DOI: 10.14232/suc.2024.5.209-242

Enno Friedrich
University of Rostock

Two Family Plots and the Reader of Livy (Liv. 1–2; 23–26)

Two family plots are present at narrative junctions in Livy's ab urbe condita: the story of Tarquinius Collatinus' revenge in the section on the Tarquinii in Rome (Liv. 1–2) and the story of Appius Claudius Pulcher's care for his family in the section on the defection and reconquest of Capua (Liv. 23–26). Both family plots can only be recognized by a reader who is particularly awake to family constellations in texts, both tell stories that run alongside the main plots of the narrative and provide contrast and accentuation. In the paper I am arguing that the two family plots are an expression of Livy's polyphonous narrative technique and may have been part of a strategy to adapt to the preferences of readers of Republican gentilician historiography and shape their ideas of historiography towards the ideals of early principate historiography.

Keywords: Titus Livius, Livy, Tarquinius Collatinus, Appius Claudius Pulcher, family, plot, historiography, Lucretia

Introduction

What readers find in texts depends largely on their expectations and cultural dispositions. Reading ancient Roman historiographical texts in modernity, modern readers bring their own expectations and dispositions to the texts, and understand them starting from these. A scholarly perspective on ancient texts is different from an everyday perspective only in so far that scholars strive to adapt their scholarly expectations

and dispositions to those of the (ancient) ideal reader, so that they will be ultimately able to grasp not only what comes to them depending on their personal disposition, but what the text has to offer in its own potential. Scholarly work with ancient texts is, thus, mainly a work of adapting one's expectations and dispositions to the offers of the texts while reading, meaning that scholarly expectations and dispositions of classicist readers are not a given but have to change during the process.

In this paper, I will address a cultural-structural phenomenon in Livy's histories that calls for an adaptation of the scholarly expectations in meeting the text: Livy, as I will argue, is addressing a reader who is very apt to understand family relationships as a motivating force. Even more than that, Livy's ideal reader seems to understand actions motivated by a logic of family that I call family plots as structuring markers in the polyphonous narrative of *ab urbe condita*. These insights help to gain a clearer picture of Livy's ideal reader and, consequently, may shine a light on the special importance family plots may have played in early principate historiography.

Using the new perspective on family plots, I will show narrative structures in *ab urbe condita* that have not been treated in this light up to now. I will present two examples: Tarquinius Collatinus in the story of Lucretia (Liv. 1–2) and Appius Claudius Pulcher and his clemency towards the senators of Capua (Liv. 23–26). Drawing on these examples, I will point out the importance of family in the eyes of Livy's reader and discuss two different literary strategies that might be connected to the use of family plots in the two example cases: accentuation through contrast, and rooting of the new historical narratives of the principate in Republican gentilician historiography.

The Involved Reader of Ab Urbe Condita *and the Creation of Suspense by Polyphonous Narration*

While historical scholarship of Livy is aiming to elucidate the veracity of Livy's account of the times he wrote about, literary scholarship has, for a while, been mainly interested in Livy's language, style and composition, in short in his literary art, in the context of early Augustan literature.[1] Recently, the rise of narratology and its application to all genres, including historiography, has led to a multiplication and specification of this line of research. Livy's readers have thus come in the focus:[2] they must be able and willing to deal with a polyphonous narrative, that includes conflicting, and also non-Roman, perspectives on the history of the Roman empire.[3] They are involved readers, who have to do their own share of interpretative work and are meant to be drawn into a text that is rather exciting than reassuring.[4] This suspense is created by ambiguities[5] and counterfactual conditionals,[6] by empathy through vivid narration of human-interest-stories,[7] or through the

[1] Forsythe (1999: 8).
[2] Dennis Pausch uses the readers as a tool to study Livy's narrative techniques, Pausch (2011), cf. Pausch (2021: 60).
[3] Pausch (2011: 189–190), cf. Tennyson (2022: 19) on Livy's characterisation of Romulus, Liv. 1, 14.
[4] Pausch (2011: 191–192; 253; cf. 2).
[5] E.g. the unclear allocation of the narrator's sympathy, when the brutality of Roman soldiers and their dishonourable motivation during the massacre of the civilians of Iliturgi during Scipio's Spanish campaign is shown (Liv. 28, 20, 6–7, cf. Pausch [2011: 137]) or when the reader is presented with the difficulty of Hannibal's crossing of the Alps through the eyes of the Carthaginians (Liv. 21, 32–33, cf. Tsitsiou-Chelidoni [2009: 533], Levene [2010: 259], Pausch [2011: 132–152]).
[6] E.g. when the readers are offered alternative versions of history that did not take place, like in the case of M. Porcius Cato's successful intervention during the battle at the Thermopylae, when the reader is first told about the potential losses of the Romans if Cato had not intervened (Liv. 36, 18, 8, cf. Walsh [1990: 10], Pausch [2011: 200–202]).
[7] E.g. in the episode of Publius Aebutius and Faecenia Hispala, with whom the reader is likely to feel compassion independently from the grand political narrative of the *de Bacchanalibus* (Liv. 39, 9–14, cf. Pausch [2011: 216–222]).

explicit anticipation of future events.[8] These various stories are told in a multifarious structure that can be perceived and evaluated differently by different readers.

Plotlines and episodes of varying sizes that represent distinct units of historical or anecdotical content exist alongside the annalistic grid of consular years and thus allow to follow the narrative on different roads.[9] As the text simulates a continuous flow of time, the ratio of narrated time to narrative time varies,[10] even though certain structural markers of time, like consular years and election cycles, keep reoccurring.[11] This variety in a simulated regularity follows the needs of the plot.[12] But even beyond the consular years and the necessary connecting elements, the structure of *ab urbe condita* is multifarious: the single books usually begin and end at meaningful points in the history.[13] On top of this, groups of books have thematic subjects, and can be ordered in pentads, decades, or pentekaidecades.[14] These different structures are not excluding each

[8] E.g. the repeated announcements of the war with Perseus (Liv. 39–42, cf. Pausch [2011: 225–237]).

[9] Levene (2010: 1–33) on the third decade, Pausch (2011: 75–123) on the annalistic schema, (225–237) on the extended plot leading towards the war with Perseus. Livy's *ab urbe condita* is an annalistic text. The story unfolds in consular years, Pausch (2011: 75–85).

[10] Not every (consular) year is given equal attention. The number of years treated in a book of Livy (excluding the quasi-mythological first book) varies between 42 and only one quarter of a year and can, thus, be narrated in minute detail or in an overview fashion, Stadter (2009: 111–114), cf. Pausch (2011: 75).

[11] E.g. the election-cycle of the Roman magistrates structures the longer or shorter narration of history and regularly breaks up otherwise unified plotlines in the story, cf. Pausch (2011: 82).

[12] This may have been generally the case with so called annalistic texts, cf. Marincola (1999: 314). John William Rich has shown that, as Livy is usually telling relatively unified thematic stories that span several consular years, he has to make connections beyond the annalistic grid, which necessitate prolepses and analepses, Rich (2009: 121–123), cf. Levene (2010: 45, 63, 74–81), Pausch (2011: 89–101).

[13] Like the first book ending with the turn from the monarchy to the republic, cf. Pausch (2011: 111).

[14] Like the pentad of the first five books from the foundation of Rome until the rebuilding after the sack of Rome by the Gauls, or the pentekaidecade of the first 15 books

other, but stand alongside each other.[15] Livy's readers have therefore various structures at their disposal when they want to orient themselves in the history: consular years, books, pentads, pentekaidecades. Different structural elements may highlight different elements of the plot or the story and thus contribute to the polyphonous, multifarious nature of the text. Usually, at every point in Livy's narrative, the readers find themselves in an overlap of different structures. If one picks any specific portion of the text, the portion has to be understood from the point of view of its belonging to various structural units in the narrative.[16]

Another layer of structure and interconnection is added to the text by the exemplary nature of many episodes and characters. Characters or whole scenes appear as variations of the same exemplary types and invite readers to judge them comparatively,[17] inviting comparison with each other at least as much as contextualization in their direct textual surroundings.[18] The involved readers have to or are free to take up some structural offers of the text and leave others aside, as they make their way through the many layered narrative. The family plots I will intro-

ending with the Romans taking control of all of Italy, followed by another pentekaidecade comprising the Punic Wars, Luce (1977: 7), cf. Pausch (2011: 114–115).

