

CITATION AND THE DYNAMICS OF TRADITION IN LIVY'S *AUC**

Abstract: This paper explores the function of citation practices as literary devices in Livy's *AUC*, and defines the specific dynamics of historical citation against the broader categories of intertextuality and allusion. Building on now familiar work on intertextuality in Roman poetry and especially meta-poetic reference, it argues that Livy uses citation not only to acknowledge his sources, but also to place his history within a literary and cultural tradition, as well as to construct and negotiate his own authority within that tradition.

The main focus of this paper is the historiographical source citation: the range of textual gestures by which an author explicitly points to his sources, whether by name or by reference to a collective tradition. Despite its ubiquity in ancient historiography, citation as a rule has tended to blend into the background, trotted out only to catalogue sources or establish the historian's working habits.¹ One of Livy's commentators, Robert Ogilvie, is reflective of a general attitude: 'Frequently he [i.e., Livy] will name variants or cite alternatives, but this is no more than the scholarly pedantry expected of a historian. It means very little.'² The ubiquity of source citations, however, demonstrates also the central position they occupy in the historiographical tradition, and the crucial role they play in engaging the reader of a history in the dynamics of a particular historical reconstruction.

Indeed, at the most basic level, source citations function as generic markers, not only constituting a distinctive feature of historical writing, but also defining the genre as concerned with particular issues: their very presence suggests research, pedantry, authentication, and credibility, or at least

* I am grateful to John Marincola for including me in the 2011 APA seminar from which this paper originated, and to T. P. Wiseman, Christopher Pelling, David Levene, and the audience of that seminar for their remarks. I am also grateful to Christina Kraus and Pramit Chaudhuri for commenting on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

¹ Citation has not, as a rule, been either theorised or considered in terms of its literary meaning. Fehling (1989) remains seminal for the fictive dimension of historiographical citation. An important attempt to catalogue Livy's citational and authorial reference has been made by Forsythe (1999), which focuses on Livy's methods in adjudicating the conflicting evidence of the First Decade. The current paper complements Forsythe's approach by asking not what attitude Livy shows to earlier traditions, but rather how the historical mannerism of citation serves both Livy's history and his historiography.

² Ogilvie (1967) 6–7.

an honest and open disclosure of the difficulties of accessing the past.³ As well as generic markers, historiographical citations are also literary devices and rhetorical gestures, which explicitly focus attention on various facets of engagement between historical texts; in other words, they are the most obvious site where allusivity and intertextuality operate, and it is this aspect of citation that this project aims to explore more fully.

To say that citation is an obvious site of intertextuality should not suggest that historiographical citation does a poorer or less sophisticated sort of literary work than the more mannered and subtle references of poetry. Rather, its explicit nature suits the historical medium well: whereas Alexandrian poetry invites the reader to recognise himself as a sharer of knowledge equal to the poet, history's didactic function demands that the author display his greater store of acquired knowledge to his audience.⁴ Nor are historians incapable of deploying both kinds of intertextuality: as much recent work shows, historians, including Livy, use embedded allusion to great effect.⁵ But citation, being so distinctive of historical writing, deserves a closer exploration as a literary feature, one that helps the author to perform the role of the diligent researcher and allows for various forms of interaction with a myriad of texts.⁶

A comparison with poetry may prove instructive here. We may observe in Latin poetry various types of citation, including the verbatim quotation (Ov. *Met.* 14.812–5):

³ Like all generic markers, source citations too can be deployed more or less ably, and with varying degrees of earnestness or artfulness. In all cases, however, citation establishes a historian's investment in appearing to tell the truth, whether or not he actually did so (which is often simply impossible to establish). On *historia* as a polyphonic genre, see Marincola (1999) and now Kraus (forthcoming).

⁴ Other didactic forms, even in verse, show similar tendencies to historiography. So Lucretius, for example, will cite or allude to his philosophical sources (usually those with whom he disagrees, e.g., Lucr. 1.635–920 (Heracleitus, Empedocles, and Anaxagoras). The scholiastic tradition, especially on the *Aeneid*, likewise lists historical variants (e.g., Servius *ad Aen.* 1.242, which collects variants from Sallust, Livy and Sisenna). Thus a broader view of citation as a literary device may be applicable to more than just historiography, though the kind of 'truth' being dealt with—historical or metaphysical or scientific—might have implications for the particular effect of the intertextuality within each genre.

⁵ On Livy's use of intertextuality, see, e.g., Jaeger (2006), Levene (2010) 83–162, and the essays in Polleichtner (2010). For historiography more generally: Kelly (2008) 161–255, O'Gorman (2009).

⁶ On the historian's construction of his persona as authoritative, see Marincola (1997), esp. 95–117 on sources. Marincola's focus, however, is on the distinction between autopsy and written or monumental sources. On citation and authority in the satirical *Apocolocyntosis*: O'Gorman (2005).

tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum
 (nam memoro memorique animo pia uerba notauī)
 'unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli'
 dixisti: rata sit uerborum summa tuorum!

You have said to me once in council, in the presence of the gods, (for I remember, and I have noted your faithful words in my remembering spirit): 'There will be one, whom you will raise to the blue of the heavens.' May your words thus be fulfilled!

The speaker here is Mars, and he is quoting Jupiter's words to him in a council of the gods. That council took place in an earlier epic, Ennius' *Annales*, and Ovid here provides a direct quotation of Ennius, *Annales* fr. 33 (Sk.). Ovid does not cite Ennius by name, but there is no mistaking the source for anyone else, and the act of quotation itself is so mannered (*tu mihi ... dixisti, memoro memorique animo*) that its significance cannot be mistaken or underestimated.⁷ Gianbiagio Conte has characterised this type of quotation as creating no 'gap', or discontinuity, between the quoting and quoted text, since the former accepts the latter as a given reality, and he suggests that Ovid quotes Ennius in order to borrow his authority for his own text.⁸ This procedure appears very much like historiographical practice, or at least some considerable portion of it, and might be said to account for the tralatician nature of Roman historiography: one historian provides a narration of events, which later historians then receive and reproduce in their own text, thus appropriating the former historian's *auctoritas*.⁹

⁷ Conte (1986) 59 suggests that the term 'quotation' should be reserved by philologists for the specific instance in which the original source is cited by name, and offers as an example Persius, *Sat.* 6.9–10, quoting Ennius, *Op. Inc.* 1 Sk (= *Annales* 16V): '*Lunai portum est operae, cognoscite, ciues*' | *cor iubet hoc Enni*. In both types of quotation (explicit and implicit), however, Conte emphasises that 'no tension is established between the two texts' (60).

⁸ Conte (1986) 59: 'The dominant function here is the 'authentication' of a new text by an authoritative new one. No attempt is made to provide new information. No metaphorical gap appears between the two texts because there is no substitution of meanings, and there is no semantic enrichment because no violence is done to the objective presentation of reality.'

⁹ One famous version of this phenomenon is Livy's extensive translation of Polybius in the fourth decade, which Levene (2011) has now suggested showcases a distinctive feature of ancient historiography, namely the authors' freedom 'to cling closely to their sources' (10). For Livy's use of Polybius in the third decade, which is rather more flexible, see also Levene (2010) 126–63 and (2011). For the tralatician nature of Roman historiography: Forsythe (1994) and (1999); see also Lendon (2009), for whom this procedure severely limited the artistic freedom of the ancient historian, thus guaranteeing at least some level of authenticity.

We can also see poetic citation operating in a slightly different way, not only to appropriate the authority of one text for another, but also to affiliate the author with a particular genre or literary tradition.¹⁰ Some poets, though by no means all, explicitly name a predecessor as a paradigm for their own work. Thus Ennius is a second Homer, Propertius a second Callimachus (Prop. 4.1.61–4):

uisus Homerus adesse poeta (Ennius, *Annales* fr. 3 Sk)

The poet Homer appeared to approach.

Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona:

mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,
ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,
Umbria Romani patria Callimachi! (Propertius, 4.1.61–4).

Ennius girded his own words with a thorny crown: grant me, Bacchus, leaves from your ivy, so that swollen Umbria should grow haughty through our books, Umbria, the homeland of the Roman Callimachus!

