, and Livy. For Polybius’ statement on the corruption of Rome after overseas wars see 18.34-35; it becomes worse after Pydna (31.25, 39.1.10).

129 A point raised by Lintott (1972) 629.
sharpen military discipline between the Macedonian wars, “Asia by the loveliness (amoenitate) of the cities, the abundance of goods by land and sea and the gentleness of the opponents made the army richer in regal possessions rather than braver” (39.1.3).\textsuperscript{130} Asia Minor becomes the urban \textit{locus amoenus}, a place of desire but also danger for the virtuous Roman soldier. Yet in Liguria, the Roman remains close to his roots in Italy. Italy is contrasted to the decadence of the infectious hybridity of the collapsing Hellenistic world. As we have already seen, Manlius’ army itself is no longer characterized as Roman, but Asiatic, an ironic extension of the synecdoche that characterizes the conqueror by the land he has conquered, like Manlius’ rival Scipio Asiagenes. Military discipline has been so corrupted by the Asian environment that the soldiers themselves become Asiatic (in the same way that the Gauls become Gallograecians). It marks the army as the conquered rather than the conquerors.

In Livy’s narrative, Rome is overwhelmed by an eastern corruption that is conceptualized not only as \textit{luxuriae}, but also as the promiscuous mixing of races which leads to a weakening of national identity. Manlius is corrupted by his Asian environment, but he is representative of his army and even Rome itself. His motivation is based on identification with his family tradition of battling Gauls, rather than the strategic considerations that he poorly presents after the fact in his own defense. Furthermore, Manlius seeks to manipulate the collective \textit{metus Gallicus} in order to advance his own personal ends, although the Gallograecians

\textsuperscript{130}Nam Asia et amoenitate urbium et copia terrestrium maritimorumque rerum et mollitia hostium regisique opibus ditiore quam fortiores exercitus faciebat. Cf. 27.3.2, for the effects of \textit{amoenitas urbium} on the army. As a general theme in Livy, see Girod (1982) 1225-26.
in their remote location present no threat to Rome and had already been weakened, according to Manlius’ own admission, by their contact with the Greeks of Asia Minor.

Manlius Vulso is a strange case: the more he seeks to imitate his family’s heroism against the Gauls, the more he and his army behave like imagined Gauls in the corrupting environment of Asia Minor, acting as the merceneries of King Eumenes of Pergamum. Manlius exhibits a peculiar form of degeneration. The individual delusion of Manlius leads to the corruption of the army and inevitably the state itself, a tale told in emblematic form by the Bacchanalia in book 39.

Manlius realizes his corruption in Asia. Livy narrates a geography that contaminates its inhabitants. In some way, the Asiatic material seems to change Livy’s style itself. Livy’s narrative of Manlius’ expedition encompasses a travelogue with odd details, Roman terrorism, oratory, representative anecdotes of extortion and rape, a resume of Gallic death postures, and a Roman siege of Mount Olympus. Livy’s narrative is as strange in its effect as the land he narrates. The oddness of the storyline presented in the familiar Roman framework of the annals gives the narrative an ironic impact for some modern readers, who have characterized Livy’s style in these passages as “artless”.

131 Gruen (1984) 549 notes that “Eumenes was the prime beneficiary” of Manlius’ Galatian campaign.

132 Grainger (1995) 24 and the following on 33: “This artless account is interleaved with interpretative comments, some portraying Manlius as masterful and assertive, others denigratory of him.”
Extortion, Geography, and the Naming of Peoples: Manlius’ Eastern Itinerary

Manlius goes to Galatia and fights the Gauls, but on the way he seems to act like a Gaul himself. His journey is marked more by extortion than conquest. In the early sections of the campaign, before Manlius even encounters the Gauls, Livy is already developing the theme of the Asiatic corruption of the Roman army.

Livy’s recital of Manlius’ itinerary maps the rough road between Pergamum and Galatia, the way from civilization to barbarism. Manlius’ journey to the Gauls, itself a digression, is delayed in order to provide a catalogue of Manlius’ conquests. These resemble the earlier extortions of the Gallogaeci but the names are valuable to embellish his triumph with their exotic quality. Here are the Alabandi, Termessenses, and Salagassenes, as well as the cities (or villages) Cibyra, Lagbe, Darsa, Lysinoe, and Synnada, but where are the Gauls? They are now the Tolostobogii, and it takes six OCT pages for Manlius to make his determined way to them, following a brief exhortation to the troops.

This travelogue is a remarkably baroque passage for the austere Livy. Livy usually avoids geographic detail, and only describes features of a landscape if they directly influence the battle. Although occasionally Livy does offer ethnographic detail, it is usually only a brief aside if there is not a broader significance for his historical narrative. Here Livy breaks from the flow of that
narrative to provide a catalogue of Manlius’ travels, complete with anecdotal material, sometimes banal, often absurd. Among other matters, the reader learns that:

At Hiera Comis, the priestess of Apollo is said to give her oracles in not-at-all disorderly verse.

Apamea, named for the sister of Seleucus, was once named Celaenae. There Marsyas competed in the flute contest with Apollo.

The Indus River was named for Indus after his elephant cast him from its back.

Certainly some of Livy’s readers would be entertained by such details, which owe more to a Hellenistic flair for the eccentric, rather a strict urge to convey annalistic material. One is uncertain whether to rush for the atlas or simply to turn the page. These tantalizing fragments give a foreign flavor to Livy’s annals, peppering his narrative with the scent of the native. Yet their appearance is far from merely incidental or gratuitous. These names and places bear the vestiges of Roman conquest, and the narrative is motivated, like Manlius, by the quest for the triumph, the sanctification of Roman imperialism. Rather than the footprints of the native these are the marks of the imperial fetter, the alterity that marks the Asiatic as the imperial subject. The names are tokens of conquest and form part of the dossier of Manlius’ triumph.

Livy makes this clear himself. He begins with a brisk geographic tracing of the route of Manlius, not a simple hike but a map of conquests. After the representative anecdote of Manlius’ extortion of Moagetes, the clever barbarian,
Livy grows impatient with his descriptive cartography and now focuses on the anxiety (metus) in the villages at the approach of the Roman troops. The mute fear of the native is not a sympathetic attribute, but shows Livy’s disdain, for them and for Manlius. Where are the Gauls? It shall be the habit of the Gauls in this book to disappear. Indeed they are easy for the reader to forget, since they are the passive antagonists but not the subject of the book. As for Darsa and Lysinoe, they are duly entered as names in the annals with the amount they paid to Manlius in order to become part of the Roman annals. The true subject of the book is a crisis of Roman power in which Manlius plays a key role.

It is Vulso’s presence that gives utterance to these places and names. The consul moves on through the narrative and the names, acknowledging those who give him payment, and destroying those who ignore his presence. The site of the narrative is created as the region of imperium. Yet in the midst of this triumphal narrative (if it is not sordid theft), the consul himself is subject to the corruptions of Asia. Throughout the travelogue Livy favors a passive construction, as if Vulso’s expedition were the wanderings of a lost tourist, rather than the accomplishments of a triumphal imperator and rival of Scipio. Often the consul doesn’t arrive; there is simply an arriving (ventum est). This, combined with the terrorism of the Roman troops, conveys the sense of Roman power as primordial force, encountering Asia not as a series of separate villages, but as a treacherous unity, an organic totality, although decentralized, like a pathogen. It is the intimacy of the ruled and the subject that jeopardizes the imperial project. Therefore one often sees in later imperialism a fascination with walls and other
means to segregate the colonizer from the colonized. From a different perspective, the threat is the crisis of mastery that finds its infinite desire in the submission of the other who therefore dominates, as the existential ground for the encounter. The consul is conquered by his own ambitions. Galatia and its environs are mere settings for the delusions of imperial power. Manlius’ actions seem motivated by a quest for triumphal glory rather than any strategic necessity.

Events in Galatia come to embody major themes that define books 31-45, especially the slow corruption of Rome by its Hellenistic victims. The nature of this danger is developed in two representative anecdotes, the extortion of Moagates and the rape of Ortiago’s wife. Although both stories contain narratives of imperial exploitation, Livy records them as cautionary tales for Roman imperium.

The extortion of Moagates is the most developed scene hitherto in the Galatian expedition. It follows two impersonal constructions describing the arrival of the consul at Cibyra near the Indus River. It is an unhappy circumstance for their ruler Moagates, who angers the consul by not sending an embassy. The negative status of Moagates is shown by his identification as tyrannus when he enters the narrative by his willful absence. Livy chooses to develop the image of Moagates, drawn in Polybius as a boastful and treacherous tyrant, using the word tyrannus five times in his account whereas the Greek has it only twice.\(^{133}\)

\(^{133}\) Nec legatio ulla a Moagate tyranno civitatis eius, homine ad omnia infido atque importuno, veniebat. See Walsh 140-1 for a comparison of the accounts of Livy and Polybius.
This also serves to emphasize the quality given to the word by the Romans, which Manlius himself distinguishes in an exceptional way in his address to the frightened embassy when it eventually appears before the consul seeking mercy.

We Romans hold no sign (*signum*) of the tyrant’s good will, and it is established among all that he is such that we must consider a punishment for him rather than friendship (38.14.7).

The tyrant’s character is such that it inspires absolute agreement of his suitability for punishment among all, therefore removing him from the *amicitia* that could make such a decision, such as the privileged position of the legitimate rulers of Pergamum. A similar absolutism marks the nature of the tyrant’s treachery and cruelty (*hominem ad omnia infido atque importuno*). The tyrant is a sign for the Romans. Although Moagates is the first named victim of Manlius’ extortion, he quickly becomes a type-character, itself a sign of the representative nature of the anecdote. Manlius’ words may be seen as echoing Roman sentiment from the time of Brutus. He himself has become a part for the whole in this peculiarly Roman moment.

The tyrant, for Manlius, and Livy, is a ruler lacking legitimacy. The character of the tyrant is wholly false. When Moagates arrives, he pleads his poverty, although Livy notes “there were, besides Cibyra, Sylleum and the place called Harborside under his rule”. Livy emphasizes the deception of Moagate’s dressing himself like a private person and his simulated tears as Manlius addresses his false pretense of poverty.

“Truly,” the consul said, “Such mockery cannot be tolerated anymore. Is it not sufficient that you have acted shameful by your absence, when you frustrated us through ambassadors? Even
present you persist in your impudence. Do 25 talents drain your tyranny? Unless you count up 500 talents in three days, expect desolation in your fields, a siege in your city. “Although terrified by this recrimination, nevertheless he persisted in his stubborn pretense of poverty (38.14.11-13).

Finally the consul receives 100 talents and ten thousand measures of wheat. Manlius leaves to sack other cities on his road to the Gauls. Livy notes these matters took six days, a stark addition to the Polybian account, as if to emphasize the delay in Manlius' travels.

Critics have noted that Livy has strengthened Polybius' unsympathetic portrayal of Moagates, emphasizing his falsehood and deception through repetition. At the same time, Manlius' actions are far from heroic. The anecdote serves to show the brutality and greed and becomes a display of extortion. Although Moagates' illegitimacy is clearly marked, Manlius demands that he drain his domain to purchase freedom from the Roman devastation of his lands. If he pays the price he has freedom to rule his lands. Rather than remove the tyrant in justification of his own Roman absolutism, Manlius allows the tyrant to purchase a place in the Roman order.

The tyranny of Moagates is reflected by Manlius himself. Although a legally selected consul, Manlius Vulso shows his ancestor's ambition for total power in a less idealistic or conspiratorial form. Whereas the famous conqueror of the Gauls worked outside the system to form a plebeian power base, Manlius Vulso works within the Roman system of triumph and treasure. Manlius Vulso already shows the worst excesses of Roman imperialism, before Livy's sweeping denunciation in book 39. By depicting the weakness of the victim and the
pettiness of the conqueror, the anecdote becomes more banal than heroic. The consul has become a mercenary and no longer upholds the Roman justice that he claims to embody. At the periphery of empire, Manlius’ actions only parody *clementia populi Romani* and *magnitudo animi*, or other qualities that Livy might use to justify Roman imperialism. Yet in Asia Minor the consul has been corrupted by his victim, whose geographic space is the setting not only for triumphant conquest but also for moral decline.

**Manlius and the Gauls: Defining Victory and Triumph**

In the Gallic and Roman narratives of rivalry, extortion and terror, we see that often the worst aspects of the enemy are mimed in his adversary, a characteristic noted by Girard in his description of the "Monstrous Double". Violence becomes endlessly repetitive. The retribution against the adversary is mimicry of violence in highly patterned and formal ways. Often the violence itself is motivated by the similar goals of the adversaries, which Girard terms mimetic desire. In Manlius’ campaign, the consul is confronted by barbarous others who seek the booty of Asia Minor just as he does. Violence is not practiced against the adversary until it is first rehearsed on the original victims of the Gauls, the small villages of Asia Minor whose catalog will give breadth to the conquests.

---

134 See Burck (1982) 1155. He argues for the presence of various moral attributes inscribed in Livy’s narrative of the Hellenistic defeat, especially in book 45. *Maiestas nominis Romani, humanitas, and iustitia* are the other virtues listed by Burck, although *humanitas* is only used by Livy in the speech of the Rhodians, a dubious source for the sentiment.

135 See Girard (1979). For Girard violence by its repetition triggers a mimesis which causes a sacrificial crisis that only ends by the invention of a scapegoat. For the aspect of mimesis in his writings, see especially “From Mimetic Desire to the Monstrous Double” (143-88). Johner (1996) has discussed the phenomenon in Livy’s narrative at some length, but she does not discuss the Galatian campaign nor Manlius.
of Manlius. It is the pathology of Manlius to disregard this resemblance, by emphasizing Gallic difference and his ancestral right to kill them. In fact Livy presents his dominant impulse as rivalry with his predecessor Scipio Asiagenes. “But Manlius’ methods resembled those practiced by the Galatians themselves too closely to be worthy of Rome,” a historian of Roman rule in Asia Minor has written. Asia is the staging ground for this violent mimesis. Livy seems to present the atrocities of Manlius as characteristic not of the agent but of his setting. The trope of synecdoche displays the Roman army as corrupted by their Asiatic environment.

Following the ransoming of Cibyra, Manlius’ journey through Galatia seems to gain speed. Now he is no longer greeted by hostility, embassies, or prevaricating tyrants. The violence of Manlius’ avarice creates dread west of the Taurus Mountains. Earlier Roman glories were motivated by Gallicus metus (dread of the Gauls), when the city itself was threatened. The anxiety felt at the Gallic approach motivated extraordinary levies and rituals, including the sacrifice of Greeks and Gauls in the Forum Boarium. Yet in book 38, a metus Romanus is depicted. Dread of Manlius’ approach creates desolation before him. The Romans freely plunder the cities abandoned by their inhabitants.

---

136 Magie (1950) 21 (v.1).
137 The phenomenon of metus Gallicus is discussed by Bellen (1985). His lucid analysis traces the development of this “furchtmotiv” from the Gallic sack of Rome to the end of the Republic. For a detailed discussion of the phenomenon in Republican times, see Perl (1982).
138 37.15.2-3: Ab Lagbe proxima urbe etu incolae fugerunt; vacuum hominibus et refertum rerum omnium copia oppidum diripuerunt. 37.15.8: eam (Darsam) metu incolarum desertam plenam omnium rerum copia invenit. 37.15.14: Inde Synnada benit, metu omnibus circa oppidis desertis.
Given the ease of the booty, Manlius welcomes an opportunity to go to Pamphylia to defend the Isiodenses from the Termessenses, a service for which he receives 500 talents of silver. Only after plundering the abandoned city of Darsa and punishing Pisidia for not sending ambassadors does the consul finally receive native guides from Seleucus who take him to the Gallograecians.\(^{139}\)

Livy pauses here in his narrative to describe the Gauls and their entry into Asia Minor some hundred years before the arrival of Manlius and some hundred years after his ancestor heard Juno’s geese warn of a Gallic invasion on the Capitol. From this point on in book 38, until the speech of the legati against Manlius, the Galatians will be known as Galli, or their respective tribal name (Tolostobogii, Trocmi, Tectosages), rather than Gallograeci. Their Greek aspect will appear as the degradation of their native identity by the gentle climate and luxuries of Asia Minor. The Galatians for Livy are thoroughly Hellenistic Gauls, a quality more of their place than their time.

Livy begins his recitation of the Gallic migration thus:

The Gauls, a great horde of men (magna hominum vis), arrived among the Dardanians when Brennus was their leader. Either they needed farmland or they hoped for plunder, since they judged no people equal in warfare among those they would go. Then a quarrel (seditio) arose. About twenty thousand men with their chiefs Lonnarius and Lutarius seceded from Brennus, and turned back in a march into Thrace (38.16.1-2).

---

\(^{139}\) 37.15.
The account of the Gauls’ entry into Asia Minor emphasizes certain aspects of them. Livy begins by emphasizing their great numbers, although using a word that suggests their violence (vis). The threat of Gauls was seen to lie in their numbers. Throughout ancient descriptions of the Gauls, their multiplicity and their violence are closely linked. Rome is particularly menaced by Gallic hordes. Next their irrationality is suggested by the uncertainty of their motives for migration-innate greed or dire need. At any rate, they are drawn to Asia Minor by the fertility of the land. Their travels result in a stipendium paid by the entire region within the Taurus mountains, a key marker for the boundary of proposed Roman influence throughout the negotiations with Antiochus.

Livy next describes the first of two schisms in the Gallic forces. Gallic rivalry is described as sedition, a word of negative value in the Roman political idiom. Rivalries among the Gallic leaders, Brennus, Lonnorius, and Lutarius, caused the Gallic invaders to separate into three groups. It is perhaps not incidental that their rivalry and subsequent separation reproduces the threefold division of the Hellenistic kingdoms. It is a familiar pattern, the imperialist power undermined by divisions within its own society. The motif of rivalry is a key theme throughout the book 38, culminating in the three trials of generals at Rome.

\[^{140}\] On the characteristic greed of the Gauls, see Feldherr (1998) 45.

\[^{141}\] 38.16.12. For the later accusation of the legati that Manlius wished to go past the Taurus mountains in his conquests and the impiety of this notion, see below.
which ends the book. Manlius himself throughout his Galatian campaign seeks
to rival the deeds of his consular predecessor in Asia Minor, Scipio Asiagenes,
the conqueror of Antiochus.

The movement of Gauls into Thrace is a singularly ominous event. These
Gauls will later loot the plunder of Manlius on his long walk back to Thessaly.
Livy there contrasts the difficulties of Manlius’ march through Thrace with earlier
facility of Scipio in defeating the Thracians after his own conquests.\footnote{36.41.11-14. Often seen as a useless digression and an example of Livy’s deficiencies in utilizing sources, Luce (1977) 203 argues for its thematic importance: “The passage in question is not given as a variant for its own sake but because it contrasts so sharply with the demoralized behavior of this same group of men (37.50.3) on their return under the leadership of Cn. Manlius.”} However, these Thraciogauls seem to have not lost their ferocity, unlike their cousins the
Gallograecians. Their military prowess has grown since Scipio’s previous
passage through their territories, for then they were “gentler”, as if in proportion
to the relative discipline of the Roman army. This shows the differing
characterizations of Thrace and Asia Minor in Livy’s narrative. Although after
Manlius’ expedition Asia Minor becomes remote and distant in the remaining
extant books, Thrace would remain an object of Roman anxiety and a catalyst in
the events leading up to the third Macedonian war and through book 45. In book
40, the Thracians reappear as barbarians threatening Macedonia as well as
Italy.\footnote{This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.}

The Gauls who continued southeast first served as mercenaries for the
Bithynian king Nicomedes. They soon left the king’s service and established
their own \textit{imperium}, largely based on the terror of the native populace. This
terror extends beyond their actions to their very name. The result of the Gallic travels are *opes* and *imperium*, from the *vectigales* and *stipendia* they establish. In this their only real offense to Manlius Vulso is that they preceded his own attempts to do the same. Livy’s narrative shows the Gauls had already accomplished what Manlius Vulso did on his way to the Gauls.

This justification for the necessity of violence shows the trace of the fatal connection of Manlius and the Gauls, joined as they are by violence and avarice. The rhetoric of violence creates the confrontation of Manlius against the Gallic multitudes. The Roman rhetoric of violence is centered upon the triumph. The description of the Gauls is therefore already overdetermined in the justifications of Manlius, which depicts them as different in the midst of his desire for plunder. Their shadows pass on the page as forms of speech for the Roman triumph. If the Galatians did not exist, it would be necessary for Manlius to invent them. Livy’s narrative tells us little about the Gauls but much about the Roman idiom of power. Moreover, it describes that power at the moment of its corruption, when it has already become less (or rather more) than itself.

In this idiom of power, the descriptions of Gauls emphasize their alterity, posing them as enemies worthy of a triumph. The Gauls become for Manlius the perfect enemy, a family heirloom. It is suitable that most descriptions of the Gauls occur within Roman speeches, reported and direct, rather than in Livy’s own narrative voice. The Gauls have been reduced to signs operating within the language of *imperium* and *sedite*. 
Manlius’ expedition begins with an *exhortatio* in reported speech:

After Manlius had taken command of the Roman troops from Scipio and completed the ritual military observances, he called for an assembly for the soldiers, in which he praised their manliness (*virtute*) since they had defeated Antiochus in one battle. He exhorted them to undertake a new war with the Gauls, since they had aided Antiochus with their forces and had such an untamed nature (*indomita haberent ingenia*) that Antiochus had been moved beyond the ridge of the Taurus mountains in vain unless the strength (*opes*) of the Gauls were broken. He added a few things about himself neither false nor immoderate. The soldiers rejoiced...believing there would no force in the Gauls alone after the king [Antiochus] had been conquered (38.12.2-4).

The speech of Manlius endeavors to show the expedition of the Gauls as necessary. Inaction against the Gauls would make their previous victory over Antiochus meaningless. This characterization of a proposed military endeavor as *necessarium* follows a familiar pattern in Livy’s speeches of martial exhortation. A further common aspect is the characterization of the action as easy (*facile*).\(^\text{144}\)

Strangely though, the ease of the operation occurs not in the rhetoric of the orator but in the collective thought of the soldiers. This provides us with a key to the success of Manlius in motivating the army. His motivations and desires become those of the army. The relation of Manlius to his army is representative as well as infectious.

Manlius adds a few words concerning himself, but they become even less in Livy’s abridgement. They are neither immoderate nor false. Livy allows the reader to imagine the suitability of Manlius for command against the Gauls based

\(^{144}\text{See Luce (1993) 72-3, for a discussion of the goals for a deliberative speech. The main body of the speech would exhort a specific course of action based on usefulness and honor, as well as possibility and necessity.}
merely on what is hitherto known of him—his name. Already Manlius Vulso is overshadowed by the imaginés whose deeds he wishes to imitate. His expedition is a realization of his ancestral heritage and, in this sense, is necessary. Manlius’ motivations are based on familial definition. He is subsumed as part to the whole. The necessity is the logic of synecdoche, for what else can Manlius do other than kill Gauls? There are a few things: bird watching and saving the Capitol, or perhaps creating distrust between the political orders and subversion.

The Gauls appear in this speech briefly and in their familiar ancestral form. They have an untamed nature (*indomita ingenia*), in contrast to the Roman troops who are distinguished by their *virtus*. This untamed nature of the Gauls appears in book 21 as the cause for their rejection of an alliance with Rome against Hannibal. There the words are uttered by the Greeks of Massilia to the Roman embassy:

> But that race was not even gentle to its own interests—so savage and untamed was their nature (*Adeo ferocia atque indomita ingenia esse*)—unless the souls of the leaders were won over by gold, which the race greatly desired (21.20).