[15] In this light, earlier discussions that would posit different structural patterns as exclusive against each other, can be refuted, cf. Pausch (2011: 115–116) with the older scholarship.

[16] For instance, in the case of Liv. 23, 32, 4–9, the story of the adventurous journey of the Macedonian embassy to Hannibal: a) in book 23, b) during the consulate of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus and Q. Fabius Maximus, this is the year 215/14 BC, c) in the decade of books that covers the second Punic War (21–30), d) in the pentekaidecade that covers the Punic Wars (16–30). Additional, more irregular, thematic structures could be found, like episodes or thematic blocks, cf. Levene (2010: 27).

[17] Like interactions of older men/leaders/fathers with younger men/subordinates/sons as the recurring centre of many episodes, e.g., Liv. 2, 3–5 (Iunius Brutus and his sons), 8, 7 (Titi Manlii), 8, 30–35 (Papirius Cursor and Fabius Maximus Rullianus), cf. Levene (2010: 81), Pausch (2011: 242–246), Albrecht (2016: 211–218), Schlip (2020: 23–25).

[18] Cf. Levene (2010: 29). Referring back to the Macedonian embassy in Liv. 23, 32, 4–9, one might have to see this portion of the text as part of an entire plotline about fraudulent Macedonian embassies or as an exemplary case for fraudulent foreign embassies recurring in *ab urbe condita*.

duce are one structure that offers itself to Livy's involved reader. This offer is facultative like most structures and plotlines in Livy's narrative.

Family Plots in the Undergrowth

The optional structures in Livy's histories are usually introduced by specific markers. This is obvious in the consular years of the annalistic grid with the explicit mention of the new magistrates, or in the books with their marked beginnings and ends. The less regular structures have markers of their own that are often related to specific plotlines. In this paper, I will explore two cases where a specific optional structure, a section of the text that could be given a meaningful headline and could stand alone to a certain degree, an episode, are each framed with a family plot. These two family-plots are embedded in the introductory and end sections of the episodes. For the reader, who will spot these markers, the family plots change the meaning of the episodes they frame. Their inclusion opens alternative interpretations or adds colour. Before I will elaborate on this, I will explain the family plots and episodes in question.

Tarquinius Collatinus, the Rape of Lucretia and the Story of the Tarquinii in Rome (Liv. 1–2)

In the story of the rape of Lucretia (Liv. 1, 57–60), her husband Tarquinius Collatinus plays a minor role and is outshone by Brutus, who becomes the champion of the emerging republic. Collatinus follows a plot of his own, though, justice in the Tarquin family, independently from the change in the political conditions for which Lucretia's suicide and Brutus' revolution have become the prominent myths.

When Rome is at war with the Rutulian city of Ardea, the Romans besiege the city for a long time and a group of young male aristocrats, who are members of the besieging army in attendance, attend a sympo-

sium at the house of Sextus Tarquinius, the son of the king. At this event, Sextus Tarquinius, Tarquinius Collatinus, his cousin, and their friends discuss the virtue of their wives and decide to ride to their different homes at night to check what their wives are doing in their absence. While all the other wives of the young Roman aristocrats are passing time idly at symposia, Lucretia, the wife of Collatinus, displays special virtue, as she is busy during the night spinning and guiding her maids.[19] At this encounter, Sextus Tarquinius falls madly in love with Lucretia.[20] A few days later he pays her a visit alone and abuses the hospitality of his relatives to rape Lucretia while threatening to kill her.[21] The next day, Lucretia calls for her father, Spurius Lucretius, and her husband, who bring along their friends Iunius Brutus and Publius Valerius. Lucretia reveals the rape, makes the four men swear to revenge her and ends her life with a dagger.[22] The four men, led by Iunius Brutus, incite a revolution by making the crime of Sextus Tarquinius public.[23] Tarquinius Superbus and his family are exiled[24] and Iunius Brutus and Tarquinius Collatinus are elected the first consuls of the Roman Republic.[25] The story of the rape of Lucretia is a distinct episode of its own. In Livy's composition, it is also part of a wider narrative about the Tarquinii in Rome,[26] more precisely its culmination.

To place the story in its immediate surroundings, it is necessary to remember the lines of episodes that form the greater story of the Tarquinii in Rome.[27] They are related to each other by recurring themes

[19] Liv. 1, 57, 4–10.
[20] Liv. 1, 57, 10.
[21] Liv. 1, 58, 1–5.
[22] Liv. 1, 58, 5–12.
[23] Liv. 1, 59, 1–10.
[24] Liv. 1, 59, 11–60, 2.
[25] Liv. 1, 60, 4.
[26] Liv. 1, 34–60.
[27] Liv. 1, 34–38 (Tarquinius Priscus and Tanaquil, his Becoming King and his Deeds), 39–45 (Servius Tullius and Tanaquil and his Deeds), 46–48 (Tarquinius Superbus, Tullia

and similar characters. The Tarquinii are usually reaching their goals through ruses.[28] On four occasions, the rule over Rome is narrated as the outcome of men being encouraged to change the flow of government by a female advisor.[29] In all of these stories the *superbia* of the Tarquins – in the negative and in the positive sense – is a recurring element.[30] The story of the rape of Lucretia brings all of the above mentioned themes to their conclusions: the last ruse of Sextus Tarquinius and his last act of *superbia* – the rape – are punished and with it also the effects of the earlier ruses of the Tarquinii are undone by the toppling of the dynasty. The characters that represent Tarquin rule at the time – the king, Tullia and Sextus have to leave Rome. Sextus dies in Gabii. The narrative about the Tarqinii in Rome is composed artfully and forms a discernible narrative subsection in *ab urbe condita* by its unique topic and many intrastructural links that give a strong coherency to the different episodes. Apart from the elements named above, this subsection is marked at its begin-

and his Becoming King through the Killing of Servius), 49–52 (Tarquinius Superbus, Turnus and the Ruse against the Latini), 53–54 (Sextus Tarquinius and the Conquest of Gabii), 55–56 (Tarquinius Superbus sacrilegious building activity and the oracle to Brutus), 57–60 (The Rape of Lucretia and the End of the Reign of the Tarquinii).

[28] Tarquinius Priscus becomes king by sending the sons of his predecessor Ancus away on the day of the election (Liv. 1, 35, 2). Tanaquil hides the death of Tarquinius Priscus to sneak Servius Tullius on the throne (Liv. 1, 41, 5–6). Tullia and Tarquinius Superbus kill their partners to become more powerful together (Liv. 1, 46, 4–9). Tarquinius Superbus' intrigues to gain the support of the senate against Servius Tullius (Liv. 1, 47, 7–12). Tarquinius Superbus frames Turnus and has him killed to crush his opposition (Liv. 1, 51). Sextus Tarquinius infiltrates Gabii to subdue the city under his father's command (Liv. 1, 53, 5–54,10). Sextus Tarquinius abuses the trust of Lucretia to rape her (Liv. 1, 58, 1–5).

[29] Tanaquil – Tarquinius Priscus, Tanaquil – Servius Tullius, Tullia – Tarquinius Superbus, Lucretia – Tarquinius Collatinus/Iunius Brutus. Cf. Kowalewski (2002: 58–85, 121–123). Kowalewski groups Lucretia in a different set of women exempla than Tanaquil and Tullia, but acknowledges the political impact of the story. Cf. Cailleux (2016) on the type of the officious counsellor, also including Tanaquil and Tullia, and excluding Lucretia.

[30] It is mentioned five times (Liv. 1, 34–60), always in relationship to Tarquinius Superbus: his (feigned) cruelty against his son (53, 6) and his people (54, 1; 57, 2; 59, 9), his apparent inclemency in conversation (54, 7).

ning and end with references to a family conflict in the Tarquin family, at the core of which lies the opposition between Sextus Tarquinius and Tarquinius Collatinus, which the Lucretia episode resolves.

