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I. Introduction

In this study, I examine from an historiographical stance the conception, use, and referents of the term *monumentum* in Livy’s *Ab Urbe Condita*. In this process, I focus on two different but complementary aspects: first, Livy’s use of the term *monumentum* within the text as a lens through which his historiographical method can be understood; second, Livy’s commentary on Roman culture as it is represented in various instantiations of the term *monumentum*, both in their internal impact on the narrative and in their reflection of the external society in which the *Ab Urbe Condita* is written and to which it is presented. The term appears a significant number of times in the extant portions of Livy, but not so many that it can be dismissed as a natural accumulation of language or as mere happenstance. Further, *monumentum* often appears in key passages—such as prefatory or closural sections—or is connected with those key passages through verbal parallels or thematic commonality.

It makes a certain amount of sense that a work focused on representing the past to an audience in the present would seek tangible or, at least, perceivable points of contact with that past. The further back in time the story goes, the greater the need may seem to be for these points

---

1 In order to emphasize the importance of *monumentum* as a term and concept with particular cultural implications—as well as to preserve the complex dimensions of the term—I use the Latin term throughout. All translations are my own.

2 *Monumentum* in some form appears at least 45 times. The passages are: *praef.* 6, 10; 1.12.6, 13.5, 36.5, 45.4, 48.7, 55.1; 2.33.9, 40.12; 4.7.10, 10.6, 16.1, 24.3; 5.30.2, 52.1; 6.1.2, 20.12, 28.6, 29.9; 7.3.7, 21.6; 8.11.16, 40.5; 9.18.7; 10.2.15, 15.5; 23.20.3; 25.39.17; 26.24.14, 41.12; 29.37.7; 30.28.5; 31.29.11, 30.7; 37.6.6; 38.53.8, 56.3-5 (four times), 57.8; 39.37.16, 40.7; 45.27.11, 43.4 (see also *per.* 38, 41, 140, and F 42 = Sen. *de Tranq.* 9). According to some manuscripts, the term also appears at 1.47.6 and 21.4.2. No editor has suggested *monumento* for the textual *momento* at 2.7.10. But the context fits for the term *monumentum* (the passage pertains to a proposed house on the Velia; see also Ch. 3 for the connection between *monumentum* and *fama*), and *momentum* and *monumentum* are commonly confused in scribal transmission (see Ch. 1). A similar argument may apply to 1.33.7 (*munimentum*). Though digital word searches have largely superseded concordances, Packard remains useful in its linear collection and presentation.
of contact, and the term certainly is more prevalent in the earlier portions of the history (in so far as is represented in the surviving text, anyways). But it is notable that all of those earliest *monumenta* have vanished with time, been replaced, or undergone dramatic change to the point that they no longer clearly fulfil the original, memorial function for which they were made. In his Preface, Livy apparently laments the reliance of the earliest portions of his history on poetic and mythical accounts (*poeticis ... fabulis*) rather than on history’s secure *monumenta* (*incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis*, 6; discussed further in Ch. 3). Why, then, does the first book contain more uses of the term *monumentum* than any other? And, as a corollary, why do *fabulae* continue to play such a large role in narrating Rome’s past beyond those earliest periods?

Livy’s *monumenta* often become problematic in the course of his narrative, in that they do not actually meet the function for which they exist; their point of commemoration is cast into doubt or contradicted; or their status as privileged preservers of the past is challenged in cross-reference with other portions of the text. I argue that Livy’s depiction of *monumenta* as inconsistent and indeterminate is a conscious and loaded one: the historian represents disconnect and fluctuation between general conceptions of *monumenta*—as they are characterized by other writers—and the ones depicted in the narrative. In so doing, he creates a dialogic space in which reader and author can negotiate and better understand the nature of Roman history as well as the larger culture itself, a collective past and identity that has traditionally been represented through commemorative artefacts.

---

3 See Bonfante 1998. Bonfante points out that written documents become more prevalent than material *monumenta* in the later books (486 n. 27).

4 The phrase *res gestae* in Livy is also not an uncomplicated one. See, esp., Ch. 4 on 8.40.4-5 and the distinction of *fama rerum gestarum* and *memoria rerum gestarum*. 
The topic is by no means untrodden ground, and the primary evidence, by nature of the specific focus on a term, has been discussed previously; my contribution is rather one of nuance than novelty. My discussion particularly stems from and builds on several full-length studies that have addressed *monumenta* in Livy over the past several decades. In the first chapter of his 1995 book, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*, Gary Miles examines the role of *monumenta* in their capacity to serve as source material for historical accounts, an issue that is complicated in the course of Livy’s narrative as the reliability of *monumenta* is repeatedly called into question. Often, despite the prefatory remark suggesting the contrary (*praef. 6*), Livy’s history lends equal weight to *fabulae* and *monumenta* as the basis of historical material; and the distinction between the two terms fades in Livy’s historiographical process. Miles concludes that Livy tints his material with such doubtfulness in order to restrict the use of the past for propagandistic initiatives, especially on the part of the looming figure of Augustus.

My approach is very similar to that of Miles’ in so far as I question the ability of *monumenta* as depicted by Livy to recover a fully reliable vision of the Roman past, which, in turn, reflects on the very restricted viewpoint from which these *monumenta* potentially originate. Instead, however, of viewing Livy’s text as offering a particularly anti-Augustan stance, I argue that Livy views the rise of the Julio-Claudian dynasty as the natural consequence of Roman society’s extreme competitiveness—as well as the dynastic character that it imposes on Rome—rather than as a singular development: if Augustus had not attained sole rule, it would have been

---

5 Though, such a state of affairs did not prevent Livy from undertaking a far more ambitious work than the present one (*praef. 2*).

6 See also the collected essays in Sandberg and Smith 2018 for less extended but more recent studies on *monumenta* in Livy—as well as other authors.
someone else; numerous historical Romans had achieved such a status to some degree before him, a point which Livy hints at in the depiction of various characters who range from good to bad. In other words, I argue that Livy highlights history as it has already been used more than he attempts to restrict its use in the future.

In Livy’s Written Rome, published in 1997, Mary Jaeger explores the narrative aspect of monumenta in so far as they create a sense of spatial awareness within Livy’s text, which, in turn, can provide structural points of reference for the audience, both internal and external. Jaeger focuses on the the impact of monumenta as sites of collective memory (lieux de mémoire, see below on Memory Studies), through which a collective sense of national identity can be communicated and imparted to the reader. But monumenta in the Ab Urbe Condita, as mentioned above, are by no means unconflicted, which will be a primary divergence of my discussion from Jaeger’s; the very spatial environment that Livy depicts, within the text and reflected beyond it, is one highly contested by a relatively small and selective group of Roman aristocrats, each with their own particular agenda. And the construction of monumenta is one of the most effective tools that ambitious figures posses for creating the rhetorically charged environment that promotes conflicting impressions of their social importance. Even monumental constructions seemingly glorifying the state as a whole or dedicated to Rome’s patron deities can heavily reflect the self-interested influence of ambitious individuals (see Ch. 1 on the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus). Thus, the idea of Livy creating a sense of national identity is not uncomplicated in the text, particular if the basis for such an identity is monumental in nature.

7 This is not to say that Augustus’ regime and, particularly, his monumental remaking of Rome were not important considerations for Livy in writing his history: naturally, in a narrative that unfolds largely through the actions of serial strongmen, Augustus as the latest would play his part. But Livy is not anti-Augustan in the same sense as, say, Asinius Pollio. See below on factionalism.

8 See also Jaeger 1993 (an earlier, and slightly different, version of one of the chapters in 1997), 2006, and 2015.
In his 1998 *Spectacle and Society in Livy’s History*, Andrew Feldherr discusses the role of *monumenta* as a traditional means of establishing socio-political prominence and argues that Livy’s depictions of *monumenta* in the *Ab Urbe Condita*—along with other elements of display—are a reflection of that practice. Feldherr concludes that this approach allows Livy to engage in aristocratic competition similar to that which he narrates in his history, a competition in which he otherwise would not be allowed a part. I also argue that Livy is engaged with Roman politics, but, rather than have him create a “backdoor,” as it were, into the very system that would only ever allow him limited access or standing anyways, I argue that Livy’s commentary on aristocratic display is more critical and that he ideally views his work as a means of encouraging reform of a questionable tendency. Livy clearly sees something compelling in the Roman state, but it is another matter to say that he is a complete convert to every Roman custom.

**Historical monumenta**

Beyond Livy, the importance of *monumenta* for Latin history is clear, both in the technical and literary—that is, historical, oratorical, and poetic—records (see Ch. 1). At its most basic level, history is a series of *monumenta*, though their manifestations can be quite limited. As Cicero says of the early annalists through the *persona* of his respondent Antonius:

exornatores rerum, sed tantummodo narratores fuerunt.” (*de Orat.* 2.52-54; cf. *de Leg.* 1.6)⁹

“history was nothing more than a compilation of annals, on which account—and in order to preserve public remembrance—from the beginning of the Roman state down to the pontificate of Publius Mucius, each Pontifex Maximus used to commit to writing all the events of the sequential years, record them on a white surface, and post up the tablet at his house, so that all men might have the occasion to peruse them. Even now those records are known as the Pontifical Chronicles. Many have adopted this style of writing, who, without any rhetorical ornament, have left behind only *monumenta* of dates, personalities, places, and events. In this sense Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Acusilas, and very many others among the Greeks, correspond to our own Cato, Pictor, and Piso, who do not understand the adornment of composition—since it is only lately that decoration of that sort has been brought here—and, so long as what they say is understood, regard conciseness as the only merit of narrating. Antipater, a noble man and a close friend of Crassus, elevated himself a bit and imparted to history a greater tone: the rest did not craft their material; they were nothing but chroniclers.”

By committing the *memoria* of the earliest events and figures to writing, Rome’s past is kept from oblivion, and the building blocks of this tradition are the *monumenta* of dates, people, places, and deeds. Without any polish (*sine ullis ornamentis*), however, Cicero doubts that the accounts will captivate anyone’s attention, a point that he makes elsewhere concerning history as it has been written about Rome’s earliest times (*de Leg.* 1.8: *ut ne legantur quidem*). Cicero outlines a basic mechanism for ensuring the remembrance of the past—that is, he provides a means of attracting a larger audience for historical works—which Livy implements in his own way. In this process, *monumenta* in their bare and strictly factual form—if such a thing can even be said to exist in a contested past—need thematic elaboration. Because *memoria* is a

---

⁹ On this passage, see Woodman 1988: esp. 76-78. See also Woodman 2008, which is a response to Northwood 2008 and Fox 2007: 134-41, who challenge Woodman’s interpretation, i.e., that Cicero’s criticism here is not just stylistic but indicates that Cicero views history as a form of rhetoric, a view that extends to other writers of history in Cicero’s time and preceding it. See also Feldherr 2009, for the argument that Cicero here is outlining a new and original literary model for history-writing, one that, in particular, allows Cicero as a *novus homo* to engage in an exercise that could have social restrictions. See also Marincola 2015.
fundamental concept in this respect, a brief look at the modern field of Memory Studies is warranted here as an underlier for aspects of my approach.

**Memory Studies**

The development and burgeoning of Memory Studies has been a significant trend for scholarship in the last century. By subverting the notion, however, that there is a single, consistent memory of the past, most of these studies have emphasized the complex process that creates cultural memories, as well as the existence of multiple cultural memories within given groups. For my purposes, Memory Studies are relevant both in the general conception of *monumenta* as preservers of memory and, more particularly, in the notion that a preserver of cultural memory can run counter to other dominant representations of the past, even while being considered a part of such representations, as I argue Livy’s history does through his nuanced depiction of cultural memory(ies).

Many scholars have subsequently applied this theory to Classical texts, unsurprisingly with a focus on prose representations of the past. In this application, the Latin term *memoria* corresponds in many ways to the ideas postulated in Memory Studies: for ancient Roman authors

---

10 The loci classici are Halbwachs 1925 (on Social Memory) and 1950 (on Collective Memory, posthumous); Nora 1984-92 (on lieux de mémoire, particularly in French culture); Assmann 2011 (on Cultural Memory). Le Goff 1992 = 1988 specifically addresses the importance of memory to history, as well as the blending of the two in practice. See Cubitt 2007 for an overview of modern scholarly discussion on the intersections between history and memory. See also Yates 1966 and Carruthers 1990 on the related but more applied topic of the art of memory (*ars memorativa*), an ancient set of approaches to memorization, especially as a tool for oratory.

11 As Woolf 2015: 222, says concerning Nora, “The citizens formed through repeated exposure to symbols of national pride were not rendered docile by their education: indeed, one thing French children learn by becoming citizens is to value revolutionary change and to challenge authority. Shared memories are as essential for argument as for consensus, and shared symbols are often the focus of the fiercest struggles.”

12 Alcock 2002 focuses the idea of social memory—that is, an identity derived from shared remembrance, a similar image of the past, and a collective design for the future—on the Ancient Greeks. Alcock especially traces social memory through examination of the landscape, particularly its monumental features. The edited collections of Galinsky 2014; Galinsky and Lapatin 2015; and Galinsky 2016 provide a representative idea of how Classicists are applying Memory Studies to the Romans. See also Hölkeskamp 2010. Other studies will appear throughout the following discussion.
dealing with narratives of the past, memoria is not an accepted or canonical version of events in the sense that it is set in stone or even consistent; rather, it is in constant flux as new experiences flow in and old ones diminish, with the result that visions of the past appear shifting and conflicting. Different people will have different conceptions of the same things—whether they be events, notable people, or ideologies—because of their particular biases and statuses, and any monolithic or all-encompassing view of memoria cannot easily accommodate the infinite number of variables involved. So too monumenta, in their association with memoria, are ever shifting, despite their common representation as more solid than, say, oral traditions. Karl Galinsky asserts: “Monumenta...are not static but keep eliciting different responses and associations, which, of course, are mostly based on the memories of viewers and onlookers. This complements another, essential characteristic of memory. So far from being archival, static, or a hard drive, the memory of individuals is a continuing process of creation and recreation.” It is under these conditions that any understanding of Livy’s historiographic aims must be approached, both in

---

13 See Timpe 2011: esp. 150: “Memoria in Latin means ‘memory,’ but also ‘tradition’ and ‘historiography’. The transition in meaning is easy to understand, but does not express identity in the subject. For the nature of the relationship between memory of a past and of an historical tradition is not such that, for example, memory of the tradition simply represents objectified memory and a tradition represents the mere fixation of memory, so that both would only be different aggregate conditions of the same substance. The relationship of memory to tradition, especially tradition fixed by writing, is rather ambivalent, complicated, and subject to change. Its definition is therefore a task of historical reflection. This process of reflection, however, may proceed from the assumption that historiography must always have recourse to memory in some form or other. It must also be conducted with the expectation that the way in which this occurs can provide information about the prevailing approach to the historical past.”

14 See Miano 2011: esp. 33-38, for an overview of how scholars of Memory Studies have generally addressed Roman monumentality.

15 Galinsky 2014: 3 (cf. Cubitt 2007: 7-8). In a similar thread, Jenkyns 2014: 23, writes: “It was not only the buildings of Rome that were changeable; there were the inhabitants too. Other states boasted, if they could, that their people were primordially indigenous, even born of the earth...By contrast, it was an old idea that Romulus had populated his town with outcasts and refugees.” Livy is very aware of the changing nature of Rome: in the preface to his history, he talks about the current, unsustainable size of the city, which began from extremely meager beginnings (ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua, pref. 4; cf. 9). Then, after the Gallic sack, he describes the city growing as if from its roots (velut ab stirpibus, 6.1.3). The pace at which the city expands is mentioned several times in the first decade (1.8.4, 1.9.9, 5.53.8, 5.54.5, 6.4.6, etc.).
how Livy himself represents events of the past, and in how he hints at ways in which others recast the past.

**Reading Livy through Livy**

My treatment especially focuses on intratext in Livy and how it can inform readings of the *Ab Urbe Condita*. The objection may arise that the size and scale of Livy’s work does not allow for such close readings across disparate portions of the history, and that similarity may rather be the product of coincidence or carelessness. In order to counter this reasonable objection, I focus on repetition of particular words, primarily *monumentum* but also *fabula, fama*, and other terms that connect different passages through cross-reference and complicate those passages through that connection. Where doubt may remain whether the repetition is a deliberate intratext or an accident, context shall guide the way. And, indeed, intratext does not necessarily determine a uniform meaning across wide swaths of text, especially with a multivalent term such as *monumentum*: one of the defining features of this term is its scope of meaning (see Ch. 1). Before even leaving Livy’s Preface, the reader encounters the term twice (*praef.* 6 and 10, discussed in Ch. 3), and these two appearances provide remarkably different connotations for the term. Another focus of my treatment in this respect is on Livy’s inclusion of

---

16 E.g., Luce 1977: 114-38, who usually approaches Livy with a more favorable view of the historian’s literary and structural talents, generally views “doublets” in Bks. 41-45 as a consequence of Livy’s working technique of using Polybius in combination with various Roman sources. See Kraus 1998: 272-73, for more thoughtful caution in this respect.

17 For a methodology of approaching intratext in Livy, see Levene 2010: esp. 117-26. Kraus 1998: esp. 272 n. 20, and 1991: esp. 314, notes that intratext in Livy is made usually by repetition of type as opposed to language but acknowledges that similar or copied language does occur (cf. Kraus 1989). It is the latter type of intertext on which I largely focus, though the former does play a part in my discussion. For a similar approach to *exemplum* as a term and concept, see Chaplin 2000. See also Penella 2004 and 1990; Pomeroy 1988; Konstan 1986; Phillips 1974, for other forms of thematic repetition. Phillips suggests that Livy’s choice of structure in history-writing, i.e., annalistic, naturally lends itself to repetition that reinforces certain ideals, particularly Livy’s history “as subsuming the vicissitudes of men and events to itself” (273).

18 Though it addresses *inter-* rather than *inratext and focuses on poetry rather than history, Hinds 1998 is conceptually useful for this discussion.
literary *monumenta*, that is, his source citations as a means of understanding his historiographic approach (see Ch. 4).^{19}

**To the detriment of all…**

It is well-established that Rome was built on the tenets of rivalry and competition.^{20} From an optimistic stance, constant agonism could ensure that the best rise to the top and, consequently, that the unworthy are weeded out in the process. In practice, however, the competitive ethos often encouraged ambitious individuals to act for their own benefit, without regard for detriment to the larger populace.^{21} An underlying element of my discussion is that Livy offers critique of this aristocratic competition from a state of relative neutrality: no faction

---


^{20} Cicero highlights the behavior of children as a window into the Roman competitive ethos, which also may indicate the values inculcated in Roman youths: *indicant pueri, in quibus ut in speculis natura cernitur. quanta studia decertantium sunt! quanta ipsa certamina! ut illi efferuntur laetitia cum vicерunt! ut pudet victos! ut se accusari nolunt! quam cupiunt laudari! quos illi labores non perferunt ut aequalium principes sint! quae memoria est in his bene merentium! quaere referendae gratiae cupiditas! atque ea in optima quaque indole maxime apparent, in qua haec honesta quae intellegimus a natura tamquam adumbrantur (“children give signs [of this behavior], in whom nature is discerned as if in mirrors. How eagerly they compete! And the contests themselves! How they are carried away with joy, when they have won! How they are ashamed in defeat! How they hate to be blamed! How they love to be praised! What toils would they not endure to be first among their peers! What remembrance they have for those who earned it! What desire for returning the favor! And these character...”) (de Fin. 5.61).

^{21} Hesiod captures the double-edged sword that is competition in his depiction of the two forms of the goddess Strife: “οὐκ ἄρα μούσῃν ἔπι τὸ Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ γαῖαν / εἰςί δὴ τὴν μέν κεν ἐπαινήσεις νοήσας, / ἡ δ᾽ ἐπιμωμητή’ διὰ δ᾽ ἄνδεια θυμῶν ἔχουσιν. / ἡ μὲν γὰρ πάλαμὼν τε κακὸν καὶ δήνην ὁφέλει, / σχέτλιν’ οὐ τις τὴν γε φιλεῖ βροτός, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀνάγκης / ἀνθρώπων βουλήσαι Ἕρν τιμῶσι βαρείαν. / τὴν δ᾽ ἐτέρην προτέρην μὲν ἐγένετο Νόξ ἔρεθον, / θήκη δὲ μὲν Κρόνος ὦψιζος, αἰθήρα ναϊῶν. / γαῖς τ᾽ ἐν ῥίζῃ καὶ ἀνθράκα πολλῶν ἀμένων / ἢ τε καὶ ἀπάλαμὼν περ ὠμῶς ἐπὶ ἐργὸν ἐγερεῖν. / εἰς ἐτερον γὰρ τοῦ τε ἱδῶν ἐργοῦ χατίζων / πλούσιον, δὲς σπεύδει μὲν ἀρόμεναι ήδὲ φύτευον / οὐκόν τ᾽ εὖ θέσθαι, ἢπείδη δὲ τε γείτων γείτων / εἰς ἔρενος σπεύδαντες· ἀγαθὴ δ᾽ ἔρες ἢδὲ βροτοῖσιν. / καὶ κεραμέως κεραμεῖ κοτέτοι τὲ τέκτων, / καὶ πτοχός πτοχῷ φθονεῖ καὶ ὀλίγος ὀλίγῳ (“There is not one but two types of Strife on the earth: the one, once considered, is praiseworthy; but the other is reproachable. They have entirely opposite spirits. The one encourages evil war and conflict, cruel as it is. No mortal loves her, but they are forced to honor oppressive Strife, by the contrivances of the immortals. But the other gloomy Night bore first, and high-throned Cronus beget, who dwells in the aether. She is in the roots of the earth and is far better for men. She pushes even the worthless man to work: when an idle man sees another—a rich man, who hastens to plow, to plant, and to set his estate in order—he feels envy, the one neighbor for the other as he hastens toward wealth. This Strife is good for mortals, so that potter contends with potter, builder with builder, beggar feels spite for beggar, and poet for poet.” WD 11-26). For discussion of the potentially detrimental effects of competition in the Roman sphere, see, e.g., Neel 2015: esp. 18-19 (with further bibliography); Takács 2009.)
or individual has the moral highground if they threaten the greater good. I will focus primarily on how this detrimental competition is depicted and plays out through *monumenta* in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, but I will include other potentially destructive aspects of this agonism as they pertain to or underwrite the monumental drive in Rome. Rather than assign a particular political stance to Livy—namely Republican or Augustan—I suggest that Livy should be read from a less factional standpoint, especially since he had no obvious stake in either of these factions or even in the Roman aristocracy more generally.

I do not mean to suggest that Livy disapproves of Rome’s traditional *viri optimi* as a rule; he clearly finds much of value in the characters and actions of many historical figures of the highest social classes. But, when power politics become detrimental to the welfare of the state, Livy’s text offers a subtle but critical commentary. Since much of the Roman past is marked by the Struggle of the Orders—the progressive conflict between patricians and plebeians—it is not surprising that factionalism plays a significant role in Livy’s account. And, the conditions in Italy under which Livy lived and began writing were potentially worse in this respect, as they were marked by further factional strife between the *populares* and *optimates*. But Livy provides an even-handed perspective on both sides—as well as on those caught in between—perhaps more so than any other Roman historian. As mentioned above, Livy’s critique is generally subtle and

---

22 The question of what constitutes aristocracy among the Romans is, of course, a complicated one (see, e.g., Brunt 1982)—and one that does not need to be revisited here. For the sake of my treatment, aristocracy includes any powerful individuals or groups that use propaganda, primarily for my purposes in the form of *monumenta*, to establish or even to misrepresent their societal prevalence.

23 For dating Livy’s composition, see, esp., Luce 1965, who questions whether Livy can properly be called an “Augustan” author. See also Burton 2000.

24 For the course of this strife in the late Republic—as well as the permeability of the factions—see still Syme 1939: *passim*. More recently, the applicability of the terms *populares* and *optimates* has been questioned, in that they do not seem to represent anything like a party in the strict sense and that there is not much continuity among the advocates of the different stances. See, e.g., Morstein-Marx 2004; Lintott 1999: esp. 173-76. Wiseman 2002, however, argues for the value of retaining these terms as a means of coming to terms with Republican politics.
requires careful perusal of the narrative, both for verbal and contextual hints. He does, however, provide a clear condemnation of factionalism in Book 4 that can serve as a preliminary justification for further investigation below.

The context for the statement revolves around an embassy from Ardea that comes to ask help from Rome based on the ancient treaty between the two states (4.9.1):

Frui namque pace optimo consilio cum populo Romano servata per intestina arma non licuit; quorum causa atque initium traditur ex certamine factionum ortum, quae fuerunt eruntque pluribus populis exitio quam bella externa, quam fames morbive, quaeque alia in deum iras velut ultima publicorum malorum vertunt. Virginem plebeii generis maxime forma notam duo petiere iuvenes, alter virgini genere par, tutoribus fretus, qui et ipsi eiusdem corporis erant, nobilis alter, nulla re praeterquam forma captus. Adiuabant eum optimatum studia, per quae in domum quoque puellae certamen partium penetravit. (2-5; cf. 1.6.4, foedum certamen; 39.5.12, plus...certaminum)

[the Ardeans] could not enjoy the privilege of peace—though it had been preserved with the Roman people by wisest deliberation—because of internal war, the cause and origin of which is said to have arisen from a factional contest: factions have been and will spell the destruction of more people than wars of invasion, than famine and disease, and anything else that people attribute to the wrath of the gods, as if the utmost of disasters for the people. Two youths sought a maiden of plebeian status, particularly remarkable for her beauty: the one was of the same class as the maiden and had the support of her guardians, who also were of the same class; the other was noble and was captivated by nothing other than her beauty. He was aided by the efforts of the optimates, which also allowed party strife to pervade the girl’s home.

---

25 Briscoe 3.193 points out that factio in Livy is usually pejorative.
26 Ogilvie 546 sees here a parallel with Thucydides judgement on στάσις (3.82-83).
27 On this passage, see Kapust 2011. Rather than emphasize the discord here, Kapust argues that harmony (Concordia) emerges in Livy through conflict and competition (cf. Vasaly 2015 and 1999; Brown 1995). Livy certainly offers examples of Concordia (see esp. Ch. 4 on Camillus), but not every instance of competition—especially factional competition—results in harmony.
Livy places this instance of civil war in Ardea, not Rome.28 Indeed, he contrasts the destructive behavior of the Ardean plebs with the more peaceable behavior of the Roman plebs (*nihil Romanae plebi similis*, 4.9.8) in a similar situation. But it is difficult to imagine that a 1st BC audience could not see some point of contact in Livy’s statement with the bloody conflicts of their own age, especially with the repetition of the word *optumates* (at 8, twice, and 11). As R.M. Ogilvie says, “The story of Ardea grew out of three basic facts, the capture by the Volsci, the defeat of the Volsci by the Romans, and the colonization, all of which would have figured in the records, being coupled with the familiar legend of The Maid . . . L. does not develop the potentialities of the material but is content with a straightforward narrative which illustrates the *fides* of the Romans and exemplifies the evils of the disease (9.3, 9.10) of *certamina factionum*.”29 It is equally possible that Livy made the story up as a passage in which to insert his condemnation of factionalism, or that he took the opportunity of a meagerly detailed story about Ardea to insert his comment. The sentiment, regardless, seems quite poignant and pointed.

**Scipio’s end and his monumental afterlife**

As initial examples of Livian *monumenta*—both physical and literary—recalling the detrimental effects of political competition, the trial, departure, and death of Scipio Africanus are particularly apt. The passage has been discussed thoroughly elsewhere, so a brief overview will suffice.30 The trial starts as a competition (*certamen*, 38.50.4; cf. 52.1, *certamina*) initiated by the

---

28 See also 41.27.3 where Livy’s own Padua is embroiled in factional strife: *M. Aemilio senatus negotium dedit ut Patavinorum in Venetia seditionem comprimeret, quos certamine factionum ad intestinum bellum exarsisse et ipsorum legati attulerant* (“the Senate gave to M. Aemilius the job of suppressing a revolt of Paduans in Venetia; even their own ambassadors had reported that their people had kindled civil war on account of a conflict of factions”).

29 Ogilvie 546.

two Q. Petillii against Scipio—or so says Valerius Antias (ut Valerius Antias auctor est, 38.50.5).

31 Scipio leaves Rome in disgust and disgrace. After the trial, Livy mentions the end of the great man: silentium deinde de Africano fuit. vitam Literni egit sine desiderio urbis; morientem rure eo ipso loco sepeliri se iussisse ferunt monumentumque ibi aedificari, ne funus sibi in ingrata patria fieret (“Afterwards, there was no word about Africanus. He lived his life in Liternum, without longing for the city; on his deathbed, it is said that he bade his burial take place at that very spot in the country and that a monumentum be constructed there, lest his funeral take place in a fatherland ungrateful to him,” 38.53.8). Whether the man’s final words were headed is left unclear.

Shortly after this closural statement, Livy returns to the question of Scipio’s tomb, but the historian emphatically states that there is no consensus on the matter—nor on many other matters:

Multa alia in Scipionis exitu maxime vitae dieque dicta, morte, funere, sepulcro, in diversum trahunt, ut cui famae quibus scriptis adsentiar non habeam. non de accusatore convenit—alii M. Naevium, alii Petillios diem dixisse scribunt—non de tempore quo dicta dies sit, non de anno quo mortuus sit, non ubi mortuus aut elatus sit—alii Romae alii Literni et mortuam et sepultum. utrobique monumenta ostenduntur et statuae; nam et Literni monumentum monumentoque statua superimposita fuit, quam tempestate disiecta nuper vidimusipsi, et Romae extra portam Capenam in Scipionum monumento tres statuae sunt, quarum duae P. et L. Scipionum dicuntur esse, tertia poetae Q. Enni. (38.56.1-4)

Many other elements (especially the end of Scipio’s life, his court date, his death, his funeral, his burial site) are so irreconcilable that I do not know with which rumor or with which written account to agree. There is no consensus on the

31 Livy later suggests that Cato was involved in disgracing Scipio: morte Africani crevere inimicorum animi, quorum princeps fuit M. Porcius Cato, qui vivo quoque eo adlatrire magnitudinem eius solitus erat. hoc auctore existimantur Petillii et vivo Africano rem ingressi et mortuo rogationem promulgasse (“with the death of Africanus, the courage of his enemies grew, the foremost of which was M. Porcius Cato, who had regularly hounded him about his greatness, even while he was alive. He is thought to be the instigator behind the Petillii, both when they launched their suit against Africanus while he lived, and when they introduced their bill against him after his death,” 38.54.1-2).

accuser—some say M. Naevius, others say that the Petillii arraigned him—on the date of his trial, the year of his death, the location of his death, nor the location of the burial—some say that he died and was buried at Rome, others at Liternum. In either place, monumenta and statues can be seen. At Liternum, there is a monumentum and a statue placed on the monumentum, which I myself recently saw, though it had been split by the elements. And, at Rome, there are three statues beyond the Porta Capena on the monumentum of the Scipiones: two of the figures are of P. and L. Scipio; the third is of the poet Q. Ennius.

Livy’s statement about questionable sources for the earliest portions of Rome’s history (praef. 6) does not apply here: written accounts on the subject of Scipio were available to Livy, apparently a plenitude of them; but they provide conflicting information. Livy goes on to say that the discrepancies are not restricted to historical accounts but also occur in oratorical ones (nec inter scriptores rerum discrepat solum, sed orationes quoque, 5). Thus, despite the numerous monumenta, which are supposed to secure memory, the exact details of the situation, as Livy portrays it, are irretrievable.

The circumstances of Scipio’s downfall—that is, political wrangling—seem to have taken their toll. And the various monumenta—the evidence on which the received tradition of the famous figure depends—rather convolute than inform the situation from an historian’s viewpoint. Livy reserves authorial judgment on the matter here, even beyond his stated practice not to affirm or refute certain matters (praef. 6; see Ch. 3), which is all the more surprising considering the character in focus. As a figure of paramount importance in Rome’s past,

---

33 For discussion of another disagreement pertaining to Scipio’s downfall—namely the quantity and make-up of the indemnity imposed on the Scipiones—see Briscoe 3.194-95.

34 Even autopsy in this instance adds nothing more solid (nuper vidimus ipsi), though eyewitness evidence is generally considered to have an elevated status as evidence in ancient historiography. On this singular instance of autopsy in Livy, see Briscoe 3.197; Marincola 1997: 102 n. 198: “Atypically, Livy’s autopsy does not improve the record; if anything, it is a complaint that autopsy can contribute nothing to the problem.” For autopsy in historiography more generally, see, e.g., Marincola 1997: 63-86, with further reference. See also Schepens 1980, with emphasis on Herodotus and Thucydides.

35 After recounting another conflicted tale about Scipio, that is, the betrothal of one of Scipio’s daughters to Ti. Gracchus, Livy offers a final assessment of the tradition(s) on Scipio: haec de tanto viro, quam et opinionibus et
Scipio’s life should be documented at every step, but, in this respect, the accumulated \textit{monumenta} as lasting memorials—both material and written—fail.\textsuperscript{36} Ultimately, the fate even of the general’s mortal remains is left in doubt. Thus, the place of \textit{monumenta} in the \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} warrant examination, since they often do not fulfil the typical function(s) attributed to them, that is, as privileged preservers of the past.

\textbf{Summary of the chapters ahead}

\textit{Monumentum} is a notably difficult term to define, which stems from its sheer range of meanings and appearances. The first chapter sets the groundwork for the subsequent discussion, particularly the complexity and poignancy of \textit{monumentum} as a term and concept. With this foundation, it is possible to see why \textit{monumenta} fill such a significant role in the societal transmission and preservation of remembrance. It is further possible to see how Livy both follows and diverges from the standard conception of \textit{monumenta}; his divergences are often subtle, but they can offer hints on how Livy conceives of the wider use to which \textit{monumenta} are put beyond his text, that is, as influencers in Roman society.

The second chapter builds on the groundwork of the first chapter to examine the extension and abstraction of \textit{monumenta} to what is, ideally, a more lasting form because it is less susceptible to physical degeneration or destruction—that is, the possible function of written texts as \textit{monumenta}. Written \textit{monumenta}, including literary works, ideally counter the shortcomings of their material correllaries, though this notion will be complicated in subsequent chapters. But this chapter provides the conceptual basis for Livy’s depiction of his own history as a \textit{monumentum},

\textit{monumentis litterarum variarent, proponenda erant} (“about such a man, I had to record these accounts, how different they are both in anecdote and literary \textit{monumenta},” 38.57.8).

\textsuperscript{36} Miles 1995: 59, points out that Livy concludes this passage with a \textit{fabula} rather than a \textit{monumentum}, which is necessary to match the details—or lack thereof—of Gracchus’ speech (\textit{alia tota serenda fabula est Gracchi oratione conveniens}, 38.56.8). See further Ch. 3.
primarily through the lens of poetic *monumenta*, which display the basic functions of literary *monumenta* as means of attempting immortality; yet, they differ in significant ways to that of Livy’s *monumentum*, particularly in how and upon whom they focus the benefit of their literary artifice.

The third chapter addresses Livy’s prefatory *monumenta* (6 and 10) and examines them in light of other passages on which they reflect, either verbally or conceptually. This chapter further explores the surprising correspondence of Livian *monumenta* with other terms, including some of its notional opposites—that is, *fabula*, *fama*, and *miraculum*. The blending of these terms offers a view of Livy’s narrative as an historiographical workshop: that is, he uses the terms of his narrative to help the reader understand the sources that traditionally constitute Roman history and to reflect upon elements from his own day that are hinted at within the text. In this respect, variant or conflicting accounts within the history do not reflect the carelessness or ineptitude of the historian; rather, they offer the terms of Livy’s particular perspective in approaching the past.

The final chapter explores literary *monumenta* within the text of Livy’s history, both those created by Livy himself through the exercise of history-writing and the historical works of others that appear in the *Ab Urbe Condita* as cited sources. Rather than attempt to use these citations as a means of retracing the appearance of the authors’ text, I examine Livy’s source citations as a means of better understanding his approach to history. Though Livy makes seemingly programmatic statements about the elevated status of, say, contemporary accounts or ones, at least, closer in time, those accounts in practice are often depicted as undergoing a similar loss of accuracy or solidity to that which can be observed for *monumenta* and *fabulae*. Livy
provides these accounts nonetheless as windows into Rome’s past, but he significantly challenges their pretense to inherent superiority as historical sources.

In his history, Livy includes multiple intratextual contradictions, inconsistencies, and refusals to distinguish between conflicting accounts, but he does so as a reflection of historiographical method. If he is given his proper due as a literary master, Livy provides a vision of the past that is extraordinarily honest—if not factually accurate, according to a modern perspective—and free from bias in its presentation: he does not hesitate to acknowledge the doubtfulness of certain received traditions, and he avoids privileging any particular variant that may support the ambitions of power-hungry individuals. But he also does not attempt to overwrite or systematically to exclude the material that was generally considered to constitute Roman history; he just recasts it so that it can provide benefit on a wider scale. In other words, Livy creates a *monumentum* worthy of Rome.
II. Ch. 1: Monumenta in Context

This chapter explores the complexities of the term *monumentum* as it is represented in technical writing and the ancient literary tradition beyond Livy. An examination of these sources helps identify where and how Livy’s uses can be explained as extensions or complications of how the term is used by others. *Monumenta* as they exist in the ancient conception at large—that is, as the building blocks for reconstructing the past and the means for imparting particular messages and pieces of information to the present—warrant special scrutiny in so far as they can reveal the circumstances and biases of particular versions and representations of the past.¹ For instance, the balance of this time focus could be easily and subtly reversed to the benefit of the present: rather than represent a venerable past, *monumenta* could function to make current figures more venerable by imbuing them with a constructed sense of continuity or even superiority.²

In special focus for my treatment are the difficulties of defining the term and the interpretative problems that accompany manifestations of *monumenta*, especially given the

---

¹ See Miano 2012: 98: “*Monumentum*, in the general sense, is a key concept for understanding how the Romans represented their past, together with *exemplum*, *virtutes* and *mos maiorum*. It is closely connected with historiography, and helps us to understand the connections between historiography, documents, ceremonies and other memorial practices.” But this understanding, as Miano hints, should not be treated as a coherent picture so much as a broad conception: there are multiple versions of the Roman past, and their representation depends heavily on who is disseminating them and why they are being disseminated.

² E.g., Augustus’ erection in the Forum Augusti of statues of *triumphatores* and *summi viri* of the past as well as their *elogia* (see P & A 221) may be viewed as focusing the series to culminate with the *princeps* himself—in so far as the entire complex is a *monumentum* to Augustus—rather than providing reminders of the individual figures. See Chaplin 2000: 168-96; Luce 1990. See also Woolf 2015: 209-10: “The key innovation of the Forum of Augustus was the subject matter of the statuary. The quadriporticus of Pompey was famous for elaborately themed images from Greek mythology—famous courtesans, women who had given birth to remarkable children, and so on—and what little we know of the paintings displayed in the Forum Iulium also suggests the emphasis was on works of named artists, for the most part on Greek mythological themes. Pass through from the Forum Iulium to the Forum of Augustus, however, and the visitor moved from Greek myth to Roman history, from old masters to newly commissioned images that solidified a political rather than a cultural order of things.”
constraints of perishability, changeability, and manipulability to which they are always obviously liable. The traditional complications with monumenta provide rich material with which Livy can subtly tease out and critique socio-political excesses and shortcomings from Rome’s history and, thereby, in the Rome of his own day. In the Ab Urbe Condita, the past becomes a lens through which the problems of the present as well as their course of development can be magnified, diagnosed, and potentially remediated. Thus, exploration of monumentum as a term is necessary to show its nuance and multivalence.

The initial section of this chapter examines stricter classifications of the term monumentum that seek to define it in a restrictive and fixed way. In so far as these treatments are limiting in nature, they generally represent a relatively artificial endpoint to the conceptual development of monumentum as a term; nevertheless, they do reveal some consistent points in the broad ancient cultural understanding of the term. The subsequent sections expand beyond the initial semantic confines thus established and explore the less static images and conceptions of monumenta as represented in Roman visual culture and literature, with focus on particular types of manifestations, their notable characteristics, and their intended purposes. It is difficult—and unnecessary—to match exactly the instances below to those of Livy or to figure out Livy’s exact definition of monumentum because each of his instances has its own context and circumstances. But definitions of the term relate to and connect its appearances and functions across disparate sections of Livy’s history. To establish these common elements of the various surviving definitions of the term, the more rigid ancient classifications are a good starting point in that they provide a working, conceptual definition for the term monumentum—though, of course, it must be reiterated that such a definition is helpful only in approaching an understanding rather than
determining one. Indeed, often Livy hints at larger issues by showing complications to these elements that are supposedly common and significant to *monumenta*.

**Ancient definitions of the term *monumentum***

Although often in modern scholarship no distinction is made between the term *monumentum* and its English derivate “monument,” and although it is easy to concede that the two have much in common, the Latin term has a range of valences that its derivate does not and, thus, deserves careful exploration in its own right.[^3] The Latin term *monumentum* has a clear metaphorical dimension, subsidiary to its seemingly primary function of designating physical objects, both in the form of man-made structures and natural features. C.S. Kraus makes a key observation that the term *monumentum* is used, seemingly interchangeably, of both physical and written reminders.[^4] The extension from physical objects to writing, as well as the confusion and interplay between such categories,[^5] allows for a significant range in meaning less in evidence in the modern term. Indeed, the sheer range of meaning of *monumentum* is one of its defining features. Even rather mundane objects or seemingly nondescript localities can become *monumenta*. Further, the written aspect of *monumentum* varies significantly, from simple

---

[^3]: See, e.g., Rouveret 1991: 3051: “Le terme de monument évoque, aujourd'hui comme dans l'Antiquité, un ouvrage lié à la perpétuation de la mémoire d'un personnage ou d'un événement. Cependant, dans son acception courante, le mot présente actuellement un sens plus restrictif que pour les Anciens. Nous désignons avant tout par ce terme des bâtiments ou des œuvres figurées, à valeur commémorative, ou dignes en eux-mêmes de mémoire, alors qu'à Rome le monumentum s'entend tout autant des ouvrages de parole, éloges ou textes écrits.”

[^4]: Kraus 86: “L. uses *monumentum* both of physical objects like tombs (38.56.3) and of written records…Sometimes, as at Praef. 6, the meanings overlap, as in the common comparison of a literary *monumentum* to a physical one (most famously at Hor. C. 3.30.1) …Written *monumenta* are the verbal representation of Roman *gesta*, as the *monumenta* of the city are their visual incarnation” (cf. 251). Further, Wiseman 1979: 39, says: “It is characteristic of the Roman attitude to history that the same phrase, ‘monumenta rerum gestarum’, was applied equally to these visible reminders and to the works of historians, which were thought of as performing essentially the same function.” See also Fowler 2000: 193-217, esp. 197-98; Oakley 2.211; Feldherr 1998: 19-25; Wiseman 1986: 89-90.

[^5]: As Marincola 1997: 20, points out, “We cannot say, unfortunately, how many people learned their history of Marathon from Herodotus and how many from Micon’s painting of the battle in the Painted Stoa; or how many in Augustan Rome learned their history from Livy and how many from the portrait busts of great Romans in Augustus’ Forum — not to mention the interaction of the different forms of commemoration upon each other.”
inscriptions of names to full-fledged literary works and poetic programs. As will be discussed in the following section, for the Romans, the term *monumentum* could be applied to just about anything so long as it has a commemorative effect.

Gary Miles comments that “In Livy, as in other authors, *monumentum* refers so often to specific, concrete objects that the very few occasions when it does not do so can be taken as metaphors.”

Certainly concrete objects are often termed *monumenta*. The issue, however, becomes more complicated in practice, both in Livy and elsewhere, as, through the course of time, concrete objects are extremely prone to displacement, destruction, or disintegration, but the tradition concerning the *monumentum* in its original form and location, does not necessarily vanish, even if all physical traces of it have been lost. Thus, the metaphorical aspect may even be the stronger one as it provides the underlying notion of the *monumentum* as reminder. It is this very metaphorical power and the association of architectural construction with literary construction that allow texts to be termed and/or function as *monumenta*. For Livy’s treatment of early history especially, the physical instantiations of *monumenta* are not what keeps them alive since the earliest *monumenta* had left little, if any, physical trace. It is, rather, enduring abstraction in the form of oral or written tradition and other manifestations of collective memory that carry these *monumenta* down from extreme antiquity.

Surviving sources that give us insight into how ancient thinkers conceived of the term range in date from the 1st BC to the 7th AD, and in a sense earlier, since the earliest source in this range may stem from previous treatments of a similar sort. Despite this considerable chronological range, these sources do share particular elements that emerge from a comparative

---


7 Miles appears to include written *monumenta* alongside other specific and concrete ones, but the material manifestation, say, of a literary text does not establish its memorial function (see Ch. 2).
examination. With the exception of Varro’s *de Lingua Latina* 6.49, most ancient passages that attempt explicitly to define the term *monumentum* are quite late. They are mostly written by grammarians, antiquarians, jurists, or other linguists all focused on similar and somewhat myopic concerns. The definitions tend to revolve around rather strict classifications and distinctions of the sort that were especially popular in the later imperial periods and Late Antiquity.\(^8\) Far from recognizing the literary range and versatility of words like *monumentum*, grammarians, as the “agent[s] of linguistic control,”\(^9\) tend to distill, subdivide, and delimit them. Their method of approach simplifies the layered traditions of words and concepts and encourages more uniform dissemination.\(^10\) Their treatments still generally do, however, reflect elements that are salient in extant authors, including Livy, and associations that are significant for better understanding the term.\(^11\) In addition to the connection of *monumentum* with *memoria*—a theme that underlies my entire treatment—those elements include: its implications and outlook in regard to time and successive generations; its idealization as enduring; its connection with the dead and commemoration of them; and, as mentioned above, its multiplicity of appearance, particularly in the possible designation of writing as *monumentum*.\(^12\) These defining elements help retrace the

---

\(^8\) See Kaster 1988: esp. 9-96; Kaster 1987; Marrou 1956: 274-83.

\(^9\) Kaster 1988: 53.

\(^10\) E.g., Kaster 1987: 150, says: “A day spent with the daunting bulk of Keil’s *Grammatici Latini* is enough to confirm this general characteristic: belonging for the most part to the third through sixth centuries, the handbooks collected in those volumes appear intent, one after the other, on imposing a deadly uniformity on their material, as the grammarians repeat the same patterns of analysis, teach the same lessons — often in precisely the same words, repeated from older sources — and use for illustration the same examples that had been used for generations.”

\(^11\) As Miano 2012: 98, says, “The ancient sources describe the meaning of this word in a quite coherent manner.” In practice, the situation changes dramatically as nearly anything can be a *monumentum* so long as it fulfills the function of a memorial. For technical discussions and ancient definitions, however, there is a good deal of overlap and similarity among the pertinent passages.

\(^12\) Cf. Jaeger 1997: 18, on the common characteristics of *monumenta*: “we can assume of all *monumenta* some common characteristics: an absent person or thing commemorated; a present audience reminded; a memory or an exhortation that is socially relevant; and a meaning determined jointly by the reminder, its physical context, and the circumstances of each viewer.”
word’s character and development in literature as well as the societal conception of *monumenta* as reflected in literature.

A look at the various forms of appearance of the word *monumentum* may help account, in part, for the considerable attention paid to it by grammarians. It can be a problematic word in the textual tradition. On a very basic level, because of the variety of its possible ancient spellings and its similar appearance to other words, it has the potential to be confused in transmission with, for instance, *munimentum*, *momentum*, and *molimentum*,\(^\text{13}\) but often the context of the passage is enough to determine the correct reading, especially when notions of commemoration are present. *Monimentum* is a common variant spelling.\(^\text{14}\) As far as manuscript transmission preserves them, certain authors prefer one spelling to the other: Suetonius, for example, seems to use the \(-i\)-spelling nearly exclusively.\(^\text{15}\) Any distinction, however, between the spellings is superficial as many authors seem to use them interchangeably, and both forms show up in all ages. The \(-i\)-spelling becomes more prevalent in later periods,\(^\text{16}\) but \(-u\)- does not disappear. It is unclear whether Livy preferred one spelling to the other or was consistent in using it.\(^\text{17}\) At any rate, variance or preference of spelling of this word is largely obscured in the course of transmission as copiers could simply have imposed their own preference or operated with a level of caprice.

\(^\text{13}\) For instances, see *TLL* 8.0.1461.55. For a representative example in the transmission of Livy, see 5.52.1 in Ogilvie’s OCT.

\(^\text{14}\) Other variant spellings or morphological forms are *monmentum* (e.g., *CIL* 8.168), *monementum* (e.g., *CIL* 1.2.1739), *monumentus* (e.g., *CIL* 6.27977), and *munimentus* (e.g., *CIL* 2.266).

\(^\text{15}\) The exception is Suet. *Nero* 38.2.

\(^\text{16}\) As the *TLL* article says: *-nim*… *postea magis magisque crebrescit* (8.0.1461.20).

\(^\text{17}\) See, e.g., the MSS readings of *monimentum* over *monumentum* in Ogilvie’s Oxford Classical Text (xxi) and his note on orthography (in *rebus orthographicis eas formas semper reposui quae, quod ex epigraphicis alissque fontibus cognosci potest, apud Livii aequales percrebrescebant, quamquam non sum adeo occaecatus ut ignorem neque Livium ipsum secum semper consentire et codices saepe multas et diversas varietates praebere; xvi)*.
The author of the *Differentiae Sermonum*, a grammarian of uncertain date, postulates a meaningful semantic distinction between spellings: *inter monumentum et monimentum hoc interest, quod monimentum memoriae, monumentum sepulturae dicimus* ("between *monumentum* and *monimentum* this is the difference: that we say *-i*- for designation of a memorial and *-u*- for grave," 289.23-24 K *Supp*. 11). No such distinction is apparent from the written record, and it is the kind of over-classification that a grammarian would perpetuate,\(^{18}\) but the connection of *memoria* with *sepultura* is significant as the two words appear repeatedly in conjunction in ancient passages discussing the term *monumentum* (see below). It is also significant that an ancient scholar would find a variant spelling worth such a semantic distinction, in the sense that his effort hints at the wide range that the term can cover and an ensuing desire on the scholar’s part to curtail that range for the sake of neat, grammatical organization.

*Monumentum* is generally thought to derive from *moneo + mentum*, but there are several possibilities for the base of the latter word in particular. It may come from *meminisse*;\(^{19}\) it may come from the Indo-European root *"to think, consider"*;\(^{20}\) or it may be an enlargement of the suffix *-men*, simply to indicate that the word comes originally from a verb.\(^{21}\) The Latin term *mens*, “mind, intellect, reasoning,” also plays a role. Regardless of whether or not the word is directly related, it lends itself to association or wordplay as in the expression *quod mentem*

---

\(^{18}\) See the comments of the editor of *TLL* 8.0.1461.10 on this passage: *argutius quam verius discrimen statuit… re vera utraque forma sine discrimine notionis inventur et in inscr. et in libris vetustioribus* ("the distinction is more pedantic than real…in fact, both forms, without different meanings, are found in inscriptions as well as older literature").

\(^{19}\) See, e.g., L & S s.v. *-mentum > miniscor = memini*


\(^{21}\) See Prisc. *GL* 2.125.15 K (fl. 500 AD): *alia vero in ‘mentum’ desinunt, quae plerumque a verbis veniunt… ‘moneo, monitus, monimentum’* ("but other words end in ‘mentum,’ which, for the most part, come from verbs [such as] ‘moneo, monitus, monimentum’"). See also Fruyt 2011: 161; Perrot 1961: *passim*, for the formation and frequency of words ending in *-mentum*. 
moneat (Serv. ad Aen. 6.512, 12.945; Isid. Orig. 15.11.1 L; Diff. 1.314 C; Aug. de Cura 4.6 Z), and monumenta were by nature certainly understood to engage mental faculties. These etymologies may be false from a modern perspective, but that made them no less serviceable in the ancient world. As a basic definition broadly acceptable among our ancient readers, monumentum means something that reminds someone of something or someone. Thus, monumenta connect the present with the past but, more significantly, reframe and define the past for the present. Monumentum is particularly versatile in its manifestations, but the special poignancy of the term derives from its use as a vehicle for preserving tradition.

The first extant attempt to address the etymology, conceptual associations, and early forms indicated by the term monumentum dates to the 40s BC. Varro, in de Lingua Latina, says the following:

\[\text{meminisse a memoria, cum <in> id quod remansit in mente rursus movetur; quae a manendo ut manimoria potest esse dicta.}\]
\[\text{Itaque Salii quod cantant Mamuri Veturi, significant memoriam veterem.}\]
\[\text{ab eodem monere, quod is qui monet, proinde sit ac memoria; sic monimenta quae in secularis, et ideo secundum viam, quo praetereuntis admoneant et se fuisse et illos esse mortalis. ab eo cetera quae scripta ac facta memoriae causa monimenta dicta. (LL 6.49)}\]

‘To remember’ is from memory, since what has remained in the mind is evoked, and this, like manimoria, could have been derived from ‘remaining.’ Therefore,

\[\text{Cf. Serv. ad Aen. 3.486 (a mentis admonitione); Isid. Orig. 15.11.2 L (pro mentis admonitione).}\]

\[\text{See Meadows and Williams 2001: 41-42, for a succinct discussion of the preceding etymologies.}\]

\[\text{As O’Hara 2017: 58, points out: “It must be stressed that in judging the ancient evidence, the question of whether or not an etymology is true according to modern linguistics is completely irrelevant. At times whether the derivation is even literally true according to what the ancients knew will also be irrelevant.” O’Hara is discussing poetic, esp. Virgil’s, applications of etymology, but his description of the phenomenon is relevant to its appearance in prose also.}\]

\[\text{The term manimoria only shows up here in extant Latin literature. Galinsky 2002: 2, asserts that Varro is saying that he derives memoria itself from manimoria.}\]

\[\text{Paulus explains this name rather as that of an especially adept craftsman of the ancilia of Mars, who requested that his name be included in the Salian hymn rather than a physical reward for his work (probatum opus est maxime Mamuri Veturi, qui praemii loco petit, ut suum nomen inter carmina Salii canerent, 117 L; cf. Ov. Fast. 3.373-92). Cf. the inclusion of Augustus’ name in the Salian hymn as a decree of the Senate (RG 10.1).}\]
the Salian priests, when they chant Mamuri Veturi, mean ancient memory. ‘To remind’ is from the same word because that which reminds is the same as memory. Also, *monimenta* are what we find on tombs along the roadside, to remind passersby both that they [their occupants] themselves used to be alive and that the observers are destined to die. As a result, other things that are written or done for the sake of remembrance are called *monimenta*.

Varro thus treats the noun *memoria* as the ultimate source for the other terms rather than as a derivation from *monere*, but otherwise his approach matches that of most other extant sources as well as modern etymological studies. It is significant as well that Varro identifies the initial manifestation of *monumentum* with funerary structures, the construction, maintenance, and emulation of which are particularly loaded forms of socio-political discourse (see below).

Discussions of *monumentum* in a technical sense bear heavily on Varro’s assessment, as his shows, possibly, the earliest surviving linguistic and antiquarian treatment of the term. As an influential writer of the late Republic and early Empire, Varro sought to uncover meaning in an increasingly convoluted and distorted socio-political world, the distortions of which public and private monumentality came to mediate and represent as it grew more and more prevalent.

One of Varro’s tools in that attempt was etymology. The derivations of *monumentum* from

---

27 E.g., E & M and Maltby s.v. See Pfaffel 1987, who discusses the “modernity” of Varro’s etymology. See, however, De Melo 2017: esp. 119-20, on Varro’s possible idiosyncratic and unreasoned approach to etymology.

28 Apuleius gives the term *monumentarius* for the particular type of piper employed for funerals (*Flor.* 4.2). Though the source is relatively late (2nd AD) and the word is a *hapax legomenon*, the term well represents the connection between *monumentum* and funerary elements.


30 See below on Nonius’ citation of Cicero.

31 See MacDonald 2016, who focuses on topography and Roman investigation of the past in Varro and Propertius, and Pfaffel 1987. MacDonald opens her discussion with Cicero’s estimation of Varro: *nos in nostra urbe peregrinant et errantium tamquam hospites tui libri quasi domum reduxerunt, ut possemus aliquid quod in uti esse munus agnoscere* (“your books led us, lost and wandering in our own city like foreigners, back home, so to speak, that we could finally see who and where we were,” *Acad.* 1.3.9). See also MacRae 2017; Feldherr 1998: 37-50, for discussion of Cicero’s assessment of Varro as illuminating for various cultural and juristic aspects of the late Republican world.
manere and monere that appear consistently in other ancient definitions of the term may be understood to derive directly or indirectly from Varro. The legal writer Macer has the only divergent derivation of the term monumentum: he derives it from munire, “to fortify, build up, protect.” Such an association could emerge easily from the actual role of monumenta in that they protect remembrance, and their construction results in areas being built up. But the verbal associations for monumentum of monere and manere are far more prominent, both in conception in the grammarian tradition and in practice in the larger textual tradition. In particular, the direct association of monumentum and monere is a key one in the record. As ancient writers understand them, monumenta are first and foremost reminders in their function of carrying a certain message to the observer to evoke, rehearse, and restore a memory that otherwise may be lost, that is, a recollection of a person or event that is by nature nonpermanent.

The association of monumentum and manere is also important, although it is perhaps less significant than monere for the appreciation of the reminder factor of monumenta. Varro presents the derivation from manere as a possibility rather than as a secure conclusion (potest esse dicta), but it fits well with the often physical nature of monumenta and their defining durability. As memoria covers what remains in the mind, monumentum, in its manifestation as a tangible object, covers what remains in the landscape from past events and people; from there, the term is applied to the abstract notion of writing in its various forms. Monumenta transmit important information to current people such as the values of the past, the continuity of those values, and

32 Monumentum autem sepulchri id esse divus Hadrianus rescripsit, quod monumenti, id est causa muniendi eius loci factum sit, in quo corpus impositum sit (“The deified Hadrian, however, wrote that the monumentum is the part of a sepulcher that has been built for the sake of monumentum, that is for protecting the place where the body is interred,” Dig. 11.7.37.1). The association between monumentum and tombs is again present. Cf. Isid. Diff. 1.162 C for a similar confusion or even multiplicity of word associations, in that case munus as derived from munire or monere (munus a muniendo vel a monendo).

33 Cf. the wordplay at Ov. Met. 1.159, 5.227, 10.725, Fast. 4.709 between monimenta and various forms of manere. See also Fantham 1998: 224.
the sorts of things that are worthy of remembrance to maintain such values. In large part, they convey such vital information through their material persistence, but loss of a physical structure does not necessarily correlate to loss of the memorial function. Some significance, at least, outlasts physical loss and, thus, the valence of manere in relation to monumentum extends to the abstract and a more metaphorical form of lasting power.

Another important passage comes from the c. 4th AD grammarian Nonius Marcellus. It is possible that he transmits a definition of monumentum that predates Varro’s since he purports to supply Cicero’s words from a letter to Julius Caesar. If Nonius’ information originates in authentic correspondence between Cicero and Caesar, there is an obvious terminus ante quem of Caesar’s death in 44 BC. The first attested epistolary exchange between Cicero and Caesar dates to 54 BC.34 Thus, the information, if genuine, is most likely to belong to the date range 54–44 BC, so at a time when the Republic was struggling acutely with its current and traditional identity. It is possible that Nonius’ citation is misattributed or fabricated, but the sense is consistent with Ciceronian ideas on monumenta elsewhere (see below on posteritas).

Nonius says: ‘monumenti’ proprietatem a monendo M. Tullius exprimendam putavit ad Caesarem epistula II: ‘sed ego quae monumenti ratio sit nomine ipso admineor; ad memoriam magis spectare debet posteritatis quam ad praesentis temporis gratiam’ (“In a letter to Caesar, Cicero thought that the proper signification of monumentum was expressed by monere: ‘I am reminded what the meaning of monumentum is by the word itself. It ought to look more to remembrance in the future than pleasure in the present time’,” 47 L). Memoria is, thus, again closely connected with monumentum, but here a temporal focus is prominent: as an ideal, monumenta are intended for the future (ad memoriam posteritatis), not primarily for the present.

34 See Pauli 1957.
In practice, however, *monumenta* have considerable impact on their contemporary audience, which can allow for manipulation of their intended purpose. As an advocate of socio-political cooperation and a political pragmatist, Cicero cannot always apply his own ideal for the outlook of *monumenta* (see below), but the focus on posterity is an important one for Livy’s use and depiction of *monumenta*.

Like Varro, Nonius makes the connection with *monere* but does not comment on Cicero’s use of the compound *admonere*, which Varro also uses (*admoneant, LL 6.49*). While the two verbs sometimes are synonymous, one extant source records a slight semantic difference, which can further illuminate the various functions of *monumenta*. Isidore of Seville, though writing in the late 6th-mid-7th AD, is a repository of earlier material. His research into etymology bears heavily on many of the authors discussed in this section, so his assessment is worth considering in this respect. Isidore makes the distinction that *monere* indicates an advisement or the offering of a new piece of information as a friendly act, while *admonere* indicates bringing back what has escaped one’s memory (*inter monere et admonere: monet qui praecipit; admonet qui, quod exciderat, memoriae reducit, Diff. 1.221 C*), with the further implication of a threat inherent in the forgetting. The semantic difference between the simple and the complex verb as Isidore presents it need not be taken too seriously. Rather, the distinction is significant because it hints at

---


36 Isidore credits Cato as the first Latin author to distinguish between words based on their original meaning (*1.praef. C*). See Codoñer 1992: 303, for discussion of and further bibliography on whether this is Marcus Porcius Cato or the 1st BC grammarian Publius Valerius Cato.

37 Cf. [Fronto] *Diff. 520.8-9 K: monet propter benivolentiam, admonet ut confirmet memoriam* (“one reminds out of kindness; one warns to reaffirm recollection”). E.g., *Cic. Pis. 94: admoneri me satis est; admonebit autem nemo alius nisi rei publicae tempus, quod mihi guident magis videtur quam tu unquam arbitratus es appropinguare* (“It is enough that I am warned, but no one else shall warn me if not the crisis of state, which seems to me to approach more than you have ever thought”).
the different registers of *monere* proper: *monere* can mean “to remind,” “to advise,” “to warn,”38 and “to exhort,”39 which carry significant variances in tone and connotation. That range carries over to *monumentum* as a notional derivate of *monere*.

The warning aspect is especially prevalent on gravestones as the Varronian passage above suggests: the living must treat the dead with care if they wish to ensure the same consideration for themselves after death. A first century BC grave inscription near Cremona well exemplifies the standard Roman sentiment of *memento mori*: *heus tu viator las|se, qu[i] me praete|reis, cum diu ambula|reis, tamen hoc | veniundum est tibi* (“Hey, weary traveler, who passes me by, although you may walk on for some time yet, here must you come in the end,” *CIL* 1.2.2138).40 Thus, the very personal nature of the grave becomes collective and extends to a larger social target, that is, the deceased extends a power, with a larger scope, potentially beyond that which they exerted in life. A similar cautionary sentiment seems present in the concept of *monumenta* since the referents provide not only a model for others to attain to but, by correlation, a model to avoid.41

The 2nd AD grammarian Festus, whose information comes directly from Verrius Flaccus in the early empire, touches on further points as well as those addressed by Varro and Nonius.42 Festus writes: *MONUMENTUM est, quod et mortui causa aedificatum est et quicquid ob*

38 As Feldherr 2000: 219, says, “they are called *monumenta* not because they preserve the memory of the dead but because they remind or admonish the living that they too will die.” See also Goldschmidt 2017: 379; Moles 2009: 72; Meadows and Williams 2001: 33-34.

39 See Miano 2012; Jaeger 1997: 16-17, for exhortations inherent in *monumenta*.

40 Cf., e.g., *CIL* 1.2.1836: *ita casta veitae constitit ra[tio meae]. | Valebis, hospes; veive, tibi iam m|ors venit* (“so the reckoning of my life is pure. Goodbye, stranger. Live, for death comes for you”). See Lattimore 1962: 257-58, for further examples and discussion.

41 Cf. Liv. *praef*. 10 (*quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites*), discussed below (ch. 3).

42 For Festus’ use of and divergence from Verrius as well as Verrius’ connection with Varro, see Glinister 2007: 11-24.
memoriam alicuius factum est, ut fana, porticus, scripta et carmina. sed **monimentum**\(^{43}\) quamvis mortui causa sit factum, non tamen significat ibi sepultum (“Monumentum is both that which is built for the sake of the dead and anything that is made for remembrance of someone/something, like temples, porticoes, writings, and poems. But **monimentum**, although it has been made for the sake of the dead, does not mean that it is a burial site,” 123 L). Festus, thus, makes **monumenta** structures that commemorate the dead, as Varro does, but adds the distinction that the structure need not contain remains. Thus, it is not necessarily a grave so much as a memorial to the deceased. Here the disembodied force, both literally and figuratively, of **monumenta** emerges. A **monumentum** does not necessarily need to incorporate physically the person or thing that it commemorates to evoke the target memory. Therefore, the potential impact of the **monumentum** is greatly enlarged, and Festus hints at the existence of multiple funerary **monumenta**—in multiple places—for single people. Festus further generalizes **monumentum** to encompass all things within the scope of **memoria**: the form of **alicuius** is ambiguous, so it may refer to an object or other such item as well as a person. By extension, **monumenta** can bring to mind not only individuals but also events, places, and ideas.

In this passage, the possible manifestations of **monumentum** itself are also greatly expanded. The list includes some standard memorial structures (**fana** and **porticus**), and **aedificare** hints at their physical nature as well. But Festus’ conception of **monumenta** includes a further range of possibilities with written **monumenta**, whether in prose (**scripta**) or poetic (**carmina**) form.\(^{44}\) The funerary association prominent in Festus’s definition may suggest that

\(^{43}\) Although the lemma gives the -\(u\)- spelling of the word, Festus’ entry contains the -\(i\)- variant. The variant does not seem to have any semantic distinction like that postulated in the *Differentiae Sermonum* entry above (289.23-24 K Supp. 11).

\(^{44}\) See, e.g., Paulus-Festus 12 L: *aedificare cum sit proprie aedem facere, ponitur tamen καταχρηστικῶς in omni genere constructionis* (“although *aedificare* properly is to build a structure, it is more loosely applied to every manner of construction”). For discussion of the blending of material (i.e., statues and sepulchers) and metaphorical
these writings are inscriptions, encomia, epitaphs, or elegies, but it does not of itself preclude larger-scale written works, such as histories, biographies, epics, or dramatic works.

The funerary association in the definitions of monumentum so far is well attested in the inscriptive record, where the term frequently features on or indicates graves, as seen in the common inscriptive formula hoc monumentum heredes non sequetur (H.M.H.N.S.: “let the plot not pass to heirs”), which is meant to preserve the integrity of the tomb and curtail appropriation and crowding of the plot by others. In a turn of popular culture, for example, Horace gives a versified form: heredes monumentum ne sequeretur (Sat. 1.8.13). Thus, it is not surprising that Varro and Festus foreground tombs in their discussions of monumenta as they are a prominent type both in their physical and conceptual role as reminders. Yet, monumentum is not limited only to tombs. Varro and Festus—the latter with the phrase mortui causa—both use tombs as their examples but allow for a more extensive range of monumenta. Far from the notion being restricted, anything written or made (scripta ac facta, Var. LL 6.49 ~ factum...scripta, Fest. 123 L) can fit the description, provided that its purpose is commemoration.