Each of these statements is significant, and more importantly, programmatic, even if they do not provoke the investigative work demanded by a more *recherché* allusion. Thus, the second passage explicitly juxtaposes Ennius and Callimachus, each modeling a different type of poetics, and appropriate for a book concerned with epic and historical questions. The juxtaposition complicates Propertius' self-positioning vis-à-vis the poetic tradition. His diction hints at epic precisely at the point he seems to define himself as non-epic: *cingat* has militaristic connotations (*OLD*, s.v. 'cingo', 2–4), while *tumefacta* likewise describes the overdressed poetry antithetical to Callimachean poetics, with hirsute Ennius standing in for epic poetry.¹¹ Proper-

¹⁰ Or, conversely, to dissociate an author from his predecessors. For the literary-historical dynamics allusivity enables: Hinds (1998) 52–98. For historiographical 'author-theatre': Pitcher (2009) 34–9.

¹¹ The repetition of the name *Umbria* literalises the swelling Propertius imagines for his homeland, bulking up the lines even further. The hyperbaton in *nostris ... libris* (63) also emphasises the scope of Propertius' endeavor. On *tumefacta* as a literary critical term see Hutchinson (2006) 72 *ad loc.*: 'The narrator sounds un-Callimachean, however: not only does *tumefacta* hint at the fat, swollen poetry Callimachus opposed, but Callimachus avoids such tones of exultant boasting.'

tius thus defines himself not only as Callimachus redux, but also against an epic background. Of course, the representative of that epic background, Ennius' *Annales*, for all that it reached back to Homer, was itself highly innovative in its own time and similarly informed by an Alexandrian poetic sensibility.¹² Thus Propertius lays claim to a double poetic inheritance, the parts of which initially seem mutually exclusive but are in fact highly compatible.

Now a historiographical citation may not do quite so much in terms of generic and authorial affiliation as the proclaimed genealogies of epic, lyric, and elegy, but the mannerism itself, I suggest, functions in a comparable way across all genres. As a preliminary example, we might take the opening of Livy's *AUC* (1.1.1):

iam primum omnium **satis constat** Troia capta in ceteros saeuitum esse Troianos, duobus, Aeneae Antenorique, et uetusti iure hospitii et quia pacis reddendaeque Helenae semper auctores fuerant, omne ius belli Achiuos abstinuisse.

There is general agreement that after the capture of Troy, the Greeks raged against the rest of the Trojans, but in the case of two of them, Aeneas and Antenor, they abstained from any right of conquest, because of the old obligation of hospitality and because they always advocated peace and the return of Helen.

Satis constat is at the anonymous extreme of source citation, but it serves well enough to establish not only a tradition, but also a seemingly unanimous one.¹³ Commencing with the sack of Troy and the departure of Aeneas rings a very familiar note, and indeed Livy and Vergil seem to have embarked on their works not too far apart in time from each other.¹⁴ Livy, however, is also engaged here in a subtle polemic, for *satis constat* obfuscates more than it reveals. In fact—as *satis* already hints—various traditions existed on the manner and circumstances of Aeneas' departure from Troy, with Vergil, at least,

¹² On Ennius as an innovative poet-'annalist': Gildenhard (2003). On the process of becoming an 'old poet': Hinds (1998) 52–98.

¹³ Miles (1995) 8–74 lays out the issues, with particular attention to the doubt implicit in *satis constat* in 24–5. It is also worth noting Miles (1995) 25 n. 24, which emphasises how focused Livy's outlook actually is, especially in comparison to the expansive antiquarianism of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

¹⁴ Vergil started work on the *Aeneid* eleven years before his death in 19 B.C., i.e., in 30 B.C. (Horsfall (1995) 14–17). New assessments of the dating of Livy's first Pentad have pushed Livy's start date to 33–30 B.C., up to three years earlier than Vergil's (Luce (1965) and Burton (2000)).

appearing to follow Naevius in having Aeneas depart as a fugitive and under cover of darkness.¹⁵ In this sense at least, Livy aligns himself with a particular strand of the tradition—that Aeneas departed from Troy with the consent of the victorious Greek army—and arrogates for it the appearance of learned consensus. But the consensus Livy presents hides an important point of controversy: whether Aeneas betrayed Troy or not. Answers varied, and not across generic lines, as Servius' note on *Aen.* 1.242 (*Antenor potuit*) reveals: Livy and Vergil concurred (*hi enim duo Troiam prodidisse dicuntur secundum Livium, quod et Vergilium per transitum tangit*), Horace rejected the idea of betrayal altogether (*ardentem sine fraude Troiam*), and the historian Sisenna thought only Antenor was involved in the *fraus* (*Sisenna tamen dicit solum Antenorem prodidisse*).

Antenor, famously, was the founder of Livy's native Patavium, and Livy thus accords him a place of honour at the opening of the *AUC* with the first re-foundation of the lost Troy (1.1.2–3):

casibus deinde uariis Antenorem cum multitudine Enetum ... uenisse in intimum maris Hadriatici sinum ... et in quem primo egressi sunt locum Troia uocatur pagoque inde Troiano nomen est: gens uniuersa Veneti appellati.

Then they suffered different fates. Antenor, with a host of Eneti ... arrived into the innermost shore of the Adriatic sea ... And the place where they first arrived is called Troy, and takes its name from the Trojan tribe: and the entire race is called Veneti.

The element of competition is evident here. Although Livy carefully marks Aeneas as destined for greater things (*maiora*, 1.1.4), Antenor nevertheless appears first in the text, and Livy reports him as having arrived in Italy before Aeneas. His story, and that of Livy's own homeland, therefore precedes that of Aeneas and Rome, and this is indeed the sequence followed by Vergil in the *Aeneid*. But this ktistic aside reveals that *satis constat* is a fairly porous concept, which defines a consensus only to hint simultaneously at its multiplicity of voices. For Antenor was not the only Trojan to have washed up on Italian shores. Servius relates that Cato the elder gives us a story similar to the one Livy does for Antenor, but for the descendant of Priam's hapless son Polites (Servius *ad Aen.* 5.564 = Cato frag. 54 P = Beck and Walter 2.24):

¹⁵ Although Naevius has Aeneas depart with only one ship (Naevius, fr. 9); see the caveats in Goldberg (1995) 55–6. On Naevius' influence on the annalist tradition: Strzelecki (1963).

POLITE PROGENIES illum dicit quem supra a Pyrrho introduxit occisum; de quo Cato in originibus dicit, quod ad Italiam uenerit et segregatus ab Aenea condiderit oppidum Politorium a suo nomine.

DESCENDANT OF POLITES: this is the Polites whom he introduced before as having been killed by Pyrrhus; about his descendant Cato says in the *Origines* that he came to Italy and having separated from Aeneas founded the city of Politorium, naming it after himself.

Antenor, it is true, makes his own way to Italy, while Polites arrives with Aeneas only to then be separated, but his story then runs parallel (and presumably separate from) the narrative of Rome's foundation. The city of Politorium was in Latium, and Cato probably recounted this story as he was discussing the origins of the Latin *ciuitates* in Books 2 and 3 of the *Origines*.¹⁶ Whether or not Cato's presence can be detected behind Livy's Antenor, the arrival of various Trojan survivors to Italy was of some interest to the historians of Rome: Sallust, likewise, dealt briefly with the subject.¹⁷ Thus, Antenor's arrival in Italy points to a myriad parallel stories: it is not unique, but part of a broader network of foundation stories deriving from the Trojan legend. Livy's initial *satis constat*, therefore, smoothes over accretions of sources and variants, all of which Livy chooses not to dwell on, expand, or name.¹⁸

How does this compare with Propertius' tumid poetry? As the *satis constat* example already shows, Livy's gestures to his sources, even when they are generalised, are mannered exercises in the dynamic of tradition. Just as Propertius takes for himself Ennius and Callimachus as a double poetic inheritance, so too does Livy align himself within a tradition that included Cato's *Origines* and intersected with Vergil's new epic project. Rather more crucially, Livy's mannerism economically combines a subtle flagging up of

¹⁶ Plin. *NH* 3.68: *in prima regione praeterea fuere in Latio clara oppida Satricum, Pometia, Scaptia, Politorium ...*

¹⁷ Servius *ad Aen.* 2.242 notes: *alii qui Sardiniam secundum Sallustium [i.e., euaserint Troianorum periculum]*. Compare the more traditional story in Sall. *Cat.* 6.1–2. On Polites' descendant more specifically, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.564–5 *nomen aui referens Priamus, tua clara, Polite, | progenies, auctura Italos*. On the importance of Trojan descent in Rome: Wiseman (1974).

