

LIVY AND DIONYSIOS OF HALIKARNASSOS AS ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGISTS

INGRID E. M. EDLUND

In reconstructing the historical events of Rome, we are provided with valuable information about kings, consuls, and wars in the writings of both Livy and Dionysios of Halikarnassos.¹ Although large sections are missing, it is still possible to analyze the overall scope and structure of their works, at least for the early history of Rome. Each author has a definite reason for writing, and a set goal in mind. Thus, for Livy the accounts of the past center around individuals, men and women, who in their roles as leaders and heroes display as *exempla* the true Roman ideals of virtue, faith, and courage. The stability of the past is idealized, and placed in contrast with the uncertainty of the present.² Dionysios of Halikarnassos, on the other hand, sees it as his mission to explain to his countrymen, and to some extent also to the Romans,³ how Rome in fact is part of the Greek world, and how her miraculous achievements were accomplished. Whereas Livy apologizes for spending so much time on the early history (*Praef.*), Dionysios is consciously filling a gap in the historiography of Rome by concentrating on the period down to the First Punic War, which is where Polybios starts his account (D.H. 1.8.2). In outlining their sources, both Livy and Dionysios are aware of the multitude of traditions, of conflicting stories, and discrepancies in the preserved records. Throughout the narrative, they agree with (or contradict) their predecessors, both Greek and Roman, by naming them directly, or by alluding to them in general terms.⁴

Among the facts supplied by Livy and Dionysios are references to buildings and monuments of Rome. It is my intention to discuss their sources for this topographical material and to show how they use such references as an integral part of the narrative. By evaluating their interests in this particular area, our understanding of their works is enhanced, and we may ultimately venture an estimate of their qualifications as Roman "archaeologists".⁵

First of all, we must establish *when* Livy and Dionysios refer to a building in Rome, and the context in which it is mentioned (or not mentioned, in cases where their accounts differ). Since neither of them is writing a study of Roman topography or architecture, it must be assumed that such references are made with a specific purpose in mind, one that makes them relevant to the narrative as a whole.⁶

Dedication dates of temples and the rituals connected with either the consecration or the dedication itself form a link between a strictly historical account and archaeological and topographical concerns. Particularly in Livy we find brief notes (ultimately based on the *Fasti* or the *Annales*) recording the date of such events, through which a building is closely tied to the names of the eponymous magistrates for each year.⁷

When temples are mentioned by Livy and Dionysios in connection with names of consuls or other magistrates, it is not the building as such that is of importance, but rather the actual act of dedication. Thus both authors mention the temple of Saturn, the dedication of which is recorded for 497 B.C., when Aulus Sempronius and Marcus Minucius were consuls (Livy 2.21.1; D.H. 6.1.1). There was some question as to who was responsible for the foundation of the temple, and Dionysios quotes several names, including Titus Larcus (cos. 498 B.C.) and Tarquinius Superbus, without specifying his sources more than by a general "some historians say" (6.1.4).⁸

Other times, both historians mention a certain temple, but for different reasons, and with a different emphasis. Thus, the day of dedication, July 15, is recorded by Livy for the temple of Castor (2.42.5), whereas Dionysios mentions this temple in connection with all the other monuments erected in honor of the Dioscuri (6.13.4).⁹ The role played by the women of Rome for the temple of Fortuna Muliebris is emphasized by both Dionysios (8.55.3) and Livy (2.40.12), but the latter uses the dedication to make a comment on the proper behavior

of the Romans in the days of the past: « Rome in those days was free from petty jealousy of others' success, and the men of Rome did not grudge the women their triumph. To preserve the memory of it for ever the temple of Fortuna Muliebris was built ». The temple of Hope, on the other hand, is used by both historians as a landmark to indicate where the battle between the Romans and the Etruscans took place in 477 B.C. (Livy 2.51.2; D.H. 9.24.4).¹⁰

References to buildings (temples usually) are sometimes made in connection with an individual, whose glory is increased by the fact that he adorned the city with new buildings, or restored already existing ones. Both Livy and Dionysios are explicit about Tarquinius Priscus' building activity (Livy 1.38.5-7; cf. 1.35.7-10; D.H. 3.67.4-5; 3.68.1; 3.69.1) as a result of the peace gained for the Romans, who could now afford to spend time on such activities: « However, it was peace with a difference: for the king set his people with such enthusiasm to various civic undertakings that they had even less leisure than they had had during the wars. . . . and, finally, the foundation of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol was laid. Tarquin had bound himself, during the Sabine war, by a solemn vow to build this temple: one cannot but feel that in some way he already foresaw the future splendour of that famous place » (Livy 1.38.7).

