LIVY'S 5 AND 6 BOOKS. LINKED OR SEPARATED?

BY LEVENTE TAKÁCS

The presentation and interpretation of ancient literary works hardly ever miss sketching the structure of the given work. All modern attempts at structural analysis contain some elements of contradiction, which suggests that it is very difficult to cover these works' complex structure with one or two schemes. In this respect Livy has presented a huge problem for scholars, particularly because 142 cannot be divided by any whole number between one and twenty other than one and two. Naturally not even the most daring scholars have assumed that Livy divided his monumental work into units of one or two books. Moreover, it has never been supposed that Livy did not mould his work into shorter units. This way there are only two possible explanations. It is either that *ab urbe condita* is unfinished and Livy wanted to end it with book 150; or that the individual units are not made up of the same number of books. [1]

All these attempts are refutable or disputable in at least one respect each. The reason behind it is that not the whole of *ab urbe condita* has survived. The rumour that the whole work can be found in some remote monastery in the North came up at times in the age of humanism.[2] The report by Nicolo Nicolli saying that there are ten decades by Livy in a Danish monastery highlights the fact that the *ab urbe condita* was regarded as a work of ten-book-sections until the modern age. This was what Pope Gelasius thought at the end of the 5th century. Antonio Bonfini also was influenced by this view when he wrote his historical work about the Hungarians in the form of decades. No doubt he planned at least 5 decades out of which he wrote 45 books, although he knew of only 35 by Livy.[3] Machiavelli also must have calculated on sections of ten books when writing a study about the first decade (*Discorsi …*). Consequently we must as-

---

[1] *Ph. A. Stadter*, The Structure of Livy's History. Historia 21/2 (1972) 287. *T.J. Luce*, Livy. The Composition of His History. Princeton–New Jersey 1977, 14.

[2] This rumour existed even in the 18th century cf. *B. Doer*, Livy and the Germans. In: *T.A. Dorey* (ed.), Livy. London–Toronto 1971, 105–107.

[3] Pope Gelasius: *Luce*, op. cit. 5. n. 8. Bonfini: *Fógel–Iványi–Juhász* (edd.), Antonius de Bonfinis: Rerum Ungaricarum Decades. Lipsiae, Teubner 1936, VIII, XI–XII.

sume that Machiavelli and his age also divided the *AVC* into units of ten.[4]

Modern research has set up roughly three schemes. Walsh thought that Livy wrote his work in pentads, although from time to time he deviates from this. This could be a good explanation for the complexity of the events in later books, e.g. in the case of the eight books on the civil war. After book 45 the pentads concentrate on the deeds of some outstanding Romans. Stadter reasoned that the deliberate composition that can be found in the books existing today was a characteristic feature of the lost books as well. According to him it was based on decades.[5]

These previous conceptions were combined into a complex scheme by Luce who set out from the thorough analysis of books 31–45. His basic unit is the pentad, which is sometimes used on its own, but from time to time it is used in pairs of books of five. The existing books show a symmetrical structure: there are three larger sections each containing 15 books, and these sections can again be divided into units of five and ten. When presenting the eventful history of the late republic Livy aimed mainly at continuity, but occasionally one can discover traces of pentad-structure, so that it can be assumed that Livy went on with the structure developed at the beginning of *AVC*.[6]

Nevertheless this arrangement into sections of five or ten is not free from problems. To begin with questions arise in connection with the beginning and end of the very first decade. The first book is an individual unit separated from the following books by two things: on the one hand, by its topic (the regal period), on the other hand, by the preface at the beginning of book 2 (Liv. 2.1.1). There was an attempt to explain this problem with an earlier edition, but so far only some later insertions could be revealed in book 1 and 4, which only suggests that the books above were restructured later.[7] The end of book 10 is absolutely characterless, presenting only annalistic facts. What is more, it finishes in the very middle of the closing of the third Samnite war.[8] A further problem is that *periochae* consider the Caesarian civil war a separate unit of eight books

---

[4] On Machiavelli, see *M. v. Albrecht,* Geschichte der römischen Literatur I. Bern 1992, 683. *J. H. Whitfield*, Machiavelli's Use of Livy. In: *Dorey*, op. cit. 73–96. The division into decades can be observed in the case of modern editions as well, e.g. *W. Weissenborn –M. Mueller*.

[5] *P. G. Walsh*, Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods. Cambridge 1963, 5–8. *Stadter,* op. cit. 300–301.

