

Representing Zama to create an iconic event

Frances Billot

University of Auckland

FrancesBillot@gmail.com

The Hadrianic author Florus describes the battle at Zama¹ in 202BC as the most important battle in Roman history; Scipio and Hannibal are considered two of the greatest generals of all time, one for conquering Italy, the other for Spain:

non fuit maior sub imperio Romano dies quam ille, cum duo omnium et antea et postea ducum maximi duces, ille Italiae, hic Hispaniae victor, conlatis comminus signis direxere aciem (Florus, 1.22.58).²

In the time before the Roman empire there was no greater occasion than when the two generals, better than any before or since, the one the conqueror of Italy, the other of Spain, brought their armies together for pitched battle.³

To consider why Florus singles out Zama, Scipio and Hannibal from all the options available to him, this paper compares how three earlier authors who covered the story of the Second Punic War, Polybius, Livy, and Silius Italicus, present the battle at Zama in their texts (other authors, such as Appian and Cornelius Nepos, are drawn on where they help illustrate a point). All three authors treat the battle at Zama as the climactic event of, or grand finale to, the Second Punic

¹ Cornelius Nepos (*Hann.* 6) gave the battle its familiar title, Zama; Silius Italicus uses the same name, *Pun.* 3.261. For Scipio and Zama, see Scullard (1970) 140-160; Goldsworthy, (2001) 286-309.

² Florus *Epitome of Roman History*, Loeb edn. (Cambridge, Mass. 1995). Latin and Greek quotations are taken from the Loeb editions (giving details) unless indicated otherwise.

³ Adapted from Forster (1995) 113. Translations are taken or adapted from the Loeb editions, unless indicated otherwise.

War, and this paper argues that, despite their different aims and genres, this broad agreement between them is demonstrable through similarities in their presentations in the use of certain structural and literary features.

The features compared here are often found in relation to promoting particular events, such as battles like Zama, but rarely applied in totality to one event. In this respect the battle at Zama is unique in the extant texts and the cumulative effect is to promote it as a highly significant event. The features considered in this paper are charted in Appendix A and include: the location of the event within each text; representations of what the protagonists thought they were fighting for; representations of a meeting between Scipio and Hannibal prior to battle; use and patterning of speeches; patterning of harangues against descriptions of the disposition of forces; comparisons of Scipio and Hannibal; battle scenes that hint of epic, hand-to-hand combat and/or a duel between Scipio and Hannibal.

This analysis requires reading Polybius' *Histories* as a literary text, which is challenging for some because Polybius' credible style of prose presentation and self-professed pragmatism are deceptively comforting to the modern reader. Polybius' apparent credibility, coupled with the stated respect for him by ancient authors, has resulted in a tendency among modern scholarship to accept Polybius' interpretation of events over other texts while glossing over the underlying style of the *Histories*.⁴ Nonetheless there are those who study Polybius in relation to a role in

⁴ Astin (1970; 1982 <2005>) esp. 9-10 prioritises Polybius over Livy as a source text for this period; Silius is not mentioned, even in the 'literary texts' section. Walbank's powerful three volume *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, (1957-1979) and lifetime of scholarship overshadows discussions of Polybius as a literary text; his comparisons of Polybius and Livy are usually discussed in terms of Livy's use of sources. Also Tränkle (1977); Moore (1989); Hoyos (2001) 68-92; (2006); (2008) 5; Briscoe (1980) 189-191; Bosworth (2003) 168. Cicero and Livy indicate that later Romans had great respect for Polybius while acknowledging his shortcomings, especially a bias for the Scipio family, Cicero, *De Off.* 3.113.7; *ad Fam.* 5.12.2.8; *ad Att.* 13.30.2.2; Livy, 30.45.7; 33.10.10; 34.50.6; 36.19.11; 39.52.1; 45.44.20. For Livy's sources see Walsh (1963) ch. 5; Mellor (1999) 67 calls Livy's praise of Polybius at Livy, 30.45 a 'unique accolade.' This does not mean that Livy prioritises Polybius over others; the citations above show that Livy more frequently acknowledges a preference for Polybius in the fourth decad. His

historiography, including Davidson, Mehl and Marincola.⁵ The comparisons made in this paper supports their work as it highlights some of the literary qualities of Polybius' *Histories* in order to illuminate the complex engagement between Silius Italicus and two of his historiographical predecessors.⁶ In some instances it is shown that Silius seems to combine features that are otherwise exclusive today to either Polybius or Livy.

Wiseman⁷ argued that the 'Scipio myth' is derived from the presentations in Polybius' *Histories* and Silius' *Punica* which recognises a correlation between these two texts; although arguably Polybius' presentation suggests that the 'Scipio myth' long predates the *Punica*. The correlation between the *Histories* and the *Punica* over the role of Scipio is illustrated by a brief comparative overview of the importance of Zama to the three authors: Polybius believed that the outcome of Roman victory over Carthage was pivotal to shifting the balance of power across the wider Mediterranean area, and that one man, Scipio Africanus, was largely responsible for taking the war to Africa, defeating Hannibal and ending the war (*Hist.* 16.23). Polybius supports this view by treating the battle at Zama as a major event and opens the battle narrative with the comment that he believed the Carthaginians fighting for their own safety and for Africa but that the Romans were fighting for domination of the entire world⁸:

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαύριον ἅμα τῷ φωτὶ τὰς δυνάμεις ἐξῆγον ἀμφοτέροι καὶ συνίσταντο τὸν ἀγῶνα, Καρχηδόνιοι μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς σφετέρας σωτηρίας καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην πραγμάτων, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ περὶ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῆς καὶ δυναστείας (*Hist.* 15.9.2).

praise of Polybius at 30.45.7 is balanced against his strongest criticism of Polybius at the end of the fourth decad - over Polybius' dating for the death of Hannibal (Livy, 39.52.1).

⁵ Davidson (2009) 123-136; Marincola (1997; 2007 esp. 'Introduction'); Mehl (2011) 9: 'For Greeks and Romans, historical narratives were ... works of literature...' For style in Livy, see Luce (1977) 139-229.

