ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	*LVIII.*	*2022.*	*pp. 19–36.*

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CITY. LOSS IN THE GREEK AND ROMAN MEMORY

BY FANNI JANCSOVICS

PhD candidate, Eötvös Loránd University
jancsovi@student.elte.hu

Abstract: The appearance of the ethnically "Other" naturally has an impact on a society's own identity. It provokes the confirmation or rephrasing of identity. The loss and destruction caused by an ethnically "Other" group creates an especially deep conflict in the society's self-definition. This paper focuses on such events and the collective memory concerning these, through the case study of the Persian sack in 490 BC and one hundred years later the Gallic siege of Rome.
Keywords: Persian sack, memory, war trauma, trauma process, Gallic siege, barbarian, identity

The Destruction of the City. Loss in the Greek and Roman Memory

Because the Greeks invented the literary art form of history-writing, the beginning of Roman historiography was heavily influenced by its Greek forefathers. However, the Roman aristocracy's attitude toward Greek culture became somewhat ambiguous over time. It was motivated by apprehension that the adoption would jeopardize Roman cultural identity. This caution, however, had worn off by the time of Livy. In the Greco-Roman civilization in which Livy wrote his *opus*, the Roman elite was free from this fear and caution. Furthermore, Livy himself was free of any kind of inferiority complex regarding his Greek predecessors.[1] By many means, as Walsh writes, "Livy is indirectly the heir to the views of numerous Greek historians."[2] The idea of Livy being a worthy successor of his Greek predecessors was already expressed by Quintilian: "I should not hesitate to match Sallust against Thucydides, nor would Herodotus resent Titus Livius being placed on the same level as himself." (Quint., Ins. 10,1,101.)[3] Quin-

[1] Champion 2015, 190–91.
[2] Walsh 1961, 21.
[3] English translation by Harold Edgeworth Butler. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1920.

tilian's note is much more a valuation of Livy than an actual, in-depth comparison of the two authors. Nonetheless, this comparison became one of the main topics of modern research concerning the style and techniques of Livy.

As it is stated many times Livy uses Herodotus freely as an example for inserting speeches into the narrative and for interrupting the narrative with first-person addresses to his reader[4] and as a source for creating a detailed narrative with transferred episodes and motives from Greek myth and history.[5] In this paper I would like to deal with the latter case, when Livy uses an episode of Herodotus and adapts the great predecessors narrative and motives quasi as a set of guidelines. For this I analysed the occupation stories of two cities: Athens and Rome, the stories of the Persian sack in 480/479 BC and the Gallic siege in 390 BC. My main question was how these occupations were signified in the works of Herodotus and Livy and how these reflected in the cultural memory. And lastly, if it is possible to evince the reaction to loss of these two societies and more precisely in what ways they processed the trauma of the war.

1

The description of the occupation of Athens by Herodotus begins with the moment of the prediction request from Delphi. While waiting for the oncoming battle with the Persians the Athenians sent envoys to Delphi. The received prophecy predicted the destruction of the City by fire causing the ruination of the temples and within them the statues of Gods.

> Many a fortress too, not yours alone, will he shatter;
> Many a shrine of the gods will he give to the flame for devouring;
> Sweating for fear they stand, and quaking for dread of the enemy,
> Running with gore are their roofs, foreseeing the stress of their sorrow (Hdt., 7,140,3.)[6]

First the envoys were devastated by the unfavourable prophecy. Then on the advice of a respectable man from Delphi, they dressed in pleading clothes and asked the Pythia again for a new prophecy. This second, new prophecy reinforced without doubt the meaning of the first one. It highlighted that the destruction was inevitable, furthermore it predicted the battle of Salamis. "Divine Salamis, you will bring

[4] But he does much less than Herodotus. Champion 2015, 193.

[5] Oakley 1997, 85. As an example for this Oakley mentions the episode of the fall of Gabii which surely echoes the Herodotean stories of Zopyrus and Thrasybulus. (See Hdt., 3,154., 5, 92,6. and Liv., 1, 54, 5–8.) See also Ogilvie 2003, 205–6. Ogilvie compares Livy's brief description with Dionysius' more lengthy version, so in comparison with D.H. Livy's literary method of rewriting the motive is rather indicative.

[6] English translation by A. D. Godley. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1920.

death to women's sons" (Hdt., 7,142,2.) The only exceptions from the future complete destruction were the wooden walls. After the envoys returned home with the second prophecy, the Athenians interpreted this in two different ways. According to the first interpretation the wooden walls referred to the Acropolis, as Herodotus explains the Acropolis in the old times was fenced by a thorn hedge. The second interpretation stated that wooden walls imply the ships. Although the line related to Salamis seamed to weaken this explanation because it foreshadows a naval battle and enormous loss. Despite of the contradiction, the second interpretation won which seemed to be confirmed by an additional miracle. The sacred serpent of Athena, which was fed regularly with honey-cake by the priests, left the offerings untouched. In the context of this episode Plutarch[7] writes that Themistocles used this miracle as reasoning to leave the town, instead of arguments, stating that the Goddess left the City, and so should they. The remark on Themistocles is not included in Herodotus' narrative, here the miracle occurs during the evacuation of the City, as a divine confirmation of the evacuation. Only three groups stayed in the City: the stewards of the sacred precincts, the poor people and those who interpreted the prophecy with the escape of the Acropolis and following this interpretation they withdrew there. Through the open gates the Persians arrived in an empty city and protractedly besieged the Acropolis. Finally, the Persians climbed up the hill on a path previously thought to be unscalable, and therefore left without watch. This way they successfully occupied the Acropolis. The Persians demolished and burnt down the temples and the cult statues. The following day Xerxes ordered the exiled Athenians in his accompaniment to perform sacrifices, according to their tradition. That is in brief the destruction of the City in Herodotus' narrative.

