
Ragioni di spazio mi vietano un ulteriore esame ed una specifica confutazione più dettagliata di altri passaggi, condotti sullo stesso metodo, operazione logicamente del resto ormai ridondante; è chiaro comunque che la tesi genealogica di F., con le sue conseguenze, costituisce un ritorno su posizioni storiografiche vecchie e ben sorpassate, ed è basata su metodi di analisi linguistica del tutto inconsistenti. La valutazione del libro di F. risulta da quanto esposto: la tesi genealogica è minata alla base da un combinatorismo ermeneutico acritico ed incontrollato, può contenere al massimo soffocati spunti positivi, da ricavare a fatica nella massa confusa di affermazioni immotivate; la parte genealogica è più debole, al di fuori di ogni metodo. Essa è destinata al profondo oblio: storici ed etruscologi possono dormire sonni tranquilli senza conoscerla, od impegnarsi in una seria analisi critica.
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Jane D. Chaplin begins, as is usual in Livian scholarship,1 by examining the programmatic section 12 of Livy’s Preface where Livy invites his readers to seek ex-empla in his narrative, i.e. to look for models of behaviour from the past, worthy for imitation or avoidance. Students of Livy have done a great deal on the earlier part of Livy’s message – that history is the storehouse of moral lessons –, but,
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C. notes (p. 2), they have overlooked the second part of Livy’s claim – that people can model their actions according to what they have learned from the past. Thus the purpose of her thesis is to investigate just how Livy illustrates the usefulness of *exempla*, to examine the ways in which they are received, interpreted and acted on by various audiences within Livy’s text. The approach is in fact innovative. Given that the Romans were so fond of *exempla* (on their place in the aristocratic education, pp. 11–16) and given also that the Roman historian’s main goal was the visualisation of the past (pp. 16–29), *omnis te exampli documenta in illustri posta monumento tueri*, as Livy says, what happens – C. asks – if we study the ways in which Livy shows people choosing and using *exempla* from the past? This is certainly motivated by the fact that Livy constantly describes people interpreting and using historical knowledge. The first and immediate result is, C. claims, that a much wider range of material becomes available for exemplary analysis (pp. 2–3 and 38).

C. lists in the Appendix the items that are cited as *exempla* (pp. 203–214). The list includes people, events, and procedures referred to for imitation or avoidance in the surviving books of Livy. In the list there are about 260 items and over 1000 references which of course as such show the importance of the *exempla* in Livy’s History. On the other hand, as noted also by C., the very compiling of the list involves a lot of interpretation and, as a result, it is her own subjective list: not everyone would obtain the same results. Much depends on how one defines an *exemplum* (see below). There are two criteria to identify an *exemplum* in Livy (p. 2) a) the use of language (Livy himself defines something as an *exemplum*, usually by the word *exemplum* or *documentum*), b) the behaviour of the people Livy describes (the characters are depicted as basing their behaviour on their knowledge of previous history). Because of the large definition, the *exempla* enumerated by C. are not only moral, as is the usual definition, but also practical. C. does not comment on the list and therefore it remains difficult for the reader to understand and maybe somehow unnecessary. For instance, many occurrences refer to the same event or procedure and therefore one «model example» is multiplied. To take an example: In 38. 43. 8–9 the consul C. Flamininus defends M. Fulvius against accusations raised by the Ambraeians (in the rivalry between Fulvius and M. Aemilius Lepidus): sic M. Marcellum ab Syracusanis, sic Q. Fulvium a Campanis accusatos, quam eadem opera T. Quinctium a Philippo vege, M’. Acilium et L. Scipionem ab Antiocho, Cn. Manlium a Gallis, ipsum M. Fulvium ab Aetolis et Cephalantiae populis accusari paterentur? Chaplin lists 14 *exempla* from these lines. Another illustration: in 38.44.9–52.3 there is a debate dealing with Cn. Manlius Vulsio’s request for a triumph. L. Furius Purpurio and L. Aemilius Paulus speak against and Manlius defends his rights. Both sides cite examples from the previous warfare and from previous triumphs; the listed *exempla* are 18 altogether: M’. Acilius (2), Antiochus (1), Carthage (2), P. Cornelius Scipio, L. Cornelius Scipio, Q. Fabius Labeo, Hannibal (2), Philip V (3), T. Quinctius (2) and triumphs in general.

