

ALLUDING TO REALITY: TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF HISTORIOGRAPHICAL INTERTEXTUALITY*

Overview: This paper asks whether and how intertextuality operates differently in historiography than in poetry and, if it does, whether and why any difference matters. The paper begins by offering a provisional taxonomy of intertextual approaches to historical narrative and then argues that where other genres allow allusions to originate with the author, the text, or the reader, historiography adds the historical actor as a source. In brief, the paper contends that Scipio Aemilianus deliberately embarked on a program of imitation and quoted his biological father and adoptive grandfather until he achieved their renown. His creation of ancestral intertexts expands the taxonomy of historiographical intertextuality and suggests that it is worth reconsidering our understanding of Scipio Africanus.

1. A Provisional Taxonomy

As David Levene puts it in his book on Livy's Third Decade, 'The defining feature of history is that it is—or purports to be—a representation of real events'.¹ One can argue that, where allusion and intertextuality are concerned, historiography's unique relationship to lived experience either does not or does matter. The first alternative holds, to a very large extent. To take just one example, in the APA seminar on this topic two years ago, Christopher Pelling began with historiography's privileged access to reality, but went on to explore multiple instances of intertextuality in historical texts where these are completely comparable to other sorts of literature.² To the extent that historiography is a type of literature, then, an intertextual approach can be a rich way of reading. But there are also implications for historiography's claim to represent reality, and here the presence of allusivity can matter. One important consequence is the possibility of what

* This is a working paper; please do not cite without permission. I would like to thank Craig Champion, Randall Ganiban, Christina Kraus, and David Levene for their comments and Barrett Smith for his editorial work.

The following abbreviations are used: *CIL* = T. Mommsen, *et al.* eds., *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin 1853–; *ILLRP* = A. Degraffi, ed., *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*, 2 vols., (Florence, 1965, 1963); *RE* = A. von Pauly, *et al.*, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893–1964).

¹ Levene (2010) 85.

² See now Pelling (2013).

Tony Woodman named ‘substantive imitation’ over three decades ago.³ That is, in the process of borrowing, historians may generate reality. More recently Ellen O’Gorman has explored theoretical aspects of intertextuality particularly in relation to the different timeframes intrinsic to historical narrative.⁴ Both authors demonstrate that allusivity conditions ‘what really happened’.

Further arguments in favour of thinking harder about the relationships among intertextuality, historiography, and reality are found in other papers from the 2011 APA seminar. Both Ayelet Haimson Lushkov and David Levene deal, in different ways, with sources. These are an essential component of historical narrative; starting with Herodotus, the ancient historians indicate, from time to time and to different degrees, where their information comes from. The question, however, is whether e.g. Arrian’s use of Callisthenes differs from e.g. Virgil’s use of Homer. The instinctive reaction might be that of course it does, since the *Iliad* is not a source for the *Aeneid* in the same way that Callisthenes’ Alexander history is for Arrian’s. At least formally, however, both the epic poet and the historian are drawing on earlier texts, so it is necessary to find ways to be more precise about historical borrowing and its differences from imitation in other genres. Both Haimson Lushkov and Levene do exactly that. Haimson Lushkov discusses source citation in Livy as a form of intertextuality: in her words ‘historiographical citations ... are the most obvious site where allusivity and intertextuality operate’.⁵ Levene looks at what amounts to joint authorship: his case-study is Flamininus’ declaration of Greek freedom at the Isthmian Games in 196, a passage Livy takes over more or less whole cloth from Polybius, and which both Florus and the *Periochae* then condense from Livy, producing multiple combinations of authors of the same episode.

It would be interesting to extend Haimson Lushkov’s analysis both to other historians and non-literary sources. Are the monuments and personal conversations dear to Herodotus intertexts? Within Livy himself, should we add autopsy as he describes it for his *dramatis personae*, such as Aemilius Paulus’ tour of classical Greek sites?⁶ Levene’s analysis takes Polybius as its foundation, but since the Greek historian was a small child when Flamininus declared Greek freedom at the Isthmian Games of 196, he must have had ‘sources’ of his own: where does joint authorship begin? When Polybius cites Hannibal’s epigraphic recording of the forces he brought to Italy (3.33.18

³ Woodman (1979) 152 = (1998) 81.

⁴ O’Gorman (2009).

⁵ Haimson Lushkov (2013) 22.

⁶ Levene (2006) 77–87.

and 56.4), is the historian making the general collude with him? What about Polybius' citation of Laelius (10.3.2)? Does the latter share in the authorship of Scipio Africanus as he emerges from Polybius' rolls?⁷

I will consider sources and where historiographic substance originates further below, but it is useful to note first other areas where historiography pushes at the boundaries of intertextuality because of the genre's relationship to reality. In a 2010 article, Cynthia Damon showed that indeterminacy can be a feature of historiographical allusions, where either texts, actual events, or both can provide the intertext. To use one of her examples, Galba's last day resembles Caesar's, but is Tacitus evoking a source, or the Ides of March in general? There seems no way to differentiate. The example substantiates her point that 'historical actors ... were themselves aware of the literary and historical precedents for their situations and highlighted the connections by their choices: events themselves can allude to earlier events.' She follows Rhiannon Ash in observing how Otho's 'Catonian death' could easily have been intended by the emperor as a way to establish his legacy.⁸ Otho's death is also a good example of what John Marincola calls 'the "intertextuality" of real life'. As he puts it, 'sometimes the literary echoes in a historian will have arisen from the fact that his subject was actually seeking to call up previous historical actors'.⁹ He connects this kind of intertextuality with exemplarity, which he treats in the context of Xenophon's speeches in the *Hellenica* and the debate between Caesar and Cato in Sallust's *Catiline*. Levene, in his book, makes much the same point as Marincola does about the existence of intertextuality in human experience and behaviour: 'In practice events in real life may show striking resemblances to other historical events, and people in real life may deliberately choose to model their behaviour or public image on earlier figures'.¹⁰

Taken together, the work of these four scholars points to the intersection of historiography and reality as territory requiring further scrutiny and definition. But while the contours of the terrain (if I may continue the metaphor) are not in dispute, and while many individual features of interest have been noted, the standard atlas has yet to be produced. And to abandon the metaphor, here the taxonomy breaks down. There are some familiar individual cases: Alexander's imitation of Achilles and the subsequent cottage industry of Alexander-impersonators; Cato the Elder at Thermopylae; the suicide of

⁷ On Polybius and Laelius, see Walbank (1957–79) II.198–203 and Scullard (1970) 16–18.

⁸ Damon (2010), esp. 381–3, with Ash (2007) 200.

⁹ Marincola (2010) 265.