When introduced in book 1, 57, 6 Tarquinius Collatinus is not a blank page but somebody with a particular history within the family. Lucretia's husband is introduced as *Egerii filius* (Liv. 1, 57, 6) – 'son of Egerius'. This attribute refers back to the story of Tarquinius Priscus at the beginning of the Tarquinii subsection. The progenitor of the Tarquinii, according to Livy, is a refugee from Corinth to Tarquinii with the name Demaratus (1, 34, 2). This man had two sons: Lucumo, the later fifth king of Rome Tarquinius Priscus, and Arruns. Arruns had a son, of whom he did not know, as he died while his wife was pregnant; this son would later be called Egerius (1, 34, 3) and is the father of Tarquinius Collatinus. As Arruns, the father, did not know of his son, neither did Demaratus, the grandfather, when he died shortly after Arruns, still before Egerius was born. For this reason, Lucumo, the remaining son of Arruns and apparently the only heir, inherited all of Demaratus's inheritance, including the part which, had Egerius been known to Demaratus, would have been the share of his brother Arruns and his offspring (1, 34, 3). Egerius, according to Livy, was given his name because he had been born too late to inherit any of his grandfather's wealth and, therefore, had grown up in a condition of great lack (*egere*) (Liv. 1, 34, 3). Lucumo, the later Tarquinius Priscus, had used his inheritance, greater by the loss of his nephew, to marry a wealthy woman of good standing, Tanaquil (1, 34, 4), and become king of Rome with her help. In Egerius and his son Tarquinius Collatinus, we are meeting the disinherited, disenfranchised branch of the Tarquinii family. Thus, when the text reminds its readers at the introduction of Tarquinius Collatinus at the banquet of Sextus that he is a 'son of Egerius', it reminds them that Sextus Tarquinius and Tarquinius Collatinus are two Tarquinii, whose

contrasting stations in life have been predestined by the injustice two generations earlier. Sextus Tarquinius, the current heir to the throne of Rome, is the grandson of Lucumo, and Tarquinius Collatinus, the kinsman in his following, is the grandson of Arruns.

The allusion to Tarquinius Collatinus' family background with the attribute *Egerii filius* is very brief. Only a reader, who has the family story of the two branches of the Tarqinii in mind, could understand the rape of Lucretia in the light of a family conflict within the Tarquin family, especially as more than 20 chapters separate Livy's account of Lucumo's lucky inheritance and its brief mention in the introduction of Collatinus.[31] This understanding might also be impeded by the more compelling Republican plot of Lucretia and Iunius Brutus. However, the opposition between Sextus and Collatinus is marked clearly on other occasions in the episode, taking up the initial hint to the family conflict.

At the symposium, Tarquinius Collatinus brags about the virtue of his wife (1, 57, 7) and initiates the chain of visits that ends with the proof of Lucretia's superiority (1, 57, 10).

> *inde certamine accenso Collatinus negat verbis opus esse, paucis id quidem horis posse sciri quantum ceteris praestet Lucretia sua.*[32]
>
> Then Collatinus, burning with the spirit of competition, denied that there was need of further talk, because within a few hours they could know how much his Lucretia was superior to the other wives. (Liv. 1, 57, 7)

In the initial conversation, the text states expressly that Collatinus was 'burning with the spirit of competition' and reference to Collatinus'

[31] Liv. 1, 34, 2–3; 57, 6.
[32] Text of Liv. 1–5 after Ogilvie (1974).

wife is made with the possessive pronoun *sua*, emphasizing Lucretia's belonging to her husband. Collatinus is looking for competition with his cousin and his friends; Lucretia is clearly intended to be his means to triumph over the others. The text performs the scene particularly vividly by giving Collatinus' words in indirect speech – we can hear the eager young man ourselves. The triumph of Lucretia over the other men's wives is consequently described as a triumph of the husband.

> *Muliebris certaminis laus penes Lucretiam fuit. Adveniens vir Tarquiniique excepti benigne; victor maritus comiter invitat regios iuvenes.*
>
> The crown for the competition of the wives was with Lucretia. When the man and the Tarquinii had been gladly received upon their arrival, the winning husband cheerfully invited the kingly young men. (Liv. 1, 57, 10)

Collatinus is ultimately described as *victor maritus* – a winning husband – underscoring again that the competition is between him and the other men. In the scene, Collatinus' joy about his triumph results in his cordially inviting the other men for dinner, which is expressed with the adverb *comiter*. According to the story, it was then that Sextus is taken over by the urge to rape Lucretia.

> *Ibi Sex. Tarquinium mala libido Lucretiae per vim stuprandae capit; cum forma tum spectata castitas incitat.*
>
> There, an evil urge to commit adultery with Lucretia by force took a hold of Sextus Tarquinius; as he was attracted as much by her beautiful body as by the chastity he had just witnessed. (Liv. 1, 57, 10)

Next to Lucretia's physical beauty (*forma*) the text mentions expressly the fact that Sextus had witnessed Lucretia's chastity (*spectata castitas*)

as instigators of the rape. While one might attribute this attraction to the particular challenge posed by the chastity of the woman, the timing in the story would suggest otherwise. Following the logic of a rivalry, it happens at this particular moment of Collatinus' triumph that Sextus decides to rape Lucretia. He wants to take the price away from his inferior kinsman to prove his superiority in the end. A son of Egerius must not own what a grandson of Lucumo does not have! Sextus and Collatinus act according to a logic of competition, that is in accordance with the unresolved feud of the two branches of the Tarquinii.

The opposition between Collatinus and Sextus is present yet at another level. At the culmination of the contest of the wives, when Lucretia has been proven the most virtuous, Collatinus is twice separated from Sextus and his friends in the text. The text goes: *Adveniens vir Tarquiniique excepti benigne; victor maritus comiter invitat regios iuvenes.*[33] Two times Collatinus, Sextus and their group are described; both times Sextus and his friends are given an attribute that appears to separate them from Collatinus. In the first instance, *adveniens vir Tarquiniique*, 'the man upon his arrival and the Tarquinii', Tarquinius Collatinus is separated from the other Tarquinii and his true belonging to the group of Tarquins is put into question. In the second instance, *victor maritus comiter invitat regios iuvenes*, 'the winning husband cheerfully invited the kingly young men,' the other Tarquins are given the attribute ‚kingly' (*regius*), underscoring that they belong to the king's family or following, while Collatinus, it seems, does not. In both instances, Collatinus is marked as Lucretia's husband, the owner of the price in the contest of the wives. The description mirrors the psychological state of Tarquinius Collatinus that is also otherwise displayed in the contest of the wives and seems to suggest itself in the opposition of the two family-branches: Collatinus' true belonging to the *gens Tarquinia* and to the dynasty of the king is doubtful. Even though he is a Tarquin, he is

[33] Liv. 1, 57, 10. Translation above.

none of the Tarquins who matter. To counter this perceived inferiority, Collatinus needs the victory in the contest of the wives, pushes for it and savours it in front of the other Tarquinii.

When Lucretius, Valerius and Iunius swear to revenge the rape of Lucretia, Collatinus does so, too,[34] but, in accordance with the plot of the two branches of the Tarquinii, he has an additional motivation to do so. By joining the rebellion, he revenges two injustices: 1. the one that has been committed against him personally by his cousin Sextus, the rape of Lucretia his wife; 2. the one committed by Lucumo against the Arruns-Tarquins. By toppling the dynasty of the Lucumo-Tarquins and becoming ruler of Rome in the guise of consul, he corrects the suppression of the Arruns-Tarquins by the Lucumo-Tarquins two generations earlier. Putting a focus on this plot of the two family-branches is relevant for the composition of the Tarquinii-subsection in Livy's narrative.