¹⁸ Cf. Miles (1995) 31 on the rhetorical organisation of the narrative: '[t]hus Livy discourages the reader from seeking actively to evaluate his narrative objectively, in terms of historical reliability.' As I argue below, I would add that Livy goes a further step, and encourages the reader to evaluate the *AUC*, and the tradition underlying it, solipsistically and on Livy's own terms.

the problems in the tradition with a superficial veneer of consensus, thus allowing Livy to give Antenor pride of place without sacrificing valuable real estate to recounting what Cato the Elder already discussed in his *Origines*.¹⁹ The gesture itself is significant: Livy's history will not be that of ktistic adventures or of the Italian peninsula; rather, its economy and structure hang from the start on the nascent Roman state and on its imperial project. Therefore, while the comparison with poetic practice highlights certain generic differences, it also reveals some common ground. On this view, embedded allusion and explicit citation are simply two types of the same intertextual process of refining an author's position in relation to the literary (and historical) tradition. This dynamic is present in prose as much as in poetry, and it is not confined to a particular genre: it is a literary mannerism, and while its particular manifestation changes according to generic expectations, its purpose remains largely consistent.

In this paper, therefore, I propose to offer a preliminary typology of Livian citation practices in order to establish the 'range of reference'²⁰ available in the *AUC*, its 'rhetoric of annotation'.²¹ Within that framework two issues will be of particular interest: first, Livy's positioning of himself and his sources relative to a collective tradition; second, the self-referential nature of Livian citation, which often works to conflate the *AUC* with the historical tradition of which it was part. This range of reference, I suggest, establishes source citation as part of a larger literary strategy that underpins the historical purpose of the work and, in particular, constructs a literary tradition and historiographical background for the *AUC*.

¹⁹ In 45.25.3, Livy refuses to reproduce material Cato the Elder has already treated, though in that case it was a published speech which Cato integrated into his *Origines*; cf. Brock (1995).

²⁰ The phrase is from Thomas (1986) 198. Although his typology differs from mine in its categories, I suggest that his view of the purpose of reference in Vergil applies to Livy as well: 'if there is a single purpose, it is that of subsuming or appropriating an entire literary tradition, extending across 800 years and two languages.' I take for granted the existence of embedded allusivity in the *AUC*, and so exclude it from this survey, except where, as I suggest below, it comes into fruitful engagement with citation practice. On allusivity in Livy, see n. 8 above, and especially Levene (2010) 98–9 on the criteria for identifying meaningful allusion in prose.

²¹ Grafton (1997) 233: 'A full literary analysis of modern historical writing would have to include a rhetoric of annotation as well as some version of the existing rhetoric of narration.' Although Grafton's point is about modern historical writing, it is no less true of ancient historiography.

Unnamed Citation and the Ghosts of Tradition

I would like to begin by introducing the formal distinction between named and unnamed citation. Named citation, which includes all references to sources by name—*Coelius tradit*, *Polybius scribit*, *Valerius auctor est* and their like—will be the focus of the next section. By contrast, unnamed citations are those which do not indicate a source by name, and these, I suggest, come in two forms, which I term Impersonal and Anonymous. The Impersonal kind includes vague or generic references to a tradition, in whatever form: *fama est*, *dicitur*, *satis constat*, etc. As we saw in the example of Livy 1.1, above, such references can act as a marker of a particular tradition, existing in tension with the surrounding allusions, which expose the scholarly debate, like that underlying the tradition on Aeneas' departure from Troy.

Anonymous citation, on the other hand, acknowledges a source, or a group of sources, but without, or instead of, assigning individual names. Characteristic of this type of citation are phrases such as *in quibusdam annalibus*, *ceteri auctores*, and *uetustiores annales*. This type of general reference has sometimes come under some suspicion, as being taken over from Livy's source, or as substituting a plural for the singular source Livy actually used. This suspicion, grounded largely in the now defunct Nissen's Law, can now by and large be dismissed, though it is naturally impossible to establish whether genuine sources appear behind every single case.²² The vague reference, rather, suggests that Livy was not interested in providing either a single or a named source, perhaps for much the same reason he deploys the even vaguer Impersonal type of citation.

In some places, we are able to compare Livy and his source, and such comparison—a familiar exercise in the scholarship—illustrates how this type of citation functions. The best known example is the duel of Manlius and the Gaul in 7.9–10, to which I return below, but a more fitting example of the Anonymous type of citation is the aedileship of Flavius the Scribe late in Book 9 (Livy 9.46.1–4):

eodem anno Cn. Flavius Cn. filius scriba, patre libertino humili fortuna ortus, ceterum callidus uir et facundus, aedilis curulis fuit. **inuenio in quibusdam annalibus**, cum appareret aedilibus fierique se pro tribu aedilem uideret neque accipi nomen quia scriptum faceret, tabulam posuisse et iurasse se scriptum non facturum; quem aliquanto ante desisse scriptum facere arguit Macer

²² Discussion and comprehensive bibliography in Northwood (2000) 45–7, esp. nn. 2–3, and Briscoe (1973) 9. For Nissen's Law: Nissen (1863), and now, more succinctly, Pitcher (2009) 72–8.

Licinius tribunatu ante gesto triumviratibusque, nocturno altero, altero coloniae deducendae. ceterum, id quod haud discrepat, contumacia aduersus contemnentes humilitatem suam nobiles certauit ...

In that same year Cn. Flavius, the son of Gnaeus, a scribe, born of humble stock to a freedman, but otherwise a man of cunning and eloquence, was a curule aedile. I find in some histories that when he was waiting on the aediles and saw that he would be elected aedile himself by the tribes, but that his election would not be recognised because he was recording the events, he put away his tablets and swore that he would not record the events. But Licinius Macer says that he had given up record keeping a while earlier, and had been tribune and triumvir, once in charge of the night shift, and once for establishing a colony. In any case, he strove diligently against the nobles who spurned his low birth, and on this there is hardly any disagreement ...²³

The story of Flavius the scribe survives, as it happens, in an annalistic source: a fragment of L. Piso Frugi, preserved by Aulus Gellius (*NA*. 7.9.1–4 = Piso frag. 27 P = frag. 37 Forsythe (1994) = Beck and Walter 30):²⁴

Quod res uidebatur memoratu digna, quam fecisse Cn. Flauium Anni filium aedilem curulem L. Piso in tertio annali scripsit, eaque res perquam pure et uenuste narrata a Pisone, locum istum totum huc ex Pisonis annali transposuimus. ‘Cn.’ inquit ‘Flavius patre libertino natus scriptum faciebat, isque in eo tempore aedili curuli apparebat, quo tempore aediles subrogantur, eumque pro tribu aedilem curulem renuntiauerunt. Aedilem, qui comitia habebat, negat accipere, neque sibi placere, qui scriptum faceret, eum aedilem fieri. Cn. Flavius Anni filius dicitur tabulas posuisse, scriptu sese abdicasse, isque aedilis curulis factus est.’

²³ The story of Flavius continues, in both Livy’s (9.46.9–10) and Gellius’ (*NA* 7.9.5–6) versions, to recount his visit to a sick colleague’s house, where he outwitted a group of young patricians who snubbed him, by having his curule chair placed at the exit. In this way, he noted, they would eventually have to rise in his presence, thus according him due honor. I omit this account for reasons of scope, but the same citational dynamic can be observed there as well (Oakley (2005) 605).

²⁴ An alternative tradition, focusing more on sumptuary legislation, is preserved in Pliny *NH* 33.17–9, and derives probably from Fenestella; see the discussion in Forsythe (1994) 339–41. For Livy’s account: Oakley (2005) 600–45.