In the Introduction C. briefly reviews the definitions of the *exemplum* in rhetoric and the didactic purposes of the *exempla* in Greek and Roman historiography, particularly she emphasises the ancient Roman tradition of teaching by instructive examples and lastly she argues that Livy surpasses his Greek and Roman predecessors in the depth and complexity of his use of *exempla* (p. 29). She defines an *exemplum* as «any specific citation of an event or an individual that is intended to serve as a guide to conduct»; the *exemplum* is «hence an opportunity to learn from the past» (pp. 3 and 203). Though the path taken by C. is new and innovative, the method followed in the body of the book is the traditional text interpretation seasoned with concepts of modern narrative theory (Genette).
C. is more interested in recovering Livy’s narrative intentions and practices than to place his text in the cultural context. True, the cultural context is in the background all the time especially when C. recurrently refers to the reading audience which of course implies Livy’s contemporaries, and finally in ch. 6 ‘Livy Augustus, and Exempla’ C. looks outside Livy’s text to explore the use of past exempla by Livy’s contemporaries and particularly by Augustus. Livy and the Augustan Rome is a much discussed theme. Thus it is understandable that C.’s otherwise very representative list of works cited is not complete in this aspect. Particularly, in this book about exempla, one misses K.-J. Hölkeskamp’s article ‘Exempla und mos maiorum. Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität’ in Gehrke – Möller, Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein (Tübingen 1996), 301–337.

C.’s definition of the exemplum is broad, and it seems to me that she overemphasises her own thesis at the expense of the actual moral examples. She finds it curious that no one in the extant books of Livy takes Lucretia, the victim of Sex. Tarquinius’ lust, as a model of conduct, and therefore «no one ever profits from Lucretia’s experience» (pp. 1, 168). But what is the example provided by L. «Nor from now on shall any unchaste woman live with Lucretia as her model»? Does she encourage raped women to commit suicide? Or does she discourage women from adultery? If the latter, the extant books of Livy bear testimony to L.’s success. Anyway, in Livy (Book 3) Verginia is the replica of Lucretia as a victim of the tyrannical lust. In fact, C. admits this (p. 1 n. 3 and p. 168), but she denies the value of L.’s exemplum for the characters in Livy’s narration. Therefore one may also ask, for whom are Livy’s exempla intended? C. distinguishes two kinds of audiences, internal and external, and she investigates how the text internal audiences use the past knowledge, but ultimately the more important audience is Livy’s readership, in fact the only who can make real profit from the historical exempla. This means firstly that it is the question about Livy as the historical narrator which is in the focus of C.’s thesis, and secondly that Livy’s readers could see past exempla effective also in passages where they are not expressly cited.

The bulk of the book is taken up with a close reading of the text of Livy by means of carefully selected case-studies. Ch. 1 entitled ‘Caudium as Event and Exemplum’ is a detailed examination of the famous episode of the Roman army’s surrender to the Samnites at Caudine forks (Livy Book 9) and its later invocations showing the complexity and flexibility of Livian examples. The memory of Caudium bears many different meanings determined by the circumstances in which it is cited, by the person who invokes the example and by the purpose for which it is cited or by the expectations of the people who are the recipients of its message. One result of C.’s study is that the Romans use exempla better and accordingly they learn from the past better than Rome’s enemies do. C. also observes that the characters of Livy’s narrative mainly use examples from the recent history. Ch. 2 ‘Speaker, Audience, and Exemplum’ firstly explains the concepts that are central to the whole work. C. distinguishes three ‘voices’ for articulating exempla: the historian in the role of a moralising narrator, secondly, historical personages as ‘focalisers’ (i.e. persons who remember the past and base their behaviour on it), and thirdly, the Livian characters who in their speeches hark back to earlier exempla and use them as a means of persuasion. (p. 3 and 50). The ‘audiences’ that absorb exempla are twofold: internal – i.e. the audiences within the text – and external – i.e. the reading audience –. C. makes it clear that Livy’s readers, the external audience, always have the different information from the internal audiences and accordingly can draw conclusions that the historical personages within the text cannot. Livy’s readers can appreciate both the repeated citations of the same example and the cumulative effect of Livy’s interpretation.
of the exemplary knowledge (particularly pp. 53ff). C. illuminates this describing the ways in which the Roman defeat at Cannae appears as an *exemplum* in Livy’s Book 22. C.’s conclusion is that Livy showing historical characters interpreting *exempla*, reacting to the lessons and learning from them teaches his readers use the knowledge of history in a constructive manner. Therefore in C.’s view Livy ceases to be only a literary artist and a second-rate historian, and «becomes instead a perceptive observer of the sweep of Rome’s republican past, especially as that past relates to the problems his own generation faced» (pp. 4–5).