¹⁰ Levene (2010) 85.

the younger Cato.¹¹ These seem either generalised (Alexander) or limited to a single act (the Catos). I want to try to sharpen current lines of analysis by looking at a less familiar and somewhat different case. In his biography of Scipio Aemilianus, A. E. Astin observed,

There is an even more interesting feature of Scipio's career. Several times the writers of antiquity observe that Scipio earned by his own merits the same cognomen, 'Africanus', which he had inherited from his grandfather; but it did not need the literary men of later generations to conceive of this idea. The cognomen was highly distinctive; the parallel must have been intentional. Perhaps then it is not merely coincidence that Scipio found his closest friend in a Laelius, that his achievements as a military tribune in 149 inspired talk that he was the only worthy successor of Paullus and the Scipios, that reports circulated that he was aided by the same deity that had enabled Africanus to foresee the future, that he achieved the consulship at an unusually early age and that he attained the command in the struggle against Carthage.¹²

Astin believes that the similarities between Aemilianus and his adopted grandfather were 'intentional', but he does not specify whose mind or minds produced them. This paper explores the life of Scipio Aemilianus and argues that over the course of years he deliberately modelled himself on his biological father, Lucius Aemilius Paullus, and his adoptive grandfather, Scipio Africanus. Although the identical names meant that he more obviously succeeded in making an *exemplum*, or intertext, of the grandfather, he pursued both routes. His career has implications for thinking about intertextual and historical analysis.

¹¹ There is a convenient summary of Alexander and imitation in Griffin (1986) 188–9; for the older Cato, see e.g. Dillery (2009) 95–100; for the younger Cato, Ash (2007) 199–200.

¹² Astin (1967) 21–2.

2. Scipio Aemilianus

It is no bold assertion to say that Scipio Aemilianus repeatedly presented himself as a traditionalist, but in the illustration of this point it is important to note that the evidence comes from a wide range of texts. No single author controls the narrative here, and many writers quote from his speeches. In Astin's biography, the longest of the twelve appendices is the one devoted to Scipio's 'Dicta'. Although some are variants of others and yet others clearly paraphrases and translations, they give peculiar access to a historical personage; and of course they show that early on there was an interest in collecting Scipio's sayings and preserving his speeches. In witness of traditionalism there is, for example, a passage in Aulus Gellius where he both notes that Aemilianus wore traditional clothing (*hac antiquitate indutus, P. Africanus, Pauli filius* ...) and that he gave a speech attacking the new style of long sleeves (Gel. 6.12.1–7). Equally, Macrobius knows Aemilianus' speech against a law of Tiberius Gracchus in which he somehow came to attack modern dancing and along the way to note that *maiores nostri* approved of singing (*Sat.* 3.14.6–7). Most famously, during his censorship, he gave a speech in which he exhorted the Roman people to follow the ways of their ancestors: *Publius Scipio Africanus, Pauli filius, utramque historiam posuit in oratione quam dixit in censura, cum ad maiorum mores populum hortaretur*.¹³

Closely related to his self-representation as an 'old-school' Roman, Aemilianus evidences an interest in exemplary thinking, seeing patterns in history and expecting others to learn from the past. Famously, gazing upon captive Carthage, he foresaw the same destiny for Rome (Pol. 38.21.1). In one of his earliest pronouncements he turned Zeus and Poseidon into precedents for himself as he had a splendid view of a battle between Masinissa and the Carthaginians: ἔλεγέ τε σεμνύνων δύο πρὸ αὐτοῦ τὴν τοιάνδε θέαν ἰδεῖν ἐν τῷ Τρωικῷ πολέμῳ, τὸν Δία ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδῆς καὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶνα ἐκ Σαμοθράκης.¹⁴ Further, Astin regards Aemilianus as a practitioner of deterrence through fear or, as he puts it, 'the severe punishment of recalcitrant peoples, as a means of securing Rome's rule by examples of terrorism'. He cites Scipio's handling of the Celtiberians in 152–151, his treatment of Carthage, his punishment of deserters, cutting off the hands of Numantine sympathisers at Lutia, and the razing of Numantia, and suggests that two fragments of Diodorus (32.2 and 4) almost certainly derive from Polybius and

¹³ Publius Scipio Africanus, the son of Paullus, included both stories in the speech he gave during his censorship when he urged the ways of the ancestors on the people (Gel. 4.20.10).

¹⁴ He said solemnly that two before he had seen such a sight in the Trojan war: Zeus from Ida and Poseidon from Samothrace (App. *Pun.* 71).

‘very possibly reflect [Aemilianus’] belief in this course of action’.¹⁵ One vignette about Aemilianus, during his repatriation of the foreign art recovered from Carthage, is less barbarous and more certainly intentionally didactic. According to Cicero, when restoring to Agrigentum the bull of Phalaris, Aemilianus designated it an embodiment of both native cruelty and Roman mildness, from which the Agrigentines could contemplate whether they preferred to be enslaved to their own people or to be under Roman sway: *Scipio ... dixisse dicitur aequum esse illos cogitare utrum esset Agrigentinis utilius suisne seruire anne populo Romano obtemperare, cum idem monumentum et domesticae crudelitatis et nostrae mansuetudinis haberent* (*Verr.* 2.4.73).

There is then sufficient, I’d venture ample, evidence that Aemilianus thought in terms of models. Further, the wider cultural context repeatedly voiced the expectation that sons should live up to their ancestors.¹⁶ Recently there has been a great deal of interest in the *imagines* and the Roman aristocratic funeral, so I will not rehearse that particular body of material here, but it is worth reviewing the evidence most germane to Aemilianus.¹⁷ In *De Officiis*, Cicero enunciates the naturalness of sons desiring to rival and surpass their fathers and gives Aemilianus as a prime example (*Off.* 1.116):

Quorum uero patres aut maiores aliqua gloria praestiterunt, ii student plerumque eodem in genere laudis excellere, ut Q. Mucius P. f. in iure ciuile, Pauli filius Africanus in re militari. Quidam autem ad eas laudes, quas a patribus acceperunt, addunt aliquam suam, ut hic idem Africanus eloquentia cumulauit bellicam gloriam.

In fact those whose fathers or ancestors achieved distinction are usually eager to excel in the same realm of renown, as for example Quintus Mucius son of Publius in civil law and Africanus the son of Paullus in warfare. Further, some of these add something of their own to the renown they inherited from their fathers, as this same Africanus piled eloquence atop military glory.

He mentions also Timotheus, son of Conon, for adding intellectual achievements to military ones. Cicero later reiterates and expands the idea

¹⁵ Astin (1967) 331.

¹⁶ For the weight of family history in general and the particular case of pressure on Brutus to fulfil his ancestral destiny and assassinate Caesar, see MacMullen (1966) 7–10.

¹⁷ On the *imagines* and funerals, see above all Flower (1996). Walter (2004) 110, in discussing the *imagines*, notes the plausibility of Aemilianus’ response to the popular talk that he fell short of his family and wanted to be worthy of it (cf. *Pol.* 31.23.9–12 and see further below).

of sons imitating fathers in his speech for Rabirius Postumus. Interestingly, here his examples are Publius Decius, an unspecified Fabius Maximus, and again Aemilianus' pursuit of the martial glory achieved by Paullus (*Rab. Post.* 2). So of the five pairs Cicero cites as illustrations, only the second-century heroes appear twice, thereby suggesting that they were the canonical *exemplum*, at least for Cicero.

