FROM HISTORY TO LEGEND: M. MANLIUS AND THE GEESE

Since a brief but profoundly disquieting paper by Otto Skutsch in JRS 1953,¹ students of early Roman history have been compelled, if not to accept, then at least to acknowledge the existence of,² a quite widely diffused story, according to which, in 390 BC, the Capitol fell, like the rest of Rome, to the Gauls. Such a narrative evidently precludes, for example, the rousing of the sleeping garrison by the geese, M. Manlius³ blow with his shield-boss to knock the first Gaul over the cliff, and, for that matter, Camillus' last-minute intervention to halt the payment of the ransom (which is anyway a late development in the story).

It has long been recognised that the events of 390 - or rather, 387/6⁴ - are, in their transmitted form, a hopeless jumble of aetiological tales, family apologias, doublets and transferences from Greek history.⁵ Literary testimonia are exceptionally copious, and the topic has been a matter for fierce academic debate at least since the days of Niebuhr and G. C. Lewis.⁶ I shall concentrate almost exclusively upon the Capitol and the geese; much else may then fall into place.

Not all the evidence for the Gallic capture of the Capitol has been surveyed with equal, or with sufficient care, but a detailed assessment of all the evidence is no longer required. Our earliest evidence — and a surprising amount of it comes from within a century of the events — does nothing, it is acknowledged, to encourage acceptance of the traditional Livian version.

(i) Arist. ap. Plut. Cam. 22. 3 (= fr. 610 Rose, FGrH 840 F 23): Aristotle the Philosopher τὸ μὲν ἀλάντα τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ τῶν Κέλτων ἀκρίβως δηλὸς ἔστιν ἀκτικοίς, τὸν δὲ σωσάντα λέχκον εἰναι φήσαι.⁷ Plutarch predictably complains that Camillus' praenomen was Marcus; scholars recently have been tempted to see here a reference to L. Albinius, who carried the sacra to Caere.⁸

(ii) Theopompus ap. Plin. 3. 57 (= FGrH 115 F 317 and 840 F 24): nam Theopompus, ante quem nemo mentionem habuit (sc. of Rome) urbem dumtaxat a Gallis captam dixit; as the context makes it quite clear, the force of dumtaxat is 'Theopompus says only that the urbs was copra a Gallis', rather than 'that only the urbs was captured.'" It is possible that Just. 20. 5. 4. legati Gallorum, qui ante menses Romam incendarent, reflects Theopompus."

1 I am most grateful to friends in the School of History, Macquarie University, for encouragement and criticism, and to Classical Journal for kind permission to reprint CJ 76 (1981), 298-311. Several substantial alterations have been made.
2 JRS 43 (1953), 77f, reprinted with important Postilla in Studia Enniana (London 1968), 138ff; reference hereafter to the SE pagination. See also idem on Enn. Ann. 2271:
3 But not to study in detail; contrast the great mass of literature on Tarpeia, (below. n. 40), E. Norden, Ennius u. Vergiliius (Leipzig, 1915). 107 n. 2, stumbled upon the version here discussed but did not pursue it.
4 Cf. Walbank on Plb. 1. 6. 1; M. Sordi, I rapporti romano-cervi (Rome, 1960). 26ff.
6 An Enquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History 2 (London. 1855), 324ff, still repays careful study, as do Schweger's pages, Röm. Gesch. 3 (Tiibingen. 1858). 252ff.
7 That the city was taken by the Celts it is quite clear that Aristotle the philosopher has heard, but he says that her savour was Lucius.
8 Luce (n. 5), 291; R. M. Ogilvie, A commentary on Livy 1-5 (Oxford, 1965). 723. "The Greek, like Aristotle's, will simply have referred to 'Rome': nothing can be made of the occasional use of πόλις/urbs in the sense of 'Acropolis/Capitol'.
10 'Legates of the Gauls, who had burned Rome months before': cf. Sordi (n. 4), 34.
(iii) Heraclides Ponticus Ἔριδὶ Ψυχῆς (ap. Plut. Cam. 22. 3 = fr. 102 Wehrli, FGrH 840 F 23): 'a story prevailed out of the West that στράτος ἔκατε πολέμων ἑκατέρτων ἱππακόμενοι πόλεμον ἐλληνίδοι." Ὄμην ἔκει πολεμικήν ἑπείν τὴν μεγάλην ἀλάσσαν.\[13\]

(iv) It may well have been narrated to Timaeus — it is so narrated in both DS (14. 117. 7) and Strabo (5. 2. 3) — that it was not the Romans who defeated the Gauls and forced them to withdraw, but the Caeretans;\[14\] Strabo calls the invaders the Galatians τοὺς ἔλοντος τὴν Ὄμην, who took Rome.

(v) It is perhaps worth adding the account in Polybius, who here probably follows Fabius Pictor (2. 18. 2):\[15\] κατέσχον αὐτὴν τὴν Ὄμην πλην τοῦ Καπητιδίου. But a diversion occurred: the Veneti invaded their territory and they withdrew after making a treaty with the Romans. No word of Camillus, of the payment of a ransom, of a Roman victory as the Gauls withdrew.

It emerges so far only that perhaps by the time of Fabius Pictor the peculiar salvation of the Capitol had in some way been established. No word of such a story appears to have seeped out in the fourth century, though that in isolation is not an argumentum ex silentio by which much store should be set.

