

**Valerius Maximus on Vice:  
A Commentary on *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* 9.1-11**

**Jeffrey Murray**



**Thesis Presented for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy (Classical Studies)  
in the School of Languages and Literatures  
University of Cape Town**

**June 2016**

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

## **Abstract**

The *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* of Valerius Maximus, written during the formative stages of the Roman imperial system, survives as a near unique instance of an entire work composed in the genre of Latin exemplary literature. By providing the first detailed historical and historiographical commentary on Book 9 of this prose text – a section of the work dealing principally with vice and immorality – this thesis examines how an author employs material predominantly from the earlier, Republican, period in order to validate the value system which the Romans believed was the basis of their world domination and to justify the reign of the Julio-Claudian family. By detailed analysis of the sources of Valerius' material, of the way he transforms it within his chosen genre, and of how he frames his *exempla*, this thesis illuminates the contribution of an often overlooked author to the historiography of the Roman Empire.

## **Acknowledgements**

In the course of writing this thesis I have accrued a number of debts of thanks. First and foremost, I wish to acknowledge the support of my supervisor and friend, David Wardle. He has been exemplary in his role as supervisor, and his own commitment to scholarship a worthy model to imitate. Any infelicities that remain in this work are undoubtedly the result of my own stubborn refusal to pursue all of his suggestions.

I also wish to thank my friends and colleagues in the Classics section of the School of Languages and Literatures at the University of Cape Town. Mention must be made of Clive Chandler, Roman Roth, Gail Symington, John Atkinson, Berenice Bentel, Vanessa Everson, and especially Matthew Shelton.

Many happy months of research were spent, both in 2011 and 2014, as a visiting member of the Centre for the Study of Greek and Roman Antiquity at Corpus College, Oxford thanks to the magnanimous invitation of Stephen Harrison, and made possible by the generous support of the University of Cape Town via the Baron Hartley Scholarship for International Travel. In this regard, I wish also to thank Aneurin Ellis-Evans and Lydia Matthews for their assistance and hospitality.

Elke Steinmeyer and Alan Ross provided help with particular points. I owe debts of gratitude also to Christopher Mallan, Jorg Rüpke, Helen Scott, and Eva Valvo, who all assisted me in obtaining key bibliographic items, as well as Jane Bellemore, who provided me with a copy of a forthcoming publication, and Sarah Lawrence, who sent me a copy of her unpublished PhD thesis on externality in Valerius Maximus.

A doctoral scholarship from the National Research Foundation as well as a doctoral grant and the Frances Arnold and Esme Clarke bursary provided by the University

of Cape Town must be acknowledged for the munificent financial support which enabled me to undertake this research.

Finally I wish also to thank my friends and family for their ongoing support and encouragement. I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my father, Boyd William Murray (1949 – 1992).

## Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	2
Abbreviations	5
Introduction	7
Beyond Bloomer: Recent Approaches to Valerius Maximus	10
Valerius Maximus: Biography, Date, Context	16
Valerius Maximus on Vice	31
The Sources of Valerian Vice	35
A Canon of Vices?	41
A Valerian Voice	47
Commentary	52
Bibliography	275

## Abbreviations

Abbreviations of ancient authors and works are given according to the fourth edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 2012). Journal abbreviations follow those set out in *L'Année philologique*. For the text of Valerius Maximus I follow John Briscoe's edition in the Teubner series, *Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* (Stuttgart, 1998), printing consonantal *u* as *v*; any significant textual deviations, particularly in relation to D. R. Shackleton Bailey's 2000 Loeb edition of the text, are highlighted within the commentary. Further abbreviations are listed below.

ANRW	H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> (Berlin, 1972–).
BGU	<i>Berliner Griechische Urkunden Ägyptische Urkunden den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin</i> (1895–).
BMC	<i>British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire</i> (London, 1923–).
BNP	H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), <i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World</i> (Leiden, 2002–).
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> (Berlin, 1863–).
CRRBM	H. A. Grueber, <i>Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum</i> (London, 1910).
EJ	V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones (eds.), <i>Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius</i> (Oxford, 1976) <sup>2</sup> .
FGrH	F. Jacoby (ed.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin, 1923–).
FRHist	T. J. Cornell <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>The Fragments of the Roman Historians</i> (Oxford, 2013).
ILS	H. Dessau (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i> (Berlin, 1892-1916).

- IRT J. M. Reynolds and J. B. Ward Perkins (eds.), *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* (Rome, 1952).
- Lewis and Short C. T. Lewis and C. Short (eds.), *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879).
- LSJ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*<sup>9</sup> (Oxford, 1940).
- LTUR M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (Rome, 1999-2000).
- MRR T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York, 1951-1986).
- OCB B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (Oxford, 2012).
- OCD<sup>4</sup> S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>4</sup> (Oxford, 2012).
- OGIS W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig, 1903-5).
- OLD P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 2012).
- ORF<sup>4</sup> H. Malcovati (ed.), *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*<sup>4</sup> (Turin, 1967).
- PECS R. Stillwell *et al.* (eds.), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton, 1976).
- RE A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll (eds.), *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Berlin, 1893–1980).
- RRC M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (London, 1974).
- SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Amsterdam, 1923–).
- SIG<sup>3</sup> W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1915-24).
- TLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900–).

## Introduction

'Who writes commentaries? Who reads them? Why? And perhaps most importantly, what for?' These were the questions posed by a collection of essays edited by Gibson and Kraus in 2002 in a volume on classical commentary writing.<sup>1</sup> The answers to these questions are as varied as the scholars who set out to write modern 'classical commentaries', a genre of literature that seeks to elucidate Greek and Roman texts to their readers through a variety of approaches, theories, methodologies, and practices. These include textual criticism, philological analysis, historical and literary criticism. The approaches themselves are often also as diverse as the authors who practice them. It is prudent, therefore, to set out briefly what the aims are that I have set out for my own commentary on 9.1-11 of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*.<sup>2</sup> My focus is historical and historiographical. To declare one's commentary to be both 'historical' and 'historiographical' in emphasis could appear at first sight a redundancy – or merely tautologous rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> But a careful and necessary

---

<sup>1</sup> Gibson and Kraus 2002: ix. The bibliography on the practice of writing classical commentaries is rapidly growing; see also the essays collected in Most 1999, Henderson 2006, and Kraus and Stray 2016, for examples of some of the best self-conscious reflections about the task of the commentator.

<sup>2</sup> Within the scope of this thesis I have focused my discussion on chapters 1-11, breaking off commentary after the rhetorical and extended diatribe against an unnamed conspirator from Tiberian Rome (9.11.ext.4). This *exemplum*, dealing as it does with Sejanus, provided a neat 'break' in the text at which point I was able to limit my discussion, principally on the basis of space. It will be obvious to any readers of Book 9, however, that the final four chapters include further words and deeds that fall within the ambit of immorality (e.g. 9.13; 9.15), but that, however, also include sections that could be considered miscellaneous (e.g. 9.12; 9.14). In the same way, sections outside of Book 9 could have also fallen, quite easily, within the category of chapters dealing with vice (e.g. 3.5; 5.3; 7.8; cf. also 6.2.praef. for words and deeds that fall somewhere between virtue or vice). The section 9.1-11 has been marked off as a unit by a number of scholars, cf. e.g. Römer 1990: 106; Wardle 1998: 8; Lawrence 2006: 114; Morgan 2007: 130.

<sup>3</sup> See Rhiannon Ash's (2002: 269-294) excellent meditation on the role of the commentator on Latin historians. There is, however, some slippage in Ash's approach. She begins by setting out 'historical'

distinction may be drawn between these two categories. I use 'historical' to signify aspects of the commentary which deal with history, that is, for example, who the characters are mentioned in an *exemplum*, when the events described took place, whether or not the events occurred as Valerius presents them, and so on. Whereas by 'historiographical' I denote those elements which explain the way that V. has written his work, for example, where he has drawn his material from, how he structures it, how the individual *exempla* cohere into chapters, as well as how he shapes the material that he has amassed. The degree to which V.'s writing reflects the thought world of his time, its value systems, and his perception of the imperial system and its (dis)continuity with the past can be assessed. What this means, therefore, is that I have not written, for example, a philological or narratological commentary (the range of possibilities is wide), although, on occasion I am likely to have dealt with all of these aspects and more (e.g. archaeological and topographical) as I judge them to be relevant to my larger purpose in elucidating historical and historiographical features of his work.<sup>4</sup> In this way, in writing the commentary I have attempted the following: (i) for each of the key value-terms that V. introduces, primarily those that form the subjects of chapters, but also those appearing within individual *exempla*, I have set out briefly what these might have meant to V.'s predecessors and to him, attempting to place them within the Roman thought world of the Late Republic and Early Principate; this endeavour of tracing the development of ideas sometimes

---

or 'literary' commentary as two possible poles by which to locate one's writing endeavour, but later sets up 'historical' and 'historiographical' commentaries as viable alternatives (e.g. in her illustration of the respective merits of G. E. F. Chilver's historical commentary on Tac. *Hist.* 2.93 and her own historiographical approach); whereas on p. 274 she designates historical or literary, or 'an integrated mixture of both (i.e. historiographical)'; see now also, esp. Davies 2016: 233-249.

<sup>4</sup> Ash (2002: 272) points out that 'most commentators on ancient historical texts purposely avoid pinning themselves down in their title, and choose instead to clarify their working methods in an introduction or preface to the work'. Indeed, this dissertation is no different, evidenced by the title which simply designates 'commentary'.

involves more of a linguistic aspect than I have attempted in the rest of the commentary; (ii) for the short prefatory sections of the chapters, where V. usually appears prominently as 'author' I again have commented more than in the rest of the commentary on the language and imagery that is used to present the individual vice(s) to the reader; (iii) for the individual *exempla* (as far as is possible in each instance) I have (a) identified the historical context of the events described and the identity of the figures involved (revealing by comparison with other extant evidence whether and how V. may have erred), have (b) identified where V. may have drawn his material from (where direct comparison is possible I have discussed how V. adapts his source-material for his work), (c) have identified what in the *exemplum* constitutes the manifestation of the vice(s) in question and how that is located in V.'s presentation, (d) and examined V.'s framing of the 'factual core' of the *exemplum* for the development of his argument.

The nature of V.'s text, in providing a combination of both big ideas and individual *exempla* of each idea, presents the commentator with the difficulty of providing distinctive treatment for each. I have, therefore, provided necessarily limited introductory essays at the beginning of each chapter situating the subject within its literary, historical, and philosophical or legal background as appropriate.

Howell (1995: iv) rightly laments, in his commentary on the fifth book of Martial's epigrams, that the commentator is fated to leave some of his or her readers unfulfilled. It is, however, worth reflecting on the following point made by Rhiannon Ash (2002: 271), 'A commentator's criteria for selecting and presenting information should ideally reflect what will most enhance the imagined readership's experience of reading a particular text'; indeed I could have written a multi-volume commentary on the scale of Oakley's *Livy* on the eleven chapter which I have set out to comment on, and referred my readers to much more secondary literature that I

have done, but in each lemma I have sought to enhance the experience of those readers whose primary purpose is to understand Valerius Maximus.

### **Beyond Bloomer: Recent Approaches to Valerius Maximus**

For many scholars of Valerius Maximus, W. Martin Bloomer's 1992 monograph, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* marks a kind of watershed moment in Valerian studies. Whether merely symbolic or real, the standard narrative told is that scholarly approaches to V. prior to Bloomer were largely dominated by *Quellenforschung*; even if only partially true, this certainly was the approach of most scholars in the 19th century.<sup>5</sup> With the publication of *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, however, V. finally received readers who were interested in his work for its own sake, as well as interested in the author's own approaches to the material he was excerpting; he no longer merely provided fodder for footnotes.<sup>6</sup> This so-called historical narrative of Valerian studies, however,

---

<sup>5</sup> For examples and further bibliographies of this approach, see Wardle 1998: 15 n. 68.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. e.g. Potter 1993: 'For well over a century it has been regarded by the majority of scholars as little more than a source to be culled for anecdotes (not all of them reliable) about the Greeks and Romans. It is the great strength of Bloomer's book that it is now possible to see Valerius as a human being with some very interesting habits'; Sinclair 1996: 151: 'The virtue of Bloomer's work over earlier studies lies in his impulse to view Valerius' collection of *exempla* as conditioned by the needs of its readers'; Mueller 2002b: 'We stand at the end of the first decade of a gathering Valerian Renaissance, inaugurated ten years ago by W. Martin Bloomer, whose study recapitulated the critical work of a century and a half (concerned primarily with Valerius' sources) and offered also a sensitive appreciation especially of Valerian rhetoric in the early imperial context'; Muller 2002a: 3: 'although his work has long served as a treasure trove for rhetoricians, moralists, and ancient historians (categories not always mutually exclusive), Valerius Maximus until recently remained unappealing to literary critics'; Wardle 1998: v: 'Valerius was to me one of those authors into whom historians dip for minor details, not one to be read continuously or to be evaluated in his own right'; Langlands 2000: 8 'Valerius Maximus is Mr Footnote; in the notes of scholarly works on Roman history references to his work are ubiquitous. There is rarely any discussion of them in the main text, but I doubt that if there

is not entirely correct. While certainly, it is true, that the general approach of (largely) German industry in the 19th century was *Quellenkritik*, scholars in the twentieth century, such as G. Maskalov (1984: 437-496), who examined V.'s place within exemplary literary tradition, and T. F. Carney (1962: 289-337), who scrutinised V.'s presentation of a key exemplar (Marius) across the work, not only provided novel approaches to V.'s text, but also established new models for reading it.<sup>7</sup>

Bloomer's study, the central thesis of which left some unconvinced, nevertheless advanced scholarship on V.'s work by offering an attempt to read the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* within its own socio-historical context.<sup>8</sup> Since Bloomer, these trends have continued into the twenty-first century aided, undoubtedly, (in the Anglophone world at least) by two new English translations of his text – by D. R. Shackleton Bailey for the Loeb Classical Library series in 2000 and Henry J. Walker in 2004 – and by the first attempts at modern commentaries on his work, on Book 1 in 1998 by David Wardle and Book 2 in 2008 by Andrea Themann-Steinke.<sup>9</sup>

---

is any recent work on any aspect of ancient Roman history whose arguments are not bolstered by at least a couple of references in the notes to his *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*'.

<sup>7</sup> For discussion of 19<sup>th</sup> century German scholarship on V., see the section of this Introduction dealing with V.'s sources. Writing nearly a decade before Bloomer, Maskalov notes, 'Taking only an impressionistic view, one may be inclined to remark that whereas at the beginning of this century Valerius was to be found near the centre of scholarship, these days he may be hard to discern even on the periphery' (1984: 484). Against this 'impressionistic view' he goes on to present a substantial, but necessarily selective, review of key studies from the middle of the twentieth century up until the time of his own writing (pp. 484-496). Carney expanded his work further in 1967: 5-22.

<sup>8</sup> Bloomer's central thesis (1992: 12-13), that V.'s intended audience were those from outside of Rome – those in need of guidance in traditional, aristocratic, Roman morality – was rejected by Skidmore (1996: 105ff.); cf. Kleijwegt 1998: 105-110; Wardle 1998: 12-5.

<sup>9</sup> Samuel Speed produced the first translation of V. in English, published in London in 1678, *Romae Antiquae Descriptio: A View of the Religion, Laws, Customs, Manners, and Dispositions of the Ancient*

Understanding V.'s methods in shaping the material that he excerpts from his sources as well as the rhetorical ploys he uses in presenting various *exempla* are some of the challenges that have faced scholars such as Rebecca Langlands, who has examined his moral purpose within the 'generic' category of exemplary literature. In a series of articles, she has argued that V.'s arrangement and literary presentation of various *exempla* has the didactic purpose of educating his readers in ethical thinking (2008: 160-187), and that the very medium of the *exemplum*, in order to convey a set of morals, enables individuals to apply them to specific situations or contexts – in this way V. presents his Roman readers with a guide to 'situational ethics' (2011: 100-122).<sup>10</sup> Similarly, Carney's earlier attempts at reading an individual character's depiction across the work has found favour, more recently, among a variety of scholars who have attempted similar studies.<sup>11</sup>

---

*Romans and Others, Comprehended in their Most Illustrious Acts and Sayings Agreeable to History, Written in Latine by that Famous Historian Quintus Valerius Maximus, and now Carefully rendred into English, together with the Life of the Author.* Wardle's 1998 commentary accompanies an English translation of Book 1. Translations in many other modern languages are available also, e.g. in German: Friedrich Hoffmann (1829) and Ursula Blank-Sangmeister (1991); French: Pierre Constant (1935) and Robert Combès (1995-7); and Italian: Rino Faranda (1971). Other examples of reading V. within his own socio-historical context are to be found in Weileder (1998), who stresses, in particular, the context of Tiberian Rome, as well as in a collection of French-language articles arising from a research group working in Strasbourg, produced in 1998, and edited by Jean-Michel David. More recently, Wiegand (2013) has devoted considerable space to V. as a 'Tiberian' writer in her study of the literature of the period.

<sup>10</sup> Langlands stresses in her approach that *exempla* are open to interpretation at the point of their reception; for ways of reading *exempla*, see also Roller 2009: 214-30; now also Langlands 2015: 68-80.

<sup>11</sup> For example, on Alexander the Great: Lambert 1970: 6-15; Haegemans and Stoppie 2004: 145-17; Wardle 2005a: 141-161; Spencer 2010: 175-191; Bellemore 2015: 299-316; Hannibal: Valvo 2008: 37-55; Scipio Aemilianus: Perruccio 2005: 49-66; Julius Caesar: Wardle 1997: 323-345; and Augustus and Tiberius: Wardle 2000: 479-493; Wardle 2002: 433-440.

In addition to this, some have recently begun to produce valuable studies on certain aspects or themes within his work, such as, Westphal (2015: 191-208) on *moderatio*, Lawrence (2015: 135-155) on V.'s putative Stoicism, Rüpke (2016: 89-111) on religious knowledge and memory, Mueller (2002) on religion, Langlands (2006) on *pudicitia*, and Williams (2012: 7-17) on friendship.<sup>12</sup> Tara Welch, through an intertextual approach to his work, has positioned the *Facta* somewhere between declamation and historiography, claiming that V. seeks neither so much as to proffer his rhetorical skills (as declaimers do), nor enter into debates involving authority (as historians do), but rather to present his work as a popular lesson-book, available to all Romans.<sup>13</sup> Although many of her points are broadly applicable, the limited scope of her study renders it not wholly convincing. Those convinced of the usefulness of the application of psychoanalytic theory to the literature and culture of Ancient Rome, are likely to find Erik Gunderson's (2013: 119-212) reading of V.'s exemplary project in light of Lacan's theory of the hysteric stimulating. Others, however, who are ambivalent, or less convinced by the anachronisms that a deeply theoretical approach such as this takes, will find problems in the details; and many of the points that he raises are not without their own difficulties.<sup>14</sup> His suggestion, for example, that at Rome *exempla* functioned in much the same way as mythological stories did

---

<sup>12</sup> Other studies worth noting here are: Lennon (2015: 719-731) on the use of the phrase *sacra mensae* across the work; Nguyen's use of V. in a discussion of social *persona*, in order to illuminate Pauline Christianity (2008); Gowing (2010: 249-260), who provides discussion of V.'s treatment of the Civil Wars, writing under Tiberius (fuller discussion of V. on the Civil Wars is to be found in Bloomer 1992: 147-184, cf. also Freyburger 1998: 111-117); and Gowers (2010: 446-449), who is suspicious of Sextus Pompeius' absence from a list of *exempla* on inglorious sons (Val. Max. 3.5).

<sup>13</sup> Welch 2013: 67-82.

<sup>14</sup> A compelling, but still deeply ambivalent, case for the usefulness of psychoanalytic theory in 'reading' Ancient Rome, see Oliensis 2009.

in Greece, elides the fact that the classification of *'exemplum'* incorporates both mythological and historical types already.<sup>15</sup>

Scholars have also been interested in V.'s reception. Pioneering work in the 20th century, in this regard, was done by Dorothy M. Schullian who produced a number of studies relating to V.'s manuscript transmission, commentaries, versifications, and imitators.<sup>16</sup> V.'s use by later classical writers has begun to be explored too, for example, in Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* and Plutarch.<sup>17</sup> Often these are only initial steps and much more work remains to be done.<sup>18</sup> In addition to his epitomators, Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus, other post-classical authors, such as Ammianus Marcellinus and Orosius have also received a nod.<sup>19</sup> By far the best served in this regard though, are medieval and Renaissance writers, which is perhaps understandable considering V.'s popularity during these periods.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The majority of V.'s *exempla* are historical; for examples of mythological *exempla* in his work, however, cf. 4.6.1; 5.3.ext.3a; 5.5.3.

<sup>16</sup> See Ogle and Schullian 1933; Schullian 1934: 35-46; Schullian 1935: 154-184; Schullian 1937: 516-518; Schullian 1937: 349-359; Schullian 1937: 70-72; Schullian 1940: 202-206; Schullian 1944: 290-293; Schullian 1960: 81-95; Schullian 1981: 695-728; Schullian 1984: 287-403.

<sup>17</sup> On Pliny, see Beagon 2005: *passim*; on Plutarch, Hilton and Matthews 2008: 336-342.

<sup>18</sup> The caution of Schullian (1984: 289) should be heeded: 'We must remember, however, that parallel passages in ancient authors can deceive and that whether Valerius is named or not – in Pliny the Elder, Lucan, L. Annaeus Seneca, Frontinus, Plutarch, Gellius, Apuleius, Aelian, Lactantius, Ammianus, Macrobius, Symmachus – , the possibility of a common source must be considered'.

<sup>19</sup> A commentary on Januarius Nepotianus by Rainer Jakobi is *forthcoming*; see further Schullian 1984: 251-2; Schullian 1984: 253-5. For Ammianus, see Kelly 2008: 266-277; Rohrbacher 2005: 20-30; for Orosius, Van Nuffelen 2012: *passim*.

<sup>20</sup> See Carter 1975: 26. Apart from the Herculean labours of Dorothy M. Schullian cited above, see also, Crab and De Keyser 2013: 667-684; Crab 2013: 291-318; Crab 2014: 153-166; Léglu 2012: 61-83.

Given that much of the scholarship on the *Facta* has dealt with source criticism, and more recently the historical and cultural context in which the text was produced (as outlined above), a real *desideratum* in Valerian studies is a detailed historical and historiographical commentary on the entire text. While, as previously mentioned, two commentaries do already exist, they cover only the first two books of his work – books that deal primarily with religion (Book 1) and ancient custom (Book 2). Commentary, then, on the sections of the work dealing with Roman values explicitly is lacking.

In turn, there have been an increasing number of studies written recently, within the discipline of Classics, focusing on ancient value systems, emotions, ethics, and morality.<sup>21</sup> These studies, however, have often provided synoptic views of these values but have rarely narrowed their focus in detail to the level of commentary on specific authors and texts. This study, therefore, built up from individual words or phrases and almost pointillistic scrutiny of the text rather than from the imposition of an already accepted notion of the value system in question, will lead to further analysis of individual *exempla*, which in turn will lead to an understanding of how each individual chapter is constructed, and the study of each chapter to that of the whole book. This is an approach that proves abundantly fruitful when carried out on an author such as V. who has actively shaped material predominantly from the republican period in order to produce a collection of highly rhetorical *exempla* for his imperial audience.

---

<sup>21</sup> Taking monographs from the bibliography of this thesis alone as a representative sample, see e.g. Balot 2001; Barton 2001; Braund and Gill 1997; Braund and Most 2003; Dowling 2006; Edwards 1993; Earl 1967; Harris 2001; Kaster 2005; Langlands 2006; Lobur 2008; McDonnell 2006; McHardy 2008; Morgan 2007; Stafford 2000; Tsouna 2007.

## Valerius Maximus: Biography, Date, Context

What little can be said in the way of biography of Valerius Maximus is summarised in a fifteenth century *Life*, found in the Venice edition.<sup>22</sup> The *Life* claims patrician birth, military service, during which time, he sailed to Asia in the company of Sextus Pompeius, scholarly work in Rome under the reign of Tiberius, and descent on his father's side from the *gens* Valeria, and on his mother's, the *gens* Fabia. As noted by most scholars, almost all of these facts can be gleaned from internal references within the *Facta*: that he wrote during the reign of Tiberius is clear from the opening invocation in the *Praef.* of the work (more on the date below); at 2.6.8 V. mentions his trip to Asia with Sextus Pompeius, usually identified as the consul of AD 14, and proconsul of Asia; while his lineage remains less certain.<sup>23</sup> V.'s membership of the patrician Valerii remains purely conjectural.<sup>24</sup> Descent from the Fabii has also been proposed.<sup>25</sup> Syme has commented on V.'s relative poverty (*mea parvitas, Praef.*; cf. 4.4.11), while the preface to 5.5 – a chapter on fraternal devotion where V. mentions his ancestral *imagines* – has been used to suggest possible senatorial, even patrician

---

<sup>22</sup> The *Life* is printed in Skidmore 1996: 113-4.

<sup>23</sup> The argument for Sextus Pompeius' identification with the consul of AD 14 is made clearly by Briscoe 1993: 399-400; Wardle's suggestion that V.'s 'casual' mention of Pompeius reveals him to be 'a very ungrateful client', and that Pompeius may, in fact, be a 'humble unknown' (1998: 1), is countered by Shackleton Bailey (2000: 2): 'A humble unknown was unlikely to be travelling to Asia with Valerius and a company of Romans ... And a lady of the highest station would not have been so anxious for the honour of his presence at her deathbed', and furthermore, 'The *seemingly* casual introduction of the episode, along with a generous dose of flattery, probably appeared to Valerius as a graceful manoeuvre, the dedication of his work having gone to the Emperor, not to Pompeius'. In addition cf. 4.7.ext.2, as well as Gowers 2010: 446-9.

<sup>24</sup> No *praenomen* is recorded with any certainty; Skidmore 1996: 114; Wardle 1998: 1. Saddington (2000: 166-172), through the comparative evidence of inscriptions, has suggested the possibility, at least, of V. being of equestrian status.

<sup>25</sup> Skidmore 1996: 130 n. 1.

extraction.<sup>26</sup> This same preface could be used to support suggestions that V. was married, had children, and a brother; however, it could equally be regarded as merely rhetorical.<sup>27</sup>

The date of the work's composition as well as that of its publication has attracted much attention by scholars. The *communis opinio* places final publication at least after October AD 31; heterodox opinion suggests a date from earlier in Tiberius' reign (AD 14-16).<sup>28</sup> If the unnamed villain of 9.11.ext.4, however, is indeed Lucius Aelius Sejanus, as the current consensus holds ('Briscoe's discussion should have settled all doubts about whether the nameless conspirator really was Sejanus'), and not M. Scribonius Libo Drusus, or some such other unknown conspirator, then a date after October AD 31, at least for Book 9, is necessary, and not in the early years of Tiberius' reign.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Syme 1986: 437; Skidmore 1996: 114-7. The senatorial Velleius uses a similar abstraction (*mea mediocritas*; 2.104.2) to describe his own status. Whether *parvitas* indicates something more lowly than *mediocritas* is impossible to determine.

<sup>27</sup> Themann-Steinke 2008: 16-17.

<sup>28</sup> See, principally, Carter 1975: 30-33; Bellemore 1989: 67-80; Briscoe 1993: 398-404; Combès 1995: 8-11; Wardle 1998: 1-6; Shackleton Bailey 2000: 1-3; Themann-Steinke 2008: 17-28; Briscoe 2010: 380-381.

<sup>29</sup> The quote is taken from Shackleton Bailey 2000: 2 n. 2; Bellemore (1989: 67-80) argues for M. Scribonius Libo Drusus, or some other unknown conspirator. Further support for the identification of the villain of this *exemplum* as Sejanus is the 'Ciceronian flavour' of the *exemplum* and indeed the chapter as a whole (cf. 9.11.3). Weiler (1998: 62) has noted the Ciceronian rhetoric employed by V. in casting Sejanus as a 'latter-day Catiline' (Levick 1976: 178), '*Eine Person wird angeredet und völlig verdammt; diese rhetorisch durchstilisierte Invektive läßt Anklänge an Ciceros Angriffe gegen Catilina wie auch an offizielle Verurteilungen unter Tiberius erkennen*', citing two passages from Cicero's *Catilinarians* as parallel passages (Cic. *Cat.* 1.33 and 2.29). Sejanus, like the Catilinarian conspirators, was also condemned at a meeting of the Senate in the Temple of Concord (cf. Dio 58.11.4; Levick 1976: 36-7, 177-8); these allusions, therefore, provide even further proof that the unnamed conspirator of 9.11.ext.4 was indeed Sejanus.

As recently as 2008, Themann-Steinke has supported the earlier date.<sup>30</sup> Bellemore, in support of her arguments for an earlier date of the work and following Carter, emphasises that 9.11.ext.4 comes among the *exempla externa*, and thus possibly requires a non-Roman conspirator.<sup>31</sup> However, while a general rule in V.'s organising principles, complete separation between Roman and foreign *exempla* is not hard and fast, as she herself concedes.<sup>32</sup> Indeed, it is better to view this *exemplum* as a conclusion to the chapter as a whole, 'not an ill-fitting addition to the non-Roman items'.<sup>33</sup> In fact, it could plausibly be argued, as this *exemplum* not only concerns a contemporary event from Tiberius' reign, but also recalls a number of themes (e.g. *providentia* and punishment) from the work's preface, that this *exemplum* really concludes the work as a whole, with the remaining *exempla* of the final four chapters constituting a kind of miscellaneous afterthought, or an appendix of sorts.<sup>34</sup>

In addition to 9.11.ext.4, internal evidence used to date the work is found in two further passages: 2.6.8 and 6.1.praef. Kempf's suggestion that Sextus Pompeius' journey to Ceos as proconsul of Asia occurred in AD 27 (recorded at 2.6.8) has largely been retained by Briscoe, who refines it further (based on Syme's arguments)

---

<sup>30</sup> Themann-Steinke 2008: 17-28; her arguments improve upon those made by Carter 1975: 26-56 and Bellemore 1989: 67-80; cf., however, Briscoe 2010: 380-381.

<sup>31</sup> Bellemore 1989: 78 n. 3.

<sup>32</sup> Bellemore 1989: 78 n. 43; cf. e.g. 7.7.4; 2.6.8; 4.7.ext.1.

<sup>33</sup> Briscoe 1993: 401.

<sup>34</sup> See Römer 1990: 106 for a similar suggestion. V.'s refers to his work as *opus nostrum*, cf. 4.8.1, 5.4.7 or *hoc opus* (8.13.praef, 8.14.praef). No differentiation of parts may suggest an author conscious of a unity, even if its parts were published (or written) at different times. Cf. 9.15.1 where V. inserts a cross-reference to his earlier treatment of Equitius at 9.7.1 and by using *huiusce libri* strongly indicates that we have to conceive of the whole of our extant Book 9 as a *liber*; this does not, however, affect the notion of 9.1-11 as a separate treatment of *vitia*.

to the possibility of AD 24-26, thus providing a *terminus post quem* for Book 2.<sup>35</sup> The preface of 6.1 refers to Julia (i.e. Livia) as living (she died in 29), giving a *terminus ante quem* of AD 29 for Book 6.<sup>36</sup> Ultimately, as suggested above, Book 9 emerges only after the Sejanus conspiracy, and hence the final *terminus post quem* must be October AD 31. Little can be said, therefore, about the period of composition – as Briscoe notes, ‘we have no idea of the speed at which he composed, that must be pure speculation’ – but the general timeframe of the internal evidence certainly suggests production in the latter half of Tiberius’ reign.<sup>37</sup>

A problem confronting the historian of the context of late Tiberian Rome is the ability to isolate securely what was distinctive about this period, as truly contemporary evidence is limited. Velleius Paterculus’ work of AD 30, for example, provides a very different picture to those presented by Suetonius or Tacitus in the

---

<sup>35</sup> Kempf 1854: 3-8; Syme 1986: 237-8; Briscoe 1993: 398-401; Briscoe 2010: 380. It should be noted that no datable inscription fixes Sextus Pompeius’ proconsulship (see Vogel-Weidemann 1982: 258-9). The ‘problem’ of Sextus Pompeius’ death (which also bears upon the work’s date) has also been an issue in interpreting 4.7.ext.2; on the meaning of *iactura* Carter (1975: 52 n. 16) states, ‘Valerius’ rhetoric is so woolly that it is impossible to decide which of the three chief metaphorical meanings (*bankruptcy, disfavour, death*) is intended; but cf. Briscoe 1993: 399-400 n. 29, ‘the perfects that precede and the beginning of the following chapter make it clear that Pompeius is dead’; see also Wardle 1998: 2 n. 7.

<sup>36</sup> Briscoe 1993: 401.

<sup>37</sup> Quote taken from Briscoe 1993: 401. Similarly, little can be said about whether or not all books of the work were ‘published’ together or serially. A chapter like 9.15, placed at the very end of the work, might present the best evidence for the final dating of, at least, this section of the work, in that it could be taken to reflect the crisis of the false Drusus who appeared in AD 31 (Tac. *Ann.* 5.10; Dio 58.25.1) shortly after the Sejanus affair – V. tactfully omits recent shock, but provides the very useful parallel of Augustus’ actions against impostors (9.15.ext.1-2).

second century, or Cassius Dio in the third.<sup>38</sup> The important new dossier of inscriptions – the *Tabula Siarensis* (AD 19), *Tabula Hebana* (AD 20)<sup>39</sup>, and the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* (AD 20) – belong early in the reign of Tiberius, and, although crucial in illuminating the ideological background, may in some respects be ‘out of date’ ten or so years on.<sup>40</sup> It is probable that the annalistic tradition was hostile to Tiberius from its beginnings. Aufidius Bassus, in at least one fragment, appears positive towards Tiberius, which could suggest publication before Tiberius’ death; however, we have no certainty about his dates.<sup>41</sup> Servilius Nonianus wrote slightly later than Bassus, and Caligula’s reign, or indeed Claudius or Nero’s, provided an ideal environment for a hostile tradition to have emerged, critical of the killer of the relatives of these emperors.<sup>42</sup>

A number of points concerning the latter half of Tiberius’ reign (c. AD 26 – 37) from the historiographical record warrant comment, particularly because they stand in apparent contrast to what can be sketched from V. Firstly, the presentation of Tiberius as an ‘absent emperor’. Tacitus, for example, highlights the problems of Tiberius’ relationship with the senate (e.g. *Tac. Ann.* 5.3.1; 6.2.4) – a government by letters. V., however, stresses the *praesens* power of Tiberius which is especially notable in the context of Sejanus’ plot, i.e. five years after Tiberius returned to Capri (cf. *Praef.*; 9.11.ext.4). Secondly, the historiographical record generally represents the

---

<sup>38</sup> In general, on Velleius Paterculus, see the essays in Cowan 2011; for Suetonius, see Lindsay 1995: 6-26; on Cassius Dio, Mallan 2015: 40-73. For the date of publication of Velleius’ work as AD 30, see Woodman 1977: 121.

<sup>39</sup> The version of this found at Ilici in Spain dates from AD 23/24, after the death of Drusus (*EJ* 94b).

<sup>40</sup> On this collection of inscriptions, see principally, Rowe 2002.

<sup>41</sup> F 4 (*FRHist* II.xxx); on Aufidius Bassus’ dates, see *FRHist* I.518-21 (Levick). Publication after AD 39 is also possible, once Caligula had had a ‘change of heart’ about Tiberius (Dio 59.4.2).

<sup>42</sup> For Servilius Nonianus, see *FRHist* I.522-4 (Levick). See Martin 2001: 22-26 for Tacitus’ sources on Tiberius.

imperial family as riven with tension (recognised even by Velleius Paterculus at 2.130; while Tacitus devotes careful attention to the demises of Germanicus, Drusus, and Agrippina; cf. e.g. *Ann.* 2.70-73, 5.1.3, 6.23.2). V., by comparison, excludes them all and any notion of anything other than an homogenous *domus Augusta* of virtuous individuals.<sup>43</sup> Thirdly, the latter half of Tiberius' reign is couched in an atmosphere of paranoia: the elite are terrified of potential conviction and death, and Tiberius, who even before Sejanus' fall was suspicious of plots and deception, becomes even more so after.<sup>44</sup> Thus, for example, we see in the historical tradition Cassius Dio claiming that Tiberius was suspicious of the armies of Pannonia and Germanicus (57.3.1-2; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.7.6; Suet. *Tib.* 25). Indeed we see the soldiers in the province of Germany threatening Tiberius' rule by wishing to revolt and install Germanicus as emperor (cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 1.31.1; Vell. Pat. 2.125.1; Dio 57.5.1). Events such as these must have had much resonance behind a chapter like 9.7 and the *exempla* given there demonstrating military sedition, and yet no hint is given in V. about the stresses of his own recent history – rather examples are taken up from further back in the past. The latter part of Tiberius' reign, as the atmosphere of paranoia intensified and, particularly once the reality of the Sejanus conspiracy had been proven, saw a demonstrable change in what were considered the acceptable limits of revenge. Early in the reign (cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 3.18; *SCPP* 1. 61) the senate lauded the emperor for not permitting hatred to be visited upon the corpse of Piso, but at 7.8.5 V. can celebrate the dragging of the corpse of Q. Caecilius through the streets as *exsequias quales meruit*. While the atrocities of posthumous violation that V. records in Book 9 (9.2.1-3) attract righteous indignation, this is because ties of duty were ignored (9.2.1), the victim was undeserving of his fate (9.2.2), or sacrilegious contamination of sacrifices was committed (9.2.3). Sejanus' attempted parricide was so heinous that his whole family could rightfully be exterminated (9.11.ext.4). Nonetheless V. does

---

<sup>43</sup> On V.'s presentation of the *domus Augusta*, see further Wardle 2000: 479-493.

<sup>44</sup> For Tiberius' fear of Sejanus, cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 6.51; Dio 58.4.1.

not give *carte blanche* to revenge – even though he accepts it as essentially just (9.10.praef.); in the final *exemplum* he cautiously opens the possibility that revenge can sometimes not be sufficiently just (*satis iusta*). Tiberius would hardly have approved of the assassination of a ruler for a minor personal injury. The extirpation of a conspirator’s family by a paradigmatic *princeps* arouses no shadow of doubt. The loyalist can justify anything.

Another important aspect of the historical context is the threat (and memory) of civil war that loomed large over the Tiberian Principate. While V. may cast Tiberius as the saviour solely responsible for Rome’s ongoing stability (e.g. at 9.11.ext.4), it must be remembered that Tiberius himself was also a survivor of the civil wars.<sup>45</sup> Under Tiberius the civil wars were a dangerous topic – something to which the case of Cremutius Cordus in AD 25 testifies. As Gowing (2010: 253) has noted, V. shows a clear dislike for writing about the wars (cf. e.g. 5.8.5; 6.2.8; 3.3.2; 4.4.2; 4.6.4; 9.7.mil.Rom.3); and in fact, he goes so far as to censor himself from recording certain *facta* and *dicta* from them (cf. e.g. 2.8.7; 3.3.2). Similar points can be made for V.’s contemporary Velleius Paterculus’ engagement with the civil wars.<sup>46</sup> The *SCPP* (ll. 45-7), having represented the civil wars as buried by Augustus and Tiberius, suggests that Piso was guilty for attempting to start another. Tacitus, too, presents

---

<sup>45</sup> This point is taken from Gowing 2010: 249-250. For fuller discussion of V.’s writing of the civil wars, see Bloomer 1992: 147ff.; Lawrence (2006: 184) states that 9.11.ext.4 ‘perhaps holds a key to Valerius’ on-going interest in civil conflict throughout the work’, continuing to claim that despite the relative peace of Tiberius’ reign, the Sejanus incident as recorded by V. ‘must have reminded those at Rome far too clearly of the excesses of civil war’.

<sup>46</sup> ‘This same sense of caution and reluctance ... about recalling the civil war may be observed in Velleius Paterculus’ (Gowing 2010: 254). Gowing argues, convincingly, that Velleius’ civil war narrative served the purpose of demonstrating that the conflicts of the wars – and even the potential of such wars – were not possible under a ruler like Tiberius.

Sejanus arousing 'civil war alarm'.<sup>47</sup> The anxiety, therefore, of renewed civil war may well have been a very real threat in the mind of Tiberius. And at the same time there was a very real need on the part of the emperor to justify his present power and position as 'guarantor of security'.<sup>48</sup> Given the wars' place in recent history, however, a writer such as V. could hardly have avoided writing about them; indeed, he must have felt compelled to include them, or at least feature aspects of the wars within his *exempla*. But in doing so, he was careful to emphasise that his emperor was the guardian of Rome's safety and the author of his own epoch's *tranquillitas* (8.13.praef.).

Tacitus' account, more than any other, brings out the grim series of prosecutions that punctuate the reign, from the trials of Falanius and Rubrius (*Ann.* 1.73), through to that of L. Arruntius in the dying days of Tiberius' reign (*Ann.* 6.47-8). Two crimes predominate: *maiestas* and *repetundae*. Contemporary authors such as Velleius and V. faced a difficult challenge in dealing with the former in particular – Velleius, in the souped-up finale to his work evokes the *scelerata consilia* of Libo Drusus and Piso and more allusively the plots of Agrippina and Nero (*quod ex nuru, quod ex nepote*), which caused the *princeps* pain (2.130.3-4). V., as we have seen, fulminates against the evil Sejanus (9.11.ext.4), but in other respects chooses the path of judicious silence – *maiestas* never appears in his work as designating 'treason'; a whole chapter on the subject (2.10) avoids any controversial element. Certainly in the aftermath of the fall of Sejanus, when his role in the malicious persecution of many was now manifest, some of those found guilty provided poor examples of Tiberian justice, but are passed over.

---

<sup>47</sup> Relevant examples cited in Damon 2010: 263-5.

<sup>48</sup> Gowing 2010: 257.

By contrast Tiberian handling of gubernatorial corruption (*repetundae*) could be broached, albeit indirectly. Twelve *repetundae* trials are recorded for Tiberius' reign, more than any other reign; eight resulted in convictions.<sup>49</sup> Scholarly opinion (e.g. Levick 1976) is that Tiberius was a stricter enforcer of the law and that provincials believed they could secure convictions rather than that his reign was worse than that of other emperors. Given his attitude to abuse of *vehiculatio*, it is likely that Tiberius did not look kindly on abusive governors.<sup>50</sup> In this light V.'s comments that there was universal approval of revenge against the avaricious Hadrianus (9.10.2) taken by his provincial victims may reflect favourably on the current situation – because governors were constrained by Tiberius' strictness, there were no similar cases of revenge in his day.

Situating V.'s work within the intellectual and cultural context of late Tiberian Rome is perhaps even more tricky given not only the range of sources (literary and material) one may use to designate a specific cultural epoch, but also given the difficulty of delineating an *actual* culturally distinct period – what makes Tiberian Rome 'Tiberian' ideologically or culturally, for example, and not simply a continuation of Augustan Rome? While some modern scholars have attempted to see the period as one of continuity rather than change, others have firmly attempted to delimit a set period.<sup>51</sup> A number of points are worth considering in relation to the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* and Book 9 in particular that will establish how V. has assimilated key intellectual and cultural developments of the Tiberian period.

---

<sup>49</sup> See Brunt 1990: 90-2 for tabulation of these.

<sup>50</sup> See e.g. Mitchell 1976: 106-131.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. e.g. Balmaceda (2014: 361), citing Velleius Paterculus; Cowan (2009b: 179-210), who discusses Tacitus' presentation of Tiberius dependence on Augustus and Augustan precedent; Roller (2015: 15 n. 9) states that 'neither Velleius Paterculus nor Valerius Maximus present Augustus as a watershed: Velleius in particular presents a smooth teleological narrative climaxing with Tiberius, whom he suggests has brought the *res publica* to perfection'.

Unlike the 'golden' literary outpouring which occurred during the reign of his direct predecessor, Tiberius' most notable contribution to the world of letters was to inhibit it.<sup>52</sup> A number of writers were prosecuted or censored – Goodyear goes so far as to say that only authors like Velleius Paterculus were able to flourish in such a climate.<sup>53</sup> In discussing 'Tiberian culture', Alain Gowing notes that, while Tiberius in contrast to Augustus 'does not appear to have exerted much influence over the creative imaginings of the writers who worked under his regime', the majority of literature that we know of from his reign appears to be historical in nature.<sup>54</sup> His further contention is that the reason behind this historical preoccupation is a general attempt to view Tiberius' rule as an extension of the Roman Republic that Augustus 'restored'. It is important to point out that Tiberius' personal tastes were not common.<sup>55</sup> He enjoyed the obscure in mythology (cf. e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 70.3) and ambiguity in his speech (cf. e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 86.2; Tac. *Ann.* 13.3.2). Given these tendencies and the various dedications that Tiberius received from authors – usually of scholarly works as Barbara Levick has noted – it is tempting to suggest that a more 'technical' literature developed under Tiberius, one that could stand out as a

---

<sup>52</sup> Goodyear 1984: 603: 'Tiberius most directly influenced literature by inhibiting it'.

<sup>53</sup> See Goodyear 1984: 603-6 for further examples.

<sup>54</sup> Gowing 2005: 32-4. Composition of a list of Tiberian authors proves difficult given the paucity of information we have regarding the dates of certain authors, and indeed the exact natures of their works. A simplistic list, in addition to V. and Velleius Paterculus, may include the following: Fenestella, Aulus Cremutius Cordus, Brutteditus Niger, Seneca the Elder, Clutorius Priscus, Phaedrus, M. Manilius, Germanicus, Aulus Cornelius Celsus, Apollonides of Nicaea, Ovid, Strabo, Pomponius Secundus, Albinovanus Pedo, Aufidius Bassus, and indeed the emperor himself.

<sup>55</sup> See e.g. Champlin 2008: 408-425; Champlin 2014: 199-246.

hallmark of ‘Tiberian culture’ more generally.<sup>56</sup> This, then, would provide a fertile context for the production of a ‘handbook’ of *exempla*.

The rise of declamation among elite society in late republican and early imperial Rome and what Lobur has called the ‘rhetoricizing aspects of early imperial prose’ is an important cultural phenomenon in which to situate V.’s production of his work.<sup>57</sup> While, however, the kinds of rhetorical embellishment on which declamation placed great value are ubiquitous in V., and *exempla* have a role in declamation (seen e.g. in Seneca the Elder’s *Controversiae*), it is unlikely that V.’s work was created as a handbook for declaimers.<sup>58</sup> Here a focus on only a few aspects of V.’s language and ideology are relevant in relation to Book 9.