Other grammatical writers expand on the funerary element by making monumentum a particular component of graves and showing an even greater degree of the grammarian’s typical punctiliousness. Thus, the author of the Differentiae Sermonum writes: inter sepulchrum,
tumulum, monumentum, bustum hoc interest, quod sepulchrum locus in quo corpora sepeliuntur

monuments (i.e., name and glory), see Suerbaum 1968: 160-63, ad Enn. Ann. F 411-412 S. See also Cic. de Orat. 2.63, where the finished structure of a written history is called exaedificatio (cf. Kraus 10 n. 43, 26 n. 110, discussed below).

45 E.g., CIL 1.2.1201 (hoc est factum monumentum), 1.2.1204, 1.2.1212, 1.2.1216, 1.2.1295, 1.2.1319, 1.2.1578, 1.2.1687, 1.2.1837, 1.2.2123. As Suerbaum 1968: 327, says, “Der Zusammenhang zwischen monumentum-monere-memoria wurde in Ciceronischer und Augusteischer Zeit durchaus, und zwar gerade im Zusammenhang mit sepulcra, empfunden.”

46 Cf., e.g., Petr. Sat. 71.8; Quint. Inst. 7.9.5-6. For further examples, see TLL 8.0.1463.50. For discussion, see Hope 2009: 172-73; Carroll 2006: esp. 102 and 134; Toynbee 1971: 74-75.
et a sepeliendo dicitur, tumulus qui cineres tegit, monumentum quod sepulchro circundatur
dictum a monitionibus, bustum in quo ossa sunt, quasi 'bene ustum' (“between sepulcher,
mound, monumentum, and pyre, this is the difference: sepulcher is the place where the bodies are
buried and is called that from ‘burying’; the mound is what covers the ashes; the monumentum,
which is circled by the sepulcher, is named from ‘reminders’; the pyre is where the bones are, as
if from ‘well burnt’,” 286.18-21 K). Here, then, the definition of monumentum becomes highly
technical and extremely limited, which doubtless reflects the grammarians’ desire for specificity
and classification more than it does the extensions of the term in literary texts, but the derivation
from monitiones does fit the wider conception of monumentum.

The Virgilian commentator Servius in the early 5th AD lists further elements of tombs in
association with the term monumentum, but, in the list, an important blending of terms and
concepts emerges. Servius associates memoria and monumentum in such a way that the
distinction between them vanishes, and the former comes to indicate a physical structure rather
than an abstract concept: terrae congestio super ossa ‘tumulus’ dicitur. sane apparatus
mortuorum ‘funus’ dici solet, exstructio lignorum ‘rogus’, subiectio ignis ‘pyra’, crematio
cadaveris ‘bustum’, locus ‘ustrina’, operis exstructio ‘sepulcrum’, inscriptum nomen
memoriaque ‘monumentum’ (“the piling of earth over bones is called ‘tumulus.’ Of course, the
preparation of the dead is generally called ‘funus,’ the stacking of wood ‘rogus,’ the placing of
fire ‘pyra,’ the burning of the corpse ‘bustum,’ the place ‘ustrina,’ the structure ‘sepulcrum,’ the
inscribed name and the memorial ‘monumentum’,” ad Aen. 3.22). For Servius, much of this

47 The jurist Ulpian seems to treat monumentum and sepulchrum without distinction (sepulchrum sive monumentum, Dig. 11.8.1.7).

48 Cf. Paulus-Festus 29 L for a similar semantic distinction of funerary terms, though the passage does not mention monumentum. Cf. Cic. de Leg. 2.64 for the equation of bustum to the Greek τύμβος (a passage closely followed by the term monumentum). See Noy 2000 for discussion of the general partition and categorization of funerary elements.
terminology is an exercise in antiquarianism that stems from academic interest as cremation was no longer the normal practice in the Roman world. But whether they are correct or, as is more probable, artificial, such precise definitions need not be taken to reflect either general or literary usage. Rather, the urge to classify again betrays an unease with the melding of terms that circulated in the same semantic range.

Servius’ conflation of *memoria* and *monumentum*, however, as terms for physical memorials hints at an increasingly close relation between the words, to the point that the relationship can be used to obliterate their normal semantic distinction. Further, here the conflation of physical and abstract notions of *memoria* bears on *monumentum*: the reminder inherent in the latter term can outlast material degeneration. Another important element is touched upon in the inscription of the name (*inscriptum nomen*), which ensures the remembrance of a particular individual along with the more general memorial implications of the tomb. The preservation of a name is perhaps less detailed and informative than other monumental commemoration, but it is the simplest means of preserving a person’s memory and, therefore, the person themselves. In such cases, the type of commemoration is very personal, but elsewhere the scope of commemoration can be more extensive (discussed below).

There are three further, probably derivative, definitions of *monumenta* that bear on this discussion, particularly in their connection to legalism. The first passage comes from the late 1st-

---

49 Cremation as the most common form of treating remains fell out of style around the 2nd AD. See Noy 2000: esp. 30 n. 2, for Servius’ interest in the apparatus of cremation. See Morris 1992: 31-69, on the general transition from cremation to inhumation in the Roman world.

50 As Suerbaum 1968: 162, says concerning poetic inscriptions (discussed below), “Vor allem die Dichter der Augusteischen Zeit haben immer wieder *nomen* und *sepulcrum* zusammengestellt, offenbar aufgrund der allgemein verbreiteten Anschauung, daß durch die Aufschrift auf dem Grabdenkmal der Name über das Grab hinaus dauert.” See further *ibid.* 325-26.

early 2nd AD legal writer Ulpian, which is essentially an abbreviated assessment of the term’s general function as reminder. He writes: *monumentum est quod memoriae servandae gratia existat* ("*monumentum* is that which exists for the sake of preserving remembrance,” *Dig.* 11.7.2.6). In the second passage, Porphyrio, a commentator on Horace from the early 3rd AD,\(^{52}\) writes: *monumentum non sepulcrum tantum dicitur, sed omnia, quidquid memoria* testatur ("not only is a grave called *monumentum*, but anything at all that bears witness to remembrance,” ad *Hor. C.* 1.2.15). The potential polyvalence and versatility of *monumentum* again is latent in the words *omnia* and *quidquid*. In other ways as well, this passage and the preceding one largely repeat what Varro and Nonius say, but *testor* is interesting here because of its association with forensic practice and because, as a result, it suggests that *monumenta* may be viewed as the physical evidence of history.\(^{53}\) In the legal sphere, proof, whether physical or written,\(^ {54}\) is essential for establishing the veracity of the account in question, and the situation is similar in the case of accounts or representations of events farther back in time into which a party wishes to inquire.

In the third passage, Florentinus, a 4th AD *notarius* and legal writer, says: *monumentum* generaliter res est memoriae causa in posterum prodita: in qua si corpus vel reliquiae inferuntur, fiet sepulchrum; si vero nihil eorum inferatur, erit *monumentum* memoriae causa

\(^{52}\) See *OCD* Pomponius Porphyrio and *RE* 106 s.v. Porphyrio’s commentary contains material from earlier commentators, such as Helenius Acro (2nd AD), but the commentary that survives is a 5th AD redaction of the original and contains further material from Servius.

\(^{53}\) Immerwahr 1960: 269, concerning Herodotus’ conception and use of monuments, says: “To [Herodotus] great deeds leave visible traces behind, and the historian and his public arrive at an understanding of the greatness of the past partly through these visible traces. In general, therefore, Herodotus prefers things seen to things heard, despite the fact that history is, by its nature, based on oral accounts. Visible traces of men’s deeds are the guarantee of their greatness. Works, both concrete and abstract, thus represent…past human greatness in the present and future.”

\(^{54}\) See, esp., Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.177, where Cicero characterizes evidence of Verres’ thefts as *monumenta* (see below) along with written documents (*litteras remotas esse de medio, decreto sociorum erepta mihi esse istius indicia ac monumenta furtorum*). Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 753; Verg. *Aen.* 3.486-91.
factum, quod Graeci κενοτάφιον appellant (‘monumentum is generally something that, for remembrance’ sake, is created for the future. If a body or remains are placed in it, it is a sepulcher, but if nothing of the sort is placed in it, it will be a monumentum made for the sake of remembrance, which the Greeks call a cenotaph,” Dig. 11.7.42). The passage is again a grammarian’s classification and largely repeats the substance of the passages above, but the focus on the future, similar to that of the Nonian-Ciceronian passage above (posteritatis, Non. 47 L ~ in posterum), is important, as is the extensive range of monumenta as seen in the term generaliter. Florentinus, or his source, hits on memoriae causa rather than Festus’ mortui causa, but the association with funeral memorials is once again clear.

In a later passage of the Differentiae than the one discussed above, Isidore provides a more significant semantic distinction: inter sepulcrum et monumentum: sepulcrum tantummodo tumulus defunctorum est; monumentum vero nunc sepulcrum, nunc historia rerum gestarum, vel ad memoriam defuncti, vel ad recordationem rei scriptae (“[the difference] between sepulcher and monumentum: sepulcher is only a mound of the dead, but monumentum sometimes is a sepulcher and sometimes a written account of history, either for remembrance of the dead or for recording a written work,” Diff. 1.314 C). Thus, the potential range of the term monumentum as written or physical takes point here. Isidore specifies the form of written monumentum as history with a doubling of terms (historia and res gesta). Burial and commemoration of the dead are

---

55 For cenotaphs, see Toynbee 1971: 54.

56 For discussion of this passage and Isidore’s particular interests in the written form of monumentum, see Codoñer 1992: 381-82.

57 On rhetorical and thematic distinctions between res gestae and historia in Republican literature, particularly in their use as titles, see Krebs 2015. For further possible distinction with the term annales, see Ch. 3.
still very much included in the semantic range, but Isidore here does not mention appearances of *monumenta* beyond tombs and historical works.

Some briefer mentions provide an explicit association between the terms *monumentum* and *memoria* or *monumentum* and terms denoting written records, such as *historiae* or *annales*. While most of the preceding writers suggest or imply such a connection, Servius makes the terms directly equivalent in a gloss on *Aeneid* 3.486: *MONUMENTUM memoria*.\(^5^8\) Charisius, writing sometime during or after the middle of the 4\(^{th}\) AD, reports a brief list of synonyms of *monumentum* according to a pseudo-Ciceronian author: *monumenta publica, annales, historiae, libri veteres, scrinia antiqua* ([Cic.] *Synon.* *apud* Charisius 434.6 B). Given the other examples here, *monumenta publica* must pertain to writing of some sort, presumably civic or pontifical inscription or other putative or historical documentation like the *Libri Lintei, Annales Maximi, Fasti Capitolini*, etc.\(^5^9\) Servius further glosses *monumentum* as *historiae* (ad Aen. 3.102), thereby also equating *historia* and *memoria*.\(^6^0\) The range of different types of writing, from bare public records to full-scale histories, is significant for the following discussion.

In the *Origines*, Isidore makes the same point with further qualification than in his passage from the *Differentiae* above: *historiae autem ideo monumenta dicuntur eo quod memoriam tribuant rerum gestarum* (“but histories are called *monumenta* because they pass on

---

\(^5^8\) See Häusle 1980: 29-40, for *memoria* as synonymous with *monumentum*, i.e., for the idea that the physical structure creates the memory and dictates its form, even if it is little more than a name.

\(^5^9\) For the use of the *Libri Lintei* by historians, see esp. Liv. 4.20.8-11, 23.1-3; DH Ant. 11.62.3. For the *Annales Maximi*, *Cic. de Orat.* 2.51-53, *de Leg.* 1.6; DH Ant. 174.3. For discussion of these documents, including doubts on their form or existence, see Rich 2018: 19-28; *FRHist* (also Rich) 1.141-59, 324-26, 3.431-35; Elliott 2013: esp. 23-30; Frier 1999; Frier 1975; Ogilvie 544-45; Walsh 1961: 110-14, 275-78; Ogilvie 1958.

\(^6^0\) For general discussion from a modern perspective of the interplay as well as the distinctions between history and memory, see Cubitt 2007: esp. 26-65.
remembrance of deeds,” Orig. 1.41.2 L). The connection between monumentum and historical writing here goes beyond many of the definitions so far encountered in that it is a direct equation of the two terms with explanation of the melding between them. The “public” monumenta, however, of Charisius’ source above allows for more physical manifestations, such as statues, porticoes, temples, etc., rather than just written ones. The adjective also implies the distinction between monumenta publica and monumenta privata, which will be addressed in Ch. 4. The distinction is often included in the record elsewhere and is important in understanding Livy’s treatment of monumenta, particularly because the distinction can fade or vanish entirely.

Finally, Augustine of Hippo around AD 420 nicely recaps many of the important elements about monumenta discussed in the passages above, including the term’s association with memoria and with funerary contexts, the guarantee of recollection, and the etymology of the term:

sed non ob aliud vel memoriae vel monumenta dicuntur ea quae insignita fiunt sepulcra mortuorum, nisi quia eos qui viventium oculis morte subtrahit, ne oblivione etiam cordibus subtrahantur, in memoriam revocant, et admonendo faciunt cogitari: nam et memoriae nomen id apertissime ostendit, et monumentum eo quod moneat mentem, id est, admoneat, nuncupatur. propter quod et Graeci μνημεον vocant, quod nos memoria seu monumentum appellamus; quoniam lingua eorum memoria ipsa qua meminimus μνήμη dicitur. (de Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda 4.6.8-17 Z 630)

61 In de Oratore 2.52, Cicero’s interlocutor M. Antonius gives a similar equation of terms in relation to early Greek and Roman historians: erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio, cuius rei memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa ab initio rerum Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus (“what was history other than the compilation of yearly accounts? And, for the sake of preserving the event and public remembrance, the pontifex maximus entrusted every affair of individual years to writing, from the inception of the Roman state to the pontificate of P. Mucius”). The term monumentum appears right after this passage (53, see Introduction), and the phrase memoriae...retinendae causa is similar to several passages addressed above concerning the purpose of monumenta (Var. LL 6.49, memoriae causa; Ulp. Dig. 11.7.2.6, memoriae servandae gratia; Florent. Dig. 11.7.42, memoriae causa).

62 E.g., Cic. Sull. 41; de Dom. 74; Sest. 95: 128; de Leg. 2.65; Deiot. 37; Nep. Dion 10.3; Liv. 6.1.2; 8.40.5; 29.37.7; L. (?) Marius Maximus de Vita Commodo 101 F 16 FRHist = HA [Lampr.] Comm. 20.5; Tac. Ann. 3.57. Cf. Cic. Verr. 1.14; Har. Resp. 16; de Leg. 2.58; Liv. 5.52.3; 9.6.7; 39.40.4; Quint. Inst. 3.7.17.

63 See Rose 2013: 192-99, for fuller treatment of this passage.
But not for any other reason are the notable tombs of the dead called either *memoriae* or *monumenta* than because they recall to memory those who have been taken by death from the sight of the living, lest they be drawn out also from hearts by forgetfulness, and, by issuing reminders, they ensure that they [the dead] are thought of. Both the word *memoria* most clearly shows it, and *monumentum* is so called precisely because it reminds the mind, that is, it brings to mind. So, indeed, the Greeks call μνημείαν, that which we call *memoria* or *monumentum* since, in their tongue, the very memory by which we recollect is called μνήμη.

Here *memoria* and *monumentum* become nearly synonymous through their Greek analogues, μνήμη and μνημείον. The focus is on memorials to the dead, but the Greek term μνημείον, like its Latin equivalent *monumentum*, is not restricted to funerary monuments. Augustine also touches upon several different registers for *memoria*: the faculty by which people remember; the specific recollection of lost things, here people, facilitated by a physical reminder; and the physical memorial of a grave or other funerary monument, where the distinction between *memoria* and *monumentum* wanes as it does in the Servius passage above (ad Aen. 3.22).

To sum up, in these passages taken together, several prevalent elements emerge: the function of *monumenta* as resting places of and especially as memorials to the dead; the connection of *memoria* with *monumentum*; the temporal focus of *monumenta*, that is, their

---

64 A similar connection occurs between Greek and Latin with the names Μνημοσύνη and Moneta, a connection that reveals, at least to some of the ancients, a connection to memory. Livius Andronicus’ *Odusia* gives Moneta as the mother of the muses (Prisc. GL 2.198.6 K; cf. Hyg. *Fab. praef.* 27: *ex ilove et Moneta, Musae*. But a nearby entry complicates the association between the Greek and Latin goddess of memory by giving *ex ilove et Clymene, Mnemosyne, praef.* 31). For discussion, see Miano 2012: esp. 92, and 2011: esp. 60-62, 71-86; Meadows and Williams 2001: esp. 33.

65 Immerwahr 1960 explores the term ἔργον in Herodotus and Thucydides as potentially representing either deed or monument with a concrete and abstract notion attached. He connects these two appearances of ἔργον with μνημόσυνον (esp. 166-68), which is very similar to μνημείον in the passage above.

66 See, esp., DH 1.1.2 (μνημεία).

67 See Davis 1958: esp. 169-70, for discussion of these two components of *memoria*.

68 Cf. the similar blending of concepts revolving around the term μνήμα at Thuc. 2.43.2. Rusten 1989: 169-70, says: “μνήμα can be applied to both the actual tomb and the subjective memory of the dead...T. takes up the less suitable synonym τάφος and extends the conceit: in addition to the actual oration and tomb, the dead receive an ἔπαινος and τάφος that transcend time and place.”
outlook on the future and on descendants; the design of *monumenta* as things intended to ensure continuation and lasting recollection of things gone; and writing as a possible instantiation of *monumenta*, in various forms ranging from documentary material to literature, including poetry (discussed in Ch. 2).

But before discussing these elements, the different forms that *monumenta* can take warrant discussion. The foregoing discussion has shown *monumentum* to be a versatile and multivalent term with a wide semantic range that repeatedly challenged ancient scholars seeking to constrict it. Ultimately, identifying different types of *monumenta* is not an attempt to categorize them so much as to show that the term defies neat categories and must be approached within the context of individual instances, an approach that is especially important in understanding Livy’s application of *monumentum*.

**Types of monumenta**

As several of the passages above suggest, *monumenta* can take a wide array of forms: anything, in fact, that is intended to facilitate remembrance can be a *monumentum* (*quicquid ob memoriam alicuius factum est*, Fest. 123 L; cf., esp., Porphyrio ad Hor. C. 1.2.15; Florent. *Dig.* 11.7.42). In a handful of transferred instances, *monumentum* can be equated with people, in particular, offspring, which is an apt association for familial remains, so to speak, and as something that carries remembrance forward across generational boundaries. In a related way,
a few constellations and other astral bodies are called *monumenta* as reminders of mythic characters who underwent catasterism.\(^{71}\) A couple of examples refer to physical injuries as *monumenta*,\(^ {72}\) though they are quite free in their association and dramatic in character. On a much larger scale, cities and even whole regions are sometimes characterized as *monumenta*.\(^ {73}\) But, in most instances, *monumenta* are small enough to be visible in their entirety to an individual. The force of some *monumenta* arises from their dislocation, such as spoils of war,\(^ {74}\) gifts,\(^ {75}\) or offerings to the gods. Natural features that develop associations with people or events can also fit the bill, as with pools, outcroppings, and fissures.\(^ {76}\) The distortion of natural features

---

children *thalami monimenta coacti*. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.151-62, where earth ensures a *monumentum* of her offspring, the Giants, by creating a race of humans that turns out to be very violent on account of their source material. See also the *fragmenta Cusana* of Cicero’s *pro Flacco*, where someone is characterized as a *monimentum antiquitatis*.


\(^{72}\) Plaut. *Stich.* 58-63 (welts from a beating); Verg. *Aen.* 6.509-14 (Deiphobus’ mutilation from Helen’s betrayal).

\(^{73}\) Cities: Plaut. *Rud.* 935 (Gripus, a city named after the character); Liv. 5.30.2 (Veii), 26.41.11 (Cannae), 31.29.11 (Capua), *per.* 41 (Gracchuris); Val. *Max.* 3.2.14 (Utica), 3.7. ext 6 (Cannae); Vell. 1.12.5 (Carthage); Flor. *Epit.* 1.22.4 (Saguntum), 2.33.58 (Lancea). Cf. Cic. *Inv.* 1.100, esp. *urbi* and *monumento*. In the passage, Cicero is discussing a form of prosopopoeia, but the connection implied between *urbs* and *monumentum* is notable. Regions: Vell. 2.38.6 (Syria and Pontus), 2.40.4 (Africa, Europe, Asia). Cf. Catull. 11.10-13, where the Rhine (as well as the Britons themselves) are called *monimenta* of Caesar.

\(^{74}\) E.g., Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.88, 2.4.97, *de Leg. Agr.* 2.49; Verg. *Aen.* 12.945-46; Prop. 3.11.59, 4.6.17; Liv. 25.39.16. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.494-98. Trophies assembled from enemy spoils on the field of victory are a similar sort of *monumentum*, though their force does not exactly stem from their dislocation so much as their arrangement on the spot of commemoration. See, e.g., Cic. *Pis.* 92, where Piso is criticized for setting up *tropaea* in Macedonia, things “which all nations have designated as markers and *monumenta* of military praise and victory” (*quae bellicae laudis victoriaeque omnes gentes insignia et monumenta esse voluerunt*).

\(^{75}\) E.g., Liv. *Aen.* 5.538, 572 (*monumentum et pignus amoris*).

\(^{76}\) E.g., Liv. 1.48.7 (*Vicus Sceleratus*; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 6.609-12); Var. *LL* 148-50 and Liv. 1.13.5, 7.6.1-6 (*Lacus Curtius*; cf. Prop. 3.11.61); Var. *LL* 5.41 (Tarpeian Rock; cf. Liv. 6.20.12); Plin. *NH* 12.11 (the plane tree on Crete where Zeus/Jupiter had sex with Europa). Cf. the trees in Cic. *de Leg.* 1.1-5 and see Woodman 2012: 1-16, for discussion of their relevancy to historiography, esp. 15: “Though Atticus is initially convinced that the oak he has seen is the one described by Cicero in his poem, his immediate doubts about this identification allow full discussion of the possibility that Cicero invented the tree, an invention so successful that readers assume that the poetic tree has an independent existence as a real tree. And, even if that real tree should die, another tree will be assumed to be the tree which Cicero described in his poem. In other words, invention ensures commemoration; and, since commemoration is a principal function of historiography, a poet of Cicero’s accomplishment is the ideal writer of history: if a poet can ensure the longevity of something which he has invented, think what he can do for something that actually existed or happened!”
is a further form of *monumentum*, in that the reminder of great works leaves a mark on the landscape. With these *monumenta*, the locality in general is memorialized along with its physical characteristics, but other *monumenta* are not directly attached to any particular place as their manifestation is more abstract, such as works of literature, including poetry. Besides the physical form and material of a scroll or codex, written words are often portrayed as having a more lasting power than physical memorials (discussed in Ch. 2). Most often, however, *monumenta* are structures or other architectural works constructed for a commemorative purpose.

Some of the most common forms of *monumenta* are temples, shrines, basilicas, palaces, tombs, statues, porticoes, columns, arches, and other constructions meant to have a set and

77 See Ch. 2 on Liv. 10.15.4-5. Cf. Hdt. 7.24.1 on Xerxes’ excavation of the Athos peninsula: Ως μὲν ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὑρίσκειν, μεγαλοφροσύνης εἶνεκν αὐτῷ ξέρξης ὑρίσσειν ἐκέλευε, ἥθελον τε δύναμιν ἀποδείκνυσθαι καὶ μνημόσυνα λατάσθαι (“As far as I can find from conjecture, Xerxes bade this excavation out of pride: he wished to show his power and leave memorials of it”). Cf. Hdt. 1.1.1: ἀπόδεξις ἀποδείκνυσθαι, a comparison which has implications for the extension of written memorials (*monumenta*) with material ones.

78 For temples, see, e.g., Cic. Verr. 2.1.129, 2.4.69, ad Q. Fr. 1.1.26, Cael. 78; Liv. 1.55.2, 2.40.12, 7.3.7; Ov. Fast. 6.611. For shrines, see, e.g., Cic. Verr. 1.14 (delubra), although the terminology is often difficult to distinguish between temple and shrine as delubrum, aedis, and fana can signify either.

79 For basilicas, see, e.g., Cic. Att. 4.16.8. For palaces, see, e.g., the regia (Hor. C. 1.2.15; cf. Tac. Ann. 15.41.1-2). See P & A 440-43.

80 *Monumenta* as tombs are well attested in the literary record as places with strong, continuing familial bonds, sometimes invoked to vouchsafe oaths. E.g., Ter. Eun. 13 (*in patrium monumentum*); Rut. Lup. Schem. Lex. 2.6 (pro parentum monumentis). Cf. Cic. Mil. esp. 17-18, for the impact of Clodius killing people among his ancestral tombs (cf. Quint. Inst. 5.10.41), and Sen. de Ira 3.18.2, for Catiline killing M. Marius Gratidianus at the tomb of Q. Catulus. See also Sen. Contr. 10 praef. 7 on T. Labienus, following the senatorial order to burn his books: *non tulit hanc Labienus contumeliam nec superstes esse ingenio suo voluit, sed in monumenta se maiorum suorum ferri iussit atque ita includi, veritus scilicet ne ignis qui nomini suo subjectus erat corpori negaretur. non finivit tantum se ipse sed etiam sepelivit* (“Labienus did not endure this insult, nor did he want to outlive his own talent. Rather, he ordered that he be born into the monumenta of his ancestors and that he be inclosed therein; he was clearly afraid that the fire that had been put to his nomen would be denied to his body. Not only did he end himself, but he also buried himself”).

81 E.g., Plaut. Curr. 438-41; Cato Orig. 4 F 76 FRHist; Cic. Verr. 1.14, 2.2.158, 2.4.139, Phil. 9.11; Nep. Them. 10.4; Ov. Met. 5.227-29; Quint. Inst. 3.7.17-18. Cf. Ov. Met. 4.550, where the Theban companions of Ino are transformed, essentially, into statues by Juno (*saevitiae monimenta meae*).

82 For porticoes, see, e.g., Liv. per. 140. For columns, see, e.g., Cic. Att. 4.16.8; Liv. 2.33.9; Curt. Ruf. 10.1.14. Cf. Cic. de Leg. 2.64.
permanent location. Generally these *monumenta* are constructed to commemorate a certain person or event, but they could be associated with a whole group of people, either explicitly or by extension. Commemorations of military victory are an important category here in that they recall an event that took place in another location and, thereby, relocate the memorial focus where it has a greater audience and impact.

Issues arise, however, with the range of individuals involved in the creation of the *monumentum*, whether dedicatee, dedicator, craftsman, or restorer, as well as appropriation of commemoration by individuals not involved in the process. In addition to the name and fame of those in whose honor the structure was built, *monumenta* can preserve and enhance the reputation of others just as much. Even when the dedication is to a god, the person or persons who dedicated, paid for, or built it often had their names attached alongside the god’s, and the *monumentum* could easily be associated more with the person behind its construction than the

---

83 Cic. *Mil.* 37 also refers to the Via Appia as a *monumentum*. For the Via Appia as a site, extended across time and space, of memory and monuments, see Della Portella 2004: *passim*. See also P & A 559-60.

84 Miles 1995: 17, gives three subcategories of *monumenta*: intentional memorials, i.e., those built for the purpose; unintentional ones, i.e., those that preexisted and developed associations; and written documents (cf. Jaeger 1997: 17). These subcategories work for a basic approach, but circumstances can become complicated in many instances. E.g., inscribed plaques are both intentional memorials themselves and written documents; they further can memorialize events or people unintentionally.

85 Miano 2011: 28, says: “I monumenti legati alla vittoria militare possono essere classificati in tre tipologie: a) templi b) statue e affreschi c) decorazione e monumentalizzazione di edifici tramite il bottino di guerra (*spolia*).” For examples of these categories and discussion, see *ibid.* esp. 27-33.

86 See, e.g., even for a very minor public figure, *CIL* 1.2.990: *C. Volcaci. C. f. har. de stipe Iovi Iurario [dedit ob m]onimentom* (“Gaius Volcacius, a seer, son of Gaius, provided for this out of his allotment as a memorial, to Jupiter of Oaths”). Volcacius’ name takes primacy of place and serves as a bracket of the inscription along with Jupiter of Oaths. See below for discussion of the attachment of the dedicator’s name to a *monumentum* and the relegation of the dedicatee to the dedicator in hierarchy of written and associational position.
deity being venerated.\textsuperscript{87} Further, the instigator of the \textit{monumentum} could claim the backing of the named deity by the act of constructing.

Thus, \textit{monumenta} could be applied to very individual forms of glorification rather than more wide-reaching forms of commemoration. Moreover, \textit{monumenta} could essentially be stolen as they were prominent battlegrounds for the competitive ethos that served as a cornerstone for the Republican aristocracy: old \textit{fora} make way for new ones, \textit{monumenta} connected with previous strongmen are replaced with those of the current, and new associations form from the restoration of the old. As Penelope Davies says, “Long before they started writing histories, members of the Roman republican political elite used architecture to weave into the landscape a narrative of the city’s history and their own place within it.”\textsuperscript{88} Often, the more personal application became the primary focus. The grandeur of a commemorative structure could both reflect and construct the societal prestige of individuals, families, or factions. And perhaps nowhere is this competitive construction clearer than in the treatment of the dead and their importance to and use by the living. There is a special level of poignancy and, thus, a key means of influence and manipulation inherent in this relationship.

\textbf{Funerary \textit{monumenta} and the principle of visibility}

\textit{Monumenta} that have funerary associations—including tombs as well as other artefacts meant to encourage remembrance of the deceased—are an important category as they show commemoration in a sphere where the stakes are extremely high because a form of immortality and afterlife can be achieved, an aspect that has cross-over implications for other types of

\textsuperscript{87} See below on Cicero’s reference to the second Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as the \textit{monumentum} of Q. Catulus. Cf. Liv. 1.55.1-3 for Tarquin beginning construction on the first temple as a \textit{monumentum regni sui nominisque} and Cic. Mil. 37 for the Via Appia as \textit{monumentum sui nominis}.

\textsuperscript{88} Davies 2018: 477.
monumenta. Funerary monumenta deal with a particularly emotional and loaded form of commemoration, which permits—or was exploited to allow—embellishment of that act of commemoration. This embellishment could seek the longest possible scope of remembrance, one far longer than the life of the now deceased. These monumenta are designed to ensure and to protect remembrance of those who are gone but still are nevertheless understood to be of benefit to the larger society as carriers of tradition, which may include establishers and proponents of cultural institutions or models to live by for those that follow. Thus, while they allow the dead to continue to have a role in society, the primary targets of funerary structures are the living. Monumenta are meant to be seen, and, in their manifestation as roadside tombs, they need to be visible, even conspicuous, to be effective, as the Varronian passage above suggests (LL 6.49). Naturally, those making provisions for their eventual deaths or, in the case of unexpected deaths, their descendants would pick the most visible and well-trafficked places available for their

---

89 As Hope 2000: 109, says, “Once the corpse was disposed of a monument could mark and protect the site of the grave, whether it contained cremated or inhumed remains. Compared to the transient funeral, a tomb could preserve honour and achievements in a more tangible and lasting form. This was true of any building or statue funded by or dedicated to the individual; but only in the tomb was the monumental complemented by both the physical and spiritual presence of the dead.”

90 On general types of funerary monuments in the Roman world, see Hope 2009: 159-66; Carroll: 1-16, 86-125; Purcell 1987; Toynbee 1971: 101-244.

91 E.g., the tomb of a young girl characterizes itself as “lofty” (tumulum hunc excelsum, CIL 1.2.2161) in token of its creators’ awareness that it should be clearly seen. As Lattimore 1962: 229, says: “The point is, of course, that a conspicuous tomb or much-read epitaph ensures a sort of oblique immortality.” Cf. Liv. pref. 10: inlustri...monumento (discussed in Ch. 3). Cifani 2018 argues that many archaic monumenta, funerary monumenta included, still existed in the mid to late Republic, and, thereby, he extends the idea of visibility as a means of significance for monumenta. Their survival and their place of prominence is a sign of continued importance.

92 See, esp., Jaeger 1997: 17 n. 8, for the importance of visibility in this passage. For the visibility of monumenta more generally, see Mackay 2000: esp. 167 n. 21; Feldherr 1998.
tombs. Without an audience, they cannot fulfill their function of recalling the dead, commenting on death, and dictating societal values represented by the dead.

Rather than hiding away the remains of the dead in labyrinthine graveyards far removed from society or with restrictive design, many Romans chose a more integrated relationship with the dead. The residences of the dead often imitated those of the living in furnishing, functionality, and form to extend people’s impact beyond that of their mortal coil. This is not to say that the dead were fully integrated among the living or vice versa, but there was often a degree of interaction between the living and the dead that could obscure the boundaries.

---

93 Pliny the Elder well displays this notion at NH 34.24, where the Senate declares a statue for the legate Octavius, who was killed on duty, in “the most eyed spot” (oculatissimo loco). Though the statue does not actually mark a tomb, commemoration of the dead is the operative element, an element that permits the extension of funerary commemoration to far more public forms of commemoration (see below).

94 Flower 1996: 114, characterizes Roman funerals as “popular history” and says that “A family’s presentation of its past needed to be accessible as well as being impressive.”

95 See Hope 2009: 154-59; Carroll 2006: 1-3; Purcell 1987: esp. 32-33, 37-38; Toynbee 1971: 73-91, for the placement and organization of cemeteries in the Roman world—although Hope points out that the term coemeterium (from the Greek for “sleeping place”) is not used until the Christian periods (155).

96 See Toynbee 1971: 37-38, 277-81, for examples and discussion.

97 See Hope 2009; Purcell 1987; Toynbee 1971: 94-100, on productive gardens (cepotaphia) attached to tombs as well as kitchens, dining rooms, and other facilities to support feasts and other celebrations.

98 Though largely a development of the 2nd AD, the many “house” tombs that dotted the Roman landscape especially exemplify the continuing inclination to model the abodes of the dead on those of the living. On house tombs, see Wallace-Hadrill, 2008; Hope 1997; Purcell 1987; Toynbee 1971: 132-43. Imitations of homes as places for the dead seem to span Roman tradition. Some early Etruscan cinerary receptacles as well as some of the early 4th BC are in the shape of houses (Toynbee 1971: 15). Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 42, further writes: “what makes the tomb a house is not so much shape as the extension of the activities of lifetime, the commercial success, the popular benefactions, and the garden which ensured that the family could have regular festivals to celebrate around the tomb, the Parentalia, the Rosalia, and the Violaria that are specified in so many inscriptions. People, not walls, make a house as well as a city.” Hope 2009: 153, hints at the political ramifications of mirroring life in death: “[the] city of the dead paralleled the city of the living, with all its social distortions and aspirations.” Cf. ibid. 178.

99 As Carroll 2006: 1, says: “Tombs and cemeteries also were often located in close proximity to suburban houses and shops, and they sometimes encroached on each other. This too helped break down the boundaries between the dead and the living and to foster the intimate connection between the spaces inhabited by both.” See also Johanson 2011: “The city of Rome presented a paradoxical arrangement of the living and the dead. By rule of law the dead were buried outside the realm of the living. But in a city of shifting and fuzzy boundaries, the dead and symbols of death were everywhere. The living walked alongside the dead at funerals, bathed next to their tombs and walked or rode among them for miles whenever they traveled.”
funerary conventions and commemorative structures vary dramatically based on time period, location, and the status of the deceased, but certain elements remain active throughout the Republic and into the imperial period, including the noticeable appearance and placement of funeral memorials, their role in displaying as well as extending public honors, their potential for blending the boundaries between past and present as well as living and dead, and their general connection with socio-political agonism.¹⁰⁰

According to law, human remains were not allowed in publicly owned spaces.¹⁰¹ Only a few earned or were given the privilege to be buried within city limits, such as Publius Valerius Publicola, Gaius Fabricius Luscinus, and Aulus Postumius Tuburtus in Rome,¹⁰² or cremated in public spaces, such as Julius Caesar in the Forum or Clodius in the Curia Hostilia, an occurrence that showed the reason behind such restrictions as the building burned along with the remains.¹⁰³ But areas just outside cities were inundated with graves, especially along major roads leading in, which would allow for the most exposure.¹⁰⁴ Those who could afford it,¹⁰⁵ at least, tended to put

¹⁰⁰ For a creative reconstruction of what a Roman funeral looked like and the pervasive socio-political elements involved, see Johanson 2011: esp. 408-20.

¹⁰¹ Cic. de Leg. 2.58 cites the Twelve Tables as his source. Purcell 1987: 27, asserts that such laws were not strictly followed. But basic sanitary concerns must have ensured general observance of these restrictions, even if not in the case of extraordinary figures.

¹⁰² Cic. de Leg. 2.58; Plut. Pub. 23.3, Quaest. Rom. 79. Cf. Nepos’ account of Dion being buried at public expense in the most packed section of Syracuse and commemorated with a monumentum (itaque in urbe celeberrimo loco, elatus publice, sepulcri monumento donatus est, Dion 10.3).

¹⁰³ For Caesar, see App. BC 2.148; Dio 44.50. For Clodius, see Dio 40.49; P & A: 142-43.

¹⁰⁴ For the monumental nature of Rome’s approach-ways, see Patterson 2000: 96-101; Hope, 2009: esp. 155; “The roads that led to the town gates became a focal point for burials. Roman cemetery areas often had an elongated appearance, stretched out along the main access routes. The association between road and burial allowed maximum visibility and access to tombs for casual passers-by, travellers and more regular, purposeful visitors.” Wallace-Hadrill 2008: esp. 61, however, concludes that the visibility of roadside funeral monuments is an innovation of the late Republic as an extension of earlier, spectacular funeral practices. Cf. Purcell 1987.

¹⁰⁵ Less expensive burial locations were the columbaria (prominent in the early imperial period), catacombs (generally later, esp. associated with Jews and Christians), and puticuli (see Var. LL 5.25), anonymous mass graves
their dead in dialogue with the living and to maintain some role for them in the community, 106 both with representations of their ancestors in private space and the erection of funeral and other commemorative monumenta along well-trodden thoroughfares.

Funeral monumenta not only remind the observer of the deceased but keep them alive for the survivors in a very active way. 107 As with the Roman institution of funeral masks (imagines) 108 and other insignia of bygone relatives that played an active—if ceremonial—role in society, so sepulchers interact with the world around them. By renewing the actions of and interactions with the dead on a regular basis, survivors could better ensure remembrance, 109 but safeguards are needed to keep the boundaries between living and dead from blurring too much, safeguards that often were not observed in respect to monumentality.


106 As Assmann 2011: 19-20, says, “The rupture between yesterday and today, in which the choice to obliterate or preserve must be considered, is experienced in its most basic and, in a sense, primal form in death…We say that the dead will live on in the memory of others, as if this were some kind of natural prolongation of their life. In reality, though, this is an act of resuscitation performed by the desire of the group not to allow the dead to disappear but, with the aid of memory, to keep them as members of their community and to take them with them into their progressive present.” See also Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 47; Morris 1992: 9-10.

107 See Hope 2009: 39: “Tombs were most often about remembering the dead as they had been when alive rather than as dead and decaying entities or representing them as members of a new and separate afterlife. Monuments were about memories of the past…Leaving a lasting legacy and a good posthumous memory, or failing this, a simple name in an epitaph or a portrait on a tomb, staked a claim on the future. It was as if people aimed or hoped for some sort of immortality of memory in this world, perhaps to compensate for tenuous afterlife beliefs and the feared finality of death. These were, then, less preparations for the death of the self and more preparations for the perpetuation of memory.” The deceased, however, certainly enjoyed their legacy less than their successors.

108 Flower 1996 gives thorough analysis of the various aspects of the imagines. As Flower says, “They were the supreme status symbols of an aristocracy which based its claim to preeminence on prestige and on a heritage of merit rather than on money. The imagines fulfilled their role at a funeral by offering an illustration of a man’s greatness and his place in the community and in history. They were intimately linked to the image of ancestral frugality, rustic virtues, and public service which the families of the Roman elite tried to project” (121).

109 For the continued presence of deceased relatives or friends, see Hope 2009: 98-102, 154; Flower 1996: passim.
The deceased must be kept familiar but still separate from the living to limit any religious or physical pollution, but the pervasive impact of remembrance also needs to be kept in check, particularly in its deployment for socio-political aggrandizement. The effect of funerary commemoration could be quite extreme, and *monumenta* recalling the dead could be extremely poignant to survivors. In reference to Zeno the Stoic, Cicero discusses the “freshness” of a memory of a lost loved one as having a negative impact on the living.\(^{111}\) He gives the example of Artemisia II: *Mausoli Cariae regis uxor, quae nobile illud Halicarnassi fecit sepulcrum, quam diu vixit, vixit in luctu, eodemque etiam confecta contabuit. Huic erat illa opinio cotidie recens, quae tum denique non appellantur recens, cum vetustate exaruit* (“the wife of king Mausolus of Caria, who built that well-known tomb at Halicarnassus, as long as she lived, lived in grief and wasted away, done in by the very sight of that tomb. For her, that mental state was daily fresh, which is only then not called fresh when it has vanished with time,” *Tusc.* 3.75).\(^{112}\) Far more than ensuring basic remembrance, this structure rather disallows the healing benefits of forgetting and letting painful or overwhelming memories fade. Though the case here is a very personal one, the

\(^{110}\) For separation of the dead from the living, see Hope 2009: 154; Purcell 1987: 41.

\(^{111}\) *Additur ad hanc definitionem a Zenone recte, ut illa opinio praesentis mali sit recens; hoc autem verbum sic interpretantur, ut non tantum illud recens esse velint, quod paullo ante acciderit, sed, quam diu in illo opinato malo vis quaedam insit, ut vigeat et habet quandam viriditatem, tam diu appelletur recens* (“an addition is made to this definition, properly, that this notion of present evil is a fresh one. This word, however, is so interpreted that it means not only fresh, in that it happened a little before, but also that, as long as there is any power in that imagined evil so that it flourishes and has a certain ‘greenness,’ so it is called fresh,” *Tusc.* 3.75).

\(^{112}\) Cf. Gell. *NA* 10.18.4-5: *molita quoque est ingenti impetu operis conservandae mariti memoriae sepulcrum illud memoratissimum dignatumque numerari inter septem omnium terrarum spectacula. Id monumentum Artemisia cum dis manibus sacrum Mausoli dicaret, “agona,” id est certamen laudibus eius dicundis, facit pontique praemia pecuniae aliarumque rerum bonarum amplissima* (“to preserve the memory of her husband, [Artemisia] also built, at the cost of enormous labor, that most memorable tomb, worthy to be counted among the seven wonders of the world. When Artemisia dedicated this *monumentum* as sacred to the divine shades of Mausolus with an ‘agon,’ that is, a contest of speaking his praises, she set up very lavish prizes of money and other goods”). For a poetic account that involves a physical memorial of sorts, see Ov. *Met.* 15.547-51, where the nymph Egeria is transformed into a spring and a stream on account of her unending grief and weeping for her deceased husband Numa. Here the transformed Egeria is the reminder, but the freshness of grief is certainly operative.
sentiment is representative of the intended effects of *monumenta* on a wider and more public level too.

At times, the impact of reviving and reintegrating the dead was felt by the authorities to be detrimental on such a scale, something that can be seen in the enactment of legislation banning conspicuous—and potentially disruptive—public forms of mourning and commemoration.\(^{113}\) During his discussion of an ideal constitution, Cicero in *de Legibus* mentions sumptuary laws extending back to the Twelve Tables that range from restrictions on expenditure at funerals to prevention of too much self-inflicted physical harm for women at funerals to the banning of saving bones to have funerals at later times (2.59-60).\(^{114}\) Practical concerns such as limiting insalubrious conditions brought on by putrefaction or preventing disorder stemming from public display that had gotten out of hand were operative in such restrictions, but a further concern was to curtail aristocratic competition and self-glorification.\(^{115}\) In practice, however, people constantly attempted to push or bypass such legislation.

In one such expression, graves not only marked the location of remains but spoke to observers, both in a symbolic sense and a literal one, through inscriptions.\(^{116}\) The potential of inscriptions to function in a larger sense as themselves *monumenta* is discussed in Ch. 3, but

---

\(^{113}\) By the time of the jurist Salvius Iulianus (mid to late 2\(^{nd}\) AD), funerary *monumenta* were banned from the public roads that had been such prominent venues for conspicuous display during the Republic: *nemini licet in via publica monumentum exstruere* (“it is permitted to no one to build a *monumentum* on a public way,” Dig. 43.7.2).

\(^{114}\) For discussion of the Roman legal history on restricting funerary display, see Hope 2009: 122-26, 152; Corbeill 2004: 75-77; Flower 1996: 115-21; Toynbee 1971: 54, 293 nn. 199-201.

\(^{115}\) See Hope 2009: 126, 153-54, 163-66; Hope 2000; Patterson 2000: esp. 98: “Just as the houses, temples and basilicas within the city reflected the rivalries of the aristocracy, so did the tombs and temples outside it”; Flower 1996: *passim*. Purcell 1987 argues that notions of display or *philotimia* in tomb-building did not emerge at Rome until the late 4\(^{th}\) BC and derived from Hellenistic aristocratic sepulchers. Cf. Morris 1992: 43-44. The idea of competitive commemoration at Rome, however, appears in other venues than tomb-building, and the underlying drive for such competition is so engrained in the Republican mindset that it cannot be credited solely to Hellenistic influences.

\(^{116}\) For general discussion of the types of messages conveyed on and by graves, see Carroll 2006: 126-50.
grave inscription can also function more simply to add a layer of articulation to funerary memorials; that is, inscription brought the funerary *monumentum*’s further potential to fruition: the inscription would not only speak of a connection between the deceased and the living but would tell who the deceased was and what worthy things they did for family and state. Furthermore, they would speak to the continuing importance of that family for the Roman people. With the passage of time and neglect of transmission, even family could forget the individual being commemorated, a point that appears in a letter of Cicero to Atticus, in which Cicero mentions his chastisement of someone for not recognizing the *imago* of his own great-grandfather (*Att*. 6.1.1; cf. 17-18).

But an inscription can also communicate with those completely unacquainted with the deceased and disseminate their impact to wider audiences. A common grave inscription directly addresses the passerby, generally referred to as “stranger” (*hospes*), and enjoins them to stop and read,117 which would lose point if the plot were only noticed by caretakers or family members. Thus, even private burials served a public function,118 which carries over to other forms of *monumenta*.

The competition that is ingrained in the Roman world from its inception has considerable ramifications for the social reception of funerary *monumenta*, particularly in the mingling

---

117 E.g., *CIL* 1.2.1209, 1.2.1210, 1.2.1211, 1.2.1212, 1.2.1702, 1.2.1732, 1.2.1837, 1.2.1930, 1.2.2161, 1.2.2172, 2.1821, etc. Cf. Prop. 4.1; Hutchinson 2006: 62, for a poetic play on this trope in which the *hospes* is enjoined to view the features of Rome before the foundation of the city. Cf. Ov. *Trist.* 3.3.71, for a similar injunction for the traveler to gaze upon Ovid’s tomb. See Hope 2009: 37-39, 115; Häusle 1980: 13-28; Lattimore 1962: 126, 230-37, for discussion of the “speaking” grave. Cf. ibid. 217-20.

118 Burial at public cost carried heavy commemorative value for individuals and their families as well as the larger community. See, e.g., the emphasis on public burial in an epitaph found on a tomb at Rome: *C. Poplicio L. f. Bibulo aed. pl. honoris | virtutisque caussa senatus | consulto populiique iussu locus | monumento quo ipse postereique | eius inferrentur publice datus est* (“to Gaius Poplicius Bibulus, son of Lucius and aedile of the plebs, due to his honor and excellence, a plot was given at public cost to be a *monumentum* where he and his successors might be conveyed,” *CIL* 1.2.834).
between funerary *monumenta* proper and other forms of commemoration. The Roman drive for competition was extensive and even pervasive as it trickled down from the aristocracy to the rest of society in conspicuous consumption.\(^{119}\) Such seemingly paltry physical characteristics as gait and facial expression were venues for public competition.\(^{120}\) Even with quotidian attire, the complicated folding and arrangement of the toga speaks to Roman emphasis on conspicuous display over practicality or comfort.\(^{121}\) How Romans carried themselves in their day-to-day life was a considerable socio-political focus and could express and secure an individual’s position in society.

But how people were remembered after death held ongoing importance for the societal role of their families and social groups, particularly in the continued visibility of the dead in some form as a mechanism for the perpetuation of what they represent and as a source of authority for those that continue their initiatives.\(^{122}\) Moreover, this remembrance and perpetuation of social status was negotiable, particularly through the construction of tombs,

\(^{119}\) Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 63, notes that grave inscription was important for all classes rather than just the rich: “We accept far too easily the idea that naming was a privilege for the master of the house and his close family; it is the use of incised marble that is the privilege.” Cf. Purcell 1987.


\(^{121}\) For the spectacle aspect and “rhetoric” of clothing in Roman society, see Vout 1996. See also Wilson 1924: esp. 20: “the toga is probably the earliest distinctively racial garment, that is, the earliest garment which was both a necessary article in the wardrobe, and at the same time a badge of citizenship, or membership in a political organization. The privilege of wearing it, its color and decoration were prescribed by law as well as by custom. It was doubtless these facts which account for the long survival of the toga, despite its inconvenient form.” For a further level of competitive dress, Cassius Dio reports that Augustus forbade any but senatorial magistrates to wear purple because private individuals were wearing such garments (τὴν τε ἐσθήτα τὴν ἁλουργῆ μηδένα ἄλλον ἔξο τῶν βουλευτῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ὄντων ἐνδύσασθαι ἐκέλευσεν· ἥδη γὰρ τινες καὶ τῶν τυχόντων αὐτῆ ἐχρώντο, 49.16.1), seemingly in an attempt to promote their social prestige. For Augustus’ revival of the toga and other garments in a particular form, see Zanker 1988: 162-66. Zanker concludes: “The symbolic meaning of the garment became more important than its functional aspect or outward appearance” (163).

\(^{122}\) E.g., at Liv. 25.31.10, following the taking of Syracuse and the accidental killing of Archimedes, Marcellus provides for his burial (*sepulturae...curam*) so that the memory of his name may provide honor and protection for his family (*honori praesidioque nomen ac memoriam eius fuisse*). The idea of a tomb offering protection for the family of the deceased is a significant one, which could be pushed to provide more active and pervasive forms of influence.
though ambitious figures certainly did not stop with funerary commemoration. The very landscape of Rome served as a pageant for competition with its eponymous roads, aqueducts, porticoes, statues, and so on. But that instinct to compete created confusing and conflicting scenes as *monumenta* were superseded by newer, grander, or more conspicuous ones. Thus, the motivation for a more lasting form of commemoration—one less vulnerable to reinterpretation—is easy to discern, and the particular veneration attached to funerary *monumenta* fill such a role.

Though funerary *monumenta* still have limits to their longevity, they offer a greater degree of stability in so far as Roman society greatly valued its predecessors and the *mos maiorum*. Living people who were engaged in monumental competition could be swayed, discredited, intimidated, or even killed, but the legacy and commemoration of the dead was more difficult to erase or diminish. In this sense, death can ensure more stability than life as the recollection of the dead is, as it were, set in stone. Although memory of the dead is highly malleable, potential agents of such manipulation are restricted. Families have significant control in the situation as direct successors to the dead, so it is largely their initiatives that the dead and their commemoration support.

But each family had their own past that could be used as a socio-political tool, whether actually glorious or simply made to look that way. In this process, *monumenta* constructed

---


124 There is also the concern that someone will simply come off as petty and underhanded in attacking another who is no longer alive to defend themselves in person. See, e.g., Plin. *NH praef.*, 31: *nec Plancus ineptide, cum dicetur Asinius Pollio orationes in eum parare quae ab ipso aut liberis post mortem Planci edentur, ne respondere posset, ‘cum mortuis non nisi larvas luctari.’ quo dicto sic repercussit illas, ut apud eruditos nihil impudentius iudicetur* (“Plancus put it cleverly in dealing with Asinius Pollio, when [the latter] was reported to have arranged speeches against him to be published by him or his heirs after the death of Plancus so that he not be able to reply. [Plancus said] ‘only spirits quarrel with the dead.’ By thus speaking, he undermined those speeches so much that nothing is considered more shameless by educated people.”). Yet, the same concern does not hold for someone claiming the authority and support of the dead for their own initiatives.

125 The grandeur of a tomb could posthumously elevate the prestige of a person. See, e.g., the epigram possibly of Varro of Atax: *marmoreo Licinus tumulo iacet, at Cato parvo, / Pompeius nullo: credimus esse deos?* (‘Licinus lies
with the particular form of euphemism expected in contexts of death and mourning become confused with more general forms of commemoration.\textsuperscript{126} The notion of not speaking ill of the dead becomes a vehicle by which the living could also benefit by transferring traits of particularly funerary monumentality to that of socio-political agonism on a more pervasive scale.\textsuperscript{127} Livy notes and objects to this mingling of \textit{monumenta} in a statement that is, I argue, more programmatic for the \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} as a commentary on abuses that stem from socio-political competition than has previously been appreciated (8.40.4-5, discussed in Ch. 4).

\textbf{Time, \textit{monumenta}, and the role of posterity}

Another important element associated with \textit{monumenta} is time and the various aspects that it takes in relation to memorials, that is, the different connections with past, present, and future. In particular, the term \textit{posteritas} or cognate terms that designate future descendants often appears in passages alongside the term \textit{monumenta}.\textsuperscript{128} Closely connected to the temporal aspects in a marble tomb, but Cato in a small one, and Pompey in none at all; do we trust that there are gods?" F24a B = \textit{Schol. ad Pers. 2.36}. For the possible identity of this Licinus, see Wiseman 1987: 25-26. One of the possibilities is that he was a freedman and hairdresser of Augustus.

\textsuperscript{126} Concerning the \textit{imagines} of prominent figures, Flower 2009: 71, says: “The rituals of memory surrounding the wax masks of politicians were a vital repository of information about the past, albeit presented in a eulogistic light of celebration and political competition in the present.”

\textsuperscript{127} See Plin. \textit{NH} 34.17 on the practice of making statues, esp. of individuals: \textit{expta deinde res est a toto orbe terrarum humanissima ambitione, et in omnium municipiorum foris statuae ornamentum esse coepere propagarique memoria hominum et honores legendi aeo hasibus inscribi, ne in sepulcris tantum legerentur. mox forum et in domibus privatis factum atque in atriis: honos clientium instituit sic colere patronos (“then, from a most human form of rivalry, the practice was taken up by the whole world, statuary began to decorate the public spaces of all towns, human memory was spread, and honors were sculpted on the bases of statues to be read for all time, rather than just reading them on tombs. Soon, a ‘public space’ was set up in private residents and atria: the respect given by clients established the veneration of patrons in this way”). See also Chaplin 2000: 14-15, on the larger social impact of this passage and similar ones.

\textsuperscript{128} E.g., Cic. \textit{Verr.} 2.4.82 (\textit{monumenta…non solum suis posteris verum etiam omnibus viris fortibus et bonis civibus}), 2.4.98 (\textit{posteris monumenta religiosa}), Sest. 102 (\textit{monumentis annalium mandantur, posteritati propagantur}), Mil. 18, Phil. 5.17 (\textit{gravissimis ignominii monumentisque huius ordinis ad posteritatis memoriam}), 12.12, 14.38 (\textit{ad memoriam posteritatis sempiternam}), ad Brut. 1.14.9, ad Fam. 5.12.1; Hor. C. 3.30.7 (\textit{postera}, discussed below); Liv. 1.12.6 (\textit{posteris}), 36.5 (\textit{ad posteros}); Curt. 9.3.19 (\textit{monumentum…posteritati fallax miraculum}); Quint. \textit{Inst.} 3.7.18, 12.2.31, 12.10.49, 12.11.4, esp. \textit{posteris}; Plin. \textit{Epist.} 7.29; Tac. \textit{Ann.} 3.72. See also the Florentinus passage above (\textit{Dig.} 11.7.42, \textit{in posterum}). The inscriptional record also pairs \textit{monumentum} with
are the registers of reminder, warning, and exhortation that are inherent in the term *monumentum* (see above), which correspond, to various degrees, with the different aspects of time: a reminder maintains the past; a warning keeps the present in check; and an exhortation aims the present’s gaze and motion toward the future. Of course, as with other constituents of *monumentum*, temporal associations are never monolithic or simple: past can blend with present, and original meanings can be lost; present interprets past through its own lens; and future, from the perspective of both a creator and a viewer of a *monumentum*, must remain a construct imagined subjectively and substantially controlled by dominant motivators of the current generation. A *monumentum* by nature allows for such multivalence and flexibility, but there is a careful balance to be maintained between these different aspects of time and registers of meaning. Otherwise, the *monumentum* runs the risk of being a piece of self-promotion rather than a preserver of something worthy of remembrance, especially when too much bias and influence from the present is exerted.

For the remembrance of a person, event, or custom to attain any form of durability, the present must provide a secure, often tangible, means of continuity between its temporal point of origin and the time that follows that moment, that is, posterity on a general level. And preservation requires constant rehearsal of remembrance by a particular application of *memoria*. *Monumenta* are, in essence, constructs that create a nexus—even a vortex—of time, but certain

---

129 For a perspective stretching from ancient to modern, see Le Goff 1992: 1-19, for the various forms of blending and interaction between these three time registers on the developmental, linguistic, myth/ritual, and collective level.

130 See Woolf 1996: 25: “monuments do imply a sense of posterity, of viewers and readers to come, whose progress through the public spaces or along the public roads where monuments were often set up, might be arrested, and who might then pause to read, and to remember.” For reaching and connecting to *posteritas* through history-writing, see Plin. *Ep.* 5.8 and Woodman 2012: 231.
aspects of time can be privileged based on design and intention. As Mary Jaeger says, “The word 
monumentum...denotes a reminder, but one that also exhorts. Present temporally as well as
spatially, Janus-like in pointing back to the past and forward into the future, from the viewer’s
perspective monumenta link together all of time.”¹³¹ But, since monumenta can be a form of
competitive display, this temporal link can be misapplied or distorted.

When a monumentum is constructed while its subject is still living—especially if the
subject is also the initiator—the form of commemoration may emphasize the pervasiveness of a
present figure rather than ensure the remembrance of an absent one, which weights the
contemporary aspect over others.¹³² Also, commemoration on a public scale but focused heavily
on one’s personal family history can result in simple nostalgia or active political maneuvering.
Thus, ideally, the intention of a monumentum must carefully take into consideration and balance
its temporal reference points. From the point of view of the one who erects a monumentum, the
ultimate outlook should be on the future and posterity and should seek to provide benefit for its
future audience from the experience gained from past events more than it provides contemporary
glorification.¹³³

In the Nonius passage above (47 L), Cicero certainly draws attention to the focus of
monumenta on the future more than the present and memoria as a means of access to that end (ad

¹³¹ Jaeger 1997: 17. See further ibid., esp. 4-5, 10, 17-18, where Jaeger focuses particularly on space—both physical
and textual—and monumentality. Cf. Miles 1995: esp. 17-18, who discusses the reliability, or lack thereof, of the
link between past and present established through monumenta.

¹³² The colossal statue of Nero as part of his Domus Aurea, placed on the top of the Velia, exemplifies the notion of
contemporary magnification over the establishment of cultural continuity in the future (Suet. Nero 31; Plin. NH
34.45; cf. Cic. Rep. 2.53; Liv. 2.7; DH Ant. 5.19; Plut. Popl. 10, for P. Valerius Publicola cancelling his plans to
build a house on the Velia because of the misgivings of the people over possible monarchical ambitions). Further,
the statue shows the potential for later individuals to recast such monumenta for their own benefit: Domitian and
Commodus may have changed the head to portraits of themselves. See P & A 130-31.

¹³³ See Kattago 2015: esp. 190: “The past is understood as the space of experience and the future as the horizon of
expectation.”
sentiment that he repeats elsewhere. For instance, in a mock legal quandary over whether it is right to set up a memorial commemorating a defeat of Greeks by other Greeks, Cicero gives point and counterpoint: *ratio est:* ‘*eam enim ex bello gloriam virtute peperimus,* ut eius aeterna *insignia posteris nostris relinquere vellemus,*’ *infirmatio est:* ‘*at tamen aeternum inimicitarum monumentum Graios de Graiis statuere non oportet*’ (“the grounds are: ‘by our excellence, we won this glory in war with the result that we wish to pass down a lasting memorial of it to our descendants.’” The counter-argument is: ‘Still it is not right for Greeks to set up a permanent memorial of their animosities with other Greeks’,” *Inv.* 2.70). Thus, the *monumentum* is notionally permanent (*aeterna . . . aeternum*; see below) and directed toward one’s descendants, which, in the perspective of the counter-argument as Cicero has it, is precisely what makes it bad. Though not exactly a civil war, the circumstances of the conflict being between Greeks potentially establishes a dangerous precedent for the future. The eternality of the memorial is here precisely what is problematic: it will rehearse and keep fresh the conflict for subsequent generations, at least, under the premise of the counter-argument. The benefit provided by such a *monumentum* is very one-sided and could be a detractor to, for instance, future alliances or other agreements. According to the initial grounds, however, the purpose is the positive preservation of...
excellence (virtute) and glory (gloriam) that was thereby earned. Thus, in other cases such
cross-generational transmission can be a good thing. The issue shifts radically based on
perspective of reception and intention of initial establishment.

Over thirty years later and in a far more philosophical strain, Cicero, now in the Tusculan
Disputations, in a discussion on nature and divinity, pushes the point about posterity:

maximum vero argumentum est naturam ipsam de immortalitate animorum
tacitam iudicare, quod omnibus curae sunt et maximae quidem, quae post mortem
futura sint. “serit arbores, quae alteri saeclo prosint,” ut ait Statius in
Synepehis, quid spectans nisi etiam postera saecula ad se pertinere? Ergo
arbores seret diligens agricola, quaram aspiciet bacam ipse numquam; vir magnus
leges, instituta, rem publicam non seret? Quid procreatio liberorum, quid
propagatio nominis, quid adoptiones filiorum, quid testamentorum diligentia,
quid ipsa sepulcrorum monumenta, elogia significant nisi nos futura etiam
cogitare? (Tusc. Disp. 1.31)

Nature itself makes its own silent proclamation on the immortality of souls, in that
everyone has anxieties, and indeed very serious ones, about what will happen
after death. “He will plant trees that will benefit another generation,” as Statius
says in the Synepebi; what is he contemplating if not that future generations also
are relevant to him? Thus, the conscientious farmer will plant trees, though he
will never see a berry from them himself. Will not the great man plant laws,
institutions, and government? What does the begetting of children, the
perpetuation of a name, the adoption of sons, the care over wills, the very
monumenta of tombs, and epitaphs mean, if not that we also take thought for the
future?

Certainly, Cicero’s conception is idealized here. It ignores such things as personal ambition and
public delight that would be fed by the construction of celebratory structures or by the public
reading of eulogies. It also does not factor in decay, but, in particular with the repetition of

\[137\] Cf. Augustus’ claim of handing down positive models for imitation with posterity as the target audience
(multarum rer[um] exempla imi- | tanda post[eris] tradidi], RG 8.5). Cf. Liv. praeef. 10, where the reader plays an
active role in determining the value of exempla (found in the words tibi, tuae, capias, and vites; discussed in Ch. 3)
rather than having personal models of behavior imposed as valuable, as with Augustus’.

\[138\] I.e., Caecilius Statius, the drama writer of the late 1st-early 2nd BC, praised by Volcacius Sedigitus c. 100 BC as the
futura, it does focus clearly on the nature of monumenta as enduring rather than intended for temporary and contemporary purposes.

In the process, posterity is the material beneficiary. Like the conscientious farmer (diligens agricola), the one who initiates the process does not reap instant benefits. But the initiator receives the boon of commemoration and, thereby, a form of immortality through the interaction and continuity between past, present, and future. All parties receive their respective perquisites. By transmitting something of value to posterity—whether an orchard, a constitution, a bequest, or a funeral plot—and by placing posterity in their debt, the initiator earns the privilege of remembrance. Thus, the immortality of inheritance in its various forms is established through the reciprocal connection of different time registers.

Cicero’s outlook for monumenta seems to find a partial echo in Livy: he too emphasizes the importance of monumenta for posterity. For example, in Livy’s narrative on Romulus and Rome’s early interactions with its neighbors, such a monumentum is mentioned. The Sabines, having taken the Citadel, are driving Romulus’ troops back, so he promises a dedication to stem the flow of battle and turn back the enemy: hic ego tibi templum Statori Iovi, quod monumentum sit posteris tua presenti ope servatam urbem esse, voveo (“here I vow a temple to you, Jupiter Stator, to be a memorial for future generations that, by your current aid, the city was saved,” 1.12.6). Thus, the request is for the present and the action that is necessary in the moment, but the potential monumentum looks firmly to the future and permanence of recollection. The event

139 Cf. Livy’s concern for contemporaneous authorities to pass the information along to posterity concerning Scipio Africanus’ command in Africa: id quibus virtutibus inducti ita iudicarint, sicut traditum a proximis memoriae temporum illo rum scriptoribus libens posteris traderem, ita meas opiniones conjectando rem vetustate obrutam non interponam (“I would freely pass on to posterity by what excellence [the Senate] was induced to make this decision, if it had been recorded by authors closest to the recollection of those times, but I will not impose my opinion by conjecturing on matters covered by antiquity,” 29.14.9). Without the close point of contact between the original information and the reporting of it, the notion provides less value to the future.
commemorated is important for the city (urbem), not one of personal glorification: by vowing the temple, Romulus is acknowledging rather than creating a debt for posterity. And the recipient of commemoration is a god whose assistance is marked both by the more traditional monumentum of a temple and the cult title—as well as the cult to go with it—of Stator, which is a sort of monumentum in its own right in so far as names and epithets on their own become reminders of deeds connected with the names.¹⁴⁰

Livy again shows the importance of a view toward the future with monumenta in his account of the augur Attus Navius. When war again arises with the Sabines, Tarquinius Priscus decides to enroll new centuries to bolster his ranks of cavalry, but Attus recalls traditional observances and determines that this increase cannot be done unless the bird signs are propitious (1.36.2-3). Irritated with this determination, Tarquin attempts to trap the augur with a ploy wherein he would have to cut a whetstone with a razor. Attus has no trouble in doing so: tum illum haud cunctanter discidisse cotem ferunt. Statua Atti capite velato, quo in loco res acta est, in comitio in gradibus ipsis ad laevam curiae fuit; cotem quoque eodem loco sitam fuisse memorant, ut esset ad posteros miraculi eius monumentum (“then they say that the razor cut it with no resistance. A statue of Attus with his head veiled was at the left of the senate-house in the comitium on the steps themselves where the deed was done. They report that the whetstone

¹⁴⁰ E.g., the name Camillus is a keyword for the re-founding of Rome after the Gallic sack; the epithet Publicola for P. Valerius stands for his deference to the people in not constructing a house on the Velia. For the connection of name and exemplum, see Gotter 2009: esp. 116: “the essence of the exemplum is the inextricable connection between deed and name, which tightens through repetition so that mentioning the name practically recalls the memorable deed itself. The name of the protagonist becomes a code word for specific normative qualities and behaviors.” Cf. Hölkeskamp 1996: 310-15, esp. 311: “diese Namen bilden einen geradezu kanonischen Kernbestand von Chiffren und Symbolen für eine glorreiche Vergangenheit.”
also was placed in the same place to be a *monumentum* of this wonder for posterity,” 1.36.4-5).\textsuperscript{141}

Here a *monumentum* is particularly necessary as support for remembrance because of the miraculous nature of the commemorated event. The statue fits the bill for a *monumentum*, but it is the whetstone that is specifically termed one, which seems significant.\textsuperscript{142} In this case, it is the thwarting of the king’s self-aggrandizement at the expense of traditional religion that warrants remembrance. The statue runs the risk of commemorating and glorifying the individual, whereas the whetstone commemorates the event and the religious scruple that it represents. Thus, what is preserved for posterity is Roman observance of augury in face of tyranny, not one man’s defiance of a king.\textsuperscript{143} An instance of excellence in the past is preserved; a warning against personal ambition is kept for the present; and encouragement is provided for the future to maintain these memories.

