This article considers aspects of the psychagogy and rhetoric of two speeches by Livy's 'ideal Roman', P. Scipio Africanus Maior, who is perhaps the chief character in the third decade of the *Ab urbe condita*.

XXVI.41.3–25 is an opening address delivered, at the outset of Scipio's Spanish campaign, to his father's veterans, and XXVIII.43.2–44.18 is a reply, on the eve of his triumphant departure for Africa, to the strictures of Fabius Maximus Cunctator.

Various scholars, of course, have to a greater or lesser extent analyzed the majority of Livy's speeches, these included; but until recently, as Burck observes, most of the discussions were concerned above all with a mechanical or statistical treatment of the rhetorical content, so that specific discussion and illustration of the differentiation of the psychagogy and of the other artistic elements behind the rhetoric had scarcely been attempted.

The formal rhetoric of the two speeches comprises:

A. The three *genera causarum*—*iudiciale, deliberatium, demonstratium* (Arist., *Rhet.* I.3 ff.; Quint. III.4.12 ff.);

B. the allied *genera dicendi*—*subtile, grande, medium* (Quint. XII.10.59);

C. the four basic *partes orationis*—*exordium, narratio, argumentatio, peroratio* (Quint. IV.1.1.);

D. the well known rhetorical divisions—*utile, rectum, honestum*, etc., or their opposites (Quint. III.8.2 ff.); and

E. the technical formulation of the linguistic elements, as set forth especially by Quintilian (Quint. VIII and IX).

The underlying psychagogy—which is made up of the elements that help to persuade the reader: rhetoric, attitude adopted, content and scope—is a feature of the presentation which is partly elucidated by the disposition of Livy's speeches throughout the narrative. Each of the speeches analyzed below is accordingly introduced by some brief remarks on its allotted position within the decade. It remains to add that a summary of XXVIII.40.3–42.22 (Fabius' speech) must precede the assessment of Scipio's reply.

When Scipio is introduced into Book XXVI (18.7), the tide of the second Punic War has begun to turn in Rome's favour. The history has been so ordered that after the recovery of Capua (1.1–5; 5.1–2), the new disposition for the Spanish
theatre of war stands out as a turning-point in the struggle: 'Et Romae senatui populoque post receptam Capuam non Italiae iam maior quam Hispaniae cura erat' (18.2). Thus Scipio's election to the proconsulship of Spain is especially significant; and Livy gives an aptly graphic portrayal of events at the polls (18.6–19.1). While senate and people falter as to who will assume the new command, Scipio alone steps forward and confidently proffers his candidature; a roar of approval greets him as he is unanimously elected to office (18.8). He then sails to Spain (19.1), and is only later reintroduced into the narrative (41.1). The war has then evolved further in Rome's favour, however, and Livy can justly observe: 'Ita aequante fortuna suspensa omnia erant, integra spe, integro metu, uelut illo tempore primum bellum inciperent' (37.9).

At this critical juncture, then, when for both sides all hangs in the balance, Scipio is drawn to the centre of events to make his first important speech. The major action is briefly retarded as the reader awaits with expectancy the address which is to open the vital command.

XXVI.41.3–24

The exordium (3–5) is a principium ab auditoribus. Scipio is the first general ever to have given his soldiers deserved and justifiable thanks before he has learnt what they can do for him (3). Even before he saw Spain or their headquarters, fortune made a bond between him and them (4). The bond consists of their pietas towards his father and uncle, in life and in death, and of their virtus in recovering Spain for him and for the Roman people (5).

These opening words, which embody a captatio benevolentiae, echo the exordium of an earlier speech, held after the loss of Scipio's father and uncle (XXV.38.2 ff.). Marcius observes that the two fallen generals, pressing him to avenge their country, haunt his thoughts and dreams (5). It is their memory which impels the Spanish troops into battle; proving to the Carthaginians that the nomen Romanum did not perish with the Scipios (9).