The positive evidence collected from authors writing in Latin stands as follows:

(vi) Enn. Ann. 164f V = 227f Skutsch:

\textit{qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti moenia concubia vigilesque repente cruentant.}\[16\]

The whole point of the classical Livian version is that the watchmen were not surprised and were therefore not bathed in blood. Attempts have, unnecessarily, been made to reduce Ennius and Livy to narrative uniformity at the cost of violence to the language” or to common sense, for example, by supposing that the guards, though bloodstained, repelled the assault.”\[17\]

(vii) Virg. Aen. 8. 652ff must be considered at the same time:

\textit{in summo custos Tarpeiae Manlius arcis stabat pro templo et Capitolia celsa tenebat... atque hic auratis volitans argenteus anser porticus Gallos in limine adesce canebat; Galli per dumos aderant arcenque tenebant.}\[18\]


\[13\] 'A story prevailed out of the West that an army from the distant land of the Hyperboreans had taken the Greek city of Rome. established somewhere near the great sea.’

\[14\] Luce (n. 5), 292: Ogilvie (n. 7). 723. 726: Sordi (n. 4), 32ff.

\[15\] See Walbank 111 loc: and on 1. 6. 1: 'they occupied Rome herself except for the Capitol.'

\[16\] On which the Gauls, stealthily at dead of night, attacked the high points of the citadel and made bloody of a sudden walls and guards” (a difficult passage: I gratefully follow Skutsch’s interpretation). Prop. 3. 3. 15 is of doubtful relevance: see Skutsch. comm. 15ff, and. unconvincingly. S. J. Heyworth, CQ 36 (1986), 200-1.

\[17\] Cf. too Skutsch (n. 2), 138ff.

\[18\] Skutsch (n. 2), 141 n. 11, 142 n. 1: Norden (n. 3), 102ff.

\[19\] ‘At the top Manlius, guard of the Tarpeian citadel, stood before the temple and occupied the lofty Capitol... and here a goose of silver, fluttering in porticoes of gold, gave vocal warning that the Gauls were there on the threshold: the Gauls were close. through the thickets, and held the citadel.’
Is Virgil saying that the Gauls reached the top? He is characteristically elusive: Servius engagingly comments _deest paene_; _nam prope tenuerunt_. More sophisticated commentators argue that _tenebant_ should be taken _de instanti_. were on the point of holding, but it is not easy to take _tenebat_ (653) as continuous, of Manlius persisting in holding the citadel, in contrast, as Gransden notes, to the imperfect _de instanti_ or conative ('were eager to hold') four lines later (the same verb, at the same point in the line, but used now not of the defenders. but, as Fordyce notes. of the assailants): nor is it easy to locate the Gauls: at 656 _per damos aderant_ — they are on the way up, but in the previous line the goose warned that they _in limine adesse_, that is, were on the temple steps already. The repetition _adesse . . . aderant_ is awkward, not rhetorically effective. Skutsch's suggestion (_loc. cit._) that the passage is unfinished is attractive: Virgil has Manlius the _custos_ of the Capitol, he has the geese fluttering through golden porticoes. and yet. in the plain sense of the Latin, he has the Gauls holding the citadel.

(viii) The evidence of Varro, _de vita populi Romani_ ii, has been challenged: the text in Nonius reads _ut noster exercitus ita sit fugatus ut Galli Romae Capitoli sint potiti neque inde ante sex menses cesserint_; _Romae nisi Capitoli Popma, Romae praeter Capitolium_ Riposati (165 n. 1, after Quicherat); = Non. p. 800L = fr. 61 Riposati. The text was emended — 'Rome but for the Capitol' — both to bring Varro into line with the conventional story of the Capitol's survival and to render Varro consistent with himself, for in _de vita ii_ he also writes" (the subject will presumably have been _Galli_; _auri pondo duo milia acceperunt. ex aedibus sacrarum et matronarum ornamentis; a quibus postea id aurum et torques aureae multae relatae Romam et consecratae_; clearly, if the Capitol was seized (fr. 61), then the circumstances in which a ransom was paid, let alone recovered (fr. 62), are not easy to envisage. But there is no reason why Varro should have to narrate the conventional story and certainly no reason why he should have to be made internally consistent — not only on account of his hasty and careless technique of composition, but on account of his regular practice of setting down numerous versions of a story between which he sees no reason to decide." There is, therefore, no good reason to alter the text of Varro. and, as it stands, it should be allowed all due weight.

(ix) Lucan: the text of Geoffrey of Monmouth (d. 1154; ed. Griscom) 3. 10. _remansit Brennius in Italia populum inaudita tyrannide efficiens_, is echoed, as has long been recognised, by Matthew Paris (Chron. Mai. 1. 59 ed. Luard; Matthew d. 1259 and here followed directly the _Flores Historiarum_ of Roger of Wendover, d. 1236): _et populum inaudita tyrannide fatigavit_. But Matthew (Roger) continues: _de quo etiam Lucanus poeta eximius sic dixit: Tarpeiam cum fregerit arcem / Brennius hic est. Capitolium_. Morel inserts (not quite

20 'Though (?) our army was so routed that the Gauls took possession of the Capitol at Rome nor departed thence for six months.'