[6] *Luce*, op. cit. 3–7, 20, 23–24.

[7] *Walsh*, op. cit. 6. *Stadter*, op. cit. 289. On later insertions see *T.J. Luce*, The Dating of Livy's First Decade. TAPhA 96 (1965) 210, 232–234.

[8] *Borzsák I.*, Livius (In Hungarian). In: Dragma II, Budapest 1996, 148. Possible solutions: *Stadter*, op. cit. 294. *Luce*, op. cit. 4, 7. *Walsh*, op. cit. 7 considers the Samnite wars to be the topic of 6–10, thus he preserves the pentad. If we consider the history of the Samnite wars only, there is a 'pentad' indeed starting in book 7 and finishing in book 11.

(109–116), which does not fit the conception of units of five or ten at all.[9]

Considering all these factors, could we assume that beside the units of five and ten Livy sometimes formed smaller or larger parts, just has he did in the case of some books? Book 35 and 36 were formed to make an interconnected pair.[10] The history of the third Punic war takes up three books. The debate between Cato and Scipio Nasica whether to start war or not constituted the first part of book 49. Book 51, which presented the end of the war, must have started with the younger Scipio taking over the command of the army in Africa.[11] Scipio's triumph is also covered in this book.[12]

Book 5 is the best-known example of Livy forming the structure of the books deliberately. This book can be divided in two parts that are in contrast with each other. The first part (Liv. 5.1.1–32.5) tells us about the fall of Veii, and the second one presents the Gauls' victory and Rome's occupation. In other words: the first part concentrates on the biggest Roman victory till then, the second one presents the circumstances of the biggest Roman defeat. In between there is a digression about the migration of the Gauls (Liv. 5.33.2–35.3). The symmetry of form is emphasized by the unity of the topic: the relationship between people and gods. The harmony between them helps the Romans occupy Veii, whereas the neglect of duties towards the gods causes the fall of Rome.[13] Book 5, however, can be viewed not only as an individual unit but as one half of a diptich as well. Some elements of the story bind book 5 and 6 tightly and the thematic unity known from the first pentad continues. The second book is built around the idea of *libertas*, the fourth one is based on *moderatio*, the fifth one concentrates on *pietas*[14], and the topic of the sixth book is the *concordia ordinum*. The structure of the latter is symmetrical. Both halves have the above mentioned *concordia ordinum* in the centre. The main event of the first half is M. Manlius Capitolinus' sedition (Liv. 6.11–20), whereas in the second half it is the rogations made by Licinius and Sextius that disturb the unity of the state but finally the *patres* and the people reach an agreement and the *concordia ordinum* is achieved. The fifth book deals mainly with external affairs while the

---

[9] *Walsh*, op. cit. 6. *Stadter*, op. cit. 287.

[10] *A. C. Scafuro*, Pattern, Theme and Historicity in Livy Books 35 and 36. ClAnt. 6 (1987) 253 sqq.

[11] Cf. *Luce*, op. cit. 21.

[12] Liv. per. 49–51. *Stadter*, op. cit. 300–301 suggests dividing the 3rd Punic war into two different decades, although he himself admits that the triumph puts an end to a unit, 290–291.

[13] *E. Burck*, Aktuelle Probleme der Livius-Interpretation. In: *E. Burck*, Vom Menschenbild in der römischen Literatur. Heidelberg 1966, 356–359. *R. M. Ogilivie*, A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5. Oxford 1965, 626. *T. J. Luce*, Design and Structure in Livy: 5.32–55. TAPhA 102 (1971), 268, 272. *Luce*, op. cit. 25–27.

[14] *Ogilvie*, op. cit. 233, 626 et passim. *Luce*, op. cit. 26.

sixth one concentrates on domestic affairs.

The most outstanding linking element is the figure of Camillus. One of the most important innovations of Hellenistic historiography was that it appraised the role of individuality; the main change was brought by the presentation of Alexander the Great's deeds and of his personality. It is from this point that the activity of the characters could really become the central element of the narrative. Camillus' presence had already been seen as the linking element of the two parts of book 5. [15] Nevertheless it cannot only be by chance that Camillus also appears in book 6 and he only dies at the beginning of book 7. In conclusion Camillus' activity is limited to these two books. In book 6 Livy also relies on making Camillus appear and disappear just as he does in book 5. [16]