At a critical stage in the war, then, when Scipio is about to change the balance in Rome's favour, the psychagogy of the exordium insinuates that the country's resurgent fortunes have been inextricably linked to his gens, and to the pietas and virtus which the memory of his father and uncle has inspired in the troops. This hint is enforced by the structure of 4–5, where the devotion and valour of the troops frame their allegiance. It is further suggested that the successful turn of events has been ordained by a benevolent fortuna which, by dint of their qualities, has auspiciously forged a prior bond between the troops and their new commander.

The exordium, then, suggests Scipio's personal devotion to his house, his own pietas and virtus—displayed, for example, when he saved his father's life in battle (XXI.46.8)—and conveys the ingratiating gist of the principium ab auditoribus and captatio benevolentiae.

'Die Gottheit', Stübler notes, 'steht über der Fortuna, sie ist nicht blind und unberechenbar; wer ihr folgt, kann sich auf sie verlassen.' Thus a confident
Scipio can, at the outset of the *narratio* (6-7), specify clearly and eagerly the general scope of the operations on which, by God's blessing, the troops are poised to embark (6: antithesis, anaphora). Yet he is afraid, at the same time, that the troops may feel misgiving at the scope and boldness of his project; Rome has suffered some crushing defeats in Spain, and he is still young (7).

This deprecatory remark heralds a transition of the argument. Scipio, seeking to salve the troops, spells out the *possibile* (8-13), the opening division of the *argumentatio*. Both reasons for the possible apprehension of the troops first converge in an admission of his own awareness of Rome's defeats in Spain. The significance of these setbacks is rooted for him in his devotion to the Scipionic house (8). This involvement then enables him to turn his painful recollections to apt advantage; his *pietas* and *virtus* appease a bad omen by means of a good one. To be left almost orphaned and desolate was enough to break his spirit; but his confidence in Rome's *fortuna* and *virtus* forbade him to despair of the final issue (9). He then elevates the argument to a wider plane. Rome's *fortuna* and *virtus* merge with his affirmation of the destiny granted her people by some inscrutable *fatum*; that in all their great wars they have emerged victorious from defeat (9).

The *pietas* and *virtus* of the Spanish troops have enabled them to secure Rome's recovery in Spain, which *fortuna* has ensured by dint of their devotion to the Scipios (3-5). Yet their young general's devotion to his house—*pietas* and *virtus* are generated in him, as in them, by remembrance of its fall—reveals to him not only Rome's destiny, but the providence which has ordained her continuance.

This auspicious psychagogy enhances the import of 9, which is now elaborated in a vivid review of the misfortunes which have befallen Rome in her past wars (10-12). The rhetoric intensifies with Scipio's feelings at a vital stage of the argument. He must vouch for the workings of *fatum* by translating Rome's past defeats, in equal proportion as they were disastrous, into the harbinger of victory for the troops in his forthcoming campaign.

Asyndeton evinces his impatience as he dismisses Rome's early struggles with Porsenna, the Gauls, the Samnites (10, first part) and anaphora stresses the heavy Roman losses of the first Punic War (10, second part). A *percunctatio* introduces the review of the present war. Scipio, by dint of his *pietas*, is so intimately a part of the terrible struggle (11, *omnibus . . . sensi*), that he is uncertain where to begin. Yet despite his youth (cf. 7), he can nevertheless recount with feeling the disastrous course of the war.

Trebia, Trasimene, Cannae, what do they signify but the loss of Rome's armies, and the deaths of her consuls? (11). Add the defection of Italy, much of Sicily, and Sardinia; and the moment of ultimate horror and fear: the Carthaginians encamped between the Anio and Rome, victor Hannibal almost within the gates (12).

The rhetoric—asyndeton (11), two anaphoristic imperatives, asyndeton, polysyndeton, *homoioioteleuton*, alliteration (12)—conveys the full extent of
Rome's disasters, regarding both Italy and the city itself (12, *adde ... adde*). Transcending this virtual ruin of her fortunes, however, one thing alone stood firm and ensured Rome's continuance: the inviolable, the unshakeable *virtus* of her people (12).