The first of these is the ‘sacralising’ language used by V. in discussing the emperor and the imperial family, especially in relation to the growth of imperial cult during the later years of Augustus’ reign and subsequently under Tiberius.<sup>59</sup> As David Wardle has already noted, although the imperial family does not feature frequently within the *Facta* (in comparison with an exemplar such as Marius for example), nonetheless the passages when they do appear are significant qualitatively: as ‘direct or indirect panegyric of the imperial house appears at key structural points in the

---

<sup>56</sup> Levick 1976: 230; see also Goodyear 1984: 606: ‘Perhaps, within the somewhat narrow range of his own interests, Tiberius positively encouraged scholarly activity, but we cannot so affirm with any confidence’.

<sup>57</sup> Lobur 2008: 128. See Lobur 2008: 128-169 for a survey of declamatory practices at Rome during this period, along with various case studies.

<sup>58</sup> See Wardle 1998: 12-15. The effect of declamatory practices on Latin literature, and here Valerius Maximus, is not a focus of this thesis; see further Sinclair 1980; Sinclair 1984: 141-146.

<sup>59</sup> This aspect is a key indicator of a shift in what could be said about an emperor in prose from the earlier Augustan period, reflecting not only the development of ruler cult, but also how the role of the emperor was perceived; cf. e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.104.3.

work, which gives it a greater prominence'.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore Wardle has noted that one of the most remarkable aspects of V.'s presentation of Caesar, Augustus, and Tiberius is his stress on their divinity.<sup>61</sup> One area where this is seen most clearly in V.'s text is in what could be called the 'language of stars', that is, sidereal language associated with imperial cult. From as early on as the work's preface, V. refers to Caesar as a star, along with Augustus, intimating also Tiberius' own present and future celestial divinity.<sup>62</sup> Later at 2.1.10 V. refers to the Caesars as *divi* – the brightest part of the heavens (*caeli clarissima pars*). At 3.2.19, in a chapter on bravery (*fortitudo*) V. refers specifically to Caesar as a man once superior in military and civilian life, but now the bright splendour of the stars, the god Julius (*sed ut armorum et togae superius, nunc etiam siderum clarum decus, divum Iulium*). The comet that had appeared in the sky in July 44 during his funeral games was exploited by Octavian as proof of Caesar's apotheosis – a belief taken up by many of V.'s contemporaries.<sup>63</sup> In the climactic *exemplum* within a chapter illustrating changes in fortune, V. refers again specifically to Caesar, who, through his virtues, we are told, secured his path to heaven (6.9.15). The *exemplum* itself recounts an incident from Caesar's youth, in which, having been captured by pirates, he ransomed himself for fifty talents. Capturing the pirates, in turn, he had them crucified. V.'s explanation – that if Fortune did not even spare the brightest star in the universe, whose divinity was the same as her own, and that therefore mere mortals could hardly hope for more – continues the sidereal vocabulary where Caesar is concerned; concluding that he vindicated himself by his 'celestial power' (*caeleste numen*).

---

<sup>60</sup> Wardle 2000: 479.

<sup>61</sup> Wardle 1997: 323-345; Wardle 2000: 479-493; Wardle 2002: 433-440.

<sup>62</sup> 1.praef.: *mea parvitas eo iustius ad favorem tuum decucurrerit, quo cetera divinitas opinione colligitur, tua praesenti fide paterno avitoque sideri par videtur, quorum eximio fulgore multum caerimoniis nostris inclutae claritatis accessit: reliquos enim deos accepimus, Caesares dedimus.*

<sup>63</sup> Ramsey and Licht 1997 is the standard work; see now also, Pandey 2013: 405-449.

Augustus, by comparison with Caesar, is subjected less frequently to stellar treatment by V.<sup>64</sup> One possible reason for this is that opportunistic use of celestial phenomena, such as that which he himself made in 44 BC in order to link himself to adopted father, was no longer necessary, nor, indeed, could he guarantee a repeat performance – and hence his own sidereal propaganda was not as pronounced. Augustus had been formally deified by the senate in AD 14, and both Suetonius (*Aug.* 100.4) and Cassius Dio (56.46.2) relate that a former praetor had been found to attest to his ascent to heaven. In V., outside of the direct reference in the preface itself, only oblique allusions are made to his celestial position (e.g. 1.7.1; 7.7.4); and usually only to indicate his posthumous divinity.

Tiberius, in turn, as we have already seen in the preface, is said by V. to equal the stars of his father and grandfather in their divinity. In his typical grandiose rhetoric, V. refers to Tiberius as the ‘surest salvation of the fatherland’ (*certissima salus patriae*), whose ‘celestial providence’ (*caelestis providentia*) enables him to act as arbiter over morality and the virtues and vices that V. will go on to discuss. Elsewhere, in an elaborate *exemplum*, V. recounts Tiberius’ dash to his dying brother’s side. In concluding remarks to this example of fraternal piety, V. compares Tiberius and Drusus to Castor and Pollux – the Greek mythological brothers who were turned by Zeus into the constellation Gemini, and were also later widely celebrated at Rome.<sup>65</sup> V., here, is very much cued into contemporary associations between the heavenly twins and the imperial brothers. It is surely not coincidental, then, that elsewhere (4.6.ext.3) V. again refers to the ‘noble fame’ of Castor and Pollux, the ‘pair of brothers destined for the stars’ (*nobilis famaе ... destinatum sideribus par fratrum*).

---

<sup>64</sup> On Augustus’ treatment more generally, see Wardle 2000: 483-489.

<sup>65</sup> See Wardle 2002: 433-440 for detailed discussion of this *exemplum*; for the mythological pair’s popularity at Rome, as well as their use in Tiberian propaganda (mentioned below), see Champlin 2011: 73-99.

Perhaps one of the most important examples for Tiberius comes from 9.11.ext.4. As discussed in the commentary on the passage, the language in this *exemplum* deliberately recalls the preface and celebrates Tiberius' leadership and preservation of the commonwealth in the face of a deadly conspiracy. The Roman empire, V. tells his readers, was safeguarded because of Tiberius' present divine power (*praesenti numine*), and goes on to claim that the eyes of the gods (*oculi deorum*) were vigilant and that the stars retained their strength. *Oculi deorum*, given its use elsewhere in the work, specifically at 4.3.3, where V. directly refers to Augustus and Tiberius as the 'two divine eyes of the commonwealth' (*duobus rei publicae divinis oculis*), is likely to have specific application to Divus Julius and Divus Augustus here rather than only to the state. Even V.'s phrase *sidera suum vigorem obtinuerunt* – 'the stars maintained their potency' in Shackleton Bailey's translation – could refer to Caesar and Augustus as stars, given that elsewhere in the work he refers to them as such.<sup>66</sup>

These aspects find points of contact in the language used of the *domus Augusta*, and the apotheosis of Caesar and Augustus especially, in some of V.'s near literary contemporaries – the works of Ovid that date from his exile, as well as the astronomical treatise of Manilius, and V.'s prose contemporary Velleius Paterculus.<sup>67</sup> Likewise, material remains in the form of inscriptions also demonstrate the language of cult both as an Italian and empire-wide response to the Sejanus conspiracy which finds parallels in V. (see 9.11.ext.4 with comment).<sup>68</sup> As Greg Rowe has shown, the imperial family was central in creating a uniformity of imperial political culture, which in turn was fundamental to the creation of a uniform imperial ideology at this period – in which, something like imperial cult was but one facet.<sup>69</sup> V.'s language in

---

<sup>66</sup> See further discussion in the commentary *ad loc.*

<sup>67</sup> On Ovid, see e.g. Millar 1993: 1-17; cf. e.g. Man. *Astron.* 1.7-10; Vell. Pat. 2.47.1, 2.124, 2.126.

<sup>68</sup> E.g. *ILS* 157 from Interamna and *ILS* 158 from Gortyn.

<sup>69</sup> This is a central thesis of Rowe 2002.

this regard is fully in line with his contemporaries, therefore, and particularly appropriate in the aftermath of conspiracy.

The early imperial period also saw the growing prominence of virtues and vices as well as moral language more generally in public discourse.<sup>70</sup> This is perhaps seen most clearly in the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* from AD 20. Although, as stated above, because this text is from earlier in Tiberius' reign and may therefore be less relevant for the ideological world of late Tiberian Rome, it does at least demonstrate the rise of moral language in public discourse which would then go on to influence later periods. Alison Cooley's lucid reading of this document illustrates a number of relevant points of contact with the worldview we find informing V.'s work. As she notes, in issuing the document the Roman senate is prescriptive in exhorting the people to model its behaviour on Tiberius.<sup>71</sup> Similarly, as she continues, 'The vast majority of the Senate's decree is concerned with condemning the vices of Piso and with stemming the infection within his family on the one hand, and with praising the virtues of the *domus Augusta* on the other'.<sup>72</sup> In addition to such senatorial decrees, coinage issued at Rome is another way of tracing the language of a set period, as well as the ideologies which an emperor wished to transmit to the people.<sup>73</sup> Dating, however, is often less than certain, but a number of trends emerge during the Tiberian principate. The term 'virtue', as Barbara Levick has noted, fails to cover the range of 'moral or emotive words' that an emperor wished to have expressed on official coinage, but whatever the term used, the language of Tiberian Rome appears to cluster around the following terms: *concordia, salus, clementia,*

---

<sup>70</sup> See e.g. Wallace-Hadrill 1983; Noreña 2001: 146-168; Noreña 2011.

<sup>71</sup> Cooley 1998: 200.

<sup>72</sup> Cooley 1998: 207.

<sup>73</sup> The influence an emperor had over the mints is subject to debate; see e.g. Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 298-323; Levick 1982: 104-116.

*iustitia, pietas, virtus, providentia*, and, perhaps most famously for Tiberius, *moderatio*.<sup>74</sup>

In a similar way to the *SCPP*, Velleius Paterculus, too, refers to Tiberius as an example for the Roman people to follow – referring to him as the *optimus princeps*.<sup>75</sup> This idea is fully congruent with V.’s presentation of the emperor. Not only does V.’s refer to Tiberius using the same language (cf. 2.praef.), but he explicitly (and right from the start of the work) invokes Tiberius to the job (cf. 1.praef.) – for V. Tiberius not only provides an *exemplum* of virtuous behaviour on which the Roman people are able to model themselves, but he is also the key enforcer of the moral system which V. goes on to present in his work. Eleanor Cowan has argued that in adopting the idea of Tiberius as *optimus princeps*, the Tiberian writers confirmed Tiberius’ right to rule – based not necessarily on dynastic principles, or his adoption of Augustus as a model, but simply because – in their presentation at least – he was the best man for the job of *princeps*.<sup>76</sup>

### **Valerius Maximus on Vice**

Book 9 of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is the only book of the work to have an unremitting focus on negative values. V.’s purpose in including *exempla* detailing various vices complements the larger moral purpose of his work in selecting and arranging words and deeds that he considers are worthy of record, in order to spare his readers lengthy searches in the voluminous works of other earlier and more well-

---

<sup>74</sup> See Levick 1976: 82-91; Levick suggests that the term ‘principles’ is better. For *moderatio*, see comment on 9.3.2.

<sup>75</sup> Vell. Pat. 2.126.5; the designation is found also on inscriptions: cf. e.g. *CIL* 6.93, 6.902, 6.904, 6.3675, 11.3872 (collected at Cowan 2009a: 483 n. 83); cf. also e.g. Sen. *Dial.* 9.14.4; Plin. *Ep.* 3.18.3, 8.6.10 (see Themann-Steinke 2008: 115).

<sup>76</sup> Cowan 2009a: 468-485.

known writers.<sup>77</sup> Although, admittedly, the majority of the work is taken up with examples of virtue – aspects of moral excellence transmitted, principally by earlier Romans, but to a lesser degree by other peoples as well – the very fact that V., in his invocation of the emperor Tiberius in the Preface to the work, refers to him as an arbiter of morality, not only in the fostering of virtue, but *also* in the punishment of vice, indicates to the reader that immorality will also be considered. That he includes *vitia* in lesser quantity is also significant because he claims, at least twice in the work, that too much meditation on immorality could be unprofitable.<sup>78</sup>

Some have claimed that V.'s inclusion of vices in the work is merely for the sake of rhetorical variety and readability.<sup>79</sup> While this reason is not without its merits, the examples that record vices are not wholly without their own didactic purposes too, as seen, for example, in his statement in the preface to chapter 9.13: *verum quia excessus e vita et fortuitos et viriles, quosdam etiam temerarios oratione attigimus, subiciamus nunc aestimationi enerves et effeminatos, ut ipsa comparatione pateat quanto non solum fortior, sed etiam sapientior mortis interdum quam vitae sit cupiditas.*<sup>80</sup>

Elsewhere, V. expresses his reasons for the inclusion of vices in the work in other ways. At the opening of Book 9, for example, in the preface to the twin vices of *luxuria* and *libido*, V. comments that he includes these examples in order to promote

---

<sup>77</sup> Val. Max. 1.praef. For V.'s moral purpose, see Skidmore 1996: 53-82; Wardle 1998: 12-15; and more recently, Langlands 2008: 160-187; Langlands 2011: 100-105; and Morgan 2007, esp. pp. 149-151 on the vices.

<sup>78</sup> Skidmore 1996: 79; cf. Val. Max. 9.4.praef.; 3.6.praef.

<sup>79</sup> E.g. Bliss 1951.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. e.g. Val. Max. 5.2.praef. As Skidmore (1996: 80) notes, 'Comparison is the motive for the inclusion of vices'.

repentance from them.<sup>81</sup> Similarly, in the preface to 9.2, a chapter on cruelty, V. claims that silence only increases the spread of this vice, but that by denouncing it, the vice may be limited. And he also encourages his readers to possess the correct moral response towards vices; in the case of *crudelitas*, hatred.<sup>82</sup>

One way to think about V.'s exemplary project in morality, something that he himself signals, is to think of *exempla* in relation to *imagines*. Pre-empted in part already by Skidmore (1996: 84-5), Langlands (2000: 13-24), and Gowing (2005: 56-7), I wish to add a slightly different dimension to this relationship, especially in regard to vice, from the arena of moral philosophy. Principally, *imagines* were the wax portraits of male ancestors kept in the *atria* of Roman houses, often displayed also during aristocratic funeral processions.<sup>83</sup> The semantic range of the Latin term *imago*, however, is broad, particularly when used in more abstract senses, where it includes things like 'ghost', 'vision', 'example or personification', 'model', 'picture' etc.; but it is also specifically used to translate the Greek philosophical term of εἰδωλον (*OLD* 4).<sup>84</sup> In a number of passages across the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* V. refers to *imagines*

---

<sup>81</sup> *Blandum etiam malum luxuria, quam accusare aliquanto facilius est quam vitare, operi nostro inseratur, non quidem ut ullum honorem recipiat, sed ut se ipsa recognoscens ad paenitentiam impelli possit. iungatur illi libido, quoniam ex isdem vitiorum principiis oritur, neque aut a reprehensione aut ab emendatione separentur, gemino mentis errore conexas.*

<sup>82</sup> *cui [i.e. crudelitati] silentium donare crementum est adicere: quem enim quem modum sibi ipsa statuet, si ne suggillationis quidem frenis fuerit revocata? ad summam, cum penes illam sit timeri, penes nos sit odisse.*

<sup>83</sup> The processional element is important. As Flower (1996: 35) has noted, 'the *imago* enabled the Romans to view their past history as a pageant'; similarly, some of the vices that V. details, he personifies and drags out as spectacles to behold; cf. e.g. 9.2.praef.; 9.4.praef.; 9.5.1; 9.6.praef.

<sup>84</sup> The best most recent study is to be found in Flower 1996, see esp. pp. 32-59. Many of the *exempla* referring to *imagines* within the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* refer to ancestor masks proper; other references are less clear; cf. e.g. 1.7.praef.; 1.7.ext.1; 1.7.ext.2; 1.7.ext.9; 2.7.5; 2.9.3; 2.9.6a; 3.5.praef.; 3.7.11; 3.8.7; 4.1.6; 4.4.1; 4.5.2; 4.6.praef.; 5.4.ext.1; 5.5.praef.; 6.6.praef.; 7.5.5; 8.1.damn.3; 8.9.ext.3; 8.11.ext.5; 8.15.1; 9.3.praef.; 9.9.praef.; 9.11.praef.; 9.14.3; see also Weileder 1998: 88 n. 298.

in relation to the *exempla* themselves. In a chapter on dreams (1.7.praef.), for example, he refers to the *certis imaginibus* (cf. Wardle's 'definite images' with Shackleton Bailey's 'sure apparitions') that he will then go on to enumerate as *exempla*. At 4.6.praef., in a chapter on conjugal love, he states that he will place *imagines* before his reader's eyes, even while acknowledging that these deeds will be hard to imitate, but justifying their inclusion by their usefulness in knowing. And in lists of *exempla* demonstrating either the vices of anger (*ira*) or hatred (*odium*), he informs us that these 'sure images' (*certissimae ... imagines*) have been allowed their visibility by the gods (9.3.praef.). Finally, in the preface to 9.11, V. clearly states *how* he has been going about his project in recalling both the good and bad of human life, claiming that he has been substituting *imagines* with *exempla*. He makes much out of the fact that he has placed these *imagines* before his reader's eyes (cf. e.g. 4.6.praef.; 5.4.ext.1; 6.6.praef.), and on occasion, points to the fact that these *imagines* have served as negative *exempla* – that is, that they have provided audiences with examples of things not to imitate, a moral code of don'ts.<sup>85</sup>

From at least as early on as Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.11.1ff.) this idea of 'setting before the eyes' (πρὸ ὀμμάτων ποιεῖν) has been noted as a tool in the art of rhetorical persuasion. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a treatise from the early 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C., transmits this idea while also linking it to the medium of the *exemplum* (cf. 3.22.35; 4.48.61ff.). Voula Tsouna has explored this technique in relation to the works of the Epicurean philosopher, Philodemus.<sup>86</sup> As she notes, although used by many philosophical schools, Epicurean authors, in particular, drew 'vivid if elliptical portraits which [brought] out characteristic features of certain types of persons, good

---

<sup>85</sup> In addition to those examples mentioned above, especially from Book 9, cf. also e.g. 8.9.ext.3.

<sup>86</sup> See Tsouna 2007: 86-7, 195-6, 204-8 for explanation and discussion of examples; for more general discussion of Philodemus on vice, see also Tsouna 2001: 233-258.

or bad' placing them before the eyes of their readers.<sup>87</sup> This 'moral portraiture' (to use her terminology) serves a quasi-medical and therapeutic purpose. By having various vices put before their eyes, the 'viewer' is persuaded to moral conduct. In stating this purpose more fully, Tsouna writes,

'to "put-before-the-eyes", to compel us to imagine just what it is like to be superstitious, arrogant, irascible, etc., and also what it is like to be the opposite. Imaginings of this sort can be very effective, but the success of the technique depends on the literary qualities of the representation ... If the technique works, we feel aversion not only towards isolated elements, such as arrogance or rage, but towards the entire personality of someone arrogant or irascible. We simply do not want to be that sort of person, but just the opposite'.<sup>88</sup>

In a similar way, V.'s highly rhetorical and vivid descriptions of *exempla* illustrating key vices attempt to persuade his readers, not only to shun immorality, but also to lead moral lives.

### **The Sources of Valerian Vice**

Right at the outset of his work V. claims that he has selected his stories from famous authors (*ab illustribus ... auctoribus*; 1.praef.), giving the impression that he has read far and wide, sparing his readers much effort. Scholars interested in *Quellenforschung* have produced an ever widening and narrowing pool of authors or (now lost) exemplary collections on which V. supposedly draws, but current scholarly

---

<sup>87</sup> Tsouna 2007: 86. The 'vividness' of these portraits is important; ἐνάργεια, both philosophically and rhetorically, is used in persuasion; see Vasaly 1993: 89ff.

<sup>88</sup> Tsouna 2007: 87.

consensus provides a somewhat select group: Livy, Cicero, Varro, and Pompeius Trogus.<sup>89</sup>

For Book 9.1-11, I have indicated V.'s sources, where possible, within the commentary. In some instances, owing to the significant verbal and structural similarities of V.'s *exemplum* to its source passage clear identification has been possible. In other instances these aspects of the *exemplum* suggest at least partial (or potential) use of a certain source. It must be remembered, however, that V. does not merely collect *exempla* and arrange them under various rubrics, but he also consciously adapts and varies their style and content.<sup>90</sup> Out of the 90 *exempla* contained in 9.1-11 (I have excluded prefaces and other 'para-textual' elements to the *exempla* themselves), I have indicated within the commentary itself six examples of direct demonstrable dependence upon Livy, with a further thirteen possible instances of dependence.<sup>91</sup> For Cicero I have identified four direct uses, with a

---

<sup>89</sup> See Wardle 1998: 15-18; Dübner (1845: 260-3) identified Livy, Cicero, Pompeius Trogus, and Sallust as V.'s main sources; Kempf (1854: 12-34) put forward Livy and Cicero as the principal sources, along with Zschech (1865) who added Varro; Krieger (1888) developed Varro as a source further, and to him he added Dionysius of Halicarnassus; this continued with a number of scholars each focusing on a specific author as a source for V., hence e.g. Crohn (1882) on Pompeius Trogus and Maire (1899) on Diodorus Siculus. Klotz (1909) argued that V. used an Augustan collection of *exempla* written by C. Julius Hyginus; Bosch (1929) furthered this thesis by proposing that V. used two exemplary handbooks, one of Ciceronian date. Helm, however, in two publications (1939, 1940) refuted these propositions and reiterated Varro and Cicero as major sources for V. Bliss (1951) gave special place to stylistic evidence in discerning V.'s sources and provided close analysis of the linguistic variations between V., Livy, and Cicero. See also, Maslakov 1979: 104-338; Sinclair 1980: 176-214; Maslakov 1984: 437-496; Bloomer 1992: 59-146.

<sup>90</sup> This was demonstrated most convincingly by Bliss 1951.

<sup>91</sup> For Livy as a direct source, see the commentary at 9.1.ext.1; 9.3.1; 9.3.3; 9.3.6; 9.6.1; 9.10.1; for possible dependence, see, 9.1.3; 9.1.ext.2; 9.2.1; 9.3.5; 9.3.ext.3; 9.4.2; 9.5.2; 9.7.mil.Rom.2; 9.7.mil.Rom.3; 9.8.1; 9.8.2; 9.9.3; 9.10.2 with commentary.

further eight passages that suggest evidence of use.<sup>92</sup> Pompeius Trogus seems a likely candidate for many of the foreign *exempla*, when one is able to check via verbal similarities found in Justin, or simply by subject matter, and finally Sallust appears to be a minor source for five passages.<sup>93</sup> The passages with unknown sources, therefore, are numerous, and while the lost books of Livy, or Varro, or Pompeius Trogus could offer likely candidates, the process becomes a rather questionable exercise in ‘educated guessing’.

Some of the passages appear to demonstrate that V. used more than one source in his composition of the *exemplum*, while in others it would perhaps be more correct to label as instances of intertextuality. For example, 9.11.ext.4 shares rhetorical similarities with Cicero’s *Catilinarians*, but given that the event described in the *exemplum* comes from the Tiberian Age, the substance of the *exemplum* most certainly cannot come from a Ciceronian source.<sup>94</sup>

The general pattern of 9.1-11 roughly corresponds with Bliss’ findings. His statistics showed that V. can reliably be shown to imitate Livy and Cicero in little over ten percent of his *exempla*. One could say, therefore, that as far as it can be securely demonstrated, V. makes infrequent use of these authors. But to do so would disregard the fact that much of Livy’s history is lost and therefore reliable comparison is impossible – as Maslakov has noted, ‘the evidence provided by Bliss’ statistical classification of the parallels (counting the number of transfers and

---

<sup>92</sup> Direct: 9.1.ext.3; 9.2.ext.8; 9.4.1; 9.11.2. Possible use: 9.1.1; 9.1.7; 9.1.9; 9.2.ext.10; 9.4.3; 9.10.2; 9.11.3; 9.11.ext.4.

<sup>93</sup> For Pompeius Trogus, see, 9.1.ext.4; 9.1.ext.5; 9.2.ext.4; 9.2.ext.5; 9.2.ext.6; 9.3.ext.1; 9.5.ext.1; 9.10.ext.1; 9.11.ext.2. For Sallust, 9.1.5; 9.1.9; 9.2.1; 9.8.ext.1; 9.11.3.

<sup>94</sup> For V. possibly using more than one source for an *exemplum*, see e.g. 9.1.9; 9.2.1; 9.10.2; 9.11.3 with commentary.

variants) tends to undermine rather than confirm his general thesis.<sup>95</sup> In cases where the number of variants is slight and the *exemplum* in Valerius brief, dependence on Livy is unprovable'. A similar argument can be made for V.'s use of Cicero, many of whose speeches and philosophical dialogues survive only in fragments or not at all.

But the quantity of V.'s use of these authors aside, perhaps a more interesting question is the 'quality' of V.'s use. For example, when we can reliably identify Livy, or Cicero, or some other author, as V.'s direct source, does its new context, as well as V.'s rewriting of it, impose on the *exemplum* a different aim or interpretation? Maslakov, having surveyed Bliss' research, claims that 'as far as Livy was concerned, Valerius did not conceive his historical judgments as a dominant model to follow ... Livy as an interpreter of the Roman tradition leaves little trace in Valerius'.<sup>96</sup> Sarah Lawrence has reached a similar view claiming that 'while many differences between Livy's text and that of Valerius are intriguing and significant others may simply reveal the different priorities of a historian and a writer of *exempla*'.<sup>97</sup> Maslakov points to a number of reasons for this variation in use, citing not only V.'s use of other sources, but also 'his moral, religious and political traditionalism that seems to condition his rhetoric at vital points' thereby situating the *exempla* within his own moral sequence.<sup>98</sup> Again, similar points can be made regarding V.'s use of Cicero.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Maslakov 1979: 143 n. 1 = 1984: 460 n. 41.

<sup>96</sup> Maslakov 1979: 142 = 1984: 459.

<sup>97</sup> Lawrence 2006: 14; cf. also Wardle 1998: 16-18.

<sup>98</sup> Maslakov 1979: 142-6 = Maslakov 1984: 459-61.

<sup>99</sup> The statistics of V.'s use of Cicero are given in Bliss 1951: 284-91; he finds 194 parallels. The general impression given is that V. excerpts mainly Cicero's philosophical works, and possibly his letters, but not key political speeches. 9.1-11 confirms this impression.

Maslakov's judgement is confirmed by examples from Book 9.1-11. Because of verbal similarities (underlined in the texts below) it can be argued with a fair degree of certainty that V.'s source for 9.9.3, for example, is Livy (4.17.1-6).

<p><i>in horum magistratu Fidenae, colonia Romana, ad Lartem Tolumnium [Veientium regem] ac Veientes defecere. maius additum defectioni scelus: C. Fulcinium, Cloelium Tullum, Sp. Antium, L. Roscium, legatos Romanos, causam novi consilii quaerentes, iussu Tolumni interfecerunt. levant quidam regis facinus; <u>in tesserarum prospero iactu</u> vocem eius ambiguam, ut occidi iussisse videretur, a Fidenatibus exceptam causam mortis legatis fuisse,—rem incredibilem, interventu Fidenatium, novorum sociorum, consulentium de caede ruptura ius gentium, non aversum ab intentione <u>lusus</u> animum nec deinde in <u>errorem</u> versum facinus. propius est fidem obstringi Fidenatium populum ne respicere spem ullam ab Romanis posset conscientia tanti sceleris voluisse. legatorum qui Fidenis caesi erant statuae publice in Rostris positae sunt.</i></p>	<p><i>Ceterum falsa opinatio nescio an praecipuam iniuriam Lartis Tolumnii, Veientium regis, penatibus intulerit: nam cum <u>in tesserarum prospero</u> iactu per iocum collusori dixisset 'occide', et forte Romanorum legati intervenissent, satellites eius, <u>errore</u> vocis impulsus, interficiendo legatos <u>lusum</u> ad imperium transtulerunt.</i></p>
--	---

Placing the passages side by side immediately reveals that V. has greatly abbreviated Livy's account – the length of the passages alone demonstrates this, but removal of key details is also evident. Not only has V.'s stripped the *exemplum* of his historical

context, he has also removed Livy's interpretation of the event (see commentary *ad loc.*). Rather V. has latched onto a key word in Livy's text *errore* – the 'moral aspect' (see the introduction to the chapter) that he wished to showcase in the chapter and has presented a much simpler *exemplum* in order to demonstrate the fatal consequences brought about because of it.<sup>100</sup>

Similarly at 9.11.ext.1 V. abridges Livy's narrative of Tullia's infamous impiety (1.48.6-7). As in the previous instance, V.'s removes the *exemplum* from the context provided by the historian. Maslakov (1979: 186) has noted that V. has also changed a minor detail – which he attributes to V.'s compression of the story. For in Livy's account, Tullia is returning home, whereas in V.'s account she appears to be heading towards Tarquinius' embrace. This minor difference is not unimportant in V.'s moral classification of this event, as it must surely serve to damn Tullia further – not only has she ridden over the body of her dead father, but she did so in her rush to embrace his murderer. In this way, V.'s *exemplum* highlights the moral aspects of the narrative rather than its historical, or antiquarian, detail.

Again verbal similarities point to a passage in Livy at 2.27.1-7 as V.'s source for 9.3.6. In Livy's account the episode is shown within the context of the struggle between the *patres* and the people, with the senate playing an important role (*senatus a se rem ad populum reiecit*). V., however, in the context of his chapter on anger, intends the *exemplum* to highlight the anger of the people – which, although effective, he does not look favourably upon (made clear by his opening comments at 9.3.7). As

---

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Maslakov (1979: 147-153 = 1984: 461-464), who provides an excellent discussion of V.'s use at 9.6.1 of Livy 1.2, concluding that 'As far as the question of Valerius being an imitator of Livy is concerned, this parallel shows that a presence of stylistic variants, indicating a degree of dependence on Livy, is compatible with the combination of these derived elements into a substantially different account, one that projects an essentially distinct understanding of the even in question'.

Maslakov (1979: 219) notes, 'Livy tempers his evidence of this display of popular will by a reference to the senate's decision to refer the matter to popular arbitration' – V. demonstrates a clear change of emphasis in his framing of a Livian source.

Similar points can be made for V.'s use of Cicero. For example, stylistic variation is clearly seen in V.'s *exemplum* on Xerxes' desire for novelty in his excesses of *luxuria*. While Cicero (*Tusc.* 5.20) has *praemium proposuit, qui invenisset novam voluptatem* (and clearly designates *libido*), V. varies Cicero's language only slightly, offering instead *ut edicto praemium ei proponeret, qui novum voluptatis genus repperisset* (and using *luxuria*).<sup>101</sup> Elsewhere at 9.2.ext.8 V. aims at highlighting the Athenian community's *crudelitas* instead of the natural law argument of *utilitas* found in his source (*Cic. Off.* 3.46).<sup>102</sup>

### **A Canon of Vices?**

Who and what, then, are the subject(s) of Valerian vice? Superficial speculation would perhaps suggest that examples from foreign nations would illustrate more clearly the vices that V. presents than Roman ones. Given the sharp structural distinction within V.'s work between Roman and foreign *exempla*, a number of scholars have tended to characterise V. as being generally negative towards foreign nations.<sup>103</sup> Sarah Lawrence, however, has recently argued against such a simplistic view, claiming that 'Valerius' philosophy gives primacy to behaviour above all;

---

<sup>101</sup> See further Maslakov 1979: 302.

<sup>102</sup> See further Maslakov 1979: 319-320.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. e.g. Krieger 1888: 9; Watts 1976: 92; Sinclair 1980: 7-8; Bloomer 1992: 21, 48-50; Mueller 2002a: *passim*. Recently Rüpke (2016: 96), in reading the Preface (*Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna*), has stated that 'foreign examples are admittedly demoted to second place in each class'. While certainly syntactically in second place, *que* is not a subordinating conjunction; it would perhaps be better to understand the phrase as V. claiming that he will collect his examples from the entire world.

accidents of birth and geography are discounted in the face of demonstrably universal ideas'.<sup>104</sup> Other scholars argue that V.'s includes *externa exempla* for the sake of variety, pleasure, or entertainment.<sup>105</sup>

One thing that must be noted is that the inclusion of foreign material within an exemplary collection at this period is unusual.<sup>106</sup> And Lawrence's suggestion that 'Valerius Maximus may actually have had more interest in the external material than his predecessors and perhaps the inclusion of the external material served a particular, important role. The moral ideas that he discusses are as vividly present in the external *exempla* as they are in the Roman material' is attractive.<sup>107</sup>

The context of the production of V.'s work might provide some clues in understanding his rationale for, not only the structure, but also the generally neutral, and even occasionally positive, presence within the work of such a significant body of foreign material. Two factors may be relevant: firstly, the emphasis on 'universalising' history within the historiography of the Tiberian Principate, and secondly, the emperor's own penchant for the foreign and exotic.<sup>108</sup>

Indeed, if V. wished to cast his foreigners in a particularly negative light, 9.1-11 would be the ideal place within the work to do so. But even crude statistics

---

<sup>104</sup> Lawrence 2006: 3.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. e.g. Skidmore 1996: 89-92; Wardle 1998: 212.

<sup>106</sup> See Skidmore 1996: 38.

<sup>107</sup> Lawrence 2006: 25.

<sup>108</sup> For 'universalising' historiography, see Rüpke 2016: 94-96; Krasser 2011: 233-251; Tiberius' fondness for the exotic is seen e.g. by his companions on Capri (Houston 1985: 179-196), his philhellenism (Rutledge 2008: 453-467), and his intellectual passions and literary tastes (Champlin 2008: 408-425; Champlin 2014: 199-246).

demonstrate that this is not the case.<sup>109</sup> Roman *exempla* showcasing various vices consistently outnumber foreign *exempla* – as Lawrence (2006: 26) has affirmed, ‘behaviour, and not nationality, is the organising principle in Valerius’ text and, despite arbitrary and gratuitous assessments to the contrary, Valerius’ attitude is truly “cosmopolitan” – Romans behave just as badly as their Greek, Persian, Carthaginian, and Egyptian counterparts.

One of the main questions that must be asked of 9.1-11 is why V. has chosen to include the specific list of vices that he does and not others? One way to answer this question is to examine, as scholars have done for certain virtues, what the key vices were of Tiberian Rome. Historians and biographers, when writing of the period, consistently attribute particular vices to Tiberius himself. So, for example, Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.51.3) in summation of Tiberius’ virtues and vices notes specifically his savagery (*saevitia*) and his veiled lusts (*obtectis libidinibus*); Cassius Dio, pointing out that Tiberius had both many virtues and vices (58.28.5), presents the emperor’s bloodthirstiness (*μυαιφονία*) and his cruelty in the most detail.<sup>110</sup> Suetonius is able to record tales highlighting Tiberius’ dissimulation, his *avaritia*, *saevitia*, and his sexual excesses.<sup>111</sup> Indeed, many of the vices that the anti-Tiberian strands of Roman historiography attribute to the emperor could find their counterparts in V.’s vice-list.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> For Book 9 as a whole, Roman *exempla* outnumber foreign *exempla* 60 : 40; with Roman vices making up roughly 15 percent as opposed to 13 percent for foreign. Lawrence (2006: 111) has provided statistics for just the first eleven chapters of Book 9: the domestic *exempla* outnumber the foreign *exempla* 104 to 37; the overall percentage of external *exempla* in the work as a whole is 33 percent with 9.1-11 coming in only slightly higher at 35 percent.

<sup>110</sup> See discussion of the main passages in Mallan 2015: 54.

<sup>111</sup> A good place to start, to examine some of these vices, is Lindsay 1995: 11-19.

<sup>112</sup> I have indicated examples of this throughout the commentary where relevant, and particularly in the introductory sections to each of the vices treated. A notable exception to this is, perhaps, the very

Modern scholarship in turn has adopted the idea that a tyrannical emperor is marked by a standard set of stereotypical vices which he exhibits and which are linked to his abuse of power.<sup>113</sup> Tiberius, in fact, fits this model so well that he even features as the first example cited in one of the standard articles on the topic by J. Roger Dunkle.<sup>114</sup> The vices that cluster around this ‘stock tyrant’ have been identified as *vis*, *superbia*, *libido*, and *crudelitas*.<sup>115</sup> These were the vices seen by Dunkle in political invective at Rome from as early on, at least, as Cato. To his initial list, Dunkle added *avaritia*, after examining the trope specifically in Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus.<sup>116</sup> All of these vices, too, are clearly evident in 9.1-11. What must be noted, though, and I have done so throughout the commentary as appropriate, is that while later historians and biographers certainly linked Tiberius with a number of these so-called ‘tyrant vices’, V.’s *exempla* in no way reflect ill on the emperor – indeed V.’s choice of *exempla* deliberately avoids any potential echo of specific manifestations of vices that may have appeared in contemporary thought.

Franz Römer (1990: 90-107) argues that Stoic doctrine informs V.’s arrangement of his material – principally, in the majority of the work, around the cardinal virtues of Wisdom, Moderation, Justice, and Courage, but also their corresponding vices. In this regard, Stoics viewed all emotions (*πάθη*) suspiciously, asserting that they had no part in living a virtuous life and furthermore that vice was a form of ignorance of

---

first vice that V. lists – *luxuria* – for Tiberius was well-known for his miserliness (see e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 46-8); the sexual aspect of the chapter – evident in V.’s coupling of the vice with *libido* – is certainly something attributable to Tiberius.

<sup>113</sup> The idea is linked to a kingship *topos* seen in the ancient world, where a good king is determined by his virtues, whereas the tyrant is identified by his vices; see Stevenson 1992: 421-436.

<sup>114</sup> Dunkle 1971: 12-20.

<sup>115</sup> Dunkle 1967: 151-171; *crudelitas* later is occasionally replaced by *saevitia*; see Dunkle 1971: 14.

<sup>116</sup> Dunkle 1971: 15.

those things of which the equivalent virtue was the knowledge. Indeed, in summation of Stoic vices, Diogenes Laertius identifies the following: cowardice, injustice, licentiousness, incontinence, stupidity, and ill-advisedness.<sup>117</sup> Again, admittedly, some of the vices that V.'s treats in 9.1-11 could quite neatly align with Stoic categories, for example anger or error, but, as a strict organising principle, Römer's scheme has found little support from scholars.<sup>118</sup> On more than one occasion V.'s purpose appears to be more general in his selection of vices, claiming that he is presenting those virtues and vices peculiar to human life – indeed, it appears as if no vice is beyond consideration.<sup>119</sup>

Another way to establish if there were such things as 'Tiberian vices', would be to examine the language of V.'s nearest contemporary – Velleius Paterculus; doing so throws up some similarities, but also some points of divergence. From a rudimentary and simply quantitative analysis of key terms, *severitas*,<sup>120</sup> *saevitia*,

---

<sup>117</sup> Diogenes (7.1.93) distinguishes between primary and secondary vices: ἀνὰ λόγον δὲ καὶ τῶν κακιῶν τὰς μὲν εἶναι πρώτας, τὰς δ' ὑπὸ ταύτας· οἷον ἀφροσύνην μὲν καὶ δειλίαν καὶ ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀκολασίαν ἐν ταῖς πρώταις, ἀκρασίαν δὲ καὶ βραδύνοιαν καὶ κακοβουλίαν ἐν ταῖς ὑπὸ ταύτας· εἶναι δ' ἀγνοίας τὰς κακίας, ὧν αἱ ἀρεταὶ ἐπιστῆμαι.

<sup>118</sup> See e.g. Wardle 1998: 7-8; Thurn 2001: 79-94; cf. also Themann-Steinke 2008: 38-9. Lawrence (2015: 135-155) has, most recently, taken up the argument again for a Stoic flavour to the work, at least for chapter 9.13 on which she focuses her discussion. She concludes, 'The simplest explanation appears to be that Valerius was familiar with Stoic ethics and that he embraced at least part of the doctrine with some enthusiasm' (p. 155). Admittedly, scholars (e.g. Brunt 1975: 7-35) have demonstrated the affinities of the Stoic value system with traditional Roman values, and therefore there is little surprise that parallels can be found.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. 9.11.praef.; 6.2.praef.

<sup>120</sup> *Severitas*, of course, is considered to be one the most Roman of virtues when executed with moderation (and is used in such a way in V.; cf. e.g. 2.7; 5.8; 6.3; see also Langlands 2008: 160-187); in excess, however, it becomes a vice.

*perfidia*, *luxuria*, *cupiditas*, *furor*, and *ferocia* receive the most coverage, whereas *crudelitas*, *ultio*, *ira*, *avaritia*, *superbia*, and *error* receive comparatively little.<sup>121</sup>

In a recent article on Velleius Paterculus' presentation of Tiberius' virtues, Catalina Balmaceda (2014: 361) has claimed that in writing history during this period an author needed to present both change and continuity – change in focusing more on personal biographical elements because the rule of one man of the Roman empire necessitated this (along with a focus on universal themes), and continuity 'because the treatment of the past had not been altered'. These ideas could also suggest a reason for why V. also chose to present the virtues, and more importantly for the purposes of this thesis, the vices that he did. For, as many of his examples of vicious words and deeds come from Rome's past, they are also presented as the immoral acts of individuals and communities (both Roman and foreign), distinct from the *optimus princeps*, who acts as the ultimate exemplar of virtue and punisher of vice, but the value-system remains the same (ostensibly at least).<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> This is in no way an exhaustive list. Rather, it represents those vices which appear frequently enough to notice. *Severitas*: 1.15.3; 2.5.2; 2.8.1; 2.10.1; 2.81.1; 2.89.4; 2.92.2; 2.125.3; 2.125.4; 2.127.3; *saevitia*: 2.74.4; 2.7.3; 2.7.4; 2.13.2; 2.22.1; 2.22.5; 2.28.4; 2.120.5; *perfidia*: 1.12.6; 2.1.5; 2.18; 3; 2.54.1; 2.63.3; 2.73.1; 2.87.2; 2.102.1; 2.119.2; *luxuria*: 1.11.5; 2.1.1; 2.33.4; 2.100.3; 2.105.2; 2.129.2; 2.100.3 (*libido*); *cupiditas*: 2.25.1; 2.33.1; 2.32.2; 2.46.2; 2.97.1; 2.117.2; *furor*: 2.80.2; 2.107.2; 2.111.4; 2.112.7; *ferocia*: 2.49.3; 2.108.2; 2.114.4; 2.115.2; 2.115.4; *crudelitas*: 2.6.7; 2.25.3; 2.28.2; 2.87.2; *ultio*: 1.1.3; 2.7.6; *ira*: 2.74.4; 2.21.4 (*iracundia*); 2.41.1 (*iracundia*); 2.68.5 (*iracundia*); *avaritia*: 2.22.5; 2.92.2; *superbia*: 2.11.2; 2.60.3; *error*: 2.6.1.

<sup>122</sup> A model of how to behave – a similar idea has been seen behind the *SCPP*; see Cooley 1998: 207. The edict from Sagallanos (*SEG* 26. 1392) which preserves Tiberius' own words on the subject of *vehiculatio* shows that from the beginning of his reign he presented himself as an active punisher (*vindicaturus*) of those who transgressed his rules.

Much has been made of the canonicity of virtues in the early empire, as well as the adaptation of republican virtues to the imperial age.<sup>123</sup> Similarly, New Testament scholars have studied the various lists of virtues and vices found, for example, in the Pauline epistles. Often these lists are not exhaustive of the various virtues or vices that they treat, but while mostly random, they can at times be targeted and tailored to specific communities.<sup>124</sup> Whether or not the ‘string of vices’ dealt with in Book 9.1-11 is meant to be read as an extensive exemplary vice list or not, whether the vices included represent a kind of canon, or whether they are keyed in to the specific vices of Tiberian Rome, without explicit comment from V. himself, is impossible to determine with any certainty.<sup>125</sup>

### **A Valerian Voice**

Two roles that, while found at other periods in the Roman world, had particular significance during the Early Principate and especially Tiberian Rome, are those of the *delator* and the *praeceptor*. Both provide useful lenses through which to understand what V. is aiming to achieve by setting out the vices that he does in 9.1-11 and, indeed, how he goes about doing it.

---

<sup>123</sup> For the debate on whether or not there actually was a ‘canon of virtues’, see, e.g. Charlesworth 1937: 105-33; Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 298-323; Fears 1981: 827-948; Classen 1991: 17-39; Noreña 2001: 146-168; Noreña 2011; on Roman virtues and morality more generally, see Earl 1967; Edwards 1993; Barton 2001.

<sup>124</sup> On these and similar kinds of lists, see e.g. López 2011: 178-95; OCB s.v. ‘Ethical Lists’; for lists of *exempla* (esp. in Seneca the Younger), see Roller 2015: 81-95.

<sup>125</sup> I take the phrase ‘string of vices’ from Morgan 2007: 130 (cf. Bloomer 1992: 255: ‘the difficulty of stringing together resistant material...’). V. does certainly, on occasion, (especially in the rhetorical introductions or concluding statements of the various chapters) explicitly link some of the vices to one another in a sort of chain.

Steven Rutledge (2001) argues that the ancient sources present the practice of delation reaching its height during Tiberius' reign – indeed Tacitus claims that Tiberius encouraged the *delatores* (*Ann.* 4.30.2-3).<sup>126</sup> While their actions and motives would have been just as evident and understood in Republican Rome as they were in the Early Empire, it is the development of new structures and laws for prosecution, as well as the operation of criminal courts under autocratic rule that contributed to the perception of their growth in visibility in this period.

In multiple passages in 9.1-11, V.'s vocabulary appears to support the notion that he is exposing vice, in a manner not dissimilar from the *delatores* of his day. And so at 9.2.praef. V. justifies the introduction of his discussion of the vice of *crudelitas* into his work by stating that to remain silent about it allows it the opportunity to increase (*cui silentium donare crementum est adicere*). At 9.4.praef. V. encourages avarice to be exposed (*protrahatur etiam Avaritia*) – the imagery is aggressive, and could be seen as akin to the agent who tracks down criminals and drags them from hiding – an *inquisitor*. This process, of dragging forth vices and putting them on display, continues at the beginning of the subsequent two chapters. At 9.5.1 V. puts *superbia* and *impotentia* 'conspicuously in view' (*in conspicuo ponatur*), and at 9.6.praef. *perfidia* is likewise dragged out of its hiding place (*occultam iam et insidiosum malum, perfidia, latebris suis extrahatur*). While *indagatrix*, used at 9.4.praef. of *avaritia*'s ability to search out hidden profit is a term which has philosophical overtones (see the commentary *ad loc.*), it may recall the *index* – the informer who denounces crime, but does not necessary prosecute it.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Rogers (1935) provides examples of the trials.

<sup>127</sup> The term is the Republican equivalent of *delator*, but in the early Empire can be used synonymously; see Rutledge 2001: 9-10. *Indicium* is a frequent term in V. for evidence cf. e.g. 3.7.praef.; 4.3.9; 4.7.4; 4.8.1; 5.1.1b; 9.2.1; 9.8.ext.1.