Moreover, there are some structural elements which show that Livy considered these two books to be closely related. The two speeches by Appius Claudius Crassus provide a frame for the events starting with the siege of Veii until the laws in 367/366 B.C. The first speech is given at the beginning of book 5 (5.3.2–6.17), while the second is delivered at the end of book 6 (6.40.3–41.12) in similar situations. The frame role of the two speeches is shown by the fact that Appius Claudius plays no special role in these books. Although he makes his first political appearance as a young man in book 4, he carries out his remarkable deeds in book 7 only. [17]

As a matter of fact both speeches by Appius can be seen as an answer to the speeches of the tribunes. The fact that the word *adversus* and its derivatives[18]

---

[15] *Burck*, op. cit. 357–358. *Ch. W. Fornara*, The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1983, 34–36. *G. Miles*, Maiores, Conditores, and Livy's Perspective on the Past. TAPhA 118 (1988), 200. *C. S. Kraus – A. J. Woodman*, Latin Historians. Oxford 1997, 59.

[16] Liv. praef. 9. *Walsh*, op. cit. 7. *Luce*, op. cit. 19. *Borzsák*, op. cit. 147. *Miles*, op. cit. 195. Although *Stadter*, op. cit. 295–297, 301 denies the existence of the units of 15, he virtually has a similar conception of structure when he breaks the narration of the Jugurthine war because of the figure of Marius. Similarly to Camillus, the Aetolian Thoas, about whom Scipio Africanus delivers a necrology after book 35–36, is a linking element in a structural unit. (Liv. 37.45). Cf. *Scafuro*, op. cit. 266–267. Livy must have set dividing points at moments, when a commander arrived at the seat of war or when *summi viri* died, cf. *Luce*, op. cit. 20–22. *A. J. Pomeroy*, Livy's Death Notices. G&R 35/2 (1988) 178–183 disagrees with this view, although he also admits to the importance of the so-called *death notice*.

[17] About the career of Appius cf. *Ogilvie*, op. cit. 607. *S. P. Oakley*, A Commentary on Livy. Books VI–X. New York 1999, 696–697. *A. Vasaly*, Personality and Power: Livy's Description of the Appii Claudii in the First Pentad. TAPhA 117 (1987) 222–225. The text in 5.2.14. refers back to the suggestion of the young Appius in 4.48.6. The speeches e.g. in the case of the third decade also have such a role (i.e. to end a unit): *A. Rossi*, Parallel Lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade. TAPhA 134 (2004) 360, 364.

[18] *adversarium haud imparem* (5.2.13); *militantium adversarii* (5.3.7); *adversariorum certe orationibus* (5.4.2); *adversus tantum apparatum adversariorum* (6.38.4); *adversus intercessionem*

appears strikingly many times in the given chapter reflects well the atmosphere of the debate and the ferocious political struggles between the patricians and plebeians. At the beginning of book 5 the leaders of the army besieging Veii decide to build a winter camp, which is strongly opposed by the tribunes of the *plebs*. In their view the aim of the whole action is to keep the young, who provide the power of the *plebs*, away from the town: *ablegatione ab urbe et ab re publica iuventutem* (Liv. 5.2.4). This, of course, would endanger the people's freedom: *venisse libertatem plebis* (Liv. 5.2.4) and *liberos et cives eorum, non servos militare* (Liv. 5.2.11). Basically Licinius' and Sextius' speech at the end of book 6 has the same structure when the speakers mention the youth's removal: *ablegatione iuventutis ad Veliternum bellum*[19] and the people's aim, freedom: *liberam urbem ... liberos agros* (6.39.9).

Appius Claudius' two reply speeches can be viewed as a pair just like the tribunes' speeches, which form a pair on the basis of their structure and content as well. Appius Claudius' most effective rhetorical technique is contrasting the plebs' and the tribunes' interest (5.3.2; 6.40.7; 6.40.8–11), since in the speeches of the tribunes the speakers' intentions might seem contradictory. It also violates the principle that the tribunes have to serve the people's interests. Appius' speech attempts to tackle this real or suspected problem by trying to follow the tribunes' intentions.[20] When talking about the relationship between the winter camp and the soldiers' pay Appius says in book 5: *Nusquam nec opera sine emolumento nec emolumentum ferme sine impensa opera est. Labor voluptasque, dissimillima natura, societate quadam inter se naturali sunt iuncta.* (5.4.4.) In book 6 tribunes' speech contains the same idea expressed with the help of similar words: *adversus optimates maximo privatim periculo, nullo publice emolumento stare* (6.39.6), as well as: *quae munera quando tandem satis grato animo aestimaturos, si inter accipiendas de suis commodis rogationes spem honoris latoribus earum incidant?* (6.39.10). It is Licinius' and Sextius' intentions that are pilloried when Appius talks about *merces magna.*[21]