The argument under the *possibile* culminates here as Scipio equates the *virtus populi Romani* of 12 with the *fatum quoddam* of 9. The *exemplum* of her misfortunes, which embraces the whole prior development of the war, is framed by the affirmation of these two reasons for Rome's continuance. This structure imparts a persuasive cogency to the argument in encouragement of the troops.

The *possibile* closes on an intimate note. The troops, too, have shared in the process of Rome's recovery. Had they not checked the Carthaginian advance after Cannae, under the leadership and auspices of Scipio's father, the Roman name would have ceased to exist (13). It is appropriate that their new general, who was also closely involved, should now address them as *milites* for the first time (13).

In 13 Scipio again adduces the *pietas* and *virtus* of the troops as the prop which has sustained the *nomen Romanum* in Spain. This echo of the *exordium* evinces an important aspect of his conception of the struggle. He specified the steadfastness of the troops in the first stage of the war, when his father and uncle were generals, as the factor which had enabled providence to ordain Rome's recovery (6, *iam benigintate deum*). It is apt that, having expounded the dauntless course of this development to them, he should again specify providence at the outset of the second stage (14, *nunc benigintate deum*), in which, under his generalship, the troops are poised to vindicate the Scipios by winning the war.

It is the motif of God's blessing, then, which heralds the *utile* (14-17), in which Scipio reverts to his projected operations and expands the contents of the *narratio* (6-7). Heaven has ensured that Rome's affairs in Italy and Sicily are prospering (14), so that the strategic details can now be put excitedly to the soldiers (15: *asyndeton, alliteration*). Hannibal, too, has been driven from the greater part of Italy, and is on his knees in Bruttium (16). What could be more unreasonable than for the soldiers to be faint-hearted now? They who, with his father and uncle, upheld Rome's broken fortunes during the terrible disasters of the past (17).

The content of 15, by partly reversing the situation set forth in 12, aids the heartening psychagogy of the *utile*. Both Scipio's house and the Spanish soldiers have been plagued with a series of misfortunes (17, cf. 8). By reason of the *benignitas deum*, however, their fortunes are about to revive in the favourable circumstances of the war.

Scipio's demeanour in the preceding divisions has been deferential. The fortunes of his house were clouded (7), and he subordinated his confidence to a disclosure of such features of the *res publica* as might encourage the troops. A lively spirit now suffuses his words, however, and he assumes a very different stand under the *religiosum* (18-19). The lacuna at 18 obscures the exact transition, but the argument, which expands the *utile*, is aptly centred on his
relationship with the immortal gods, the guardians of Rome's empire, who have ordained his election to the Spanish command and now foreshow to him, by portents, omens, dreams, nothing but success (18). His own mind, too, always his most trusted seer, foretells that Spain will fall to Rome: that the Carthaginian soldiers and ships will soon cover land and sea in cowardly flight (19).

A seer (19, uates) is not implicated in the interpretation of the future only; he is also concerned with divining the meaning of the present and the past: his business, all in all, is fatum. Rome's past and present fortunes in the war have been set forth under the preceding divisions of the speech; but the prophecy in 19, auspiciously couched in the present tense and emphasized by alliteration, is a dénouement of Scipio's entire argument. Past, present, and future converge while his inward eye, as it were, discloses to him the whole significance behind the prior development of the action. At this opposite point, then, he openly declares himself to be the fatalis dux huiusce belli.

The last division of the argumentatio is the facile (20–22). A sententia in isocolon takes up the gist of the religiosum—the rational strategy of the general must support the mystical trust of the visionary (20)—as Scipio reveals to the troops the ease with which the campaign will be won. Carthage's allies, now weary of their burdens, are seeking Rome's protection; and her three generals, their respective forces separated, are at odds with one another (20). Clearly, the same bad fortune which recently dogged Rome, is gathering impetus against Carthage (21). Scipio then re-emphasizes the situation from Carthage's point of view (22), indicating how completely fortune supports the Romans. He asks but one thing of the troops, under these circumstances: that they give their unfailing loyalty to the name of Scipio, the scion of their lost commanders, growing again from the lopped branch (22).