Because the action appeared worthy of memory that Cn. Flavius the son of Annius performed as curule aedile, which L. Piso wrote in the third book of his *Annals* and which was narrated so clearly and charmingly by Piso, I have transposed the entire passage here from the *Annals* of Piso. 'Cn. Flavius', he writes, 'the son of a freedman father, was a record-keeper, and at that time was waiting on the curule aedile, when the aediles were being voted on, and the tribes elected him as curule aedile. The aedile in charge of the assembly refused to accept his name, nor did it please him that the record keeper should become aedile. Cn. Flavius the son of Annius was said to have put away his tablets, resigned his clerkship, and became a curule aedile.'

Although Livy acknowledges that he found the episode in earlier histories, he does not tell us exactly which ones he means, and his ascription to a plural group of annals (*in quibusam annalibus*) militates against too close a reliance on one specific source. In fact, even without the survival of Piso's fragment, Licinius Macer already stands as a variant, and Livy's *haud discrepat* suggests at least two sources. Livy's phraseology, however, closely tracks that of Piso, and the linguistic confluence suggests that despite the plurality of sources Livy indicates, Piso was certainly a favourite:²⁵

<i>patre libertino humili fortuna ortus</i> Livy 9.46.1	<i>patre libertino natus</i> Piso fr. 27.1 P = Gellius <i>NA</i> 7.9.2
<i>appareret aedilibus</i> Livy 9.46.2	<i>aedili curuli apparebat</i> Piso fr. 27.2 P = Gellius <i>NA</i> 7.9.2
<i>quia scriptum faceret</i> Livy 9.46.2	<i>qui scriptum faceret</i> Piso fr. 27.5 P = Gellius <i>NA</i> 7.9.3
<i>tabulam posuisse</i> Livy 9.46.2	<i>tabulas posuisse</i> Piso fr. 27.6 P = Gellius <i>NA</i> 7.9.4
<i>iurasse se scriptum non facturum</i> Livy 9.46.3	<i>scriptu sese abdicasse</i> Piso fr. 27.6 P = Gellius <i>NA</i> 7.9.4

The avoidance of referring to Piso by name while following his language so closely is a peculiar strategy; Livy has elsewhere in the *AUC* both recognised Piso explicitly, as well as listed him in lists of parallel sources, and he could easily have repeated the procedure here.²⁶ Piso, however, is so natural-

²⁵ See the stylistic comments in Oakley (2005) 604–6, and Courtney (1999) 142–4.

²⁶ Livy 1.55.7: *eo magis Fabio, praeterquam quod antiquior est, crediderim quadraginta ea sola talenta fuisse, quam Pisoni, qui quadraginta milia pondo argenti seposita in eam rem scribit*; Livy 2.32.3: *ea frequentior fama est quam cuius Piso auctor est, in Auentinum secessionem factam esse*; Livy 2.58.1: *numero etiam additos tres, perinde ac duo antea fuerint, Piso auctor est*; Livy 9.44.2: *hos consules Piso*

ised in the text that Livy can instead cite a variant by Licinius Macer followed by a reassertion of the unity of the tradition. But the linguistic confluences between Livy's and Piso's texts strongly imply allusion, and thus form their own manner of literary acknowledgement. Furthermore, they complicate the seemingly straightforward process implied by *inuenio in quibusdam annalibus*, which suggests that Livy discovered a set of sources, of roughly equal merit, which related the story he proceeds to tell. But with Piso so richly embedded in the language of the text, we can infer a more nuanced process at work, one that favours one particular source at the expense of others. Moving from named citation (*Piso tradit ...*) to allusion is itself significant: when explicit citation exists as a generic possibility, allusion can be seen not only as the more erudite of the two options, but also as an appropriative gesture, which takes over the original text without obvious acknowledgement. The explicit reference to Licinius Macer bolsters this distinction, since it invites the reader to wonder who else might be considered among Livy's sources, while drawing attention to the interplay between the various kinds of citation.

Both types of unnamed citation work, therefore, in a similar way: they establish an external tradition and naturalise it within Livy's text, while hinting all the while that more turbulent waters run beneath the calm surface.²⁷ Where Anonymous Citation differs from the Impersonal version, I suggest, is in degree rather than in kind, because it is able to draw on a productive tension between the possibility of naming a 'real' source (as opposed to an impersonal tradition) and an anonymous allusive practice. Still, the central characteristic of both types of citation is the lack of a named source: Livy appropriates for himself the force of tradition, or of his sources, without af-

Q. Fabio et P. Decio suggerit biennio exempto, quo Claudium Volumniumque et Cornelium cum Marcio consules factos tradidimus; Livy 10.9.12: id ne pro certo ponerem uetustior annalium auctor Piso effecit, qui eo anno aediles curules fuisse tradit Cn. Domitium Cn. filium Caluini et Sp. Caruilium Q. filium Maximum; Livy 25.39.15: Piso quinque milia hominum, cum Mago cedentes nostros effuse sequeretur, caesa ex insidiis scribit.

²⁷ This applies, I suggest, even to more ambiguous phrases like *fama est*, which might have made for a more complicated case, with its connotation of falsehood or maliciousness (*OLD*, s.v. 1b–2). Even at its least generous, *fama* establishes an external tradition, and hints simultaneously at problems with that tradition (e.g., 1.7.2, *fama uulgatior* (Remus' death), 1.1.6, *duplex fama* (Rome's foundation)). See Marincola (1997) 93–6 and Miles (1995) 8–74. On *fama* narratives see now Hardie (2012), especially chapter 7 on Livy, and more programmatically on p. 4: 'Locutions of the kind *ut fama est* "as report, tradition has it", *ut perhibent* "as they relate", *fertur* "it is said", the so-called "Alexandrian footnote", are notoriously self-conscious of their equivocation between being a claim to the (very possibly unreliable) authority of previous tradition, and a licence for the poet to invent his own "tradition".'

fording the reader genuine access to his source material. The presence of allusion, on the other hand, offers the reader the chance of access, but only as mediated through Livy's own text. In the end, therefore, the reader is asked to replicate Livy's own efforts at historical research, or is expected to use similar knowledge, but through the tendentious lens of Livy's own text.

Named Citation and the Dynamics of History

Unnamed citation, as I have suggested above, emphasises the interaction of the author with a faceless tradition, while linguistic confluences direct the reader to glimpse and trace the ghosts of the individual authors whom anonymity obfuscates. Named citation, it might be assumed, must operate quite differently, deriving its interest from the explicit mention of an individual author, whose positions Livy must engage with directly. As this section will show, named citation adds an important dimension to Livy's range of reference, but the more remarkable instances do so because they engage not only the cited source itself, but also Livy's citational practice, both named and unnamed.

Named citations in Livy may be divided into three broad categories: Simple, Variant, and Intratextual.²⁸ Simple citations are the common and standard form one associates with historical practice, wherein the historian names his source for a particular item of information, whether he agrees with it, rejects it, or professes agnosticism. I do not mean to suggest that acceptance and rejection of a source are the same kind of gesture, which of course they are not, but rather that for my purposes, the important features are first, that an authority is explicitly named, and second, that at the moment of citation Livy does not comment on methodology, list contrasting accounts, or display any further inquiry into the matter. His comment extends simply to the explicit naming of his source.²⁹ Complications are of

²⁸ Both Variant and Intratextual citation can have unnamed versions, where Livy distinguishes two or more versions without naming a source explicitly (variant: e.g., 1.4.7 (Acca Larentia), 21.28 (how elephants cross rivers), and 25.17 (death of Gracchus)), or where he alludes back to an anonymous citation (intratextual: e.g., the chronological problem at Saguntum in 21.15, though here Polybius adds yet another level of citation by naming specific authors, especially Fabius Pictor (Pol. 3.8–9), whom we know Livy to have read). Such cases introduce a greater complexity to the operation of each type of citation, particularly in blurring the lines between the various types. I plan to discuss this issue at greater length in a forthcoming monograph on the topic.