The assumed difference of intentions between the *plebs* and the tribunes is

---

(6.38.7); *adversus ea* (6.38.8); *velut in acie adversus optimates* (6.39.6); *adversus tam obstinatam orationem tribunorum* (6.40.1); *semper plebis commodis adversatos esse* (6.40.3); *ea ... adversa quis putet* (6.40.5); *quae ab nostrum quo dicentur adversis accipietis* (6.40.14); *et comitia consulum adversa nobilitate habita* (6.42.9)

[19] 6.39.7. For further parallels cf. *Oakley*, op. cit. 693–694.

[20] *R. de Beaugrande–W. Dressler*, Introduction to Text Linguistics. London–New York 1981, 190–192. Device used in both cases is the figure of *sermocinatio*, which is further emphasised in book 6 by the presentation of *unus civis. Chr. Shuttleworth Kraus*, Livy. Ab Vrbe Condita Book VI. Cambridge 1998, 306, 312. *Adamik T.–A. Jászó A.–Aczél P.*, Retorika (In Hungarian). Budapest 2004, 86.

[21] Liv. 6.40.8, cf. *Shuttleworth Kraus*, op. cit. 313.

also emphasized by the patrician speaker saying that the tribunes have offended not only their belonging to the plebs but to the whole civil community by not acting in a *civilis* way. In 6.40.15 it refers to the tribunes' expectations, i.e. the reward in particular: *sermo est minime civilis*; in book 5 it refers to the way in which the *patres* and *plebs* are prevented from getting closer to each other: *si quicquam in vobis, non dico civilis, sed humani esset* (5.3.9). On the one hand the *civilis* way refers to the speech or activity being acceptable for the audience; on the other hand – arising of course from the previous explanation – it is one of the rhetorical *topoi*. Besides the usual rhetorical *topoi* like *utile, aequum, dignum* we can also encounter *civile* as well as *militare* or *tutum* in both speeches, although book 5 concentrates on military problems and book 6 deals with domestic affairs only. [22]

The four speeches can be arranged in pairs in several ways. At first the tribunes are against a proposal, later they side with another one; Appius' role is exactly the opposite. The speeches in book 5 start with *principium ab adversariis*, whereas those in book 6 begin with *principium a nostra persona*. Both speeches of the tribunes are short and are written in indirect speech; while the speeches of Appius are long ones in direct speech. [23] The mere fact that Appius' first speech wins while the second loses would not reflect deliberate composition if Livy did not draw attention to this by using different rhetorical devices. Knowing Livy's proficiency in rhetoric, it is not surprising that the argument structure of the two speeches reflects their outcome. All the speeches in the *genus deliberativum* are in fact dialogues between the speaker and his audience or between the speaker and his opponents no matter whether they are present or not. Consequently the speeches are made up of sets of arguments and argument devices that always have in mind what the opponent has already said or is about to say. That is the reason that the argument system of the speeches can be regarded as one of their characteristic features. [24] According to the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and to Cicero, the perfect form of argumentation consists of five steps which are called: *propositio, ratio* or *approbatio, rationis confirmatio* or *adsumptio, exornatio* or *adsumptionis approbatio*, and finally *complexio*. There was, however, another version consisting of three steps called *propositio, adsumptio* and *conclusio*. Nevertheless the latter was supposed to be

[22] *Oakley*, op. cit. 705. On *topoi* as means of composition and characterization see *Walsh*, op. cit. 225, 232.

[23] Cf. *Walsh*, op. cit. 222. *Burck*, op. cit. 368–369. To the *recta - obliqua* problem: *J. B. Solodow*, Livy and the Story of Horatius, 1.24–26. TAPhA 109 (1979) 256–257.

[24] *D. Leith– G. Myerson*, The Power of Address. London–New York 1989, 23 sqq.

less effective. [25] Livy did not only study Cicero's theoretical works but he also knew *Rhetorica ad Herennnium*, because the preface of book 6 refers to *Rhet. ad Her*. 3.32. [26] The argument structure of the two speeches by Appius is based on these works.