21 Non. p. 338L = fr. 62 Rip.; Nonius' _i_ was emended to _ii_ by Popma to juxtapose the fragments on the Gallic sack. Cf. further M. J. McGann, _CQ_ 51 (1957). 127. n. 4. 'They took two thousand pounds of gold by weight from sacred buildings and matrons' ornaments: from whom thereafter that gold and many golden torcs were brought back to Rome and dedicated.'

22 Ogilvie (n. 7) on 5. 48. 8. (n. 5) 167: Lucc (n. 5). 293 n. 52; Mommsen. _Röm. Forsch._ 3 (Berlin, 1879). 329f.


24 Geoffrey: _Brennius remained in Italy afflicting the population with unheard-of tyranny_; Roger: _wearied the population with unheard-of tyranny_.

25 Of whom too the distinguished poet Lucan speaks as follows: "when Brennius shattered the Tarpeian citadel". That is, the Capitol. See P. Esposito, _Vichiania_ 6 (1977). 132f; O. Skutsch, _BICS_ 27 (1980); W. D. Lebek, _Das angebliche Lucan-frAGMENT 12 FPL_ (Morel). _Mitteil. JhB_ 18 (1983). 226ff. Prof. Skutsch and Lebek were most generous in granting the access to their papers before publication, but I still remain unconvincingly by Prof. Lebek's arguments. Cf. also McGann (n. 21). 128. for a possible contest within Lucan's opus for the fragment, with F. Ahl, _TAPA_ 102 (1971). 4ff.
mandatorily) saevus (exempli gratia) between Tarpeiam and arcem for the sake of the metre. Fregerit arcem is an unparalleled but not a difficult collocation, and for Tarpeiani ... arcem McGann (loc. cit.) compares Luc. 7. 758. There is, as McGann rightly insists, no prima facie case why Matthew (Roger) should not have cited a piece of otherwise unknown Lucan. The issue might appear to be complicated by Walter of Chatillon, *Alexandreis* 1. 12ff (1178-82):

At tu, cui maior genuissit Britannia reges
gaudet avos. Senenum quo praesule non minor urbi
nupsit honor, quam cum Romam Senonensibus armis
fregit, adepturus Tarpeiam Brennius arcem,
si non exciret vigiles argentus anser. 21

Let us be clear: Matthew (Roger) is not citing Walter directly, nor can the text of the *Alexandreis* be used to help restore a regular caesura in Matthew's (Roger's) quotation: of the five words in common (including fregit-fregerit with sharply differing meanings) only arcem stands at the same point in the line. Perhaps more seriously, Walter's text clearly follows the five words in common (including quite other than that in Walter. Far easier to suppose that Matthew's (Roger's) Lucan is indeed altered the text of Walter and ornamented it with a false attribution in order to support a story quite other than that in Walter. Far easier to suppose that Matthew's (Roger's) Lucan is indeed Lucan, cited for ornament in a moderately inappropriate context, and that the same text was also known to Walter, who could not credit the deviant version — which was in fact one beyond dispute well-known to Lucan himself, *Phars.* 5. 27 — and altered the text neatly, as he at least was very well able to do, to suit the familiar story. Walter, William and Matthew (Roger) all write 'Brennius'; the citation is inevitably normalised. Orthographic modernisation is no argument that Matthew (Roger) also misattributed the citation. Misattribution is of course perfectly possible; it is in no way mandatory. Even if Lucan fr. 12 succumbs to Prof. Lebek's scepticism (I confess that I do not see why it should), it is his great merit (ad fin) to have unearthed yet another reference to the sack of the Capitol, as will appear from his citation of Joseph Iscanus' *Antiocheis* (after 1190. 10ff).

(x) Skutsch has recently pointed out new evidence in Tacitus, but Tacitus' position is in fact yet more complex: writing of the sack of Rome, 19 Dec. AD 69, he comments, *sedem lovis Optimi Maximi auspicato a maioribus pignus imperii conditam, quam non Porsenna dedita urbe, neque Galli capta temerare potuisset, furorio principum excipi* (Hist. 3. 72. 1). The possibilities that Horatius did not keep the bridge, that Cloelia did not swim the Tiber, and that Rome fell to Porsenna emerge excitingly and are, historiographically, strikingly parallel to the