Here the nature of the Gauls serves as a contrast to the Greeks, who remain loyal to the Romans. Similarly Manlius will later contrast the savage Gallic people (*ferox natio*) to the Greeks of Asia Minor, the most gentle race of men (*mitissimum genus hominum*).\(^{145}\) Despite their differences, Gaul and Greek are often paired, as in the human sacrifices of a representative couple from both

\(^{145}\) 38.17.3.
races when Hannibal threatened Rome.\textsuperscript{146} The polarity of Greek and Gallic sensibility in the Roman mind is a key to understanding the monstrous hybridity of Gallograecia, and also why the compound cannot be maintained in Livy’s narrative. In their savagery, the Galatians are Gallic, but in their decadence and defeat they are Greek. The Greek experience of the Gauls in Asia Minor exacerbates their natural tendency towards decadent avarice.\textsuperscript{147}

Livy is able to make such distinctions by sweeping declarations of a specific racial nature (\textit{ingenia}). As in the case of Eurylochus and the Thessalians, the enemy in the imperialist scenario is shown as unstable, a clear projection of their conflict with the imperial project. In Roman ethnographies the \textit{classicum verbum} for this instability is \textit{mobilitas}, which emphasizes the variability of the native whose hostility is characterized as out-of-place.\textsuperscript{148} Livy’s language emphasizes lack by using the privative- the restlessness (\textit{inquietum}) of the Thessalians, the untamed (\textit{indomita}) Gauls. The deficiency of these groups is their historic resistance to the Roman order, whereas in Livy’s own time the Thessalians become quiet and the Gauls subdued. The negativity of the characterizations shows the enemy as not only out of place but also out of time. Yet for Livy, it would seem that the more these peoples assert independence, the

\textsuperscript{146} 22.57.

\textsuperscript{147} Feldherr (1998) 45 notes the negative consequences of avarice among the Gauls, as depicted in Livy (5.33.2) and Caesar (\textit{BG} 1.1.3)

\textsuperscript{148} For a discussion of this term and its application by Caesar in his “rhetorical ethnography”, see Vasaly (1993) 150. She discusses the application of the term \textit{mobilitas} to unassimilated or liminal groups on the fringes of empire. For a general discussion of Roman views of barbarians and wild men, see White (1978) 150-82, especially 165 where the following catalog of adjectives is borrowed from Bernheimer, \textit{Wild Men in the Middle Ages} (from ch. 1, which concerns Roman notions): \textit{silvester, indomitus, rudis, incultus, ferox, immanis, saevus, insanus, lascivus, ferus}.
more his Romans become convinced that they must be dominated and changed by force into the imperial subjects of the *Praefatio* who were perfectly content with Roman rule.\footnote{Praef. 8: *Et hoc gentes humanae patiantur aequo animo quam imperium patiuntur.*}

We may allow this shiftiness of the Gauls to guide our analysis of their appearance in the rhetoric of Manlius’ second speech (38.17), his first in *oratio recta*. His mission is to fix the form of the Gauls in his speech, thereby making their defeat *facile* and *honestum*. He accomplishes this by treating the Gauls as a historic artifact, preserved by the *res gestae* of his ancestors Titus and Marcus. Indeed, Manlius assures the soldiers, the Romans have nearly achieved more triumphs over the Gauls than any other race.\footnote{38.17.6: *Plures prope de Gallis triumphi quam de toto orbe terrarum acti sunt.* 17.8: T. Manlius. 17.9: M. Manlius.}

The familiar battle shouts of the Gauls cause terror in the Greeks, Phrygians, and Carians, who are unaccustomed to such antics. It is a mere performance intended to inspire terror. For the Romans the familiar noise is vain.\footnote{38.17.5: *Sed haec, quibus insolita atque insueta sunt, Graeci et Phryges et Cares timeant; Romanis Gallici tumultus adsueti, etiam vanitates notae sunt.*}

Similarly, in their first onslaught the Gauls seem impressive, with their fervent temperament and blind rage (*fervido ingenio et caeca ira*). Soon afterwards they show their soft bodies (*mollia corpora*), their soft spirit (*molles animos*). Livy also wishes to emphasize the Roman experience of hand to hand combat with the Gauls, which stresses not
only the valor of the Romans legions at close arms but also recalls the glorious
duel of Titus Manlius and an anonymous Gaul.\textsuperscript{152}

Furthermore, the legendary Gallic ferocity has been already weakened by
their degeneration in their new Hellenistic environment. Manlius notes:

> These men are already degenerate, mixed and truly Gallo-
Graecian, which they are named. Just as in fruits and pack animals
not so much does the seed function to preserve their innate quality
\textit{(indolem)}, as the property of the earth and the sky under which they
are raised changes them (38.17.9-10).

Next Manlius recites a list of Greek races that became degenerate on foreign
soil, namely the Macedonians, the Massilians, and Spartans. He then states a
common rule in sententious terms:

> Each thing becomes nobler when it comes to be in its proper place.
When sown in a foreign land, in which it is nourished by a different
nature, it degenerates (38.17.13).

These passages reveal the interesting polarity of Gaul and Greek which we have
already had occasion to mention. The Gauls in Asia Minor therefore become
both familiar and different, monstrous hybrids, and Manlius’ duty to eliminate
them becomes metaphysical as well as an ancestral duty. This argument shows
the necessity of Manlius’ expedition against the Galatians, who are inherently out
of place (Despite the fact that Manlius was invading people who had been in Asia
for at least a hundred years).

Manlius bases his argument on the value of innate qualities. Hybridity
must be overcome at all costs. It is not a simple case of Greeks being a higher
race who are contaminated by Gallic influence in Massilia. Rather, the Gauls are

\textsuperscript{152} 38.17.7-9. Livy describes the duel of Torquatus at 7.9.6-10.14.
also contaminated by Greek influence, and in that degenerate form become
Gallograecians, a monstrous compound struggling under the weight of its
syllables.\textsuperscript{153}

This threat is in the landscape.\textsuperscript{154} The scene influences the actor.

Manlius presents the logic of synecdoche in his agricultural metaphor: the
planting of men into the earth who are so tightly rooted that it shapes their
actions. Yet how will Manlius’ legions overcome this threat of contamination in
Asia Minor? Manlius cautions his troops against becoming infected by not taking
root:

\begin{quote}
By Hercules you men of Mars must beware and escape as soon as
possible the luxury of Asia. These foreign (\textit{perigrinae}) pleasures
are able to drain the strength of your spirit insofar as the contagion
of the custom and character of its inhabitants prevail among you
(38.17.18).
\end{quote}

Manlius’ rhetoric draws a clear distinction between the quality of his legions and
their degraded opponent. The Roman men are marked by their lineage from
Mars (\textit{Martiis viris}). They possess the seed of greatness as a familial relation,
like Manlius himself, who seeks to imitate the great deeds of his ancestors
against the Gauls. This Roman manliness is contrasted to \textit{perigrinae voluptates},
the foreign pleasures that threatens to overcome them. Indeed, in Livy’s

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{153} Similar thoughts are expressed by the Commissioners who criticize the conduct of Manlius in
Galatia: \textit{Nolite nomen tantum existimare mixtum esse Gallograecorum; multo ante et corpora et
animi mixti ac vitiati sunt} (38.46.1). On Manlius’ speech as Livy’s own views of the effects of
environment on character, or setting on agent, see Luce (1977) 282-83 and Pagnon (1982) 121-23.

\textsuperscript{154} For the influence of environment on morality in Livy’s work, see Luce (1977) 276-81. Veyne
(1993) 343 discusses Roman plant metaphors, especially as an analogy for wild and
domesticated peoples, a concept found in Caesar (\textit{BG} 1.1.3) and Cicero (\textit{Fin.} 5.19.54, \textit{Tusc.} 2.5.13).
\end{flushright}
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narrative, this is the invisible, abstract enemy that confronts Manlius and his troops. The Gauls themselves have become a representative image of degeneration.

Manlius gives no concrete instructions on how his troops may counter this threat of corruption. He turns instead to the illusion of the great deed that he seeks to create among the Greeks for the realization of a ready-made triumph:

This nevertheless happens luckily [i.e. Gallic degeneration], since, just as they use violence against you worthlessly, they possess a reputation among the Greeks equal to that with which they came. As victors you will have that same glory among our allies as if you had conquered Gauls preserving the ancient mark of their character (*antiquum specimen animorum*) (38.17.19-20).

The ancient mark of the Gallic character now exists in the subject rather than the object. However, for this illusion to be truly effective, Manlius must also convince the Romans at home when he defends his right to a triumph. Therefore, he there characterizes the Gauls as “the most fierce enemies” (*ferocissimorum hostium*; 38.47.6). Here however, they are depicted by Manlius as mere phantoms of their former heroic past (*antiquum specimen animorum*).

The degeneration of the Gauls leads to their characterization as animals, which is not a sign of their savagery, but of the ease of killing them. They die like sacrificial beasts for the triumph of Manlius Vulso. He argues that Romans have slaughtered the Gauls like herds for 200 years, as if they functioned merely as a body count for ambitious Roman consuls.155 The fixation on the Galatian body

---

155 38.17.6: *Semel primo congresso ad Alliam olim fuderunt maiores nostros; ex eo tempore per ducentos iam annos pecorum modum consternatos caedunt fugantque, et plures prope de Gallis triumphi quam de toto orbe terrarum acti sunt.*
count reappears in Manlius’ words in defense of his claim to triumph: “I who captured or slaughtered more than 40,000 men...am cheated of my triumph” (38.47.6-7). Livy also gives various body counts for Manlius’ expedition from the various Latin authorities, whose fascination is based not so much on historical precision but on showing that Manlius far exceeded the 5,000 bodies necessary to qualify for a triumph. At the siege of Mount Olympus alone Claudius Quadrigarius asserted that 40,000 died, whereas Valerius Antias placed the number at no more than 10,000.\footnote{156}

In Livy’s narrative, Manlius is preoccupied with calculations to inflict the maximum amount of casualties:

Immediately the consul sent troops to pursue the enemies. Later, after he had given the tribunes of the army custody of the captives, he himself followed, since he calculated (\textit{ratus}) that he would defeat them decisively if he slaughtered or captured as many as possible while in that panic (\textit{pavore}) (38.23.3).

Manlius elsewhere reveals his mastery at inflicting panic, a Roman virtue at least since Tullus Hostilius consecrated a temple in honor of Pallor and Pavor.\footnote{157} It occurs in two other instances in the siege of Mount Olympus, where it is inflicted on the Gallic camps, so that they are “full of panic and confusion (\textit{pavoris et tumultus}) since there were women, children and a mixed crowd of noncombatants.” In its most revealing usage, Manlius exhorts his troops to

\footnote{156} 38.23.8. On the requirements for 5000 dead in order to earn a triumph, see Valerius Maximus (2.8.1).

\footnote{157} For Livy’s account of the vowing of the \textit{fana}, see 1. 27.7.
abstain from looting the camps but to apply pavor to the fleeing enemy.\textsuperscript{158} Pavor is contrasted to praeda. Yet in the story of Manlius that follows the siege of Olympus, he and his soldiers increasingly fall prey to desire that corrupts and weakens them in the midst of triumphant slaughter, as they become an Asiatic rather than a Roman army.

The ease of killing the Gauls takes a graphic form in Livy’s narrative of the siege of Mount Olympus, where the Gauls vainly trusted in the protection of geography. Livy provides a description of Gallic wounds remarkable for its brutal voyeuristic detail, which I here translate in full:

For wherever they [the Gauls] fought hand to hand, when they were allowed to suffer and inflict wounds in turn, rage inflamed their spirit, and in addition when they were wounded from hidden and distant light spears, they did not consider where they were rushing, and just as wounded wild beasts they rashly ran upon their own comrades. Their wounds were uncovered because they were fighting nude, their bodies fleshy and white, since they never were nude except in battle. Thus, all the more the blood would pour from much flesh, more fouly their wounds were gaping, and their white bodies were more stained by black blood, but they were not deterred by such gaping wounds. Moreover when the skin was sliced where the wound was wider rather than deeper, they then imagined themselves to fight more gloriously. Furthermore, when an arrowhead or hidden bullet from a sling pinched them with a wound slight in appearance, and after examining where they might pluck it out yet the point would not emerge, then turned towards madness and shame at the sting of such a small wound they stretched their bodies on the ground (38.21.8-11).

This battle scene is remarkable for its clinical review of Gallic wounds. The alterity of the Gauls is shown not only by the animal metaphor, now wild rather

\textsuperscript{158} 38. 21. 14. \textlt{Galli effusa fuga castra repetunt pavoris et tumultus iam plena, ut ubi feminae puerique et alia imbellis turba permixta esset. 38. 23. 3: Sequi pro se quemque et instare et perculsis pavorem addere iubet.}
than domesticated, but also by their fleshy, white skin. Interestingly, this skin, a
marker or specimen of their ancient valor in battle in their own heroic ethos,
becomes an aspect of their banal death throes. in bidding us to contemplate the
contrast of white skin to black blood as Roman weapons tear Gallic flesh, Livy
revels in a voyeuristic description of enormous human violence. Gallic death
becomes a spectacle, an exhibition worthy of Manlius' triumph.

The source for this aesthetic of violence is not difficult to find. Its Greek
origin is at Pergamum and its famous statues of dying Gauls, erected in
commemoration of the defeat of the Gallic invaders by Attalus I (241-197).
These remarkable statues, which display the death throes of Gallic invaders,
have been discussed as an example of “Hellenistic Baroque”.

Livy has here taken inspiration from a Hellenistic image and made it a Roman moment in his
monumenta annalium. This survey of Gallic wounds does not merely appropriate
the Greek original, but supercedes it. Livy has given the dying Gauls a form
more lasting than bronze. Yet like their literary ancestors, these soft and fleshy
Gauls are caricatures of the Greek original.

Yet this grotesque moment threatens the Roman status of the narrative.
These are like the hostile images or statues of the Greeks spoken of by Cato:
“Believe me, hostile statues (infesta signa) have been brought into this city from
Syracuse.” The use of vivid verbs of motion (inlata sunt) to describe corrupting
foreign influences at Rome places the hostile statues in the context of

\[159 \text{ See for instance Biers (1987) 291-2.}\]
programmatic statements found in the Praefatio. Cato is particularly concerned that the statues from Greek lands are an incitement to destructive desires. Here the imagery of dying Gauls, although seemingly triumphant, is representative of Manlius’ desire for glory that culminates in Hellenistic Baroque.

The very setting of the battle at Mount Olympus seems to indicate the hubristic character of Manlius’ conquest. The Romans lay siege to a sanctified setting for Greek culture and pollute its ridges with blood and slaughter. Yet at the same time, it must be considered that for Livy that this is not the primary Greek sanctuary of Olympus, but its Asiatic counterpart, one of the many mountains that shared the name Olympus. In that way, the climatic battle of Manlius’ campaign is a parody of the cosmic battles of mythology. Later, in Book 45, Aemilius Paulus will visit the hallowed Olympus of Thessaly. With suitable piety the consul will make an offering to the god as if he were making a sacrifice to Capitoline Jupiter. By referring the hallowed place to a Roman paradigm, Aemilius places Greek culture in a subordinate position. Roman hegemony is

---

160. 34.14.4: Infesta, mihi credite, signa ab Syracusis inlata sunt huic urbi. These words are reported in Cato’s extended oratio recta against the Lex Oppia, a passage I shall return to in chapter three. For insightful discussions of this passage, see Luce (1977) 251-3 and Feldherr (1998) 42-44, who both note the relation of Cato’s speech to the Praefatio.

161. 34.4.3: Et iam in Graeciam Asiamque transcendimus omnibus libidinum inlecebris repletas et regias etiam adrectamus gazas.

162. 45.28. See Jaeger (1997) 1-5 for a lucid discussion. For her, the passage has significance for the Roman “organization of space”: “Rome is the center of the empire it rules, and the Capitoline, the fixed center of Roman religion and home of the gods who are the source of Rome’s supremacy, is the center of Rome” (3).
maintained, and the statue remains in situ, indicative in Livy’s narrative of Roman piety. In some way, this action of Aemilius purifies the earlier slaughter of Manlius on the other Mount Olympus.

A fitting representation of Manlius’ expedition is found in the anecdote of the rape of Ortiago’s wife, based on a more customary Greek original, Polybius. Given the narrative importance of this episode, I must translate it in full as well:

A memorable deed (facinus) was done by a captive woman. The wife of the chieftain Ortiago, a woman of remarkable beauty, was guarded among many captives, under the custody of a centurion, a man of military lust and avarice. At first he tested her feelings. When he saw that the woman abhorred voluntary debauchery, he used force on the body that was his slave by fortune. Then in order to soften the indignity of her injury, he offered her hope of return to her own people, and although loving her not even this would he do for free. After he had agreed to a certain amount of gold, he permitted her to send any captive she wished to her people, so that none of his own comrades would become an accomplice. He specified a place near the river where no more than two of her kinsmen would come with the gold on the following night to receive her. By chance there was a slave of the woman among the captives of that same custodian. At twilight, the centurion led out this man as a messenger beyond the guards. On the following night the two kinsmen of the women and the centurion with his female captive met at the established place. After they showed the gold which fulfilled the stipulated amount of Attic talents, the woman by her own tongue ordered them to unsheathe their sword and slaughter the centurion while he was weighing the gold. She herself carried the decapitated head of the slain man in her robe and came thus to her husband Ortiago, who had fled back home from Mount Olympus. After she had embraced him, she cast down the head of the centurion before his feet. In response to his wondering whose head this was or what had been this hardly womanly action (facinus haudquam muliebre), she admitted to her husband the injury to her body and her vengeance for her chastity violated by force. It is said otherwise that she preserved until her end the glory of this matronly deed (matronalis facinoris decus) by the sanctity and gravity of her life (38.24.2-11).
Here again we confront a female character that, like Theoxena, becomes representative of her people, who as individuals remain anonymous. The victimization of Ortiago's wife, and in a sense her revenge, represent the role of Galatia, not as an allegory, but as synecdoche, since she participates in the suffering of the Gallograecians. Like Theoxena, Ortiago's wife seeks to preserve her chastity through violent means. Unlike Theoxena, her violence is worked against her oppressors rather than herself and her family. Another important difference is that her enemy is Roman rather than a Hellenistic king, and her rape is realized rather than simply imagined.

Like Theoxena, her action is repeatedly described as a \textit{facinus}, an ambivalent term that can refer to any deed, but often specifies a criminal deed. For Livy the deed is memorable, but for her husband it is hardly womanly. At the end it is seen as a matronly deed, due to its preservation as a token of her dignity. In general, the deed has a shifting, undefined quality, like the Gallograecians themselves.

Indeed, in Livy's narrative, the entire scene relates rather to the Roman experience in Galatia rather than specifically to the Galatians themselves. That is, the anecdote does not represent the Galatians so much as it represents the corruption of Manlius' troops, and his loss of control, his failure to reign in their military lust and avarice. In this way it resembles the rape of Lucretia, in that the woman's body comes to symbolize the body politic or the collectivity of the group, whereas the rapist symbolizes tyrannical loss of control, motivated of course as
the fault of woman, for her outstanding beauty motivates the centurion’s lust.\textsuperscript{163} The victim is blamed for her ravaging; Asia Minor corrupts mighty Rome. As a trope of synecdoche, the centurion’s actions are representative of the conduct of Manlius and the Roman army rendered Asiatic. Now any guard may mimic the excesses of the Hellenistic kings and tyrants.

This may be shown by briefly considering Polybius’ account of the same scene, which is preserved by Plutarch in his \textit{Virtuous Deeds of Women}. Although Livy seems to follow Polybius closely, including the reference to the general lust and greed of soldiers, he omits the victim’s name, Chiomara, and merely refers to her as Ortigo’s wife. By maintaining the latter, she becomes an undefined woman from the upper echelon of Galatian society, rather than a particular individual. This allows the focus to shift from the possible virtue of her action to the brutality of the centurion’s lust and its eventual punishment by barbarian rather than Roman hands, a further recrimination against Manlius’ command.

Considered from Livy’s viewpoint, the anecdote does not concern female virtue, but rather the vice of the Roman troops when left to their own desires. It becomes an indictment of Manlius. Even a captive woman has more control of his forces than he does. The centurion thereby becomes representative of Roman self-defeat, since he is conquered by his own lust. This is shown by

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{163} Here I borrow liberally from fascinating analysis of Joshel (1992) concerning Livy’s Lucretia, especially page 120, where the fault of the woman’s beauty and “male uncontrol” is discussed, and the relation of empire to bodies and discipline as imperial authority. In this context, the rape of the Gaul shows the loss of imperial control at the same time it is exerted.
\end{footnote}
another Livian variation to the Polybian account. In the Greek, the centurion is murdered while bidding affectionate farewell to his victim, whereas in Livy he is killed while weighing the gold. Livy presents the woman as currency or the object of exchange. Livy emphasizes the avarice of the centurion, a Gallic rather than Roman characteristic. Now the role of Rome and Gaul is reversed. Chiomara’s accomplices play the role of Camillus.

Therefore, the reader may conceptualize the “ornament of the matronly crime” (*matronalis facinoris decus*) as the head itself of the centurion, an artifact of Roman corruption, wrapped in the cloak of the victim of his desire, and placed before the Galatian chieftain. The severed head of the Roman centurion becomes a representative image for the ultimate fate of Manlius Vulso’s expedition. It is an artifact of Roman desire castrated and displayed to the fugitive chieftain Ortiago, whose escape from Mount Olympus shows the ultimate failure of Manlius’ expedition.

Yet Manlius does succeed in obtaining his primary objective: he obtains a triumph, but this too, like his success, is flawed, or spoiled by the objections of the *legati*, sent by the Senate to oversee negotiations with Antiochus. This commission of ten men, led by Aemilius Paulus, would become the greatest critics of Manlius in Livy’s narratives.

---

164 Joplin (1990) 54-55, in the context of Lucretia, but also as a general rule for Livy.

The Triumph of Manlius

When Manlius returns to Rome, a crisis for Roman empire ensues. Rather than merely the issue of awarding a triumph, Romans were confronted with the question of whether Senatorial power or ambitious generals such as Manlius should define the limits of the empire. Yet more is happening here in Livy’s narrative. Manlius in fact has become representative of the corruption of Roman virtue through contamination by Eastern conquests, thereby changing the consul into a Hellenistic despot. Such is the language that the Senatorial legati use to characterize Manlius’ campaign. They also emphasize the Greek element by characterizing Manlius’ victims as Gallograeci, although Manlius persists in calling them Galli.

The legati, sent to Asia Minor to negotiate peace with Antiochus, strongly opposed Manlius Vulso’s request for a triumph. This special embassy contained Lucius Aemilius Paulus, under whose command the Macedonian kingdom finally fell from power. For Livy he is a heroic figure, notable for his moderation and restraint. This temperance in the figure of Aemilius is an aspect of his characteristic as a figure of fortune, whose personal destiny intersects that of Rome. As such he becomes paradigmatic, a purely Roman figure.