The damage caused by the Persians can be archaeologically detected[8]: the chronological order of the potteries from the Agora deposits support our literary sources.[9] The cult statues were found with crushed faces and mutilated limbs – the reason for this was, that the returning Athenians buried them ritually. The ritual burial of the destroyed statues was the first necessary reconstruction work done since they could no longer fulfil their previous function. It also can be interpreted as reaction to the City's destruction, the traces and evidence of the destruction had to be removed from sight.[10] However this is not the only attitude we can observe in the returning Athenians facing their burnt City. Different intentions can be identified in the construction of the new walls for the Acropolis: the columns of the old Athena temple destroyed by the Persians, were built into the New Walls in a spectacularly arranged order. Based on this we can deduct

[7] Plut., Them. 10, 1.
[8] Meiggs 1963, 37. Thompson 1981, 343–45.
[9] Shear 1993, 415.
[10] Kousser 2009, 271.

that not only sheer practicality dictated such use of the debris, but also a desire to show public display of the Persian destruction and through this emphasize the survival of Athens. Thus, it can be interpreted in both ways: as the memento of the Persian impiety and as the memento of the City's recovering from the loss.

This is the only construction which we associate with the work of Themistocles. After the building of the New Walls there is a rather long pause in the reconstruction of the Acropolis. We can ascertain a nearly 30-year delay in the renovation of the temples and shrines, finally in 449/448 BC a decision is made about the building of the Parthenon.[11] The delay can be explained with rather practical motives: the first task after the departure of the Persians had to be the stabilization of peace and an overall consolidation. After that possibly the rebuilding of residential houses could have had priority over the public buildings, or simply they could not finance the reconstruction. This was resolved with the acquisition of the treasury of Delian league.[12] But this 30-year delay was incomprehensible even in the eyes of the orators in the 4th century BC and as such some kind of explanation was demanded. This need for explanation brought to life a fiction called: the "Oath of Plataea".[13]

> I will not rebuild a single one of the shrines which the barbarians have burnt and razed but will allow them to remain for future generations as a memorial of the barbarians' impiety. (Lyc., 81.)[14,15]

In the eyes of this generation living after the Persian Wars, in the 4th century BC it meant a quasi-preservation of the ruins, this way it was the act of conscious remembering, and a tool in transmitting the trauma caused by this destruction. With the memory attached to the ruins the temples became *lieux de memoir*. This 30-year delay meant that the sight of the ruins became a part of the city's landscape. The physical lack which reminded them of the loss and destruction as they looked up from the Agora, they could see only absence.[16] Absence of the old Athena Polias

[11] Meiggs 1963, 39.

[12] Ratté 2003, 45.

[13] Kousser 2009, 269., Bélyácz 2020, 244–48.

[14] English translation by J. O. Burtt. M.A. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1962.

[15] For the question of the Persians' impiety see Cic., Rep. 3,14–15. Cicero mentions an opposite conception. According to this Xerxes orders the burning of temples out of *pietas*, which is naturally the reverse of the Roman concept of *pietas*. "And in fact Xerxes is said to have ordered the Athenian temples to be burned for the sole reason that he thought it sacrilege to keep the gods whose home is the whole universe shut up within walls." (English translation by C.W.Keyes. Loeb Classical Library 213. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.)

[16] Somhegyi states that the definition of ruin includes the connection of three things: the loss of function, the absence, and the time. In my opinion the absence is the key-component in the

temple and absence of the monument assigned for the Battle of Marathon: the semi-finished Old Parthenon. The physical void was filled only later with finishing the New Parthenon in 438 BC. The New Parthenon was built using the foundations of the Old one – the ruins of a never finished building. Thus, it had a dual function and meaning, similarly to the New Walls. First of all, it was the victory monument for the Battle of Plataea, as a votive offering to Athena. Secondly the monument of the Old, never finished, and demolished Parthenon and of the destruction of the Acropolis.[17] Despite the interpretation that this is a victory monument, the ornamentation of the building emphasizes the depiction of loss rather strongly. The metopes illustrate the stories of the Gigantomachy, of the Amazonomachy and of the Centauromachy. In these depictions, as Kousser writes "metopes highlight the price of victory, not its effortless achievement."[18] The above mentioned three mythological wars – the Gigantomachy, the Amazonomachy, the Centauromachy – previously were already favourite topics in the architecture[19], however in this moment they evolved to the level of allegory and thus became a part of the political symbolism.

In this interpretation the war against the Persians became an episode of the eternal war between civilization and chaos, and the Persians became transferred to the world of mythology, so the victory over them got cosmological importance. The elevation of events of the not-so-distant past to the level of mythology is also important from the view of processing the trauma and loss: it provides distance. Thus, through mythology the trauma decreases and through its lens it is easier to accept the loss.[20] The concept of Barbarians is born. This concept coheres also with the war between civilization and chaos: the enemy became the ideological construction of the Other, the complete opposite of the collective identity.[21] Alexander calls the time gap between the actual traumatizing event and the representation of it, the time of the *trauma process*. In this time gap the cultural classification happens, when the event proves its significance

remembering connected to ruins, because as Somhegyi writes the view of absence in ruins is not about passing and loss rather survival and continuance. The component of the time also more complex than is seems. It does not simply mean the passing of time which shapes the ruin rather the meeting of opposite segments of time. From the perspective of the viewer the ruin is always momentary because the spectacle is connected to the momentary status of the ruin, which condenses in itself the passing of time. (Somhegyi 2013, 4–7.) See also Somhegyi 2014.

[17] Ratté 2003, 48., Kousser 2009, 275.

[18] Kousser 2009, 276.

[19] Ratté 2003, 49.

[20] Kousser 2009, 277.