The inclination to control posterity’s interpretation of and narrative surrounding a *monumentum* is not a surprising one, especially in a setting of uncertainty and upheaval, as with the tumultuous 1\textsuperscript{st} BC.\textsuperscript{144} But a careful balance and level of restraint is necessary for the creator. On one level, the instinct of control is a good one as it ensures that the original intention for the *monumentum* is not lost or misinterpreted, which can happen all too easily in changing social and physical environments. Further, providing a stable interpretation can limit the possibility of

\textsuperscript{141} Cf. Cic. *de Div.* 1.32-34, who reports, indirectly, that the whetstone and razor were buried and stone curbing (*puteal*) was placed over them to mark the spot.

\textsuperscript{142} It is also notable that the tense of the verbs (*fuit, fuisse*) indicates that the memorials no longer existed in Livy’s time, a point that will be discussed below. See Ogilvie 151.

\textsuperscript{143} See, however, Pliny the Elder’s speculation that the statue of Attus was actually set up by Tarquin (*NH* 37.29). See also DH 3.71.5, where Attus instructs Tarquin himself to cut the whetstone with the razor.

\textsuperscript{144} As Woolf 1996: 34, says, “the desire to fix the past in stone for posterity was an understandable response to the uncertainty of the present.”
adaptation and appropriation by later individuals. On the other hand, if the original intention is one of personal or familial advancement over more collective good, the *monumentum* fails in preserving something worthy and can rather create an impression of worth in something that may not deserve it.

To return to Cicero’s assessment (*Tusc. Disp.* 1.31), there is certainly a degree of political maneuvering and a bid for control inherent in the idea of inheritance. The immortality available therein can easily lead to selfish initiatives. But, so long as the commemorative focus of one of the three time-registers does not gain dominance over the others—specifically the present at the expense of the past or future—and the focus of the human benefit available from a given *monumentum* is kept on a constantly receding posterity, a *monumentum* can accomplish something greater than temporary and restricted goals. This point will be important in distinguishing Livy’s goal for his work from other *monumenta*, written and material (discussed in Ch. 3).

**The eternality of monumenta and their guarantee of reputation**

A point that is closely connected with the outlook of *monumenta* toward posterity is the need for their physical continuance so that they can basically stand in for something that no longer exists. It is through their persistence that *monumenta* attempt to keep their commemorated referent alive and active. *Monumenta* certainly provide a more lasting memorial for important events, which in themselves are restricted to a certain time and, thereby, are inherently fleeting. But when the *monumentum* itself disappears by the same means that the object of
commemoration initially did—that is, degeneration or destruction—the effectiveness of their ability to extend life, as it were, is in doubt.\textsuperscript{145}

In effect, the physical \textit{monumentum} itself develops a need for further reminders to preserve it. Memory in the form of tradition plays an important role in this maintenance as stories carry a memorial function of their own. Even after their disappearance, structures that began as physical \textit{monumenta} can maintain a disembodied memorial power.\textsuperscript{146} This power is particularly important for those \textit{monumenta} that are a significant focus of Livy’s treatment of early Rome, that is, the oldest ones that have vanished with time. The disembodied persistence of \textit{monumenta} is simply an extension of the ideal for their physical endurance (discussed in Ch. 2). For this reason, the notional durability of physical \textit{monumenta} warrants discussion before treatment of their disembodied force. In particular, the reality of attrition stands as a counter to the ideal of durability, which in turn requires its own counter through abstraction.

\textit{Monumenta} are certainly subject to the destructive force of natural disasters, wars, and other catastrophic events,\textsuperscript{147} but they also face the much more persistent threat of time and more quotidian elements. The conspicuous placement that is so important in ensuring the widest exposure of a \textit{monumentum} can also expose it to increased degeneration and set a limit to its existence, as is true of placement on the peak of a hill, where the \textit{monumentum} faces the full

\textsuperscript{145} See Woolf 1996: esp. 27: “The eternity of monuments guaranteed not lasting things, but rather momentary events of lasting significance.”

\textsuperscript{146} In some cases, the origin or initial circumstances surrounding \textit{monumenta} can also be lost, though the memorial itself continues to exist. For a poetic instance, see Ov. \textit{Fast.} 4.679-712, which provides an etiology for the custom of setting a fox on fire and letting it loose during the Games of Ceres. Ovid explains that the original event fell out of memory but that reminders of it remain in the form of the continued practice with the foxes (\textit{factum abiit; monumenta manent}, 709).

\textsuperscript{147} E.g., Hor. \textit{C.} 1.2, esp. 13-16: \textit{vidimus flavum Tiberim retortis / liitore Etrusco violenter undis / ire deiectum monumenta regis / templaque Vestae} (“we have seen the sandy Tiber, with its waves wrenched forcefully from the Etruscan shore, go to cast down the \textit{monumenta} of the king and the Temple of Vesta”).
onslaught of sun, wind, and rain. Regardless of the material with which a particular monumentum is constructed, no physical medium is immortal. Lucretius gives several pointed examples of such impermanence and, thus, offers a good starting point. His pointedly Epicurean agenda surely causes him to push the idea of the relevance of impermanence to its extreme. But he provides observations on the temporary nature of monumenta and the effects of time on them that are particularly apt for the discussion here. He writes:

Denique non lapides quoque vinci cernis ab aevo,
non altas turris ruere et putrescere saxa,
non delubra deum simulacraque fessa fatisci,
nec sanctum numen fati protollere finis
posse neque adversus naturae foedera niti?
denique non monumenta virum dilapsa videmus,
†quaerere proporro sibi sene senescere credas,†
non ruere avolsos silices a montibus altis
nec validas aevi vires perferre patique
finiti? neque enim caderent avolsa repente,
ex infinito quae tempore pertolerassent
omnia tormenta aetatis privata fragore. (5.306-17)

Do you not also see that stone is overcome by time,
that high towers collapse and rock crumbles,
that temples of the gods and their likenesses crack with wear,
that their sacred divinity cannot extend beyond their fated end
or struggle against the pacts of nature?
Do we not see the monumenta of men collapse,

... or boulders, torn from high mountains, tumble down
and not endure and last the powerful force of an age,
even a limited one? They would not fall, suddenly torn away,
if, from age unbounded, they had endured

---

148 MSS OQ read quaerere proporro, sibi cumque senescere credas, which offers no better sense than the text above. West 1965: 499, conjectures quae fore in aeternum nec posse senescere credas. The inclusion of aeternum would be interesting for the current discussion, but it is by no means secure. Woodman 2012: 94-95, suggests that the corrupted content makes a comparison between the decay of monuments and the death of humans, which makes as much sense as anything.

149 Fowler 2000: 193, begins a discussion of Roman monuments with an epigram of the 4th century poet Ausonius (Epigr. 37 Green = Epitaphia Heroum 32 Peiper, Prete). Ausonius’ verbal and conceptual parallels with Lucretius are striking, esp.: monumenta fatiscunt, / mors etiam saxis nominibusque venit (“monumenta crack, death comes also to stones and names”). Cf. further Lucr. 3.78: intereunt partim statuarum et nominis ergo (“some die for statues and a name”), and 3.458: aevo fessa fatisci.
all the vicissitudes of time, free of splitting.

Thus, everything has a limited duration (fati...finis) as dictated by the elements (naturae foedera).\(^{150}\) Even the artifices of divinity are not safe from this attrition, as with temples and simulacra. Here Lucretius shows that a grand event such as war or natural disaster is not required for monumenta to come to an end;\(^{151}\) destruction can come from much more mundane sources.

Following several lines on the perishability of earth and sky, Lucretius then brings the notion of eternality, or rather the lack of it, into the equation:

\[
\text{Praeterea si nulla fuit genitalis origo} \\
\text{terrarum et caeli semperque aeterna fuere,} \\
\text{cur supera bellum Thebanum et funera Troiae} \\
\text{non alias alii quoque res cecinere poetae?} \\
\text{quo tot facta virum totiens cecidere neque usquam} \\
\text{aeternis famae}^{152} \text{monimentis insita florent? (5.324-29)}
\]

Furthermore, if there was no initial creation of the earth and sky, and they were always there eternally, why have other poets not also sung about other events beyond the Theban war and the deaths at Troy? Why have so many deeds of men so often fallen away and nowhere flourish, though they are grafted on eternal monumenta of fame?

The connection of poetry and eternality will be discussed in Ch. 2, but the doubtfulness of eternality reflects on more tangible items. If even the earth and sky are not everlasting, human structures have no hope of the eternal ideal.

\(^{150}\) Ctr. Stat. Silv. 1.1.91-94 on the equestrian statue of Domitian: non hoc imbriferas hiemes opus aut Iovis ignem / tergeminum, Aeolii non agmina carceris horret / annorumve moras: stabit, dum terra polusque, / dum Romana dies ("this edifice shall not shudder at the rainy winters or the triple-pronged fire of Jupiter or the ranks of Aeolus’ dungeon or the slow march of years: it shall stand as long as the earth and heavens, as long as the Roman day").

\(^{151}\) Lucretius does mention later that lightning can damage and destroy monumenta made by men (monimenta virum commoliri atque ciere, 6.242). Segal 1989: 199, notes that the word monu(i)mentum only appears three times in Lucretius (5.311 and 5.328 are the others), and “each time they are imperiled.”

\(^{152}\) For the role of monumenta in ensuring fama, see Ch. 3.
Though his own stance is very much the opposite, Lucretius hints at the larger societal notion that great deeds (facta) can be preserved by commemorating them with and attaching them to (insita) monumenta. The metaphor of grafting and plant husbandry hints at the ability for the commemorated event or person to grow with the structural support and foundation that a monumentum can offer. A further implication, however, is that the commemoration is dependent on the physical survival of the monumentum to which the memory is grafted, and this physical survival is very much in doubt. Lucretius’ may be the more extreme stance of a particular philosophical sect, but the notion appears elsewhere in close connection with the function of a monumentum.

As already mentioned in the Lucretius passage above (5.329), monumenta are ideally lasting, indeed everlasting (aeterna, sempiterna, vel sim.). To return to funerary monumenta, tombs themselves must persist in a physically present form in order to fulfill their function as reminders, which encourages their characterization as eternal. They are intended to transcend the bounds of mortality—unlike their occupant or referent in the case of cenotaphs—and provide continuity across generational gaps. For instance, a gravestone near Rome reads:

C. Hostius C. 1. Pamphilus | medicus hoc monumentum | emit sibi et Nelpiae M. l. Hymnini | et liberteis et libertabus omnibus | postereisque eorum. | Haec est domus aeterna, hic est | fundus, heis sunt horti, hoc | est monumentum nostrum. (CIL 1.2.1319)

153 Cf. Cicero’s connection of agriculture and monumentality above (Tusc. Disp. 1.31).

154 E.g., Cato F 48 M = Char. 282.14 (ego mihi haec monimenta sempiterno posui quae cepi); Cic. Inv. 2.70, Verr. 2.1.129, Cat. 3.26, Sest. 83, de Leg. 1.62, ad Brut. 1.14.9; ad Verum Imp. 2.1.2 (monumento ad aeternam gloriam relicto). For similar notions of longevity expressed with different terms, see, e.g., Hor. C. 3.30.1: exegi monumentum aere perennius (discussed below); Ov. Met. 5.227: quin etiam mansura dabo monimenta per aevum (“surely then I will provide monimenta that will last through the ages”); Fast. 2.265 (antiqui monumenta perennia facti).

155 Cf. CIL 1.2.193 (aer|ernam| domu). For the domus aeterna, see Woodman 2012: 87 n. 9; Korzeniewski 1968: 32-33; Lattimore 1942: 167 n. 78. See Plin. NH 35.6-7 for another version of the aeterna domus: he discusses the character of old Roman houses with their accumulated imagines, spoils of war, and written records and histories (monimentis rerum in magistratu gestarum) that could not be removed from their places of prominence even if the
Gaius Hostius Pamphilus, a doctor and freedman of Gaius, bought this *monumentum* for himself and Nelpia Hymnis, freedwoman of Marcus, and for all their freed-people and their descendants. This is our everlasting house, this our farm, these our gardens, this our *monumentum*.

After death, the deceased continues to have an impact, even a persistent one, in memorial form in the relation of grave with the everyday settings of house, farm, and gardens. The association of tomb and house has already been discussed, but the phrase *aeterna domus* represented on this gravestone adds a significant dimension: even if the flesh will decay, this structure is designed to last. The purchaser of the tomb facilitates the deceased’s continuation in a direct link with his family line as they shall one day be reunited with their forebear in the eternal house, but, in the meantime, they continue to enjoy and be a part of their ancestor’s status and prestige in the community. Wallace-Hadrill asserts: “By the familiar paradox, the *domus* is degraded to the status of a temporary lodging house, while the funerary monument becomes the true home, the *domus.*” As temples are the houses of the everlasting gods, so tombs are in this conception the everlasting houses of mortals.

Ennius offers a striking vision of what the eternality of *monumenta* has to offer in his version of Euhemerus’ work on the origins of gods. His text as it has come down to us implies that a mortal can even promote the impression of being a god through *monumenta*. He writes:

---


158 If indeed it can be called Ennius as the transmitted form comes through Lactantius and other potential intermediaries who may have changed the form of the text. See Winiarczyk 2013: 115-22 with further bibliography.

159 Winiarczyk 2013: 109-14, 122, argues that Ennius produced the *Euhemerus* to pave the way for the deification of Scipio Africanus. While the theory is just that, it does have possible implications for monumental representations of Africanus.
Deinde Iuppiter postquam quinquies terras circumivit omnibusque amicis atque cognatis suis imperia divisit reliquitque hominibus leges mores frumentaque paravit multaque alia bona fecit, inmortalis gloria memoriaque affectus sempiterna monumenta suis reliquit. Aetate pessum acta in Creta vitam commutavit et ad deos abiiit eumque Curetes filii sui curaverunt decoraveruntque eum; et sepulchrum eius est in Creta in oppido Gnosso et dicitur Vesta hanc urbem creavisse inque sepulchro eius est inscriptum antiquis litteris Graecis ZAN KPONOY id est Latine Iuppiter Saturni. (F 11 Vahlen = Lactant. Div. Inst. 1.11.45-46)

Then, Jupiter travelled the earth five times, divided power among all his friends and relatives, provided people with laws, values, and food, and prepared and made many other good things. Then, concerned with his undying glory and remembrance, he left eternal monumenta to his people. When he had lived out his life, he died on Crete and departed to the gods. His sons, the Curetes, took care for and honored him. His tomb is on Crete in the town of Cnossos, and Vesta is said to have created this city. In ancient Greek letters, there is inscribed on his sepulcher: Zeus, son of Cronos, that is in Latin Jupiter, the son of Saturn.

By creating these monumenta, this version of Jupiter ensures not only remembrance but veneration after death. His descendants not only tend to his memory (curaverunt) but even glorify it (decoraverunt). It is, however, the lasting (aeterna) nature of the monumenta that allows the memory of the mortal Jupiter—according to this manifestation—to fade and be replaced by a belief in a divine Jupiter. The seeming eternity of the monumenta shifts onto the commemorated individual to make him immortal—something that again has significant implications for the abuse of monumentality by individuals or particular groups at Rome, especially when the referent of the monumentum is still alive. While the concept here is taken to the extreme under a Euhemeristic

---

160 Cf. Lactant. Div. Inst. 1.11.33 (F 7 Vahlen), where Euhemerus finds a column of gold set up and inscribed by Jupiter “to be a monumentum of his deeds for posterity” (ut monumentum posteris esset rerum suarum).

161 Courtney 1999: 36, points out that decorare is commonly used for funerary honors and cites another Ennian passage: nemo me lacrimis decoret (Epig. F 2 V). Cf. Cato Orig. 4 F 76 FRHist (decoravere monumentis), discussed in Ch. 2.

162 As Mackay 2000: 167, says, “Clearly, the erection of a public monument in commemoration of oneself during one’s lifetime was a very high form of gloria and played a major role in acquiring a permanent mystique for oneself. While public opinion may shift like the winds, a monument in stone is a permanent memorial of the acclaim of the moment.”
conception of divinity, the impact of long-lived *monumenta* can be applied in other instances, particularly as an extension of their core pertinence to funerary commemoration.

For the *monumentum* to ensure the impression of immortality, the material from which it is constructed is significant: it must be sufficiently costly and grand to warrant notice; and the more perishable the material, the less effective the *monumentum*. Stone is more durable than wood, bronze more so than stone, and so on. In essence, the memory becomes the material, and the material becomes the memory for the purposes of longevity, propagation, and rehearsal. The physical endurance, however, of *monumenta* is far from secure even with more durable material. Although stone is more lasting than flesh, it is still subject to wear and destruction.

The various temples of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

A passage in Cicero’s second Verrine oration illustrates the awareness that attrition and destruction come even to the most significant of *monumenta*. It further shows awareness of the

---

163 See Woolf 1996: 30: “Monuments of all sorts, whether built of earthen ramparts, megaliths, baked clay or stone, require a significant investment of skills, time and energy, making monuments rare enough to be symbolically prominent. Equally, it is the capacity of monuments to resist time that makes them suitable as vehicles for representing the contingent as permanent and the contestable as fixed.”

164 See Plin. *NH* 34.99: *usus aeris ad perpetuitatem monimentorum iam pridem tralatus est tabulis aereis, in quibus publicae constitutiones inciduntur* (“for the perpetuity of *monimenta*, the use of bronze for a long time has been applied for bronze tablets on which public records are stamped”). Cf. DH 4.26.5. See also Ch. 2 for discussion of Horace’s poetry as “more lasting than bronze” (C. 3.30.1).

165 As Le Goff 1992: 59 = 1988, says concerning Greco-Roman monumentality, with a particular eye toward inscription, “Stone, usually marble, served as a support for an overload of memory. These ‘stone archives’ added to the function of archives proper the character of an insistent publicity, wagering on the ostentation and durability of this lapidary and marmoreal memory.”

166 Livy even mentions an instance in which the senate thinks an abstract *monumentum* that recalls an instance of Rome’s greed against Ardea ought to be destroyed (*senatui superesse aliquid ad delendum publicae avaritiae monumentum videbatur*, 4.10.6), i.e., the intention is forgetting rather than remembering (see Flower 2005). Cf. Verg. *Aen*. 4.494-98 for the desire to destroy *monumenta*, particularly the various items that Aeneas has left in Dido’s house upon his departure.

frailty of the associations that develop around *monumenta*, such as those circulating in interrelation among builder, dedicator, dedicatee, etc. This frailty results from the perishability of material. In a passage that exemplifies this frailty, Cicero exhorts Q. Catulus to take care in his dedication of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the former iteration of which has burned down:

loquor enim de tuo clarissimo pulcherrimoque *monumento*. Non iudicis solum severitatem in hoc crimine, sed prope inimici atque accusatoris vim suscipere debes. Tuus enim honos illo templo senatus populique Romani beneficio, tui nominis *aeterna* memoria simul cum templo illo consecratur. (*Verr* 2.4.69)

I speak about your most famous and beautiful *monumentum*. Not only must you take on the severity of a judge in this crime but the force practically of a personal enemy and an accuser. Indeed, your reputation lies in that temple endowed by the senate and Roman people; the everlasting memory of your name is consecrated along with that temple.

Though the temple is built to venerate Jupiter, it is identified as Catulus’ with repeated personal adjectives (*tuo, tuus*) as well as the shift from official functionary (*iudicis*) to private enemy (*inimici*). Thus, the eternality that Cicero mentions here concerns a person as much as the structure. The form of the structure, its renown and aesthetics, reflects on its dedicator as well as its dedicatee and can offer immortal fame thereby. The reputation of the founder or patron grows with that of the *monumentum* because their name is inextricably linked with it (*simul cum*).

But the dedicator’s connection of commemoration can be a detractor as well as a boon. Neglect or misappropriation of the structure or its contents also reflects on the person’s reputation, a charge that Cicero elsewhere levels against Verres. In this case, Cicero concludes that the various dedicated items that Verres has stolen from the Temple of Castor on Sicily will

---

168 Concerning the balance of monumental focus on gods and mortals, Johanson 2011: 416, says: “The works of Roman men had partly obstructed the view of the gods. And like all denizens of the city, they too must settle for partial views, cut off by haphazardly placed monuments.”
be an eternal reminder of his brazenness (audaciae suae monumentum aeternum, Verr. 2.1.129).\textsuperscript{169} If the theft of votary objects by a supposed caretaker has such a lasting effect, not preventing the destruction of a temple would have an even greater impact on the reputation of its protector, which would, in turn, pass to their descendants.

The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus is particularly significant not only as a dedication to important deities of Rome—Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva—but also as a repository of physical memorials tracing Roman history and its leading figures, that is, it is a monumentum that contains further monumenta in the form of offerings, spoils, artwork, and the like that are associated with and evoke key moments in Rome’s past.\textsuperscript{170} Following the passage aimed at Q. Catulus above, Cicero continues:

\begin{quote}
Tibi haec cura susciendi, tibi haec opera sumenda est, ut Capitolium, quem ad modum magnificentius est restitutum, sic copiosius ornatum sit quam fuit, ut illa flamma divinitus exstitisse videatur, non quae deleret Iovis Optimi Maximi templum, sed quae praecellularis magnificentiusque deposceret. (Verr. 2.4.69)
\end{quote}

This is the care you must undertake, this is the effort you must undergo, that the Capitol, as it has been re-founded more grandly, be decorated more lavishly than it was, so that that fire seems to have come from the heavens not to destroy the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus but to require one more renowned and awe-inspiring.

\textsuperscript{169} Cf. Cic. Pis. 92 (ad sempiternum dedecus sui generis et nominis).

\textsuperscript{170} For the material and psychological importance of the temple for Rome and its perceived security, see Flower 2008: esp. 79-80: “It is no longer possible to make a detailed inventory of the losses but they included the archaic cult statue of Jupiter, all the votives and art objects currently in the building, and even the Sibylline books, which were kept in a special chest in an underground room. Needless to say, these items were essentially irreplaceable and represented memorials of generations of Romans. The temple had been further adorned by many leading Romans during the time of Rome’s imperial expansion in the second century BC, both as regards its fabric and its votives. Consequently, the structure and items that burned also reflected the more recent wealth of empire and the competitive culture of Rome’s office-holding elite during the middle Republic.” Cf. the poetic references to the Capitoline, discussed in Ch. 2.
Cicero here refers to the burning of the original temple in 83 BC,\textsuperscript{171} which occurred during Sulla’s rise to the dictatorship and his march on Rome. This particular \textit{monumentum} has already seen the limits of its physical frame once, and, indeed, it will see them again in other iterations of the temple.\textsuperscript{172}

Cicero’s mention of the inscription of the name of the dedicator above (\textit{tui nominis}) is particularly significant in this respect.\textsuperscript{173} It has points of commonality with the preservation of names on funeral memorials.\textsuperscript{174} But, while the name on a tombstone ensures some continuation of the deceased, it only preserves the most basic information and does not necessarily explain why that person is commemorated, though deed is sometimes included with name. Still, a name on a \textit{monumentum} with its own claim to fame and a function larger than the commemoration of an individual mortal is more significant: the size, extravagance, and cultural importance of the structure magnifies the name by its very association with the temple. Further, the distinction between dedicator and dedicatee blends in a way favorable to the former.

This magnification, however, also brings further risk from competition and envy, both to the eponymous figure and the structure itself. Despite Cicero’s attempts to put a hopeful spin on

\textsuperscript{171} Tacitus says that the temple had burned during civil war but that it was caused by the misdeed of private citizens (\textit{arserat et ante Capitolium civili bello, sed fraude privata, Hist. 3.72}).

\textsuperscript{172} There were four temples of Jupiter Optimus Maximus dedicated: one under the Tarquins (Liv. 1.55-56.1; DH \textit{Ant.} 4.61); one begun in the time of Sulla, which is the one here, eventually completed by Catulus (Cic. \textit{Verr.} 2.4.69; Liv. \textit{per.} 98; Plin. \textit{NH} 7.138; Tac. \textit{Hist.} 3.72.3); one under Vespasian (Tac. \textit{Hist.} 4.4.9; Suet. \textit{Vesp.} 8); and one under Domitian (Suet. \textit{Dom.} 5). See Cifani 2018: 392-94; Flower 2008: esp. 77-78; P & A 297-302, for the various changes, restorations, and re-buildings of the temple. While Cicero does not have the advantage of foresight for the latter two iterations of the temple, he does mention the perishability of and need for rebuilding physical structures in respect to the first and second.

\textsuperscript{173} As Rouveret 1991: 3052, says: “Le monument est donc un outil de mémoire, le plus souvent un outil de rappel du nomen comme le souligne encore Cicéron dans les Verrines IV,69 à propos du temple de Jupiter O.M. dont la réfection était due à Catulus et qui, conformément à l'usage romain, portait de ce fait le nom du magistrat responsable des travaux.”

\textsuperscript{174} See, esp., Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 3.22; Aug. \textit{de Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda} 4.6.8-17 Z 630 (discussed above).
the fire that burned the temple as a divine initiative for further adornment (*copiosius ornatum*) and enlargement (*magnificentius...restitutum*), the destruction of the temple is still the central fact of the passage. By inference, the connection that it shared with its previous dedicator has faded and been replaced. Catulus’ reputation (*honos*), indeed continued remembrance of his name (*tui nominis aeterna memoria, Verr. 2.4.69*), relies heavily on the continuation of the physical structure. Although Cicero characterizes Catulus’ potential reward as *aeterna memoria*, the actual circumstances of the temple show a much more doubtful situation: Catulus’ inscribed name is susceptible to replacement, removal, or destruction, just as the previous dedicator’s name was. It is no more eternal than the surface on which it is inscribed or the interested

---

175 See Jenkyns 2015: 20: “the desire to flatter may distort, but Cicero was addressing Catulus in a public speech, and his words needed to have a broad appeal; it remains notable that he should describe the temple’s destruction as an opportunity for improvement, with no sense of irremediable or indeed of any loss.” Ov. *Fast.* 201-3, published nearly a century after the destruction of the temple, also hints at its need for expansion and adornment: *Iuppiter angusta vix totus stabat in aede, / inque Iovis dextra fictile fulmen erat. / frondibus ornabant quae nunc Capitolia gemmis* (“all of Jupiter barely stood in his cramped temple, and in his right hand was a clay thunderbolt. They used to decorate the Capitol with leaves, which now they do with gems”). Davies 2018: 479-83, however, points out that the actual restorations of the temple were relatively conservative in nature and sought to preserve the previous form as a means for the restorers to stabilize their authority through continuity with the past (cf. Cifani 2018). In his description of the size of the original temple and its scale fit for Rome of the future rather than the present, Livy (1.55) supports the idea that the first temple was not in need of enlargement (cf. 1.38.7). See DH *Ant.* 4.61.4 for the assessment that only the costliness of the material made the second temple differ from the first.

176 Cf. Val. Max. 6.9.5 (*nomenque eius in Capitolino fastigio fulgeret*); Tac. *Hist.* 3.72 (*Lutatii Catuli nomen...usque ad Vitellium mansit*). Plin. *NH* 7.138 says of Sulla: *hoc tamen nempe felicitati suae defuisse confessus est quod Capitolium non dedicavisset* (“still he admitted that he missed out on happiness by this alone: that he had not dedicated the Capitoline temple”). See also Liv. 6.4.2-3 for some smaller memorials within the larger *monumentum*, specifically three golden bowls placed as votives in the temple, inscribed with the name of Camillus (*cum titulo nominis Camili*), until the temple burned.

177 For a similar series of temple dedications, cf. the case of the Temple of Apollo, initially built outside of the pomerium in response to a plague (Liv. 4.25.3) with the cult title Medicus (Liv. 40.51.6). Cn. Julius Mento completed and dedicated the temple in 431 BC, but his consular colleague, T. Quinctius Cincinnatus, resented being left out of the dedication because he was in the field at the time (Liv. 4.29.7). C. Sosio, a partisan of M. Antony subsequently pardoned by Octavian (see *OCD* s.v.; *RE* 2), later restored the temple, which then seems to have acquired the title Apollo Sosianus in recognition of the re-dedicator (Plin. *NH* 13.53; 36.28). There is possibly another restoration and rededication between the initial construction and Sosio’s renewal, perhaps due to damage done during the Gallic sack of Rome (*aedes Apollinis dedicata est*, Liv. 7.20.9). See further Zanker 1988: 66-69; Ogilvie 574; P & A 15-16.
parties that keep it in place. Catulus’ name is not the first to be associated with the temple, nor will it be the last.

In Livy’s report, the first temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline—the same destroyed temple that Cicero discusses above (Verr. 2.4.69)—was a product of Tarquinius Priscus’ domestic policy: *erat primum ut Iovis templum in monte Tarpeio monumentum regni sui nominisque relinqueret: Tarquinios reges ambos, patrem vovisse, filium perfecisse* (“his first initiative was to leave behind the temple of Jupiter on the Tarpeian hill as a *monumentum* of his kingship and his own name: both Tarquin kings were involved, the father vowed it, the son completed it,” Liv. 1.55.1; cf. 1.38.7).¹⁷⁸ Thus, two names are already attached to the temple, and their intention in constructing the temple is self-glorification. The situation is further complicated by the dedication of the temple, in which the Tarquins do not get to take part; it falls instead to Horatius Pulvillus (Liv. 2.8.6-8; cf. 7.3.8).¹⁷⁹

Further, Cassius Dio reports that the Senate voted to remove Catulus’ name from the temple and replace it with that of Caesar, though the vote ultimately did not carry (43.14.16; cf. 37.44.1-2).¹⁸⁰ It is possible that Dio’s is a later invention as it does not appear in the earlier sources, but the issue of replacing or erasing inscribed names is a very real issue in the Roman world, one that is pointed out by Livy himself (discussed in Ch. 4). The drive for aristocratic

---

¹⁷⁸ W & M 1.250 argue that *Tarquinii reges ambo, pater vovit, filius perfecit* “wird die Inschrift des Iupitertempels gewesen sein.” Ogilvie 210 acknowledges the epigraphic nature of the writing but concludes that “no real inscription is intended since the temple was not dedicated till the Republic and any such inscription could not have survived till the first century.”

¹⁷⁹ See also Tac. Hist. 3.72: *sed gloria operis libertati reservata: pulsis regibus Horatius Pulvillus iterum consul dedicavit ea magnificentia quam immensae postea populi Romani opes ornarent potius quam augerent* (“but the glory of the work was saved for free times: with the kings expelled, Horatius Pulvillus, consul for the second time, dedicated it with such grandness that the enormous wealth of the subsequent Roman people decorated rather than enlarged it”).

¹⁸⁰ For further desires and attempts on the part of significant Romans to put their names on the temple, see Flower 2008: 84-85.
self-promotion and commemoration can be fulfilled by the simpler recourse of rededication rather than new construction.\textsuperscript{181} The act can even be represented with the nostalgic restoration and preservation of the past, whether it is a sincere acknowledgement of the glorious past and the \textit{mos maiorum} or not. The potential for social conflict in the act of rededication or restoration is significant.\textsuperscript{182}

**Livy and the eternity of \textit{monumenta}**

To return to the notion of eternality and to connect it with Livy, the modifier \textit{aeternus} appears only once in the \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} in relation to the term \textit{monumentum}, and it is an indirect relation as it does not even modify the term itself. Further, the passage in question shows how fragile \textit{monumenta} ultimately are. This fragility in opposition to the ideal of eternality can be seen as a reflection of Livy’s careful approach to \textit{monumenta} in his history and of his recognition of their shortcomings.

The passage falls in a speech of Lycortas, the father of Polybius and a supporter of Philopoemen. The speech concerns a charge brought against the Achaeans by the Spartans for violent treatment (39.36.3-5). In the speech, Lycortas mentions \textit{monumenta} seemingly in the form of tablets or other media for recording political proceedings. Lycortas says: \textit{quae iureiurando, quae monumentis litterarum in lapide insculptis in aeternam memoriam sancta atque sacra sunt, ea cum periurio nostro tollere parant. veremur quidem vos, Romani, et si ita vultis, etiam timemus: sed plus et veremur et timemus deos immortales} (“that which, by swearing

\textsuperscript{181} Cf. the case of Augustus promoting the point that he restored the temple on the Capitoline as well as the theatre of Pompey without inscribing his own name thereon (\textit{sineulla inscriptione nominis mei, RG} 20.1). Thus, Augustus accomplishes the purpose of associating his name with these structures without directly claiming them.

\textsuperscript{182} For an example involving Caesar’s monumental discourse with Marius, see Vell. 2.43.4: \textit{restituta in aedilitate adversante quidem nobilitate monumenta C. Marii} (“the \textit{monumenta} of C. Marius were restored during [Caesar’s] aedileship, though the nobility was opposed;” Plut. \textit{Caes.} 6.1-5). The preceding part of this passage mentions the conflicts between Caesar and Catulus (2.43.3).
oath, has been made sanctified and sacred by *monumenta* consisting of letters inscribed on rock for eternal remembrance, they try to destroy by means of our perjury. We certainly respect you Romans, and if you like, we also fear you; but we respect and fear more the immortal gods,” 39.37.16-17).\(^\text{183}\)

The speech is “highly sophistic” in character\(^\text{184}\) and has a very anti-Roman feel,\(^\text{185}\) particularly when it comes to Lycortas’ comparison of Achaean treatment of Sparta to Rome’s treatment of Capua in the Second Punic War (39.37.9-12). Lycortas caps his speech with *monumenta* as the basis, indeed the physical evidence, for his strong claim. He even invokes the plaques as a poignant focus of attention for his audience in so far as they are items protected by divinity. The medium of stone is meant to ensure the lasting quality of the oath, as is the use of writing (see Ch. 2). The *monumenta* are characterized as guardians of everlasting remembrance, but the danger in which their eternality stands is also the focus of what Lycortas has to say. Indeed, the Achaeanans ultimately have to comply with the ruling of the Roman delegation, which goes contrary to the dictates of the original legislation, despite its monumental custodian.\(^\text{186}\)

Thus, the *monumenta* are subsequently voided along with the purpose for which they were constructed since the words of the oath—literally written in stone (*in lapide insculptis*)—have minimal impact on the outcome. Some remembrance, however, of the event survives both


\(^\text{184}\) Tränkle 1977: 77 (“einer höchst sophistischen Rede”).

\(^\text{185}\) Walsh 1994: 150, says: “The loss of the speech in the source of Polybius is particularly galling; one suspects that the anti-Roman sentiments have been intensified by Livy himself.” See Briscoe 3.341, however, for caution against discounting Polybius’ willingness to give an anti-Roman view.

\(^\text{186}\) The Achaeanans make a moderate concession to save face, by requesting that the Romans make the changes in Achaean policy toward the Spartans so that they do not have to break an oath and violate religion (*id modo petierunt ut Romani, quae viderentur, de Lacedaemoniis mutarent nec Achaos religione obstringerent irrita ea, quae iureiurando sanxissent, faciendi, 39.37.21)*.
the physical loss and ideological undermining of the plaques, tablets, or other form that these monum[187]enta may take. These lapidary records were intended to preserve the proceedings that Lycortas invokes as well as the circumstance that led to their enactment. In some respect, this intention is realized in the recounting of Lycortas’ speech. Otherwise, Livy would not be able to learn of and narrate the event. But, regardless of the source of the story, Livy’s presentation of it modifies and mediates its memorial impact by reorienting and adding further associations to the original monum[188]enta.

Conclusion

To conclude, monumentum as a term is neither straightforward nor restrictive in its scope, regardless of attempts to make them appear so. Indeed, the term’s defining features, its range and multivalence, reflect an extensive evolution of form and concept. That evolution ultimately recognized that monum[189]enta could serve as tools for the manipulation of the past, despite the standard notion that that past was secured by the monumental landscape. Though the elements of future outlook, eternality, and secure preservation of remembrance are regularly taken to characterize monum[187]enta, not all of them necessarily hold true in reality: monum[189]enta may originally seek to secure a continued place for the dead, but people may use the particular force of funerary monum[187]enta while still alive; again, monum[187]enta may be designed to cement certain valuable memories about the past, but since memory is a venue for conflicting viewpoints, the sum total of those monum[187]enta will add up to no coherent account or singular cultural memory;

---

187 Briscoe 3.344 does not speculate on the actual appearance of the monum[187]enta but calls them “a formal record of the decisions taken concerning Sparta…it was doubtless set up at the Homarion, near Aegium.” As the symbolic center of the Achaean League, the location would naturally be a repository for important monum[187]enta. For the importance of the cult of Zeus Homarios to the Achaean League, particularly as a repository of federal documents, see Walbank 2002: 137-52, esp. 147-48; Walbank I.226, 624.

188 Polybius seems a likely candidate in so far as his father is featured.

189 The collected articles in Galinsky and Lapatin 2015 well represent the idea that memory—in the sense of cultural or collective memory (see Introduction)—in the Roman world cannot be encompassed as a single, monolithic idea;
while *monumenta* may be represented as beneficial for future generations, their message may be especially or even solely catered to the current generation; their intention may ideally be to last, but they face the quotidian issues of destruction and degeneration as well as the more pointed acts of restoration and replacement. Thus, in their act of tracing the course of the past, *monumenta* may be defined in practice more by their mutability and their manipulability than their persistence and consistency.

Naturally, then, in investigating a past heavily determined by *monumenta*, Livy meets with difficulties, at the most basic level because of the fragility of physical structures in the face of time’s deleterious effects. Despite their temporary nature, however, *monumenta* continue to be prime determiners of how the past is perceived and of what messages they convey to the present. Yet, agents from the very present with which *monumenta* are designed to communicate can exert their own controlling influence over interpretation; that is, how the past is perceived is heavily determined by how agents in the present wish to perceive it. This control becomes especially problematic when *monumenta*—both new and old—are used as mechanisms for competing propaganda and as tools for individuals with dynastic or other political ambitions. Physical structures and other temporary memorials can fulfil this function; but in addition to these, other, potentially more lasting versions of *monumenta* are deployed to support, spread, and secure particular messages. In this respect, the written word is especially powerful when it is involved in and represented as a *monumentum*, a subject that will be the focus of the next chapter.

cultural memories rather form in and are attached to different micro-identities, though overlap can certainly occur, and larger memories can overlap with smaller ones. As Galinsky says as a point of comparison to Roman memory (in *ibid.* 3), “cultural memory is culture specific. The ‘culture’ under discussion often is much smaller than, for instance, all of Greece. Rather, there is a plethora of regional and local cultures, all with their distinct features, that nevertheless share a general ‘Greekness’.” Cf. Flower 2010: esp. 18-34, for the stance that the Roman Republic should not be approached as a single, long period but rather as multiple republics in an historical sequence, each having its own particular contexts and properties within the larger framework.
III. Ch. 2: Monumenta and the Written Word

In writing history, a visible and even tangible point of contact with the past in the form of a *monumentum* can be an effective tool.¹ Material *monumenta* are valuable on the grounds that they establish a direct link to the past and provide an apparent “hard-core” of data for the historian to use in writing.² They also mark the progression and continuation of Roman history for the contemporary viewer. For instance, a pedestrian passing by the south-western side of the Palatine hill may recall from tradition that this is the area in which the exposed infant Romulus floated to safety, and the observer may feel a sense of spatial connection to Romulus and, thereby, to the very beginnings of Rome itself: they can reasonably imagine what Rome was as they behold what Rome has become, and they, in a sense, can traverse time while they remain in place.³ If they see, say, the monumental entrance to the Lupercal,⁴ that vague sense of connection finds a physical point of reference between past and present. The characteristics of the

¹ For discussion of how Greco-Roman historians use material monuments to support what they write, see, e.g., Cifani 2018; Sandberg 2018: esp. 360-72; Gabba 2011: esp. 357-59; Hölwercher 2001; Marincola 1997: 20, 99-103; Rawson 1991: 582-98; Wiseman 1986 and 1979: esp. 41-44; Immerwahr 1960. As Wiseman 1986: 89, says, however, “We cannot simply assume that accurate knowledge of the true nature of such monuments [i.e., from the regal and early-Republican periods of Rome] survived till the beginning of the Roman historiographical tradition—and the same may be said of such other ‘documents’ of early history as the tombs of the Horatii, the *tigillum sororium*, the statues of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia (or Valeria), the Column of Minucius and the *busta Gallica*. The stories that accounted for them were part of the ‘expansion of the past’ (to borrow Badian’s expressive phrase [Badian 1966: 11])—the elaboration into satisfying detailed ‘history’ of the meagre record of Rome’s early past that was available to Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus at the end of the third century.” For a different view on the survival of early *monumenta*, cultic practices, and other institutional relics, see Cornell 1986: 82-86.

² For the notion of a “hard core” of historical information that a historian would then elaborate for rhetorical and literary polish, see esp. Woodman 1988: 76-116. See Jaeger 1997: esp. 174-75, for the role of *monumenta* as the basis for this hard core.

³ For discussion of *monumenta* particularly in Livy as a means of connecting space, time, and national identity, see Jaeger 1997: esp. 1-14.

⁴ For the Lupercal, its monumental entryway (restored by Augustus: *RG* 19.1 with Cooley 2009: 186-87), and other monumental markers attached to it, see Liv. 10.23.12 (with Holleman 1987); DH 1.79.1 (with Andrén 1960: 92-93); P & A 321.
monumentum—is its ornateness and general grandeur—mark it as distinct from its surroundings but also indicate its foundational importance in the development of those surroundings. But time's obscuring effects and the accretion of associations make connection to the past more difficult. Thus, the burden of the historian is to uncover or create a firm point of contact perhaps even without a tangible referent.

In the previous chapter, the term monumentum was examined for its basic characteristics and instantiations, with an eye largely toward the tangible and visual impact of monumenta on their landscape: that is, the material placement and dimensions of, and the rhetorical and ideological intentions surrounding tombs, temples, statues, etc. Also, the ideal of eternality for these material structures was discussed, though their temporary and destructible nature is frequently observable. Indeed, it is this very friability in conjunction with the notional integrity of monumenta that gives rise to the conceptual challenge they present, particularly in their metaphorical dimensions. This challenge for monumenta also underlies their potential as an analogue for historiographical method in Livy, as I will explore in the next chapter. In order to lay the groundwork for that discussion, this chapter explores the potential of monumenta to extend beyond strictly physical limitations: the Latin term—as touched on above—can have more abstract extensions, and such instances of monumenta have the power to overcome many of the issues inherent in their material kin, such as restriction of placement, susceptibility to elemental degeneration, and loss of memorial associations as an effect of the passage of time or through deliberate manipulation.

Livy's use of the term monumentum encompasses the full range, from entirely material and temporary to abstract and longer-lasting, including monumenta that incorporate writing as a key feature of their memorial function. The initial sections of the chapter discuss the potential for
“disembodiment” of *monumenta*, by which they achieve an impact that is not determined by their corporeal existence. The final sections extend the notion of *monumentum* to its even more abstract and more lasting instantiations in the form of written works—as mentioned above, literature is often termed *monumentum*, both prose and poetry. It is the understanding thus arrived at by the end of the chapter that best informs the already well-established idea of Livy’s own written work as a *monumentum* (discussed in Ch. 3). To that idea will be added the notion that Livy’s fascination with *monumenta* is not only a product of their function as windows onto the past but also of their function as workshops for understanding the present in which the challenges of historiographical method broadly can be explored.

**Lasting impressions: *monumenta* and disembodiment**

In response to their friability, *monumenta* can have a disembodied force that allows the memorial function to continue after the physical memorial has vanished, degenerated, or undergone change in appearance or reference. The *monumentum*—in the valence of a physical structure—offers a guarantee of remembrance, though how long that guarantee is fulfilled is variable. The structure further imposes some control over how the event or person is remembered, in that the placement, size, and shape of the *monumentum* carries determining social and ideological significance. But, after the establishment of remembrance, the memory has some lasting power that continues independently of the structure. The form of the memory may

---

5 As a sort of alternative to material *monumenta*, Ovid brings up the notion that customs and rites as *monumenta* can also connect the past to the present. E.g., the custom of the Luperci to run naked acts as a reminder of ancient practices (*monumenta vetusti moris*, Fast. 2.301-2; cf. 4.709), which, in this account, extend back to the Arcadians and a sort of Saturnian time (289-300). It may be worthwhile to note that, in Ovid’s exploration of these ancient customs, *monumenta* are followed by a *fabula* full of ancient humor (*traditur antiqui fabula plena ioci*, 2.304). No clear connection between this passage and Livy’s statement on *fabulae* and *monumenta* (praef. 6, discussed in Ch. 3) exists, but the parallel is interesting.

6 For a powerful example of this function of memory, see Cic. *de Fin.* 5.2, in which the interlocutor M. Piso comments on the evocative nature of place—in this case the Academy in Athens—to bring to mind memories (*memoria* is repeated three times in this small segment) of famous figures of the past, with such force that they seem to be present (*in conspectu meo*). Piso continues: *equidem etiam curiam nostrum—Hostiliam dico, non hanc novam,*
not have the same consistency and uniformity that it did when associated with a crafted and deliberate material *monumentum*, but its ability to persist and outlive its material counterpart is notable.

Thus, in a sense, the *monumentum* is what remains, regardless of whether it is physical—as with ruins—or abstract—as with a memory. Varro’s connection, discussed above, of *monumentum* with *manere* is operative in this respect (*a manendo, LL* 6.49), particularly in reference to the notion of remnants or ruins. At the extreme logical extension of this notion, sometimes *monumenta* are little more than vestiges that show that there once were structures or temporary works on the sites they mark: that is, the *monumentum* actually marks the removal of something else that could be considered a *monumentum* in its own right. The place itself is important in this case, in that it becomes the mechanism for remembrance.

Livy gives an example of such *monumenta* in his account of Quintus Fabius Maximus and Publius Decius Mus’ campaign in Samnium: *quinque et quadraginta loca in Samnio fuere in quibus Deci castra fuerunt, alterius consulis sex et octoginta; nec valli tantum ac fossarum vestigia relictas, sed multo alia illis insigniora monumenta vastitatis circa regionumque depopulatarum* (“in Samnium, there were 45 places in which Decius camped, and 86 for the

---

\*quaem minor mihi esse videtur posteaquam est maior—solebam intuens Scipionem, Catonem, Laelium, nostrum vero in primis avum cogitare; tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis, ut non sine causa ex iis memoriaeducta sit disciplina* (“it is the same also with our senate house—I am talking about the one called Hostilian, not this new one, which seems lesser to me following its enlargement—I was accustomed to look on it and to think about Scipio, Cato, Laelius, and, foremost, my own grandfather. Such is the force of reminders in places that, not without reason, the practice of memorization is based on them”). Thus, the memory of an old structure—though it has been replaced by a new one—continues to recall significant figures.

7 The prevalence of *relinquere* in various forms in the passages discussed in my treatment complements the notion of remains or vestiges. It also may give the notion of inheritance to successive generations. E.g., Enn. *Euh. F11 Vahlen = Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.11.44; Asellio 20 F 1 *FRHist.* = Gell. *NA* 5.18.8; Cic. *Inv.* 2.70; *Verr.* 2.1.129, 2.2.4; *Leg. Agr.* 2.49; *Sest.* 140; *de Oraet.* 2.53; *de Q. fr.* 1.2.11; *Phil.* 9.12; Varro *LL* 5.41; Liv. 1.55.3, 10.15.5; 37.6.6; Fronto *ad Verum Imp.* 2.1.2. Cf. Cato Cato *Orig.* 4 F 76 *FRHist.* = *NA* Gell. 3.7 (laus...relictas as a corollary to various types of monumenta; discussed below).
other consul; and not only were the remnants of their earthworks and trenches left behind, but also other reminders, much more remarkable than these, of the surrounding devastation and the depopulated areas,” 10.15.4-5; cf. 5.30.2, esp. monumento and vestigiis). Thus, in addition to the temporary leavings that follow a campaign, there are the much more poignant monumenta of destruction and extermination, characterized here by absence of life (depopulatarum) and desolation (vastitatis).9

While the remains of earthworks and other fortifications are included in Livy’s use here of the term monumentum, notable absence carries more impact than presence in this situation. The monumenta that Livy marks as more notable (insigniora)10 do not preserve what was but rather preserve the destruction of it.11 The further implication is that monumenta can survive the disappearance of the things that initially constituted the memorial, or they may even be transformed by the loss. Also, associations change radically depending on the perspective of the observer, like with Cicero’s hypothetical case in Ch. 1, in which Greeks attempt to memorialize victory over other Greeks (Inv. 2.70). For the Romans, the monumenta of Fabius and Decius

8 Cf. Sil. It. Pun. 17.232: ibo et, castrorum relegens monumenta meorum, qua via nota vocat, remeabo Anienis ad undas (“I will go, and, retracing the monumenta of my camp, I shall return to the waves of the Anio, where the familiar path calls”).

9 Perhaps a similar element appeared in Livy’s lost description of Metellus’ campaign against the Numidians (Q. Caecilius Metellus consul duobus proelis Iugurtham fudit, totamque Numidiam vastavit, per. 65). Cf. Liv. 31.30.5, where the Athenians charge Philip with crimes beyond the normal scope of war: omnia sepulcra monumentaque diruta esse in finibus suis, omnium nudatos manes, nullius ossa terra tegi (“all the tombs and monumenta in their borders were torn down, the shades of all were exposed, the bones of none are covered with earth”).

10 Cf. Aug. de Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda 4.6.8-17 Z 630 (discussed in Ch. 1) for the similar adjective insignitus. See also Liv. 7.6.6 (insignitus, discussed in Ch. 3).

11 Cf. Liv. 30.28.5, where Hannibal “has filled the Spanish and Gallic lands and Italy from the Alps to the straits with the monumenta of his great deeds” (Hispanias, Gallias, Italiam ab Alpibus ad fretum monumentis ingenti sermon complessit). These monumenta must be characterized by destruction or, at least, conquest. Cf. 1.2.5, where the Etruscans—specifically through the reputation of their name—have filled a similar swath of land and sea (Etruria erat ut iam non terras solum sed mare etiam per totam Italiae longitudinem ab Alpibus ad fretum Siculum fama nominis sui implesset). See Ch. 3 for the connection between monumentum and fama.
above commemorate victory; for the Samnites, utter defeat. Like the so-called damnatio memoriae, conspicuous removal is not the deletion of all traces that the event ever occurred or that the person ever existed so much as the creation of a reminder of what happens to those that defy the Roman state—or, at least, the prevailing faction or individuals within the state.\(^{12}\) Such treatment of memorials is, in effect, a pointed and specific admonition to forget,\(^{13}\) an admonition that paradoxically perpetuated the memory of what it overtly aimed to eradicate. The most important element and indeed the aim of the damnatio is that the devastation it effects remains for subsequent people to see and to recollect what happened. The powerful corollary of this function of the kind of destruction effected by damnatio is that it aims to make itself longer lasting than the physical structure it overwrites. Yet, in overwriting, it makes evident its dependence on the existence and memory of the history that it overwrites.

The use of notable destruction as a monumentum occurs also on a smaller scale, in places that would engage with their environment and neighbors to create complex memory systems, especially in cases where the houses of individuals are demolished and replaced with something else or left empty.\(^{14}\) Cicero’s description in de Domō Sua of the confiscation, destruction, and replacement of his own house provides a good example of the impact of such actions. As

\(^{12}\) The term damnatio memoriae is not an ancient one but does correspond to a societal inclination to punish individuals with memory sanctions, if they engaged in divergent behaviors. Flower 2006: xix, points out that memory sanctions at Rome were not standard; each was carried out in an individualized way. See further ibid: passim for full discussion of the different aspects of memory sanctions (for the origins of memory sanctions in the late Republic, see 42-66).

\(^{13}\) As Flower 2006: 6, says: “Because sanctions targeted the formal and symbolic memory spaces of the political elite, not all memory was erased. People who had witnessed the past themselves knew and surely had their own opinions about what had happened. Yet the opinions of most ordinary people (or even the ways in which they might cultivate those memories) counted for little at the various moments when sanctions were imposed by those in power. Rather, sanctions looked ahead to a future that was never too far away in Rome, a future when a new generation would be learning the story of the (not necessarily so distant) past from the collective remembrance and monuments of the city.”

\(^{14}\) For a list of house demolitions and their owners found in Republican literature, see Roller 2010: 120-21 n. 10. See also Kaplow 2012; Smith 2006; Flower 2006: 44-51.
Matthew Roller says, “The demolition of his Palatine house by Clodius in 58 BCE, and the erection of a sanctuary of the goddess Libertas on the lot, has long engaged scholars as a case study in the political violence and legal wrangling of the later Republic.” Yet, in the case of Cicero, the destruction of his house does not spell the death of his prominence. In the speech itself, Cicero seeks that his property be returned and that his house be reconstructed at public cost. In other words, he seeks to make his reconstructed house a public monumentum and attempts to maximize on a personal defeat. As with funerals and funerary monumenta granted at public expense, houses given to individuals at public cost carried significant social prestige.

A destruction of property with similar elements happens in Livy’s account of Sp. Maelius, which carries a much clearer message of finality than the example of Cicero above. Maelius purchases grain and distributes it among the plebeians as an act of demagoguery and an attempt at rule (4.13). In doing so, he takes on a role beyond that of a private citizen (supra

---

15 Roller 2010: 120.

16 E.g., de Dom. 137, where Cicero describes his confiscated and destroyed house as a potential memorial to the destruction of the Republic (monumentum deletae rei publicae).

17 Elsewhere, Cicero claims that the Senate had granted the building of a private residence at public cost for him alone (Har. Resp. 16, Pis. 52), but the commentator Asconius casts doubt on the matter and brings up other examples: hoc Cicero oratorio more, non historico, videtur posuisse: nam multis aeratibus ante Ciceronem nulli id contigisse verum est, nemini vero unquam anteae videamus ne parum caute dicat. antiquis enim temporibus pluribus idem contigit: nam Valerio Maximo, ut Antias tradidit [25 F 21 FRHist.], inter alios honores domus quoque publice aedificata est in Palatio, cuius exitus, quo magis insignis esset, in publicum versus declinaretur, hoc est extra privatum aperiretur. Varronem autem tradere M. Valerio, quia Sabinos vicerat, aedes in Palatio tributis I\ulius\ Hyginus dicit [63 F 1 FRHist.] in libro priore de viris claris, P. Valerio Volesi filio Publicolae aedium publice locum sub Velio, ubi nunc aedis Victoriae est, populam ex lege quam ipse tulerat concessisse (“Cicero seems to have made this claim in an oratorical fashion rather than an historical one: it is true that it had not happened for anyone for many generations before Cicero, but let us look to see if he does not speak with insufficient caution when he says no one ever before. In ancient times, the same thing happened to many: Antias reports that, among other honors, a house was constructed for Valerius Maximus at public expense, and that the door was set to open toward the public to be more noticeable, that is, it opened beyond his private space. Julius Hyginus, however, in his first book on famous men, says that Varro reports a house on the Palatine given to M. Valerius because he had defeated the Sabines, and that the people granted the cost of a space for a house at the base of the Velia to P. Valerius Publicola, the son of Volesus, according to the law that he himself had passed,” Pis. 18-19St). See further FRHist. 3.339-40, 552.

18 For possible adaptations to the story of Maelius in order to draw comparison to the Gracchi in the late Republic, see Flower 2006: 45-47; Smith 2006: esp. 52-54.
modum hominis privati, 4.13.3). In response, Cincinnatus is made dictator, and Maelius is killed trying to avoid prosecution. Cincinnatus further sees to it that Maelius’ house is demolished with an eye toward exemplarity: domum deinde, ut monumento area esset oppressae nefariae spei, dirui extemplo iussit. id Aequimaelium appellatum est (“then he ordered that the house be immediately destroyed so that the site might serve as a monumentum of the foiling of nefarious hope. This place is called the Aequimaelium,” 4.16.1). The house itself, even left in a state of perpetual emptiness, would have served as a reminder of the person and his attempt to overturn the state (4.15.8) and, thus, as a continuing focus for kingly ambition. But its destruction and the designation of the space as empty of subsequent construction is a far more effective reminder against behavior of the sort displayed by Maelius. The former would send a positive message to other individuals with sights on kingship, while the latter prioritizes the state as a whole.

19 Maelius’ actions blur the line between himself as a private citizen (privatim) and the public figure L. Minucius (publice) who is in charge of the grain supply (4.13.7-8; cf. 10, in privata domo). See Ch. 4 on the confusion of public and private monumenta.

20 Cf. Val. Max. 6.3.1b: itaque quod prius domicilium impotentis viri fuerat, nunc religiosae severitatis monumentum est (“Thus, what was before the house of a power-hungry man, is now a monumentum of religious severity”). Cicero derives the name of the place from Maelius and aequus = “just” (de Dom. 101); Varro from aequus = “level” (LL. 157). See P & A 2; Nisbet 1939: 154. Roller 2010: 128-30, compares the case of M. Manlius Capitolinus in Livy because the location of his house eventually is occupied by the Temple of Juno Moneta (7.28.4-5; cf. Ov. Fast. 6.183-90), though he points out that Livy does not mention the actual destruction of the house. See also Chaplin 2000: 82-85. Another case of a house being confiscated and demolished in Livy concerns the Fundanian general Vitruvius Vaccus who “had a house on the Palatine, which was called the Vaccan meadow after the building was demolished and the land confiscated” (aedes fuere in Palatio eius, quae Vacci prata diruto aedificio publicatique solo appellata, 8.19.4). Though the term monumentum is not used, the similarity to the Aequimaelium is clear.

21 See Roller 2010: 125-28, esp. 126: “Maelius’ house is presented as the logistical base in which the aristocratic owner nurtures his social network and from which he projects his social power out into the civic sphere—familiar functions of aristocratic domus in Livy’s own day.”

22 Cic. de Dom. 101 says that this form of treatment was considered by the ancestors to be the most severe penalty for criminals (maiores nostri sceleratis ac nefariis civibus maximam poenam constitui posse arbitrati sunt). Cf. Nep. Hann. for a similar “commemoration” through destruction: after Hannibal leaves Carthage in secret to take refuge with Antiochus (7.6), the Carthaginians confiscate his goods, demolish his house, and declare him an exile (bona eius publicarunt, domum a fundamentis disiecerunt, ipsum exulem iudicarunt, 7.7). The same punishments are enacted on his brother Mago (8.2).
But eventually even the absence of a physical structure and the significance of the empty space will disappear. The space itself may remain, but the surroundings will change with inevitable construction and renovation and, potentially, additional layers of commemoration that confuse or obscure previous recollection. The audience also will change the reception of such *monumenta* as subsequent people focus on generationally-specific elements and forget about or adapt old traditions.\(^{23}\) A basic inclination behind *monumentum* is the attempt to offset change, to capture a moment of history or culture frozen forever in place.\(^{24}\) Change, however, is an inevitable consequence of *monumenta*, both in their impact on their environment—including their interaction with or supplanting by further monumental construction—and in their marking of the passage of time; that is, in their physical and memorial distinction from what grows up around them. As with the original physical setting, the disembodied force of the *monumentum* too will fade or be overshadowed, unless it is secured by something more lasting. The written word offers a potential solution that mediates this disembodied force and becomes its culmination, as it allows for longevity in the face of physical destruction and change, particularly in its ability to transcend the bounds of materiality and space. This, of course, is not to say that writing is not subject to its own issues of confusion and manipulation.

**Monumental writing**

In so far as words are not necessarily subject to the same degeneration caused by time and the elements as are material structures, writing has the potential to prove a more lasting vehicle for preserving remembrance as well as a more determinative means of fixing

\(^{23}\) As Fowler 2000: 211, says, “The essence of the monument is paradoxically its lack of monumental stability, the way in which it is constantly reused and given new meaning, and therefore its inability to offer a return rather than a new journey.”

\(^{24}\) See Woolf 1996: esp. 30-32.
interpretation. A descriptive account replete with names and specific details is far harder to manipulate than, say, a statue constructed on the basis of generic and typical guidelines. From the outset, however, the term “written monumentum” can cover an extensive range of phenomena: here too, definition is not a straightforward matter. But a defining distinction for the present purposes arises in the question of how much of the commemorative function the writing carries: that is, how much the writing itself constitutes the monumentum as opposed to writing in combination with material elements.

Granted, even a basic material form—such as that of a statue, column, or temple—carries on an unspoken dialogue with its audience by means of its placement, size, and mythological or other cultural appropriations. Yet, monumenta that contain inscriptions can communicate their purposes more precisely than edifices alone, depending on the inscriptions’ length, detail, and quality. In other cases, the content and overall effect of the writing is the monumentum as a work of literature. If the monumentum is a literary text, it enjoys increased freedom from its

---

25 See, e.g., Tac. Ann. 11.14, who discusses the development and role of writing on and as monumenta, which he traces back to the Egyptians at the far range of human memory: primi per figuras animalium Aegyptii sensus mentis effingebant—ea antiquissima monimenta memoriae humanae impressa saxis cernuntur—et litterarum semet inventores perhibent (“the Egyptians first depicted the thoughts of the mind through animal glyphs—these most ancient monumenta of human remembrance can be seen chiseled in rock—and they maintain that they are the inventors of letters”). Though these monumenta are subject to wear and tear, the range of remembrance is still superlative (antiquissima). The Egyptian idea of monumentality, however, is significantly different from that of the Romans. See, e.g., Assmann 1994: esp. 25-26, for Egyptian “materialization” of gods, i.e., that the physical representations of the gods were considered gods themselves.

26 See, e.g., Enn. Scipio F 2 V/ F 1 R: quantam statuam faciet populus Romanus / quantam columnam quae res tuas gestas loquatur? (“what a statue shall the Roman people erect, what a column to speak of your deeds?”). Though the term monumentum is not used, statues and columns are standard material types indicated by the term (see Ch. 1). Here they are not only speaking in general but are actually reciting history (res...gestas). For possible notions of competition between material memorial culture and written/poetic commemoration inherent in this fragment, see Goldschmidt 2017: 372-73.

27 E.g., in the case of the mistaken imago discussed above (Att. 6.1.1), Cicero is not chastising the person for misunderstanding the general commemorative function of imagines but rather for not recognizing the particular imago of his great-grandfather. If the likeness had had an inscription, the mistake would not have occurred.
physical manifestation—it’s first ink-and-papyrus form—and the locality in which it came into existence, an aspect that the material counterpart cannot possess.\(^{28}\)

Further, though literature is certainly subject to manipulation and influence, the written as opposed to the spoken tradition achieves a status that combats change as a matter of course: orality allows for adaptation to circumstances; that is, each generation or identity group will tweak the tradition to fit the context in which it is told.\(^{29}\) Literature, on the other hand, can take on a canonical quality. That is not to say that literature is not based in part on oral tradition or that it is not altered to fit its cultural milieu, but changes to a written tradition must, in some way, be justified by the agent of change.\(^{30}\) Such “literary *monumenta*” are certainly conceptual or metaphorical extensions of less systemically written *monumenta* and even uninscribed material ones,\(^{31}\) but their mobility, their ability more fully to articulate their intentions, and their capacity to incorporate other *monumenta*, set them apart.

\(^{28}\) See, e.g., Tac. *Agr.* 46.3-4: *non quia intercedendum putem imaginibus quae marmore aut aere finguntur, sed, ut vultus hominum, ita simulacra vultus imbecilla ac mortalia sunt; forma mentis aeterna, quam tenere et exprimere non per alienam materiam et artem, sed tuis ipse moribus possis. quidquid ex Agricola amavimus, quidquid mirati sumus, manet mansurumque est in animis hominum in aeternitate temporum, fama rerum* (“it is not that I think that a ban ought to be put on likenesses made of marble or bronze, but, as with people’s appearances, so likenesses of their appearances are meaningless and temporary; [only] the shape of the mind is everlasting, which one can maintain and express not through the crafted material of another but through their own character. Whatever we have cherished in Agricola, whatever we have admired, this stays and will stay in people’s hearts for time unending through the means of history [*fama rerum*, see Ch. 4].) As Jaeger 2015: 71, puts it, “The power of memory preserved in stone gives way to that of memory preserved in literature.”

\(^{29}\) Discussions of oral versus written media in the composition of history are myriad. For a general overview, see the contributions in Luraghi 2001, esp. the chapters by Murray. For the connection of the Latin term *memoria* and oral tradition as a basis for historiography, see Timpe 2011. For discussion of Livy’s distinction between what is seen and what is heard as well as the Greek historical tradition from which it stems, see Miles 1995: 8-74, esp. 9-14.

\(^{30}\) As Le Goff 1992: 132 = 1988, says, “The written is supposed to provide more freedom, orality leading to a mechanical knowledge, learned by heart and intangible. The study of tradition in oral cultures shows, however, that the specialists in tradition can innovate whereas the written text may on the contrary have a ‘magical’ character that makes it more or less untouchable.” “Untouchable” is perhaps reaching, especially given the Roman mindset that permits multiple versions of stories without drawing a hardline on “official” versions.

\(^{31}\) Cf. Pasco-Pranger 2015: 297, on Seneca’s conception of Cato the Elder (*Ep.* 87): “The literary image of Cato on his laden horse serves the same role an equestrian statue might.”
For the purposes of the discussion here, the term “written monumentum” of itself can readily encompass anything from the smallest inscriptive commemoration—such as a name chiseled on a gravestone—all the way to massive works of literature—such as Livy’s monumental vision of Roman history from the beginning (praef. 10). It is worthwhile then to distinguish between these various types of written monumenta before discussing the particular functions and effects of specifically literary monumenta. A definitive and clear-cut distinction is impossible due to the level of overlap and blending that is inherent in the term monumentum itself, as discussed throughout this and the previous chapter. But there is a significant range of difference in the effect that, say, a military dispatch and a history of the event in which the dispatch was integrated have on reader-interpretation, not to mention their respective chances of survival and dissemination.