This anticipates a little, but not too much. Aemilius Paulus has been selected for special attention here in order to signal the large role he will play in what follows, culminating in his defeat of Perseus. Now Aemilius Paulus is merely a senator, although already dwelling for the reader in the shadow of his deed, the extension of Roman imperium. Even here, in his first appearance, he
already is marking the boundary of imperium, the terms of peace treaties. Livy presents him as the most vocal opponent of Manlius Vulso’s request for a triumph, and the speech against Manlius is ambiguously attributed to Aemilius and Furius Purpurio. The presence of Aemilius reiterates the significance of the deeds of Manlius Vulso in book 38 for the fifteen book unit that culminates in the Roman conquest of Macedonia in book 45 and shows the intelligent design of Livy’s text. Even as Manlius’ character sets himself in rivalry against Scipio Asiagenes, Livy persistently contrasts Manlius Vulso with Aemilius.

The rivalry of Manlius and the legati is foreshadowed in the doubling of chapters 38 and 39, where the consul and the commission are shown transacting their imperial business. Chapter 38 presents the terms of peace imposed on Antiochus by the decemviri. The following chapter shows Manlius’ establishment of peace on the Galatians. As will be noted by the legati, Manlius’ conditions are imposed without consultations with the senate. The doubling of the theme strengthens and undermines the motif of imperial negotiation as imperial display, usually a tidy list of new imperial possessions and a catalogue of the lost privileges of the defeated. Manlius’ imposition of Roman authority in Galatia is contrasted to the actions of the legati in a way that suggests competing versions of Roman imperialism.

The speech of the legati contains many of the criticisms that have been noted above in the analysis of representative scenes. The decemviri criticize Manlius’ attacks against harmless people in remote regions (38.45.10). Manlius makes no reply to this specific charge. This is related to the complaint of his
successor consuls against Manlius' continued command in Galatia. The extension of the time for their consular authority leads to the terrorism of Manlius and Fulvius. This is the specific charge of their successors, Marcus Fulvius Nobilior and Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, who had to accept the less glamorous (but more virtuous) appointments in Liguria. They contrast their situation to that of their predecessors Fulvius and Manlius:

Fulvius and Manlius already for two years, the one in Europe, the other in Asia, ruling just as substitutes for Phillip and Antiochus... With the terror of war they wandered among the nationes, against whom no war had been declared, selling peace for a price (38.42.10-11).

The complaint may be seen as a moral protest against Roman terror in Greece and Asia, but in fact the envious consuls compare their predecessors to Hellenistic kings, as a reductive presentation of their abuse of power (in fact the Senate had of course legally prorogated their commands). Regardless of the merit of the accusation, its basis is a condemnation of un-Roman activities, a Greek mimesis in Roman dress. The consuls in Livy's narrative exploit a jaundiced view of Hellenistic authority. By the logic of synecdoche, the kings embody the worst attributes of their society, and therefore the sentiment can easily move from liberation rhetoric to anti-Hellenism.166

Manlius and Fulvius are also accused of selling peace through terror. This again recalls the Gallic hordes in Asia, who are preceded in their march by terror that is delayed from realization only by official acknowledgement and payment.

166 Pagnon (1982) notes that Manlius is charged with two vices associated with the enemies of Rome: Deceit (38.45.2; a plot against the life of Antiochus) and expansionism (38.45; his wish to go beyond the Taurus mountains).
Manlius therefore mimes the mercenary and extortionist Gauls at the same time as he acts the part of the Hellenistic king Antiochus. Manlius has become an Hellenistic hybrid in the reductive attacks of his envious successors.

The legati emphasize the hybridity of the Galatians by the compound Gallograecians, whereas in Manlius’ speech they are simply Gauls. The commissioners note the degenerate nature resulting from this mixture of Gaul and Greek:

Do not think that only the name of the Gallograecians is hybrid (mixtum). Long before both their bodies and spirit have been mixed and defiled (vitiati). Rather if those had been Gauls, with whom there has been war with varied outcomes in Italy, although our dear commander is able, would scarcely a herald have returned from there?

The military strength of the Gauls is found only where there is purity. By becoming a Greek compound, the Gauls are now degenerate and marred in the mingling, rather than improved by the Greek element. These are not the heroic Gauls from Manlius’ ancestral heritage. Yet the Gauls do have familiar markings from the past, now absurd rather than epic: “Just as a flock of birds they flew off at the first noise of the missiles (38.46.5).” The warning of Juno’s geese to another Manlius in book five is mocked by the bird-like fright of the Gauls before the march of Manlius in book 38.

The commissioners show greater mockery of Manlius’ pretensions to triumph in their descriptions of his mercenary intentions. Therefore rather than waging a public war of the Roman people, Manlius engages in private banditry. He is a consul mercennarius (38.45.9). His proper role as a representative of the
Roman public is subverted by his mercenary actions. Manlius is less Roman, and again more like the legendary Galatians described in suitably canonical form by Livy.

The argument of the legati against Manlius’ claim for a triumph is framed in the legal question of *iustum bellum*. They allege that Manlius fought the Gallograecians without senatorial authority, and therefore fought an illegal war, totally unsuitable for a triumph. These reproaches have been interpreted as those of the historian himself, and this passage has been seen to mark the end of Rome’s just wars. Manlius’ actions do represent what Girard would call a sacrificial crisis, since the rite of the Fetials shows the religious nature of warfare for Roman idealism. In such a sacrificial crisis the very real threat is that mimetic desire will destroy society by its reciprocal violence, thus triggering a sacrificial crisis. The end result of this cycle would be the annihilation of civil war. The sacrificial crisis is only ended by the invention of a scapegoat. Rather than a scapegoat, for Livy the campaign of Manlius Vulso shows the destructive decadence of Roman violence transformed by its eastern experience of mimetic desire. The motif of corruption is closely connected to the Hellenization of Rome in various forms, notably perverse after the second Macedonian war.

---

167 38.45.4-5: *Cum ibi nullam belli causam inveniret quiescentibus regiis, circumegisse exercitum ad Gallograecos, cui nationi non ex senatus auctoritate, non populi iussu bellum inlatum.*

168 Pagnon (1982) 122-3, who notes the significance of the theme of *iustum bellum* for Livy, shown for instance by his emphasis on the fetial rite in the first book (1.22).

169 Girard (1979) 78-81.
Manlius must counter the argument of the legati by making the Gallograeci of their speech into Gauls. This regressive move is fortified by renewed reference to Brennus' raid. Manlius even makes mention of the sacking of Delphi, if only to immediately to disregard it as an object of concern to Rome, unlike current Gallic activities west of the Taurus Mountains. The current difference is that Roman empire now includes Greece and Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{170}

Manlius reasserts the boundaries of Roman interest, in some way usurping the role of the legati while reminding them of the boundaries they themselves had set. The elimination of Gauls in Asia Minor is a legitimate of Roman imperium within its borders. The Galatians become the invaders of Roman Empire, although they were present when that Roman power was established.

Manlius' words are retroactive, restoring cultural purity to the Gallograeci as a means to validate his actions as iustum bellum. This requires a renewed emphasis on Gallic savagery. Now the degenerate Gauls are the most fierce (ferocissimorum) of enemies.\textsuperscript{171} He appeals to the shared knowledge of the senators (communiter scitis), who know about the savagery (immanitate) of the Gallic race, in a praeteritio, which pretends to its relevance to the present circumstances.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{170} 38.48.3.

\textsuperscript{171} 38.47.6.

\textsuperscript{172} 38.47.9: Non sum postulaturus a vobis, patres conscripti, ut quae communiter de immanitate gentis Gallorum, de infestissimo odio in nomen Romanum scitis, ea de illis quoque qui Asiae terras incolunt existimis Gallis.
This vocabulary of savagery indicates the fundamental flaw of Gallic character that can only be corrected by Roman violence:

“I tried to mitigate the innate savagery (feritate insita) of the Gallic spirit, and after I perceived them to be untamed and unappeasable (indomitos atque implacabiles), then finally I determined that they must be confined by force and arms (vi atque armis coercendos).” (39.45.12).

Once again Gallic nature is characterized not only as a deficiency, but also as an excess that must be enclosed by Roman violence. There is a strange symbiosis portrayed in Manlius’ rhetoric. In order for his victory to be a pure triumph, he must show the purity of the Gauls. The Galatians must take their appropriate place in the Roman world as Gauls that must be killed, if not subdued.

Manlius’ justifies his actions as establishing order. His campaign is in fact part of the Roman mandate to keep peace on its lands. “You judged it your concern that they (the imperial subjects) have peace on land and at sea”\(^{173}\). Here the maintenance of peace includes the waging of war. Such logical quandaries are only possible by the ground of a synecdoche, which sees threats to the part as threats to the whole. Synecdoche could easily be extended to cover any rhetoric of purity, which magnifies parts into whole, both in the formulation of anatomical parts (as in the ritual significance of certain parts of the body) or the significance for certain actions of individuals for collectivities outside of any recognizable causality (such as the celibacy of holy individuals invested with official status in a society).

---

\(^{173}\) 38.48.4: *Curae vestrae censetis esse ut pacem terra marique habeant.*
The dispute of the commissioners and Manlius is a conflict whose resolution establishes a precedent. Manlius will either extend the ability for consuls to act without senatorial approval or bloody conquests will no longer be honored with a triumph, even though they meet all the pertinent criteria. As we have seen, Manlius by all estimations slaughtered far more than the required 5000 souls. Will Manlius be an example to follow or shun?

As a conflict about precedents Manlius’ expedition presents a crisis of narrative. Livy sets out in his *Praefatio* the goal of his narrative as the recording of *exempla*, some to imitate, others to avoid. Manlius himself has merely followed the example of his illustrious ancestors by killing Gauls and earning a triumph. He seeks to rival the actions and especially the triumph of his consular predecessor. These purely Roman motivations have taken on a strangely Hellenistic cast when transplanted to Asia Minor and now they appear as tyranny and mercenary ambitions. Manlius Vulso seeks to find his paradigms in his past but he is an avatar of future eastern adventurers such as Lucullus and Pompey who would dominate Roman society by their armies, money and influence.

Manlius is permitted to bring the hostile Greek things into the city. The dying Gaul of Pergamum may now enter the gallery of Roman images, although copied from a Greek original. The dispute between the commissioners and Manlius is pointless to the resolution of the dispute; in fact it is the persuasive influence of powerful friends that gains him a triumph rather than simply his representation of the Galatians as pure Gauls. For Livy, this shows that the
corruption of Rome will still continue. Rivalry was the source of Gallic *seditio*, and a reason for their weakness. This dissension among the Gauls was brought about during their contact with Greeks.

The story of Manlius, rather than a digression, shows the development of the major theme of Roman corruption in a representative form. It shows the dominant theme of books 31-45, the Roman conquest of Macedonia and its resulting crisis in identity. The triumph of Manlius is not a victory, but an epiphany for the antagonisms that motivate Livy’s narrative, the entry of corrupting objects and desires into the city. It is a crisis of hybridity that is signaled in the term Graecoroman, like the compound Gallograeci.

This fatal and violent connection of the Gauls and Greeks is a familiar obsessive and violent mystery in ancient Rome. In 225, after the defeat at Cannae, the Sybilline books were consulted. An extraordinary sacrifice was prescribed: the living inhumation of a Gallic couple and a Greek couple, as if a representation for the two races and furthermore the foreign menace in general. Indeed, the Gaul and Greek in Livy’s history, as alterities undermining the stability and purity of Roman *exempla*, live often underneath the event of the narrative, buried as if dead, but alive. There is still a threat that the city will be invaded and possessed by the foreign. This seems to happen in the next section we shall examine: the Bacchanalian conspiracy.

\[174\] 22.57.
In chapter 39 of Livy’s history, the metonymic rhetoric of infection is realized in the presentation of the Bacchanalia as the disease of Hellenism in the Roman body politic. This contamination shows the closeness of home and abroad in Livy’s narrative. The Bacchanalia will be examined here with other passages, such as the discovery of Numa’s books and the speech of Cato against the Lex Oppia, as emblematic of the role Hellenism plays in the narrative as a cultural artifice not only polluting Roman purity, but also threatening the order of the state. The Bacchanalia, following the Galatian campaign of Manlius Vulso, may be seen as a Roman imagining of the entry of monstrous Hellenistic culture in their midst, and in some ways marks the culmination of the theme in Livy’s extant history. Afterwards its effect on Romans shall be seen as more insidious, since Livy sees the threat of Hellenism as an internal threat manifest in Roman mimesis of Hellenistic mores rather Greek conspiracies or phalanxes. Yet the Bacchanalia is an important thematic development in Livy, since the marginality and hybridity of the Greek world suddenly appears in Rome itself.175

175 The anti-Hellenic tone of Livy’s account of the Bacchanalia seems unmistakable. Luce (1977) considered it “a paramount example of how foreigners and foreign excess modified the Roman character” (261). For the argument that this anti-Hellenism is representative of the politics of its time, see Gruen (1990) 73-75., although he notes the exaggerated language of the description of
Livy’s narrative of these episodes is directed by a metonymy that has reduced the state of Roman morality (and its presumed crisis) to Greek influence, understood as a contagion, as if the Roman state (civitas or res publica) could be shown as a body politic, subject to pollution from cultural bacteria, or as if ignoble Hellenism could be understood in the figure of the wandering Greek, a manic sage, the source of the Bacchanalia, or as if Greek influences could be dramatized as New Comedy in Roman dress, the story of Aebutius and Hispala, so that Roman citizens become a Hellenistic culture artifact. Livy writes for us the only specimen of New Comedy set in Rome, a dramatic representation of the Bacchanalia that is ultimately reductive rather than representative. Elsewhere, in the episode of Numa’s books, Hellenism is understood as forbidden books or as the manners and clothes of Roman women in Cato’s speech against the repeal of the Oppian law. The presentation of Hellenism is reductive throughout these episodes. We shall discuss these three episodes, the Bacchanalia, Numa’s books, and the Lex Oppia, as metonymies of Hellenism in the midst of Livy’s Roman narrative.

As throughout this project, my application of the tropes is heavily influenced by the theories of Burke. Burke writes that “the basic strategy of metonymy is this: to convey some incorporeal or intangible state in the terms of the corporeal or tangible”. He continues:

_____

the cult, writing that it “shows clear signs of distortion and deliberate misrepresentation” (63). For a bold denial that “a harmonious equilibrium was ever reached between Greek and Roman culture” (117), see the excellent study by Woolf (1994). For an overview of the enormous twentieth century scholarship on the Bacchanalia (up to 1988), see Pailler (1988) 61-122.
Language develops by metaphorical extension, in borrowing words from the realm of the corporeal, visible, tangible, and applying them by analogy to the realm of the incorporeal, invisible, intangible; then in the course of time, the original corporeal reference is forgotten, and only the incorporeal, metaphorical extension survives (often because the very conditions of living that reminded one of the corporeal reference have so altered that the cross reference no longer exists with near the same degree of apparentness in the objective situation itself).\(^\text{176}\)

Metonymy is a particularly effective tool for the rhetorician who intends to convince, if the metaphorical extensions are widely accepted by his audience. At any rate, Livy’s reduction of Hellenism to the ritual objects and actions of an imagined Bacchic cult is a key point in Livy’s narrative. In the episodes that I shall discuss Livy seeks to dramatize threats to contemporary Rome in the annals of the past.

Livy throughout his history uses figurative language to discuss foreign influence at Rome. Most notably, he emphasizes its alien and threatening quality by utilizing vivid verbs of motion. Therefore, in the *Praefatio*, avarice and luxury immigrate.\(^\text{177}\) This is contrasted to a primordial Roman purity, distinguished by frugality and thriftiness,\(^\text{179}\) a morality built upon the absence or presence of money. This metonymic morality of money is further developed in the lines that follow, describing wealth as foreign excess:

\(^{176}\) Burke 506.

\(^{177}\) *Praef. 11*: *Avaritia luxuriaeque immigraverint*. See also Feldherr (1998)40-43 for this externalization of corruption in Livy’s history.

\(^{178}\) *Praef. 11*: *Nulla umquam res publica . . . ubi tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit*
Recently wealth has imported avarice and abundant gratifications have imported (*invexere*) an extravagant lustful desire for destruction and destroying all things (*Praefatio* 12).^{179}

Livy here has disrupted the expected order of desire and seduction. Wealth creates avarice and gratification creates lust. His rhetoric also easily drifts from the metonymic morality of money to sexuality, both imagined as foreign vices that are brought into the city that destroys itself in the midst of its desires. In the midst of its conquest, the Romans are destroyed by their desire for everything that is transformed into the destruction of all things, including themselves.

Livy utilizes these same connotations of Hellenism in the midst of narrative of the Macedonian Wars in Book 39. There the triumph of Manlius is an example of wealth and extravagance, but also foreign influence, here reduced to a list of the foreign plunder. These were the first soldiers to bring in such luxury: gilded beds, elaborate textiles, and Latin words fail to describe the furniture (*monopodia et abacos*). There were also female musicians, duly noted by the Greek names (*psaltriae sambucistriaeaeque*).^{180} Did Manlius conquer Greeks or Gauls? Yet as we have seen, for Livy the Galatians were very Hellenistic Gauls indeed. At the crescendo of Livy’s list of corrupting Asiatic fashions is the social ascension of the cook, a representation of the cult of the belly, severed from the traditional

179 *Nuper divitiae avaritiam et abundantes voluptates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdidendique omnia invexere.*

180 A similar point has been made regarding the description of war booty as *gazae* in the speech of Cato regarding the *Lex Oppia* (34.4.2). It has been argued that the word is Greek, but they received the word from the Persians; see Feldherr (1998) 43 n. 131. However, I would argue that the (mis)understandings of such encounters with alterity are more sensuous than analytical, for which see Taussig (1993).
paternalistic mind to moderate it. The dilettantes are reduced to paunch. It is the triumph of the body over imperial constraint, just as in the anecdote of Ortiago’s wife (and the many other terrorisms of imperialism).

The Bacchanalia as Contamination

Although the Bacchanalia could be regarded as representative of Hellenism, and therefore a synecdoche, I shall here focus on the reductive elements of Livy’s narrative.\(^\text{181}\) Hellenism is troped as a thing or an essence that infects the body politic, to use a favorite metaphor of Livy. The metonymic links of Livy’s narrative allows the anti-Hellenism to be implicit rather than explicit. This is done even by the odd mode of narrative that Livy chooses. The story seems like the plot of a Greek comedy.

He begins his account of the Bacchanalia (39.8-19) with an anonymous Greek who arrives in Etruria and introduces the rites. Livy takes this occasion to provide a description of the perversions of the cult. Next follows the story of Aebutius, a Roman youth who is to be initiated in the cult, due to the encouragements of his evil mother and stepfather. They tell him that he must take an oath of sexual abstinence in preparation for initiation. This disconcerts his girlfriend, the prostitute Hispala, and she is further troubled when she discovers the cause of his sudden chastity. It seems that she herself had been initiated when she was still a slave, and she bore testimony to her lover of the

\(^{181}\) I do however concede the overlap and even confusion of synecdoche and metonymy. For a discussion of this issue, see Burke (1969) 505-9.
many depravities of the cult. Upon returning home, Aebutius refuses to take further ritual preparations for initiation. This caused his mother and stepfather to drive him from the house. When his aunt learned from Aebutius the cause of his expulsion, she convinces him to go to the consul Postumius and inform him of the cult. The consul arranges a conference between his mother Sulpicia and Hispala. She is startled by the sudden appearance of the consul with his lictors. After hearing the prostitute’s story, he summons the Senate and relays the information he has gathered. The Senate bans the Bacchic rites throughout Italy and a *quaestio* is decreed. Bacchic priests are to apprehended and questioned. Next there is a lengthy oration by Postumius before the Senate. After characterizing the cult’s practices in lurid terms, he convinces the Senate to take vigorous action. Penalties for participation in the cult’s offenses include death. The rites of Bacchus are hitherto banned, with the exception of those that were permitted by Senate, if such rites were demonstrated to be “traditional and necessary”. As rewards for Hispala and Aebutius, she is granted citizenship and he is removed from military service.

Livy introduces the Bacchanalia with a glance to its origins and a denunciation of its effects in the population. Then a comedy follows, starring a rather gullible youth and a virtuous prostitute. The final section is the long speech of Postumius, which reiterates certain elements of the introduction and the comedy, but in exaggerated form. In the first and final parts of the narrative there is an emphasis on pollution, and the middle part thereby should be seen as
a description of symptoms.\textsuperscript{182} Livy’s message is that Hellenism is an infectious substance in Rome and therefore necessarily requires the remedies of forceful Roman authority. The Bacchanalia reinforces themes and tropes from the 

*Praefatio*.\textsuperscript{183}

The aggressive entry of destructive foreign influence realizes the sententious admonitions of the *Praefatio*. The Bacchanalia is similarly characterized in reductive language of importation and infection. The origin of this new destructive Greek influence is described:

> First an ignoble Greek (\textit{Graecus ignobilis}) came into Etruria, a man with none of those skills for the cultivation of our mind and bodies that the most learned race brought to us, but a little holy man and prophet (\textit{sacrificulus et vates}) (39.8.3).

Aside from characterizing him further as the hierophant of secret nocturnal rites (\textit{occultorum et nocturnorum antistes sacrorum}; 39.8.4), Livy discusses him no further, but proceeds to describe the Bacchic rites as a series of inversions of normal Roman ritual. These descriptions of Bacchic initiations, intended to be lurid and captivating, have distracted many from pondering this solitary Greek pathogen. Soon this unknown Greek vanishes into the perverse rites that he imports. The diffusion of his mystery teachings is likened to an infection or plague.

> The infection of this evil from Etruria penetrated Rome just like a contagious disease (39.9.1).


\textsuperscript{183} Many of these same points have also been made by Pailler (1988) 394-6 and Luce (1977) 259, but without examining the rhetorical strategies that characterize Livy’s depiction of Hellenism.
The medicinal metaphor recalls the language of the Preface, and prepares the reader for the harsh remedies that shall follow, an exercise in centralized Roman authority, a surgical strike upon immorality in the Roman body politic.

The ignoble Greek is the key to understanding the Bacchanal infection. First, it is a Greek phenomenon. Livy tells us more about its Hellenic character by contrasting it with other Greek imports, namely the *artes* of mind and body that distinguished Greek erudition among Romans. This ignoble Greek comes later. This Greek is already marginalized in the shadows of his ancestors. He is degenerate, like the Gallograecians. By lacking the very arts that distinguished Greeks among Romans, he enters the Roman world of Etruria as less Greek. By the word *ignobilis* a number of things are suggested. It tells us that the Greek is not notable, therefore without distinction, but also unfamiliar. It can also suggest the low class of this Greek, perhaps echoed in the diminutive *sacrificulus*. This is the subaltern Greek, wandering on the margins of the Roman and Greek world. Livy does not distinguish his regional identity, and the reader is permitted to imagine him as any Greek, but especially the degenerate Greek, the sort of Greek who had totally lost his *artes*. He is an unknown Greek, and his humanity is quickly reduced to his affect upon Roman ritual practice and morality. He enters Etruria as a man and leaves as a disease. The origin of the Greek sickness is the Greek subaltern, a decadent echo of Greek majesty, a sign of a civilization in decline (and infectious).\(^{184}\)
In a way, Livy’s banal drama of Aebutius and Hispala could be seen as a narrative response to the entry of infectious Hellenism, for Livy here writes a Greek comedy in Roman dress. This narrative response is not unusual, since plague and theater are not unconnected phenomena, as Augustine and Artaud inform us. Augustine wrote with contempt of the plays performed at Rome to appease the gods in times of plague. Artaud develops the subtle connection of plague and theater:

The plague takes images that are dormant, a latent disorder, and suddenly extends them into the most extreme gestures; the theater also takes gestures and pushes them as far as they will go: like the plague it reforges the chain between what is and what is not, between the virtuality of the possible and what already exists in materialized nature.185

The nature of plague and theater is transgressive for Artaud, yet it only manifests the chaos that lurks under the veneer of social order. He describes it as “a battle of symbols”. Similarly, the Bacchanalia is the manifestation for Livy of a latent corruption that is narrated in the form of a Greek comedy. There is the prologue of the ignoble Greek, and then the domestic drama of Aebutius’ proposed initiation to the Bacchanalia and his rescue from his nefarious mother by the virtuous prostitute next door. From this perspective, the speech of the consul Postumius functions as a deus ex machina. He restores the civic balance by

184 Woolf (1994) argues that this was a persistent and general attitude among Romans who felt that “Greeks may have invented civilization but now they have lost it” (121). Elsewhere he notes “To Romans the past achievements of the Greeks only reinforced the impression of their present-day decadence” (132). Perhaps the more consensus view is that Greek manners were already well integrated into Roman society at the time of the Bacchanalia, as argued in Macmullen (1991) 428.