The episodes of Lucumo stealing Egerius' inheritance[35] and of Collatinus helping to end the rule of the Lucumo-Tarquins in Rome[36] give a frame to the story of the Tarquins in Rome in *ab urbe condita*. The brief but explicit reference to Collatinus' family background serves to build this frame. Once the reader is made aware of the family context, the symmetry, exact contrast and inner connection of the two stories becomes apparent and rounds off the narrative subsection. In both stories, a Lucumo Tarquin takes what belongs rightfully to an Arruns-Tarquin, the inheritance of Egerius and the wife of Collatinus.[37] In the first story,

[34] Liv. 1, 59, 1–2.
[35] Liv. 1, 34, 3–4.
[36] Liv. 1, 59–60.
[37] The parallel between the lucky inheritance and the virtuous (and economically desirable) wife might be reflected also in Lucretia's potentially speaking name (*Lucretia – lucrum*). She is a boon to any household. Neither speaking name nor the parallel could have been the product of Livy's literary genius alone but would have to have been present in the earlier tradition. Lucretia's name is documented by Cicero and among other instances in a fragment from Accius, cf. Acc. *praetext.* 1 *Brutus* (Ribbeck) = Cic. *div.* 1, 44; Cic. *rep.* 2, 46, 1; 10; *leg.* 2, 10, 10; *fin.* 2, 66, 1; 5, 64, 8.

the injustice goes unpunished and leads to the Lucumo-Tarquins becoming rulers over Rome.[38] In the second story, the injustice is revenged in the political sphere. Sextus and the Lucumo-Tarquins are driven into exile and the Arruns-Tarquin Collatinus becomes consul, reversing also the outcome of the first story and the original injustice. In this light, it is possible to understand the story of the Tarquinii in Rome and the rape of Lucretia as a story about justice in the Tarquin family.

Ultimately, this is not very likely, though. The story of the rape of Lucretia is not a story about the restoration of justice within the Tarquin family, but, as we are used to think, about the birth of the Republic. Livy takes no chances that we understand it correctly. At the beginning of the second book, Tarquinius Collatinus, the consul, the quasi king of Rome[39] has to step down again, because of his belonging to the hated *gens Tarquinia*.[40] The results of the family plot, justice in the Tarquin family, are not only immediately removed again, but even corrected in favour of the Republican narrative. All of this had to happen to end the reign of external Tarquin rulers, even though Livy's narrator distances himself from the rash acts of the Roman senate and people and calls the necessity of the consul's removal into question.[41]

[38] Livy's text emphasizes the effect that the important inheritance had on Lucumo's prospect of marrying Tanaquil and, thus, acquire all the benefits that this union opened up to him, Liv. 1, 34, 4: *Lucumoni contra, omnium heredi bonorum, cum diuitiae iam animos facerent, auxit ducta in matrimonium Tanaquil, summo loco nata et quae haud facile iis in quibus nata erat humiliora sineret ea quo innupsisset.* – 'But for Lucumo, the heir of all the goods, as the riches already raised his spirits, the marriage with Tanaquil, who had been born at the highest position and who would not easily let pass that the position she had married into would be lowlier than the position she had been born into, the prospects became brighter.'

[39] Liv. 2, 1, 7–8: *Libertatis autem originem inde magis quia annuum imperium consulare factum est quam quod deminutum quicquam sit ex regia potestate numeres.* – 'The origin of liberty lay rather in the fact, that the dominion of the consuls was limited to one year rather than there being any reduction from the power of the kings'.

[40] Liv. 2, 2, 3–11.

[41] Liv. 2, 2, 2: *Ac nescio an nimium undique eam minimisque rebus muniendo modum excesserint.* – ‚I do not know whether they exceeded their measure by defending liberty at all sides and against even the smallest things.'

To give a brief summary, there is a distinct family plot about justice in the *gens Tarquinia* inscribed into the story of the Tarquinii in Rome in Livy's *ab urbe condita*, given prominence by its inclusion in the structure, junctions and plotline of the narrative subsection. Although it is there and can be traced into Livy's narration of the story of the rape of Lucretia, it is not meant to overrule the more prominent plotline of the birth of the Republic by Lucretia's self-sacrifice and Iunius Brutus' particular heroism. In a later section of this paper, we will have to ask, what effects the inclusion of this additional plotline has on the text and what strategy it might serve. First, a second example of family plot in *ab urbe condita* shall be presented for comparison.

Appius Claudius Pulcher and his futile clemency towards the senators of Capua (Liv. 23–26)

In the second Punic War, Capua defects from Rome and is reconquered. After the reconquest, the two commanders of the Roman army are divided on the punishment of the Capuan senators. While Q. Fulvius Flaccus wants to execute the senators right away, App. Claudius Pulcher opts to wait for a decision from the senate in Rome and save the Capuans for interrogation. Fulvius has the Capuans secretly executed in neighbouring towns before a verdict from Rome can reach him.[42] Appius Claudius Pulcher's attempt to save the Capuans can be understood as part of a family plot inscribed in the text.

Like the section on the Tarquinii in Rome and the episode of the rape of Lucretia, the defection of the Capuans has to be seen as one narrative section within the greater narrative of the Hannibalic War in the third decade consisting of a number of smaller episodes that stand alongside the story arc of the entire section and support its unity at the

[42] Liv. 26, 15, 1–10. Cf. Ungern-Sternberg (1975: 77–122); Levene (2010: 354–375); Pausch (2011: 182–185).

same time.[43] One recurring plotline that spans over four books and is one of the playing fields for the turn from Carthaginian to Roman success in the decade is the defection and reconquest of Capua. The story of Capua's defection begins with Pacuvius Calavius. After the battle of Lake Trasimene in 217 BC, the ambitious and populist nobleman saves the Capuan senate from a bloody revolution of the people, making himself its leader and forcing the senators to follow popular opinion.[44] This release in optimate leadership is identified by Livy as the decisive cause for Capua's opportunist turn towards Hannibal after the battle of Cannae.[45] Under this condition, Vibius Virrius, the emerging leader of the anti-Roman party, having learned the details of Rome's defeat at an au-

[43] The story of the Hannibalic Wars in *ab urbe condita* consists broadly of two halves, the first (21–25) focussing on the successful warfare of Hannibal in Italy, the second (26–30) on the comeback of the Romans centring on the victories in Spain, the reconquest of Sicily and the Italian cities and, finally, the decisive battle of Zama in Africa leading to a crippling peace treaty for the Carthaginians. Below this structure, each single book has a thematic focus and a story arc of its own, cf. Levene (2010: 25–30), while also forming symmetries or contrasts with other books in the decade and, thus, supporting its greater structure: speeches of Hannibal and the older Scipio at Ticinus (21) – speeches of Hannibal and the younger Scipio at Zama (30), Carthaginian victory at Cannae (22) – Roman victory at Metaurus (27), moral decline of the Carthaginian soldiers in Capua (23) – the same of the Roman soldiers during a winter of peace in Spain (28), and more pairings of this nature. Cf. Levene (2010: 16–19; 78).

[44] Liv. 23, 2, 2–4, 3, cf. Ungern-Sternberg (1975: 26–28).

[45] Liv. 23, 4, 4–6: *iam vero nihil in senatu agi aliter quam si plebis ibi esset concilium. Prona semper civitas in luxuriam non ingeniorum modo vitio sed affluenti copia voluptatium et illecebris omnis amoenitatis maritimae terrestrisque*, (5) *tum vero ita obsequio principum et licentia plebei lascivire ut nec libidini nec sumptibus modus esset*. (6) *Ad contemptum legum magistratuum senatus accessit tum, post Cannensem cladem, ut cuius aliqua verecundia erat, Romanum quoque spernerent imperium*. 'And indeed already nothing was handled differently by the senate than if it had been an assembly of the people. A state that had always been bent on luxury, which was not only due to the defects of the locals, but to the great affluence of desirables and to the charms of every kind of maritime or inland amenity, (5) would now, with the consent of the leaders and the unrestraint of the people, run wild, so that there was no limit neither on indulgence nor on the costs. (6) To the contempt of the laws of the senatorial magistrates was then, after the defeat of Cannae, added that they now also despised, what had been of a somewhat high regard before, the power of Rome.'