⁶ For Silius Italicus and historiography, see Gibson (2010); Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2492-2561.

⁷ Wiseman (2004) 177 believes that Scipio Africanus was the first historic Roman figure to be assigned divine parentage.

⁸ Adapted from Paton (2000) 485.

This anachronistic assessment of Roman ambition seems to be Polybius' justification for his extensive and extraordinary treatment of Zama.⁹ His belief that Roman ambition was for world domination is a recurring theme in his text, first expressed in the *Introduction* (*Hist.* 1.3.7), voiced through Scipio in his harangue just prior to battle at Zama (*Hist.* 15.10.2) as well as commented on by Polybius in *Histories* 9 when he reflects on the Roman plundering of Syracuse and thought it impossible to aim for world domination without first removing the wealth of others (*Hist.* 9.10.11-13).

Livy is more muted over the role of Scipio as an individual and his narrative draws attention to the many other Romans involved; thus the decisive victory over Hannibal at Zama is the result of both a collective and individual Roman effort. It was considered a pivotal event for a Mediterranean power struggle as Livy's report on the meeting between Hannibal and Scipio has *both* parties saying that they were fighting for world domination (Livy, 30.32.2). Livy repeats the sentiment at the close of *Hannibal's* (not Scipio's) harangue to the Carthaginian component in his army, when Hannibal tells them that they faced either servitude or ruling the world (Livy, 30.33.11). Although Zama is presented as a critical event, Livy's narrative of the aftermath indicates that it took longer than Polybius implied for Carthage to capitulate (Livy, 30.33.7; *Per.* 30).¹⁰

Silius Italicus' *Punica* 17 is closer to Polybius' view in that he returns the audience focus to the individual, Scipio Africanus, and that the victory at Zama also marks a subtle shift of power - not, however, across the Mediterranean as Polybius presents it, but at Rome. Silius' representation of Scipio's rise to power and victory at Zama has been interpreted as presenting

⁹ Walbank (1967) 444 describes Polybius' comment as an 'interesting anachronism' ... the issue of the Second Punic War was not yet of interest ... beyond the western Mediterranean, despite Agelaus' warning *Hist.* 5.104.

¹⁰ Cornelius Nepos also says that Hannibal continued warfare in Africa for some years after Zama (Cornelius Nepos *Hann.* 6).

the first step toward the principate and the one-man rule of imperial Rome.¹¹ The link is made more explicit at the close of the *Punica*, where Silius salutes Scipio as a parent or father (*parens*, *Pun.* 17.651) a title that became particularly associated with the principate and imperial Rome (neither Polybius nor Livy use the term or any of its cognates in respect of Scipio Africanus in their extant texts).¹² Silius voices through Hannibal alone that it was a battle for world domination, and like Livy, he places it toward the close of Hannibal's harangue where it carries more emphasis:

Non altera restat

iam Libyae nec Dardaniis pugna altera restat.

certatus nobis hodie dominum accipit orbis. (Pun. 17.335-7)

Neither Carthage nor Rome can fight another battle. Today must decide the struggle between us for mastery of the world.¹³

The first half of Polybius' *Histories* 15 is devoted to Zama, including the events leading up to it and follow-up analysis (*Hist.* 15.1-19). Even given the fragmentary state of *Histories* 15, this is relatively extraordinary treatment for one battle when Polybius is writing a 'universal history' (the remainder of *Histories* 15 covers events in Asia Minor, Greece and Egypt). Yet for the amount of space devoted to it, his Zama narrative is little more informative in historical terms

¹¹ Ahl, Davis, Pomeroy (1986) 2505-11; Cowan (2010) 335. Fears (1981) 779: 'the literary image of Scipio assumes various attributes of Hellenistic kingship. Ennius celebrated Scipio as *invictus* and thus associated the victory with the person not Rome as a society.' Marks (2005) argues that Silius Italicus presents Scipio as a positive role model for Domitian.

¹² Whilst acknowledging the modern book divisions do not necessarily reflect the original text, in this instance the divisions do not affect the overall argument.

¹³ Duff (1989) 463.

than his treatment of other notable battles.¹⁴ Polybius builds up tension through the first three chapters of *Histories* 15 when Scipio sends Roman envoys sent to Carthage to inform them that the Romans had ratified the treaty; the envoys fail in their mission and their ship is attacked, which leads to a resumption of hostilities (*Histories* 15.1-3). There is another, final, attempt at peace negotiations through a meeting between Scipio and Hannibal who each have a formal speech. The battle narrative is also preceded by harangues given by Scipio and Hannibal. After the battle, Polybius devotes a further five chapters to its aftermath in the form of analysis of Hannibal's tactics; summarising Scipio's attitude to the Carthaginians, and outlining the terms Scipio imposed. Hannibal is given a final address, in direct speech, at Carthage persuading the Carthaginians to accept Scipio's terms (*Histories* 15.19.2-8). After this Polybius does not return to affairs between Rome and Carthage until the next appearance of Scipio at his triumph, placed by editors at *Histories* 16.23. Notwithstanding the missing text, Polybius' presentation of the interactions between Scipio and the Carthaginians suggests that the Carthaginians capitulated shortly after Hannibal's defeat at Zama.

Livy locates the battle at Zama in the last quarter of the final book for the third decad; it is the final battle in the decad, and presented as the closing battle to the Second Punic War (Livy 30.33-35). In the chapters immediately following the battle, Livy's narrative indicates that it took time for the Carthaginians to accept overall defeat but they had done so by the time of the penultimate chapter which contains Hannibal's final speech in the decad. Hannibal's address to the Carthaginian senate is not urging them to accept the peace terms, as in Polybius, but arguing that the indemnity owed to Rome could be raised through a wealth tax. Hannibal's voice is used to foreshadow a major topic on Carthaginian politics that features early in the following decad.

¹⁴ Walbank (1967) 446: 'there are more problems - sources, chronology, site, numbers and tactics - over Zama than for any other battle in the war.' This is quite remarkable considering how much space Polybius devotes to it.

Meanwhile, the third decad closes with a memory of the Roman victory at Zama with the description of Scipio's triumph.

