THE COMPLETE WORKS OF TITUS LIVIUS PATAVINUS HISTORY OF ROME Illustrated

THE TRANSLATIONS

HISTORY OF ROME

Translated by B. O. Foster (Books 1 to 22) and William A. McDevitte (Books 23 to Fragments)

Ab urbe condita libri , Livy’s only surviving work, was commenced midway through the historian’s career, c. 27 BC, and completed when he left Rome for Padua in old age, following the death of Augustus, during the reign of Tiberius. It is a monumental history of ancient Rome, spanning the time from the stories of Aeneas, the earliest legendary period, before the city’s founding in c. 753 BC, to Livy’s own times in the reign of the emperor Augustus, up to 9 BC, finishing with the death of Drusus. The Latin title can be literally translated as “Books since the city’s founding”. Less literally in English, it is now known as ‘History of Rome’. Sadly only 25% of the work survives, though summaries of the missing books have survived from antiquity. Books 11 to 20 and books 46 to 140 are lost, leaving only 35 books extant, with 105 lost in total.

The first book of *Ab urbe condita libri* starts with Aeneas landing in Italy and the founding of Rome by Romulus and Remus, culminating with Lucius Junius Brutus and Lucius Tarquinius Collatinus being elected as consuls in 502 BC according to Livy’s own chronology (509 BCE according to more traditional chronology). There are a number of chronologies; these two dates represent an approximate range. Books 2 to 10 deal with the history of the Roman Republic to the Samnite Wars, while books 21 to 45 concern the Second Punic War and finish with the war against

Perseus of Macedon. Books 46 to 70 deal with the time up to the Social War in 91 BC. Book 89 includes the dictatorship of Sulla in 81 BC and book 103 contains a description of Julius Caesar's first consulship. Book 142 concludes with the death of Nero Claudius Drusus in 9 BC. Though the first ten books concern a period of over 600 years, once Livy started writing about the 1st century BC, he devoted almost a whole book to each year.

Livy's style can be viewed as a mixture of annual chronology and narrative, where he often interrupts a story to announce the elections of new consuls. His history therefore is an expansion of the *fasti* , the official public chronicle kept by the magistrates, which was a primary source for Roman historians. Those who seem to have been more influenced by the method have been termed annalists. Nevertheless, Livy was criticised for contradicting himself in his History and for becoming repetitious and verbose in the later books. One particular infamous digression in Book 9 suggested that the Romans would have beaten Alexander the Great if he had lived longer and had turned west to attack the Romans, causing much wry amusement for modern critics.

The first five books of the *Ab urbe condita libri* were published between 27 and 25 BC. Livy continued to work on the project for much of the rest of his life, publishing new material by popular demand. This

necessity explains why the work falls naturally into 12 packets, mainly groups of 10 books, or decades, sometimes of five books (pentads) and the rest without any packet order. The scheme of dividing it entirely into decades is a later innovation of copyists. The second pentade was not released until c. 9 BC, some 16 years following the first pentade.

The subject material of Livy's history can vary from mythical or legendary stories at the beginning to detailed and authentic accounts of apparently real events toward the end of the great work. He himself noted the difficulty of finding information about events some 700 years or more removed from the author. Of his material on early Rome he said, "The traditions of what happened prior to the foundation of the City or whilst it was being built, are more fitted to adorn the creations of the poet than the authentic records of the historian." Nonetheless, according to the tradition of history writing at the time, Livy felt compelled to relate what he read without passing judgement as to its truth or untruth. One of the problems of modern scholarship is to ascertain where in the work the line is to be drawn between legends and true historic events. The traditional modern view is that buildings, inscriptions, monuments and libraries prior to the sack of Rome in 387 BC by the Gauls under Brennus were destroyed by that sack and made unavailable to Livy and his sources. His credible history therefore is likely to begin with

that date.

Ab urbe condita libri was enormously successful. Livy became so famous that a man from Cadiz reportedly travelled to Rome just to see the historian and once he had met with him, returned home. The popularity of the work continued through the entire classical period. A number of Roman authors used Livy as a basis for their own works, including Aurelius Victor, Cassiodorus, Eutropius, Festus, Florus, Granius Licinianus and Orosius.