dience with the consul, negotiates a treaty with Hannibal and brings Capua's defection into effect.[46] The Capuans, who celebrate Hannibal when he first enters the city, are contrasted with the critic Decius Magius, who advises against the treaty with the Carthaginians and is, eventually, removed from Capua by Hannibal, whereby the treaty is broken,[47] and the son of Pacuvius Calavius, who plans to assassinate Hannibal and abstains only out of filial piety.[48] Carthaginian-ruled Capua seems not to bring luck to its new masters: already in the first winter, the Carthaginian troops stationed in the city are said to be corrupted by luxury.[49] In the following year, the Capuans, trying to trick the Cumaeans, fall themselves prey to a ruse of the loyal Cumaeans and lose 2000 men to a Roman attack during a public sacrifice outside of the city.[50] In the year 212, four years after the defection, the Capuans cause a delay in transport and give occasion to Hanno's defeat and the destruction of the Carthaginian camp near Beneventum,[51] which leads to the siege of Capua by the Roman army.[52]

The battle of Capua begins with a loss of the Romans followed by a duel between a Roman and a Capuan knight who had been *hospites* before the war, eventually won by the Roman.[53] Since Hannibal, while destroying Roman armies in Lucania and Apulia, cannot disperse the Roman armies from Capua,[54] the siege begins with the Romans manning entrenchments, storing provisions and encircling the city.[55] The Capuans send an embassy to Hannibal, asking for relief, and refuse a

[46] Liv. 23, 5, 1–7, 2. Cf. Ungern-Sternberg (1975: 29–31).
[47] Liv. 23, 7, 4–12; 10.
[48] Liv. 23, 8–9.
[49] Liv. 23, 18, 10–16.
[50] Liv. 23, 35, 1–36, 4.
[51] Liv. 25, 13, 3–14, 14.
[52] Cf. Liv.25, 15, 18–19.
[53] Liv. 25, 18. Cf. Todaro (2022).
[54] Liv. 25, 19–21.
[55] Liv. 25, 20, 1–3; 22, 5–9.

last Roman offer of amnesty.[56] In the next year, after having implemented a new tactics of using light infantry brought into battle by horsemen,[57] the Romans have the upper hand in Capua. Hannibal fails again to trap the besieging Roman armies between the Capuans and himself,[58] and turns towards Rome to force the Roman armies to leave.[59] Rome withstanding Hannibal's attack, Hannibal leaves Rome and Capua for southern Italy.[60] Having seen a last secret message to Hannibal intercepted and the messengers mutilated,[61] the despairing Capuan senators hold a meeting within which Vibius Virrius, the leader of the anti-Roman party, convinces his followers to commit suicide,[62] while the other Capuans hand over the city to the Romans.[63]

The last act of the Capuan story concerns the punishment of the Capuan senate. The two former consuls in command, proconsuls at the time of the reconquest in 211, Appius Claudius Pulcher and Quintus Fulvius Flaccus, differ on how to proceed. While Fulvius Flaccus wants to execute the Capuan senators immediately, Claudius insists that they should be spared for interrogations, as he thinks they might share information on the possible cooperation of other Italian cities with Capua during the war:

> *De supplicio Campani senatus haudquaquam inter Fulvium Claudiumque conveniebat. Facilis impetrandae veniae Claudius, Fulvi durior sententia erat. (2) Itaque Appius Romam ad senatum arbitrium eius rei totum reiciebat: (3) percontandi etiam aequum esse potestatem fieri patribus, num com-*

[56] Liv. 25, 22, 10–16.
[57] Liv. 26, 4.
[58] Liv. 26, 5, 1–6, 13.
[59] Liv. 26, 7.
[60] Liv. 26, 8–11.
[61] Liv. 26, 12.
[62] Liv. 26, 13, 1–14, 5.
[63] Liv. 26, 14, 6–9.

municassent consilia cum aliquis sociorum Latini nominis <aut> municipiorum et num ope eorum in bello forent [et ad municipiorum] adiuti.[64]

Concerning the punishment of the Campanian senate there was no agreement at all between Fulvius and Claudius. Claudius wanted to grant an easily obtainable mercy while Fulvius' judgement was harsher. Therefore, Appius wanted to defer the entire decision in this case to the senate, saying it would also be just that the senators be given the opportunity to interrogate [the Campanian senators], whether they had shared their plans with anybody from the allied towns of Latin origin and whether they had been assisted in war with their means. (Liv. 26, 15, 1–3)

While Claudius expects his colleague to wait until a decision from the senate can reach them, Fulvius orders troops to move to the neighbouring towns, Teanum and Cales, where the Capuan senators are held in custody and has them all whipped and beheaded. He continues this procedure even when a letter from Rome with orders to delay the executions reaches him in the second town, Cales, pretending not to have received the message in time.[65] Livy speculates about the authenticity of his first report of the events, bringing a second version according to which Claudius, who had been injured during the battle with the Capuans and Hannibal,[66] had already died at the time of the reconquest. The narrator, thus, calls into question the exact circumstances of the executions, before giving his report on the fate of Campania under Roman rule.[67]

The final act of the Capuan story is meaningful for the structure of the narrative as it stands in a close relationship to the beginning of the

[64] Text of Liv. 26 after Jal (1991).
[65] Liv. 26, 15, 4–15. Cf. Ungern-Sternberg (1975: 77–78).
[66] Liv. 26, 6, 5; 8, 9.
[67] Liv. 26, 16. Cf. Ungern-Sternberg (1975: 77–89).

section, giving a frame to the narrative. It all begins with the indulgence of the immoral Capuan populace by the populist noblemen. When all is over, in an act of apparent universal justice, the remaining populist noblemen are executed, and the populace is punished.[68] This symmetry of beginning and end in the story of the defection of Capua is an obvious feature of Livy's literary technique. One element of the story remains mysterious, though: the disagreement between the two proconsuls.

Appius Claudius Pulcher's attempt at leniency towards the Capuan senators must come as a surprise for an ancient reader, as the text takes various steps to make the Capuans appear undeserving of this clemency, even in their own eyes. The Capuans defect from Rome at her darkest hour, just after the battle of *Cannae*, with the clear intention of taking over Italy under the supreme rule of Carthage, once Hannibal will have finished off the Romans.[69] This intention appears to be particularly dark, as it follows an address of the Roman consul to the Campanian legates, within which the consul admits openly that the situation of the Roman state is dire and that the Romans have to ask the Campanians to support them in return for earlier protection.[70] The defection is, thus, narrated as a breach of personal trust and an act of extreme ingratitude. At the moment of the defection, the Campanians do not simply expel the Roman garrison, as the Carthaginians had demanded, but also murder the Roman local commanders brutally by suffocating them in the bathhouse.[71] In accordance with the moralist frame of the section, Capua is presented as a rotten counter-image to Rome, whose immorality is contagious and effects both Roman and Carthaginian troops

[68] Cf. Levene (2010: 354–375; especially 359–360; 365–367; 374–375). On the justice of the punishment cf. Beltramini (2022: 191).
[69] Liv. 23, 6, 1–5.
[70] Liv. 23, 5.
[71] Liv. 23, 7, 3.

whenever they are stationed there.[72] This moral weakness is mirrored in the low social status of the last Capuan leader Seppius Loesius.[73] As if to give even more weight to the moral argument, the text has the leader of the anti-Roman party, Vibius Virrius, spell out the reasons for Rome's wrath to his compatriots, ending on the admission of Roman justice, before he invites them to commit suicide:[74]

> *Romanos, Roma circumsessa, coniuges, liberi, quorum ploratus hinc prope exaudiebantur, arae, foci, deum delubra, sepulcra maiorum, temerata ac violata a Capua non averterunt; tanta aviditas supplicii expetendi, tanta sanguinis nostri hauriendi est sitis. Nec iniuria; forsitan nos quoque idem fecissemus, si data fortuna esset.*
>
> Not the besieged Rome, not their wives and children, whose cries could almost be heard until here, not the altars, sacred fires, the temples of their gods and the graves of their forefathers, which had been desecrated and violated, turned the Romans away from Capua. So powerful is their greed to exact vengeance on us; so great is their thirst to drink our blood. And rightfully so! Probably we too had done the same, had we been given the opportunity. (Liv. 26, 13, 13–14)

Appius Claudius Pulcher's clemency, especially in comparison with the just wrath that even Vibius Virrius expects, may raise suspicion in Livy's Roman readers. What could Claudius' intentions have been? Did he really believe that the treacherous Capuan senators could be of any use to the state? As so often in *ab urbe condita*, whenever a story appears

[72] Liv. 7, 38, 5–10; 23, 18, 11–16; 35, 1. Cf. Levene (2010: 362), Kenty (2017).
[73] Liv. 26, 6, 13–17.
[74] Liv. 26, 13, 4–19. Cf. Liv. 26, 33, 2, where the justice of the punishment is reaffirmed. On the suicide and the topos of Campanian luxury in the meal that impedes a swift death, see Levene (2010: 366), cf. Beltramini (2020: 191–193).

to be worth the telling but is hard to believe, Livy offers an alternative version, within which Claudius died before the reconquest, making Fulvius the only commander at the time. But also staying with the first version, there are hints in the text to satisfy a suspicious and scrutinous reader. It might occur to them that Appius Claudius is entangled in family business with the Capuan senate.