For a distinction on the terminological level, we might look to the fact that the word monumentum often appears with defining genitives or other complements that specify a given instance as written, such as in the phrases monumenta rerum gestarum, annalium, in litteris, or litterarum. But these apparent specifications are rarely restrictive and can be rather general. The latter two phrases, monumenta in litteris and litterarum, make clear that the term monumentum can apply to writing in the widest sense, to include inscriptions on the bases of

---

32 See also Kruschwitz 2016 for discussion of other, “fringe” instances of epigraphy and their communicative impact, such as stamped foodstuffs, educational apparatus, carved scribblings in trees, etc.

33 See Woodman 2012: 88 n. 13; Kraus 86.

34 Cic. Verr. 2.4.82, 88, Font. 41, de Orat. 1.201, 2.53; Liv. 6.29.9; Plin. NH 35.7; Gell. NA 13.4.1. Cf. the use of rerum alone: Cic. Mur. 31, Rep. 3.2.3; Liv. 8.40.5; Quint. Inst. 12.11.4; Gell. NA 17.9.18, 19.14.2.


statues or other memorials, epitaphs, decrees, etc. The former phrases (*monumenta rerum gestarum* and *annalium*) seem to refer particularly to historical writing; yet, it is separately clear that *monumentum* without further modifiers can also indicate history. Thus, when Cicero appeals to his friend Luceceius to write a record of his deeds as consul, he refers to his works simply as *monumenta* (*monumentis…tuis, Fam. 5.12.1*). But, in context, they are clearly works of history. Transmitted speeches are also on occasion characterized as *monumenta* through defining genitives, and it can be assumed that the term defines other genres of literature as well.

Beyond the qualification of written *monumenta* afforded by the phrases above, there is a substantial distinction available in the fact that a literary account can include documentary information within it, such as official records previously etched on various media and displayed to the public or stored in archives, which can subsequently be integrated into the historian’s work. In these instances, the literary form assumes mastery over the documentary one. For instance, in the speech of Lycortas discussed in Ch. 1 (39.36-37), Livy includes details from the tablet to which Lycortas refers as well as a version of the speech that Lycortas gave, though it

---

37 There are several similar phrases in the record, particularly in Cicero. E.g., Cic. *Verr. 2.3.209* (*monumentis ac litteris*), 4.106 (*litteris ac monumentis*), *Leg. Agr.* 2.88 (*perscriptum in monumentis veteribus*), *de Dom.* 4 (*litterarum monumentorumque*), *Brut.* 26 (*monumentis et litteris*), *Lig.* 6, *Deiot.* 37 (*litteris monumentisque*), *de Div.* 1.20 = *de Consulatu suo* F11 (*scripta ac monumenta*).


39 E.g., Liv. 9.18.7 (*ex monumentis orationum*; cf. 38.56.6). For *monumentum eloquentiae* indicating surviving copies of speeches, see Liv. 39.40.7; *Quint. Inst.* 12.2.22; *Tac. Ann.* 4.61. Cf. *Quint. Inst.* 12.10.49-51: *mihi unum atque idem videtur bene dicere ac bene scribere, neque alius esse oratio scripta quam monumentum actionis habitae* (“to speak well and to write well seem to one and the same. A written speech is nothing else but a *monumentum* of a suit held”).

40 E.g., Liv. 29.37.7 (*in publicis tabulis monumenta*; cf. 6.1.2-3, *publicis…monumentis*).
has almost certainly been modified for literary effect by Livy. The actual public records are, thus, put into play to support the historical account, subordinated to the purposes of Livy’s finished, literary product, that is, his larger work as monumentum.41

Documentary material of this kind provides a skeleton of public information and memory, but it can be—even has to be—adapted for a larger narrative and literary structure.42 Further, documents and their like do not necessarily represent an uncontested “truth” about the past or even an accurate portrayal of raw data.43 Records are, after all, the province of record-keepers who have their own interests and biases. And basic documentary information may not provide significant cues to place it in context or to inform the viewer how it is to be understood.

For instance, a list of magistrates may not supply such necessary information as source(s), compiler, date of compilation, circumstances of compilation, etc.44 Literature certainly exerts its own prejudices and pressures, but it does so within a structural framework and an inherent methodology, whether explicit or implicit. Thus, inclusion of documentary sources in literature by necessity imposes context and intention on them in order to adapt their relatively

---

41 Cf. Rigsby 2018’s discussion of Cicero’s presentation of documentary evidence, particularly legal material, for purposes of establishing and attacking character rather than technical lawbreaking, i.e., “that Cicero has a powerful set of tools at his disposal which allow him to read both ‘with’ and ‘against’ the grain of a variety of texts in a variety of circumstances to get the results he needs” (257). Rigsby concludes by suggesting the possibility of similar inclusion and usage of documentary evidence by ancient historians as points of evidence in their overall literary programs.

42 Edwards 1996: 18, refers to public documents in the city of Rome as “a storehouse of Roman memories, an archive which ordered them and made them accessible.” Yet archival material on its own that had not been artistically re-elaborated would be inaccessible and indigestible to a wider audience. Documents give information but do not interpret its importance or provide it an application.

43 As Le Goff 1992: xvii = 1988, says “The document is not objective, innocent raw material, but expresses past society’s power over memory and over the future: the document is what remains” (see further ibid. 58-68). Le Goff’s assessment falls within a more extensive treatment of history and memory that extends from antiquity to modernity, but the idea of vetting or, at least, doubting documents, especially by historians, has its ancient precedents.

44 For a case study on the contentious nature of secure information on such points, consider scholarly debate on the form, coverage, compiler(s), etc. of the Annales Maximi (see Ch. 1).
bare form for the more explicative and coherent literary exterior that enfolds it. It is this subsumption, adaptation, expansion, and combination that establishes a qualitative difference between a literary monumentum and its documentary or inscriptive written kin: literature ultimately is more able to control and recast its source material, while the reverse is not so clear.

Thus, the greater complexity of literary monumenta allows for greater versatility, though that complexity develops as an extension of compositeness in other monumenta. By nature, monumenta, both purely material ones and those that involve writing—across the full range of possibilities allowed by “written monumenta”—are complex in the various webs of associations that can accumulate around them as they develop through time: a triumphal arch can be incorporated as an entryway into a new forum; a statue can be moved to a new location and the person depicted can be changed along with the inscription (titulus); a private lake can be filled in deliberately and overtly and be replaced with a public amphitheater; etc. The associations with individuals and places that develop in this process of change direct interpretation, whether the associations are intentional or coincidental, imposed or organic.

A monumentum in its most basic form “tells a story.”46 The story told by an entirely material monumentum is subject to an easily mis- or re-interpreted rhetoric of space and association. The story can change radically depending on a variety of circumstance, including how the environment has changed, how the monumentum itself has changed, and what the viewership is. The location tells as much of the story as the size, shape, and type of the monumentum does. By contrast, a written monumentum, such as an inscribed triumphal arch,

45 See Newlands 2004: esp. 65, for instances of swapping a statue’s identity and similar acts for the imperial periods.
more accurately dictates the form of the story to all that have access to and can read it.\textsuperscript{47} Yet, its location is still a determining factor in its interpretation. In addition, the more highly trafficked the area of the \textit{monumentum}, the more propagated the message and its impact.

Therefore, an important distinction emerges between inscriptive writing and literature: literature transcends the bounds of space and materiality, characteristics that allow it to incorporate inscriptions along with other forms of documents. Both inscription and literature—unlike purely material \textit{monumenta}—have the ability to articulate their purpose, but the survival of an inscription relies on the survival of the material on which it is inscribed.\textsuperscript{48} Because it is unbound by location and can circulate in multiple copies, literature is potentially free from the consequences that result from the physical degeneration or destruction of any one of the exemplars in which it exists—though, of course, even here time and transmission can eventually take their toll.

A text certainly has a material component: papyrus and parchment are extremely susceptible to the elements and other vicissitudes of transmission—an issue that is fully pertinent to Livy and the loss of 107 books of his history.\textsuperscript{49} But material versus literary reproduction differs substantially: making a replica of a statue, a painting, a temple, etc. shows the innovative

\textsuperscript{47} As Wiseman 2014: 48, says, “A statue or a wax portrait can remind you what a person looked like, but it cannot tell you what he did in life…material objects alone could hardly transmit a memory of events. That, it seems, was something that had to be \textit{read}, whether in an inscription…or in an archival document.”

\textsuperscript{48} E.g., Dio Chrysostom (11.37-38) relates the boast of an Egyptian priest that he knows more Greek history than the Greeks because, as the priest claims, all previous history is recorded in temples or on columns through inscription. Many of the columns on which that history is inscribed, however, no longer exist. Thus, only a few know the history that was contained thereon.

\textsuperscript{49} On a decorative level, the calligraphy and other flourishes of manuscripts create their own impression, though it is somewhat coincidental to the content of the literary work recorded (just as epigraphic \textit{monumenta} have their own ornamental features that decorate the content of what is written, for example, the general presentation of engraved letters, the particular forms of truncation, abbreviation, and ligaturing, and their fundamental inscription on a material form). For discussion of the monumentality of epigraphy, see Woolf 1996.
quality of the original work; but the act of copying does not necessarily preserve the commemorative associations of the model because those associations are inherently tied to original location and to continuity in place.\textsuperscript{50} Copying a text, on the other hand—while it is also an acknowledgement of the innovative quality of the work—does not undercut the validity of its original message or fundamentally change the context of the work.\textsuperscript{51} The scribe does not replace the creator, whereas the craftsman or artist seeks to overshadow their predecessor.\textsuperscript{52} Furthermore, the addressees of history potentially dramatize its ability to traverse space as well as time without altering its relationship to the past it commemorates.\textsuperscript{53} The medium on which a literary *monumentum* is placed is nowhere near as deciding a factor of its impact and interpretation as are its contents in respect to artistic quality and complexity.\textsuperscript{54} Therein lies the abstraction of the literary *monumentum* and one of its major defining characteristics.

Further, literature as *monumentum* permits greater exposure and dissemination through freedom of movement and so has a potentially greater impact than a *monumentum* limited by absolute physical constraints. Certainly, literature can focus on very specific places, the seeing of

\textsuperscript{50} This is, admittedly, a reductive view of the potential impact of copied artwork for the sake of the current discussion. See, e.g., Anguissola 2014 on the role of Roman copies of Greek statuary—as well as their sculptors’ embellishments and divergences—in shaping collective memories.

\textsuperscript{51} For instance, in his discussion of papyrus, Pliny the Elder refers to parchment—after its invention in and spread from Pergamum in response to an Egyptian non-exportation of papyrus—as a basis for human immortality (*rei qua constat immortalitas hominum, NH* 13.70). This form of immortality must refer to the potential continuance of written transmission through inscribable media rather than the lasting quality of the parchment itself. Pliny attributes the discussion—if not necessarily the wording—to Varro (*Varro…travit*).

\textsuperscript{52} See, however, Woolf 2015: 218: “Far from being a mere instrument of its creator, a work of art, once created, has a degree of autonomy all its own. Indeed, it is one aspect of this autonomy that it allows a given image to evoke multiple memories, including conflicting ones, within a wide viewership.”

\textsuperscript{53} For the general role of audience in historiography, see Dillery 2009; Marincola 2009; Nicolai 2007; Marincola 1997: 19-33.

\textsuperscript{54} This element, of course, is not clearly delineated in every case. E.g., the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* has literary qualities but was copied in various places and manifested as more material *monumenta*, such as the *Monumentum Ancyranum* and the bronze plaques on the pillars in front of Augustus’ mausoleum. The propagandistic nature of the *Res Gestae* surely creates its own scenario. See Woodman 2012: 181-200.
which can vivify the writing in the mind of its reader. History in particular is very connected to place in so far as place is the theater in which the stories of the past are acted and presented to a new audience.\(^5^5\) The reading of history, however, is not physically confined to these places in the way that observing material *monumenta* is.\(^5^6\) Having knowledge of the places in which the events of a historical work take place can add appreciation to or further inform understanding of the written account, but even one who has never seen these places will be able to take something from the account. Since a literary *monumentum* can travel, the quality of conspicuousness—a desirable, if not fundamental, characteristic for a *monumentum* to have as discussed above—consists more in its mobility and its ability to access audiences; it is not subject to stationary physical placement, as with a material *monumentum*—regardless of whether or not it has an inscription inscribed upon it.\(^5^7\)

This quality of abstraction from any one physical form also means that literary *monumenta* can claim superior commemorative ability to material ones. The latter generally have a simplex form. But, as discussed above, literary *monumenta* can accumulate and so also preserve the memory of friable material *monumenta* beyond the latter’s point of extinction.\(^5^8\) If a material memorial is destroyed or lost to time, a written description of the structure or an account

\(^{5^5}\) Cf. Liv. 5.51-54 for Camillus’ emphasis on the actual space of Rome (discussed in Ch. 4).

\(^{5^6}\) As North 1983: 169, says: “the only significance the individual can still have after death is as one of the remembered dead, through his writings or through records of his achievement. Perhaps, the very greatest could survive without the help of writing — though even Augustus needed his *Res Gestae* as well as his Mausoleum; but written record and hope of survival were inseparable ideas for almost everybody.”

\(^{5^7}\) For a very general treatment of the previous notions, grouping a wide range of sources, see Hui 2009: esp. 19-20: “texts [are] superior to physical monuments because of their ability to transcend their materiality, take leave of their origins, be imitated, appropriated, and adapted multiple times and in various historical situations; hence they have more avenues of dissemination and therefore alternative means of survival. The advent of print has, of course, increased the possibilities of textual survival; but before this technological revolution, the practices of imitation, translation, and literary appropriation were perceived as advantages that texts have over other monuments.”

\(^{5^8}\) See Andrén 1960 for the idea that Dionysius of Halicarnassus merely read about the Roman monuments that he describes, rather than experiencing them through autopsy (an idea that Andrén calls into question).
of the event commemorated can replace the material form. The literary account can also provide a further degree of constancy and depth for future audiences through analysis, cross-reference, and authorial judgement.  

But a reciprocity exists, whereby literary monumenta are also the beneficiaries of the material monumenta they subsume. As with points of evidence in legal investigations, literary monumenta that make claims to reliability—as is routinely the case with historiography—need corroboration to establish their reliability (see above, Ch. 1). For a literary monumentum, abstraction makes the issue all the more acute, since the anchors of space and shape are not there for the audience to appreciate. To counter such physical absence, additional sources of confirmation contribute a great deal. For literary monumenta, the corroboration can include both material and written monumenta, including inscriptional and other documentary material, as support. Thus, a literary monumentum—particularly an historiographical one—is at its most effective when it subsumes other forms of monumenta, whereas material monumenta run the risk of being confused or overwhelmed as their changing landscape forces associations from other monumenta on them.  

To recap, a literary monumentum is not beholden to the same physical or spatial constraints as a material one. But literary monumenta can incorporate other types of monumenta,
to the mutual benefit of either. Historical accounts especially benefit from their integration of further monumenta, as the latter represent evidence for the past and so help supply the historian with credibility. In turn, the physical abstraction of literary works allows material monumenta in an abstract form to exist as well with a degree of freedom from their original spatial constraints.

Written monumenta, complex literary or documentary and simplex, further have the advantage that, though they remain subject to multiple perspectives and interpretations, they can to a greater degree than purely material monumenta direct their own interpretation through the detail they include and the scope of commemoration they articulate. Other means of recording articulated stories—such as oral tradition—are notoriously susceptible to change, but a written record is more stable, though it remains subject to rebuttal and renegotiation by subsequent writers as well as by the original writer. Literary authors certainly could issue revised editions of their work, make insertions, or otherwise alter the content. But, unlike the situation with, for instance, the rededications of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (see Ch. 1), the original author retains their creative property and remains the primary authority on their particular, literary monumentum. The content within is still, of course, subject to the competitive and

62 Cf. Edwards 1996 for a similar notion on constructing an understanding of the city of Rome through physical monuments and written works, esp. 3: “Romans interpreted their city in a multiplicity of ways…Through complex dialogues between texts and monuments were constructed the competing discourses which together have composed and continue to compose the city of Rome.”

63 For the view that Livy issued a second edition of his first pentad, e.g., see Budé (Bayet) 1.xvi-xxii. Contra a second edition (but not later insertions): Ogilvie 73; Walsh 1964: 29; Syme 1959: 46-49. See also Luce 1965: 210: “Hypotheses of second editions are generally distasteful, for they smack of the drastic and desperate; this is particularly true when, as in Bayet’s argumentation, no single passage cited as a later addition seems particularly compelling or necessary. But the question of later additions and of a second edition is neither idle nor academic; in particular, if it can be shown that the passages concerning Augustus in Books One and Four, dating soon after 27 B.C., are later additions, the composition of the first pentad must be pushed back, possibly before the Battle of Actium.”

64 It is perhaps an uncontroversial point, but even works edited by others remained the creative property of their authors. For an Augustan example, it is Virgil’s name attached to the Aeneid, though, according to the Vita Vergilii of Aelius Donatus (39-42), L. Varius Rufus and Plotius Tucca are said to have edited (albeit minimally) and published it. On the veracity of this report, see Stok 2010: 110-12.
potentially defamatory discourse of the aristocratic Roman world, as with all forms of *monumenta*.\(^{65}\) Thus, a further burden falls on the author to establish their own authority on the topic and guide the reader to the preferred interpretation, but that author can articulate and emphasize that particular interpretation and so offer it more stability than is available to purely material *monumenta*.\(^{66}\)

**A Literary *monumentum*: an example from Cato’s *Origines***

Cato provides an example of a passage of literature matching and superseding multiple material and smaller-scale written *monumenta*. In effect, the passage shows the possibility for an historiographical *monumentum* to underwrite collective commemoration. The passage in question is one that survives from the *Origines*—as cited by Aulus Gellius. In it, Cato narrates the exploits of a military tribune in the First Punic War who offers to sacrifice himself and a small band of troops in Sicily so that the rest of the army can escape (Gell. *NA* 3.7.1-17). The results are as expected, except that the tribune manages in Cato’s account to survive the engagement. Cato then compares him to the Spartan king Leonidas in his respective self-sacrifice at the battle of Thermopylae.

The description of the subsequent memorialization of Leonidas features the term *monumentum*, applied to a variety of material and written types:

\[
\text{idem benefactum quo in loco ponas nimium interest. Leonides Laco, qui simile apud Thermopylas fecit, propter eius virtutes omnis Graecia glori\textup{am} atque gratiam praecip\textup{uam} clarit\textup{ud}inis in\textup{c}l\textup{itissim}ae decoravere *monumentis*: signis, statuis, elogiis, historiis, aliisque rebus gratissimum id eius factum habuere; at tribuno}
\]

\(^{65}\) As Wiseman 1986: 100, puts it, “Glory could be preserved in words as well as in stone or bronze, and attacked as effectively by the pen as by the pickaxe.”

\(^{66}\) For the particular brand of authority boasted by ancient Greco-Roman historians, see Marincola 1997: esp. 6-7: “the narrator employs an ‘artificial authority’ by which he interprets the events in his work for the reader, and explicitly directs the reader to think in a certain manner.” This artificial authority emerges in authorial insertions that highlight the approach to or the process of the investigation rather than maintain the flow of narrative. Examples of this practice include mentions of travel or autopsy of sites and events, comparisons of variant accounts, and qualitative judgments of source material.
militum parva laus pro factis relictà, qui idem fecerat atque rem servaverat. (Cato Orig. 4 F 76 FRHist. = Gell. NA 3.7.19)

the audience for which you perform the same service makes an enormous difference. For Leonidas the Spartan, who did something similar at Thermopylae, because of his excellence, all of Greece adorned his glory and offered special thanks with monumenta for his most illustrious reputation: with pictures, statues, inscriptions, in their histories, and in other ways, they have treated that deed of his as most deserving of gratitude; but for the military tribune, who had done the same thing and even saved the state, small praise was allotted in proportion to his deeds.

Of the four specified examples of monumenta in this passage, two then are written (elogia, historiae), and two are material (signa, statuae). Cato says it was by these combined means that the Greeks magnified and commemorated the deeds of Leonidas, whereas the Roman equivalent gets little return in this respect for his exemplary deeds (parva laus pro factis).67

In writing about the tribune, however, and in comparing him to Leonidas, Cato elevates the Roman hero to the level of the Greek one—or even beyond, in that the tribune additionally possesses the virtue of having done without all the fanfare of commemoration that Leonidas posthumously received.68 Thus, Cato’s account of the story becomes a monumentum that outdoes those set up to commemorate Leonidas. As a representation of Roman virtus, Cato’s tribune receives a monumentum both more modest than Leonidas’ Greek rewards and at the same time more outstanding, in that it subsumes and casts aspersions on the latter.

67 There is a possible cultural judgement here that Greek commemoration is excessive, whereas the respective Roman practice—at least as Cato represents it—falls short of what is deserved. For Cato’s mixed views on Greek culture, see FRHist. 1.194-95, 3.124; Gruen 1992: 52-83, esp. the assessment of Cato as “Roman curmudgeon par excellence” (52) and “stalwart opponent of infection by Greek culture” (55), an assessment that becomes complicated in the discussion; Astin 1978: 157-81.

68 So argues Krebs 2006. Contra FRHist. 3.122: “If the episode had been a well-established part of the tradition about the First Punic War, commemorated in Naevius and Ennius, or in Fabius Pictor and other early historians, one would expect the hero’s name to have been enshrined for ever. And in such circumstances it would have been less easy for Cato to complain that the tribune had received scant praise for his deeds.”
Still, the question arises who or what exactly is praised and commemorated in this passage. Gellius concludes that Cato intends the account as a form of accolade: *hanc Q. Caedicii tribuni virtutem M. Cato tali suo testimonio decoravit* (“M. Cato honored the excellence of Q. Caedicius with his account here,” 3.7.20). But the account may not reflect an actual historical person or, at least, may reflect him in an imaginative way. Cato’s *monumentum* does not commemorate an individual so much as an ideal.69 Gellius identifies the tribune by the name Caedicius. It is unclear, however, that Cato provides a name,70 which is not surprising in light of testimony that Cato did not include names in his work (Nep. *Cato* 3.4; Plin. *NH* 8.11).71

But since names often themselves serve as crucial *monumenta*—as they represent a basic mechanism of commemoration—it is significant that that element is potentially left out. There is the further possibility that the name and character is generic (Caedicius > *caedo* = “the one who is cut down”). The tribune is the model of a Roman soldier and commits perhaps the most Roman of deeds: a version of the *devotio*, even though his particular version does not end with the standard result of death. Further, evidence survives in his speeches that Cato’s advocacy for restraint in personal ornamentation and glorification extended specifically to many of the

69 See Gotter 2009: esp. 112; “[the central point of the story] is a matter of devaluing individual heroics as a whole: thus Cato denies his protagonist a heroic death and does not let his life end in apotheosis but in the anti-climax of everyday politics. This deheroization of the single individual does not signify a devaluation of norms; *virtus* remains the key concept in Cato’s perspective as well. These norms are, however, not enacted by the individual but by the Roman people as a whole. The tribune is a hero as a Roman, not as an individual or a member of a *gens*, as traditional mechanisms of commemoration would have shown him.” See also Chaplin 2000: 21-22, for the importance of exemplarity in this passage.

70 In other traditions, the tribune is identified as Laberius or M. Calpurnius Flamma. See *FRHist.* 3.121; Krebs 2006: 93 n. 1; Courtney 1999: 74-75; Calboli 1996; *MRR* 1.207, for the different forms of the name and their sources. There may also be here the signs of Roman family competition and the enlargement or invention of ancestors’ deeds (see Chs. 3 and 4).

71 See *FRHist.* 3.121-22 for the view that Cato gives names for individuals when they are elected or appointed to office but mentions them only by title thereafter. See Gotter 2009 for the assertion that Cato omits names that would have been familiar to his readership anyways as a response and counter to the tendency to record family names in annalistic state records. See also Letta 1985; Dench 1995: 85-94.
monumenta with which he describes Leonidas’ reception.\textsuperscript{72} His account memorializes the proud absence of those in the representation of Rome that he elevates.

Perhaps we do best, then, if we interpret Cato’s written monumentum as commemorating the Roman values of courage, sacrifice, and focus on the collective—though, of course, Cato’s impetus here to generalize praise may be an attempt as a novus homo to discredit his aristocratic political competitors: whereas they can fall back on the authority—monumental and otherwise—of a long and outwardly prestigious family tradition, Cato’s reputation is less established by his family’s imprints on the Roman past. Through his literary monumentum of Caedicius, Cato elevates and immortalizes larger social values, not an individual or single family as, say, a tomb does with its close, personal associations. There are, however, literary monumenta with personal focuses that, by contrast, can help to contextualize Livy’s own historical monumentum. These personal literary monumenta show up especially in programmatic expressions in poetry.

**Poetic monumenta**

The written forms of monumenta are, of course, not restricted to prose.\textsuperscript{73} Here, after briefly glancing at the concept and early instantiations of poetic monumenta, we will focus on poetic monumenta of the Augustan age and beyond. As with the other literary monumenta discussed above, monumentum here is used to indicate the abstract notion of full poems or poetic programs rather than the specific material monumenta that are often mentioned within poems. These mentions of material monumenta are significant, particularly when great architectural or

\textsuperscript{72} E.g., a sampling of the fragments of Cato’s speeches shows him rejecting and attacking such individualistic forms of commemoration as paintings and plaques (from the speech de signis et tabulis, FF 94-95, 98 M), statues (FF 95-96, 98 M), and the general construction of grandiose buildings (FF 133, 174, 185 M). See Gruen 1992: 54. Livy, however, gives an assessment of Cato at odds with the idea of him being a strict champion of collective—as opposed to individual—values: haud sane detractator laudum suarum ("clearly not one to pass over his own praises," 34.15.9).

\textsuperscript{73} See, e.g., Fest. 123 L: scripta et carmina, discussed in Ch. 1. For discussion of the metaphorical development of the term monumentum from material memorial to poetic work, see Suerbaum 1968: esp. 160-62, 327-28.
artistic marvels are compared to literary artefacts—in particular because it is the latter that are generally represented in the poems as a more powerful means of memory maintenance than the former.

By mentioning these material *monumenta*, the poets incorporate them into their written works and provide, as it were, abstract *monumenta* to replace the physical structures themselves. But the resulting abstract depiction both incorporates a disembodied form of the material *monumentum* into the poem—improving its chances of longevity as part of the poem—and allows for a more direct comparison between poem and material *monumentum*, again devaluing the effectiveness of the material form in light of the poetic one. In this respect, the poetic conception of *monumentum* has significant implications for Livy’s approach to his own large-scale literary *monumentum*, both in how the historical model is similar to and how it differs from its poetic comparanda. In particular, the connection comes in the scope of commemoration, that is, who or what can be commemorated as well as on what grounds they are commemorated, and the relationship between writer and reader in how that commemoration is carried out.

The first extant reference to poetry as *monumentum* appears perhaps in a fragment of Lucilius: *haec virtutis tuae cartis monumenta locantur* (“these monumenta of your excellence are placed in pages,” F 1084 M = Non. 340 L). To return to the discussion above on the mobility of literary versus material *monumenta*, the *monumenta* here are placed (*locantur*) on the page but are not subject to a fixed, geographical location, as the case would be with, say, a statue. The pages allow what they hold to travel. Thus, it is the content of the pages, which is presumably

---

74 For the present discussion, these similarities and differences will focus on explicit usages of the term *monumentum* and will not directly address other forms of interplay as, say, Livy’s annalistic presentation of material and Ennius’ title *Annales* for his epic.

75 Cf. the abstract object of commemoration here with that of Cato above (*virtutis ~ virtutes*, Orig. 4 F 76 FRHist.).
poetic—or, at least, literary—that constitutes the *monumenta* rather than the pages themselves. Unfortunately, the context of this passage is not clear enough to allow for any degree of certainty. Furthermore, *c(h)artis* is a conjecture by Lachmann for *artis*, which undermines the assumption that what we have here are literary, as opposed to material, *monumenta*.

Catullus provides a better attested characterization of a poem as a *monumentum* when he displays his approval of the *Smyrna* of C. Helvius Cinna: *parva mei mihi cordi monumenta <sodalis>* (“the brief *monumenta* of my companion are a delight to me,” 95.9). Here, the commemoration achieved by the literary *monumentum* is of Cinna as a neoteric author and, thus, a companion (*sodalis*) of Catullus: it appears as a close and personal reminder appropriate to the impression of the particular intimacy that is a defining trait of neoteric verse. The preciosity and minuteness (*parva*) of—as well as the sentimentality (*cordi*) attached to—this *monumentum* stands in contrast to the standard conception of grand, public *monumenta*. This *monumentum* is playing on and with the standard conception; it nevertheless retains many of the traits of *monumenta* as discussed above, such as the preservation and dissemination of remembrance and the connection of name and *monumentum* in that the very first line of the poem provides the identity of the author (*mei Cinnae*). Even in contexts where the term *monumentum* does not appear, much of early Roman poetry presents itself or is read as fulfilling many of the functions of *monumenta*, particularly where a claim to eternality or conspicuousness appears.

---

76 There are also textual issues with this poem (apart from the conjecture of *sodalis*), particularly in whether the final lines of 95 are part of the larger poem and, thus, whether this line can be definitively taken as a reference to Cinna’s *Smyrna*. E.g., on 95.9-10, Mynors notes: “a praeceidentibus [versibus] seiuixit Statius, haud scio an recte” (97). The assessment of Cinna’s work as *parva*, however, seems fitting with the neoteric aesthetic and the content of the rest of 95. See Quinn 1973: 431-33; Fordyce 1961: 383-85. Regardless, some work of poetry is characterized as *monumenta*.

77 There is also here similarity to the inscribed, personal gravestone that commemorates an individual or family/group.

78 E.g., Lucretius refers to the poetry of Ennius as eternal (*Ennius aeternis exponit versibus*, 1.121).
A passage that illustrates the role of poetry as written *monumentum* especially well is the much-discussed monumental *sphragis* of Horace’s first set of *Odes* (C. 3.30). The poem directly addresses the enduring nature of writing as opposed to material means of memory preservation. This poem, along with the rest of *Odes* 1-3, was published in 23 BC. Thus, while direct interaction by Livy with the poem at some point during his writing career is possible, it is not certain, given that the date of composition and publication of Livy’s early material—particularly his preface—remains controversial. It is, thus, uncertain whether *Odes* 3.30 could have been directly relevant to Livy’s initial design and overall approach to history, just as it is uncertain whether Livy’s work was produced in time to be available to Horace for response. Regardless, the concept of *monumentum* expressed in *Odes* 3.30 and its characterization as freer from wear and tear than its material counterparts allows for an interesting comparison with an understanding of Livy’s own work as a *monumentum*.

Horace’s idea of his poetry as a *monumentum* first and foremost highlights the potential of literary *monumenta* in terms of temporal durability:

```
exegi monumentum aere perennius
regalique situ pyramidum altius,
quod non imber edax, non aquilo impotens
possit diruere aut innumerabilis
```

79 For Horace’s *sphragis* in C. 3.30, see Woodman 2012: 86; Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 364-65. For *sphragis* in general, see Seider 2018: 304 n. 6 (with further bibliography); *OCD* s.v.; and, esp., Kranz 1961.

80 For date of publication and issues of arrangement that may have implications for date of composition, see Nisbet and Rudd 2004: xix-xx; Conte 294-95; Williams 1969: 2.

81 The evidence for Livy’s first pentad is: 1.19.2-3, for the title Augustus (27 BC) and no mention of the second closing of the Gates of Janus (25 BC); and 4.20.5-11, on Cornelius Cossus’ *spolia opima* and the possible reference to the contemporary appeal for that honor of M. Licinius Crassus (29 BC). The arguments for dating the first pentad are numerous, but some of the highlights are: Budé 1.xvi-xix (Bayet), for the possibility of a second edition for Books 1-5; Syme 1959: 42-50, for the preface as a later composition meant to pertain to the entire work rather than just the first pentad; Luce 1965, for composition dates earlier than the canonical 27-25 BC and doubt concerning Livy as an “Augustan” author; and Burton 2000, for a reassertion of Luce’s argument with further arguments dating the beginning of composition to 33 or early 32 BC. See also Oakley 1.109-10.

82 For general discussion of Horace’s engagement with Roman historians, see Woodman 2012: 112-20.
annorum series et fuga temporum.\(^83\)
non omnis moriar multaque pars mei
vitabit Libitinam: usque ego postera
crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium
scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex. (C. 3.30.1-9)\(^84\)

I have built\(^85\) a *monumentum* more lasting than bronze
and higher than the royal site of the pyramids,
which not consuming deluge nor the unrestrained
North Wind can destroy, nor the uncountable
progression of years nor the flight of time.
I will not perish entirely: a great part of me
will avoid Death: continuously I shall grow,
fresh with the praise of posterity, so long as
the priest scales the Capitol with the silent virgin.

Several of the elements discussed above appear in this poem. Conspicuousness is operative in the
metaphorical height (*altius*) of the poem. Death and burial are prevalent with the mention of the
pyramids as burial sites (*situs*),\(^86\) the inclusion of Libitina, the goddess of death, and the particular
verb used (*moriar*). The poem is, in effect, an epitaph and so a funerary *monumentum* to the

---

\(^83\) Ctr. Lucan 7.397-99: *non aetas haec carpsit edax monimentaque rerum / patria destituivit: crimen civile videmus / tot vacuas urbes* (“it is not consuming time that has eaten at these *monimenta* of the past and left them defiled: it is
the crime of civil war that we witness in the desolation of these cities”). For discussion of this and related passages,
see Gowing 2005: 88-94.

\(^84\) Woodman 2012: 94-95, proposes the Lucretian passages discussed above (particularly 5.306-7, 311-12, 328-29)
as a source of inspiration here. As Woodman says, “The similarities are unmistakable, but Horace, as so often,
tempers and alters the rigid doctrine of Lucretius to suit his own more realistic view of the world” (95). See also
Rusten 1989: 161, for a comparison of Pericles’ funeral oration at Thuc. 2.41.4 with Horace’s *monumentum*.

\(^85\) On *exegi*, Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 367, point out: “not just ‘I have completed’ but ‘I have perfected’.” As such, the
notion is one of finish, not simple construction. This literary *monumentum* is perfect to a degree that material
*monumenta* cannot attain.

\(^86\) See Woodman 2012: 89 (with further bibliography), for the possible translation of *situs* as gravesite and its
connection to the grave inscription *hic situs est*. 
author.\textsuperscript{87} Persistence (\textit{perennius})\textsuperscript{88} and freshness (\textit{recens}) are at issue. There is also an outlook for the future and for reputation (\textit{postera...laude}).\textsuperscript{89} Moreover, this \textit{monumentum} is not subject to the attrition of the elements (\textit{non imber edax, non aquilo impotens}) or passage of time (\textit{innumerabilis annorum series et fuga temporum}) that gnaw at material \textit{monumenta}.\textsuperscript{90} Rather than the grand displays of pharaohs and other potentates, Horace offers poetry as his legacy.\textsuperscript{91}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{88} Cf. Ov. Am. 1.15.7 for the phrase \textit{fama perennis}, which the poet seeks (\textit{quaeritur}, 8) over mortale...opus (though McKeown 1989: 2.393, cautions against reading this line too definitively as an allusion to Hor. C. 3.30.1). See Ch. 3 for the connection between \textit{fama} and \textit{monumentum}, as well that between \textit{opus} and \textit{monumentum}.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Cf. Prop. 3.1.33-34: \textit{Homerus / posteritate suum crescere sensit opus} (“Homer perceives how his work grows in the future”).
\item \textsuperscript{91} Cf. Hor. C. 4.8; Suerbaum 1968: 176-81, 192-98, on the superiority of poetic offerings to physical ones—such as bowls (\textit{pateras}, 1), bronzes (\textit{aera}, 2), tripods (\textit{tripodas}, 3), etc.—particularly in the poet’s ability to speak about the value of the gift (11-12). See also Goldschmidt 2017: 370-73, who argues that Horace in this poem exploits the memorial impact of poetry over material \textit{monumenta} as exemplified by Ennius (\textit{Calabres Pireides}, 4.8.20) concerning Scipio Africanus. Goldschmidt then asserts that Horace claims superiority over the archaic poet on the grounds that “only Horace and his contemporaries can see through to the end of history in Augustan Rome. It is only for and under Augustus, not Scipio Africanus, whom Augustus far outshines (\textit{Epod}. 9.25-26), that a truly lasting textual monument can be constructed” (373). The idea of poets—and authors in general—competing with predecessors is compelling. Goldschmidt’s argument, however, must remain speculative due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence from the older authors (as Goldschmidt indirectly acknowledges: “Ennius and Naevius lie in \textit{disiecta membra},” 381), though, admittedly, the same can be said for Livy due to the loss of so much of his work. But a more contiguous and sustained picture of Livy’s work does remain nonetheless.
And this *monumentum* has a much better chance at securing eternal remembrance than a statue, house, or even temple, in that it cannot be destroyed or replaced.\(^{92}\)

As the conclusion to the three books, *Odes* 3.30 establishes the *monumentum* that is Horace’s poetry, which promises an extension of the poet’s fame and, thus, of the poet himself beyond what a material memorial can accomplish. The standard interpretation of the poem is as a means of immortality or as near to it as can be attained.\(^{93}\) It will persist, indeed its fame will increase (*crescam*),\(^{94}\) at least as long as (*dum*) Rome does, here represented by the Capitoline.\(^{95}\)

The connection to the city itself can ensure the continuity and exposure by which the *monumentum* can become established or fully constructed (to push the metaphor between material and written).\(^{96}\) Yet, here the city that is connected with the poem’s survival is more the

---

\(^{92}\) Suerbaum 1968: 166, terms the construction of such edifices to ensure remembrance and fame a fallacy (“Hinfälligkeit”) in light of Horace’s written *monumentum*. Edwards 1996: 4-6, however, mentions problems even with literary commemoration, particularly in the loss of Varro’s *Antiquitates*. Edwards says: “Even Rome’s literary landscape then, apparently more durable than the material fabric of the ancient city, turns out to be fragmentary and full of gaps” (6).

\(^{93}\) Cf. Cic. *de Leg.* 1.1: A. *lucus quidem ille et haec Arpinatium quercus agnosci tur saepe a me lectus in Mario. si manet illa quercus, haec est profecto; etem in est sane vetus. Q. *Manet vero, Attice noster, et semper manebit; sata est enim ingenio. nullius autem agricolae cultu stirps tam diuturna quam poetae versu seminari potest* (“Atticus: ‘I know that grove and this Arpinate oak tree, from often reading the [poem] Marius. If that oak survives, this is definitely it; it is clearly old.’ Quintus: ‘Of course it survives, my dear Atticus, and it always will: it was planted by imagination. No plant tended by a farmer has such longevity as can be sown by the verse of a poet’.”). For discussion of Horace’s play for immortality through poetry, see Ingleheart 2015: 296-300; Woodman 2012: 87-88, 94-95, 102-3; Hui 2009: 22-27; Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 364-67; Williams 2002: 418-20; Hulton 1972; Suerbaum 1968: 165-67. Cf. Fraenkel 1957: 303, on *C.* 3.30: “The future life of Rome with its unalterable ceremonies is taken for granted, if not to the end of all time, yet for so immense a period that no one needs to cast his thought beyond it.”

There is perhaps still acknowledgement of the perishability of Horace’s *monumentum*: it is “more lasting” (*perennius*), not ever lasting; a great part of the poet, but still only a part (*pars*), will cheat death; and the survival of his fame is linked with the survival of the Capitoline and the city itself (*dum*). See also Segal 1989 for a similar immortality proposed by Lucretius’ poetry, which applies to the philosophical doctrine of Epicureanism and the “golden phrases” (*aurea dicta*) that perpetuate it rather than the poet himself.

\(^{94}\) Cf. Liv. *praef.* 4 (*creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua*).


\(^{96}\) See Woolf 1996: 25: “Monuments, the *Ode* implies, if they lasted long enough and were prominent enough, would preserve the fame of the commemorated, acting like mnemonics to trigger memories and perhaps speech.
concept of Rome and the idea of the eternal city rather than its physical streets and structures. As with the notion of what it means to be Roman, so too the poem can grow. While the material monumentum diminishes with time, the written expands to a wider audience, to a greater level of fame for the poet, and to its full extent of meaning, which will be picked up on and emulated by subsequent authors as they reference Horace.

As Horace continues, it emerges that the poet’s claim to have constructed a monumentum for himself lies in his innovation and his originality in bringing Greek meter, particularly those of Alcaeus and Sappho, into Latin verse: *dicar...ex humili potens / princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos* (“I, from a lowly position to a powerful one, will be called the first to have brought Aeolian poetry to Italian verses,” C. 3.30.10-14). Thus, while Horace’s monumental mission is one of personal continuance through his poetry, the process involves many more agents, including Horace’s Greek predecessors, his successors who carry on his monumentum through the greatest form of flattery, and, most importantly, his readers. The essential task of memory preservation requires an audience to negotiate the impact of the monumentum.

Other poets following Horace continue the notion of memorializing through the monumenta of their particular brand of poetry. Propertius picks up on Horace’s notion of the perishability of the material as opposed to the written, even in the grandest of structures:

\[
\text{nam neque pyramidum sumptus ad sidera ducti,} \\
\text{nec Iovis Elei caelum imitata domus,}
\]

Once evoked, the deeds and qualities of the monumentalized would be rehearsed, whether orally or in silence, and admired, and he or she would not ‘perish utterly’.

97 For originality as a poet’s basis for immortality, see Kyriakidis 2016: 17-20.

98 As Woodman 2012: 94, puts it, “in Horace’s poetry it is the essence of the poet himself which lives on.” Cf. Porphyrio ad Hor. C. 3.30.1: *hæ<e>c ó<ö><δη qua tertius liber consummator in ipsius auctoris laudes scripta est* (“this ode, in which the third book culminates, has been written for praise of the author himself”).
nec Mausolei dives fortuna sepulcri
mortis ab extrema condicione vacant.
a aut illis flamma aut imber subducet honores,
annorum aut tacito pondere victa ruent. (3.2.19-24)

Not the costly pyramids, reaching up to the stars,
nor the house of Elean Jupiter, modeled after heaven,
nor Mausolus’ tomb for all its rich fortune
shall be free from the final constraint of death.
Either fire or rain shall rob them of their honors,
or they shall fall, conquered by the silent weight of years.

The examples given are all among the seven wonders of the ancient world—and two, the Great Pyramids and the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, are funerary structures—but their greatness will not save them from the elements and the inevitable march of time. Propertius, however, has a solution for this perishability, which resides in his poetry: at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aevo / excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus (“but fame acquired through genius will not perish with time: glory based on genius endures undying,” 3.2.25-26).99 It is the success of the poet’s work that lends him immortality; only through talent can death be combatted.100

But, unlike Horace’s monumentum, which only provides immortality for the poet, Propertius includes other potential beneficiaries of his poetry’s act of commemoration: fortunata, meo si qua est celebrata libello! / carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae (“fortunate is she whoever is praised in my little book! My songs will be so many monumenta of your beauty,” 3.2.18). Thus, the poet’s girlfriend—whoever that may be at the time (si qua)—also will receive the perquisites of his poems, particularly the disembodied imperishability that their inclusion in

99 Cf. Ov. Met. 15.876: nomenque erit indelebile nostrum (“my name shall not be liable to destruction”). Cf. also Ov. Am. 1.15.31-32: cum silices, cum dens patientis aratri / depereant aevö, carmina morte carent (“though rocks and the tooth of the enduring plow perish with time, songs are free from death”).

100 Concerning immortality, Catullus draws a distinction between types of literary works and the extent of the talent of the author. In contrast to the excellence, seemingly because of neoteric polish (see above), of Cinna’s Smyrna, Catullus disparages the work of a certain Volusius: Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam (“the annals of Volusius shall die at the Padua itself [the branch of the Po river that passes through the author’s birth place],” 95.7; cf. 36.1, 10 for Volusius’ work as cacata carta).
his written work will bestow. As a fleeting characteristic itself, the beauty of the poet’s girlfriend will be preserved in poetry as an unchanging ideal, even though the putative person commemorated is subject to change according to the poet’s caprice. The nature of the monumenta, however, are still very personal: the commemoration is on a small, individual scale, as it was with the Catullus passage above (95.9).

In the *Tristia*, Ovid gives a further example of a poetic monumentum extending the range and duration of the poet’s reputation and, in effect, lifespan. In this case, however, the poet makes his poetry a sort of commentary on the political situation behind his exile. Ovid asks that his wife see to it that his bones be returned home from exile, that his remains be treated in the proper way and interred in a marble tomb, and that a brief epitaph be inscribed thereon (3.3.65-76). After he gives the epitaph, Ovid dismisses it with “this is enough for the inscription” (*hoc satis in titulo est*, 77; see Ch. 4 for discussion of tituli). As discussed in Ch. 1, an epitaph on its own often provides very little information beyond name and notice of death. Ovid continues instead with more significant vehicles of commemoration than a simple tomb can offer: *et enim maiora libelli / et diuturna magis sunt monimenta mihi, / quos ego confido, quamvis nocuere, daturos / nomen et auctori tempora longa suo* (“my little books are even greater and longer-lasting monumenta for me. I trust that they will grant reputation for a long time to their author, though they harm him,” 77-80).

---

101 Claassen 1996: 583, points out that Ovid’s wife also is a recipient of the poetic immortality sought after in the work. Claassen (585) further discusses the importance to Ovid that his work be transmitted to posterity (*Trist. 4.10.2; cf. 4.9.26, for a threat against an enemy extending to posterity, perpetuae…posteritatis*).

102 Huskey 2005 discusses Ovid’s references to and expansion upon Tibullus’ literary epitaph (1.3.54-56). Huskey says: “But what good is an epitaph? In the absence of the rest of his poetry, Ovid’s epitaph would provide meager proof of his skill as a poet; if all that remained of Tibullus’s poetry were his epitaph, we would not know at all that Tibullus had been a poet” (379)

103 Cf. Ov. *Trist. 1.7.11-12: sed carmina maior imago / sunt mea* (“but my songs are a greater portrait”).
The material memorial of the tomb—even with the added vouchsafe of inscription—is far less effective for commemoration than the written *monumenta* provided for by Ovid’s poetry, even if that effectiveness has a detrimental side in recalling unpleasant memories. The *libelli* to which Ovid refers here must include the *Ars Amatoria* as a poem that caused its author harm in leading to his banishment from Rome. The remembrance of the author established by the poems is personal but, in this case, has a clear political tinge as well. The exile that Ovid bewails is an effect of his interactions with the ruling family. In addition to their importance as a *monumentum* to Ovid’s literary talent, his *libelli* will, therefore, commemorate the “poem and mistake” (*carmen et error, Trist. 2.207*) that landed him in Tomi.

Our final example comes from the late 1st AD poet Martial. In this instance, the commemorative effect of poetry emerges as a sort of dialogue between author and audience, which exemplifies the memorial impact of the poetic *monumentum* as a negotiable interaction between reader and writer. Martial writes:

> lector, opes nostrae: quem cum mihi Roma dedisset,  
> “nil tibi quod demus maius habemus” ait.  
> “pigra per hunc fugies ingratæ flumina Lethes  
> et meliore tui parte superstes eris.  
> marmora Messallae findit caprificus et audax  
> dimidios Crispi mulio ridet equos;  
> at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt.  
> solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori.” (10.2.5-12)  

Reader, you my source of wealth: when Rome gave you to me, she said: “I have nothing greater to give you.

---

104 As Huskey 2005: 383, says, “[Ovid] has demonstrated that his literary corpus will provide a more meaningful memorial of his literary life than any epitaph that he could compose.”


106 This reference has become obscure with the passage of time. Seemingly this line refers to a broken charioteer statue of a certain Crispus (Passienus?), which resided next to a cart path leaving the city.

107 For the type of immortality established by this and related epigrams, see Williams 2002; Garthwaite 1998.
Through him, you shall escape the sluggish waters of thankless Lethe, and you shall survive with the better part of yourself. The fig tree splits the marble of Messalla, and brazenly the mule-driver mocks the halved horses of Crispus: but theft does no harm to sheets, and the centuries avail them. These monumeta alone know no death.”

Again, the impermanence of funerary monumeta (marmora), in particular the tomb of Messalla,\textsuperscript{108} is superseded by the written form. In this case, time (saecula) and defacement (furta) cannot lessen the impact of the monumentum. Indeed, the commemorative value of the writing can even improve with age (prosunt) and is unique (sola) in its power to overcome death.\textsuperscript{109}

Martial extends the idea of poetic commemoration, however, beyond the preceding authors in a significant way or, at least, makes the point more explicitly in connection with his monumeta: the form of commemoration is still a personal one in that the poet’s reputation is extended, but the process by which it is established is reciprocal. The poet’s legacy—indeed the very value of the poetry (opes)—lies with the reader, a gift given by Rome herself.\textsuperscript{110} Thereby, a contract of sorts is established: the writer will continue to write quality poetry provided that the

---

\textsuperscript{108} This is M. Valerius Messala Corvinus, the Republican partisan under C. Cassius Longinus who transferred his allegiance first to M. Anthony, then to Octavian. He was also the patron of Tibullus, Lygdamus, Sulpicia, and Ovid for a time. Messala’s tomb was said to be particularly grand. See \textit{OCD s.v.}; \textit{RE} 261. See also Mart. 8.3.5-8: \textit{et cum rupta situ Messalae saxa iacebunt / altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt, / me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes / ad patrias sedes carmina nostra ferret} (“and when the rocks of Messala lie in ruin, and the high marbles of Licinius turn to dust, I shall still be read, and many a stranger will carry my poems with them to their ancestral homes”). For a similar idea, cf. Juv. 10.142-46: \textit{patriam tamen obruit olim / gloria paucorum et laudis titulique cupidio / haesuri saxis cinerum custodibus, ad quae / discutienda valent sterilis mala robora fici, / quandoquidem data sunt ipsis quoque fata sepulcris} (“at some point still the fatherland was overcome by the glory of a few and their desire for praise and an inscription meant to cling to stone, the guardian of ashes. For splitting these rocks, the evil strength of the sterile fig is a match since ends have been given also to tombs themselves”).

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. \textit{Ov. Am.} 3.9.28: \textit{defugiant avidos carmina sola rogos} (“my poems alone escape the greedy pyre”); [Sen.] \textit{Epig.} 26.9-10: \textit{carmina sola carent fato mortemque repellant; / carminibus vives semper, Homere, tuis} (“poems alone are free from fate and fend off death; you will live forever, Homer, in your poetry”).

\textsuperscript{110} For the originality here of the reader as a source of immortality as well as the involvement of personified Rome in the process, see Williams 2002: 422-24.
reader will continue to read. The monumentum that is the individual poem, as well as the poetic program as a whole, is created initially by the author’s talent but is carried into the future by the ongoing appreciation of the reader.

**Conclusion**

The preceding passages come from very different poets and styles of poetry, but, through allusion, the poems show that they are conceived of in a similar strain to those of their predecessors. Further, they share a characteristic in that they represent relatively individualistic forms of commemoration, similar to those monumenta connected closely with their dedicators discussed in Ch. 1. The poets above especially evoke funerary valences for their monumenta in their comparison of poems to tombs, as these will, in essence, have the last word even beyond the death of the poet. The poetic monumentum, however, has a better claim to eternality than its material equivalent as its survival is not dependent on a particular instance of physical substance. And subsequent inclusion of similar themes and words by later poets extends that eternality through the act of emulation rather than replacement. The identity of a poem cannot be exchanged so easily as that of a statue. But, in all the preceding poetic instances, the clear focus of the monumentum is on individuals, whether the poet himself or an affected persona of the poet, a fellow poet, or a beloved. Admittedly, a primary purpose of creating memorable poetry is so that the author can enjoy remembrance after death. But the focus on personal benefit found in these poems can cast light on Livy’s conception of his monumentum, which has a different focus and audience, to be discussed further in Ch. 3.

---

111 See, e.g., Ov. Am. 1.15, where the poet lists Greek and Roman predecessors as support for his own desired literary immortality. The list includes Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Sophocles, Aratus, Menander, Ennius, Accius, Varro of Atax, Lucretius, Virgil, Tibullus, and Gallus. For similar lists, see McKeown 1989: 2.394-95. See also Feeney 2016: 1-4.
As in the case of the poetic *monumenta* above, Livy’s work is monumental by virtue of its literary characteristics, that is, first and foremost because of its cumulative and inclusive character. Literary *monumenta* are further defined—as opposed to material *monumenta*—by the greater degree of freedom they offer from physical degeneration. When a literary author adopts material—including inscriptional—*monumenta* into his text, the author abstractly reimagines those primary monumental instantiations through the written word. Thus, the author frees those *monumenta* from the confines of their own original materiality. It also has the potential to free them to an extent from the ideological constraints under which they were constructed and to which they are necessarily beholden. Because it is complex and articulate, a literary *monumentum* has the capacity to preserve multiple traditions and viewpoints; it can give alternative descriptions or different origin stories of the same *monumentum*; it can present differing perspectives without necessarily voiding others; and it is more than a combination of all these things in its capacity to grow beyond the sum of its parts into something more complex and communicative. These features of literary *monumenta* are common to poetic *monumenta* and Livy’s *Ab Urbe Condita* as *monumentum*.

But Livy’s *monumentum* differentiates itself from the poetic ones in the degree and distribution of perquisites available from the work. While, say, Horace’s *monumentum* commemorates and benefits Horace as a poet and individual, Livy’s personal gain in writing the *Ab Urbe Condita* is dismissed by the author in key places of the work, especially by his prefatory

---

112 Perhaps Livy’s most notable instance of providing multiple etiologies of a *monumentum* without necessarily devaluing either—especially by separating the two accounts—is that of the Lacus Curtius (1.13 and 7.6), discussed in Ch. 3.

concession of personal reputation (*praef.* 3).\textsuperscript{114} Granted, Horace is working in a different literary medium with more focus on the personal. And poetry certainly does offer something of value to the audience in exchange for the benefit of continued recollection of its author: if the poems were not good quality, entertaining, and in some way edifying, they would not achieve the goal of preserving and elevating the poet. Further, poets can include others in their memorial enterprises. In parallel to other kinds of *monumenta*, a poetic *monumentum* often offers a commemorative element—aptly in the form of a name—in dedications to or other mentions of personal friends, patrons, or public figures who are further commemorated through association with the poet’s skill and attention.\textsuperscript{115}

But it is only a small step for this focus on the creator rather than the created to be used for egotistic and power-seeking ends, especially if that focus is applied in the writing of history where the past can be an instrument of influence and self-promotion rather than a guide for the current generation, founded on tradition and vested with its authority. As Livy presents it, however, the tracing of Rome’s past is not a place to voice self-serving agendas or petty rivalries, nor is it a place blatantly to glorify the author in the process of tracing and depicting their account. Horace’s *monumentum* is very personal in so far as the primary impression it leaves is of the knowledge, skill, inspiration, and cultivation that the poet puts into it and, thus, the reason for the author’s monumental self-commemoration. Livy’s *monumentum* relegates individualistic commemoration—including that of its author—to more general examples of recollection, with

\textsuperscript{114} Several scholars see Livy’s rejection of personal gain as disingenuous (see Ch. 3). Livy’s modesty, whether affected or not, appears most prominently in prefatory remarks, both in the initial preface and that in Bk. 31.

\textsuperscript{115} For a sampling of poetic dedications and mentions of patrons, see, e.g., Catull. 1.3 with Wiseman 1979: 170-74 (Nepos); Hor. C. 1.1.1, *Sat.* 1.1.1 (Maecenas); Tib. 1.1.53 (Messalla); Prop. 1.1.9 (Tullus). Lucretius’ reference to Memmius may be a special case (see, e.g., the note by Roller 1970). For thorough discussion of the various aspects of exchange and relationship between poet, patron/other dedicatees, society, etc., see White 1993. For a discussion with less detail but wider scope of time, see Van Dam 2008. See also below (Ch. 3) for dedications in works of history and how they may define audience as well as the status of the author.
wider potential to benefit the audience in the absence of particular vested interests. Livy subtly hints at this monumental goal through comparison and contrast with his historical predecessors as well as through reflection on the typical place of *monumenta* in the Roman political arena, which will be the focus of the next chapter.
IV. Ch. 3: A New *Monumentum*

The plural form *monumenta* often indicates historical writing of some form (see Ch. 2), but I argue in the following pages that Livy is undertaking an innovative form of history in his direct characterization of his own extensive, combined work as *monumentum*. He follows through on this claim by making his history serve as a laboratory for exploring the challenges in and to historiographical method that *monumenta* in all their various forms present. Livy incorporates and builds around different registers of the term in his preface, first by referring to history—and by implication to his own present work—as in effect an inclusive literary *monumentum* (*praef.* 10); and secondly by foregrounding at this programmatic moment the various *monumenta* that shape the memorial landscape of the Roman past (*praef.* 6), which he explores in context in subsequent portions of his narrative, where he connects them verbally and conceptually to other programmatic passages in his history. Further, Livy creates something original in his work through comparison and contrast with a familiar Roman inclination observable on a wide scale: he highlights the standard societal practice of monumentalization in such a way as to reflect its faults and susceptibility to manipulation as well as its impact thereby on the writing of history; that is, Livy comments on an issue that he witnesses in the Rome of his day by depicting the same issue in his history.

In other words, Livy uses the wide range of the term *monumentum* and its linked appearances throughout the *Ab Urbe Condita*—along with the vicissitudes that various *monumenta* are shown to undergo—as an historiographical workshop. Through this exercise in exploring the methodology of historical writing and its challenges, Livy exposes and criticizes aspects of the monumentalizing tendency of Roman society at large: in general, *monumenta*
feature prominently in the process of recording the past, and they both influence understanding of the past for Livy’s contemporaries and provide precedent for the continuance of monumentality as it has existed.¹ And, though Livy’s subject is the past, the value of that past lies in its ability to reflect on and affect the present.² Especially in focus are the potential excesses of the aristocratic competitive ethos,³ which exerts such a large influence on the creation of monumenta and the drive toward monumentality, both in their material form and in works of Livy’s predecessors as literary monumenta.

The importance of genealogical succession and the preservation of family prestige was powerful for the Romans long before Livy’s time, but the practice escalated in the final century of the Republic: the tendency to present a family’s past and present as continuous became especially acute as Roman politics became progressively more divisive, and the collapse of the Republic unfolded. This, indeed, was the climate in which Livy was writing and the experience of the audience for which he was writing.⁴ Commentarii—such as those of Sulla and Caesar—

---

¹ See, e.g., Kousser 2015: 40: “Clearly, Roman commemorative monuments were heavily fictionalized. They presented a programmatically shaped version of reality, which in no way offered unmediated access to the past. Still, with their particularizing details — the up-to-date hairstyles, distinctive portrait features, accurate battle gear, and so forth — these works of art put limits on their range of reference that were not present in, for example, the mythological or divine images of the Greeks. At the same time, the strong contemporary resonances of the Roman works constrained their subject matter and their mode of depiction, permitting the acknowledgment of only those aspects of Roman reality that were construed as positive.” The idea of what constitutes positive, of course, is in many ways determined by the access to the past that is presented by the very monuments to which Kousser refers.

² As Bonfante 1998: 480, says, “Livy was not an antiquarian. He did not collect ancient sources and customs for their own sake: there is always a connection with the present, and he takes great pains to link past and present.” For a key distinction in outlook for antiquarian and historical works, see Glinister 2007: 24-32. Glinister points out that antiquarians rather than historians combine Roman history and heritage in a positive way, i.e., one not focused on resistance, defeat, and conquest. For reflections of contemporary Rome in Livy’s first decade in particular, see von Haehling 1989. See also Woodman 1988: 128-34, for reflections of the contemporary civil wars in Livy’s preface. Woodman says: “since Livy refers to the present time on [four] occasions in the preface… it would seem perverse not to maintain that these passages too refer to the civil wars” (132).

³ Syme 1939: esp. 10-27, still has much to offer on this point.

⁴ As Sumi 2011: 206-7, puts it, “the late Republic through the Triumviral period and culminating in the Augustan Principate… was one of transition, marked by political instability and social unrest leading to the formation of a new form of government. Such a period was especially conducive… to the formation of a new ideology. But as was the
are prime targets for the charge of personal promotion through historical writing, but other forms of history also could narrow their outlook for the benefit of particular people or groups.

A common motivation for establishing *monumenta* was as a tool for establishing the appearance of social preeminence, and it could take written form as well as material: history could glorify an individual just as much as or more than a statue could. But Livy’s history does not clearly do so. He shows an obvious ardor for Rome’s history, but it is not a history in which his family line has a stake in the same way that, say, one of the Claudii, Fabii, or Scipiones did. Thus, self-promotion does not guide Livy’s depiction of the past. By not engaging in pointed socio-political promotion of individuals, I argue, Livy creates a literary *monumentum* that recasts case with so much of the Augustan Principate, this ideology had to obtain legitimacy by forging a link with the Republican past and hence was inherently conservative.”

---

5 For discussion of *commentarii*—particularly that of Sulla—as products of extreme ambition and self-promotion, see Scholz 2003.

6 As Flower 2009: 67, says: “the divisive politics of the late second century BCE saw the birth of political autobiography and memoirs, as well as monographs and histories written to justify and support the increasingly sharply drawn divisions in Roman politics and life.”

7 Of the annalists, for instance, Valerius Antias is most often accused of distorting the role of the Valerii in Rome’s history as well as emphasizing other self-serving elements, such as the prominence of his own city (Antium). For discussion of Antias’ unrestrained inventions, see Wiseman 1998: 75-89, 1986, and 1979b: passim; Badian 1966: 20-22; Ogilvie 13-15; Walsh 1961: 88-89, 121-22. For more moderate assessments of Antias’ invention, see *FRHist* 1.293-94, 300-2, 2.339-41 (Rich); Rich 2005: esp. 147-55 (a more extended treatment than that in *FRHist*); Cornell 1986: 77-78 (see also *MRR* 258 n. 8). For concise presentation of the evidence with a more cautious approach to assessment, see Oakley 1.89-92. See Ch. 4 for further discussion of the sorts of inventions to which personal interest may have driven historians.

8 See, e.g., the historical works arising from cults of personality, esp. that of Alexander the great, collected and discussed at Fornara 1983: 34-36.

9 As a literary reference point for Livy, in a comparison of Naevius—an outsider to Rome—and Fabius Pictor—a Roman politician from an established family—whose works cover the same events but are so formally different, Dillery 2009: 84, says: “there would have been a difference, presumably, in the two texts’ receptions on the basis of who had produced them. It is important to see in Fabius an example both of communication with outsiders (the Greeks), and also elite self-fashioning (the aristocracy at Rome). Neither can be said to be the case of Naevius—he wrote in Latin and was not a member of the Roman nobility; indeed he was probably not even a Roman citizen by birth. While his verse account of the First Punic War has been properly characterized as a patriotic work…we must never lose sight of the fact that the man who wrote the work was himself an outsider at Rome. What Fabius presented of the Roman past to his peers, even if identical with what Naevius wrote, must have been received differently. Yet, of the two works in question, the one that looks superficially ‘more Roman,’ written in Latin and in a native verse, is in fact a product of the ‘other’.”
aspects of the traditional, family-focused narrative of the Roman past. That is, he relies on and includes many of these traditional, agonistic elements in so far as they offer beneficial examples, but he does not place one group over others to promote their interests. In this way, Livy’s larger *monumentum* subsumes the smaller, individualistic *monumenta* in such a way that it is both more inclusive and less restricted in its outlook.

**A visitor in Rome**

The *monumentum* that is Livy’s work reflects Rome as a concept and an ideal, one that reaches beyond the allegedly recent influx of greed, luxury, and license (*praef.* 11-12). The material with which Livy crafts his history derives ultimately from the competitive discourse of society’s prime movers, but that material does not necessarily determine the shape of the historian’s work. While the *Ab Urbe Condita* idealizes certain actions, behaviors, and points of view, it does so in a way that avoids providing precedent, encouragement, or justification for ambitious individuals in Livy’s contemporary world. Instead, he idealizes elements with the potential to benefit society conceived timelessly by offering positive *exempla* that are less susceptible to perversion for self-aggrandizement or other autocratic ends. Or he shows how characters that are initially positive models can meet with downfall.10 Livy’s practice contrasts with the use to which notable figures of the past are often put among the Roman elite, a problem that is prevalent in Livy’s contemporary society and is hinted at in his literary account as a reflection of that society.11 Indeed, he offers negative *exempla* displayed by those who attempt

---

10 For instance, Coriolanus, Manlius Capitolinus, and Scipio Africanus (discussed in Introduction).

11 The practice was done by both plebian and patrician. An obvious and very striking example is the claim on the part of the Julio-Claudians that they were descended from the line of Aeneas and, therefore, from Venus (for the development of this association, see Badian 2009), a descent alluded to and complicated by Livy himself when he casts uncertainty on the actual identity of the Iulus/Ascanius to which this line is traced (1.3.1-3). Suetonius reports that Caesar publicly declared his descent from Venus as well as from the Roman king Ancus Marcius in his eulogy to his aunt Julia in 69 BC (*Div. Iul.* 6.1), a practice that was ubiquitous in the eulogies of nobility and other epideictic speech venues. For further examples of families claiming descent from mythical or divine figures, see *FRHist* 3.234,
such self-promotion, both as characters within the narrative—potentially mirroring figures in Livy’s own time or recent past—and as literary predecessors that display notable socio-political or personal bias in their works (see Ch. 4).

This is not to say that Livy excludes accounts originating from self-interested agonism from consideration in his exploration of the past: these accounts are the traditional fabric of Rome’s progression. Livy chooses to follow the basic dictates and conventions of historiography, and events of his history must appear in accordance with the basic expectations of his audience, who, after all, must have had some knowledge of the tradition and what they were willing to accept about it. But he has significant latitude in shaping and presenting the details and the personalities of characters within the history, by which he can craft his desired message about Roman history.

Thus, Livy’s literary work has greater potential for meaningful social commentary, relatively free from external influence and engrained societal pressures, in so far as it refuses to

238, 271; Miano 2011: esp. 109-42; Wiseman 1987: 207-18 (with numerous instances); Brunt 1982: esp. 3 n. 14. For the “type-casting” of historical names with benefit for family-lines that employed those names, see Wiseman 1979: esp. 24-25. See further Ch. 4.

12 See Marincola 1997: 12-19, for discussion of the historian’s task as an innovator or emulator of existing tradition and historiographical practice rather than as a creator of a genre that may appear obviously different, though the approach must allow for a conception of genre that is dynamic rather than static. See further Marincola 1999: esp. 310: “Paradoxically, innovation, far from threatening genre, assures its continued existence, since like other things genre must adapt to survive,” and Gabba 2011.