[21] Hartog 1988, 213.

and the *carrier groups*[22] construct a compelling framework of cultural classification. This constitutes creating a new master narrative.[23] The invention of the concept of barbarians fits completely into this theory. Following its scheme, the 30 years of delay can be identified as the *trauma process*, while the cultural classification created a new master narrative: the narrative of the eternal war between civilization and chaos. This resulted the concept of the barbarian enemy.

The oratory of complete opposition and the new idea of foreign enemy changed the thinking. The depiction of the opponent became different. With this, from the 5th century a drastic violence starts appearing on vase paintings. They no longer show the struggle of equal parties, the Persians become the absolute enemy destined to be destroyed. Thus, with the picture of the luxury-loving and cowardly Persian, the stereotypical Oriental enemy was born.[24] As opposed to Greek nudity the clothing of the Persian gained importance in the paintings. The early Attic vases portray them with big, bushy beards and long moustaches, the variety of their hats rival with the diversity of the reliefs at Persepolis. These earliest depictions accurately show the ethnographical particularity of the Persian, both in clothing, and in the types of weapons, armours. The most famous example of this is the cup by the Painter of the Oxford Brygos which represents them with fish-scale corselet, wicker shield and spear.[25] Around 460 BC we can notice a turning point in the visual rhetoric: bows start to appear in the depiction of Persians as the symbol of unmanly fighting. And by the end of the 5th century BC the Persian clothes became the tool of feminization in opposition to Greek nudity: the symbol of physical and moral superiority. As the fight against the Eastern enemy was elevated to the level of mythology, correspondingly Persian dresses started to appear on depictions of the Amazons.[26] So the trauma's translation to mythology and the foreign enemy's placement in the world of fantasy acted in two directions. First with the provided distance it decreased the trauma. Secondly it also affected Athens' own history, because through the depiction of mythological figures, endowed with the peculiarity of the recent enemy they became a part of reality. Thus, the events of the mythological past and the events of the recent past placed next to each other in the collective memory a link is formed between the two endpoints of the history of Athens.[27]

[22] The collective agents of the trauma process.

[23] Alexander 2004, 11–12.

[24] This picture and idea of a luxury loving Eastern enemy lost its meaning with Alexander The Great. Instead of the stereotypical Eastern enemy a new concept of the word barbarian is born: the uncivilized and savage Gauls. Hölscher 2003, 10–13.

[25] Miller 2006, 113–14.

[26] Miller 2006, 115–16.

[27] Following the categorization of Assmann these to endpoints are located in the cultural and in the communicative memory. In this case the communicative memory is identifiable in the

Another example with a different form of the commemoration to the Persian Wars is the drama of Aeschylus. The premiere of the play Persians was in 472 BC. The source of Aeschylus was autopsy, he was a first-hand eyewitness of the Persian Wars, and it is most likely that he fought at Marathon himself.[28] The play itself does not get its importance from its historical accuracy or the reliability of its details (for example in comparison with Herodotus it is clear, that Herodotus is much more reliable in the names of the Persian commanders). Rather because it can be studied as a document of the Athenian collective imagination. Its main elements are the images of the ethnically 'Other' in the ethnic self-definition. These images show more about the Athenians own identity than about how they see the ethnically 'Other'. [29] If we attempt to examine the play from the view of the *trauma process* and the new master narrative created by the cultural classification, we notice a quite different attitude from the birth of the barbarian concept. Aeschylus uses a sympathetic tone in the portrayal of the Persians, while still uses the barbarian stereotype.[30] The same intention appears on the Attic vase-paintings of the second half of the 5th century BC. They start to place the Persians in genre scenes. Focusing on the impact of Aeschylus, in 1847 Lenormant identified one *oinochoe* as an illustration to the play. Later on, his theory got discarded and the *oinochoe* got classified to the genre scene of the 'Warrior's Departure' type. Another type worth mentioning in which the Persians were placed: the 'Visit to the Tomb' on *lekythoi*.[31] The placement in the scenes of everyday life shaped the Persians from enemy to less scary, familiar figures. This kind of attitude helped to psychologically process the stress and trauma caused by the 'Otherness' of the Persians.[32]

The memory of the destruction of the Acropolis appears explicitly in the play:

> For, on reaching the land of Hellas, restrained by no religious awe, they ravaged the images of the gods and set fire to their temples. Altars have been destroyed, statues of the gods have been thrown from their bases in utter ruin and confusion. (Aesch., Pers. 809–812.)[33]

explanation of the orators of the 4th century and on the vase-paintings of the 5th century. We can identify the metopes of the Parthenon as the expression of the cultural memory, which Assmann defines as "mythical history of origins, events in an absolute past". Assmann 2011, 41. For the created and through the act of remembering again and again renewed link between past and present see Hölkeskamp, 2006. 483–487.

[28] Hall 1996, 14.

[29] Hall 1996, 5–6.

[30] Hall 1996, 3.

[31] Miller 2006, 116–117.

[32] Miller 2006, 119.