The simile in 22 applies to Rome herself, and embraces the whole gamut of Scipio's heartening argument. Under the present circumstances of the war, ever loyal to his house, the troops, by God's blessing, are poised with him to secure the resurgence of the res publica and the consequent revival of his gens.

The forthcoming operations, then, foreshow nothing but growth and regeneration. At such a point, it is apt that the peroration (23–25), should include a lively exhortatio. Three imperatives in asyndeton urge the soldiers to action, alliteration stresses their virtus, and an anaphoristic traducite echoes the original plan of campaign (23, cf. 6).

The entire scope of the projected operation is embraced by this formula, and Scipio, having emphasized the virtus of the troops, appeals now to their pietas. His physical likeness to his father and uncle shows that he is the reincarnation of their gens; he will seek to emulate their qualities, too, so that by his deeds the troops may believe that their beloved generals have risen from the dead (24–25).

This precept of Rome's ancestral religion, the psychagogy of which echoes the exordium, crowns the speech. The virtus of the troops in the first stage of the war, by reason of their pietas towards Scipio's father and uncle, has ensured Rome's continuance in Spain (3–5). The import of the peroratio, however, leads into
the future. The *uirtus* of the troops is now at Scipio's command (23) and their *pietas*, its motive force, is focused on him, a deferential cynosure of their lost commanders (24–25). This careful structure, then, foreshows another glorious victory for the allegiance of the Spanish troops.

IV

This speech is the first in the decade by a Roman general to the country's troops since that of Scipio's father at the Ticinus (XXI.40–41.17). The careful disposition of the two speeches marks the balance prevailing in the war. In Book XXI Rome was on the brink of defeat; but she is now poised, under heaven's aegis, to gain the victory by reason of the *pietas* and *uirtus* of the Spanish troops and of their new commander. It is apt that at this juncture Scipio should translate the country's circumstances into an encouraging review of its resourcefulness in adversity and reveal to the troops all the significance of the prior development of the action.

The elements of his speech rightly combine to fire the troops with enthusiasm for the impending campaign (42.1 *accensis militum animis*). This tendency in the rhetoric is evinced by the specification of the imminent operations (6–7), the review of the present war (11–12), the summary of Rome's favourable circumstances (15), and the final exhortation of the troops (23–25).

The speech is clearly of the *genus medium*, however, so that its import is cerebral rather than emotional, and evolves from the psychagogia rather than from the rhetoric. As witness there is the affirmation of trust in Rome's *uirtus* and *fortuna* (8–13), the mystical profession of Scipio's faith in a benignant providence (18–19), and his optimistic *pietas* and *uirtus*, which frame the speech and enhance the entire argument.

The position allocated to the speech further supports its psychagogia. Rome and Carthage are on equal terms in the war, and Scipio, at this crucial stage, unerringly reveals himself as the *fatalis dux* (18–19). Witness, too, his understanding of Rome's history (10–12), his resolute faith in her destiny (9), his unshakable trust in the *uirtus Romana* (12). Thus the reader is made to wonder, either with anxiety or hopeful expectation, whether Scipio will fulfil his destiny and carry the campaign to its successful conclusion.

V

The prior course of the second Punic War, as described in Book XXVI, culminates with Scipio's military (and moral) successes at New Carthage. The balance prevailing at the outset is now changed in Rome's favour, and the glory of this achievement is Scipio's: 'Hoc maxime modo ductu atque auspicio P. Scipionis pulsi Hispania Carthaginensi sunt, quarto decimo anno post bellum initium, quinto quam P. Scipio prouinciam et exercitum accept' (XXVIII. 16.14 f.).

The careful ordering and accentuating of prior events in the narrative—compare, for example, a key passage inserted into the report of the elections for
208 B.C. (XXVII.20.9 f.) —brings to Book XXVIII and to its recognition of Scipio’s res gestae (above) a vivid impression of his waxing reputation and of the seemingly inglorious end to Hannibal’s Italian campaign (XXVII.51.12 f.).