Moving back in time, and away from Cicero's reception of Aemilianus, there are testimonials from the latter's lifetime of the expectation that he would imitate his most famous forebears. According to Plutarch in his life of Lucius Paullus, when Aemilianus was campaigning for the censorship by associating with the lowly, his opponent Appius Claudius invoked the spirit of Paullus and the disapproval he must feel in seeing his son thus depart from his own loftier conduct (38.3–4). Aemilianus in this case was failing to live up to a paternal standard, but the reproach depends on the assumption that he ought to be imitating his father's behaviour, not departing from it. Even more telling are the second-century epitaphs from Aemilianus' family tomb, where men are identified by their fathers (beyond the standard formula) and where contributions to the family tradition are expected. Most notably, the Publius Africanus sometimes thought to be Aemilianus' adoptive father would have surpassed the glory of his ancestors if he had been allowed to live long enough: *quibus sei in longa licuisset tibi utier uita, | facile facteis superases gloriam maiorum* (*ILLRP* 311);¹⁸ and a Lucius Cornelius was shortchanged of renown by a truncated lifespan: *quoiei uita defecit, non honos honore, | is hic situs, quei nunquam uictus est uirtutei, | annos gnatus XX is loeis mandatus* (*ILLRP* 312). The epitaph of Aemilianus' second cousin Gnaeus Cornelius Hispanus dwells on his contributions to the family: *Virtutes generis mieis moribus accumulauit, | progeniem genui, facta patris petiei. | Maiorum optenui laudem ut sibi me esse creatum | laetentur; stirpem nobilauit honor* (*ILLRP* 316). The key words are *facta patris petiei*—I emulated my father's deeds—though all four lines bespeak a belief in continuity of the family and its reputation. This sentiment must have been familiar to Aemilianus, given the interest he took in the family tomb.¹⁹

To return to the literary sources, Polybius asserts that Aemilianus very much wanted to live up to his inheritance. In the historian's famous account of his first consequential conversation with the future general, he reports that Aemilianus openly expressed a sense of inadequacy (31.23.10–12):

¹⁸ The case for the identification is based on the early death. See Dessau's note on *ILLRP* 311 for the literary sources.

¹⁹ Coarelli (1988).

ἢ δῆλον ὅτι καὶ σὺ περὶ ἐμοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχεις διάληψιν, ἣν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πολίτας ἔχειν πυνθάνομαι; δοκῶ γὰρ εἶναι πᾶσιν ἡσύχιός τις καὶ νωθρός, ὡς ἀκούω, καὶ πολὺ κεχωρισμένος τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς αἰρέσεως καὶ πράξεως, ὅτι κρίσεις οὐχ αἰροῦμαι λέγειν. τὴν δ' οἰκίαν οὐ φασι τοιοῦτον ζητεῖν προστάτην ἐξ ἧς ὀρμῶμαι, τὸ δ' ἐναντίον· ὃ καὶ μάλιστα με λυπεῖ.

It is clear that you have the same opinion of me that I have learned that other citizens do; for I seem to everyone to be a disengaged and sluggish person, as I hear tell, and to share very little in Roman ways and actions because I choose not to argue legal cases. And they say that the house I come from does not seek that sort of champion, but the exact opposite; and this grieves me deeply.

Polybius notes his admiration for Aemilianus' distress at not having the character of the household from which he springs (σοῦ γε μὴν ἄγαμαι νῦν ἀκούων, ὅτι δοκεῖ σοι λυπηρὸν τὸ πρᾶντερον εἶναι τοῦ καθήκοντος τοῖς ἐκ ταύτης τῆς οἰκίας ὀρμωμένοις),²⁰ and states that he would be delighted to help him to act and speak in a way worthy of his ancestors (ἐγὼ δὲ κὰν αὐτὸς ἠδέως σοι συνεπιδοίην ἐμαυτὸν καὶ συνεργὸς γενοίμην εἰς τὸ καὶ λέγειν τι καὶ πράττειν ἄξιον τῶν προγόνων).²¹ Aemilianus accepts his offer enthusiastically, on the grounds that it will instantly make him worthy of his family and ancestors (δόξω γὰρ αὐτόθεν εὐθέως ἐμαυτῷ καὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἄξιός εἶναι καὶ τῶν προγόνων).²²

If accurate, and I will return to that question later, the conversation confirms that Aemilianus recognised the need to emulate his glorious kin. But the exchange also raises a further point. In his commentary on Polybius, F. W. Walbank notes that the words ἐκ ταύτης τῆς οἰκίας in the historian's initial reply refer to the Cornelii Scipiones, not the Aemilii Paulli.²³ Which father and which set of ancestors was Aemilianus expected to emulate? In the passages from the second *Verrine* and Aulus Gellius discussed previously, Aemilianus is identified as the son of Paullus, and in the anecdote from Plutarch, Appius Claudius chastises him for deviating from Paullus' conduct. Further anecdotal evidence suggests that although Aemilianus was adopted

²⁰ 'Listening to you now I admire you because you are distressed to be milder than is right for those coming from this household' (31.24.4).

²¹ 'I myself would gladly give myself up entirely to you and become your partner in speaking and acting in a way worthy of your ancestors' (31.24.5).

²² 'I think that from that very moment I will be worthy of both my household and my ancestors' (31.24.10).

²³ Walbank (1957–79) III.498.

out of his natal family while he was still a child, his biological parents continued to be closely involved in his upbringing.²⁴ Certainly he cared enough about his mother to give her the lavish accoutrements he inherited from her sister-in-law (and his biological aunt) Aemilia (Polyb. 31.26.1–10). He seems to have spent a great deal of time with his biological father, who Polybius says was his pattern for *μεγαλοψυχία* and *καθαρότης* (31.25.9–10). Aemilianus went on campaign with Paullus in 168, and reportedly his disappearance after Pydna had Paullus distraught until he returned to camp (Livy 44.44.1). Although the cognomen Africanus might suggest a preference towards the adoptive family, in practice Aemilianus seems to have actively maintained his double ancestry and to have set out both to become Africanus and to emulate Aemilius Paullus.

To begin with the latter, Aemilianus seems to have taken at least one page directly from Paullus' copy book. After the battle of Pydna, when the defeated Macedonian king Perseus was brought before him, Paullus questioned him and then used him as an example of how Fortune can raise a man high and then bring him low (29.20.1–4):

ὁ δὲ μεταλαβὼν τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διάλεκτον παρεκάλει τοὺς ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ βλέποντας εἰς τὰ παρόντα, δεικνὺς ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν τὸν Περσέα, μήτε μεγαλαυχεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς κατορθώμασι παρὰ τὸ δέον μήτε βουλευέσθαι μηδὲν ὑπερήφανον μηδ' ἀνήκεστον περὶ μηδενός, μήτε καθόλου πιστεύειν μηδέποτε ταῖς παρούσαις εὐτυχίαις· ἀλλ' ὅτε μάλιστα τις κατορθοίη κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον βίον καὶ κατὰ τὰς κοινὰς πράξεις, τότε μάλιστα παρεκάλει τῆς ἐναντίας τύχης ἔννοιαν λαμβάνειν. καὶ γὰρ οὕτω μόλις ἂν ἐν ταῖς εὐκαιρίαις ἄνθρωπον μέτριον ὄντα φανῆναι. τοῦτο γὰρ διαφέρειν ἔφη τοὺς ἀνοήτους τῶν νοῦν ἐχόντων, διότι συμβαίνει τοὺς μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀτυχίαις παιδεύεσθαι, τοὺς δ' ἐν ταῖς τῶν πέλας.