13 See Marincola 1999: esp. 320. Lendon 2009 takes a rather different stance in arguing that the Roman historians—including Livy—were compelled by social and generic constraints to present a factually accurate version of the past that accords with public documents and is policed by the criticisms of other historians. Though Lenton concedes that documentary sources could be falsified or misinterpreted (49 n. 29), his stance still seems to rest on the idea that a significant amount of some form of documentation was available, consistent, and unbiased in the process of recording it (for additional objections to Lenton’s stance, see Levene 2010: 383-84 n. 136). For a more balanced cautionary view on the amount of literary invention that can be allowed to ancient historians, see, e.g., Cornell 1986: 75-86. See also the various contributions in the edited volume of Sandberg and Smith 2018 for the survival of Roman physical monuments as a resource for Romans to map their own, particularly written, history in accordance with or in conflict with Greek versions of Rome’s history. Distortion and (re)invention, however, were required to combat other, more indigenous forms of memory, such as antiquarian and legal sources and popular tradition. As Sandberg and Smith say, “The Roman knowledge of their past cannot be distinguished from their invention of it; the very act of writing down history constructs stories, imposes interpretation and encourages debate” (7).
advocate for factionalism or sycophancy. Though Livy may show approval of, say, the more reasonable aspects of the aristocratic stance in the Struggle of the Orders, he does not buy wholesale into a party-line: positive and negative examples come from patrician and plebe alike. Indeed, in Roman politics, the dividing line between the two “parties” is permeable, at best, and often simply dictated by pragmatism, a point that Livy hints at in various passages of his work (see the Introduction). Yet, Livy also does not alienate his potential audience by going the opposite route of revolution and the radical rejection of society: he makes comfortable use of a rich tradition of positive examples in Rome’s past, without allowing his narrative slavishly to parrot the accretion of centuries of private socio-political ambition and propaganda. There is a general expectation in Greco-Roman historiography that historians give a balanced view and operate with a degree of impartiality. But Livy exceeds this expectation by critiquing Roman society’s inclination toward biased presentation, both in material *monumenta* and in literary production.

14 Historically scholars have not always read Livy in this way: see, e.g., Walsh 1974: 5-7, on assessments of Livy as a mouthpiece for the new order in Rome, a scholarly perspective that was largely the product of modern fascist environments rather than rooted in the text itself. As Walsh says, “This view of Livy as propagandist for the regime is now happily out of favor” (5). Through a comparison of the *Ab Urbe Condita* and the Hall of Fame in the Forum Augustum, Luce 1990 makes a nuanced argument that Livy and Augustus shared a view on the significance of the Roman past, without the former necessarily buying wholesale into the regime of the latter. For further discussion of the Forum Augustum and its intention, see Weisweiler 2015: esp. 69-73; Woolf 2015: esp. 206-12, 219-23; Galinsky 1996: esp. 197-213; Zanker 1988: *passim*.

15 For a passage that perhaps gives a solid point of contact for Livy’s view on deliberative government and the role of the soundest minds therein, see 21.3-4. In this section, the party in the Carthaginian leadership that supports Hannibal and war—including the soldiery and commons—outvotes the opposition—represented here by the speaker Hanno: *pauci ac ferme optimus quisque Hannoni adsentiebantur, sed, ut plerumque fit, maior pars meliorem vicit* (“a few, among them the very best, agreed with Hanno, but the greater portion, as happens most of the time, overcame the better one,” 21.4.1; cf. 21.2.4, 3.1, 10.1-3, 11.1-2).

16 As Marincola 2009: 15, puts it, “historians were expected to write a history free from the passions of the present that would serve as a valuable testimony for those hereafter. This almost certainly remained more of an ideal than a reality, but the notion was old and time-honored.”
In the following reading of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, I read Livy as a politically astute thinker, who, though he may not have been an active participant in the actual administration of the state, engages in thoughtful commentary on and criticism of the political system of Rome, as it exists in his own day but also as it has evolved from its beginnings. Indeed, Livy’s status as someone at least moderately at the margins of the society may contribute to his ability to perceive and comment on potential issues with *monumenta*, without being as subject to the latent cultural assumptions of Romans too engrained and invested in the system. Someone with an active stake in aristocratic power-wrangling may find a way to justify or simply refuse to acknowledge the shortcomings of their actions, regardless of clear detriment to the state as a whole. Livy is not, from all indications, directly involved in the same activities as the ambitious politicians of his day—though he has a clear interest in the Roman people—and would be better situated to notice possible deficiencies in Roman society, while still being able to recognize the positive elements of that same society.

---

17 See Kraus and Woodman 1997: 56, on *praef.* 10: “Time and memory, then, provide the material from which we can benefit if we read Livy. According to the adage, ‘those who do not understand history are doomed to repeat it.’ Yet in Livian history it seems that you are precisely encouraged (in the case of good *exempla*) to repeat the past. Such an assumption has led generations of scholars to characterize Livy as one who looks constantly to the ‘good old days’, wishing for their return, scorning the modern world. The matter is not so simple. As we have seen, though acknowledging the pull of the past, the *Ab urbe condita* moves ahead, eagerly: the past may be pleasurable as a retreat and a source of historical knowledge, but it is only really useful as a tool.” In a similar strain, it is worth asking: does Livy really see the “good old days” as better? His history of the early periods offers negative *exempla* just as much as subsequent portions do. See also Kraus 1998: 283: “as Livian readers have often noted, the problems of the present infect the past: despite his eulogy of the good old days before vice immigrated to Rome (*Praef.* 11), Livy’s early Romans fight the same moral and political battles that engaged late Republican and early Augustan society.”

18 Cf. Timpe 2011: 169: “Livy was not a senator or active politician, but rather a *rhetor* and a literary figure, who followed no direct political objectives, but did indeed follow a type of intellectual programme, and one, moreover, that Augustus, under whom he wrote, welcomed, approved, and supported. Livy was also not a man from Rome or the regional centre of the Roman-Italian state, but from the upper Italian periphery. That made it easier for him to pay homage to a somewhat abstract and schematic patriotism, to identify himself with the Roman state generally without wanting to shape the politics of his day. Livy cultivates the gestures of clemency and neutrality. He sheds the subdued light of a noble classicism over the battlefields. It becomes still clearer, however, that for him the people in their entirety are the actual actors and representatives of meaning in Roman history.”
Though discussion of Livy’s social status and access to political engagement must remain largely speculative, the text provides sufficient evidence for the deficiencies of *monumenta* in Rome’s particular form of elite competition. *Monumenta* served in the Roman world as a prime means of influencing public perception and acquiring societal clout, a tendency that Livy mirrors in his literary treatment of Rome:¹⁹ that is, Livy reveals the socio-political evolution of aristocratic monumental commemoration in such a way that its inherent flaws and contradictions come to light.

As a necessary precondition to my reading of Livy’s treatment of *monumenta*, my analysis views Livy as a master of subtlety: Livy’s criticism of the competitiveness inherent in the Roman political system from the foundation of the city, as he depicts it—and even among Livy’s proto-Romans before the city’s foundation—appears through careful examination, not boldfaced assertions. Livy’s history is full of examples of the positive effects of rivalry. But it also repeatedly demonstrates the consequences of excess in the same sphere, ²⁰ both through Livy’s depiction of historical characters and events and through his implicit or explicit

---


²⁰ A foundational moment for Rome’s excessive rivalry (*foedum certamen*, 1.6.4, *certamine irarum*, 7.2; see the Introduction) comes very early in the *Ab Urbe Condita* and revolves around the death of Remus. After they set out to establish a new city, the twins are infected with their ancestral evil, the desire for rule (*avitum malum, regni cupidio*, 6.4; cf. 3). Certainly, the ancestral aspect of this evil refers specifically to the supplanting of Numitor by Amulius (3.10), but this passage also seems more generally to establish a formative notion for the Roman people to come, particularly in that *regni cupidio* and similar phrases are recurrent in Livy (see below). It is notable that the contest between the twins involves the imprinting, as it were, of a name on the city itself (6.4 and 7.3), which recalls the function of a name on *monumenta* (see Ch. 1).

For discussion of rivalry as the impetus for the slaying of Remus, see Neel 2017: 73-77, 142-49. For discussion of the tyrannical undertones concerning Romulus—esp. leading up to the 1st BC—see Miles 1995: 102-3; Newlands 1995: esp. 119-21 (on Ovid’s *Fasti*). For discussion of Roman hatred toward kings more generally and the development of that idea, see Glinister 2006; Erskine 1991.
engagement with previous authors. Though the actions taken by Livy’s various characters are often similar, their intentions vary significantly in the extent to which they act for the good of the state or for their own good, and it is in the distance between these various motivations that Livy’s criticism—as I read it—often appears. This criticism is not unambiguous. But *monumenta* connected in the text to those characters can shine light on where they fall in the spectrum from positive to negative.

As an initial example, L. Furius Camillus and M. Manlius Capitolinus both display exemplary behavior in saving Rome during the early Gallic invasion of the city, but their impetus for doing so and their subsequent actions lead them down very different paths.\(^{21}\) Both men leave their mark on Rome’s history in Livy’s rendition. And, within the narrative, both characters privilege their connections to *monumenta*; but they do so with very different intentions and results. Camillus rejects the strong personal benefits that would come from a powerful *monumentum* to himself (*monumento gloriae suae*, 5.30.2, discussed in Ch. 4) and rather emphasizes those *monumenta* that belong to Rome over any one particular individual (5.52.1). By doing so, Camillus convinces the Romans not to abandon their devastated city.

Manlius, on the other hand, emphasizes his connection to the Capitoline hill and his actions thereon as a sort of *monumentum* to himself and a justification for his kingly ambitions.\(^{22}\) Livy draws attention to the status of Manlius as a member of a patrician clan, “a source that

---


\(^{22}\) Liv. 6.22.4 (*ad regni crimen*) and 5 (*cupiditas regni*). As Kraus 210 says, “regnum is unequivocally bad in the AVC...by presenting Manlius as an example of its pernicious effects L. can appeal to a new consensus—that of all men—to condemn him in advance.” For discussion of *crimen regni* in Livy, see Bruno 1966: esp. 236-48. See also Kaplow 2012; Smith 2006.
could have been least suspected” *(unde minime timeri potuit, 6.11.2).*\(^{23}\) In the end, Manlius is thrown from the Tarpeian Rock, and “the same place became a *monumentum* for a single man’s outstanding distinction and utmost punishment” *(locusque idem in uno homine et eximiae gloriae monumentum et poenae ultimae fuit, 20.12).*\(^{24}\) Thus, the character’s desire for power and prestige determines the ultimate effect of the *monumentum*. But, to restate the point: the issue of excess inherent in the sort of *monumenta* that highlight the glory of individuals do not always receive such final moral condemnation at Livy’s hands as that of Manlius does.\(^{25}\) That is, in place of imposing on his readers an explicit, uniform response to *monumenta* and the uses to which they are put, Livy allows for a range of interpretation in confronting the ethics of *monumenta*. Within the scope of this range, it is left to the reader to assess the ultimate impact(s) of given monumental practices and moments, though Livy does offer guidance for such interpretation, particularly in his preface.

**Monumenta in the context of Livy’s preface**

The importance of *monumenta* for Livy’s historiographical mission emerges at the very start of the work in his prefatory remarks. Those remarks are dense, intricate, and often contradictory—or, at least, call for further explanation. Thus, they both invite and require

---

\(^{23}\) One may detect a hint of irony in this statement: many agents of sedition in Livy’s early Republican history were patrician, including the Roman youths who sought to restore the Tarquins—among them the sons of Brutus himself (2.3-5)—and Sp. Cassius, the consul who first proposed agrarian reform (2.41).

\(^{24}\) For discussion of spatial connections—geographic and literary—in Manlius’ rise and subsequent fall, see Jaeger 1997: 57-93, and 1993 (an earlier version of the discussion). In assessing Livy’s treatment of Manlius’ memorability, Jaeger 1997: 87-88, suggests, “One reason Livy reminds the reader of Manlius’ accomplishments before telling of his condemnation and death is to reinforce his suggestion that Manlius, by using honors as reminders first in a bid for kingship and then to save himself after his attempt fails, destroys the very *monumenta* that would have remained to remind posterity of his accomplishments had he died after a long and useful life, like Camillus, or while fighting on Rome’s behalf.” For issues with topography in Livy’s account of Manlius, see also Wiseman 1987: 225-43.

\(^{25}\) See, however, Kraus 146-47, for discussion of Livy’s inclusion of moral complexity in this episode. See also Oakley 1.476-93, for the various literary motifs included in the episode, as well as approaches to source-criticism here.
juxtaposition with other passages throughout the work to establish their fuller importance.\textsuperscript{26} The expectation that readers notice subtle (or even not so subtle) references spread across wide swaths of text is a demanding one, especially in a work so expansive and with such limits of accessibility due to sheer size and number of scrolls.\textsuperscript{27} Livy’s recurring use of \textit{monumenta} acts as a theme that helps guide readers’ recognition of intratexts,\textsuperscript{28} but the readership, I argue, still has to be a highly focused and highly attuned one with a particularly trained eye/ear for significant elements. It follows, then, that not every reader would have been expected to catch these subtle connections, and those that did pick up on them would still need close guidance from the author. Livy, in fact, begins to train his readership to meet these demands in his preface and continues the endeavor as the work progresses. This effort on his part will be another focus of this chapter before proceeding to Livy’s prefatory \textit{monumenta} in their dual appearances; an argument for the existence of such a didactic relationship is needed to underwrite the reading of Livy’s varied \textit{monumenta} that I am proposing.

In his discussion of Livy’s preface published originally in 1993, John Moles points to the direct reference to the \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} as a \textit{monumentum} (\textit{praef.} 10).\textsuperscript{29} Moles understands this...

\textsuperscript{26} As mentioned in the Introduction, Chaplin 2000 takes an approach similar to the one here for the term \textit{exemplum} as it appears, verbally or conceptually, throughout the \textit{Ab Urbe Condita}. Chaplin shows that the term builds progressive significance and provides insight for reading the history as a whole rather than as a collection of loosely connected episodes (see esp. 5).

\textsuperscript{27} In the context of Livy’s approach to the supernatural, Sailor 2006: esp. 357, cautions against making too close a relation among seemingly thematic material from widely separated portions of the work and using that relation to determine a reciprocal understanding of that material. Sailor, however, concludes that related thought patterns do occur, which allows consistent meaning to appear across different portions of Livy’s work. As an extension of Sailor’s notion, verbal parallels that show a similar thought pattern, e.g., instances of \textit{monumenta} spread throughout the text, also can yield further meaning, so long as the immediate context of the various passages is observed and taken into account as well. Further, the term \textit{monumentum} appears in Livy a relatively small number of times and often in clearly programmatic passages.

\textsuperscript{28} See the Introduction for references to intratextual studies in Livy. For a discussion of similar intratext in the works of Tacitus, see Woodman 1998: esp. 70-85.

\textsuperscript{29} Moles 2009: esp. 72-75 = 1993b: 153-55 (hereafter given by the pagination of the 2009 update).
use of the term *monumentum* to be operating in two ways: on the one hand, he reads it as designating the work as a reminder of the history of Rome, while on the other he sees it as reflecting Livy’s version of that history as a means of preserving Livy’s own efforts and compositional approach as its author; that is, Moles proposes that the work commemorates Rome’s past as well as Livy himself and his efforts in compiling the past. The work certainly preserves Livy’s approach to history—for the purposes of the discussion below, especially his approach to *monumenta*. Moles concludes that Livy’s history is a means to bring back Rome from its current state of moral and physical collapse, but that, for this enterprise to succeed, the history as *monumentum* has to be taken as a whole and not as an agglomeration of disparate episodes. Moles argues that, by focusing the full “gaze” of the readership on the impact of Livy’s historical *monumentum* in its totality, Livy seeks to curtail the current crisis.

Throughout his discussion, Moles focuses on the different roles of reader and writer, as well as the interplay between them: for the readers of the history to gain any benefit, they must be involved—along with the historian—in the process of interpreting the importance of that history as well as in accepting and assisting in the change that will bring remedy to their world;

---

30 Moles 2009: 73, points out that the term *opus*, which appears prominently in Livy’s preface as an indicator of the author’s efforts (*praef.*, 4, 13; cf. 1, for the related term *opera*), can even stand as a gloss for the term *monumentum* (cf. 1.38.5, 4.24.1-3; see also Rouvet 1991: esp. 3056). For other instances of *opus* standing in for or related to *monumentum*, see Cic. *Har. Resp.* 16 (*ullo de opere publica, de monumento, de templo*); Prop. 3.1.34-35 (*opus*), which alludes to C. 3.30.7-8 (*posteritate...crescere...laudabit ~ postera crescam laude*; see Camps 1966: 58); Ov. *Met.* 15.871 (*opus exegi*) as an allusion to Hor. C. 3.30.1 (*exegi monumentum*). Cf. also Mart. *Epig.* 1.8, where the Flavian Amphitheater is described as an *opus* in comparison to other great works (including the Great Pyramids, the Walls of Semiramis, the Temple of Artemis, the Temple of the Delians, and the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, 1-6).

31 Importantly, this gaze encompasses the good and the bad, what to imitate and what to shun (Livy. *praef.*, 10). One need only look to the *Vicus Sceleratus*—the place where the princess Tullia is said to have committed the hideous crime of running over the corpse of her father Servius Tullius (*foedum inhumanumque inde traditur scelus, monumentoque locus est—Sceleratum vicum vocant, 1.48.7*)—to see the potential for negative models as *monumenta*. As Moles 2009: 72, says of Livy’s larger project, “the *monumentum* has to be taken as a whole: it allows neither self-indulgent escapism into the past, nor concentration only on what is good.” Pomeroy 1988 highlights Livy’s mixture of positive and negative elements following the deaths of important characters in the history. See also Levene 2010: esp. 339-54, for discussion of moral causation in Livy.
Livy’s is very much a call to action for his readership. For Moles, this call is in response to the ills of Livy’s own collapsing world, the remedy to which, in Moles’ reading, is sole rulership, specifically that of Augustus.\(^{32}\)

In my own argument below, I argue that Livy represents the crisis he discerns in his contemporary political world not as singular and unprecedented, as Moles and others have it, but rather as the inevitable evolution of Roman politics as he sees them develop throughout Rome’s history and depicts them in his own account of history. Livy certainly laments that the state’s own power has been turned against itself (*praevalentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt*, *praef.* 5) and that, in his day, Roman values have degraded to the point of collapse (*praef.* 9). From the very beginning of his history, however, ambition, detrimental rivalry, and the desire for kingship are key characteristics of the Roman world as Livy depicts it, a significant aspect of which is the tendency to memorialize through *monumenta*.\(^{33}\) In some respects, these *monumenta* also contributed to the crisis occurring in Livy’s own time, as the foremost members of society used the landscape of the city and the wider Mediterranean as a battleground for their own primacy. And collapse in some form was constantly imminent from invasion or internal conflict. From this perspective, as is in its own right widely acknowledged, Augustus’ ascendancy is merely the logical outcome of Roman politics, perhaps extraordinary in its degree but based on clear precedents in figures such as Caesar, Pompey, Sulla, Marius, and even Scipio Africanus.

But Moles makes a key observation that Livy sets up an exchange in his preface between author and audience to unlock, create, and dictate meaning in the *Ab Urbe Condita* through the

\(^{32}\) See Moles 2009: esp. 68-71. As Moles say, “history provides the healthful lessons which, along with the therapeutic imposition of monarchy, will cure the Roman state, provided that each individual plays his part” (71).

\(^{33}\) As an example of Livy’s portrayal of self-memorialization in its connection to kingship, see 1.55.1, where Tarquin begins construction on the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as *monumentum regni sui nominisque* (discussed in Ch. 1).
interactive dialogue of reading—a point that is accepted by and crucial to the discussion to follow. Especially at issue for my treatment is Livy’s use of *monumenta* as intermediaries to this author/reader exchange, both his own work as *monumentum* and the other various material and written forms of *monumenta* that dot the landscape of Rome’s past as he presents it and that provide the basis for the metaphor of his history as *monumentum*.

Livy’s depiction of these *monumenta* reflects the importance of the reader in the creative process, as engagement with the past on the reader’s part leads to a skeptical understanding of power politics in the present; that is, not a complete rejection of the way society operates but rather a cautious and critical approach to it. Further, appreciation of intratextual elements throughout the work provides reciprocal significance in the understanding of Livy’s history, which requires the author’s presentation and the reader’s reception to become a collaborative effort. It is in this respect that Livy trains his reader through the interactivity of studying history, particularly by presenting programmatic statements that subsequently may need to be questioned.

*Inlustre monumentum* and Livy’s preface

Like Moles’, other scholarly discussions of Livy’s historiographical approach to *monumenta* take their start from the work’s preface and hone in on a few brief but important statements there. In these statements, two different registers of *monumentum* figure prominently: Livy’s direct characterization of his history as *monumentum* (*praef.* 10) and *monumenta* as possible evidence to attest to past events (6).\(^{34}\) As the conventional primary home of programmatic elements, ancient prefaces are natural places to look to uncover important hints at

---

\(^{34}\) As Levene 2010: 390, puts it: “That Livy in some way sees his text as representing Roman history has been a significant theme of recent Livian scholarship, taking its cue not least from Livy’s programmatic description of his own work as a ‘conspicuous monument’ (*Praef.* 10 *inlustri...monumento*), and the way in which the language of the Preface (and elsewhere) slips ambiguously between language describing his work and language describing the subject-matter of his work, as if the two were identical (e.g. the use of *res* at *Praef.* 4).” The works to which Levene primarily refers are Feldherr 1998; Jaeger 1997; Kraus 1994; Moles 2009.
their author’s approach, biases, and character; they effectively cue the reader to look out for other important elements in subsequent portions of the work. As mentioned above, this is not to say that programmatic statements necessarily appear in the form of straightforward assertions, nor, of course, that they are restricted only to the preface. For Livy in particular, intentional and measured ambiguity is his mode, by which he trains his readers to pay close attention to what follows, especially to Roman tradition as it is reported. This conception of Livy’s approach alone establishes the need and develops the potential for the complex type of reading and the attentive readers that I have already signaled as a presupposition of my thesis. And Livy’s deployment of *monumenta* provide an application within the text.

In particular, *monumenta* have a role to play in making textual space for complex readings, in that they can provide a good deal of complication between cross-referenced passages: for instance, in a general statement, *monumenta* may seem to be given a privileged status as source material for history-writing (*praef.* 6), but certain instantiations betray a lack of consensus in their own origin, as with the Lacus Curtius (1.13 and 7.6, discussed below). Again, following the earliest portions of Rome’s history, after time and destruction are in theory less problematic for material survival, *monumenta* may seem to promise more accurate and secure information (6.1.1-3), but subsequent sections reveal that this information has been compromised.

---

35 For standard practices in prefaces in general, see Herkommer 1968; Janson 1964. For practices in historiographical prefaces, see Marincola 1997: *passim.* As Janson 1964: 64, says: “The prefaces of the ancient historians have been discussed in the literature much more thoroughly than have those of other authors. This is understandable enough. The historians have a very central position in classical research. In their prefaces have been sought—and found—the answers to questions of basic importance for the assessment of their works as a whole, questions as to why the author wrote history, how he regarded history, what aims he was concerned to realize.”

36 For the general complexity of elements in Livy’s preface, see Moles 2009: esp. 56: “slippage or doubleness of reference is an important aspect of the language, and hence of the thought, of the whole preface.” Cf. Burton 2008: 85: “The text is polyvalent, and its multiple voices should be construed as illuminating and reinforcing one another, rather than canceling each other out. Livy performs in the preface a kind of rhetorical high wire act, trying to strike the right balance between pessimism and pedagogy.”
by blatant fabrications made for personal gain (8.40.4-5, discussed in Ch. 4); and even the combination of material and written *monumenta* may provide indeterminate or conflicting information on important historical figures (see the Introduction for the various accounts of Scipio’s last days).

Certainly, the most illuminating section of Livy’s preface for a discussion of monumentality is his statement of the work’s value, which rests on the conception of the work itself as a *monumentum*, as Moles’ 1993 discussion long ago highlighted (see above):

> Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita *monumento* intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites. *(praef. 10)*

This is what is especially salutary and productive in the understanding of history: for you to gaze on instances of every type of model, set upon a splendid *monumentum*; then, for yourself and your state, to seize what to imitate and what, being base from beginning to end, to avoid.

Thus, as presented here, the understanding of history (cognitio rerum) requires the backdrop of a *monumentum*, though Livy has already complicated the notion of relying on *monumenta* more generally *(praef. 6; discussed below)*; the *monumentum* to which Livy here refers is something different from the standard memorial structure.*38* Livy’s use of the term works well as a metaphor for a material *monumentum*, especially in so far as the (re)construction of history by Livy mirrors that of physical structures, that is, he literally *builds* the past. This *monumentum* is

---

37 Cf. Liv. 26.38.4: *id foedum consilium cum incepto tum etiam exitu fuit* (“this plan was base both in its beginning and also its end”). See Levene 2010: 340-41, on this passage.

38 For a similar self-distinction, see Thuc. 1.22.4: *κτήμα τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παρασχῆμα ἀκοῦειν ξύγκειται* (“[my history] has been composed as a monument for all time, not a competition piece to be heard for the moment,” cf. Poly. 3.31.13; Plin. Ep. 5.8.11). Cf. also the similarity between Livy’s idea of *exempla* in the passage above as models for imitation and avoidance with Thuc. 2.41.4 (*μνημεῖα κακῶν τε κάγαθον*). For other Thucydidean inspirations in Livy, see Rodgers 1986. See also DH 1.1.2, esp. *μνημεῖα* as what is left behind from historical inquiry, a term that correlates to valences of *monumentum* (see Ch. 1, esp. Aug. *de Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda* 4.6.8-17 Z.630).
clearly figured as possessing a physical manifestation, both in its visibility and conspicuousness (*inlustri, intueri*), which allow it to be presented to the reader as if seeing it in person,\(^{39}\) and in its placement (*posita*), in so far as it can display *documenta* and *exempla* as if on exhibit.\(^{40}\) But the function of this *monumentum* surpasses the potential short-sightedness of individualistic *monumenta* by expanding its scope of commemoration and impact.

In his 1998 book, *Spectacle and Society in Livy’s History*, Andrew Feldherr examines the visual qualities of Roman monuments in their capacities as vehicles and preservers of deeds, and he extends the larger trope to Livy’s characterization of his own work as a *monumentum*.\(^{41}\) Feldherr particularly looks at elements of the spectacular in Livy’s narrative. He asserts that, as the object of the audience’s gaze, Livy’s *monumentum* mirrors contemporary society’s spectacles—including forms of elite monumentalization—in so far as the history resembles these other mechanisms of authority. As material *monumenta* can provide models to influence public will toward the patron, determine opinion, and popularize elements of culture, Feldherr argues that there is a similar mechanism that allows the reader/viewer to gain advantage from the study of Livy’s history as it provides them with imitable figures.

Further, Feldherr postulates that Livy’s socio-political situation, that is, as a non-Roman, uninvolved in formal politics, excludes him from actively engaging in the commemorative rivalry of the Roman elite. Thus, according to this reading, Livy designs his own literary *monumentum* to contend with and supersede the *monumenta*, especially the material *monumenta*,

\(^{39}\) See Feldherr 1998: *passim*, for discussion of the importance of visuality and *enargeia* in ancient historiography.

\(^{40}\) See Kraus and Woodman 1997: 54-56, on the significance of the combination of *monumentum, exemplum*, and *documentum* here.

of the standard Roman influencers.\textsuperscript{42} The discussion below adopts Feldherr’s notion that Livy is engaging with Roman politics.

But, rather than include Livy as an active—if relatively disenfranchised—participant in the very process that would exclude him, my treatment focuses on how Livy as an author distances himself from and creates a commentary on the competitive ethos of Roman politics with an eye toward exposing its inherent faults. In light of passages in the \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} that highlight the instability and malleability of \textit{monumenta}, it seems warranted to explore Livy’s own written \textit{monumentum} as something that separates itself from the standard practice of \textit{monumenta} as means of self-promotion and of the establishment of public legitimacy for an individual. In my reading, Livy does attempt to replace the \textit{monumenta} of the traditional aristocracy, but he does not necessarily invite competition in the process. Rather, he dismisses the need for such \textit{monumenta} by reaching beyond the function to which many of them are put, that is, as means of promoting the individual(s) commemorated, regardless of any wider-reaching detriment.

In applying the term \textit{monumentum} to his work, Livy both expands and restricts the notion of what constitutes a \textit{monumentum} from the regular use of the term to designate a commemorative structure: on the one hand, he modifies its inclusivity (see Ch. 2), and, on the other, he restricts its concentration of praise. More generally, in maximizing the praise that attaches to \textit{monumenta}, size and grandeur are important characteristics, especially when so many other commemorative structures and practices are competing for the gaze of the audience. To create this sense of grandeur for an individual, the \textit{monumentum} must overshadow or subordinate

\textsuperscript{42} In addition to Feldherr’s discussion, see also Levene 2010: 382-92, esp. 390-92; Sailor 2006: esp. 372-74.
other possible referents to emphasize the importance and greatness of the commemorated individual.

A statue of a general, say, tends to perpetuate that commander’s success and excellence rather more than it preserves a great Roman victory or the successful coordination of that commander’s subordinates. The significance of the event and the embodiment of key values become integrally tied to the individual.\textsuperscript{43} That individual—or even their descendants—then controls the importance of that event and thereafter exerts a level of general association with and influence over those values. In other words, the values come to reflect the person rather than the other way around. Though others can benefit from the afterlife of the commemorated individual(s), the \textit{monumentum} first and foremost emphasizes the referent. Thus, the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus was built for Mausolus; the Great Pyramid was built for Khufu/Cheops; even the tomb of the Scipios was built for a particular family, not for Rome. Only through persistent emphasis of how much Rome owes that family does a tomb complex become a “Roman” \textit{monumentum} as opposed to, say, a Scipionic one (see the Introduction). Livy’s \textit{monumentum}, however, is far too complex and wide-reaching for such a restricted focus.

Livy describes both extravagance (\textit{inlustri}) and expansiveness on his \textit{monumentum} when he claims for it the capacity to contain proof (\textit{documenta}) of all forms of moral exemplar (\textit{omnis...exempli}).\textsuperscript{44} The capaciousness here, however, is a less specific and more inclusive one.

\textsuperscript{43} E.g., clemency was considered a particularly Caesarian trait (see, e.g., Konstan 2005). As a corollary, Livy notes the \textit{fama} (see below) that Cn. Cornelius Scipio attained in Spain for clemency and justice (21.60.1-4). On the other hand, Livy notes the \textit{fama clementiae} of Hannibal shortly beforehand (21.49.10). For possible (implicit) Livian criticism of \textit{clementia} in an episode from the early Republic (2.3.2-4) as a reflection of the touted characteristic of the real-life Caesar, see Baier 2003: esp. 245-48.

\textsuperscript{44} Chaplin 2000 demonstrates the possible range of \textit{exempla} beyond the typical manifestation of a hero from tradition that embodies some moral element: “Any specific citation of an event or an individual that is intended to serve as a guide to conduct is an \textit{exemplum} and hence an opportunity to learn from the past” (3). By Chaplin’s conception, the \textit{exempla} contained in/on Livy’s \textit{monumentum} can exemplify practical matters, e.g., military strategy, elements of governance, and religious procedure, as well as moral concepts.
than standard aristocratic memorials because it looks to the *full* range of models as they offer examples—positive or negative—of morality, rather than as they provide public legitimacy and precedent for private initiatives. Thus, even when Livy focuses on individuals, he does not do so for the sake of that individual’s family or adherents. Political manipulation and the privileging of individuals—even the author—through this *monumentum* are avoided because it does not have the same shortsighted restrictions of personal commemoration. One aspect involves the positioning of names: in conventional *monumenta* the connection of the terms *monumentum* and *nomen* (see Ch. 1) comes into play in so far as the attached name is a means of monumental control and restriction; Livy distinguishes his *monumentum* by privileging the name of Rome, as it were, over his own.

**Rome at centerstage**

Livy the historian and litterateur appears relatively frequently in the *Ab Urbe Condita* in such devices as authorial judgments, variant accounts, disagreement with predecessors, and even one case of “what if” history. On the other hand, Livy the historical actor—that is, the personal Livy—is far more rarely in evidence. Personal details do not appear in Livy’s extant history, neither does the author’s name. The absence of attached name and biographical information is indicative of a significant distinction in Livy’s approach as it figures in context with the Greco-Roman literary tradition broadly, including in its most relevant context of the historiographical tradition. Also, this exclusion or subordination of self may be taken as programmatic when compared with other instances of literary and material *monumenta* narrated by Livy.

---

45 That is, Livy’s digression on what would have happened if Alexander the Great had made an expedition west (9.17-18). For a reading of this passage’s criticism of one-man rule and its possible implications for Augustus, see Morello 2002.

46 See, e.g., DH 1.1.1: Τοὺς εἰσοδήμας ἀποδίδοντα ἐν τοῖς προομίσος τῶν ἱστοριῶν λόγοις ἦκετα βουλόμενος ἀναγκάζομαι περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ προειπεῖν, οὕτ’ ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις μέλλοις πλεονάζειν ἐπιώς, οὕς ἐπαρχῇς οίδα φανομένους τοῖς ἀκούοις, οὕτε διαβολίς καθ’ ἑτέρων ἐγνωκός ποιεῖσθαι συγγραφέων, ὀσπερ ἄναξιμένης καὶ
Names appear prominently in Greek historical writing, such as in the opening lines of Herodotus’ and Thucydides’ histories that give their respective names and nationalities (Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησσέως, Hdt. 1.1.1; Θουκυδίδης Αθηναίος, Thucy. 1.1.1; cf. Ἐκαταῖος Μυλήσιος FGrHist 1 F 1a). Roman historians generally do not provide the same formal introductions, and their names are not granted such primacy of place. But the personal circumstances of Roman historians do show up. For instance, this practice appears in the apologetic remarks of Sallust, when he discusses his experience with politics and his subsequent turn to history writing (BC 3.3-4.2; cf. BJ 4.1-4). Or in those of Tacitus, when he acknowledges his political advancement under the Flavians (Hist. 1.1). Fabius Pictor—from what we can tell—even includes himself autobiographically in his narrative when he goes as a delegate to Delphi on the orders of the Senate (FRHist 1 T 3-4). And there is also Livy’s own assessment of Cato the Elder: haud sane detractator laudum suarum (“clearly not one to pass over his own

47 On historians introducing themselves at the start of their works, their possible reasons for doing so, and precedents from other genres, see Asheri et al. 2007: 72-73; Marincola 1997: 271-75.

48 See Marincola 1997: 273. The names of Roman historians must have appeared as some form of signature or title, but inclusion of the historian’s name and personal life in the narrative is another matter.

49 The comments of Aulus Postumius Albinus in his preface may also be pertinent, where he asks forgiveness from his readers for his less-than-perfect Greek and receives the criticism of Cato the Elder. See Pol. 39.1.1-12; Plut. Cat. Mai. 12.6; Gell. NA 11.8: nam sum, inquit, homo Romanus, natus in Latio (“I am a Roman, he said, born in Latium”). For discussion of Albinus’ self-deprecation, see FRHist 3.59-60; Janson 1964, 130-32.
praises,” 34.15.9), which hints at this historian’s positive presentation of himself within his history.

As with the poetic instances above (Ch. 2), in some instantiations of history, the inclusion of a dedicatee in the preface could point to the social stratum of the historian or the circles in which they ran. But such markers of personal identity do not come up in Livy’s work. It might be argued that Livy the person does not appear because he had no public role in Rome. Therefore, he had no deeds or offices to mention and lacked the standard aristocratic friends and acquaintances. But Livy does describe an interaction of some sort with Augustus himself (4.20.5-11), and Tacitus mentions some kind of friendship between the two (Ann. 4.34.3; discussed further in the Conclusion). Thus, the idea that Livy had no basis for displaying personal connections to the Roman aristocracy meets with difficulty. Suetonius even reports that Livy provided encouragement for the future emperor Claudius to take up history writing (historiam...hortante T. Livio, Claud. 41.1). I propose a different reason why Livy did not include his autobiographical self in his history, particularly as it appears in the preface: that is, as

50 Cf. 1.10.5 on Romulus and the spolia opima: ipse, cum factis vir magnificus tum factorum ostentator haud minor, spolia ducis hostium caesi suspensa fabricato ad id apte ferculo gerens in Capitolium escendit (“he himself, a man both amplified by his deeds and hardly less a boaster of the deeds, carried the spoils of the enemy’s dead commander, hung from a frame outfitted for this purpose, and he ascended the Capitoline”).

51 Livy’s assessment of Cicero warrants mention, as reported by Seneca the Elder: in cuius laudes perseuendas Cicerone laudatore opus fuerit (“in expressing his own praise, Cicero would have been needed as the adulator,” Suas. 6.22).

52 For discussion of dedications in works with historiographical characteristics, see Elliott 2018: esp. 116-18; Woodman 2012: 201-22, esp. 201-4; Marincola 1997: 52-57. See also Janson 1964: 116-24, for the stance that the relationship between author and dedicatee had very little impact on the form of the preface or larger work.

53 For the lack of details found about Livy’s life in the text as well as the author’s use of a persona, see Kraus 1-9, and Kraus and Woodman 1997: 70-74. See also Ogilvie 1-5; Walsh 1961:1-9, who attribute the lack of biographical details to the loss of Livy’s later books as well as his reclusive focus on writing. Walsh (with perhaps a tinge of hyperbole) concludes: “Livy remains the most nebulous figure of all the greater historians of the ancient world” (1).

54 For discussion of Livy’s stylistic and content influences on Claudius, see Last and Ogilvie 1958.
a programmatic means of focusing what is primarily at stake and how Livy as author differs from others.

In essence, the historian is swallowed up by the *monumentum* that is the history itself. Livy rather emphasizes the importance of his history for the Roman people (*res populi Romani, praef. 1*), a people moreover that is in his claim the foremost of all (*principis terrarum populi, 3*). He makes clear the difficulty involved in the task of writing such a massive work (*immensi operis, 4*; cf. 31.1.2, *tanti operis*), but the magnitude of the work reflects something much more than the author’s effort, which he represents as a task of personal pleasure (*iuuvabit, praef. 3*; *voluptatis; 4*) rather than personal fame. Indeed, if we take Livy at his word, the author’s glory is a distant afterthought to the glory of Rome.

I do not mean to say that Livy’s talents are not recognized by his readers. Certainly, the author does achieve a modicum of fame in the process of recording Rome’s achievements. One need only think of Pliny the Younger’s anecdote about the man from Cadiz to witness the level of celebrity that Livy attained: *numquamne legisti, Gaditanum quendam Titi Livi nomine gloriaque commotum ad visendum eum ab ultimo terrarum orbe venisse, statimque ut viderat abisse?* (“have you never read about that man from Cadiz who was moved by Titus Livy’s

---

55 See, however, Plin. *NH praef. 16* = Liv. F 58, who criticizes Livy for continuing to write on the basis that his own fame, rather than that of Rome, would continue to grow. But, due to its placement in the preface and the nature of the work, Pliny’s criticism may be explained as a rhetorical means of setting his own work over that of his predecessor who made a similar venture into displaying the excellence of Rome’s past. Further, Livy’s paraphrased words do not give as definitive a point of criticism as Pliny represents them: *satis iam sibi gloriae quaesitum, et potuisse se desidere, ni animus inquies pasceretur opere* (“he had sought enough of glory already, and could have rested, if his restless mind were not fed by work”). Hardie 2012: 236-37, points out the similarities of this Livian statement to several passages of Cicero (*Marc. 25; Phil. 1.38; Fam. 10.1.1*), which purportedly originate with Caesar himself. Perhaps Livy’s allusion conveyed special significance in the context of the now lost portion to which it pertains.

56 As Marincola 1997: 170, puts it, “Rome was the hero of Livy’s history.” For elements of collectivity, see also Pomeroy 1988: esp. 174: “the early history of Rome is the story of the collective accomplishments of the *viri* who helped Rome to achieve gradual greatness, not the deeds of outstanding individuals, as Livy himself notes contrasting the crowd of capable Romans with the individual success of Alexander the Great (9.17-18).”
reputation and glory to come from the furthest reaches of the earth to see him and then promptly departed?” *Ep. 2.3.8*). Seneca the Younger includes Livy as one of the three most eloquent Latin authors, along with Cicero and Asinius Pollio (*tribus eloquentissimis, Epist. 100.9; cf. Tac. Agr. 10.3: *eloquentissimus auctor*). But this renowned figure does not make an appearance in the Preface; rather, the author is introduced as a humble servant, subsidiary to the glory that belongs to Rome.

Livy uses the 1st person in various forms throughout the preface, beginning with the very first sentence. But attention to this authorial first person quickly gives way to a focus on the Romans as the foremost of all people (*principis terrarum populi, praef. 3; cf. 7*). Far from seeming egocentric, the “I” of the preface is overshadowed by subject matter, and, thus, the preface famously promotes its author’s modesty to a remarkable degree—though perhaps deference is a better descriptor than modesty. In confirmation of this point, Livy’s first

---

57 Ogilvie hints that this story may have been fabricated by Livy himself (4), but the theory is entirely speculative. Cf. Hier. *Epist. 53.1: ad Titum Livium lacteo eloquentiae fonte manantem visendum de ultimo terrarum orbe venisse Gaditanum quendam legitimus* (“we have read about a certain man from Cadiz who came from the farthest reaches of the earth to see Titus Livy, a man dripping with the milky font of eloquence”). For the “milky richness” (*lactea ubertas*) of Livy, see Quint. *Inst. 10.1.31-32* and Hays 1987. Hays argues that Quintilian’s phrase refers to the nourishing qualities of Livy, that is, his suitability for young students of rhetoric rather than the smoothness in Livy’s style. See also Quadlbauer 1983, for further discussion of the expression *lactea ubertas* and its reception.

58 For further examples of Livy’s reputation, see, e.g., Quint. *Inst. 10.1.101: At non historia cesserit Graecis. Nec opponere Thucydidi Sallustium verear, nec indignetur sibi Herodotus aequari Titum Livium* (“But let history not stop with the Greeks. I would not be afraid of comparing Sallust to Thucydides, nor would Herodotus deem it unfitting to be compared to Titus Livy”); Mart. 1.61.3: *censetur Aponi Livio suo tellus* (“the land of Aponus [a Venetan god of waterways] is judged by its own Livy”). See also Kraus 1-9, esp. 2-5. For a brief overview of Livy’s more long-term influence and reputation, see Walsh 1974: 32-33.

59 Facturus…sim, perscripsim, scio, sciam, ausim (1), videam (2), mea, me, meo, consoler (3), ego, petam, me, repeto, avertam (5), ponam (8), mihi (9), me (11). See Moles 2009: esp. 52; Marincola 1997: 11-12. Cf. Wheeldon 1989: esp. 50: “The basic difficulty for the Roman historian in composing his preface was that whereas some claim of disinterestedness was more or less obligatory, the use of the first-person mode of itself drew attention to the historian’s particular perspective. Therefore, despite the fact that this claim was a conventional *topos*, it was not a subject about which the historian could afford to be artistically indifferent and for which he could rely on conventional phrases.” Den Hengst 2010: 52, views Livy’s use of the 1st person as a literary dialogue with Sallust. See below for further such interaction.

60 For Livy’s prefatory modesty as a deviation for historiography, see Moles 2009: esp. 51-54; Burton 2008; Ogilvie 23-25. Marincola 1997: 248-49, points out that such humility is standard in rhetorical technique but notes that it is
sentence notoriously begins with an expression of serious hesitation in the face of taking on such a gargantuan task: \textit{facturus operae pretium sim, si a primordio Urbis res populi Romani perscripturum, nec satis scio, nec, si sciam, dicere ausim} (“whether it will be worth the effort to write up the deeds of the Roman people from the formation of the city, I do not rightly know; nor, if I knew it, would I dare to say so,” 1).\textsuperscript{61} Whether this hesitancy and modesty is genuine or not is less important than the simple fact that it is included in the Preface, where it is clearly meant to reflect on the larger work in a programmatic way.\textsuperscript{62}

The daunting nature of the task ahead of him (\textit{inmensi operis}), which requires an examination extending over a period of more than 700 years (4),\textsuperscript{63} just makes the author’s deference more significant. Livy adopts an overtly unassuming tone, promising only to write history to the best of his ability (\textit{pro virili parte}, 3) and for his own satisfaction (\textit{iuvabit}). Thus, he avoids using the Preface as an opportunity to claim any sort of unique credentials in writing rare for historians. See also Sailor 2006: esp. 370-74, for the complicated mixture of diffidence and authority that Livy establishes in his preface.

\textsuperscript{61} Livy again touches upon the notion of brazenness at the start of Bk 31, though in this case he makes the charge on himself for having taken on such a project: \textit{etsi profiteri ausum perscripturum res omnes Romanas in partibus singulis tanti operis fatigari minime conveniat, tamen cum in mentem venit tres et sexaginta annos—tot enim sunt a primo Punico ad secundum bellum finitum—aequque multa volumina occupasse mihi quam occupaverint quadringenti duodenonaginta anni a condita urbe ad Ap. Claudium consulem, qui primum bellum Carthaginensiibus intulit, iam provido animo, velut qui proximi litoris vadis inducti mare pedibus ingrediuntur, quidquid progredior, in vastiorem me altitudinem ac velut profundum invehi, et crescere paene opus, quod prima quaeque perficiendo minui videbatur} (“though it is unsuitable for one who has dared to claim that he will write all Roman history to tire in individual sections of such a work, still the thought emerges that sixty-three years—for so many passed from the first Punic war to the end of the second—filled as many of my volumes as 488 years from the founding of the city to Ap. Claudius’ consulship did (he initiated the first war with the Carthaginians). Like those enticed by the shallows closest to the shore who step into the sea, I see in my heart that, wherever I advance, I am carried into greater depth as if it is bottomless. And the work almost grows, though at first it seemed to diminish as I completed it;” 31.1.2-5). For notes on this passage, see Briscoe 1.50-51.

\textsuperscript{62} See, however, Seneca’s more critical take on history, which bears heavy resemblance—in form rather than tone—to Livy’s statement here: \textit{haec ita vera si quis quaesiverit unde sciam, primum, si noluero, non respondebo. quis coacturus est?} (“and so, if anyone will seek the source of my knowledge, first, if I will not wish, I will not respond. Who would make me?” Apoc. 1.1).

\textsuperscript{63} Cf. the repetition of various forms of \textit{labor} (\textit{laboret}, 4; \textit{laboris}, 5) and \textit{magnitudo} (\textit{magnitudine}, 3 and 4). For discussion see Moles 2009; Marincola 1997: 153-54.
such a work, a move that may be taken as a sign that Livy is uniquely qualified to write it in so far as he leaves it to the reader to weigh what is at issue in historical accounts and determine for themselves what to believe. Livy provides the readers with guidance in coming to terms with these accounts but does not impose a magisterial judgement on the material which he presents to his readers.

**Monumentum sine nomine**

Another factor directing attention in the *Ab Urbe Condita* to the concept of Rome and away from the person of the author is the conditional exclusion of the author’s name, by which Livy actively dismisses the perpetuation of his own reputation in a way that contrasts with the typical notion behind the construction of *monumenta* in his world: *si in tanta scriptorum turba mea fama in obscuro sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler* (“if, amid so large a crowd of writers, public opinion should pass me by, I shall comfort myself with the celebrity and greatness of those who obscure my reputation,” 3). One may detect a tone of insincerity here, but, again, it is less important that the sentiment is sincere than that it is included in such a prominent place for the work as a whole.

---

64 For more skeptical responses to Livy’s modesty, see den Hengst 2010: 52-67; Cizek 1992. See also Kraus 2: “At the start of a monumental history of Rome from the beginnings to the present, ‘Livy’ adopts a position of nearly incredible modesty, a combination of magisterial assurance and polite uncertainty that will recur throughout the work.”

65 As Hardie 2012: 235, points out, “This, the first occurrence of *fama* in Livy, is applied not to the subjects of history but to the writers of history themselves. It appears in a context of social hierarchy, with a contrast between the obscure because ignoble status of Livy as historian and the nobility of those who eclipse his name.” See also *ibid.* 235-36: “In the Praefatio then Livy both involves himself in a central part of the business of his History, the competition for fame, and excuses himself from it, finding consolation rather than fuel for *invidia* in the ‘nobility and greatness’ of those who overshadow him.”

66 Janson 1964: 70, says: “Like Cicero, Livy depicts his subject as being so extremely difficult that it is granted only to the very few to handle it with success. Livy says that those who perhaps will later overshadow him must possess *nobilitas* and *magnitudo*…The writer is doubtful not because he considers himself incompetent but because he regards the actual subject as so enormously demanding.” As mentioned above, the size of the work is a key focus of the preface, as is the remarkable nature of the work’s topic, Rome (*praef.* 11). But these elements do not automatically void the diffidence of Livy’s self-presentation in the preface: just because the work is taxing does not
The doubling of the terms *fama* and *nomen*—here practically synonymous—certainly emphasizes what is at stake and what the author is conceding. But, as Feldherr points out, the inclusion of the term *nomen* closely resembles the *nomen* that might be inscribed on a *monumentum*, whether a simple tombstone or a grand temple. Feldherr says:

Livy’s fame is in darkness, but his work is *inlustre*, not only in the light but also a source of light. His own *nomen*, as if on an inscription, is blocked out by those of others; his text, though, is not just an inscription but a whole *monumentum*. The effect of this strategy is to distinguish as much as possible the significance and public role of the work itself from his own personal status. The preface begins with a flurry of self-reference. But as the text proceeds, the author himself progressively retreats from it, rarely intruding his own persona into the narrative. And it is precisely the visual qualities of the *monumentum* that facilitate this procedure—by deflecting the reader’s gaze toward the monument of his work, he renders his own person invisible and increasingly irrelevant as the *monumentum* itself exerts its beneficial effects on the audience.\(^{67}\)

In other words, the *monumentum* that is the *Ab Urbe Condita* will not be the sort of vehicle of personal, reputational gain, either Livy’s or anyone else’s, that was so common in the Roman world; it will instead be a conduit for understanding the Roman world—both its merits and its flaws.

The passage above also has been identified as a response to a passage of Sallust’s in the preface to his *Histories*, which can help to illuminate Livy’s motives in writing the phrase:\(^{68}\) *nos in tanta doctissumorum hominum copia, F 3 M ~ in tanta scriptorum turba, Liv. praef. 3.*\(^{69}\)

Maurenbrecher identifies the fragment from the *Histories* as prefatory and referring to authors

---


\(^{68}\) For Livy’s disapproval of Sallust’s style and form of expression, at least, see Sen. *Contr. 9.1.14: T. autem Livius tam iniquus Sallustio fuit ut hanc ipsam sententiam et tamquam translatam et tamquam corruptam dum transferat obiceret Sallustio* (“Titus Livy, however, was so unfair to Sallust that he accused Sallust of both translating and ruining this very epigram [*Hist. F 55.24 M*]”). See also Kapust 2011: 89-92; Ogilvie 3-4; Syme 1959: esp. 54.

that had preceded Sallust in writing Roman history.\textsuperscript{70} From what survives of the Sallustian sentiment, the defining characteristic of these authors is that they are very learned. The defining features, however, of Livy’s “mob” are the *magnitudo* and *nobilitas* that come in the next clause (*nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient*).\textsuperscript{71} Through his reference to Sallust and his mention of nobility, Livy seems to make a class distinction here, which pertains especially to literary *monumenta*.\textsuperscript{72}

Despite the characterization of his historical predecessors as a *turba*, Livy’s phrase, at first glance, seems laudatory—or, at least, not openly derogatory—of his fellows. But a usage of *magnitudo* follows that complicates the picture: *ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua* (“beginning from humble origins, [the state] has grown to such an extent that it now struggles under its own *magnitudo*,” praef. 4). Without further reference, *magnitudo* here seems simply to indicate the scale of the state as it has developed. But, Livy has just given this term as a quality of the very people—there further defined by the term *nobilitas*—that threaten to overshadow his efforts on behalf of the state. These men as writers clearly have a vested interest in the portrayal of themselves and those connected to their basis of prestige. Thus, the crisis that threatens the state in Livy’s day is verbally connected to aspects, at least, of the

\textsuperscript{70} Maurenbrecher 1966: 4.

\textsuperscript{71} As Moles 2009: 57-58, points out: “it is difficult to resist the feeling that Livy is here being somewhat ironic, even sarcastic, about other AUC historians…while *turba* is not necessarily a pejorative term, Livy’s wording lacks the positively respectful tone of Sallust’s and also picks up, and takes colour from, the somewhat ironic *novi semper scriptores*. Moreover, *magnitudo*, as it were within the light imagery, creates the slightly bizarre notion that these writers’ sheer size will put him in the shade, and outside the light imagery it must, because of the link with *tanta turba*, suggest volume or bulk, as well as greatness.” See also McGushin 1992: 1.71-72: “It is possible that with this statement…Sallust acknowledged that he did not presume that he could emulate his predecessors successfully, but had decided to deal with a period which was still awaiting a satisfactory treatment. I doubt very much, however, if the Sallustian passage carried on in the same diffident tone as that of the corresponding Livian extract.”

\textsuperscript{72} See Hardie 2012: 235-36; Miles 1995: 51-54, for discussion of the class distinction between Livy and his predecessors that is suggested here.
nobility. Those seeking personal power—here, as it seems, by the means of writing (turba scriptorum)—to the detriment of the state have possibly brought it to the point of ruin.

Now we turn from Livy’s allusion to one made by Propertius on Livy’s prefatory remark about fama, which may cast further light on Livy’s subordination of self. In 3.1, Propertius sets the personal goal for his own poetry at odds with Livy’s more civic-minded goal, a contrast that helps to accentuate further the divergence of Livy’s mission from the larger literary tradition.73 A.J. Woodman notes the many verbal and conceptual parallels between Propertius 3.1 and Livy’s preface. In the poem, Propertius writes about his reputation and the role of deified Fama (9; cf. Honos, 22), saying: …me Fama levat terra sublimis, et a me / nata coronatis Musa triumphant equis / et mecum in curru parvi vectantur Amores, / scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas. / quid frustra immissis mecum certatis habenis (“soaring Fame carries me above the land, and the Muse born from me triumphs on crowned horses, and little Loves are conveyed with me in my chariot, and a throng of writers follows my wheels. Why do you vainly contend with me, with loosened reins?” 9-13).74 The form of engagement here is certainly agonistic (certatis) in magnifying the personal fame earned and enjoyed by the poet, which, indeed, matches the intention of poetic monumenta discussed in the previous chapter.75 It is also significant that the

73 For the evidence and uncertainty of dating Book 3 of Propertius, see Fedeli 1985: 29. It is clear from the layers of reference, however, that Propertius has Livy’s preface at hand, whether it is an original component or a later addition.

74 See Woodman 2012: 145-46, with the further connection of tantum operis (Prop. 3.3.4 ~ Liv. praef. 13). To Woodman’s list of parallels may be added invidia turba (a second use of the word turba, Prop. 3.1.21 ~ Liv. praef., tanta turba), memorator Homerus (Prop. 33 ~ Liv. 3, memoriae), and the ending of both pieces with prayer (Prop. 38, vota ~ Liv. 13, votis). Another parallel can be found in a different prefatory remark of Livy: crescere...opus, 31.1.5 ~ opus, Prop. 3.1.17, and crescere opus, 34. For Propertius’ intertext with Hor. C. 3.30, see also Ch. 2.

75 See also above on Moles’ connection of opus and monumentum. Though the term monumentum is not used in this poem, Propertius uses opus twice (3.1.17, 34).
crowd in question follows the poet, who processes in a chariot as if a conquering general in triumph, an event that shares many of the magnifying aspects of monumentality (see Ch. 4).

In Propertius’ reading, the importance of the funerary element returns, as he continues with a vision for the afterlife of his poetry: omnia post obitum fingit maiora vetustas: / maius ab exsequuis nomen in ora venit (“time makes all things greater after their demise: after the funeral, a name resounds more loudly,” 23-24). But, unlike the metaphorical tombstone of Propertius and other poets, Livy’s history is a tombstone not to himself but to all Rome as it exists in the ideal. In recasting Livy’s words, the elegiac author offers a very different vision of the function of literary memorialization from the historian’s and provides an ancient perspective on Livy’s stance: Propertius’ fama—in a generic twist on familiar triumph imagery—is the driving force behind the poem and the patron, of sorts, of its author; Livy consigns his fama rather to a doubtful fate, provided that the importance of Rome and its salubrious examples remains.

Author and reader

In addition to telling Livy’s readers what is most important (hoc illud…praecipue) in the reading of history, the preface also reveals who is most important in this process from a programmatic standpoint: omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites (“for you to gaze on instances of every type of model, set upon a splendid monumentum; then, for yourself and your state, to seize what to imitate and what, being base from beginning to end, to avoid,” praef. 10). The accumulation of 2nd person elements is striking here: though it clearly must refer to multiple readers, the singular addressee makes the charge appear personal, directed

---

76 Woodman 2012: 146, suggests that Propertius “is perhaps upstaging Livy’s gloomy prediction.”
to individuals with a sense of urgency. Livy is actively calling on each reader and endowing them in his construction with a personal interest in Rome (\textit{tuae...rei publicae}). Further, the persons of the preface progress from general to specific, as Moles points out. Finally, Livy closes the preface with the 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural (\textit{nobis, inciperemus}, 13). This usage may seem to be a singular “we” referring to the author or else a collective idea of “we” as historians, but the progression from 1\textsuperscript{st} to 2\textsuperscript{nd} to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person suggests that it is better to take this “we” as a reference to the collaborative effort between author and audience: that is, “me, Livy” and “you, the reader” in tandem. For the collaboration to be effective, the audience that Livy seems to address must display a level of attention beyond the run of the mill.

Although Livy’s history is open to all, Livy sets out to train a particular readership that has the capacity to be attuned to more subtle viewpoints contained in his work. These opportunities for the reader to engage with the text are often flagged through contradictory and conflicting elements in the narrative, as these variances naturally call attention to themselves for the perceptive reader. By targeting and training such an audience from the preface on, Livy

\footnotesize

77 Cf. Kraus 14, for the establishment in Livy’s preface of a relationship between writer and reader in the reading and understanding of history: “There is a direct, personal relationship between the \textit{ego} of the text and this \textit{tu} [\textit{praef. 10}]: history is understood — even made — in the space between them. The reader’s job is to observe closely (\textit{intueri}) not only the results (displayed in L.’s \textit{illustre monumentum} as in a diorama) but also the workings of history.” See also Chaplin 2000: passim; Kraus and Woodman 1997: esp. 52-53; Levene 1993: 28-30. For further discussion of Livy’s encouragement of reader participation in general, see Pausch 2011; Moles 2009; Pittenger 2008: 18-19; Gowing 2005: 24; Kraus 1998; Kraus and Woodman 1997: 53-56; Kraus 13-15; Walsh 1961.

78 See Moles 2009: 70-71, for the progression in Livy’s preface from 1\textsuperscript{st} person singular, to 3\textsuperscript{rd} plural, to 3\textsuperscript{rd} singular, to 1\textsuperscript{st} plural, to 2\textsuperscript{nd} singular.

79 As Kraus 1998: 264, says, “Beyond perhaps all other genres, history needs its readers. Whether we regard Livy’s \textit{monumentum} as a treasury or a jumbled heap, it demands our attention, insists that we compare, contrast, interpret, and, above all, judge. Only the consensus of readers, following the historian’s clues, can identify a given character or event as a good or bad \textit{exemplum}, a subject of imitation or avoidance; the sum total of such identifications establishes the narrative as an authoritative version of the past. This process relies on the reader’s recognition of familiar story patterns: conventional, repeating elements of narrative and theme.” See further \textit{ibid.} 281-83.

80 On different audience expectations from and different audiences for different styles of history as well as different authors, see Marincola 1997: 19-33. As Marincola says, “Each historian must envision his audience before deciding
creates his collaborative history, the extended meaning of which unfolds as a dialogue of nuance, skepticism, and close attention to verbal detail scattered throughout the text. The *monumenta* of Rome’s past provide an apt medium for this dialogue, in that they represent both a series of objects familiar to Livy’s audience and a societal inclination—even obsession, as the topography of the city demonstrates—with which they were equally familiar.

**Monumenta and corruptibility**

Besides characterizing his work as a whole as a *monumentum* at preface 10, Livy also mentions that his literary edifice incorporates building blocks in the form of *monumenta* (*praef.* 6) as smaller-scale records of the past. The structurally complex and interconnected *monumentum* that is the *Ab Urbe Condita* is constituted by an interrelated series of individually identifiable *monumenta* that may be assumed to have had parallel existences outside his text, that is, as structures or other kinds of memorials marking elements of the Roman past. Yet, this source material is often marked by the author as problematic in the course of the text. Livy’s work as a whole transcends the biases—and, to an extent, the associations—of these individual *monumenta*. As discussed in Ch. 2, what sets literary *monumenta*, such as Livy’s, apart is their ability to subsume other, formerly free-standing material and written *monumenta*. Thus, Livy integrates as raw material other *monumenta* to provide an outline and content for his larger

---

81 See, e.g., Fox 2015: 287: “The effect is to keep readers involved in the problems of the sources, and to keep the work of the historian visible in readers’ minds. Thereby, questions of methodological difficulty, of belief of disbelief, do not disappear from the texture of the work. Rather, they are used to allow Livy to put forward his own versions of stories without insisting too much upon his own authority. That involvement helps increase readers’ sense of a relationship with the historian, upon which he can build in his more dramatic narratives.”
memorial to the Roman past; in the act, he frees those *monumenta* from their original contexts, especially those that may have focused their impact in a manipulative and self-serving way.\(^{82}\)

These other *monumenta*—whether material or textual—do not have the same uniformity of outlook and extensiveness of vision as Livy’s literary *monumentum*; that is, they do not share his account’s comprehension of Rome in its totality, as a city, a people, and an idea; rather, they represent disparate commemorations of individuals, occurrences, or egocentric initiatives. But, as the traditional fabric of the Roman memorial landscape, such *monumenta* of necessity provide raw material for historical works and establish authority to their accounts through solid points of contact. This challenge of authority is one with which Livy tacitly plays to establish his own *monumentum*, as he describes it at Preface 10, as something qualitatively different from standard *monumenta*. Livy begins to hint at the distinction between traditional *monumenta* and his own by acknowledging his use of the former at the beginning of his history, though not in a way that excuses them from further scrutiny.

In the passage in question, Livy mentions two types of sources available to him in retracing Rome’s earliest period in order to explain the fabulous nature of some of the material that will follow: *quae ante conditam condendamve urbem poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur, ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est* (“As to the material passed down from before the city was founded or when it was about to be founded, which is more germane to poetic tales than the uncompromised *monumenta* of history, I have no intention either to confirm or to refute it,” praef. 6).\(^{83}\) With this statement, Livy

---

82 Cf. Neel 2015: 13: “*monumenta* offer the Roman writer a skeleton of names and extremely basic events that could then be fleshed out in a manner that fit his own aims.”

83 See Wiseman 1986: 90, where he postulates that mistaken interpretations of early *monumenta* on the part of historians “enabled them to fill the wide open spaces of the early Republic…[with] the late-republican historian’s own irresponsible inventions.” Cf. Kraus and Woodman 1997: esp. 1-10; Cornell 1986: 68-75 (a summary of scholarly opinion on the matter in the same volume as Wiseman, though Cornell’s actual stance on the
famously hints at issues of historical source methodology—particularly reliability—which seems in his description to apply especially to ancient times. With the opposing terms *poeticae...fabulae* and *incorrupta...monumenta*, he seems to draw an important distinction in the qualities of the information about the past available to him—although paradoxically he does so apparently only to deny a commitment to differentiating between them, a stated practice that Livy further complicates in the course of the narrative (discussed below).

If the opposition Livy here creates—if apparently only to set it aside—is taken in isolation, without reference to passages in other parts of the history, it seems to suggest that there is such a thing as wholly reliable (*incorrupta*) monumeta available to investigators of Roman history; only the earliest times seem to lack these solid points of contact. Indeed, the phrase *incorrupta . . . monumenta* here is often taken by modern scholars—and at least one ancient one (Tac. *Ann.* 15.41.2, discussed below)—to indicate the genre of history itself. In practice, however, it is unclear that Livy is suggesting that these *incorrupta . . . monumenta* even exist: he regularly casts doubt on events that he records or complicates the characteristics of individuals

---

84 Cf. Pliny’s assessment that certain types of material combat “corruption”: *nigri silices optimi, quibusdam in locis et rubentes, nonnasquam vero et albi, sicut in Tarquiniensi Anicianis lapicidinis circa lacum Volsiniensem et in Statoniensi, quibus ne ignes quidem nocent. idem et in monimentis scalpti contra vetustatem quoque incorrupti permanent (“the best silex is black, though in certain places it is also red, and also white on occasion, as in the Anician quarries in Tarquinia around lake Volsinia and in Statonia, which stone not even fire harms. The same rock also, sculpted in monimenta, remain inviolate to age,” 36.168). Cf. Shannon 2012: 752 n. 15.

85 Moles 2009: 64, asserts: “There is a fundamental implication here: the history, as opposed to the *fabulae*, will be true, and true in the most basic sense: factually true.” *Fabulae*, however, continue to play a part in Livy’s history even beyond periods where antiquity allows for the inclusion of more marvelous tales, in places where, according to Moles’ assessment, one might expect facts to be quite secure.

86 E.g., Shannon 2012: 753; Moles 2009: esp. 64-65; Sailor 2006. For Livy’s contrast between *fabulae* and *monumenta* as a distinction between spoken accounts and visual representations of the past, see Miles 1995: 8-74, esp. 16-18, where he defines *fabula* as speaking in the form of oral tradition.
depicted in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, despite the general notion that *monumenta* are supposed to provide a more secure means of commemoration (discussed below).

By inference, what the tradition and materials available to Livy do provide are *monumenta* that relay sources of information that are somehow compromised (*corrupta*). This causes Livy’s *fabulae*—though they seemed initially to be less desirable to the historian than their counterpart—to appear much more akin to the *monumenta* included in the history.\(^87\) Indeed, in various parts of Livy’s narrative, the historian allows the distinction between *fabulae* and *monumenta* to fade, even where the excuse of antiquity’s obscuring effects is no longer applicable. Thus, Livy’s indication that the time period in question dictates the nature of the type of source-materials available first needs attention. I argue that Livy makes his prefatory distinction between *monumenta* and *fabulae* not to establish a genuine disparity between these two carriers of the past and tradition: rather he draws attention to a more widespread perceived difference in value that will diminish or disappear in the course of the narrative.