At this point, when Rome has assumed the initiative, a fresh stratum is introduced into the events: ‘[E]t cum ceteri laetitia gloriaque ingenti eam rem uolgo ferrent [Scipio’s subjugation of Spain], unus qui gesserat, inexplebilis uirtutis ueraeque laudis, paruum instar eorum quae spe ac magnitudine animi concepisset receptas Hispanias ducebat. Iam African magnamque Carthaginem et in suum decus nomenque uelut consummatam eius belli gloriam spectabat’ (XXVIII.17.2-3).

A crossing to Africa and the end of the war now seem possible for the first time. It is Scipio who is again at the heart of the action; his new project is independently conceived. Whereas the rest are content with his brilliant subjugation of Spain, he alone turns his mind to Africa and Carthage.

After his election to the proconsulship for 204 B.C., however, Scipio’s proposal encounters senatorial opposition. The clash assumes such proportions that he threatens to override the senate by obtaining popular support for the proposal (40.2). A motion is put to the house, however, and Fabius, the most influential member of the senatorial party, confronts Scipio.

It should be noted that Scipio does not convince the opposition with his argument; but he does obtain Sicily as his province and a grudging right of crossing to Africa (45.1-8). The allotment of Sicily was conclusively treated (38.12) before the encounter with Fabius. A supplementary aim of the antithetical dialogue, then, is to juxtapose the two generals.

Initially, Fabius asserts that Scipio’s motion is out of order: his own deeds, exemplified by history, will exonerate him from a charge of envy or ill will (40.3-14). He then stresses the perils of an African operation, especially by dint of Hannibal’s stature as general (41.1-11). Italy will be prone to great danger, should Scipio leave: history teems with examples of generals who invaded foreign soil with disastrous results (12-17). Scipio’s operations in Spain bear no comparison with the dangers he will have to face in Africa (42.1-7). He dare not trust Syphax and the Numidians; he will have to fight Hannibal (8-17). The strategic advantages of an Italian campaign are obvious. Let Scipio recall the example of his father, who returned from Spain to protect Italy against Hannibal; and abandon the African project, which the senate should not ratify (18 f.).

The exordium (43.2–8), a principium ab adversariis, counters individually the points advanced in Fabius’ corresponding division (40.3–5). First, Scipio instances the claim that Fabius cannot be charged with disparagement (2). His deference aside, he cannot discount all suspicion of such a motive (3). For a self-
regarding Fabius has implied that he (Scipio) needs to fear only nobodies, not a man who, by reason of his pre-eminence (which Scipio, besides, is determined to attain) was unwilling that a rival should be thought his equal (4). Further, by representing himself as an old man, and Scipio as even younger than his son, Fabius, forgetting that fame lives on in the memory of posterity, has made it seem co-extensive with the span of human life—5: the *sententia* proclaims Scipio’s air of assuredness—whereas the noblest minds compare themselves with the illustrious men of every age, not merely with their contemporaries (6).

Scipio, having adroitly rebuffed Fabius and exposed his lack of magnanimity, reiterates his determination to equal—more, even surpass: the parenthesis is ironical—Fabius’ renown (7). This, he trusts, will not precipitate any jealousy, which would be universally harmful (8).

‘Sofort’, as Hoffmann well observes of the juxtaposition, ‘ist der entscheidende Gegensatz gegeben. Während Fabius zurückblickt auf die Taten von einst und den bisher befolgten Grundsätzen nichts hinzuzufügen hat, ist in Scipio alles vorwärtsdrängende Energie.’

Having openly avowed his *cupiditas gloriae* in the *exordium*, Scipio seeks to justify his forthcoming operation to the senate. The *tutum* (9–16) negates the objections set forth in the major division of Fabius’ speech (41.11–17). Fabius, in stressing the danger he would meet in crossing to Africa, seemed anxious about Scipio’s welfare (9). Whence the solicitude? (10). This pithy question, filled with irony, prompts an account of the wrack which marked the outset of Scipio’s career (10–11). The heightened rhetoric emphasizes the critical circumstances which clouded the Spanish War (10: fourfold anaphora, asyndeton) and stresses Scipio’s mettle when, though young, he alone dared offer himself for appointment to the command (11: twofold anaphora, asyndeton).

