

## “Speaking in Fragments: Narrators and the Roman Historiographic Tradition in Livy’s Third Decade”

This paper analyzes the fragments of two of Livy’s predecessors, Coelius Antipater and Valerius Antias, and argues that Livy incorporates elements from these texts into the *AUC* through the use of internal narrators and focalizers. This analysis reveals Livy’s engagement with the Roman historiographic tradition outside of the direct citation of his sources. Recent editions of the corpora of the fragmentary historians of Rome (Chassignet 1996-2004; Beck and Walter 2001-2004; Cornell 2014) have created an atmosphere primed for work on these authors. In addition to work on the early Roman historiographic tradition (Badian 1966, Kierdorf 2003), I build upon recent scholarship addressing Livy’s use of his sources (Levene 2010), methods of citation (Haimson Lushkov 2013), and narrators (Pausch 2010 and 2011), as well as Roman perceptions of Hannibal (Chassignet 2008, Moore 2010) and Scipio (Chaplin 2010).

I begin by briefly describing the characteristics of Coelius’ and Antias’ narratives and Livy’s explicit use of their texts. First, Coelius likely used Silenus as a source for his monograph (F8 *FRHist* = Cic. *de Div.* 1.49), perhaps giving rise to his fantastical accounts (e.g., F32, F36, and F52 *FRHist*). Second, Silenus’ text provides Coelius with a source that allows him to frame his narrative from the Punic perspective (e.g., F22 *FRHist* = Gell. 10.24.6-7 or F32 *FRHist* = Cic. *de Div.* 1.48). Livy directly incorporates these aspects of Coelius’ histories through variant citations, as he does when he notes Coelius’ version that Cornelius Scipio is saved at Ticinus by a Ligurian slave (F12 *FRHist* = Livy 21.46.7-10). Valerius Antias’ *Annales*, on the other hand, provide the shape for Livy’s annalistic framework (Rich 1997), given the presence of Antian fragments in Livy’s annalistic notices (F58, F63, F64 *FRHist*). Livy also often questions details noted in Antias’ text (e.g., F23 *FRHist* = Livy 3.5.12-13, F36 *FRHist* = Livy 33.10.8).

I then examine Livy’s engagement with these narratives through his use of focalizers and internal narrators. First, his use of focalization allows him to include fantastical elements found in his predecessors. Livy integrates (22.5) Coelius’ account of the earthquake occurring on the same day as the Battle of Trasimene (F14b *FRHist* = Cic. *de Div.* 1.77-78) by noting the soldiers’ failure to notice it. While Antias records a flame reflecting on Lucius Marcius as he addresses the troops in Spain (F27b *FRHist* = Pliny *NH* 2.240-1), Livy (=F27a = *AUC* 25.39.14) sensationalizes the account, uses the army as character-bound focalizers, and cites this less realistic narrative as the *opinio communis* of his sources. Second, Livy also uses internal speakers to incorporate details of his predecessors’ narratives into the *AUC*. Livy (22.51) subsumes Coelius’ speech of a Punic general (F22 *FRHist* = Gell. 10.24.6-7) who offers to deliver Rome to Hannibal by suggesting the achievement of Coelius’ conditional statement. Antias engages in a famous debate about Scipio’s morality (F29 *FRHist* = Gell. 7.8.3-6) by describing the general’s use of a Spanish captive for his sexual pleasure. Livy notes Antias as a source in his narrative of the fall of Carthago Nova (=F28 *FRHist* = Livy 26.49.1-6), but gives no explicit validation to Antias’ account of Scipio’s sexual indiscretion. Instead, Livy has the young general give a speech publicly returning the captive girl to her relatives (26.50). Within Livy’s report of this speech, however, Scipio demonstrates his interest in the woman, suggesting that the Roman would have fulfilled his desires had his duty not interfered. Livy thereby incorporates Antias’ version within the speech of a secondary narrator and focalizes the desire and its subsequent refusal from Scipio’s perspective. This paper argues that Livy subsumes elements of Coelius’ and Antias’ narratives through his use of secondary narration and focalization. The voices of these internal narrators expose fragments of variant traditions from Rome’s historiographic past and allow scholars another way to engage with these lost texts.

## **Bibliography:**

- Badian, E. 1966. "The Early Historians." In: T. A. Dorey (ed.) *The Latin Historians*.
- Beck, H. and U. Walter. 2001-2004. *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker*, 2 vols. Stuttgart.
- Bosworth, A.B. 2003. "Plus ça change...Ancient Historians and their Sources." *CA* 22: 167-98.
- Brunt, P. A. 1980. "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes" *CQ* 30:477-94.
- Chaplin, J. 2010. "Scipio the Matchmaker." In Kraus, Marincola, and Pelling, edd. *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts. Studies in Honor of A. J. Woodman*. Oxford: 60-72.
- Chassignet, M., ed. (1996-2004) *L'Annalistique Romaine*, 3 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Chassignet, M. 2008. "L'Image des Barcides chez les Historiographes Latins de la République: Naissance d'une Tradition" in Pigoń, J. (ed.) *The Children of Herodotus: Greek and Roman Historiography and Related Genres*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 206-18.
- Cornell, T. J., ed. 2014 *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, 3 vols. Oxford.
- Haimson Lushkov, A. 2013. "Citation and the Dynamics of Tradition in Livy's *AUC*" *Histos* 7: 21-47.
- Kierdorf, W. 2003. *Römische Geschichtsschreibung der republikanischen Zeit*. Heidelberg.
- Levene, D. S. 2010. *Livy and the Hannibalic War*. Oxford.
- Moore, T.J. 2010. "Livy's Hannibal and the Roman Tradition." In: W. Polleichtner (ed.) *Livy and Intertextuality*. Bochum: 135-67.
- Pausch, D., ed. 2010. *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*. Berlin.
- Pausch, D. 2011. *Livius und der Leser: Narrative Strukturen in ab urbe condita*. Munich.
- Peter, H. [1870] 1914 and 1906. *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, vols. I and II. Leipzig.
- Rich, J. 1997. "Structuring Roman History: the Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition." *Histos* 1.