[33] English translation by Herbert Weir Smyth. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. 1926

Furthermore, the memory of Persian loss is a recurring element: the messenger groans as to remember to Athens[34], the catastrophe that Xerxes has inflicted on his people is unforgettable, as the ghost of Darius says[35] and later on he also warns the choir: "For presumptuous pride, when it has matured, bears as its fruit a crop of calamity, from which it reaps an abundant harvest of tears. Bear in mind that such are the penalties for deeds like these, and hold Athens and Hellas in your memory." (Aesh., Pers. 820–824.) These are the examples of the unforgettable memories of loss. Although they were put into words from the enemy's point of the view, from the mouth of Darius' ghost the explanation of the Greeks' is echoing: the burning of the shrines and statues was an unforgivable sin[36], consequently Xerxes had to lose on the field of Plataea. On the premiere of the play in 472 BC they had to place emphasis on the audience's collective trauma caused by the destruction of the City and the Acropolis. The *Persians* is not the only play which presents the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars, Phrynichus' *Capture of Miletus* also illustrated the collective war trauma on the Athenian stage.[37] The play unfortunately did not survive, so we do not know the tone of this work, but we know that it caused a scandal and was fined to a thousand drachmas, as Herodotus writes: "The Athenians made clear their deep grief for the taking of Miletus in many ways, but especially in this: when Phrynichus wrote a play entitled *The Fall of Miletus* and produced it, the whole theater fell to weeping; they fined Phrynichus a thousand drachmas for bringing to mind a calamity that affected them so personally, and forbade the performance of that play forever." (Hdt., 7,21,2.) The dating of the premiere of Phrynichus' play is contested, it may have been during the archonship of Themistocles in 493/492 BC.[38] Considering that the capture of Miletus was in 494, the cause of the unfavourable reception could have been the pain and war trauma being too deep and too recent.[39] Another reason is the fact that this was the first time when the Athenian audience saw a play depicting the City's recent past in lieu of a mythological theme. So, 20 years later when Aeschylus' *Persians* premiered, it was not a new, unseen, rather shocking way to process the memory of a collective trauma. The premiere of the *Persians* was not followed by a scandal, moreover

[34] "Alas, how I groan when I recall the memory of Athens!" (Aesch., Pers. 285.)

[35] "Therefore a calamity dreadful and unforgettable has been caused by him, a desolating calamity such as never before befell this city of Susa since our Lord Zeus first ordained that one ruler should bear sway over all Asia with its flocks and wield the sceptre of its government." (Aesch., Pers. 759–764.)

[36] This thought is also present in Herodotus' narrative, when on the following day after the burning of the Acropolis, Xerxes orders to the exiled Athenians to perform sacrifices, maybe under the influence of a dream or because he regretted it. (Hdt., 8, 54.)

[37] Proietti 2019, 81.

[38] Hall 1996, 7.

[39] McDonald 2006, 85.

after the death of Aeschylus his dramas were revived. The familiarity of Eupolis and Aristophanes with the *Persians* implies that the tragedy had been performed in the second half of the 5th century.[40]

2

Moving on to the narrative by Livy in the defeat at Allia by the Gauls and the following siege of Rome, it shows a close connection with Herodotus. He serves an example for the description of the City's occupation.[41] Livy's narrative contains several identical elements and motives, like the divine warning or the empty city etc.[42] Before the Gallic invasion a voice was heard by Marcus Caedicius plebeian citizen on the Via Nova. The voice ordered him to report the Gallic approach to the military tribunes. But the military tribunes *reject the warnings of Heaven* and they ignored the report and did not make any preparations. The expressed concept compressed into the phrase "warnings of Heaven" is the same as in Athens: the destruction of the City and the defeat will happen inescapably. The unprepared Roman army was defeated due to the negligence of the divine warning and they had evacuated the City also. The citizens left the City, the few people who were left behind: the refugees from the battlefield of Allia with their women went up to the Capitol. In the City itself only the old senators remained, those who had triumphed and those who had been consuls. The Gauls found open gates just like the Persians in Athens. Livy further emphasizes the motive of the open gates: the old senators open the doors of their houses and behind the open gates and doors they are waiting for death. The climbing of an unscalable path also appears and it is supplemented with the warning of Juno's sacred animals: with the episode of Manlius and the geese.[43] The parallel between the geese of Juno Moneta[44] and the snake of Athena is the point where the following of Herodotus' example weakens in contrast with Athens. Iuno does not leave the City under siege, but she is present and sends a warning through her sacred animals and saves the Capitol. If the story of the geese is not placed into the narrative to

[40] Hall 1996, 2.

[41] To understanding more the building blocks of Livy's narrative of the Gallic siege Roth recently compered it with Polybius' account of the capture of Phoenice. Roth's research focuses on the importance of the fortune's role in both narratives. (Roth 2021, 115–45.)

[42] Ogilvie 2003, 720.

[43] The episode of the geese is not too early addition to the story, maybe Greek, if not even directly inspired by Herodotus himself. Horsfall 1981, 310.

[44] Cicero associates the verb *monere* with Iuno Moneta for two separate occasions, but the warning function of Iuno appears in a context of an earthquake. (Cic., Div. 1,101., 2,69.) Horsfall 1981, 309.

somehow imitate and reinterpret the motive of the holy serpent, then we have to consider reading it as the aetiology of the *gens Manlii cognomen* Capitolinus.[45] Other explanation of the episode is that it is an imitation of the abortive attack by Philip on Byzantium in 346 BC, where the defenders were warned by barking dogs. Either way the geese are not associated with Juno anywhere else, and the Goddess is not accompanied by them on any known monument.[46] This addition of the geese to the story allows to draw parallel between the serpent of Athena. In contrast with the Acropolis the warning of the Goddess encourages the opposite behaviour, Juno calls the Romans to fight, and not to leave their City, their Capitol to the hands of the enemy. In this direct contrast, with a little twist on the previously created analogy Livy projects that the Capitol will have a different fate from the Acropolis. The besieger enemy does not occupy it, and the shrines and cult statues escape the fire caused by the Gauls. We can assume that in the background of this twist hides a very Roman explanation for the two different fates of the Cities and two different outcomes of the sieges. The Capitol survived because the Gods did not abandon the City, but the Acropolis got destroyed because the Gods abandoned the City of Athens.[47] The presence of the Gods in the City is expressed through the following sentence in Livy.[48] "But they did not escape the notice of the geese, which were sacred to Iuno and had been left untouched in spite of the extremely scanty supply of food." (Liv., 5,47,4.)[49] The starvation of the defenders is a new and important element in the narrative of the siege compered to Herodotus. So, the holy geese are spared despite the starvation and because of this testimony of *pietas*, Juno does not leave her temple on the Capitol and even warns the Romans of the approaching enemy. The parallel drawn between the two events, because their opposite outcomes, can seem forced. But the outcome of the siege given by Livy is not the only version of the story in Roman memory and historiography. Skutsch interpreted few lines from Silius Italicus and Vergil as a hint to that the Gauls occupied the Capitol successfully.[50] Twenty-five years later he argued for his previous theory with a sentence of Tacitus. Although Skutsch's theory and arguments are questionable, it adds to the understanding of the layers of memory. It is not the only case when an event

[45] Horsfall 1981, 310.