These were the crises, personal and military (fourfold anaphora), which daunted the start of his career (two-fold anaphora). Yet why, then, did no one emphasize his youth, the enemy’s strength, the difficulties of campaign, the defeats of his father and uncle? (12). The indignant question, by means of asyndeton, discredits Fabius’ *portenta* individually.

The older man’s solicitude, then, is spurious: and Scipio can now instance the feasibility of his impending operation. The situation overseas is introduced by a question. Chiasmus juxtaposes the Spanish theatre of war, already described, to circumstances in Africa (12). The argument is then expanded by three further questions, each stressed by anaphora, which imply the reverse of what is asked (13–14). The African campaign, Scipio asserts, will be as simple as his operations in Spain. Of course it is easy, despite his total subjugation of Spain, to belittle his achievements there—*gradatio*, fourfold anaphora, and asyndeton proclaim the whirling speed of his great victory (14–15)—just as it would be easy, if he returned triumphant from Africa, to belittle the things of which the danger is now being exaggerated to keep him at home (16).

The *tutum* is closed by this appeal for recognition of Scipio’s *res gestae* and of his consequent ability to launch a successful African campaign. The
psychagogy, which is fraught with irony, again negates Fabius' assertion that he was not disparaging his rival.

If it is feasible, Scipio's operation must be practicable too. The facile (43.17-44.5) again counters Fabius' corresponding division (41.1-11). Scipio, starting from the assertion of strategic difficulty, which was stressed by the exemplum of Regulus' capture (42.1; 6-7), discounts the alleged lack of harbours and approaches in Africa, discrediting the negative exemplum (17). Could he not, had Regulus been captured in the present war, have crossed the continent now—by dint of Regulus' experience in Africa with the accessible harbours and approaches (cf. 17)—as easily as he crossed to Spain after the death of his father and uncle? (18). This antithetical construction, skilfully couched as a percutentatio, turns the deterrent exemplum to his own advantage. The portent of Xanthippus' birth would, in the event, have been expunged to Rome's benefit—and, with it, Regulus' defeat—whereas Scipio's confidence would have increased from his awareness of what one man can do for a campaign (19).

Passing to the exemplum of the Athenians—they quit Greece, sailed to Sicily, and were then defeated (41.17)—Scipio intimates, by means of a gerundive, the tedium of Fabius' argument (20). As he has the time to spin out tales from Greek history—enarrare: the implication is disparaging—he might instance a better example: Agathocles, King of Syracuse, who diverted hostilities from Sicily to Carthage, is then substituted for the Athenians (21).

Scipio's 'vorwärtsdrängende Energie', noted at the outset, is revealed again in his disavowal of the negative exempla; Fabius' deterrent counsel becomes a pragmatic affirmation of the African campaign.

The second part of the facile (44.1-6), where the argument expands 43.21 and is allowed free rein, is without correspondence in Fabius' speech. Scipio's preoccupation with Niederwerfungssstrategie is revealed at once. An antithetical sententia (multum...uideas) underscores Hannibal's lesson: the aggressor invariably holds the psychological advantage (2). Unfamiliarity, too, is canceled out by physical presence in enemy territory (3).

These are the intangible benefits of an offensive. The practical advantages follow (4-5). Hannibal's experience with Rome's wavering allies in Italy presupposes that the Carthaginians are even less likely to win support in Africa (4). Nor will their mercenaries give them the help which Rome will obtain from her own indomitable troops (5).

The unfettered considerations of this division are practical and optimistic. His prior disavowal of Fabius' negative exempla lets Scipio dwell pragmatically on the encouraging aspects of his impending operation.

Under the utile (44.6-11), in which correspondence with Fabius' speech is slight (cf. 41.1-20), Scipio draws the African operation closer. He stresses the need for haste in the campaign (6: four graded polysyndeta convey his impatience), basing his trust in the outcome, as specified in the rhetoric above, on the fortuna of the Romans and their allies (7). Action on the spot will reveal what is now obscure: redoubtable generals exploit the propitious changes of
fortune to suit their own designs (8).