As the preface has it, the issue of the reliability of source-material is pertinent exclusively in Livy’s investigation of Rome’s most distant past; that is, to those events and figures that are too far removed from the present for unaltered and unalterable testaments to the past (*incorrupta…monumenta*) to survive or to be reliably distinguishable from legendary material associable with poetic invention (*poeticis…fabulis*). That “distant past” can be taken to encompass both a time that might be termed pre-historic—even bare state documents cannot predate the creation of the state (*ante conditam condendamve urbem*)—and also the subsequent

---

\(^87\) Cf. Liv. 32.33.5, in which representatives of king Attalus demand from Philip of Macedon that a temple be restored to new (*pro incorruptis*) because it had been pillaged and destroyed (*spoliasset evastassetque*). Though Livy may not have had his preface in mind when he wrote this passage, the idea of “pillaged” sources of history well grasps the potential perversion of the past for personal gain on the part of ambitious individuals or families.
periods of the kings, early consuls, dictators, decemvirs, and consular tribunes to 390 BC and the Gallic sack of Rome, a grouping that Livy makes at the start of his second pentad (6.1.1).\(^8\)

The following discussion will explore the ways in which Livy’s narrative as a whole counters the preface’s presumption that the issue of source-reliability is restricted to the earliest periods.\(^9\) In fact, the issue turns out to extend well into those times that are recorded in written accounts, particularly in Livy’s narrative connection of the terms *monumentum, fabula,* and *fama.*\(^9\) In cases of historical uncertainty beyond that statement in the preface (6), Livy directly attributes the difficulty of ascertaining the facts to the haze of time, but it turns out that, after the haze of time has dissipated, uncertainty about the historical past and our means of access to it does not. Deliberate distortion of the past, however, is suggested and even lamented throughout the work, which begs the question of how *monumenta* in Livy’s account become *corrupta*.

I do not necessarily mean to suggest that Livy planned from the start the exact verbal references that would connect back across huge swaths of text and then deployed them at the predetermined moment of composition. But, due to the level of careful craftsmanship and

\(^{8}\) Though Livy only mentions the very earliest periods in his preface, at 5.21.8-9 he narrates an episode with striking verbal and conceptual parallels to *praef.* 6, which indicates a similar situation for the lack of reliable sources (see below).

\(^{9}\) In tracing the how and why of history, the passage of time is lamented by Livy as a perennial enemy because it occludes access to the past. Many of the passages in question, however, do not fit in the category of most ancient. For *antiquitas* or its derivatives blocking sure knowledge, see Liv. 3.5.12; 5.21.9; cf. 1.24.1. For *vetustas* or its derivatives, see W & M 6.26; *praef.* 2; 1.3.2; 2.4.3; 2.21.4; 4.23.3; 6.1.1; 7.6.6; 29.14.9; cf. 1.23.4; 3.71.7; 21.52.7; 22.11.6; 37.1.9. Cf. also Ov. *Met.* 15.871-72 and its verbal parallels to Hor. C. 3.30.1-3 (*opus exegi ~ exegi monumentum; edax vetustas ~ imber edax;* etc.); Woodman 2012: 102-3; Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 367; Hulton 1972: 501. See also Liv. 1.23.3, which provides an implicit *monumentum* for the Alban invasion of Roman territory: *castra ab urbe haud plus quinque milia passuum locant; fossa circumdant; fossa Cluilia ab nomine ducis per aliquot saecula appellata est, donec cum re nomen quoque vetustate abolevit* (“they set up camp hardly more than five miles from the city, and they surrounded it with a trench. The trench was called Clulian after the name of their leader for some ages, until the name as well as its referent vanished with age;” cf. 2.39.4-6; Plut. *Cor.* 30.2).

\(^{9}\) An example of this confluence of terms revolves around Livy’s narrative of the character Scipio Africanus, about whom agreement is lacking both in material *monumenta* and written ones (38.53.8-10, 56.1-6, 57.5-8; discussed in Ch. 4).
thematic subtlety in the preface, it is reasonable to conclude that Livy had a basic idea of how subsequent concepts would unfold in light of his prefatory themes. Thus, Livy’s remark about antiquity needs further attention.

“Neither to affirm nor refute”

In his preface, Livy makes the significant disclaimer for his approach to information-gathering that he has “no intention either to confirm or to refute” (nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est, 6). As mentioned above, he seems to set up the distinction between fabulae and monumenta only to dismiss it with the subsequent recusatio: that is, in essence he explicitly refuses to take on what was conventionally a major function of the historian: their role as arbitrator in establishing criteria for reliability and in transmitting what they judge as more reliable. Livy provides an explanation for this deficiency, on the one hand, when he simply points out the antiquity of the affairs in question and, on the other, when he suggests that fabulous stories of divine intervention in Rome’s early history were tolerated in light of the city’s later history:

datur haec venia antiquitati, ut miscendo humana divinis primordia urbium augstiora faciat; et si cui populo licere oportet consecrare origines suas et ad deos referre auctores, ea belli gloria est populo Romano ut cum suum

91 Cf. the similar prefatory remark made by Herodotus: ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτω ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο, τὸν δὲ οἷα αὐτὸς πρὸτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδίκων ἔργων ἐς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας, τούτων σημόνως προβήσομαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω τὸν λόγον, ὁμοίως σμίκρα καὶ μεγάλα ἀστεία ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών. τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ σμίκρα αὐτῶν γέγονεν: τὰ δὲ ἔπει ἐμεθή ἡ μεγάλα, πρότερον ἡ σμικρά. τὴν ἀνθρωπητίαν ἢν ἐπιστάμενος εὐδαιμονίην οὐδαμά ἐν τῶν ἡμείσσων, ἐπιμνήσομαι ἄμφιτέρων ὁμοίος (“For my own part, I will not say that this or that story is true, but I will name him whom I myself know to have done unprovoked wrong to the Greeks, and so go forward with my history, speaking of small and great cities alike. For, many states that were once great have now become small, and those that are great in my time were small formerly. Knowing therefore that human prosperity never continues in the same way, I will make mention alike of both kinds,” 1.5). The two sentiments certainly do not match: Herodotus ignores the quibbling of the traditions that he has heard because he knows the truth; Livy, on the other hand, avoids taking a definitive stance on matters that cannot be proven definitively.

92 As Sailor 2006: 336, says: “Historiography was not a science, nor was there an elaborated theoretical discourse about it. A historian was, however, expected to have a standard operating procedure: to have authorities, to decide between them when they differed, and to employ a consistent set of practices in doing so.”
conditorisque sui parentem Martem potissimum ferat tam et hoc gentes humanae patiantur aequo animo quam imperium patiuntur. (praef. 6-7)\textsuperscript{93}

this pardon is granted to ancient times: to make the origins of cities more venerable by combining human and divine elements. And if it is fitting to permit any people to sanctify their beginnings and speak of the gods as their progenitors, the glory of war grants it to the Roman people that, when they call Mars most powerful their father and that of their founder, the nations of mankind must endure it with as steady a mind as they endure rule.

Yet, though the passage opens with the veneer of an explanation, it conveys a tone of skepticism through provisions and conditions (\textit{si, licere, oportet}), which, as I see it, serve as markers of a need for greater scrutiny on the reader’s part.\textsuperscript{94}

The statement reflects on Rome’s role as an expansionist power, but the explanation for why Roman conquest and rule should be tolerated hardly vindicates the conquest and rule themselves. The actual example that Livy uses—Martian paternity of Romulus and, therefore, of the Roman people—is presented as a pretense (\textit{ferat}), one that reoccurs in the narrative proper.

In Book 1, Livy returns to Romulus’ conception, again with a measure of doubt. Concerning Rhea Silvia and the father of her twins, Livy writes: \textit{vi compressa Vestalis, cum geminum partum edidisset, seu ita rata, seu quia deus auctor culpae honestior erat, Martem incertae stirpis patrem nuncupat} (“The Vestal was raped. When she gave birth to twins, either because she believed it or because a god was a more honorable perpetrator of the crime, she declared Mars to be the father of her doubtful offspring,” 1.4.2). Livy takes no definitive stance—in other words,

\textsuperscript{93} For discussion of historians’ “appropriate caveats” when it comes to the distance of time, see Levene 2010: 384-85; Pelling 2002: 171-95.

\textsuperscript{94} For discussion of Livy’s skepticism here and its implications, see Sailor 2006: 349-54; Feldherr 1998: 75-78; Miles 1995: 110-19, 137-78; Alfonsi 1983.
he neither confirms or refutes—but, by providing alternatives, he allows for a stance between blind acceptance and complete denial.\footnote{Sailor 2006: 352, asserts: “[Livy’s] declared policy about traditions better suited to \textit{fabulae} than to history is often characterized as fence-sitting…Rarely observed is that this strongly privileges skepticism: refusal to confirm is itself to take a skeptical position (otherwise, why \textit{not} confirm?) while refusal to deny is not all to take a position of belief.”}

Furthermore, in the passage above (\textit{praef.} 6-7), antiquity is not the only issue that contributes to Livy’s unwillingness to confirm or refute. Deliberate distortion mixes human elements with divine (\textit{miscendo humana divinis}),\footnote{See Ogilvie 27, who compares Livy’s mention of human and divine here to Cic. \textit{de Inv.} 1.23, which gives means for “securing the favorable attention of readers.”} with the intention to magnify (\textit{augustiora faciat}).\footnote{The possible connection of \textit{augustiora} and August (see, e.g., Hirst 1926) is titillating but ought not be pushed too far.} Thus, in Livy’s tacit presentation, the obscuring power of antiquity lies just as much in the ability of more recent times to make aggrandizing claims that cannot be disproven as it does in the difficulty of finding evidence that actually originates in ancient times (see below on 7.6.5-6). Lack of proof works to the advantage of, say, a prominent individual claiming descent from grand figures of the past—and, therefore, claiming their positive qualities: though hearers may find the claim absurd, the seed has been planted, and there exists no means of definitively disproving the claim.

Here the charge of distortion is perhaps less extreme because it seems to be made by and for the Roman people as a whole, which, as Livy has it, has the privilege of making superlative claims, if any people does (\textit{si cui populo licere oportet}). But the notion of claiming gods as the originators (\textit{ad deos referre auctores}) even of a family line has actual corollaries in Livy’s contemporary society.\footnote{A prime example may be Julii and their claim of descent from Venus (discussed above).} It is further significant that the means by which this distortion is
achieved is the glory of war (*belli gloria*): military prestige—perhaps here in connection with official power (*imperium*)—is a deciding factor for individuals in establishing social prominence in Rome, a point to which Livy will return at key points of his history, particularly in the promotional celebration of a triumph (discussed in Ch. 4).

Livy in particular advertises his disinterest in confirming or refuting ancient reports that have reached him. He does so by means of a contrast between his own approach to source-material and that of others: *sed haec et his similia, utcumque animadversa aut existimata erunt, haud in magno equidem ponam discrimine* (“but these stories [on the divine origins of Rome] and things like them, regardless of how others will tend to think of and assess them, I for my part will hardly subject them to much scrutiny,” 8). Thus, after drawing what seems to be a significant disparity in the value of source material diversely described as *incorrupta . . . monumenta* and *poeticae . . . fabulae*, Livy again paradoxically discounts any ability or effort on his part to maintain such distinctions. He does, however, highlight the limitations of the available evidence, and he cues the reader into its problematic nature.

Even without further examination, Livy’s explicit statement about lacking reliable sources shows an awareness of the problematic nature of his task: that is, he is well aware of how *monumenta*—material, inscriptional, or literary—have been used to support particular versions of history and to popularize certain visions of the past. But, by the end of the preface, Livy has turned the lack of reliable sources to the advantage of his historiographical approach, a technique that he continues in other parts of the *Ab Urbe Condita*: by pointing to the ethical

---

99 See Miles 1995: 6: “Livy makes quite clear his awareness of the limitations of the available evidence as a means for reconstructing the past that lies behind it. His narrative is organized so as to direct attention away from the idea of Roman tradition as something permeable, through which the historian may penetrate to a prior reality, toward the idea of tradition as something opaque and impenetrable and therefore itself the ultimate object of the author’s reconstruction, analysis, and interpretation.” Cf. Forsythe 1999: esp. 133-35.
value (*praef.* 9) that stories based on flawed sources offer and privileging that over the factual accuracy that they cannot, Livy draws from traditional Roman history what can benefit a wider audience and curtails what can benefit only prominent individuals.\(^{100}\) By removing *monumenta* from their potentially self-serving origins, they become useful again. Further, in the process, Livy carefully unveils that distortion of the past occurs not only as a contingent of the passage of time but also as a mechanism for socio-political advancement.

**Livy and Tacitus on the conflagrations of Rome**

The desire for historical source material that has not mutated or been tampered with is an understandable one. Tacitus, an acute reader of Livy, comments on the reliability and loss of sources on the past in a manner that can persuasively be read as an allusion to Livy’s preface. Kelly Shannon points out that the phrase *incorrupta . . . monumenta* shows up in Latin literature only in Livy’s preface and in Tacitus’ description of the great fire of Rome in 64 AD (*Ann.* 15.38-41). Shannon effectively demonstrates that the temples and other religious sites destroyed in the fire have Livian precedent and that Livy is very much on Tacitus’ mind in his account of the fire.\(^{101}\) Among the losses of the fire, many ancient structures figure prominently, including the

---

\(^{100}\) As Levene 2010: 392, says, “there is little doubt that for Livy it is morality that matters above all. His self-presentation centres on showing himself as a provider of ethical lessons, and...he highlights his presentation of causation in ethical terms, and the reader is forced to interpret it in those terms not least because it is so hard to make sense of it in any other terms. Livy’s world is an ethical world: it is also a real world. But the real world is one where causal sequence, chronology, human behaviour and everything else are subordinated to the moral structure that Livy offers, and which he implies is also the moral structure of the universe. Ethics effectively controls everything else. The ultimate understanding of how Livy can present his text, with its self-acknowledged contradictions, as if it were reality, may be that he regards the moral picture that his text presents as a valid account in its own right, but also an accurate demonstration of the way the world works. By reading through Livy’s text one learns its moral lessons—complex and contested though they are—and one is obliged to focus on morality precisely because there is no other way of making sense of that text.”

\(^{101}\) Shannon 2012: esp. 750-56, for the following discussion. Shannon asserts: “The temples destroyed have good Livian credentials, and in fact only reveal their complete significance when ‘read’ with Livy” (762). For further Tacitean nods to Livy, see Marincola 1997: 251-53. For Tacitus’ account of the rebuilding of Rome after the fire (*Ann.* 15.43.1-5) following that of Livy’s after the Gallic sack, see Kraus 1994: 286-87.
Temple of Luna, the Ara Maxima along with the connected shrine to Hercules, the Temple of Jupiter Stator, the Regia, and the Temple of Vesta (41.1).\textsuperscript{102}

Tacitus continues: \textit{iam opes tot victoriis quaesitae et Graecarum atrium decora, exim monumenta ingeniorum antiqua et incorrupta ut quamvis in tanta resurgentis urbis pulchritudine multa seniores meminerint, quae reparari nequiban}t (“also lost were numerous riches, won in conquest, and the ornaments of Greek atria, and the ancient and \textit{incorrupta monumenta} of great minds, so that, though the situation was one in which the immense beauty of the city was re-emerging, the older people recalled many things that could not be recovered,” 41.2).\textsuperscript{103} Among the greatest edifices and treasures of Rome’s past, \textit{incorrupta monumenta} figure prominently, and their loss is immediately felt in a twist by which people recall (\textit{meminerint}) that which can no longer fulfill its function of preserving remembrance of the past. The fire marks a hard break between the past—the old and established (\textit{antiqua, seniores})—and the present—the new and changing (\textit{resurgentis}).\textsuperscript{104}

Shannon suggests that these \textit{monumenta} are works of literature—particularly history—that burned along with a public library, an assessment that fits well with their description as the

\textsuperscript{102} Cf. Suet. \textit{Nero} 38.2: \textit{per sex dies septemque noctes ea clade saevitum est ad monumentorum bustorumque deversoria plebe compulsa. Tunc praeter immensum numerum insularum domus priscorum ducum arserunt hostilibus adhuc spoliis adornatae deorumque aedes ab regibus ac deinde Punicis et Gallicis bellis votae dedicataeque, et quidquid visendum atque memorabile ex antiquitate duraverat (“for six days and seven nights this disaster raged on while the people were driven to the shelter of \textit{monumenta} and tombs. Then—besides a huge number of apartment buildings—the houses of ancient leaders, still decorated with enemy spoils, and the temples of the gods, vowed and dedicated by the kings and later in the Gallic and Punic wars, burned, as well as whatever had survived from antiquity that was worth seeing or remembering”).

\textsuperscript{103} I suggest that \textit{incorrupta} here may indicate that these \textit{monumenta} had not yet been compromised by the current regime. Nero himself is described as \textit{corruptior} in the preceding chapter (37.4), and items burned in the fire are twice characterized as \textit{corruptus} (38.2, 4), a fire with “cause unsure: whether it arose by chance or by a device of the princeps—both versions have their proponents” (\textit{forte an dolo principis incertum—nam utrumque auctores prodidere}, 38.1).

\textsuperscript{104} Jenkyns 2015: 20-21, argues that Tacitus’ lament for these “ancient things” must stem from their exemplification of ancient \textit{religio} (\textit{vetustissima religione}, \textit{Ann.} 15.41) rather than their actual age or aesthetic quality.
products of human intellect (*ingeniorum*).\(^{105}\) Then, Shannon comments on the different implications of the phrase for the two historians: “While for Livy the phrase *incorrupta monumenta* was meant to draw a contrast between old myths of the pre-foundation and his own more accurate genre of history, Tacitus’ distinction is between the venerable historical writings now lost and the new city Nero is founding upon the ashes of the old.”\(^{106}\)

But Livy’s distinction between *fabulae* and *monumenta* is not one that holds hard and fast in practice in his work; even in the preface he is unwilling to claim the means or even the intention to maintain it. These *monumenta* for Tacitus are lost (*amissa, exusta*, 41.1) and irreplaceable (*reparari nequibant*), and, thus, they are the property of a bygone time, a better time than that narrated under the rule of Nero—at least as Tacitus portrays it. But the further implication from the allusion to Livy is that Tacitus believes that *incorrupta monumenta* existed in the earlier historian’s time in the form of historical accounts, even if he would concede to Livy that perhaps they did not account for the earliest period of Rome (*quae ante conditam condendamve urbem*, Liv. *praef*. 6). For Livy, however, as we have seen, *monumenta* of this sort are no more than a hypothetical: through the comparative inherent in *magis decora*, Livy does not attest to a firm dichotomy between *fabula* and *monumentum*; he just allows for a degree of difference.

Thus, the mention of different types of sources emerges not so much as a judgement of the worth of different kinds of material available to Livy; it is just an acknowledgement of available material. Livy has in fact used the opportunity of the preface to prepare attentive

\(^{105}\) Cf. Seidman 2014, who argues that Tacitus, particularly at *Ann*. 1.61, uses spatial, artistic, and imaginative *monumenta* in his account of the Battle of Teutoburg Forest implicitly to establish his literary account as a *monumentum* in line with that of Livy (*praef*. 10). See also Rouveret 1991 for a more general discussion of *monumenta* in Tacitus.

\(^{106}\) Shannon 2012: 753.
readers for the notion that no source is entirely *incorruptum* if subjected to scrutiny, a notion that careful reading of the *Ab Urbe Condita* brings further to light. Livy, however, counters the pessimism inherent in this outlook on the viability of accessing the past by redirecting his reader’s focus to other characteristics of his subject-matter—that is, its ethical values—a redirection that redefines Livy’s approach to historical material generally: *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* (“I would have my readers, each for themselves, acutely apply their mind to these things: what the lifestyles were, what the values, who the men through whom and the practices by which rule was achieved and increased at home and abroad,” *praef.*, 9). It is the depiction of values and behaviors that makes the history. Livy lets the reader know that it is more important how they read and understand the stories than that they come from an authority that is unimpeachable by absolute standards of truth. Further, Livy in practice reinforces this approach of deflating the question of the historical accuracy of his material in favor of promoting its ethical import through his frequent practice of pointing out the gaps, mistakes, and distortions of many traditional accounts of Rome’s past.

In other words, Livy elevates the content and value of his account by focusing on something more universal. If there is an *incorruptum . . . monumentum* to be had, it is only available to readers through selfless examination of the past, an appraisal of beneficial values without consigning those values exclusively to the characters that on occasion display them. Livy’s own work achieves status as such a *monumentum*, by subordinating the author of the work to its function. Livy distinguishes himself from the *novi scriptores* that he mentions in the preface (see above) and their competitive drive to find something more solid in the details (*in rebus certius aliquid allatus*, *praef.*, 2); he seeks to find something more secure by returning to
what was originally important in making Rome great: not the people *per se* but the circumstances
and standards that allowed them to do great things and thereby be great people.

*Fabulae in the Ab Urbe Condita*

In *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*, Gary Miles explores Livy’s use and conflation of the terms *fabula* and *monumentum*. The following discussion is heavily indebted to that discussion, but the topic bears repeating.¹⁰⁷ Livy’s application of the term *fabula* leaves plenty of room for ambiguity. As noted above, Livy gives the impression in his prefatory remark (*praef.* 6) that *monumenta* and *fabulae* are conceptual opposites, an impression that needs further examination. That is, Livy at first glance seems to differentiate clearly between the references of the two terms: if *monumenta* represent relatively reliable modes of access to past events, *fabulae* do not.¹⁰⁸ In practice, however, Livy subjects that opposition to resistance or shows it to fade entirely, as *fabulae* and *monumenta* both serve as source-material for historical accounts that are notable for their fabulous characteristics. As Livy treats the term, *fabulae* can even have a direct connection to *monumenta* within the narrative (discussed below), which allows for an increased blending of the two terms.

The early portions of Livy’s history certainly feature more instances of stories and events explicitly registered as *fabulae* than the later portions do, a feature that may be explained away by the same “pardon of antiquity” discussed above (*praef.* 7). But later portions of the *Ab Urbe Condita* are not devoid of fabulous elements. As the narrative progresses, Livy continues to use *fabulae* as media for access to the Roman past, despite the fact that historical accounts exist,

¹⁰⁷ Miles 1995: 8-74; I note with more specific page ranges where Miles’ discussion comes directly into play for my own.

¹⁰⁸ See Moles 2009: esp. 64. Moles comments that Livy follows Thucydides in distinguishing between *poeticae . . . fabulae* and *incorrupta . . . monumenta* (equivalent in that reading to myth/poetry as distinguished from history); and that Livy follows Herodotus in the refusal to judge reported tradition.
some even written by people contemporary to the events and involved in them. That is, literary monumenta are available for those eras, but fabulae—either explicit or implicit—persist in Livy’s rendition, which heavily resemble those interspersed in the narrative of earlier times.

For instance, in presage of his kingship, the head of the young Servius Tullius is said to have caught fire in the sight of many witnesses (caput arsisse ferunt multorum in conspectu, 1.39.1), without harm to the boy. A similar kindling of the head happens during Livy’s decade on the Second Punic War to the equestrian Lucius Marcius, who takes command of the Roman forces following the deaths of Publius and Gnaeus Scipio. Following Marcius’ defeat of the Carthaginian generals Mago and Hasdrubal, “flame spouted forth from his head as he gave a speech, without his own knowledge but to the great fear of the surrounding soldiers” (flammam ei contionanti fusam e capite sine ipsius sensu cum magno pavore circumstantium militum, 25.39.16). Thus, both occurrences seemingly have the testimony of a crowd that has witnessed these miraculous happenings.

The latter story is firmly set in a period where writing—“the sole reliable guardian of the remembrance of history” (una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum, 6.1.1, discussed in Ch. 4)—is decidedly available. But, though separated by nearly four centuries, the two stories are quite similar in nature, particularly in that Livy calls both events miracula (1.39.2; 25.39.16), which connects them conceptually—if not verbally—with fabulae (see below). Indeed, Livy says that the miraculum of Marcius’ head catching fire is a literary addition on the part of historians to

---

109 Cf. Virg. Aen. 2.682-83. For the mythological trope of an important character’s head catching fire, see Ogilvie 156-58. See also Liv. 26.19 and 38.56, where other miraculous tropes—marked by the term fabulae—figure prominently in connection with Scipio Africanus.

the figure’s actual glory (verae gloriae eius etiam miracula addunt).\textsuperscript{111} It is further significant that these historians seem to call on the assurance of a monimentum to support their account of the story, complete with a conspicuous nomen: monimentumque victoriae eius de Poenis usque ad incensum Capitolium fuisse in templo clipeum, Marcium appellatum, cum imagine Hasdrubalis (“they say that there was a monimentum of his victory over the Carthaginians—up to the burning of the Capitol—in the form of a shield in the temple, which was called Marcian and bore the likeness of Hasdrubal,” 25.39.17; cf. Plin. NH 35.14).\textsuperscript{112} The inclusion of miracula/θαύματα is by no means out of place for history,\textsuperscript{113} but Livy’s description here provides clues into his approach to such elements: he passes over the report without explicit censure, but the seed of doubt has been planted, both in the similarity of the event to one in

\textsuperscript{111} It is worth note that Marcius is characterized as a vir unus (25.37.2). On Livy’s use of the expressions vir unus, homo unus, and the like, see Elliott 2009a; Santoro L’hoir 1990; Dutoit 1956. Santoro L’hoir concludes that Livy’s depiction of Marcius—especially his characterization as vir unus—is a positive reference to Octavian’s youthful military record and that “Livy’s citation of three separate sources for Marcius’ exploits attests to his belief in their authority” (234). The complication of confusing “actual glory” with miracula, however, does not allow for such a definitive reading of Livy’s support of Augustus’ rule. See also Livy’s description of Manlius Capitolinus as a homo unus at the moment of his fall, both figurative and literal (locusque idem in uno homine et eximiae gloriae monumentum et poenae ultimae fuit, 6.20.12; discussed above), which further shades the intratextual impact of the phrase.

\textsuperscript{112} See Haimson Lushkov 2018: 36-38, for this passage as a “variant citation,” which sets contrasting sources against a notion of general consensus. See also id. 2013: 34-8.

\textsuperscript{113} See, e.g., Humphreys 1997: 218: “the meta-category of the exceptional or marvelous was a focus both of aesthetic appreciation and of intellectual effort. Belief in portents was not discarded, but theorized. Even where as in Stoic theory, the rationalization of portents was embedded in a new theology, we are dealing with attempts to understand phenomena and events that were neither part of regular experience nor obviously fantastic. Both history and ethnography dealt with testimonies from regions marginal to contemporary experience—spatially or temporally—which were not necessarily to be rejected on that account. There was no sharp line between myth and history, between the possible and the inconceivable.” See also Gabba 2011: esp. 343-45; Marincola 1997: 82-83.
ancient—even mythological—times, where the excuse of antiquity may account for its character (praef. 7), \textsuperscript{114} and in the application of the term \textit{miraculum}.\textsuperscript{115}

In Livy’s explicit use of the term, though, \textit{fabulae} are not necessarily bad or deficient, as he incorporates them often in his history\textsuperscript{116}—although this involves the additional challenge that the matter is, of course, difficult to assess in practice: what one person may feel is a \textit{fabula}, another may find to be less suspect. Further, the term \textit{fabula}—like \textit{monumentum}—can have a wide range of meanings, from genre-specific to a somewhat neutral indicator of a story.\textsuperscript{117} In this respect, a brief exploration of the term in Roman literature can cast light on Livy’s use of \textit{fabulae} in historical episodes, particularly how the term comes to engage with \textit{monumentum} as a near parallel rather than an opposite.

\textsuperscript{114} Of course, Livy may call traditions or reports into question on a more practical level than their miraculous level. See, e.g., Livy’s reference to Cincius Alimentus (21.38.3-5), who should be the weightiest authority on the numbers of Hannibal, having served in the war and been made a prisoner of Hannibal himself. But Livy counters Cincius’ authority by charging him with miscalculation of the size of Hannibal’s forces (discussed further in Ch. 4).

\textsuperscript{115} Concerning the phrase \textit{miracula addunt}, W & M 5.212 say: “wie häufig bei denkwürdigen Ereignissen oder hervorragenden Persönlichkeiten,” a phrase that mirrors Livy’s authorial comment at 24.3.7: \textit{ac miracula aliqua adfingunt, ut plerumque tam insignibus locis (“and tradition attaches certain marvels, as happens in places so famous”). But the acknowledgement that memorable events and people attract legends does not rule out Livy’s engagement with such distorted source material. For \textit{miracula adfingunt, fama est}, and similar phrases as authorial “footnoting,” see Jaeger 2006: esp. 400.

\textsuperscript{116} Cf. Quint. \textit{Inst.} 2.4.18-19: \textit{narrationibus non inutiliter subiungitur opus restruendi confermandique eas, quod ἀνασκευή et κατασκευή vocatur. Id porro non tandem in \textit{fabulosis} et carmine traditis fieri potest, verum etiam in ipsis annalium \textit{monumentis}: ut, si quaeratur ‘an sit credibile super caput Valeri pugnantis sedisse corvum, qui os oculosque hostis Galli rostro atque alis everberaret’, sit in utramque partem ingens ad dicendum materia: aut de serpente, quo Scipio traditur genitus, et lupa Romuli et Egeria Numae; nam Graecis historiis plerumque \textit{poeticae} similis licentia est. Saepe etiam quae in tempore, de loco, quo gesta res dicitur, nonnumquam de persona quoque, sicut Livius frequentissime dubitat et alii ab aliis historici dissentiant (“not without utility is the task of refuting and confirming connected to narrative, which in Greek is called ἀνασκευή and κατασκευή. Indeed, this task can be applied not only to mythic and poetic traditions but also to the very \textit{monumenta} of the annals. If it is asked, say, whether it is believable that a raven perched on Valerius’ head as he fought and attacked the face and eyes of his Gallic enemy with its beak and wings, there are significant grounds for speaking from either perspective. The same is true for the serpent by which Scipio is said to have been sired, and for Romulus’ she-wolf, and Numa’s Egeria. For the Greek historians, a license is taken very near to that of poetry. Also, it is often customary to question the time and the place in which deeds are said to have been done, and also sometimes the person, a point on which Livy very often has his doubts, and certain historians disagree with others”).

\textsuperscript{117} See Bettini 2008: 363-68.
**Fabula in context**

Varro derives the term *fabula* from *fari*, “to speak,”\(^{118}\) with which he further connects *fama* and *falsum* (discussed below), among other terms (*LL* 6.55).\(^{119}\) As a technical term, *fabula* indicates tragedy, comedy, or some other dramatic performance. In this respect, the term can refer to a particular type of performance,\(^{120}\) or it can be more general as a judgment of the sort of things that may be seen on the stage.\(^{121}\) Through the dramatic and other meanings of the term, the basic theme that emerges is that *fabulae* are fabricated rather than factual, which makes them unsuitable for situations that call for accounts claiming accuracy—in the way that many forms of historical narrative do. Beyond the basic concern for accuracy, on the other hand, the author who uses the term may be cognizant of the affect of the term on the reader/hearer and may actively be making a judgement about its veracity. As Maurizio Bettini says, “There is no question of the fictitious and incredible character of *fabulae*…To call a story a *fabula*, then, means that the speaker does not put much faith in it; a *fabula* is a narrative that others may believe, but which the speaker who defines it as such does not trust.”\(^{122}\)

---

\(^{118}\) See Maltby; E & M; L & S; *TLL* s.v., for further passages in support of this etymology. See also Bettini 2008, who discusses *fari* as an archaic word associated with power and prophecy and argues that these characteristics eventually led—paradoxically—to associations of untrustworthiness in the verb’s derivates, in particular for the discussion here, *fama* and *fabula*. See also Hardie 2012: 8.

\(^{119}\) Cf. Liv. *Per.* 49 (*ad falsam eius fabulam and fabulam autem talem finxit*).

\(^{120}\) The basic types of performance are sometimes distinguished by a Roman or Greek setting and are the *fabula* *togata/palliata* and *Tabernaria* (comedy) and the *fabula praetexta/cothurnata* (tragedy). For general discussions, see Manuwald 2011; Conte 29-38.

\(^{121}\) L & S s.v. II.B.1. See, e.g., the pithy comment of the Christian grammarian and rhetorician Victorinus Afer: *fabulae sunt quas fere videmus exitisse ex Phaedris, Medeis, Clytaemnestris aliisque similibus* (“*fabulae* are what we generally see Phaedras, Medeas, Clytemnestras, and other such [figures] produce,” *Explantionum in rhetoricam M. Tullii Ciceronis* 1.17 199.39-40 H).

\(^{122}\) Bettini 2008: 363.
In his discussion of narrative forms, Quintilian gives a basic, handbook definition of *fabula* as the type of narrative used in various forms of literature, that is, the subset that does not eschew the fantastic. Though definitions such as Quintilian’s are restrictive and technical, they provide some key characteristics of the term’s general sense, in this case especially in that Quintilian signals the conceptual gap between *historia* and *fabula*:

narrationum, excepta qua in causis utimur, tris accepinmus species, *fabulam*, quae versatur in tragoediis atque carminibus non a veritate modo sed etiam a forma veritatis remota, *argumentum*, quod falsum sed vero simile comoediae fingunt, *historiam*, in qua est gestae rei expositio. (*Inst.* 2.4.2; cf. Liv. 39.43.1, esp. *fabulae* and *argumentum*) \(^1\)

In addition to the type of narrative we deploy in legal cases, we have acknowledged three sorts: the *fabula*, which is used in tragedies and poems and is removed not only from truth but even the appearance of truth; the *argumentum*, which is used in comedy and is made up but possible; and *historia*, which is a narration of events that have taken place.

Thus, in this conception, *historia* is the narration of past achievements: the expectation it carries with it is that people will believe it—though they may know that the depicted event cannot have happened exactly as described. \(^2\) Certain liberties can be taken in the context of historiographical—that is, literary—works on stylistic grounds, but the reader or listener can, at

---

\(^1\) This partition of *narrationes* seems to go back—in Latin terminology, at least—to the extended discussion at Cic. *Inv.* 1.27. Cf. *Rhet.* Her. 1.8.13: *id quo in negotiorum expositione positum est tres habet partes: fabulam, historiam, argumentum*. *fabula* est quae neque veras neque veri similis continet res, ut eae sunt quae tragoediis traditae sunt. *historia* est gesta res, sed ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota. *argumentum* est ficta res quae tamen fieri potuit, velut *argumenta* comoediarum (“that [narrative] which is deployed for the exposition of facts has three types: *fabula*, *historia*, and *argumentum*. *Fabula* contains things neither true nor likely, as those handed down in tragedies. *Historia* is an account of a deed, but one beyond the recollection of our own time. *Argumentum* is an invented account that still could happen, as those of comedies”); Isid. *Orig.* 1.44.5 L: *inter historiae et argumentum et fabulam interesse. nam historiae sunt res verae quae factae sunt; argumenta sunt quae eti facta non sunt, fieri tamen possunt; fabulae vero sunt quae nec factae sunt nec fieri possunt, quia contra naturam sunt* (“there is a distinction between *historia*, *argumentum*, and *fabula*: *historiae* are actual things that were done; *argumenta* are those that, even if they were not done, could still happen; but *fabulae* are those that were not done nor could happen since they are contrary to nature”). Cf. Prisc. *de Narr.* 2.5 552.10-16 H, esp. *fabularis* [narratio]. See Krebs 2015: esp. 511-12, for further discussion of these terms, in particular how they pertain to Roman historiography.

\(^2\) See, e.g., Woodman 1988: 110 n. 100, on Fleischmann 1983 and the sort of belief that was entrusted in historians of the Middle Ages. As Pelling 1990: 38, puts it, the work of the ancient historian is a “creative reconstruction,” but one that is plausible, not a simple fiction or invention.
least, imagine the possibility of the event described and see its relevance to themselves.\textsuperscript{125} Fabula, on the other hand, does not necessarily give the impression that it is in any way true or even realistic. According to Quintilian’s assessment, fabulae, then, are not just simple lies, distortions, or hearsay:\textsuperscript{126} they are of such a supernatural or sensational nature that they cannot readily be believed.\textsuperscript{127} Quintilian’s treatment has its specific context and application, but similar conceptions of fabulae appear in other authors.

Cicero especially seems to hold little faith in fabulae, though he is happy to concede their charm.\textsuperscript{128} In de Divinatione, for instance, Cicero’s speaker ‘Marcus,’ identified with Cicero as author, engages in an extended discussion of the peripatetic philosopher Cratippus’ conception of divination (2.107ff.) and, from there, questions the use of prophetic texts: \textit{num igitur me cogis etiam fabulis credere? quae delectationis habeant, quantum voles, verbis, sententiis, numeris, cantibus adiuventur; auctoritatem quidem nullam debemus nec fidem commenticiis rebus adiungere} (“so you think you can compel me to believe even fabulae? Let them have as much delight as you will, let them be as polished in their expression, thought, meter, and poetics; we

\textsuperscript{125} For verisimilitude in myth and history, as well as the intersection of rhetoric and history as genres, see Fornara 1983: esp. 4-12.

\textsuperscript{126} See Liv. 45.39.15, however, for the verb form (fabulentur) indicating simple empty talk and lies.

\textsuperscript{127} Priscian, the early 6\textsuperscript{th} AD grammarian, diverges slightly from the standard assessment of credibility in fabulae: \textit{fabula est oratio ficta verisimili dispositione imaginem exhibens veritatis} (“a fabula is a tale created with a realistic arrangement and offers the pretense of truth,” \textit{de Rhet.} 1.1 550.1 H).

\textsuperscript{128} See, esp., Cic. \textit{de Leg.}1.5: \textit{Q. Intellego te, frater, alias in historia leges observandas putare, alias in poestate. M.: quippe, cum in illa omnia ad veritatem, Quinte, referantur, in hoc ad delectationem pleraque; quamquam et apud Herodotum, patrem historiae, et apud Theopompon sunt innumerabiles fabulae} (“Quintus: ‘I take it, brother, that you think that some rules must be followed in history and others in poetry.’ Marcus: ‘Of course, Quintus, since, in the former, all is concerned with truth, but, in the latter, most elements are concerned with pleasure. Though, there are countless fabulae in Herodotus, the father of history, and in Theopompus’.”). For discussion of Cicero’s stance on fabulae and different standards for their inclusion in history and poetry, see den Hengst 2010: esp. 23-26; Woodman 2012: 1-16, esp. 6-10.
should concede no authority to nor place any faith in made-up stories,” 2.113; cf. Mil. 3.8; Rep. 2.2, 10; de Nat. Deo. 2.70-71; etc.).

Cicero is perhaps taking a selective stance here and pushing the point to the extreme: the Sibylline prophecy to which he particularly refers was used by Lucius Cotta in an attempt to have Julius Caesar declared a king (de Div. 2.110). Calling a competitor’s grounds for argument a fabula is for Cicero an easy but effective way to discredit that argument—a move that is likewise available to historians to establish themselves as more reliable than their fellows. By refusing to distinguish between monumenta and fabulae, however, Livy also suggests that he is not engaging in this type of competition, in a similar way to that in which he separates himself from the novi…scriptores (praef. 2) and scriptorum turba (3) discussed above.

Fabulae as narratives of particular events or episodes do play a large part in the Roman historical tradition, either as the primary account or as alternate versions of a given tradition. But how the historian approaches and presents these fabulae can reveal a great deal about their methodology and bias. For instance, a historian may present a fantastic version of a story but follow up with a more rational one, such as Livy does in his account of the she-wolf and Romulus and Remus (1.4.3-9; see below), or in his account of Romulus’ death, where the alternatives he presents are that the king’s death happened through apotheosis or else took place

---

129 Cf. Cic. Scaur. 3 for the proximate uses of monumenta (in omnibus monumentis Graecae) and fabulae (here indicating drama). Cicero further says that the Greeks invent many things (at Graeculi quidem multa fingunt, 4), which hints at a less than clear-cut distinction between monumenta and fabulae, at least, in a Latin thinker’s appraisal of Greek history.


131 For instance, rationalizing versions of traditional Roman myths are, in essence, attacks on the reliability of earlier historians who report those tales with their fantastic elements fully intact. See, e.g., Wiseman 1979: 57-139, on Tubero and Antias.
at the hands of antagonistic senators (1.16.1-4, esp. *perobscura fama*). In these instances, Livy does not expressly focus his efforts on proving or disproving either version (cf. *praef*. 6), but, by using the term *fabula*, he may be signaling to the reader that something is coming in the narrative that warrants either a suspension of disbelief or a greater degree of skepticism, depending on what the situation requires.

Throughout the narrative, Livy’s treatment of *fabulae* varies—as his treatment of *monumenta* does. On one occasion, *fabula* is used to indicate a pretext for war (3.10.10). Several times, Livy applies the word to mythological stories. On a few occasions, Livy even uses the technical term: that is, *fabula* as a dramatic piece, either as an actual instance of a play or in a metaphorical application. The association between familiar productions of the stage and

---

132 For the connection of *fabula, perobscura fama* here on Romulus’ death, and Livy’s comment on his own *fama* (*praef*. 3), see Hardie 2012: 226-72, esp. 234-36. As Hardie says, “the class-distinction between a ‘very obscure, humble’ *fama* and a ‘noble, celebrated’ *fama* is not purely metaphorical, since it was in part the perceived greatness of the man Romulus (*admiratio viri*) that gave weight to this *fama* (the other contributory factor being fear, very often a potent magnifier of *fama*). In the *Praefatio* then Livy both involves himself in a central part of the business of his *History*, the competition for fame, and excuses himself from it, finding consolation rather than fuel for *invidia* in the ‘nobility and greatness’ of those who overshadow him” (235-36). See also Liv. 30.19.11 for the phrase *obscura…fama*.

133 On *fabulae* in Livy particularly, see Marincola 1997: 123-24. As Marincola says, “Like Diodorus, Livy reveals a care in the narration as he proceeds; unlike Diodorus, he does not do this by long passages of indirect discourse, but rather by consistent reminders in the early books of the fact that he is reporting tradition.” Yet, *fabulae* continue to play a role in the later books of Livy’s history as well.

134 E.g., 5.34.6 (*de Hercule fabulis, see Ch. 4*); 28.43.21 (*Graecas fabulas*); 39.17.13 (a Locrian ambassador compares the legate Q. Pleminius to Scylla and Charybdis from *fabulae*; cf. Sen. *NQ* 3.29.7); 34.2.3 (Cato refers to the story of the Lemnian women).

135 E.g., 7.2.8: *Livius post aliquot annis, qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere* (“Livius [Andronicus], after some years, was the first who moved away from satire and dared to weave a play with a plot”; cf. 11, *lege haec fabularum*, “by the rule of plots”).

136 E.g., 3.44.9: Appius Claudius Decemviris’s ruse to acquire Verginia (*notam iudici fabulam petitor, quippe apud ipsum auctorem argumenti, peragit: puellam domi suae natam furtoque inde in domum Vergini translatam suppositam ei esse; id se indicio compertum adferaturumque vel ipso Verginio iudice, ad quem maior pars inuiiae eius pertineat; interim dominum sequi ancillam aequum esse*, “the plaintiff performed a comedy with which the judge was acquainted since he himself was the creator of the plot, to the effect that the girl had been born in his house and, from there, had been stolen, carried off to the house of Verginius, and situated there as his daughter; he had evidence to prove this charge, even if Verginius himself were the judge, on whom the greater portion of this injury fell; meanwhile, it was right for the servant to go with her master”; on the significance of *fabula* in this
Livy’s presentation of foundational moments for Rome’s history is an important one: though these stories are fantastic, Livy’s prefatory claim that examination of the past—in its various forms—can provide benefit to society in perpetuating and cementing core values (praef. 9) remains active throughout the text. Further significance also emerges when those passages are read in connection with other passages in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, as is the case with the *monumenta* of Livy’s history.

There is also a possible historiographical connotation for the term *fabula* in relation to other historical thinkers. In his assessment of what differs between *annales* and *historia*, the late 2nd BC historian Sempronius Asellio makes a direct connection between the writing of *annales* and the telling of *fabulae*, one that—from Asellio’s perspective—honorably distinguishes *historiae* from *annales* because the former has no such connection with *fabulae*. Asellio, as cited by Gellius, writes:

> nam neque alacriores…ad rem publicam defendundam neque segniiores ad rem perperam faciundam annales libri commovere quicquam possunt. scribere autem bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit, et quis triumphans introierit ex eo, quae<que> in bello gesta sint non praedicare aut interea quid senatus decreverit aut quae lex rogatione lata sit, neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint iterare, id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere. (*FRHist* Asellio 20 F 2 = Gell. *NA* 5.18.9)\(^{138}\)

Books of *annales* are incapable of inspiring people to be more prone to defense of the state or of making them less inclined to do wrong. Moreover, to write in whose consulship a war began, in whose it was completed, and who entered in...
triumph as a result, and not to pronounce the deeds of the war, what the senate decreed in the meantime, or what law or proceeding was brought forth, nor to emphasize the planning by which these deeds were done, this is telling *fabulae* to boys, not writing history.

Asellio’s purpose here is to stake his historiographical claims—particularly his advocacy of contemporary history—and to distinguish his own approach over that of competitors on whom he casts aspersions. For the discussion here, however, the important point is Asellio’s casting of *fabulae* as puerile through the insinuation that they are not appropriate for serious minds or serious historiographical endeavors.

As will already be clear, Livy’s position on the role and uses of *fabulae* in the writing of history is not identical with Asellio’s. There are nonetheless some points of commonality between Asellio’s historiographical values as here articulated and Livy’s prefatory remarks. For instance, Asellio’s idea of history’s utility in inspiring the defense of the state (*ad rem publicam defendandum*) and the avoidance of harmful behavior (*ad rem perperam faciundam*) finds a parallel in Livy’s injunction to his reader on *exempla* to copy or avoid (*tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites, praef. 10*). And

---

139 For basic distinctions (though the author emphasizes that such distinctions blend in practice; cf. Marincola 1999) of different genres of Greco-Roman history, see Fornara 1983: 1-46. Fornara discusses why Roman writers of horography or “local history,” among whom he places Asellio, are less distinct from contemporary historians than their Greek counterparts (esp. 23-28).

140 Much ink has been spilled over the distinction between *historia* and *annales*. For ancient discussion of the limitations of *annales*, see further Cato *Orig. 5 F FRHist*; Cic. *de Leg. 1.6* (esp. *ieiunius*); *de Orat. 2.52-53*; Serv. *ad Aen. 1.373* (with Serv. [Auct.] on a possible connection with the *Annales Maximi*). For some highlights in the discussion of the Asellio passage and its treatment of the term *annales*, see Rich 2018: 28-33; Krebs 2015; Elliott 2013: 18-74, esp. 30-38, 58-60; *FRHist* 1.275-76, 3.277-79 (Pobjoy); Wiseman 2002a; Frier 1999: 201-24; Feldherr 1998: 21; Rawson 1991: 245-71; Verbrugghe 1989: esp. 199 n. 17; Woodman 1988: esp. 70-98; Wiseman 1987: 244-62.

141 Cf. Cic. *de Leg. 1.7* on the historian Sisenna (esp. *in historia puerile quiddam consectatur*).

142 Further, Kraus 4-5, though not with explicit reference to Asellio, points to a partial overlap of genre: “When complete, the *AVC* included the three main types of historiography found at Rome, i.e. history *a Remo et Romulo*, universal or world history (as Rome expanded to encompass and indeed to create the ‘known’ world), and contemporary history” (with reference to Wiseman 1987: 246-48, for the three types).
based on the initial distinction he sketches between *fabulae* and *monumenta*, one may well think that Livy has a similar assessment of *fabulae* as untrustworthy; modern scholars do tend to identify a tone of what was clearly at this date conventional skepticism in Livy’s uses of the term.\(^1\)

Yet, though Livy presents *fabulae* with caution, he does not disavow their use for the early period of Roman history, as we have seen,\(^2\) and in fact they go on to form a large part of the history and tradition that he reports for later periods.\(^3\) The readers of ancient historians must have made some degree of allowance for the inclusion of such material in their history—and, indeed, must have expected it, if the inclusion of such stories in the surviving historical record is any indication.\(^4\) These stories were in some part Roman history so far as popular tradition was concerned, even if they seemed absurd on the face of it. Livy’s open assertion, however, of the uncertain nature of *fabulae* shows an appreciation for the inaccuracy that grows around

---

\(^1\) E.g., Ogilve 675, says, “*fabula* for L. means a story to which he attaches little belief” (cf. Moles 2009: 64-66; Bettini 2008: 364-65; Forsythe 1999: *passim*; Feldherr 1998: 6-7, 75-76; Oakley 2.101-2; Levene 1993: 184). The picture in practice may be more complicated as Livy attaches little belief also to accounts that are not identified as fabulous in his narrative, such as the reckoning of troops, supplies, or spoils by historical predecessors (see Ch. 4). But it must be acknowledged that Livy’s use of the term *fabula* does often coincide with an extra degree of the marvelous.

\(^2\) As Horsfall says (in Bremmer and Horsfall 1987: 5), “One would, at Rome, be most unwise to distinguish sharply between myth and legend, between *fabula* and *historia*; Livy lays down no firm periodization in terms of chronology and credibility.” While Horsfall’s second clause is a matter for discussion (see, e.g., a challenge to Horsfall in Wiseman 1994: esp. 24), the first clause certainly speaks to an issue in all nationalistic “history,” including in the modern age. For instance, the probably apocryphal story of chopping down the cherry tree and admitting to the act may appear alongside so-called objective history in accounts of George Washington’s life.

\(^3\) Oakley 2.102 separates Livy’s use of *fabulae* into four categories: 1). myths; 2). supernatural accounts; 3). annalistic inventions; 4). lies. Often, however, it is difficult—and unnecessary—strictly to distinguish between these categories.

\(^4\) E.g., Suetonius mentions the proclivity of the emperor Tiberius to study mythology to a foolish and laughable extent (*curavit notitiam historiae fabularis usque ad ineptias atque derisum*, Tib. 70.3). *Historia* here may have the more general valence of the term (“story” vs. “history”), but the modifier *fabularis* (nearly a *hapax legomenon*; see L & S, s.v.) may indicate a type of history-writing in which myth constitutes the subject matter. See Wiseman 1987: 250-51, and 1979: 151. Cf. also Fornara 1983: esp. 4-12, on the genre of history that he terms genealogy or mythography.
But he also takes from *fabulae* what he claims as valuable for his purposes, that is, the positive lessons that they preserve.

Such a preservation of a fabulous tale occurs in Livy’s account of the she-wolf (*lupa*) that suckles the exposed infants Romulus and Remus before the shepherd Faustulus finds them and brings them to his wife, Larentia, to be reared (1.4.3-9). A less fabulous story is slipped in at the end: *sunt qui Larentiam volgato corpore lupam inter pastores vocatam putent; inde locum fabulae ac miraculo datum* (“there are those who think that Larentia was called *lupa* among the shepherds because of her prostitution, which gave grounds for the miraculous tale,” 7). Thus, the story slips from remarkable and other-worldly to quite mundane. Yet, it is significant that Livy gives the *fabula* first, even if it is not directly termed a *fabula* until the close of the account; the surprise twist at the end does not entirely void the memorable nature of the twins’ early days in the fabulous account, and it certainly does not negate the popular tradition of the she-wolf. It is reasonable to assume that the more common—or, at least, more compelling—story for a Roman audience is the one that grants a degree of supernatural and divine acceptance to the city’s founders.

---

147 Though his comments and the sentiment expressed therein are somewhat dated, Walsh 1966: 124, says: “The scientific historians like Mommsen and Pais…rejected the early books as a tissue of fiction. But modern scholars applaud Livy’s decision [to include *fabulae*]. They allow that the written and oral traditions suffered distortion and accretion, and that Livy’s authorities manipulated these traditions in a spirit of chauvinism, party-politics, gentile glorification and literary elaboration.”

148 See above on Livy’s statement that antiquity receives a degree of pardon for supernatural elements that are included in accounts (*praef*. 7).

149 See Wiseman 1995: *passim*, for the popular tradition on the *lupa*. For the idea in historical works that what is well-established is “true,” see above.
In the story of the she-wolf/prostitute, Livy represents *fabula* and *miraculum*—if not exactly equivalent—as parallels (*fabulae ac miraculo*). Both are, according to Livy, the result of the embellishment that comes from a long tradition and the expansion innate to a natural, story-telling inclination (*inde locum...datum*). The term *miraculum* and its close connection to *fabula* here adds another layer of connection between *fabulae* and *monumenta* and further complicates the idea in the preface that they are so disparate in their reliability: *fabulae* can justify or even spawn the creation of *monumenta*, just as *monumenta* can vouch for the veracity of *fabulae*; but, in Livy, *monumenta* can commemorate and vouch for *miracula* in a similar way (see below).

Indeed, by their nature, miraculous events call for a point of solid contact in the form of a memorial, a need that can easily lead to the fabrication of such a point of contact. Though *monumenta* are notionally solid preservers of events and—often literally—set in stone, it turns out in practice that, just as a *monumentum* can preserve a tradition, so a tradition can create a *monumentum*. In a passage discussed above (Ch. 1), where a priest cuts a stone with a razor to counter the excesses of king Tarquin, the razor is preserved as a *miraculi eius monumentum*.

---

150 For the term *miraculum* paralling the marvelous aspects of *fabula*, see also Liv. 1.39.2; 26.19.6-9 (contains *fabula, fama*, and *miraculum*). For a very “theatrical” performance described as a *miraculum*, see 1.59.3 (Brutus parading the body of Lucretia through the streets).

151 Cf. Gabba 2011: 359: “In the first two books of Livy, legendary or historical events are in a certain sense validated by reference to monuments, in particular statues, still visible in the time of Livy or his sources. Such references were intended to guarantee the historicity or at least the credibility of the legend or event in question. The problem is instructive from a methodological point of view. It seems clear that monuments, statues, toponyms, whose significance was for various reasons unclear, were at first invested with fantastic meanings of different kinds, but always related to legendary episodes or episodes of earliest Roman history; this took place in the context of an antiquarian and guidebook tradition aiming to explain and expound the monuments involved. In a complete reversal of roles, the monuments then became the documents which guaranteed the historicity or credibility of the legends or stories which had grown up.”
(1.36.5). The story is unbelievable from a purely rational standpoint, but it does preserve a tale of religious observance, steadfastness, and rejection of absolutism.

In another episode, a certain Sabine attempts to regain power and supplant Rome as the capital of the region (caput rerum, 1.45.3) by means of a prodigy and prophecy. The story goes (dicitur) that a cow of marvelous size and beauty (miranda magnitudine ac specie) was born, which, according to soothsayers, would bring supremacy to whoever sacrificed it at the shrine of Diana (4-5). The Sabine attempts to carry out the sacrifice but falls victim to a ruse by a clever and knowledgeable Roman priest, who then sacrifices the cow to secure Roman hegemony (6-7). As a reminder of the cow’s marvelous nature, the horns became an offering of the temple, referred to by the term monumentum: fixa per multas aetates cornua in vestibulo templi Dianae monumentum ei fuere miraculo (“the horns were mounted in the vestibule of the Temple of Diana for many generations as a monumentum of this wonder,” 4).

Again, the story is of a fantastic nature but is supported by the existence of a monumentum testifying to its validity (cf. 25.39.16-17, discussed above). At the same time, the story is likely a long-established one. In addition—in line with Livy’s claims on behalf of the validity of including fabulae in his history—it preserves access to instances of positive behavior in the past: religious observance of prophecy, literal sacrifice for the state, and cleverness in service of the state. In the Livian effort to transmit exemplary values, the distinction between

---

152 At Liv. 1.19.5 a miraculum is explicitly given as a fiction (commento miraculi) in Numa’s fabrication of the goddess Egeria’s advocacy for his reign.

153 The Sabine’s plot is notably “private” (privato consilio, 1.45.3). See Ch. 4 on the blending of public and private and its issues for trustworthiness in Livy.

154 Important for the following section, the size of the cow also creates fama (magnitudo victimae celebrata fama, 1.45.6), a concept that Livy connects with fabula (discussed below).

155 Cf. Val. Max. 7.3.1; Plut. QR 4. Valerius seems to derive his anecdote from Livy, but Plutarch cites the antiquarians Juba and Varro as his sources. See also Ogilvie 183-84.
fabulae and miracula, on the one extreme, and monumenta, on the other, fades: they all are capable of conveying what makes history beneficial. In a further twist, the monumentum of the horns no longer exists (per multas aetates . . . fuere);\(^{156}\) the fabula is after all the only thing that remains.

Another occurrence of the term fabula in Livy’s text further highlights its miraculous nature and simultaneously connects it verbally with the programmatic statement from the preface on not affirming or rejecting information about the past (praef. 6). As Camillus and his troops are engaged in siege works to conquer the city of Veii, Livy recounts a marvelous tale:

inseritur huic loco fabula:\(^{157}\) immolante rege Veientium vocem haruspicis, dicentis qui eis hostiae exta proseccisset ei victoriam dari, exauditam in cuniculo movisse Romanos milites ut adaperto cuniculo exta raperent et ad dictatorem ferrent. sed in rebus tam antiquis si quae similia veri sint pro veris accipiantur, satis habeam: haec ad ostentationem scenaev gaudentis miraculis aptiora quam ad fidem neque adfirmare neque refellere est operae pretium. (5.21.8-9)\(^{158}\)

Here a fabula is inserted: while the king of the Veientes was making burnt offerings, the Roman soldiers in the tunnel heard the haruspex say aloud that victory would be given to the one who cut up the entrails of that victim, and they were impelled to open the tunnel, snatch the entrails, and bring them to the dictator. My view is that I ought to make allowance for it if—in stories dating to so long a time ago—probable accounts are believed instead of true ones: it is not worthwhile for me either to confirm or refute accounts that are more fit for the gaudiness of the stage, which glories in the marvelous, than for a reliable account.

Here Livy makes the connection explicit between the fabula that he includes in his history and those of theatrical performances (see above). As in the preface, Livy again addresses the trouble

\(^{156}\) See Ogilve 184.

\(^{157}\) Cf. Liv. 1.11.8 on the addition of a fabula (additur fabula) in which Tarpeia, in exchange for betraying the Roman citadel to the Sabines, asks for what the soldiers have on their left arms; though she expects extravagant jewelry, she is crushed to death by their shields. See also 2.7.2 (adiciunt miracula), 24.3.7 (miracula aliqua afdingunt), and 25.39.16 (miracula addunt, discussed above).

\(^{158}\) Cf. Liv. 5.22.4-7, where there is a fabula that the cult statue of Juno both nodded and spoke assent to the question of moving it (evocatio). For resonances of the Trojan war in the sacking of Veii and the subsequent sacking of Rome, see Kraus 1994. See also Levene 1993: 184-86 on the importance of religious observation here, especially for the characterization of Camillus (discussed in Ch. 4).
with antiquity—that is, the impossibility of affirming the truth-value (*similia veri, pro veris*) of the accounts of the distant past that are by any means preserved (*in rebus tam antiquis*). There are also several references to the preface besides the direct verbal parallel (*nec adsfirmare nec refellere*): the conditional clause with subjunctive verb (*= praef. 1-2*); the phrase *operae pretium* (*= praef. 1*); the comparative construction (*aptiora ~ magis decora, praef. 6*), which significantly replaces *fabulae* from the preface with *miracula*; and the nature of the material is given a value judgement—in this case, the stage is equivalent to the preface’s poetic tales (*poeticis . . . fabulis, praef. 6*), and trustworthy accounts (*fidem*) to the preface’s *incorrupta monumenta*.\(^{159}\)

**Fama, fabula, and multiplicity**

A closely related concept to *fabula* is that of *fama*.\(^{160}\) Miles views *fama* as a concept in Livy that encompasses both *fabulae* and *monumenta* as they are presented in regard to historical reliability; that is, in his view, *fabulae* and *monumenta* in combination determine the form of the received *fama* that develops around events and people.\(^{161}\) As Miles acknowledges, however, such a meaningful distinction can disappear in practice: *fama* and *fabula* often show up in close proximity in Livy and can operate as near synonyms.\(^{162}\) Indeed, the story of the she-wolf

\(^{159}\) See Moles 2009: 64.

\(^{160}\) See Maltby; E & M. An essential work on *fama* as a term and concept is Hardie 2012 (see also the collected chapters in Kyriakidis 2016: esp. 4-7, which take their inspiration from Hardie 2012). For the doubtful credibility implied by the term *fama*, as well as its conceptual association with *fabula* and the two terms’ related etymology, see Bettini 2008: 350-58, 363-68. Though both terms imply something less than full believability, Bettini argues that *fama* derives authority from communal consensus, whereas *fabula* relies on a specific tradition.

\(^{161}\) Miles 1995: esp. 30. See also Hardie 2012: 246, who observes “the dual nature of *fama* as both process and product. The individual in pursuit of fame or glory hopes to achieve something lasting. a permanent product arising out of the process, a *monumentum*. But history has a way of proving the transience or at least the mutability of *fama*, as the products of *fama* re-enter the processes of contestation and negotiation from which they arose.”

\(^{162}\) For the similarity of meaning between *fama* and *fabula* in Livy particularly, see Steele 1904: 23-24.
discussed above is introduced as a *fama* (*tenet fama*, 1.4.6),

163 but in the ultimate assessment it is termed a *fabula* and a *miraculum*. This similarity of application for the three words—and their connection with *monumentum*—allows for further cross-reference. Thus, a brief examination of *fama* as a term and concept is in order.

*Fama* in Livy can simply have its most general meaning of report,

164 and—as seen above in Livy’s assessment of his own reputation (*praef*. 3)—it can indicate renown, usually that of an individual, which can range from good to bad.

165 But when *fama* operates as a near synonym for *fabula*, it denotes a traditional account that carries fabulous or mythic connotations. For instance, in his account of Horatius Cocles’ famous stand at the Pons Sublicius against Etruscan invaders, Livy closes the tale with a note on the embellished character of the received story: *ita sic armatus in Tiberim desiluit multisque superincidentibus telis incolums ad suos tranavit, rem ausus plus famae habituram ad posteros quam fidei* (“and so armed he leapt into the Tiber and swam across, unhurt amongst the numerous falling projectiles. He dared a deed that would be

---

163 For Livy’s depiction of such stories as a form of nostalgia for ancient Roman religious practices, see Forsythe 1999: 87-98, esp. 94.

164 There are many instances of this use of *fama* in Livy, but perhaps an apt example here is a proverb put in the mouth of Hannibal: *famam bellum conficere, et parva momenta in spem metumque impellere animos* (“report wins the war, and trivial influences drive minds to hope or fear,” 27.45.5; cf. 21.32.7; 24.19.7).

165 A sort of “footnote” example of reputational *fama* that underlines Livy’s approach to historical figures as dynamic rather than static, is at 27.8. The passage concerns the forced appointment of C. Valerius Flaccus as *Flamen Dialis* and his subsequent acceptance into the Senate. Livy says that he gladly would have passed over the reason for a priest being compelled into their position (*causam inaugurari coacti flaminis libens reticuissem*, 5) except that Flaccus had shifted from bad reputation to good (*ni ex mala fama in bonam vertisset*). Upon being appointed, Flaccus puts aside his previous, negative behavior (*antiquos mores*, 6) for the better. Initially, the praetor Licinius blocks Flaccus’ entrance into the Senate despite his shift in values, though ancient right dictates otherwise. Licinius claims: *non exoletis vetustate annalium exemplis stare ius, sed recentissimae cuiusque consuetudinis usu volebat: nec patrum nec avorum memoria Dialem quemquam id ius usurpasse* (“the right is not based on examples from annals lost with time but on most recent practices in each case; and no *Flamen Dialis* had relied on this right, either in the memory of their fathers or grandfathers,” 9). Flaccus is ultimately allowed into the Senate, though more on the basis of his upright lifestyle than priestly law (*magis sanctitate vitae quam sacerdotii iure*, 10). Thus, *fama* emerges as more important than law and precedent in this Livian footnote. For possible implications of *recentissimae*, see below on *recentiore* (7.6.6).
more famous than credible in the future”). By reserving this assessment until the end of his account of this episode, Livy allows the embellished version to stand—after all, it is a good story with exemplary potential for posterity (see Ch. 1)—but his concluding assessment recognizes the possibility that the story’s transmission failed to guarantee its accuracy, or at any rate that its receivers were liable to question it. The idea of a fully armored individual, after single-handedly taking on an enemy force, swimming unharmed to safety could very easily be described as a poetica fabula. Yet, despite the license taken in this traditional tale, a monumentum is constructed to mark Cocles’ deed: grata erga tantam uirtutem ciuitas fuit; statua in comitio posita; agri quantum uno die circumarauit, datum (“the people were grateful for such excellence, and they erected a statue in the Comitium and granted him as much farmland as he could plow around in a single day,” 2.10.12).

166 On the magnifying effects of fama in Latin literature more generally, Hardie 2012 provides discussion throughout his work on a wide variety of contexts, authors, and time periods. See also Oakley 2.474 for the pairing of the verb increb(r)eso and fama, rumor, and similar notions. For further instances in Livy where fama corresponds to a distortion of the events or sentiments described, see 1.35.7; 2.49.3; 4.5.6; 5.18.9; 10.25.12; 21.32.7; 24.21.5; 25.30.12; 26.20.5; 28.24.1; 45.27.5 (on the last of which, see Jaeger 1997: 1-5). Cf. 36.15.12 on the memory of Leonidas’ stand at Thermopylae, in which the death becomes more memorable than the battle was (morte magis memorabilia quam pugna; see Jaeger 2015: 70-72; see also the discussion in Ch. 2 about Cato’s assessment of Leonidas’ monumental commemoration). Ct. 23.12.2, where a fama is “closer to the truth” (propior vero est), though the impression is left in this passage that the level of accuracy characterizing it is atypical for fama in Livy’s assessment. Cf. Sall. BC 8.2: Atheniensium res gestae, sicut ego aestumo, satis amplae magnificaeque fuere, verum aliquanto minores tamen quam fama feruntur. sed quia provenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbeh Atheniensium facta pro maximis celebrantur (“the history of the Athenians, as I judge it, was sufficiently full and great, though still somewhat less than it is reported. But, since writers of great talent originated from there, the deeds of the Athenians are spread throughout the world as the greatest ones”).

167 It is worth mentioning that one of Macaulay’s poems on ancient Rome featured Horatius. Cf. Flor. Epit. 1.10.3: tunc illa tria Romani nominis prodigia atque miracula, Horatius, Mucius, Cloelia, qui nisi in annalibus forent, hodie fabulae viderentur (“then [during the Etruscan attack] came those three prodigies and marvels of the Roman name: Horatius, Mucius, and Cloelia, who, if they had not been in the annals, would be today considered fictions”). See also Cornell 1986: 74, for the stance that this story and others are annalistic inventions to counter a series of Roman defeats passed down in other historical accounts.