The effectiveness of the speech in book 5 was due not only to the circumstances (*accepta calamitas apud Veios*, 5.7.1), but to the use of the argument structure as well. In the *propositio* Appius accuses the tribunes of having different interests from the plebs because their only aim is to prevent the plebs from approaching the patres (5.3.2–10). This is followed by the *ratio*, which tries to prove the charges by using arguments *aequum* (5.4.1–8), *dignum* (5.4.9–14) and *utile et necessarium* (5.5.1–11). The *rationis confirmatio* (5.5.12) makes the rhetorical effect perfect with the help of a simile. In *exornatio* (5.6.1–13) Appius goes on to say that breaking off the siege would decrease military discipline and it would also damage the Romans' fame. Moreover, it would enable those from Veii to receive help from the other Etruscans. According to the *complexio* (5.6.14–17) the tribunes demolish the unity of the state and misinterpret the idea of *libertas*. [27]

The other speech follows the structure which was less recommended by ancient authors, and as a matter of fact it can be divided into three part. According to the *propositio* (6.40.3–7) the former deeds of the patricians, or rather of the Claudii, were not against the interests of the *plebs* even if they were sometimes against its mood. On the contrary, Licinius and Sextius deprived the *plebs* of its right to decide freely. The *adsumptio* lists four arguments: *civile* (6.40.8–14), *militare* (6.40.15–18), *indignum* (6.40.19–41.3), *religiosum* (6.41.4–10). Surprisingly the *conclusio* (6.41.10–12) is not a summary of the speech but it returns to the other two proposals concerning the land and debts. This causes a break in Appius' logical system of arguments. In the argumentative part of his speech he only deals with the proposal in which the tribunes' and the plebs' interests could be separated. Nevertheless, in the *conclusio* he hints at a subject not even mentioned in the speech and one which is also against the audience's

---

[25] *Rhet. ad Her.* 2.18.28. Cic. *de inv*. 35,61. *Adamik–Jászó–Aczél*, op. cit. 73 sq. *Balázs J.*, A szöveg (The Text). Budapest 1985, 246.

[26] *Kraus–Woodman*, op. cit. 57, n. 30.

[27] *Ogilvie* divides Appius' speech into units which take into consideration the parts of rhetorical speeches. In the unit he considers *refutatio* (5.4.3–5.12, although its beginning is not marked exactly by O.), however, Appius does not point out what is bad about the tribunes' rogation, but instead he shows the way to be followed. It is because he does not want to threaten the tribunes' *negative face*, and thus he avoids making them react again. *P. Brown–S. C. Levinson*, Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge 1987. In terms of pragmatics he applies *Leech*'s *Politeness Principle. G. Leech*, Principles of Pragmatics. London–New York 1983. The speeches on *libertas* also connect books 35 and 36, cf. *Scafuro*, op. cit. 261–262.

expectations. In the end it is only too obvious that his attempt, which seemed to be unsuccessful from the very beginning (*odio magis iraque quam spe ad dissuadendum*, 6.40.1), is to end in failure.

Taking into consideration the effectiveness of the speeches Livy seems to apply the two argument structures to the two speeches deliberately: first he makes use of the better developed model, later on he applies the less recommended one. This degree of deliberate composition suggests that the speeches indeed formed a pair.

If we look at the two speeches from the point of view of the whole narrative a difference might strike us. The debate in book 5 could be taken out without breaking off the unity of structure and that of content. At the end of the first chapter Livy tells us about the building of the Roman fortresses around Veii, and the seventh chapter deals with the events which took place at the very same fortresses, of course after Appius' and the tribunes' debate has come to an end. This fact is also reflected in the *periocha* written to book 5, in which there is no mention of the Appius speech, though it is a lengthy one (it is 4 *capita* long in a book consisting 55 chapters).[28] The second pair of speeches in book 6 is an organic part of the last chapters. The part about the proposals made by Licinius and Sextius can be divided into five larger sections connected by transitions, and at the end of the book Livy places an annalistic closing.

After the typically Livian introduction consisting of one short sentence we encounter the arguments of the *intercessores legum*. Livy brings out the superfluity of their interference with an amplificatio: *capti et stupentes animi* (6.36.7–9). The inquiry of the proposing tribunes (*interrogando*) follows (6.36.10–37.11). After some delay we get to know the content of their proposals. First we read about a proposal in connection with land. The way the problem is raised shows an A-B-A structure. A is about the plebeians (*plebi*) having little land, B is about the patricians' (*ipsis*) huge possessions and A is again about the plebeians' (*plebeio homini*) small possession. The other proposal is about running into debt, the negative consequences of which are expressed first in a concrete form, then also in an abstract one by the author (*in nervum ac supplicia*).