At the beginning of the section, the Campanian senator Pacuvius Calavius, 'the head of the party that had effected the defection to the Carthaginians' according to Livy's narrator,[75] shares a delicate detail about his family life in the introduction to the very address to the Campanian senate that stands at the beginning of the defection:

> *Vocato senatu cum sibi defectionis ab Romanis consilium placiturum nullo modo, nisi necessarium fuisset, praefatus esset,* (6) *quippe qui liberos ex Ap. Claudi filia haberet filiamque Romam nuptum <M.> Livio dedisset […]* (9) *inquit* […].[76]
>
> After the senate had been called together, after he had said that he would under no condition agree to the plan about the defection from Rome, if it was not necessary, (6) as he had children from the daughter of an Appius Claudius and had married his daughter to a Marcus Livius in Rome […], (9) he said […]. (Liv. 23, 2, 5–9)

Pacuvius Calavius, who must have been among the Capuan senators who would be executed by Quintus Fulvius Flaccus after the reconquest, unless he committed suicide with Vibius Virrius, of which we do not learn, is a relative of the Appii Claudii. No matter how close or how distant a relative of Appius Claudius Pulcher he is, the proconsul might,

[75] Liv. 23, 8, 2: *princeps factionis eius quae traxerat rem ad Poenos*.
[76] Text of Liv. 21–25 after Briscoe (2016).

according to the most basic principles of family loyalty, intend to spare his relatives when he opts for leniency with the Capuans.[77] Familial ties between Roman and Capuan nobles are mentioned earlier as a delaying factor in the final break-up between the two states.[78] Besides the possible historicity or credibility of Claudius family ties to the Calavii, the additional family plot is a strong compositional force in this section of *ab urbe condita*.

The information that allows the reader to conceptualize Appius Claudius Pulcher's family ties to the Capuan nobility is given at the exact beginning and end of the story of the defection and reconquest of Capua.[79] It thus duplicates the frame already present by the first moral failure of the Capuan nobles and their final punishment. A reader who recognizes this pattern might be likely to also connect the otherwise inconspicuously brief mention of Pacuvius Calavius' Roman relatives and Claudius' peculiar clemency more than three books later. On a closer look, the narration of Claudius' clemency itself seems to guide the reader to be suspicious of the proconsul's intentions. When the alternative of the two ways of dealing with the Campanians is presented, Claudius' clemency is tagged as *facilis impetranda venia* – 'a clemency easy to be obtained'. In the light of the injustice and deception committed by the Capuans against the Romans, which is summarized two chapters earlier by Vibius Virrius, clemency of the Romans towards the Capuans is not to be granted easily or lightly. Fulvius' 'harsher judgement' (*durior sententia*) appears to be more just, because of the implicit inappropriateness attached to Claudius' clemency by the text.[80] The inappropriateness

[77] Cf. Ungern-Sternberg (1975: 78) with the older scholarship.
[78] Liv. 23, 4, 7. Cf. also Liv. 26, 33, 3, where the Capuan legates remind the Romans of their close familial ties.
[79] Liv. 23, 2, 6.
[80] Luca Beltramini has argued to the contrary that the justice of the harsh punishment of the Capuans by Fulvius is questionable in the text pointing to Claudius' resistance, the executions without consent from the senate and the discussion of the question

of Claudius' proposals and the texts implicit distancing from Claudius continue. When Claudius explains that he wants to spare the Campanian senators for interrogations, the text gives his argument in indirect speech, giving no indication whether or not these were Claudius' true intentions. Claudius' speech begins with a word that is given an ironic second meaning in the context of the text: He says 'it would be just to give the senators the opportunity to interrogate' using the word *aequum*, which means 'just', in the literal sense of 'appropriate' or 'well measured to the circumstances.' Claudius earlier suggestion of clemency in the wording of the text (*facilis impetrandae veniae*) appears particularly inappropriate. The text therefore creates a mildly comic effect when he who seems to have just proven his lack of good measure, talks about the right thing to do in terms of good measure (*aequum*).

If Appius Claudius Pulcher is discredited here, what picture are we to make of him, according to the text? Sparing the Capuan senators, although it is clearly not appropriate to do so, the proconsul puts his apparent family interests before the interests of the state. This selfish action appears to be particularly grave, as Claudius has been leading Roman troops for the last four years against Capua. This breach of trust weighs also on the reader as they have suffered with the Roman army (and trusted Claudius' leadership) for three books. A reader, who reflects on the character of Appius Claudius Pulcher in the way that has been outlined, might find that his character is conspicuously well in tune with the characterisations of other Appii Claudii in *ab urbe condita*.

In literature, Roman politicians of the same family often show the same character over generations. Every Cato is an ascetic, conserva-

later in the book, Liv. 26, 33–34, Beltramini (2022: 191–194). In contrast to Beltramini, I would argue that, in the eyes of the text, Fulvius is morally right to punish the Capuans swiftly, even though he is not following the law – this is reaffirmed by the later decisions of the people and of the senate.

tive Republican, and also other families have typical attributes.[81] Appii Claudii generally rank their interests and those of their class and family higher than those of the Roman state and of the people. Appius Claudius Regillensis, the consul at the beginning of the conflict of the orders, is characterized as a strict patrician and enemy of the people: when the people, impatient because of their unjust treatment as debtors, refuse to go to war,[82] he repeatedly argues for an uncompromising stance of the Patricians and even demands the institution of a dictatorship.[83] Appius Claudius, the decemvir of the Verginia story,[84] is characterised similarly as an enemy of the plebs. Having installed himself as the leader of the perpetual *decemviri*,[85] he forces Verginia, the attractive daughter of a simple citizen, into his power by the means of a contrived judgement.[86] In the mock-trial Verginia's father can only save the virginity of his daughter by taking her life, which leads to the abolition of the illegitimate decemvirate, the reinstitution of the Republican institutions[87] and the death of Appius Claudius the decemvir.[88] The characterisations of the Appii Claudii in Livy's first decade have therefore been described as "a symbol of self-interest, party politics and discordia" by the scholarship.[89]

In the light of his family plot, Appius Claudius Pulcher appears to be an extreme version of his ancestors. Earlier Appii Claudii acted out of *superbia* against the interest of the people for the interest of their own class and family. Appius Claudius Pulcher does the same thing but extends his

[81] Cf. Walter (2004a), Richardson (2015: 180–181).
[82] Liv. 2, 23–30.
[83] Liv. 2, 23, 15; 27, 1; 11–12; 29, 9–12.
[84] Liv. 3, 33, 1–58, 11.
[85] Liv. 3, 38, 1–2.
[86] Liv. 3, 44, 4–5.
[87] Liv. 3, 48, 7–49, 5; 3, 53, 6–55, 1.
[88] Liv. 3, 58, 6.
[89] Vasaly (1987: 225); cf. Walter (2004b: 121–130).

loyalty even to the members of his own class in the hostile state of Capua at the time of war. This extremeness can have a comic effect, as the contextualization of Claudius' indirect speech shows. In the Capua-section, Claudius' family plot strengthens the frame of the moralist narrative via its co-presence at beginning and end. At the same time, Claudius' actions may themselves be understood in close relationship to the moralist plot. The family plot characterises him: the commander cares more for the enemies than for his own compatriots while, paradoxically, leading troops in war. A rotten Roman conquered rotten Capua. Fulvius' treatment of the Campanians appears more justified: he might only make sure that the family loyalties of his colleague cannot save the enemies of Rome. The moral focus of the Capua section is given another layer by the inclusion of Appius Claudius family plot: Did the Appii Claudii infect themselves with Capuan immorality when they intermarried with the Campanians? Or if Roman nobles act so immorally out of their own accord, are they so much better than the Capuan senate? The effect of this additional complexity shall be the focus of the end of this paper.