In the imperial period, the *delator* played a role in ensuring the personal safety of the emperor, and by extension the security of the empire itself, by exposing direct threats.<sup>128</sup> It is a role like this one that could, therefore, inform V.'s rhetorical tirade against Sejanus' conspiracy in 9.11.ext.4. Quintilian (*Inst.* 12.7.1–3) believed the task of accusation an important duty towards the state. And indeed, it is delation's link with oratory that could be behind statements by V. where he appears to show some reluctance at naming specific *maximi viri* as exemplars of particular vices. So for example at 9.3.ext.praef., V. comments *neque ab ignotis exempla petere iuvat et maximis viris exprobrare vitia sua verecundiae est*. This reluctance squares nicely with Quintilian's statement that the first aim of orators is that they appear unwilling to take on the role of accuser (*Inst.* 11.1.57).

V.'s reserve in the last example (*verecundia*) may suggest the second, more positive, role that he plays in recording *exempla* of vices – that of the *praeceptor*. A teacher, or instructor (*OLD* a), V. nowhere applies the term to his task. But it is his very absence as an author that must propel the reader to examine V.'s deontic language in the introductions and conclusions of *exempla* in order to construct for this hidden author a persona. In the example already mentioned, V.'s modesty (*verecundia*) in upbraiding (*exprobrare*) the vices of great men must be overcome by fidelity to his task – in fact V. may potentially be making a self-conscious joke: although he is Maximus in name, but he is of a different social status to his great exemplars (*maximi*).

From the outset of Book 9, V. guides his reader to the appropriate responses to vice. While *virtus* deserves praise (*laus*), *vitia* must be met with *reprehensio*.<sup>129</sup> And so, in introducing the twin vices of luxury and lust V. comments, *neque aut a reprehensione*

---

<sup>128</sup> For this specific role of *delatores*, see Rutledge 2001: 157-174.

<sup>129</sup> See esp. Skidmore 1996: 53ff. for V.'s moral purpose.

*aut ab emendatione separentur* (9.1.praef.). Compare also the preface to V.'s chapter on *perfidia*, where he states that the vice should receive as much reprehension as good faith wins praise. The second preface of the vice section instructs the reader about an unacceptable response to vice: silence. To not speak out about *crudelitas*, V. says, allows it to grow (9.2.praef.: *cui silentium donare crementum est adicere*). This response is in fact seen also at 9.5.2; 9.8.3, and 9.9.2 (see further discussion in the commentary), as well as elsewhere in the work (cf. e.g. 4.1.1; 4.8.4; 5.1.9; 8.3.praef.). Other responses that V. highlights as appropriate to vice are shame (*rubor*; 9.2.ext.1), hatred and laughter (*odium, risum*; 9.4.ext.1), horror (*horror*; 9.8.2), execration (*exsecratio*; 9.8.3), and indignation (*indignatio*; 9.7.mil.Rom.1, 9.8.3) – what is interesting, is that in almost all examples V. encourages his readers to emotional and physical reactions to the stories he relates. Like the Horatian father of *Satire* 1.4.105-6, V. teaches by examples, how to avoid vice.

In examining, albeit briefly, a few key statements by V. in 9.1-11, I have attempted to begin to identify an authorial voice on vice for him. While previously, as noted above, scholars generally used V. simply to supply their work with footnotes, some at least admitted that V. was present in his work. Far from invisible, Wardle noted that as an author V. was persistent in entering his own text, especially in the prefaces and conclusions to the *exempla* themselves.<sup>130</sup> Others, similarly, have attempted to find V. within the work. For Bloomer, V.'s was 'cannibalistic and combative' in his style and use of sources, but also 'sophisticated' in his composition.<sup>131</sup> Skidmore argued that he was original in his task, while Mueller found V. to be 'passionate' in his religious belief, and his religious rhetoric to be fully conversant with Augustan values.<sup>132</sup> And it is surely in this lengthy treatment of vices in 9.1-11 where V.

---

<sup>130</sup> Wardle 1998: 14-15.

<sup>131</sup> Bloomer 1992: 256-7.

<sup>132</sup> Skidmore 1996: xvii; Mueller 2002a: 4.

displays his originality the most, for no other exemplary work survives which covers this range of vices. Indeed, treatises on individual negative values come down to us (e.g. Seneca's *De Ira*), but before V. negative *exempla* are limited to occasional examples in larger historical or philosophical works (such as in Livy or Cicero). Sustained treatment on the scale of which V. presents his readers with, along with both his orchestrated guiding of his readers' responses to the vices treated, as well as his structural organisation – which is one of the principal reasons for his task (as he outlines in the Preface to the work) – is near-unique in the body of Latin literature.<sup>133</sup> In matters of vice, V. provides his readers with a 'moral-didactic guide to conduct'.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> See Skidmore 1996: 44-50.

<sup>134</sup> Van der Blom 2010: 3.

## Commentary

### De Luxuria et Libidine

V. begins Book 9 by addressing the associated vices of luxury (*luxuria*) and lust (*libido*).<sup>135</sup> In Roman elite thought, *luxuria* (and its variants, *luxus* and *luxuries*) meant ‘indulgence’, ‘extravagance’, ‘excess’, the crossing of a line, and especially ‘an excess of lifestyle’.<sup>136</sup> From its earliest appearances in extant Latin literature (e.g. Plaut. *Asin.* 819; Ter. *Heaut.* 945) *luxuria* held overwhelmingly negative connotations for the Romans who contrasted it with *frugalitas* or *parsimonia*.<sup>137</sup> It was viewed as depraved, and was defined as going against nature; it led to weakness and effeminacy and therefore threatened Roman society.<sup>138</sup>

While the negative definition of luxury in antiquity is unanimous, opinions on the historical origins of the vice and its threat to Roman society are somewhat less clear and lack agreement. According to Livy (39.6.7), the return and triumph of Cn. Manlius Vulso’s army from Asia in 187 B.C. brought luxury to Rome. Pliny (*HN* 33.148-50), in contrast, places the date at 189 B.C. with Scipio’s subjugation of Asia and with the occupation of the kingdom of Attalus III (34.34). Polybius (32.11) offers 168 B.C. as the fateful year, with the destruction of the Macedonian monarchy, and Sallust (*Cat.* 10), the destruction of Carthage. Velleius Paterculus (2.1) comments that

---

<sup>135</sup> Edwards (1993: 5) speaks of them as ‘cognate vices’.

<sup>136</sup> *BNP* 7.905-907; cf. *OLD* s.v. 3 ‘*luxuria*’; *TLL* vii.2, 1919ff.; Lebek 1970: 292ff. Adams (1974: 57) notes that the noun *luxus* ‘is a rare and artificial variant for *luxuria*’; on the statistical usage of *luxuria* and *luxus*, as well as individual Latin authors’ preferences of use, see Woodman & Martin 1996: 379.

<sup>137</sup> See *TLL* vii.2, 1920-3; cf. e.g. Cic. *Flacc.* 71, *Quinct.* 92; Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.73 (*frugalitas bonum, luxuria enim malum*) and Val. Max. 2.5.6 where *frugalitas* is an enemy of luxurious living and immoderate sex (*inimica luxuriosis epulis et aliena nimiae vini abundantiae et ab immoderate veneris usu aversa*).

<sup>138</sup> Zanda 2011: 1-5; for its association with softness cf. *OLD* s.v. ‘*luxus*’; for *luxuria* as *contra naturam*, see e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 119.14-15; 122.5.

the younger Scipio introduced the Romans to luxury. V. himself offers the date 197 B.C. – the date of the earlier defeat of Philip V of Macedon at Cynoscephalae.<sup>139</sup> In each instance, however, while the date and circumstances of luxury's invasion may differ, certain aspects about its arrival remain the same. Almost all writers situate Rome's moral decline as the result of its territorial expansion, and almost all characterise it as an external force, imported to Rome from foreign nations, usually the East (except in the case of Sallust, who places its origin in North Africa).<sup>140</sup>

Another common feature in the narration of Rome's moral decline is the juxtaposition of a virtuous past with the corrupt present, something that V. stresses also in this chapter, especially by contrasting the actions of fathers and sons (see e.g. 9.1.6 with further commentary there). An important distinction that the Romans drew in their evaluation of the morality of luxurious displays was the distinction between private and public *luxuria*. While private luxury was considered immoral on all occasions, public luxury, especially in the form of public magnificence, brought honour to the state.<sup>141</sup>

For Roman writers recording its influence, *luxuria* permeated almost all areas of upper-class Roman daily life, and attacking it became a way for the elite to 'air their anxieties' about challenges to their position in the social hierarchy.<sup>142</sup> Its presence was felt at the table, whether in the extravagance of banquets and feasts, or in the variety of dishes displayed for consumption, it was seen also in architecture, the size

---

<sup>139</sup> Val. Max. 9.1.3. For fuller discussion on the origins of *luxuria* at Rome, see: Lintott 1972: 626-638; Zanda 2011: 7-12.

<sup>140</sup> This is not entirely correct. Sallust does in fact acknowledge the origin of *luxuria* in the East (cf. *Cat.* 11.4), his concern in the passage cited (*Cat.* 10) is in fact the removal of fear of the enemy (*metus hostilis*), which occurred for Rome at the destruction of Carthage; cf. comment on Val. Max. 9.1.4.

<sup>141</sup> Zanda 2011: 10-11.

<sup>142</sup> See Edwards 1993: 138.

of villas, or the opulence of the materials used (for example, marble) in their construction. It was found also across a range of daily-use items, for example, furniture, cutlery, clothes, cosmetics, and jewellery. Examples of almost all of these appear in *exempla* of this chapter.

*Leges Sumptuariae*, various laws passed at different periods throughout Roman history in order to curb and restrain *luxuria*, rarely achieved their goal. Tiberius himself, however, attempted some reforms (cf. e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 33-34.1; Tac. *Ann.* 2.33, 3.52-3; Dio 57.15), but on the whole demonstrated less zeal towards policing Roman morality in this way than others had done previously during the Republic, or even Augustus had during his principate (see e.g. Wardle 2014: 271-2). According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.54.6), Tiberius displayed utter realism about the success of sumptuary legislation and opposed the mere denunciation of the vice that resulted in hostility.

*Libido*, in turn, meant 'sexual appetite, or desire, lust, wantonness' (*OLD* s.v. 3). It too, like *luxuria*, according to Roman moralists at least, threatened political and social stability.<sup>143</sup> In moral and philosophical thought, *pudicitia*, whether manifest as a personification of virtue, or demonstrated in the various acts of individuals, was the antithesis of *libido* and combatted it.<sup>144</sup>

To find the pair of vices, *luxuria* and *libido*, coupled in V.'s preface is not unusual. Their association is well established in Roman moralising texts and is demonstrated by simple verbal *comparanda*, seen especially, for example, in Livy (*Praef.* 12: *luxum*

---

<sup>143</sup> See e.g. Val. Max. 4.3.praef.; Langlands 2006: 134ff.

<sup>144</sup> See e.g. Val. Max. 6.1; Langlands 2006: *passim*.

*atque libidinem*) and Sallust (*Cat.* 28.4: *libido atque luxuria*).<sup>145</sup> A close reading of Sallustian allusions in Livy's preface demonstrates that in the *Ab urbe condita* Livy was in clear dialogue with his predecessor.<sup>146</sup> With chapter 9.1, V. too enters into this dialogue, and becomes a clear inheritor of this tradition.<sup>147</sup>

The structure of the chapter is in line with most others in the work. Following on from a rhetorical preface which highlights the vice(s) under scrutiny are the *exempla* themselves, distinguished by V. between Roman (*domestica*) and foreign (*externa*). Out of the Roman examples, the first five deal solely with *luxuria*, while 9.1.6, although favouring *luxuria*, incorporates aspects of *libido* also. 9.1.7 is the first *exemplum* to combine the two vices explicitly, while 9.1.8 and 9.1.9 deal solely with *libido*. The foreign examples connect luxury and lust in *exempla* 9.1.ext.1-3; 9.1.ext.4 to 9.1.ext.7 deal solely with *luxuria*, with the exception of 9.1.ext.5 which alone deals solely with *libido*.

9.1.praef.

**Blandum ... malum:** 'a seductive evil'; for this phrase cf. Lucilius (1097 Marx); Sen. *Ep.* 103.1; 118.8; Mart. 5.84.3; *TLL* ii.0, 2038ff. For its use adjectivally, specifically of *luxuria*, cf. ps.-Sen. *Oct.* 426-7 (*maximum exortum est malum/luxuria, pestis blanda*).

**luxuria:** (= Gk. τρυφή); on luxury's place as a vice in Roman moralising texts, see the introduction to the chapter.

---

<sup>145</sup> Cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.80; *Cael.* 25.27; *Off.* 1.92; Livy *Praef.* 12; Sall. *Cat.* 28.4; *Iug.* 89.9; Vell. 2.100.3; Quint. *Inst.* 12.1.8; 12.10.47; Suet. *Nero* 26.1; *Vesp.* 11. Cf. also '... tam serae avaritia luxuriaque immigraverint, nec ubi tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit.' (Livy *Praef.* 11); '... iuventus luxu atque avaritia corrupta ...' (Sall. *Hist.* 1 fr. 16M); '... luxuria atque avaritia ...' (Sall. *Cat.* 5.8); '... ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbia invasere.' (Sall. *Cat.* 12.2); Lebek 1970: 200 n. 20; Edwards 1993: 5.

<sup>146</sup> Den Hengst 2010: 52-67; Burton 2008: 70-91; Moles 1993: 141-168.

<sup>147</sup> Guerrini (1979: 152-166) has already noted the Sallustian flavour of the chapter as a whole.

**accusare aliquanto facilius est quam vitare:** The frequency of condemnation in extant works from Cato the Elder down to the orators of V.'s own day (see e.g. Edwards 1993: 137-72 on the aspect of luxurious buildings), as well as regular attempts to legislate, even by Augustus and Tiberius (see the introduction to this chapter above), confirm V.'s point on the ubiquity of the vice.

**operi nostro inseratur, non quidem ut ullum honorem recipiat, sed ut se ipsam recognoscens ad paenitentiam impelli possit:** For V.'s moral purpose in the work, see Skidmore 1996: 53-82; Wardle 1998: 12-15; Langlands 2008: 160-187; Langlands 2011: 100-105. V.'s statement that the vice should be discussed, not for the sake of honour but so that it can recognise itself and repent, is in line with the purpose laid out in the preface to the entire work, where Tiberius is invoked as arbiter of morality, and punisher of vice: *Te igitur huic coepto ... Caesar, invoco, cuius caelesti providentia virtutes, de quibus dicturus sum, benignissime foventur, vitia severissime vindicantur*; cf. Vell. 2.126.2-5; Wardle 1998: 69-70. Unlike Tiberius, who is acknowledged as the punisher of various vices, V. merely exposes them (cf. e.g. 9.2.praef.; 9.3.praef.; 9.4.praef.; 9.5.praef.; 9.6.praef.). As an author this is all V. could do; a holder of magisterial or other power could execute justice. By 'exposing' evil, V. is acting as a kind of *delator*, the individual necessary for laying a charge in Roman law. In the area of *maiestas*, *delatores* in Tiberian Rome acquired a bad reputation, but their role was publically affirmed by Tiberius (cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 4.30.2-3). V. need fear nothing, therefore, from the dedicatee of his work other than approbation for his role; see further Rutledge 2001.

**iungatur illi libido:** On the pairing of these vices, see the chapter introduction.

**ex iisdem vitiorum principiis oritur, neque aut a reprehensione aut ab emendatione separentur, gemino mentis errore conexae:** At 9.2.praef. V. has the vices of *luxuria* and *libido* arise from the desire for novelty (*novae cupiditati inhaerentium oculorum*), and a mind that is under the influence of various lures and unstable (*delicato cultu affluentis perque varios illecebrarum motus volitantis animi*). Cf.

ps.-Sen. *Oct.* 428 (*error gravis*) for the use of *errore* in conjunction with the vice of *luxuria*. *Reprehensio* is an obvious function of a moral work in relation to vice; cf. e.g. 5.3.ext.3; 6.2.praef.; 9.6.1.

### 9.1.1

Owing to the popularity of Cicero's *Hortensius* in antiquity (seen, for example, in its use by Augustine, *De beata vita* 26; see Doignon 1982: 193-206), and by taking V.'s general reading pattern into account, especially of Cicero as a major source (Wardle 1998: 15-18; Bloomer 1992: 59-146), his probable source for this *exemplum* is this work (Cic. *Hort.* = *Phil.* fr. 5.76 Müller): *primus balneola suspendit, inclusit pisces* (Non. 285L, s.v. *balneae*). While the chapter is not chronologically arranged, Orata is perhaps a suitable choice for V. to begin with because of his popularity in antiquity as a key exemplar of *luxuria* (cf. Varr. *Rust.* 3.3.10; Colum. *Rust.* 8.16.5; Plin. *HN.* 9.168; Fest. 196L; August. *De beata vita* 26; Macrobian. *Sat.* 3.15.2f.); and see, most recently, the discussion by Bannon 2014: 166-182. He appears in other Ciceronian works also: *De or.* 1.178, *Fin.* 2.70, *Off.* 3.67.

**C. Sergius Orata:** Maiuri (1950: 29) suggests a Campanian, even Puteolan, origin for Orata. Although he had no public career, and was a member of the equestrian order, Wikander (1996: 181-182) postulates that Orata belonged to an aristocratic, even patrician, branch of the *gens Sergia*, linking his *nomen gentile*, *Sergius*, with the patrician family the Sili; see also Nicolet 1974: 849 n. 2.

Most ancient sources connect Orata's *cognomen* with his cultivation of fish (cf. e.g. Varr. *Rust.* 3.3.10; Colum. *Rust.* 8.16.5; Macrobian. *Sat.* 3.15.2f.). Macrobius, particularly, explains the *cognomen* by Orata's taste for gilt-heads (*sparus aurata*); Higginbotham (1997: 48) discusses the fish's etymological link with the colour gold, as well as its popularity in antiquity. The practice of adopting names taken from fauna has parallels, see Kajava 1998-1999: 253-268; cf. also Kajanto 1965: 332. For the pronunciation, i.e. 'au = ō' cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 22. Festus (196L) provides an alternative

etymology, claiming that the *cognomen* was due to Sergius' wearing of two large gold rings. Although Orata has been labelled an Epicurean by some, most notably Momigliano (1941: 149-57), mainly on the basis of Cicero *Fin.* 2.70, Castner (1986: 138-147), has demonstrated that this identification is mistaken, stating that 'No ancient author names him as an Epicurean ... Cicero must mention him at *De fin.* 2.22.70 not because he was known as an Epicurean, but rather, as other authors have done, because he was an exemplar of extravagance and indulgence unmotivated by even superficial philosophical belief' (1986: 145).

**pensilia balnea primus facere instituit:** *pensilia balnea*: lit. 'hanging baths'. If Cicero's *Hortensius* is V.'s source, then V. has modified Cicero's diminutive *balneola* ('small baths'). Exactly what these baths were, or how they worked, is a matter of some dispute. Based on V.'s linkage of Orata's baths with his fish-farming activities, as well as Cicero's use of *balneola* (and hence the smaller size of these baths likely discounting human bathing), Fagan (1996: 56-65) suggests the possibility of them being specialised fishponds. He also notes that heated fishponds are unlikely, as the species of fish kept by most Romans would not have required heated water (1996: 2); note however Dio 48.51.1-2, who records natural hot springs in the region and enterprising uses of them for bathing (with the comments of Marasco 2010: 72ff.). In contrast to this, Fagan claims that the connection of hot water could be an innovation on the part of Asclepiades for medical use (Plin. *HN* 26.16), and hence V.'s comment that Orata's expense almost ended up there (*quae impensa <a> levibus initiis coepta ad suspensae caldae aquae tantum non aequora penetravit*). Surveying much of the same evidence as Fagan, Wikander (1996: 177-182) concludes that, while some of the details remain unclear, baths for human bathing cannot be ruled out; see also, more recently, Marasco 2010: 69-79. With no further evidence, the nature of what these baths were exactly, and how they worked, must remain uncertain. Although V. does not locate Orata's balneae expressly in Campania, his oyster business on the Lucrine

Lake does place other activities in the region. V.'s reader may make the common connection between Campania and luxury, as V. does more explicitly at 9.1.ext.1.

Along with Cicero, V. acknowledges Orata's primacy in setting the baths up (**primus facere instituit**). Pliny (*HN* 9.168) alone claims Orata to be their 'inventor' (*ostrearum vivaria primus omnium Sergius Orata invenit ... primus pensiles invenerit balneas*).

**idem, videlicet ... abundarent:** V.'s use of **idem** here signals the introduction of a second example of *luxuria* on the part of Orata. V. presents Orata's dietary whims as the cause of his circumvention of nature. The implication in the *exemplum* is that not only his financial greed, but also his gluttony, led him to become an exemplar of *luxuria* (cf. Plin. *HN* 9.168, who cites his avarice as the sole motive for his commercial enterprises: *nec gulae causa sed avaritiae*; Bannon 2014: 180 believes he 'corrects' V.'s version; however V. may be intentionally downplaying the financial aspect to adapt the material to an *exemplum* on *luxuria*). In antiquity from at least Plato onwards (e.g. *Rep.* 3.404b-c), fish became a symbol and feature of luxury; cf. e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 6.169-182; Plin. *HN* 9.53; and Beer 2009: 54-70. On seafood's association with luxury, see Gowers 1993: 18-21; on its excess and variety as something to be condemned, cf. Sen. *Ep.* 95.26-9; and Zanda (2011: 18-24) on the luxury of the table (*luxus mensae*); the word *ferculum* has the double meaning of both dish and platform used for carrying spoils and sacred displays in processions (see Gowers 1993: 39; Bannon 2014: 179). V. has in mind not only the variety of dishes served at Orata's tables as an excessive luxury, but also the fact that he defied seasons in order to produce it (*ut nulla tam saeva tempestas inciderit qua non Oratae mensae varietate ferulorum abundarent*). V.'s use of 'Neptune' connotes a sacrilegious transgression, in the same vein as Xerxes' crossing of the Hellespont (cf. e.g. Val. Max. 3.2.ext.3; Hdt. 7.33ff.), as well as Hannibal's crossing of the river Vergellus (e.g. Val. Max. 9.2.ext.2; Mueller 2002a: 128). Orata's creation of new 'seas' by dams is readily understood as part of the common trope of confusing the distinction of land and sea which plays a prominent role in Roman discourse on luxury (cf. Edwards 1993: 145-8); a violation of a

preeminent natural boundary. V. casts Orata's mental ingenuity in a negative light by his use of the verb **excogitavit**; novelty was a double-edged concept for the Romans; in a society where tradition was very highly valued, innovation could be represented as dangerous and reprehensible (cf. 9.1.7; 9.2.ext.6), but not exclusively so (cf. 2.5.6; 3.2.7; 5.3.ext.2; 7.4.2). Here in the transgressive context of Orata's 'private seas', the connotation is negative. On Roman pisciculture, more generally, see: Higginbotham 1997; D'Arms 1970: 18-72.

**aedificiis ... fruere** **tur**: Here **etiam** introduces the third, and final, of V.'s examples of Orata's activities which earned him a reputation for *luxuria*. By using the adjectives 'large' and 'lofty' (**spatiosis et excelsis**) of the buildings, V. probably intends to alert his reader to the ostentatiousness of Orata's building enterprises. Pliny (*HN*. 9.168) credits Orata as the first man to begin ostreiculture on the Lucrine Lake. By V.'s own day the topography of the area must have changed and been remarkably different from the period of Orata's activities there, due mostly to the construction of the *Portus Iulius* by Agrippa in 37 (note V.'s **ad id tempus**). For the place of Lucrine oysters at luxurious dinners cf. e.g. Mart. 3.60.1-4, 12.48.1-4, 6.11.5, 13.82.1-2; Macrob. *Sat.* 3.15; Sen. *Ep.* 78.23. See now also Marzano 2013: 176-8.

**ubi <dum> se publicae aquae cupidius immergit, cum Considio publicano iudicium nactus est**: V. compounds Orata's *luxuria* with greed by use of the adverb **cupidius**. Bannon (2009: 219-233), based on V.'s description of the Lucrine Lake as *aqua publica*, provides possible reasons for this lawsuit. As the waters of the lake were open access to all under public law, any interference of the fishermen's activities by land owners would be illegal. Thus if the structures of Orata's oyster farms interfered in any way with Considius' activities, he, as a public contractor, would have been able to bring an interdict against Orata. Münzer (*RE* IIA 1713-4) and D'Arms (1970: 31-37) attempt to combine the details of this trial with Orata's later prosecution by M. Marius Gratidianus (*De or.* 1.1178; *Off.* 3.67) over the concealing of a servitude, on the basis that L. Crassus represented him in both trials.

This, however, does not square with the sources. For a full summary of this trial, see Rodger 1983: 134-150; Bannon 2009: 219-233.

**in quo L. Crassus ... reperturum:** L. Licinius Crassus (*BNP* 7.523-4) was consul in 95, and the most famed orator of his day (see also 9.1.4). **Amicum** is ironic, and the joke is made by a pun on *tegula* which refers to a roof tile (an unlikely place to find oysters) or tiles used in oyster ponds on which oysters were farmed (Bannon 2009: 228; Marzano 2013: 183-4); the joke may be connected to a proverbial expression from folklore, cf. Petron. *Sat.* 63.2 with Schmeling's comment (2011: 260); crucial also is the word-play **tegulis/te gula**, linking these tiles back to earlier mention of Orata's appetite (*gula*; see Bannon 2014: 180); Crassus was famous for his wit (Plin. *HN.* 17.4).

#### 9.1.2

**Huic Aesopus tragoedus:** The *exemplum* is linked simply by a demonstrative pronoun (cf. e.g. 5.1.7; 6.9.9; 7.3.ext.7). Clodius Aesopus (Leppin 1992: 195-6), a first century B.C. Roman actor. Bloedhorn (*BNP* 1.261-262) states that he was a freedman; Lebek (1996: 41), however, is uncertain whether to make this assumption based on his Greek *cognomen* alone. Whether free-man or freedman, Cicero (*Q. Fr.* 1.2.14) refers to him as '*nostris familiaris*'. For his ability as an actor, see Sutton 1985: 63-73. It appears that Aesopus never acted in comedies; Horace calls him '*gravis Aesopus*' (*Epist.* 2.1.82). Elsewhere (8.10.2), V. states that along with Roscius, Aesopus was preeminent in acting at Rome in the first century (*Aesopum Rosciumque ludicrae artis peritissimos*), although he is said to have given a disappointing performance in 55 at the consecration of the Theatre of Pompey (*Cic. Fam.* 7.1.2). As well as Atreus (Plut. *Cic.* 5.5), he also played the role of Ajax, but felt himself unsuited to this role, and thus played this part rarely (*Cic. Off.* 1.114). He is also mentioned as performing in Accius' *Eurysaces* and *Brutus* (*Cic. Sest.* 120-123).

**in adoptionem ... iuvenem:** On V.'s ambivalent attitude toward adoption, see Mueller 2002a: 195 n. 58. On the ability of Roman fathers to disinherit their sons, see Lindsay 2009: 97-122; for disinheritance in relation to moral wrong-doing, cf. e.g. Gell. 1.6.

**quem constat ... ponere:** While no specific source for this *exemplum* can be traced, the use of **constat** by V. implies that it was a well-established and well-known anecdote; the alliteration of 'c' provides euphony suitable to the *exemplum*'s subject. V. at first conflates the actions of father and son, ascribing both acts to the son (hence **quem**); however, he later distinguishes between the two, noting that both father and the son performed outrageous actions (**quorum alterius senis, alterius adulescentis sectam secuti longius manus porrexerunt**). V. presents Aesopus as taking what would have already been regarded as *luxuria* even one step further: instead of the normal *ficedula*, he serves expensive songbirds; cf. Pliny (*HN* 10.141-2; cf. 35.163), who records that Aesopus senior served a *patina* of either songbirds or ones able to mimic human speech.

**immanibus emptas pretiis:** Pliny (*HN* 10.141-2) sets the price of the dinner at 100 000 sesterces, and claims a price of 6 000 sesterces per bird. This act was seen as particularly outrageous because, as Pliny describes, a sort of cannibalism motivated Aesopus' actions, in that his own fortune was made through his vocal abilities: *nulla alia inductus suavitate nisi ut in iis imitationem hominis manderet, ne quaestus quidem suos reveritus illos opimos et voce meritos*.

**ficedulis:** Lit. 'fig-pecker', the Italian name 'beccafico' is normally used in English. These birds were regarded as a delicacy, best served in the autumn months; cf. Petron. 33; Mart. 13.49; Aul. Gell 15.8.2. Their price was set at forty denarii under Diocletian's Price Edict, see: Dalby 2003, s.v. 'Beccafico'; also Thompson 1936: 274-5.

**acetoque ... solitum:** The second outrageous act concerns Clodius junior, who consumed pearls and served them to his guests to consume also. Horace (*Sat.* 2.3.239-242) provides the fullest account of this anecdote: *Filius Aesopi detractam ex*

*aure Metellae, scilicet ut deciens solidum absorberet, aceto/diluit insignem bacam: qui sanior ac si illud idem in rapidum flumen iaceretve cloacam?* For Clodius' relationship with Caecilia Metella (daughter of Q. Metellus Celer and Clodia), see Wiseman 1974: 176-191. Along with Caligula (Suet. *Calig.* 37.1), Cleopatra, famously, also followed Clodius junior's example in order to win a wager with M. Antonius (Plin. *HN* 9.119-121; Macrob. *Sat.* 3.17.14). Jones (2010: 207-220), despite many modern sceptics and in agreement with ancient sources (Paus. 8.18.6; Vitruv. *De arch.* 8.3.1-27), proves that the dissolution of pearls in vinegar is scientifically possible. In the case of Cleopatra, Ullman (1957: 193-201) posits, citing V.'s use of **potionibus aspergere** as a technical medical term, that the concoction of pearl and vinegar acted as an antacid for Cleopatra; whereas in the case of Clodius Aesopus, Pliny (*HN* 9.122) suggests that the motive behind such an extravagant act was curiosity about the flavour of pearls. Horace (*Sat.* 2.3.240) relates that Aesopus' motive was a desire to consume a large sum of money (*scilicet ut deciens solidum absorberet*).

**amplissimum patrimonium:** 20 million sesterces (Macrob. *Sat.* 3.14.14); a substantial fortune, see Duncan-Jones 1974: 343.

**quorum ... reperta:** The rhetorical flourish (anaphora of **alterius**; wordplay of **sectam secuti**; **ibi ubi** finds precedent in Cicero – *Fam.* 6.1.1; *Att.* 11.2.3) with which V. concludes this *exemplum* joins it to the previous one. He first refers to Orata's fish-farming (**inde ab oceani litoribus attracti pisces**), then to Aesopus senior's culinary treasures (**inde infusae culinibus arcae censusque**), and finally to Aesopus junior's discovery of gastronomic pleasures (**edendi ac bibendi voluptas reperta**). In the same way that V. suggests Orata adopted Clodius Aesopus' son, so the oyster is the parent of the pearl; cf. Plin. *HN* 9.107: *partum concharum esse margaritas* (Ullman 1957: 198). V.'s generalisation about vice (**neque enim ullum vitium finitur ibi ubi oritur**) is consistent; cf. e.g. 9.1.1: *a levibus initiis*; 9.1.3: *cotidie ... adiectum*; 9.1.4: *quanto ... angustiore*.

### 9.1.3

In this *exemplum* V. gives a much condensed account of the abrogation of the Oppian Law of which Livy provides an extended presentation (34.1-8.3). V. has taken Livy's summary of the Oppian measures (34.1.3) and varied the order of the first two provisions, the word order of the second (*auri plus semunicam* for *plus semunciam auri*), has omitted *oppidove* from the third, and has changed *sacrorum publicorum causa* to *sacrificii gratia*; the kinds of changes which he makes regularly to his sources, where we can check. He names none of the key figures in the repeal of this law, apart from the mention of the house of the Bruti (tribunes M. and P. Junius Brutus, who supported the law), nor does he provide any of the speeches recorded in Livy given by M. Porcius Cato in favour, and L. Valerius against (along with his fellow tribune, Marcus Fundanius).

**secundi Punici belli finis et Philippus, Macedoniae rex, devictus licentioris vitae fiduciam dedit:** Seemingly a new contribution to the debate; see introduction to 9.1. V. sets this act of liberation within the contexts of the end of the Second Punic War (201), as well as the defeat of Philip V of Macedon, at the Battle of Cynoscephalae (197).

**quo tempore ... domum ausae sunt obsidere:** 195; V.'s *audere* (cf. Liv. 34.1.7, but not at 8.2) characterises the women's actions as extreme.

**abrogationi legis Oppiae:** The *Lex Oppia*, established by the tribune C. Oppius in 215, was passed in order to alleviate economic distress at Rome caused by the Second Punic War. It laid down that no woman should (1) possess more than one *semuncia* of gold, (2) multi-coloured clothing (specifically that trimmed in purple), (3) or be allowed to ride in a carriage within the city of Rome, except on the occasion of a religious festival (cf. Livy 34.1-8; Tac. *Ann.* 3.33-34; Aul. Gell. 10.23, 17.6; Oros. 4.20.14; Zon. 9.17.1; *vir. ill.* 47; Culham 1982: 786-793). Pomeroy (1975: 177-81) notes that after the defeat of Hannibal in 201, Rome recovered its prosperity, which

resulted in the men being allowed to display their finery, but dissatisfaction on the part of the women, who were still constrained by this wartime measure (see also Daube 1972: 27-29).

**urbem:** V.'s simplification of Livy's *urbe oppidove* (see above) loses the broader scope of the law to the whole *ager Romanus* (Briscoe 1981: 45).

**ius per continuos viginti annos servatum:** The *Lex Oppia* was passed in 215 (Liv. 34.1.3; 6.9, 8.3) and abrogated in 195.

**non enim providerunt saeculi illius viri:** *Providentia* was a common imperial virtue, particularly of Tiberius, cf. e.g. the preface to the work; Wardle 1998: 69; 9.11.ext.4: *divino consilio providit*.

Briscoe's preference for AL's **cultum** and **coetus** over Wensky's *cu<m>ulum* and Eberhard's *cultus* is to be supported; V. does not use *cumulus* elsewhere except with a dependant genitive; *cultus* of clothing is not uncommon in V. (cf. 2.4.6; 2.6.1; 2.6.13; 3.2.7; 3.2.ext.9; 5.6.8; 9.5.ext.1). *Coetus* appears in a similar sense at 9.1.ext.2 and aptly fits the blockadged roads V. has described above.

**quo se usque:** Possible allusion to Cic. *Cat.* 1 (*quo usque tandem...*); for V.'s use of Cicero's *Catilinarians*, cf. 9.11.3; 9.11.ext.4; tmesis of the phrase is common, cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 3.3; Lucr. 2.1044-7; Verg. *Aen.* 5.383-5; Luc. 2.632-5; Stat. *Theb.* 4.635-7; 11.122-4; Mart. 2.64.9.

**audacia:** A negative descriptor of Republican women, used particularly in relation to their involvement in politics (Bauman 1992: 10-11). Although V. can use *audax/audacia* in a positive sense (cf. e.g. 2.6.14; 6.2.5; 7.3.9), in Book 9 it always has negative connotations (cf. 9.7.2; 9.11.2; 9.15.2).

**quibus cotidie aliquid novitatis sumptuosius adiectum est:** Augustus' sumptuary restraints (e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 34.1) were clearly ineffective. V. appears to have this continue to Tiberius' reign, if the strict sense of the perfect tense is taken.

**Sed quid ego ... loquor:** A transitional phrase that indicates a change to an even worse example of the vice expressed; cf. e.g. 9.11.ext.4. V.'s questioning marks a

distinct contrast between men and women as exemplars; male exemplars dominate throughout, both in virtue and vice, however women also appear as examples of each; cf. also, for example, V.'s comment at 8.3.praef. On the gendered nature of exemplary literature, see Parker 1998: 152-73, and more recently Langlands 2014: 214-37.

**imbecillitas mentis:** 'Mental weakness'; a common view of women in antiquity, which finds its origin, most probably, in Greek philosophy; cf. e.g. Arist. *Pol.* 1260a. On its application in a legal context, see Schulz 1951: 182; cf. Cic. *Mur.* 27; Liv. 3.48.4; Tac. *Ann.* 6.49.2; Sen. *Marc.* 1.1; see also Dixon 1984: 356f.

**cum temporum superiorum ... priscae continentiae ignotum deverticulum:** V. often contrasts moral decline in terms of earlier and later periods; cf. e.g. Val. Max. 2.5.5-6, upholding the commonly held Republican belief of decline; when contrasting different stages of Republican history V. can ignore the moral improvement that came with the imperial system. In a chapter on *abstinentia* and *continentia* (4.3.praef.), V. presents *continentia* as a particularly masculine virtue, one that is also presented as a means of repelling lust and greed; on the manliness of this virtue, see Edwards 1993: 78; Langlands 2006: 134-6. It is thus entirely appropriate that here V. turns from women to men in increasing the magnitude of the vice of *luxuria*.

**idque iurgio ipsorum pateat:** V.'s closing statement provides a proleptic link to the next *exemplum* where *iurgium* becomes *altercatio*.

#### 9.1.4

**Cn. Domitius L. Crasso collegae suo altercatione orta obiecit:** Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (*BNP* 4.641), consul in 96, was censor with L. Licinius Crassus (*BNP* 7.523-4), famed orator and politician, in 92. Despite their quarrel referred to here, which Pliny (*HN* 17.3) would suggest was caused by their dissimilar characters, they cooperated on some issues, for example, on an edict against the teaching of rhetoric in Latin (Suet. *Rhet.* 25). V.'s **collegae** makes it explicit that he dates this disgrace to

their censorship. It is also clear from Pliny (*HN* 17.1-4), that Domitius' rebuke of Crassus' extravagant living was considered more severe because he held the office of censor.

**columnas Hymettias in portico domus haberet:** Pliny (*HN* 17.1-4, 36.7-8) confirms this, with different figures to those recorded in V., stating that Crassus was the first at Rome to set up 6 columns (cf. V.'s 10) of Hymettian marble of no more than twelve feet in height. The quarries of Mt. Hymettus near Athens produced a fine-grained blueish-grey marble that was used widely in Athens. Surviving finds from Italy suggest that its use there was highly restricted and diminished from the Augustan period (see Attanasio et al. 2006: 87-90; cf. Blake 1947: 51-52; Ober 1981: 70). Its rarity made it a statement of luxury, duly noted from its first introduction. Marble features in moralists' criticisms of luxury from Cato (*Fest.* 282L) onwards (cf. Sen. Ep. 86.6; Juv. 14.86-95); Horace (*Carm.* 2.18.3) provides the closest evidence in time to that of V. Pliny records that because of its luxury it earned the nickname 'Palatine Venus' from M. Brutus (*LTUR* II.128).

**quem continuo ... compensas:** Domitius' house was situated in the Sacra Via, on the slope of the Velia, leading up from the Forum (*LTUR* II.92). There is a disparity in the figures recorded and confusion over whose house's value is being estimated. In V., Domitius' house is estimated at 6 million sesterces and without 10 of its trees at only 3 million sesterces. In Pliny (*HN* 17.1-4), however, Crassus' house is estimated as worth 1 million sesterces and without 6 of its trees, Domitius refused to buy it for even 1 denarius (*ne uno quidem denario*). It is clear from Pliny (*HN* 17.1) that trees were considered expensive and luxurious assets. He identifies them as nettle-trees (*lotus*), which Marzano (2007: 99 n. 73), believes to be the European hackberry (*celtis australis*). V. simply refers to them as small trees, or shrubs, (**arbuscularum**); the diminutive enhances V.'s point.

**sermonem ... Pyrrhi ... Hannibalis ... transmarinorum stipendiorum abundantia:** *Exclamatio*, very common throughout V.'s work, and indeed in particular in Book 9

(further examples collected and discussed in Sinclair 1980: 95-101), serves to indicate passion and to rouse the reader's emotions (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.26), here against the vice. Domitius and Crassus' conversation represents the middle link in V.'s teleology of moral decline. Pyrrhus (*BNP* 12.274-6), king of Epirus and Macedonia, appears in V. as an exemplar of *impietas* (1.1.ext.1), and an enemy of Rome (e.g. 3.7.10a; 4.3.5; 6.5.1), in relation to bribery (4.3.14), and positively of *humanitas* (5.1.ext.3). V.'s uses him here with Hannibal as the two great generals whose campaigns in Italy threatened Rome's dominion most. Hannibal (*BNP* 5.1127-9), also one of Rome's greatest enemies, is presented negatively by V. in a manner consistent with his traditional presentation in Roman historiography. He is the most frequently cited foreign exemplar in the work, and is cited most often in Book 9 (9.1.ext.1; 9.2.ext.2; 9.3.ext.3; 9.5.ext.3; 9.6.ext.2; 9.8.ext.1); see Valvo 2008: 37-55; Stocks 2014, esp. pp. 29-32. On the increase of inter-regional trade and taxation during this period, see Hopkins 1980: 101-125. By evoking two of Rome's greatest enemies, as well as the economic abundance of her expansion, V. is adopting the Sallustian motif of *metus hostilis* (cf. Sall. *Hist.* 1.12McG; *Cat.* 10.1-2; *Iug.* 41.2; see Earl 1961: 13-17; Paul 1984: 124-5; Wood 1995: 174-189). V. most clearly applies this motif elsewhere in his account of Q. Metellus' speech after the conquest of Carthage (7.2.3).

**insequentium saeculorum aedificiis et nemoribus:** Despite V.'s rhetoric, there was no legislation against extravagant domestic architecture or furnishings (Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 336). V. chooses *nemus* in order to include non-structural elements in the scope of increasing luxury.

#### 9.1.5

**Quid:** Introduces the list of rhetorical questions that form the basis of the exemplary acts which are being condemned. Not until V. raises the question of the location of these indulgences does he change mode, thus emphasising the unusual time and place for their occurrences and justifying the force of his criticism.

**princeps suorum temporum Metellus Pius tunc:** V.'s claim that Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius (*BNP* 2.879) was the leading man of his time is clearly supported by his achievements and the various offices he held: pontifex in 97, praetor in 89 and 88/87, pontifex maximus in 82, consul with Sulla in 80, as well as proconsul in *Hispania Ulterior* during the war against Sertorius (79-71); cf. also V.'s designation of him at 8.15.8: *principe civitatis*. It is ironic given his actions here, that he retains that designation, for the *princeps*, despite being the most influential and prominent of citizens, was also singled out to be a role model and to confirm to certain social ideals, one of which was abstinence of a desire for excessive luxury (*BNP* 2.855ff. s.v. 'Princes'); cf. e.g. a senatorial resolution in 161 against luxury at the table of the *principes civitatis* (Aul. Gell. 2.24.2). Velleius Paterculus (2.15.3) records how, through filial devotion to his father, Numidicus, Metellus received the agnomen 'Pius' (cf. Val. Max. 5.2.7). Diodorus (36.16.11) also records that Metellus, in mourning-dress (long hair and a dark-coloured toga), went around the forum beseeching his fellow citizens to pass a law which would return his father from exile (Edmondson 2008: 21-46). This portrait of Metellus Pius stands in contrast with his luxurious attire and surroundings presented here, probably because V. takes this *exemplum* from Sallust (*Hist.* 2.59 McG = 2.70M), whose anti-Optimate bias affects his presentation of one of the leading figures of the Optimate faction. The *Periochae* give no clue as to Livy's presentation of this episode of Pius' life.

**cum in Hispania:** Sallust (*Hist.* 2.59 McG = 2.70M), places Metellus Pius, not simply **in Hispania**, but more precisely *in Ulterior Hispania*. Dating Metellus Pius' festivities in *Hispania Ulterior* is notoriously difficult. The events of this *exemplum* occur most likely in the year 75 (Konrad 1995: 157-187). Placing these festivities directly after Calagurris, instead of after his victory at Segontia is congruent with Sallust's presentation of Pius: 'Metellus' festivities were entirely inappropriate by Roman, indeed by anyone's standards: *ultra Romanum ac mortalium etiam morem ... quis rebus aliquantam partem gloriae dempserat, maxime apud veteres et sanctos viros superba illa,*

*gravia, indigna Romano imperio aestimantis*. Such accusations are more forcefully levelled when someone is celebrating his victories excessively, despite more recent setbacks' (Konrad 1995: 168-9). Metellus is portrayed negatively by Sallust, who contrasts him with Pompey, whose army at the time was starving due to lack of support from Rome, exacerbating his hardships over the Celtiberian campaign. McGushin (1992: 225), however, based on Livy (*Per.* 93), places the events of this *exemplum* after the 74 campaigning season. Sallust's version (followed by Macrob. *Sat.* 3.13.6f.) includes more detail than V.'s does, identifying Metellus' quaestor, C. Urbinus, along with others, as the hosts of these lavish dinner-parties. V. follows his source in portraying Metellus acting in a quasi-divine manner, whose luxurious and extravagant behaviour anticipates his triumph (which he was granted, along with Pompey in 71). Plutarch also characterises him thus, e.g. *Sert.* 22ff. where his men proclaim him *imperator*; see also Grueber, *CRRBM* 2.357ff.

V.'s lists his accusations against Metellus in rhetorical fashion; anaphora of *cum* introduces each new charge.

**aris et ture:** Indicative of the divine honours that the Roman citizens in Spain afforded Metellus in anticipation of his saving of them from danger (Taylor 1931: 56); cf. Macrob. *Sat.* 3.13.8: *venienti ture quasi deo supplicabatur*.

**cum Attalicis aulaeis contectos parietes laeto animo intuebatur:** 'Attalid tapestries', i.e. tapestries with gold-embroidery, named after Attalus II of Pergamum, who invented the art of embroidering with gold (Plin. *HN* 8.74). The adjective 'Attalic' is comparable to modern trade names given to oriental goods, for e.g. 'Persian rugs' (Wace 1972: 438).

**cum inmanibus ... sinebat:** Feasting and games were a common feature of post-triumphal festivities (Beard 2007: 263-264); here, however, they are inappropriate because victory had not yet been secured.

**cum palmata veste convivia celebrabat:** Metellus adopts the dress of a *triumphator*. V. refers to the *tunica palmata* worn by lictors in the triumphal procession; *palmatus*

may be a mistranslation, signifying 'Phoenician'. The following reasons for the garment's designation have been suggested: (1) because it was purple, (2) 'Phoenician' could refer to the type of decoration, (3) it was embroidered with palm-branches, (4) 'Palm' was a symbol of victory; see Bonfante Warren 1973: 584-614. In Sallust's account, Metellus wears the *toga picta*; both were a part of the *vestis triumphalis*; see Versnel 1970: 56-57; Beard 2007: 273.