Fortuna and ratio converge in this sententia. Blind submission to chance is, however, eschewed; the vicissitudes of destiny must be rationally exploited: ratio controls fortuna. Scipio here proves that Fabius' attack on his 'rashness' is a misrepresentation. He is not, by seizing the random chances offered by fortune, abrogating his rational faculties of generalship. The fortuna on which he relies, as in his first campaign, is that of the populus Romanus, and it contains no elements of chance; but it is intimately connected with his destiny as Rome's fatalis dux.33

The broad, similar issues in Fabius' speech deal essentially with Ermattungsstrategie in the face of Hannibal's stature as general. The sententia at 44.8, however, precludes all doubt as to the man elected by destiny to win the war: Scipio, all auspicious and confident energy, or Fabius, all doubtful and negative caution.

Turning now to Fabius (9: a vocative marks the transition), Scipio accepts from him a confrontation with Hannibal. He clarifies, by means of antithesis, his anticipated strategy, and, juxtaposing it to the meagre rewards of his Spanish operation, instances the prize of victory in Africa (9). The psychagogy of this lively scene recalls the disparagement of his res gestae—especially the references to Spain (43.10-12)—and signals the onset of Fabius' eclipse.

Scipio next reassures Fabius about Italy. While he is engaged in Africa—10: the anaphoristic dum makes the intended stages of his campaign a vivid reality—the res publica will come to no harm; for the consul Licinius can, in Scipio's absence, do equally well what Fabius has already done—protect the res publica (11). Scipio belittles Fabius, anticipating, under the impulse of the forthcoming operation, his own greater renown.

The honestum (12-15), which is without correspondence in Fabius' speech, is introduced by the possibility that, in spite of Scipio's strategy, the campaign in Africa may be long (12, first part). Yet his projected operation will nevertheless propagate the dignitas and fama of Rome; for it will prove that the country has defensive as well as offensive powers (12, second part). A defence of the country, then, brings dignitas, but Scipio's operations involve fama. After all, foreign nations should not believe, or put it about, that no Roman general ever dared rival Hannibal—the psychagogy contrasts the proposed campaign with Hannibal's offensive against Italy—or that Africa, though repeatedly attacked during the first Punic War, was left unmolested in the second (13). This proposed vindication of Rome's dignitas then becomes a vengeful apology for the offensive which is to generate Scipio's fama. Antithesis juxtaposes Italy and Africa (14), and asyndeton focuses the horror of Hannibal's campaign in Italy on the projected theatre of war (15).

Scipio's confidence and forward-looking energy culminate in the honestum. His militant pietas, centred on Africa by dint of his confidence in Rome's destiny, is yet to win him fama. Fabius' pietas, however, which is directed to the need of protecting Italy rather than of carrying the war overseas, has already earned him
dignitas. The honestum, then, heralds the eclipse of Scipio’s rival.

The peroration includes amplificatio and a captatio benevolentiae (16-17; 18). It is enough to have spoken of high policy, of the imminent campaign, of the duties at issue (16-17). Alternative tactics did, of course, present themselves; Scipio, too, by bolstering up his own military reputation, might have discredited Fabius—as happened to his (Scipio’s) Spanish campaign: a subtle praeteritio—but this would have been irrelevant and tedious (17). Let the senators, then, as his achievements are such that he can rest content with their impartial decision, be pleased with his moderation of speech (18).

VI

The elements of this speech set up the backdrop against which Scipio’s achievements in Africa are portrayed. It is fitting that, prior to his last great campaign, which ends Rome’s bitterest war, the country’s fatalis dux should eclipse his last Roman rival of stature.

Psychagogy and rhetoric combine, in part, to achieve this purpose. Witness, for example, Scipio’s proud affirmation of his res gestae (43.14-15), his manipulation of Fabius’ negative exempla (43.17-21), and his defiant statement—in his eminent rival’s very face, at a point where the psychagogy proclaims him to be the fatalis dux—of the dramatic course of his projected operation (44.9-10).

As this speech is, however, also of the genus medium, it is primarily the psychagogy which contributes to Fabius’ eclipse. Witness, for example, the subtle exposure of his disparagement (43.7-8; 44.17), the import of the key sententia at 44.8, and the entire content of the honestum (44.12-15).