According to the author of a commentary on book 6 the tribunes' speech (6.32.2 and on) is made up of three parts[29], but in my view the part that she considers to be an *argumentatio* can be divided into a real *argumentatio* and in addition a *refutatio*. There are textual elements that also support the division in four separate parts. At the beginning of the speech the tribunes make reference

---

[28] Liv. per. 5. Generally *periocha* is not a strong argument, cf. *Stadter*, op. cit. 288–289. *C. M. Begbie*, The Epitome of Livy. CQ 17/2 (1967) 333–335.

[29] *Shuttleworth Kraus*, op. cit. 285.

to the two proposals made in the previous unit: *nec agros occupandi modum nec fenore trucidandi plebem*. The parallel structure (noun-gerund-noun) ensuring textual stability presumes some connection in content as well. Thus Livy enriches the content of the text with its composition, too, since the tribunes insist on both their proposals being accepted at the same time (cf. 6.39.11). The actual proposition, or rather the next proposal, follows: *alterum ex plebe consulem*. The argumentation tries to prove that it is *necesse* and that *seponendum extra certamen alterum consulatum*. The *refutatio* (6.36.8–9) denies the plebeians' inaptitude, though they are charged only latter.[30] The final conclusion returns to the main topic: *consulatum superesse plebeiis*. We also notice some gradation in the repetition, as beside the first demand the idea of necessity appears.

The short narrative section lasting till Camillus' appearance (6.37.12–38.3) begins with a fourth proposal: *decemviri creentur ita ut pars ex plebe, pars ex patribus fiat*, which is followed by a lengthy repetition, which seems superfluous.[31] Camillus' behaviour (6.38.4–13) is characterised in the very first sentence: *plenus irae minarumque*, an idea which returns later as well: *percitus ira Camillus ... addidit minas*. The tension of the situation is further stressed by the word order of the phrase: *ferentium legem intercedentiumque*, when the proposal makers and those with the right to *veto* confront each other over the law. The *figura etymologica* in Camillus' speech : *intercessioni – cedunt*, points out the central motive of the speech i.e. the defence of *intercessio*. (In 6.38.5–7 the word *intercessio* comes up five times.) This word refers back to the beginning of the text being analysed, where, talking about the intercessores, Livy declares them *capti et stupentes*. It looks as if Camillus is having a quarrel with the author himself to defend the *intercessio*. In his opinion it is not the interfering tribunes that are *capti*, but those listening to the proposal-maker Licinius and Sextius (*tamquam captae civitati*). Using a simple repetition the author makes it possible to connect two remote, however closely related, parts of the text.

As the proposal about a plebeian consul is rejected, Licinius and Sextius get again the opportunity to speak (6.39.5–12). It is the author who points out the topic of their speech in his opening sentences: *continuari honorem*, words which are returned to by the speakers at the end of their speech: *continuatione honoris*. As with their former speech (6.37.2–10), it is the indication of the topic that provides a frame for the speech. The speeches given by Licinius and

---

[30] To the previous statement that the speech is part of a dialogue cf. *Leith–Myerson*, op. cit. 85.

[31] The content of A *omniumque earum rogationum ... Velitras obsidebat* immediately repeated in: *Prius circumactus est annus ... tribunos militum dilata*. According to its definition we could call it a paraphrase, but because of the immediate repetition we cannot talk either about not remembering the content or about being economical, cf. *Beaugrande–Dressler*, op. cit. 48–49.

Sextius during the two appearances are closely related not only on the basis of he concentric structure of the text being analysed but also because of the similar compositional principle as well. The following parts refer back to the events which had previously taken place and been referred to, which sum up Licinius' and Sextius' political struggles. The *intercessione collegarum* refers back to 6.36.8–9; *ablegatione iuventutis* reminds us of 6.36.9, 6.37.12 and 6.38; *dictatorium fulmen* refers to the text in 6.38.5–9, and it is mentioned again in *iam nec collegas, nec bellum, nec dictatorem obstare*. Having described their struggles, the tribunes recall those proposals that were successful among the people: *liberam urbem ac forum a creditoribus, liberos agros ab iniustis possessoribus* etc. (6.39.9–10).