PREFACE

THE Latin text of this volume has been set up from that of the ninth edition (1908) of Book I., and the eighth edition (1894) of Book II., by Weissenborn and Müller, except that the *Periochae* have been reprinted from the text of Rossbach (1910). But the spelling is that adopted by Professors Conway and Walters in their critical edition of Books I.-V. (Oxford, 1914), which is the source also of a number of readings which differ from those given in the Weissenborn-Müller text, and has furnished, besides, the materials from which the textual notes have been drawn up. I have aimed to indicate every instance where the reading printed does not rest on the authority of one or more of the good MSS., and to give the author of the emendation. The MSS. are often cited by the symbols given in the

Oxford edition, but for brevity's sake I have usually employed two of my own, viz. ω and ς. The former means " such of the good MSS. as are not cited for other readings," the latter "one or more of the inferior MSS. and early printed editions." Anyone who wishes more specific information regarding the source of a variant will consult the elaborate apparatus of the Oxford text, whose editors have placed all students of the first decade under lasting obligations by their thorough and minute report of the MSS. With the publication of their second volume there will be available for the first time an adequate diplomatic basis for the criticism of Books I.-X.

I have utilized throughout the translations by Philemon Holland, George Baker, and Canon Roberts, and have occasionally borrowed a happy expression from the commentaries of Edwards, Conway, and others, mentioned in the introduction. The unpretentious notes in the college edition of my former teacher, the late Professor Greenough, have been particularly useful in pointing out the significance of the word-order.

Acknowledgments are also due to my colleagues, Professors Fairclough, Hempl, Cooper, and Briggs, and to Professor Noyes of the University of California, each of whom has given me some good suggestions.

B. O. F. Stanford University,

California. 1919.

INTRODUCTION

I

From entries in Jerome's re-working of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius we learn that Titus Livius the Patavian was born in 59 B.C., the year of Caesar's first consulship, and died in his native town (the modern Padua) in 17 A.D. Of his parents nothing is known. They were presumably well-to-do, for their son received the training in Greek and Latin literature and in rhetoric which constituted the standard curriculum of that time, and was afterwards able to devote a long life to the unremunerative work of writing. That he was by birth an aristocrat is no more than an inference from his outstanding sympathy with the senatorial party. Livy's childhood witnessed the conquest of Gaul and Caesar's rapid rise to lordship over the Roman world. These early years he doubtless passed in his northern home. Patavium laid claim to great antiquity. Livy tells us himself in his opening chapter the legend of its founding by the Trojan Antenor, and elsewhere describes with unmistakable satisfaction the vain attempt of the Spartan Cleonymus (in 302 B.C.) to

subdue the Patavians. They defended themselves with equal vigour and success against the aggressions of the Etruscans and the inroads of the Gauls, and in the war with Hannibal cast in their lot with Rome. In 49 B.C., when Livy was ten years old, the town became a Roman municipality and its citizens were enrolled in the Fabian tribe. The place was a great centre of trade, especially in wool, and under Augustus was perhaps the wealthiest city in Italy, next to Rome, to which in some respects it presented a striking contrast, since the Patavians maintained the simple manners and strict morality which had long gone out of fashion in the cosmopolitan capital. We cannot say how old Livy was when he left Patavium, but it is probable that his tastes and character had been permanently influenced by the old-world traditions of his native town. Did he go to Rome with the intention of pursuing there the career of a rhetorician and subsequently become interested in historical studies? It may have been so. Perhaps he had already resolved to write history and wished to make use of the libraries and other sources of information which were lacking in a provincial town. Certain passages in his earlier books indicate that he was already familiar with the City when he began his great work, about 27 B.C., and a reference to a conversation with Augustus in Book IV. seems to argue that it was not long till he was on a friendly footing with the Emperor. He doubtless continued to reside in Rome,

with occasional visits to Patavium and other places in Italy, till near the end of his long life.

Livy seems never to have held any public office, but to have given himself up entirely to literature. Seneca says that he wrote dialogues which one might classify under history as well as under philosophy, besides books which were professedly philosophical. And Quintilian quotes a letter from Livy to his son which was very likely an essay on the training of the orator, for in the passage cited he advises the young man to read Demosthenes and Cicero, and then such as most nearly resembled them. So, in another place, Quintilian tells us that he finds in Livy that there was a certain teacher who bade his pupils *obscure* what they said. It may have been in this same essay that he made the criticism on Sallust which seemed to the elder Seneca to be unjust, — that he had not only appropriated a sentence from Thucydides but had spoilt it in the process. And there is another passage in Seneca where Livy is credited with having quoted approvingly a *mot* of the rhetorician Miltiades against orators who affected archaic and sordid words, which may also be an echo of the letter. If Livy was about thirty-two years old when he began to write history it is probable that this essay was composed some years later, for it is unlikely to have been written before the son was about sixteen. We may therefore think of the historian as putting aside his magnum opus for a season, to be of