Keeping up with Livy for the family-minded reader

David Levene has pointed out that it is ‚bewilderingly difficult [to merely keep track of the story'] in Livy's third decade because of the large amount of information that readers need to stay aware of over vast stretches of text.[90] This is true for the entire *ab urbe condita* and especially for the two family plots that have been outlined above. In both cases, the reader needs to connect pieces of information that are given one half or even three books apart from each other. It is therefore the weakest link in the chain of argument for these family plots that they might well have gone undetected by most readers. Readers might not have remembered the necessary

[90] Levene (2010: 63–64).

information from earlier when they would have needed it to recognize the conspicuous intergenerational symmetry between Lucumo & Egerius and Sextus & Collatinus, or the suspicious family ties of Claudius and Calavius. The most important point to counter this valid criticism is purely theoretical: I am not interested in or dare to make statements about the average historical readers of *ab urbe condita*. A study that would want to do this would need to have entirely different means and could not be only text-based. Talking about Livy's reader, I mean the ideal reader who can be constructed out of the text and who has the knowledge, the patience and the cultural capacities to take up all of its offers.[91] The construction of ideal readers is, of course, like most tasks in the humanities, an imperfect hermeneutic circle: it is only by constructing such ideal readers that we can learn, what knowledge, patience and cultural capacities some historic readers of Roman historiography might have had. Whether or not this ideal reader would be often approximated by Livy's historical readers, is beyond the reach of literary studies. Classicists have to be aware, though, that ideal readers might be modern scholars' best shot to form a qualitatively distinct picture of the interests and mental capacities of historical ancient Romans at all, whose average mindsets are even more unavailable to us than ideal constructions out of the texts that we have.

What speaks for the intended presence of the family plots is their conspicuous relationship to the text's structure. Granted their presence, the problem of the bewildering difficulty can be turned around for epistemic gain: if Livy's reader could be expected to notice and remember the information about Tarquinius Collatinus' and Appius Claudius Pulcher's family ties, they would have to be much more likely to do so than most modern readers would be. Is this probable? In the light of the importance of family-belonging in almost all spheres of Roman (elite)

[91] Iser (1980: 27). Iser himself points at the practical limitations of this model, (28–29).

life,[92] one would have to admit this possibility. Being well informed about the exact family relationships of one's acquaintances would be a practical life skill for freeborn Romans, decisive in making good matches on the marital market or in forming alliances in economy and politics. It would always matter to know exactly whose cousin the other person was. It would therefore be only natural to assume that Roman readers would bring this practical skill also to their reading. They might actually be likely to catch hints on family relationships of protagonists on the fly and memorise them without much effort. Therefore, we can expect Livy's reader to keep up with the family plots laid out above. Even more than that, one might take these family plots present in *ab urbe condita* as an indication to search more closely for similar plots in Livy and in other Roman historiographical texts.[93]

Second Voices and Accentuation through Contrast

With a view to the episodes or sections in *ab urbe condita*, one has to ask how the presence of the family plots changes the respective parts of the text. In both cases, a different story with a meaning of its own is added to the main story. In both cases the priority of the main story over the family story is clear from the fleeting nature of the family plots. In the case of the Tarquinii, the Republican perspective on the Tarquinii, which emphasizes the (over-)ambition of the Tarquinii and the heroism of Lucretia and Iunius Brutus, is expanded by a perspective from inside the Tarquinii, which focuses on justice inside of the ruling dynasty. This perspective is ultimately in tune with the frame of (over-)ambition that leads to the destruction of the dynasty. The inferiority of the second

[92] Cf. Dixon (1991: 28).
[93] Family as a frame of reference in Roman culture and cultural products has been scrutinized in Roman art, archaeology and history, cf. Kampen (2009), Terrenato (2019), Van Oyen (2020).

perspective is asserted, when Iunius Brutus has Tarquinius Collatinus expelled from Rome,[94] undoing the family plot's logical conclusion.

In the Capuan story, we find a similar constellation of plots. It evolves around the moral failure of the Capuan elite that is juxtaposed to the general moral superiority of the Romans in war after the battle of Cannae. Morality is a recurring topic in the surroundings of this section.[95] The family plot of Appius Claudius Pulcher forms a contrast to these stories of morally superior Romans, as Claudius lets his loyalty to foreign family members come before the one to his troops and to the state. In both cases, Collatinus and Claudius, the family plots, form a contrast or even an exact opposite to the main plot. Is this a Second Voice offering a true alternative to the Republican or Roman narratives? It can hardly be, as the main plots are overly dominant in both sections. It seems rather that the additional family plots serve to accentuate the main plots or specific characters in the main stories. Brutus and Lucretia appear more exceptional in contrast to the common revenge plot of Collatinus. Collatinus works for his family-branch, Brutus and Lucretia work for justice and Rome. Similarly, Claudius selfish family-mindedness accentuates the harsh justice of his colleague Fulvius. At the same time, it allows for another reflection on moral behaviour: what is a leader supposed to do when an unjust colleague uses the institutions of the state to further his selfish ends?

Moreover, the two family-plots do not only accentuate the other plots, but add to the general polyphony of *ab urbe condita*. The narrative of Livy's histories is multi-layered and aims to make the impression of opening different routes for the reader to pursue. This strategy allows the text to recreate the experience of meeting history as an undetermined field ready to be freshly discovered, and to divert.[96] The rape

[94] Liv. 2, 2, 2–11.
[95] Cf. Jal (1991: XLII) on moral behaviour in Liv. 26, cf. Ducos (2022) on the exemplary elections for 210 BC, cf. Schlip (2020: 404).
[96] Cf. Pausch (2011: 253).

of Lucretia led to the Roman Republic, but there were also people like Collatinus, who had different ideas. After Cannae, the Roman leaders really pulled themselves together and saved the Roman state, but there were also black sheep like Appius Claudius. The family plots work like a pinch of salt in a sweet desert. They add to the realism of the entire story and thus round off Livy's narrative.

Taking up Republican Memorial Culture

It is maybe not coincidental that the additional and contrasting plots described above are family plots. Republican memorial culture and historiography focusses on the exploits of single Roman *gentes*, the patrons or kinsmen of the artists and historiographers, who produce artefacts or write history. The memorial culture and historiography of the early principate breaks with this tradition and replaces the single *gentes* with the *gens Iulia*, including its mythological forbears, and new forms of public history focussed on the Roman state.[97] *Ab urbe condita* stands at the beginning of the new historiography of the early principate.[98] Livy's reader, used to Republican memorial culture, might have expected to find a narrative focussing on or including family stories. The additional family plots may serve a dual purpose. On the one hand, they meet the reader's expectation. On the other hand, they perform their own marginality and, thus, refer the reader to the central contents of Livy's early principate historiography.

In the case of Tarquinius Collatinus, the presence of the revenge and justice plot within the *gens Tarquinia* runs very little risk of being mistaken for the main plot, as Tarquinius Collatinus is removed from the consulate, the price of his revenge, very quickly. The presence of this plot,

[97] Walter (2004b: 408–426).
[98] Walter (2004b: 422–426).

alongside the main plot, serves rather to show what Livy's story of the Tarquinii in Rome does not focus on. It does not focus on the inner justice within the *gens Tarquinia*, like Republican gentilician historiography maybe would, but on those people who advanced Roman society with their exceptional acts, Brutus and Lucretia. In the section about the defection and reconquest of Capua, the presence of Claudius' family plot works differently but to the same effect. At a time when the individual virtue of Roman leaders and the coherency of the Roman state decides the fate of Rome, the protagonist who acts the most according to the logic of gentilician belonging, Claudius saving his Capuan relatives, is the least virtuous Roman.