Although in this part Livy seldom expresses his own opinion, after the tribunes' speech he does express it just as in 6.37.1: *tam obstinatam orationem tribunorum* (6.40.1). It is followed by Appius Claudius' response (6.40.2–41.12). The words *odio magis iraque* recalling 6.38.5–8 draw a parallel on the one hand between Appius and Camillus, on the other between Appius and his own ancestor from book 2, who was *efferatus hinc plebis odio* (2.29.9) and *plenus suarum, plenus paternarum irarum*.[32] The recalling of the two parallels and the rest of the sentence (… *iraque quam spe ad dissuadendum*) gives rise to preconceptions in the readers concerning the content of the speech. Similarly the words from Camillus' speech: *non rei publicae magis universae quam vestra causa* are paraphrased by Appius in the form of *quae pro universa re publica fiant, ea plebi … adversa quis putet*.

Naturally beside the repeated accusations he does not lose sight of the proposals: *de fenore atque agris;* or *quia pecunias alienas, quia agros dono dant* and *altera lege … pellendo finibus dominos, altera fidem abrogari*. These words remind us of the first two proposals but they also cause the previously mentioned break in the logical line (6.41.11). The phrases *alterum ex plebe creari necesse sit* or *necessitatem vobis creandi* recall the *promulgatio* concerning the election of a plebeian consul.

In the political debate consisting of a huge number of arguments and counterarguments Livy creates order by using cohesional devices. The macrostructure of the text ensures that small parts can be isolated from each other within the annalistic narratives. First the tribunes acting against the proposals appear, then comes Licinius' and Sextius' response. After that we come to Camillus' appearance and speech, which is reacted to by the speech of the tribunes. The answer to this is Appius Claudius' speech, which is a lot lengthier than the previous ones and it is followed only by the debate, which is at the

---

[32] Liv. 2.61.3. On the Appii Claudii see *Vasaly*, op. cit. 203–226.

same time the closing of book 6. The five main parts are actually concentric in structure: the first and fifth units present the patricians' arguments, the second and fourth units describe Licinius' and Sextius' arguments, and they all encircle the third unit about Camillus' acting as a dictator.

If we examine how embedded in the context the speech is in book 6, it is striking that Appius' speech at the beginning of book 5 has so little connection to the narrative. Most of the speeches are Livy's own work, therefore it must have depended on the author whether he inserted or left them out. [33] Thus we can assume that the previous one was composed for the sake of the frame structure only so that Livy could link book 5 and book 6 even more closely.

The reader turning the pages of book 5 and book 6 can easily notice a fact that has been noted by scholars for a long time. Book 6 starts with a new *praefatio*, which draws a sharp borderline between the two books. [34] How can we account for these two seemingly contradictory facts? Do the two books belong together, or are they parts of different units? The answer might be given by unifying the two points of view dialectically. The third decade, which is obviously consistent thematically, is divided in the middle into two parts by Livy. The turning point is book 26, more exactly the fate of Capua. [35] However, the two halves are connected by Scipio's and Hannibal's „parallel lives".[36] The same can be assumed about book 5 and book 6. In spite of the break between the two books the frightening Gauls appear as enemy in book 5, then the struggle with them continues in the further parts of the *decas*. The two books are connected by the figure of Camillus just as the third decas is by Scipio's. Camillus' speech does not separate book 5 from the rest since the elements raised in it return through Appius at the end of book 6; what is more they are taken up again later in one of P. Decius Mus' speeches (Liv. 10.7–8). It is probable that by being separate and belonging together at the same time the two books simultaneously symbolise closure and continuation. [37]

It might be asked why Livy applies this complicated structure. The Romans' view concerning historical time was cyclical and linear at the same time. The well-known example of the latter is the *ab urbe condita* dating, which, however, was not generally widespread in ancient times because the founding date

---

[33] *Ogilvie*, op. cit. 634: *free composition by L. himself*. *Burck*, op. cit. 362. Generally: *Fornara*, op. cit. 167.

[34] Liv. 6.1.1. *Burck*, op. cit. 357. *Stadter*, op. cit. 289. *Luce*, op. cit. 3. *Shuttleworth Kraus*, op. cit. 83.

[35] *Stadter*, op. cit. 290. Concerning the main points *Kraus–Woodman*, op. cit. 59–60 has the same views, although she considers the decade as an arc.

[36] *Rossi*, op. cit. 359–381.