Switching to Latin, Paullus exhorted those in the council watching the proceedings to direct their gaze at Perseus and neither to exult in success beyond what was due, nor to determine on anything arrogant or fatal to anyone, nor to trust wholly in a phase of good luck; but especially whenever someone is meeting with success in his personal affairs or in public matters, then especially he exhorted them to take thought for the opposite of good luck. For even in this way can a man scarcely remain moderate amidst prosperity. Paullus further said that the difference between the wise and the foolish was that the foolish learned from their own bad luck but the wise from that of their neighbours.

²⁴ So also Astin (1967) 13.

When Hasdrubal surrendered to Scipio Aemilianus twenty-two years later, the latter staged exactly the same scene, articulating a message about *τύχη* similar to his father's (38.20.1–3):

ὅτι τοῦ Ἀσδρούβου τοῦ τῶν Καρχηδονίων στρατηγοῦ ἰκέτου παραγενομένου τοῖς τοῦ Σκιπίωνος γόνασιν, ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐμβλέψας εἰς τοὺς συνόντας ὄρατ', ἔφη, 'τὴν τύχην, ᾧ ἄνδρες, ὡς ἀγαθὴ παραδειγματίζειν ἐστὶ τοὺς ἀλογίστους τῶν ἀνθρώπων. οὗτός ἐστιν Ἀσδρούβας ὁ νεωστὶ πολλῶν αὐτῷ καὶ φιλανθρώπων προτεινομένων ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀπαξιῶν, φάσκων δὲ κάλλιστον ἐντάφιον εἶναι τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὸ ταύτης πῦρ, νῦν πάρεστι μετὰ στεμμάτων δεόμενος ἡμῶν τυχεῖν τῆς ζωῆς καὶ πάσας τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχων ἐν ἡμῖν. ἂ τίς οὐκ ἂν ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν θεασάμενος ἐν νῷ λάβοι διότι δεῖ μηδέποτε λέγειν μηδὲ πράττειν μηδὲν ὑπερήφανον ἄνθρωπον ὄντα;'

When the Carthaginians' commander Hasdrubal was a suppliant at the knees of Scipio, the Roman general, looking around at his companions said, 'Gentlemen, you see luck, how good it is at showing by example foolish men. This is the Hasdrubal who recently deemed unworthy of himself our many, beneficent offers, and claimed that his fatherland and its incineration made the finest shroud; and now he stands with the boughs of a suppliant, begging us for his life and pinning all his hopes on us. What man who has seen this spectacle would think that it is right for a mortal being ever to speak or to act with arrogance?'

Nor did the resemblances end there. As both Astin and Elizabeth Rawson discuss, when Scipio opted to sacrifice the weaponry captured from Carthage, his choice of dedicatory deities echoed that of Paullus after Pydna, and the selection of Mars and Minerva seems to be unusual, not explicitly paralleled elsewhere. Moreover, Aemilianus held victory games on the spot, as did Paullus.²⁵ The Livian *Periocha* for Book 51 reports that *Scipio exemplo patris sui, Aemilii Pauli, qui Macedoniam uicerat, ludos fecit transfugasque ac fugitivos bestiis obiecit*.²⁶ He may well have been imitating Paullus also in not converting

²⁵ Livy 45.32.8–33.7 for Paullus after Pydna; Appian *Lib.* 133–5 for Aemilianus after Carthage. See Astin (1967) 76 ('A new Africanus—perhaps also a new Aemilius Paullus') and 341–2, and Rawson (1991) 85–7, who specifically considers the modelling relationship between Paullus and Aemilianus. She notes also the meditations on Fortune.

²⁶ 'Following the example of his father, Aemilius Paullus, who had defeated Macedonia, Scipio put on games and threw deserters and runaway slaves to the beasts'. The

the victory to his personal gain, as Paullus refrained from lining his pockets in Macedonia (Polybius 18.35.9–11). Finally, the Carthage episode may be the occasion for Africanus' quoting his biological father's credo that a good general fights from either overwhelming necessity or overwhelming opportunity.²⁷ Rawson assigns the words to the Carthaginian celebrations while Astin dates them to the Numantine campaign.

Certainly the latter was another opportunity to imitate Paullus. According to Livy, when Paullus took over the campaign against Perseus, he introduced strict military discipline, tightening the chain of command and making veterans think that they were finally being instructed *in re militari*, like new recruits.²⁸ Similarly, when Aemilianus was sent to take charge of the campaign against Numantia, he too began by re-establishing military discipline, a process amply attested by the number of sharp remarks recorded by various writers. He forbade the riding of mules when the army was on the move because an army that cannot walk is not much good in war (App. *Lib.* 85). To a soldier protesting that his load was burdensome, Aemilianus said he could stop carrying his fortification once he learned to fortify himself with his sword (*Per.* 57). He told a military tribune who brought elaborate wine jugs that he was useless to his general and his country for thirty days and useless to himself for his entire life (Plut. *Mor.* 201D). Once the campaign was successfully concluded and Aemilianus returned to Rome, he was granted a triumph. Astin notes that because Numantia furnished nothing like the riches of Carthage, the triumph must have been much less grand and the soldiers received bounties of just seven *denarii* a man, a sum likely to cause discontent. As Astin puts it, 'Scipio will not have forgotten that in 167 one hundred denarii had been deemed insufficient by his father's troops. If he himself did not pay more, it was because his resources were depleted'.²⁹

Finally, one curious incident from Aemilianus' censorship is worth mentioning. Though many of his efforts were blocked by his colleague Lucius Mummius, the destroyer of Corinth, Aemilianus wanted to conduct the census rigorously. Among those he demoted was an unnamed soldier who had been a centurion at Pydna but not fought because, he alleged, he remained in camp to protect the baggage (*De Orat.* 2.272). The episode is transmitted by Cicero for Aemilianus' rebuke of excessive diligence, so the context is

punishment of the latter is one of Astin's examples of Aemilianus' confidence in the power of deterrence.

²⁷ *Nam se patrem suum audisse dicere L. Aemilium Paulum, nimis bonum imperatorem signis conlatis non decertare nisi summa necessitudo aut summa occasio data esset* (Sempronius Asellio in Gel. 13.3.6).

²⁸ Livy 44.33.4–34.9; quotation from 34.6.

²⁹ Astin (1967) 231.

lost. Whatever the reason for punishing the man twenty-five years after his offense, the incident suggests that Aemilianus remained attached to the memory of his biological father.