This act of improving the appearance of the city was preceded by that of Romulus, which is mentioned by Livy in passing (1.7.3.15; 1.8.4; 1.10.5-7), whereas Dionysios is more direct in his praise of how Romulus considered buildings and temples important for the general welfare of the citizens: « He established temples, sacred precincts and altars, arranged for the setting up of statues, determined the representations and symbols of the gods, and declared their power, the beneficent gifts which they have made to mankind, the particular festivals that should be celebrated in honour of each god or genius, the sacrifices with which they delight to be honoured by men, as well as the holidays, festal assemblies, days of rest, and everything alike of that nature, in all of which he followed the best customs in use among the Greeks » (2.18.2; cf. 2.3.1).

It is in connection with Romulus and the buildings attributed to him that we find the best example of how Livy and Dionysios differ in the way

in which they make a building or monument part of the narrative, as well as an entity in itself from a topographical or archaeological point of view.

According to Livy, the first 'temple' to be consecrated in Rome was that of Jupiter Feretrius, where Romulus placed the *spolia opima* won by killing the leader of the men from Caenina who had invaded the territory of the Romans (1.10).¹¹ The emphasis in Livy's account is that these spoils should be kept in a place worthy of their importance, and that this was a rare occasion in the history of Rome, repeated only twice in later times.¹² Dionysios, too, mentions the spoils, and adds a note on the etymology of the word 'Feretrius', which he seems to derive from 'ferre' 'to bear' (2.34.4). However, especially important for our discussion here is the fact that he describes the actual building constructed for Jupiter Feretrius. It is said to be small, less than fifteen feet in length, and the remains were still visible in Dionysios' own time (2.34.4).

The interpretation of this one brief note is crucial for two reasons: first, it is one of the key passages for evaluating Dionysios' interest in the monuments of Rome, as compared with Livy, and secondly, it links Romulus, the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, and the *spolia opima*, with the second founder of Rome, namely Augustus.¹³

Whereas Livy only rarely refers to the fact that a building is, or is not, still standing in his own time, or that he has seen it himself,¹⁴ Dionysios repeatedly uses phrases like « I have seen » (ἔβλεψάμην) or points out that a monument still exists 'even in my time' or 'even to my day' (1.34.4 ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένει; 1.34.4 ἐπ' ἐμοῦ; 1.64.1 ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμέ).

There might be several reasons for this difference in expression and ways of referring to monuments in Rome. First of all, Livy's Roman audience was more likely to know the streets of Rome than the Greeks for whom Dionysios is writing. Also, by limiting any references which assume a continuity of ideas, or in this case buildings in the city, Livy created a greater distance between the past and the present.¹⁵

As for Dionysios' concern with emphasizing his own experience with Rome, one can attribute this to his efforts to learn as much as possible about the city where he spent twenty-two years of his life: « I arrived in Italy at the very time that

Augustus Caesar put an end to the civil war, in the middle of the one hundred and eighty-seventh Olympiad, and having from that time to this present day, a period of twenty-two years, lived at Rome, learned the language of the Romans and acquainted myself with their writings, I have devoted myself during all that time to matters bearing upon my subject » (1.7.2).