Silius locates the battle towards the close of the *Punica* 17 (*Pun.* 17.385-617) and condenses time as the poem moves quickly from the battlefield through Hannibal's final speech to Scipio's triumph at Rome (*Pun.* 17.618-654). In one sense this structure echoes the extant structure of Polybius in that 'Roman affairs' in the *Histories* moves from the victory on the battlefield to Scipio's triumph; in another sense it follows Livy's structure by closing the story with Scipio's triumph. The poem diverges from both Livy and Polybius as Hannibal's final speech is not an address to the Carthaginian Senate but a soliloquy in which Hannibal sits on a rock musing about his loss and swearing to continue his enmity against the Roman people (*Pun.* 17.606-15).

It has been observed that Livy makes no comment on anyone aiming for world rule in the opening to the third decad in book 21.¹⁵ In contrast, Polybius' and Silius' views on what the combatants thought they were fighting over at Zama have echoes in their introductions (*Hist.* 1.3.7; *Pun.* 1.7-8). Incidentally, of the various representations over what Rome and Carthage were fighting for at Zama, it is perhaps Florus who summarises the outcome in terms that most closely reflect the historical reality: Africa was the prize of victory, and after Africa, the rest of the world soon followed: *praemiumque victoriae Africa fuit et secutus Africam statim terrarium orbis* (Florus, 1.22.61).

A number of authors present a 'moment in history' depicting Scipio and Hannibal meeting shortly before Zama to discuss the possibility of agreeing to peace terms (Polybius *Hist.* 15.6.3-14; Livy 30.30-31; Appian *Pun.* 39; Florus 1.22.58; Zon. 9.14). The attempted peace negotiation is a unique event and distinguishes Zama from the other battles in the Second Punic

¹⁵ Gibson (2010) 52.

War, as, apparently for the first time, the two opposing generals are said to meet. The marked differences in the representations of the meeting among the ancient texts as well as the inclusion of artificially scripted speeches by Scipio and Hannibal has led to much discussion over the historicity or otherwise of the meeting.¹⁶

Polybius depicts Hannibal requesting the meeting out of respect for Scipio's courage and unusual treatment of captured Carthaginian spies (the spies were caught but returned unharmed after being taken on a conducted tour of Scipio's camp, *Hist.* 15.5.9-10; 15.6.1).¹⁷ Polybius' remark about Hannibal being impressed with Scipio may underlie the descriptions by Livy and Florus that purport to record Hannibal and Scipio gazing at each other in mutual admiration at the start of their meeting: *et steterunt diu mutua admiratione defixi* (Florus, 1.22.58). Livy's scene is so over-dramatised that it creates an impression of a degree of irony:

Summotis pari spatio armatis, cum singulis interpretibus congressi sunt, non suae modo aetatis maximi duces, sed omnis ante se memoriae, omnium gentium cuilibet regum imperatorumve pares. Paulisper alter alterius conspectus, admiratione mutua prope attoniti, conticuere. Livy, 30.30.1-2

Keeping the armed men at the same distance, each accompanied by an interpreter, they advanced to meet, being not only the greatest leaders of their own age, but of all before

¹⁶ Walbank (1967) 451: 'the meeting possible... but...might be derived from Ennius'; Paton (2000) 533 n16; at n17 and n18 acknowledges Hannibal's and Scipio's speeches as unlikely to be historical; Goldsworthy (2001) 301 accepts the meeting but not the speeches; also Seibert (1993), 465. Mellor (1999) 61 describes the meeting in Livy's text as 'fictitious... but... encapsulates the confrontation better than any description of battle tactics.'

¹⁷ Valerius Maximus, 3.7.1d, cites the event as an example of Scipio's self-confidence and intention to break the enemy psychologically. Walbank (1967) 450 notes the parallels to Xerxes' treatment of three Greek spies in Herodotus 7.146.7, and in Laevinus' treatment of Pyrrhus' spies in Dion. Hal. 19.11; Zon. 8.3.6; Frontinus, *Strat.* 4.7.7. Goldsworthy (2001) 301: Scipio's treatment of the spies was ... either to convince Hannibal that Masinissa had not yet arrived (*Hist.* 15.3) or to demoralise Hannibal because Masinissa had arrived (Livy, 30.29.1-10).

their time of any race, equals of any kings or generals. For a while they remained silent, looking at each other and almost dumbfounded by mutual admiration.¹⁸

Livy acknowledges various traditions about the meeting, including Valerius Antias saying that Hannibal was one of a group of delegates who met Scipio to discuss terms after Hannibal had been defeated by Scipio in a battle prior to Zama (Livy, 30.29.7). In addition, Livy casts doubt on the credibility of the speeches said to have taken place by commenting that the meeting was held in private, so when Scipio addressed his men afterwards, he was free to report on the meeting as he wished: *ad hoc conloquium Hannibalis in secreto habitum ac liberum fingenti qua volt flectit* (Livy, 30.32.8-9).

Furthermore Livy is not convinced over Hannibal's motives and wonders if Hannibal requested the meeting because he had an order from Carthage: *id utrum sua sponte fecerit an publico consilio neutrum cur adfirmem habeo* (Livy, 30.29.6). Cornelius Nepos believes that there was a meeting but it was not held at Hannibal's request out of admiration for Scipio but because Carthaginian resources were depleted and Hannibal wanted to negotiate a truce to buy more time. The two men could not agree on terms and fought at Zama a few days later (Cornelius Nepos, *Hann.* 6.3). Like Nepos, Livy's seed of doubt that Hannibal genuinely sought to negotiate peace enables those among the readers who believe in Hannibal as an eternal enemy to continue in that belief as eternal enemies are unlikely figures to seek peace.¹⁹

The 'aggressive' Hannibal who will not negotiate is closer to the overall depiction of the Hannibal figure in the *Punica*. There is no meeting between Scipio and Hannibal in the *Punica* but there might be a lacuna in *Punica 17* following line 290.²⁰ The text seems to break just after

¹⁸ Adapted from Moore (1955) 473.

¹⁹ Cf. Rossi (2004) 359: Livy's version of the meeting is 'indebted to Polybius' account' ... 'Livy's Hannibal has some distinct non-Polybian characteristics.'