At the same time, he seems to have been well aware of the import of being a Publius Cornelius Scipio. Astin sees the bid for the first consulship, that of 147, as an orchestrated campaign to present Aemilianus as a new Africanus. He emphasises that in the mid-second century it was extraordinary to choose someone below the proper age (Aemilianus being around 37) who was merely a candidate for the aedileship and had not yet held the praetorship. He notes that not since Titus Quinctius Flamininus in 198 had anyone been consul without having previously served as praetor and that the requirement for the praetorship to precede the consulship probably dates from Flamininus' election. For Astin, Aemilianus' military accomplishments in Spain and Carthage are not sufficient to explain this exceptional breach of precedent. He believes that Aemilianus was behind the stories circulating about his inheritance of Africanus' divine aid:

It is unlikely that Scipio ever publicly stated that he wanted to be consul in 147—that would have spoiled the effect—but it is more than likely that, perhaps even while he was still serving under Manilius, he saw in the situation an unrepeatable opportunity to reach the heights of glory as the new Africanus, and that he and his friends arranged the implanting, spreading, and encouraging of the idea that he must be elected consul: that Carthage would be captured only by this able and heroic soldier, who alone had proved a match for the Carthaginians, this heir—this worthy heir—of Paullus and Africanus, who indeed had so inherited the power and influence of Africanus that he had arbitrated between nations and organised a kingdom; and who was said to be aided by the divinity which had aided Africanus himself. Then at the last he could represent himself as bowing to the overwhelming force of public opinion that he should be elected.³⁰

Astin's account is persuasive, but Aemilianus' calculated construction of himself as Africanus redux appears to have begun even earlier. The crucial moment was the decision to volunteer to go to Spain in 151. The senate had decided to prosecute the war there until the Celtiberians acknowledged total defeat but, according to Polybius, neither the general population nor elites cooperated, making recruitment of troops and officers impossible. At a senate meeting, Aemilianus volunteered to set aside his trip to Macedonia, where he had been invited by locals to resolve internal problems, and to go

³⁰ Astin (1967) 61–4; quotation from 64.

to Spain as some kind of junior officer. As depicted by Polybius, his action catalyzed Rome. His reputation for apathy evaporated, and hordes of men followed his initiative and proffered their services (Pol. 35.4.7–14).

This move too closely resembles Africanus' behaviour in 211 to be coincidence. According to Livy, after the deaths of Africanus' father and uncle no one could be found to assume the command in Spain. Then the young man put himself forward, and the crowd rapturously ratified his appointment (Livy 26.18.2–9). The similarity led Scullard, followed by Walsh, to conclude that Livy's account retrojects the circumstances of 151 sixty years earlier.³¹ The idea that the episode of 211 was reconstructed from that of Aemilianus' day carries some weight, but the interaction between the two events might be a little more complex than these scholars allow. The basic scenario was the same: warfare in Spain required new leadership, which was provided by someone named Publius Cornelius Scipio. If 211 resembles 151, the reason is that Aemilianus made it so; he turned his adoptive grandfather into a precedent for his own conduct.

It was a brilliant move. At 34 or so, he was already older than Africanus at the time when the latter earned his cognomen. Aemilianus had achieved nothing—Polybius emphasises how he totally reinvented himself from laggard to hero by volunteering—and so had nothing to lose. In effect, he traded up, from personally requested intervention in Macedonia to publicly sanctioned celebrity in Spain. In Macedonia he would have been Paullus' son; but in Spain the ties were doubly strong, for not only had Africanus expelled the Carthaginians and established an enormous client base, but Paulus spent his praetorship in Spain, where he was acclaimed *imperator*.³² In terms of local influence, then, Aemilianus probably had more in Spain. The peninsula presented other opportunities too, most immediately the chance to make a name for himself as a warrior. He seems to have sought to achieve distinction, engaging in single combat and being first over the wall in the siege of Intercatia (Polyb. 35.5.1–2 and *Per.* 48).³³ And opportunity came his way, in the form of a mission to obtain elephants from Masinissa. Presumably he was sent because of the family connection. The errand led to his meeting Masinissa as well as to a request from the Carthaginians to broker terms with the Numidian king (App. *Lib.* 71–2).³⁴ The negotiations failed, but

³¹ Scullard (1951) 66 n. 2; Walsh (1961) 96 n. 2.

³² *CIL* II.5041.

³³ The passage in the Livian epitome encapsulates his double identity: *P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, L. Pauli filius, Africani nepos, sed adoptivus*.

³⁴ This was the occasion of his observing the fight between the latter and Carthaginian forces.

Aemilianus was clearly reaping the benefits of his inherited name. Masinissa subsequently made Aemilianus the executor of his will (App. *Lib.* 105). In short, by following his grandfather to Spain instead of his father to Macedonia, Aemilianus positioned himself to become a new Africanus.

Astin sees Africanus serving as a model in yet another way. In 187 the hero of the Hannibalic war was accused of embezzlement and voluntarily left Rome for his estate in Liternum (Livy 38.50.4–60.10). Aemilianus faced a similar challenge in 140 when he stepped down from the censorship—which he conducted as severely as he could—and was prosecuted by Tiberius Claudius Asellus. Both Cicero and Gellius know of the trial, and the latter refers to Aemilianus’ fifth speech, a number that suggests to Astin that the trial was a close fight.³⁵ He further sees a lesson learned from Africanus: ‘Neither Scipio nor his enemies could be unmindful of the way in which the public career of the elder Africanus had been brought to an ignominious end. Now the second Africanus was being attacked in a similar matter and at a crucial point’.³⁶ The difficulty of proving a negative extends to *exempla*; if Aemilianus succeeded in avoiding exile because Africanus served as a deterrent, there is no way to demonstrate it. The idea, however, is suggestive. In any case, Aemilianus managed to make his public life resemble that of his grandfather enough to be perceived to merit the same cognomen. He too became Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus.

Before moving on, I would like to address a significant counter-argument to the idea that Aemilianus is responsible for the similarities between himself and his father and adoptive grandfather: namely, that a great deal of evidence originates with Polybius. This problem is particularly noteworthy for the initial conversation between the historian and the future Africanus Minor, and for the meditations on *τύχη*. The latter is Polybius’ favourite theme.³⁷ It seems all too convenient that his hero and his hero’s father used nearly identical circumstances to expound upon its workings. Walbank points out that Aemilianus was, according to Plutarch, present when Paullus dilated on the lessons to be learned from Perseus, and he surmises that Aemilianus told Polybius about it. He regards both passages and Aemilianus’ imitation of Paullus as genuine.³⁸ That is certainly one scenario. If Polybius’ earnest protestations about his narrative’s veracity are to be relied on, contemporaries, both Greek and Roman, had access to his work

³⁵ Cicero *De Orat.* 2.268; Gel. 2.20.5–6 and 6.11.9; the former includes *ex oratione ... quinta*; Astin (1967) 127.

³⁶ Astin (1967) 176.

³⁷ See Walbank (1957–79) I.16–26.