21 TLL s.v. *frango* 1241, 7ff; McGann (n. 21), 127 n. 1
22 ‘But you [Archbishop William of Rheims], to whom great Britain rejoices to have borne kings as ancestors, with you as their lord, no less an honour embraced the city of the Senones, than when Brennius, with the gnomes of the Senones, shattered Rome. being about to capture the Tarpeian citadel, did not the silver goose wake the guards.’
23 McGann compares *Tac.* Ann. I. 5. 41. 3 and *versus pop.* *trp.* *Suet.* Ner. 39. 2 = Morel FPL 133. 3.
24 *JRS* 68 (1978). 93f. ‘The scat of Jupiter Best and Greatest. founded after auspices by our ancestors, a pledge of empire, which neither Porsenna when the city was surrendered. nor the Gauls when it was captured. were able to defile. was destroyed by the madness of the emperors.’
story of the fall of the Capitol in 390.\textsuperscript{30} Tacitus earns a bouquet: "the scepticism of a powerful intelligence"; the story of Porsenna's success is likewise scantily attested elsewhere." But Tacitus clearly appears to suggest that the Capitol escaped during the events of 390. Yet he equally clearly knew the story that the Capitol fell, as we have recently learned: for him the question of which story to use is an issue of rhetorical appropriateness. In\textit{JRS} 1978 (see n. 10), Skutsch drew attention to a passage in the debate about Gallic senators: Claudius (\textit{Ann.} 11. 24. 9) paraphrases an objection which has been raised: \textit{at cum Senonibus pugnavimus};\textsuperscript{33} and answers it: \textit{sicelict Vulsci et Aequi numquam adversam nobis aciem instruxere}. The next objection he restates as: \textit{capti a Galli sumus}; and answers it: \textit{sed et Tuscis obsides dedimus} (cf. n. 32) \textit{et Sanmitium iugum subimus}. The passage in the previous chapter (11. 23. 7) first stating the objection is corrupt:\textsuperscript{34} it is transmitted as: \textit{quid si memoria eorum moreretur qui Capitolio et ara Romana manibus eorumdem per se saris oreretur}. It is quite immaterial that we are still not entirely sure what Tacitus wrote here (does the sentence end with \textit{perissent}?); the use of \textit{capti}, the link with Porsenna, just as at \textit{Hist.} 3. 72, and the unquestioned reference to the Capitol! make the line of argument certain. Claudius' reasoning is not in doubt; whatever the precise text, it is virtually certain that, as Skutsch suggested, Tacitus also knew and here used the 'deviant' version of the events of 390.

(xii) Three passages from Silius which may also bear upon this argument were discussed with admirable clarity by Skutsch in his 1953 article:\textsuperscript{35}

1. 625f. \textit{Gallisque ex arce fugatis arma reverterentis pompa gestata Camilli.}
4. 150f. \textit{ipse tumens atavis Brenni se stirpe ferebat Crixus et in titulos Capitolia capta trahebat ('Prahleire'. Norden\textsuperscript{''}).}
6. 555f. \textit{Allia et infandi Senones captaeque recursat attinentis arcis facies.}

(xii) Tert. \textit{Apol.} 40. 9: \textit{omnes dei vestri ab omnibus celebantur cum ipsum Capitolium Senones occupaverunt . . .} The Gauls' capture of the Capitol is presented as the climax of an extended list of catastrophes in the BC period; its sources have been discussed in detail,\textsuperscript{38} and it

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Skutsch (n. 2), 140.
\textsuperscript{32} Cf. Plin. \textit{Hist.} 19. 5. 34. Liv. 2. 13. 4 does refer to the hostages.
\textsuperscript{33} 'But we fought against the Senones' (the tribe charged in many texts with having sacked Rome: Wolski (n. 5), 32ff; Ogilvie on Liv. 5. 35. 3); 'I suppose the Volsci and Aequi never drew up their line of battle against us'; 'but we were captured by the Gauls'; 'but we also gave hostages to the Etruscans and passed under the Samnite yoke'.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Omeretur} for \textit{moreretur}, Bach; \textit{arce} for \textit{ara}, Acidalius; \textit{capta} before \textit{Capitoliis}, Skutsch. Accurate translation is not possible.
\textsuperscript{35} Skutsch (n. 2). 138. Wolski (n. 5) advances inadequate and unconvincing explanations. 'The arms of Camillus borne in the procession on his return, when the Gauls had been chased from the citadel'; 'Crixus himself, swollen with pride in his ancestors, held himself up of the race of Brennus and carried the capture of the Capitol among his titles'; 'the Allia and the unspeakable Senones and the appearance of the captured citadel returned to men in their terror.
\textsuperscript{36} Norden (n. 3), 107.
\textsuperscript{37} Cf. G. W. Clarke, CR 81 (1967). 138. 'All your sods were worshipped by everyone when the Senones took possession of the Capitol itself.'
\textsuperscript{38} T. D. Barnes, \textit{Tertullian} (Oxford, 1971), 204ff; 'a particularly precious piccc of information' (204); \textit{idem, Studia Patristica} 14 (1976), 4.
emerges as beyond question the product of wide reading: this reference is not a 'mere' rhetorical flourish.'"

Lastly, we must consider Simylus, an elegist of increasingly less uncertain date, quoted by Plut. Rom. 17. 5, who could certainly be interpreted as lending oblique support to the case here argued:


This passage is beset with problems." Tarpeia traditionally betrays Rome to the Sabines in the time of Romulus. Her motive is given either as greed for the Sabines' ornaments, by which she is crushed to death. or, uniquely, by Prop. 4. 4, as love for the Sabine general, Titus Tatius. Propertius' story is of an extremely familiar and widespread type, both in Graeco-Roman literature and elsewhere..." but there exists no parallel for its application to Tarpeia in the context of Romulian Rome." The traditional story of Tarpeia and the armillae raises a number of formal problems: the story stands in conflict with the fact that the Romans did not yet, in the time of Romulus, occupy the Capitol; it conflicts also with the traditional austerity of the Sabines, who may have dwelt near the Capitoline rock before the destruction of Rome, who longed to become the bride of the lord of the Celts did not watch over the home of her forebears.' And after a little, about her end: 'her, rejoicing, the Boii and numberless tribes of the Celts did not establish within the streams of the Po, but casting forward their armour from their warlike hands they made ornament death upon the hated maiden'. See, above all, H. A. Sanders, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series 1 (1904). 22f; his collection of material on Tarrow is unmatched, but his approach is vitiated by a rigid and untenable source-analysis. Cf. too Momigliano (n. 41), 479ff; K. Miller, Mh 21 (1963). 114ff; F. E. Brem, in Studies in Latin Literature, ed. C. Deroux (Coll. Lor. 164, Brussels 1979). 1: 66f; W. Burkert, Structure and History (Berkeley, 1979). 761;