However, this interpretation assumes that we can regard Dionysios as a *historian*, interested in presenting the facts as they stand, without ever considering the rhetorical effect of his narrative. It has often been noted that, in spite of the autobiographical statement just quoted and the overall historical subject matter, Dionysios is foremost a rhetorician to whom the stylistic effects were as important (or perhaps even more important) than history itself.¹⁶ His dependence on Herodotos has been studied in detail by Sven Ek, who suggests that Dionysios' use of the phrase 'even to my time' or the equivalent is a purely rhetorical device, borrowed from Herodotos, and that it has no bearing on the monuments and events that Dionysios discussed.¹⁷

Although Herodotos undoubtedly served as a source of inspiration for Dionysios in many ways, I follow Andr  n in believing that a passage such as the one about the remains of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius should be taken for what it is, namely an observation based on firsthand knowledge.¹⁸ Although Dionysios in writing about the early history of Rome, and much of his material consequently must be taken from his predecessors, and, in some cases, elaborated with all the rhetorical wordiness of which he was capable, it cannot be disputed that he had as much occasion as Livy to walk through the city of Rome and observe the buildings, altars, and statues, new and old.

Why then does Livy choose to be so distant and almost abstract in his references to Roman monuments, while Dionysios takes his reader to the building itself, and comments on its relation to the present appearance of the city? The answer may well lie in the personal attitude of the historians, but also in the connection between the past and present which appeared in the references to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, as indicated earlier. Dionysios does indeed mention the traces of the original temple, but does not indicate its subsequent history. Livy, on the other hand, brings

up the question of who had the right to put spoils of honor in this temple, and refers to a statement by Augustus himself to the effect that Aulus Cornelius Cossus was consul, and not just military tribune, when he dedicated such spoils in 437 B.C. (4.20). In this context he describes Augustus as the founder and restorer of all temples (*templorum omnium conditorem aut restitutorem*), including this one which he had rebuilt, thereby saving it from complete destruction and oblivion (*aedem Feretri Iovis quam vetustate dilapsam refecit*, 4.20.7).

If we disregard the very complicated story about Cossus' actual title at the time when the spoils were dedicated, and the problem as to when Livy wrote this passage,¹⁹ the facts concerning this very building are that it was first 'built' by Romulus (according to Livy and Dionysios of Halikarnassos) and restored by Augustus, as recorded in the *Res Gestae* (ch. 19). Dionysios claims to have seen the remains of the old temple structure (the foundation?), but we cannot determine with certainty whether these ruins in fact referred to the structure set up by Romulus or to one of its subsequent rebuildings.

It is striking that so many of the monuments referred to by Dionysios in some detail were in fact connected with the building program of Augustus. They are either old and venerated spots such as the hut of Romulus (1.79.11) and the Lupercal (1.79.8), or actual temples which had been restored by Augustus such as the Capitoline temple (3.69.1; 4.59-61), the temple of Quirinus (2.63.3), and the temple to the Penates (1.68), all of which are mentioned by Augustus in the *Res Gestae* (chs. 19-20).

There are many indications that Dionysios of Halikarnassos was well aware of the political and cultural ambitions of Augustus.²⁰ Although it would be an exaggeration to say that Dionysios makes a point of mentioning certain buildings just because they were important to Augustus, it seems that the combination of many Augustan themes in the *Roman Antiquities* is not accidental. Romulus, the founder of Rome, and Tarquinius Priscus were great builders, as was Augustus. The monuments erected during the monarchy or Early Republic — temples, altars, and statues — have reached new glory not only by surviving until the time of Augustus (and Dionysios of Halikarnassos) but by

being restored and made part of the new city, the second foundation as it were. The ties with the past are made through the traditions, through the foundation stories of Aeneas at Lavinium²¹ and Romulus in Rome, and, in the eyes of Dionysios, also by buildings which would remind the present-day Romans of the glorious past as well as the glorious present. Dionysios' role as 'archaeologist' can thus be said to be that of using the physical aspects of Rome, with her beautiful monuments, as one more piece of evidence of what the Romans had accomplished.