use in the education of the boy, who, whether or no he profited by his father's instructions in rhetoric, at all events became a writer, and is twice named by the elder Pliny as one of his authorities, in Books V. and VI. of the *Natural History,* which deal with geography. In a sepulchral inscription found in Padua, which may be that of our Livy, two sons are named — Titus Livius Priscus and Titus Livius Longus, — and their mother's name is given as Cassia. The only other item of information we possess about the family is supplied by the elder Seneca, who mentions a son-inlaw, named Lucius Magius, as a declaimer who had some following for a time, though men rather endured him for the sake of his father-in-law than praised him for his own.

Of Livy's social life in Rome we know nothing more than that he enjoyed the friendship of Augustus, and probably, as we have seen, from an early date in his stay in Rome. The intimacy was apparently maintained till the end of the Emperor's life, for it cannot have been much before A.D. 14 that Livy, as related by Suetonius, advised his patron's grand-nephew Claudius (born 9 B.C.) to take up the writing of history. The good relations subsisting between the Emperor and the historian do honour to the sense and candour of both. Livy gloried in the history of the republic, yet he could but acquiesce in the new order of things. And the moral and religious reforms of Augustus, his wish to revive the traditions of an elder day, his respect for the forms

inherited from a time when Rome was really governed by a senate, must have commanded Livy's hearty approval. On the other side, when Livy's great history was appealing to men's patriotism and displaying the ideal Rome as no other literary work (with the possible exception of the contemporaneous *Aeneid*) had ever done, it was easy for the Emperor to smile at the scholar's exaggerated admiration of Pompey, and even to overlook the frankness of his query whether more of good or of harm had come to the state from the birth of Julius Caesar. Livy died three years after Augustus, in 17 A.D., at the ripe age of 76. If he continued working at his history up to the last he had devoted more than 40 years to the gigantic enterprise. Jerome says that he died in Patavium. We can only conjecture whether he was overtaken by death while making a visit to his old home, or had retired thither, with the coming in of the new regime, to spend his declining years. The latter is perhaps the more likely assumption. The character of Tiberius can have possessed little claim to the sympathy of Livy, and life in Rome may well have lost its charm for him, now that his old patron was no more.

II

Livy seems to have called his history simply *Ab Urbe Condita,* "From the Founding of the City," just as Tacitus was later to call his Annals *Ab Excessu Divi*

Augusti, "From the death of the Divine Augustus." He began with the legend of Aeneas, and brought his narrative down to the death of Drusus (and the defeat of Quintilius Varus?) in 9 B.C. There is no reason to think that Livy intended, as some have supposed, to go on to the death of Augustus. In the preface to one of the lost books he remarked that he had already earned enough of reputation and might have ceased to write, were it not that his restless spirit was sustained by work. He probably toiled on till his strength failed him, with no fixed goal in view, giving his history to the public in parts, as these were severally completed. The following table, taken from Schanz, is an attempt to reconstruct these instalments:

- Books I.-V. From the founding of the City to its conquest by the Gauls (387-386 B.C.).
- VI.-XV. To the subjugation of Italy (265 B.C.).
- XVI.-XX. The Punic wars to the beginning of the war with Hannibal (219 B.C.).
- XXI.-XXX. The war with Hannibal (to 201 B.C.).
- XXXI.-XL. To the death of King Philip of Macedon (179 B.C.).
- XLI.-LXX. To the outbreak of the Social War (91 B.C.).
- LXXI.-LXXX. The Social War to the death of Marius (86 B.C.).

- LXXXI.-XC. To the death of Sulla (78 B.C.).
- XCI.-CVIII. From the war with Sertorius to the Gallic War (58 B.C.).
- CIX.-CXVI. From the beginning of the Civil Wars to the death of Caesar (44 B.C.).
- CXVII.-CXXXIII. To the death of Antony and Cleopatra (30 B.C.).
- CXXXIV-CXLII. The principate of Augustus to the death of Drusus (9 B.C.).