[46] Ogilvie 2003, 734.

[47] Ogilvie states that Livy represents each episode of the story "as a stage in the restoration of Roman moral" and as such the episodes should be read as *exempla pietatis*. (Ogilvie 2003, 720.)

[48] The presence and help of the Gods as a form of *fortuna* is the point where the Livian narrative shows close connection with Polybius's narrative of the capture of Phoenice. See Roth 2021.

[49] English Translation by. Rev. Canon Roberts. New York, New York. E. P. Dutton and Co. 1912.

[50] Skutsch 1953, 77–78.

included two opposite outcomes in historiographical tradition.[51] But if we accept Skutsch' suggestion the episode of Manlius Capitolinus becomes out of place. If the Capitol was occupied by the Gauls then it excludes Manlius' heroic action[52] and with that the motive of the sacred animals becomes necessarily excluded also. So, the version with the fall of the Capitol might seem to be more fitting to the parallel drawn, but as we saw the episode of Manlius and the geese is one of the elements that creates a dialogue with Herodotus' narrative. However, regardless of Herodotus' impact on Livy' narrative, the element of the ransom itself is enough to refute the fall of the Capitol.[53]

Another possible parallel story from Roman memory and from historical tradition is the aetiology where this episode takes place: the rock and the story of Tarpeia. On the surface the story of Tarpeia and her *exemplum* is the reverse of Manlius' *exemplum*. The traitor Tarpeia helped the enemy to seize the Capitol and showed a secret way up versus Manlius, who beat off and repelled the enemy crawling up on the hill. The contrast between the two characters becomes problematic in the aspect of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi's interpretation of the story. He interpreted the figure of Tarpeia as a patriot and a national heroine, because of a public sacrifice made at the supposed tomb of Tarpeia.[54] The possibility to read her story contradicting the leading tradition appears in Livy's narrative also. He mentions a version where, when Tarpeia asked the Sabines what they hold in their left arm, she in fact asked for their shields not for their jewellery, and the Sabines suspecting her betrayal killed Tarpeia with the shields that she asked for.[55] The connection between the stories becomes even closer if we look at the place of death of Tarpeia and Manlius. Tarpeia died on the rocks named after her and Manlius was executed on the Tarpeian Rock after he was found guilty in the accusation of aiming at monarchy.[56] The memory of his heroic deed is a recurring element in the narrative of his trial. The first attempt of the voting was called off by the tribunes. They realized that on the Campus Martius, where the people were convened to vote and whence the Capitol was visible, the charges against Manlius will not stand. As the sight of the Capitol was enough to recall the memory of Manlius' great deed

[51] For example, Liv., 1. 16. Livy reports two different explanation of Romulus' death. In addition to the well-known version of Romulus' deification, Livy mentions the less known version of his assassination by his senators – "a tradition to this effect, though certainly a very dim one, has filtered down to us." (Liv., 1,16,4.)

[52] Takács 2008, 92–93. Referring to Wiseman and Liv., 6.20.12. Takács counts on the possibility that the version of the Capitol's escape was born from the desire to create an impressive contrast with Manlius' later *seditio*.

[53] Roth 2018, 461.

[54] For the *exemplum* of Tarpeia see Stevenson 2011, 178–179.

[55] Liv., 1,11,9.

[56] Liv., 6,14–20.

and the almost occurred catastrophe of the Capitol's destruction. So, they summoned the Assembly on another day at Peteline Grove, from where the Capitol was not visible, and where the death penalty was able to pass. On the aspect of the execution Livy notes the following: "The tribunes hurled him from the Tarpeian rock, and the place which was the monument of his exceptional glory became also the scene of his final punishment." (Liv., 6,20,12.) So the Tarpeian Rock which as *lieu de memoire*[57] recalled an episode of the mythological past, the treachery or patriotism of Tarpeia, and the memory of the narrative's recent past, the exploit of M. Manlius Capitolinus, now gained another layer of remembering. And with this, the circle of the memory of the Tarpeian Rock is finally closed. To this *lieu* of the Roman memory, they are connected figures of the past, who are simultaneously saviours and traitors of the *patria*.

Beside the breaking of the Athenian analogy, and the explicitly not mentioned parallel of Tarpeia's story another, more obvious one comes into view. Which is Rome's own origin story, the siege of Troy and the city's destruction caused by fire. The motive of the demolished city and the foundation of a new city are recurring elements in the Roman memory. After Troy, Lavinium was founded and after Alba Longa, Rome was founded.[58] This motive appears in Livy's 5th book also. Before the Gallic invasion the Romans are besieging the City of Veii for a long time. In the description of this Livy obviously uses the analogy with Troy, he emphasizes the length of the siege, the richness of the people of Veii and that the gods left the walls of the City of Veii. So, in this analogy the Romans are the besieger Greeks, and the people of Veii are the besieged Trojans.[59] Following this with the siege of the Capitol the analogy cannot be continued, from victorious Greeks the Romans turn into besieged Trojans. But their own history of