With Livy, the analysis is more complex. It cannot be doubted that he in many ways brings in Augustan themes in the narrative, the blessings of peace foremost. Also, it should be noted that Livy uses Augustus as a reference in connection with the temple of Jupiter Feretrius and the spoils of honor, even though we cannot ascertain from that statement alone whether they did in fact discuss difficult points in the reconstruction of earlier Roman history.²² On the other hand, Livy's mind is so much directed to the past, both in the Preface and in references throughout the narrative. Recent building activities may be elaborate and splendid²³ but it is as if Rome had never fully recovered from the Sack of the Gauls in 390 B.C. According to Livy, the haphazard rebuilding that took place then created a generally unorganized city plan: «The work of reconstruction was ill-planned. Tiles were supplied at the state's expense; permission to cut timber and quarry stone was granted without any restrictions except a guarantee that the particular structure should be completed within a year. All work was hurried and nobody bothered to see that the streets were straight; individual property rights were ignored, and buildings went up wherever there was room for them. This explains why the ancient sewers, which originally followed the line of the streets, now run in many places under private houses, and

why the general lay-out of Rome is now more like a squatters' settlement than a properly planned city» (5.55).

This description of Rome certainly does not fit with the glorifying statements in the *Res Gestae*, or even with Dionysios' scattered references. One explanation may be that Livy believed that Rome, in fact had never again reached the climax of its early days, when men were heroes, noble and virtuous, and buildings were modest and quite appropriate to the Roman ideals.

However, another explanation for the differences in Livy's and Dionysios' treatment of Roman monuments is to consider when their respective works were written. If, in fact, the first pentad was completed as early as 27 B.C., as suggested by Luce,²⁴ Livy would have little or no reason to stress the new beauty of Rome, which was to become the result of Augustus' activity during a long period of time.²⁵ Dionysios, on the other hand, was writing twenty years later (1.3.4), and had thus had more of an opportunity to follow Augustus' policies and to watch the transformation of the city. It was thus a lucky combination of time and place that encouraged Dionysios to direct his attention to the buildings and monuments of Rome, and make them an important part of his narrative.

Our two historians, then, can both be said to be aware of the existence and importance of Roman buildings, and their different emphasis is due primarily to the milieu in which they were working. Dionysios comes closer than Livy to qualify as an 'archaeologist' in that it is through him that we have our knowledge of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, and, of course, also the Capitoline temple, the symbol of what Rome was and wanted to be.

Department of Classics
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

¹ The topic of this article was first presented as a paper at the meeting of the Southern Section of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South in Sarasota, Florida, October 26-28, 1978. I am grateful for the suggestions made by my colleague, Professor M. Gwyn Morgan.

² Livy, *Praefatio*. The Latin quotes from Livy follow the OCT text. The English translations are those of A. de Séincourt in the Penguin edition of Livy, *The Early History of Rome* (1960). For references to Dionysios of Halikarnassos (abbreviated D. H.), see the Loeb edition, with an English translation by E. Cary, vols. I-VII (1937-1950).

³ Dionysios' Roman audience/readers are emphasized by Jonas Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund 1959), 10-16.

⁴ The complicated problem of Livy's sources is summarized well by R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5* (hereafter cited as *Commentary*) (Oxford 1965; repr. 1970), Introduction, and most recently, T. J. LUCE, *Livy The Composition of His History* (hereafter cited as *Livy*) (Princeton 1977), Introduction.

⁵ For specific references in Livy, see OGILVIE, *Commentary*. Dionysios' interest in Roman monuments is discussed by A. ANDRÉN, « Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Roman Monuments », *Hommages à Léon Herrmann, Coll. Latomus XLIV* (Bruxelles-Berchem 1960) 88-104.

⁶ Such a demand is justified by the fact that both authors make a point of stressing the meticulous care with which they approach their subject (LIVY, *Praefatio*; D. H. 1.6.3).

⁷ These notes provide an interesting change in the narrative style, see OGILVIE, *Commentary*, 21, and LUCE, *Livy*, 192-193. Also discussed by JANE E. PHILLIPS, « Form and Language in Livy's Triumph Notices », *CPh* 69 (1974) 265-273.

⁸ As Gwyn Morgan points out, neither Livy nor Dionysios says that the temple was dedicated by the consuls of 497. However, the context would seem to imply that the consuls were in fact responsible for the dedication.

⁹ The 'traditional' date of the dedication was January 27, see OGILVIE, *Commentary*, ad loc.

