

This paper, derived from a larger study of Roman *exempla*, examines how and to what ends two Augustan-era Romans—Livy in the *AUC*, and Augustus in his forum—deploy the figure of Appius Claudius Caecus. The divergent representations of Appius in these and other sources have long challenged historians, who have generally sought to explain the differences, and to forge a coherent account of Appius' career, by using source-critical techniques (e.g. Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*; Ferenczy, *AAntHung* 1965 and 1970; Oakley, *Comm. Liv.*; now Humm, *Ap. Claud. Caec.*). To focus on *exempla*, however—as I do here—is to consider how and why figures from the past are appropriated and deployed anew in each specific context. Hence I ask: What is distinctive about each of these versions of Appius? And what work does each Appius do in context, in relation to each author's social, ideological, and moral orientations?

I begin with Livy, whose Appius is an abrasive, restless innovator. He first appears at 9.29–30, in the account of his tumultuous censorship. For virtually every censorial act, Livy remarks upon the antagonism it arouses, its departure from precedent, and Appius' isolation in pursuing his course. Further disruptive, unprecedented interventions in domestic politics are noted later (9.33–34, 46; 10.7–8). Indeed, he has no alternative to making his name in civic arts, as he is shut out of military command during his first consulship (9.42). Yet his peers come to respect his preeminence in this area, and eventually either undertake to challenge him in eloquence (Decius, 10.7–9; Volumnius, 10.19) or are mocked for shirking this challenge (Fabius, 10.15). On the other hand, Livy's Appius is an incompetent general, perhaps even a novice. Taking the field late in his second consulship, he bungles his command and must be saved by his more capable colleague Volumnius; under expert guidance, however, he acquits himself acceptably (10.16–19; similar episodes at 10.25, with Fabius, and 10.31, with Volumnius). Thus Livy's Appius pioneers “domestic politics” as a legitimate arena of aristocratic competition—one parallel to but separate from the established military arena—precisely because he competes poorly in the latter. Through studied juxtapositions and comparisons between Appius and his rivals, Livy characterizes both the degree of his deficiency in the one arena and of his preeminence in the other (see Rossi, *TAPA* 2004; Carroll, *JAAC* 2002).

Augustus, meanwhile, included Appius in the gallery of *summi viri* in his forum. Accompanying the statue was a brief *elogium* (*ILS* 54, etc.), listing Appius' magistracies, including junior military offices (*tr. mil. III*) that seem incompatible with Livy's portrait of an inept, novice general. It goes on to credit him with military victories for which Livy assigns him at best a subordinate role, and notes his temple-dedication to Bellona. Only secondarily does it note his public works, and his late speech against Pyrrhus. Why such a portrait? Despite scholarly disagreement over the criteria for inclusion in this gallery, and over these figures' relevance to Augustus (e.g., Frisch, *ZPE* 1980; Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis*; Chaplin, *Livy's exemplary history*), military credentials are clearly a *sine qua non* of inclusion. Hence their priority here, making Appius a standard-issue military hero with some civic accomplishments.

Such a portrait, I suggest, accords with the overall claim of continuity in actions and values made by Augustus' gallery of republican heroes. Livy's Appius, conversely, is an *exemplum* of innovation that not only anticipates later innovators in the *AUC* (e.g., Fabius Cunctator), but also resonates with the sweeping changes in the modes and venues of aristocratic competition during the Augustan age—and may implicate Livy himself, one of the first Roman historiographers from a non-senatorial family. The example of Appius thus bifurcates ideologically just as the Augustan order itself does: it can emplot either tradition or innovation, depending on immediate needs. This exploration of how Romans consume their own past should also help source-critical historians assess more accurately the character of their sources.