The story is at least as old as Fabius, fr. IX; cf. Cincius fr. 5P, both ap. DH 2. 38ff.


 Pace Ogilvie (n. 7). 74: Antigonus, FGrH. 816 F 2 = Plut. Rom. 17. 5, does not make love for the enemy general her motive: not Ant. 'of Carystos': so Ogilvie. ? after Mielzentz. 2333. 53. See FGrH. loc. cit.; Sanders (n. 34). 7: La Penna (n. 33). 120n. 27.
Indeed have worn enticing ornaments, but will not have been thought to;" and thirdly, the story overrides the traditional association of armillae with the Gauls. All these apparent difficulties are avoided in Simylus' version, with Tarpeia enamoured of a fourth century Gaul." To this version there exist at first sight two analogues:

(i) Schol. Luc. 1. 196. *Capitolium autem dicitur a quaedam virgo quae Tarpeia vocabatur.* a *Gallis quondam interfecta,* but this text may itself derive ultimately from Simylus, for the scholia from which it comes display a good deal of learning from Greek sources. with Plutarch not excluded.

(ii) Clitophon of Rhodes. *Galatika (?) I (FGH 293 F 1 = (Plut.) Par. Min. 15 = Mor. 309B-C.* Cf. Stob. Flor. 10. 71):

Brennus the king of the Galatians, when he was ravaging Asia, came to Ephesus and fell in love with a maiden Demonice. She promised to satisfy his desires and also to betray Ephesus. if he would give her the Gauls' bracelets and feminine ornaments. But Brennus requested his soldiers to throw into the lap of the avaricious woman the gold they were wearing. This they did and she was buried alive by the abundance of gold they were wearing.

The motives of gold and love are here hopelessly confused and Salomon Reinach described the passage as 'd'une absurdité révoltante'. Though Clitophon, like Simylus, does refer to Gauls, the story cannot be pinned down in historical terms; it does not belong to Brennus' invasion of Greece in 280-79, for Asia Minor was spared; it cannot confidently be connected with the Galatian descent on coastal Asia Minor in 277-5, and indeed we are under no very strong obligation to try to locate the romantic episode in a real context of events, for Clitophon is after all a Schwindelautor, and has indeed been recognised as such for a long time. Demonice's literary ancestry is irretrievably confused: she may in part be a bastard offspring of the traditional Tarpeia story. At all events, she is wholly the creation of bogus-*Wissenschaft* and spurious ingenuity, and she has no independent existence or value. Without Demonice, Simylus' Tarpeia stands quite alone, like Propertius', and as in the case of Propertius. we may wonder whether she was derived, or was the product of studied originality and unorthodoxy.

At first sight, however, Simylus' account has much to commend it: in the fourth century. the Capitol is inhabited by the Romans and the *armillae* are worn, as they should be, by the Gauls. And if we acknowledge Simylus' as an old and independent version of the story (and not merely an elegantly innovative piece of learned originality), then we may begin to speculate. Was Tarpeia the original betrayer of 390? Did the story of Manlius then displace her? And was she thus forced back into the Romulean period? Or was that where she had originally belonged and was she brought down to 390 to lessen the shame of the Capitol's fall, as Sinon's

48 Hubbard (n. 42). 120: Ogilvie (n. 7). 74f.
49 It is a myth advanced by Rumpf (*JHS* 71 (1951). 168; cf. Ogilvie. *loc. cit.*) that according to DH the Subines had taken over luxury from the Etruscans: at 2. 38. 2. DH says only that the Subines were not less luxurious than the Etruscans: cf. Poulet (n. 42). 11x n. 194.
50 *BS* n. 7; *DSS* 5. 27; 2: *Liv*. 24. 4. 3: Claud. Quad. fr. 10Bp.
51 'The Capitol is also called Tarpeium from a girl who was called Tarpeia. once killed by the Gauls.' *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*, ed. Cavajoni (Milan. 1979). 37.
52 Sanders (n. 43). 23.
54 PW s.v. Brennus (3).
treachery served to assuage the shock to pride and courage of Troy's fall (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2. 196ff)? And was she then — but for Simylus' poem — displaced by the story of Manlius?

But the story cannot be made to bear so much weight. It is no real objection to the traditional Tarpeia-story that the Romans are located on the Capitol in the reign of Romulus: in our texts the hill is frequently enough associated with Romulean Rome and no topographical difficulty can have been sensed in the 'normal' story of Tarpeia.  

