

This paper explores the function of citation practices as literary devices in Livy's *AUC*, and defines the specific dynamics of historical citation against the broader categories of intertextuality and allusion. Building on now familiar work on intertextuality in Roman poetry (e.g., Edmunds 2001, Farrell 2005, Hinds 1998, Thomas 1986), and especially meta-poetic reference ('the Alexandrian footnote,' Hinds 1998:2), I argue that Livy uses citation not only to acknowledge his sources, but also to place his history within a literary and cultural tradition, as well as to construct and negotiate his own authority within that tradition. The historiographical treatment of sources thus acquires renewed importance as a key to understanding both the process of composition and the self-fashioning of the author within a literary tradition.

This paper begins by offering a typology of Livy's overall intertextual practice. Proceeding from a basic distinction between anonymous allusion and named citation, I argue that Livy is capable of varying degrees of textual appropriation, ranging from complete absorption of episodes without explicit acknowledgment all the way to scholarly *Quellenforschung*. Within that range, I recognize three main categories: 1) *anonymous adaptation* (e.g., the duel of Manlius and the Gaul (Livy 7.9-10; Quadrigarius ap. Gellius 7.9.1-6 = F 10b Peter = Beck and Walter 2004:117-8) or wide-ranging adaptation from Polybius); 2) *named citation* (e.g., 21.46.8-10 (Coelius Antipater); 38.50.5 (Valerius Antias)); and 3) *intratextual citation*, by which I mean those citations that point not only to the work of another author but also to material in Livy's own text (e.g., 32.6.5 (Valerius Antias); 29.27.13-15 and 38.52.5-7 (consensus of authors)).

Focusing on citation, especially of types 2 and 3, I suggest that Livy occasionally conflates inter- and intra-textual relationships and in doing so advertises the alluding author's – i.e., Livy's – mastery over his predecessor and source. By pointing to episodes and evidence subsumed within his own text even as he refers to documents, artifacts or texts that properly belong outside of it, I argue that Livy renders external reference ultimately subordinate to internal reference (cf. Chaplin 2000, Jaeger 1997). The entwining of inter- and intra-textual relationships subjects current assumptions about ancient historical method to literary and generic considerations. In this light source-citation is revealed as a literary device as well as a technical procedure in the transmission of historical knowledge. Further, this practice allows Livy to establish his place in a broader generic tradition while positioning himself as superior to his predecessors and ultimately representing his work as commensurate with Rome and its history. As such, intertextuality becomes a powerful tool for exploring the dynamics of the historical tradition. I conclude by suggesting that this historiographical approach to intertextuality is deeply rooted in Augustan literary culture, and is symbolic of contemporary political, aesthetic and cultural values.