²⁹ E.g. 7.3.7, *diligens talium monumentorum auctor Cincius adfirmat*; 45.44.19, *Polybius eum regem indignum maiestate nominis tanti tradit*. Other characteristic phrases include *scribit* (e.g. 8.19.14, 34.10.2), and occasionally *nominat* (2.58.1–2).

course possible. For example, the infamous Trial of the Scipios begins with a Simple named Citation:

P. Scipioni Africano, ut Valerius Antias auctor est, duo Q. Petillii diem dixerunt. (Livy 38.50.5)

Publius Scipio Africanus, as Valerius Antias writes, was the subject of a suit brought by the two Q. Petilii.

A corroborating narrative follows, but the further the reader proceeds with the story of the Trial, the more controversies become apparent, and the more Livy relies on alternative sources: contemporary documents, material artifacts, and archaeological remnants.³⁰ So even an ostensible case of Simple citation can become increasingly complex, with source citation serving as a starting point for a more elaborate structure of reference and usage.

In this regard, named citation requires a more explicit engagement with the idea of a literary tradition, since in it the vaguer constructs formed by unnamed citation give way to a single and specific source, with the general consensus about the event either subsumed in the text or existing as background. This engagement with the historical tradition is seen more directly in the second type of named citation, Variant Citation. As the name suggests, these citations function not merely to report a source, but rather to contrast it with other variants, be it Livy's own narrative or another source altogether. In this category we may include as a straightforward case the numerous instances where Livy simply lists or notes multiple variants, for example of casualty or booty figures, wherein he can explicitly demonstrate and comment on the unevenness of the historical tradition.³¹ More complicated cases, however, are those where the discrepancies are not only at the level of detail, but at the level of narrative or plot, as we shall see below.

The difference between Simple and Variant or Intratextual citation marks a move from unitary to composite citation, which is to say, from citations which refer to a single source (named or unnamed) to ones that explic-

³⁰ On citation and intertextuality in the Trials of the Scipios, see Haimson Lushkov (2010).

³¹ E.g. 25.39.11–17 (casualty figures after L. Marcius' victory in Spain; Claudius, Valerius Antias, and Piso). Other examples include variant chronologies (e.g. 21.15.3–6 for the fall of Saguntum), variant sources (e.g. 27.27.12–4, three different versions of the death of Marcellus, all in Coelius Antipater), or minor variants in details. Forsythe ((1999) 17) recognised four sub-types: 'unanimous with alternatives', 'not unanimous', 'unanimous with a variant', and 'variant'.

itly refer to multiple sources.³² Although anonymous citations often advert to a plurality of sources, they do so through a single reference. Their engagement with a nameless source or tradition reduces the composite nature of the historiographical tradition into a semblance of simplicity or unity. By contrast, composite citation, whether Variant or Intratextual, confronts the reader directly with the polyvalence of the underlying tradition.

A good example comes from Book 32 of Livy, and involves the conflicting accounts of Livy and Valerius Antias regarding Villius' alleged capture of the gorge of Antigonea during the war with Philip. The relationship of Livy to Valerius Antias is complicated in and of itself, with Livy both using and chastising Antias throughout the course of the *AUC*.³³ Livy's frequent editorialising in the case of Antias establishes already that Livy engaged in some reflection on the merits of Antias, and Rich has recently suggested that he relied on Antias because of the fullness of his account as well as his wide archival research.³⁴ These reasons are both convincing and sympathetic to Antias, but they continue to categorise source citation as a historical rather than literary technique; in the latter sense, at least, Livy's ambivalent view of Antias suggests that these citations work to situate the *AUC* alongside, or even to subsume entirely, a problematic predecessor. Here, then, is the Villius episode (Livy 32.6.5 = frag. 31 P = Beck and Walter 32):

Valerius Antias intrasse saltum Villium tradit, **quia recto itinere nequiuert** omnibus ab rege inessis, secutum uallem per quam mediam fertur Aous amnis, ponte raptim facto in ripam in qua erant castra regia transgressum acie conflixisse; fusum fugatumque regem castris exutum; duodecim milia hostium eo proelio caesa, capta duomilia et ducentos et signa militaria centum triginta duo, equos ducentos triginta; aedem etiam Ioui in eo proelio uotam, si res prospere gesta esset. Ceteri Graeci Latinique auctores, quorum quidem ego legi annales, **nihil memorabile** a Villio actum integrumque bellum insequentem consulem T. Quinctium accepisse tradunt.

Valerius Antias reports that Villius entered the gorge, because a frontal approach was not possible, with the king's soldiers blocking his

³² Composite citations often evolve from, or are made up of, simpler citation-units. In the Flavius passage above, for example, Livy begins by using an Anonymous citation, taking over Piso's language. He then, however, cites Licinius Macer for an alternative tradition, at which point the citation becomes composite and Variant.

³³ On Livy and Antias: Luce (1977) 159–68, 180–3, Oakley (1996) 89–91. On Antias himself and his influence on the tradition: Forsythe (2002), Rich (2005) and (2011).

³⁴ Rich (2005) 158.

way. He followed the valley through the middle of which the river Aous flows, and having hastily made a bridge onto the bank on which the king's camp was located, he crossed and attacked; he routed the king and despoiled the camp. 12,000 of the enemy were killed in this battle; 2200 were captured, and 132 military standards and 230 horses; he also vowed a temple to Jupiter in this battle if things should turn out well. The remaining Greek and Roman writers whose annals I have read report that nothing memorable was done by Villius and that the following year's consul, Titus Quinctius, took up the war.

It is clear from this passage what Antias' story must have been: Villius entered the gorge and covered himself in glory, proof of which is furnished by the complicated enumeration of spoils, captives and casualties. Antias' reasons for choosing this version of events are lost to us, but Villius' actions conform well to a standard Roman *aristeia*, complete with a temple vow at the end, so that the story, at least as Livy reports it, seems just the material of Roman historical accounts.³⁵ But Livy can and does do more with this passage, by the simple and expedient means of citing it at all. The co-existence of these two narratives within the *AUC* parallels the historical situation, wherein Antias' text circulated alongside competing versions, including Livy's own. But within the text of the *AUC*, Antias' version can have currency only because Livy allocates it some space in his narrative through the expansive usage of Variant citation.

The Livian narrative that surrounds this citation does little to develop Villius' attack, which suggests either Livy's agreement with those annalists who say that Villius did nothing memorable, or alternatively (and more interestingly) Livy's mimicry of Villius' initial indecision by offering two conflicting accounts.³⁶ As it happens, the narrative of the following year confirms Livy's agreement with the consensus of authors over Antias, since when Flamininus arrives at the scene in 32.9.8, he picks up exactly from Villius' initial debate on how to approach the gorge, which he repeats nearly

³⁵ For the standard report of battle casualties and booty in triumphal requests, see Pittenger (2008) 105–6. For the effect of such requests in annalistic historiography: Pittenger (2008) 146.

³⁶ Villius' deliberation on whether or not to enter the *saltus*: 32.6.3, *consilium habuit, utrum per insessum ab hoste saltum, quamquam labor ingens periculumque proponeretur, transitum temptaret, an eodem itinere quo priore anno Sulpicius Macedoniam intrauerat, circumduceret copias*. News from Rome on the election and imminent arrival of Flamininus renders the question moot. On Antias' account as invented: Rich (2005) 152.

verbatim.³⁷ But if history remembers Villius as having done *nihil memorabile*, it is nevertheless not quite the same as simple *nihil*, and while Livy's transmission of the more common version of events itself corroborates Villius' lack of action, Livy's citation of Antias reveals just how selective historical memory can be; whatever Villius had done was clearly sufficiently memorable for Antias, and by extension for Livy, annalistic *inuentio* notwithstanding.³⁸ Ostensibly, Livy's choice of which version to accept for the main narrative indicates his disagreement with Antias, but the conspicuousness of the citation in an otherwise unremarkable portion of the narrative invariably draws our attention to it, all the more so since the citation in fact encompasses a whole story, which is subsequently 'untold'.