I am made suspicious of Simylus' story by his artful blending of two distinct motives — love and greed — kept separate in all other accounts of the episode, into a single version: "it is tempting to wonder whether Simylus may not have concocted the story just because he knew of the lavish and familiar Gallic *armillae* and wanted to achieve independence and originality in his treatment of Tarpeia. One might also, by contrast, consider whether the *armillae* of the Sabines in the traditional version might not be the product of the widespread antiquarian urge to find Sabine antecedents for so many Roman social and military practices — in this case, perhaps the wearing of honorific military decorations, however simple originally, on the arm, perhaps prompted by some faint knowledge of Italic gold ornaments."

The 'rightness' of Simylus' version, which has excited recent enquirers a good deal, does not, I think, withstand sceptical analysis. That is a pity: did it emerge as the sole representative of an old and independent tradition, then it would be very simple to argue that the Gauls' success and Tarpeia's treachery had stood conjoined, till displaced by the classical geese.

The archaeological evidence, both positively and negatively, is entirely inconclusive. 'Damage' in the Forum is not (see below) as convincing as once it seemed. On the Capitol, only one site, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, has been explored in sufficient detail, and it was already clear from the literary evidence that few or no traces of damage by fire would be found, for the Carthaginian treaty of 509 perhaps survived there: "and when in 83 BC the temple was rebuilt, the original sixth century foundations were used. Archaeologists no longer acknowledge any surviving traces of the Gallic sack in the Forum; the references to total destruction in the literary tradition (Plut. *Cam.* 31. 1 is perhaps the most extreme) rest upon inference not evidence. There are therefore no relevant deductions to be drawn from the archaeological material."

But the literary evidence for the Gauls' capture of the Capitol stands firm without archaeological assistance. Students of early Rome have not been eager to welcome this new datum: 'The story of Manlius and the geese is the authentic stuff of history.' 'Une hypothèse faiblement fondée du point de vue de la critique et de la vraisemblance historique.' Perhaps not enough consideration has been given to the possibility of poetical or rhetorical exaggeration


*Ogilvie* (n. 7). 751; L. G. Roberts. *MAAR* 2 (1918), 58ff.

*Plb.* 3. 22.

*DH* 4. 61.4: *Tac.* *Hist.* 3. 72.


*Ogilvie* (n. 7). 734.

Wolski (n. 5). 45.
in these instances.'67 How this version (that the Capitol fell) dealt with Manlius and the geese is not known; presumably they were simply left out. At any rate for our purposes it may be ignored.68

Nothing has been done either to discredit Skutsch's evidence in detail (too much has now been accumulated for that to be a real option), or to try to integrate the version he has isolated into a revaluation of the legends of the Gallic sack. In historiographical terms, the situation is of course striking: both capture and non-capture are attested. both triumph and disaster, survival and indignity.

It may be helpful to compare:

(i) The mediaeval legend of Belisarius, which began to develop in the seventh century, in which the campaigns against the Persians; Vandals and Goths are forgotten and Belisarius rebuilds Constantinople, is imprisoned for three years, invades England, but is then blinded — so that his son Alexios rescues the state from a Persian invasion (after which, however, Belisarius is found as a blind beggar by ambassadors from abroad). Every important feature of the historical Belisarius' record comes to be lost, or distorted fundamentally."'

(ii) The story of Roland:70 in Einhard's Life of Charlemagne (§ 9), Hruodlandus Britannici limitis praefectus was one of a number of distinguished casualties in Charlemagne's severe defeat by the Basques in the Pyrenees on 15 Aug. 778. It took three hundred years of development for Roncevaux to become a great Christian victory, during which the minstrel Taillefer actually sang of Charlemagne, Roland and Oliver to hearten the Normans at Hastings.71 Here we have a comparable reversal of historical fact as the end-product of an extended period of heroisation and romanticisation. We should therefore enquire whether there are comparable indications of how capture is turned into survival and how a Gallic coup de main becomes a Roman victory. It is altogether implausible — and entirely unparalleled in Roman pseudo-history — that an original national victory had been recast as a catastrophic and embarrassing loss of the greatest national shrine.72

The story of the geese is itself of a familiar type,73 in early Icelandic literature. the warning role is taken by a golden cock, conceivably under indirect Livian influence. Attention has been drawn74 to an attack by Philip on Byzantium in 346 BC, when the alarm was raised by dogs; one might also wish to compare Agesipolis' use of dogs to enforce his blockade of Mantinea by night,75 the dogs used for Aratus' defence of Acrocorinth,76 and the key role played by the gardener's little dogs in Aratus' projected attack on Sicyon.77 There is, moreover, gentle

67 Luce (n. 5). 291 n. 41.
69 H.-G. Beck, Gesch. der byz. Volksliteratur (Munich. 1971). 150ff; B. Knöss, Eranos 58 (1960). 237ff. I am most grateful to Dr M. Jeffreys for alerting me to the existence of this legend and for assisting me with references.
71 Menendez Pidal (n. 70). 271, etc.
72 I am most grateful to Mr M. Walkley for assistance.
75 Polyaeus 2. 25.
77 Plut. Arat. 5, 5, 6. 3. 7. 4f. 8. 1f.
discussion of the merits of dogs as against geese as guard animals in writers on warfare and on natural history, not least since the dogs failed, as we shall shortly see, in 390."