168 Cf. the honors bestowed on the other two major heroes of this episode, Mucius Scaevola and Cloelia: Liv. 2.13.5: patres C. Mucio uirtutis causa trans Tiberim agrum dono dedere, quae postea sunt Mucia prata appellata (“due to his excellence, the fathers granted to C. Mucius a farm across the Tiber, which afterwards was called the Mucian Fields”); 2.13.11: pace redintegrata Romani nouam in femina uirtutem nouo genere honoris, statua equestri, donauere; in summa Sacra uia fuit posita uirgo insidens equo (“when they had reestablished peace, the Romans reciprocated unprecedented excellence in a woman [Cloelia] with a new sort of accolade, an equestrian statue, which took the form of a maiden sitting on a horse at the top of the Via Sacra”). The naming of the Mucian Fields suggests
For an example that falls beyond those early periods for which Livy supposedly relies on the excuse of antiquity (*praef.* 6-7), the story of Hannibal’s childhood relationship with his father Hamilcar is characterized as *fama* (21.1.4; cf. 21.22.6).¹⁶⁹ In the story, Hamilcar forces the nine-year-old child to touch an altar and vow to be an enemy of Rome as soon as possible (*se cum primum posset hostem fore populo Romano*). Livy clearly marks these elements of the tradition as sensational, but he includes them nonetheless for the value that they offer; that is, the one on Horatius as an example of self-sacrifice for the state and the one on Hannibal as a formative moment in establishing Rome’s greatest foe. Thus, in his approach to history-writing, Livy deploys *fama* in much the same way as *fabulae* and *monumenta*—that is, as points of access to the past—though he makes it clear that all three elements require scrutiny rather than superficial acceptance when they appear in the narrative.¹⁷⁰ Their value is in what they teach, not in the accuracy of the information they convey.

**The Lacūs Curtii**

As Miles points out, the first appearance of *fama* in Livy is “twofold” (*duplex…fama est*, 1.1.6; cf. 5.18.9, *multiplex fama*; 8.20.6, *duplex…fama*; 25.17.4, *varia est fama*; 27.27.14, *fama* that Cocles had an additional *monumentum* to his statue (cf. the Aquimalium, discussed in Ch. 2, and the Lacus Curtius, discussed below, both of which are explicitly termed *monumenta* in Livy).

¹⁶⁹ The experiences of Hannibal are often characterized by the term *fama*. See, e.g., Feldherr 2009, who discusses Livy’s uses of the term *fama* along with marvelous elements as thematic markers in his third decade to distinguish the character of Hannibal from those of Livy’s standard narrative technique. Feldherr explores the paradox of Livy’s Hannibal, as he gains success through manipulating the world around him, by a (loose) comparison with Lucretius’ Epicurean ideal of mastery over fear and the false perceptions of the world.

¹⁷⁰ For a Roman view of the connection between *monumentum* and *fama* in perpetuating a tradition, see, e.g., Cic. *Sest.* 102. Cicero succinctly traces the progression of imitable (*imitamini*) figures from the past (in particular, M. Scaurus, Q. Metellus, and Q. Catulus are listed at 101): *haec fama celebrantur, monumentis annalium mandatur, posteritati propagantur* (“these models are disseminated through word of mouth, they are committed to the *monumenta* of the annals, they are passed down to our descendants”). Thus, *fama* comes first here (cf. Wiseman 1986 on *fabula* coming first, then *monumentum*, in the establishment of a tradition), *monumenta* provide secure media for transmission, and posterity reaps the benefits of such models (for *posteritas* as key for *monumentum*, see Ch. 1).
Livy also attributes similar qualifications to *fama* with comparative adjectives, such as *vulgatior fama* (1.7.2; 25.17.4), *frequentior fama* (2.32.3), and *obscurior fama* (23.20.3); that is, Livy seems to take pains to convey the indeterminate nature of *fama*. But when Livy’s connection between *fama*, *fabula*, and *monumentum* is taken into account, the other concepts show their correlation to *fama* in being potentially *duplex* or *multiplex*, especially when the *monumentum* is of the written, historical variety: two of the key means of validation for ancient historians are challenging previous authorities and providing different—and presumably more accurate—versions of events. For instance, Livy gives two different accounts of the Lacus Curtius, a pool of water covered and monumentalized in the Roman forum: one extends back to the earliest days of Rome into the realm of myth—and,

---


172 For discussion of various forms of *vulgatus* with *fama*, see Miles 1995: 34-35. Miles concludes that this pairing of words is often associated in Livy with false, misleading, or fantastic stories (esp. 35 n. 16), but he does acknowledge that Livy does not explicitly reject them.

173 The obscurity of this last instance is due to the lack of *monumenta*: *Perusinorum casus obscurnor fama est, quia nec ipsorum monumento allo est inlustratus nec decreto Romanorum* (“the story of the Perusians’ fate is more hidden, since it is illuminated neither by a *monumentum* of themselves nor a decree of the Romans,” 23.20.3; cf. praef. 3, *mea fama in obscuro*). The *fama*, however, would not cease to exist if a *monumentum* attested to it. By extension, *famae* can be created or, at least, supported by *monumenta*.

174 Cf. Prop. 4.2.19: *mendax fama*. For comparative adjectives used in assessments of unsureness, cf. Liv. 1.24.1 on the two sets of triplets serving as champions for Rome and Alba Longa: *Horatios Curiatosque fuisse satis constat, nec ferme res antiqua alia est nobilior; tamen in re tam clara nominum error manet, utrius populi Horatii, utrius Curiatii fuerint* (“it is sufficiently agreed that they were the Horatii and Curiatii, and pretty much no ancient matter is more famous. But, in a story so well known, confusion of name persists: to which people belonged the Horatii and to which the Curiatii”). Despite the fame of the story and the consensus on a more general level (*satis constat*), the basic details remain in doubt, particularly the occupants of the different tombs: though they are not characterized as *monumenta* in the episode, they certainly fit the bill. Yet, they lack the most basic element of burial *monumenta*: preserved names (see Ch. 1). Livy also adds that the burial mounds still exist (*sepulcra exstant*, 1.25.14). See Sandberg 2018: 364-70. See also Johanson 2011: 421-22, for an interpretation of how a passerby may have experienced the confusion of identity for the tombs. Oakely 2010: 127 n. 30, views the confusion as no more than a footnote that intrudes upon the narrative. Certainly, this notice is a footnote of sorts, but such footnotes are often important in understanding Livy’s approach to the material. For the importance of etiology in general in this episode, see Solodow 1979: esp. 261-68.

175 Cf. Liv. praef. 2: *novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt* (“the constant stream of new writers think that they will bring something more secure in their accounts or will overcome uncouth antiquity by the art of writing”).
therefore, within the putative scope of pardon (*praef. 6*)—but the other falls within the range of those written accounts that Livy evokes at the beginning of his second pentad (6.1.1-2, see Ch. 4), which are supposed to offer more secure grounds for belief.¹⁷⁶

The later account does not explicitly identify the pool as a *monumentum*, but the earlier version does. And Livy links the two passages both through direct mention of the previous one and through programmatic elements, particularly with the issue of time (*vetustas*, 6) as a block on sure knowledge (see above). Further, the second account is characterized both as *fama* and *fabula* (7.6.6)—as with the example above involving the she-wolf (1.4.6-7). The first episode does not foreshadow the second, as if not to disrupt the narrative flow. Thus, the later episode seemingly replaces the impact of the first but not until its proper point of narrative chronology, with the assumption that the reader will think back—or possibly read back—to the previous version. Therefore, it seems probable that the two passages are meant to be read in reference to each other, though they are separated by a significant swath of text. In the end, the relative value of each version reveals an important aspect concerning what determines accepted tradition.

The first etiology for the Lacus comes from the battle between Romans and Sabines, following the kidnapping of the latter’s women. The Sabines under their commander Mettius Curtius are initially successful until Romulus calls on the help of Jupiter (1.12.6-7). Curtius, because he is on horseback, is put to flight by the subsequent Roman push and gets stuck in a swamp (9-10). He manages to extract himself, but the battle is ultimately decided by the intervention of the Sabine Women. The swamp, however, gains a memorial association:

*monumentum eius pugnae, ubi primum ex profunda emerus palude equus Curtium in vado*

¹⁷⁶ The passages are Liv. 1.12-13 and 7.6, discussed below. For other accounts of the origin of the Lacus Curtius, see Var. *LL* 4.148-50 = L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi 9 F 8 *FRHist*; DH 2.42, 46.3, 50.2; Ov. *Fast*. 6.403-4; Val. Max. 5.6.2; Plut. *Rom.* 50. See also Pausch 2018; Spencer 2007; Ogilvie 75-77; P & A 310-11.
statuit, Curtium lacum appellarunt (“as a monumentum of this fight, they called the pool Curtian where first the horse emerged from the deep swamp and set Curtius in the shallows,” 1.13.5). It is notable that this episode mentions another monumentum, that is, the Temple of Jupiter Stator vowed by Romulus (1.12.6, see Ch. 1), which commemorates the saving of the city (servatam urbem) by divine aid. Thus, both monumenta here focus on more than individual commemoration. Indeed, Curtius could hardly be glorified by an anecdote that he fell in a swamp and had to be rescued by the efforts of his horse.

In Book 7, rather than the pool memorializing the turning point of the early Roman and Sabine conflict, the second etiology recalls a self-sacrifice—a devotio (se devovisse, 7.6.4)—by a Roman youth, M. Curtius, in 362 BC. The story goes that a chasm opened in the middle of the Forum; soothsayers declare that an offering needs to be made, consisting of the greatest strength of the Roman people (quo plurimum populus Romanus posset; cf. Val. Max. 5.6.2: qua populus Romanus plurimum valeret). Curtius recognizes that Rome’s greatest assets are weapons and excellence (arma virtusque, 3) and casts himself fully armed on horseback into the pit, an act that remedies the issue.

---

177 For the argument that the monumenta in this episode establish a relationship between physical and narrative space, see Jaeger 1997: 30-56. See also Pausch 2018.

178 The version of this story told by Dionysus of Halicarnassus gives a far more admirable depiction of Mettius: the Sabine commander contemns all fear and danger, makes a strategic and successful push in response to Romulus’ gains on the wings of the battle lines, stands single-handedly against the advancing Roman forces to allow his men to escape, receives numerous wounds, and finally is forced to jump into the lake (2.42.2-6).

179 As an extension of the metaphorical dialogue that occurs between proximate monumenta, Statius has the ghost of Curtius ascend from the underworld and address the equestrian statue of Domitian that was constructed over the Lacus Curtius (Silv. 1.1.66-83). Statius does not use the term monumentum, but he states that the sacred chasm and the well-known pool preserve the name of Curtius in memory (sacra vorago / famosique lacus nomen memorabile servant, 66-67), which is the basic task of a monumentum. For discussion of this passage, esp. the memorial accretion of the location, see Newlands 2004: 60-65. For archaeological discussion of Domitian’s equestrian statue with arguments for its exact location, see Thomas 2004.
Livy concludes the episode in indirect statement: 180 *lacumque Curtium non ab antiquo illo T. Tati milite Curtio Mettio sed ab hoc appellatum. cura non deesset, si qua ad verum via inquirentem feret; nunc *fama rerum standum est, ubi certam derogat vetustas fidem; et lacus nomen ab hac recentiore insignitius fabula est* (“[it is said that] the Curtian Pool is named not after that ancient soldier of T. Tatius, Curtius Mettius, but from this youth. Effort would not be lacking, if there were any path to bring the investigator to the truth. As it is, the reported tradition must stand, where age denies secure trust. And the name of the pool is better known from this more recent *fabula,*” 5-6). 181 On initial analysis then it seems that Livy undermines the earlier version involving Mettius Curtius that he has already recounted, which is a common scholarly reading of this passage. 182 The episode, however, begins with a note of uncertainty in the cause of the seismic event—“either from an earthquake or some other force” (*seu motu terrae seu qua vi alia, 1*)—and, by the end, doubt has not entirely dissipated (*nunc fama rerum standum est*). Certainty on either point has hardly been reached, despite the author’s willingness to expend effort to attain it (*cura non deesset*). The first story remains as valid in its own place as it did before; 183 the difficulty arises from trying to reconcile historical discrepancies, an activity that

---

180 For possible implications for Livy’s use of indirect statement in his historiographical approach, see Miles 1995: esp. 20-38.

181 The phrase *fama rerum* (cf. 9.27.1; 37.46.6) may be evocative of *fama rerum gestarum,* which recurs in other passages of Livy (25.38.8; 26.3.11; 28.35.5; 30.34.12; 33.23.8; 37.54.17; 40.43.4; cf. 22.30.7), discussed in Ch. 4.

182 For the view that Livy accepts the second etymology but on indecisive and arbitrary grounds, see Miles 1995: esp. 33-38. *FRHist* 3.198 (Pohjny) concludes that Livy fully replaces the earlier etiology concerning Mettius Curtius in favor of this later one, but the passage above does not support such a definitive assessment—just that it cannot be established otherwise (*standum est*). Indeed, Livy’s comment on the lack of secure trust (*certam derogat vetustas fidem*) for the story hardly suggests wholesale acceptance of the later tradition. Cf. Oakley 2.102: “The agnostic attitude adopted here to the truth of the story of M. Curtius is entirely characteristic of L.’s technique and temperament.”

183 It may be argued that Livy simply did not know the later story when he recorded the first (see, e.g., Oakley 1998: esp. 281, a review of Miles 1995), or that his technique of composition allowed him only to follow one main source at a time with occasional variants (see, e.g., Ogilvie 75-77, who attributes the first version of the story to Calpurnius Piso—as Varro does at LL 5.149—or Valerius Antias and the second to Licinius Macer; cf. W & M 1.126: 3.117-18); but the Lacus Curtius was a well-known site among prominent lieux de mémoire for the city of Rome (the Roman
challenges secure trust (**certam...fidem**),\(^{184}\) even without the challenge of extreme antiquity (**vetustas**).\(^{185}\)

Though the story of M. Curtius exemplifies precisely the sort of behavior that Livy seeks to disseminate (**praef.** 9), the final phrase of the episode and the nature of the tradition’s preservation warrant attention. The name of the **monumentum** is more notable from the more recent story (**nomen ab hac recentiore insignitius fabula est**), not for its truth or trustworthiness (**verum, fidem**). A possible implication here is that an older tale may simply be overwritten by a newer one or a more sensational one, a point that likely will remain in the mind of the careful reader as they make their way through Livy’s history.\(^{186}\) But, true to form, Livy neither affirms nor refutes the story.

**Conclusion**

In summation, despite a suggested prefatory distinction between **monumenta** as solid preservers of the past and **fabulae** as poetic fabrication, both play a significant role in telling the

---

\(^{184}\) For discussion of the historical unreliability indicated by these conflicting etiologies, see Pausch 2018: esp. 281-82; Spencer 2007; Miles 1995: 35-38.

\(^{185}\) Cf. Wiseman 1979: 50-53, esp. 50 n. 47: “[Livy] contradicts himself, but his second thoughts do not lead him to alter what he had already written in book 1.”

\(^{186}\) Cf. Liv. 35.10, where “campaigning in the consular elections had smoldered more than ever before” (**ambitio magis quam unquam alias exarserat consularibus comitiis**, 1). The brunt of the campaigning falls to P. Cornelius Scipio, the cousin of Africanus, and L. Quinctius Flamininus, the brother of T. Quinctius Flamininus—the hero of the Second Macedonian War. These relatives of the candidates especially excite the competition as they are the two most famous generals of the day (**ante omnia certamen accendebat fratres candidatorum, duo clarissimi aetatis suae imperatores**, 5). Scipio had achieved greater glory and, thereby, greater envy, but Quinctius had more recent glory due to his triumph that year (**maior gloria Scipionis et quo maior eo propri invidiam, Quincti recentior ut qui eo anno triumphasset**). Ultimately, the novelty and “freshness” (see Ch. 1) of Quinctius carries the day (**in Quinctio nova et recentia omnia ad gratiam erant**, 7; cf. recens, 5).
story of Rome’s past. Indeed, they often operate in tandem in this respect. Livy’s blurring of the
two—as well as terms such as *fama* and *miraculum*—seems far too pointed not to be deliberate,
especially in light of his mission statement not to affirm or refute: Livy does engage in this
distinction in various parts of the text, though not by means of an authoritative statement of
approval or denial. Miles concludes that Livy’s recreation of the past through a combination of
*fabulae* and *monumenta*—as he sees it, the traditional historical distinction between oral and
visual evidence—provides an “alternative basis for the construction of Roman history, one that
does not use received tradition as evidence from which to reconstruct an accurate and reliable
record of the past but presents tradition, rather, as the record of the Romans’ own perception of
themselves, a record that may be used as the basis for reconstructing and interpreting their
identity.”

In my reading, there certainly is an element of, so to speak, Livy attempting to bring the
Romans back to themselves. The *Ab Urbe Condita* clearly left its mark as a standard work on
the history of Rome, so much so that demand of accessibility led to the various summaries of the
work, which, paradoxically, may have contributed to the loss of so much of the work. But
Livy’s representation of tradition as inaccurate is not a mere consequence of time’s distorting
effects: active manipulation for self-serving ends has taken its toll as well. In this respect, Livy’s
statement about the received version of the Lacus Curtius above is quite problematic: the notion
that the more recent version is the more determinant one may imply that the most recent

---


188 Cf. the words of Cicero on the work of Varro: *nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque
tamquam hospites tuo libri quasi domum reduxerunt, ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi
essemus agnosceret* (“your books led us, lost and wandering in our own city like foreigners, back home, so to speak, that we could finally see who and where we were,” *Acad.* 1.3.9; see Ch. 1).

189 For a brief overview of the *Periochae*, Florus’ *Epitome*, the Oxyrhyncus epitome, etc., see Bessone 2015.
contender for power in Rome determines, in many ways, what form of the past reaches the present. In this determination, history as monumentum plays its particular role, which will be the focus of the following chapter.

This issue may find a point of contact in Livy’s preface, where he sets himself apart from others in avoiding—or, at least, putting off—writing about current events: ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca illa tota mente repeto, avertam, omnis expers curae quae scribentis animum, etsi non flectere a vero, sollicitum tamen efficere posset (“I, on the other hand, shall take this reward as well for my toil, that I shall avert my gaze from the evils that our generation has seen through so many years, and, so long indeed as I retrace those ancient things with my whole mind, I shall be entirely free of the concern that could still make the heart of the writer agitated, if not twist them from the truth,” praef. 5).
V. Ch. 4: *Monumenta* in Practice

This chapter explores the impact of literary *monumenta* as they appear in Livy’s text, that is, *monumenta* that are conceived of and created through the written word, with some degree of separation from their putative physical referents. The initial sections approach an episode within the *Ab Urbe Condita* that exemplifies the creation of a *monumentum* within the text, that is, Livy (re)creates a version of the past that serves in its own right as a memorial and preserver of Rome’s history. By combining such individual *monumenta*—further visions of the Roman past from the author—Livy constructs the overarching history as *monumentum*: the *inlustre monumentum* of his Preface (10). The particular instance revolves around the Gallic sack of Rome, the role of Camillus in ensuring the continuance of Rome, and the subsequent rebuilding of the city. This discussion establishes a means of judging how Livy views his own monumental history as distinct from those of his predecessors, which are then explored as a counterpoint.

The final sections of this chapter examine a selection of Livy’s references to other authors as a reflection of the same historiographical workshop through which Livy puts *monumenta, fabulae*, and the like—that is, as a means of bringing a skeptical approach to dominant views of the Roman past. It must be said from the start that my discussion is not directly interested in the traditional *Quellenforschung* that dominated Livian scholarship for over a century.¹ Rather than approach Livy as a mine of previous, fragmentary authors—as has often been done—I look to Livy’s explicit mentions of previous historians as a means of better understanding his historiographical method and his authorial reflection on the contemporary

¹ For surveys of *Quellenkritik* as the previously dominant mode of approaching Livy, see, e.g., Chaplin and Kraus 2009: 2-3; Oakley 1.16-18; Luce 1977: xv-xxvii (see also Miles 1995: 1-7). See Vasaly 2015: 1-8, for a more general overview of Livian questions in scholarship.
world found therein: in other words, I read in Livy’s source citations literary markers that reveal more about his own methodology than they provide any clear indication of the content of previous works.

Nor am I interested in Livy’s “working methods” as they can be derived from comparative studies. The practical concerns for how Livy uses his various sources—that is, what text or texts Livy has in hand while he writes—do not dictate his conception of history-writing, nor do they reveal why Livy (sporadically) cites sources in the way that he does. Even for Polybius, “an author not to be ignored” (*haudquaquam spernendus auctor*, Liv. 30.45.5; cf. 33.10.10: *non incertum auctorem*)—and whom Livy follows very closely in the details of his narrative, particularly for Books 31-45—it cannot be said that Livy’s use of him perfectly reflects the original or that Livy entirely agrees with his notions of historiography. As David Levene says concerning Polybius as a source for Livy, particularly in the third decade, “Contrary

---

2 Cf. Haimson Lushkov 2013: esp. 28: “I propose to offer a preliminary typology of Livian citation practices in order to establish the ‘range of reference’ available in the *AUC*, its ‘rhetoric of annotation’. Within that framework two issues will be of particular interest: first, Livy’s positioning of himself and his sources relative to a collective tradition; second, the self-referential nature of Livian citation, which often works to conflate the *AUC* with the historical tradition of which it was part. This range of reference, I suggest, establishes source citation as part of a larger literary strategy that underpins the historical purpose of the work and, in particular, constructs a literary tradition and historiographical background for the *AUC.*” Luce 1977: 139-84, still has much to offer on the topic of Livy’s source citations.

3 Cf. Haimson Lushkov 2018: 31: “Livy’s history relies on a heavy and extensive engagement with its predecessors for its architecture, lessons, and meaning, and especially for the construction of its author’s persona and his place in the tradition he inherited. Livy’s catalogues of historiographical predecessors are, therefore, in some fundamental ways self-referential, telling us more about Livy and his habits of thought than they do about the sources themselves.”

4 Cf. Kraus 1998 and 1991 on “doublets,” i.e., intratextual repetition, in Livy. Kraus seeks “a reading that is less interested in the production of the *Ab Vrbe Condita* than in its reception, and in the crisis of interpretation and authority generated by this ‘bad’ repetition” (267). This is not to say that examinations of Livy’s working method are not informative. See, e.g., Courtney 1999: 144-50 (with further reference) for a side-by-side comparison of Livy’s depiction of T. Manlius Torquatus’ duel with a Gaul (7.9.8-10.13.20) and that of Claudius Quadrigarius (Gell. *NA* 7.9.2-6). See, however, Haimson Lushkov 2013: 38-40, who focuses rather on how the discrepancies between the two accounts can reveal elements of Livy’s historiographical method.

5 See, e.g., Tränkle 1977.
to what one might have expected, our possession of substantial quantities of hard data has not
diminished controversy: if anything the opposite.”6 Thus, it is worthwhile to examine some of
these references to other historians in an attempt to figure out why Livy cites them in particular
ways and to explore the context in which he cites them. First, however, it is necessary to look at
Livy’s text as a construction—an ideal, even—of what history should look like.

**Reconstructing the present through the past**

Nowhere in the surviving text does Livy explicitly condemn the leading figures of his
time, but he also does not seem conclusively to support either of the leading ideologies of his
day—that is, *optimates* or *populares* (see the Introduction).7 Indeed, it is often difficult to tell in
Roman politics who is aligned with what ideology, especially in the last century of the Republic
when the trajectories of increasingly powerful autocrats place allegiance in constant need of
renegotiation.8 Livy’s place in this environment of power-wrangling has traditionally been a
topic of contention.9 But, Livy’s socio-political views cannot, leastwise from his surviving

---


7 See, however, the markedly ambiguous sentiment attributed to Livy by Seneca the Younger on Julius Caesar: *quod de Caesare maiori vulgo dictatum est et a Tito Livio positum in incerto esse utrum illum magis nasci an non nasci rei publicae profuerit, dici etiam de ventis potest* (“what is commonly said about the elder Caesar and reported by Titus Livy—that it is unclear whether his birth or lack thereof would have been more beneficial to the Republic—
can also be said about the winds,” Liv. F 58 Bk. 116 W & M = *Nat. Quaest.* 5.18.4).

8 As McGushin 1992: 2, says of Sallust’s political relationships with Milo and Cicero, on the one hand, and Pompey
and Clodius, on the other, “Roman politics often placed ill-assorted people temporarily on the same side.” As the
civil wars progressed and escalated, ideological reversal of those caught in the middle must have as well.

9 Politically, Livy has been identified as a champion of conflicting ideologies. As Galinsky 1996: 281, writes:
“definitions of Livy’s exact political stance have run the entire gamut from joyous cheerleading for Augustus to
subversive criticism” and “The guiding ideas, as can be seen, are the definition of *res Romana* in moral terms, the
concern about its decline, the need for regeneration and the realization that it will be anything but easy, and an
immense patriotism, including pride in foreign conquests. Livy needed no Augustus to imbue him with such
sentiments. Rather . . . these convictions were shared by many in the late republic and explain why the rule of
Augustus found such ready acceptance, with the exception of some senatorial opposition, once he started
implementing these ideas. They were not only his; they were those of the generation to which he and Livy
belonged.” I do not view Livy’s sense of patriotism quite so optimistically, but otherwise the sense seems correct.
See also Ridley 2010 with further reference for discussion of the different political directions that Livy has been
pulled. Walsh 1961: 10-19, and 1974: 5-7, provide discussion of the problems that arise in applying too extreme a
written work, be distilled into a coherent creed and especially not a single-minded one. Rather than approach Livy as a “Republican” or “Augustan” author, I propose another route, both more moderate and more extreme: that is, these identifiers assume that Livy would take a hardline in a system of factionalism in which there is no clear indication that he was involved. Livy depicts *monumenta* in the contentious atmosphere in which they could be conceived, which may suggest a more condemnatory view of Roman society. Livy clearly finds much of value in Rome, but the self-serving squabbling of ambitious figures is another matter, one that incurs Livy’s disapproval at key moments of his history.

Through representation of the past, Livy heavily critiques many aspects and actions of the present, as generations of his readers testify. And his critique does not follow a party line. As discussed in Ch. 3, Livy does not offer direct and obvious commentary but rather trains the attentive reader to pick up on cross-referenced passages. These cross-references may be signaled by verbal contradiction or confusion, the inclusion of variant accounts that undermine seemingly important elements, or not following stated methodological approaches, which may involve similarities in language as an indication to the reader to pay close attention. *Monumenta* appear prominently in these instances or in connection with them. In making a literary reconstruction of

---

10 Perhaps the most notable ancient reading of Livy is that found at Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.3, where the outspoken historian Cremutius Cordus characterizes Livy’s leanings as “Pompeian,” which apparently originates from a comment by Augustus himself (discussed further in the Conclusion). Many discussions exist of Livy’s possible relationship with Augustus, with particular emphasis on Augustus’ appearance within the text of Livy as an interjecting authority on the rank of A. Cornelius Cossus, consul or military tribune, when he dedicated the *spolia opima* (4.20)—and with significantly different conclusions. See, e.g., Flower 2000; Rich 1996; Miles 1995: 47-54; Badian 1993; Burck 1991; Deininger 1985; Daly 1981; Mensching 1967; Walsh 1964; Mette 1961; Petersen 1961; Syme 1959; Dessau 1906. Sailor 2006 provides a thorough and thoughtful discussion of this matter; Sailor connects Augustus’ testimony with instances of supernatural fabrication within Livy’s narrative, which he further argues sets up a competition of authority in the text between Livy and Augustus. I agree with Sailor in so far as I find that Livy’s history undercuts many traditional sources of authority.
Rome based on *monumenta*, an obvious opportunity from Rome’s past is following an event of destruction so that that reconstruction can correspond to a physical one in the narrative. Of key importance to this literary picture of the city is M. Furius Camillus, a character whose significance as an *exemplum* is pronounced in Livy’s history.\(^1\) As a character in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, Camillus is not necessarily deprived of all historical details, but he certainly is not left unmodified by Livy either.\(^2\)

**The city as monumentum**

For the following discussion, the connection between material *monumenta* and the *Ab Urbe Condita* as *monumentum* (*praef.* 10) is fundamental. In her commentary on Book 6, Kraus detects a verbal and conceptual connection that Livy makes between the construction (*exaedificatio*)\(^3\) of his literary account and the physical rebuilding of Rome following the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 BC, a connection that is accepted by and vital to my reading.\(^4\) Kraus discusses the crossover of different types of construction—material and metaphorical—in the

---

\(^1\) See, e.g., the situation of M. Livius, an exile restored to residency in Rome: when Livius rebukes the people for inconsistency at making him consul after dishonoring him with banishment, the Senate reminds him of the *exemplum* of Camillus’ actions in support of the state after the ancient hero is recalled from exile to Rome (27.34.12-15). For discussion of Camillus as a recurring *exemplum*, see Chaplin 2000: 43-44, 111, 114-15, 125-26.

\(^2\) It is worth note that, when Livy wrote, no one from the patrician *gens* of the Furii Camilli had achieved high office for hundreds of years (Syme 1939: 18). Perhaps this familial fall from prominence encourages Livy’s depiction of Camillus, as he would not run the risk of encouraging or supporting a dynastic claim for Camillus’ descendants.

\(^3\) For the term *exaedificatio* as it applies to the composition of history, see Cic. *de Orat.* 2.63 with Woodman 1988: 70-116.

\(^4\) See also Kraus 1994: 268: “Livy’s allusions to the metaphorical identification of his text and the events it describes go far beyond the familiar pun on *res gestae* (‘deeds’) as both the subject and the name of history. Throughout the *Ab urbe condita* the historian draws attention to the overlap of the content of his city (the *Urbs* he is writing about) and its form (the *Urbs* he is writing). The various metaphors with which he expresses this overlap share a conception of the text as an object growing in both time and space, one which Livy simultaneously builds and traverses.” Cf. Jaeger 1997: esp. 9-12.
context of the second pentad, but the notion also has implications for the rest of Livy’s text.\textsuperscript{15} In this literary construction, Kraus discusses the prominent role that \textit{monumenta} play as subject matter and source material going forward in Rome’s history (\textit{praef. 6}).\textsuperscript{16} The slippage of language between these \textit{monumenta} and the larger work as \textit{monumentum} in the preface reveals a particular consciousness on Livy’s part of his creation and its character as a literary construction.

By extension of Kraus’ argument, I suggest that the \textit{monumentum} that is the larger work becomes a receptacle and focalizer of multiple, interrelated \textit{monumenta}; that is, of multiple, interrelated reminders of historical events and people, which includes other literary approaches. The author is consciously making a construction built from other constructions. Further, through the process of construction, the textual \textit{monumentum} establishes a means of communicating and negotiating particular interpretations of the material and written \textit{monumenta} contained within. In other words, Livy’s deliberate and explicit construction of the text as a \textit{monumentum} recreates the traditional conditions under which \textit{monumenta} from Rome’s past were conceived of and constructed, or, in some cases, the situations in which these \textit{monumenta} were manipulated for other purposes. In this way, the competitive nature of \textit{monumenta} in establishing the primacy of ambitious figures is recast to open up their interpretation for the benefit of a less strictly defined readership.

Before examining the \textit{monumenta} that remain in Livy’s reconstructed city, it is useful to start at the end of the episode and read backwards, particularly to reflect on the character of

\textsuperscript{15} As Haimson Lushkov 2013: 20 says, “In a work conceived as a physical monument, physical artifacts naturally have a heightened potential for significance.” See also id. 2018.

\textsuperscript{16} See Kraus esp. 26 n. 110; Kraus and Woodman 1997: 56-62. Cf. Haimson Lushkov 2018: esp. 31; Bonfante 1998: esp. 481: “The architecture of Livy’s history is also a monument, as he himself calls it, reflecting in some way that of the city whose story—and monuments—he reconstructs;” and 483: “Livy reconstructed Rome, building by building, street by street, with the religious halo of its mythology, which was, as always, historical.” See also Foster 1911: lxvi-lxvii, for some brief remarks about the character of Livy’s \textit{monumentum}, particularly as the history of a nation (cf. Ogilvie 28).
Livy’s reconstruction of the past. The first pentad concludes with the depiction of Rome sacked at the hands of the Gauls; the second pentad opens with a new preface, which contains a much-discussed statement about the value of writing as opposed to material *monumenta* in the reconstruction of the past. Livy writes:

> quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam eandem Romani sub regibus primum, consulibus deinde ac dictatoribus decemvirisque ac tribunis consularibus gessere, foris bella, domi seditiones, quinque libris exposui, res cum vetustate nima obscuras, velut quae magno ex intervallo loci vix cernuntur,17 tum quod parvae et rarae per eadem tempora litterae fuere, *una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum*, et quod, etiam si quae in commentariis pontificum alisque publicis privatisque erant monumentis, incensa urbe pleraeque interiere. (6.1.1-2; cf. 29.37.7, *in publicis tabulis monumenta exstant*)18

What the Romans did from the founding of the city of Rome to its capture, I have set forth in five books, first under the kings, then the consuls, the dictators, the decemvirs, and the consular tribunes. Events are clouded with extreme antiquity, like things scarcely perceived at a great distance, both because writing was limited19 and uncommon in these times, which is the sole reliable guardian of the remembrance of history, and because, though20 there was writing from the pontifical records and other public and private *monumenta*, most of it burned and was lost along with the city.

---

17 See Kraus 84-85, who lists the similarities between the segment *res...cernuntur* and Thuc. 1.1.3 (cf. Oakley 1.384; W & M 3.1), as well as the whole passage and Rhet. Her. 3.32. Cf. also Tac. Ann. 3.57 (*publicis privatis monimentis, ad memoriam temporum*).

18 Cf. Liv. 7.3.5-7: *Lex vetusta est, priscis litteris verbisque scripta, ut qui praetor maximus sit idibus Septembribus clavum pangat; fixa fuit dextrae lateri aedis lovris optimi maximini, qua parte Minervae templum est. Eum clavum, quia rarae per ea tempora litterae erant*; *notam numeri annorum faisse ferunt eoque Minervae templo dicatam legem quia numerus Minervae inventum sit. Volsiniis quoque clavos indices numeri annorum fixos in templo Nortiae, Etruscae deae, comparare diligens talium monumentorum auctor Cincius adfirmat* (*there is an ancient law, written in archaic letters and words, to the effect that whoever is the chief magistrate on the Ides of September shall drive a nail; [the plaque] was attached to the right side of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, where the shrine of Minerva lies. They say that this nail, because writing was infrequent in these times, was a marker of the number of years. The law was entrusted to the shrine of Minerva because the number was an invention of Minerva. Cincius, a devoted recorder of such *monumenta*, confirms that at Volsinii nails are driven into the Temple of Nortia, an Etruscan goddess, as indicators of the number of years;* cf. 8.18.12-13 for a slightly different account on the origins of this practice).

19 Oakley 1.384-85, mentions *pauciae* and *parcae* as proposed variants of *parvae* but ultimately finds all these words problematic because they do not fit the sense that he expects or lack parallels for a particular sense. W & M have no issues with *parvae*, and Kraus 85 offers parallels for the translation “insignificant,” which seems to fit the sense here. Regardless, the sense seems to revolve around the limited nature of writing, whether in scope or scale.

20 For this translation of *etiam si*, see Frier 1999: 120 n. 33 (with Allen and Greenough 527c).
Livy asserts that, unlike the material preceding the sack, which is too clouded by age to be trustworthy (<i>res cum vetustate nimia obscuras</i>; see Ch. 3), what comes next will be supported by writing: here the written word is not only a protector of past events but their guarantor.

Livy continues his second pentad with similar, more positive assessments of the available evidence following the loss of so much historical fodder. Among the casualties are pontifical records (<i>in commentariis pontificum</i>), whether they were contained inside a temple or other official storehouse, or were displayed in the open; the losses also include public and private <i>monumenta (aliisque publicis privatisque . . . monumentis)</i>, presumably material and written. But the historiographical situation going forward appears to have more to offer in Livy’s view:

*clariora deinceps certioraque ab secunda origine velut ab stirpibus laetius feraciusque renatae urbis gesta domi militiaeque exponentur* (“from here on, the deeds of the city, which was renewed more expansively and more tenaciously, both at home and on campaign, will be set out more transparently and more definitely from the second foundation, as if from the roots of a city that had been re-born more prosperous and more fruitful,” 6.1.3). The city that emerges after the sack is not an entirely new entity since it rests on the same metaphorical roots (<i>stirpibus</i>), but,

---

21 There may be a further verbal connection here with the preface: <i>res…vetustate nimia obscuras ~ mea fama in obscuro…nobilitate ac magnitudine (praef. 3)</i>. If there is an intended connection, it hints that history (<i>res</i>) is hidden by time in a similar way as Livy’s reputation is hidden by the status of aristocratic writers (see Ch. 3).

22 Kraus 85–86 points out that the phrase <i>fidelis custodia</i> is used elsewhere in Livy only at 5.40.7 (cf. 5.51.9), where some of Rome’s sacred objects (<i>sacra</i>) are buried in the forum to protect them from the Gallic onslaught. As Kraus says, “The epithet [<i>fidelis</i>], which appears to be applied to literature in general, in fact pushes the AVC into the limelight: like the place in the Forum, L.’s history proves to be a safe place, each of them unexpectedly preserving Roman tradition from the Gauls, who destroy the city and its records.”

23 For the argument that these <i>commentarii pontificum</i> are the <i>Annales Maximi</i> in some form, see Frier 1999: esp. 119–20; W & M 3.1. For doubt in making the terms equivalent, see <i>FRHist</i> 1.143, 149. For a cautious approach to the available evidence, see Oakley 1.24–27; Kraus 86.
along with the fortunes of the city, the situation as far as available information for historical
treatments goes seems at this point to have improved in Livy’s historical vision.\textsuperscript{24}

As discussed in Ch. 2, writing encourages traditions—including those concerning
\textit{monumenta}—that are self-consistent. Whereas oral traditions can shift without the audience or
speaker even being aware, the written word remains in principle the same each time it is
recounted. Thus, writing as a means of transmission provides less-shifting grounds for a
tradition.\textsuperscript{25} Writing can foster a consistent view of the past in so far as the text preserves the
same words each time the reader reads them. Yet, the matter is complicated by the fact that the
written word is subject to multiple, active influences (discussed further below).\textsuperscript{26} Also, a more
uniform written history has to derive from somewhere. As discussed in Ch. 3, Livy himself
acknowledges his incorporation into his \textit{monumentum} of \textit{fabulae} and \textit{famae}, which would, in
large part, come from oral tradition. Thus, the contents of the writing that is to perform the
custodia (“safekeeping”; 6.1.2, quoted above) of the past requires evaluation. The following
sections will examine Livy’s own account of the destruction and rebuilding of Rome as a model
of what this “guardian of remembrance” should resemble.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. the argument that Claudius Quadrigarius began his history after the Gallic sack because of the lack of records
from preceding times. The argument is based on the lack of reference to times before 390 BC in the fragments of
Quadrigarius. See \textit{FRHist} 1.289; Frier 1999: 152-53; Frier 1975: 92. Zimmerer 1937: 8-10, is the only opposition to
this stance.

\textsuperscript{25} As Purcell 1987: 25, says, “to understand properly the patterns of evolution and development in Roman — or
indeed in any — funerary architecture and practice, we must go beyond the physical remains. After a certain point
these can only be mute, and they must be given voice by other evidence for the thought-world of their builders and
occupants.” While Purcell’s focus is only on funerary monuments, the notion extends to other \textit{monumenta},
especially literary ones, for the notion of providing voice.

\textsuperscript{26} Oakley 1.382, asserts: “No one familiar with the problems of book vi would wish to assert that the quality of
evidence it provides is notably superior to that found in book v; and though much in books ii-v is uncertain, it is self-
evident that much authentic material about the fifth century survived for the annalists to use. Books ii-x become
increasingly more full of useful material, but there is no clear point at which authentic records begin.” While
Oakley’s focus is on the reliability of Livy’s account as it matches with the historical record, his assertion has
implications for Livy’s literary treatment of an uncertain and unprovable past.
A city of the imagination: Camillus’ survey of Rome

It is writing that can fill in the details of past events and provide traits for characters that otherwise may be lost to time or distortion; that is, literary monimenta preserve the very past that they, in many ways, create. In the final section of Book 5, Livy depicts a city that is a shell of its former self—a city that would hardly survive at all if not for his written account, because the physical landscape has been radically altered. The Gallic attack and sack of Rome in 390 BC have taken their toll on the city, which has been reduced to a single, intact stronghold (arx) and a few, dispersed landmarks. These landmarks, which indeed after the destruction are monimenta more than ever (see Ch. 1), carry what is left of the Roman past for the contemporary denizens of the “half-ruined city” (semirata...urbis, 5.49.4).

To keep the survivors from abandoning Rome for Veii, Camillus evokes the dotted but still familiar landscape in a highly sentimental and rhetorically charged way, deploying a very Ciceronian list of commonplaces. In the middle of his speech, Camillus says:

“Haec culti neglectique numinis tanta monimenta in rebus humanis cernentes ecquid sentitis, Quirites, quantum vixdum e naufragiis prioris culpae cladisque emergentes paremus nefas? Urbem auspicato inauguratoque conditam habemus; nullus locus in ea non religionum deorumque est plenus; sacrificiis sollemnibus non dies magis stati quam loca sunt, in quibus fiant. Hos omnes deos publicos privatosque, Quirites, deserturi estis?” (5.52.1-3)

---

27 See Ogilvie 743, for stylistic parallels to Cicero. For physical edifices and particular locations as structuring devices in the speeches of Cicero, see Vasily 1993: 15-87.

28 This passage suffers from textual difficulties, which center on the word monumentum (see Ch. 1). Ogilvie follows MSS HEO PU, which give monumenta; MO give munimenta; Heinrich Glarean (Glareanus) conjectures momenta, which W & M accept. Ogilvie 744 takes the sense of the word to be “actions,” for which he draws in the parallels of 26.41.11 and 37.6.6. Miles 1995: 17 n. 17, similarly suggests translating monumenta as “consequences” of piety or lack thereof. Miles’ suggestion fits well with the notion of “warning” inherent in the term monumentum, as destruction may carry significant implications of threat to future observers, but there is no reason why these particular monumenta cannot have the more neutral connotation of “reminder” alongside that of “warning” in so far as Camillus points to particular locations and structures in the rest of his speech. The term monumenta here seems to have material referents as well as more abstract ones.

29 See Feldherr 1998: esp. 46-50, 78-81, for discussion of this passage with a focus on the visible elements left in the city and their impact on the observers. For further discussion of space and commonplaces in Camillus’ speech, see Miano 2011: esp. 49-70; Jaeger 1997: esp. 89-92; Kraus 1994: esp. 278-87.
“As you perceive these great *monumenta* of divinity tended and neglected among our human travails, do you not feel, Quirites, how great a wrongdoing you set out on, all while scarcely coming up from the shipwreck of your previous fault and disaster? We have a city founded on auspice and augury; no place in it is not full of piety and the gods; for our holy sacrifices, the days are no more fixed than the places in which they may happen. Will you abandon, Quirites, all these gods, both public and personal?”

In the rest of the speech, the Capitoline, the Citadel (*arx*), and their resident *monumenta* are repeatedly evoked as the site of Rome’s salvation during the attack (5.51.3, 9, 52.3, 6, 12, 53.5, 9, 54.7), but other structures and features from throughout the city also appear prominently. Camillus inserts a catalogue of key *monumenta*, among them the *comitia* (52.16), the Temple of Vesta (52.7, 13-14, 54.7), the hut of Romulus (53.8), the shields of Mars Gradivus (52.7, 54.7), etc. He particularly shames the Romans for considering relocation when the temples of their gods are still standing (*stantibus templis deorum*, 53.9).\(^{30}\)

The speech effectively gives a spatial tour of the city with physical *monumenta* marking the primary highlights, but the picture of the city is surely not intended as a literally realistic one. Livy’s audience, like the audience Livy evokes for Camillus, may have a clear conception of these *monumenta*. But sacred objects dating to the founding of the city or before (*sacra aequalia urbi, quaedam vetustiora origine urbis*, 52.7) would have been scarcely legible. Livy’s own account, as we have seen, promotes his reader’s awareness of the fragility of structures and objects, subject by nature to the ravages of time. That impression of fragility and vulnerability to human and natural agency, and to the competition of perspectives that results, is only amplified by Livy’s suggestion that the subsequently rebuilt city grows “in a random fashion” (*promisce*,
The city to which Camillus refers is, thus, a city of literary imagination, not one invented entirely by Livy but one whose impact emerges according to the author’s particular arrangement and creativity.

The material *monumenta* of Camillus’ speech allow the reader/observer to create their own dialogue with a past that no longer exists but that is, as a consequence, free from possible accretion in their own time. Camillus’ mention of these material *monumenta* reminds his internal audience of their connection to something familiar. For the external audience of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, Camillus provides a means of accessing and interpreting a world not only after it has changed in the past but as it continues to change. Rome is not eternal because of a museum-style preservation of an unchanging environment but rather because of its reception of an organic and fluctuating past that accommodates new structures as they are erected, as existing ones collapse or are demolished, and as new dedications and associations arise and conflict with old ones.

The actual appearance of the landscape only yields its historical value if the layers are mediated, if the historian shows what is of interpretive significance underneath the confusion. The gaps must be accounted for, inconsistencies must be reconciled or, at least, recognized, and details must be added. The viewer also undergoes changes in outlook, which creates a sort of ongoing mental negotiation in how they perceive and understand the structures. *Monumenta* of this sort constitute an outline to be filled in by other means, particularly by authors like Livy; in turn, the new monumental medium of his history is one the reader again needs assistance in negotiating. The strategies that Livy makes available to his readers for interpreting the

---

31 For instances of extreme growth in Livy’s Rome, see also *praef.* 4, 9; 1.8.4; 1.9.9; 5.53.8, 54.5; 6.4.6; etc. See also Kraus 1994: esp. 268-70.
monumenta his work has subsumed are equally available to them for interpreting the
monumentum that he has forged in the form of his history as a whole.

**Camillus as a counter to self-aggrandizement**

Prior to the sacking of Rome and Camillus’ subsequent speech, Livy foreshadows the importance of Camillus as a figure standing apart from the typical self-serving of powerful figures. In that passage, Livy adumbrates the possibility of a city, Veii in its entirety, potentially becoming a monumentum to an individual, Camillus. In his initial appeal to block a migration from Rome to Veii—here in the context of a conflict between patricians and plebes—Camillus gives the same reasons against such a migration that he does later in Book 5, though here in indirect speech: the altars, hearths, temples, and native soil of Rome (pro aris fociisque et deum templis ac solo in quo nati essent, 5.30.1). But Camillus adds a personal factor: si suae gloriae sibi inter dimicationem patriae meminisse sit fas, sibi amplum quoque esse urblem ab se captam frequantari, cottidie se frui monumento gloriae suae et ante oculos habere urblem latam in triumpho suo, insistere omnes vestigiis laudum suarum (“[he said that], if it were proper to think about personal glory while the fatherland is in conflict, it would also be fine for him that a city which had been captured by him be inhabited, and that daily he enjoy the monumentum of his own glory, and that he have, before his eyes, a city carried in his triumph, and that all follow the footsteps of his praise,” 2). In the perspective presented here, by commanding the army that

---

32 See Vasaly 2015: esp. 77-80, for Camillus as the antithesis of tyrannical characters in other parts of Livy’s history. One aspect of Camillus as a model for leadership is his avoidance of self-serving initiatives. When he does engage in competition (see the Introduction on Livy’s criticism of certamina), it is either against people who pose a clear danger to the state (e.g., Manlius Capitolinus; see Ch. 3), or he contends with himself to validate the people’s faith in him (e.g., 6.6.9, esp. certantem secum ipsum). On Camillus’ encouragement of concord, see Hardie 2012: 250-56; Momigliano 1942b.

33 Ctr. 6.29.8-9, where the dictator T. Quinctius celebrates a notable campaign with a monumentum: T. Quinctius semel acie victor, binis castris hostium, novem oppidis vi captis, Praeneste in deditionem accepto Romam revertit triumphansque signum Praeneste dejectum lovis Imperatoris in Capitolium tulit. Dedicatum est inter cellam lovis ac Minervae tabulaque sub eo fixa. monumentum rerum gestarum, his ferme incisa litteris fuit: ‘Iuppiter atque divi omnes hoc dederunt, ut T. Quinctius dictator oppida novem caperet’ (“T. Quinctius—once a victor in the battle-line,
conquered Veii, Camillus seemingly has a claim to the entire city and its future prospects as a personal *monumentum*, one that takes a quality so significant for *monumenta*—that is, conspicuousness—to new heights (*ante oculos*)\(^{34}\) and promises heavy exposure to viewers (*frequentari* and *cottidie*) by virtue of its scale.

Despite the conditional stipulation on the propriety of considering his own glory (*si suae gloriae sibi . . . meminisse sit fas*), the sentiment seems self-serving at first sight. The situation bears some resemblance to the commemorativeness of Tarquin the Proud, who begins to construct the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as a *monumentum* of his reign and to himself (*monumentum regni sui nominisque, 1.55.1*), not for the glory of the god. But Camillus’ follow-up makes it clear that his own glory is not his primary concern: *sed nefas ducere desertam ac relictam ab dis immortalibus incoli urbem, et in captivo solo habitare populum Romanum et victrice patria victam mutari* (*“but [he went on that] he thought it improper that a city—abandoned and left destitute by the gods—be inhabited, and that the Roman people live on captive soil and exchange their conquering fatherland for a conquered one,” 3*).\(^{35}\) Camillus shows that the reason that the state is in trouble is because the people—patrician and plebian alike—are twice in the camps of the enemy, with nine cities taken by force, and with the surrender of Praeneste received—returned to Rome. In triumph, he carried the image of Jupiter Imperator, a spoil from Praeneste, to the Capitoline. It was dedicated between the shrines of Jupiter and Minerva, and a plaque was attached beneath it—*a monumentum of his deeds*—which was inscribed with something like these words: *‘Jupiter and all the gods granted that the dictator T. Quinctius capture nine cities’*.

---

\(^{34}\) Ogilvie 693, point out that *urbem latam* refers to models or pictures of conquered cities to be carried in triumphs. But, regardless of any firm visual representations, the primary impression of the passage is that the occupation of Veii and Camillus’ association with the deed as well as the city itself would be like a daily triumph to the benefit of his reputation and position. In other words, the extreme honor accorded to an individual during a triumph would become quotidian rather than remarkable.

\(^{35}\) See Jaeger 1997: 91-92: “[Camillus] then conjures up in the minds of his competitive peers a troubling vision: Veii as a reminder of his glory . . . Camillus’ rhetorical manipulation of Veii as a place that constantly commemorates him (note the reflexives *suae, ab se, suo, suarum*) has the deterrent effect he intends. It inspires the Senators to adopt his rhetorical use not of Veii but of Rome, for they cling to their city in the face of the alternative that Camillus has made appear far more threatening to their own prestige.”
thinking of themselves over the gods and their native land; in other words, they have forgotten their *pietas*.\(^{36}\)

In effect, the rhetorical feint that Livy has his Camillus make in suggesting that conquered Veii would be a pervasive reminder of himself both highlights and problematizes the large presence of self-promotion at Rome, including through the construction of and close association of individuals with *monumenta*. Livy has his Camillus use this moment to put such behavior in perspective. Mary Jaeger argues “All Rome is a monument to Camillus.”\(^{37}\) Livy’s Camillus, however, does not use *monumenta* in the way that, say, someone with dynastic ambitions might: the *monumenta* that remain of the ravaged city to which Camillus directs his audience’s gaze do not reflect the importance of Camillus to the city but rather the importance of the city to the Roman people. Just as Livy’s *monumentum* (*praef. 10*) is not a memorial to the author, so too Livy has his Camillus direct focus away from himself. The city as *monumentum* is, as Livy invites his audience to see it, in good hands with this rendition of Camillus.

**Public vs. private *monumenta***

At *Ab Urbe Condita* 6.1.1-2 (discussed above), Livy does not seem to make a pointed distinction between the types of *monumenta* lost in the sack: whether they are collective or individual (*publicis privatisque...monumentis*), these *monumenta* constitute sources of

---

\(^{36}\) Camillus, after all, is “the most scrupulous practitioner of religion” (*diligentissimus religionum cultor*, 5.50.1). See, e.g., Stevenson 2000; Bonfante 1998; Miles 1995: 75-109; Lipovsky 1981: 89-94; Hellegouarc’h 1970. It is also significant that the group that Camillus subsequently assembles to govern the state receives a singular commendation from the contemporary Senators: *nec dictatore unquam opus fore rei publicae, si tales viros in magistratu habeat, tam concordibus iunctos animis, parere atque imperare iuxta paratos laudemque conferentes potius in medium quam ex communi ad se trahentes* (“[they said that] the state would never have need of a dictator, if it should have such men in office, men so connected by their commonality of purpose, ready likewise to obey or to command, gathering accolade for the common good rather than siphoning it therefrom for themselves,” 6.6.18).

information now gone.\textsuperscript{38} On one level, the combination of public and private lends a sense of pathos in the sheer scope of the destruction, which makes no status distinction in what it devours.\textsuperscript{39} In the subsequent rebuilding of Rome, however, the hastiness of construction creates confusion of public and private property: \textit{ea est causa ut veteres cloacae, primo per publicum ductae, nunc privata passim subeant tecta, formaque urbis sit occupatae magis quam divisae similis} (“this is why the ancient sewers, which were originally directed through public ways, now run here and there beneath private buildings, and the appearance of the city is more like one appropriated than planned,” 5.55.5; cf. 39.44.4). Here, the confusion might be taken as fairly coincidental: both public and private had been destroyed, and the rebuilding required quick and industrious action—not to mention that the resulting city is quite different from the previous one.\textsuperscript{40} Elsewhere, however, Livy makes the distinction between public and private clearer and makes their confusion a significant one for what is transmitted from the past, as well as how it is transmitted.

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. Liv. 5.53.2 in Camillus speech about public and private buildings (\textit{tectis publicis privatisque}; cf. 5.52.3), with a possible distinction between the two still intact at this point. As Woolf 1996: 27 says, “The reality, visibility, and prominence of a monument supported the claim it commemorated, whether it was a claim about the state, or about the worth of an individual, or about the relationship between that individual and those who commemorated her or him.” But the focus of commemoration could easily get lost or confused if, say, private individuals who once held high offices continued to monumentalize themselves with the association or regalia of such offices, an act that extended even beyond death in the display of funerary masks (\textit{imagines}) of ancestors. The public and private becomes intertwined to the detriment of the former.

\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Liv. 1.29.6: \textit{egressis urbe Albanis, Romanus passim publica privataque omnia tecta adaequat solo, unaque hora quadringerorum annorum opus quibus Alba steterat excidio ac ruinis dedit} (“after the Albans had left the city, the Romans everywhere leveled all buildings, public and private, and, in one hour, they delivered to ruin and destruction the work of the 400 years for which Alba had stood”). It may be noted that only the temples were spared in Alba Longa, similar to the situation that Camillus describes above in Rome.

\textsuperscript{40} As Jaeger 1997: 4, points out: “the Capitoline alone remains intact and provides topographical continuity during the transition to the rebuilt city of Book 6.” See also Kraus 1994: esp. 282-87. On the loss of distinction here between public and private, Kraus says: “While the erasing of distinctions is normally a bad thing, it seems to be acceptable here—a case of the end justifying the means?” (286). There may be, however, more significant ramifications of the blending of public and private as the following discussion explores.
Livy makes another important statement about public and private *monumenta* in Book 8.

The passage follows an account of a war with the Samnites in 322 BC. Livy reports that there is disagreement among writers about the role of various magistrates in the war (8.40.1):

>nec facile est aut rem rei aut auctorem auctori praeferre. vitiatam memoriam funebribus laudibus reor\(^{41}\) falsisque imaginum titulis, dum familiae ad se quaeque famam rerum gestarum honorumque fallenti mendacio trahunt; inde certe et singulorum gesta et publica monumenta rerum confusa. nec quisquam aequalis temporibus illis scriptor exstat, quo satis certo auctore stetur. (8.40.4-5; cf. 30.45.7; 38.57.1)\(^{42}\)

It is not easy to favor one account to another or one author to another. I think that remembrance of the past has been compromised by funerary praise and distorted inscriptions on likenesses, as each family appropriates to itself a report of deeds and offices through deceitful fabrication. It is certain that this tendency has caused confusion between the deeds of individuals and the public *monumenta* of events. Nor is there any writer contemporaneous with the events, on whose sufficiently sure authority the matter may stand.

From the perspective of the historian—indeed, from anyone’s perspective who is not receiving the boons of this distortion—this is extremely problematic. Though the passage follows on a particular instance, the sentiment has repercussions for other portions of the *Ab Urbe Condita*. In the first place, the language of this passage is very similar to that at the start of Book 6 (see above). In particular, there is a coupling of public and private *monumenta*: though the reference is not verbatim, *singulorum gesta* clearly corresponds to the notion of *privata monumenta*.\(^{43}\)

Further, the structural placement of the two passages lends them great weight and intratextual

\(^{41}\) For Livy’s use of *reor* in authorial statements and the degree of certainty implied, see Oakley 2.772.

\(^{42}\) For another connection between *tituli* and *monumenta*, see Plin. *NH* 2.154: *monimenta ac titulos gerens nomenque prorogans nostrum et memoriam extendens contra brevitatem aevi* (“[Mother Earth] carries our *monimenta* and epitaphs, prolongs our name, and stretches remembrance of us beyond the brevity of life-span”).

\(^{43}\) For general discussion of the aristocratic blending of public and private elements in Roman politics, see Timpe 2011; Woolf 1996. On Livy in particular, Timpe says: “Livy wants to say [at 6.1.2]: history is the location of *memoria publica*; it keeps watch over the undistorted knowledge of the *res gestae populii Romani* and protects it against interests from the private side that promote distortion [at 8.40.4-5]” (162).
significance: one opens a book—not to mention the larger structural unit of a pentad—and the other closes a book.

This passage reflects on the historiographically corrosive effects of a natural Roman—indeed, human—tendency to extend and to magnify the reputation of the deceased (see Ch. 1). But, in addition to understandable euphemism on the part of the survivors and descendants, the magnification they engage in betrays a vested interest in perpetuating the exaggerations of funerary praise at large: not only are the families accumulating the credit of good deeds and offices among themselves, but they are actively inscribing them through deceitful fabrication (fallaci mendacio; cf. 40.39.8, mendacio probabili) in the public record (publica monumenta).

A certain love of honor among a highly competitive population is to be expected. But, for Livy as historian, the problem arises when these private versions of the account falsely assume the

---

44 See above for the reflection of material construction in Livy’s literary construction of the Ab Urbe Condita.


46 See, e.g., Carroll 2006: 25: “a part of the funeral itself, the publicly delivered eulogy (laudatio funebris), sometimes appears in inscribed texts on the tomb to symbolically extend the funeral in time and to allow the eulogy to be recalled long after the spoken words had been forgotten.” For general discussion of laudationes funebres, see ibid. 34-35; Flower 1996: 145-50; Kierdorf 1982; Walbank 1.737-38. The locus classicus for details of the Roman funeral is Poly. 6.52-54. For the loss of distinction between public and private during Roman funerals, see Johanson 2011; Timpe 2011: esp. 153-55.

47 For discussion of notions of public and private in the Roman world as well as the slippage between them, see, e.g., Russell 2016: esp. 1-42; Riggsby 1999 and 1997. See also Sen. Dial. 6.1.3 for the characterization of Cremutius Cordus’ history as publica monumenta.

48 See, e.g., Plin. NH 35.8 on the effects of appropriating the funeral masks (imagines) of others: etiam mentiri clarorum imagines erat aliquis virtutum amor multoque honestius quam mereri, ne quis suas expeteret (“even falsely making claims to the likenesses of famous people showed a certain love of their excellence, and it is much more noble than acting in such a way that no one aspire after one’s likenesses”).
role of solid authorities (*auctorem*) for past events.49 The practice could only tend to bloat the role of particular individuals and families in the common account of the past.50

The slippage of language—that is, the verbal disparity between *publicis privatisque...monumentis* (6.1.2) and *singulorum gesta et publica monumenta* (8.40.5)—may also be interpretable: perhaps in a conscious reflection of the situation in question, the words and concepts are “confused” (*confusa*), so that *res gestae*—the deeds—and *monumenta*—the preservers of the deeds—are conflated and potentially reversed.51 Rather than the *monumenta* commemorating notable deeds, they create the deeds to form the pretense of history: that is, a *fama rerum gestarum* emerges rather than a reliable and firmly attested account of the past, a *memoria rerum gestarum* (6.1.2),52 which further mirrors Livy’s prefatory remarks (*rerum gestarum memoriae*; cf. praef. 6: *rerum gestarum monumentis*). As an ideal, history is supposed to preserve recollection of deeds because they are memorable, whereas the version of history that *fama* provides potentially fabricates memorability where it is not entirely warranted.53

---

49 As W & M 3.302, say on the phrase *publica monumenta*, “scheint zu bedeuten, daß aus den Familiendenkmälern die erdichteten Ehren und Taten auch in die öffentlichen, die *fasti triumphales, consulares u. a. . . kamen und so die Geschichte verfälscht wurde.”

50 In discussing the amount of historical knowledge possessed by an average Roman, Timpe 2011: 157, suggests: “Here too there might not have been any boundary between factual knowledge and richly imaginative sage. In dubious cases the authority was not an historical document or a rational argument; rather it was the authority of the socially superior individual.”

51 See Wiseman 1986: 87-88: “First comes the *res gesta*, the exploit worthy of record; then the rewards for achievement, *honores* and the triumph; then the *monumentum* to preserve the memory of the deed; then the celebration of it by story-tellers and learned historians, for the unlettered multitude and the literate elite respectively.” For an analogue to the conflation of terms such as *res gesta* and *monumentum*, cf. the grammarian conflation of *memoria* and *monumentum* discussed in Ch. 1, as well as the characterization of *monumentum* as *historia* or similar terms.

52 On the phrase *memoria rerum gestarum*, see Kraus and Woodman 1997: 51. For the related phrase *fama rerum gestarum*, see Hardie 2012: 231-32; Timpe 2011; Grethelein 2006: esp. 135-40. See also above on the second etiology of the Lacus Curtius (7.6.6: *fama rerum*; discussed in Ch. 3)

53 Cf. Liv. 25.38.8, where L. Marcius asserts that the two slain Scipiones live and flourish by the *fama* of their deeds (*vivunt vigentque fama rerum gestarum*). It is worth note that the *fama* here creates a *documentum* (9). Cf. praef. 10.
Also, the idea of certainty appears (*certe* and *certo*) in the passage above as if to emphasize to the reader the lack of surety under the conditions of private distortion. The *monumenta* that trace and, in many ways, determine the course of the Roman past are subject not only to the vicissitudes of time (*vetustas* or *antiquitas*) and the exaggerations of popular storytelling (*fabula* and *fama*, see Ch. 3), but they also face deliberate tampering for socio-political self-promotion, in “the infinite capacity of public monuments to privatization” in the Roman world.\(^{54}\) But, whereas the distortions that come from the creativity of *fabulae* can still provide useful models for behavior and other beneficial elements, those for political aggrandizement have much less secure value for society as a whole due to the fundamental restriction of their scope. Livy himself, as discussed above, freely invents in matters that allow such invention, but his creation is not focused on self-promotion.

As noted above, the actual means by which this self-serving distortion of the past is brought about are funerary elements (see Ch. 10), both in the form of eulogies (*funebribus laudibus*) and inscribed likenesses (*falsisque imaginum titulis*).\(^{55}\) Like written *monumenta*, *tituli* are important witnesses for the Roman past, especially since they provide more detail than just the physical appearance of a statue or an etched name on a tombstone. Here lies the issue as Livy has the reader confront it: *tituli* are sources of authority and collective memory, but that memory has been violated (*vitiatum memoriam*) by familial competition.\(^ {56}\) In this respect, eulogies are no

\(^{54}\) Fowler 2000: 213.

\(^ {55}\) For another *falsus titulus*, see Liv. 4.20.5-11 on the linen breastplate dedicated by A. Cornelius Cossus as *spolia opima* and Augustus’ reading of it. The passage has been thoroughly discussed by others; see, e.g., Haimson Lushkov 2018: 42-43; Sailor 2006: esp. 335-41; Flower 2000; Miles 1995: 47-54.

\(^{56}\) For an example of a *titulus* that is perhaps not distortive—because it pertains to Camillus—see Liv. 7.1.10: *par…titulo tantae gloriae fuit dignus habitus quem secundum a Romulo conditorem urbis Romanae ferrent* (“he was a match for the epitaph of such great glory and was considered worthy to be called a second founder of the Roman city after Romulus”). Cf. 6.4.3 on Camillus’ inscribed plates (*cum titulo nominis Camilli*).
better than any of their monumental kin, as they are just as liable to serve as means of legitimating and elevating surviving family as they are to commemorate and honor the dead.\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, eulogies are not an institution restricted to Rome’s early days, and, thus, the distortion that they promulgate has ongoing implications for Livy’s world. The idea of \textit{incorrupta monumenta} becomes more and more ephemeral, even where extreme antiquity cannot be blamed, possibly in deliberate contradiction of the statement at Preface 6.

\textit{Tituli and falsi tituli}

Thus, \textit{tituli}, which can be prominent features of \textit{monumenta}, seem to replace the function of \textit{monumenta} in transmitting information about the past; but, as Livy has it (8.40.4), they are especially susceptible to distortion. In his account of the Second Punic War (218-201 BC), Livy gives a hypothetical example of the potential excess of \textit{tituli}. It is worth note that the passage is a speech, so the level of poignancy is potentially elevated (see Ch. 1 on the speech of Lycortas). After the Carthaginians have evacuated Sicily, the Syracusans send an embassy to Marcellus to plead their case. Livy has the envoy say:

\begin{quote}
“Gloriam captae nobilissimae pulcherrimaeque urbis Graecarum dei tibi dederunt, Marcelle. quidquid umquam terra marique memorandum gessimus, id tui triumphi \textit{título} accedit. famaene credi velis quanta urbs a te capta sit, quam posteris quoque eam spectaculo esse, quo quisquis terra, quisquis mari venerit, nunc nostra de Atheniensibus Carthaginiensibusque tropaea, nunc tua de nobis ostendat, incolmesque Syracusas familiae vestrae sub clientela nominis Marcellorum tutelaque habendas tradas?” (25.29.5-6; cf. 37.54.13)\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{57} For the use of a \textit{titulus} as proof of conquest, see Liv. 28.46.16: \textit{propter Iunonis Laciniae templum aestatem Hannibal egit, ibique aram condidit dedicavitque cum ingenti rerum ab se gestarum titulo, Punicis Graecisque litteris insculpto} (“Hannibal spent the summer near the Temple of Juno Lacinia, where he set up and dedicated an altar with a huge description of his deeds, chiseled with Punic and Greek letters”). As with the passage above (8.40.4-5), the altar acts as a \textit{monumentum} through basic commemoration, and the \textit{titulus} takes the partial function of history by reporting \textit{res gestae}, though this version of history shows the clear vested interest of Hannibal. For discussion, see Jaeger 2006.

\textsuperscript{58} As Jaeger 2003: 231, says on this passage, “when the Syracusans use their city’s glorious past to persuade Marcellus, they point out that what they have accomplished will accrue to Marcellus’ glory and touch skillfully on what aristocratic Romans love most: glory, triumphs, \textit{tituli}, having the city survive as visible proof [\textit{spectaculum}] to
“The gods granted to you the glory of capturing the most excellent and beautiful city of the Greeks, Marcellus. Whatever memorable deed we accomplished on land or sea, this is added to the record of your triumph. Would you have people believe hearsay on how great a city was captured by you rather than leave it to be a sight also for posterity? A city that would show to all, whoever comes by land, whoever by sea, in one place our spoils from the Athenians and Carthaginians, in another your spoils from us? Would you not hand down Syracuse, intact, to your family, under the clientage and protection of the name of the Marcelli?”