We might also read the language of the citation itself as participating in Livy's navigation of the conflicting sources. Villius enters the gorge *quia recto itinere nequiverit*, 'because a frontal assault was not possible', and had to look for alternative ways to achieve his aim.³⁹ Now *iter rectum* might be applied metaphorically to narratives as well as paths and roads, so that Villius strays from the straight path, while Livy himself here digresses from the linear progression of his (consensus) narrative to report this variant to the consensus opinion.⁴⁰ Of course, the citation and the digression it engenders achieve the

³⁷ With 32.6.3 (quoted at n. 36 above) compare 32.9.8, *consilium habuit utrum recto itinere per castra hostium vim facere conaretur, an ne temptata quidem re tanti laboris ac periculi per Dassaretios potius Lyncumque tuto circuito Macedoniam intraret ...* Flaminius' deliberation therefore alludes intratextually both to Villius' initial deliberation (the consensus version) and, through the phrase *recto itinere*, to Villius' attack on the gorge (Antias' version). On Intratextual citation, see below.

³⁸ A comparable example is Livy's report on Africanus' second consulship: 34.48.1 *Scipionem alii coniuncto exercitu cum collega per Boiorum Ligurumque agros populantem isse, quod progredi silvae paludesque passae sint, scribunt, alii nulla memorabili re gesta Romam comitorum causa redisse.* On annalistic *inuentio* see Woodman (1988) *passim* and Oakley (1998) 72–89, but such elaboration would have provided the colour and details rather than the singular fact of Villius' triumph.

³⁹ On this point, Briscoe (1973) 177 notes 'it is far from clear what Antias thought was the *rectum iter* which was avoided by going through the *saltus*. There was no other clear route.' Note also that both Villius and Flaminius are concerned about taking an alternative and circuitous route into Macedonia (Villius 32.6.3, *circumderet copias*, Flaminius 32.9.8, *circuito*), which further confirms that the gorge itself was the *rectum iter* (cf. Briscoe (1973) 185). This geographical discrepancy combined with the discrepancy in the sources suggests strongly, therefore, that Livy is engaging in self-reflection rather than showing ignorance or incompetence.

⁴⁰ On digression as an alternative path, see Livy 9.17.1: *nihil minus quaesitum a principio huius operis uideri potest quam ut plus iusto ab rerum ordine declinarem uarietatibusque distinguendo opere et legentibus uelut deuerticula amoena et requiem animo meo quaererem.* See also Oakley (2005)

opposite effect, reminding us of (Antias') disagreement with the consensus opinion, rather than silently agreeing with the majority of authors.⁴¹ Thus what cannot be said in the main narrative, *in recto itinere*, can be said instead in the margins of the text, and in another man's words.⁴²

I now move to the last, and most complex, type of named citation: Intratextual citation. This citation is composite in nature, and made up of at least two phases. The first phase consists of named citation, either Simple or Variant, and in itself is no different from the examples already discussed.⁴³ What makes the citation intratextual is its second phase, in which Livy alludes to the content of the initial citation, but without explicitly acknowledging its source in any way. This repetition is therefore intratextual in nature, since it refers to material already present in the first citation, now incorporated into the fabric of the *AUC*. This intratextuality is, however, necessarily also *intertextual*, because any act of citation necessarily points to material outside the *AUC* proper. The first citation, therefore, functions both as a key to deciphering the second citation and as a substitute for the 'original' (i.e., source) text.⁴⁴

The episode of Manlius and the Gaul (Livy 7.9.6–10.14) offers an example of this type of citation. We know from external survival that Livy derived the story from the history of Claudius Quadrigarius, but Livy does not cite any sources in his account of the duel itself.⁴⁵ The attentive reader of Livy, however, will recall that the story was actually the subject of a chronological discrepancy, one that Livy had settled at the end of Book 6, where he does explicitly cite his source (6.42.5–7):

207, and Kraus (1994) 268: 'The text is a road down which the author and his readers are travelling.'

⁴¹ On *ceteri Graeci Latiniq̄ue auctores*, see Briscoe (1973) 9, and Northwood (2005).

⁴² The expansive and descriptive relative clauses *per quam* and *in qua* may allude to Antias' own style (cf. fr. 57 P, *Tiberius Gracchus, qui quaestor C. Mancino in Hispania fuerat, et ceteri qui pacem speponderant*). As Briscoe (2005) 69 notes, the small sample of verbatim quotation makes certainty impossible. Even without stylistic allusion, however, the citation is itself sufficient to suggest a literary borrowing.

⁴³ For the possibility of such citation starting with unnamed citation, see n. 28 above.

⁴⁴ This type of citation has some similarity to Thomas' 'multiple reference': 'a practice which allows the poet to refer to a number of antecedents and thereby to subsume their versions, and the tradition along with them, into his own.' ((1986) 193). The significant difference is that Livy himself becomes one of the antecedents, and thereby makes the appropriation of the antecedent more explicit.

⁴⁵ Quadrigarius fr. 10b = Beck and Walter 10b. The two accounts of this duel have now become a standard compare-and-contrast exercise. For a thorough discussion, with further bibliography, see von Albrecht (1989) 86–101, Oakley (1998) 113–23 and Courtney (1999) 114–51.

bellatum cum Gallis eo anno circa Anienem flumen auctor est Claudius inclitamque in ponte pugnam, qua T. Manlius Gallum cum quo prouocatus manus conseruit in conspectu duorum exercituum caesum torque spoliauit, tum pugnatam. pluribus auctoribus magis adducor ut credam decem haud minus post annos ea acta, hoc autem anno in Albano agro cum Gallis dictatore M. Furio signa conlata. nec dubia nec difficilis Romanis, quamquam ingentem Galli terrorem memoria pristinae cladis attulerant, uictoria fuit.

Claudius claims that there was war with the Gauls in that year near the river Anio, and that the famous duel on the bridge, in which T. Manlius tangled with the Gaul when provoked by him, and in sight of both armies killed him and took his torque as spoils, was fought then. I am compelled, rather, by many authorities to believe that these things were done no less than ten years later. But in this year in the Alban territory there was battle with the Gauls with M. Furius as dictator. And the Roman victory was neither difficult nor in doubt, even though the Gauls caused them great fear because of the memory of the recent defeat.

The passage is a good example of Variant citation, contrasting Claudius, a single source (Simple citation), with *pluribus auctoribus*, an anonymous tradition (Anonymous citation).⁴⁶ Even without reaching for Quadrigarius' text, we might notice that Livy is engaged in an intricate recalibration of the annalist tradition. The issue at stake here is the chronological discrepancy, and that has hardly been resolved. Although Livy sides with the majority of the sources (*pluribus auctoribus*) against Claudius' dating the duel in 367 B.C., his agreement is cast as passive (*adducor ut credam*) and his final dating of the episode to 361 B.C. is in fact only seven years later than Claudius' initial date, rather than the 'no less than ten' (*decem haud minus post annos*) Livy professes here.

The detail of the dating, therefore, connects the explicit citation in Book 6 with the anonymous appropriation one book later: Claudius' mistake is corrected in Livy's version. In the correction, however, the name of the original author, Claudius, is excised, and while Livy largely follows Quadrigarius both thematically and in verbal detail, any awareness of Livy's debt depends for us on either an external source or, alternatively, on Livy's own citation in the previous book. Both the short distance between the two notices—a mere ten chapters—and the fame of Quadrigarius' account in antiquity suggest that a contemporary reader might not have had difficulties in

⁴⁶ For our Claudius as Quadrigarius: Oakley (1997) 718.

associating Quadrigarius with the duel. Nevertheless, Livy's authorial hand is much in evidence—the repetition of the magistrate's name in both phases of the citation (6.42.5, *T. Quinctium Poenum magistrum equitum dixit* ~ 7.9.4–5, *dictatorem T. Quinctium Poenum eo anno fuisse satis constat*), together with the fuss Livy makes over the discrepancy in the sources, as well as the chronological misfit—ten years have not yet passed—all encourage the reader to refer back to 6.42.5 and to Quadrigarius.