²⁰ See McGushin (1985).

Venus persuades Neptune to calm his storm against Hannibal sailing to Africa because the next line opens with Hannibal's harangue to his men just prior to battle at Zama. Therefore, if Silius Italicus had included a meeting between Scipio and Hannibal, it is lost. The Loeb translator, Duff,²¹ believes it inconceivable that Silius Italicus would omit such a dramatic moment, yet it is possible that Silius Italicus did *not* include the meeting because his more general depiction of Hannibal in the *Punica* does not present him as the negotiating type. In support of this view, when Scipio was in the underworld, he met the ghost of Hannibal's father, Hasdrubal, who reminded Scipio of Hannibal's *fides* to his childhood oath before they went their separate ways in hatred (*Pun.*13.736-751).²²

Speeches are a feature of both ancient historiography and epic poetry.²³ Apart from the speaker, the inclusion, placement, sequence, length and voice of speeches prior to an event are all indicators to the importance of that event. Where the importance of a battle might be indicated with the inclusion of paired harangues in direct or indirect speech by the opposing generals, Zama is preceded not only by paired harangues but also, in both Livy and Polybius, paired speeches assigned to Scipio and Hannibal at their meeting beforehand.

Polybius and Livy both present the meeting to negotiate peace in the form of a proposal and response given in direct speech. In both cases, Hannibal, as supposed initiator of the meeting, speaks first and Scipio responds, and in each case, Hannibal's speech is relatively long compared to Scipio's. Hannibal supposedly sues for peace but provocatively offers no more than

²¹ Duff (1989) 460, n.a: 'that some verses... have been lost here seems... certain... Further it is known that Scipio and Hannibal met in conference before the battle... it is inconceivable that Silius should pass over an incident so dramatic.'

²² Interestingly, Appian's description of the meeting between Scipio and Hannibal is similar to this meeting - the two are said to part after exchanging threats (Appian, *Pun.* 7.39).

²³ Gibson (2010) 67; Mehl (2011) 21; Marincola (2007) ch9.

that which Romans haven't already taken (Spain, Sicily and other islands), and concludes with a note of pessimism while Scipio's reply is brief to the point of being curt, and unrelenting.

Thus Polybius presents Hannibal offering a peace treaty on the basis that Spain and all the islands between Africa and Italy recently conquered by Rome will belong to Rome, closing with a promise not to wage war against Rome. Hannibal's opening preamble reviews the war through summarising his own command and reflects a touch of pessimism on the vicissitudes of Fortune (*Hist.* 15.6.4-7.9; 15.7.8-9).²⁴ Indeed, Scipio's reply rejects all Roman responsibility for the war, claims that Carthage had broken a recently negotiated truce, and does not believe that Hannibal is genuinely seeking peace. He closes with a challenge that Hannibal either surrenders unconditionally or fights (*Hist.* 15.8.2-14).

Livy's Hannibal has a much longer speech than the one in Polybius' text. Hannibal reviews not only his own career but also shows that he is fully aware of Scipio's extraordinary rise to power. His summary of the main events of the war effectively reviews the decad from fighting Scipio's father at Trasimene to facing Scipio in Africa. Thus the two Scipios are linked through facing the same enemy and the only figure who spans the decad. In a possible response to the point about who started the war made by the Polybian Scipio, Livy's Hannibal *accepts* responsibility for being the aggressor and explains his current situation by claiming that he incurred the envy of the gods for conducting the war so well.²⁵ Rossi notes that Hannibal's concluding offer of lands already taken by Rome through conquest and expression of pessimism

²⁴ Walbank (1967) 452: noted the sense of hindsight underlying Hannibal's expectation that Scipio would not show magnanimity. 'Hannibal's speech might be derived from Ennius *Ann.* 312-13... but... its Hellenistic sentiments are commonplace, the parallelism slight and the Ennian context uncertain.'

²⁵ Moore (1989) 60 says that Scipio is given the highest praise when Livy couples *pietas* and *virtus* in Hannibal's speech (Livy, 30.30.13). That depends how much value is placed on praise voiced by an enemy in private conversation (Livy, 30.32).

that Scipio would not negotiate for peace are the closest points of contact to Polybius' version of Hannibal's speech (Livy 30.30.3-30).²⁶

Kraus and Woodman, in their study of Livy's passage, note that Scipio's response is in sharp contrast to the mutual respect implied at the start of the meeting.²⁷ Livy himself acknowledges that his version of Scipio's speech was not historically exact: *hanc fere sententiam respondit* (Livy, 30.31.1). Livy's Scipio extends the claim made in Polybius about the cause of the war to accuse the Carthaginians of being the aggressors in both the First and Second Punic Wars, and that Hannibal only left Italy because Scipio invaded Africa. This Scipio further claims that if Hannibal had returned to Africa and sued for peace before Scipio's invasion, the Romans might have negotiated but now demands that Hannibal either agrees to an additional indemnity on the previous terms or they fight (Livy, 30.31.2-9). (Polybius presented Scipio demanding unconditional surrender.)

Polybius and Livy both pattern the paired harangues by Scipio and Hannibal with paired summaries of the dispositions of the respective armies. These two pairs are patterned slightly differently in each text. Polybius creates a chiasmic ArBrBcAc²⁸ pattern as he describes the dispositions for the Roman forces before summarising Scipio's harangue. Hannibal's harangue is next, followed by the disposition of the Carthaginian forces. The sense of symmetry is further enhanced by roughly the same number of lines being devoted to each description of the dispositions. The paired harangues, however, are reversed in terms of length against the paired speeches given in the earlier 'private' meeting. This time Scipio has the longer, direct speech while Hannibal's harangue is considerably shorter, partly reported and partly direct.

²⁶ Rossi (2004) 1.

²⁷ Kraus and Woodman (1997) 60.

²⁸ A: dispositions; B: speech; r: Roman; c: Carthaginian.

In terms of content, Scipio's harangue echoes Polybius' theme that the Romans were fighting for world domination. It also creates a link back to *Hannibal's* harangue at the Ticinus River shortly before defeating Scipio's father, through the admonition that the men must conquer or die (ἢ νικᾶν ἢ θνήσκειν *Hist.* 15.10.6 cf. *Hist.* 3.63.4). The phrase reminds the audience that the situation is now a reversal of that first battle in Italy because the Romans are now the invading force and have no escape route.