³⁸ Walbank (1957–79) III.392.

during his lifetime and would have discredited outright falsifications (31.22.8–11).³⁹ One could also adopt any number of more sceptical positions: Perseus and Hasdrubal were brought before Paullus and Aemilianus respectively, but no one recollected exactly what words were spoken, and Polybius made his historical actors say what he thought they should have about *τύχη*. Or one scene took place more or less as Polybius reports it, and he assimilated the other to it. Alternatively, one could discard the episodes altogether as evidence for Aemilianus as a quoter of his forebears.

More troubling because more fundamental is the introductory conversation between the historian and the Roman. Apart from the fact that it presents Polybius in an extremely flattering light, he had adumbrated it in an earlier, now lost passage (31.23.1), and he uses it to set up his interpretation of Aemilianus. So, for example, the conversation starts Aemilianus on the path to achieving *ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη δόξαν* (31.25.2). When he volunteers to go to Spain, Polybius introduces him by saying that he had by then acquired *ἐπὶ καλοκάγαθία καὶ σωφροσύνη δόξαν* (35.4.8). This intratextual allusion exposes the connection between the two passages. One might reasonably suspect that Polybius forged an Aemilianus eager to live up to his family name(s) and likely to imitate noble ancestors whenever he could.

The Polybius–Aemilianus exchange presents a further problem. In 1945 Paul Friedlander published an article arguing that the scene noticeably resembled the conversation between Socrates and Alcibiades in Plato's *Greater Alcibiades*. He regards the later conversation as having nothing to do with 'literary tradition or literary imitation', but rather as 'an exact and highly reliable report' precisely because Polybius himself participated. His explanation for the similarities is that 'The event, probably at the very moment when it happened, and certainly at a later time when it was written down, evoked the scene from Plato's dialogue in Polybius' mind'.⁴⁰ In other words, the historical conversation occurred and reminded one interlocutor of a literary conversation, with the result that when he wrote up the historical conversation it carried resonances of its literary predecessor. This type of intertextuality is closely related to Marincola's 'intertextuality of real life'⁴¹ and the coincidences between life and literature Levene notes. One could also follow Levene and suggest that Polybius deliberately played Socrates to Aemilianus' Alcibiades. That line of interpretation transfers everything to the

³⁹ For Champion (2004), Polybius' dual audience is key to his narrative; see esp. 7, and 96–8.

⁴⁰ Friedlander (1945) 337–48, quotations from 344 and 347 respectively. His larger brief is to show Platonic influence on Rome's development, and he appends a discussion of Aristotle (348–51).

⁴¹ See p. 3 above.

textual world: Polybius imitates Plato to lay the foundation for his figuring of Aemilianus as a man bent on replicating the virtues and accomplishments of his family.

Walbank rejects Friedlander's analysis, arguing against the verbal echoes. He doubts, despite Friedlander's efforts to show the contrary, that Polybius was familiar with the *Greater Alcibiades*, and he cannot imagine that Aemilianus would have liked to be compared to the Athenian renegade.⁴² My own view is that one could discount all the evidence from Polybius—the conversation, the remarks on Fortune, his description of Aemilianus' volunteering for Spain—and that the material cited from Sempronius Asellio, Cicero, and Aulus Gellius nonetheless suffices to show that Aemilianus consistently and intentionally borrowed from Paullus' and Africanus' lexica of actions and that his career thus manifests a systematic program of both allusion to past actions and appropriation of the past as an intertext for himself.

3. Implications and Conclusions

The Romans had a habit of manufacturing allusions. Sulla said of Caesar 'There are many Mariuses in him'.⁴³ Lentulus boasted to his associates that he would be a second Sulla.⁴⁴ Of course this tendency is not specific to them. Agesilaus attempted to sacrifice at Aulis to establish himself as a second Agamemnon and, as noted, Alexander both modelled himself on Achilles and inspired multiple imitators.⁴⁵ Nonetheless, Roman republican elite culture enshrined imitation to an extraordinary degree. Jasper Griffin has stressed that it was second nature for Romans 'to see through history' and to recognise one event or person in another'.⁴⁶

This inclination has repercussions for historiography, with its proprietary attitude towards real people and real actions. If the ancient tradition about Aemilianus correlates at all with who he was and was perceived to be, it is necessary to take seriously the role of historical actors in creating the allusions found in texts: the quotation may actually have happened, and the historical personage joins the writer, the audience, and linguistic systems as a source of both allusions and intertexts.

⁴² Walbank (1957–79) III.496.

⁴³ *Nam Caesari multos Marios inesse* (Suet. *Iul.* 1.)

⁴⁴ *Seque alterum fore Sullam inter suos gloriatur* (Caes. *BC* 1.4.2).

⁴⁵ For Agesilaus, see Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.3–4 and 7.1.34, and Plut. *Ages.* 6.4–6; for Alexander, see pp. 3–4 above.

⁴⁶ Griffin (1986) 191 with n. 3 for the quotation from Gregory of Nyssa. One theme of Griffin's book is the way that the Augustan poets incorporate real life in their poetry. On the Romans' orientation towards the past, see Bettini (1991) and on the importance of history in Roman republican culture, Walter (2004).

This conclusion then has implications for the ideas advanced by the scholars discussed initially. Levene proposes a model of joint authorship, where one historian accepts a predecessor's account and chooses to transmit it, with the degree of variation depending on his own preference. The shared authority behind an allusion could in addition be that of historian and historical personage. A possible example is Aemilianus' speech about Fortune. He was present at his father's remarks on the same subject, and both he, necessarily, and Polybius, probably, were on hand for his own. They might in various ways have colluded in the allusion now preserved in Polybius' text. This in turn relates to Haimson Lushkov's discussion of source citation. When Polybius purports to be relaying a conversation between himself and Aemilianus, he blurs what happened and how he knows what happened. It is not surprising that he decided to reassure his Greek audience that his Roman audience guarantees his *bona fides* (31.22.8–11). An extreme version of shared authority is Damon's indeterminacy. Here the audience too participates in the authoring of allusions: one person or event resembles another because everyone knows that the similarity ought to be there. This could be called the 'crowd-sourcing' of allusions.

Further, it is possible to amplify Marincola's observations about intertextuality and exemplarity. Throughout the paper I have used the terms allusion and intertext, sometimes loosely (either for *variatio* or because intertextuality lacks a verb), but more often deliberately. When it comes to exemplarity, the difference between the terms matters because *exempla* can either be allusions or make intertexts. An *exemplum* is an allusion in that when someone invokes a historical precursor, he is alluding to it; but at the same time, the act of invoking an *exemplum* actually makes that precursor into an intertext. Africanus' offer to go to Spain was not an *exemplum* until Aemilianus imitated it. In that sense, exemplarity is identical to intertextuality; everything is latent until someone decides it is meaningful. Much as someone might hope his behaviour will set a precedent or inspire imitation, until someone else chooses to adopt his model, the behaviour remains in a potential state. In the case of Africanus (as with any other historical actor), there were potentially infinite interpretations. Aemilianus chose to canonise the volunteering, the defeat of Carthage, and succumbing to the pitfalls of civilian life. A negative analogue comes from Stephen Hinds' account of Statius' failed attempt to make Roman epic be about the *Metamorphoses* rather than the *Aeneid*.⁴⁷ History is written not so much by the victors as by the living; the survivors get to decide what the past means. As Paul Cohen puts it in *History*