The earlier citation, however, is itself problematic, since it hovers between Livian diction and Claudian content. Livy summarises the encounter between Manlius and the Gaul as follows: 6.42.5, *inclitamque in ponte pugnam, qua T. Manlius Gallum cum quo prouocatus manus conseruit in conspectu duorum exercituum caesum torque spoliavit, tum pugnatam*. Since we possess Quadrigarius' text, it is fair to say that this summary is Livy's own, and while it falls short of replicating Quadrigarius' account, it does for the most part find a precise and easy parallel in Quadrigarius' language. For example, in one sentence of Quadrigarius we find parallels with almost a quarter of Livy's summary: *in ponte* (Livy 6.42.5) ~ *in ipso ponti* (Quad. fr. 10b.13 P = Gellius 9.13.16), and *in conspectu duorum exercituum* (Livy 6.42.5) ~ *utroque exercitus inspectante* (Quad. fr. 10b.13 P = Gellius 9.13.16). But although Livy echoes Quadrigarius' diction both here and in the episode itself, the diction of the summary in places differs markedly from Quadrigarius' account. *Manus conseruit*, for example, is regular in Livy, but unattested in prose before the late Republic.⁴⁷ Likewise, though more subtly, the prepositional phrase *in conspectu*, attested only in poetry before Caesar and Cicero, breaks down and replaces Quadrigarius' *inspectante*, a verb form attested in Latin prose as early as the fragments of Cato and Laelius. Thus, Livy's versions of the story, in both phases of the citation, have a more complex relationship with their source than imitation or correction. Livy's tracking of Quadrigarius' diction, as in the case of Piso above, incorporates the source-text into Livy's own account, but the ambiguities we find in Livy, especially the discrepancies of language and content, suggest a wider gap between the two texts.

Another, and more explicit, example comes in Book 29, where Livy tells us about the crossing of Scipio Africanus and his troops from Sicily to Africa. The story he presents involves some vacillation on the precise location of the landing—whether to the promontory of Mercury or of Apollo—but no mention of any difficulties on the voyage. The only divergence from this consensus is the report of Coelius Antipater, which Livy appends at the end of his own description (Livy 29.27.13–15 = frag. 40 P = Beck and Walter 47):

⁴⁷ Though see Briscoe (2005) for the methodological problems inherent in analyzing the word choices of the fragmentary historians (with pp. 66–8 on Quadrigarius in particular).

prosperam nauigationem sine **terrore ac tumultu** fuisse permultis Graecis Latinisque auctoribus credidi. Coelius unus praeterquam quod non mersas fluctibus naues ceteros omnes **caelestes maritimosque terrores**, postremo abreptam tempestate ab Africa classem **ad insulam Aegimurum**, inde aegre correctum cursum exponit, et prope obrutis nauibus iniussu imperatoris scaphis, haud secus quam naufragos, milites sine armis **cum ingenti tumultu** in terram euasisse.

I have trusted the many Greek and Latin authors that the crossing was swift and without fear or disruption. Coelius alone reports all horrors of the sea and sky, though the ships were not sunk in the waves, and then that the fleet was snatched by the storm from Africa to the island of Aegimurus, from where they just barely corrected their course, and with the ships practically overturned and without orders from the general, the soldiers, hardly any different from shipwrecked men, waded to shore without their arms and in great chaos.

In itself, then, this is an example of Variant citation, and it follows, in structure at least, the same pattern as the Villius example: the variant account of a single source is recounted against a consensus of authors whom Livy appears to endorse in the main narrative. The continuity of language between the report of other sources and the view of Coelius—*terrore ac tumultu* prepares the reader for *caelestes maritimosque terrores* and *ingenti tumultu*—emphasises the discrepancy between the two versions: the elements explicitly stated to be absent from the standard account are, word-for-word, present in the citation of the alternative account. But the historiographical status of such citations is always problematic, since it is unclear whether the citation paraphrases the language of the source or provides something closer to Coelius' *ipsissima uerba*. What, then, is the internal verbal echo in fact echoing—Coelius' original or Livy's paraphrase thereof? In either case, the verbal echo draws further attention to what is already an inherent ambiguity about the status of the 'quotation'. As a consequence, I suggest, the echo both directs the reader to a text outside the *AUC* and at the same time suggests that all the salient details are fulfilled within Livy's text itself. It is that double motion, at once externally referential and introspective, that characterises this intratextual subset of Livy's citational practice.

A book later, however, we once again encounter the island of Aegimurus in a now familiar context (30.24.6–9):

Cn. Octauio ducentis onerariis triginta longis nauibus ex Sicilia traicienti non eadem fortuna fuit. in conspectum ferme Africae

prospero cursu uectum primo destituit uentus, deinde uersus in Africum turbauit ac passim naues disiecit. ipse cum rostratis per aduersos fluctus ingenti remigum labore enisus Apollinis promunturium tenuit: onerariae pars maxima **ad Aegimurum insulam**—ea sinum ab alto claudit in quo sita Carthago est, triginta ferme milia ab urbe—aliae aduersus urbem ipsam ad Calidas Aquas delatae sunt.

Gnaeus Octavius did not enjoy the same good fortune when he was transferring 200 cargo ships and thirty warships from Sicily. Having had a good trip, the wind dropped just as he was in sight of Africa, and then raged from the direction opposite to Africa, and scattered the ships far and wide. He himself, relying on the great labour of the rowers against the opposing currents, made it with the beaked ships to the promontory of Apollo; the greater part of the cargo ships [reached] the island of Aegimurus—it closes off from the north the bay in which Carthage is located, about 300 miles from the city—while the others were driven to Aquae Calidae, right opposite the city.

Even at first glance, this passage is remarkably similar to Coelius' version of Scipio's crossing one book earlier.⁴⁸ Both deal with a Roman force crossing from Sicily to Africa, only to encounter considerable difficulties when a storm breaks out at sea, and with only partial success in regaining the original course and completing the crossing. The results are equally unfavorable; Scipio's soliders are practically shipwrecked (*haud secus naufragos*), and without their arms (*sine armis*) while Octavius' men abandon their ships to the Carthaginians.⁴⁹ A few verbal echoes also appear: *prosperam nauigationem* ~ *prospero cursu*, as well as the island of Aegimurus itself (*ad insulam Aegimurum* ~ *ad Aegi-*

⁴⁸ The phrase *eadem fortuna* assimilates, and encourages comparison between, Octavius' crossing and that of P. Lentulus, which was noted briefly in 30.24.5: *per indutiarum tempus ex Sardinia a P. Lentulo praetore centum onerariae naues cum commeatu uiginti rostratarum praesidio, et ab hoste et ab tempestatibus mari tuto, in Africam transmiserunt. Eadem fortuna* thus acts as an intratextual marker, along similar lines to *eodem itinere* in Villius' attempt on the gorge (32.6.3 and n. 36 above). The presence of an intratext, however, especially of such importance as Africanus' crossing, endows the pronominal adjective *eadem* with a stronger mnemonic force, and allows it to refer not just immediately backwards to the note on Lentulus, but also to Scipio's earlier crossing. On allusion as poetic memory: Conte (1986) and Hinds (1998) 1–10. On Scipio as a paradigm for future practice (although in the limited context of irregular triumphal requests): Pittenger (2008) 58–62.

⁴⁹ Livy 30.24.12 *desertae fuga nautarum primum ab Aegimuro, deinde ab Aquis onerariae Carthaginem puppibus tractae sunt.*

murum insulam), which appears only in these two instances in the extant portions of the *AUC*.

Besides the allusion to the earlier citation from Coelius, however, the report of Octavius' crossing also alludes to the consensus version of the Scipionic crossing, that is, the version Livy in fact adopted in Book 29. That account of Scipio's crossing (Livy 29.27.6–13), which Livy ended by characterising as *prospera navigatio*, can be summarised as follows.⁵⁰ The fleet approaches its destination only to have winds, clouds, and fog (29.27.10, *uentus premente nebula cecidit*) conspire to buffet the fleet back into deep waters and prevent it from actually seeing the shore. After a fretful night at sea (29.27.11 *nox deinde incertiora omnia fecit*), the wind shifted, and the fleet happily set in at the promontory of Apollo (29.27.12, *Pulchri promunturium*). The dramatic arrival within sight of Africa, the shifting of the winds, the reverse into deeper waters, and the final arrival at the promontory of Apollo are all paralleled in Octavius' later crossing as well. This short, almost annalistic notice thus reaches out to both parts of the earlier Scipio story, both the consensus adopted by Livy and the Coelian variant, which Livy had explicitly singled out for citation, thereby incorporating it within the body of his history.