Hannibal's harangue looks back to the past as he reminds his men of their three great victories against Scipio's father, Flaminius and Aemilius Paulus, as well as their seventeen years of comradeship in Italy; he urges them to maintain their invincible record (*Hist.* 15.11.6-12).²⁹ Walbank describes both speeches as 'mainly commonplaces.'³⁰ This may be so, nevertheless Hannibal's harangue seems, at least in part, adapted to suit the figure who is about to be defeated.

The sequence of the two exhortations in Livy's text is a reversal of that in the Polybian account and they are patterned differently against the army dispositions. The exhortations are directly adjacent to each other, in indirect speech, with Hannibal's first, and they precede the paired dispositions of the forces (Roman dispositions placed first) to create a different pattern: BcBrArAc (Livy, 30.33). In addition, Luce identified a further pairing of exhortations as those by the two Scipios (father, son) and Hannibal to their respective armies before battle at the Ticinus River and at Zama, describing them as the only such chiastically arranged pairs in Livy's surviving work.³¹

In terms of content, Hannibal's exhortation has subtle differences to the one in Polybius' text. Hannibal reminded his men of their *sixteen* years spent in Italy and, in keeping with Livy's

²⁹ Unlike Livy, Polybius does not record a defeat of Hannibal by Marcellus outside Nola.

³⁰ Walbank (1967) 456 on Scipio: 'little but commonplaces ... there may be some anachronism;' cf. 459 (Hannibal).

³¹ Luce (1977) 27, n. 58 sequence of speeches: Book 21: Scipio – Hannibal; Book 30: Hannibal – Scipio.

depiction of Hannibal losing a battle to Marcellus; this Hannibal does not claim an ‘invincible’ record in Italy. It is apparent that this Hannibal knows many men personally as he recalls the deeds of certain individuals (language was no barrier) but there is no list of famous Romans killed (Livy, 30.32.4).³² Scipio’s harangue opens by recalling the Roman conquest in Spain; he accuses the Carthaginians as treaty breakers with an innate lack of *fides* and closes by looking forward, not to world domination but to something far more tangible for his men, the spoils of Carthage and their return home to their families: *Adesse finem belli ac laboris, in manibus esse praedam Carthaginiis, reditum domum in patriam ad parentes, liberos, coniuges penatesque deos* Livy, 30.32.10.

Silius Italicus treats the material differently but nevertheless combines features from both Polybius and Livy. If dispositions of the two armies prior to Zama were included in the *Punica* then they must have been placed before the harangues which are adjacent to each other, in an (AA)Bc(Br) pattern. Scipio’s harangue is bracketed because he was cut short before saying anything: his men are so eager to fight that they don’t need further encouragement (*Pun.* 17.340). Thus only Hannibal actually addresses his troops and his harangue, in direct speech, is longer than the one in Livy’s text. It also differs where the emphasised *tu* or *te* throughout the speech suggests that the epic Hannibal recognises individual soldiers more quickly by their feats in battle than by their names and faces. Silius’ Hannibal also echoes and develops the ‘Hannibal’ harangue in Polybius’ text in the sense that where the Polybian Hannibal recalled the three victories over Scipio’s father, Flaminius and Aemilius Paulus, Silius’ Hannibal gives a roll-call of famous Romans killed over the course of the war (Flaminius, Paulus, Marcellus, Gracchus, Appius, Fulvius, Crispinus as well as the elder Scipio *Pun.* 17.295-337). Hannibal concludes

³² Serrati (2005) 250 argues that Hannibal spent many years in Spain and may have spoken local dialects as well as Punic - and Greek from his tutor. Cf. Kaplan (2003) 34: ‘Hannibal could only communicate through interpreters.’

with an acknowledgment that this battle is ‘final’ and echoes the Polybian ahistorical claim that it is for world domination: *certatus nobis hodie dominum accipit orbis* (*Pun.* 17.337).

Polybius inserts proverbs and quotes from Homeric poetry at intervals through his battle narrative and Zama is the only event given such treatment in the extant sections of the *Histories*. Polybius’ first quotation, described by Walbank³³ as a contaminated mixture of Homer’s *Iliad* 2.804; 4.437 and *Odyssey* 19.175, compares the plethora of voices in the Carthaginian army to the Trojans whose allies came from many areas:

οὐδ’ ἴα γῆρυς,
 ἄλλη δ’ ἄλλων γλῶσσα, πολύκλητοι δ’ ἔσαν ἄνδρες,
 καθάπερ ἀρτίως ἐξηριθμησάμην. *Hist.* 15.12.9

Mixed was the murmur, and confused the sound,
 their names all various.³⁴

ἄλλη δ’ ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων. *Iliad* 2.804³⁵

οὐδ’ ἴα γῆρυς,
 ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ’ ἔσαν ἄνδρες. *Iliad* 4.437
 ἄλλη δ’ ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη: ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοί, *Odyssey* 19.175

Polybius thus elevates Zama to an epic status, perhaps countering Thucydides’ claim that the Trojan War could not be compared to a contemporary conflict (*Thuc.* 1.7.3) although similar comparisons and the metaphor for confused enemy noise are also in narratives of Greek victories

³³ Walbank (1967) 459; also Paton (2011) 551 n19.

³⁴ Paton (2011) 493.

³⁵ Homer, *Iliad* and *Odyssey* text extracts taken from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>

over the Persians.³⁶ In this instance, Polybius contrasts the confused noise on the Carthaginian side against the united Roman war cry and custom of striking their swords against their shields as they approach the enemy. Comparing the Carthaginians to the Trojans is an interesting choice on the part of Polybius, and perhaps indicates that Roman claims of descent from the Trojans were not yet entrenched at the time of writing. In historical terms the comparison is less valid because Hannibal had a good record of managing an army of mixed ethnicities³⁷ and, indeed, the Roman side also comprised a multiplicity of peoples not least of which were their new Numidian allies.