185 Artaud (1958) 27.
exhorting the Senate to take vigorous action.\footnote{In this sense I agree with Scafuro (1989) 127-8. She argues that the entry of the consul breaks the “comic paradigm”. For an overview of the comic form of the narrative, see 125-6.} Hispala becomes a citizen and may live happily ever after with Aebutius, who has been removed from military enlistment, as if he is a \textit{puer aeternus}. The characters of the Bacchanalia are exaggerated types or symbols, whose function is more reductive than representative.

Livy introduces his hero and heroine with diminutives. Aebutius is an orphan (\textit{pupillus}; 39.9.2) and a little young man (\textit{adulescentulum}; 39.9.3).\footnote{187} These terms are used in the midst of the descriptions of his manipulation by his stepfather and mother, who wish to rob him of his inheritance. The terms are inappropriate for Aebutius’ age, for he certainly seems mature enough for Hispala. The diminutives heighten the sympathy of the audience for Aebutius. The language also excuses the boy’s vulnerability. Indeed, in a way Aebutius will never be a man since he will never serve in the army. The scandal freezes him in a liminal state of youth, exempt from military service, the consort of Hispala, who protects him from his wicked mother.

Hispala is also introduced by diminutives. She is a little servant or slave girl (\textit{ancillula}; 39.9.5) and a little prostitute (\textit{meritrícula}; 39.9.6). These diminutives endear Hispala to the reader, and she can be excused for her activities, especially since she is not a citizen. In the first diminutive she is

\footnote{Johner (1996) 74-5 argues that throughout Livy’s history adolescents play an important role as a catalyst for events.}
excused from reproach for her occupation. “She was not deserving of that occupation. She had grown accustomed to it as a little slave girl”. Livy notes that she chose to continue this occupation after she had been freed. These diminutives show the comic nature of the narrative, since they are both frequently found in Roman comedies but nowhere else in Livy’s 35 extant books.

The latter term is used when Livy describes her financial support of Aebutius: “While his own family was causing all manner of harmful things for him, he was supported by the munificence of a little prostitute.” Certainly this is a remarkable situation for a Roman youth. The situation is already comic before the revelations of the Bacchanalia. The crisis of state will lead to the happy union of the lovers and privileged status among the Roman citizenship. We must imagine that Hispala shall no longer work. The virtuous prostitute will become a Roman matron.

She is introduced to the reader as a “notable prostitute, the freedwoman Hispala Faecinia”. Nobilis here seems to refer to her fame. Its class implications are limited by the word libertina that follows in the Latin. Still, the words do carry broader implications for the marginal status of Hispala. The contrast of the three words is exceptional: whore, noble, former slave. This noble

---

188 39.9.5: Non digna quaestu cui ancillula adsuerat, etiam postquam manumissa erat eodem se genere tuebatur.
189 Scafuro (1989) 125. For a complete list see 139 n. 27. Plautus seems especially fond of using ancillula.
190 39.9.6: Maligne omnia praebentibus suis meretriculae munificentia sustinebatur.
191 39.9.5: Scortum nobile libertina Hispala Faecenia…
whore immediately makes us remember the ignoble Greek, the anonymous
sacrificulus (another diminutive) who introduced the Bacchanalia into Roman
territories. The Greek is anonymous and ignoble. The whore is notable,
illustrious, noble—all of this in nobilis. The Greek is compared to the whore and
found wanting.

Hispala emerges as the most remarkable character in the narrative. The
events revolve around her, since it is her information that will be the basis of the
remarkable decrees of the Senate, and the quaestiones, suicides and executions
that follow. All of this is the result of her exercising her sexual privileges with her
lover (she ultimately convinces him). It is a paradox that this notable prostitute
must coax her lover for sex. Yet he initially refuses, saying that he must observe
ten days of sexual abstinence before his initiation in the Bacchanalia. Hispala,
aroused or alarmed, tells him that he must abandon his vow and any participation
in the cult. She warns him of the perils of the cult in language that echoes Livy’s
previous description. Hispala makes her startling revelations in the only bedroom
scene featuring consenting participants in Livy’s extant history.

She said that she knew that it was the training ground of every type
of corruption and now for two years no one older than twenty years
old was initiated. Each initiate was brought in like a victim to be
handed over to the priests. They lead the initiates away into a
place that echoed with shouts and singing and the pounding of
music from cymbals and drums, so that the screams could not be
heard when someone was attacked for rape (39.10.6-7)
This passage echoes Livy’s earlier passage, which first described the Bacchanalia after its introduction by the wandering Greek. I have underlined the passages that are echoed in Hispala’s warning to Aebutius.

There were initiations that were conveyed at first to a few, and then began to become common among both men and women. The pleasures of wine and feasting were added to religion, with the result that the souls of many were seduced. When wine had moved their souls, and night and the men mixed with women, the delicate of age and their elders, extinguished all discretion of shame, at first corruptions of every kind (*corruptelae...omnis generis*) began to occur, since each had a source of pleasure for that which their nature was most inclined. These promiscuous rapes of freeborn men and women were not the only kind of offense, but also false witnesses, seals, testimonies and evidence were coming from that same training ground (*officina*). Likewise there were poisonings and murders so secret that not even bodies remained to bury. Many things were dared by deception, many by violence. The violence was hidden since no scream during the rapes and slaughters could be heard above the ritual shouts and the noise of the drums and cymbals (39.8.5-8).

The prostitute confirms the historian. First there is the wild exaggeration of imputing to the Bacchanals “corruptions of every kind”. This hyperbole is in fact a form of metonymy that reduces the cult to the ethically other, the subversion of every virtue. Once this simple point is agreed upon, Livy may interpret any aspect of the cult to any particular vice he chooses, since the cult supplied material for every perversity.¹⁹²

The next idea that is replicated in both descriptions is the notion of the Bacchanalia as an *officina*. I have followed the traditional translation of this word

---

¹⁹² 39.8.6: *Corruptelae primum omnis generis fieri coeptae, cum ad id quisque quo natura pronioris libidinis esset paratam voluptatem haberet.*
as “training ground”. The commentators have related the term to military discipline. The motif of military service is found several times in the narrative. This depiction of the Bacchanalia as a perverse militia is related to the broader theme of the Bacchanalia as the mirror image of the state that mimics its institutions in a subverted form. This is a figure that persists through Livy’s narrative of the Bacchanalia, from his initial description in chapter 8 to Postumius’ vitriolic speech to the Senate in the temple of Bellona. The Bacchanalia is the opposite of the Roman state, the totally other. The conspirators perversely mime the Roman state.

The word officina has the more basic meaning of a workshop. The Bacchanalia there is concerned with the production of a certain type, the anti-Roman. This objectification of the participants of the cult reduces them to products of a process of manufacture in the workshop of a degenerate Hellenism.

The third idea that is replicated in the descriptions of the narrator and Hispala is the ululations and percussion instruments that drown the screams of the rape and murder victims. This use of the trope is particularly effective usage of metonymy, for it conveys the unknown by the known. Several times it is said that the noise of the cult was well known in Rome. The ritual screams and percussion instruments would be familiar to the audience, although they would still bear the taint of the foreign, and therefore their exotic qualities could have a cathetic effect on the audience. The sounds of ritual, harsh and alarming for the nonparticipant, become tokens of violence.
The hyperbole of absolute corruption, and the reduction of the cult to a workshop of perversions, pulsing with the sounds of rape and murder rather than ecstatic devotions, illustrates the metonymic strategies of Livy’s narrative. Scholars have compared the Bacchanalia to later persecutions of the Christians in the imperial age and the witches in the middle Ages. Certainly they share a rhetoric that relies on metonymy, a frequent trope for descriptions of conspiracy that obfuscate official atrocities.\(^{193}\)

By reprising these lurid characterizations in the warnings of the virtuous whore Livy gives them a greater realism, and therefore the official utterance of such charges, despite their further elaborations, ring true for the reader (although a cynical reader could suggest that Hispala’s description is a clever stratagem to cause Aebutius to break his vow of chastity).\(^{194}\) This aspect of the narrative shows Livy’s masterful approach, since the language of official hysteria, proper to tragedy, is placed in the context of a comedy. The consul is the *deus ex machina* who will dissolve the comedy with a speech from the rostra that will motivate the Senators to record the events in the official form of an edict. The domestic drama motivates the actions of the Senate in the public space and an inscription to be known throughout the provinces of Italy.

Livy lingers on the character of Hispala and her encounter with Roman power in the character of Postumius’ mother-in-law Sulpicia and Postumius

\(^{193}\) Cohn 10-11 discusses the Bacchanalia in the context of a witchcraft conspiracies of the Middle Ages. For a critique of this view, see Pailler (1988) 797-816.

\(^{194}\) The exaggerated tone of the consul’s speech is noted by Gruen (1990) 40 and Pailler (1988) 349.
himself. This meeting is presented as a comedy of manners. Hispala, when summoned to Sulpicia, is disturbed at the prospect of an audience with such a notable and grave woman (tam nobilem et gravem feminam). When she arrives at Sulpicia’s house and sees the lictors in the courtyard, she nearly collapses. The notable prostitute is humbled before the notable matron. It is particularly the quality of gravitas that Hispala lacks, but which is manifest in Sulpicia and the lictors that stand in her courtyard. Indeed it is Hispala who motivates much of the comic effects of the narrative. Throughout the scene at Sulpicia’s house Hispala’s marginality contrasts with the majesty of the consul and his mother-in-law.

However, it is hardly easy for the consul to extract the information from the informer. He must extort the information from her. The consul’s effect on the prostitute is panic (tantus pavor; 39.12.5). This is the same word that Livy used for the effect of Manlius Volso on the Galatians. Faced with the marginal hybrid, the effect of consular authority is panic. This dissolves much of the tension in the scene. The end is a foregone conclusion. Hispala will confess, pleading her delicate and servile status as an excuse for her participation. By emphasizing her vulnerability, she places herself in a helpless circumstance similar to that of Aebutius. At the same time, this reinforces the description of the cult as an officina, by emphasizing the youthfulness of Hispala and her therefore unwilling participation.

195 39.12.2.
196 Unlike Scafuro (1989) 127-28 I would argue that the scene is highly comical.
Hispala reluctantly admitted to the consul her participation in the cult. She describes the youth of the participants and the mixing of women and men. Emphasis is placed on perversions and subversions of traditional cult. At first the participants were only women, but then young men were initiated. The unwilling became sacrificial victims. The men prophesized in ecstasy.

Hispala reveals the alarming dimensions of the conspiracy. Already the extent of the conspiracy constituted a state within a state and had spread to the nobility. Hispala’s account describes the movement of the cult from the Campanian priestess Paculla Annia to anonymous Roman nobility, from women to men, from periphery to center. These are the only nobiles that are unnamed in Livy’s narrative of the Bacchanalia. The others are the prostitute and the consul’s mother-in-law. Since these other subversive Roman notables remain nameless, the threat to Roman society, and the very stomach of it, to borrow Livy’s metaphor, is threatened in a general, total, but unknown way. It is the mystique of conspiracy. An atmosphere is created that can reduce any gesture of a Senator, private citizen or even slave to a seditious act. Conspiracies are metonymies- whether their actions are common breathing (conspiro) or swearing of oaths (coniuratio), they reduce the participants to the awful moment in which they renounced their prior allegiance by swearing fidelity to something new. Often Livy dramatizes the moment of the oath. Here the oath is the ritual itself, a terrible inversion of Roman mores.

Another aspect of Bacchic inversion is the nocturnal gatherings, in contrast to the daytime rites of the Roman state. Similarly, the Bacchic rites are
hidden, whereas those of the state are public. Yet a much more insidious effect of the cult is its mixing of the genders. Repeatedly Livy or his characters speak of the mixing of the sexes in the cult. This reductive characterization of the activities of the cult becomes a running theme of Livy’s narrative from its beginning to its end. By repeatedly referring to this mixing of women and men in the cult, Livy can characterize the Bacchants as criminals against gender as well as the state. Rome therefore perpetuates the natural order that Hellenism seeks to undermine through its corrupting influence.

Hispala lists four innovations of the priestess Paculla Annia. Meetings would occur five times rather than three times a month. The meetings took place at night rather than day. No one older than 20 would be initiated, and now men as well as women could participate. It has been shown that these are not notable divergences from traditional practices in the cult. Furthermore, it is uncertain when precisely Paculla made these changes. Presumably it was some time after the Second Punic War, but it could have been earlier. Livy tells us that her son was apprehended during the Roman crackdown, but there is no word about her. The essential problem is that these changes are not particularly

---


198 In this sense Livy would agree that the Romans saw the Bacchanalia as a threat to social order and the state cult, as argued by Beard, North and Price (1998) 95-96.

199 Bruhl (1953) 93-94 and more recently Gruen 1990 52-54 (although see North (1979) 89-90 for a different view).
exceptional, nor can they be easily dated to the period before 186. These four aspects are however the very things that Livy emphasizes in his alarming narrative: The frequency of the nocturnal meetings, the corruption of the young, and the mixing of the sexes. These practices are characterized as contrary to Roman tradition.

Although the Greek nature of the conspiracy is not explicitly stated, it is implicit in every mention of Bacchus and its cognates. The Greek element of the conspiracy is presupposed throughout Livy’s account. When Postumius refers the matter to the Senate

Enormous panic (pavor ingens) seized the fathers, on the one hand on behalf of the public, lest those conspiracies and nocturnal meetings should bring in (importarent) some hidden injury or danger, then also each on their behalf, lest any guilt should be their own (39.14.4).

The verb importare recalls the verbs of motion used to describe the decay of the Republic in the Praefatio. Luxury and avarice there immigrated, and wealth carried in avarice. Again, Livy chooses to emphasize implicitly the pristine purity of Rome, undermined by the corruption of its empire. The only solution offered by Postumius is tighter centralized control and a murderous purge of Rome itself.

200 North 89

201 Patres pavor ingens cepit, cum publico nomine, ne quid eae coniurationes coetusque nocturni fraudis occultae aut periculi importarent, tum privati suorum cuiusque vicem, ne quis adfinis ei noxae esset.
Even before Postumius’ long speech before the Senate, the climax of Livy’s Bacchanalia narrative, the senators are alarmed by the consul’s intentions. The anxiety of the Senators is *pavor*, the same effect that the display of consular authority had on Hispala and the unfortunate Galatians. Their fear that they themselves might be implicated shows not only the extent of the cult’s popularity, but also the dimensions of consular authority. After the vitriolic speech of Postumius before the Senate, the end result of the exercise of state power is *terror*:

> After the assembly had been dismissed, there was great terror in the entire city nor was it contained in the walls of the city or Roman borders, but throughout all Italy people were seized with trembling (39.17.4).\(^{203}\)

The spread of this terror from Rome to its Italian provinces is strikingly conveyed as an uncontained force in striking language. Just like the travels of Manlius in Galatia, this imperial exercise is conveyed in a passive construction: *trepidari coeptum est*. This effect of imperial authority on its subjects is an extension of the *pavor* that struck the *patres* at Postumius initial revelation to the Senate. The proliferation of imperial authority throughout its Italian provinces parallels the spread of the Bacchanalia itself. Whereas that spread from Italy to Rome and

\(^{202}\) Scafuro (1989) 136 suggests this reflects the experience of proscriptions in Livy’s own time. In this context the actions of the *triumviri capitales* to secure the city (39.14.10) would be a significant echo and would strengthen her argument.

\(^{203}\) *Contione dismiisa magnus terror urbe fuit, nec moenibus se tantum urbis aut finibus Romanis continuit, sed passim per totam Italiam…trepidari coeptum est.*
infected the highest classes, the anonymous nobiles themselves, state terror spreads back from the highest classes, the patres themselves, and permeates totam Italiam.

The object of provincial fear and senatorial anxiety is imperial speech itself: the second senatorial edict and the speech of the consul. Imperial authority is understood as speech and inscription. It does not matter that the motive for this imperial exercise is unsubstantiated allegations and bombastic language of vice and decadence. This rhetoric only increases the terror it has already created and therefore makes the display of imperial authority that much more effective.

The exaggerations of the consul’s speech are ultimately reductive since the cults participants are identified with the vices they allegedly suffer and perform. The vice is infectious, and easily transferred from criminal to victim. The participants in the cult are “sworn over to their own debaucheries and others” (cooperti stupris suis alienisque; 39.15.14). This has ruined the value of the young men for military service. The speech reinforces the previous characterizations of the cult as an officina, but it is dependent on troping the conspiracy in the reductive moment of the oath. Allegiance to the cult is incompatible with allegiance to the state, since the ritual oath has subverted the public one:

Oh Quirites, do you think that these youths will be made into soldiers after they have been initiated by this oath (sacramento)? Should weapons be entrusted to them, led from this obscene shrine (sacrario)? (39.15.13)
The oath at entry into the cult here recalls the military oath, which it implicitly nullifies for Livy. The *sacrarium* could refer to a private shrine, but it seems more often to have indicated a public place of worship. The Bacchic cult is contrasted to worship at the military camp or in the field of Mars.

Throughout Postumius’ speech, he conveys his denunciation in a language rich in emotional content intended to arouse the patriotism of the Roman audience. He addresses the assembly as Quirites and makes an appeal to the religious customs of the ancestors (*maiores*).

Not those, that lead minds seized by wicked and foreign worship just as by a maddening goad (*furialibus stimulis*) lead them towards every abomination and every lust. (39.15.3)

The alleged conspirators are unfavorably contrasted to the ancestors and found wanting. Moreover, their religious practice is characterized as foreign and hybrid, as the phase *furialibus stimulis* shows. The first word is a Dionysian word and has Hellenic associations. The latter word recalls the indigenous cult of Stimula, a religious practice of the ancestors, characterized as foreign.\(^{205}\)

Postumius’ speech immediately reprises the hyperbolic *omne genus* allegation that we have noted in the speeches of Hispala and Livy’s narrative introduction to the Bacchanalia. Here the crimes are characterized as *scelus* and

---

\(^{204}\) *Hoc sacramento initiatos iuvenes milites faciendos censetis, Quirites? His ex obsceno sacrario eductis arma committenda?*

\(^{205}\) This is an idea developed at some length by Cazanove (1983). For his interpretation of *furialibus stimulis* as a Roman conception in Greek dress, see 73. There he quotes Plautus *Captivi* 598: *deliramenta loquitur: larvae stimulant virum.*
libido. The second word recalls the “lust for self ruin and the ruin of all things” mentioned in the Praefatio. Indeed, as something alien that enters the city and corrupts Rome, the Bacchanalia is a manifestation of the programmatic corruption for Livy. It is Greek, diffused in the Roman culture, but when it manifests it is displayed as Greek decadence, the women controlling the men, the women the source of all evil. It culminates in the men becoming women, Greek homosexuality imagined as the ultimate promiscuity. It is the worst Greek stereotype enacted in the midst of Rome itself. 206

The gatherings themselves are characterized as illegal and contrary to tradition. The ancestors, in their wisdom, would not allow these meetings of the multitudo without the presence of a magistrate, a lawful manager (legitimum rectorem). Gatherings were for the purpose of raising an army or holding elections. These lawful gatherings are contrasted to the nocturnal coetus of the Bacchic initiates; a word that suggests but does not mean sex, a word subject to the imagination of the audience, a guide to desire and loathing. Livy is fond of using this word and forms of coire to describe the gatherings of the initiates.

Postumius instructs the Quirites to not dread legislating the worship of the god, in fear of arousing divine anger. This form of religion is wicked and illegitimate (religio prava). Postumius implies that he could cite precedents, but instead utters it as a truism that foreign religion was unwelcome in Rome.

———

206 39.15.9: Primum igitur mulierum magna pars est, et is fons mali huiusce fuit; deinde simillimi feminis mares, stuprati et constupratores fanatici. The importance of stubra has been over emphasized by Macmullen 429-30.
How many times in the age of our fathers and grandfathers was the matter entrusted to the magistrates to forbid foreign rites to occur, to prohibit the little priests and soothsayers (sacrificulos vatesque) from the forum around the city, and they sought out and burned their soothsaying books (vaticinos libros), and they abolished all sacrificial learning outside of the Roman custom! Indeed the men most prudent in matters of human and divine law judged that nothing was so destructive of worship as when a sacrifice was done in a foreign rather than native rite (39.15.8-9).

This portion of Postumius’ speech contains several important themes in Livy’s narrative of the other Greeks. The sacrificuli recall the anonymous degenerate (ignobilis) Greek who began the narrative. The word that follows, vates signals to the reader that this little priest masks his foreign rites in Roman dress, a thought further developed with the vaticinos libros, which suggests the sacred knowledge of rites, including divination, all state secrets of the Roman pontiffs and magistrates. But this is not a pontiff or magistrate, but a sacrificulus vatesque. Postumius’ rhetoric is heavily invested with contrasts, explicit and implicit.

Postumius’ description of the Bacchic culminates in a series of contrasts between the lawful authority of the state and the nefarious oath of the conspirators.

After they had been initiated they had uttered prayers from the sacred poem, with a priest leading the chant, in which the unspeakable conspiracy was held together for every crime and lust (39.18.3).

This is surely a terrible conspiracy, held together by an unspeakable oath. This is the perhaps the peak of Postumius’ rhetoric. The literal meaning of words has been lost in the metonymic trope. The impact of Postumius’ rhetoric is cathectic
rather than logical. For the reader, the Bacchanalia is connected to the *Praefatio* by the motif of *libido*, the lust for destruction, and the corruption of the Late Republic. Yet these passages are also connected by their foreign source of ethical problems in Rome. The foreign source of the corruption in Postumius’ speech is a central concept, but it is also a key element of Livy’s history.

It is true that Livy and the Senatorial decree seek to characterize the cult as foreign. There is no reference to Liber anywhere in the documentary evidence. Greek forms of Bacchus show the alleged Greek pedigree of the cult. Yet assimilation of Bacchic elements in the worship of Liber is well known. Tradition dated to 495 B.C.E. the founding of the temple of Liber, Ceres and Proserpine on the Aventine. The region of the Aventine remained a ritual center for the worship of Liber throughout the Republican era.\(^{207}\)

Another familiar aspect of Liber’s cult is its association with *libertas*. Perhaps the connection of the two words helped transform the temple of Liber and the two goddesses into a political center for plebeian political aspirations. It was there that the tribunes stored important documents. Liber would become an emblematic god for the propaganda of the populares in the political contests of the late Republic.\(^{208}\) This association of Liber and the Roman under class, as well as the proximity of the grove of Stimula to the Aventine, has caused some to suspect a revolutionary plebeian content to the Bacchanalia.\(^{209}\) Notable in this

\(^{207}\) See Gruen (1990) 47 for the significance of the location.