[37] *Kraus–Woodman*, op. cit. 58–59.

was uncertain. [38] This kind of continuity of Roman history is suggested by the title of Livy's work, *ab urbe condita*, which is widely used today, although it is probably not the original one. The other way to order historical time was by specifying cycles. It had a long established tradition in Greek historiography, namely the theory of recurrence of forms of state. Plato had already dealt with the forms of state and their transition from one to another (e.g. rep. 8, 544 C), which was called complicated and lengthy even by Polybius. He sketches three ideal forms of state and three of their deformed varieties. History consists of the recurrence of these six forms (Pol. 6.3–9). The Romans were influenced not only by Greek theories but the Etruscan philosophy of life. The question whether Rome will renew and survive or whether it will be laid waste can be traced back to Etruscan roots. The idea of *saeculum*, which gave some kind of answer to these questions, comprised both the elements of linearity and circularity, and it had already been an important literary element since the third century B.C. [39]

While Livy was forming the concept of history in his work, both of the above mentioned conceptions were there before his eyes. In the *praefatio*, *avaritia luxuriaque* (Liv. praef. 11) are mentioned as the cause of the fall, but the *metus hostilis*, well known from Sallust, does not appear at all. According to Gary B. Miles the same can be found in book 5, where all the actions and thoughts of the Romans concentrate on fortune, money and land well until the Gauls' attack. The *metus hostilis* is not mentioned here either although it would be self-evident in this context. Livy consciously draws a parallel with his own age. As with the catastrophe after the moral decline following the occupation of Veii there was a way out due to the reconstruction led by Camillus, in the same way renewal is also possible with the repetition of the cycle. The decadence caused by three treasure from the conquests culminated in the catastrophe of the civil wars, the solution to which could be the reconstruction led by Augustus. [40]

Miles restricted his research to book 5, although reconstruction only starts in book 5 and is completed in book 6. At the end of book 5 some steps related to worship are taken, and the restored gold is placed under Jove's throne (5.20.2–

---

[38] *E. J. Bickerman*, The Chronology of the Ancient World. London 1980, 77–78. *L. Havas*, Romulus Arpinas. Ein wenig bekanntes Kapitel in der römischen Geschichte des Saeculum-Gedankens. ACD 36 (2000), 84 sqq.

[39] *Havas L.–Tegyey I.* (edd.), Bevezetés az ókortudományba IV. (Introduction to the Science of Antiquity). Debrecen 2001, 112–114. *L. Havas*, Cicéron et le septiéme centenaire de Rome (Esquisse préliminaire). ACD 31 (1995) 104 sqq.

[40] *G. Miles*, The Cycle of Roman History in Livy's First Pentad. AJPh 107/1 (1986) 3–22, who calls it a *potentially recurring cyclic* (p. 21). In less detailed, however, the same idea appears at *Havas–Tegyey*, op. cit. 236–239. For the causes of decline see *Fornara*, op. cit. 87.

7). As a result of Camillus' speech the danger of having to move to Veii disappears and the purchase of wood needed for construction is limited (5.55.1–5). These elements of reconstruction return in book 6. The laws and contracts, mainly those related to worship, must be collected (6.1.9–10); the religious implications of the defeat at Allia must be recorded in the calendar (6.1.11–12); the people who have moved to Veii must be forced to move back to Rome (6.4.5); Rome's reconstruction continues and the wall of the city is built (6.4.5–12). The physical and religious renewal of Rome is followed by the restoration of Rome's honour among the neighbouring nations (6.2–11). Book 6, however, is more than the retrieval of the havoc caused by the Gauls. Book 5 presents the decline and fall and the first moments of the escape, while this prosperous state of affairs is stabilised by the events in book 6, Rome's renewal takes place on political grounds as well. Manlius' sedition, which endangers the order of the state, fails; after long struggles Licinius' and Sextius' reforms are agreed to, ensuring a constitutional basis for later development. Thus it is in book 6 that the real renewal takes place. Decline and renewal mean at the same time belonging together and standing apart.[41] It is suggested on the one hand by the elements linking the two books, and on the other hand by the separation of the pentads. It is in this way that the cycle of fall and renewal, which is built up by the two books together, becomes part of the linear conception of Roman history.[42]

---

[41] The close interconnectedness of books 7 and 8 (according to *E. Burck*, Zum Rombild des Livius. In: *E. Burck*, Vom Menschenbild in der römischen Literatur Heildelberg 1966, 324–325) suggests the same interconnectedness of books 5 and 6.
[42] The fact that Camillus, the cycle's *protagonistes* dies at the end of the decline – renewal cycle shows distant relation with the secular concept, cf. *Havas–Tegyey*, op. cit. 113.