Octavius' crossing was not in itself an especially important episode for either the Hannibalic war or Livy's narrative of it, and indeed the only reason it might draw any attention is because of its similarities to Coelius' description of the Scipionic crossing, a description which Livy himself regards as mistaken. Thus, we have an element of scholarly correction at work in the initial passage, but more importantly the very incorporation of that Coelius passage—whether through paraphrase or quotation—is precisely what allows the reader to see intertextuality with Coelius in the subsequent Octavius episode. To some extent, then, intertextuality (with Coelius) becomes intratextuality (within Livy). There is no need to postulate the text of the Coelian original; it does not ultimately matter if the passage is quotation or

⁵⁰ 29.27.6–13: *secundum has preces cruda exta caesa uictima, uti mos est, in mare proiecit tubaque signum dedit proficiscendi. uento secundo uehementi satis prouecti celeriter e conspectu terrae ablati sunt; et a meridie nebula occepit ita uix ut concursus nauium inter se uitarent; lenior uentus in alto factus. noctem insequentem eadem caligo obtinuit: sole orto est discussa, et addita uis uento. iam terram cernebant. haud ita multo post gubernator Scipioni ait non plus quinque milia passuum Africam abesse; Mercuri promunturium se cernere; si iubeat eo dirigi, iam in portu fore omnem classem. Scipio, ut in conspectu terra fuit, precatus deos uti bono rei publicae suoque Africam uiderit, dare uela et alium infra nauibus accessum petere iubet. uento eodem ferebantur; ceterum nebula sub idem ferme tempus quo pridie exorta conspectum terrae ademittit et uentus premente nebula cecidit. nox deinde incertiora omnia fecit; itaque ancoras ne aut inter se concurrerent naues aut terrae inferrentur iecere. ubi inluxit, uentus idem coortus nebula disiecta aperuit omnia Africae litora. Scipio quod esset proximum promunturium percontatus cum Pulchri promunturium id uocari audisset, 'placet omen'; inquit 'huc dirigitur naues.' eo classis decurrit, copiaque omnes in terram expositae sunt.*

paraphrase—all that is required for the reader to relate the two episodes is already supplied by Livy himself, while duly acknowledging the existence of variant accounts and authorities. The intertextual move that situates Livy within a tradition of historiography—the citation of Coelius—is recast via the allusive Octavius episode as an intratextual move that situates the larger historiographical tradition within Livy’s own cannibalising text.

Conclusion

The mechanics of historiographical citation are a complex topic, and the range of reference I have proposed here—Impersonal, Anonymous, Simple, Variant, and Intratextual Citation—only begins to trace the possibilities open to the historian. Schematic though it is, however, this range already establishes the complexity and polyvalence of this very historiographical gesture, and it ought to make citation part of the vocabulary of literary critical thinking about historiographical practices.

This is not to say, of course, that historiography and poetry are identical, nor to suggest that the historians formulated their citations with a literary rather than historical purpose in mind. But precisely as a gesture that is markedly historiographical, citation in the *AUC* does more than simply establish the historical authorities on which an author relied; it is also inherently allusive, and thereby both defines a literary tradition and positions the historian relative to that tradition, as well as exposing the intricate processes of historical transmission. In this sense, source citation is programmatic, and definitive of the double valence of Roman historical writing: capacious in its research and competitive in its art.

AYELET HAIMSON LUSHKOV

The University of Texas at Austin

ayelet.haimsonlushkov@austin.utexas.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- von Albrecht, M. (1989) *Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius* (Leeds).
- Beck, H. and U. Walter (2001) *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker I. Von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius* (Darmstadt).
- (2004) *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker II. Von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus* (Darmstadt).
- Briscoe, J. (1973) *Commentary on Livy, books XXXI–XXXIII* (Oxford).
- (2005) 'The Language and Style of the Fragmentary Republican Historians,' in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, and J. Adams (edd.) *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (Oxford) 53–72.
- Brock, R. (1995) "'Versions", "Inversions", and Evasions: Classical Historiography and the "Published" Speech', *PLLS* 8: 209–24.
- Burton, P. (2000) 'The Last Republican Historian: A New Date for the Composition of Livy's First Pentad', *Historia* 49: 429–46.
- Conte, G. B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (Ithaca and London).
- Courtney, E. (1999) *Archaic Latin Prose* (Atlanta).
- Fehling, D. (1989) *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (ARCA 21; Leeds).
- Feldherr, A., ed. (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge).
- Forsythe, G. (1994) *The Historian L. Calpurnius Frugi and the Roman Annalist Tradition* (Lanham).
- (1999) *Livy and Early Rome* (Stuttgart).
- (2002) 'Dating and Arranging the Roman History of Valerius Antias', in V. B. Gorman and E. W. Robinson (edd.) *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies and Military Power in the Ancient World* (Leiden) 99–112.
- Gildenhard, I. (2003) 'The 'Annalist' Before the Annalists: Ennius and His *Annales*', in U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi, and U. Walter (edd.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte* (Darmstadt) 93–114.
- Goldberg, S. (1995) *Epic in Republican Rome* (New York and Oxford).
- Grafton, A. (1997) *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Haimson Lushkov, A. (2010) 'Intertextuality and Source Criticism in the Scipionic Trials', in Polleichtner (2010) 93–133.
- Hardie, P. (2012) *Rumour and Renown. Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (Cambridge).
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Horsfall, N. (1995) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden).
- Hutchinson, G. (2006) *Propertius: Elegies Book IV* (Cambridge).

- Jaeger, M. (2006) 'Livy, Hannibal's Monument, and the Temple of Juno at Croton', *TAPhA* 136: 389–414.
- Kelly, G. (2008) *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge).
- Kraus, C. S. (1994) *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita Book VI* (Cambridge).
- (forthcoming) 'Is "Historia" a genre?', in S. Frangoulidis, ed., *Generic Interfaces: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations in Latin Literature* (*Trends in Classics*; Berlin and New York).
- Lendon, J. E. 2009. 'Historians without History: Against Roman Historiography', in Feldherr (2009) 41–62.
- Levene, D. (2010) *Livy and the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).
- (2011) 'Historical Allusion and the Nature of the Historical Text.' *Histos* Working Papers 2011.1.
- Luce, T. J. (1965) 'The Dating of Livy's First Pentad', *TAPhA* 96: 209–40.
- (1977) *Livy: the Composition of His History* (Princeton).
- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
- (1999) '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) 281–324.
- Miles, J. (1995) *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca and London).
- Nissen, H. (1863) *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin).
- Northwood, S. (2000) 'Livy and the Early Annalists', in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 10 (Collection Latomus; Brussels) 45–55.
- Oakley, S. (1996–2005) *A Commentary on Livy: Books VI–X*, 4 vols. (Oxford).
- Ogilvie, R. M. (1965) *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford).
- O'Gorman, E. (2005) 'Citation and Authority in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*,' in K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (Cambridge) 95–108.
- (2009) 'Intertextuality and Historiography', in Feldherr (2009) 231–42.
- Peter, H. (1967) *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* (Stuttgart).
- Pitcher, L. (2009) *Writing Ancient History: An Introduction to Classical Historiography* (London).
- Pittenger, M. R. P. (2008) *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Polleichtner, W., ed. (2010) *Livy and Intertextuality* (Bochum).
- Rich, J. (2005) 'Valerius Antias and the Construction of the Roman Past.' *BICS* 42: 137–62.
- (2011) 'Structuring Roman History: the Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition,' *Histos* 5: 1–43; orig. *Histos* 1 (1997), electronic publication, of which a revised and abridged version appeared in J. Chaplin

and C. S. Kraus, edd., *Livy* (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies; Oxford) 118–47.

Strzelecki, W. (1963) 'Naevius and the Roman Annalists', *RIFC* 91: 440–58.

Thomas, R. (1986) 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCP* 90: 171–98.

Wiseman, T. P. (1974) 'Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome', *G&R* 21: 153–64.