\(^{208}\) Bruhl (1953) 41-45.
respect is Livy’s statement that two of the four key organizers of the cult are from plebeian families. However, much of our evidence suggests that the Bacchants were from various political backgrounds. The aunt of Aebutius is not unfamiliar with the family of Postumius, and she easily gains a conference with the consul’s mother. After the speech of Postumius, Livy tells us that many of the Senators were anxious for their own in the face of the proposed prosecutions.

Yet there is much to suggest that the cult of the Bacchanalia was a well-established custom in the Aventine region. Livy tells us that the rituals occurred in the grove of Stimula, a native goddess of Rome. Varro listed her as one of the indigitamenta. She seems to have presided over the transition from adolescence to adulthood. She represented the goading of desires, as well as their release. She may also be associated with ritual ecstasy. The image of the goad (stimula) would remain emblematic of divine possession in Latin literature. Her cult seems to have been assimilated to the cult of Liber in the neighborhood of the Aventine. One must wonder how much indigenous or at least well-integrated Roman religious activity underlies the Bacchanalia.

Nonetheless, Livy suggests that the Bacchic practice is not the true practice of the Roman elite, but rather a foreign practice that infects them. Therefore, the plebeian associations of Liber, although unstated, help to emphasize the subaltern characteristics of Bacchic cult that Livy describes. An

---

209 See Frank (1927) 130.

210 39.17.7.

211 This is the great contribution of the study by Cazanove (1983). For Stimula’s place among the indigitamenta see Varro apud Augustine Civ. Dei 4.11.
attentive and imaginative reader of Livy may see the progress of the Bacchic illness, representative of the destructive fascination with Hellenistic culture, as seeping from the skin into the limbs, and finally infecting the very marrow of Roman society. The infection proceeds from the outside to the inside. It begins in Greece, spreads to Etruria and Campania, manifesting in Rome near the Aventine, whence it will infect the entire city. To borrow a metaphor of Livy, it spreads from the environment (allies) to the limbs (plebeians) and infects the stomach (Senate).212 One could even say it spreads from the food of the Roman elite, the material production of the plebeians, the acquisition of empire.

The problems of empire and Roman identity form the basis of the Bacchanalia and are its catalyst in Livy’s narrative logic, rather than merely a background. Just before Livy’s narrative of the triumphs of Fulvius and Manlius, and the political controversies surrounding them, Livy tells us that there was an expulsion of 12,000 Latin allies from Rome. He describes them as a “multitude of the foreign-born (alienigenarum) burdening the city”.213 Although this action is performed at the behest of Rome’s Latin allies, who complained to the Senate that too many of their citizens had migrated to Rome, Livy shows the ultimate result as beneficial to Rome. These foreigners are burdensome to the city. It is surely not incidental that Italian migrants are portrayed as the basis of the Bacchic conspiracy; a Faliscian and a Campanian, representing the Etruscan and South Italian strains of the cult, are the key co-conspirators with the two

212 Here I borrow Livy’s metaphor at 2.32.
213 39.3.6. For a discussion of the circumstances, see Walsh (1994) 110.
plebeians. “From them all the crimes and infamies arose,” Livy writes. “They were the greatest priests and founders of that ritual.” At its root, in Livy’s narrative, the Bacchanalia is Greek, but its stem is Italian, its leaves are plebeian, and its flowers are the senatorial elite.

The affair of the Bacchanalia gives Rome an opportunity to demonstrate its power and authority over Italy. Livy’s narrative climaxes with the Senatorial decree that tightly regulates Bacchic cult throughout Italy. The manifestation of alterity, both Italian and Greek, in Rome itself, ends with a demonstration of centralized authority over the periphery. Although the roots of the Bacchanalia might be hysteria engendered by empire, its final outcome is a reaffirmation of empire and a statement of difference between Roman and non-Roman. In the many executions and banishments that occurred, one may see a continuation of the Latin expulsions that precede it in Livy’s history. Although one of its major purposes in the narrative is to define the Greeks, especially in the degenerate qualities of the anonymous hybrids on the periphery of the Greek world, the Bacchanalia also investigates the center and periphery of the Roman world; the expulsion of the Latins and the authoritative decree that regulates the Bacchic cult throughout Italy defines the relation of Rome to its subject states in Italy. The Bacchanalia is a tale about the Romanization of Italy and Rome itself. In the midst of completing quaeestiones in South Italy, the consul Postumius is pleased

---

214 39.17.6-7: Capit autem coniurationis constabat esse M. et C. Atinos de plebe Romana et Faliscum L. Opicernium, et Minium Cerrinium Campanum; ab iis omnia facinora et flagitia orta, eos maximos sacerdotes conditoresque eius sacri esse.

215 This observation is also made by Gruen (1990) 73-75.
to announce that he has established Roman colonies on both shores of Italy, Sipontum and Buxentum. Here those who would draw distinctions between home and abroad find the lines blurred. The empire generates social hysteria. The social hysteria generates empire.

Therefore, in the later notices on the Bacchanalia in Livy’s annals, the action is outside of Rome, in the provinces of Italy. For instance, in the final reference to the Bacchanalia, Livy writes the following:

To the praetor Lucius Duronius, to whom the lot had assigned the province Apulia, there was added an investigation concerning the Bacchanals, whose residue had been apparent in the previous year, as if the seeds from previous evils (40.19.9).

Repressions of the Bacchanals continue to be a demonstration of centralized authority, but now the official is a praetor, who exercises the policies of the Roman Senate and consul. Livy has returned to the seed metaphor, a transformation of the medicinal metaphor into degeneration as harvest, for the corruption is here viewed as multiplied or reproduced in the provinces. The praetor accordingly follows the quaestiones and punishments of the Roman model, in contrast to his predecessor in Apulia, who Livy tells us was too lenient.

But the quaestiones had been only started by the praetor Lucius Pupius rather than managed towards any conclusion. The fathers ordered that the new praetor seize the matter so that the Bacchanals not spread more widely (40.19.10).

The repression in Rome is exemplary, and Livy need only give brief notices of the action taken by the Roman official, a testimony to his

216 39.23.3-4.
administrative efficiency rather than the threat of the cults’ participants. Livy barely mentions specific crimes. Livy’s history depicts a greater Roman control over the Italian provinces, as praetors conducted *quaestiones* into Bacchanals, poisonings and conspiracies of shepherds. It has been suggested that the latter conspiracies, associated by Livy with simple acts of banditry, may be related to the Bacchanalia inquiry. *Archiboukolos* is a term found in Dionysian cult in Asia Minor, especially in Pergamum. Livy however, does not make the connection that scholars allege. For Livy, the Bacchanalia is part of a larger story about Rome and its Italian provinces. As Rome monitors its citizens and enforces official moralities, it extends its legal inquiries throughout Italy. Not only do these proceedings reaffirm Rome’s control, but it also replicates the social experience of Rome in the provinces. The moral crisis and social hysteria in book 39 leads to further Romanization of Italy, as events in Italy mirror those in Rome.

In this sense, it is notable that Liber became a symbol for Italian aspirations for citizenship. The image of the god appears on several coins minted by the confederacy in the course of the Social War. The Italians perhaps appropriated the symbolism of the plebeians, in the hope of their eventual enfranchisement. Livy’s story also ends with enfranchisement of the prostitute Hispala. The connection of Liber and *libertas* is preserved in Livy’s narrative, yet the motif is subverted. In order to become a citizen, Hispala must first renounce her Bacchic past. In losing herself, she becomes Roman.

---

Livy’s Home Remedies: Cato the Censor

The decadence of Rome must be countered by a representative image of Roman tradition. The figure of Cato the Censor appears more reductive than representative. In Livy’s history, it is Cato who emerges at critical times to resolve a crisis, or to contrast the increasing corruption of the Romans. In the narrative of his censorship in Book 39, the figure of Cato performs both functions.218

Livy’s narrative begins with a panegyric to Cato, and this before his election to the censorship. “Cato surpassed by far all the patricians and plebeians of the most notable families” (39.40.3). It is hard to say if this indicates the predominance of Cato in popularity or in Roman virtus. The statement serves as an introduction to a discourse on the virtues of Cato. The censorship is a position that is concerned with morality, as an extension of its original task of measuring. The censor comes to be responsible for the organization of Roman society, and Roman order in the elite ideology is dependent on Roman mores. Still, the extended praise of Cato’s personality is remarkable and is emphasized for its thematic function. Cato is a symbol of Romanitas that counters the Hellenistic decadence that permeates Roman society (especially the nobility).219

218 For a review and refutation of the persistent notion of Cato’s actual involvement in the suppression of the Bacchanalia, see Pailler (1988) 147-9.
Livy inherits the monumental Cato from his predecessors. He depicts Cato in absolute terms, reducing his complex politics to emblematic statements about his character or *ingenium*. Cato’s *ingenium* is closely linked to the fortunes of the Roman state. Its major characteristic is his force and his versatility.

In this man so great was the force of his spirit and his character (*ingenium*) that in whatever place he was born it seemed that he would make a fortune for himself (39.40.4). This man had a versatile character (*versabile ingenium*) suited equally for all things, so that you would say that he had been born to do whatever he happened to be doing (39.40.5).

This versatile character (*ingenium*) should be contrasted to the *inquietum ingenium* of the Thessalians. There it was part of a portrait of the impossibility of Thessalian politics, and justified the forming of governments by the Roman occupiers. Yet it is the very versatility of Cato that makes him useful for the Roman state, and particularly Roman politics at this time of crisis. He has the ability to turn towards tasks rather than turning away from them. Livy emphasizes this flexibility of Cato since he wishes to portray him as equal to the task of correcting Rome’s faults.\textsuperscript{220}

Cato is therefore the master of opposites. He is skilled at the arts both public and private, urban and rustic. He receives honors both in peace and war. In war he was a great soldier and commander. In peace he was a great orator.

\textsuperscript{219} Luce (1977) 261 similarly notes the thematic relationship of Cato’s censorship to the preceding account of the Bacchanalia, writing that it “stresses most forcibly the themes of *luxuria* and debased morality”.

\textsuperscript{220} Luce (1977) 262 n. 62 argues that the character sketch is all the more significant given their relative rarity in Livy’s extant history. Walsh (1994) 157 observes that Livy is elsewhere critical of Cato (34.15.9, 37.57.13, and 38.54.1).
for the prosecution and in his own defense. Cato is the Roman superman. He has mastered the dialectic of home and abroad that is the format of Livy’s history. He is the imperialist and the legislator. Indeed Cato realizes that legislation at home is closely linked with the imperial fortunes of Rome, as we shall see in his defense of the Lex Oppia in Livy’s 34th book.

His great enemy in book 39 is the nobility. The theme of nobilis and ignobilis is central to the narrative of the Bacchanalia and the depiction of Roman corruption. The category of nobilis has been hopelessly confused throughout the book. Cato’s censorship continues the theme. The opposition of the nobiles to the candidacy of Cato is based not only on the status of Cato as a novus homo, but also because they fear what Cato may do to them. Like the Senators in the Bacchanalia, the nobiles are concerned with their own reputations rather than with the good of the state, and they remain anonymous, as if a threatening totality. This shows the corruption of the upper class and the necessity for Cato’s tristem censuram (gloomy censorship). Cato begins to actively campaign for his proposed colleague, Lucius Valerius Flaccus, since with him alone can he punish the new abuses and recall the old customs. The new is reduced to vices, opposed to old customs. For Cato (as for Livy) Rome has fallen from a state of purity.

The corruption in Rome itself is tightly connected to problems in the empire around it, disrupted by poisoners, rebellious shepherds and Bacchanals. After the election of Cato and Flaccus, there is a brief notice on the activities of Quintus Naevius, who has been conducting quaestiones in Sardinia, where 2000
were condemned, according to the dubious number of Valerius Antias. Meanwhile Lucius Postumius has been punishing the conspiracies of the shepherds in Tarentum and mopping up the remains of the Bacchanalia. These notices, seemingly regarding events abroad, show the tight relation between home and abroad in Livy’s history. These events are the background for Cato’s censorship. It occurs with a background of tighter Roman control in the provinces. The gloomy censorship of Cato is part of the exercise of imperial control. Livy perhaps shows us a historical phase in Roman empire, when its domination of Italy and the islands was demonstrated by an assertion of authority in its internal affairs, but Livy certainly demonstrates the logic of empire, since crackdowns in the provinces are closely connected to repressive steps in the capitol. Cato’s censorship appears to be a natural extension of the previous *quaestiones*.

Cato removed seven from the Senate. Representative of these is the case of Lucius Quinctius Flamininus, brother of the Liberator of Greece.\(^\text{221}\) The downfall of Quinctius is representative, but its cause is the imperial object of desire that causes the perversion of Roman *nobilitas*. As in the story of Otiago’s wife, the imperial desire is enacted as sexual desire. This trope is found also in Lucretia’s rape and the *stupra* of the Bacchanalia. This desire rushes towards the dissolution of itself in its lack of control, although all of its corruptions are an

\(^{221}\) 39.42.7-42.5. Cicero had earlier written a version of the incident with the slave boy from the lips of his old Cato (*De Sen. 42*).
exploitation of its excessive control. An emblematic moment illustrating this would be the decapitation of the centurion as he counts the ransom of his rape victim.

Quinctius had become enamored of one Philippus Poenus, a notable whore (nobile scortum) in Rome. He took the boy to his assigned province of Gaul with him. The boy complained that he missed the gladiatorial shows in Rome due to his travels with his lover. By chance, while the consul and his lover were reclining at a feast, a notable man of the Boji (the modern Bohemians) (nobile Boium) came to the proconsul as an exile with his children seeking assistance. While the pleading of his guest was translated, Quinctius asked his lover if watching the Gallic visitor die would make up for the gladiatorial shows that he missed. Although the boy assents, Livy excuses him from blame by noting his consent was “hardly serious” (vixdum serio adnuisset). The proconsul’s offer however was deadly serious, for he grabbed a sword and struck the head and side of his Gallic visitor.

This little anecdote is remarkable for its recollection of some of the guiding themes of Livy’s history, especially for the fourth decade. The name itself of the famous male prostitute is remarkable, Philippus Poenus. Some commentators have suggested that Poenus is an adjective, so that the notable prostitute would be Phillip the Carthaginian.222 Regardless, this boy is indeed a lethal object of desire, since he unifies two Roman adversaries- the Macedonians and the

---

222 Thus Walsh (1994) 159, who dismissively notes the Hellenized environment of early second century Carthage. Cicero does not provide a name.
Carthaginians. These were the two greatest enemies of Roman imperialism in
the Hellenistic era. It is fitting that a prostitute with both these cultural attributes
should corrupt the illustrious proconsul, brother of the liberator of Greece, by boy
love. Roman authority is subverted by the pederastic obsessions of classical
Greece. This story about imperial desire is rich in Livy’s prejudices towards
Hellenism. Hellenism perverts the consul, as his erastes coyly makes imperial
decisions about life and death for him.

Philippus Poenus is indeed notable (nobilis). The term recalls Livy’s
Hispala, herself a scortum nobile. There we found her contrasted to the ignobilis
Graecus, a term that seemed ironic. Here the boy prostitute is contrasted by the
nobilis Boium. The Gallic chieftain, helpless and supplicating, is representative
of the imperial subjects that welcome Rome’s power over them, like the happy
imperial subjects of the Praefatio. His most notable aspect in Livy’s narrative is
his senseless death, a clear abuse of Roman authority, although it was not
ordered by a Roman official insomuchas it was for the idle amusement of the
erastes. Both the boy and the Gaul are nobiles, as is the proconsul himself, who
is “distinguished by nobility and honors”. This phrase introduces the reader to
Quinctius as the only named of the seven senators removed by Cato’s census.
This makes him noteworthy indeed. The entire story of Quinctius shows how
nobilis has become a term for one noteworthy for scandals rather than honors.
Indeed, the nobiles should beware a gloomy censorship.

The setting of the scandalous scene is also evocative of Livy’s themes of
Hellenistic decadence among the Romans. It takes place at a feast (convivium),

158
and the excess of the occasion is indicated by the inebriated state of the proconsul (cum iam vino incaluisset; 39.42.10). Livy tells another anecdote of Quinctius’ brutality, here citing his source, Valerius Antias. He compares it to the story of Philippus Poenus, as “similar by its lust and cruelty”. The mention of libido recalls the destructive lust of the Praefatio. This anecdote also is set at a feast (convivium), but the proconsul lusts for a famous woman of Placentia. She visits him at dinner, and he executes some of the condemned in order to entertain her. These two scenes of slaughter for convivial entertainment prompt Livy towards a rare apostrophe:

A crime (facinus) was committed, savage and atrocious. Among the cups and feasting, when there is a banquet for libations to the gods, where it is the custom to address the gods with devotion, a human victim is slaughtered for the spectacle of an insolent prostitute reclining in the lap of the consul, and the table is sprayed with blood!  

Livy presents the abuse of Roman authority as arising from sexual debauchery among the totems of luxury, the cup and the feast. Livy’s rhetoric reduces corruption to an objectified presence. Luxury, desire and corruption, the very elements of Rome’s contemporary corruption in the Praefatio, are also the culprits here. But from whence did they migrate?

223 39.43.4: Facinus, sive eo modo quo censor obiecit, sive ut Valerius tradit, commissum est, saevum atque atrox; inter pocula atque epulas, ubi libare dis dapes, ubi bene precari mos esset, ad spectaculum scorti procacis in sinu consultis recubantis mactatam humanam victimam esse, et cruore mensam respersam!
To answer this we must turn to another speech of Livy’s Cato, this time in book 34, the oration against the abrogation of the Lex Oppia.\[^{224}\] This law was an austerity measure passed at the height of the second Punic war. It forbid women to possess more than a twenty-fourth of a *libra*, the wearing of dyed clothing or a yoked vehicle in the city, except for transport to a religious ceremony.

Cato attacks the repeal of the law by characterizing female interest in the abrogation as sedition. Livy informs us that the forum had filled with women urging the men to vote for the repeal. This legislative activism is strongly condemned by Cato as anti traditional.

Our ancestors wished that women do no matter, not even private business, without a legal guardian, and that they be under the power of their parents, brothers, and husbands. We, by the gods, allow them now to take control of the republic and to mingle (*immisceri*) in the forum nearly in the assemblies and elections!\[^{225}\]

This characterization of the women’s advocacy for repeal is similar to the later rhetoric of Postumius, who described the Bacchanalia as an unlawful gathering, Both orations recalled the strictures of the *maiores* against such meetings without a Roman official present. The gathering of women is characterized as a conspiracy:

Indeed, I use to think it a fantastic and fictional thing that the entire race of men on some island had been cut down at the root by a

\[^{224}\] Feldherr (1998) 43 has also noted the thematic importance of this speech and its relationship to Livy’s narrative of the entry of *luxuria* and corruption into Rome.

\[^{225}\] 34.2.11.
conspiracy of women. By no means is there not extreme peril if you allow these gatherings, counsels, and secret consultations. (34.2.4)

Cato compares the situation in the Roman forum to the myth of the Lemnian women. The reference seems offhand, but it is lent weight by its placement as the second and third sentences of the speech. Although Cato slyly forgets the name of the island, the atmosphere is mythic and Hellenistic, a stumbling sort of Alexandrianism. The reference is to the island of Lemnos, where all the men but one were killed. The hyperbole is ultimately reductive and wholly insufficient to describe the nature of the excited forum, but effective nonetheless in its patriarchal snarl.

The toleration of the Roman women’s activism is exemplary, but of the worst sort:

I don’t know if this matter itself is worse or if it is worse as an example (peiore exemplo). (34.2.4)

The women’s behavior may be viewed as being the sort of example to be shunned by the reader. Cato again replicates the rhetoric of the author of the Praefatio.

Cato’s next move is rather contradictory, since he finds a precedent for the sedition urged by the women in the secession of the plebs. The women’s self-assertion is compared to Hellenic prototype and then plebeian metaphor. Cato’s rhetoric utilizes metaphors that marginalize the women’s legislative activism. Cato continues by contrasting the ways of the women, modeled on Hellenistic myth and plebeian agitation, to the ways of the ancestors.
Valerius, in his response, will notice the contradiction of Cato’s approach, since the Lex Opppia was emergency legislation, rather than a product of antiquity. Valerius argues for a more progressive view, in which law is not timeless, but adapted to various circumstances. Laws, like men, are changeable. Some laws are liable to circumstances, such as the laws of peace and war. Yet for Cato the abrogation of this one law will weaken all laws. Cato’s view is thoroughly conservative and authoritarian. There is a certain siege mentality to his rhetoric. His language of crisis precedes and perhaps foreshadows the later language of the Bacchanalia narrative, especially when the cult is represented as a novelty and contrasted to Roman tradition.

At the end of Cato’s speech, the law does not constrain people insomuch as it restrains luxury, which is likened to a savage beast. In this metaphor the laws are chains on the animal that is luxuria. Once its chains are removed it runs wild. The reductive language of theriomorphism is founded on the previous characterizations of the Hellenistic peril. In the end, the Greek is an animal and a metaphor for feminine lusts. Like Ortiago’s wife, the threat to Rome is lust and the feminine, a figure that haunts Livy’s narratives of Hellenistic decadence infecting imperial Rome.

Cato’s discussion of luxuria recalls the language of the introduction.

Often you have heard me complaining about the extravagance of women, often also of men too, and not only private citizens but also

---

226 34.6.5-6.

227 34.3.4-5.
magistrates. The citizenship labors under two different vices, avarice and luxury, the two plagues that overturn all empires (34.4.1-2).

Rome here is shown following the examples of previous empires, by indulging in vices that it should shun. The various manifestations of the *vitia* in women, private citizens and even officials, give the spread of corruption the characteristic of an infection. Cato next describes the foreign origin of Rome’s vices.

And now we cross over into Greece and Asia, lands filled with all the seductions for lust and we even extract the regal treasures. (34.4.3)

Greece and Asia, regions that will dominate the narrative in books 31-45, are linked to the warnings of Livy for the contemporary Roman world. This perilous crossing of the ocean recalls the metaphor that Livy used to start book 31, but also some of the central themes of the *Praefatio*. Here we see the source of the lusts that Livy told us immigrated into Rome. The foreign source of the wealth is emphasized by the foreign word *gaza*, and further defined as regal, and therefore bearing the royal virus. It possesses the one who owns them. “I fear that those things have taken us rather than we them” (34.4.3). Rome looses its mastery in the exercise of its mastery. For Livy, this is perhaps best represented as the presence of foreign statues in the city, like an occupying army. “Believe me, hostile statues have been carried off from Syracuse and brought to this city”

228 *Et iam in Graeciam Asiamque transcendimus omnibus libidinum inlecebris repletas et regias etiam adirectamus gazas.*

229 On the significance of this word as a marker for the east and imperial decline, see Feldherr (1998) 45 n.3 and
(34.4.4). The source of the enemy is the margins of the Greek world, Magna Graecia, just as in the Bacchanalia. Livy’s Cato warns us that other Greeks elsewhere, in Asia, are equally dangerous (and notably again, on the outskirts of the Greek world, and subject to the hybridity demonstrated by the Galatians).