No difficulty, then, in inventing an appropriate type of story to account for the survival of the Capitol. It has also been observed" that parallels are to be drawn between, for example, Livy’s account of the Gallic attack on Rome and the Persians’ sack of Athens: ‘in particular the resemblance between the massacre of the senators and the liquidation of those Athenians who had taken refuge on the Acropolis, and between the abortive attempt on the Capitol (sic) and the successful ascent of the Acropolis is to be noted’ (Ogilvie loc. cit.). I would add that further parallels should be drawn between the flight to Caere (Liv. 5. 40) and the flight to Salamis — amid closely parallel scenes of distress.30 But especially to be noted is the story of the serpent: ‘it is said by the Athenians that a great snake lies in their temple to guard the Acropolis: in proof whereof, they do ever duly set out a honey cake as a monthly offering for it: this cake had ever before been consumed, but was now left untouched.’31 So the Athenians thought the goddess had deserted them and were the readier to flee. The priests, suggests Plutarch, were told what to say by Themistocles.32 At Rome, on the other hand, the geese were fed despite the famine: pietas was preserved: the sacred geese gave the alarm; the citadel was saved. Thus the traditional version — almost as though in calculated antithesis to the story of Athena’s serpent.

The geese are at the heart of the matter: the Gauls, wrote Livy, climbed so quietly, ut non custodes solum fallerent, sed ne canes quidem, sollicitum animal ad nocturnos strepitus, excitarent. anseres non fellelere quibus sacris lunonis in summa inopia cibi tamen abstinerentur (Liv. 5. 47. 3). From this text, it would appear that the dogs were common secular mutts, and that the geese were already there and sacred to Juno in 390.33 But with what temple were they associated? Mommsen referred confidently to ‘the holy geese of Capitoline Juno’. and Schwegler34 asserted that their connexion with the Capitoline temple ‘liegt in der Natur der Sache’. But there is no text which explicitly confirms the point. The rival claims of Juno Moneta will be considered shortly.

At a later stage, geese and dogs were both involved in a commemorative ritual, on whose detail we are copiously and variously informed; the Gauls were held to have fired Rome on 19 July: the traditional chronology35 points to a siege from July to the following February36 but Lydus curiously (Mens. 4. 114) places the ritual on 3 Aug. Minor variants aside. the geese,
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85 Schwegler (n. 6). 3. 259 n. 2.
86 Ogilvie (n. 7), 736: Schwegler (n. 6). 254f; Roberts (n. 61). 65f; E. Komemann, Klio 11 (1911). 335f.
amid purple and gold were carried on litters. while dogs were impaled or crucified on elder-stakes. The ritual clearly survived till Plutarch's time and the use of the present tense by Arnobius and Ambrose suggests that it went on a good deal longer. The geese were fed by the censors: it was the first of their duties to put out the contracts. The dogs were likewise maintained at state expense, though it might seem from Cicero that they had acquired a custodial function. and the place of their sacrifice, in the Circus Maximus, is as hard to explain as the date."

It is often stated that the geese were sacred to Juno Moneta. The temple of Juno Moneta was dedicated in 345, and it seems increasingly likely (see below) that there had been some earlier cult of Juno on the site, but the story of the geese is not itself an argument, since the avoidance of anachronisms is not a characteristic of aetiological stories. Bonier rightly observes that there is not a word to connect the geese explicitly with Juno Moneta, and negatively, it is worth observing that though Cicero twice connects Moneta with monere (Div. 1, 101. 2. 69), the warning is of an earthquake, not of the Gauls' assault."

The one piece of artistic evidence is no more secure: an Antonine relief from Ostia shows two_and_a_half agitated geese in front of a temple. But there is no compulsion to suppose that this must have been the temple of Juno Moneta. though possibly a mid-second century AD artist may have had that temple in mind. The geese are therefore not precisely located. and they do not in themselves provide evidence for a cult of Juno involving geese on the Arx prior to 390. though it seems likely from the archaeological evidence that some cult in Juno's honour did pre-exist the temple of 345 (Giannelli n. 83, 17f).

We may also note that though the Gauls' upward route is variously recorded. it is of no assistance to us in determining the location of the geese:

(i) The Gauls reach the summit of the Capitol by means of a tunnel: Manlius, woken by the geese. ejects them from the temple; though it might appear that the Capitoline temple was meant. it is not so specified."

(ii) They climb the Tarpeian rock, on the SE side of the arx (ie. the northern summit of the Hill. overlooking the Forum); a late version of the story."

---

91 Plut. loc. cit.: Arnob. 6. 20: Ambr. Hex. 5. 13, 44.
92 Cic. Rosc. Amer. 56; Arnob. loc. cit.: Plin. 10. 51 (cf. Plut. QR 98), 29. 57.
93 Cic. loc. cit.: Arnob. loc. cit.
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(iii) In the version of (?) Quadrigarius, as reflected by Livy and Plutarch,\textsuperscript{105} they climb up the cliff nearest the Porta Carmentalis, at the SW end of the hill, overlooking the Forum Boarium.\textsuperscript{106}