In both sections, the family plots may take up the reader's expectation to find stories about Roman *gentes* in historiographical writing. But they then guide them away from themselves, as they merely form the contrast to the main plots. The family plots, thus, may play a role that is closely connected with the aims of Livy's historiographical writing. As a new history for a new time, early principate historiography developing itself against the tradition of Republican historiography, *ab urbe condita* needs to appeal to readers and at the same time change their ideas on how to read history.[99] In this endeavour, the additional family plots may be part of a strategy to attract the attention of the reader, who is used to gentilician historiography, and lead them to a point where the family plots dissolve and only contrast the more vital main plots. Following well-trodden roads of gentilician historiography, the reader is ultimately left with the new individual, state-centred plots of principate historiography.[100]

[99] *Ab urbe condita* would, thus, do to Republican historiography what the building projects of Augustus did to the public spaces of Republican Rome. Cf. Walter (2004b: 416–419).
[100] In this respect, I would see Livy, like Vergil, as a close cultural collaborator of the principate, cf. Walter (2004b: 423).

Conclusion

The two family-plots described in this paper are entwined with the narrative structures of Livy's *ab urbe condita* to the extent that they are only recognisable for a reader who is aware of these structures. If discovered, they open two additional plot perspectives, by which the story of the Tarquinii in Rome (1–2) and the story of the defection of Capua (23–26) can be perceived. They, thus, add an additional voice to the polyphonous narrative that has been recognized as one of the principal literary features of Livy's histories. Their relationship to the surrounding plotlines is such that they clarify adjoining plotlines by contrast and ultimately delegitimize themselves as main plots in the narrative, adding depth and variety to the whole of the text. Their presence points to the special interest that Livy's reader takes in matters of family, as it takes a reader who can easily perceive and remember family constellations to recognize them. Furthermore, the family plots point to the normality of family stories in Republican gentilician historiography. In Livy's polyphonous narrative the family plots accentuate other major plots about exemplary individuals and the state and, thus, serve to lead readers with gentilician-historiographical interests to the plots that represent principate-historiography best. Due to the presence of these minor plots among others, however, also readers with Republican preferences can experience relative freedom in following their own way through the histories.

Primary Sorces

Briscoe 2016 — J. Briscoe (ed.): *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita. 3, Libri XXI–XXV.* Oxford 2016.

Jal 1991 — P. Jal (ed.): *Tite-Live, XVI: Livre XXVI.* Paris 1991.

Ogilvie 1974 — R. M. Ogilvie (ed.): *Ab Urbe condita. I, Libri I–V.* Oxford 1974.

Secondary Sources

Albrecht 2016 — D. Albrecht: *Hegemoniale Männlichkeit bei Titus Livius.* Heidelberg 2016.

Beltramini 2020 — L. Beltramini: *Commento al libro XXVI di Tito Livio.* Pisa 2020.

Beltramini 2022 — L. Beltramini: *La voce dei vinti: Capua e Siracusa nel libro 26*. In: P. Duchêne, C. Guittard, M. Miquel (eds.): *Relire Tite-Live, 2000 ans après: actes du colloque tenu à l'Université Paris Nanterre et à l'École normale supérieure de Paris, 5 et 6 octobre 2017.* Bordeaux 2022, 183–195.

Cailleux 2017 — F. Cailleux: *Tanaquil, Tullia, Damarata: les conseillères officieuses des rois dans l'« Histoire romaine » de Tite-Live et la dégradation de la monarchie*. In A. Queyrel-Bottineau, M.-R. Guelfucci (eds.): *Conseillers et ambassadeurs dans l'Antiquité*. Besançon 2017, 487–509.

Dixon 1992 — S. Dixon: *The Roman Family*. Baltimore 1992.

Ducos 2022 — M. Ducos: *Une* élection *exemplaire pendant la seconde guerre punique (Tite-Live 26.22).* In: P. Duchêne, C. Guittard, M. Miquel (eds.): *Relire Tite-Live, 2000 ans après: actes du colloque tenu à l'Université Paris Nanterre et à l'École normale supérieure de Paris, 5 et 6 octobre 2017.* Bordeaux 2022, 99–109.

Forsythe 1999 — G. Forsythe: *Livy and early Rome: a study in historical method and judgement.* Stuttgart 1999.

Iser 1980 — W. Iser: *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore 1980.

Kampen 2009 — N. Kampen: *Family fictions in Roman art: essays on the representation of powerful people.* Cambridge 2009.

Kenty 2017 — J. Kenty: « Altera Roma » : Livy's variations on a Ciceronian theme. ICS 42, 1 (2017) 61–81.

Kowalewski 2002 — B. Kowalewski: *Frauengestalten im Geschichtswerk des T. Livius*. München 2002.

Levene 2010 — D. S. Levene: *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford 2010.

Luce 1977 — T. J. Luce: *Livy. The composition of his history.* Princeton 1977.

Marincola 1999 — J. Marincola: *Genre, convention and innovation in Greco-Roman historiography*. In: C. S. Kraus (ed.): *The limits of historiography: genre and narrative in ancient historical texts*. Leiden 1999, 281–324.

Pausch 2011 — D. Pausch: *Livius und der Leser: narrative Strukturen in ab urbe condita.* München 2011.

Pausch 2021 — D. Pausch: *Livy, the Reader Involved, and the Audience of Roman Historiography*. In: M. Baumann, V. Liotsakis (eds.): Reading History in the Roman Empire. Berlin/Boston 2021, 59–78.

Rich 2009 — J. W. Rich: *Structuring Roman History: The Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition*. In: J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.):

Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Livy. Oxford/New York 2009, 118–147.

Richardson 2015 J. H. Richardson: *The Complications of Quellenforschung: The Case of Livy and Fabius Pictor*. In: B. Mineo (ed.): *A companion to Livy*. Chichester 2015, 178–189.

Schlip 2020 C. Schlip: *Typen, Gruppen und Individuen bei Livius: Untersuchungen zur Darstellung und Funktion historischer Akteure in Ab urbe condita*. Berlin/Boston 2020.

Stadter 2009 P. A. Stadter: *The Structure of Livy's History*. In: J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.): Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Livy. Oxford/New York 2009, 91–117. (= Historia 21 [1972] 287–307)

Tennyson 2022 T. T. Tennyson: *Cicero's Romulus and the crafting of historical « exempla »*. *HPTh* 43,1 (2022) 1–30.

Terrenato 2019 N. Terrenato: *The Early Roman Expansion into Italy. Elite Negotiation and Family Agendas*. Cambridge 2019.

Todaro 2022 G. Todaro: T. Quinctio Crispino Badius Campanus hospes erat: *l'ultimo duello capuano (Liv. 25.18.4-13)*. *Histos* 16 (2022) 145–165.

Tsitsiou-Chelidoni 2009
C. Tsitsiou-Chelidoni: *History beyond Literature: Interpreting the 'Internally Focalized' Narrative in Livy's Ab urbe condita*. In: J. Grethlein, A. Regakos (eds.): Narratology and Interpretation. Berlin/New York 2009, 527–554.

Ungern-Sternberg 1975
J. v. Ungern-Sternberg: *Capua im Zweiten Punischen Krieg. Untersuchungen zur römischen Annalistik*. Müchen 1975.

Van Oyen 2020 A. Van Oyen: *The Socio-Economics of Roman Storage. Agriculture, Trade, and Family*. Cambridge 2020.

Vasaly 1987 A. Vasaly: *Personality and Power: Livy's Depiction of the Appii Claudii in the First Pentad*. TAPhA 117 (1987) 203–226.

Walter 2004a U. Walter: *„Ein Ebenbild des Vaters". Familiale Wiederholungen in der historiographischen Traditionsbildung der römischen Republik*. Hermes 132 (2004) 406–425.

Walter 2004b U. Walter: *Memoria und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt 2004.