Livy’s Cato replicates the figure of disease and remedy, as found in the Praefatio. He compares luxury to an illness or disease (morbus):

> Just as it is necessary that the illnesses be known before their remedies, thus the desires (cupiditates) are born before the laws that moderate them.\(^{230}\)

Here the remedies are much less ambiguous than those of the Praefatio. They are clearly the laws that the moderate the desires (libidines or cupiditates) of the women, the private citizens and the magistrates. Cato’s conservatism is based on the power of the law to restrain imperial lust. His rhetoric could justify the Quaestiones de Repundatis but also the absolute power of Augustus in the administration of empire, and therefore the regulation of its riches.

Throughout the speeches of Livy’s Cato, we find the metonymic characterizations of the traces of Hellenism: The feast, the cup, and finally the hostile statues. We can only understand the seduction of Flamininus by the hybrid boy whore as a dramatization of the warnings of Cato in Book 34. The metonymies of Hellenism in Livy’s narrative prepare the reader for the strange affair of Phillipus Poenus and so the synecdoche is invested with significance by the metonymic trope that precedes it.

---

\(^{230}\) *Sicut ante morbos necesse est cognitos esse quam remedia eorum, sic cupiditates prius natae sunt quam leges quae iis modum facerent.*
Numa’s Ghost: How Rome was Haunted by the Hellenes

There is another notable example of a metonymy of Hellenism in a later passage of Livy, and although it is a little episode, it merits brief mention. In Book 40 Livy writes the enigmatic narrative of Numa’s books. Here the objectified presence of corrupting Hellenism is not the wandering ignobilis, but mystic Pythagorean literature.\textsuperscript{231}

Livy tells us that two chests were found in the field of the scribe Lucius Petilius. An inscription on one announced the remains of Numa Pompilius, and there was Greek and Latin script upon both. The chest that was said to have contained Numa was empty, the result, Livy tells us, of its great age. The other contained writings in Latin and Greek. The seven Latin Books contained pontifical lore, whereas the Greek writings were about the "wisdom teaching" (\textit{de disciplina sapientiae}).\textsuperscript{232} Livy notes that Valerius Antias said the writings contained Pythagorean writings, since the falsehood that Numa had been a

\textsuperscript{231} The relevance for this remarkable episode to the Bacchanalia has been investigated most fully by Pailler (1988) 623-703. For Gruen (1990) it is again a reaction to Hellenism, a notion strongly contested by Orlin (2000). The earlier study of Rosen (1985) argues that the books had been placed on the Janiculum in order to discredit its owner Fulvius Nobilior, conqueror of the Aetolians and a famous philhellene in actuality, although hardly one in Livy’s history.

\textsuperscript{232} Moore (1989) 117-18 notes the Greek and negative connotations of \textit{sapientia} in Livy’s history, in contrast to its positive value in writers of the Late Republic.
follower of Pythagoras was common. Although Livy characterizes this as a believable ruse, it is the very association with Pythagoreanism that discredits it. For him, the tomb of Numa is empty in more ways than one.

These books were read by Lucius Petilius and his friends, and were becoming popular in his circle. This alarms the urban praetor, who confiscates the books. After reading them he decides that there are many things found in them that are “destructive to religious practices” (dissolvendarum religionum). Postumius used the same phrase to describe the deleterious effects of the Bacchanalia. He recommends to the Senate that the books be burned. The books are solemnly burned at the comitia. The fire, Livy tells us, was solemnly tended to by the victimarii, a term used for sacrificial assistants. This is indeed a religious ceremony, a holocaust, performed to purge the Romans and their history.

The notion of Numa’s books was an easy façade for fraud. Livy himself tells us that Numa had written several books. The episode shows the dangers in the new form of the Hellenistic appropriation of the Roman past. Numa is Hellenized in his empty grave. This Hellenism is objectified in the Hellenistic script used to communicate the wisdom teachings of Pythagoreanism. Somehow, the presence of this Greek script taints the entire find, and therefore the Latin writings must be burned too, as if they have been polluted by contact.²³³

_________________________________________
²³³ For Orlin (2000) 78 the presence of Latin books with the Greek books in the excavation and their subsequent paired incineration is proof that the incident is not anti-Hellenic. However, the necessity of their common destruction is easily explained in the metaphors of contagion favored by Livy.
The story reminds the reader that the destructive and corrupting hybridity of empire remains a virus in the belly of the earth in the very imperial capitol. For Livy it subverts Roman *mores, religiones* and even the past. It is reduced to the objects of luxury and desire, even the antiquarian desire of lost books. It undermines Roman identity on a personal and historical level.

Numa’s missing remains are a vanished presence of the past in the midst of the forged Greek script of the present. This discovery of Greek influence buried in Roman earth recalls the previous sacrificial inhumation of the Greek couple when Rome was threatened with sacking by the Punic hordes. It is as if the Greek hybridity that exists in Rome cannot be overcome. Rome remains haunted by Hellenistic hybridity.
CHAPTER 5
MACEDONIAN IRONIES

The mood of Livy’s narrative takes on an ironic tone in Book Forty, and this will continue throughout his history through book 45, where the fall of the Macedonian empire culminates in the restrained triumph of Aemilius Paulus. This tone of irony releases the tension of Roman crisis, as developed most dramatically in the Bacchanalian affair, but not lacking in the depiction of Manlius Vulso’s Galatian campaign. The nature of the crisis is the threat of Hellenistic hybridity in Rome itself, a contagion transmitted from the margins of the Hellenistic world, conceptualized as a species of transplanted Hellenism, in the metonymies and synecdoches I have sought to trace. In Book 40, there begins a movement of Roman power from the periphery to the source and origin of the Hellenistic world, the land of Alexander. In this movement from Hellenistic periphery to center, Livy now conceptualizes a Greek mimicry of Rome, rather than a Roman mimicry of Greece. His narrative of Macedonia shows an inversion of Roman order by the ineffective mimicry of Roman practices and narratives by King Philip’s sons, such as the Macedonian troia game and deadly fraternal rivalry. The effect on the reader is ironic at a number of levels.
First, the Macedonian leadership shows itself as ineffectual just when it attempts to display its power. Whenever Philip and his sons act like Romans, they show their inferiority, since they do it so poorly. This serves to imply the innate *virtus* of the Roman national character, as defined in the broad Italian terms of the Augustan project. For Livy the other Greeks cannot be Roman and similarities in actions further emphasize their alterity.

The story may be briefly summarized before we analyze its details. King Philip had two sons, Perseus and Demetrius. The latter was the Roman favorite for an heir, since he had been a hostage at Rome and had been sufficiently courted by the Roman elite. Although Demetrius was younger, the growing hegemony of Rome advanced his claim, as well as rumors of the illegitimate birth of Perseus. The animosity of the two brothers came to a head during a state ritual of the Macedonians, in which the Macedonian royalty, followed by the army marched through the halves of a severed dog. Afterwards, a mock battle ensued, in which the brothers fought too spiritedly. Demetrius won and this only increased his brother’s desire to remove his rival.

An opportunity provided itself that evening. The brothers hosted separate drinking parties. A spy of Perseus was detected at Demetrius’ party and was severely beaten by Demetrius’ drinking mates. Later, when Demetrius attempted to visit his brother but was denied entrance, these men were found to be carrying weapons. Perseus takes this as an opportunity to make allegations of an assassination attempt before his father the following day. Demetrius is
summoned and a trial of sorts occurs, with the father acting as judge of the forensic speeches of his sons. The result is a stalemate, but Perseus obtains his objective by increasing suspicions against his brother. An exploratory trip to Mount Haemus with his father provides further occasion for Perseus to pursue the claim that the younger brother was an agent of Flamininus and the Romans. Shortly upon returning, Demetrius is executed with the approval of Philip. He is poisoned then suffocated.

Livy’s Macedonian narrative is an odd narrative departure for the historian who prides himself on sticking closely to Roman matters. Although I have already discussed the two passages that follow, it is well here to recall Livy’s own declaration on his subject matter.

Greek matters unmixed with those of the Romans have delayed me for a moment, not since these events themselves are worthy of recording, but since they were the causes of war with Antiochus (35.40).

If I went on to set forth the causes and chronology of that war, I would be neglecting my principle to not deal with foreign matters, unless in some way they were connected to Roman affairs (39.48.6).

At first glance, it seems that Livy has violated the plan of his project by developing the rivalry between Perseus and Demetrius in such detail. Twenty pages are devoted to it in the Oxford Classical Text (Chapters 5-16 and 20-24). It cannot be described as a narrative of the causes of the Third Macedonian War, since Livy has already presented the causes in Book 39, namely the negotiations
on cities ceded to the Macedonian crown following the denouement of war with
Antiochus. According to Livy, Philip never forgave the Romans for taking these
“fortified villages” in Thessaly from his control. As a result of the historical
significance of the negotiations, completed at Tempe to the disadvantage of
Philip, a diplomatic Cynoscephelae, Livy develops the narrative at some
length.\textsuperscript{234}

One excuse for Livy has been the argument that the conclusion of the
rivalry shows the certainty of Roman war with Macedonia, since Perseus was
determined to cause conflict. Indeed, Livy earlier in his history, after the
negotiations at Tempe, tells us that Perseus inherited war with the Romans.\textsuperscript{235}
Yet this statement, uttered in book 39 after the revelation of the true causes of
war, would make Livy’s development of the rivalry all the more otiose and
unnecessary, for not only has he stated the cause of the war, but he has written
that Perseus would make war inevitable, as part of his royal power, as if he were
a second Hannibal. Demetrius has already been named the younger, and there
is therefore no need to question the royal succession of Macedonia. The death
of Demetrius could be summarized in a few short lines, or a paragraph if Livy
wished to emphasize the cruelty of the royal house that killed its own children, if
he saw fit to mention it at all. The historical value of these chapters is negligible.
The enigma is increased by Walbank’s observation that Livy seems to have

\textsuperscript{234} 39.23-29.
\textsuperscript{235} 39.29.
expanded the speeches of Perseus, Demetrius and Philip, in the account of Polybius.\(^{236}\)

As has been noted since Conway, the story of the fall of Macedon can be exemplary for the Romans and serve as a warning about the decay of imperial power.\(^{237}\) The story’s force is strengthened by superficial similarities to Roman themes and practices. Therefore, as a Roman read this story of Roman triumph over Alexander’s descendents, he would be reminded of Rome in its current position of global dominance, and was chilled by the parallels he saw, especially in the palace intrigues and poisonings of the Macedonian royal house.

According to Conway, the rivalry of the Macedonian prince is emblematic of those in the house of Augustus himself, and is meant to serve as a warning. Much of the argument is implicit, but he seems to suggest that Tiberius may be compared to Perseus, whereas any number of possible successors to Augustus, such as Marcellus, but even Germanicus, Drusus and Agrippa Postumus could assume such a role, as the innoxius \textit{adulescens} who dies prematurely under suspicious circumstances.\(^{238}\) Although these events may have “a striking resemblance” to the death of Perseus, we must do some violence to chronology

\(^{236}\) Walbank (1974) 64.

\(^{237}\) Conway (1926). This is the basic thesis of his monograph. See especially page 8: “When he (Livy) is contrasting the best Roman spirit breathed by men like Flamininus with the policy and aims of Philip, he is also contrasting it inevitably, with the fundamental character of the government under which Rome was living in his day.”

\(^{238}\) Conway (1926) 18-20. After describing the poisoning and suffocation of Demetrius, Livy writes \textit{Ita innoxius adulescens, cum in eo ne simplici quidem genere mortis contenti inimici fuissent, interficitur} (40.24.8).
to suggest that Livy was consciously reflecting upon these events, since with the exception perhaps of the death of Marcellus they could not have happened when he wrote about Perseus and Demetrius. If we accept the popular estimate of Livy writing at the pace of three books a year, he would be writing book 40 around 15 B.C.

However, one cannot help wondering if Livy had noted the new atmosphere in the house of Augustus, and perhaps had seen evidence of the insidious plotting against certain personalities of the court. This is easily paralleled by the clandestine strategies of Perseus and his agents, such as Demetrius’ false friend Divas and the attitude of the Macedonian nobility towards Demetrius when the intentions of Perseus became clear.

However since he didn’t think himself strong enough on his own for what he was contemplating in his womanly soul (*mulierbri cogitabat animo*), he decided to test some of his father’s friends with enigmatic suggestions. And at first some of those offered the appearance of rejecting such innuendo, since they continued to put their hope in Demetrius. Then, since daily Philip’s hatred of the Romans was growing, and Perseus indulged his temper, whereas Demetrius opposed this sentiment with all his might. They foresaw in their mind destruction for the youth incautious of fraternal deceit, and they joined Perseus to aid what they saw as a foregone conclusion and abetted the hope of the more powerful son (40.5.3-5).

The use of the adjective *muliebri* to describe the treacherous family member is certainly suggestive for any who wish to see Livia as the source of Augustus’ fatal problems with imperial succession. Certainly such self-interested
partisanship in the midst of the princeps was familiar to Livy and present shortly after the battle of Actium.

Similarly, Johner has noted that the presence of poisoning in the death of Demetrius and the reports of Bacchanalian conspiracies in Rome and elsewhere shows aspects of intrigues in the later Republic and early empire. Poisoning is a method used increasingly in Livy’s History, especially in his narratives of the Macedonian Wars. It is a form of murder associated with the Bacchanalia and seems rather unRoman. Johner notes that of 31 occurrences of poisoning in Livy, a third are Macedonian. The proliferation of poisoning is another form of Hellenistic influence in Rome, and thus another way in which Hellenism poisons Roman society. The poisonings in Rome increase in frequency in books 39 and 40, and include the case of a woman who poisons her husband, a consul.

In this atmosphere of palace intrigue and the use of poisons Livy may be reflecting some of the tensions of Augustus’ inner circle. Yet in the context of Livy’s narrative of the Macedonian crisis itself there is a development of Roman themes that are more traditional than Tacitean. By developing these themes in a Macedonian context, Livy can depict the ineffectuality of the Hellenistic monarchy and by extension the superiority of Rome. This message becomes all the more portentous since Livy’s contemporaries could find parallels to the current situation of Rome.

---

240 40.37.4-8, Johner (1996) 234 n. 88.
The traditional Roman themes are numerous in the story, and create the impression of a Macedonian mimicry of Roman power. First and foremost is the rivalry of the brothers that frames the narrative, a theme that recalls the initial rivalry of Romulus and Remus. This rivalry is manifested at a traditional Roman setting, a ritual marking the beginning of the military campaigning season, and a mock battle of noble youths on horseback, a curious parallel to the Roman Troia. The imperial pretensions of the Macedonian house mirror those of Rome itself. The Macedonian quest for power is represented in Philip’s ironic journey to the (non)privileged vantage point of Mount Haemus, from which he is disappointed to not discover a view of his future conquests that will not occur. Throughout the narrative the tone is ironic beneath the tragic mechanisms.

Before considering these parallels in depth, one should note the narrative setting of these revelations about the inner workings of Macedonian power. Livy depicts Macedonia as kingdom in crisis. Philip’s power has been challenged by Athamanian, Perrhaebian and Thessalian envoys to the Senate, who assisted by Eumenes’ ambassadors contested Philip’s claim to Aenus and Maronea. This, for Livy, had been the cause of war with Rome. When ordered by Roman mediators to withdraw, Philip caused stasis in the towns to reestablish his hegemony.

It is with some alarm that Quintus Marcus Philippus informed the Senate of events in Macedonia and described the growing threat to Rome. Marcus Philippus is a guest-friend of the King, but he is constantly undermining Macedonian power and pleading for its destruction by the Romans. His
duplicitous dealings with the king become known as *nova sapientia*, and further
evidence of Hellenistic tactics and behaviors among the Roman elite. This
seems rather surprising, since Philippus had been the colleague of the consul
Postumius during the Bacchanalian persecutions. The irony is that these
Hellenistic methods, a sign of Roman decadence, are employed in an effort to
defeat a decadent Hellenistic kingdom. Marcus Phillipus becomes a doublet to
King Philip himself and it will be necessary to return to his emblematic role in
Livy’s narrative.

Livy prefaces his account by telling us that Marcus Philippus had been
sent to observe matters in Greece and Macedonia.\textsuperscript{241} After his return to Rome,
his report “had increased the anxiety about Philip”.\textsuperscript{242} The account of
Macedonian affairs must be the substance of his report. This seems to stretch
credibility since the narrative of Macedonian events lasts some 14 chapters
(40.3.1-16.5), yet it is impossible to find where the report of Marcius Philippus
begins or ends. This Macedonian story contains a summary of Macedonian
immigration policies, the exemplary persecution of Theoxena, a Macedonian
ritual, and the two long judicial speeches of Perseus and Demetrius. Livy
abruptly switches in chapter 16 to more traditional annalistic material, the setting
out of the two consuls to Liguria, a training ground for Roman virtue, as we have
seen.\textsuperscript{243}

\textsuperscript{241} 40.2.7-8. He is sent by the Senate at 39.48.5.

\textsuperscript{242} 40.3.1: *De Philippo auxerat curam Marcius*.  

176
The narrative of the Macedonian domestic rivalry is intimately connected with Marcus Philippus, but in an oblique way. In considerations of the Macedonian narrative in Book 40, this relationship has been largely ignored. Rather than an indictment of the previous scholarship on Livy, this failure is a reflection of the lack of clarity in Livy’s narrative. Nonetheless, scholars have largely neglected the question of who is the narrator of the Macedonian events. There is a drifting in Livy’s text from the indirect speech of Marcus Philippus before the Senate, followed by a seamless transition to the detailed narrative of internal affairs in the Macedonian kingdom. This has escaped most readers. Yet it is necessary to wonder if the narrator’s comments on the Macedonian events are the sentiments of Livy or part of his portrayal of Quintus Philippus. At the very least, the voice of Quintus Philippus fades into that of the annalist. In this way, like the Galatian expedition and the Bacchanalia, we may consider the Macedonian story as a Hellenizing narrative within the frame of Livy’s annals.

Marcus Philippus’ report seems to motivate the Senate’s view that Philip’s cooperation with the Romans was transitory and only done from necessity, and he looked forward to an opportunity to rebel. The king seems to exhibit the mobilitas that is characteristic of insurgent elements at the borders of Roman imperium. There follows a catalog of Philip’s activities in Macedonia and his occupied territories in Thessaly and Thrace, with little distinction made between them. The purpose of this catalog is oblique, and is largely contradictory in its relation to Roman power. Although Philip’s power seems to be crumbling, he

---

243 See 39.1-2 and the discussion above in the preceding chapters.
also seems to be rebuilding his strength in order to launch an invasion on Rome. In fact, the purpose is to display Macedonian recklessness, thus rendering Philip’s power illegitimate at the same time as it dangerous to Rome. He exhibits the lack of control seen in other enemies of Roman empire that are destined to fall.

The catalog begins by describing the mass transfer of people from the coastal cities to Emathia and the importation of Thracians to take their place. This diaspora is depicted in vivid language by Livy, with the customary description of women and children tearfully leaving their home (penates), while curses are uttered against the king as Thracians take their place. Macedonia is thus inflicted by disordered hybridity that undermines the legitimacy of Macedonian rule. Rather than organizing his kingdom, Philip is shown as undermining its innate qualities by introducing the Thracians into its territories while displacing the native people. Although the move is clearly strategic, it shows that Macedonia is becoming less than itself, at the same time as it becomes more than itself, like the Gallograecians. Now Philip is creating the Thracomacedonians. If the reader has taken to heart the vivid seed and plant metaphors of Livy’s theoretical ethnography, and the many metaphors of ingenium, he cannot help but conceive Philip’s immigration policies as a sign of inner decay in the Macedonian kingdom. This hybridity is further shown through Philip’s marriage of a son, perhaps Perseus, to a princess of the Bastarnae.244
Although the curses of the displaced Macedonians lack the force of the
curses that followed the suicide of Theoxena, since those later curses had the
power of the Roman gods behind them, they still start a process that will cause
Philip to become increasingly paranoid and cruel, until his violence is directed
within his own family. Familial strife is a motif for civil war, but here it serves to
illustrate the downfall of mighty Macedonia by its own internal divisions and
contradictions. This is due to a lack of the very qualities that allow Rome to
conquer. This scheme is enacted by a tableau of Roman themes in a
Macedonian setting, therefore inverting them, not without an ironic effect. The
irony is only increased when the reader considers that Marcus Philippus, the
presumed source of the information, shows some of the same character traits
that distinguish Greeks from the Romans.

Philip’s paranoia, engendered by the curses of displaced Macedonians,
causes Philip to taking the extraordinary step of imprisoning and killing the
children of his political opponents. I have already considered above the
exemplary story of Theoxena. Aside from the contemporary Roman parallels of
palace intrigues and poisonings, the motif of the paranoid despot would be all too
familiar to Roman readers who had experienced cycles of proscriptions in current
and previous generations.

This Roman parallel is increased by introducing the Roman gods into the
story by the desecration of rites celebrating Aeneas by the failed capture of

244 40.5.10. Although Walbank makes convincing arguments for identifying this son as Perseus,
Livy does not name the son. His purpose was to stress the links between the Macedonians and
barbarous tribes around Thrace, rather than create a biography of Perseus.
Theoxena.  This debacle causes a second round of curses to fall upon Philip and his family.  Livy conveys the effect of these curses in vivid metaphorical language.

The atrocity of this crime added as if a new flame to the hatred (invidiae) of the king, so that commonly they cursed him and his children.  Those curses (dirae) were heard briefly by the gods so that they made him rage (saeviret) against his own blood (40.5.1). \(^{245}\)

Livy stresses the role of the supernatural by his use of curse language throughout these two result clauses that set the stage for the domestic drama of the murder of Demetrius.  The line of causality follows epic lines.  The crime of Philip generates flame.  The flame produces invidia, literally the evil eye, of the Macedonian public (volgo) against their king.  The gods hear the curses and cause to Philip to rage; that is they inflame him to direct the paranoia of his crimes against the House of Herodicus towards his own family.  Demetrius’ death therefore takes on a metaphysical rather than strictly historical significance.  Since the gods who manipulate this infernal machinery are those who respond to the crime at Aenus, they are necessarily those who favored the endeavors of Aeneas, namely the gods of the Roman state.  It would seem that the story of Philip’s tragic reversal is indeed a Roman story.  Still, one must note that it is a Roman story in Greek dress, for the entire story retains the tragic machinery of Polybius’ account that Walbank found so troubling.

\(^{245}\) Huius atrocitas facinoris novam velut flammam regis invidiae adiecit, ut volgo ipsum liberosque exsecrantur; quae dirae brevi ab omnibus dis exauditae ut saeviret ipse in suum sanguinem effecerunt.
While Livy retains the structure of his Greek source, he emphasizes certain aspects that suggest Macedonian parallels to Roman themes. Although the greatest of these is implicit in the motif of fraternal rivalry, Macedonian traditions are depicted in a way that seems reminiscent of Roman customs, although the parallel has the force of a shadow rather than a reflection. The ineffectuality of these rites shows the displeasure of the gods with the Macedonian kingdom and their corresponding favor towards the Roman empire.

Philip’s mental state has already deteriorated before his son’s antagonisms begin in earnest. This condition rendered him sensitive to the deceptions of Perseus and his suggestions that his brother was a Roman spy.