Here the *titulus* is a triumphal—and metaphorical—one and not funerary as at 8.40.4, but the notion of glorification and commemoration is present, particularly in the inclusion of Marcellus’ family line.⁵⁹ Though the term is not used, the speaker essentially offers the city of Syracuse as a *monumentum* to Marcellus, and this *monumentum* will be a conspicuous one (*spectaculo*) rather than the ghost of a report (*famae*).⁶⁰ Further, it comes with not only the material spoils (*tropaea*) but also the memorable deeds (*quidquid…memorandum gessim*) that they commemorate, which would then be transferred over as further memorials for Marcellus. The entire city will be inscribed, as a tombstone, with the name of Marcellus (*nominis Marcellorum*) to be a *monumentum* to those who come after (*posteris*) but, more imminently, to Marcellus’ family.

Moreover, Livy introduces the term *clientela*, in reference to the quintessentially Roman power relationship. But for a whole city to be the client seems excessive in light of Syracuse’s vulnerable position. That excess had, of course, become a reality in the Late Republic, as

---

⁵⁹ Marcellus does, in a way, arrogate the benefits of a funerary *monumentum* when he provides a tomb for Archimedes, who is killed during the taking of Syracuse (25.31.10). The act is presented as a service to Archimedes’ family, but it positively reflects on Marcellus as a sort of patron of the deceased and his family line. See Jaeger 2003: 231-32. For Marcellus as a controversial figure who becomes a focus for disagreement among social groups—largely because of his plebeian origins—see Miles 2008: esp. 61-69; Flower 2006: 59-60, and 2003.

⁶⁰ Cf. Veii as a potential *monumentum* to Camillus (Liv. 5.30.2, discussed above).
governors and conquerors alike assumed the privileges of patrons over entire cities and regions.\textsuperscript{61} Marcellus personally does not receive these perquisites for long, since he is soon thereafter killed in an ambush (27.27). Notwithstanding that, Livy’s presentation of an entire city being a memorial to an individual is problematic, particularly in light of the distortive capacity of \textit{tituli} discussed above (8.40.4-5).\textsuperscript{62} Moreover, according to Livy’s account, the Marcelli did maintain ongoing patron privilege over the Sicilians; because of the actions of a single ancestor, the entire family receives gain for an indeterminate future.\textsuperscript{63}

Further, Livy elsewhere connects the issue of \textit{falsi tituli} to his prefatory remark about holding back from accepting or rejecting information that is difficult to trace because of its age \textit{(nec adfirmare nec refellere, praef. 6)}, a principle that in any case Livy does not consistently

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{61} For examples of this practice and discussion, see Braund 1989: esp. 139-40 (on the Marcelli in Sicily), 143-51 (on potential excesses and disfunctions of patronage on this scale). Concerning the expansion of personal patronage over large areas, Braund says: “Public and private are scarcely distinguishable as the complex of patronage is deepened and extended” (142), a statement that has significant implications for Livy’s depiction of Marcellus and Syracuse. On international patronage in general in the Roman world, see, e.g., Rich 1989; Gruen 1984: 1.158-200; Badian 1959.

\textsuperscript{62} It is worth note that Livy, at the close of the episode on Marcellus’ death, mentions the multiplicity of accounts (27.27.12-14). Livy says that Coelius Antipater alone, leaving others aside \textit{(ut omittam alios)}, gives three versions: the traditional one \textit{(fama)}, one based on the historian’s own investigation, and one given in eulogy \textit{(in laudatione)} by the younger Marcellus. Along with his father, this Marcellus was a participant in the engagement \textit{(qui rei gestae interfuerit)}, which seems to correspond to Livy’s want of contemporary authority at 8.40.4-5, but the means of transmission in eulogy also corresponds with the doubtful funerary praise of that passage \textit{(funebribus laudibus)} and the associated distortion of family interests. See also Ridley 1983: esp. 374-75.

\textsuperscript{63} See also Levene 2010: 122-26, for a possible comparison on Livy’s part between his depiction of Marcellus and the figure of Verres depicted in Cicero’s speeches. Marcellus, after all, does initiate the first significant influx of corrupting wealth into Rome: \textit{Marcellus captis Syracusis, cum cetera in Sicilia tanta fide atque integritate composuisset ut non modo suam gloriam sed etiam maiestatem populi Romani augearet, ornamenta urbis, signa tabulasque quibus abundabant Syracusae, Romam devexit, hostium quidem illa spolia et parta belli iure; ceterum inde primum initium mirandi Graecarum artium opera licentiaeque huius sacra profanaque omnia vulgo spoliandi factum est, quae postremo in Romanos deos…vertit} (“with Syracuse taken, Marcellus, though he had settled the other matters in Sicily with such trustworthiness and uprightness that he increased not only his own reputation but also the dignity of the Roman people, carried the decorations of the city—the statues and paintings of which Syracuse was full—back to Rome. Certainly, these possessions of the enemy were dispensed as the rightful spoils of war. But, from there came the beginnings of fetishizing Greek works of art and this common willingness to pillage all things holy and divine, a behavior that finally was turned against the Roman gods,” 25.40.1-3). Cf. 27.16.7-8, where Livy compares Fabius Maximus to Marcellus, particularly in that the former abstained from the same sort of plunder on account of his nature \textit{(sed maiore animo generis eius praeda abstinuit Fabius quam Marcellus)}. See also Haimson Lushkov 2018: 44-45.
follow in practice, as discussed in Ch. 3. Indeed, in one case a *falsus titulus* is the very means by which something is refuted. Following his account of the *monumentum* of the demolished house left to discourage behavior like that of Spurius Maelius (4.16.1, discussed in Ch. 2), Livy interrupts his narrative in order to dispute a detail of the historical record concerning L. Minucius, one of the men responsible for spoiling Maelius’ ambitions to kingship. The issue he then stops to discuss features a *falsus titulus*:

Hunc Minucium apud quosdam auctores transisse a patribus ad plebem undecimumque tribunum plebis cooptatum seditionem motam ex Maeliana caede sedasse invenio; ceterum vix credibile est numerum tribunorum patres augeri passos, idque potissimum exemptum a patricio homine introductum, nec deinde id plebem concessum semel obtinuisse aut certe temptasse. Sed ante omnia refellit falsum imaginis titulum paucis ante annis lege cautum ne tribunis collegam cooptare liceret. (4.16.3–4; cf. 3.72, 22.31.11)\(^{64}\)

Among certain authorities, I find that an account that this Minucius transitioned from the patricians to the plebeians and, after he was coopted as the eleventh tribune of the plebs, soothed rebellious feelings instigated by the killing of Maelius. But it is hardly believable that the fathers allowed the number of the tribunes to be increased, or that this precedent especially was initiated by a patrician; nor is it believable, on the other hand, that the plebs, once this concession was made, would not have held to it or certainly have tried to. But, above all, the false inscription on the likeness is refuted by the legal proviso a few years before to the effect that the tribunes not be allowed to coopt a colleague.

Here the jurist record—perhaps to be equated with a *documentum*—disproves the false claim of a *monumentum*.\(^{65}\) But the *titulus*, the inscription on the *monumentum*, is what gives rise to the lie

---

\(^{64}\) Cf. Cic. *de Dom.* 81: *at tu etiam, ereptor civitatis, legem de iniuriis publicis tulisti Anagnino nescio cui Menullae pergratam, qui tibi ob eam legem statuam in meis aedibus posuit, ut locus ipse in tanta tua iniuria legem et inscriptionem statuae refelleret: quae res municipibus Anagninis ornatissimis multo maioris dolori fuit quam quae idem ille gladiator scelerata Anagniae fecerat* (“but you, snatcher of citizenship, brought forth a law on public crimes, to the pleasure of an Anagnian, a certain Menulla, who set up a statue to you in my house in exchange for this law, so that the place itself, under the great pressure of your wrongdoing, refutes the law and the inscription on the statue. And this matter was a much greater source of pain for the very decorated municipalities of Anagnia than the crimes that gladiator had committed at Anagna”).

\(^{65}\) The term *monumentum* is not used here, but the assertion at 8.40.4–5 between *monumenta* and *tituli* provides a conceptual basis for comparison. It is worth noting that the term *exemplum* also appears in the passage here, which further connects it to the preface.
in the first place. This particular instance of deceit perpetrated by a monumentum is caught by the preservation of a law.

Livy is hardly the first explorer of antiquity to mention the issue of fabrication of historical records following the destruction of existing information during the Gallic sack. In the following instance, both written and material monumenta again play a part in the fabrication. And the authority in question who calls out the fabrication may be as early as Claudius Quadrigarius. At the beginning of his biography of Numa Pompilius, Plutarch mentions the existence of genealogical records for the tracing of early figures in Rome’s history, but he mentions the divergent opinions of an obscure chronographer Paulus Clodius:

Εστι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν Νομᾶ τοῦ βασιλέως χρόνων, καθ’ οὓς γέγονε, νεανικὴ διαφορά, καίπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τοῦτον κατάγεσθαι τῶν στεμμάτων ἀκριβῶς δοκοῦντων. ἄλλα Κλώδιος τις ἐν ἐλέγχῳ χρόνων (οὔτω γὰρ πῶς ἐπιγραφαῖς τὸ βιβλίον) ἰσχυρίζεται τὰς μὲν ἀρχαῖας ἐκείνας ἀναγραφαῖς ἐν τοῖς Κελτικοῖς πάθεσι τῆς πόλεως ἡμανίσθαι, τὰς δὲ νῦν φαίνομένας οὐκ ἀληθῶς συγκείσθαι δι᾽ ἀνδρὸν χαριζομένων ταῖν εἰς τὰ πρῶτα γένη καὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους οἶκους ἐξ οὓς προσηκόντων εἰσβιαζομένοις. (Plut. Numa 1.1; cf. 21.4)

There is certainly strong disagreement about the time in which king Numa lived, even though from the beginning down to his time there is a record of seemingly accurate genealogies. But a certain Clodius in an examination of time (for so the book is titled) insists that these early records were destroyed in the Gallic sack of the city, and those that now exist are forgeries of people trying to please certain people by enrolling them in the foremost families and most noble houses, though they had no claim to it.

---

66 For the scanty evidence and speculation on Clodius and his possible identity(ies), see Cornell 2018: 187-89; FRHist 1.264-65, 3.271 (Briscoe); Frier 1999: 121-27, and 1975: 92-94 (this Clodius likely is Claudius Quadrigarius; see also Leeman 1963: 1.78); Crawford 1998 (very brief discussion); Badian 1966: 17-21 (this Clodius is not to be identified with Claudius Quadrigarius).

67 Cf. Plin. NH 35.8 = M. Valerius Messalla Rufus 42 T 2 FRHist, for the written complaint by a certain Messala objecting to the inclusion of an imago properly belonging to another family among those of Scipio Pomponianus.
Here an additional problem comes into play: not only are descendants seeking to capitalize on the legacy of their ancestors, but also clients and potential clients are fabricating ancestry for those whose favor they wish to acquire through written accounts.\textsuperscript{68}

Cicero also discusses falsifications of ancestry along with other forms of self-serving deceit in a passage of the \textit{Brutus}. This passage is often compared to Livy’s assessment of falsified family records discussed above (8.40.4-5), but it bears repeating.\textsuperscript{69} The topic arises from a discussion on testimonies for the eloquence of significant Romans, the search for which looks to \textit{monumenta} (\textit{monumentis suspicari}, 53). Cicero, as a respondent in the dialogue, essentially concludes that funeral orations (\textit{mortuorum laudationes}, 62) are more for delight (\textit{delectant}) than reliable information.\textsuperscript{70} He says:

\begin{quote}
“Et hercules eae quidem exstant; ipsae enim familiae sua quasi ornamenta ac \textbf{monumenta} servabant\textsuperscript{71} et ad usum, si quis eiusdem generis occidisset, et ad memoriam laudum domesticarum et ad illustrandam nobilitatem suam. Quamquam his laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum est facta mendosior. Multa enim scripta sunt in eis quae facta non sunt, falsi triumphi, plures consulatus, genera etiam falsa et ad plebem transitiones, cum homines humiliores in alienum eiusdem nominis infunderentur genus; ut si ego me a M’. Tullio esse dicerem, qui patricius cum Servio Sulpicio consul anno x post exactos reges fuit.” (62)\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{68} Cf. the case of Valerius Antias and his possible attempt to ingratiate himself with or insinuate himself among the patrician Valerii (see the note in Ch. 3).

\textsuperscript{69} See, esp., Ridley 1983.

\textsuperscript{70} The first Roman whose eloquence is recognized is M. Cornelius Cethegus on the testimony of Ennius (57-58), among others (60). Cicero writes that the judgment is sound (\textit{idoneus}) because Ennius writes about him posthumously, so there is no suspicion of him lying out of friendship (\textit{ex quo nulla suspicio est amicitiae causa esse esse mentitum}).

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. Cicero’s conception of history as a combination of \textit{monumenta} and \textit{ornamenta} (esp. \textit{de Orat.} 2.53) with Woodman 1988: 76-95.

\textsuperscript{72} Ridley 1983: 372 n. 2, heavily pushes the derivation of Liv. 8.40.4-5 from this passage. Certainly, there is much in common between the two assessments, and Livy reportedly has a high opinion of Cicero (see, e.g., Quint. 10.1.39; Walsh 1966: 119). There is no reason, however, to conclude that Livy is entirely reliant on Cicero’s assessment (cf. Oakley 1.30 n. 40). Regardless, the Livian passage has the trademarks of a programmatic statement for his history, especially with the 1\textsuperscript{st} person authorial assertion (\textit{reor}).
“And, indeed, some of these still exist: the families themselves keep them as if they are their own adornments and *monumenta*, and to use, if anyone of the same clan has died, and for remembrance of the glories of their house and for the perpetuation of their own great origins, though, by these laudations, our history is made rather deceitful. Many things are written in them that did not happen: false triumphs, additional consulships, even false lineages and shifts to plebeian status, when lower-born people blend into an unrelated clan of the same name. It is as if I were to say that I was descended from Manius Tullius, who was a patrician consul with Servius Sulpicius 10 years after the kings were expelled.”

To Cicero’s charge here of distortion in family commemoration—particularly in funerary praise and *monumenta*—Livy, as we have seen, adds the significant element of *falsi tituli* (8.40.4-5, above) as it applies to *monumenta*.

Fabrication of deeds, offices, and triumphs for the sake of family prestige is not the only issue of elite appropriation that Cicero discusses: he also mentions the active theft of commemorative power of *monumenta* by individuals through the device of inscription. In a tirade on the misdeeds of his mortal enemy Clodius, Cicero mentions his treatment of commemorative structures: *imperatorum monumenta evertit: inimicorum domus disturbavit: vestris monumentis suum nomen inscrisit. Infinita sunt scelera, quae ab illo in patriam sunt edita* (“he overturned the *monumenta* of commanders, he destroyed the homes of enemies, he etched his own name on your *monumenta*. His crimes that he committed against his fatherland are countless,” *de Har. Resp.* 58; cf. *de Dom.* 80, 137). Cicero paints Clodius’ behavior as a break from his family line rather than in promotion of it: the latter essentially gives up his

---

73 The removal of inscriptions is also an issue. See, e.g., Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.78-79.

74 Cf. Cic. *de Dom.* 102: *clarissimi viri mortui monumenta delebat et meam domum cum Flacci domo coniungebat* (“he destroyed the *monumenta* of the most famous man, now deceased, and joined the fate of my house with that of Flaccus”). For the inclusion of *nomen*, cf. *de Dom.* 100, *in conspectu prope totius urbis domus est mea, pontifices: in qua si manet illud non monumentum urbis, sed sepulcrum, inimico nomine inscriptum, demigrandum mihi potius aliquo est quam habitandum in ea urbe, in qua tropaia et de me et de re publica videam constituta* (“my home is visible to nearly the whole city, priests. And, if it stays here not as a *monumentum* of the city but a tomb, inscribed with the name of an enemy, I must depart somewhere else rather than live in this city, where I see trophies constructed both over me and the Republic”).
patrician status through adoption for a shot at the Tribunate. But the self-aggrandizing intention of Clodius’ original actions is obvious. The charge, however, loses some of its power in light of Cicero’s own pragmatic approach to personal prestige; for example, elsewhere he characterizes his private domicile as a *monumentum* of the state (*de Dom.* 137; see Ch. 2).

**Papirius Cursor and Fabius Rullianus: an aristocratic feud**

In a passage just preceding his lament of familial distortion of history (8.40.4-5), Livy also mentions the issue of leading figures attempting to claim the glory of another’s victory by the simple act of inscribing their name on *monumenta*, an act that greatly expands the potential for distortion of the object’s original intention. By its very lack of details, the plain inscription of a name allows for future embellishment or “expansion of the past”: without a more descriptive account, the name can become more prominent than the events themselves. The problem becomes more acute when the material *monumenta* are cast—and potentially distorted—through the lens of a literary *monumentum*. In his approach to other literary *monumenta*, Livy provides clues into where distortion may have taken place—as he does with their material kin; thus, he recasts the issue so that the story of the past remains, but possible manipulation is pointed out and drawn in question.

In one notable case, the theft is enacted by the inscription of a name on a pre-existing object; the story revolves around trophies of war and the ensuing discord between two generals. The term *monumentum* is not actually used, but the prevalence of *nomen* in the key passage (8.30.9) and the centrality of aristocratic competition connect this episode with others that

---

75 See, e.g., *de Har. Resp.* 57: *iste parentum nomen, sacra, memoriam, gentem Fonteiano nomine obruit* (“that man bowled over the name, rites, memory, and clan of his parents with the name Fonteius”).

76 Badian 1966: 11.
feature *monumenta* thematically.\(^{77}\) In this instance, the problems of personal accumulation of glory and divergence from past *exempla* unfold through a complex of contributing elements: that is, the narrative course of the individual episode steers interpretation, but episode directly preceding this one in Livy’s text features one of the characters in question and helps determine the intratextual impact. Further, the conflict that unfolds shows pronounced reference to a particular Livian *exemplum* from a previous section of the *Ab Urbe Condita*—that is, T. Manlius Torquatus, who had his own son killed for engaging an enemy against orders (8.7). The use of this *exemplum* has a negative value, in that it shows a virtue the Romans like to claim in its own right—bravery—perverted for the personal prestige and initiative of an ambitious, aristocratic figure. Using such a model from the past for present action fits well with Livy’s prefatory mission statement of selecting *exempla* for imitation (*praef*. 10), but the use to which this particular model is put raises issues.

The conflict arises after a successful engagement against the Samnites and their allies in 325 BC. The war occurs on two fronts, which fall by lots to the consuls: Junius Brutus Scaeva on the one front easily defeats the Vestini and gives the spoils to his troops (*praedam militibus…concessit*, 8.29.14), an act that stands in counterpoise with what occurs in the other theatre of battle. Camillus, the other consul, falls ill and is tasked with appointing a dictator (29.8-9).\(^{78}\) Camillus chooses L. Papirius Cursor, who appoints Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, the grandfather of the famous general of the Second Punic War, as master of the horse. Already at

---

\(^{77}\) Cf. Liv. 29.37.4-17. Here two censors, M. Livius Salinator and C. Claudius, engage in a series of petty contests against each other. They shamefully conclude their consulship by trying to harm the other’s reputation, which has adverse consequences for both their reputations (*foedum certamen inquinandi famam alterius cum suae famae damno factum est*, 11). The conflict is introduced by the use of the term *monumentum*, in this case to be public records of troop strength and wealth (*ut quantum numero militum, quantum pecunia valerent in publicis tabulis monumenta exstarent*, 7). It may be significant that *exemplum* also appears in this passage (15).

\(^{78}\) Perhaps Livy makes the absence of Camillus from this event pointed in so far as influence as the *exemplum par excellence* may have prevented discord.
the beginning Livy cues the reader to expect trouble by noting that the campaign is marked by
uncertain auspices (*incertis…auspiciis*, 30.1; cf. 34.4), but the conflict arises internally between
the dictator and master of the horse rather than externally with the Samnites: *par nobile rebus in
eo magistratu gestis, discordia tamen, qua prope ad ultimum dimicationis ventum est, nobilius*
(“they were equally famous for the deeds done during their offices, but they were more famous
for their strife, which nearly came to the point of a fight to the death,” 29.10). The impetus for
the feud involves Fabius initiating and winning an engagement and his subsequent treatment of
the prizes—elsewhere, a category of *monumentum* (see Ch. 1)—while the dictator is absent.

After the battle is won but before the spoils are handled, Livy interrupts his narrative with
a survey of previous treatments of the event, which serves as a further cue to the reader to
approach the following description with careful attention: *viginti milia hostium caesa eo die traduntur. Auctores habeo bis cum hoste signa conlata dictatore absente, bis rem egregie gestam; apud antiquissimos scriptores una haec pugna invenitur; in quibusdam annalibus tota res praetermissa est* (“tradition has it that twenty thousand of the enemy were killed that day. I find authors who say that, while the dictator was away, twice battle was met with the enemy, and twice the deed was accomplished outstandingly. Among the oldest writers, this was a single battle; in certain annals, the whole event is passed over,” 8.30.7). Whether there was a single

---

79 In later passages, Papirius, the son of the dictator, pays close attention to auspices. See, e.g., 10.39.8, 40.2-5, 9-14, 42.7.

80 Cf. Liv. 8.30.1: *cuius rei vitium non in belli eventum, quod prospere gestum est, sed in rabiem atque iras imperatorum vertit* (“the fault of this event was not in the outcome of the war, which was waged successfully, but in the subsequent madness and rage of the commanders”). The *topos* of discord between commanders recurs in Livy. It should be noted that several of these instances involve Fabii (e.g., Fabius Maximus and Minucius at 22.14.27-29).

81 Cf. Liv. 4.29.7, for another instance of two colleagues having a quarrel because of how dedications were handled while one of them was absent at the time (see Ch. 1).

82 As Chaplin 2000: 111, says, “Livy was picking and choosing among his sources when he assembled Fabius Rullianus’ career. Having described Fabius’ victory in Papirius’ absence, Livy then concedes that in some accounts
battle or two is less important for the following discussion, but the exclusion of the event entirely from certain accounts points to something significant: those who have written about the account may have a vested interest in how it is portrayed—even if it is portrayed—and, therefore, may use the story as an opportunity for self-serving distortion. In particular, Fabius Pictor may attempt an overly positive depiction of his ancestors, a point that Livy makes by way of a parenthetical remark.\(^{83}\)

After Fabius the master of the horse defeats the Samnites, he deals with the spoils in a peculiar way that illustrates issues of personal ambition as they coincide with *monumenta* (implicitly) and triumphs as another key form of aristocratic self-representation.\(^{84}\)

Magister equitum, ut ex tanta caede multis potitus spoliis, congesta in ingentem acervum hostilia arma subdito igne concremavit, seu votum id deorum cuipiam fuit, seu credere libet Fabio auctori eo factum, ne suae gloriae fructum dictator caperet nomenque ibi scriberet aut spolia in triumpho ferret. (8.30.8-9)\(^{85}\)

The master of the horse, after he took possession of so much booty from such a slaughter, piled the enemy arms in a huge heap and kindled a fire underneath to

---


84 For triumphs in Livy as a key occasion for aristocratic conflict, see Pittenger 2008. For the over-arching theme of spectacle as a mechanism for aristocratic representation and competition as well as its various manifestations, see Feldherr 1998.

85 Cf. Plin. *NH praef.* 30 on attempts to aggrandize on the triumphs of others. Though Livy presents as an alternative the version in which apprehension exists over Papirius’ potential appropriation of the spoils, it is the view that informs the following narrative and provides the point of contention for the episode. See, e.g., Fabius’ words about the dictator to the soldiers at 8.31.2-3: *venire amentem invidia, iratum virtuti alienae felicitatique; furere quod se absente res publica egregia gesta esset; malle, si mutare fortunam posset, apud Samnites quam Romanos victoriam esse; imperium dictitare spretum, tamquam non eadem mente pugnari vetuerit qua pugnatum doleat* (“he comes maddened by envy, angry at the excellence and good fortune of another. He rages because a great deed is done for the Republic while he was away. He would prefer, if fortune could be changed, that the Samnites win rather than the Romans. He doggedly states that his command has been slighted, as though he did not forbid the fight with the same motive as he was pained by the fight”). See also Liv. *per.* 99 on Q. Metellus’ claim that Pompey stole the glory of his achievements (*queritur Q. Metellus gloriam sibi rerum a se gestarum a Pompeio praeverit*).
burn them: this act was either an offering to some god, or—if one trusts Fabius as a source—it was done so that the dictator not seize the benefit of his own glory and write his name on the spoils or carry them in triumph.

Thus, the discord on the one view stems from an unwillingness on Fabius’ part to concede or even share glory, here particularly in the form of material goods denied to the dictator for inscription and triumph. In other words, if Fabius cannot have them, no one can. On the other hand, the subsequent narrative shows that Fabius was correct—at least, in part—to mistrust the ambitions of Papirius: the latter subsequently attempts to have Fabius killed under the pretense of maintaining military discipline. As discussed above, the potential for inscription of a nomen to reassign the accolades to another, not their intended recipient, resonates with the act of doing so on other monumenta and, thus, to appropriate unearned reputation among posterity. Both parties in the conflict claim that the other has violated a significant Roman value: Papirius charges Fabius with a lack of disciplina; Fabius charges Papirius with acting like a tyrant. In the end, both seem to be acting for their own personal prestige, not for the good of the state.

Upon hearing what Fabius has done, Papirius sets out for the camp full of threats and anger (plenus minarum iraeque, 8.30.12). But, more significantly, he invokes a figure of the near past, “praising the deed of T. Manlius with nearly every other word” (alternis paene verbis T. Manli factum laudantem, 30.13; cf. 34.2). Thus, Papirius casts himself as another Manlius. Though the younger Manlius had been victorious, the elder Manlius determines that his son’s value will be as a model against ignoring military decorum and has him killed: the model is sorrowful but beneficial for the future (triste exemplum sed in posterum salubre, 8.7.17), a

---

86 For discussion of writing names on spoils as a means of magnifying personal glory and other instances of that practice, see Oakley 2.712-14, 781. As a point of partial support for my argument that Livy views excessive competition as ingrained in Roman politics from the beginning, Oakley concludes: “this passage shows that already in [Fabius Pictor’s] day there was rivalry over aristocratic self-advertisement” (2.714), an inclination that must have worsened amid the dynastic struggles of the 1st BC.
sentiment that Livy seems to mirror in his authorial assessment (22). But, whereas Manlius’ earlier harshness by all appearances represents a true belief on what is best for the Republic, Papirius’ intentions are troubled by the possibility of his own aggrandizement in the act. And he attempts to establish a dangerous privilege for the dictatorship in his invocation of Manlius.

To counter Papirius’ search for retribution, the master of the horse has to rely on his own family history of prestige. Fabius’ father, a former consul and dictator himself, defends his son from Papirius’ punishment by charging the dictator with the tyrannical trait of superbia. He further accuses Papirius of a most disturbing intention: Papirium tamquam ex hostium ducibus, sic ex Romano imperatore victoriam et triumphum petere (“Papirius, as if over the leaders of enemies, is seeking a victorious triumph over a Roman commander,” 8.33.13). The thought of Romans triumphing over other Romans certainly has parallels in Livy’s own time.

---

87 See Kraus 1998: 270. Cf. exemplum and salubre here with præf. 10. For the significance of exempla in both the Manlius episode and that of Papirius and Fabius, see Elliott 2009b: Chaplin 2000: 108-14 (specifically for the interaction between an older and younger commander). See also Oakley 2.436-39, who reads authorial ambivalence about such harsh discipline in both episodes.

88 For another potential self-initiative attempted by prestige of the office of dictator, see Liv. 7.3. The instance revolves around the appointment of a dictator to drive a nail into the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus as a means of measuring time (5-8). But one appointee tries to pervert this function: qua de causa creatus L. Manlius, perinde ac rei gerendae ac non solvendae religionis gratia creatus esset, bellum Hermicum adventans dilectu acerbo iuventutem agitavit; tandemque omnibus in eum tribunis plebis coortis seu vi seu verecundia victus dictura abiti (“for this reason, L. Manlius was appointed. But thereupon, as if he had been appointed for the sake of waging war and not fulfilling a religious obligation, he aimed at war with the Hernicii and harassed the youth with a harsh levy. In the end, all the tribunes of the plebs rose against him, and, whether overcome by force or shame, he abdicated his dictatorship”).

89 As Oakley 1.519, points out, “superbus and superbia were political catchwords in the late Republic, which one could apply to opponents whose behavior was, or could be held to be, authoritarian and arrogant. In particular, superbia was equated with the behavior of tyrants.”

90 See Liv. 6.16.5-8 for the public outrage that can be excited by a charge of a Roman gaining triumph over other Romans. In this passage, the faction of M. Manlius Capitolinus levels the charge against the dictator Aulus Cornelius Cossus for attempting to curtail Manlius’ seditious ambitions. Cf. 38.52.5 for the charge of triumphing over the Roman people, posed by the tribunes of the plebs against Scipio Africanus—see also 53.7, where the charge is turned around.
Concerning the character of Papirius, Livy may provide a bit of foreshadowing that is generally passed over without comment or taken as an instance of Livy’s poor practices as an historian. This foreshadowing provides a further window into the self-serving character of Papirius. Preceding the war with the Samnites, Livy briefly narrates the abolition of *nexum*, Roman debt-slavery.\(^91\) The stimulus for the abolition originates with one man: *mutatum autem ius ob unius feneratoris simul libidinem simul crudelitatem insignem. L. Papirius is fuit* (“but the law was changed due to the extreme lust and cruelty of a single usurer. He was L. Papirius,” 8.28.1).\(^92\) This Papirius takes possession of and violates the son of a debtor, which leads to public outcry and legislation against such acts.\(^93\)

Oakley comments that this figure is otherwise unknown.\(^94\) It is certainly possible that this is a typical case of Roman prosopographical confusion: no cognomen is provided in the text for secure identification. But Livy’s description of character suggests that this Papirius is to be identified as Cursor. In particular, lust and cruelty are given two more times as defining characteristics of the character in the immediate episode (*ad libidinem et contumeliam*, 6:

---

\(^91\) For the confusion of names and details in the various accounts of this story, along with the accounts themselves, see Oakley 2.688-91. Oakley points out that the name of the violator and the violated, Publilius, are the same as the names of the consuls in the year of the Caudine disaster (9.7.15) but draws no further conclusion from this point. Cf. W & M 3.273.

\(^92\) Cf. Liv. 8.28.8: *victum eo die ob impotentem iniuriam unius ingens vinculum fidei* (“an enormous bond of credit was overcome that day on account of the senseless wrongdoing of one man”; cf. 36.3: *in uno viro L. Papirio*). This *unus* is not the same as the *unus vir* that has the potential to save the state in Livy’s history (see the note in Ch. 3), but the similarity is clear. For the concept of *unus vir* as it relates to the Fabii in Livy, see Santoro L’hoir 1990: esp. 230-32.

\(^93\) The *OCD* says that Livy depicts Papirius Cursor as a co-author of the law to abolish debt-slavery, along with Poetelius Libo Visolus, based on the information that they were the two consuls of the year (*s.vv. Poetelius and Papirius Cursor*), but the only mention of a Papirius in the passage above is the one that violated the youth. It should also be noted that Livy mentions discrepancy over the cognomen of the consul Papirus, either Mugillanus or Cursor (*Cursorem in aliis annalibus invenio*, 8.23.17). Varro places the passage of the Lex Poetelia in 313 BC (*LL 7.105*). See *MRR* 1.146-47.

\(^94\) Oakley 2.691.
libidinem crudelitatemque; cf. 6.14.3). Then, crudelitas is later used three times to describe Papirius Cursor in his dealings with Fabius (8.31.1, 33.11, 13), providing a verbal connection that seems to indicate that these two Papirii are the same or, at least, share a negative trait that can be taken as dynastic through genealogical commonality.95 Before dismissing the “confusion” across the narrative as a sign of Livy’s ineptitude as an historian, the repetition of language and theme warrants examination first as intentional signposting.96 Thus, the dictator who attempts to act so harshly in the subsequent episode is already established as a potentially negative figure in this initial episode.

For the episode in which the conflict occurs, Livy’s treatment of his sources for the story adds a further element in need of attention for its methodological implications. Following his mention of previous historical treatments of this event (8.30.7), Livy specifies one, at least, of the antiquissimi scriptores as Fabius Pictor. Further, Pictor’s account is given as an alternative, and Livy casts a good deal of doubt on it (seu credere libet, 8.30.9),97 but it is, in fact, that version—reimagined by Livy, of course—that dominates the subsequent account: Cursor does take Fabius Rullianus’ actions as a threat to his primacy. Rather than allow for the spoils to be offered as a vow to the gods—a suitably pious act—the account leaves the reader with a version of the event in which petty rivalry and personal pride take point.

95 For Roman expectations of typical behavior established across family lines, see Levene 2010: esp. 177; Walter 2004b; Richard 1972. For family stereotyping as a possible structural device in Livy, see Vasaly 2002: esp. 283. See also Vasaly 2015: esp. 55-76, for more degenerating forms of dynastic behavior in Livy.

96 See, however, Levene 2010: 63-74, esp. 73-74, for the theory of the “indexing fallacy” in which modern readers feel the need to catalogue every instance where a figure is mentioned as cross-referenced to every other instance in a systematic way. Levene—particularly for the third decade—argues that this method would not fit with Livy’s practices as an ancient historian, though he does not deny that certain characters are meant to develop in meaningful ways over progressive portions of text. I do not think that Levene’s indexing fallacy applies in the case of these two Papirii—nor does Levene address this particular instance.

97 Casting doubt on the accounts of an antiquissimus scriptor clashes with Livy’s stated practice elsewhere concerning authors of Roman history, esp. Fabius Pictor (see below).
The phrase that concedes to the reader the choice of believing Pictor (seu credere libet) finds a possible verbal parallel in Livy’s first pentad, where he narrates a migration of Gauls across the Alps: Alpes inde oppositae erant; quas inexsuperables visas haud equidem miror nulladum via, quod quidem continens memoria sit, nisi de Hercule fabulis credere libet, superatas (“There the Alps blocked the way. I am not at all surprised that they seemed unpassable since they had yet to be crossed by any route, at least, in so far as can be recalled, unless one believes tales about Hercules,” 5.34.6; cf. Cic. de Div. 2.113, discussed in Ch. 3).98

Thus, Pictor’s own account (Fabio auctori, 8.30.9) seems akin—I would argue intentionally on Livy’s part—to a fabula no more trustworthy than one about, perhaps, the greatest figure of myth.99 This passage recalls Livy’s prefatory remark hinting at the distinction between his source

---

98 For the Alps as a standard place in narrative accounts where history and myth intertwine, see Poly. 3.47.6-9: ἔνιοι δὲ τὸν γεγραφὸν περὶ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς ταύτης, βουλόμενοι τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ἐκπλήττειν τῇ περὶ τῶν προειρήμενον τόπων παραδοξολογία, λανθάνουσιν ἐμπίπτοντες εἰς δύο τὰ πάσης ἱστορίας ἀλλοτριώτατα· καὶ γὰρ ψευδολογεῖν καὶ μαχαίρεια γράφειν αὐτοῖς ἀναγκάζονται. ἀμα μὲν γὰρ τὸν Ἀνήνιαν ἀμήμητόν τινα παρεισάγοντας στρατηγίαν καὶ τόλμη καὶ προνοία τοῦτον ὠμολογομένον ἀποδεικνύον μὴν ἄλογοτότατον, ἀμα δὲ καταστροφὴν οὐ δυνάμενοι λαμβάνειν οὐδὲ ἐξόδον τοῦ ψεύδους θεοῦ καὶ θεῶν παίδας εἰς πραγματικὴν ἱστορίαν παρεισάγουσιν. ὑποθέλουσιν γὰρ τὰς ἐρμονήσεις καὶ τραχύτητας τῶν Ἀλπεῖν ὄρων τοιαύτας ὡστε μὴ οἶσθιν ὕποις καὶ στρατόπεδα, σὺν δὲ τούτως ἐλέγοντας, ἀλλὰ ἡπὶ τε πεζοὺς εὐξόνους εὐχερὸς ἄν διελθείην, ὡμοίος δὲ καὶ τὴν ἔρημον τοιαύτην τινὰ περὶ τοὺς τόπους ὑπογράφαντες ἢμιν ὡστ’ εἰ μὴ θεοὶ δὲ τὶς ἔρως ἀπαντήσασι τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀνήνιαν ὑποδείξας τὰς ὁδοὺς, ἐξαπορήσασιν ἄν καταφθάρησι πάντας, ὠμολογομένοις εἰς τοῦτον εἰς ἐκάτερον τῶν προειρήμενον ἀμαρτημάτων ἐμπίπτοντος ("some who write about [Hannibal’s] crossing of the Alps, in a desire to impress their readers by the marvelousness of their narrative, do not notice that they fall into two elements most unsuitable for full history: they are forced both to falsify and compose contradictory elements. They depict Hannibal as a general unmatched in daring and foresight, while simultaneously showing him to us as most lacking in prudence. Therein, they cannot come to terms with their falsehood or find an escape from it. Thus, they introduce gods and the offspring of gods into pragmatic history. They describe the Alps as so steep and trackless that not only horses and the soldiers on those famed elephants could not easily cross them, but even hardy foot soldiers. At the same time, they narrate to us about the desolation of the region such that, unless some god or hero met Hannibal and showed him the way, his full force would have gotten lost and perished. Thus, they fall into each of those aforementioned errors"). Walbank 1.381 suggests Chaereas, Sosylus, and Silenus of Callaeact as possible recipients of Polybius’ opprobrium and adds further reference to the sort of sensationalist history that Polybius attributes to Timaeus and Phylarchus (2.16.14, 56.10-13). On Livy’s engagement with this passage, see Feldherr 2009: esp. 313-15, 321-23.

99 There may be objections to the idea of taking these two passages as deliberate intratexts, but, regardless, the sentiment expressed in both cases reflects a wider tendency of how Livy may approach sources in his narrative, particularly where believability is in doubt. See also Livy’s use of this sort of expression on Valerius Antias’ authority: 33.10.8 (si Valerio qui credat); 36.19.12 (quid si Antiati Valerio credamus); 39.41.6 (si Antiati Valerio credere libet); 44.13.12 (si Valerio Antiati credas). Cf. 26.49.3; 30.3.6; 33.6.5-8; 33.10.8; 29.43.1-4; etc. See the note in Ch. 3 on the charge against Antiat that he tends to magnify the role of the Valerii in his history.
materials (*praef. 6*), here more clearly a distinction between history and myth: though the myth is mentioned in the account, it is no more than a parenthetical remark, not worthy of further thought or belief. But, as discussed above, *fabulae* are a fundamental part of Livy’s history. Indeed, Livy himself narrates a tale about Hercules full of mythic elements, including mention of the monster Geryon and the slaying of Cacus (1.7.4-15); the story even produces a *monumentum* of sorts in the Ara Maxima (10-11). Just as he includes that *fabula* of Hercules, Livy also includes the story relayed by “the most ancient authors” about Fabius Rullianus and Papirius Cursor. The two stories—though seemingly so different in character—have much in common as they are depicted in the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

**Livy and other writers**

As discussed above on 6.1 and 8.40, Livy establishes the unavailability of reliable material and written—that is, inscribed or other documentary—*monumenta* in his examination of Roman history and what it reveals of the larger society. But there is a further implication that emerges from comparing the two passages, namely in how Livy treats literary sources in their capacity as *monumenta*, especially historical accounts.¹⁰⁰ Livy writes that *litterae* are the only reliable safeguard for preserving the past (*una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum*, 6.1.2), but, at 8.40, he makes it clear that this written guarantor does not necessarily derive from eulogies or inscriptions beneath ancestor masks and other forms of family commemoration, which seek a more beneficial reception of their own subjects. Larger scale literary *monumenta*, however, do not necessarily offer an alternative to these more limited forms of written evidence. Further, literary *monumenta* may draw their material from family-based history, though they are supposedly designed with a larger public in mind.

¹⁰⁰ See Ch. 2 for discussion of literature as *monumenta.*
At first glance, the authority of Livy’s custodia does rely on literary writers, particularly contemporary ones (aequalis temporibus illis scriptor . . . quo satis certo auctore stetur, 40.5; cf. 22.7.4); the issue in the case of 8.40 is that such an author does not exist for that time. For other time periods, however, the same issue does not stand, or, at least, authors closer in time can make up some of the difference. There does seem to be a sort of reverence when Livy refers to veterrimos or antiquissimos auctores. But, as with the seemingly definitive differentiation between monumenta and fabulae at Preface 6, the notion of older sources—including contemporaneous authorities—as guarantees for accuracy is complicated in numerous places: even writers of contemporary history have their flaws, as Livy suggests for Fabius’ believability at 8.30.9.

---

101 See 2.18.5 (apud veterrimos . . . auctores), 8.30.7 (apud antiquissimos auctores, discussed above). For Fabius particularly, see 1.44.2 (scriptorum antiquissimius Fabius Pictor); 2.40.10 (apud Fabium, longe antiquissimum auctorem). Cf. 1.55.8. Ogilvie 6-7 characterizes these phrases as “lordly allusions” and cautions against taking them seriously. They are meant, however, to have some impact. For various discussion of these phrases, see Rich 2018: esp. 47, 51-52; Haimson Lushkov 2013; Oakley 2009: 447-49; Forsythe 1999: 52-64, esp. 59-60. Cf. Sailor 2006: esp. 336: “Now and then, Livy breaks the narrative to expose the process that produced it. He tells us he has chosen a version because it is supported by more authorities or by the oldest ones, or because it seems more probable; he also concerns himself with the mendacity of particular historians.”

102 A recurring issue for Livy on authors closer in time to—if not necessarily contemporaneous with—the events in question is their silence or lack of details on significant matters. See, e.g., 3.23.7: certum adfirmare, quia nulla apud vetustiores scriptores eius rei mentio est, non ausim (“but I would not dare to confirm [a revolt of the Antiates] since there is no mention of the matter in the older writers”); 6.12.2-3: non dubito, praeter satietatem tot iam libris adsidua bella cum Volscis gesta legentibus illud quoque succursurum, quod mihi percensenti proiores temporibus harum rerum auctores miraculo fuit, unde totiens victis Volscis et Aequis suffecerint milites. Quod cum ab antiquis tacitum praetermissum sit, cuius tandem ego rei praeter opinionem, quae sua cuique coniectante esse potest, auctor sim? (“despite the fulsomeness of so many books now, I have no doubt that what was marvelous to me—as I surveyed writers closer in time to these events—will occur also to those reading about the constant wars waged against the Volscians: namely, where did the Volscians and Aequians get enough troops after so many defeats. But, since the ancients pass it over in silence, how shall I ultimately write of the matter, except by drawing the same opinion which is available to each person through conjecture?” See Kraus 160-61 on this passage); 10.46.7: quam in ipsa dimicatione votam apud neminem veterem auctorem invenio neque hercule tam exiguo tempore perficere potuisse (“I find no ancient authority that [the Temple of Quirinus] was vowed in the conflict itself, nor, indeed, could it be completed in so short a time”). Cf. 29.14.9: id qubus virtutibus inducti ita iudicarint, sicut traditum a proximis memoriae temporum illorum scriptoribus libens posteris traderem, ita meas opiniones coniectando rem vetustate obrutam non interponam (“If writers who lived nearest in time to men who remembered those days had handed down by what virtues the senate was led to make that judgment, I should indeed gladly hand it on to posterity. But I shall not interject my own opinions, reached by conjecture in a matter buried by the lapse of time”). See also 10.37.13-14 for Fabius Pictor not providing specific details about consuls.
Elsewhere, Livy casts doubt on what should be his greatest source on a particular matter in accordance with the authority of contemporary eyewitness: that is, Cincius Alimentus, an active participant in the Second Punic War and, reportedly, a prisoner of Hannibal himself:

Quantae copiae transgresso in Italiam Hannibali fuerint nequaquam inter auctores constat. Qui plurimum, centum milia peditum viginti equitum equum fuisse scribunt; qui minimum, viginti milia peditum sex equitum. L. Cincius Alimentus, qui captum se ab Hannibale scribit, maxime auctor moveret, nisi confunderet numerum Gallis Liguribusque additis: cum his octoginta milia peditum, decem equitum adducta— in Italia magis adfluxisse veri simile est, et ita quidam auctores sunt. Ex ipso autem audisse Hannibale, postquam Rhodanum transierit, triginta sex milia hominum ingentemque numerum equorum et aliorum iumentorum amisset.

Authors do not at all agree on the size of Hannibal’s forces when he crossed into Italy. Those at the high end of the range record that there were 100,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry; those at the low end, 20,000 infantry and 6,000 cavalry. L. Cincius Alimentus writes that he was captured by Hannibal; he would be an especially compelling author, if he did not confuse the number by adding Gauls and Ligurians. Including these, he says that Hannibal led 80,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry—it is more likely that they joined in Italy, and so say certain authors. Moreover, Cincius says that he heard from Hannibal himself that, after he crossed the Rhone, he lost 36,000 troops and a huge number of horses and other pack animals.

Thus, Livy returns to a practice that he proposed in an earlier section: veri simile est – in rebus tam antiquis si quae similia veri sint pro veris accipientur, satis habeam (“my view is that I ought to make allowance for it if—in stories dating to so long a time ago—probable accounts are believed instead of true ones,” 5.21.9; discussed in Ch. 3). Only, in the later passage, extreme antiquity cannot be blamed for Livy’s acceptance of likelihood (veri simile), especially since there is a—perhaps the most—contemporary authority (aequalis temporibus illis scriptor, 8.40.5) on the matter. But, all the same, Livy chooses to follow the vaguely defined category of “certain authors” (quidam auctores).

---

103 Luce 1977: 141, refers to this approach as “the commonsense yardstick of likelihood.”
I do not mean to say that Livy distrusts contemporary writers as a rule. He clearly wants
to be able to rely on their authority; that, at least, is the impression that he gives at 8.40.5. But he
makes it clear that he cannot take such authority for granted, just as neither he nor his readers can
rely on material *monumenta* to establish a window to the past that provides an unconflicted and
relatively bias-free view. Contemporary writers may lean heavily on their own family records for
their accounts, a significant aspect of which must revolve around the types of funerary
commemorations that Livy charges as a traditional source of distortion.104 Indeed, Livy openly
accuses one of his predecessors, Licinius Macer, of just such personally focused distortion.
According to Livy, Macer reports the efforts of a consular ancestor in thwarting the improper
ambitions of his colleague, to which Livy responds: *quaesita ea propriae familiae laus leviorem
auctorem Licinium facit* (“this praise sought for his own family makes Licinius a more frivolous
authority,” 7.9.5).105 Yet, Livy provides the information, despite his criticism of the source.
Through this comment, Livy certainly is drawing a comparison between himself and his
predecessor here, but there is the further implication that family distortion is apparent in Roman
history and that it should be scrutinized.

As Livy depicts it, the earliest historians are also not entirely immune to the tendency to
distort. Indeed, in discussing the losses reported by historians for the Battle of Lake Trasimene,
Livy applies the charge of distortion as a general tendency of writers: *multiplex caedes utrimque*

104 For discussion of family records as a basis for historical accounts and the potential for misinformation therein, see *FRHist* 1.176-78; Hardie 2012: 231-32; Timpe 2011; Dillery 2009: 84–90; Oakley 1.28-33, 98-99; Marincola 1997: 99-101; Cornell 1986: 82-83; Wiseman 1986: 90; Ridley 1983; Wiseman 1979: 113–39. As Badian 1966: 1, says, “That family records, in a state in which high office conferred nobility, went back a long way is self-evident.” The long-standing existence, of course, of such documentation does not eliminate the enormous potential for distortion or counterfeiting. As Dillery 2009: 86, says: “the favoring of one’s own *gens* in an historical account meant not just the partisan advocacy or defense of an important clan member from earlier times, but also the telling of the Roman past through the lens of an aristocratic family’s past. Indeed, even famous figures unrelated to a particular historical episode could be brought within the orbit of familial re-telling.”

105 See Last and Ogilvie 1958.
facta traditur ab aliis; ego, praeterquam quod nihil auctum ex vano velim, quo nimis inclinant
ferme scribentium animi, Fabium aequalem temporibus huiusce belli potissimum
auctorem habui (“the bloodshed visited upon either side is made severalfold by some; besides
the fact that I want nothing exaggerated needlessly—an inclination that most writers have in
excess—I have chosen Fabius as the best source for this war, since he is coeval with it,” 22.7.4).
In a battle so famous and memorable, an inclination towards magnification is perhaps
understandable, but Livy’s parenthetical remark should not be ignored. Fabius is the best
because he is a contemporary of the event, but he certainly is not excused from the charge of
distortion. This issue is both widespread (ferme) and excessive (nimis).

Conclusion

The question stands, why does Livy cite other authors, especially since he persistently
displays lack of trust in their authority? Citations do show some sense of the extent to which
Livy engages with the historical tradition. But if he were only displaying his own considerable
efforts, one might expect him to specify all of the authors that he has read, rather than a partial
and often vague list. Certainly, there is a comparative element in establishing a value-based
difference between Livy and other authors. But if he were attempting only to establish his own
superior authority, an authoritative presentation—in which sources are rarely named or are not
mentioned at all—would seem to work better, such as the narrative approach of Thucydides.

Livy may offer some insight into his intentions with source citations in Book 8. The
episode involves the first documented case of poisoning in Rome. Livy writes:

Foedus insequens annus seu intemperie caeli seu humana fraude fuit, M. Claudio
Marcello C. Valerio consulibus. Flaccum Potitumque varie in annalibus
cognomen consulis invenio; ceterum in eo parvi refert quid veri sit; illud

---

106 As Livy says, haec est nobilis ad Trasumennum pugna atque inter paucas memorata populi Romani clades (“so
goes the famous battle at Trasimene, a disaster memorable like few others to the Roman people,” 22.7.1).
The following year was awful, either because of the harsh weather or human deceit. M. Claudius Marcellus and C. Valerius were consuls. I find that the cognomen of one consul varies in the annals between Flaccus and Potitus; but this is no reflection of what the truth is. In one respect—and not all authors agree—I would prefer the traditional story to be untrue, namely that the people whose deaths made the year notable for disease were killed by poison. All the same, the account must be presented as it is passed down, lest I deprive any author of their trustworthiness.

This passage repeats many of the elements discussed above, particularly the indeterminacy of the details (quid veri sit ~ similia veri sint, 5.21.9; veri simile est, 21.38.4; simillima veri sunt, 26.49.6). Here, the issue of truth revolves around the minor point of a consul’s cognomen, but Livy further mentions that authorities disagree about the whole story (nec omnes auctores sunt; cf. varie in annalibus). Livy here, however, goes further by expressing a wish that the reported tradition be false. It is hard to reconcile the level of doubt that these sentiments encourage with their inclusion in the history, but Livy seems to bypass that doubt by insisting that each source be given their due (ne cui auctorum fidem abrogaverim). Thus, Livy inserts his own opinion as author and historian—that is, that this story represents the worst of what the Roman past has to

---

107 Cf. 21.46.10 on the tradition of Scipio Africanus saving his father. Livy gives two possibilities: that the elder Scipio was saved by a Ligurian slave; or his son saved him. As if a final word on the matter, Livy says: malim equidem de filio verum esse, quod et plures tradidero auctores et fama obtinuit (“Certainly, I would prefer the story about his son to be true, in that many authors have handed down [that version] and general report holds it to be the case”). But the subjunctive verb indicates that majority opinion and fama do not necessarily place the variant beyond doubt. Livy’s preference seems to stem more from the value of Scipio as an exemplum in saving his father—though that version is not unconflicted, a point that may reflect on the involvement of family records in the transmission of the story.

108 For the phrase nec omnes auctores and its similarity to various forms of the phrase in annalibus in Livy, see Oakley 2.195.

109 See Luce 1977: esp. 144-47.
offer, though Livy does establish that even negative *exempla* have their purpose (*praef.* 10, esp. *foedum ~ foedus*, above)—but he still passes along the tradition as it stands (*sic ut proditur tamen res*), despite the inherent issues concerning truth and disagreement.

But there may be more at work here—and, by extension, in the rest of the *Ab Urbe Condita*—than a simple deference to tradition, especially in that Livy casts significant doubt on much of what has been passed down as history, both with the subtle act of providing variant accounts and with direct skepticism on what other authors have reported. As Livy suggests, Roman history is not an unbiased affair: the public and private spheres are pervasively conflated; authors have vested interests in how they portray history; families control and, in many ways, create the influence of their ancestors; and the use to which the past is put is determined by the initiatives and prerogatives of people in the present. But Livy does not insert himself into this crowd of writers by doing more of the same. Rather than attempt an historical account that ignores or denies accepted accounts of the past, Livy includes those accounts; but, by presenting the traditional sources of Roman history in a way that acknowledges their shortcomings and biases, he offers his readers the opportunity to see how self-aggrandizement in the practice of history-writing has shaped the past rather than the other way around. In other words, Livy’s *monumentum* differs from those of others because he includes those other literary *monumenta*. But his inclusion of these *monumenta* reveals their original bias and recasts them for the lasting benefit of all rather than that of a limited group. Like Thucydides’ κτήμα ἐς αἰεί (1.22.4), Livy’s history surpasses agonistic works that look to temporary and immediate ends; his is a *monumentum* built to last.
VI. Conclusion

In the Latin language, the ideal conception of *monumentum* as a term indicates that the construction—whether material or written—provides a solid point of continuity between past and present, secures the remembrance of its particular referent(s), and creates a sort of reserved space—ideally both eternal and sacred—in which the commemorated person or event can outlast the regular limits of transience. Livy, however, does not offer such an optimistic view of the *monumenta* that mark the progression of his history, both in how they can overlap and how they can contradict. He repeatedly shows the complications that occur with *monumenta* in practice, not only confusion as a consequence of time’s passage but also deliberate distortion as a mechanism for Roman aristocratic, competitive self-fashioning, in which recentness has a greater impact than venerability on reception. Thereby, in addition to revealing the problematic nature of investigating Rome’s past, Livy’s account reflects elements of his contemporary society, including issues with the traditional power-politics of that society.

A key feature of Livy’s depiction of *monumenta* is the slippage that occurs between them as supposedly privileged preservers of historical information and other traditional sources that are presumably less accurate carriers of past information, such as *famae*, *fabulae*, and *miracula*. In this respect, Livy makes his *monumenta* serve as an historiographical workshop; through this workshop, Livy offers insight to his readers into how, by whom, and for what purpose Roman history-writing has traditionally been carried out. Further, Livy’s depiction of his various *monumenta* and the context of their creation can help to suggest his socio-political perspective on Rome’s governing class and the means by which that class maintains its societal preeminence—practices that have brought a remarkable state to the point of collapse (*praef*. 4). In particular,
Livy subtly brings to the readers’ attention the degenerative problems of factionalism, a tendency encouraged by the traditional competitiveness of the Roman aristocracy, which often plays out through *monumenta*; that is, Livy offers unique insights into Roman society that are freer from the biases and blindspots of an historian more engrained and vested in the system, and that offer an outsider’s perspective on Rome—both its admirable qualities and its detrimental ones.

Because Livy’s account of Rome’s past has so heavily informed our understanding of that past and because he so thoroughly captures the Roman mindset in his narrative, it has often been assumed that Livy would have the same viewpoints and cultural characteristics as an upper class Roman, fully engrained within that aristocratic system. Such assumptions have often constructed a conflicting view of Livy as an historian. Arguments for Livy’s ideological stance have ranged dramatically, from diehard Republican to sycophantic mouthpiece for the Julio-Claudian dynasty (see above). Because it often determines how Livy’s potential stance on his contemporary society is assessed, it is worthwhile to reexamine the idea of Livy as “Augustan” or “Republican.” By way of a conclusion, I argue that these identifiers force entirely too strong and specifically Roman stances on the historian. A more moderate approach is needed to allow the notion of Livy as an historian of Rome rather than as a Roman historian, which would make his particular perspective more valuable in that it offers a view of the past different from other Roman historical accounts, one freer from the standard biases. Further, the basis for such factional assessments of Livy rests on evidence that is not at all definitive.

**Livy “Pompeianus”**

In his account of the reign of Tiberius, Tacitus narrates the stifling influence that an emperor can have on an historian’s freedom of expression. The event takes place in 25 AD, when two clients of Sejanus charge the historian Cremutius Cordus with an entirely novel crime (*novo*
actum primum audito crimine, Ann. 4.34.1), namely that, when he published his annals, he praised Brutus and Cassius as the last of the Romans (editis annalibus laudatoque M. Bruto C. Cassium Romanorum ultimum dixisset; cf. Suet. Tib. 61.3). Cremonius as an historical figure was famed for his frankness. But Tacitus’ presentation of Cremonius shows that the historian’s downfall results from the conditions under which he produces his praise of the “Liberators” rather than the novelty of such praise, a point that comes across especially in the speech that Tacitus attributes to Cremonius.

In this speech, Cremonius provides a list of Republican precedents to defend himself, though he knows that he is doomed to death (relinquendae vitae certus, 4.34.2):

“My words, Conscript Fathers, are being prosecuted: yet, of crimes I am blameless. And these words are not against the princeps or his father, whom the law of treason protects: I am charged with praising Brutus and Cassius, about whose deeds very many have written, and no one has recorded without honor. Titus Livy, a man renowned among the foremost for his eloquence and trustworthiness, praised Cn. Pompey so much that Augustus called him

---

1 For general discussion of Cremonius Cordus, see FRHist 1.497-501; McHugh 2004; Rogers 1965.

2 See, e.g., Quint. Inst. 10.1.104: habet amatores—nec inmerito—Cremoni libertas, quamquam circumcisis quae dixisse ei nocuerat: sed elatum abunde spiritum et audaces sententias deprehendas etiam in iis quae manent (“the openness of Cremonius has its admirers—and not undeservedly—though the parts, the speaking of which caused him harm, have been cut; but lofty spirit and bold expressions can be found in abundance in what remains”). See also Dio 57.24.2-4.

3 As Martin and Woodman 1989: 176-77, point out, “[Cremonius Cordus] has little historical significance beyond the present episode but is the only historian in the whole of classical historiography to play so active a role or deliver a speech. T.’s unique presentation of a fellow historian in the context of his historiography is thus memorable and suggestive.”
'Pompeianus,' but this did not deter their friendship. Nowhere are Scipio, Afranius, this very Cassius, this Brutus called thief or parricide, terms which are imposed nowadays; often he refers to them just as notable men. Asinius Pollio’s writings pass down very favorable remembrance of the same men; Messalla Corvinus glorified Cassius as his own commander. And they both flourished with wealth and honors.”

For Cremutius, this list of historians counterpoises the death of free-speech and any vestiges of the Republic. But, this passage has often served as a central point of evidence in attempting to define Livy’s political stance. And, as mentioned above, discussions generally have placed Livy in one camp or another: either he has been made into a sycophant for the new regime based on the notion of amicitia with Augustus; or he has been made into an outspoken advocate for the old system. But such assessments seek a strong factional stance for Livy, one that he would have no obvious investment in, other than a general admiration—by no means an uncomplicated one—for the Roman state and the values that contributed to its greatness. Since it is the central point by which a strongly Republican Livy is conceived, the quip Pompeianus warrants rethinking.

Livy is not the only Roman historian to be characterized as Pompeian. Indeed, the adjective seems to have been a catchword for factionalism during the early emperial period, that is, as a designator for those who opposed the principate in some form. Seneca the Elder makes a similar assessment in his description of the character of T. Labienus, a relative of Caesar’s

---

4 See Ch. 4, esp. nn. 9-10.

5 As Syme 1938: 125, says, “There were ‘Pompeiani’ of very different types in the Principate of Augustus; and the word itself is ambiguous. As the Latin language lacked a single word to express the meaning of ‘Republican’ or ‘anti-Caesarian,’ the term ‘Pompeianus’ was called into service. Republicanism, of course, was highly respectable in the Principate of Augustus. As for Pompeius Magnus, however, his violent, illegal and treacherous career resembled far too closely that of the ruler of Rome to make a complete rehabilitation anything but uncomfortable. Pompeius was not a true champion of the Republic. Still, Pompeius, though unedifying in his life, had become sanctified by dying for the Republic against Caesar; and Caesar was a ‘bad man,’ politically suppressed by the heir to his name and power.” See also id. 1939: esp. 28-46.
lieutenant of the same name. Seneca writes: *libertas tanta ut libertatis nomen excederet, et, quia passim ordines hominesque laniabat, Rabienus vocatur. animus inter vitia ingens et ad similitudinem ingenii sui violentus et qui Pompeianos spiritus nondum in tanta pace posuisset* ("his freeness of speech was so great that it surpassed the name of freedom, and, because he lambasted classes and people without distinction, he was called Rabienus. Despite his faults, he had a great mind and a violent one in likeness to his brilliance. And he had not yet set aside his Pompeian spirit in such a state of peace," *Contr. 10 praef. 5*). Labienus paid for his outspoken criticism first with the burning of his books and then with his life through suicide.

Unlike Labienus’, however, Livy’s work is not subjected to destruction. It follows that Livy’s praise of Pompey did not approach the subversive tenor of Cremutius’ or Labienus’. The loss of Livy’s 1st BC is truly lamentable, but there is nothing in the *Periochae* or fragments of Livy’s later books that suggests that he praised Pompey any more than other historical characters, and Livy’s characterization is never so one-sided as to be fully positive or negative. Certainly, the *Periochae* cannot be relied on precisely to mirror Livy’s characterization or narrative technique. But, it is difficult to imagine that, even with the rest of the narrative lost, a *sententia* summing up the life and career of Pompey would not persist in some form—as they do for Cicero (Sen. *Suas. 6.22*) and Caesar (Sen. *Nat. Quaest. 5.18.4*)—especially if Livy truly is as full of praise for Pompey as Cremutius says.

---

6 On Labienus the partisan of Caesar and subsequently of Pompey, see Syme 1939: esp. 31 n. 6, 67 n. 7, and 1938. For the scanty details on the life of the historian Labienus, see FRHist 1.472-73 (with some further references).

7 Hayne 1990, somewhat cautiously, suggests that Livy’s depiction of Pompey is favorable, due to positive treatment of his early career, emphasis on the extraordinary powers and privileges granted to him, and a general avoidance of him as involved in excessive acts of violence. But, attributing some positive characteristics to an historical figure is by no means a sign of whole-hearted approbation in Livy; his praise is never so undynamic. Indeed, early excellence can deepen the impact of a subsequent fall, as it does for C. Manlius Capitolinus—among others.
Cremutius’ assessment of Livy as Pompeianus—apart from being reported through several degrees of separation—cannot be taken as a determination of the older figure’s exact political stance as a staunch supporter of dominant Republican practices: Cremutius has obvious rhetorical and legal intentions in casting Livy as a forerunner of himself. As for the adjective itself, from Augustus’ perspective, anyone who did not expressly mimic his propaganda campaign could be called Pompeianus, without necessarily creating enmity, as a means of limiting their impact; it is the sort of viewpoint that the leader of a faction might have, in viewing anyone with a different stance from their own as supporting, to some degree, their opposition.

Modern scholars have made much out of Livy’s possible stance on Augustus and the advent of the principate through the comparison of multiple characters in the Ab Urbe Condita to Augustus, especially Romulus, Camillus, and Scipio. But these comparisons are not without ambiguity; all of these characters are subject to reversal of fortune in the course of the narrative—a significant commentary on power in itself—a reversal that happens under the cloud of factional strife: Romulus, though he is loved by the common people and the soldiery, is potentially torn to shreds by senators (1.16.4, perobscura fama); Camillus, though he is afterwards praised by all, is subjected to envy and exile on account of the extravagance of his triumph over Veii (5.23); Scipio, “a man more memorable for the art of war than of peace, more memorable in the first part of his life than in the last” (vir memorabilis, bellicis tamen

---

8 See, e.g., Jaeger 1997: esp. 183-84; Miles 1995: 75-109; Hellegouarc’h 1970; Mazza 1966: 186-91; Syme 1959. For the potential alternate title of Romulus rather than Augustus—a title that the princeps rethought due to negative associations (see Ogilvie 60; Hirst 1926)—see Suet. Aug. 7: Gai Caesaris et deinde Augusti cognomen assumpsit, alterum testamento maioris avunculi, alterum Munati Planci sententia, cum quibusdam censentibus Romulum appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis, praevaleisset, ut Augustus potius vocaretur, non tantum novo sed etiam ampliore cognomine, quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicantur (“He adopted the name of Gaius Caesar and then the title of Augustus, the one because of his great-uncle’s will, the other because of Munatus Plancus’ opinion, since, although certain people were judging it proper that he be called Romulus—just as he himself was a founder of the city—[Plancus] won out, so that he rather was called Augustus: it was not only an original but also a more glorious title, as sacred places and those in which anything is consecrated are also called augusta;” cf. Dio 53.16; Flor. 4.12.66).
magis quam pacis artibus; memorabilior prima pars vitae quam postrema fuit, 38.53.9), ends his days in bitterness and disgrace, a self-imposed exile of Rome (see Introduction).  

Rather than view these characters as points of comparison in prefiguring Augustus and his novel regime—either in a positive or negative light—they may suggest that the princeps is no more than the next installment in a long line of leading figures that have been forged in the fires of factionalism and the Roman ancestral crime of desiring kingship (avitum malum, regni cupido, 1.6.4), a self-serving desire that persists throughout the Ab Urbe Condita. The degree to which Augustus’ program was different is rather the privileged view of hindsight than the perspective of someone living through what must have appeared to be continuity rather than transition in its similarity to events and figures of the recent past. Perhaps we do best then if we view Livy’s historical commentary as above the fray of factional politics in Rome’s transition from Republic to Empire. Thereby, he contributes something new to the traditional picture of Rome’s past, something that offers a remarkably non-partisan account; that is, the popularity of Livy’s history stems from how it recasts Roman history in a way that removes many of its traditional limitations. In calling his history a monumentum (praef. 10), Livy reasserts the ideal of the term monumentum: he helps to reclaim a powerful, memorial instrument that had often been put to corrupted use—much like control of the past itself—in the power-seeking of ambitious individuals; to Rome as a whole and posterity, Livy gives back its history.

---

9 Scipio may have the clearest verbal connection to Augustus in Livy’s history. The phrase pace terra marique parta appears twice in the extant work: the first instance is an insertion into the narrative on king Numa and mentions the closing of the Gates of Janus following the Battle of Actium (1.19.3); the second has Scipio imparting the peace (30.45.1). By Livy’s time, the phrase, particularly in its Greek form, had become a catchphrase for Hellenistic rulership (see, e.g., Aug. RG 13, [terra marique es]set parta vic-[toriis pax; Cooley 2009: 117; Ogilvie 94; Momigliano 1942a).
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