Metellus also receives his **aureas coronas** from heaven (**velut caelesti ... recipiebat**), which again alludes not only to the quasi-divine presentation, but also to his triumphal garb. The 'as if' (**velut**) is significant; V. underlines for the reader that Pius was not divine; V. uses *caelestis* unqualified only of Caesar and Augustus (1.praef.; 1.7.1; 3.2.23; 6.8.4; 6.9.15; 7.6.6; 7.7.4; 8.9.3), and of Homer (8.8.2). No specific designation is given for Metellus' headgear apart from the fact that it is gold (which V. adds); traditional triumphal garb included a *corona triumphalis*, which could be either one made of laurel leaves (*corona laurea*; Aul. Gell. 5.6), or a second crown which was made of gold (sometimes referred to as the *corona Etrusca*), but too large and heavy to be worn by the general and thus held by a *servus publicus* above his head, or a third kind, also made of gold, which was presented to a commander from the provinces (cf. Tert. *De corona militis* 13); cf. also Livy 30.15. Sallust's fuller account records that the *corona* was placed on Metellus' head by Victory, let down from the ceiling by a rope, and accompanied by the automated sound of thunder: *praeterea tum sedenti transenna demissum Victoriae simulacrum cum machinato strepitu tonitruum coronam capiti imponebat*; parallels are found in Petron. *Sat.* 60; Suet. *Nero* 31; Rosati 1999: 85-104, esp. 97-98.

**quarum luxuria Severitas ipsa corrumpi poterat**: V. personifies *Severitas*. The 'virtue' is presented both positively and negatively across the work, cf. e.g. 2.7; 5.8; 6.3; for discussion, see Langlands 2008: 160-87.

**et ubi ista? non in Graecia neque in Asia ... provincia**: V. emphasizes the location of these activities. This *luxuria* occurred not in the typical places Romans would expect

to find it (i.e. in the proverbial East, Greece or Asia), but in Spain, which V. describes as a 'rough and warlike' province (**sed in horrida et bellicosa provincia**); for Greece and Asia as localities of *luxuria*, cf. e.g. Livy 39.6.7; Plin. *HN*. 34.47; Sall. *Cat.* 11.5-6; with Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 315-355; Isager 1993: 257-275.

**Sertorius:** From 80 onwards, Q. Sertorius (*BNP* 13.322-323) was commander of the Iberians and the anti-Sullan Roman exiles. Elsewhere in V. (7.3.6), he features on account of his craftiness. Plutarch (*Sert.* 12-13), contrasting his prowess in military matters with that of Metellus, notes that Sertorius employed guerrilla tactics against Metellus' more traditional fighting tactics; he also contrasts their characters: Sertorius was full of vigour, strength, speed, and accustomed to plain living, and Metellus was past his prime and given over to an indulgent way of life.

**cum ... praestringeret:** Strabo (3.3.6), when describing the militaristic characteristics of the Lusitanians, mentions their use of spears. His account matches the portrait of them in Plutarch (*Sert.* 12.5); cf. also Diod. 5.34.

**illi patris Numidica castra:** Pius accompanied his father on his Numidian campaign (Sall. *Iug.* 64.4). Sallust's presentation of Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus's campaign against Jurgurtha is positive; cf. Sall. *Iug.* 43. 1-5, where he is specifically mentioned as *advorsum divitias invictum animum gerebat*, contrasting sharply with V.'s portrayal of his son. Although V. does at times present a paradigm of intergenerational decline (see, e.g. Lucarelli 2007: 37-129), his presentation of Metellus Pius elsewhere as an exemplar of *gratia* (5.2.7) and a *decus* of the Roman state (8.5.4) for his vindication of its *maiestas*, seems to cast the failing of *luxuria* as a unique and late-flourishing blemish in his career.

**patet ... luxuria adfluxerit ... adulescentia priscos mores vidit, senectus novos orsa est:** *Luxuria* is often used in conjunction with imagery of flooding and fluidity (Edwards 1993: 175; Woodman & Martin 1996: 379, with examples). On the distinction of morality between youth and old age in Roman moralising discourses, see Eyben 1993: *passim*.

### 9.1.6

**Consimilis mutatio:** In the same way that there was an exchange in morality of father and son in the previous *exemplum*, V. is eager to show that a similar gap is also evident between Curio *pater* and *filius*; on the differing morality between father and son over one generation, cf. Cicero's remarks: *Haec Curionem, haec Hortensi filium, non partum culpa corrumpit* (*Att.* 10.4.6).

**in domo Curionum:** Gaius Scribonius Curio *pater* (*BNP* 13.115-6), legal orator, tribune of the plebs in 90, praetor in 80, consul in 76, and possibly censor in 61. He was an opponent of Caesar's. Gaius Scribonius Curio *filius* (*BNP* 13.116) was married to Fulvia, widow of his friend P. Clodius Pulcher, and was involved with M. Antonius (*Cic. Phil.* 2.45f.). He was elected as tribune in 50. At first anti-Caesarian, like his father, he later adopted Caesar's cause after having his debts paid off by him; cf. *App. BCiv.* 2.26; *Dio* 40.60.3; *Plut. Caes.* 29.2, *Pom.* 58.1; *Schol. Luc.* 4.820; *Serv. Aen.* 6.621; *Suet. Caes.* 29.1; *Vell.* 2.48.4; *Lacey* 1961: 324-9; *Gruen* 1974: 473.

**patris gravissimum supercilium:** 'Haughty frown', used elsewhere also in the disapproval of prodigality, cf. e.g. 7.2.ext.1; *Plin. Pan.* 41.3; *Sen. Epist.* 4.10; for frowning specifically connected with fathers cf. *Calp. Ecl.* 4.21: *fronte paterna*.

**sescenties sestertium aeris alieni:** Many sources (e.g. *App. BCiv.* 2.26; *Dio* 40.60.3; *Plut. Caes.* 29.2, *Pom.* 58.1; *Schol. Luc.* 4.820; *Serv. Aen.* 6.621; *Suet. Caes.* 29.1; *Vell.* 2.48.4) record the debts of Curio junior and his reckless behaviour. V.'s figure of 60 million sesterces is the largest recorded; the next highest estimate (10 million sesterces) is given by Velleius. It is unclear whether V. has deliberately exaggerated Cicero's figure (6 million sesterces; *Phil.* 2.45) to make Curio's profligacy seem extreme or whether there was a manuscript error early in its transmission.

**contractum famosa iniuria nobilium iuvenum:** Cicero (*Phil.* 2.45-7) records conflict in the Curio household. As part of his invective against M. Antonius, he alleges a sexual liaison between him and the younger Curio (whom, elsewhere, he labels

pejoratively *filiola Curionis*; *Att.* 1.14.5). Cicero claimed that M. Antonius took the passive role, being wholly under Curio's negative influence (*Phil.* 2.45: *nemo umquam puer emptus libidinis causa tam fuit in domini potestate quam tu in Curionis*). Curio *pater*, disapproving of this liaison, attempted to exclude M. Antonius from his household. Curio *filius* approached Cicero for his help, as he had agreed to stand surety for M. Antonius' debt of 6 million sesterces; however, still being under his father's *potestas*, he would have been powerless to do this without his father's approval (see Ramsey 2003: 229).

**eodem tempore et in iisdem penetibus diversa saecula habitarunt:** Here V. explicitly returns to the theme of virtuous fathers and prodigal sons (cf. 9.1.2; Lucarelli 2007: 37-129), and of earlier epochs being more virtuous than subsequent ones (cf. 9.1.3; 9.1.4; 9.1.5).

#### 9.1.7

Curio *filius*, as one of the *barbatuli iuvenes*, through various inflammatory activities opposed the senatorial enactment against Clodius' sacrilege (see Eyben 1993: 58-63); and hence the logical progression to Clodius in this *exemplum*; on Curio's activities in this regard, see Eyben 1993: 58-63.

Verbal similarities (see below **noctes** ...) suggest that V.'s principal source for this *exemplum* is Cicero (cf. *Att.* 1.16); whether his correspondence or the *In Clodium et Curionem*, which he was composing at the same time as his letters to Atticus, is unclear; it is highly likely that Cicero echoes in his private correspondence the language of the speech. V.'s use of Cicero's correspondence as sources for his *exempla* is unconvincing (Shackleton Bailey 1965: 62-3); Shackleton Bailey is somewhat sceptical that V. had read Cicero's letters (cf. *Val. Max.* 4.2.4; 6.2.9; with Shackleton Bailey's note at 2000: 362 n. 5, vol. 1).

**P. autem Clodii iudicium ... luxuria et libidine abundavit!:** With the simple use of **autem** as a transitional particle, V. is able to maintain the gradual crescendo of vice

from one *exemplum* to the next without detracting from his main focus by the inclusion of a longer rhetorical introduction; hyperbaton of names in V. is common, cf. e.g. 9.11.3. Publius Clodius Pulcher was on trial in May 61, charged with *incestum* for sacrilegiously entering Caesar's house in December 62 while the rites of the Bona Dea were being performed. A thorough account of the sources and trial is provided by Balsdon 1966: 65-73; more recently, see also Tatum 1999: 62-86. This *exemplum* is also the first instance in the chapter (outside of the preface) where V. explicitly connects the vices of *luxuria* and *libido* (see introduction to the chapter).

**evidenter incesti crimine nocens ... absolveretur:** The crucial testimony of Caesar and Aurelia, and Cicero's subsidiary breaking of Clodius' alibi made his guilt unquestionable. However, extensive and lavish bribery secured a narrow acquittal by 31 votes to 25.

**noctes matronarum ... erogatae sunt:** Cf. Cic. Att. 1.16.5: *etiam noctes certarum mulierum atque adolescentulorum nobilium introductiones non nullis iudicibus pro mercedis cumulo fuerunt*; Cicero emphasises monetary bribes (of 400 000 sesterces) and the additional incentive of sex; V.'s use of *matronae* (i.e. married women), for Cicero's *certae mulieres* highlights the outrage; see also Schol. Bob. 86, 91.

**quo ... tam taetro tamque ... qui ... an qui ... an qui:** V. ends the *exemplum* in grand rhetorical fashion; alliteration and anaphora exaggerate all involved in the corruption surrounding this trial. With *dubitatio* V. is able to blast all three targets equally.

**qui istud corruptelae genus excogitavit:** The actual identity of the originator of this bribery is a matter of scholarly debate. Cicero identifies him only as *Calvus ex Nanneianis ille* (Att. 1.16.5). Traditionally, M. Crassus was proposed, based mostly on the assumption that the *oratio honorifica* mentioned by Cicero (Att. 1.16.5), refers to Att. 1.14.3. However Wiseman (1968: 297-302) has ingeniously proposed C. Licinius Calvus (note, however, the concerns of Fulford-Jones 1971: 183-85). Without conclusive evidence supporting either candidate, speculation must remain open; see

also mostly recently Tatum 1999: 82-85, with further references. Cicero (*Att.* 1.16.5) does point out that the bribery was carried out by his slave, an ex-gladiator at best! *Excogitavit* (cf. 9.1.1) evokes the traditional Roman suspicion of inventions.

**an qui ... passi sunt:** Cicero (*Att.* 1.16.16-18) identifies these women simply as *certarum mulierum atque adulescentulorum nobilium*. V. takes it a step further and replaces Cicero's 'certain women' with 'married women' (**matronarum**). V. casts the chastity (*pudicitia*) of these women as well as of the young noblemen as a commodity, able to be used in bribery; on his use of *pudicitia*, see Langlands 2006: 123-191. The final group that V. wishes to execrate is the corrupt jurymen themselves (**an qui religionem stupro permutarunt**). The term *stuprum* designates any offence that violates the sexual integrity of a freeborn Roman, of either sex (see Williams 2010: 103-136); elsewhere (6.1.praef.), V. invokes *Pudicitia*, as antithetical to *stuprum*, claiming her protection over both freeborn boys and women (*tuo praesidio puerilis aetatis insignia munita sunt, tui numinis respectu sincerus iuventae flos permanet, te custode matronalis stola censetur*); cf. Sen. *Epist.* 97.2. Apart from the elusive *lex Sca<n>tinia*, the Republic had no specific legislation against *stuprum*; on this law, cf. Williams 2010: 130-136; Richlin 1992: 224-5; Cantarella 1992: 106-114; Fantham 1991: 285-7; Boswell 1980: 65-9. The *lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* passed by Augustus included *stuprum cum masculo* among its list of illegal activities; as Richlin (1983: 224 n.8) has noted, D.48.5.9(8).pr. states that 'the one who lends his house for the purpose of *stuprum* or *adulterium* with another's wife or *cum masculo* is punished as an *adulter*; *stuprum* is defined as *in vidua vel virgine vel puero*'; legislation such as this would perhaps have been uppermost in V.'s mind, and as such, the next *exemplum*, given its similar contents, naturally follows on from this one.

### 9.1.8

**Aequè flagitiosum:** This transitional phrase not only links this *exemplum* with the previous one in terms of its (im)moral value ('equally'), but also by the common

designation of the acts as *flagitiosus*; the term *flagitiosus* ('disgraceful'), as it is used here, perhaps, also brings to the reader's mind the usage of the word *flagitium* as 'a public demonstration of disapproval outside one person's house' (*OLD* 1), hence V.'s comment about the *convivium* bringing shame upon the community (**magno cum rubore civitatis**); despite Gemellus' banquet being conducted within his *domus*, it engenders negative public attention. The status of the *matronae* and the *puer* illicit V.'s particular outrage; cf. 9.1.7 with comment there on legislation against *stuprum*.

**Gemellus ... deformis:** V. castigates Gemellus (whose identity remains speculative; Münzer, *RE* XIV 253) for what he considers an inappropriate sense of *officium*, and not simply as 'hyperbolic moral criticism or mere snobbery' because of his social position as a tribunician messenger (**tribunicus viator**) as McGinn (2004: 160) points out; the function of *tribunicus viator* was predominantly carried out by freedmen, but some met equestrian status (Purcell 1983: 152-4), certainly under the empire. V.'s comment on Gemellus' freeborn status is thus pointed; the pimp (*leno*) was *infamis* and as such not a *civis integer* (see McGinn 1998: 67-8 on Val. Max. 7.7.7). V.'s comment, by equating his activity with servile status (note Shackleton Bailey's translation of **intra** is misleading), goes beyond the law, evoking popular hostility towards *lenones*. For V.'s description of Gemellus as *ingenuus sanguis*, cf. 5.4.7; as Lawrence (2006: 66-7) notes, V.'s uses the phrase on this occasion to contrast the individuals' 'positive qualities' with a 'sordid and disgraceful environment' of his own making – 'Valerius ... uses Gemellus' free blood as a contrast with his behaviour. The free blood of Gemellus is essentially meaningless because he chooses to behave like a slave'.

**Metello Scipioni consuli:** Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (*BNP* 2.880-1) was consul in the year 52, thus dating this *exemplum*; cf. 9.5.3.

**lupanari:** On the creation of pretend brothels, or 'sex clubs', within one's *domus*, see: McGinn 2004: 157-166; cf. also, e.g. Suet. *Cal.* 41.1.

**Muciam et Fulviam ... viro utramque inclitam:** Here Shackleton Bailey has followed the common emendation of the main MSS' Munia and Flavia to produce identifiable women (Shackleton Bailey 2000: 300 n. 8). Bauman (1992: 239 n. 8) questions the need for emendation; however, the identification of Fulvia, wife at various times of Clodius, Curio and M. Antonius, and Mucia, daughter of Q. Mucius Scaevola the Augur and divorced by Pompey in 61, certainly fits the context of the *exemplum*, as does the condemnatory moralising tone in which they are presented; Fulvia was commonly depicted as the counter-image of the Roman matron (*BNP* 5.577-78; Delia 1991: 197-217); see also Masi Doria 2014: 493-500

† **victoriam** †: Obelised by Briscoe following *A<sup>c</sup> LG: ras. A:* but Shackleton Bailey and Kempf plausibly prefer the reading **inclitam**, which has weight *if* the two women are Mucia and Fulvia.

**nobilem puerum Saturninum:** Shackleton Bailey (2000: 301 n. 9) identifies this Saturninus as Cn. Sentius Saturninus, the father, or more likely uncle, of Cn. Sentius Saturninus, cos. 19 (see Syme 1964: 162, who calls Klebs' prosopography a 'sorry mess'). On his reputation, cf. Cic. *Fam.* 8.14.1. Despite not being of noble birth, i.e. not having a consular ancestor, the boy's pedigree was prominent enough to suggest the descriptor **nobilem puerum**. V. is not concerned with the technical definition of *nobilitas*

**probrosae patientiae corpora:** 'Bodies infamously *patient'*, i.e. to suffer, or be passive; connotes not only women, who were *pati natae* 'born to suffer' (Sen. *Ep.* 95.21), but also 'abnormal' men who took on the passive role in sex acts (Parker 1997: 47-65, esp. 50).

**epulas consuli et tribunis non celebrandas sed vindicandas:** In reality punishment was the job of censors and aediles (McGinn 1998: 201-2), and so V.'s rhetoric may ignore strict legal technicalities. In practice, however, Tiberian consuls did compose memoranda on the punishment of those who violated the dignity of their social order (SC from Larinum, ll. 4-5).

### 9.1.9

**Verum praecipue Catilinae libido scelestus:** The wickedness of L. Sergius Catiline (BNP 3.17-9) is a fitting climax to the domestic *exempla* of this chapter; made explicit by **praecipue** (cf. e.g. 5.2.ext.4; 8.8.praef.). Catiline appears elsewhere as an exemplar of *dictum improbum* and of *facta scelerata* (9.11.3), and V. alludes to Cicero's orations on him to scaffold his condemnation of Sejanus, see Introduction and 9.11.ext.4 with comment; cf. also e.g. 4.8.3; 5.8.5. V.'s principal source for this *exemplum* (see McGushin 1977: 110ff.) is Sall. *Cat.* 15.2-3: *postremo captus amore Aureliae Orestillae, cuius praetor formam nihil umquam bonus laudavit, quod ea nubere illi dubitabat, timens privignum adulta aetate, pro certo creditur necato filio vacuum domum scelestis nuptiis fecisse*, which possibly also borrows from Cic. *Cat.* 1.14 (however, note that βγ *domum* rather than *ah's locum* is to be preferred): *nuper cum morte superioris uxoris novis nuptiis locum vacuefecisses, nonne etiam alio incredibili scelere hoc scelus cumulavisti?*; cf. also Livy 1.46.9: *prope continuatis funeribus cum domos vacuas novo matrimonio fecissent, iunguntur nuptiis*. Skard (1956: 57ff.) believes the form of the narrative to be taken from an early tragic motif; specifically the inverted literary parallels between Catiline, his son, and Aurelia Orestilla, and the tragic myths surrounding the house of Atreus, particularly Orestes' parricide, suggested by the coincidence of the name.

**nam vesano ... correptus:** Here V., by labelling Catiline's *amor* as *vesanus*, condenses two separate aspects of Sallust's version (*Cat.* 15), in which Catiline is both *captus amore Aureliae Orestillae* and in a state of mental duress (*ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat*). V.'s typically substitutes the vocabulary of his source with a close synonym, in this instance, *correptus* for *captus*; V.'s term is perhaps slightly more vivid.

**Aureliae Orestillae:** Daughter of Cn. Aufidius Orestes, consul in 71 (Evans 1987: 69-72). Not much can be said about her with any certainty; Sallust (*Cat.* 1.15) tells us that the only good thing about her was her beauty, and that she was wealthy (*Cat.*

35.3). Syme (1964: 84-85) believed her to be Catiline's last (and possibly third) wife (however, cf. Lewis 2006: 301: '[a]ll that can be accepted from this with any confidence is that Aurelia Orestilla ... was not his first wife'). Catiline's marriage to her was probably contracted in the mid-60s (Marshall 1977: 151-4). Appian (*BCiv.* 2.2) notes that Orestilla was afraid to marry a man with a son.

**cum unum ... habebat:** V. does not explain why his (adult) son was an impediment to Catiline's marriage to Aurelia; Sallust (*Cat.* 15) states simply that Aurelia was afraid of her step-son; cf. the motive behind SASSIA's reluctance to marry Oppianicus (*Cic. Cluent.* 27-28). Typically, it is stepmothers who are potentially dangerous to their stepchildren (see Watson 1995); here this motif is inverted.

**veneno sustulit:** V. goes much further than Sallust (cf. App. *BCiv.* 2.4), who states simply that he killed his son. During the Republic, the *ius vitae necisque* gave the *paterfamilias* the power of life and death over his family (Lacey 1986: 121-144); abuse of this power, however, was regulated by the censors, and restrictions were placed on the *ius* during the Imperial period (see Harris 1986: 81-95; as well as Eyben 1991: 112-43, who states, 'It is notable that almost all known cases of fathers who killed a son involved offences against the [early] Republic' [122]). In striking contrast, Catiline's filicide is spurred on by his own personal lust (**libido**). Poison was typically viewed as a woman's weapon, see Currie 1998: 147-168.

The fact that V.'s mentions that it was Catiline's only child (**solum**) marks this act as truly shocking, and against his duty as a father to preserve his line. By mentioning that the son was past the age of puberty (**aetate iam puberem**), V. makes clear that this was not a case of defensible infanticide; **et ... et ...** marks out the two aspects of equal value.

**protinusque ex rogo eius maritalem facem accendit:** The idea that the marriage torch became a funeral torch is not uncommon in Latin literature (cf. e.g. Prop. 4.11.46; Ov. *Fast.* 2.561-2); see also Trogus 11.1.4; Yardley 2003: 101. With this

imagery V. moves on from his sources to paint a lurid picture of the haste with which Catiline married Orestilla.

**ex rogo ... novae maritae orbitatem suam loco muneris erogavit:** V. has Catiline present his new wife with the gift of his own childlessness. The image V. may have in mind is the giving of the *anulus pronubus* in engagement, which the groom presented to his fiancée (Tert. *Apol.* 6; Plin. *HN* 33.12); gifts given after the marriage were not customary (Hersch 2010: 176-7). *Paronomasia* (**ex rogo ... erogavit**) adds V.'s rhetorical conclusion.

**eodem ... dedit:** With **animo**, V. echoes Sallust's *vastus animus* (*Cat.* 5.5); for Catiline linked with parricide, as well as parricide's link with treason, in V., cf. 9.11.3 with commentary. Sexual lust is a common marker of tyrannical behaviour in Latin historiography and rhetoric; see Dunkle 1971: 12-20.

#### 9.1.ext.1

Hannibal's alleged wintering in Capua in 216/5 is treated most fully by Livy (23.18.10-16), who is most likely V.'s principal source for this *exemplum*; if Livy is indeed V.'s source, he does not take any noticeable expressions from him and adds the role of perfumes. The details also occur at Cic. *De Leg. Agr.* 2.95; Flor. 1.22.21-2; Zon. 9.3.4; for a literary refashioning of this *topos*, see Sil. *Pun.* 11-13. Polybius (11.19.3) states that Hannibal never encamped his army near a city in 16 years of warfare in Italy (however his claim at 7.1.1 seems to contradict this); the earliest tradition has a winter siege of Casilinum (Polyaen. 6.38.6; Zon. 9.3.4) that fully occupied Hannibal; see also Frederiksen 1984: 257-8; Walsh 1961: 78, esp. n. 2; Wheeler 1996: 238, who believe that Hannibal's winter in Capua was an invention of Roman annalists, which concealed the defeat.

**At:** Adversative, important here for the ostensibly paradoxical part that a vice proved beneficial to Rome.

**Campana luxuria:** Campanian luxury is well attested in antiquity; cf. e.g. 2.4.6; Frederiksen 1984: 244; 298-9. The fertility of the actual land contributed to the image of Campania as a site of luxury in antiquity (cf. e.g. Strabo 5.4.13; Athen. 538a).

**invictum ... armis:** At this point Hannibal had been victorious in major battles (e.g. Trebia, Trasimene, and Cannae). For *invictus* as a descriptor of great generals, see Weileder 1998: 94-5; cf. wordplay at Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.94: *tum invictum voluptate vicit*.

**vincendum ... tradidit:** After Cannae, Capua and its satellites defected to Hannibal, but subduing the whole of Campania proved impossible. Hannibal and his forces spent no further winters in Campania.

**vigilantissimum ducem:** An allusion to the famous character sketch by Livy (21.4.6).

**dapibus largis ... et delicias evocavit:** The vice list that V. enumerates does not completely follow the one found in Livy, who offers unadorned nouns (23.18.12: *somnus enim et vinum et epulae et scorta balineaque et otium*). V.'s list is enhanced by emotive adjectives and includes, lavish feasts (**dapibus largis**), abundant wine (**abundanti vino**), the fragrance of unguents (**unguentorum fragrantia**; for these as a Capuan speciality, see Oakley 1998: 291), unrestrained sexual indulgence (**veneris usu lasciviore**), sleep (**somnum**), and pleasures (**delicias**).

**Seplasia ei <et> Albana:** Both markets in Capua; Seplasia, proverbial for its wealth (cf. e.g. Varro *Sat. Men.* 7.3; Cic. *Pis.* 24), specialised in perfumes and medicines, and was not situated in a classical forum but on a street, hence '*Seplasia*' is usually considered as fem. sing. with '*via*' understood (Frayn 1993: 42-46). Seplasia's specialisation in perfumes explains V.'s addition of *unguentorum fragrantia* to his list. Seplasia and Albana are sometimes found mentioned in conjunction (e.g. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.94). Frayn (1993: 44) believes that Albana is mentioned together with Seplasia in the sources not because they sold the same wares but because they were both markets.

**quibus virtus atteritur:** *Virtus*, from the Latin word for man (*vir*), characterises the ideal self-image and behaviour of Roman men. It encompassed a sense of manliness

that was bound up with notions of moral excellence; see McDonnell 2006. It was a common belief that excessive pleasure and leisure resulted in effeminacy, in this instance bringing about the mollescence of Hannibal's troops; cf. Strabo (5.4.13) who has Hannibal claim that his soldiers have become women; see also Livy 23.45.4-6. Moralising texts presented pleasure, leisure, and luxury as threats to martial *virtus*, cf. Cato's contrasting of *virtus* with *voluptas* and *vitia* (ORF<sup>4</sup> 8 141); Cic. *Rep.* 1.1; McDonnell 2006: 55-9.

**victoriae ... convertitur:** Cf. Livy 23.45.4, who claims that Capua had been Hannibal's Cannae (*Capuam Hannibali Cannas fuisse*); see also, Flor. 1.22.21-2. As Livy (23.18.14) claims, Capua destroyed the morale of Hannibal's army and hence marked a watershed in his military career, where previously he had been *invictus*.

**animique pariter et corporis vires expugnantur:** The effects of *luxuria* on both body and spirit is seen also at Livy 23.45.3.

**adeo ut nescias ... an ... habendum sit?:** An example of *dubitatio comparativa*, used according to Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.2.19) to encourage trust in a speaker's honesty (Whitton 2011: 267-277).

#### 9.1.ext.2

V. turns next to the sybaritic lifestyles of the inhabitants of Volsinii. Etruscan extravagance was a common *topos* of Greco-Roman ethnography going back at least to Theopompus (F204 = Athen. 12.517d-518b); for a recent ('revisionist') study challenging this notion, see Liébert 2006.

**Quae etiam:** Sc. *vitia*; **etiam** links to the previous example.

**Volsiniensium urbem:** *Urbs Vetus* (modern Orvieto), see Camporeale 2004: 303-314; Stopponi, *BTCGI* 13.1-88. Volsinii may be negatively singled out by V. because it was the birthplace of Sejanus (Tac. *Ann.* 4.1).

**gravibus et erubescendis cladibus:** Blushing is used by V. to connote something shameful (cf. e.g. 1.8.9; 2.5.5; 2.6.3); see comment at 9.5.3.

**erat opulenta, erat moribus et legibus ordinata:** Cf. Oros. 4.5: *Volsinienses, Etruscorum florentissimi*; Plin. *HN* 2.39: *qualiter cum Volsinii, oppidum Tuscorum opulentissimum*; Zon. 8.7.4: πολιτεία τε εὐνομουμένη ἐκέχθητο.

**Etruriae caput habebatur:** Volsinii was the meeting place of the national annual meeting of the Etruscan confederation (*principum Etruriae concilium*) in order to elect its *sacerdos* (Versnel 1970: 275). Cf. Livy 10.37: *tres validissimae urbes, Etruria capita, Volsinii, Perugia, Arretium*.

**sed postquam luxuria ... insolentissimae dominationi subiceret:** V. is our earliest source for these events. In 265, the ruling Etruscans were overthrown by their slaves. They were re-established the following year by the Romans who preferred an oligarchic government (cf. however Plin. *HN* 34.34, who records a claim by Metrodorus of Scepsis that the Romans attacked Volsinii on account of 2 000 statues). This class conflict in Volsinii is also treated in Zonaras 8.7.4-8, Florus 1.16, Orosius 4.5.3, *vir. ill.* 36, and John of Antioch, *FHG* 4.557 fr. 50; see also, Radke, *RE* 9A. 843-44; Harris 1971: 83-4; 115-8. Minor differences occur between the sources on the major points of the rebellion. According to both Zonaras and Florus, Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges was sent to deal with the situation, however, according to Zonaras, he was killed in battle and another unnamed consul had to finish the war. According to the *De viris illustribus* (36.2) it was Decius Mus who subdued the revolt, while M. Fulvius Flaccus (cos. 264), according to the *Fasti Triumphales*, was given a triumph *de Vulsiniensibus* (Reynolds 1971: 138); Harris (1971: 84) rejects Decius Mus' involvement. V.'s terminology is consistent with the other sources: *domini* or δεσπότες is commonly used for the masters (V. is alone in also referring to them as *ingenui*), while *servi* or οἰκέτες for the slaves (Harris 1971: 115ff.). On the actual status of slaves within Etruria, see Pallottino 1974: 136-7; Torelli 1986: 60-1. V. ends the *exemplum* by listing the various saturnalian actions performed by the slaves; each of which violates Roman norms.

**primum ... mox ... postremo:** V. presents a clear and rapid decline of the Vulsinian state, illustrating with specific measures the general decline he has outlined (*prolapsa, decidit*).

**pauci senatorium ordinem intrare ausi:** Cf. Zon. 8.7; Oros. 4.5.3 has the Volsinii free their slaves.

**testamenta ad arbitrium suum scribi iuebant:** Roman slaves could not register an official *testamentum* (see Champlin 1991); even where a master permitted unofficial wills (e.g. Plin. *Ep.* 8.14), the slave's wishes would not have been final.

**convivia coetusque ingenuorum fieri vetabant:** By banning free-born assemblies (including *convivia*), a violation of freedom of association, the former slaves presumably were able to limit opportunities for political engagement among the free-born.

**filiis dominorum in matrimonium ducebant:** Cf. Oros. 4.5.5. Under Roman law no *conubium* could exist between citizens and slaves (Ulp. *Tit.* 5.5; Treggiari 1991: 43). *Matrimonium* could not be contracted between slaves and free, however, the quasi-married state of *contubernium* could be; cf. Paul *Sententiae* 2.19.6; Treggiari 1991: 51-53. In Roman eyes, this extreme form of hypogamy would be seen as even worse, for it is the man who is the slave and the woman who is freeborn. The *Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* (*Dig.* 23.2.44) forbade freedmen from marrying women from senatorial families; V.'s moral sensibilities will have been guided by this.

**postremo lege sanxerunt ut stupra sua in viduis pariter atque nuptis impunita essent:** V.'s use of *stuprum* here is appropriate; so far as in that *Roman* legal terms at least, it designated both free-born women and men (Williams 2010:103-136). For V. this is the climactic horror, reflecting the violation of the power of families, heads of houses, obliterating traditional rights by means of a new law that inverted the traditional order. The rape of a wife traditionally merited revenge (e.g. that on Tarquinius Superbus).

**ac ne qua virgo ingenuo nuberet cuius castitatem non ante ex numero ipsorum aliquis delibasset:** The shaming nature of this act (see the comment of Williams 2010: 110-136) would most likely be the principal reason for its legislation by the former slaves. Interpreting Etruscan sexual practices through the lens of their Greek and Roman neighbours yields all the familiar tropes associated with the sensuality of the 'barbarian' Other; see Bonfante 1996: 155-169.

Sources do indicate that the status of Etruscan slaves (even in matters concerning sexual activities) was different to that of their Greek counterparts (Bonfante 1996: 159; Pallottino 1974: 136-7; Torelli 1986: 60-1). Note Fell's comments on this passage: 'The details given by our authorities that the slaves compelled the free-born to make wills in their favour and to give them free women in marriage might be merely an aristocratic version of the winning by the plebs of the rights of intermarriage and succession.' (1924: 132 n. 2).

### 9.1.ext.3

V.'s version greatly condenses Cicero *Tusc.* 5.20: *nam Xerxes quidem refertus omnibus praemiis donisque fortunae, non equitatu, non pedestribus copiis, non navium multitudine, non infinito pondere auri contentus praemium proposuit, qui invenisset novam voluptatem—qua ipsa non fuit contentus; neque enim umquam finem inveniet libido.* Cicero, similarly, used the anecdote to contrast virtue, as the path to a good and happy life, with pleasure.

**Xerxes:** Both Cicero and V. specify Xerxes the King of Persia (486 – 465), but this story is told also of the king of the Assyrians (Plut. *Mor.* 622A), Persian kings more generally (Athen. 144e = Theophrastus fr. 125W; Athen. 514e = Clearchus of Soli fr. 51a; Athen. 529d = Clearchus of Soli fr. 50 Wehrli), as well as of Darius III specifically (Athen. 539b = Clearchus of Soli fr. 50 Wehrli). Xerxes features elsewhere in Book 9 as an exemplar of arrogance (9.5.ext.2) and as someone fearful of his own mortality (9.13.ext.1); he is also a common feature in Roman moral *exempla* more generally,

most often in a negative light; see Rosivach 1984: *passim*; and most recently Bridges 2015: 163-70.

**opum regiarum ostentatione:** With this phrase V. has condensed Cicero's enumerated list of royal wealth and emphasised ostentation. V.'s use of **regiarum** evokes in his Roman reader's mind the negative connotations associated with *rex*; Xerxes was often portrayed as a tyrant in Latin literature (e.g. Sen. *Q Nat.* 5.18.10, *Const.* 4.2, *Brev. Vit.* 17.2).

**novum voluptatis genus:** The desire for novelty often appears as a feature of vice; cf. e.g. 9.1.1, 9.1.3.

**luxuria:** Xerxes' motivating vice in Cicero is *libido*, which V. has substituted with *luxuria* here. This provides further support for the synonymous interchangeability of these vices in moral categories, or at the very least their close association (as outlined in the introduction to this chapter).

**amplissimi imperii ruina evasit:** V. uses *imperium* here in the sense that Cicero employs it, rather than in its standard post-Augustan sense (see Richardson 2008: 151-153), and refers allusively to the humiliating defeat and retreat of Xerxes' invasion force (481-79) that he mentions elsewhere (e.g. 1.6.ext.1).

9.1.ext.4

V.'s immediate source for this *exemplum* is probably Pompeius Trogus (cf. Just. 38.10.3-4), who may have been influenced by Posidonius (Bar-Kochva 1976: 99-102); exaggeration is likely.

**Antiochus quoque, Syriae rex:** Antiochus VII Sidetes 'Euergetes' (*BNP* 1.764-765) was king of the Seleucid realms from 138-129 V.'s use of **quoque** continues his list, begun in the previous *exemplum* with Xerxes, of 'rhetorical tyrants' associated with the vices of *luxuria* and *libido*. The notorious extravagances of Hellenistic kings played a role in the consolidation of Rome's largely negative attitude towards the concept of kingship; however, *rex* can also be used neutrally in Latin literature, and

does not necessarily take on *all* negative connotations of the Greek τύραννος (see Erskine 1991:106-120); V., however, clearly deploys them throughout his work as exemplars of various vices, as was common in declamatory texts of the period, cf. e.g. Sen. *Contr.* 1.7, 2.5, 3.6, 4.7, 5.8, 7.6, 9.4; Juv. 7.151.

**nihilo continentioris:** *continentia* is a feature frequently commented on by V., a virtue celebrated at 4.3. *Incontinentia*, the inability to restrain one's desires, was a conventional characteristic associated with tyrants; see Edwards 1993: 28.

**cuius caecam et amentem luxuriam exercitus imitatus:** The occasion for this luxurious behaviour is Antiochus' Parthian campaign, which began early in 131 (for the chronology, see Assar 2006: 104). V. claims that the army acted in imitation of their leader. Justin (38.10.2) states that the army was as suited to luxurious living as it was to fighting a campaign.

**aureos clavos crepidis subiectos habuit:** V.'s has replaced the regular term for military footwear, *caligae*, used by Trogus (Just. 38.10.3), with **crepidis** (sandals). The sole of the *caliga*, the heavy sandal worn by Roman soldiers, was usually studded with hobnails (*clavi caligarii*; see e.g. Plin. *HN* 34.143); here the **clavos crepidis** are **aureos**, a clearly luxurious innovation as gold would have been unsuitable for real campaigning.

**argenteaque vasa ad usum culinae comparavit:** That the cooking utensils were silver earns V.'s moral opprobrium; cf. e.g. 2.9.4; 4.3.7.

**et tabernacula textilibus sigillis adornata statuit:** Tents adorned with tapestries do not appear in Justin, but perhaps go back to Pompeius Trogus.

**avaro potius ... strenuo mora:** A generalisation that takes no account of Antiochus' victorious campaign. V. cannot allow the excess to appear rewarded. His comment may also reveal an allusive reference to Antiochus' ultimate defeat by the Parthians, which would involve no moral difficulties for V. If so, then V. describes the Parthians as both greedy and strong (*strenuus*), a characterisation that would be appropriate in the latter years of Tiberius' reign, when Artabanus was consolidating

Parthia's strength for attacks on Roman territory (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.31-9), and the *victoria* is theirs rather than the initial successes of Antiochus.

9.1.ext.5

**Ptolomaeus rex:** Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (*BNP* 12.143-144), c. 182/1-116. Assessment of Euergetes' rule and reputation is near unanimously negative (see e.g. Green 1990: 597).

**accessio vitiorum suorum vixit:** V. later (9.2.ext.5) describes these vices as 'lustful madness' (*libidinosae amentiae*) and also singles Ptolemy VIII out for his cruelty.

**Physcon:** (= Gk. Φύσκων; 'pot-belly') According to Trogus (Justin 38.8.9; cf. Athen. 549e) he was ugly, short, and had a fat belly that resembled a beast's: *erat enim et vultus deformis et statura brevis et sagina ventris non homini, sed beluae similis*; see Whitehorne 1994: 107-8.

**sororem natu maiorem communi fratri nuptam sibi nubere coegit:** All three siblings shared the same parents: Ptolemy V Epiphanes and Cleopatra I. Cleopatra II (*BNP* 3.440-441), was born soon after 190 (making her 9 years older), she was married (from 175 onwards) to their common brother Ptolemy VI Philometor (*BNP* 12.141-142). Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II were married in 145 after Philometor's death. Brother-sister marriage was viewed as incest in Roman terms; for Roman attitudes, cf. e.g. Sen. *Apoc.* 8; Diod. 1.27.

**postea deinde filia eius per vim stuprata ipsam dimisit, ut vacuum locum nuptiis puellae faceret:** Cf. Liv. *Per.* 59: *et cum sorori eius Cleopatra, quam filia eius virgine per vim compressa atque in matrimonium ducta repudiaverat*; Justin 38.8.2-5: *ipsam quoque sororem filia eius virgine per vim stuprata et in matrimonium adscita repudiata*. Noticeable verbal similarities between V., Livy, and Pompeius Trogus/Justin are evident. While not completely certain, Livy is most likely Trogus' source, see: Yardley 2003: 28; Seel 1956: 173-5. Against the sources, Boswinkel and Pestman (1982: 66 n. 14) have suggested that Cleopatra III was possibly not a victim of her uncle's rape, but that

she had ambitions towards the throne. Ptolemy's marriage to Cleopatra III is dated to between the 8 May 141 and 14 January 140 (Pestman 1993: 86b). Despite the fact that V., along with Livy and Justin, record that Ptolemy divorced Cleopatra II, he remained married to both simultaneously, simply distinguishing between Cleopatra II ἡ ἀδελφή (his sister), and Cleopatra III ἡ γυνή (his wife), see Mooren 1988: 436; see also Whitehorne 1994: 108-117. Uncle-niece marriages were illegal in Rome before AD 49, but V.'s stress lies on the rape element, punishable by death under the *lex Julia de vi (per vim stuprum)* Dig. 48.5.30.9.

#### 9.1.ext.6

The direct source for this *exemplum* is unknown; however, aspects of it are treated in many ancient authors (collected at *MRR* 2.218). Aulus Gabinius, having been bribed with 10 000 talents by Ptolemy XII Auletes, restored him to the throne of Egypt in 55, defeating Archelaus and Ptolemy's daughter, Berenice, at Pelusium (cf. Cic. *Att.* 4.10.1, *Rab. Post.* 19-21; Strabo 17.1.11; Liv. *Per.* 105; Joseph. *AJ* 14.98-100; *BJ* 1.175-6; Plut. *Ant.* 3.2-6; App. *BCiv.* 2.24; Dio 39.55-8; 42.2.4; Caes. *BC* 3.4.4; *Bell. Alex.* 3.3; Sullivan 1990: 241-3).

**Consentaneus igitur regibus suis gentis Aegyptiae populus:** Roman views of Egypt and Egyptians, especially of Alexandria itself as well as the Ptolemies, and especially post-Actium, were largely negative; typically they were cast as the decadent and effeminate 'Other'; see Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984: 1852-2000 and Gruen 2011: 107-111, with further bibliography cited there. Cicero especially, in *Pro Rabirio Postumo*, presents 'a highly negative picture' of the king of Egypt, Ptolemy XII Auletes, 'a capricious and untrustworthy monarch' (Siani-Davies 2001: 1) and of Alexandria as well (Versluys 2002: 426-8). With **consentaneus**, V. links the Egyptian people with their leader Archelaus simultaneously linking this *exemplum* with the previous one; Strabo (17.1.11) also links the misrule of Egyptian monarchs, particularly Auletes, with their luxurious living.

**ductu Archelai:** Claiming to be the son of Mithridates Eupator, Archelaus (*BNP* 1.982) married Berenice IV in 56 becoming king-consort. Strabo (12.3.34; cf. 17.1.11) reports that Archelaus was killed by Gabinius during the battle, whereas Plutarch (*Ant.* 3.5-6) and Dio (39.58.3) place his death after the battle.

**A. Gabinium:** Aulus Gabinius (*BNP* 5.632) was consul in 58. During his governorship in Syria, he was instrumental in restoring Ptolemy Auletes to his throne, after which he was convicted of extortion and forced into exile. His career was marked by military success; he was also responsible for much domestic legislation; initially an *amicus* of Pompey, he, however, later supported Caesar during the Civil War; see Sanford 1939: 64-92; Badian 1959: 87-99; Williams 1978: 195-210; Fantham 1975: 425-443; Siani-Davies 1997: 306-340; Siani-Davies 2001: 132-4.

**moenibus ... non potuerunt:** V. is the only ancient source to mention the Egyptian populace's discontent at the physical effort of fortifying their camp. V.'s conclusion contrasts the minds (**animi**) of the Egyptians, which have been enervated by pleasure, with the spirit (**spiritum**) of the Roman army. The Egyptians were considered an unwarlike people (e.g. *Flor.* 4.2.60).

#### 9.1.ext.7

This anecdote occurs also in Athenaeus (256c-d; whose source may be Clearchus of Soli's *Gergithius*) and Plutarch (*Mor.* 50d-e). Athenaeus dates this *exemplum* to the time of Glous the Carian (on whom, see: Sekunda 1991: 83-143, esp. 89-90) in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century, when certain women were designated as *κολακίδες* (female flatterers) by their mistresses. Athenaeus also records that some of these women were called upon to visit the wives of Artabazus III (c. 387-320s; satrap of Phrygia) and Mentor of Rhodes (a Greek mercenary commander and Artabazus' brother-in-law) on the mainland (i.e. Syria; cf. *Plut. Mor.* 50d). Athenaeus (256d) states that the women were named *κλιμακίδες* ('female ladders'; an obvious pun on *κολακίδες*

and κλῖμαξ) because they made their bodies into steps for their mistresses to walk on in order to ascend or descend from their chariots.

**effeminatio:** Used broadly as a term of condemnation, see Williams 2010: 137-176; cf. e.g. 2.6.1; 2.7.9. V. designates the Cypriots as more effeminate (than the Egyptians of 9.1.ext.6) for tolerating this luxurious practice, calling into question their masculinity.

**gradibus:** V.'s Latin does not replicate the word-play between 'flatterer' and 'ladder' found in Athenaeus' Greek, however no pun would be possible in Latin between *adulor* or *blandior* and *gradus*.

**viris enim, si modo viri erant, vita carere quam tam delicato imperio obtemperare satius fuit:** V. questions the masculinity of the Cypriot men who have submitted to the *imperium* of women, particularly as it is *delicatum*; it is a complete inversion of the Roman ideal, and in V.'s eyes death is preferable; see Williams 2010: 150-1.

## De Crudelitate

V. predominantly uses the standard Latin term *crudelitas*, and its cognate forms in his discussion of the vice in this chapter (13 instances in total). The prominent appearance of *crudelitatis* as the first word after the initial linking sentence justifies the later chapter-title. *Saevitia* and *feritas* (and their cognates) which are commonly used synonymously in imperial Latin (cf. e.g. Sen. *Ira* 3.17-19), also appear in the chapter, but with lesser frequency; 5 times and 3 times respectively.<sup>148</sup>

The language of *crudelitas*, although evident in the Early Republic, only begins to develop into a rhetorical discourse of its own in the Late Republic, specifically

---

<sup>148</sup> On the nuance in usage, especially in regard to the 'rhetorical tyrant', between *crudelitas* and *saevitia*, with the latter's proper use being made in relation to animals and only metaphorically to humans, see Dunkle 1971: 14-15.

within a political context.<sup>149</sup> From some of its earliest uses *crudelitas* was characterised as insatiable (e.g. Accius [W 147]: *quorum crudelitatem numquam ulla explet satias sanguinis*; cf. e.g. Val. Max. 9.2.praef.: *quem modum sibi ipsa statuet*; 9.2.1: *parum ... satiates ... inexplebilis; nec contentus*). This ‘bottomlessness’ of cruelty, as Dowling (2006: 8) labels it, is seen especially in V.’s descriptions of the culprits of the vice within the chapter. Often they are given over to an excess savagery (e.g. the ‘*rabies saevitiae*’ of 9.2.ext.4) and described in animalistic terms. For Roman Stoics *crudelitas* resulted from ‘emotional excess’ and brought misery because of its lack of self-regulation.<sup>150</sup> In this way, the performance of cruel acts is a danger not only to the victim, but to the performer as well, because he is liable to descended into irrationality, taking pleasure in the suffering of others (Dowling 2006: 9).