¹⁰ On the whole, Livy and Dionysios agree in their references to temples, except that Dionysios alone mentions the dedication of the temple of Ceres in 493 B.C. (6.17.2; cf. Livy 2.41.10), and Livy brings in the temple of Mercury for 495 B.C. (2.21.7; 2.27.5). For the connection between this temple and the story of Coriolanus, see OGILVIE, *Commentary*, ad loc.

¹¹ Livy here refers to a *templum*, a term which does not necessarily imply a building. Later on he uses *aedem* (1.33.9 and 4.20.7), which would suggest at least a sacellum. Traditionally, this temple was roofless (see OGILVIE, *Commentary*, ad loc.).

¹² In 437 B.C. and 222 B.C. See below, and OGILVIE, *Commentary*, ad loc.

¹³ For the parallelism between Augustus and Romulus, see A. von PREMERSTEIN, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Neue Folge, Heft 15, München 1937) 9, 119; P. MARTIN, « Le dessein de Denys d'Halicarnasse dans les *Antiquités Romaines* et sa conception de l'histoire à travers sa Préface du livre I »,

Caesarodunum 4 (1969) 197-206; IDEM, « La propagande augustéenne dans les *Antiquités Romaines* de Denys d'Halicarnasse (Livre I) », *REL* 49 (1971) 162-179; INGRID E. M. EDLUND, « Dionysios of Halicarnassos: Liberty and Democracy in Rome », *CB* 53 (1976), 27-31.

¹⁴ See, for example, 1.25.14 (tombs of the Horatii and Curiatii); 1.26.14 (tomb of Horatia); 2.7.12 (shrine of Vica Pota); 3.63.7 (temple of Apollo).

¹⁵ *Praef.* 4-5 Walsh, on the other hand, ascribes to Livy a general tendency to accept recorded facts without investigating the evidence for himself. See P. G. WALSH, *Livy His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge 1961) 112-113.

¹⁶ For example, M. EGGER, *Denys d'Halicarnasse* (Paris 1902).

¹⁷ SVEN EK, *Herodotismen in der Archäologie des Dionys von Halikarnass* (Lund 1942) 18-20. See also, GIUSEPPE NENCI, « Il motivo dell'autopsia nella storiografia greca », *Studi Classici e Orientali* 3 (1955) 14-46.

¹⁸ Of course, we cannot assume that what Dionysios saw was part of Romulus' original structure. Andrén suggests that the remains belonged to a sacellum of the Regal period, *op. cit.* (above, n. 5) 91 n. 1.

¹⁹ OGILVIE, *Commentary*, ad loc., and T. J. LUCE, « Livy's First Decade » *TAPA* 96 (1965) 211-215.

²⁰ Above, n. 13, and J.P.V.D. BALDSON, « Dionysios on Romulus: A Political Pamphlet », *JRS* 61 (1971) 18-27.

²¹ See especially the important passage on the tomb of Aeneas, 1.64.4-5, recently brought into the archaeological discussion because of the 7th century B. C. tomb discovered at Lavinium, for which see P. SOMMELLA, « Heeron di Enea a Lavinium: il contributo dei recenti scavi a Pratica di Mare », *RendPontAcc* 44 (1971-1972) 47-74; G. K. GALINSKY, « The Tomb of Aeneas at Lavinium », *Vergilius* 20 (1974), 2-11.

²² LUCE, *Livy*, 290-297.

²³ See, for example, 1.56, which according to OGILVIE, *Commentary*, ad loc., refers specifically to the rebuilding of the Cloaca maxima and the Circus (*quibus duobus operibus vix nova haec magnificentia quicquam adaequare potuit*).

²⁴ *Op. cit.* (above, n. 19) 238-240.

²⁵ His view of the present is generally pessimistic, but there are a few traces of a changing attitude. Thus, he seems to see in Augustus the only hope for a revival of the 'good old days'. This change would account for the insertion of the passage about Cornelius Cossus (above, n. 19). However, his admiration of Augustus is cautious - see LUCE, *Livy*, 290-292.