Polybius not only compares the Carthaginians to the Trojans but later quotes *Iliad* 4.300 to compare Hannibal to King Agamemnon for the manner in which Hannibal forced any reluctant Carthaginians³⁸ to keep fighting by placing them in the middle, behind the mercenaries thus also forcing the mercenaries to fight (*Hist.* 15.16.3). Comparing Hannibal to Agamemnon not only connects Hannibal to the mythical king of the *Iliad* but also to the well-known figure of Greek Tragedy.

The provenance of Polybius' final proverb comparing Hannibal and Scipio is not known: *a brave man meets another braver yet*.³⁹ ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν ἄλλου κρείττονος ἀντέτυχεν (*Hist.* 15.16.6). Walbank suggests that it may be from a Hellenistic poem.⁴⁰ In sum, Polybius attributes Hannibal's defeat to a mix of bad luck and being up against a better man; the corollary for Scipio being a combination of personal merit and good fortune.⁴¹

³⁶ Goldsworthy (2001) 305.

³⁷ Polybius may have prepared his audience for this analogy earlier when he described Hannibal ordering his officers to address their own contingents in the army while he addressed the Carthaginians (*Hist.* 15.11.4-6).

³⁸ Walbank (1967) 464 notes that the sense is changed by Livy, 30.35.7 where Hannibal's mercenaries are the unstable element placed in the centre. Frontinus, *Strat.* 2.3.16 says Hannibal put his Italians in the rear because he distrusted their loyalty. The logic seems odd, those least trustworthy are unlikely to be at the rear where they can attack from behind (cf. Cannae).

³⁹ Paton (2011) 501.

⁴⁰ Walbank (1967) 464 summarises the arguments for the origins in either a Hellenistic epigram, or the killing of Eurypylus by Neoptolemus or a quote from Theognis.

⁴¹ See Fears (1981) 760-1 for discussion on Polybius' use of luck and personal merit.

Livy does not quote from epic poetry, but applies the superlative to elevate Zama through his description of the generals' personal qualities, the bravery of their armies, and the comparative wealth of the two peoples:

ad hoc discrimen procedunt postero die duorum opulentissimorum populorum duo longe clarissimi duces, duo fortissimi exercitus, multa ante parta decora aut cumulaturi eo die aut eversuri Livy, 30.32.4

To this dispute they went out on the following day, the two most distinguished generals and the two bravest armies of the two wealthiest nations, either to crown the many distinctions previously won or to bring them to nothing.⁴²

Silius, already in epic mode, turns to the divine. Jupiter and Juno converse and Jupiter decides on the fates of Hannibal and of Carthage (*Pun.* 17.341-85). The final decision lay with Jupiter because, unlike Polybius' estimation, the comparison of the epic Scipio and Hannibal shows they are equal (*Pun.* 17.401-405). However it was not a difficult decision because Scipio's divine heritage had been confirmed earlier in *Punica 13* in due course, it would be claimed for Caesar, thus Zama marks both an end and a new beginning (*Pun.* 13.634-647; 17.356-4).⁴³ This dual role of Zama in the *Punica* was heralded through an earlier comparison to the late-republican civil war battle at Thapsus where Silius described the two battlefields as sites of spilt Roman blood (*Pun.* 3.261).⁴⁴ The context of the spilt blood was, of course, quite different, the two 'victorious'

⁴² Adapted from Moore (1955) 487.

⁴³ Also Boyle and Sullivan (1991) 303.

⁴⁴ Ahl, Davis, Pomeroy (1986) 2518 note the link to Lucan: 'another Scipio confronts Caesar ... at Thapsus: the battle that Lucan says the ghosts of Carthage will have their fill of Roman blood (Lucan 6.309-311).'

Scipios involved were at opposite ends of the scale for *virtus* and another Scipio was defeated (Suetonius, *D. Iul.* 59).

According to Polybius, Hannibal's tactics were thwarted from the beginning when his elephants began their charge but panicked. Some ran back toward Hannibal's ranks, others ran down the spaces created as Scipio's men stepped aside. As the Roman infantry gradually gained ground, the Carthaginian centre began to give way, some of them turned back. However, as Hannibal would not allow those who turned back into the ranks they began to fight those behind. In the meantime, the Roman cavalry defeated and chased off the Carthaginian cavalry leaving Hannibal's flanks exposed.⁴⁵ The 2000 Loeb and Teubner editions of the *Histories* bracket an opening phrase at *Hist.* 15.13.1 that describes the battle in terms of hand-to-hand combat [the men using neither spears nor swords] with a footnote suggesting that the phrase was a late insertion.⁴⁶ The Perseus Digital Library text and the 2011 Loeb change the negative and the phrase [διὰ τὸ μὴ δόρασι <ἀλλὰ> μηδὲ ξίφεσι χρῆσθαι τοὺς ἀγωνιζομένους]: *the whole battle was fought at close quarters with swords, not spears* (*Hist.* 15.13.1). This confusion suggests a number of possibilities that later copyists and editors were so imbued with traditions about Zama and/or expectations about Polybius' style that the original text was corrupted beyond recognition.

Although there is much in common between Livy and Polybius for the battle narrative at Zama, the differences are important.⁴⁷ While not directly describing the battle in terms of hand-to-hand or close combat, Livy puts it in very personal terms of Scipio and Hannibal as if matched against each other for decisive combat: *Scipio et Hannibal velut ad supremum certamen*

⁴⁵ For discussions of the battle, see Goldsworthy (2001) 298-309; 193-203; Bradford (1981) 193-203.

⁴⁶ Paton (2011) 498, note b alerts the reader to a possible interpolation.

⁴⁷ Miller (1975) 46; 51-53 Livy used Polybius for this episode. Cf. Tränkle (1977) 241 argues for close adherence to a mutual source. Chaplin (2000) 25; Burck (1967) 440-52 that the 'Hannibal speech' before Zama is the closest that Livy comes to simply reproducing Polybius.

comparati duces (Livy, 30.28.8). Livy's approach may be different, but the effect nevertheless adds to the aura of Zama.