In the Imperial period, the spheres of discourse in which *crudelitas* is employed (often in relation to *clementia*) are expanded from military and political uses to ethical settings as well. Seneca, for example, writing only a few decades later than V., in the peroration to the first book of his *De clementia* (1.25-26), outlines a number of reasons why savagery is so abhorrent. Firstly, he says, it transgresses the limits of custom and humanity; secondly, novelty is one of its characteristic features in its search for types of punishment and in devising ever-new instruments of torture for prolonging and varying pain; and finally also it delights in human misery. According to Seneca, it is animalistic and a disease of the mind. A reader, familiar with V.’s chapter on cruelty, would have no difficulty in pinpointing the similarities between his *exempla* and Seneca’s later discussion; so, for example, V.’s makes a point of noting the novelty of certain cruelties performed by his exemplars; 9.2.1: ‘*novus punitor*’; 9.2.ext.9: ‘*inventor*’; 9.2.ext.11: ‘*in poena excogitanda*’.

---

<sup>149</sup> Dowling 2006: 5-28.

<sup>150</sup> Dowling 2006: 8 states, ‘[c]ruelty is insatiable because the self-limiting factor, the pain, is felt by others’.

In the Roman conception of cruelty two further aspects are often highlighted as important: firstly, that the judgement of an act's cruelty lies not in the act itself, but rather in the status of the sufferer; hence humiliation and the destruction of the victim's *dignitas* is the governing feature more often than the infliction of actual physical harm. And secondly, for the condition of an act labelled 'cruel' to be satisfied, it is to be 'performed not in pursuit of an identifiable interest, but to satisfy emotion'.<sup>151</sup> 'Performed', as we will see from V.'s Roman examples, is exactly the correct word, for one of the recurring motifs is the visual spectacle and theatricality of the acts themselves, along with the satisfaction that the punisher or torturer gets from carrying out these deeds and watching his victims suffer.

In Roman thought, *crudelitas* is also often the antithesis of the virtue *clementia* (as seen above) – a virtue with which Tiberius was eager to associate himself, a point of fact that must impact on V.'s presentation of its opposing vice.<sup>152</sup> Yet in dealing with *crudelitas*, any author writing under Tiberius, especially after the milder first nine years of his reign, had to take into account the reputation of the emperor. Of all Suetonius' Caesars, for example, he attracts the most attributions of the vice (cf. e.g.

---

<sup>151</sup> Lintott 1992: 9-27; see also Lintott 1968 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1999). Notice V.'s identification of the status of various victims, e.g. praetor (9.2.1); consul and censor (9.2.2); and references to *cives* (9.2.1; 9.2.4), who would have been protected from physical violence by various laws. This second aspect is more difficult to determine in any given case because the lines blur between what could be understood as an 'identifiable interest' and what was done simply to 'satisfy emotion'. Cases could be made for both aspects in any of the *exempla* which V. presents.

<sup>152</sup> On the antithesis between *crudelitas* and *clementia*, see Dowling 2006: *passim*; Braund 2009: 39. On Tiberian clemency, attested not only in the *SCPP*, but also on coinage (coins with the legend CLEMENTIAE were issued c. AD 22), as well as in the senate's decision to erect an altar to *Clementia* (Tac. *Ann.* 4.74.2), see Dowling 2006: 170-84; Levick 1975: 123-137; Levick 1999: 87-91.

*Tib.* 52.3, 61.1-2, 75.1); in Tacitus, however, the actual labels of *crudelis/crudelitas* are not prominent (cf. 6.4; and the frequency of *saevitia/saevus* by contrast).

V. has carefully constructed the chapter to avoid comment on his present day. All domestic examples are taken from the civil wars, which shields the early principate from criticism, as Augustus was acknowledged as the terminator of them (cf. e.g. *SCPP*, 1. 46), and the acts of cruelty are perpetrated by individual Romans against other Romans. Without seeking to minimise the atrocity of these cruel actions and the abuse of magisterial power that they embodied, V. in effect limits them to individuals who have fallen short of Roman ideals in the exercise of power. By contrast in the foreign examples cruelty may be inferred to be a national vice (e.g. 9.2.ext.4, 8, 10-11); and V. sometimes specifies the type of power most of the foreigner perpetrators exercised (e.g. in 9.2.ext.3 *rex*; and tyrant in 9.2.ext.9).<sup>153</sup> These *exempla* could provide potential difficulties for a Tiberian writer, especially as some of the examples exemplify the kinds of cruelty that Tiberius himself demonstrated against members of his own family, but V. is quick to tell his readers that no shadow is cast on Rome by their inclusion (9.2.ext.1).

9.2.praef.

V. shifts to the vice of *crudelitas* with a weighty introductory apposition between the previous chapter's vices, *luxuria* and *libido*, and *crudelitas*. This vivid impression is achieved by personifying their contrasting characteristics. Although the personification of abstractions in classical literature is widespread (Stafford 2000: 1-

---

<sup>153</sup> Bloomer (1992: 48-54), when he states that 'the Roman *exempla* are all civil', must surely mean located within the context of the civil wars; that is, anything but *civilis*. V.'s silence of the legal position of the perpetrators is telling – e.g. Sulla's actions, initially as proconsul and later as dictator, were ratified by the senate. *Crudelitas* was one of the most closely associated vices of the tyrant in Roman oratory and historiography, see Dunkle 1971: 12-20.

44), V. takes this to extreme lengths in describing facial as well as other characteristics of the vices (virtues were found in statue-form; cf. also e.g. the famous temptation of Hercules at Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21ff.). The paired vices (**societas vitiorum**) of luxury and lust (language that recalls the opening of 9.1 – *gemino, conexae*) have a wanton face (**lascivi vultus**) and eyes always fixed on new desires (**et novae cupiditati inhaerentium oculorum**). They have a mind that flits around (**volitantis animi**) from the excesses of cultivated living dedicated to pleasure (**delicato cultu affluentis**) through various enticements (**perque varios inlecebrarum motus**); cf. 9.1.praef.; Plaut. *Trin.* 1-10; and esp. Prudent. *Psychomach.* 340ff.

**horridus habitus**: cf. V.'s personification of poverty (4.4.praef.) and friendship (4.7.7).

**truculenta species**: The adjective is picked up again twice in the chapter (9.2.4; 9.2.ext.5).

**cui silentium donare clementum est adicere**: Silence is not an acceptable response to vice, nor to virtue, cf. e.g. 9.9.2: *Titinii vero non oblitteranda silentio virtus*; and further comment there. V.'s description takes on much of its vocabulary from the previous chapter: *lascivius* (9.1.ext.1); *novus* (9.1.3; 9.1.ext.3); *cupidius* (9.1.1); *delicatus* (9.1.ext.7); *illecebris* (9.1.ext.1).

By his closing remarks in the preface, V. may be offering a tacit admission that *crudelitas* is a current problem. In suggesting that rebuke provides a limit to *crudelitas* by his rhetorical question (**si ne suggillationis quidem frenis fuerit revocata?**), V. is going a step further than Livy (*Praef.* 10) in outlining the role of the historiographer in restraining vice; see also Skidmore 1996: 53-82.

**cum penes illam sit timeri, penes nos sit odisse**: The sentence that V. produces here, with its double anaphora of *penes* and *sit*, recalls Accius' combination of similar ideas (*oderint dum metuant*), in his *Atreus*, which was written under Sulla (*Sen. Ira* 1.20.4) and probably refers allusively to the latter's tyrannical behaviour. The line was well-known and often quoted before V. (cf. eg. Cic. *Sest.* 102, *Off.* 1.97, *Phil.* 1.34);

Suetonius (*Tib.* 59.2) records an epigram which lampoons Tiberius as a Sulla and the emperor's menacing response, *oderint, dum probent*, showing his familiarity with the line; Caligula went on to use Accius' words himself (*Cal.* 30.1). V. clearly intends no association of Tiberius with Sulla and the vice of *crudelitas*, but the sentence provides an appropriate link to Sulla, the first and preeminent exemplar of the chapter. V.'s words are a stark psychological evocation of what *crudelitas* actually involved in ancient world.

### 9.2.1

This complex *exemplum* – the longest in Book 9 – brings together a number of separate cruel actions, creating a list of Sulla's cruelties. Despite discrepancies over numbers, V.'s account probably derives from Livy, the extant summary of which (*Per.* 88) preserves many of the items also in V. and essentially offers the same order of events, but places the proscriptions after the murder of the Praenestines. He concludes with two items not in the extant *Periochae* – the death of Plaetorius and the posthumous punishment of Marius. Bloomer (1992: 53) suspects a change of source ('Valerius has tacked on two additional deeds of cruelty'). While Sallust certainly expatiated on Sulla's cruelty in his *Historiae*, and certainly on M. Marius' fate (1.36McG), nothing requires belief in a change of source rather than an incomplete *Periochae*. Sallust's writings on Sulla's cruelty may have provided V. with inspiration for the chapter heading, cf. Iulius Rufinianus, *De schematis dianoeas* (11 Halm): '*ut apud Sallustium de Sullae crudelitate: Ut in M. Mario, cui fracta prius crura ... artus expiraret*' (Sall. *Hist.* 1.36McG); however, cf. Bloomer 1992: 53, who argues that Livy provides the chapter heading. For Sallust as a source on the eighties, see Konrad 1988: 12-15 (with further references there).

**L. Sulla:** Lucius Cornelius Sulla (*BNP* 3.825-9). Although examples of *crudelitas* by Romans before 88 could have been paraded, V. begins the chapter with Sulla, because he was preeminent in the Roman *exemplary* tradition in cruelty (see Dowling

2000: 303-340; Thein 2014: 168-186). His cruelty was so exemplary in fact, that in Latin a neologism, the verb '*sullaturit*', was created to indicate savage behaviour in relation to the proscriptions (cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* 9.10.6; Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.32). V. also attributes *crudelitas* to Sulla outside of Book 9, cf. 2.8.7; 6.8.2. On Sulla as an exemplary figure of vice, see further Lanciotti 1977: 129-153; Lanciotti 1978: 191-225.

**quem laudare neque vituperare quisquam satis digne potest:** *Laudare* and *vituperare* are V.'s tasks in relation to virtue and vice respectively; see Skidmore 1996: 53-58. An exact verbal parallel is found at Vell. 2.17.1 (see Klotz 1942: 84), and hence an acceptable Tiberian line can be posited.

**dum ... repraesentavit:** This dual assessment of Sulla is common in ancient sources (e.g. Plut. *Sulla* 30.5-6; 38.5; Livy *Per.* 88; Sall. *Jug.* 95; Vell. *Pat.* 2.25.3; Dio fr. 109.1-3; see Dowling 2000: 303-40 for discussion), as well as in modern scholarship on him (e.g. Keaveney 1982: 156-8). V. contributes to this dual assessment of Sulla by comparing his victories (presumably those over Jugurtha and Mithradates and in the Social War) on the one hand to Scipio Africanus' defeat of Hannibal in the Second Punic War, and on the other in his cruelty shown to his fellow Romans during the proscriptions, to a Hannibal; on the antithesis of these two figures, sketched as 'parallel lives' by Livy, see Rossi 2004: 359-381. The battle at the Colline Gate provides a further parallel with Hannibal, as it was the gate he came closest to in 211. The opposition between Scipio and Hannibal occurs elsewhere for different reasons (e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 51). Scipio Africanus is V.'s most popular exemplar (with 46 mentions). Hannibal, the most frequent foreign exemplar within the work, also features as an exemplar of cruelty (e.g. at 9.2.ext.2).

**egregie namque auctoritate nobilitatis defensa:** The ancient sources set the events of this *exemplum* in November 82 after Sulla's victory at the Colline Gate. With the opening ablative absolute of this clause, V. manages to condense much of the detail of Livy's account. The 'anti-Sallustian' slant of V.'s account of Sulla's laudable defence of the nobility probably refers his readers back to the events of 88, when

Sulla had the *Leges Sulpiciae*, which favoured the *populares*, declared to have been carried *per vim* and therefore invalid and also reformed the constitution (App. *BCiv.* 1.59.266-8).

**crudeliter totam urbem ... civilis sanguinis fluminibus inundavit:** Cf. *Per.* 88: *reciperataque re publica pulcherrimam victoriam crudelitate quanta in nullo hominum fuit, inquinavit.* V. conveys the general idea of Livy's narrative. Cinna had been murdered by his own troops in 84, before being able to engage Sulla on foreign soil. With Sulla's return to Italy from the East in 83, civil war proper erupted. Marius the younger was defeated at Sacriportus. Gnaeus Papirius Carbo managed to escape to Africa. V. casts Sulla's violence in particularly dramatic language; Rome and all Italian cities are 'flooded (**inundavit**) by rivers of civil blood'; whereas rivers are typically used to cleanse impurity, often carrying pollution away from the city, here the rivers cannot bear the weight of the violence. This is heavy rhetorical exaggeration on V.'s part, as only Praeneste features among his examples; however, it is justified when considering that Appian (*BCiv.* 1.87-94) mentions killings/battles at Naples, Clusium, Faventia, and Norba.

In the first specific example that V. mentions, he chooses to highlight the huge number of victims and the fact that Sulla's *crudelitas* involved a violation of a key Roman virtue (*fides*) and of a public space closely linked with the notion of Roman citizenship.

**quattuor legiones contrariae partis:** Estimates vary: Florus 2.9.24: 4 000; Strabo 5.4.11: 3 000 – 4 000; Plutarch, *Sull.* 30.2: 6 000; Seneca, *Clem.* 1.12.2: 7 000, *Ben.* 5.16.3: two legions; Livy, *Per.* 88: 8 000; *De vir ill.* 75: 9 000; and possibly also the 8 000 prisoners mentioned by Appian *BCiv.* 1.93. The Samnites (alone of the Italians not to receive the assurance of Sulla of continued enfranchisement), referred to by V. as 'the opposing side' (**contrariae partis**) had attempted to aid Marius in Praeneste and were subsequently slaughtered by Sulla.

**fidem suam secutas:** They had surrendered (Strabo 5.4.11; Flor. 2.9.24); those taken at Antemnae were promised their safety (Plut. *Sull.* 30.2). Here and below (**fallacis**), V. emphasises that Sulla broke his word. V. celebrates *fides* as a central Roman virtue that distinguished Romans from Carthaginians (6.6) – here Sulla becomes as treacherous as Hannibal.

**in publica villa:** The Villa Publica (*LTUR* V.202-5) was situated in the Campus Martius (and therefore outside the *pomerium*, enabling Sulla to engage with the rebels without losing his *imperium*); it was enclosed and of substantial size, making it suitable to accommodate a massacre of this size. Briscoe and Shackleton Bailey correctly follow G, which omits *quae in Martio campo erat* – likely a gloss. All except Plutarch (who places it in the Circus Flaminius; *Sull.* 30.2) and Lucan (who places it at the Ovidia; 2.197, 7.306) situate the massacre in the Villa Publica. Its connection with the census of the Roman population (Livy 4.22.7) explains why Sulla brought the captives there; Cassius Dio (fr. 109) records that he ordered them there as if for the purposes of enrolment (καὶ τοῖς ζωγρηθεῖσι ἐς τὸν ἀγρὸν τὸν δημόσιον καλούμενον ὡς καὶ ἐς τὸν κατάλογον αὐτοῦς ἐσγράψων συνελθεῖν κελεύσας), only to slaughter them instead.

**nequiquam fallacis dexteræ misericordiam implorantes:** Cf. V.'s **fidem suam secutas**. V. stresses Sulla's perfidy here in the face of their sworn loyalty. In Roman gesture, the right hand was specifically linked with *fides*, and clasped in allegiance ceremonies, cf. Val. Max. 6.6.praef.; Plin. *HN* 11.250; Corbeil 2004: 20-4.

**quarum ... receperunt:** Plutarch (*Sull.* 30.2) and Dio (fr. 109.5) explicitly have the senate disturbed by the massacre; V.'s *civitatis* gives the impression that the Roman state as a whole was in terror, heightening the image of cruelty. The senate was in ear-shot of the slaughter, having been called to a meeting at the Temple of Bellona nearby, presumably to hear Sulla's report on the Mithridatic War (the senate met there to receive returning generals; Richardson 1992 s.v. 'Bellona, aedes'); the temple was in front of the *Villa Publica*.

**lacerata ... coactus:** Disposal of corpses into the Tiber was common (Kyle 1998: 213-241). The image of the Tiber burdened under the weight of the carnage (**Tiberis impatiens tanti oneris**) continues the rhetorical flooded 'river of blood' theme introduced earlier in the *exemplum*. Only V. and Dio (fr. 109.8) record this as the fate of the victims.

**quinque ... curavit:** Praeneste had, until this time, been a stronghold for the Marians, following Marius the Younger's expulsion from Rome. After the massacre at the *Villa Publica*, Sulla turned his attention towards the city (Keaveney 1982: 148-9). The Praenestines were lured outside of the walls by Cethegus – V. alone preserves this detail (cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.94; Plut. *Sull.* 32). V. chooses not to include details of any legal process followed, or of any survivors, but to present a Sulla who mercilessly slaughtered the defenceless and immediately proceeded to break Roman cultural taboos on the treatment of the dead. By scattering their bodies across the countryside (**per agros dispergenda**), Sulla ensured for his victims what Hinard has labelled '*la male mort*' (2008: 71-94) – that is, the humiliation of the dead and denial of due burial.

Lucretius Ofella commanded Sulla's forces (App. *BCiv.* 1.94), but the agency of Cethegus secured the surrender in the version V. follows. Ofella conducted a preliminary cull of the senatorial prisoners; on his arrival Sulla dealt with the rest. Two versions of the subsequent events survive: (1) Sulla initiated individual trials for 12 000 prisoners, but aborted the process in favour of mass execution (Plut. *Sull.* 32.1); and (2) Sulla differentiated between Roman prisoners, whom he spared, and Praenestine and Samnite prisoners, who were all executed (App. *BCiv.* 1.94). The latter is preferable (Keaveney 1982: 149).

**P. Cethegum:** Publius Cornelius Cethegus (*MRR* 3.64), a Marian partisan and senator in 88; declared a *hostis*, in 83 he deserted to Sulla, by whom he was pardoned. He was, then, an agent who might seem worthy of trust by the remnants of Cinna's supporters.

**abiectis armis:** Cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.94: προσέταξε χωρὶς ὄπλων προελθεῖν ἅπαντας. V. highlight the defencelessness of Sulla's victims.

**humi corpora prostravissent:** Unique to V., this detail highlights unRoman humiliation of suppliants and perhaps, as a consequence, that Sulla violated a prevailing taboo.

**quattuor ... rettulit:** Hinard 1985: 116-20 provides the most comprehensive account of the numbers involved. Appian (*BCiv.* 1.95) gives the total at 40 senators and 1 600 *equites*. The discrepancy between his figures and those of V.'s, according to Mommsen, may be made up by also including those of lower ranks in the total (Mommsen quoted in Hinard 1985: 117); cf. Oros. 5.22.4; Eutrop. 5.9.4; Flor. 2.9.25; August. *De civ. D.* 3.28; Plut. *Sull.* 31.5. Sulla was the first to publish actual proscription lists (App. *BCiv.* 1.95) and he had them set up throughout Italy and not just in Rome itself (Plut. *Sull.* 31.5).

**videlicet ne memoria tam praeclarae rei dilueretur:** V. appears to be unique in commenting on Sulla's physical publication of the lists as an *aide-mémoire* as well as his reasons for doing so. V.'s purpose within the *Facta* (1.praef.; 4.1.12), in some ways, mimics that of Sulla's. cf. e.g. 1.8.6; 1.8.ext.18; 2.2.7; 3.7.3; 3.7.4; 5.1.8; 5.1.ext.2; 5.4.ext.3; 8.3.2; for the theme in V., see also Rüpke 2016: 89-111.

With the use of the verb **diluerentur**, V. has maintained the watery imagery of this section of the *exemplum*; (**civilis sanguinis fluminibus inundavit; Tiberis ... cruentatis aquis**).

**nec contentus ... dissenserant:** The next examples demonstrate the insatiability of Sulla's *crudelitas*; on the link between insatiability and *crudelitas*, see comments in the introduction to this chapter. V. rightly identifies the targets of Sulla's anger up to this point as all those who were in arms against him (see Keaveney 1982: 150).

**etiam ... adiecit:** V. compounds the atrocity by underlining that non-combatants also suffered (e.g. Alfenus and Titinnius) and that the motive for many proscriptions was solely mercenary. Plutarch (*Sull.* 31) famously records the story of Quintus Aurelius

who was killed simply for his Alban farm (cf. also Dio fr. 109). Sulla offered rewards to informers (App. *BCiv.* 1.95; cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 90); **per nomenclatorem** suggests a certain deviousness in Sulla's approach and the use of low-class operatives. *Nomenclatores* are often presented negatively (Alexander 2009: 40-43).

**adversus ... satiatus:** In noting that there were even female victims in the proscriptions, V. stresses the full magnitude of Sulla's cruelty (cf. e.g. Firm. Mat. *Mathes.* 1.7.32; Dio fr. 109.11; however note the comment by Hinard 1985: 63 n. 212); **inexplebilis** again emphasises the insatiability of his anger.

**id quoque ... feritatis indicium est:** *Feritas* provides a bestial notion.

**abscisa miserorum capita ... manderet:** Voisin (1984: 241-293) provides a good survey of the practice of head-hunting amongst the Romans. Some of the heads of the victims of the proscription were even displayed in Sulla's own *atrium* (Val. Max. 3.1.2b; Plut. *Cat. Min.* 3.2-4). 'Feeding' on the suffering of others with one's eyes is a common trope in ancient literature, see e.g. the comments of Bartsch 2006: 150-151 and Leigh 1996: 171-197, who provides a thorough account of the so-called 'cannibalistic eye' of Roman tyrants. Actual cannibalism was considered *nefas* by the Romans, and usually thought to be practised by non-Romans (e.g. Val. Max. 7.6.ext.3; Juv. 15); here it is merely *voyeuristic* cannibalism, and V. couches it in morally condemnatory language.

**quam porro crudeliter:** V. introduces a further escalation by invoking the term under discussion – Sulla goes so far as to kill a victim personally.

**M. Mario praetore:** M. Marius (*BNP* 8.366-367), commonly referred to as Gratidianus, was the nephew of Marius and was executed in November 82. V.'s use of 'praetor' is somewhat anachronistic. Marius was an ex-praetor at the time of his death, having held the praetorship twice; the first time most likely in 86 (but certainly no later than 85, as he was still to hold a second praetorship before his death; see *MRR* 2.59 n. 1).

**quem ... confringeret:** Marshall (1985: 124-133) identifies two strands in the tradition of this *exemplum*, the 'Ciceronian version' (Ascon. *Tog. Cand.* 84.8-9), followed by Plutarch (*Sull.* 32.2), where Gratidianus' head is cut off by Catiline, and the 'Sallustian version' (*Hist.* 1.44M = 1.36 McG) of limb shattering and eye gouging, where there is no mention of Gratidianus's decapitation, nor mention of Catiline as executioner. The second, more explicitly gruesome, version is the one that V. follows here, along with Livy (*Per.* 88), Lucan (2.173-193), Florus (2.9.26), and Augustine (*De civ. D.* 3.28). Aspects of both versions were also combined, see *Comm. Pet.* 10 (inclusion here is problematic because of dating; cf. Damon 1993: 281-288); *Sen. De Ira* 3.18.1-2; *Firm. Mat. Math.* 1.7.31; *Oros.* 5.21.7-8. V. is the earliest extant version to incorporate the detail that Gratidianus was dragged to the tomb of the Lutatian gens (the location of which is unknown; see Marshall 1985: 125 n. 7; Orosius places it *trans Tiberim*). Less likely is the suggestion of Lintott (1968: 40 n. 2), who posits that this incident may be the survival of the practice of human sacrifice to the dead (cf. e.g. the alleged sacrifice of people to Divus Julius by Augustus at Perugia; *Suet. Aug.* 15). At the very least it is an example of just, albeit extreme, revenge, as, by prosecuting him for *perduellio* in 87, Gratidianus had been responsible for the suicide of Q. Lutatius Catulus (*Schol. Berne.* on Lucan 2.173), with whom Sulla had been closely involved in his victory over the Cimbri in 102 (Keaveney 1982: 32-5); see also Marshall 1985: 132ff.

**vix ... videor:** In an alliterative first-person interjection, V. enters his work, stating his near unbelief at the further extent of Sulla's cruelty. Bloomer (1992: 53) believes the interjection may mark a turn in the chapter from V.'s Livian source to a different one, accounting for the final two examples of the *exemplum* not being found in the epitome. On V.'s 'criteria of belief', see Skidmore 1996: 93-99.

**at ille etiam M. Plaetorium ... mactavit:** Sources collected at *MRR* 3.157; see also Hinard 1985: 393-4. V. is our earliest source for this anecdote. Plaetorius was a senator who was put to death at Sulla's command, along with Venuleius; cf. Florus

2.9.26, and Orosius 5.21.8, who identifies a P. Laetorius, a probable misreading on Orosius' part. The verb (**mactavit**) carries with it connotations of the slaughter of a sacrificial victim (*OLD* s.v. 4).

**novus punitor misericordiae ... scelus admittere fuit:** V. indication of novelty again rests on the Roman suspicion of the new; see comment in the introduction concerning the creativity involved in *crudelitas*.

**continuo ibi mactavit:** V. indicates that due legal process was absent – Plaetorius was killed summarily and without the verdict of a Roman court; **mactavit** may introduce the notion of a perverted sacrifice (all V.'s uses of *mactare* are explicitly in the sacrificial context).

**sed mortuorum umbris saltem pepercit? minime:** With **saltem**, V. sets up the shock of the negative response to his rhetorical question in **minime**.

**nam C. Marii ... sparsit:** Sulla had been elected quaestor in 107 and had served under Marius in his Numidian campaign. Marius chose him for demanding duties revealing remarkable trust in the young Sulla and enabling him to lay the foundations of his military reputation (cf. Val. Max. 6.9.6; Keaveney 1982: 14-21). V. mentions the relationship to highlight that Sulla should have had a collegial bond towards Marius. V.'s choice of **hostis**, rather than *inimicus*, refers to the formal declaration of Marius as *hostis* in 88 (cf. 3.8.5 and Wardle 1998 on 1.5.5.) or that of Sulla in 87 (App. *BCiv.* 1.77, *Mith.* 51). Cicero (*Leg.* 2.56) records that Sulla had Marius' remains disinterred from their burial on the banks of the Anio; cf. Luc. 1.582-3; Plin. *HN* 7.187; Gran. Lic. 36.25; Hinard 1985: 80-1. As the buried remains of corpses were regarded as sacred, those who interfered with graves suffered *infamia*, and were subject to severe penalties under the law (see Hope 2000: 122-125). This had been a capital offence and was criminal offence (see Dyck 2004: 396).

**en quibus ... putavit!:** Appian (*BCiv.* 1.97) places Sulla's adoption of the *cognomen* 'Felix' (= Gk. Εὐτυχής; Sulla adopted the epithet Ἐπαφρόδιτος in the East) in 82, while Plutarch (*Sull.* 34.4) places it after his triumph in 81. In either case, it was most

likely confirmed officially by decree of the senate (see Balsdon 1951: 1-10). Velleius (2.27.6) pointedly places the adoption after Gratidianus' death and also questions its appropriateness; the agreement of V. and Velleius suggests something of a consensus view in late Tiberian Rome. Thein (2009: 87-109), provides a good study of *felicitas* as the defining trait of Sulla's public image, while noting that Sulla's cruelty negated his claims to divine favour in the eyes of his critics.

### 9.2.2

**Cuius tamen ... nam et:** V. provides a very brief link between the previous *exemplum* and this one with the relative pronoun and the adversative **tamen**, and begins the *exemplum* proper by linking Marius with Sulla (**nam et**) in a careful balancing act that requires him to favour neither, although a century after their respective atrocities partisanship was not dangerous. For the notion that *invidia* can be relieved, cf. e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.31.4.2-3; on *invidia* itself and the moral opprobrium that it commands, see Kaster 2005: 84-103.

**C. Marius:** Marius appears as a frequent exemplar in V.; for statistical analysis, see Carney 1962: 289 n. 3. Marius emerges as a 'ruthless, *popularis*-type political adventurer with a Catonic pose as an old-fashioned military man' (Carney 1962: 289-337, quote at 335; supplemented also by Carney 1967: 5-22). In V., Marius is subject to the vicissitudes of Fortune and, on the whole, treated rather unfavourably. For Carney also, the inconsistent portrait of Marius within the work is due to V.'s political naiveté as regards Republican politics, V.'s lack of an internally coherent system of cross-reference within his work, and his authorial purpose as 'an excerptor who has to make facts fit into certain predetermined categories' (1962: 333). However, Carney holds that V. can be taken as a major source for Marius' life because of his unique position – of providing a non-partisan viewpoint and the date of his composition – in relation to the other major sources for Marius and because of the volume of content that he presents (1962: 289-291).

**nam ... destrinxit:** V.'s characterisation of Marius' actions as **nefarie** provides a deliberate parallel to his description of Sulla's deeds as *nefas* in the previous *exemplum*. While in Roman thinking pursuit of one's enemies was sanctioned (cf. e.g. Val. Max. 9.10.1), and indeed sanctioned within the very fabric of the principate from Augustus' cult of Mars Ultor, V. labels Marius' eagerness in dealing with his *inimicitiae* as excessive. The Roman ideal of *moderatio* should have provided a limit to the overly zealous; for Roman attitudes towards *inimicitiae*, see Epstein 1987: 12-29.

**iram ... destrinxit:** Cf. 2.7.15; 7.5.2. V. frequently uses the verb with *gladium* as the object, in its technical military sense (Themann-Steinke 2008: 422); it provides an appropriate metaphor for the ultra-military Marius.

**C. Caesaris consularis et censorii:** V. possibly carried away by rhetorical alliteration here transfers the offices of one brother to the other: Lucius Julius Caesar (*MRR* 2.25, 32-3) was consul in 90 and censor in 89, while Gaius Julius Caesar Strabo (*MRR* 2.26) was aedile in 90. As *inimici* of Marius, both were killed in 87 (cf. Val. Max. 5.3.3, Cic. *De or.* 3.8-10, *Brut.* 305-7; Carney 1962: 316 n. 75; Shackleton Bailey 2000: 310 n. 2). V. rhetorically juxtaposes Marius' ignoble act with Caesar's 'noble' body (**nobilissimum ... ignobili**).

**apud seditiosissimi ... bustum:** V. alone mentions Caesar's execution at Varius' tomb, which parallels M. Gratidianus' death at Catulus' tomb in the previous *exemplum*; a 'deliberate tit-for-tat' in Shackleton Bailey's view (2000: 310-311 n. 2). A corrupt passage in Florus (2.9.14), which is followed by Augustine (*De civ. D.* 3.27), locates the murder of L. Caesar in his own home, while Cicero (*De or.* 3.10) and Livy (*Per.* 80) have his head (along with others) displayed on the *rostra* (Shackleton Bailey 2000: 310-311 n. 2). Marius had aided Sulpicius in the hope of eliminating a rival for the command of the impending war with Mithridates (see Mitchell 1975: 198).

Quintus Varius Severus (?) *Hybrida* (*BNP* 15.208), tribune of the plebs in 90, sponsored the *lex Varia*, a law which founded a special court of jurors made up of *Equites Romani* in order to prosecute those who had aided the rebel allies, which V.

(8.6.4) holds started the Social and Civil Wars – in contradiction to his earlier version. Varius was prosecuted under his own law (see Alexander 1990: 109), thus meriting the description **seditionisissimi**, and was sent into exile in 89. The circumstances of his death are unknown; Badian (1969: 463-5) suggests either death from illness in exile, or in the Civil Wars rather than the torture and execution presented by Cicero (*Nat. D.* 3.81).

**id enim ... caderet:** Most likely early in 87, indicated in V. by **tunc**. V.'s phrasing has parallels with Florus (2.9.1: *Hoc deerat unum populi Romani malis...*) which suggests a possible Livian echo by both. V.'s use of **piaculo** – 'a victim offered by way of atonement; an expiatory offering' (*OLD* s.v. 1) – continues his religious vocabulary within this pair of *exempla* and highlights the perversion of the traditional religious practice of sacrificing animal victims at the tomb of family member.

**paene tanti victoriae ... in militia meruit:** Marius' military career was distinguished. He proved to be a natural soldier early on, serving under Scipio at Numantia in 134/3. In Further Spain he demonstrated skill in guerrilla warfare and he later defeated the Teutones and Ambrones at Aquae Sextiae in 102, and, with Q. Lutatius Catulus in 101, the Cimbri. He was largely successful in the Social War until his retirement; for a fuller treatment of his military career, see Carney 1961a. V. cannot suggest that defeat by the Germans would have been good for Rome; *paene* allows him to escape absurdity. V.'s use of the antithetical '**domi ... militia**' evokes the common formulaic phrase, '*domi militiaeque*', often found in Republican Latin to indicate domestic and foreign spheres of activity; on the phrase's use, see Rüpke 1990.

**caput M. Antonii ... passus <est>:** M. Antonius (*RE* I 2590-4), gifted orator and consul in 99 (cf. 2.9.5; 3.7.9; 6.8.1; 7.3.5; 8.9.2), was beheaded in 87 by the Marian faction. In this *exemplum* V., in agreement with Appian (*BCiv.* 1.72), Plutarch (*Mar.* 44.2-4, *Ant.* 1.1), Florus (2.9.14), and Orosius (5.19.23), places sole responsibility for his execution on Marius, whereas at 8.9.2, and in agreement with Vell. Pat. 2.22.3,

Cinna shares the blame; Cicero (*Phil.* 1.34) mentions Cinna alone. Lucan (2.118-124) gives a particularly gruesome account of his execution and notes that his head was brought to a festal dining table (*festae ... mensae*). The scholiast on Lucan dates this incident to the first day of Marius' consulship (see Rawson 1987: 167). By bringing the bloodied head to the dining table, Marius is transgressing the sacrosanct nature of the *convivium* (**sanguine contaminari mensae sacra passus <est>**; Vössing 2004: 538 n. 1); Leigh (1996: 194 n.56) notes that heads at the dinner table 'crop up repeatedly in antiquity', and provides a list of comparanda. For **mensae sacra** 'the sacred rites of the table' (cf. 2.1.8; 4.2.3; 5.3.3; 8.15.7; Quint. *DMin.* 321.20; Sen. *Thy.* 981; *Dial.* 3.2.2; Juv. 6. Ox4; Tac. *Ann.* 13.17.9; 15.52.5), see Lennon 2015: 719-731.

Although V. can present Marius as a careful observer of divinatory phenomena (e.g. 1.5.5), he is not presented as consistent in his attitudes to religious practice; see Carney 1962: 310-313.

**P. Annium:** Tribune in 87 (*MRR* 2.49) and member of Cinna's faction, he killed M. Antonius himself when his soldiers would not on account of Antonius' eloquence (cf. Val. Max. 8.9.2; App. *BCiv.* 1.72; Plut. *Mar.* 44.3-4; Vell. Pat. 2.22.3). In the earlier *exemplum*, V. characterises Annium as obedient to his cruel orders and immune to Antonius' eloquence: *P. Annium – is enim solus in aditu expers Antonianae eloquentiae steterat – crudele imperium truculento ministerio peregit*. Only V. mentions Marius' embrace of him to his bosom (**in sinum**); **etiam** signals that this is the culminating outrage. Appian relates that he simply *sent* the head to Marius.

### 9.2.3

Unlike in the previous two *exempla*, where V. has had to negotiate the praiseworthy aspects of Sulla and Marius' careers in his presentation of their *crudelitas*, he is under no such strain when recording the character of this *exemplum*. For Damasippus had no glory to spoil (**nihil laudis habuit**); **memoria** too, links this *exemplum* with V.'s overarching project; see comment on 9.2.1: **videlicet ... dilueretur**.

**Damasippus:** L. Iunius Brutus Damasippus (*BNP* 6.1097) was praetor in 82 (*MRR* 2.67) and was killed after the battle at the Colline Gate (*Sall. Cat.* 51.32, 34; *App. BCiv.* 1.92; *Dio.* 30-5, fr. 109.4).

**cuius ... permixta sunt:** Under Marius Gratidianus' orders, he was responsible for the executions of Q. Mucius Scaevola (the *pontifex maximus*), Carbo Arvina, L. Domitius, P. Antistius, and others (*Livy Per.* 86; *Vell.* 2.26.2; *App. BCiv.* 1.88; *Oros.* 5.20.4). It is probable that as urban praetor Damasippus convened the senate in order to propose a measure authorising the death of the enemies of the Marian faction (see Brennan 2000: 443-4; 470). V. alone mentions the mixing of the leaders' heads with the heads of sacrificial victims (**hostiarum capitibus**); hence a *hostis* quite literally becomes a *hostia*. Appian (*BCiv.* 1.88) has the victims' bodies thrown in the Tiber.

**Carbonisque Arvinae ... gestatum est:** C. Papirius Carbo Arvina (*BNP* 10.486), one of the authors of the *Lex Plautia Papiria* in 89 (which gave Italians Roman citizenship) was tribune in 90 and praetor in 83, as a follower of Cinna. By fixing his already mutilated corpse (**truncum corpus**) to a gibbet (**patibulo** = a yoke or y-shaped implement; see references collected at Mommsen 1899: 920 n. 3), a punishment reserved for criminals and particularly associated with slaves, and by having him carried around (**gestatum**), Damasippus clearly intended to make a spectacle of his death.

**adeo ... potuit:** In concluding the *exemplum*, V. contrasts (**aut ... aut**) the disreputable actions of the praetor (**flagitiosissimi hominis praetura**) with the Roman state's ineffective *maiestas* (**rei publicae maiestas nihil potuit**). For V. the state possessed *maiestas* (cf. e.g. 2.2.2; 4.1.8; 4.8.5; 6.4.2a), and in formal treaties such as the *Lex Gabinia Calpurnia* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 2500 = Crawford 1996: 345) of 58 the *maiestas* of the Roman people was presented as guarantor of peace and prosperity, but on this occasion it could not restrain a holder of *imperium* from staining it. It is this general, intangible description of the state and its grandeur that is meant here rather than the

notoriously slippery legal sense of *maiestas*, the abuse of which under Tiberius was a key part of historical tradition (see, most recently, Yakobson 2003: 103-7).

#### 9.2.4

**Munatius ... Flaccus:** L. Munatius Flaccus (*BNP* 9.283-4) was from Hispania Baetica. A more positive account of his military skills is given by Dio 43.33.4-34.4. Although Frontinus (*Strat.* 3.14.1) records that he was a Moor, V. presents him securely as a Roman (**Romano iussu**).

**Pompeiani nominis acrior quam probabilior defensor:** Supporter of Cn. Pompeius, the son of Pompey, who sent him in 45 to protect the city of Ategua (modern-day Écija; see Pemán 1988: 35-80) because the Pompeian forces there were without a general (Dio 43.33.4). What V.'s formulation shows is that, despite the condemnation of Cremutius Cordus for writing a history favourable to Pompey (*Tac. Ann.* 4.34.1-35.4), the generous treatment of Pompey's reputation that Augustus had tolerated (cf. Wardle 2014: 258-9) was continued by Tiberius; V. logically holds that one could be a *probabilis defensor* of Pompey's reputation. He himself succeeds in portraying Pompey without denigrating his rival and imperial ancestor Julius Caesar (e.g. 5.1.9; 9.5.4); even where Pompey exemplifies bad behaviour (e.g. his ignoring of divine signs), V. adds a clause (*pectus alioquin procul amentia remotum*; 1.6.12) that suggests that Pompey was not to be considered a villain.

**cum ab imperatore Caesare in Hispania ... Ateguensium obsideretur:** On Caesar's overall presentation in V. see Wardle 1997: 323-345. To preserve the historical context of the civil wars V., by calling Caesar *imperator*, downplays Caesar's divinity until the rhetorical conclusion (see note there). Dio (43.33.2) tells us that in the winter of 45, Caesar did not attempt an attack on Corduba, as it was heavily guarded, but on Ategua because it had an abundance of grain.

**efferatam crudelitatem ... exercuit:** V. casts Munatius Flaccus' cruelty in bestial terms (**efferatam**) worked out in madness (**vesaniae**); *vesania* is used four times in Book 9 (9.7.3, 9.8.ext.2; 9.11.4), presenting the idea of vice as something irrational.

**omnes ... iussit:** None of the other surviving accounts (Caes. *Bell. Hisp.* 19.4; Dio 43.33.4-34.5; Frontin. *Str.* 3.14.1) provide any detail of Munatius Flaccus' cruelty. Munatius' violence towards women (cf. Sulla's cruelty towards women at 9.2.1) and children is undoubtedly highlighted by V. in order to magnify his extreme cruelty.

**quae auditu ... resistebat:** V.'s minimises the blame attributed to Rome by observing that these cruelties, although done at Rome's order, were carried out by Lusitanian hands (**Romano iussu Lusitanis manibus administrata sunt**), which concludes the *exemplum* and prepares his reader for the transition from domestic to foreign examples. V.'s use of *Lusitanis* is peculiar because Ategua was in Hispania Baetica – *Lusitani* rightly appear in connection with Sertorius. Nothing in the *Bell. Hisp.* indicates that Cn. Pompeius installed a Lusitanian garrison; V. appears to have a low view of Lusitanians – three times he recalls them as *barbari* (more than any other people; 7.3.6 [twice]; 9.6.2). In the conclusion Caesar is cast as Munatius Flaccus' divine opponent (**divinis opibus**), whom to fight against is insane (**vecordi**), even if, as V. adds, alluding to Munatius' trickery in entering Ategua under armed guard (Dio 43.34.2), he was aided by a foreign force; Mueller suggests that by V.'s day, the name of Caesar conjured up his divinity, 'its every mention in Valerian rhetoric [invoking] both man and god at least latently' (2002a: 166). Wardle 1997: 336-343 provides the fullest treatment of V.'s presentation of Caesar's divinity; he does not, however, mention this passage within that context.

9.2.ext.1

**Transgrediemur ... inest:** Elsewhere (e.g. 8.15.ext.1) V. also moves from Roman to foreign examples by noting that the latter do not bring shame upon the Roman state;

the notion of equality (**par dolor**), suggests that V. employs a universalising value-system.

**Carthaginienses:** On the presentation of Carthaginian cruelty, a *topos* in Latin literature, see Burck 1943: 297-345 and Gruen 2011: 115-140; and e.g. Val. Max. 1.1.14; Cic. *Phil.* 11.9; Verg. *Aen.* 1.302; Liv. 21.4.9. Although a negative connotation for *Poenus* and a neutral one for *Carthaginienses* has been argued (e.g. Franko 1994: 153-158; however compare Gruen 2011: 116 n. 2), V. uses both terms less precisely, cf. e.g. 1.1.14.

**Atilium Regulum:** Marcus Atilius Regulus (*RE* II 2086-9; *MRR* 1.200), consul in 267 and suffect in 256, is a popular exemplar for his moral and military ‘achievements’ and subsequent death during the First Punic War; on his place in exemplary literature, see Mix 1970, Le Bohec 1997: 87-93, and Williams 2004: 70-98 specifically on Horace and Silius Italicus within the tradition. For his involvement in military events, see Lazenby 1996: 97-110. Elsewhere in V., Regulus features as an exemplar of keeping his word and as a stern censor (1.1.14; 2.9.8); in connection with an African snake (1.8.ext.19); and esteemed by the Roman people (4.4.6); cf. also 9.6.ext.1.

**palpebris resectis machinae ... vigilantia ... necaverunt:** Accounts of Regulus’ torture probably go back to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century; the earliest extant version is that of Q. Aelius Tubero (*Aul. Gell. NA* 7.4). Cicero (*Pis.* 43: *vigilando necabatur*; cf. *Off.* 3.100) is probably V.’s direct source for the core of this *exemplum* (Krieger 1888: 37; Bloomer 1992: 96-98). Mix (1970: 63-67) has usefully collected all references to Regulus’ torture.

**indignum passo, auctoribus dignissimum:** V., in his rhetorical cap to the example, resorts to one of his often-used notions of worthy/unworthy in his valuations of *exempla* (e.g. 1.1.6; 1.7.15; 2.6.5; 5.3.2a). Desert is a key aspect of his exemplary process. For wordplay on *dignus*-related words, cf. e.g. 3.2.14; 3.7.1a; 5.3.3.

**eadem usi crudelitate ... satiarent:** V. provides a second example of Carthaginian cruelty. Undoubtedly also within the context of the First Punic War, this barbarous act finds parallels in other Carthaginian naval engagements, e.g. the Athenian sailors captured at Syracuse in 312, whose hands were cut off; for these and other examples, see Rawlings 2010: 284. V.'s immediate source may be Varro (*Vit. pop. Rom.* fr. 413 Salvadore = 98 Riposati): *cum Poenus in fretum obviam venisset nostris et quosdam cepisset, crudelissime pro palangis carinis subiecerat, quo metu debilitaret nostros*. But this atrocity will have featured in standard Roman historiography and perhaps even in Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*; without further evidence, all is speculation.

**inusitata ratione mortis barbaram feritatem satiarent:** Foregrounding the notion of novelty or innovation (**inusitata**), for V., is basic to vice (cf. e.g. 9.1.3; 9.1.ext.3; 9.2.praef.; 9.2.1; 9.2.ext.9; 9.2.ext.11). *Barbarus* is used here only of Carthaginians (see further Lawrence 2006: 192-214, for V.'s use of the term); *feritas* has a dehumanising effect (cf. e.g. 9.1.ext.1: *Punica feritas*).

**taetro facinore pollutis classibus ipsum mare violaturi:** Cf. 2.9.3: *tam taetro facinore inquinaverat* for a similar combination of ideas. V. concludes the *exemplum* by again couching the vice within the generalised language of ritual violation and pollution, see Mueller 2002a: 128, who also argues that V. consistently treats the sea as a divinity, which explains his use of the motive of pollution here; cf. also 9.1.1.

9.2.ext.2

**Eorum dux Hannibal:** V. continues his theme of Carthaginian cruelty, begun in the previous *exemplum*, by moving from national generalities to a named perpetrator – Hannibal, the exemplar of Carthaginian vice *par excellence*. The excesses of Hannibal's cruelties, undoubtedly, are a product of the bias of pro-Roman sources (among whom V. is to be counted) – but his *crudelitas* is widely recorded and therefore cannot be fully discounted (Brizzi 2011: 484). As mentioned previously (see further references and comment at 9.1.4), Hannibal is the most cited foreign

exemplar in the work and, not surprisingly, is most frequently mentioned in Book 9. In this chapter he is specifically singled out for his cruelty – something for which V. has already prepared his reader in his presentation of Sulla (9.2.1).