The disposition of the divisions within the speech, too, assists the psychagogy. The facile (43.17-44.5) predominates in Scipio’s address. In Fabius’ the tutum (41.11-17) is the prominent division. Scipio’s pietas is positive, then, Fabius’ negative. Nor is there a parallel to the honestum (44.12-15) in Fabius’ speech. Scipio, however, here proclaims his confident wish to entrench Rome’s stature among foreign nations, and his overmastering desire for fame and gloria. The future, then, as at the outset of his career, yet foreshows to him nothing but prosperity and success.

Finally, all the foregoing elements combine, as at XXVI.41.3-25, to increase the tension of Livy’s narrative. The reader is again made to wonder, whether with anxiety or hopeful expectation, how Scipio fatalis dux will fulfil his own destiny and that of Rome.
NOTES


4. Cf. his Livy, 40 f.


7. Strictly, this division applies only to the genus iudiciale, but it may be applied to the other genera. Cf. H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Munich, 1960, 147.

8. Cf. R. Ullmann, Étude sur le style des discours de Tite Live, Oslo, 1929, 15: ‘l’ornement stylistique en général et spécialement les tropes et les figures’. Ullmann’s elements, via Quint. VIII and IX (with pruning), provide more scope for discussing Livy’s rhetoric than do the abbreviated tropi and figureae of A. Canter, AJPh 38, 1917, 125 ff. and AJPh 39, 1918, 44 ff.


11. This dramatic scene, in which Scipio fatalis dux (XXII.53.6) is juxtaposed to Hannibal, is discussed by Burck, Einführung, 123 f. Cf. too, Hoffmann, Livius, 61 f. For concise details of Livy’s presentation of Scipio and Hannibal see Burck, Livy, 31 ff.


13. On the tendency of Livy’s narrative to create tension in this way see, e.g., Burck, Livy, 41 f.


16. Scipio’s devotion to his house is a recurring theme in his speeches. It is also reflected in the only paired speeches in the decade: between his father and Hannibal and himself and Hannibal (XXI.40 ff. and XXX.30.3 ff.). Cf. Burck, Einführung, 156. The motif culminates at XXX.30.13 in Hannibal’s speech to Scipio.


18. Antithesis is frequently used to clarify and emphasize vital, and especially tactical, issues in Scipio’s speeches. See, e.g., XXVI.41.9; 13; 43.3; 6. 7. XXVIII.27.4; 5; 43.18; 44.2; 9; 14. XXX.31.3; 4. On the emotion conveyed by anaphora, Canter, op. cit. (above, n. 8), 50.

19. On the emotion conveyed by these figures, Canter, op. cit., 58.


21. Cf. XXII.53.6 and above, n. 11.


23. Cf. above, n. 12.

24. The genus grande is rhetoric itself, the genus subtile is dialectic, and the genus medium is an intermediate tertium quid. For a standard discussion, G.L. Hendrickson, AJPh 26, 1905, 249 ff.


27. ‘Romae fama Scipionis in dies crescere, Fabio Tarentum captum astu magis quam uirtute
gloriae tamen esse, Fului senescere fama, Marcellus etiam adverso rumore esse, superquam quod primo male pugnauerat'. Cf. too Burck, Livy, 24.

29. Cf. Hoffmann, Livius, 89–90 and 92. Scipio's primary aim is, of course, to bring the senate round to his view.
30. The summary relies on Hoffmann, Livius, 88.
31. The speech is discussed by Stübner: Die Religiosität, 152 ff. and (especially) by Hoffmann, Livius, 88 f. Cf. above, n. 14, for the rhetorical division, the tropes, figures and translation. Further reliance is placed on Ullmann, La technique, 120 for the parallels and divergences in the rhetorical divisions of the speech.
32. Cf. his Livius, 89.
33. For the meaning behind this key passage, Walsh, Livy, 95; Stübner, Die Religiosität, 157.
34. Cf. above, n. 29.
35. Above, n. 24.
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