It will be noticed that certain portions fall natureally into decades (notably XXI.-XXX.), or pentads (*e.g.* I.-V.). Elsewhere, and particularly in that part of the work which deals with the writer's own times, no such symmetry is discernible. Later however it became the uniform practice of the copyists to divide the history into decades. This is clearly seen in the wholly distinct and independent MS. tradition of the several surviving sections.

Only about a quarter of the whole work has been preserved. We have the Preface and Books I.-X., covering the period from Aeneas to the year 293 B.C.; Books XXI.-XXX. describing the Second Punic War; and Books XXXI.-XLV., which continue the story of Rome's conquests down to the year 167 B.C. and the victories of Lucius Aemilius Paulus.

For the loss of the other books the existence from the first century of our era of a handy abridgment is no doubt largely responsible. It is to this Martial alludes in

the following distich (XIV. cxc.):

Pellibus exiguis artatur Livius ingens, Quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit.

If we had this *Epitome* it would be some slight compensation for the disappearance of the original books, but we have only a compend of it, the so-called *Periochae,* and certain excerpts thought to have been made from another summary of it, no longer extant, which scholars refer to as the *Chronicon,* to wit, the fragments of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus,* the *Prodigiorum Liber* of Obsequens, and the consular lists of Cassiodorius.

The *Periochae,* or summaries of the several Books (only CXXXVI. and CXXXVII. are wanting), are the most valuable of these sources for supplying the gaps in our text of Livy. Their author narrates briefly what seem to him the leading events in each book, adding a reference to other matters treated in the original. The *Periochae* are thus a kind of compromise between a book of excerpts for the use of readers who for any reason could not or would not go to the unabridged Livy, and a table of contents for the convenience of those who did. They are usually printed with editions of Livy, and are included in this one. It may be noted here that *Per. I* exists in a double recension, of which B appears from its style to be of a piece with those of all the other books, while A is thought to have come from the *Chronicon.*

In 1903 a papyrus was discovered at Oxyrhynchus which contained fragments of a compend of Roman history which was based on Livy, though it seems not to have been taken from Livy directly but from the *Chronicon,* which was also, as we have said, the source of Obsequens and Cassiodorius. The MS. is assigned to the third century, and the book must therefore have been composed in that or a still earlier period. It contains eight columns of uncial writing. Of these 1-3 preserve a selection of the events recorded in Livy, Books XXXVII.-XL., (which we have), while 4-8 deal with the subjectmatter of Books XLVIII.-LV. But there is a column gone between column 6 and column 7, which treated of the years 143 and 142 B.C.

Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorius Senator lived about 480 to 575, and was Consul in 514, under Theodoric. Among his writings was a chronicle, from Adam to A.D. 519. For the earlier periods he used Eusebius and Jerome, but from the expulsion of Tarquinius to A.D. 31 he names as his authorities Titus Livius and Aufidius Bassus. His list of consuls for this period shows kinship with the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* and Obsequens.

In his *Prodigiorum Liber* Julius Obsequens enumerates in chronological order the portents which occurred from the year 190 to the year 12 B.C. In its original form the catalogue probably began, as the title in the MS. indicates, with the year 249. The little book

is of unknown date: Schanz thinks it is a product of the fourth century of our era, when paganism made its last struggle against Christianity. Rossbach inclines to a somewhat earlier date. In any case Rossbach has shown that the author was a believer in prodigies, and therefore a pagan.

III

In his preface to the whole work Livy gives a satisfactory account of his conception of history and the ends he himself had in view. He begins with an apology for adding to the already large number of Roman histories. Those who attempt this theme hope, he says, to surpass their predecessors either in accuracy or style, and it is doing Livy no injustice to infer that in his own case it was the belief that he could make the story of Rome more vivid and readable than anyone had yet done which gave him the courage to undertake the task. But whether he succeeds or not, he will be glad, he tells us, to have done what he could for the memory of the foremost people of the world. He recognizes the immense labour which confronts him, in consequence of the more than seven hundred years which he must deal with, and admits that it will be labour thrown away on most of his readers, who will have little patience with the earlier history in their eagerness to be reading of the civil wars and the events of their own generation.