**cuius maiore ex parte virtus saevitia constabat:** Cf. 9.8.ext.1. Most ancient sources mark out Hannibal's cruelty as an especially defining feature of his character (e.g. Diod. 26.14.1-2; App. *Hann.* 5.28, *Pun.* 63; Livy 21.4.9: *inhumana crudelitas*; Cic. *Off.* 1.38); however, for traditions that exculpated Hannibal cf. Polyb. 9.22.8ff. See also discussion by Canter 1929: 564-577; Christ 1968: 461-95; Rawlings 2007: 1-30; Tipping 2010: 51-61. On **virtus**, see comments on 9.1.ext.1. V. has to qualify Hannibal's *virtus*, which he is unable to fully deny, in order to maintain Roman superiority.

**in flumine <Ver>gello ... transduxit:** The context of Hannibal's bridge constructed of human bodies is the defeat suffered by the Romans at Cannae in 216 (Livy 22.44ff.; Polyb. 3.110ff.; Daly 2002). The river Vergellus; none of the MSS preserve this name; + Gello + LG : Gallo A; the emendation Ce<r>b<a>lo has been proposed by Mitalerius, however Pighius' reading <Ver>gello is to be preferred, and is corroborated by Florus (1.22.18), the only other ancient author to mention the river by name. In a generalised passage on how Hannibal further barbarised his troops, Livy (23.5.11-13) mentions the bridge building but not the river's name (cf. also Sil. *Pun.* 8.668; Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 12.2). Smith (1854: s.v.) believes it to be a rivulet of the Aufidus from its right bank between Cannae and Canusium. V. does not expand to include the cannibalism or *moles corporum* of Livy's account, the latter undoubtedly because the Romans also used bodies in that way during the Civil War (7.6.5). Elsewhere (5.1.ext.6) V. mentions at least one act of *clementia* carried out by Hannibal in the aftermath of Cannae.

**ut aequae terrestrium ... experiretur:** V. again links this *exemplum* to its predecessor. Whereas the sea was polluted in the first *exemplum*, because of the foul deeds of the Carthaginian fleet, in the second it is the land that, equally (**aequae**), was subjected to the wickedness of the Carthaginians (**scelestum Carthaginiensium**). V.'s vocabulary

is typically religious in this regard (Mueller 2002a: 128); cf. the religious explanation that V. accepts for Rome's defeat at Cannae (1.1.16). In his desire to maintain a land/sea juxtaposition, V.'s rhetoric is somewhat strained, as it is really a river that is being violated, and not the land.

**idem captivos nostros ... parte succisa relinquebat:** Here V. introduces and begins to enumerate the cruelties Hannibal visited on Roman prisoners of war after Cannae, whom the senate had refused to ransom (Livy 22.61). On Hannibal's mutilation of limbs, cf. Liv. 22.51.7: *succisis feminibus poplitibusque*; Enn. *Ann.* 287 Sk: *his pernas iniqua superbia Poeni*. In light of the Ennius fragment, Damsté's suggestion (1914: 270) to read *iam perna*, omitting **pedum parte** is attractive, given the ambiguous meanings of the word *perna*: 'The leg, esp. its upper part with the thigh' (*OLD* s.v. 1) and 'a leg or thigh of a hog used for food, a ham' (*OLD* s.v. 1b) (cf. also Varro, *Ling.* 5.110.3; Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.117). It is likely that either V., or later editors, changed or introduced **prima pedum parte** in explanation; see also the comments by Skutsch (1985: 462-3), who also suggests that *pernas* belongs to military language.

**quos vero in castra ... victorem omnes redegisset:** Combat amongst prisoners as entertainment for their captors. V., as the other sources do, stresses the fact that Hannibal even pitted kin against one another (cf. App. *Hann.* 7.28, *Pun.* 8.63; Diod. 26.14.2; Eutrop. 3.11.1; Plin. *HN.* 8.18). On the moral dilemma caused by pitting kin against each other, cf. e.g. Quint. *DMin.* 305; Drac. *LD.* 3.286-295.

V. casts Hannibal in the role of tyrant, satiated only by blood (**neque ante sanguine explebatur quam ad unum victorem omnes redegisset**); see comments on *crudelitas/satiability* in the introduction to this chapter.

**iusto ergo illum ... ad voluntariam mortem compulit:** Sources for the suicide of Hannibal by poison in 183/2 are extensive: Liv. 39.51; Polyb. 23.5.1; Nep. *Hann.* 12; Plut. *Flam.* 20.3-11; App. *Syr.* 11.43; Paus. 8.11.11; Just. 32.4.8; Obs. 4; *vir. ill.* 42.6, 51.5; Eutrop. 4.5.2; Oros. 4.20.29; Zon. 9.21.7. Along with V., the other sources to place the responsibility of Hannibal's suicide with the senate are: Valerius Antias 56.7; Nep.

*Hann.* 12; *Zon.*9.21.7; *Plut. Flam.* 21.14. Prusias I (*BNP* 12.92-3), the king of Bithynia, had granted Hannibal sanctuary but was forced to give him up to the Romans envoys led by Titus Quinctius Flaminius. V. characterises the senate's actions as just (**iusto**) in light of Hannibal's cruelties. V. generally accepts that revenge can be just – here even to the death of a suppliant – but as at 9.10.ext.2, he can suggest that it goes too far. Careful rhetorical balancing in the conclusion neatly counterbalances the exacting of punishment (**supplicio**; *OLD* s.v. 3) by the senate with Hannibal's position as suppliant of Prusias (**supplicem**). Watt (1986: 472-3) sees V.'s comments as a variation of the proverbial slow-turning wheels of justice, paralleled elsewhere in V. (1.1.ext.3); the proverb has contemporary examples in V.'s own day (see Wardle 1998: 131). The **odio** of the MSS, is retained by Briscoe, deleted by Gertz, and modified to *odia* by Shackleton Bailey (although he indicated it should be omitted, he retains it in his translation); Watt suggests it to be a corruption of *credo*, on the basis of parenthetical occurrences elsewhere in V. (1986: 473). The meaning, however, does not change.

Although as a suppliant Hannibal should have been safe from harm (e.g. Naiden 2006), and usually the killing of a suppliant attracted criticism and even divine punishment, Rome's pressure on Prusias to give up Hannibal was justified. In effect V. argues that Hannibal's cruelties outweighed the religious issues (in this case) – Hannibal's suicide further obviated the need for Rome to soil its hands directly.

9.2.ext.3

**Tam hercule quam:** Used by V. elsewhere for a change in subject; cf. 5.2.5; 8.15.2.

**Mithridatem regem:** Mithridates VI Eupator Dionysus (134-63), king of Pontus, frequently appears in V. (1.8.ext.13; 4.6.ext.2; 5.1.9; 5.2.ext.2; 6.9.6; 8.7.ext.16; 8.15.8; 9.7.mil.Rom.1; 9.13.1). V. presents him also showing gratitude towards one Leonicus (5.2.ext.2), and as a polyglot (8.7.ext.16). Surprisingly, given the fact that he was one of Rome's principal enemies in the Republican period, the only negative trait that V.

ascribes to him is his cruelty in this chapter (see 9.11.ext.2 with comment). For his presentation as cruel in the sources, cf. Sall. *Hist.* 1.27M, 2.86M; App. *Mithr.* 112. For general biography, see Mayor 2010, which should, however, be used with caution; on points of political detail McGing 1986 is to be preferred.

**qui una epistula ... gratia dispersa interemit:** The so-called 'Asian Vespers' of 88 (sometimes also 'Ephesian Vespers' as the order was issued from Ephesus), when Mithridates issued an order to kill all Romans and Italians, along with their families and freedmen, who were residents in the cities of Asia; on the date of the massacre, see McGing 1986: 113 n. 118. Mithridates' motives were twofold: firstly to remove the Roman presence in Asia, and secondly to seize their property (McGing 1986: 113-118). V. gives the lowest total that is preserved in the sources of those killed at 80 000 (**octoginta milia**); estimates vary from 80 000 to 150 000; cf. Cic. *Flac.* 25, *Leg. Man.* 5.11; Vell. 2.18; Plut. *Sull.* 24.4; App. *Mithr.* 22-4; Dio fr. 109.8; Oros. 6.2.2; Memnon 22.9. Brunt (1971: 224-7) believes even the lower estimate to be an exaggeration. On Mithridates' correspondence (**epistula**) see, Welles 1934: 294-9 and cf. Sall. *Hist.* 4.69M.

**tantaeque provinciae hospitales ... inulto cruore respersit:** The **hospitales deos** have a long pedigree in ancient religious thinking going back to at least Homer (*Od.* 6.207-8; cf. e.g. Val. Max. 1.7.ext.4; 5.1.3; Livy 39.51.12; Curt. 5.2.15); see Bolchazy 1977. Appian (*Mithr.* 22-4) mentions multiple examples of the violation of asylum of Romans and Italians who had sought refuge in temples. V.'s choice of adjective (**tantae**) for **provinciae** is interesting; it is perhaps a nod to his patron, Sextus Pompeius (2.6.8), who had been proconsul of Asia. Again V. clearly holds that vengeance was justified – Mithradates' crime deserved punishment – and was achieved, albeit again as with Hannibal, by suicide.

**quoniam cum maximo ... tandem succumbere coegit:** With Mithridates' death in Panticapaeum in 63, V. intimates that Roman blood was avenged. However, his abbreviated description of Mithridates' 'suicide' elides some of the details of his

death. This is possibly because the circumstances surrounding his death are somewhat obscure (see Højte 2009: 121-130). One tradition maintains that he tried to commit suicide by poison, but being immune to its effects because of a lifetime of experiment with toxicology and self-administered antidotes, he requested the Gaul, Bituitus, to kill him. Another tradition maintains that he was murdered by troops who had deserted to his son; cf. Livy. *Per.* 102; Just. 37.1-2, 6; App. *Mithr.* 111; Galen *Ther. Pis.* 14.283-4; Aul. Gell. 17.16; Aur. Vict. 1.76; Oros. 6.5; Flor. 1.40; Plut. *Pomp.* 41; Cassius Dio 37.13.

**simulque piacula crucibus ... scelestus imperio adfecerat:** Only V. mentions Mithridates' crucifixion of friends at the insistence of the eunuch Gaurus, who also appears only here. For other eunuchs associated with Mithridates, cf. App. *Mithr.* 76-7, 82, 108; Plut. *Luc.* 17.4, 18; see McGing 2009: 205 n. 10. By indicating that Mithridates' actions were prompted (**auctore**) by his eunuch, V. is casting Mithridates within the common (negative) Roman trope of oriental decadence (see Tougher 2008: 9, 20). By **libidinosus** V. indicates that Mithradates acted like a tyrant driven by *libido* (see McGing 2009: 205); V.'s viewpoint is undoubtedly part of a larger rhetoric at Rome which placed its own dealings with the Pontic king in a narrative of Eastern effeminacy (see e.g. Cic. *Mur.* 31). Gaurus' name in Greek suitably means arrogant or exulting – something which may have been pointed up in Greek accounts.

#### 9.2.ext.4

Although it has been argued that Diodorus Siculus was V.'s source for this *exemplum*, this thesis is unconvincing (see Bloomer 1992: 79-99) and V. is far more likely to have used Pompeius Trogus.

**Zisemis, Diogyridis filii, Thraciae regis:** V. appears to have confused the spelling of the names of both father and son, which are recorded as Zibelmios/Ziselmios and Diegylis in Greek sources (cf. App. *Mithr.* 6; Diod. 33.14-5; 34/5.12; Strabo 13.4.2).

Exact dates for their rule of the Thracian tribe, the Caeni, remain elusive but are securely placed within the mid to late second century (*RE* 10A. 397).

**etsi minus admirabilem crudelitatem gentis ipsius feritas:** From the earliest ethnographic and historiographical writings Thracians are characterised as savage: cf. e.g. Hdt. 8.116; Thuc. 7.29; Polyb. 27.12.

**narrandam tamen rabies ... corporibus nefas fuit:** 'Like father, like son', Zisemis' actions are similar to those of his father; Diodorus (33.14-5) records that Diegylis cut off the limbs of captives; at his wedding he cut two young brothers in half as sacrificial victims; and had women spread-eagled before being put to death. In mentioning parents feasting on the flesh of their offspring, V. probably makes the same association as Diodorus (34/5.12: γονέων δὲ ἐν ὄμμασι καὶ κόλποις ἐγκατέσφαζε τέκνα, καὶ κρεανομῶν τὰ σώματα παρετίθει τοῖς συγγενεστάτοις, ἀνανεούμενος τὰς παλαιὰς ἐκείνας Τηρέως ἢ Θυέστου θοινάς), having in mind the myths of Thyestes and of Tereus, Procne, and Itys (especially, because of their obvious Thracian connections, at least from the Classical period onwards; see Thuc. 2.29; also Hall 1989: 104-5).

9.2.ext.5

Although this *exemplum* appears also in Diodorus (34/5.14) immediately after that of Zibelmios (34/5.12), it is unlikely that Diodorus is V.'s source (see also comment at 9.2.ext.4); Physcon's cruelties appeared prominently in Trogus (Just. 38.8) and in Livy (*Per.* 59.14; cf. *Oros.* 5.10).

**Iterum Ptolomaeus Physcon ... amentiae taeterrimum exemplum:** V. recalls to his readers' minds Physcon's appearance in the previous chapter as an exemplar of *libido* (9.1.ext.5).

**idem inter praecipua crudelitatis indicia referendus:** For uses of *indicium*, cf. 3.7.praef.; 4.3.9; 4.7.4; 4.8.1; 5.1.1b; 9.2.1; 9.8.ext.1. *Praecipuus* suggests a particular

degree of *odium*, but V. uses this freely; *referendus* is also frequently used by V., cf. e.g. 3.5.praef.; 4.3.praef.; 6.5.ext.2; 7.3.2.

**quid ... truculentius:** V. specifies the gravamen with a term he associates with cruel deaths (cf. 3.8.ext.3, 5.3.3, 8.9.2).

**Cleopatra:** For Physcon's marriage to his sister, see note on 9.1.ext.5: **sororem natu**.

**Memphiten:** Ptolemy Memphites (*BNP* 12.144), Physcon's son by Cleopatra II, so named because he was born (c. 144/3) during his father's inauguration in the Egyptian city (Diod. 33.13). He was murdered by Physcon in 130 (dated to the consulship of M. Perperna based on Liv. *Per.* 59.14; Oros. 5.10; see *MRR* 1.501-2).

**quem ex Cleopatra ... et uxore, sustulerat:** V.'s expresses Physcon's acceptance of the boy as a legitimate heir in Roman terms (on **sustulerat**, see Shaw 2001: 31-77); which, in so doing, should have brought an end to the dynastic feud (see Whitehorne 1994: 109ff.).

**in conspectu suo:** V.'s villains, and tyrants more generally, have victims killed in their presence (cf. e.g. 9.2.1), showing the extremity of their callousness.

**caput eius ... misit:** V. provides a list of details that demonstrate the particular cruelty of Physcon to his sister and to a mother on an occasion that should have been joyful.

**perinde ... se invisum reddiderat:** V. rhetorically emphasizes that Physcon's action is a father's ordering the death of his own son – the natural ties are ignored, and he does not display the creditable *severitas* of distinguished Roman fathers who ordered the death of their delinquent offspring (cf. 5.8.1-5). Again in contrast to the Roman exemplars Physcon's action bring him no credit, but hatred. On the populace's feelings towards Physcon (cf. Just. 38.8.6-7, 13-4; Diod. 33.6, 6a, 12, 34/5.14; Liv. *Per.* 59).

**adeo caeco furore ... se ipsa repperit:** V. interrupts the narrative of the *exemplum*, in his characteristically opaque rhetoric, to comment on the nature of cruelty, his characterisation of which is couched in language familiar within Latin literature:

**caeco furore** 'blind madness' cf. Cat. 64.197; Verg. *Aen.* 2.244; Liv. 28.22.14; Sen. *Oed.* 590, *Thyest.* 27; with the verb **effervescit** ('to boil up'), associated with excited emotions (esp. anger; *OLD* s.v. 2), he situates **crudelitas** within a philosophical moral vocabulary associated with madness and anger (cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.295); and mixes his metaphors: *crudelitas* initially hot and boiling-over figuratively becomes a bulwark (**munimentum**).

**nam cum animadverteret ... partim flamma necavit:** V.'s culminating example of Physcon's cruelty possibly occurs in the context of his expulsion of the Alexandrian intelligentsia in 145 as an act of vengeance for his earlier expulsion by the Alexandrian population in 163; see Fraser 1972: 86; cf. Polyb. 34.14.1-7 = Strabo 17.1.12; Meneclēs *FGrH* 270 F9 (Athen. 4.184b-c); Just. 38.8.6-7; Diod. 33.6, 6a, 12; *Hist. Aug.* 6.2-3. V. is alone in mentioning the attack on the gymnasium; the fact that it is a gymnasium suggests a specific attack on the Greek population of Alexandria, who favoured his wife/sister. V.'s rhetorical fervor has led him to an apparent historical blunder: Memphites dies in 130; Physcon's infamous gymnasium slaughter belongs early in the reign, when his sister, Cleopatra II, already enjoyed widespread support in Alexandria from the Greek population (Whitehorne 1994: 110-11). V.'s language probably does not reflect Alexandrian reality – the members of the gymnasium were not the plebs, but likely the citizen elite.

#### 9.2.ext.6

Stronk (2010: 182) has suggested that Ctesias' *Persica* may be V.'s source for this *exemplum*. He bases his suggestion on the fact that the text was in frequent use as a source during Tiberius' principate, the fit between V.'s narrative and Ctesias' taste for recording details of cruel acts, and in the similarity between both accounts of Ochus' behaviour. V.'s usual reading pattern where foreign material is concerned, however, would also suggest the possibility of Pompeius Trogus (Bloomer 1992: 146).

**Ochus ... qui postea Dareus appellatus est:** ‘Errors compounded’, as Shackleton Bailey (2000: 318 n. 15) notes. V. has apparently confused Darius II Ochus (*BNP* 4.92-3), who reigned from 423-405, with Darius I (see further comment below). ‘Darius’ was adopted as his regnal name (cf. Ctesias: βασιλεύει Ὀχος καὶ μετονομάζεται Δαρεϊαῖος. *FGrH* 688 F 15.50).

**sanctissimo Persis iure ... inopia alimentorum necaret:** Ctesias (*FGrH* 688 F15.50) presents Ochus as an oath-breaker, but V. explicitly represents him as ‘manipulating his oath-language in a deceitful manner with the aim of achieving his goal *without* breaking his oath’ (Torrance 2012: 313). By mentioning the oath in the context of the overthrow of the ‘seven magi’ (**septem magos**), V. reveals that he has confused Ochus with Darius I, who, along with six other co-conspirators crushed the rule of the (two) magi (cf. Hdt. 3.61-79; Ctesias *FGrH* 668 F13 [16]; Val. Max. 3.2.ext.2, 7.3.ext.2).

**crudeliorem mortis rationem excogitavit: excogitavit** links to V.’s ‘novelty motif’ concerning vice (see 9.1.1) and insatiability.

**saepum ... insidiosam congeriem decidebant:** By plying his victims with food and drink, they therefore, in their sleep (and technically from their ‘own free will’), fell from the beam into a pit of ashes; Ochus was thereby exempted from blood guilt; cf. Ov. *Ibis* 315-6; La Penna 1959: 54-5; cf. also Hdt. 2.100; 2 Maccabees 13:5-8.

9.2.ext.7

**Apertior et taetrior ... cognomine Artaxerxis crudelitas:** V. links the *exemplum* with the previous one through the common name of the exemplars (**alterius Ochi**). V.’s explicitly categorises this Ochus’ cruelty as more blatant (**Apertior**), and more hideous (**taetrior**), perhaps because the victims were conscious. On his cruelty, see Diod. 17.5.3; Plut. *Artax.* 26.1; Ael. *VH* 2.17. Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* 363c-d) notes that he was hated by the Egyptians; Athenaeus (4.150b-c [Licias]) suggests that he was not wholly cruel, and could show acts of kindness. Artaxerxes III Ochus (*BNP* 2.57-8)

reigned from 359-38, having come to the Achaemenid throne in the wake of several murders (Plut. *Artax.* 30).

**qui Atossam sororem ... vivam capite defodit:** Atossa was the daughter and wife of Artaxerxes II (Brosius 1996: 66-7). For the relationship between Artaxerxes II and Atossa, cf. Plut. *Artax.* 23.3-7, 30.1. On incestuous father-daughter marriages among Persians, see Frandsen 2009. Burying upside down (and/or alive) appears to have been a Persian custom (cf. Hdt 3.35, 7.114; Ctesias *FGrH* 688 F 15.45, 56), perhaps best interpreted as a form of propitiatory ritual to chthonic deities (cf. Asheri et al. 2007: 433; de Jong 1997: 314-5). The practice is clearly meant to appear abhorrent to Roman readers, as in Roman culture only errant Vestal Virgins and German or Gallic prisoners of war were ever buried alive as the most drastic form of sacrifice in moments of acute crises for the state.

**et patrum cum ... destitutum iaculis confixit:** Ochus' uncle was Arsames, the son of Ostanes and grandson of Darius II. He was married to Sisygambis; cf. Curt. 10.5.23 (with Atkinson 2009: 154-5), who mentions the slaughter of 80 brothers of Sisygambis; and Just. 10.3.1: a slaughter of relatives and of princes.

**nulla iniuria lacessitus ... laudem consistere videbat:** Cf. Plut. *Artax.* 30, who presents a similar characterisation of the Persians' views of some of Ochus' rivals. Justin (10.3.2) credits Ochus with fear of a conspiracy, an explanation pertaining more to *Realpolitik*, but V. invokes a typically tyrannical jealousy of others' more moral characters.

9.2.ext.8

**Consimili genere aemulationis instincta:** *Consimilis* is a frequent form of connection in V. (cf. e.g. 2.7.15; 3.8.4); for emulation as a spur, cf. e.g. 2.9.6; 3.3.ext.4; 4.1.12; 4.3.10.

**civitas Atheniensium indigno ... secum descendere nequiret:** V.'s source is likely to be Cicero *Off.* 3.46 (see Dyck 1996: 551-2): *durius etiam Athenienses, qui sciverunt, ut*

*Aeginetis, qui classe valebant, pollices praeciderentur*; cf. Ael. VH 2.9. Plut. Lys. 9 mentions a similar – or possibly the same? – decree, put into effect by the persuasion of Philocles before the battle of Aegospotami in 405 (cf. Xen. HG 2.1.31-2). On the strengths of the Aeginetan navy, and its threat to Athenian thalassocracy, see Figueira 1990: 15-51. In Roman society thumbs were amputated voluntarily by citizens to avoid military service (see Wardle 2014: 188-9); this was not a punishment inflicted by the state.

**non agnosco Athenas ... a crudelitate mutuantes:** V. in general is not wholly favourable towards Athens and the Athenian community, undoubtedly because of his anti-democratic orientation (cf. e.g. 1.1.ext.7, 8; 4.5.ext.2; 5.3.ext.3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f; 9.8.ext.2). On the anti-Athenian tradition in general, see Roberts 1994 esp. 97-118 on its ‘Roman reception’. It is worth noting also that Athens enjoyed a dubious position during the early principate, particularly under Tiberius (see Bowersock 1965: 105-111).

**timori remedium:** Cf. 9.2.ext.5.

9.2.ext.9

**Saevus:** With **saevus**, V. introduces the *exemplum* with a synonym for *crudelitas* (see the introduction to the chapter for the vocabulary of cruelty), used elsewhere in relation to Perillus specifically, cf. Prop. 2.25.12; Ov. *Trist.* 3.11. 39; Plin. *HN* 34.89.3-4.

**ille aenei tauri inventor:** That is Perilaus in the Greek sources (except Callim. *Aetia* fr. 47 Harder and Dorotheus Atheniensis *FGrH* 145 F3) and Perillus in Latin ones (Prop. 2.25.12; Ov. *Trist.* 3.11. 39; Plin. *HN* 34.89.3-4). The tale of Perilaus’ invention of the bronze bull, to be used by the tyrant Phalaris as a torture device, is widely related in antiquity among historians, poets, and philosophers, beginning with Pindar (*Pyth.* 1.95); cf. also Amm. 28.1.46; Callim. *Aetia* fr. 46 (Harder); Cic. *Fin.* 5.28.85, *Rep.* 3.30, *Tusc.* 2.7.17-18, 5.26.75, *Verr.* 2.4.73; Claud. *Gild.* 1.186-8, *In Eutrop.* 1.163, *In Ruf.* 1.235; Diod. 9.18, 19, 13.90.4, 19.108, 20.71.3; Frontin. *Ad am.* 1.15.2;

Heracleid. Pont. Fr. 37; Juv. 8.81-2; Lucian *De morte Peregr.* 21, *Phal.* 1.11-2; Oros. 1.20.1-4; Ov. *AA* 1.653, *Ibis* 437-40, *Trist.* 3.11.39-54, 5.1.53; Pers. 3.39; Plin. *HN* 34.89; Polyb. 12.25.1-4; Prop. 2.25.11; Sen. *Clem.* 2.4, *Ep.* 66.18, *Ira* 2.5; Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F28c; see also Lenschau, *RE* XIX.1650-1. Walbank (1967: 380-3) believes it to have been modelled on brazen bulls found on the top of Mt. Atabyrum in Rhodes, which were used during times of disaster in the city.

**Phalaridis tyranni:** Phalaris of Acragas (*BNP* 10.908-9), ruled c. 570-555; often regarded in the sources as a tyrant *par excellence*; cf. e.g. Val. Max. 3.3.ext.2; Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.73, 2.5.145, *Att.* 7.12.2 (where his name is used metonymically for cruelty), *Off.* 2.26, 3.32, *Rep.* 3.30; Amm. 26.10.5; see Hinz 2001 for discussion on the Phalaris legend in antiquity and its *Nachleben*.

**quam quia calamitosis ... merito auspicatus est:** A number of the sources mention Perillus as the first victim of his invention, see: Callim. *Aetia* fr. 46, 47 (Harder); Claud. *In Eutrop.* 1.163; Diod. 9.18, 19; Plin. *HN* 34.89; Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F28c.

9.2.ext.10

V. source for this *exemplum* is Cic.'s *Hort.*, see fr. 99 Straume-Zimmermann (= August. *Contra Iulian. Pelag.* 4.15.78; cf. also 4.16.83): *cum in praedonum Etruscorum manus incidissent, crudelitate excogitata necabatur, quorum corpora viva cum mortuis adversa adversis accommodata quam aptissime colligabantur; sic nostros animos cum corporibus copulatos, ut vivos cum mortuis esse coniunctos*. Cicero's own protreptic to philosophy itself draws on Aristotle (*Protrep.* fr. 107 Düring), who discusses the manner in which Tyrrhenian pirates torture their captives by joining them limb to limb, the living to the dead, in order to illustrate how the soul is attached to the body. Aristotle reports the example as if it is common knowledge, 'so they say' (ὥσπερ ... φασί).

**Etrusci:** The cruelty of the Etruscans is a common motif among Greek and Roman authors; see Di Fazio 2013: 48-69.

**in poena excogitanda:** By highlighting the creativity of the Etruscans in devising this punishment, V. recalls the previous *exemplum* where a novel method of torture was invented. The ‘novelty motif’ can be traced back to the first *exemplum* of the book (9.1.1) – a persistent element of vice.

**qui vivorum corpora ... ac mortis tortores:** Like the victims bound mirroring each other, V.’s language is equally balanced, rhetorical, and alliterative (**corpora cadaveribus ... constricta; adversa adversis alligata atque; singulae ... singulis; vitae pariter ac mortis**). Vergil (see *Aen.* 8.485-8. along with Servius’ comment), attributes the same cruelty to the Etruscan king, Mezentius.

**amari ... tortores:** V.’s concluding rhetorical statement on Etruscan cruelty plays with details of the torture itself; just as living bodies were attached to dead ones, so Etruscan cruelties are so excessive that they not only torment the living, but the dead as well. For life/death antithesis in V. cf. e.g. 2.6.8; 4.6.3; 5.1.1b; 5.3.3; 7.3.8; 7.8.8.

#### 9.2.ext.11

This *exemplum* has no known historical parallel before V.’s time (Shackleton Bailey 2000: 321) but a very similar punishment is discussed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD novel of Apuleius (*Met.* 6.31-2; cf. Lawrence 2006: 210). As the entire narrative proper is much abbreviated before the extended rhetorical conclusion, V. clearly assumes an audience familiar with its contents (note his phrase **quos ferunt**). It also reveals a lack of specificity: whereas in earlier *exempla* either individuals or ethnic groups were designated for their cruelties, here the perpetrators are merely **barbari**. Jodocus Badius Ascensius’ 1510 *familiaris commentarius* on V. plausibly suggests that the barbarians were Scythians; cf. 5.4.ext.5: *immanis et barbara gens*.

**Sicut:** That is, ‘just as’ the victims of the previous *exemplum* which were bound the living to the dead, so too the living victims of this *exemplum* are bound to the dead, only in this case to animals.

**mactatarum pecudum intestinis ... corporibus nasci solent:** For parallels of this kind of torture, cf. Apul. *Met.* 6.31; SHA *Macr.* 12.4-6. This punishment brings to mind the *poena cullei* – another cruelty involving the mixing of human and animal – used in cases involving parricide. However, the unique harshness of this punishment must lie in the fact that the torture is extended: as their heads are exposed, the victims are able to eat and drink, and in the case of Macrinus' victims, converse with one another, until they rot.

**Queramus nunc cum ... impulsu crudelitas excogitaverit:** V. concludes the *exemplum*, and indeed the whole chapter, with an extended diatribe against the philosophical idea that Nature should be blamed for life's cruelties, commenting instead that even without divine disfavour man's propensity towards the vice of *crudelitas* is enough to justify his lot. What V. offers here is not robust philosophical comment on Nature, but rather the popular views of a lay-man; see Wardle 1998: 285 for further discussion of V.'s conception of Nature. For Nature as cruel, see Beagon 1992: 37-9; cf. also Val. Max. 1.8.ext.12, 1.8.ext.18. Ill-health was ascribed to the anger of the gods, cf. Celsus, *Med.* 1.pr.4; see also comment at 9.8.2.

### **De Ira aut Odio**

The theme of anger goes back to the very beginnings of Greek literature in Homer's description of Achilles and occupied a prominent place in the philosophical and rhetorical discourse of the Greeks.<sup>154</sup> As part of the modern study of emotions in the classical world anger has received extensive attention, but none treats V. in a substantial way, apart from occasional scattered citations, even though he offers a presentation of anger that deserves attention in its own right.<sup>155</sup> Aristotle's definition

---

<sup>154</sup> Harris 2001 discusses the theme of anger in texts from writers such as Aristotle, Philodemus, and Plutarch, ranging from Homer to early Christianity.

<sup>155</sup> See for example the chapters in collections by Braund and Gill 1997; Braund and Most 2003; and the monograph by Harris 2001.

is an important starting-point for subsequent discussions: Ἔστω δὴ ὀργὴ ὄρεξις μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας [φαινομένης] διὰ φαινομένην ὀλιγωρίαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ <τι> τῶν αὐτοῦ, τοῦ ὀλιγωρεῖν μὴ προσήκοντος (*Rhet.* 1378a31; translated by Harris 2001: 57: ‘the desire, accompanied by pain, for retaliation for some perceived slight to oneself or to one’s own, the slight not having been deserved’), and it appears that V.’s own introduction picks up the key themes of retaliation (*ultio*) and pain, enlarging on the latter with its own emphasis on the anxiety and pain that the soul experiences. Cicero preserves a definition with which V. would have been familiar: *libido poeniendi eius qui videatur laesisse iniuria* (*Tusc.* 4.21), the continuation of which, *odium ira inveterata* (cf. Diog. Laert. 7.113: μῆνις δέ ἐστιν ὀργή τις πεπαλαιωμένη καὶ ἐπίκοτος, ἐπιτηρητικὴ δέ; Andron. Rhod. 4.1: <Μῆνις> δὲ ὀργή εἰς παλαίωσιν ἀποτιθεμένη), may offer the key differentiation between *ira* and *odium* (which goes back at least to Zeno) and explains the connection of the two emotions by V. In this chapter, V. bears out many of the same distinctions made by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1382a1-10), in relation to hatred’s persistence and its lack of specificity.

For the Romans, following on the various philosophical treatments of the Hellenistic period, anger was a passion or emotion that was generally viewed negatively (cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.43; Sen. *Ira* 3.6.3-9.5, 10.4-11.1, 37.1), as an irrational disturbance of the soul. Livy, who is a major source for this chapter (see discussions of sources at each *exemplum*), certainly treats *ira* negatively in general, and particularly in Book 2 in his discussions of civil strife after the expulsion of the Tarquins, upon which V. draws.<sup>156</sup> Although among Livy’s lost works were philosophical dialogues, his broad handling of anger reveals nothing that identifies him as a committed Stoic. V.’s presentation of the passion is consistently negative within this chapter, although, like Livy, he can elsewhere present anger as a justified response by his exemplars, both individual

---

<sup>156</sup> Harris 2001: 216-7. Harris notes also Livy’s works on moral philosophy (Sen. *Ep.* 100.9), which suggests a moral purpose behind his presentation of *ira* within his history.

(e.g. 2.2.4) and institutional (e.g. 2.7.15). This stands against any identification of V. as a hard-line Stoic on the topic. Nonetheless, his understanding of the philosophical and intellectual treatment of anger by his predecessors is evident from his prefatory description of the vice.

The vocabulary of anger and hatred in Latin literature, especially when compared with Greek terminology, is somewhat imprecise and in general, poorer.<sup>157</sup> The standard Latin term for what is translated as ‘anger’ in English is *ira*, and V. uses this term and its cognates most frequently throughout the chapter (9.3.praef.; 9.3.1; 9.3.4; 9.3.6; 9.3.7). He uses *iracundia* 3 times (9.3.2; 9.3.8; 9.3.ext.1); *irasci* once (9.3.2); and *indignatio* once (9.3.8). The only other variation that he includes is the use of *dolor* (OLD s.v. 3), a term commonly associated with *ira* (see 9.3.praef.; 9.3.2; 9.3.3).<sup>158</sup>

Although *odium* is a concept that appears commonly in Latin, it occupies a lower profile than *ira* does. As seen above, an equivalence between  $\mu\eta\nu\iota\varsigma$  and *odium* is suggested (as an extrapolation of Cicero’s evidence above indicates); while V. links anger and hatred, from even a cursory reading of the chapter, more space is given to *ira* than *odium*, which is the subject only of the last three *exempla* (9.3.ext.2-4), and the vices are largely treated separately in the *exempla* (unlike, for example, in the chapter on *luxuria* and *libido* where both vices appeared in the same *exemplum*, e.g. 9.1.6; 9.1.7). *Odium*, when defined in this way, is borne out, at least partially, in V.’s *exempla* (see esp. 9.3.ext.2; 9.3.ext.3).

---

<sup>157</sup> However, cf. Seneca’s comments (*De Ira* 1.4.2), which demonstrate that Latin has abundant adjectives for anger; Harris 2001: 68-9. Again, note that Harris is specifically concerned with *ira* as opposed to *odium*.

<sup>158</sup> Harris 2001: 68.

Restraining anger, and exercising control over it, was a key aspect in moral thinking concerning the vice.<sup>159</sup> V. envisions that at least a part of his task in enumerating examples of the emotion, as well as its negative consequences, is that the examples themselves will provide a measure of rebuke and go some way in restraining the vice (see his comments at 9.3.praef.; 9.3.4; 9.3.ext.praef.). This is in line with his overall project of moral guidance (see comment in the Introduction).

In this chapter, V. deliberately excludes comment on his own day, drawing his examples from the Republic and ending them, chronologically, at Sulla. His is not a work in the philosophical tradition of providing advice to a ruler (e.g. Seneca's *De Ira*); implicit in this, is that a paragon such as Tiberius would not, of course, need such advice – the paradigmatic foreign potentate Alexander did have anger problems, but V. is safe in mentioning them as they are a vital part of the Alexander-tradition. V.'s Roman *exempla* focus sharply on the exercise and rejection of *imperium*; his own rhetoric is very sharp on this, and on the negative consequences of anger (usually defeat or loss of personal honour and climactically, of course, even death).

As usual, Roman examples dominate (with 8 *exempla* in comparison to only 4 foreign ones). V. seems to have structured the Roman examples climactically, as the opening statement of 9.3.4 seems to indicate – the first three demonstrate the anger of an individual against many (9.3.1; 9.3.2; 9.3.3), the next three the anger of individuals against their leaders (9.3.4; 9.3.5; 9.3.6). The final two *exempla* within the domestic section move from the rubric established in the previous three, where anger resulted in military disaster. Instead, in these two examples, little or no consequence is felt by Metellus (9.3.7), and Sulla brings about his *own* death, due to his *ira* (9.3.8). Unsurprisingly Alexander the Great heads the foreign *exempla* and provides the climactic example of *ira*. The subsequent foreign *exempla*, dealing now with *odium*,

---

<sup>159</sup> Harris 2001: 88-127.

unsurprisingly, include two generations of Carthaginian exemplars before the chapter concludes with an example of an eastern queen – the only female to feature in it. As stated above, Livy is by far the most influential source for the Roman *exempla* and for the hatred of Hasdrubal and Hannibal; Trogus is the likely source for the *exempla* of Alexander and Semiramis/Rhodogyne.

### 9.3.praef.

**Ira quoque aut odium:** V. begins the chapter with one of his standard transitional particles (**quoque**; cf. e.g. 1.1.17; 1.5.9; 1.6.praef.; 9.1.ext.4; 9.5.1; 9.6.2; 9.7.4); it brings the sense that V. is adding to his ‘vice list’, as well as demonstrating that the vices of this chapter, as the vices of the previous ones, affect the human condition; cf. V.’s concluding remarks in the previous *exemplum*. By using **aut**, V. may signal that he is concerned with a specific type of anger, given that the conjunction brings with it a sense of correcting a statement, or making it more specific (Lewis and Short, s.v. ‘aut’ IIC), but that would suggest that *odium* is the key idea, whereas more *exempla* illustrate *ira*. Interestingly, Shackleton Bailey, in his Loeb translation, has rendered the chapter title as ‘anger or hatred’, but opted for ‘anger ... and hatred’ within the text of the *praef.* The desire to read ‘et’ as opposed to ‘aut’ is evident in the textual tradition also; for which, see Briscoe’s *apparatus*. This could suggest that **ira** and **odium** should be understood as synonymous terms in V.’s usage; however, taking into account that V. later comments on the different characteristics of each, it would appear to indicate that he treats them as separate vices and not simply as synonyms. The association of *ira* with *odium* in intellectual thought is found distinctly in Cicero (*Tusc.* 4.21), probably going back to Zeno at least, as shown by Diog. Laert. 7.113; cf. also Cic. *De or.* 2.206.

**in pectoribus humanis magnos fluctus excitant:** On the seat of these vices being in the chest, see Val. Max. 9.3.6; 9.3.8; 9.3.ext.4; cf. Cic. *De or.* 1.53: *in hominum mentibus*. The ‘waves of passion’ imagery casts V.’s language into epic register; cf. Lucr. *DRN*

3.296-8 (also *in pectore*), 6.74-5; Verg. *Aen.* 4.532, 12.526-7, 12.831 (where they occur *sub pectore*); Harrison 2005: 163-176. The heart as the source of *πάθη* goes back to Chrysippus (Galen *Plac. Hipp.* 172.24-6); cf. Aristotle, *Anim.* 1.403a31, where anger is caused by the boiling of blood around the heart. On metaphors for anger, see Harris 2001: 66-8.

**procursu celerior illa:** For anger's association with speed, cf. e.g. Hor. *Ep.* 1.20.25; Liv. 6.32.11; Plut. *De cohib. ira* 454b; James 1.19. This idea is reminiscent of the 'quick tempered' (*ἀκρόκολος*) man in Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 1126a).

**nocendi cupidine hoc pertinacius:** On the obstinacy of *odium*, cf. e.g. Val. Max. 4.2.4; Cic. *Off.* 1.64.1; Sen. *Controv.* 1.1.6; Tac. *Hist.* 1.33.2, 4.43.2; Quint. *Decl. Min.* 323.19. V. is playing with the definitions of *μῆνις/odium* as inveterate, long-lasting/persistent; cf. Phld. *Ira.* 30.13-30 on anger that lasts for years and is passed down through generations (illustrated later in V., for example, by the Barcids; 9.3.ext.2; 9.3.ext.3).

**uterque consternationis plenus ... contingat ultio anxius:** V. contends that although these emotions are directed outwards in violence, they self-reflexively cause pain and anxiety to the person who experiences them; **consternationis** could suggest, philosophically, the disturbance of the soul caused by anger (cf. the *ταραχή* that Philodemus mentions affects the sage less than others; *Ira* 42.4-6; cf. 26.16). Revenge (cf. Val. Max. 9.10) was a key element in the definition of anger going back to Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1378a31), the Stoic tradition (Chrysippus in Stob. *Ecl.* 2.91), and also in the Epicurean tradition (Phld. *Ira* 8.20-7: *δεινῆς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ μετελθεῖν καὶ ἀγωνίας, εἰ δυνήσεται*; cf. 41.37-9). Aristotle's enigmatic *μετὰ λύπης* is spelled out more fully by Philodemus (*Ira* 13.4-11: *πανταχῶς τὸν μὲν τυπτόμενον ἤκιστα βλάπτουσιν αὐτοὶ δ' ἑαυτοὺς λυμαίνονται παντοδαπῶς*), but is evident also in Theophrastus (L 88 Fortenbaugh) and in Seneca (*Ira* 3.1.5; cf. the examples collected by Indelli 1988: 168); cf. also Cic. *Tusc.* 3.19, 4.21; Sen. *Ira* 1.3.3.

**proprietas eorum ... vehementiore conspici voluerunt:** As Skidmore (1996: 86-7) has noted, one of the motivating factors in V.'s selection of individual *exempla* relates

to the question of the authority (**auctoritas**) that the exemplars cited bring. One of his strategies in achieving this is by appealing to the *facta* and *dicta* of famous men (*clari viri*), thus living up to his title. As is apparent from a search through the text, most references to these personages come in the prefaces to individual chapters; cf. 4.1; 4.3; 6.4; 6.9; 7.5; 8.10.1. For V.'s treatment of his *exempla* as *imagines* – the wax portraits of a family's illustrious ancestors displayed in Roman *atria* – cf. the preface to 9.11; in all likelihood, V. expected his *exempla* to serve the same function (cf. 5.8.3); see Langlands 2000: 13-24; Gowing 2005: 56-7. It is possible also, however, that what V. envisions here are rather the εἰδωλα of philosophy (*OLD* s.v. *imago* 4); something similar to what Tsouna has labelled 'moral portraiture' (2007: 86-7, 195-6, 204-8); see the Introduction.

V.'s acknowledgment of the part played by the gods in the imparting of anger to *clari viri* is striking (**quas di ipsi ... conspici voluerunt**), and suggests more Stoic than Epicurean influence (cf. Phld. *Ira* 14). Elsewhere V. makes the gods responsible for both virtue and vice in men (cf. e.g. 1.1.14; 6.9.2). See also Skidmore 1996: 87, for V. in effect invoking divine approval for his method of persuasion.

**dicto ... facto:** A reference back to the work's title and organising principle; for collection of all such references, see Weileder 1998: 38 n. 205.

### 9.3.1

Livy's narrative (27.40.8-9) of 207 is V.'s indisputable source for this *exemplum*: *Memoriae proditum est plenum adhuc irae in civis M. Livium ad bellum proficiscentem monenti Q. Fabio ne, priusquam genus hostium cognosset, temere manum consereret, respondisse, ubi primum hostium agmen conspexisset, pugnaturum. Cum quaereretur quae causa festinandi esset, 'Aut ex hoste egregiam gloriam' inquit 'aut ex civibus victis gaudium meritum certe, esti non honestum, capiam'*. Livy appears to point up the moral more sharply than V. does: *ira in civis* is minimised because V. only alludes to Livius'

anger with the people, whereas V. is more intent on working up to a contrast between *ira* and *virtus* and in producing a pithy *dictum* for Livius.

**Hasdrubalem:** Hasdrubal Barca (*BNP* 5.1161), the brother of Hannibal, had by the spring of 207 (in the context of the Second Punic War) advanced as far as Umbria with his army, posing the most severe threat to Rome since 217 by bringing major reinforcements to Hannibal (cf. 3.7.4 and 7.4.4).

**Livius Salinator:** Marcus Livius Salinator (*BNP* 7.744-5) held the consulship twice (219 and 207), a proconsulship (206/5), and a censorship (204). He was a direct ancestor of Tiberius' through Livia. Elsewhere in V. he is presented in relation to his censorship (2.9.6a-b); as an exemplar of self-confidence (3.7.4; which has similarities with the fundamental attitude displayed here in the arrogance of his words); incidentally, in connection with the display of C. Claudius Nero's *moderatio* during his triumph (4.1.9); again in connection with Nero during their consulship of 207 (4.2.2 and 7.2.6a); and for his shrewd military stratagems during the Second Punic War (7.4.4).

**bellum gesturus:** Livius was allocated the command against Hasdrubal (4.1.9; Livy 27.35.10); his *profectio* took place soon after the start of his consulship on 15 March. The campaign of 207 culminated in the decisive Battle of Metaurus, which was a turning point in the Second Punic War. Unnoticed by Hannibal, Nero was able to join his forces with Livius, outnumbering the Carthaginians, and thus together they were able to defeat Hasdrubal (see Liv. 27.49; Val. Max. 7.4.4; Lazenby 1978: 181-190).

**Fabio Maximo:** Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (*BNP* 5.294-5), nicknamed Cunctator ('delayer') because of his military tactics against Hannibal (Enn. *Ann.* 363-5 Sk; cf. also Val. Max. 3.8.2). Elliott (2009: 532-542) has argued that Fabius Maximus' tactics are presented as a trope within a larger dialogue in Roman historiography around identity and heroism (cf. also Roller 2011: 182-210). Thus he provides a suitable foil to Livius' haste. He held the consulship five times as well as a dictatorship, and was

treated by Cicero (*Sen.* 10) as an exemplar of the 'grand old man' (see Sumner 1973: 30-2). He features frequently in V. as an exemplar (2.2.4; 3.8.2; 4.1.5; 4.8.1; 5.2.3; 7.3.7; 7.3.ext.8; 8.13.3) as well as incidentally (1.1.5, 2.2.5, 4.8.2, 5.2.4, 7.3.ext.8).

**monente:** Fabius' profile as the archetypal cautious Roman general is surprisingly muted in V. given Tiberius' own reputation for slow thoroughness and Augustus' own oft-expressed preference for cautious generalship (cf. e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 25.4), and his adaptation of Ennius' praise of Fabius to the case of Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 21.5). Here the reader has to presume that the *cautus dux* is generally preferable to the *temerarius*, whereas Livy's *temere* makes Fabius' criticism clear. V. adapts Livy's version of his advice to spell out that the size and morale of the enemy should be ascertained.