None of these versions points unambiguously to either one of the temples considered. The goose seems not to be connected with Juno elsewhere. An effort has therefore been made to locate the geese of 390 elsewhere on the Capitol: in the auguraculum, 'a place where divination was held \textit{ex tripudiiis}, by the manner in which birds treated their food'.\textsuperscript{107} It is indeed true that for \textit{auspicia ex tripudiiis}, no specific birds were required,\textsuperscript{108} and it is also true that there was an auguraculum on the Capitol." But an auguraculum was only 'ein eigenes, für ihr Kultakte bestimmte Lokal',\textsuperscript{109} that is to say, it was a place, in general, for taking auspices, and there is no reason to suppose that the Capitoline auguraculum was a permanently established sacred poultry yard of the city of Rome. Moreover, \textit{signa ex tripudiiis} are observed primarily for convenience, by generals on campaign, notably:" it is not clear why Ogilvie (n. 107) wished to import them to the Capitoline auguraculum, nor am I persuaded either that the goose was an augural bird, or that the auguraculum has been found (\textit{aliter}, Giannelli, n. 109). The auguraculum is better, therefore, altogether divorced from this argument.

We are not even really clear why geese should be connected with Juno at all, though their alleged modesty and domesticity are attested." But if the geese had in origin been domestic (and there is no reason why there should not have been, as Prof. Ogilvie suggests to me, an ordinary domestic goose-pen appropriately sited on the Capitol), then it is very hard to see why the connexion with Juno (not, after all, one generally known) should have developed.

It has been suggested that the story of Manlius and the geese is aetiological,\textsuperscript{113} either to explain the ritual of the geese and the dogs, or to account for the \textit{cognomen} Capitolinus among the Manlii.\textsuperscript{114} The \textit{cognomen} predates the hero of 390 and is most simply explained from the fact that the Manlii lived there." A simple and conclusive answer does not lie ready to hand.

M. Manlius was disgraced and put to death in 384. On the site of his house on the arx, by the Aracoeli church (cf. Giannelli (n. 83). 13ff), the temple of Juno Moneta was put up in 345, by the dictator and \textit{magister equitum} of that year in commemoration of a victory over the Aurunci: they were L. Furius Camillus. nephew or son of the dictator of 390 (PW \textit{s.v.} 41/42), and Cn. Manlius Capitolinus respectively." The story of the events of 390 is already full enough of doublets. and another might in some form lurk here: certainly the building of a temple to Juno, where Manlius' house had stood, by a Manlius and a Camillus, could be both a powerful stimulus to the creation of legend and a potent source of error.

\begin{itemize}
\item Liv. 5. 46. 9. 47. 2: Plut. Cam. 25; Wiseman (n. 68). 40ff.
\item Cic. \textit{Div.} 2. 73: Wissowa (n. 94). 532 n. 5. 530 n. 3.
\item Wissowa (n. 94). 524: \textit{quod ibi augures publice auspicerarent}. Paul. \textit{loc. cit.}
\item Pease on Cic. \textit{Div.} 1. 27: Wissowa (n. 94). 532.
\item Wissowa (n. 94). 190 n. 10; Thulin, \textit{loc. cit.} (n. 95): Gagé (n. 42). 207: Plin. 10. 44; Petron. 137: Arist. \textit{HA loc. cit.} (n. 78).
\item Schwelgcr (n. 6). 25ff.
\item Münzer, \textit{PW:V.} Manlius 1168; Ogilvie (n. 7). 694. 734: Schwelgcr (n. 6). 258 n. 3.
\item The coincidence is noted by Gagé (n. 42). 207f, but he makes nothing of it.
\end{itemize}
We should start from the assumption that there were no geese, that Manlius failed, and that
the Capitol fell. Four years later, moreover, disgrace and execution. Beyond that, there is only
speculation.

We have no idea when the story of the geese developed: evidently before Fabius Pictor
(n.15). The motive could have been to re-habilitate Manlius or the Manlii, but rehabilitation
may have been no more than a by-product. Though it has been stressed that there is no specific
evidence to connect the geese with the temple of Juno Moneta, the coincidence of names is
very seductive. Were the geese connected historically with the temple of 345, and if the temple
was raised, or thought to have been raised, on the site of Manlius' house, then it is easy to see
the glimmerings of how the story might have begun: it was creditable to Rome and to the
Manlii — and in its later, expanded form to the Camilli. But the story of Manlius and the geese
does not seem very early: this is particularly so if I am right in suggesting Greek, if not
specifically Herodotean, influence.

The temple geese need not originally have been carried in any splendid procession: their
feeding by censorial contract will not always have been connected with their role in rousing the
Capitol's defenders; equally the crucifixion of the dogs and the story of their failure to rouse
the guards will not have been integrally connected from the first. Schwegler's suggestion that
the story explains the origin of the rituals is not mandatory (n. 113). The growth of a popular
and patriotic tale could lead to a more complex pattern of growth: some simple ritual involving
geese, in honour of Juno Moneta, some sacrifice of dogs, common in Roman religion, could
even have developed under the influence of the story into the remarkable procession which so
outraged Arnobius. Such a development will have been made possible by the patriotic appeal.
The charm, the poignancy of the story, even though there always remained those who knew that
the geese had never cackled. But this historical scepticism could not affect the growth of ritual
and legend conjoined; the growth of a national folklore was irresistible.

117 Gagé (n. 42) 207f; Ogilvie on Liv. 3. 7. 12.
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