In Ch. 3 ’Reading the Past’ C. first separates two types of characters associated with the failure of exemplary knowledge: warners (often foreign truth-tellers, e.g. the Samnite Herennius Pontius, the Carthaginian Hanno or Philip of Macedon) and villains (Roman usurpers and wrongdoers like Sp. Maelius and Manlius Capitolinus). Other and maybe more important cases are when Roman audiences do not model their behaviour on the lessons of history. These often are complex situations where contemporary concerns ultimately outweigh the authority of history. In all cases C. have the same answer: they contribute to the education of the external audience. For instance, the example presented by Fabius and Scipio when they debate the invasion of Africa helps Livy’s readers see the moment of historical transition. Fabius uses *exempla* which associate him with the farther past, while Scipio’s align him with the younger generation. Likewise, in the debate over the Lex Oppia, Cato’s use of *exempla* makes him represent the voice of the past and also a warner, understandable to the reading audience but not to the audience within the text, about the danger that luxury will pose to Rome in the near future. Ch. 4 ’Past and Present’ then explores the tension between past and present in terms of the conflict between older and younger generations and between ancient and recent *exempla*. In previous discussions C. has made it very clear that the Romans within the text prefer to use recent examples and that the memories of past event vanish rather soon. This is in an apparent contradiction with the authority of the distant past and with the value of the *mos maiorum*. Here C. returns to the analysis of Livy’s Preface (pp. 132–136). In her opinion, Livy has a dynamic view about history: he describes it as an activity. Surely, the internal audiences prefer the present and they have to interpret past examples in the light of contemporary concerns: «the value of studying history lies not only in the lessons one might find in it, but more particularly in the process of learning to engage with the past and to take from it what applies most usefully to one’s own situation» (p. 135). This is an excellent analysis of the meaning of Livy’s history.

In Ch. 5 ’Precedents and Change’ C. returns to the definition of the *exemplum*. Usually it – in its rhetorical meaning – means a moral example, but the word *exemplum* has many meanings, often it is simply a precedent, an earlier occurrence of a similar event or procedure. These meanings are difficult to distinguish from each other, and the rhetoricians Cicero and Quintilian cannot make a clear distinction between historical (moral) and legal *exempla*. C. however finds out that «unlike historical and moral *exempla*, ... *exempla* in the form of precedents appear rather inflexible» (p. 139). *Exempla* as pure precedents often occur in Livy in contexts of legal or constitutional matters (quite frequently also with the word *ius*). Through a careful analysis of triumph debates C. shows that in
those situations the attitude to the past behaviour was crucial: the debating
speakers had to express their arguments in terms of precedents even in cases
where there was no past precedent to be followed. One of Livy’s lessons to the
reader is that the past has a firm grip on the present (pp. 155–156).

For the most part the author’s observations are well founded and understandable and it
is easy to agree with her conclusions. However, sometimes she seems to overrate the role
of exempla when she emphasises their impact on the internal audience and describes the
audience’s reactions to the speech. But, naturally, in the speeches there are many other
means of persuasion – sometimes maybe more powerful – than the exempla.

In the Introduction (p. 4) and also in Ch. 5 C. claims that she approaches Livy’s exem-
pla «from within the matrix of the entire history rather than as isolated episodes» and she
sees limitations in the traditional method of interpreting Livy because it mainly explains
Livy through close readings of the episodes. But, in fact, also C.’s analysis is ‘episodic’ in
the sense that her ‘episodes’ are parts of the ‘exemplary’ history. That is, despite the de-
tailed and sophisticated interpretation, C.’s analyses of ‘episodes’ are deficient because she
does not place them in the close context of the narration but only in the context of the in-
tention of the narrator in the sense of what the ‘entire history’ means. Therefore C.’s dis-
cussions – though they seem to be persuasive and conclusive in what concerns lessons of
the past – are difficult to understand at least for those who are not specialists in Rome’s
republican history.

C.’s major strength lies precisely in her careful and perceptive interpretation of
text passages that describe dramatic situations. Constructing an intricate web of
readings of exempla by various internal audiences she teaches us to understand
the historian’s working methods. C.’s book is useful to everyone who wants to
know what kind of a historian Livy was, and most definitely it adds new nuances
to our knowledge of Livy. It is a difficult read for those who want to learn
something new about Rome’s history and to understand Livy’s ‘external audi-
ence’, i.e. the attitudes towards the past in Livy’s contemporary society, Augustan
Rome.
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James Reeson (R.) a écrit le commentaire le plus approfondi qui existe sur les
‘Héroïdes’ XI (Canacé à Macareus), XIII (Laodamie à Protésilas) et XIV
(Hypermestre à Lyncée). Le commentaire le plus récent de l’‘Héroïde’ XI était
celui, sommaire, de P. E. Knox dans son recueil d’‘Héroïdes’ (I, II, V, VI, VII, X,
XI, Epistula Sapphus) parue dans la série des ‘Cambridge Greek and Latin Clas-
sics’ (1991); pour les pièces XIII et XIV, on ne disposait que du commentaire
global d’Arthur Palmer, dont L. E. Purser assura la publication posthumé
(Oxford 1898).1 Le commentaire de R. est précédé d’une édition critique fondée