**primam occasionem pugnandi ... manum conserere vellet:** Livius' haste brings to mind V.'s comments, in the preface to this chapter, on *ira* being swift in its emergence (*procursu celerior illa*).

**'ut quam celerrime ... prostratis gaudium capiam':** V. adapts Livy's *oratio obliqua*: he emphasises the notion of haste by adding **quam celerrime**, creates a tighter contrast by omitting the adjective *egregiam* and by producing a chiasmus (**gloriam ... gaudium**). In this way also, V. is true to the rationale of his work in recording both words and deeds. **Tunc**, by restricting V.'s criticism to this one episode in Livius' career, may mitigate something of this blot on the hero's character. Livius' *virtus*, perhaps the primary virtue of a Roman leader as evidenced by its position in V.'s work (3.2), his bravery manifested above all in military success over the enemy, is lauded by V., while his other motivation – the joy he will receive at the ruin of his fellow Romans (**aut ex civibus prostratis gaudium capiam**) – V. excoriates, and is what merits his inclusion in this chapter.

**illa iniustae damnationis memor:** Livius' anger towards his fellow countrymen was due to an accusation, and later conviction by them, over his failure to divide the

spoils in the aftermath of his victory, as consul in 219, against Demetrius of Pharus (Frontin. *Str.* 4.1.45; *vir. ill.* 50); he clearly viewed his condemnation as undeserved.

**haec triumphi gloriae intenta:** For the victory at Metaurus Livius was granted a joint triumph with his fellow consul, Nero (cf. Val. Max. 4.1.9; Livy 28.9.9-11; Enn. *Ann.* 299 Sk; *vir. ill.* 48, 50). The imperative for military glory was a key feature of Roman aristocratic competition (note esp. Val. Max. 8.14.praef.).

**sed nescio an ... et sic vincere:** V. expresses *dubitatio* (ἐνδοιάσειως ἐπίκρισις – Hermogenes 1.6) enables him to present Livius here as an exemplar of *ira*, despite his positive presentation more generally (cf. Loutsch 1998: 33).

### 9.3.2

V.'s opens this *exemplum* with a retrospective characterisation of Livius Salinator, whom he describes as a man of 'fiery spirit' (**ardentis spiritus**; cf. 8.7.ext.9) and 'familiar with warfare' (**bellicis operibus adsuatum**; for '*bellicis operibus*' cf. Val. Max. 2.4.4; Vell. 2.97.2; Curt. 8.1.20). Not only does it allow him to segue into his next example, but it also provides him with an opportunity to contrast (by use of **autem**) Livius' character with the generally peaceable protagonist of his current *exemplum*.

**iracundiae stimuli:** The 'spurs of wrath'; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 12.830: '*stimulos iracundiae*'. *Iracundia*, as Cicero (*Tusc.* 4.27) and Seneca (*Ira* 1.4.1) seem to imply, refers more to a disposition of character rather than just the emotion itself (*ira*); cf. also Suet. *Cl.* 38.1

**C. autem Figulum mansuetissimum pacto iuris civilis studio celeberrimum:** Nothing is known about this Figulus (*RE* XIV.1559) apart from what is mentioned here; Broughton (1991: 15) posits a date around 130. V.'s characterisation of him suggests no military track-record which would support his candidacy.

**prudenter moderationisque immemorem reddiderunt:** The *iracundiae stimuli* of the previous sentence are the subject of the verb. For the combination of these two virtues, cf. e.g. Liv. 27.34.3 (used, interestingly enough in the context of the election

of Marcus Livius, from the previous *exemplum*, to consul), 30.40.8; Curt. 3.12.20; Sen. Ep. 120.3. *Moderatio* was Tiberius' cardinal virtue, see Levick 1975: 123-137; Levick 1976: 89-91; Cowan 2009a: 480-3; for the term's use in V., see Westphal 2015: 191-208. Mention of Figulus' (usually) meek nature (**mansuetissimum**) helps to ameliorate his presentation, and demonstrates that his anger at not attaining the consulship was clearly out of character for him.

**consulatus enim repulsae ... suo datum meminerat:** His father, Gaius Marcius Figulus, had been consul in 162 and 156 (*MRR* 1.441, 447); although two consulships was a remarkable honour, in effect the second was recompense for the surrender of the first due to religious irregularities (Jehne 2011: 227 n. 75). The level of aggrievedness that Figulus might reasonably feel at not attaining the consulship, was due in part, at least, to the perceived heritability of the consulship during the Republic (see e.g. Duncan-Jones 1984: 270-4).

**cum ad eum ... consulem facere nescitis?':** In the role of jurisconsult, Figulus, undoubtedly, had expected the support of his clients in his bid for the consulship. Kunkel (1967) argues that the success of jurisconsults to attain the consulship underwent a change (linked with their social status) between the second and first centuries: whereas in the second century most of the jurisconsults were aristocrats and became consuls, in the first decades of the first century they were largely made up of equestrians, and almost never achieved the position. Figulus' witty response to his clients plays on their actions and his failure to achieve his desired position (**consulere ... consulem**).

**dictum graviter et ... melius non dictum:** A 'weighty saying' (**dictum graviter**); elsewhere *graviter dicta* provide V. with a chapter title and theme (6.4.praef.; 6.4.ext.1).

**quis populo Romano irasci sapienter potest:** Although V.'s political views were conservative, influenced by optimate historiography (Weileder 1998: 178-9), he respects the rights of the people to elect (7.5.praef.). In fact, rejection by the people

made some better (7.5.2; 7.5.3). By describing the popular rejection of M. Porcius Cato as *proxima dementiae* (7.5.6), V. comes close to an outright contradiction of his line here.

Given that Tiberius' reign had seen the effective removal of popular franchise, as elections for the magistrates were transferred to the senate (Tac. *Ann.* 1.15.1), and the *destinatio* process of the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* continued (at least to AD 23; *Tabula Hebana*). V.'s praise of popular election is interesting. No disagreement with the new imperial system should be inferred.

### 9.3.3

The source of this *exemplum* is probably Livy (9.46.12: *tantumque Flavi comitia indignitatis habuerunt ut plerique nobilium anulos aureos et phaleras deponerent*), although this is a matter not without debate (see Oakley 2005: 600 n. 1). Münzer (1897: 227) believed that V. and Pliny (*HN* 33.17-20) drew on L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi independently of Livy. He based this claim on the fact that both V. and Pliny used *abiecere* of the nobles throwing off their gold rings, while Livy did not.

**Itaque ne illi ... splendore protectum sit:** V. suggests that the high status of those who insulted Flavius protected them (at the time), but that they should now not be approved of. V.'s support for popular elections again is notable, at a time when the electoral assemblies had been reduced only to a rubber stamp.

**Cn. Flavius humillimae:** Sources for his career (along with discussion) are helpfully collected by Oakley 2005: 600-608. Gnaeus Flavius (*BNP* 5.457), the son of the freedman Annus, was by profession a scribe until his aedileship in 304; there is some discrepancy over which offices he held and when; Licinius Macer (Livy 9.46.3), Pliny (*HN* 33.17) and Pomponius (*Dig.* 1.2.2.7) record that he was also tribune of the plebs. This must have been in an earlier year if the tradition is not simply invented (see Oakley 2005: 608, 619). Livy and Piso display an essentially conservative, critical tone in relation to Flavius' career derived from their anti-plebeian sources (Oakley

2005: 606). V.'s designation of Flavius (**humillimae**) is paralleled in Livy's frequent use of the adjective and its cognates throughout 9.46 (it appears 4 times in this section) to describe not only Flavius, but also the *forensis factio*, e.g. 9.46.4, 11.

**praetoram adeptus erat:** Cf. Pliny *HN* 33.17: *tantam gratiam plebei adeptus est ... ut aedilis curulis crearetur*. V.'s praetorship must be a confusion against the clear testimony of Piso (Aul. Gell. 7.9.1) and Livy (9.46.1).

**anulos aureos ... detractas abiecerunt:** V. adapts Livy 9.46.12, adding **sibimet ipsis** and **equis ... detractis** to clarify the meaning and heightening the intensity of the action by substituting the indicative **abiecerunt** for Livy's *deponerent* (cf. Plin. *HN* 33.17) – the rings were not 'thrown away', but discarded temporarily. Although in V.'s day the gold ring was above all an emblem of the equestrian order, during the middle Republic such rings were worn by both senators and *equites* as a mark of their social status (Oakley 2005: 636-9). Bosses (*phalerae*) of silver or gold were worn by horses of the elite and may at this time have been a privilege restricted to those with a public horse. It was a regular feature of Roman mourning rituals that normal dress and accoutrements were laid aside (Scheid 1984: 117-139); here the changes are made as a political statement (cf. Livy 43.16.14).

**doloris impotentiam tantum non luctu professo testati:** V. has taken what both Livy and Pliny characterise as the nobles' *indignatio* and turned it into an *exemplum* of *ira*. The vice here manifests a fundamental loss of control (*impotentia*), a notion basic to the Greco-Roman concept that anger needed regulation; the use of *dolor* shows how the basic definition of anger of the preface is applied in this case. V. uses *doloris impotens* elsewhere (4.6.2) of private grief, but here **tantum non luctu professo** is V.'s way of intimating that the *nobiles'* action was akin to a declaration of *luctus publicus*, as would occur after a national disaster.

#### 9.3.4

The story of Manlius Torquatus' *severitas* in putting to death his own son for disobeying consular orders, by fighting in single combat against Geminus Maecius, is well attested, and widely treated as an *exemplum* (e.g. Livy at 8.7.17, 22); see Langlands 2008: *passim*, for discussion of V.'s treatment of Torquatus as an exemplar of *severitas*. The principal account is that of Livy (8.7); cf. Cic. *Sulla* 32, *Fin.* 1.23; Sall. *Cat.* 52.30-1; Dion. Hal. 8.79.2; Verg. *Aen.* 6.824-5; Zon. 7.26.3-5; Dio fr. 35.2.

**Talis irae motus ... duces eius modi: irae** retrospectively confirms the classification of the previous *exemplum*, which does not contain the keyword. V. uses the contrasting sizes of the groups being moved to anger as an opening rhetorical articulation of the *exemplum*, highlighting initially, for the reader, the group to excoriate for the vice. In the previous two *exempla* it had been the anger of a single man (C. Figulus; 9.3.2) or of a few (the *nobiles*; 9.3.3) against the Roman people, while here (and in the examples presented in the next *exemplum*), it is a group – the people in its military manifestation as the army – against a leader or commander (the youths of Rome against Manlius Torquatus; and at 9.3.5, the cavalry against Fabius, and an army against its commander, Appius). *Duces* brings out the military context particularly appropriate to 9.3.4-5.

**Manlio Torquato ... in urbem referenti:** Titus Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus (*BNP* 8.246-7; cf. also Val. Max. 2.7.6, 6.9.1) was dictator and consul three times; it was during his third consulship (340) that he celebrated his victory over the Latins and Campanians at the battle of Veseris (Livy 8.11.11-4; Diod. 16.90.2). V. celebrates him as a *severissimus custos rerum bellicarum* in his chapter on military discipline (2.7.6) and as an *amplissimus vir* in the chapter on changes in character or fortune (6.9.1); at 5.4.3 V. praises him for the *pietas* shown towards his own harsh father, which provides an interesting parallel for the father-son dynamic of the current *exemplum* (cf. 5.8.3). He is mentioned also at 1.7.3; 3.2.6a; 9.3.5.

**cum seniores omnes ... nemo obviam processit:** V.'s formulation may be based on Livy (8.12.1: *cui venienti seniores tantum obviam exisse constat, iuventutem et tunc et omni*

*vita deinde aversatam eum exsecratumque*), but there is little verbal copying. Livy's *constat* suggests a common tradition; V. has probably read Livy, but treats the incident very differently. The responses to Torquatus' victory are divided by age: the *seniores* are those too old to have been enlisted for the campaign, the *iuniores* those who had been conscripted. In V.'s eyes they also possibly provide comment on the decline in morality between generations, and intergenerational conflict, cf. 9.1.3-6 with comment there. In contrast to Livy, V. concentrates only on the immediate manifestation of the anger of the *iuniores*, not the long-term detestation of Torquatus that might better be categorised as *odium*.

**quod filium adolescentem ... nimis aspere puniti:** Oakley (1998: 439) comments that the self-sacrifice of magistrates who, in killing or punishing their own children, put their personal feelings second to duty was as much a part of Roman national myth as the *pietas* of sons towards their fathers; cf. the example of A. Postumius Tubertus (2.7.6; Livy 4.29.5-6; Diod. 12.64.3; Gell. 17.21.17). One of the motives Livy attributes to Torquatus the son's single-handed combat is *ira* (8.7.8); V.'s intention, however, is to foreground the anger of the young in response to the son's treatment at the hands of his father. V.'s **imperium** recalls Livy's *Manliana imperia* (8.7.22), along with the multiple uses throughout that section of the narrative (8.7.8: *imperii patrii*; 8.7.15: *imperium consulare*; 8.7.19: *consulum imperia*); cf. also Livy 4.29.6.

**nimis aspere puniti:** V.'s explanation highlights for the reader the (perceived) wrong that was felt, justifying the anger. 2.7.6 shows that V. himself did not consider the punishment harsh or undeserved.

**securi percusserat:** V.'s commemoration (cf. 2.7.6) of the magisterial axe, emblematic of the *imperium* conferred on Torquatus, ensures that the reader recalls the 'legal' nature of the act.

**nec factum eorum ... adfectus dividere valuit:** Cf. 9.3.praef. on the effects of anger. The concluding remarks reveal V.'s essential support for the father's actions, which

is consistent with his attitude in the rest of his work (see the comments of Langlands 2008: 172), while acknowledging the extreme severity of the punishment.

### 9.3.5

V.'s abbreviation of Livy's account (2.43.5-10), which is his source, is problematic. He misunderstands the sentence that is key to this *exemplum* (2.43.7: *ita instruxisset aciem ut solo equitatu emisso exercitum hostium funderet, insequi fusos pedes noluit*); cf. also Dion. Hal. 9.3-4.2; Zon. 7.17.7.

**Eademque:** This links the *exemplum* with the previous one; see note there.

**equitatum:** To make V. a better reader of Livy than his principal MSS and original text suggested, inferior manuscripts offer *peditatum*. V. however misunderstands Livy, attributing to the cavalry their role in his own day and forgetting their social status and political allegiances in the 5th century (Shackleton Bailey 2000: 324 n. 5).

**Fabio consule:** This second consulship of Caeso Fabius Vibulanus (*RE* VI 1873ff.) dates to 481; he held the consulship also in 484 and 479 (*MRR* 1.24).

**ad hostium copias persequendas missum:** Fabius' enemy, unspecified in V., was the Veientes (Dion. Hal. 9.2), not the Aequi (*pace* Livy 2.43.5; see Ogilvie 1965: 350-1).

**legis agrariae:** Fabius opposed the attempts by a tribune of the plebs, probably Spurius Icilius, to carry an agrarian law (Livy 2.43.3; Stephenson 1891: 26-30).

**illa vero etiam:** V. introduces a second example of a leader subjected to the anger of his men, probably inspired by Livy's direct comparison of the two (2.59.1-2), but ignores his shaping of the episode.

**Appio duci:** Appius Claudius held the consulship in 471, during which the events related in this *exemplum* occurred, and again in 451 (*MRR* 1.30; Vasaly 1987: 209-212).

**cuius pater ... acerrime impugnaverat:** That is, Appius Claudius Regillensis cos. 495 (see 9.3.6). For his support of the senate, and anti-plebeian stance, cf. e.g. Liv. 2.29.9, 2.56.5; Dion. Hal. 9.42.3; Vasaly 1987: 205-9.

**pro senatus amplitudine:** V. uses language of his own day; cf. 1.8.1, 2.7.15; 4.1.4; 9.5.1 (see Wardle 1998: 247).

**infensum exercitum ... dare coegit:** V.'s abbreviated notice (cf. Liv. 2.59.2-3) conceals the last-minute actions by the troops to avert capture of their camp, making the consequences of their anger appear greater cf. Dion. Hal. 9.50.3-7; Flor. 1.17.2; App. *Ital.* 7; Zon. 7.17.

**quotiens victoriae victrix:** V.'s alliterative 'victorious over victory' is sharper than Livy's '*non enim vincere tantum noluit ... sed vinci voluit*' (2.59.2).

**congratulationem eius ... reddidit:** The conclusion again links this *exemplum* to the previous one. The anaphoristic isocola, arranged climactically, each contain one of the three separate examples, with the effects of anger highlighted by the gerundives. Dion Hal. (9.50.5) records that the consequence of the infantry's flight was the withdrawal of Appius' forces from Volscian territory.

### 9.3.6

V.'s source for this *exemplum* from 495 is Livy 2.27.1-7 as demonstrated by the clear verbal echoes of the key elements, but he recasts the whole significantly, eliminating the detailed prefatory explanations of the people's hostility to the consuls to foreground their action; see esp. 2.27.5-6: *Certamen consulibus inciderat, uter dedicaret Mercuri aedem. Senatus a se rem ad populum reiecit: utri eorum dedicatio iussu populi data esset, eum praeesse annonae, mercatorum collegium instituere, sollemnia pro pontifice iussit suscipere. Populus dedicationem aedis dat M. Laetorio, primi pili centurioni, quod facile appareret non tam ad honorem eius cui curatio altior fastigio suo data esset factum quam ad consulum ignominiam.*

**Quam violenter:** Violence is a characteristic result of *ira*, see 9.3.praef: *violentus*.

**in pectore universi populi Romani:** V., continuing with *exempla* dealing with the Roman people (cf. 9.3.4: *populum universum*; 9.3.5 *universum populi Romani*), treats them here as the 'body politic' ascribing to them a metaphoric chest, the commonly

held location of anger (see 9.3.praef.); cf. also e.g. Livy: *sed plebi creverant animi* (2.27.7).

**suffragiis eius ... praeteritis consulibus:** Livy (2.27.5-6) records that the vote was given to the people by the senate because of the dispute amongst the consuls. The appointees, technically, would have been *duoviri aedi dedicandae*, as dedication required the possession of *imperium*.

**dedicatio aedis Mercurii:** The temple to Mercury (*LTUR* III.245-7) was consecrated on the Ides of May (Livy 2.21.7; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5.669) in 495. It stood on the Aventine Hill opposite the Circus Maximus.

**M. Laetorio primi pili centurioni:** The MSS preserve '*Pletorio*'; Briscoe has retained Perizonius' emendation based on the Livian passage. Little else is known of Marcus Laetorius; see *RE* XII.449-450; Richard 1982: 501-9. Ogilvie (1965: 303-4) believes Laetorius and his dedication of the temple to be an invention of later annalists, a retrojection of the later Laetorius who restored the temple around 300. A chief centurion (**primi pili centurioni**) would have equestrian rank in V.'s day; in the 5<sup>th</sup> c. B.C., however, a *primus pilus* was the highest ranking member of the people (Dobson 1974: 392-434).

**Appio quod obstitisset ... succurreretur:** Appius Claudius Regillensis, cos. 495, took a hard line in recovering debt, leading to the slavery of many individuals (Livy 2.27.1).

**Servilio ... languido patrocinio protexisset:** Publius Servilius Priscus Structus, the other consul of 495 (*MRR* 1.13) had promised the plebeians aid and was appealed to, but delayed and proved ineffective against Appius and the senate (Livy 2.27.2-3); see Vasaly 1987: 206.

**negas efficacem esse ... imperio praelatus est:** V.'s question reveals his indignation that a soldier could be preferred over a consul; his juxtaposition of **miles summo imperio** may draw on Livy's *consul civibus suis, imperator militibus* (2.27.2) and implicitly makes the point relating to social status that is explicit in Livy (2.27.6-7).

His main point is to emphasise the efficacy of anger. For *summum imperium* as V.'s designation of the consulship, cf. 1.1.2; 2.2.4; 5.8.1; 6.2.8; 6.2.10; 6.9.11; 8.15.8; 9.7.mil.1. It is used once of the dictatorship, of Camillus (4.1.2).

### 9.3.7

**Quae quidem non ... etiam gessit impotenter:** Anger is associated with *impotentia*; a vice that V. also discusses in his work (see 9.5); here he makes the point that anger was the cause of negligible command; for anger expressed *impotenter*, cf. e.g. Liv. 29.9.9, 31.24.18; Val. Max. 9.3.3; 9.3.8. Although the plural *imperia* is technically correct relating to the consuls, V.'s rhetoric has overwhelmed the logic in some respects, as Laetorius was given an *imperium* for his task (cf. Oakley 1998: 439-40). Here the core of V.'s disgust is that anger caused a holder of *imperium* to exercise it badly. In the previous *exemplum*, by contrast, those who suffered under holders of *imperium* were led by anger to reject the highest *imperium* (that they should have obeyed).

**Q. Metellus:** Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (BNP 2.879; Evans 1986: 99-103) was consul in 143 and proconsul in 142. Metellus is a frequent exemplar in V.; for his *severitas* in military discipline (2.7.10), *moderatio* (4.1.12), *clementia* (5.1.5); for the *felicitas* he enjoyed in life (7.1.1), for his military stratagems (7.4.5); for overcoming defeat in a consular election (7.5.4); and for an unsuccessful role as a witness (8.5.1).

**Q. Pompeium consulem inimicum:** Q. Pompeius (BNP 11.556), a *novus homo* who became consul in 141, was sent to Spain to replace Metellus. The failure of his sieges there, of Numantia and Termantia, he blamed on Metellus. He was later accused by Metellus, among others, of extortion, but was acquitted (8.5.1; Cic. *Font.* 23). That he was a noted *inimicus* of Metellus is clear (cf. Dio fr. 82). However the reasons for enmity before 141 are not so clear. See Gruen 1968: 34-7 for the hostility of the Metellan *factio* towards Pompeius.

**utramque Hispaniam ... paene <to>tam subegisset:** During his two years as consul and proconsul of Hispania Citerior he fought successfully against the Vaccaei and Numantines, without capturing Numantia itself (App. *Iber.* 76; see Simon 1962: 101-8); his victims are otherwise identified more loosely as Celtiberians (Livy *Per.* 53). It is not clear what Metellus' activities in Hispania Ulterior were to merit V.'s mention of 'both Spains'. V.'s language suggests that he is not using the provincial terminology of his own day, as from about 13 Roman Spain consisted of the provinces of Baetica, Lusitania, and Hispania Citerior (see *CAH* X: 451), but that of his (Republican?) source.

**omnes ... vetuit:** Metellus' actions, in regard to his troops, are not recorded elsewhere in the extant sources. Livy may have been V.'s source for this narrative, but what little is preserved in *Per.* 53 does not permit a firm verdict. V. means for each of these actions to be seen as deliberately negligent on the part of a responsible commander and governor, jeopardising military and food security so as to hamper his successor's efforts. Gruen (1968: 35 n. 60) calls the account 'obviously exaggerated and contradicted by Appian *Iber.* 76'.

**omnes qui modo militiam suam voluerunt finire dimisit:** As conscription was the norm under the Republic and service in Spain was notoriously unrewarding and difficult, and the pressures on Roman recruitment intense in the late 140s, given that Metellus had brought out a large new force (see Brunt 1971: 429, 663), large numbers probably wanted discharge.

**commeatus petentibus ... dedit:** For standard practice in relation to furloughs, see Wesch-Klein 2000: 459-471. Metellus violates the norms by granting leaves of absence indiscriminately and without setting time-limits.

**horrea ... praebuit:** Military granaries were found in both rural and urban areas, see Salido Domínguez 2011: 133-142.

**arcus sagittasque Cretensium ... in annum abici iussit:** Cretan archers fought as mercenaries in Roman campaigns from 171 at least (cf. Livy 42.35), see Cheesman

1914: 9. V.'s mention of Cretan bow and arrows to be broken and discarded into the river may recall one of Metellus' descendants: Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus and his engagements in Crete (Vell. 2.34.1; cf. also Flor. 1.42.4).

**elephantis cibaria dari vetuit:** Elephants were used by Romans in their Spanish campaigns, especially for attacks on small hill-towns (Scullard 1974: 190-2). V.'s mentioning of elephants calls to mind the special association that the Metelli had with elephants, given his ancestor L. Metellus' capture of them in his victory over the Carthaginians at Panormus in 250 and use of them in his triumphal procession at Rome (Liv. *Per.* 19; Plin. *HN* 7.139). This association is presented most clearly on Republican coinage, see Crawford, *RRC* 1.287ff.

**<laedendi> cupiditati suae indulisit ... fortior victor amisit:** Desire (i.e. greed) makes no sense as Metellus' motivation. Shackleton Bailey has plausibly conjectured that the addition of either *nocendi* or *laedendi* is required (1996: 183). In his 2000 Loeb edition, citing parallel passages (Apul. *Apol.* 6.4 and crucially Val. Max. 9.3.praef. underlying V.'s opening definition), he has plausibly inserted '<laedendi>'; cf. also Quint. *Decl. Mai.* 9.18.3, *Inst.* 5.7.16, 30-1.

Metellus had earlier celebrated a triumph for his Macedonian victory (cf. Cic. *Fin.* 5.82; Liv. *Per.* 52; Val. Max. 7.1.1, 7.5.4; Eutrop. 4.14; Velleius' plural [1.11.6] is rhetorical). Florus (1.33.10), probably revealing Livy's line, holds that Metellus deserved (cf. V.'s **meritum**) a (second) triumph for the capture of Contrebia and the sparing of Nertobriga. However, he did not secure the vote of a triumph, indicating significant opposition in the senate and among the people, which we must presume arose from his negligent and malicious behaviour. This loss of a signal honour (cf. Weileder 1998: 289-91) is the *dolor* that Metellus incurred for his anger.

**hostium quam irae fortior victor:** V. concludes the *exemplum* with a rhetorical contrast that highlights that Metellus failed to control his anger, but also praises him for his military achievements.

### 9.3.8

**Sulla, dum huic ... et suum erogavit:** Sulla has already featured prominently as an exemplar of cruelties (see comment at 9.2.1). V. casts this *exemplum* to illustrate the most extreme consequence of anger; Sulla not only fails to control his anger but rather is a slave to his vice (**vitio obtemperat**); his anger results not only in the loss of others' blood (which V. has amply demonstrated), but also in his own death, the ultimate manifestation of the *tormentum* and *dolor* that anger inflicts (cf. 9.3.praef.).

**Puteolis:** Sulla died in retirement at one of his villas at Puteoli (cf. Plut. *Sull.* 37.5-6).

**ardens indignatione:** For fire as a frequent metaphor for anger, cf. Val. Max. 1.8.ext.4, 6.2.1, 8.11.ext.7; see Harris 2001: 68.

**Granius princeps eius coloniae:** Granius (BNP 5.989), was a *duumvir* (cf. Plut. *Sull.* 37.3: τὸν ἄρχοντα), and from one of the leading families of the region. V.'s comment on the colonial status of Puteoli may derive from a version that emphasises Sulla's recent settlement of veterans in the area and explain his particular expectation of financial support from the community as its *patronus*. Sulla had his servants strangle Granius (Plut. *Sull.* 37.3), a fact that V. ignores in order to focus on the anger of Sulla.

**pecuniam a decurionibus ad refectionem Capitolii promissam cunctantius daret:** Cf. the imprecise formulation in Plutarch (*Sull.* 37.3): ὀφείλων δημόσιον χρέος οὐκ ἀποδίδωσιν. Sulla had begun to rebuild the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the Capitoline triad, after it had been burnt down in the fire of 83. He died before its completion. Although he did not place excessive value on building schemes in general (Keaveney 1982: 190-1), because of its crucial role in the religious life of the Republic, Sulla was keen to raise money from across Italy, especially from the *coloniae* which were built around their own Capitolia, for a restored and improved Capitol. It was dedicated in 69 by Q. Lutatius Catulus (Plin. *HN* 7.138; Tac. *Hist.* 3.72). Sulla's anger may have been justified, even in V.'s eyes.

**animi concitatione nimia ... minis mixtum evomuit:** Cf. Plut. *Sull.* 37. 3: τῇ δὲ κραυγῇ καὶ τῷ σπαραγμῷ τὸ ἀπόστημα ῥήξας πλῆθος αἵματος ἐξέβαλεν.

Probably as a result of its sudden occurrence and the vivid descriptions that circulated, the cause of Sulla's death was debated: if the suggestion that Sulla committed suicide (Dio 52.17.4) is put on one side, the explanations proffered fall into two camps: (i) a fever (App. *BCiv.* 1.105: πυρετὸς ἐμπίπτει); or (ii) a flesh-devouring infection sometimes identified as phthiriasis (Plin. *HN* 7.138, 11.114, 26.138; Paus. 1.20.7; Plut. *Sull.* 36.2; Ael. fr. 53; *vir. ill.* 75.12). The specific circumstances of a 'rupture' brought about by anger (V. and Plut. *Sull.* 37.3) should probably be distinguished from the underlying medical condition. Modern explanations of the latter have favoured venereal disease (Carney 1961b: 64-79), liver-failure (Keaveney 1982: 211; Keaveney and Madden 1982: 94-5) and tuberculosis (Cilliers and Retief 2000: 33-44). V.'s abbreviated account gives the impression that Sulla died instantly, but Plutarch's account shows that he lingered on for several hours; V.'s more dramatic casting illustrates starkly the moral he is drawing. It is plausibly conjectured that the ancient descriptions of Sulla's death were cast so as to reflect the tyrannical nature of his life (e.g. by Carney 1961b: 64). His actions in death present him as a tyrannical leader and are antithetical to Tiberian moderation (cf. e.g. Philo, *Leg.* 303-4, where Tiberius is presented as not prone to anger; see also comments on 9.3.2). For anger being felt in the chest (**convulso pectore**), cf. 9.3.praef., 9.3.6 and 9.3.ext.4.

**nec senio iam ... annum:** Sulla died in 78. Appian (*BCiv.* 1.105) says he was sixty; V. offers slightly more precision, but neither the birthday nor date of death are known. Velleius' note that he held his first consulship (88) in his 49th year is also consistent with birth in 138. The age at which someone was classified as a *senex* in Roman society varied (see Parkin 2003: 15-26). Writing under an aged emperor, V. may have been cautious about calling a man of sixty 'old'; his earlier chapter on *senectus* sets a very high bar (8.13).

**alita miseriis rei publicae impotentia furens:** The *miseriae* that V. refers to may be the general sufferings of the civil war and Sullan era (as illustrated in 9.2.1 and

frequently in V.), but they may also refer more specifically to the disaster that befell the Capitol; V.'s rhetoric is typically vague. Sulla's lack of control – his tyrannical qualities – are again foregrounded by V.'s use of **impotentia**; **furens** is probably metaphorical, but madness is closely associated with anger, and often seen as an exacerbated form of it (e.g. Phld. *Ira*. 16; Lucr. 3.294-5; Cic. *Tusc.* 4.52; Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.62; Sen. *Ep.* 18.14). On *impotentia*, see 9.5.

**iracundia ... exstincta**: For *ira* and *iracundia* used with metaphors of fire, see Braund and Gilbert 2003: 281; Harris 2001: 68. V.'s use of **iracundia** would suggest more than mere stylistic variation, but rather a character disposition (see comment on 9.3.2). The rhetorical device of *dubitatio*, one of V.'s favourites (see Whitton 2011: 273 n. 39; Sinclair 1980: 114ff.), along with the polyptoton of Sulla's name (**Sullane ... Sullae**), makes for an elevated conclusion to the Roman *exempla*.

9.3.ext.praef.

**Neque ab ignotis exempla petere iuvat**: Something of the concern of the Roman historian to deal with famous figures and events seen from Cato's *Origines* (e.g. F2 *FRHist*) onwards emerges here, and fulfils V.'s larger purposes within the work, of recording *memorable* words and deeds (cf. 1.praef.); see Skidmore 1996: 86-7 for the frequent appearance of *clari viri* (here an equivalent), as well as the criterion of pleasure in V.'s choice of examples. V.'s moral purpose may be hinted at by his use of **iuvat** (cf. 4.1.2 for *iuvat* in a similar role). Either of *iuvo*'s two main senses (cf. Lewis and Short I: 'to help'; II: 'to please') could be intended; Skidmore (1996: 86; cf. Walker 2004: 321) understands the latter, but given the weight that *exempla* of *virii clari* give, the former sense is also intelligible and appropriate; Shackleton Bailey's translation obscures this difficulty.

**maximis viris exprobrare vitia sua verecundiae est**: V. highlights a key word in his emotional vocabulary: *verecundia*; it is used 31 times across the work. *Verecundia* implies evaluation by another; see Langlands 2006: 19 n. 88, and 130-2 in relation to

V. more generally; see also Kaster 2005: *passim* for a full treatment of this term. The emotion often entails a hierarchical point of view, hence V.'s use of **maximis viris** (Kaster 2005: 26); cf. also 1.8.6; 2.5.5; 4.3.13; 6.2.10.

**dum praeclara ... conscientia non desit:** With Shackleton Bailey (1996: 183), Madvig's suggestion of *narranti* instead of the manuscripts' *narrandi* makes good sense, but destroys the parallelism of the two clauses. V. is eager to acknowledge his self-restraint (i.e. knowing his place in the social hierarchy) in fulfilling the necessary purpose of his work; see Kaster 2005: 26.

### 9.3.ext.1

Based on verbal similarities preserved in his epitomator Justin (15.3.7: *adeo aegre Alexander tulit ut eum obici ferocissimo leoni iuberet*), it is reasonable to assume that Trogus is V.'s source (Yardley 2003: 106; Wardle 2005a: 148-9; 159-160); cf. Sen. *Ira* 3.17.2: *nam Lysimachum aequae familiarem sibi leoni obiecit*; 3.23.1: *leoni obiectus*, Clem. 1.25.1: *leoni Lysimachum obicias*.

**Alexandrum iracundia:** Wardle (2005a: 161): 'Valerius' Alexander is the most prominent Greek among his exemplars and the characters with whom they interacted (see Weileder 1998: 122-9). While Alexander exhibits a mixture of virtues and vices, in Valerius' presentation the latter are demonstrably predominant'; cf. also Haegemans and Stoppie 2004: 145-172; Spencer 2010: 175-191; Bellemore 2015: 299-316). He features in 23 *exempla*, but is the exemplar in only eight of these (these figures are taken from Wardle 2005a: 141-161). He features three times in Book 9 (here, negatively; at 9.5.ext.1, negatively in a chapter on pride and outrageousness; and at 9.10.ext.2, positively, although not as the main exemplar). In his presentation of Alexander as an exemplar of anger, V. is likely to be following the (largely) hostile view of Alexander presented in Trogus (see Baynham 1998: 33); this characterisation is maintained in other later imperial sources (cf. e.g. Seneca's portrait of him in *De Ira*

3.17.1, 3.23.1). As Braund (2009: 368) notes, ‘for Seneca, Alexander was the epitome of the cruel ruler and his writings include numerous depictions of Alexander’s savagery’; cf. e.g. also Arr. *Anab.* 7.29.1; Curt. 4.2.5, 4.6.24, 5.34.2, 6.2.4, 6.5.19, 8.1.31, 9.3.18, 10.5.34; Liv. 9.18.5; Vell. 2.41.1; Sen. *Ep.* 113.29; Ael. *VH* 12.54. The tradition that Trogus and V. follow is heavily influenced by Stoic thought (see Harris 2001: 235-7; Atkinson 2009: 168-9).

**sua propemodum caelo deripuit:** Alexander’s divinity was a contested issue during his lifetime and afterwards; see e.g. Bosworth 1988: 278-90. Soon after his death stories circulated that he had ascended to heaven (*OGIS* 4.5; Diod. 18.56.2) and cults dedicated to his worship are attested from at least 270 (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1014). Alexander was a key figure in the development of ruler cult as one of the most striking religious phenomena of the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Fishwick 1987: 8-11). Writing under Tiberius, V. was a first-hand witness to the flourishing Roman manifestation of worship of the *Divi* Julius and Augustus (see e.g. 1.praef. and the Introduction). In the Roman context worship of the dead ruler as a god was predicated on the good reputation secured by that ruler during his lifetime for his *virtutes* and *opera* which then translated into a formal, posthumous declaration of his divinity by the senate, as V. explicitly states for Augustus (8.15.praef.). Against the Roman background and the reality of Alexander-worship V. can go no further than assert that notorious acts of anger *almost* robbed him of his divine position; cf. Wardle 2005a: 159-160.

**nam quid ... nisi:** Although Alexander stood accused of many other vices in the tradition, including *immodicae cupiditates* (Curt. Ruf. 5.1.36) and drunkenness, V. fastens on Alexander’s angry reaction to three friends whom he then saw as opponents. V. presents the three incidents in the order in which they appear in Curtius Rufus, which is the plausible chronological sequence, and not that in Justin (Wardle 2005a: 159).

**Lysimachus leoni obiectus:** Lysimachus, who was one of Alexander’s seven bodyguards (Arr. *Anab.* 6.28.4), clashed with Alexander over the killing of Clitus

(Curt. 8.1.46) and over his saving of Callisthenes (Just. 15.3.6-8). He survived Alexander to rule the western part of the empire; see Heckel 1992: 267-75.

V. focuses on the first known clash with Lysimachus: Curt. 8.1.14-17 relates, in the context of a hunt within the forest of Bazeira during the Sogdian campaign of 328, that Lysimachus, in attempting to protect Alexander from an extraordinarily large lion, was ordered by him to step aside and was later taunted for cowardice. He then mentions the alternate tradition, followed by V., of Alexander exposing Lysimachus to the lion, but dismisses it as unreliable. Trogus' account (Just. 15.3.7-10) places the incident within the context of Alexander's cruel punishment of Callisthenes after the Pages' conspiracy: Lysimachus gave poison to Callisthenes, because of the pity he felt towards his teacher at his treatment by Alexander; Alexander, vexed (*aegre tulit*) by Lysimachus' actions cast him to a ferocious lion. Trogus inherited the story from a Hellenistic source, possibly Duris of Samos (Heckel 1992: 268-71); cf. also Plin. *HN* 8.31.

**Clitus hasta traiectus:** V. presents a highly abbreviated account of the story of Alexander's killing, at a banquet in late summer 328, of Clitus (Heckel 1992: 34-7), the brother of his nurse Lanice/Hellanice, long-time friend and his chosen governor of Bactria. Clitus' mistake was drunkenly to criticise Alexander, who in a drunken fury ran him through with a javelin; cf. Just. 12.6.1-18; Curt. 8.1.19-2.13; Sen. *Ep.* 83.19, *Ira.* 3.17.1, *Q Nat.* 6.23.3; Plut. *Alex.* 50-2; Arr. *Anab.* 4.8.1-9.9; Carney 1981: 149-160.

**Callisthenes mori iussi:** Cf. 7.2.ext.11: *spiritu carere iussus*. The historian Callisthenes (*RE* X.1682-4) was tortured and executed in 327 on the grounds of alleged involvement in the Pages' conspiracy (Just. 12.7.2; Plut. *Alex.* 55.9). The tradition emphasises the torture and gruesome death inflicted by Alexander (Just. 15.3.3-5; Curt. 8.8.21; Plut. *Alex.* 55.9; Arr. *Anab.* 4.14.3), but V. eschews this in order to focus on *ira* rather than *crudelitas*. V. earlier (7.2.ext.11) cites Callisthenes as an *exemplum* of

someone who did not heed Aristotle's advice not to provoke Alexander and later regretted it.

**quibus tres maximas ... caedibus victas reddidit:** Alexander's victories are those over the Persians at Granicus, Issus, and Arbela. As Lysimachus was not killed by Alexander, either V.'s rhetoric has gotten the better of him or he has forgotten that Lysimachus survived Alexander (cf. 6.2.ext.3), or **caedibus** should read *casibus*. I follow Shackleton Bailey's emendation of the manuscripts' *quia* to **quibus** (1996: 183) and *victor* to **victas** (1981: 167; 1996: 183); *victus*, i.e. an Alexander overcome by anger, is also suitable, and would provide an even sharper rhetorical contrast, as well as a then ironic contrast with Alexander *invictus* (cf. 4.3.ext.4; Weileder 1998: 125). V.'s framing rhetorically casts a shadow over Alexander's greatest achievements whilst affirming their reality and significance. Despite mention of Alexander's victories, the overall tone of the *exemplum* is negative (Haegemans and Stoppie 2004: 156), as the adjective **iniustus** makes explicit.

### 9.3.ext.2

This is the first *exemplum* in the chapter to introduce *odium* as a vice in contrast to *ira*. V.'s source is not certain, as the kernel of the *exemplum* is not found elsewhere.

**adversus populum Romanum Hamilcaris odium:** As in the *exempla* illustrating *ira*, V. lays a heavy stress on the vice being committed against the Roman people as a whole; the switch to **odium** may be explained by the duration and/or severity of emotion (see the preface to the chapter). The Carthaginian Hamilcar Barca (*BNP* 5.1123), father of Hannibal and the head of the Barcid family, was a competent general and statesman, who successfully fought Rome in Sicily during the First Punic War (he also appears in V. at 6.6.2). Hamilcar devised and led the Carthaginian recovery-strategy after their loss of Sicily and Sardinia which involved conquest in Spain; see Hoyos 2003: 55-72. Carthage's defeat in the First Punic War and in particular Rome's treacherous abuse of its victory inspired Hamilcar's hatred

(cf. e.g. Polyb. 3.9.6: Ἀμίλκου θυμὸν, 12.2: δυσμενείας; Nep. *Ham.* 3.3, Livy. 21.1.4; Sil. *Pun.* 1.70-80). In Roman tradition, following Polyb. 3.9.6-9, the ‘wrath of Hamilcar’ or ‘wrath of the Barcids’ was held out as the principal cause of the Second Punic War (further references collected by Hoyos 2003: 248). Fabius Pictor, the earliest Roman historian, did not emphasise the idea of Hamilcar’s *odium* (cf. Polyb. 3.8.1-8); by the 1st century, however, it was prominent in Roman accounts making Hamilcar an exemplar of anger and hate in Roman eyes and readily available for V.’s purposes.

**quattuor enim puerilis aetatis filios intuens:** V.’s figure is likely to be wrong. Only three sons of Hamilcar are known by name: Hannibal, Hasdrubal, and Mago. Seibert (1993: 20) argues, based on V. and Cassiodorus (*Chron.* 524), that Hamilcar’s fourth son was the victim of a child-sacrifice that occurred during the Mercenaries’ War. Hoyos (2003: 223) rightly points out that V. states that Hamilcar was rearing (*alere*) the four boys, and attributes V.’s confusion to ‘a fuzzy awareness that Barca had more children than just three sons’ or to a textual corruption of ‘iii’ to ‘iiii’ or ‘iv’ from the preceding word *odium*.

**catulos leoninos in perniciem imperii nostri alere se praedicabat:** Given that the Roman general who celebrated a triumph for the final battle of the First Punic War (2.8.2), and with whom Hamilcar negotiated the end of hostilities was C. Lutatius Catulus, we should consider the possibility of an ironic pun developed at some stage in the Roman tradition: humiliated by surrendering to a ‘puppy’ (*catulus*), Hamilcar raised lion cubs (*leoninus catulus*) to secure his revenge. The choice of lion may derive simply from the African origin of Hamilcar or more broadly from its widespread role across the Mediterranean world as a symbol of ruling power, or owe something to the well-known oracular dream of Agariste (Hdt. 6.131; see Wardle 2006: 399). In epic poetry, lions are commonly referred to in similies depicting *ira* (Braund and Gilbert 2003: 256-268); for a lion/*ira* similie used of Mago, see Sil. *Pun.* 5.306-15.

**digna nutrimenta quae ... ut evenit, †converterunt†:** The text is corrupt. Briscoe obelised **converterunt**, and his conjecture – <se> *converterent* – is adopted by Shackleton Bailey. V.'s comment that Hamilcar's hatred of Rome resulted in the destruction of his own nation, refers in the first instance to the defeat of Carthage in the Second Punic War in which Hannibal, Hasdrubal, and Mago all played significant roles, but ultimately to the destruction of the city in 146. Hamilcar's exacerbated anger results in an extreme *dolor* not to him, but to his children and whole country.

### 9.3.ext.3

From the close verbal parallels it is reasonable to assume that Livy 21.1.4 is V.'s source: *Fama est etiam Hannibalem annorum ferme novem pueriliter blandientem patri Hamilcari ut duceretur in Hispaniam, cum perfecto Africo bello exercitum eo traiecturus sacrificaret, altaribus admotum tactis sacris iure iurando adactum se cum primum posset hostem fore populo Romano.*

**E quibus:** That is, one of the sons mentioned in the previous *exemplum*. In this way, V. connects these two Carthaginian *exempla*.

**Hannibal:** Hannibal is a frequent exemplar of vice within V.'s work, see 9.1.4; 9.1.ext.1; 9.2.1; 9.2.ext.2; 9.5.ext.3; 9.6.ext.2; 9.8.ext.1, along with further comment and citations at those passages. Accounts of Hannibal's swearing of an oath of enmity towards Rome begin with Polybius (3.11.3-12.1; cf. Nep. *Hann.* 2.3-6; Liv. 21.1.4, 35.19.3; Mart. 9.43.9; Sil. *Pun.* 1.99-122; Flor. 1.22.2; App. *Hann.* 3.10; *vir. ill.* 42.1; Oros. 4.14.3).

**mature adeo patria vestigia subsecutus est:** V.'s Roman *exempla* are replete with material on the actual and idealised relationship between fathers and sons (see Lucarelli 2007: 37-129). Normally, to follow one's father's example would be good, but here V. presents a perverted form of *pietas* and *obsequium* resulting from hatred.

**eo exercitum in Hispaniam traiecturo:** Hannibal's oath is performed within the context of Hamilcar's taking an army to Spain in 237 to secure a new power-base for Carthage (see Hoyos 2003: 44-54). For Barcid monarchical intentions seen through their Spanish coinage, see Fariselli 2006: 105-122.

**ob id sacrificante:** Probably to Baal Hammon or Shamim (Hoyos 2003: 246), rendered variously by the Greek and Roman accounts as Zeus (Polyb. 3.11.5) or Jupiter Optimus Maximus (Nep. *Hann.* 2.3). Hamilcar used the moment of securing favourable auspices for his undertaking to bind Hannibal to his plan.

**novem annorum:** This places Hannibal's birth in the second half of 247 (Hoyos 2008: 16).

**iuraret se, cum primum per aetatem potuisset, acerrimum hostem populi Romani futurum:** V. soups up Livy's version by the addition of **acerrimum** to present an implacable Hannibal. Whereas the plausible terms of the actual oath were more moderate (Polyb. 3.11.7: μηδέποτε Ῥωμαίοις εὐνοήσειν; cf. Nep. *Hann.* 2.4: *numquam me in amicitia cum Romanis fore*; Livy 35.19.3: *numquam amicum fore populi Romani*), this tradition introduces the active notion of being an enemy to Rome (cf. e.g. Liv. 21.1.4, App. *Hann.* 3.3). *Populus Romanus* continues the theme from the *ira exempla*. In his excerpting process V. jettisons Livy's *fama est*, words that were a firm indicator to the historian's readers of the tendentious nature of the tradition; for V. the story becomes fact.