By these things the old man’s sick mind was goaded, and he accepted those charges in his mind but concealed it in his countenance (40.5.14). 246

The language of Livy is reminiscent of the Bacchanalian narrative. The raging of Philip is now shown as a mental illness (aegra mens) that makes him susceptible to goading (stimulabatur). Philip’s condition is a peculiarly Hellenistic disease in Livy’s history, as we have seen.

At this point in the narrative,

By chance, the time for reviewing the troops (lustrandi exercitus) had come (40.6.1). 247

---

246 His per se aegra mens senis stimulabatur, et animo magis quam voltu ea crimina accipiebat.

247 40.6.1-3: Forte lustrandi exercitus advenit tempus, cuius sollemne est tale: caput mediae canis praecisae et <prior> pars ad dextram, cum extis posterior ad laevam viae ponitur. Inter hanc divisam hostiam copiae armatae traducuntur. Praeferuntur primo agmini arma insignia omnium ab ultima origine Macedoniae regum, deinde rex ipse cum liberis sequitur; proxima est regia cohors custodesque corporis; postremum agmen Macedonum cetera multitudo claudit.
This was a ritual purification of the army before the military season began, and Livy seems to suggest that it was a regular annual ceremony. Livy describes the ritual in some detail. A dog is decapitated, and the entire Macedonian army would march through the severed halves of his body. First passed royal arms of all the Macedonian kings, from the first to the last, then the King and his two sons, followed by the royal court and guard, and then the mass of the Macedonian soldiers.

The concept would be familiar to Livy’s Roman audience. Every year, before the start of the military season, the troops would be assembled in the Campus Martius for a ritual procession that ended in a ritual sacrifice of an ox, sheep and pig. The verb *lustro* would signal certain Roman expectations for the rite. The ritual should serve to unify the army, while purifying it of any latent contagion, and insure the success of its military objectives. None of these things come to pass from the dog sacrifice.

The Macedonian ritual is striking by its differences. A dog is used for the ritual, an animal that does seem to have been used in any Roman *lustratio*. Further, for the Romans the sacrifice seems to have completed the rite, and therefore followed the procession rather than preceded it. Yet perhaps the most

---

248 Although it was used in the festival of the Robigalia on April 25th. The dog with a sheep was sacrificed to Robigus, ostensibly to prevent the blighting of the wheat. Perhaps here too in Livy’s narrative we can see a plant metaphor.
significant difference is that the Macedonians pass through the sacrifice rather
than the sacrifice being led by or around the army.\textsuperscript{249}

This dog sacrifice seems to be completely subverted by the rivalries
between the Macedonian brothers. Somehow the dismembered and decapitated
dog is intended to purify and unify the Macedonian army, or at least one could
expect these results of the ritual. Yet the divisions in the Macedonian royal army
are graphically displayed by the ritual. The order of the procession is instructive
and foreshadows what shall come. The ancient arms of the previous
Macedonians, including no doubt those of Alexander himself, go before the king
and his sons, and these mementos are all that shall remain of Macedonian glory.
The King and his sons go next, and they defile the ritual since they have been
cursed. They communicate their misfortune to the rest of the army that follows
them through the severed dog.

The failure of the ritual is quickly shown in Livy’s narrative by the mock
battle that follows the solemn procession. The army is divided into two parts,
each led by a brother, and armed themselves with wooden stakes.\textsuperscript{250} This mock
combat was part of the ritual, and was probably intended as another display of
Macedonian unity and excellence in the battlefield. Yet Livy tells us that the two
sides had taken the combat too seriously, so that it appeared that it lacked only

\textsuperscript{249} See Fowler (1971) 215-19, noting the descriptions of the rite in Augustan times as observed
by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

\textsuperscript{250} Walsh (1996) \textit{apud} 40.6.6 and 9.11 follows Gronius in amending \textit{sudibus} to \textit{rudibus}. Yet the
wooden sword would be more proper to a Roman context. Wooden stakes would be more fitting
instruments for this Macedonian scene, if it is correct to imagine the two sides organized into
phalanx.
iron to be a real combat, “as if they battled for the kingdom”. He records
Demetrius, the Roman favorite, as clearly the victor.\(^{251}\)

This mock combat recalls the Roman Trojan game (*ludus Troiae*), an
entertainment of the circus popular in the time of Augustus and an alleged part of
his restoration of traditional Roman customs. The Roman youth would stage a
battle on horseback for the assembled audience. Augustus is said to have
discontinued the competition after several injuries, culminating in the broken leg
of one Aeserninus, the grandson of Asinius Pollio.\(^{252}\) Livy perhaps already knew
that such contests could become a setting for private quarrels and revenge. The
purpose of the contest is a display of excellence, for the Romans of
horsemanship, for the Macedonians of the phalanx. In the Macedonian story, the
competition is undermined by the animosity of the brothers. The friends of
Perseus even saw the rough play as a plausible circumstance for creating
suspicions of murder plots by his brother, the eventual victim.\(^{253}\)

By giving details of these Macedonian rites Livy does not strive to provide
simple ethnographic information, but he seeks to contrast Macedonia to Rome by
similarity and difference. The context of the practice of these rites is familiar to
that of Rome, but their specifics are different, rendering the dog-sacrifice and
phalanx battle as rather uncanny depictions of Macedonian customs, since they

\(^{251}\) 40.6.5-7.

\(^{252}\) Suetonius *Aug.* 43.3. See also Dio Cassius 51.22.4 for the role of the *ludus Troiae* in
Augustus’ reform of the military. It was later restored by Claudius. For general descriptions see

\(^{253}\) 40.6.7.
contain similarity and difference. The Macedonian rites could be seen to mime those of Rome, although they never lose their essential alterity. The uncanniness of the rites is intensified by their ultimate failure, since their participants subvert them even while they perform them. The king passes through the dog, but he is not purified, rather he is contaminated and contaminating, due to the curse of his people and the ill will of the gods. The Macedonian princes perform the combat to display their classic Hellenistic military prowess, but instead show their petty self-interest in the Macedonian throne, since both fought as if they struggled for kingdom, as was apparent to the spectators in Livy’s narrative. The subversion in the first case is implicit, in the second it is explicit. A further irony is that these events occur in a public setting that is meant to glorify Macedonian power but their final resting place is the literary setting of the Roman annals that are meant to glorify Roman power.

Next there follows the rhetorical debate of the brothers. The fraternal conflict is to be resolved by a new competition, this time a war of words rather than of phalanxes with sharpened sticks. This is suitable for the Hellenistic context of the passage, and shows the influence of Athens, since Livy has several times sententiously reminded the reader that the Greeks were more active with their tongues than in their deeds. The form of the debate is a genus iudicale, in contrast to the exhortatio form that is favored by Livy. In fact, this is the only appearance of a judicial speech in Livy.\textsuperscript{254} It is clear from the framework

\textsuperscript{254} Walsh (1996) \textit{apud} 40.8.4.
of the passage that Philip is to be the judge in this new and more serious contest.

Philip proceeds to define the various roles of himself and his sons:

"I sit", he said, "A most miserable father, a judge between two brothers, the accuser of parricide and the accused, who will discover the mark (labem) of the fabricated or committed charge.” (40.8.7)

Throughout the passage the three speakers will continue the judicial language, and it becomes uncertain whether the language of the courtroom is metaphorical, formal, actual or ironic. It is a metaphor for Philip in the sense of his current impossible position. It is formal for Perseus, who utilizes the language of the courtroom to add weight to his allegations. For Demetrius the status of defendant feels all too actual, although he does use the judicial language to some ironic effect. At any rate, the three speakers are all unsuccessful in their respective roles, since there is no decision. Philip promises to monitor the brothers’ actions, noting at the same time that Perseus’ charges could have easily been fabricated, although Demetrius’ relationship with the Romans was a cause for concern. At that point the speeches end, but Livy tells us rather portentously that these were the seeds of the Macedonian War. The Third Macedonian War grows out of the Macedonian fraternal conflict that intensified under the hostile machinations of the offended gods. The figure of the trial masks the infernal machinery that will poison and suffocate Demetrius and lead inevitably to the fall of royal Macedonia. The participants of the mock trial will never actively participate in justice, since it has already been determined, not by courtroom displays, but by the curse of the gods.
The metaphor of the trial becomes the dominant figure for the speeches, not only in their structure but also informing the rhetorical devices of the speakers. Although this figure is suggested by Philip, he would prefer the brothers to understand their situation not as a trial, but in the framework of the *exempla* of good and bad brothers.

How many times have you heard me, after scorning the examples of fraternal discords, recount the horrible outcome of those conflicts, by which kingdoms had completely destroyed themselves, their own family (*stirpem*), and homes! On the other hand I have also put forth better examples.\(^{255}\)

The examples that Philip goes on to list are interesting, since the three sets of brothers are all from enemies of Philip. First there are the two Spartan kings, who share power. Next there are the Pergamene brothers, Eumenes and Attalus. Finally, and most surprisingly, are two sets of Roman brothers, Titus and Lucius Quinctius Flamininus and Publius and Lucius Scipio.

Philip has provided a narrative very much like that suggested by Livy's *Praefatio*. He has presented examples in the hope of influencing his listeners in the hopes of changing them and saving the state from a crisis. It was hoped that Philip's listeners would imitate the better examples, and shun the destructive ones. However, Philip's efforts have been ineffectual, as Philip himself admits:

Neither was the wickedness of the former and the outcome suited to their wickedness able to frighten you from insane discord nor

\(^{255}\) 40.8.11: *Quotiens ego audientibus vobis detestatus exempla discordiarum fraternarum, horrendos eventus earum rettuli quibus se stirpemque suam domos regna funditus evertissent! Meliora quoque exempla parte alia posui.*
were the good mind and the good fortune of the latter able to bring you to sanity (sanitatem).\textsuperscript{256}

Philip’s application of the examples to his audience has been medicinal. It has been directed towards the sick minds of Perseus and Demetrius in the hopes of restoring them to sanity (ad sanitatem flectere). Livy’s language suggests not only mental wellness, but also wholeness. This healing is advantageous for the Macedonian state. Philip has shown in his four examples from Sparta, Pergamum and Rome how concord led to imperial success. As in Livy’s Praefatio, the moral attribute is subordinated to the imperial goal as means to an end. Good fortune follows from the good mind.

Yet Philip’s admonitions and medicinal discourse are ineffectual. Instead, Perseus and Demetrius are duly recorded in the account of the Roman annalist as an example to shun. Philip’s own discourse is subverted. The bad examples that Philip used for his sons’ edification remain anonymous in Livy’s account, since Philip and his sons have become a paradigmatic bad example in Livy’s narrative.

The commentators have noted that the Polybian source of Philip’s speech exists, although only as a fragment. The general consensus is that Livy has added the Roman examples. Chaplin suggests that these are supplements for

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{256} 40.8.16: Neque vos illorum scelus similisque sceleri eventus deterrere a vecordi discordia potuit, neque horum bona mens, bona fortuna ad sanitatem flectere.
\end{flushright}
the entertainment of Livy’s contemporaries. Certainly these are additions that emphasize the Roman reading of the Macedonian text, and underline the irony that is the master trope of Livy’s Macedonian narrative. The Roman exemplars are doubled in quantity and complete the listing of good brothers. Now Alexander’s descendents must live up to Roman standards, although the house of Philip has already been cursed by the Roman gods.

There is certainly a more pertinent Roman example for Perseus and Demetrius, and one that would be striking to Livy’s contemporaries, although it is far more ancient. The conflict of Perseus and Demetrius is oddly parallel to the conflict of Romulus and Remus, although many aspects of the story have been inverted. First, and most notably, the story of Romulus and Remus is a foundation myth of Rome, whereas the conflict of Perseus and Demetrius is a narrative about the end of the Macedonian kingdom. The varying claims of Perseus and Demetrius to innocence and therefore the throne will be judged by their father, the king. By means of augury the gods will decide the competing claims of Romulus and Remus for the throne. Romulus and Remus seek the knowledge of the gods by watching for signs in the flight of birds, whereas Perseus and Demetrius attempt to convince their father by a display of rhetorical prowess. The Roman enterprise seems divine and destined for success, but the project of Macedonian sovereignty seems all too human and ineffectually Greek,

the disfiguring sign (*labem*; 40.8.7) of a people more concerned with speeches than with actions.

The respective speeches of Perseus and Demetrius emphasize figures of externality and internality. Perseus utilizes a rhetoric that portrays Demetrius as an external threat (*insidiae*) to Macedonian society, whereas Demetrius treats the charge as an internal threat (*proditio*) that is subsequently transferred to Perseus. Therefore, the position of Perseus against his brother is Romulean insofar as Romulus protected the boundaries of the city that Remus fatally scorned.

Perseus’ speech depicts Demetrius as an outsider contaminated by the foreign enemies in Rome, whereas Demetrius in his speech tries to reintegrate himself into his family and Macedonian society.

The speech of Perseus emphasizes *insidiae*, doors and his familial piety. These are attempts to show Perseus as inside the Macedonian household as the elder offspring and the rightful heir in contrast to his brother, the exiled hostage in Rome, who had been contaminated and made an outsider by the influence of Titus Flamininus.

The very opening of the speech seeks to convey Demetrius as an external threat:

> The door should have been opened at night, the armed revelers welcomed and my neck offered to the sword, since the crime is disbelieved unless it has been committed. Although treacherously attacked I have to listen to the same things as this bandit and plotter (*insidiator*)!^258^
Perseus next rather incongruously admits the charge that he is a bastard, for that
is how his father treats him. Livy is rather fond of this charge, and he has used it
here with a double irony, for it deligitimizes the central figure of internality that
presupposes Perseus’ effort to depict Demetrius as an external threat, although
Perseus uses it as a metaphor to shame his father into renewed acceptance of
his legitimacy to the throne.

Not uselessly do such men say that you have Demetrius as your
only son, whereas I am illegitimate and born from a concubine. For
if I held the rank and the dearness of a son for you, you would not be alleging against me the treacheries (insidias) I detected but
against him who did it, nor would my life be so trivial to you so that
you are unaffected by my recent nor future danger, as it will be if
those plotters (insidiantibus) remain unpunished.259

The opening of Perseus’ speech abounds in words of insidiae. This word and its
related forms appears four times in the first ten lines of the speech. This word,
derived from the verb insidere, properly to sit upon or against, but here in the
sense of sitting in wait and hence ambush. The word is used for an external
threat, a sitting against, but insidiae are often the union of an internal insider and
outside accomplices. The insider supplies pertinent information for the use of the
outsiders who will launch the ambush. This is the case in the speech of Perseus.

Demetrius is portrayed as an agent of the Romans.

petitus insidiis audio quae latro atque insidiator. I reject the translation of Walsh (1996) that
suggests that Perseus is to be identified with the latro atque insidiator of the relative clause.

259 40.9.2-4: Non nequiquam isti unum Demetrium filium te habere, me subditum et paelice
genitum appellant. Nam si gradum, si caritatem filli apud te haberem, non in me quaerentem
deprehensas insidias sed in eum qui fecisset saevires, nec adeo vilis tibi vita esset nostra ut nec
praeterito periculo meo movereris neque futuro si <sit> insidiantibus impune.
Livy’s portrayal of Perseus is ironic, since he is in fact the one who plots the destruction of his brother, an act of brutal assassination. This blurred status of the brothers is referred to in Perseus’ speech in the other two references to insidiae: “Discern and distinguish the plotter (insidiatorem) and one sought by plots (insidiis).” The status of the two brothers is indistinguishable in the violence of mimetic desire, as Johner has argued.

Perseus however wishes to portray himself as an insider. Therefore he emphasizes the door (ianua) that Demetrius and his accomplices wish to enter. It is useful for Perseus’ general aims that his brother slept in a separate building. By recounting the details of his narrative, the image of the door returns as a sign of Demetrius as the crosser of thresholds.

The door should have been opened…
He denies that he came to my door with a crowd (multitudine)…
If I received the brother within the door to celebrate, I would have died.

Through the metonymic link of the door Demetrius’ imaginary entrance is depicted as a hostile entry across his brother’s threshold, and a matter of life and death.

---

260 40.10.1: Discerne, dispice insidiatorem et petitum insidiis.
261 Johner (1996) 228: L'encodage livien de violence repose sur la distorsion entre la differenciation de surface de la narration et l'indifferenciation des discours qui confond le bon et le mauvais, l'agresseur et l'agresse, et donne une image de reciprocite et d'identite, bien caracteristique de la crise violente.
262 The prominence of the door is noted by Johner (1996) 225.
263 40.9.1: Aperienda nimirum nocte ianua fuit. 9.14: Negat venisse se cum multitudine ad ianuam meam. 10.4: Si recepero intra ianuam comissatum fratrem, moriendum est.
The depiction of Demetrius as an outsider is directly related to his portrayal as an agent of the Romans, as Perseus discusses in the probatio portion of the speech. He alleges that the originator and master of Demetrius’ plotting with the Romans is Titus Quinctius Flamininus himself, the conqueror of Cynoscephelae who intrudes into all three speeches. At the end of his speech, Perseus suggests that Flamininus is now Demetrius' true father, thereby making him the bastard at the end of the speech, whereas at the start of the speech it had been suggested that Philip treated Perseus as illegitimate.\textsuperscript{264}

The affect of Rome upon Demetrius has made him an outsider to Macedonian society. In fact the characteristic effect of Rome on Macedonians is disloyalty, conveyed in the language of infection and disease that emphasizes mixing (\textit{infecti}):

The honorable and pure men who go to Rome from here, believing Philip to be their king, return from there imbued and contaminated (\textit{infecti}) by Roman coaxing.\textsuperscript{265}

Perseus uses Livy’s language of purity and disease, but now it is used to describe Macedonians in Rome, rather than Romans soldiers at the outskirts of the Hellenistic world.

In contrast to Demetrius, the hostile outsider, Perseus portrays himself as respectful and loyal to the will of the father. “I have worshipped nothing beside

\textsuperscript{264} 40.11.2: \textit{T. Quinctius nunc est auctor omnium rerum isti et magister. Eum sibi te abdicato patre in locum tuum substituit.}

\textsuperscript{265} 40.11.3: \textit{Qui hinc integri et sincer Romam eunt, Philippum regem se habere credentes, imbuti illinc et infecti Romanis delenimentis redeunt.}
the gods, father, and you. I don’t have Romans that I can flee to.” He swears by the paternal name, describing it as sacred. He also utters the ironic words, “Let him who was about to kill his brother receive the angered paternal gods.” By returning to the sacred character of the family, Perseus shows his status as an insider and Demetrius as an invader. This is most strikingly shown in his description of the royal aspirations of Demetrius:

He desires the kingdom and he desires it wickedly, he who hastens to transgress the order of age, nature, Macedonian custom, and the law of nations.

The words used to describe this transgression suggest a crossing of borders (qui transcendere festinat ordinem), like Remus. Whereas Perseus maintains and affirms the Macedonian order, Demetrius threatens it (Of course for Livy the true case is actually the opposite).

In response to his brother’s charges, Demetrius’ speech passes through many of the same themes as those in Perseus’ speech. This makes the appearance of proditio all the more surprising, since Perseus never mentioned this specific charge, although Demetrius’ betrayal of Macedonia to the Romans was repeatedly implied. The specific charge was insidiae, a treacherous entry into Perseus’ home in order to kill him. Demetrius chooses to portray the charge as proditio:

266 40.10.5: Nihil praeter deos, pater, et te colui. 9.7: Per te patrium[que], quod utri nostrum sactius sit iam pridem sentis. 10.2: Qui occisurus fratrem fuit, habeat etiam iratos paternos deos.

267 40.11.7: Cupit regnum, et quidem scelerate cupid, qui transcendere festinat ordinem aetatis, naturae, moris Macedonum, iuris gentium.
Moreover, Perseus, if I was a traitor (proditor) of my father and my kingdom, if I was hatching plans with others hostile to father, it would not have been fitting to have awaited last night’s legend, but I should have been accused of treason (proditionis) before.\(^{268}\)

The difference between insidiae and proditio is the difference between action that moves from the outside in (as in an ambush) and that of an action that moves from the inside out (as in a handing over of objects and information needed to take a city). To be a traitor, one must be inside the ranks that suffer the treason. By making this the charge, although Perseus never uses the word, Demetrius seeks to reposition himself in the Macedonian household.

If one were to consider insidiae as a sudden and unexpected attack, at the time when the object of attack would be most vulnerable, one could consider Perseus the insidiator, for he has had his brother awoken, probably with a hangover, to counter the charge of attempted murder, amidst vague allegations of collaborations with the enemy. Demetrius does make this argument, which is indeed the correct one in Livy’s narrative:

\[
\text{Nevertheless, as much as I am able in this sudden confusion, I will separate the things that you have muddled, and I will uncover whether that treachery (insidias) was yours or mine.}^{269}\]

\(^{268}\) 40.12.9: Oportuit autem, Perseu, si proditor ego patris regnique eram, si cum Romanis, si cum aliis inimicis patris inieram consilia, non esexpectatam fabulum esse noctis huius, sed proditionis me ante accusatum.

\(^{269}\) 40.12.12: Ego tamen, quantum in hac subita perturbatione potero, separabo ea quae tu confudisti, et noctis huius insidias aut tuas aut meas delegam.
However, the effect on Philip is only to muddle things more. Although this confusion is probably closer to the historical reality, it jeopardizes the narrator’s own assumed sympathies with Demetrius.\textsuperscript{270}

Demetrius also attempts to rebut the allegations with exaggeration and humor, noting that he was too drunk to seize the house and that he didn’t have enough men with him:

\begin{quote}
If I was going to seize (\textit{expugnaturus}) your house, and if I were going to kill its master after the house had been occupied, wouldn’t I have moderated my drinking for one day, wouldn’t I have kept my soldiers from drinking?\textsuperscript{271}

Was your home able to captured and seized (\textit{expugnari}) by four swords?\textsuperscript{272}
\end{quote}

The use of the word \textit{expugnare}, although used ironically, again refers to the movement from outside to inside, if only to dismiss the Romulean scheme that Perseus’ rhetoric had suggested; namely, the image of Perseus as playing a role similar to Romulus as a guardian of borders for kingdom and empire (realized here as the royal household). Nowhere does Demetrius mention the door that

\textsuperscript{270} Johner (1996) 223 also notes this: Le lecteur, tout comme Phillipe, serait incapable, sur la seule foi des discours, de départager les jeunes princes.

\textsuperscript{271} 40.14.4: \textit{Si domum tuam expugnaturus, capta domo dominum interfecturus eram, non temperassem vino in unum diem, non milites meos abstinuissem?}

\textsuperscript{272} 40.14.11: \textit{Quattuor Gladiis domus tua capi et expugnari potuit?}
Perseus found so compelling. It has been replaced by an absurd siege of Perseus’ home by four drunks.

Demetrius’ speech has not been able to convince his later readers that he is entirely innocent of the charges against him, especially his collusion with the Romans. In fact, the portrayal of Demetrius as rightful leader is undermined at several points in the narrative. Most telling perhaps are the tears that follow each of the three speeches. Everybody cries after Philip’s speech. After Perseus’ speech, there is silence except for the sobbing of Demetrius. At the end of his speech, Demetrius cries once again. In this way, the speech of Demetrius begins and ends in tears. He is the last man crying. His ultimate fate is to be suffocated after he is poisoned. The man who would be king speaks between sobs and dies whimpering under his pillow.