Silius Italicus' representation of Zama is unique in the sense that it does not include elephants although there is a possible poetic allusion to the pathways created by the Romans stepping aside for the elephants to charge down (Livy 30.34) when Silius says that wide passages appeared as men fell which others rushed to fill (*Pun.* 17.420-5). The other difference (apart from the missing elephants) is that the epic Scipio searches around the battlefield for Hannibal to challenge him for the spectacle of a decisive contest (*Pun.* 17.517-8). For the last time, Juno intervenes and removes Hannibal from the battlefield (for one reason or another, Hannibal never remains on the battlefield in the *Punica*, even in victory); as Juno is invisible to the Carthaginians, they believe that Hannibal has deserted them and lose heart (*Pun.* 17.585-8). Thus Silius does not directly bring Scipio and Hannibal together in a duel, although he conveys a sense of realism in that Scipio may well have wished he fought Hannibal one-to-one.⁴⁸

To sum up, there were two main strands to this paper. Firstly the comparisons illustrate how Zama is presented as a grand finale to the Second Punic War through the inclusion of a range of literary features which created an aura that endured for centuries. Secondly the comparisons aimed to highlight some of the literary construct underlying Polybius' treatment of Zama, such as in the patterning of the speeches and army dispositions, and the content of the four speeches.

Polybius and Livy use the Hannibal figure to review the war at his meeting with Scipio, and they use the harangues to create a link to the Ticinus River at the start of the war. The difference is that Polybius repeats a memorable phrase that the men must conquer or die while

⁴⁸ Appian represents the metaphor as 'reality.' Scipio and Hannibal duel with their armies, until out of compassion for tired soldiers, they attack each other directly; the spectacle reinvigorates the men (Appian, *Pun.* 8.7.44-6).

Livy applies a chiasmic patterning. Where Polybius elevates the status of Zama through including quotes from epic and proverbs, Livy applies the superlative to describe the battle as one of the most memorable ever fought. Personalising the battle as if Scipio and Hannibal are in some kind of duel aligns them with an epic tradition of single combat, a feature that the epic poet, Silius Italicus, alludes to, yet avoids direct representation. Appian's transformation of the metaphor to presenting single combat between Scipio and Hannibal as they throw spears at each other indicates the strength of the tradition to personalise this battle.

Polybius and Silius have a connection in that both authors reference Zama as a pivotal event with long-term political ramifications, albeit for different reasons. Occasionally Silius appears to respond to Polybius' presentation with a similar method to Livy, for example, where Livy might be described by expanding Polybius' version of Hannibal's speech in his meeting with Scipio, Silius expands the Polybian version of Hannibal's harangue with names of the defeated Romans. However, with so much missing from the ancient world, it's not possible to draw hard and fast conclusions about either Livy or Silius Italicus representing Polybius' text in more than simply historical terms.

To return to Florus, these earlier texts support his contention that Zama was the greatest battle ever fought. He summarised it as an even-handed battle where both sides fought long and hard. Everyone said that both generals and armies made the best of the occasion, Scipio said as much about Hannibal and Hannibal about Scipio: *hoc Scipio de Annibalis, Annibal de Scipionis exercitu praedicaverunt* (Florus, 1.22.60).

Appendix A: Representing Zama to create an iconic event

	Polybius	Livy	Silius Italicus	Others
Location in text	First half <i>Hist</i> 15. Battle scene: <i>Hist.</i> 15.12-14 Scipio's triumph: <i>Hist.</i> 16	Last quarter book 30 3 rd decad: 30.33-35 Scipio's triumph closes decad	Closing book of <i>Punica</i> 17.385-617. Scipio's triumph closes <i>Pun.</i> 17.625-650	
Fighting for:	Romans: world domination. Carthaginians: selves & Africa <i>Hist.</i> 15.9.2. Also voiced by Scipio <i>Hist.</i> 15.10.2; Pol. <i>Hist</i> 1.3.7; 16.23	Reports that both parties aiming for world domination <i>Livy</i> , 30.32.2. Also voiced by Hannibal: <i>Livy</i> 30.33.11.	Voiced by Hannibal that both aiming for world domination <i>Pun.</i> 17.335-7. Also Introduction <i>Pun.</i> 1.7-8	<i>Florus</i> 1.22.61: Africa was the prize of victory; the rest of world soon followed.
Meeting before battle to discuss possible peace terms	At Hannibal's request - out of respect for Scipio's courage <i>Hist.</i> 15.6.3-14	At Hannibal's request. Hannibal and Scipio in mutual admiration: <i>Livy</i> 30.30-31	Not in extant text.	<i>Nepos, Han.</i> 6.3; <i>Appian, Pun.</i> 39, <i>Zon.</i> 9.14; <i>Florus</i> 1.22.58. <i>Valerius Antias:</i> group meeting <i>Livy</i> , 30.29.7
Speeches at meeting	Han: <i>Hist.</i> 15.6.4-7.9 Scipio: <i>Hist.</i> 15.8.2- 14	Han: <i>Livy</i> 30.30.3-30 Scipio: <i>Livy</i> , 30.31.2- 9		

