

By OTTO SKUTSCH

In *JRS* 43 (1953), 77 f. I stated that in a number of passages Silius Italicus (I. 625 f.; 4. 150 f.; 6. 555 f.) seems to attest a version of history according to which not only the city but the Capitol also was taken by the Gauls.¹ I therefore suggested that the same version should be recognized in Ennius, *Ann.* 164 f.:

qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti
moenia concubia uigilesque repente cruentant.

In the reprint of my paper, *Studia Enniana* (1968), 138 f., I was able to add not only that, in postulating that version, I had a predecessor in O. Rossbach (1901), and that, in interpreting Ennius, G. Pasquali (1915) had to some extent anticipated me, but that the story of the fall of the Capitol had been discovered in Lucan and in Tertullian. Lucan 5. 27: 'Tarpeia sede perusta' had been so interpreted by A. Bourgery in the Budé text (1926), and M. J. McGann, *CQ* 51 (1957), 126 f., based on that interpretation his defence of the authenticity of Lucan fr. 12: M.: 'Tarpeiam . . . cum fregerit arcem Brennus'. In *CR* 81 (1967), 138 G. W. Clarke drew attention to Tertullian, *Apol.* 40.9 'cum ipsum Capitolium Senones occupauerunt'.² McGann also adduced Varro, *de uita pop. Rom.* II fr. 61 (Nonius 498): 'ut noster exercitus ita sit fugatus ut Galli Romae Capitoli sint potiti neque inde ante sex menses cesserint'; but he did not accept that testimony because of the apparent contradiction with *ibid.* II (? I *codd.*), fr. 62 (Nonius 228): 'auri pondo duo milia acceperunt ex aedibus sacris et matronarum ornamentis; a quibus postea id aurum et torques aureae multae relatae Romam atque consecratae.'

Dies diem docet. I did not then think of Tacitus, *Ann.* II. 23,³ where people are said to protest at the idea that leading men of Gallia Comata should become senators and be admitted to the *cursus honorum*: 'Let us remember those who died slain by the Gauls at the time of Rome's catastrophe'. Claudius in the following chapter argues that foreigners have ruled in Rome and freedmen have held offices. 'at' he makes the opponents say 'cum Senonibus pugnauimus', in order to reply: 'scilicet Vulsci et Aequi numquam aduersam nobis aciem instruxere'. Again he makes them say 'capti a Gallis sumus', to reply: 'sed et Tuscis obsides dedimus et Samnitium iugum subiimus'. The sentence in 23 which I freely paraphrased above is transmitted as follows: 'quid si memoria eorum moreretur qui Capitolio et ara Romana manibus eorundem per se satis'. Several corrections are needed here. I do not feel sure that *oreretur* is the right replacement for *moreretur*, but Acidalius' *arce* for *ara* is certain, and *perissent* peeps out from under *per se satis*.⁴ Yet another correction is called for by the unaccompanied ablative *Capitolio*. Editors generally accept Draeger's *Capitolio*. But why was *sub* omitted? Why *conspicante* (Ritter)? Why *obsessa* after *arce* (Halm)? The missing word is supplied by the argument which Claudius puts in the mouths of those opposing the measure: 'capti a Gallis sumus'.

¹ J. Wolski, *Hist.* 5 (1956), 44 f., denies the existence of such a version, but he regrettably misinterprets the evidence which he adduces: Pliny, *NH* 3. 9. 57 does not report Theopompus (*FGH* 115. 317) as saying that the town only was taken; he reports him as saying nothing about Rome other than that she was taken.

² On Tertullian as an antiquarian see T. D. Barnes in *Studia Patristica* XIV (1976), 3 ff., and on this passage in particular 12 f.; also his *Tertullian* (1971), 204 f. Barnes thinks Tertullian may have known Ennius; compare Vahlen's edition of Ennius, p. lxxxvi.

³ I am grateful to E. Wistrand for directing my

attention to this passage. He must not, however, be held responsible for the use I am making of it here.

⁴ The virgula above *se* is probably that which in the Mediceus is often put above an *e*, especially in monosyllables; but it might derive from the majuscule abbreviation of final *nt*. Whichever it is, *se(nt)* and *sat* look like two different shots, wrongly inserted between *per* and *is*, at an original *sent* which had become difficult to read. Some modern editors, adopting *perissent*, retain *satis*, which makes no sense, or, following Renaissance suggestions, turn it into *prostrati*, an addition wholly superfluous and therefore un-Tacitean. It could hardly be tolerated before *perissent*, let alone at the end of the sentence.

Therefore read 'qui <capto> Capitolio et arce Romana'.⁵ The omission of *capto* may be a case of plain haplography, or of haplography induced by disbelief. In *Hist.* 3. 72, stressing the outrage of the burning of the Capitol by Roman soldiers, Tacitus says that it had been captured neither by Porsenna when he took the city (again an unorthodox version!) nor by the Gauls. Here he follows the unorthodox version concerning the Gauls because it seems to strengthen the case of those opposing their advancement.

⁵The assonance *capto Capitolio* may be no more than accidental; but cf. Livy 3. 22. 1 and 23. 2: *Capitolium captum*: 34. 5. 8: *Capitolio ... capto*;

Silius 4. 151: *Capitolia capta* (*ThLL* Onom. II 162. 12 ff.).