⁴⁷ Hinds (1998) 142–4.

in *Three Keys*, ‘the lived past’ is ‘outcome-blind’, and historical meaning is determined by what happens next.⁴⁸

The comparison of what Aemilianus made out of Africanus and Paullus with what Statius failed to construct of the *Metamorphoses* leads to the central concern of this seminar: is there anything here that poetic literature, perhaps especially Roman historical epic, cannot do? In principle, the answer is no. If in practice no one in poetry sets out to become a particular person in the way that Aemilianus consciously modelled himself on Paullus and Africanus, the possibility is still there.⁴⁹ But different kinds of allusive relationships are suited to different genres.⁵⁰ Because of its relationship to reality, historiography is better than most poetry at conveying allusions that originate with a historical actor. As Chris Pelling put it in his APA paper, his argument was not limited to historiography because ‘other genres also deal with real life, but in a filtered transposition’.⁵¹

In fact, the implications of Aemilianus’ intertextual relationships may well be more important for the practice of history than they are for the reading of literature. If the second Africanus fashioned himself from his father and grandfather, and in the process of doing so constituted them as intertexts and in that sense defined them, then it is necessary to re-think our understanding of those two men. The case of the Hannibalic war hero is particularly acute because of his status in Roman republican history.⁵² Precisely because of Africanus’ significance, there is an accordingly vast bibliography. I do not pretend to command it, but wish to make only a general point: the narrative arc of Africanus’ life is rise and fall. He shot to prominence with Hannibal’s invasion, became a hero when he volunteered to go to Spain in 211, and subsequently defeated Hannibal in Africa and ended Rome’s worst war. After an awkward interval of nearly two decades, when Africanus was clearly involved in Roman public life but had no comparable success, he was publicly disgraced and went into retirement. Modern biographers dwell

⁴⁸ Cohen (1997) 61–2; quotations from p. 61.

⁴⁹ Seneca’s Medea, who becomes herself (*Medea* 171), is somewhat comparable, but she belongs to the realm of myth rather than history from Seneca’s perspective, and as a character in a writer’s tragedy, her intentions are Seneca’s.

⁵⁰ As Hinds (1998) 115 notes, ‘For poets who handle mythological themes, occasions for negotiation between the time-frames of the narrated world and the time-frames of their own poetic traditions will tend to rise again and again’; while for historiography, as Levene (2011) 2 points out, it is less likely that a text can prefigure its events through allusion. An extended example is that of Sallust’s Catiline and Livy’s Hannibal, as shown in Clauss (1997).

⁵¹ Pelling (2013) 18.

⁵² Paullus does not excite the same interest or attention.

on the ‘rise’, wrestle with the bridge years, and then turn to the ‘fall’. This last narrative segment is nicely illustrated by the titles of the relevant chapters in book-length studies of Africanus: Haywood’s ‘Catastrophe’, Scullard’s ‘The Decline and Fall of the Scipios’, Eberhard’s ‘Scipios Sturz und Abschied’, and Gabriel’s ‘Triumph and Fall’.⁵³

The pattern of rise and fall, familiar and satisfying, obscures something more fundamental about our understanding of Africanus, namely that any narrative of his life traditionally derives sequentially from first Polybius and then the Roman historical tradition, represented above all by Livy. For many scholars this means that one starts with a reliable source and then resorts to a repeatedly hopeless one.⁵⁴ While there is wide recognition that Polybius’ portrait of Africanus is laudatory and intended to complement his depiction of Aemilianus,⁵⁵ there is less attention to the problems caused by shifting from one source to another. Polybius created a panegyric,⁵⁶ and its living beneficiary, Aemilianus, collaborated in authoring it, at least in so far as he constituted Africanus as his prototype, if not also in the information he gave Polybius. The Greek historian was so willing to think highly of Africanus that he includes a story full of errors and impossibilities about Africanus’ election to the aedileship (10.4.1–5.8). He could do no wrong, in Polybius’ eyes. When Africanus, through treachery, burns Syphax’s camp, Polybius describes the devastation as horrific and then immediately characterises the deed as Africanus’ most glorious and adventurous (14.5.13–14). The juxtaposition is stunning, and perfectly illustrates Polybius’ tunnel vision. The Roman authors, by contrast, provide something closer to a panoramic view, and their Africanus is far more of a mixed bag. He saved Rome, but he also was dragged by his father from a woman’s bed,⁵⁷ antagonised senior members of the senate,⁵⁸ and was charged with mismanaging public funds.⁵⁹

I do not question Scipio’s accomplishments during the second Punic war, but it is worth wondering whether a more nuanced figure would

⁵³ Haywood (1933), Scullard (1970), Eberhard (2007), and Gabriel (2008).

⁵⁴ For discontent with Livy as a source, see e.g. Scullard (1970) 174, 216, and 289 n. 178.

⁵⁵ e.g. Walbank (1957–79) III.499.

⁵⁶ I refer here not to the question of the Scipionic legend, but rather to Polybius’ overall depiction of Africanus as flawless.

⁵⁷ Gellius reports the belief Naevius’ lines about a war hero being brought home by his father from an *amica* refer to Scipio Africanus (7.8.5).

⁵⁸ For example, the policy split depicted by Livy over the best way to end the war (28.40.2).

⁵⁹ i.e. Valerius Antias’ messy story about the trials of the Scipios, as conveyed by Livy, 38.50.4–60.10.

emerge from a more balanced treatment of the information available. R. M. Haywood, elaborating on Mommsen's argument that the senate decided to send Africanus to Spain and therefore ensured that he was the only candidate, argues vigorously that Claudius Nero was recalled from that theater out of necessity; Africanus, by contrast, was more expendable and could serve away from the Italian peninsula.⁶⁰ Marcia Patterson goes even further, showing how desperately short on leaders the Romans were at this stage of the war.⁶¹ Africanus was not so much a hero in the making as a decent alternative, with enough experience and the right family connections to be a good choice. Nor was he the only Wunderkind of his era: P. Licinius Crassus was elected censor for 210 at the age of 25 and before he had held the consulship.⁶² Flamininus was consul when not yet 30, and without having held the praetorship.⁶³ The Romans responded to a shortage of experienced generals by promoting younger men (as well as by proroguing commands).

At the other end of Africanus' career—the fall—whatever caused him to withdraw to Liternum, his disgrace could not have been very great or his *imago* would not have been exhibited on the Capitol.⁶⁴ Erich Gruen has attempted to dismantle the evidence for the matrix of prosecutions against the Scipio brothers in the 180's. He argues for just one trial, that of Lucius in 187, which did not prevent the younger brother from making a bid for the censorship, albeit an unsuccessful one, the following year. Here Polybius should perhaps carry more weight and the Roman tradition less than usual for, as Gruen points out, Polybius says only that someone tried to prosecute Africanus, not that there was a trial. In Gruen's view, Africanus left Rome in a display of disgust, and as he puts it, "There was no fall of the Scipios".⁶⁵ One does not have to accept Gruen's view entirely to see that Africanus' 'fall' was far from complete. Livy, for example, can make him an *exemplum* of a shabbily treated leader, an equivalence that works only if Africanus remained generally admired (45.38.7). And it is not necessary to wait for Livy to learn that, for Africanus' adopted grandson would not have wanted to trade on his name and legacy if he truly had lost all repute. Aemilianus co-opted him as an intertext because he continued to be regarded as Rome's saviour.