<p>Pattern of harangues with disposition of forces</p> <p>A= Dispositions B = Harangue r = Roman c = Carthaginian</p>	<p>ArBrBcAc</p> <p>Scipio: <i>Hist.</i> 15.10.1-7</p> <p>Han.: <i>Hist.</i> 15.11.6-12</p>	<p>BcBrArAc</p> <p>Livy, 30.33</p> <p>Han.: Livy, 30.32.4</p> <p>Scipio: Livy, 30.32.10-11</p>	<p>(AA)Bc(Br)</p> <p>Han: <i>Pun.</i> 17.295-337</p> <p>Scipio: <i>Pun.</i> 17.340</p>	
<p>Hannibal harangue names famous Romans previously killed</p>	<p>H recalls deaths of Scipio; Flaminius; Paulus. <i>Hist.</i> 15.11.6-12</p>	<p>No names in harangue. Livy 30.32.4</p>	<p>H gives a roll call of Romans killed: <i>Pun.</i> 17.295-337</p>	
<p>Links Zama to mythological or dramatic figures</p>	<p><i>Hist.</i> 15.12.9</p> <p>Cf. <i>Il.</i> 2.803-4</p> <p>Han. & Agamemnon: <i>Hist.</i> 15.16.3 <i>Il.</i> 4.300</p> <p><i>Hist.</i> 15.12.9: Confusion of voices, <i>Il.</i> 4.437</p> <p>Scipio: <i>Hist.</i> 15.16.6</p>	<p>Compares Scipio & Hannibal, uses superlatives</p> <p>Livy, 30.32.4</p>	<p>Jupiter & Juno converse: <i>Pun.</i> 17.371-85.</p> <p>Scipio divine heritage <i>Pun.</i> 17.653-4</p> <p>Zama and Thapsus: <i>Pun.</i> 3.261-264</p>	<p>Appian, <i>Pun.</i> 8.7.43-7</p>
<p>Scipio and Hannibal 'duel' with armies</p>	<p><i>Hist.</i> 15.13.1</p> <p>Man to man fighting at close quarters</p>	<p>Intro: Scipio and Hannibal pitched against each other</p> <p>Livy, 30.28.8</p>	<p>Scipio searches Han for single combat <i>Pun.</i> 17.517-8</p>	<p>Florus, 1.22.60</p> <p>Appian: <i>Pun.</i> 8.7.44-7 esp. 8.7.43</p>

Works cited

- Ahl, F. M., Davis, M. and Pomeroy, A. (1986). 'Silius Italicus,' *ANRW* II 32.4, 2492-2561
Berlin.
- Augostakis, A. (2010). (ed) *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Astin, A. E. (1970; 1982 <2005>). 'Sources' in *The Cambridge Ancient History* vol. 8, 3rd and
4th editions, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bosworth, B. (2003). 'Plus ça change...Ancient historians and their sources,' *Classical Antiquity*
167-198.
- Boyle, A. J. and Sullivan, J. P. (1991). (eds.) *Roman Poets of the Early Empire*. London:
Penguin.
- Bradford, E. (1981). *Hannibal*. London: Macmillan.
- Briscoe, J. (1980). Review of Walbank, F. W. (1979) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*,
Volume iii, Commentary on Books xix-xl, Oxford: Clarendon Press in *The Classical*
Review 30.2, 189-191.
- Burck, E. (1967). *Wege zu Livius*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Chaplin, J. D. (2000). *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University
Press
- Cowan, R. (2010). 'Virtual Epic' in Augostakis, A. (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*.
Leiden: Brill.
- Davidson, J. (2009). 'Polybius' in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Roman Historians*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 123-136.
- Fears, J. R. (1981). 'The theology of victory at Rome: Approaches and problems.' *ANRW* 17.2,
736-826, Berlin.
- Feldherr, A. (2009). (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*. Cambridge UK:
Cambridge University Press.
- Florus . (1995). *Epitome of Roman History*, Loeb edn. Cambridge, Mass.: University of Harvard
Press.
- Forster, E. S. (1995). (transl.) *Florus: Epitome of Roman History* (Loeb edn.). Cambridge, Mass.:
University of Harvard Press.

- Gibson, B. (2010a). 'Silius Italicus: A Consular Historian?' in Augostakis, A. (ed) *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gibson, B. (2010b). 'Causation in Post-Augustan Epic' in Miller, John F. and Woodman, A. J. (eds.) *Latin Historiography and Poetry in the Early Empire* Mnemosyne Supplements Volume 321, Leiden: Brill, 29-47.
- Goldsworthy, A. (2001). *The Punic Wars*. London: Cassell Military.
- Hoyos, D. (2001). 'Generals and annalists: Geographic and chronological obscurities in the Scipios' campaigns in Spain, 218-211BC,' *Klio* 833, 68-92.
- Hoyos, D. (2006). 'Introduction' in Yardley, J. C. (2006). Transl. *Livy Hannibal's War Books 21-30*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoyos, D. (2008). *Hannibal: Rome's Greatest Enemy*. Exeter, U.K.: Bristol Phoenix.
- Kaplan, R. D. (2003). *Warrior Politics: Why Leadership Demands a Pagan Ethos*. New York: Random House.
- Kraus, C. S. and Woodman, A. J. (1997). *Latin Historians*. Oxford and New York: Published for the Classical Association by Oxford University Press.
- Luce, T. J. (1977). *Livy: the Composition of his History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Marincola, J. (1997). *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Marincola, J. (2007). (ed) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell. Blackwell Reference Online. 24 August 2012 <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781405102162_chunk_g97814051021622>
- Marks, R. (2005). *From Republic to Empire. Scipio Africanus in the Punica of Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang.
- McGushin, P. (1985). *The Transmission of the Punica of Silius Italicus*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Mehl, A., (2011). *Roman Historiography* (transl. Mueller, H-F.). Stuttgart: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mellor, R. (1999). *The Roman Historians*. London and New York: Routledge
- Miller, N. P. (1975). 'Dramatic speech in the Roman historians,' *G&R* 22.1: 45-57.

- Moore, T. J. (1989). *Artistry and Ideology: Livy's Vocabulary of Virtue*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.
- Moore, F. G. (1955). transl., *Livy* (Loeb edn.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Paton, W. R. (2000). transl. *Polybius Histories* (Loeb edn.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Paton, W. R. (2011). (transl.) *Polybius Histories* vol. 4, books 9-15 (Loeb edn.). Cambridge, Mass.: University of Harvard Press.
- Pitcher, L. V. (2007) 'Characterization in Ancient Historiography.' *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Marincola, John (ed). Blackwell Publishing, 2007. Blackwell Reference Online. 25 August 2012 <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781405102162_chunk_g978140510216210>
- Rossi, A. (2004). 'Parallel lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's third decade,' *TAPA* 134.2, 359-381.
- Scullard, H. H. (1970). *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Seibert, J. (1993). *Hannibal*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Serrati, J. (2005). Review of Hoyos, D. (2003). *Hannibal's Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247-183 BC*. London in *JRS* XVC: 249-251.
- Tränkle, H. (1977). *Livius und Polybios*. Basel and Stuttgart: Schwabe.
- Walbank, F. W. (1957-1979). *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Walsh, P. G. (1963). *Livy, his Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiseman, T. P. (2004). *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.