"I myself, on the contrary," he continues — and the sentiment reveals at once the man's romantic spirit— "shall seek in this an additional reward for my toil, that I may turn my back upon the evils which our age has witnessed for so many years, so long at least as I am absorbed in the recollection of the brave days of old." He refers to the marvellous tales which were associated with the founding of the City as to matters of no great consequence. He declines to vouch for their authenticity, though he means to set them down as he finds them; and he apparently regards them as possessing a certain symbolic truth, at least. But the really important thing in Rome's history is the way her power was founded on morality and discipline, waxed mighty with the maintenance of these, and was now fallen upon evil days through their decay. For the use of historical study lies in its application to life. The story of a great people is fraught with examples and warnings, both for the individual and for the state. And no nation is better worth studying than Rome, for in none did righteousness and primitive simplicity so long resist the encroachments of wealth and luxury.

It was the ethical aspect of history then that chiefly appealed to Livy, and he chose Rome for his subject because the rise of the Roman empire seemed to him the best example of the fruition of those qualities which he wished to inculcate. To do this he must first of all win the interest of his readers, and if morality is

his goal style is certainly the road by which he hopes to lead men towards it. We must therefore fix our attention on these two things if we would approach Livy's work in the spirit of his ancient readers, and understand their almost unqualified approval of it.

For Livy's success was both immediate and lasting. I have already referred to the frank way in which he himself recognized his fame, in the preface to one of the books of his History, and the younger Pliny tells a delightful story of an enthusiastic Spanish admirer who travelled from Cadiz to Rome solely to behold the great writer, and having gratified his curiosity returned forthwith to his home. Livy's magnanimity was warmly praised by the elder Seneca, who said that he was by nature a most candid judge of all great talents, and it is a striking testimony to the justice of this observation that the modern reader's admiration for Hannibal is largely a reflection of Livy's, which all his prejudice against Rome's most formidable enemy could not altogether stifle. Tacitus too admired Livy, whom he considered the most eloquent of the older historians, as Fabius Rusticus was of the more recent. Quintilian compared him with Herodotus, and spoke of the wonderful fascination of his narrative, his great fairness, and the inexpressible eloquence of the speeches, in which everything was suited not only to the circumstances but to the speaker. Quintilian also praised his representation of the

emotions, particularly the gentler ones, in which field he said he had no superior. Livy shared with Virgil the honour of being the most widely read of Latin writers, and in consequence incurred the resentment of the mad Caligula, who lacked but little of casting out their works and their portraits from all the libraries, alleging of Livy that he was verbose and careless. Even Quintilian could tax him with prolixity, though he seems to have owned that it was but the defect of a quality, for he elsewhere speaks of his "milky richness." The only other jarring note in the general chorus of admiration is sounded by the critic Asinius Pollio, who reproached Livy's style with " Patavinity," by which he perhaps meant that it was tainted with an occasional word or idiom peculiar to the historian's native dialect. Owing chiefly to its intrinsic excellence, but partly no doubt to the accidental circumstance that it covered the whole field of Roman History, Livy's work became the standard source-book from which later writers were to draw their materials. We have already seen how it was epitomized and excerpted. Other writers who took their historical data from Livy were Lucan and Silius Italicus, Asconius, Valerius Maximus, Frontinus, Florus, and the Greeks Cassius Dio and Plutarch. Avienus, in the fourth century, turned Livy into iambic senarii, a *tour deforce* which has not come down to us. In the fifth he is cited by Pope Gelasius, and the grammarian Priscian used him in the

sixth. Comparatively little read in the Middle Ages, Livy found a warm admirer in Dante, who used him in the second book of his *De Monarchia,* and in the *Divina Commnedia* refers to him naively as " Livio , . . che non erra." The Italians of the Renaissance seized upon Livy's History with avidity. The poet Beccadelli sold a country-place to enable him to purchase a copy by the hand of Poggio. Petrarch was among those who hoped for the recovery of the lost decades, and Pope Nicholas V. exerted himself without avail to discover them. With the emendations in Books XXI.-XXVI. by Laurentius Valla the critical study of the text was inaugurated. The year 1469 saw the first printed edition of the History, which was produced in Rome. Early in the sixteenth century Machiavelli wrote his famous *Discorsi sul Primo Libro delle Deche di Tito Livio.* It is not too much to say that from the Revival of Learning to the present time Livy has been generally recognized as one of the world's great writers. The English scholar Munro pronounced him owner of what is "perhaps the greatest prose style that has ever been written in any age or language," and his history seemed to Niebuhr a "a colossal masterpiece."

The qualities which gave Livy his lofty place in literature are easily discovered. He was a high-minded patriot, inspired with a genuine desire to promote the welfare of his country. An idealist of the most pronounced type, he was endowed — as not all idealists