[57] Pierre Nora defines the *lieux de memoirs* as functional places, materialistic in nature, to which the imagination grants with a symbolic aura. He locates the phenomenon of the birth of the *lieu de memoire* on the crisis of memory. (Nora 1989, 7–24.) Nowadays the concept of the *lieux de memoirs* in the context of Roman memory is a widely discussed topic. Karl Galinsky's Memoria Romana project provided the surface for a debate between Hölkeskamp and Wiseman. The core of this debate is the participation of the Roman *populus* in the Roman memory. Hölkeskamps states that the *populus* was excluded from the Roman history, but was part of the memory through the *lieux de memoirs*. (Hölkeskamp 2006.) In contrast with this theory Wiseman examined the connection of some concrete *lieux de memoirs* with the people of Rome. He came to the conclusion that the *populus* was excluded even from the *lieux de memoirs*, because these are all have connection with the *gens*es own history. Instead of the *lieux de memoirs* Wiseman suggests the theatre as an area of remembering, form which the people were not excluded. (Wiseman 2014). Answering to this Hölkeskamp criticizes Wiseman on the account of that though he offers the oral culture instead of the *lieux de memoirs* as carrier of the popular memory, but he leaves out the impact of the *contio* speeches. (Hölkeskamp 2014.)

[58] Kraus 1994, 270.

[59] Kraus 1994, 273.

origin and the siege of Troy remain in the background. The moment of the City's evacuation is underlined, especially the protection concerning the sacred objects and the statues of gods. The decision is made that those cult objects, which cannot be safely hidden, should be removed by the *flamen* of Quirinus and the Vestal virgins from the City facing danger. Livy describes this episode in particular details: the Vestals are carrying the sacred objects afoot on the road to the Ianiculus, when a plebeian citizen Lucius Albinus, who had a wagon in which he was escaping with his wife and family from the soon to be sieged City, saw them. Because he thought it is a "sacrilege that the priestesses of his country should go afoot, bearing the sacred objects of the Roman People, while his family were seen in a vehicle, he commanded his wife and children to get down, placed the virgins and their relics in the waggon, and brought them to Caere, whither the priestesses were bound." (Liv., 5,40,10.) The rescue of the sacred objects as the pledge of continuity clearly summons the figure of Aeneas as he was leaving the burning City of Troy. Beside this the analogy with Troy and the question of the recurrence of the past is composed rather explicitly also. After Camillus defeated the Gauls, the Romans had to face the image of their burnt down City. In this situation the question arises about the possibility of the leaving the City and the idea to move to the recently occupied Veii. Rome is facing its own origin and heritage, however it cannot be allowed for the past to repeat itself, since if it does, Rome would cease to be Rome, as Troy ceased to exist and instead a new city, Lavinium was founded.[60] With Camillus' speech Livy creates the same kind of link between the mythological and (the narrative's) recent past, as in the Amazonomachy and the Persian Wars. The affection of this created link is the same from the view of identity: the evocation of the mythological, foundation related battle after a great loss can reassure the collective identity. The evocation of a great battle, the loss, and the survival also facilitates the processing of the cultural trauma of the City's destruction.[61] So Livy's narrative about the Gallic destruction when Rome is facing his own past, should not be read just as a rhetorical

[60] Kraus 1994, 281.

[61] Alexander gives the following definition of cultural trauma: "Cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways." (Alexander 2004, 1.) It is clear that we cannot use the concept as Alexander uses in the context of modern societies, but we can assume that the Gallic Wars or the Persian Wars had a similarly significant impact on the ancient societies' identity as the World War I had on the European societies. Alexander calls the time gap between the actual traumatizing event and the representation the time of the *trauma process.* Alexander 2004, 11.

prowess put in the mouth of Camillus, but also as a required reassurance of collective identity after a great loss as we saw on the example of the Parthenon.[62]

The argument of Camillus convinces the Romans, and they decide to stay and with the necessary reconstruction of the City we step back into the analogy with the Acropolis. If a loss needed to be portrayed as a national victory, the story of the Persian Wars, and the occupation of the Acropolis was an obvious parallel in the eyes of the Roman historians in the 1st century BC.[63] So following the Acropolis analogy the constructions begun and instead of founding a new city, they refounded the City of Rome. The most important characteristic of the reconstructing process is its unusual swiftness. In only one year, the City is completely rebuilt – according to Livy. Here it is worth returning to the building of the Parthenon and Plutarch's opinion on the quickly finished work and the lasting creation. According to Plutarch the essence of the Parthenon's extraordinariness is that although it was built extremely fast – which usually typifies bad work – it still proved to be a long-lasting creation. The works of the swiftly built City as opposed to the Athenian example begun with the renovation of the shrines and the assignment of the sacred precincts. Among others they dedicated a temple to Aius Locutius remembering the voice of the divine warning on the Via Nova.

The unreality of the story that Rome was rebuilt under one year is clear, but it points out the real, essential question concerning the extent of the destruction caused by the Gauls and the fire. From Livy's description it is not obvious how significant the damage to the City was. In the description of the beginning of the siege he writes "the fire spread by no means so freely or extensively on the first day as is commonly the case in a captured town." (Liv., 5,42,2.) And later on, the focus is on the illustration of the destruction instead the destruction's extent. From the blockaded Capitol the Romans are watching the devastating fire which is destroying their City. Plutarch's idea about the extent of the loss is much clearer: he writes about complete confusion concerning the reassignment of the sacred precincts, which seemed to be a hard work because of the deep layer of ash that covered the City.[64]

The archaeological research undoubtedly excludes the possibility of a complete destruction: the burnt layer which earlier was identified as the result of the Gallic invasion, in fact should be dated to the 6th century BC.[65] The tradition of the total devastation in our sources cannot be confirmed. So, they exaggerated

[62] Ratté interprets the building of the Parthenon as a reaction given to the destruction. The Parthenon responded to the loss by celebrating the Athenian community and power. Ratté 2003, 52.