Demetrius gives the longest speech of the three, and therefore the entire judicial setting builds to a tricolon crescendo. His speech is however enough to preserve his life only temporarily. Although the commentators are fond of writing that Livy favors Demetrius, he must lose in order to bring the Third Macedonian War, for Livy tells us at the end of the scene that these were the seeds of the war. It remains unclear if this refers to the speech themselves or the recitation of events by Marcius Philippus.

---

273 40.16.3: *Haec vivo Philippo velut semina iacta sunt Macedoni belli, quod proxime cum Perseo gerendum erat.*
By Contrast: A Story of Consular Rivalry in Rome

A striking contrast to these Macedonian events is found in the censorship of Aemilius Paulus and Fulvius Nobilior. Aemilius, as we have seen, appears at critical points of the narrative of the Macedonian wars. Earlier he was one of the decemviri who participated in the vitriolic denunciation of Manlius Volso. In the course of book 44 he shall take control of the Macedonian wars from Marcius Philippus, who was mishandling the war. Book 45 is a celebration of his exploits, culminating in his triumph and a pair of long speeches. In Book 40 his rivalry with Fulvius Nobilior is a clear contrast to the rivalry between Demetrius and Perseus that runs throughout the book.

Livy identifies Aemilius as pontifex maximus, and Fulvius as the leader of a triumph over the Aetolians, a triumph opposed by Aemilius. Fulvius is noted in Livy’s history for his harsh treatment of Ambracia, and many later envoys to the senate complained of his atrocities. Aemilius had supported these claims in the Senate. Fulvius in turn had twice prevented Aemilius from receiving the consulship. Livy uses interesting language to describe the enmity between the two men:

Between these two noble men there were notable enmities that were made known often in many violent debates (atrocibus certaminibus) both in the Senate and before the people.\(^{274}\)

\(^{274}\) 40.45.7: *Inter hos viros nobiles inimicitiae erant, saepe multis et in senatu et ad poulum atrocibus celebratae certaminibus.*
The mention of a *certamen* between two noble or notable men as a public display recalls the hostility between the Macedonian princes. Here in Rome these hostilities have a very different denouement.

At the completion of the *comitia*, the censors follow the ancient custom and go to the field of Mars to sit in their curule chairs. There they are approached by a large of citizens and the chiefs of the Senate. Quintus Caecilius Metellus proceeds to make an impassioned speech pleading for them to reconcile. He makes the argument that their dispute endangers not only themselves but also the state. Caecilius continues:

> We ask that today while in this consecrated area (*templo*) that you end your animosities (*simultates*) and that you allow to be joined (*coniungi*) in mutual reconciliation the men whom the Roman people chose by its votes to join together (*coniunxit*). May you select the Senate, review the knights, conduct the census and offer the customary sacrifice (*lustrum*) with one mind.\(^{275}\)

Many of these words recall aspects of the Macedonian rivalry. There are *simultates* between the men, a rivalry based on the similarity of mimicry or likeness of expression (*similis*). The violent debates between Aemilius and Fulvius are a jealousy or envy of mimetic desire for authority in Roman society. Fulvius is angry with Aemilius preventing his triumph, Aemilius is angered by Fulvius preventing his consulship.

\(^{275}\) 40.46.7: *Has ut hodie ut isto templo, finiatis simultates quaesumus vos universi, et quos coniunxit suffragiis suis populus Romanus, hos etiam reconciliatone gratiae coniungi a nobis sinatis; uno animo, uno consilio legatis senatum, equites recenseatis, agatis censum, lustrum condatis.*
The appeal for peace is made in the sacred space (*templum*). This is a place where the troops would be reviewed. Like the Macedonian *lustrum* described above, the public spectacle of the Roman *lustrum* is largely military. Caecilius appeals to the censors to choose the sacred space of the Campus Martius as a place to join themselves, rather than display their separation, as in the case of the Macedonian princes.

Caecilius ends with a series of *exempla*. His first one is Romulus and Titus Tatius, who ruled in harmony. Thereafter he recalls the peace between Rome and its former enemies, the Albans, Latins and Sabines. Notable in these examples is this antiquity. Unlike Philip, who relied on foreign examples for fraternal harmony, all of these examples are Roman of the old-fashioned sort. They show the *ethos* of Livy’s Roman Italian nationalism, the concord of Italians and Rome after the Social Wars.

Moved by the plea of Caecilius, the men shake hands and end their hatred (*finire odium*). This Roman hatred can be ended, unlike the new type of hatred that Demetrius described. This ability to constrain the emotions shows the righteousness of the rule of Rome. Yet for Livy that power is the most auspicious when it is shared, rather than the object of endless contests (*certamina*). The

276 40.46.14.

277 40.12.11: *Utrum ego tibi an tu mihi, novo quidem et singulari genere odii, insidias fecisses.*
sentiment is a product of the Social War rather than a nostalgic Republicanism. Livy contrasts the unity of Roman Italy to the confusion of the Hellenistic Greeks.

**Nova Sapientia: The Case of Marcus Philippus**

Although the reconciliation of Aemilius and Fulvius is auspicious, all is not right at Rome, as the role of Quintus Marcius Philippus shows. He was the prime motivator of preemptive war against the Macedonians in Livy’s narrative. As discussed above, Livy seems to link the description of Philip’s demographic policies, his assassination of opposition families, and internal discords to the report of Marcius, who served as an envoy in the areas of Greece occupied by Philip’s troops and surrogates. Although Marcius becomes the major Roman enemy of Perseus in the first half of the Third Macedonian War, until the consulship of Aemilius, he in many ways becomes a double of Philip, as his name suggests. Marcius comes to show the Hellenistic aspects that corrupt Livy’s Republic.

Marcius earned his cognomen by a family tie of hospitality to the royal Macedonian family. In Book 42 Livy records another stunning betrayal of this inherited relationship to the Macedonian crown. Perseus trusts in this ancestral connection and sends ambassadors to Larisa in Thessaly, before the outbreak of hostilities but in the midst of a massive Roman mobilization in Northwest Greece, led by the consul Marcius himself.²⁷⁸ The envoys arrange a meeting at the Peneus River. When Perseus arrived on the opposite side of the river, there was confusion about who should cross, the king or the consul.

²⁷⁸ 42.38.8: *Legati a Perseo rege venerunt privati maxime hospitii fiducia, quod ei paternum cum Marcio erat.* For a discussion of the Thessalian offer of support to Rome against Perseus, see above in chapter 2.
By a joke Marcius moved them from their hesitation. “Let the younger,” he said, “cross over to his elders (maiores) and-” (because his cognomen was Philippus) “Let the son cross over to his father.” That easily persuaded the king.\(^{279}\)

Here Marcius jokingly but strikingly identifies himself with Philip V. Indeed, his machinations for war, his treachery, and his aspirations for hegemony in Macedonia and Thessaly are also rather “Philipian”. Marcius also seems similar to his consular predecessor, Manlius Volso, who was compared to an eastern despot in his hunger for conquest. In both cases there are questionable pretenses of the defense of Roman interests in remote regions of the Greek east. They are also both countered by Aemilius Paulus, who publicly criticizes their policies.

At the Peneus river, Marcius administers a medicinal discourse to his Macedonian hospes:

> But since the man who broke the treaty must be punished by words or arms, and as I would prefer that a war against you be entrusted to someone else rather than me, I will take a rather harsh tone in my speech against my houseguest, like doctors when they apply rather severe remedies for the sake of health.\(^{280}\)

\(^{279}\) 42.39.5: \textit{loco etiam Marcius cunctantis movit. “Minor,” inquit “ad maiores et-“ quod Philippo ipsi cognomen erat- “filius ad patrem transeat.”}

\(^{280}\) 42.40.3: \textit{Sed cum aut verbis castigandus aut armis sit, qui foedus rumpit, sicut bellum adversus te alii quam mihi mandatum malim, ita orationis acerbitatem adversus hospitem, utcumque est, subibo, sicut medici, cum salutis causa tristoria remedia adhibent.}
Marcius shows Philip’s concern for a medicinal discourse. Philip’s discourse was based on exempla, and yet it failed. Marcius’ speech is a chronicle of Perseus’ misdeeds in Greece, his violence against envoys and an assassination attempt against Eumenes of Pergamum at the Delphic shrine. At the end of speech, he asks Perseus for a defense that he may give to the Senate, since he favors Perseus on behalf of their “paternal hospitality”. Perseus gives a detailed defense, and Marcius sends ambassadors to convey the message to the Senate. Marcius has achieved his goal, not to help his guest-friend, but to allow Rome time to prepare its forces to destroy his kingdom.

When Marcius returns to Rome, he is delighted to declare to the Senate his successful deception of Philip:

> When they returned to Rome, Marcius and Atilius proclaimed their embassy on the Capitol, in such a way that they exulted (gloriarentur) in nothing more than their deception of the king through the truce and hope for peace.

However, the methods of Marcius are not pleasing to all the Senators, and some even saw them as being unRoman:

> The old Senators and those mindful of the ancient customs denied that they recognized Roman skills (artes) in that embassy. The ancestors waged war neither through treachery (insidias) and night battles, nor through fake retreats and unforeseen returns against

---

281 42.40.11: Equidem pro paterno nostro hospitio faveo orationi tuae.

282 42.43.2: Ad id <cum> necessaria petition indutiarum videretur cuperetque Marcius neque aliud conloquio petisset, gravate et in magnam gratiam patiorem concessit.

283 42.46.1: Marcus et Atilius, Romam cum venissent, legationem in Capitolio ita renuntiarunt, ut nulla re magis gloriarentur quam decopte per indutias et spem pacis rege.
their careless enemy, nor did they exult (*gloriarentur*) more in cleverness than in true virtue. They were accustomed to declare war before they waged it, and sometimes even to set a place for battle where they would fight. By the same truthfulness (*fide*), when a doctor plotted (*medicum insidientem*) against the life of Pyrrhus, they told the king. By that same truthfulness the betrayer (*proditorem*) of the schoolchildren was bound and handed over to the Faliscians. These methods are Roman, not the methods of Carthaginian slyness and Greek cunning, among whom it was more glorious (*gloriosius*) to deceive an enemy than to overcome him with force.284

The methods of Marcius are further described as a “new wisdom” (*nova sapientia*; 42.46.9). Livy describes the men who had these sentiments not only as old but older (*seniores*). These are the Senators who uphold the Roman traditions in opposition to Marcius and his fellow upstarts who use Greek methods to increase the empire. Livy’s language clearly implies that Marcius’ methods should be shunned. They are associated with the betrayal (*proditio*) and treachery (*insidiae*) of the Macedonian domestic rivalry that was actually a dispute about succession and therefore a state crisis.

The treacherous doctor of the first example recalls Marcius’ medicinal discourse that deceived the king although it masqueraded as straight talk from the king’s advocate before the Senate. In contrast to such treachery is Roman *fides* that respects all oaths and doesn’t conceal its actions. There are clear references to the Fetial law of war here, as in the speech against Manlius Volso

284 42.46.4-7: *Veteres et moris antiqui memores negebant se in ea legatione Romanas agnoscere artes. Non per insidias et nocturna proelia, nec simulatam fugam inprovisosque ad incautum hostem reditus, nec ut astu magis quam vera virtute gloriarentur, bella maiores gessisse: indicere prius quam gerere solitos bella, denuntiare etiam interdum <pugnam et locum> finire, in quo dimicaturi essent. Eadem fide indicatum Pyrrho regi medicum vitae eius insidiantem; eadem Faliscis vinctum traditum proditorem liberorum; haec Romana esse, non versutiarum Punicarum neque calliditatis Graecae, apud <quos> fallere hostem quam vi superare gloriosius fuerit.*
in Book 38. Marcius is pursuing the war in an illegitimate and non-Roman manner by not boldly stating his intentions. Like Manlius Volso, Marcius glorifies himself while increasing the Roman empire in unlawful ways. Both men are avatars of the increasingly independent generals of the late Republic.

The Senate decided to approve Marcius’ actions, and approved the truce while preparing for war. The old Senators lost the debate. Marcius Philippus would eventually lead a Roman army against Perseus, contrary to his words rather than his wishes. His campaign is a miserable failure. Throughout the narrative he remains a hypocrite, a man more given to words than deeds. Before a disastrous and brutal march through the Canubrian mountains he attempts to rouse his men with words borrowed from his elders in the Senate. He passes through the various provocations of Perseus, beginning with the murder of his brother, and passing through his various criminal actions contrary to treaty (contra foedus). He continues:

He shall see in the outcome of his affairs how hateful all those things were to the gods. Truly the gods favor piety and truthfulness, and by those qualities the Roman people have reached such a great summit.285

Since these words are given in indirect speech, one might easily misread them as referring to Marcius himself. By his lack of pietas to his hospes and his lack of

285 44.1.10-11: *Ea omnia quam diis quoque invisa essent, sensurum in exitu rerum suarum: favere enim pietati fideique deos, per quae populus Romanus ad tantum fastigii venerit.*
truthfulness when negotiating a truce he lacks the very qualities that extended Roman imperium. His actions are like those of an Eastern despot. He can scarcely make it around the summits of the Canubrian mountains let alone reach their peaks.

With the figure of Marcius Philippus the ironic troping of the Macedonian rivalry is reversed. Perseus and Demetrius there functioned as an inversion of Romulus and Remus, and their rivalry becomes the seeds of a war that will be the end of the mighty Macedonian empire. Marcius Philippus acts like an eastern despot, who it seems, is simply Romana virtus inversa.

By troping through the various contrasts of Roman and Greek temperaments, Livy provides a way that Rome can find itself after it has lost itself, if only it will listen to the seniores, mindful of the ancient tradition. If only its great men will heed the advice of Caecilius, and set aside their differences. Or perhaps the best way to advance and stabilize imperial power is to set outside these differences, on the margins of the empire, where they signify the alterity that is to be shunned, buried, burned, or otherwise ritually annihilated in a way that reaffirms Rome through what it destroys.
CHAPTER 6

AFTER WORDS: THE ECLIPSE

But I hesitate lest unawares I fall into the phrase bandied around, whether the man milking the goat or the one holding the sieve is the more foolish. So too I may seem to be doing something similar by rendering a close account of annals agreed to be false (pseudologian), and by going into a discussion at great length. One might say in addition that it is completely pointless to speak about these things unless someone wants to transcribe dreams and critique the dreams of a man upon awakening. (Polybius, *Fragmenta Incertae Sedis*)

In the same manner, an eternally repeated dream would certainly be felt and judged to be reality. But the hardening and congealing of metaphor guarantees absolutely nothing concerning its necessity and exclusive justification. (Friedrich Nietzsche, “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense”)\(^{287}\)

In the preceding chapters, I have attempted to demonstrate a persistent theme and its modes of expression in Livy’s history. In books 31-45, but especially books 38-40, Hellenism is portrayed as a threatening hybridity that threatens Roman purity. This theme is largely conveyed through a series of metaphors that in someway culminate in the ironies of book 40. I have also

\(^{286}\) Although the exact location of the fragment is unknown, it is placed by modern editors at 33.21.

suggested that the theme is realized in the odd narrative turns of Livy, from the exotic travelogues of book 38 to the mimicries of comic and tragic elements in books 39 and 40.

These conclusions allow us to see Livy’s narrative of the Macedonian Wars as a work of nationalistic passion, rather than a Stoic scribe’s translations of Polybius. Livy is original and thoughtful in his arrangement of events as well as their narration. Livy invents history just as surely as any other historian. The story that Livy tells us in books 31-45 is remarkably consistent with the aims stated in the Praefatio: The entry of foreign alterities that will subvert the Roman spirit.

As we saw in the striking case of the ignoble Greek who introduced Italy to Bacchus, the Hellenism that concerns Livy is degenerate and distinguished from the Hellenic achievements of the past. However, these seem to be the only Greeks left by the time of the Macedonian Wars. The most positive comments that Livy makes about a Greek in these books are those in praise of the accuracy of Polybius on Greek history.288

The degeneracy of the Greeks is largely represented as a hybridity or mixing with different races in other regions. An example of the effects of hybridity is the case of the Galatians, also known as Gauls or Gallograecians, depending on the speaker in Livy’s history. In this sense Livy’s narrative embodies a very

288 33.10.
conservative view on cultural matters. Certainly in this sense he agrees with the Roman revivalism that marks the Augustan era and he may be somewhat excused as a creature of his times.²⁸⁹

Still, the inherent hypocrisy of this narrative is striking. This Roman annalist, himself from the provinces and perhaps born a non-citizen, writes a text that seeks to display the most striking Romanitas. His story describes the dangers of Greek influence and portrays it as a threat to Roman character. His main source is a Greek author and he writes in the Greek genre of history. Polybius would immediately identify this as *pseudologein* (speaking false). Livy writes as if he were in a dream.

These issues can be illuminated or illustrated if not resolved by considering a curious episode of the lunar eclipse before the battle of Pydna. The event is described by Livy and, among others, Cicero, Quintilian and Valerius Flaccus.²⁹⁰ Livy tells us that the night before the determining battle of the third Macedonian war, Gaius Sulpicicus Gallus, a military tribune of the second legion, received the permission to warn the troops of an impending eclipse. He demonstrated to them that such events were the result of the natural order and

---

²⁸⁹ The classic statement on Livy’s relation to Augustan times remains Syme (1939) 463-5. He would later develop Livy’s devotion to the principate in a lengthy essay (1959).

²⁹⁰ Cicero *Rep.* 1.23, Valerius Maximus 8.11.1, Quintilian 1.10.47, Pliny *NH* 2.53, Frontinus *Strat.* 1.12.8)
should not be regarded as prodigies. The Macedonians and their diviners (vates) interpreted the eclipse as portending their defeat. When the eclipse occurred they screamed and howled.\textsuperscript{291}

Given the result of the following battle, the foreboding of the Macedonians was perhaps justified. In fact, the reader would regard the eclipse as a portent, since that was its usual function in Livy.\textsuperscript{292} Yet here the tribune Gallus explicitly rejects the notion that the eclipse is a prodigy, whereas Livy tells us explicitly that the Macedonians did regard it as a prodigy. The Macedonians interpret the eclipse the same way as many readers of Livy would, and the result of the battle somehow proves them right. This reading simply follows the usual response of the Roman authorities to eclipses.

The incident is made even more interesting when one considers Polybius’ description of the same event. There both sides regard it as a portent. For the Romans it is positive, for the Macedonians is negative. Gallus is not mentioned.\textsuperscript{293} This certainly follows the narrative logic of such events in ancient history and provides no surprise. It is also the usual recitation of the event by Greek authors.

Roman authors who mention the event always mention Gallus and usually give the greatest weight to his scientific prediction in assuring victory against the Macedonians. In contrast to the other Latin authors, Livy does not comment on

\textsuperscript{291} 44.38.5-9.

\textsuperscript{292} For instance, a three day \textit{supplicatio} is declared after a solar eclipse (38.36.4).

\textsuperscript{293} Polybius 29.16.
its significance for the battle of Pydna. His emphasis is on the contrast in the
reactions of the Greeks and Romans. In this way he seems to combine the two
different narratives found in the Latin and Greek authors.\textsuperscript{294}

These contrasts are indeed striking. We have already seen that Gallus
instructs the Romans not to regard the event as a prodigy, whereas for the
Macedonians it is considered a gloomy prodigy (\textit{triste prodigium}). The Romans
are instructed on the true nature of the event by a Roman military authority on
official business, but the Macedonians rely on the \textit{vates} and there is no mention
of the response of the Macedonian command to the eclipse. The wisdom of
Gallus seems nearly divine to the Roman soldiers, but the Macedonians are
reduced to screams and howls (\textit{clamor ululatusque}), as if savages.

It is indeed odd that here the Roman leadership reacts to an obvious
prodigy with the staid response of astronomical knowledge, reported by Livy in a
brisk indirect speech. This would seem to be the proper response of the
Macedonians, given their degree of scientific learning as the originators of the
Hellenistic kingdoms. The reported response of the Macedonians would seem to
be the likely response of a Roman army of illiterate Italians. Thus at least
speculated Cicero, who characterized Gallus' military audience as “uneducated
men of the countryside” and his ability to convince such an audience was proof of
his oratorical abilities.\textsuperscript{295}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{294} Levene (1993) 118-20.
\textsuperscript{295} Rep. 23.
\end{flushleft}
It is most significant that Livy describes this astronomical knowledge of Gallus as *sapientia*. This is a word used for Hellenic knowledge and especially philosophy, as in the case of Numa’s books in Book 40. The word often has a negative connotation as a concept foreign to the Roman character that prided itself on vigorous action rather than idle contemplation. If this is a usage of *sapientia* with positive connotations, it would be a first for Livy. Whatever the case, here the word means that Gallus has appropriated Greek knowledge and conveyed it to the Roman troops. He is a striking Gallograecus indeed! Here this tribune, Gallus, the Greek astronomy scholar, presents Hellenistic learning as Roman, whereas his Hellenistic opponents have degenerated into superstitious ululations.

This assimilation would seem to be thoroughly positive, although highly ironic. By his application of Hellenistic learning, the tribune assures the following victory, or so the usual argument would go. Yet in Livy’s account, Gallus’ prediction has no impact on the battle whatsoever. The emphasis is on the responses to the eclipse of the two military camps. It demonstrates the learning of the Romans and the degeneration of the Macedonians.

In fact, as every honest reader of Livy would admit, Gallus is wrong in his prediction and the Macedonians are right. The eclipse is a prodigy, and it does forecast the fall of Perseus. There is nothing positive for the Romans in this

---


297 In Cicero’s account, Gallus gains his knowledge of eclipses from his study of Archimedes’ sphere, dedicated as war booty by Marcellus in the temple of Virtus (22). This would represent the Roman naturalization of Greek astronomical as a manly and worthwhile dispute.
assimilation of scientific knowledge. In fact it is terribly dangerous since it could lead to arrogance among the Romans. The soldiers regard the Gallus’ Greek knowledge as nearly divine. Yet the outcome of the battle shows that this speech is not in harmony with the gods, the source of prodigies. Livy’s readers know how to read such prodigies better than his Gallus. By the time the reader reads book 44, he like Livy has an “ancient soul.”

At the same time, this display of astronomical knowledge is an ironic episode, since it shows the Romanization of Greek learning. In contrast the Macedonians have become superstitious savages that react rather than forecast and preempt events. The episode shows the superiority of the Romans at the same time it shows a certain loss of connection with the gods. It also shows that much in Livy that seems like hypocrisy is in fact the result of his belief that Greeks and Gauls were degenerate races, and that their current state justified Roman power over them. Unfortunately we have lost too much of Livy’s work to determine whether these Greek and Gallic phantoms of the Forum Boarium continued to haunt his narrative.

At the same time, this display of astronomical knowledge is an ironic episode, since it shows the Romanization of Greek learning. In contrast the Macedonians have become superstitious savages that react rather than forecast and preempt events. The episode shows the superiority of the Romans at the same time it shows a certain loss of connection with the gods. It also shows that much in Livy that seems like hypocrisy is in fact the result of his belief that Greeks and Gauls were degenerate races, and that their current state justified Roman power over them. Unfortunately we have lost too much of Livy’s work to determine whether these Greek and Gallic phantoms of the Forum Boarium continued to haunt his narrative.

Et mihi vetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto antiquus fit animus.
same time it shows a certain loss of connection with the gods. It also shows that much in Livy that seems like hypocrisy is in fact the result of his belief that Greeks and Gauls were degenerate races, and that their current state justified Roman power over them. Unfortunately we have lost too much of Livy’s work to determine whether these Greek and Gallic phantoms of the Forum Boarium continued to haunt his narrative.
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