⁶⁰ Haywood (1933) 48–53.

⁶¹ Patterson (1945).

⁶² *RE* 69.

⁶³ *RE* 45.

⁶⁴ Val. Max. 8.15.1–2 for the *imago*.

⁶⁵ Gruen (1995), esp. 73–90; the quotation is from p. 88.

Once we remove the extremes of the meteoric rise and the devastating fall, the puzzle of Africanus' light footprint between the Hannibalic war and the trials is eliminated.⁶⁶ He defeated Hannibal and ended the war, for which he was celebrated—and named *princeps senatus* and elected censor. But perhaps he was not as singular and special as his grandson and Polybius encouraged people to believe. Scullard's words 'Our knowledge of Scipio in fact derives very largely, in the final analysis, from the personal link between his family and the Greek historian' should serve as a warning to look away from Aemilianus' Africanus and to scrutinise the shadows for other dimensions.⁶⁷ The interpretation of Africanus matters for the entire trajectory of Roman republican history because of the pivotal role assigned to him. There is a tendency to see him as ahead of his time, an anticipation of the first-century warlords. His failure to achieve dominance then becomes proof of the senate's strength and ability to rein in powerful individuals. If he was less powerful to begin with, it is necessary to recalibrate his place in the Romans' history.⁶⁸ In part this role for Scipio Africanus in republican history goes back to the Romans. He either refused honours later given to Caesar or, more probably, was said to have done so. Thus already in the first century he was potentially a suitable candidate as a precedent or *exemplum* or intertext for the penultimate warlord.

Since a sentence in Livy is the only evidence for Africanus' refusal to be named perpetual consul and dictator, to have statues of himself in major public locations, and to have the statue in triumphal dress brought from the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus—a negative, in short, that provided an intertext for Caesar—it looks as if that potentiality was never realised and that Caesar did not remake Africanus in his own image. He was, of course, pursuing other options, such as a familial connection with Venus.⁶⁹

The past is capacious, and a good place to find what one is looking for. Studying people who were students and systematic exploiters of their own past is the discipline of history's equivalent of studying nested narratives. Republican Romans made something of their past, and when we try to understand them and that past, it is good to pay attention to their cultural habits. Quoting history is one of those *mores*, and for that reason it is productive to look at intertextuality and classical historiography together. My brief here is to urge that the fruits of this ongoing scholarly conversation

⁶⁶ E.g. McDonald (1938) and Scullard (1970) 178; Haywood (1933) 59–85 strives to show Africanus' importance in the wars against Philip and Antiochus, but his case is thin.

⁶⁷ Scullard (1970) 11.

⁶⁸ Livy 38.56.12–13 with Briscoe (2008) ad loc.

⁶⁹ See e.g. Weinstock (1971) 17–19.

be brought back to the practice of history. Even as historians avoid *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, it is worth considering *ante hoc ergo propter hoc*, and the taxonomy of historiographic intertextuality should include the implications for ‘what really happened’.

Middlebury College

JANE D. CHAPLIN
chaplin@middlebury.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ash, R. (2007) *Tacitus: Histories II* (Cambridge).
- Astin, A. E. (1967) *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford).
- Bettini, M. (1991) *Anthropology and Roman Culture. Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*, trans. from the Italian by J. Van Sickle (Baltimore and London).
- Briscoe, J. (2008) *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40* (Oxford).
- Champion, C. B. (2004) *Cultural Politics in Polybius' Histories* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London).
- Clauss, J. J. (1997) 'Domestici Hostes: the Nausicaa in Medea, the Catiline in Hannibal', *MD* 39: 165–85.
- Coarelli, F. (1988) *Il sepolcro degli Scipioni* (Rome).
- Cohen, P. A. (1997) *History in Three Keys: The Boxers as Event, Experience, and Myth* (New York).
- Damon, C. (2010) 'Déjà vu or déjà lu? History as Intertext', *PLLS* 14: 375–88.
- Dillery, J. (2009) 'Roman Historians and the Greeks: Audiences and Models', in Feldherr (2009) 77–107.
- Eberhard, H. (2007) *Triumph und Tragik : Leben und Wirken des Scipio Africanus d. Ä., Begründer des römischen Weltreiches* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Feldherr, A., ed. (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge).
- Flower, H. (1996) *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford).
- Friedlander, P. (1945) 'Socrates Enters Rome', *AJPh* 66: 337–51.
- Gabriel, R. A. (2008) *Scipio Africanus: Rome's Greatest General* (Washington, DC).
- Griffin, J. (1986) *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London and Chapel Hill).
- Gruen, E. S. (1995) 'The "Fall" of the Scipios' in I. Malkin and Z. W. Rubinson, edd., *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World. Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz* (Leiden–New York–Köln) 59–90.
- Haimson Lushkov, A. (2013) 'Citation and the Dynamics of Tradition in Livy's *AUC*', *Histos* 7: 21–47.
- Haywood, R. M. (1933) 'Studies on Scipio Africanus', *The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* 51 (Baltimore).
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, (Cambridge).
- Levene, D. S. (2006) 'History, Metahistory and Audience Response in Livy 45', *CLAnt* 25: 73–108.
- (2011) 'Historical Allusion and the Nature of the Historical Text', *Histos Working Papers* 2011.01.
- MacMullen, R. (1966) *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge, Mass.).

- Marincola, J. (2010) 'The "Rhetoric" of History: Intertextuality and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches', in D. Pausch, ed., *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie* (Berlin–New York) 259–80.
- McDonald, A. H. (1938) 'Scipio Africanus and Roman Politics in the Second Century B.C.', *JRS* 28: 153–64.
- O'Gorman, Ellen (2009) 'Intertextuality and Historiography' in Feldherr (2009) 231–42.
- Patterson, M. L. (1942) 'Rome's Choice of Magistrates during the Hannibalic War', *TAPA* 73: 319–40.
- Pelling, C. (2013) 'Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation', *Histos* 7: 1–20.
- Rawson, E. (1991) *Roman Culture and Society. Collected Papers* (Oxford).
- Scullard, H. H. (1951) *Roman Politics, 220–150* (Oxford).
- (1970) *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician* (London and Ithaca).
- Walbank, F. W. (1957–79) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- Walsh, P. G. (1961) *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge).
- Walter, U. (2004) *Memoria und Res Publica: zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Weinstock, S. (1971) *Divus Julius* (Oxford).
- Woodman, A. J. (1979) 'Self-Imitation and the Substance of History. Tacitus, *Annals* 1.61–5 and *Histories* 2.70, 5.14–15', in D. West and A. J. Woodman eds., *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge) 143–55; repr. in A. J. Woodman, *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford, 1998) 70–85).