[63] Horsfall 1981, 307.

[64] Plut., Cam. 32, 4.

[65] Rosenberger 2003, 365.

the extent of the destruction, but nevertheless its importance in the Roman collective memory remains unquestionable. Rosenberger cites Rüpke, who calls the battle of Allia the Roman's historical psychosis and Heftner, who asserts that the shock of the loss remained present in the collective memory for centuries.[66] The significance of the events of 390 BC and the image of the Gallic enemy are not only present in the collective memory of the 1st century BC but also in the cultural programs of Augustus. This can be corroborated with two examples: with Vergil's Aeneid and the with the temple of Apollo Palatine, and between these two there is presumably some kind of connection. Before depicting the battle of Actium the longest part of the description of Aeneas' shield is the scene of the attacking Gauls on the Capitol.[67]

> Lo, on the steep Tarpeian citadel
> stood Manlius at the sacred doors of Jove,
> holding the capitol, whereon was seen
> the fresh-thatched house of Romulus the King.
> There, too, all silver, through arcade of gold
> fluttered the goose, whose monitory call
> revealed the foeman at the gate: outside
> besieging Gauls the thorny pathway climbed,
> ambushed in shadow and the friendly dark
> of night without a star; their flowing hair
> was golden, and their every vesture gold;
> their cloaks were glittering plaid; each milk-white neck
> bore circlet of bright gold; in each man's hand
> two Alpine javelins gleamed, and for defence
> long shields the wild northern warriors bore. (Verg., Aen. 8, 652–662.)[68]

The connection between this description and the temple of Apollo Palantine was spotted by Salomon Reinach. He argued that Vergil was strongly influenced and inspired by the doors of the Apollo Palatine temple, on which the reliefs depicted the hunting of the Galatians at Delphi. Hardie in a further thought writes that the colour-terms used in this description are not possible on a metal shield but fitting with the temple's ivory reliefs. The colour-term used in question is *lacteus*, meaning the white skin of the Gauls, which is quite inappropriate to describe any metal, but frequently used in associations with ivory. Furthermore, the two colours used to describe the Gauls are gold and white, which colours summon the chryselephantine statues. However we do not have direct evidence of the connection with the Palatine temple, this technique could have been worthy to a

[66] The image and the stereotype of the savage Gauls is began to disappear with the works of Caesar. Gruen, 2006. 471–72.

[67] Hardie 1986, 120.

[68] English translation by Theodore C. Williams. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1910.

building with this kind of cultural and political importance.[69] And if Vergil had in mind the ivory reliefs of the temple's doors then Hardie suggests to take a step further: "the significance of the scene of the Gauls on the Capitol is enhanced by the association of the repulse of the Galatians at Delphi with Gigantomachy, so that the implications of the preservation of Rome in 390 BC are widened beyond the assurance of the continuity of the city itself to a suggestion of a more far-reaching victory of the gods over their enemies." He evinces this association of the Galatians at Delphi with the Gigantomachy with two examples: the Great Altar at Pergamum and Callimachus.[70] So the analogy with the overthrow of the Galatians from the Parnassus and the preservation of the Capitol from the Gauls can easily be seen, and for the authors of the Silver Age the association of the scene of the Gauls on the Capitol with the Gigantomachy was quite obvious.[71] With Hardie's perception the connection between the Gallic siege of the Capitol and the Acropolis becomes two-leveled. Firstly, Livy uses the Acropolis' siege as a narrative analogy for the description of the events of 390 BC. Secondly this already created analogy allows the authors of the Silver Age to mythologize these events with the Gigantomachy, using the political symbolism created by the Parthenon's metopes.

The memory of the Gallic siege is present independently from the Persian analogy also: two *fasti* juxtaposes Memorial Days to the battle of Allia. The Tiberian *fasti Amiternini* marks 18th of July as *dies alliensis*, the fasti Antiates marks the same day *as dies alliai et Fabiorum*. It puts on the same day with another famous defeat of the Romans, on the day of the battle of Cremara, the self-sacrifice of 300 members of the Fabian gens. These denotations in the *fasti*es do not confirm that the 18th of July would have been a part of the collective memory since the 4th century BC but confirms that it was part of the tradition formed by the time of Augustus.[72] The memory of the Gallic occupation and the fire appears much later also, in the work of Tacitus. He mentions that there are people who think that the beginning day of the fire associated with Nero falls on the same day as the Gallic occupation. Beside the Gallic parallel the Trojan analogy appears also: Nero is performing in the theatre and sings about the destruction of Troy while the City is in flames.[73]

[69] Hardie 1986, 122.

[70] "And one day in the future there will come upon us a common struggle, when late-born Titans shall raise up against the Greeks barbarian sword and Celtic war, and from the furthest west they shall rush on like snowflakes." (Callim., Del. 172–175.) Hardie 1986, 123.

[71] Hardie 1986, 124.

[72] Rosenberger 2003, 370.

[73] Tac., Ann. 15, 38–43.

To summarize, we can state that the assumed complete destruction and the defeat at Allia becomes an integral part of the Roman memory and with Livy's description, inspired by Herodotus, corresponds with the Acropolis' rather concrete and complete destruction. However, it is not only a narrative parallel when Livy associates the not occurred tragedy, the escape of the Capitol with the occurred tragedy, the destruction of the Acropolis. The parallel only seemingly exists between these two events. In fact the elevation of the Persian occupation to the level of mythology permits the use of it as an analogy. More precisely the process that is represented in the architectural program of the Parthenon, the tragedy of the recent past, raised to a cosmological importance through myth. As the victory over the Persians became equivalent with the victory of the Olympian gods over the giants, or with the defeat of the Centaurs and Amazons. In the same manner the defeat of the Gauls becomes the story of order's victory above chaos.

Bibliography

Alexander 2004 = Alexander, Jeffrey C.: *Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma* In *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, University of California Press 1–30.

Assmann 2011 = Assmann, Jan.: *Cultural memory and early civilization: writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press

Bélyácz 2020 = Bélyácz, Katalin: *A salamisi csata emlékezete*. Electa. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó

Champion 2015= Champion, Craige B.: *Livy and the Greek Historians from Herodotus to Dionysius: Some Soundings and Reflections.* In *A companion to Livy*, ed. by Bernard Mineo, Malden, MA; Wiley Blackwell 190–204.

Gruen 2006 = Gruen, Erich S.: *Romans and Others.* In *A companion to the Roman Republic*, ed. by Nathan Stewart Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx, Blackwell companions to the ancient world. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 459–478.

Hall 1996 = Hall, Edith: *Persians*. Classical Texts. Warminster: Aris and Phillips

Hardie 1986 = Hardie, Philip R.: *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and imperium*. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press

Hartog 1988 = Hartog, François: *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. The New Historicism 5. Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press

Horsfall 1981 = Horsfall, Nicholas: *From History to Legend: M. Manlius and the Geese.* In *The Classical Journal* 76, 4. 298–311.

Hölkeskamp 2006 = Hölkeskamp, Karl-J.: *History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic.* In *A companion to the Roman Republic*, ed. by Nathan Stewart Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx, Blackwell companions to the ancient world. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 478–496.

— 2014 = Hölkeskamp, Karl-J.: *In Defence of Concepts, Categories, and Other Abstractions: Remarks on a Theory of Memory (in the Making).* In *Memoria Romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*, ed. by Karl Galinsky, Supplements to the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, supplementary volume X. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 63–70.

Hölscher 2003 = Hölscher, Tonio: *Images of War in Greece and Rome: Between Military Practice, Public Memory, and Cultural Symbolism.* In *The Journal of Roman Studies* 93: 1–17.

Kousser 2009 = Kousser, Rachel: *Destruction and Memory on the Athenian Acropolis*. In *The Art Bulletin* 91, 3. 263–82.

Kraus 1994 = Kraus, Christina S.: *»No Second Troy«: Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V.* In *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 124. 267–89.
McDonald 2006 = McDonald, Marianne: *War then and now: the legacy of ancient Greek tragedy.* In *Hermathena*, 181. 83–104.
Meiggs 1963 = Meiggs, Russell: *The Political Implications of the Parthenon.* In *Greece & Rome* 10. 36–45.
Miller 2006 = Miller, Margaret: *Persians in the Greek Imagination.* In *Mediterranean Archaeology* 19/20. 109–23.
Nora 1989 = Nora, Pierre: *Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire*. In *Representations*, 26. 7–24.
Oakley 1997 = Oakley, S. P. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI – X. 1: Introduction and Book VI.* Oxford: Clarendon Press
Ogilvie 2003 = Ogilvie, Robert Maxwell: *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1 – 5*. Reprinted. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
Proietti 2019 = Proietti Giorgia: *Athens as a »Landscape of Trauma«. Phrynichus' Sack of Miletus and the Aftermath of the Persian Wars.* In *The Ancient War's Impact on the Home Front*, ed. byLucia Cecchet, Christpher Degelmann, and Maik Patzelt, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 79–98.
Ratté 2003 = Ratté, Christopher: *Athens: Recreating the Parthenon*. In *The Classical World* 97, 1. 41–55.
Rosenberger 2003 = Rosenberger, Veit: *The Gallic Disaster*. In *The Classical World* 96, 4. 365–73.
Roth 2018 = Roth, Ulrike: *The Gallic Ransom and the Sack of Rome: Livy 5.48.7–8.* In *Mnemosyne* 71, 3. 460–84.
— 2021 = Roth, Ulrike: *When in Disgrace with Fortune and Men's Eyes ... Livy (and Polybius) on the Gallic Sack of Rome.* In *Usages of the Past in Roman Historiography*, ed. by Aske Damtoft Poulsen and Arne Jönsson, Historiography of Rome and Its Empire, volume 9. Leiden: Brill, 115–145.
Shear 1993 = Shear, T. Leslie: *The Persian Destruction of Athens: Evidence from Agora Deposits.* In *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 62, 4. 383–482.
Skutsch 1953 = Skutsch, O. *The Fall of the Capitol*. In *The Journal of Roman Studies* 43. 77–78.
Somhegyi 2013 = Somhegyi, Zoltán: *A pusztulás vonzása.* In *Café Bábel* 72. 3–11.
— 2014 = Somhegyi, Zoltán: *Mi marad abból, ami megmaradt?* In *Ókor* 2014, 4. 3–10.
Stevenson 2011 = Stevenson, Tom: *Women of Early Rome as »Exempla« in Livy, »Ab Urbe Condita«, Book 1.* In *The Classical World* 104, 2. 175–89.
Takács 2008 = Takács, Levente: *M. Furius Camillus: egy római hős a római történetírás tükrében*. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó
Thompson 1981 = Thompson, Homer A.: *Athens Faces Adversity*. In *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 50, 4. 343–55.
Walsh 1961 = Walsh, P. G.: *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods.* Cambridge [England: University Press
Wiseman 2014 = Wiseman, T. P.: *Popular Memory.* In *Memoria Romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*, ed. by Karl Galinsky, Supplements to the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, supplementary volume X. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 43–62.

DOI 10.22315/ACD/2022/2
ISSN 0418-453X (print)
ISSN 2732-3390 (online)