**pertinacissimis precibus ... commilitium exprimeret:** Whereas Polybius (3.11.7; cf. Liv. 35.19.3; Nep. *Hann.* 2.4) has Hamilcar ask Hannibal to accompany him, V. locates the initiative and the persistence with Hannibal. He has created from Livy's *pueriliter blandientem ... duceretur*, which in effect denies Hannibal adult intention, a singularly determined warrior. V.'s emphasis on persistence links with his prefatory remarks (9.3.praef: *pertinacius*).

**idem:** V.'s introduces a second example of Hannibal's hatred of Rome; he presents Hannibal's viewpoint which highlights the mutuality and degree of the *odium* felt

between the two nations (**quanto inter se odio Carthago et Roma dissident**). This incident is not recorded by any other extant account, but it stands in the tradition of dramatic gestures to symbolise hostility (cf. Liv. 21.18).

**inflicto in terram ... pulveris esset redacta:** Two strands appear to combine in this: firstly, almost in typically oracular fashion, as in the case of Croesus of Lydia (Hdt. 1.53), Hannibal's words prove true, but not to his own advantage; and secondly, the extreme punishment that the Romans inflicted on Carthage in 146 (Oros. 4.23.6), levelling to the ground is ironically fulfilled.

#### 9.3.ext.4

V.'s has conflated the stories of two separate ancient Near Eastern women: the more famous Semiramis, semi-mythical queen of Assyria, and the lesser known Rhodogyne, warrior-queen of Persia; it is clearly the story of Rhodogyne that is more in view, however; cf. Aeschines Socraticus fr. 18 Dittmar (= *De Mulieribus* 8 Gera): Ροδογύνη, ἡ Περσῶν βασιλίσα ... μεγίστην ἐποίησε τὴν Περσῶν βασιλείαν. οὕτως γὰρ φησιν ἀνδρείαν αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ φοβερὰν γενέσθαι, ὥστε ποτὲ περὶ τὴν ἄσκησιν τῶν τριχῶν οὖσαν, ἀκούσασαν ἀποστάντα τινὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν, ἀφιέναι μὲν ἡμιτέλεστον τὴν πλοκὴν, μὴ πρότερον δὲ ἀναπλέξασθαι πρὶν καταλαβοῦτὴν πλοκὴν, μὴ πρότερον δὲ ἀναπλέξασθαι πρὶν καταλαβοῦσαν ὑποτάξαι τὰ προειρημένα ἔθνη. διὸ καὶ εἰκὼν αὐτῆς ἀνετέθη χρυσεῖα, τὰς μὲν ἡμισεῖς ἔχουσα τρίχας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀναπεπλεγμένας, τὰς δὲ ἡμισεῖς καθειμένας; Polyaeus (*Strat.* 8-26-7) relates the kernel of the story about Semiramis; Philostratus (*Imag.* 2.5) describes a statue of Rodogyne with hair half in disarray. The two women are occasionally either linked or confused in the sources (e.g. Dio Chrys. 64.2), see Gera 1997: 154; Ehlers 1966: 48-50. It is likely that Rhodogyne appeared in Aeschines' *Aspasia*, who in turn was influenced by Ctesias

(see Gera 1997: 151, 156 n. 20; Dittmar 1912: 44; Ehlers 1966: 50). Who V. is excerpting is unknown, but the likelihood is Trogus who himself made use of Ctesias.

Rodogyne, as presented in Aeschines and Philostratus, is a warrior queen who expanded the Persian kingdom. Attempts to identify her with any historical Persian women are at best inconclusive (Gera 1997: 156-8). Only Philostratus (*Imag.* 2.5.4) provides a link with V.'s theme in this chapter: Rhodogyne's hatred of men motivated her martial endeavours (see also, Gera 1997: 153-4); V.'s framing of the *exemplum*, however, gives no hint of any Amazon-like hatred of men.

**In puerili pectore ... aequè multum valuit:** V.'s uses Hannibal's boyhood as a contrast to Semiramis' womanhood as a transitional statement. *Odiùm* is presented as equal in both (**aequè multum valuit**). For the emotion's seat in the breast (*in ... pectore*), cf. 9.3.praef.; 9.3.6; 9.3.8. Although women could be associated with *ira*, *odium*, outside of the amatory context, is rare; see Harris 2003: 121-143; Harris 2001: 264-282.

**Samiramis, Assyriorum regina:** As mentioned above, V. has confused the identity of the woman. Semiramis (*BNP* 13.237), however, is one of the most enduring female figures from the ancient Near East. She is generally held to be based on the historical Assyrian queen Sammuamat, wife of Shamshi-Adad V (823-810), and the mother of Adadnirari III (809-782). She is particularly remembered for her extensive building projects; see Gera 1997: 65-83.

**nuntiatum esset Babylona defecisse:** Semiramis is associated with warfare in Babylonia (see Gera 1997: 65-83); Rhodogyne's military campaign, however, was against the Armenians, who, according to Philostratus (*Imag.* 2.5.1), had broken their treaty with the Persians.

**altera parte crinium ... potestatem suam redegit:** In the accounts of V., Philostratus, and Aeschines, Rhodogyne's haste in rushing to battle causes her to leave half of her hair unbraided, while in Polyaeus she is bathing and washing her hair, which she

leaves uncompleted. This feature of haste provides another reason for V. to include her tale among his foreign *exempla* (cf. 9.3.praef.: *procursu celerior illa*).

**quocirca statua eius ... celeritate praecipiti tetendit:** Again, Polyaeus' account differs from those presented by V. and Aeschines. In Polyaeus, Rhodogyne is commemorated in a royal seal with her hair tied up; Aeschines claims that a golden statue of her was dedicated; V., again confused on the location, places her statue in Babylon. Semiramis had statues commemorating her set up in Babylon and elsewhere (see e.g. Ctesias *FGrH* 668 F1 a-n; Lucian, *Syr. D.* 33, 39). Philostratus' account is narrated as an ecphrasis. Whether an actual painting did exist, or it is simply a literary trope, it is safe to assume that the story of Rhodogyne and her half-unbraided head of hair was subject to material, as well as literary, commemoration.

### **De Avaritia**

Greed – the materialist desire which often results in physical attempts to satisfy bodily and psychological urges through the acquisition of money, material goods, as well as power – is represented in Greek philosophical discourses (e.g. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1129a32-33, 1130a14-1130b5) by the term *πλεονεξία*, which is repeatedly held out as a vice subject to social disapproval.<sup>160</sup> Roman discourses on *avaritia* follow on from this Greek tradition and share many similarities with it.<sup>161</sup>

At least as far back as Sallust, Roman historiography placed *avaritia* as the first cause of Rome's moral decline. Sallust defined it simply as a desire for money (*pecuniae cupido*; *Cat.* 10.3), plausibly linking it with *ambitio* (*imperi cupido*).<sup>162</sup> For him, although

---

<sup>160</sup> My definition is an only slightly adapted version of the one found in Balot 2001: 1; see also pp. 3-4 for further discussion of the term.

<sup>161</sup> Balot 2001: 14-16.

<sup>162</sup> Sall. *Cat.* 10-12; *Iug.* 41-2; Earl 1961: 13-17. Although Sallust has been held to be inconsistent between *Cat.* 10.3 and 11.1 over the priority of *ambitio* or *avaritia*, it is likely that he means that the

avarice was not wholly absent from the earlier period of the republic (*Cat.* 9.1), it became serious after the destruction of Carthage in 146 (*Cat.* 10.1) and became endemic with Sulla's tyranny (*Cat.* 11.5); in his *Bellum Jugurthinum* (41.9) he argues that from 146 to the time of the Gracchi avarice *sine modo modestiaque invadere, polluere et vastare omnia*. Avarice (*Cat.* 11.3) rendered men's bodies and souls effeminate (*corpus animumque virilem effeminat*) and was boundless and insatiable (*semper infinita, insatiabilis est*).<sup>163</sup>

Livy (*praef.* 10-12) claims that it was the actual presence of riches that caused men's *avaritia*, dissenting from Sallust by rejecting his emphasis on *ambitio*, and in focusing instead exclusively on *avaritia*.<sup>164</sup> In taking this line, Livy puts the moral decline of Rome earlier than Sallust.

*Avaritia* was also connected in Roman political and rhetorical thought with the concept of tyranny.<sup>165</sup> Cicero, for example, considered *avaritia* a foul vice (*Leg.* 1.51), and the most dangerous vice associated with rulers (*Off.* 2.77). He defines it clearly in his *Tusculan Disputations* (4.26): *opinatio vehemens de pecunia, quasi valde expetenda sit, inhaerens et penitus insita*.

V. inherits and adapts many of these same ideas. He too situates Rome's moral decline in an evaluative framework in which *avaritia* played a role (outside of this

---

latter appeared first, but that the former was the first to grow to serious proportions as a consequence of the latter (Conley 1981: 121-125).

<sup>163</sup> Greek writers also linked the discourses of greed with those of masculinity and insatiability, see Balot 2001: 15.

<sup>164</sup> Ogilvie 1965: 23-4; see also Moles 1993: 141-168. It is particularly the love of money – that is, the desire of it – that leads to immorality; this idea was current also in early Christian thinking (e.g. 1 Tim. 6:10), in which greed was condemned as sin; see further, Newhauser 2000.

<sup>165</sup> Dunkle 1971: 12-20.

chapter see especially, for example, the preface to his chapter on *abstinentia* and *continentia* (4.3), the opposites of this *dirum vitium*). For V. greed is linked closely with desire (*cupido*; e.g. 9.4.praef.; 9.4.1); it was also present during the time of the Gracchi (9.4.3); and he alludes to its connection with tyranny (9.4.ext.1). V.'s timeframe is in keeping with Sallust's chronology mentioned above; all of his examples in this chapter are taken from after 146; but elsewhere he explicitly attributes *avaritia* to Pleminius in 205 (1.1.21) and has L. Scipio deny a charge of it in 195 (3.7.1d); the vice occurs outside of this chapter in relation to Cornelia (4.2.6), L. Aurelius Cotta in 114 (6.4.2), D. Brutus in 136 (6.4.ext.1), and Antiochus VII of Syria (9.1.ext.4).

It is perhaps surprising, then, given its key role in Roman thinking concerning moral decline, that V. affords the vice so little space within his catalogue of vices – this chapter is one of the shortest in Book 9; only *Error* (9.9) merits fewer *exempla*. Tiberius appears in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD sources as notoriously avaricious; in fact, Suetonius labels his seizure of others' wealth as *rapinae* (*Tib.* 49); the first example dates from AD 25, but Tacitus notes other examples (e.g. *Ann.* 4.20.1), especially the seizure of Sejanus' assets for the imperial fiscus (*Ann.* 6.2.1). One might argue that Tiberius was particularly vulnerable or sensitive to charges of *avaritia*, but this is a precarious basis for explaining its comparative brevity here. Also surprising is that he provides only one foreign example when the vice is specifically acknowledged to be a foreign immigrant to Rome's moral world and Livy's account frequently attributes it to the Carthaginians (e.g. 22.59.14, 29.6.17).<sup>166</sup> The moral lesson of this *exemplum* is clear, though, and easily applicable to Rome's imperial position: avarice causes rulers to become slaves (9.4.ext.1: *titulo rex insulae, animo pecuniae miserabile mancipium*).

---

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Livy *praef.* 11; Feldherr 1997: 269.

In the rhetorical conclusions to all three Roman *exempla*, V. is at pains to stress that it was their avarice that caused the various exemplars to act immorally. He arranges them in ascending order of atrocity from fiduciary finagling to posthumous physical violation of a friend: in the first *exemplum* (9.4.1), Crassus and Hortensius are immoral simply because they do not expose the fraud that they become complicit in, but in the third (9.4.3), Septimuleius actively ensures that he gains his desires by not only cutting off C. Gracchus' head, but also by filling it with molten lead in order for it to be heavier, so that his reward, paid in equal weight in gold, would be that much more substantial.

9.4.praef.

**Protrahatur etiam Avaritia:** The prominent position of **Avaritia** in the opening sentence of the chapter announces it as V.'s next theme; **etiam** could suggest a vice-list of sorts (see comment in the Introduction on 'vice-lists'). For the imagery of vices being dragged forth, or out, into plain sight, cf. 9.5.1; 9.6.praef.; this may evoke the 'pageantry element' of the *imagines* (see comment in the Introduction).

**latentium indagatrix lucrorum:** *Avaritia* is also personified in philosophical texts; **indagatrix**, the fem. of *indagator*, for one who 'hunts out or tracks down, a tracker, a searcher' (*OLD* s.v.) is applied to philosophy in searching out virtue; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.5.7; Apul. *Mun. praef.* 2; the idea is found also in pseudo-Aristotle's *De Mundo* 391a. The alliteration (**latentium ... lucrorum; fructu felix; cupiditate quaerendi**) contributes to the rhetorical weight of the preface.

**manifestae praedae avidissima vorago:** V.'s language recalls Cicero, *Verr.* 2.3.23: *immensa aliqua vorago est et gurges vitiorum turpitudinumque omnium*. The imagery evoked by **praedae** and **vorago** may also allude specifically to Ptolemy's intended fate in 9.4.ext.1. There is a deliberate contrast between **latentium** and **manifestae**.

**fructu felix:** More alliteration continues the rhetorical introduction, and continues the idea of a vice not bringing personal happiness (cf. 9.3.praef.); unlike in chapter 3,

however, V.'s *exempla* here do not exemplify this aspect – at best it is a dangerous inference.

**cupiditate quaerendi miserrima:** For links between desire (**cupiditate**) and *avaritia*, cf. e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 10.3; Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.152, 2.4.46, 2.4.60, 2.4.68; *Invent.* 1.95; *Tusc.* 4.25-6; *Par. Sto.* 6.42-4, 52; Liv. *praef.* 11-2; for Greek antecedents to this idea, see Balot 2001: *passim*.

#### 9.4.1

V.'s source for this *exemplum* is Cicero *Off.* 3.37: L. Minuci Basili, locupletis hominis, falsum testamentum quidam e Graecia Romam attulerunt. Quod quo facilius obtinerent, scripserunt heredes secum M. Crassum et Q. Hortensium, homines eiusdem aetatis potentissimos; qui cum illud falsum esse suspicarentur, sibi autem nullius essent conscii culpae, alieni facinoris munusculum non repudiaverunt. V. mostly varies Cicero's plurals to singular, but by omitting the *sibi ... culpae* clause he makes Crassus and Hortensius more complicit; his **quibus ... fuerat** addition makes them behave even more inappropriately by accepting an inheritance from someone they did not even know; in Cicero, Crassus and Hortensius only suspect fraud, but V. again contrast this with **evidens ... fraus**. In V., their vice is treated far more seriously. The activity alleged in the *exemplum* is a clear example of contravention of the *lex Cornelia de falsis*; see Crook 1987: 163-71. Ward (1977: 75-6) makes a strong case for dating the crime to 74, as well as giving a political motive for it, which V.'s moralising suppresses.

**locupleti L. Minucio Basilo:** L. Minucius Basilus. Little else is known of this Minucius, except that he had intended his nephew, M. Satrius, to inherit his estate (*Off.* 3.74; see Dyck 1996: 587-8; *BNP* 9.36-7). The suggestion that Minucius is likely to have died in Greece soon after the successive consulships of Crassus and Hortensius, in the years 70 and 69 respectively, is reasonable (Dyck 1996: 587). On his family see Regina 1996: 321-334.

**falsum testamentum ... tabulis heredes inseruisset:** The forging of wills was common in Rome, and charges of *falsum* were frequent, although difficult to prove, see Champlin 1991: 82-87 (who mentions this case in particular at p. 84). V.'s attempt to compress Cicero's account produces **quidam in Graecia subiecisset** for his *quidam e Graecia Romam attulerunt* (*Off.* 3.73); leaving the action of the *exemplum* in Greece conducted by a single individual.

**potentissimos civitatis nostrae viros, M. Crassum et Q. Hortensium:** Marcus Licinius Crassus (*BNP* 7.524-5), rose rapidly to the consulship in 70 after late entry to the senate (Ward 1977: 65-6) and subsequently to the censorship in 65. He amassed his great wealth mainly through abuse of the Sullan proscriptions (*Plut. Crass.* 2.4, 6.8; *Cic. Att.* 1.4.3; *Plin. HN* 33.134), property dealing, protection racketeering and through interest in tax-farming (Ward 1977: 71-4). Despite his prominence in the historical record, V. has Crassus only as a negative exemplar who is avaricious and ignores divine warnings, thus leading to military disaster (1.6.11; cf. 6.9.9).

Quintus Hortensius Hortalus (*BNP* 6.515-6), the celebrated orator and politician, rose to the consulship of 69; like Crassus he was a creature of Sulla's and had a late start to his political career. Famous as an aesthete, and often portrayed as one given to excess (e.g. watering his plants with wine; *Macrob. Sat.* 3.13.3), V. celebrates him primarily for his eloquence as an orator (8.10.2; cf. also 5.9.2, 8.3.3), but he also records him as the father of a worthless son (5.9.2), a daughter who inherited his oratorical talent (8.3.3), and of further disappointing male descendants (e.g. 3.5.4). Augustus and Tiberius had to provide financial assistance for his grandchildren (cf. *Tac. Ann.* 2.37.1, 38.4). By V.'s time, there was no need to spare the reputation of the Hortensii.

Both men hardly needed the inheritance; on their individual wealth, see Shatzman 1975: 344-6, 375-8; rather, as V. comments, they became complicit in fraud through their greed.

**quamquam evidens fraus erat:** V.'s language suggests that there may have been a trial at which the fraud was proved, but no consequences attached to Crassus and Hortensius.

**uterque pecuniae cupidus:** For the strong link with desire, cf. 9.3.praef.

**facinoris alieni munus non repudiavit:** Even if the aspect of fraud is ignored, Crassus and Hortensius' action in accepting an inheritance from one who was not an *amicus* went against the expectation of elite behaviour. Cicero, for example, criticised M. Antonius for being made the heir of those who were not his friends (*Phil.* 2.41), and Augustus' refusal of such inheritances was paradigmatic (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 66.4; see Wardle 2014: 431-3). His practice was continued early in Tiberius' reign (*Tac. Ann.* 2.48.2; Dio 58.16.2), even under Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 9.2; cf. 12.2). V.'s change of Cicero's diminutive *munusculum* constitutes his final exacerbation of the charge.

**quantam culpam quam leviter rettuli:** Presumably V. is excusing himself for not ramping up his rhetoric more.

**lumina curiae, ornamenta fori:** The Curia and the Forum are commonly linked in rhetorical statements, cf. e.g. Cic. *Dom.* 13.9-10; *Cat.* 3.20.7; *Red. Sen.* 6.9; *Sest.* 53.11; Val. Max. 8.5.3; for those who elsewhere V. designates as *lumina*, cf. 2.1.10; 3.8.7; for *ornamenta*, cf. e.g. 4.1.12; 4.3.3; at 5.9.2 Hortensius is an *ornamentum Romanae eloquentiae*.

**auctoritatibus suis texerunt:** Cicero (*Off.* 2.77) held that avarice was especially reprehensible in a state's leadership. V. uses the term *auctoritas* (and its cognates) usually in the sense of personal influence (cf. Rowe 2013: 4-6), and attributes it to Marcellus (1.1.8), Pompey (1.6.12; 5.7.ext.2; 6.2.4), and Fabius Maximus (2.2.4). At 3.5.4 it is used of Hortensius. V. was surely aware of the prominent claim by Augustus to *auctoritas* and, even if the construction placed upon that by a majority of scholars may now be questioned (see Rowe 2013: 1-15), its importance as an attribute of the emperor and of the elite remained (cf. the many uses in Velleius, e.g. 2.125.5).

#### 9.4.2

Hirtius' *Bellum Alexandrinum* provides the earliest version of this *exemplum* and he explicitly frames it as revealing *avaritia* (55.4): *quos Cassius interfici iubet exceptis eis qui se pecunia redemerunt. Nam palam HS LX cum Calpurnio paciscitur et cum Q. Sestio L. Qui si maxime nocentes sunt multati, tamen periculum vitae dolorque vulnerum pecuniae remissus crudelitatem cum avaritia certasse significabat*; see Hall 1996: 411-415. The *Periocha* of Livy (111) links a revolt by the provincials at Corduba to Cassius' avarice and cruelty: *propter Q. Cassi [pro]praetoris avaritiam crudelitatemque Cordubenses in Hispania cum duabus Varronianis legionibus a partibus*. The (failed) assassination attempt, made on Cassius in 48, would undoubtedly have featured as a part of the full narrative. Although V. takes material from the Caesarian corpus (e.g. 1.6.12), he is more likely to have based this *exemplum* on Livy as there are no verbal similarities with Hirtius' account.

**maiores vires ... exhibuit** indicates that in V.'s opinion Q. Cassius' greed was worse than that demonstrated by Crassus and Hortensius in the previous *exemplum*; they simply did not expose the corruption that brought them wealth, Cassius' greed led him to extort money from his would-be assassins. Their crime, attempting the death of a magistrate of the Roman people, was a violation of the *lex de maiestate*, and hence extremely serious, but Cassius' greed prevents the course of justice.

**Q. Cassio:** Quintus Cassius Longinus (*BNP* 2.1167) held a quaestorship under Pompey in Spain around the year 52 (*MRR* 3.52), was tribune of the plebs in 49, and from 49-47 was governor in Hispania Ulterior. He drowned by shipwreck, attempting to sail in the winter of 47 (*Bell. Alex.* 64.2-3; Dio 42.16.2).

**Silium et Calpurnium, occidendi sui gratia cum pugionibus deprehensos:** In *Bell. Alex.* 52-55 a number of conspirators are named in the assassination plot against Cassius, including Minucius Silo and Calpurnius Salvianus; at *Bell. Alex.* 55.4 Hirtius specifically names Calpurnius and Q. Sestius in connection with bribes to prevent execution. V. may have confused the Minucius Silo mentioned earlier in his

production of the name Silius (see Klotz 1925: 234). The assassination attempt is also referred to at *Bell. Hisp.* 42.4 and Dio 42.15.

**quingagies sestertium ab illo, ab hoc sexagies pactus dimisit:** *Bell. Alex.* 55.4 gives the amounts at 60 000 sesterces for Calpurnius and 50 000 for Q. Sestius, one hundredth of V.'s figures, which are probably inflated.

**en quem dubites ... illis fuisse praebiturum:** Cf. 7.6.ext.3, 9.2.1, 9.12.3 for similar rhetorical final assertions.

### 9.4.3

Part of this *exemplum* demonstrates minor verbal similarities with Cicero, *De or.* 2.269: *ut noster Scaevola Septumuleio illi Anagnino, cui pro C. Gracchi capite erat aurum repensum*; however the verb *rependere* is commonly combined with *aurum*; cf. e.g. Vell. 2.6.5; V. Flacc. 1.661; Sen. *Suas.* 6.3.7; Plin. *HN* 7.126, 33.48; and also, given V.'s more extensive treatment, it is unlikely that this passage is his source for the bulk of the detail.

**Ceterum ... ante omnes:** Cf. e.g. 3.8.5; 5.2.ext.4. The climactic organisation of the *exempla* is made clear.

**L. Septimuleii:** Lucius Septimuleius (*RE* 2A 1621-2) came from Anagnia according to Cicero (*De or.* 2.269); Diodorus (34/5.29) names the culprit Lucius Vitellius.

**C. Gracchi:** Gaius Sempronius Gracchus (*BNP* 13.246-250), the populist leader and reformer, who was appointed as tribune of the plebs (123-122). His reforms, resented by the senate, resulted in political turmoil and violence. For his death in V. cf. 1.7.6; 4.7.2; 6.8.3; and also at 3.8.6; 5.3.2f; 8.10.1; 9.5.ext.4; 9.12.6. V.'s presentation of him is almost always negative.

**familiaris:** A number of sources mention L. Septimuleius' friendship with C. Gracchus (Diod. 34/5.29; Plin. *HN* 33.48; *vir. ill.* 65.6); cf. also Plutarch (*C. Gracch.* 17.3) who makes Septimuleius Opimius' friend.

**caput eius abscidere et per urbem pilo fixum ferre:** Plutarch (*C. Gracch.* 17.4) also mentions that Septimuleius carried Gracchus' head on a pike; for posthumous humiliation in head-hunting practices, see Voisin 1984: 241-293.

**quia Opimius consul auro id se repensurum edixerat:** Lucius Opimius (*BNP* 10.158), consul in 121 (*MRR* 1.520), secured the *senatus consultum ultimum* against C. Gracchus and his followers and proceeded by having C. Gracchus and up to 3000 of his supporters murdered (see e.g. Plut. *C. Gracch.* 18). His offer of reward in equal measure of gold for the head of C. Gracchus is widely reported (Plut. *C. Gracch.* 17.3; App. *BCiv.* 1.26; Diod. 34/5.29; Vell. 2.6.5; Plin. *HN* 33.48; Flor. 2.3.6; *vir. ill.* 65.6; Oros. 5.12.9). Opimius is also referred to by V. at 2.8.4; 2.8.7 with approbation, in line with his pro-Optimate stance.

**sunt qui tradant ... ponderosius esset, explesse:** V. includes an extreme tradition reported by some in order to emphasise the extremity of the action. For this tradition, cf. Plut. *C. Gracch.* 17.4 (who states the weight to be 17 pounds and two thirds); cf. Plin. *HN* 33.48; Diod. 34/5.29. Normally *sunt qui* functions as a distancing (or apparent distancing) device to excuse the author's own culpability in reporting (e.g. Livy 7.27.9; Suet. *Iul.* 86.1). Here, however, V. probably embraces it.

**fuerit ille seditiosus ... esurire non debuit:** Wardle 1998: 227: 'Gracchus is almost uniformly damned in V., except for his oratory (8.10.1)'; however, even in that same *exemplum*, V. refers to C. Gracchus as an impious revolutionary (*perturbare impie maluit*); see Weileder 1998: 178-9 for V.'s extreme conservative position in relation to the Gracchi and his constant characterisation of their activity as seditious and conspiratorial (cf. e.g. 4.7.2; 5.3.2f). V. is at pains to stress that he approves of C. Gracchus' death (**bono perierit exemplo**) and that the vice that he is here highlighting is Septimuleius' *avaritia* (**scelesta fames**); for the link of hunger/insatiability with *avaritia*, see comment on 9.4.praef. But V. also emphasises that Septimuleius was one of C. Gracchus' clients (**clientis**); it is possible to be labelled both *familiaris* and *cliens* (Williams 2012: 53-4). V.'s highly conservative

social position cannot tolerate clients not honouring patrons, which is a form of *ingratia*, seen in his chapter *De ingratis* (5.3); see also Lucarelli 2007: 236. Posthumous violation of a body, like denial of burial was condemned; in the tenth book of the *De vita sua* (F3 Smith), for example, Augustus clearly responded to allegations that he had refused burial (*Dig.* 48.24.1), claiming that he, himself, had behaved appropriately in respect of this prevailing sentiment.

9.4.ext.1

**Odium merita Septimuleii avaritia:** For **odium** as an appropriate response to vice, cf. 9.2.praef.

**Ptolomaei ... regis Cypriorum:** Ptolemy (*BNP* 12.148-9), the younger brother of Ptolemy XII Auletes and illegitimate son of Ptolemy IX Lathyros, was made king of Cyprus in 80 by the Alexandrians after the death of his father. However, his position was never confirmed by the senate and he was never formally *socius et amicus populi Romani*.

**risu prosequenda:** Cf. Vell. 2.45.4: *omnibus morum vitiis eam contumelian meritum*. Laughter is a wrong response to good examples (5.6.4), but is a suitable tool of ridicule for bad examples (cf. 9.12.ext.6).

**cum anxiis sordibus magnas opes corripuisset:** Appian (*BCiv.* 2.23) characterises Ptolemy as avaricious (*σμικρολογία*). Based on the Schol. Bob. on Cic. *Sest.* 57: *ferente autem rogationem Clodio publicatum fuerat eius regnum, quod diceretur ab eo piratas adiuvari*, it has been suggested that Ptolemy was involved in trafficking with pirates (Oost 1955: 100, 110 n. 21). Marcus Cato raised a mere 7 000 talents from Ptolemy's wealth (*Plut. Cat. Min.* 38); which sheds some doubts on the claims of Ptolemy's avarice (see Oost 1955: 101 and Hill 1940: 174 n. 3). It has been suggested instead that Ptolemy and his greed are a fiction created as counterfoils to Cato and his honesty (Oost 1955: 102); a tradition that V., although not mentioning Cato by name, could be perpetuating.

**propterque eas periturum se videret:** In 59 Publius Clodius Pulcher introduced a law confiscating Ptolemy's kingdom and treasury (Vell. 2.45.4; Liv. *Per.* 104; Flor. 1.44). Marcus Porcius Cato was sent to enact this law (see also Val. Max. 4.1.14; 4.3.2; 8.15.10). Some sources indicate that Clodius' motivation was revenge, as Ptolemy had offered a meagre ransom when he had been held by pirates (Str. 14.6.6; App. *BCiv.* 2.23; Dio 38.30; see also discussions by Oost 1955: 98-9; Badian 1965: 110-121).

**ideo omni pecunia ... praemium domum revexit:** V. alone records this element of the story, which quite rightly merits laughter (**risu prosequenda**). Plutarch (*Cat. Min.* 34-6) relates that Marcus Cato had sent a friend, Canidius, in advance, promising a future not without wealth and honour and the offer of a priesthood in Paphos also. Appian (*BCiv.* 2.23) has him actually dump his money in the sea and kill himself; Strabo (14.6.6) has Ptolemy decreed ungrateful (**ἀχάριστος**) to his Roman benefactors and commit suicide before his kingdom was seized; cf. also Fest. *Brev.* 13. Ptolemy chose suicide by poisoning (Dio 39.22; Flor. 1.44).

**procul dubio hic ... pecuniae miserabile mancipium:** V.'s sententious, antithetical statement is compatible with Stoic views; cf. e.g. Cic. *Par. Sto.* 6.42-3, and harks back to the *praef.*

### **De Superbia et Impotentia**

In contrast to Aristotle, who presents both the positive and negative aspects of pride (e.g. *Eth. Nic.* 1123a34–1125a35), the Roman conception of the characteristic was wholly negative – at least until some of the connotations of it were transformed during the time of Horace.<sup>167</sup> Baraz (2008: 365-397) argues that the political context informing Roman republican cultural values prevented *superbia* from gaining a positive aspect; in a system created to prevent excessive power being concentrated

---

<sup>167</sup> Cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.14-16; Baraz (2008: 392) contends that the new dispensation of one-man rule ushered in by Augustus, in direct contrast to Republican values, allowed for this positive redefinition of the term.

into the hands of a single individual of an elite body, pride was too volatile a passion.

That *superbia* ('lofty self-esteem, pride, disdain' *OLD* 1) was a negative disposition in Roman moral thought generally, and something to be done away with, is perhaps most clearly seen in Vergil's *Aeneid*.<sup>168</sup> In the underworld, Aeneas, and by implication all Romans, are commanded by the shade of his father Anchises, to crush the proud (*superbi*) in war: *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento/hae tibi erunt artes, pacique imponere morem,/parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (Verg. *Aen.* 6.851-53). The term for the Roman reader, as much as for V. (cf. 4.4.1; 5.6.1; 6.1.1), would have also evoked the last of the Etruscan kings, Tarquinius Superbus, who was portrayed as the archetypal tyrant in Roman historiography (Livy 1.49-60; Glinister 2006: 17-32). V.'s exemplars who are all rulers or leaders of some variety, exercise power in overreaching ways.<sup>169</sup> This link begs the question of what V.'s immediate audience would have made of this chapter in light of the fact of Tiberius's own rule; it is used, for example, as a descriptor of Tiberius and especially of Sejanus by Tacitus (cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 1.4.3, 4.1.3, 4.68.3; by contrast Suetonius has *adrogantia* attributed to Tiberius at 68.3 by Augustus himself).<sup>170</sup>

*Impotentia* ('lack of self-restraint, immoderate behaviour, violence, lawlessness' *OLD* 2), in turn, suggests the action or deed more than the disposition. The two terms are occasionally linked or used in conjunction, cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 5.24; Liv. 42.46.9; Sen. *Polyb.* 1.3. *Impotentia* for V. is the opposite of *moderatio* (4.1.praef.) and is attributed

---

<sup>168</sup> It is worth noting here that enough lexical difference exists between the Greek term *hubris* and the Latin *superbia* to treat them as distinct within moral categories; see discussion at Murphy 1997: 73-81; cf. Christenson 2002: 44-54.

<sup>169</sup> *Superbia* is another key vice of the rhetorical tyrant; see Dunkle 1971: 12-20; Dunkle 1967: 151-171.

<sup>170</sup> See also Murphy 1997: 79-80.

elsewhere to Sp. Cassius, who aimed at tyranny (6.3.1b), Sulla (6.4.4; 9.3.8), and Metellus (9.3.7).

Although it does not form part of the title, the term that V. employs most frequently within the chapter is *insolentia* and its cognates (5 uses as opposed to 3 for each of the others, and particularly so in the external *exempla*). This term is also related to a lack of moderation, and an arrogant disposition (*OLD* 3), but also connotes action as well (*OLD* 4). It appears widely throughout V. outside of this chapter, and specifically of C. Cassius (1.5.8), M. Fulvius Flaccus (2.8.3), Sulla (2.8.7), C. Memmius (8.1.absol.3), Marius and Cinna (9.12.5), and of Carthage (4.4.6; 5.1.ext.6).

#### 9.5.1

Having ended the Roman *exempla* of the previous chapter with L. Septimuleius and the death of C. Gracchus, it is fitting that V. begins the Roman *exempla* of this chapter with M. Fulvius Flaccus.

**in conspicuo:** A rare phrase. One Valerian usage is of drawing-up a battle line (5.1.8), the other two prominently at the start of chapters (8.15.praef. and here) and strongly connected with the word's purpose of putting virtue and vice clearly on display (see discussion of *imagines* in the Introduction). The particular resonance here may be of *imagines* being put out for viewing.

**M. Fulvius Flaccus consul:** Marcus Fulvius Flaccus (*BNP* 5.580-1) was elected to the consulship in 125. As a supporter of Tiberius Gracchus' reforms, he had been a member of the agrarian commission since 130; see also *MRR* 1.510; Hands 1976: 176-180; Hall 1977: 280-288; Reiter 1978: 125-144. He is presented somewhat negatively in Plutarch's account of C. Gracchus (e.g. *Plut. C. Gracch.* 10.3-4, 14.5), in an attempt to vindicate Gracchus (Reiter 1978: 125-144). He was elected as plebeian tribune in 122, and along with C. Gracchus and his other supporters, was put to death in the violence that ensued during L. Opimius' consulship in 121 (see e.g. *Vell.* 2.6.4-6; *Plut.*

C. Gracch. 14.5), hence his other appearance in V. (at 6.3.1c) as a *seditiosissimus civis*, justly slaughtered and posthumously humiliated; see also Stockton 1979: 94-6.

**M. Plautii Hypsaei collega:** Marcus Plautius Hypsaeus (*BNP* 11.357) was consul with Flaccus in 125 (*MRR* 1.510). He probably opposed the Gracchi, see Val. Max. 9.5.ext.4: *quem morem ... scripta patet*. V.'s mentioning of this non-entity here and at 9.6.ext.4, along with another Hypsaeus at 9.5.3, reveals V.'s careful construction of the chapter. Hypsaeus is attested as a cognomen of the Plautii over four generations, first only as an agnomen to Venno.

**cum perniciosissimas rei publicae ... civitatem mutare noluisent:** Flaccus attempted to implement proposals granting Roman citizenship to certain individual allies who desired it or *provocatio* (V.'s plural **leges** may be purely rhetorical, or it may indicate two separate legislative acts); cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.21, also 1.34; see discussions at Stockton 1979: 95-6, 165-6, 186; Badian 1970-1971: 391-3; Hands 1976: 176-180; Hall 1977: 280-288; Reiter 1978: 125-144.

**de civitate danda:** The offer of citizenship was one of the most contested issues in the Gracchan period; it would be wrong, however, to assume all non-Romans desired it (see Stockton 1979: 186-7). V. is generally very conservative on the extension of the franchise (cf. 3.1.2a; see also the comments of Weileder 1998: 179-80).

**de provocatione ad populum:** The *ius provocationis* offered the right of appeal against cruel and arbitrary use of magisterial powers; on the full extent of *provocatio*, see Lintott 1972: 226-267.

**aegre compulsus est ... responsum non dedit:** Constitutional issues are embedded here about the right of the magistrate to promote a bill before a popular assembly without consultation and support of the senate or his consular colleague; historical examples of the pre-Sullan period are rare, but significant, see Pina Polo 2011: *passim*, and at 115-6. The consul had to secure debate about the issues via one or more *contiones* before presenting the *rogatio* to the popular assembly. The senate was unable to interfere directly with the bill, and as their attempt to intimidate Flaccus

failed, probably after the popular debates but before the *rogatio* could be presented, they dispatched Flaccus to fight against the Gauls, as Appian (*BCiv.* 1.34) makes clear (Hall 1977: 285; but cf. Roman 1993: 57-66, for an identification of his foes as tribesmen of North Italy), which effectively put an end to his proposed legislation. For V., Flaccus' arrogance is his attitude towards the senate.

**tyrannici spiritus consul ... maiestate versatus est:** Reiter (1978: 126) believes that the fact that he was a consul while promulgating this bill would have been conceived as an especially egregious sin, however, as Pina Polo's recent study shows, it is more likely that it was his arrogance towards the senate that earns him V.'s opprobrium; consuls could legislate, but Fulvius Flaccus is the only known consul in the pre-Sullan period who attempted to legislate without senatorial approval (Pina Polo 2011: 120). Flaccus therefore was offending the *mos maiorum* rather than any actual *ius* (Hall 1977: 284). *Superbia* was especially associated in Roman rhetoric and political invective with tyranny (see Dunkle 1967: 151-171; Dunkle 1971: 12-20). V.'s use of **amplissimi ordinis** reflects language of his own time, particularly of Tiberius' reign (cf. 1.8.1; 9.3.5; Wardle 1998: 247); *tyrannus* and its cognates are very frequent in V. (36 instances), but this is the only example of its use in relation to a Roman other than Sulla (3.1.2). V. regularly attributes *maiestas* to the senate, reflecting a particular usage of the Tiberian period (see Wardle 1998: 247; cf. e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.89.3; Suet. *Tib.* 30); see also comment at 9.2.3.

### 9.5.2

The bare lines of this incident are found elsewhere in the Livian tradition (cf. Florus 2.5.8: *Ausus tamen obrogare legibus consul Philippus, sed adprehensum faucibus viator non ante dimisit quam sanguinis in os et oculos redundaret; vir. ill.* 66.9: *Philippo consuli legibus agrariis resistenti ita collum in comitio obtorsit, ut multus sanguis efflueret e naribus*), which suggests that Livy is V.'s likely source; V.'s account, however, preserves more context and detail than is found elsewhere.

V.'s second *exemplum*, like the previous, centres on a controversial programme of reform being pursued by an elected magistrate. Through a series of laws M. Livius Drusus sought to expand the senate by the inclusion of *equites*; have jury-panels selected from this expanded body; distribute public land; and, most controversially, offer citizenship to the Italians (sources for his reforms are collected at *MRR* 2.21-2). Although the modern scholarly consensus is that ultimately all Drusus' measures favoured the senate (i.e. that he was not a populist politician), in key strands of the ancient tradition he appears as a revolutionary radical, an idea that V. appears to take up. L. Marcius Philippus, who initially had supported him, turned against him, and as augur had his laws annulled (cf. *Cic. Leg.* 2.14, 31; *Dom.* 41; *De or.* 1.24, 2.220, 255, 3.2; *Diod.* 37.10.3; *Vell.* 2.13.2; *Ascon.* 69C; *Flor.* 2.5.8-9).

**Quae ... quoque:** V. links the *exemplum* to the previous one with reference back to the senate (**amplissimi ordinis**).

**M. ... Druso tribuno plebis:** Marcus Livius Drusus (*BNP* 7.743-4), was elected tribune of the plebs for the year 91 (cf. *Val. Max.* 3.1.2a; *MRR* 2.21-2). Although a conservative champion of the senate (see e.g. *Vell.* 2.13.2; Gruen 1968: 206-13), he was unable to fully escape being cast as a 'populist' reformer because of his concerns regarding agrarian issues, the Italians, and the criminal courts by later historians (Mankin 2011: 25). V. is seemingly unafraid to present a negative *exemplum* on the grandfather of Livia, and hence Tiberius' maternal great-grandfather; by contrast Velleius offers a more balanced evaluation (2.13).

**per summam contumeliam vexata est:** Cf. e.g. *Cic. De or.* 3.2.

**L. Philippum consulem:** Lucius Marcius Philippus (*BNP* 8.311-312) was consul in 91 (*MRR* 2.20), and censor in 86 (8.13.4), noted for his wit (*Cic. De or.* 2.220, *Off.* 1.108; *Hor. Ep.* 1.7.46-7), and as a staunch aristocrat (cf. 6.2.2; Gruen 1968: 210-11). On Philippus, see Van Ooteghem 1961: 113-33.

**quia interfari se contionantem ausus fuerat:** *Avocatio*, the disruption of a *contio*, seems to have been a noted problem (see Kondratieff 2009: 345-7). Philippus' actions

infringed on the duties and possibly the sacrosanctity of the tribune (cf. Cic. *Sest.* 79), hence motivating the act of *coercitio*; on *coercitio*, see Nippel 1995: 5-8; Lintott 1999: 97. Although a tribune could bring legislation before the senate, presumably Drusus was addressing the *concilium plebis* as the Gracchi had done (the senate was elsewhere, see below) and his address was part of the *contio* that preceded any voting gathering.

**in carcerem:** It is reasonable to assume that the *carcer* close to the rostra and *comitium* is meant, as the topographical information below suggests that Drusus' speech was being delivered into the *comitium* outside the *curia Hostilia*, very close to the *rostra*. Temporary detention only of the consul was intended, at the time unprecedented, but a precedent for Flavius in 60 (cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.1.8; and censors imprisoned in Livy 9.34.24); see Rivière 1994, esp. 582-9.

**obtorta gula:** Cf. Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.24.

**non per viatorem sed per clientem suum:** On the role of the *viator* in making arrests, carrying out magisterial *coercitio*, or here specifically *prensio*, see Lintott 1968: 101. By pointing out that Drusus used his *cliens* and not the *viator*, V. demonstrates that the allegiance of *apparitores* was tied to the state and not to individual magistrates (Purcell 1983: 139); cf. Florus, however, who claims that it was the *viator*.

**adeo violenter ... praecipitem egisse:** Florus and Auctor makes clear that Drusus and his client's actions were done in the context of Philippus' opposition to his agrarian legislation. Ironically, Philippus himself had applied a novel form of *coercitio* on L. Crassus also in 91 and was accused of an assault on the *auctoritas* of the senatorial order (Cic. *De or.* 3.4-5).

**cum senatus ad eum misisset ut in curiam venire:** On the right of summons (*vocatio*), see below.

**ipse ... ad me, venit:** The pre-Sullan rostra was in front of and opposite the Curia Hostilia (cf. e.g. Varro *Ling.* 5.115), on the southern side of the *comitium* (cf. e.g. Varro *Ling.* 5.115; *LTUR* IV.212-4).

**piget adicere quod sequitur ... tribuni verbis paruit:** According to Varro (Aul. Gell. 13.12.6) a tribune of the plebs could not summon anyone to attend him, whereas consuls and praetors could – hence the senate, through its magistrates, could rightly ask Drusus to come to them, but his summons to them was not just rude, but also illegal. The illegality and the effrontery of the junior magistrate to the body as a whole constitute the gravamen of this *exemplum*. V. neatly balances **tribunus** and **senatus, imperium** and the **tribuni verbis** and by his claim (**piget adicere**) leaves his readers in no doubt as to the appropriate response to Drusus' effrontery towards the senate's *auctoritas*.

### 9.5.3

**Cn. autem Pompeius quam insolenter:** Pompey's career posed problems for those writing under the early principate (see, e.g. Seager 2011: 303): in one respect Caesar's defeated foe and champion of the former order could be represented negatively (e.g. 1.6.12), in others his career, personal honours, and achievements were precedents for the principate and could be paraded appropriately (see e.g. Bloomer 1992: 214, 'Pompey's glory is not denied but ... eclipsed by the brighter imperial light'); Augustus honoured Pompey in the Forum Augustum and respected his theatre complex (Suet. *Aug.* 31.5). The problem of balance appears vividly at 5.3.5: Pompey's achievements are lauded, but he was on one occasion an *ingratus* (the incident recurs at 9.13.2, where the focus is not on Pompey); and he was responsible for the civil war (1.8.10). He appears only once in Book 9 as an exemplar of vice, and so gets off fairly lightly overall (see also the comments of Wardle 1998: 175-6). This *exemplum* presents two incidents, both of which occurred in 52, that demonstrate Pompey's notorious inconsistency in relation to the enforcement of his own laws (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.28.1). By comparison with Plutarch (*Pomp.* 55.6), V. has reversed the historical order of the incidents, placing the more egregious transgression second. A keynote of Velleius' presentation of Pompey is his love of power (*potentia*), his jealousy at sharing it, and

his loathing of seeing others as his equal (2.32.1; cf. Seager 2011: 298-300); his sole consulship of 52 marked his reconciliation with the optimates and was exercised for positive ends (2.47.3). For V. the key issue is the violation of *civilitas*, but he depoliticizes the incident by not noting Pompey's status as consul; he is horrified by the arrogant treatment of a friend, a man of Pompey's own social status and who as a defendant was asking for Pompey's assistance.

**qui balneo egressus:** Preprandial bathing was a common activity, see Fagan 1999: 22; it is likely that conducting informal business was a feature of the public baths (cf. e.g. Suet. *Vesp.* 21; Fagan 1999: 218). Bathing would normally have occurred around the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 9<sup>th</sup> hour, and dinner would begin around the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> (Schmeling 2011: 90-1).

**ante pedes suos prostratum ... iacentem reliquit:** Pompey's rejection of Hypsaeus' supplication is extreme; not only was Hypsaeus an *amicus*, but Pompey insulted him by walking away leaving him behind (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 55.6). Suppliants were not to be rejected (Naiden 2006: 129ff).

**Hypsaeum ambitus reum, et nobilem virum et sibi amicum:** P. Plautius Hypsaeus (*BNP* 11.357) had been a partisan of Pompey and served as his quaestor in the East (Ascon. 35C). Along with T. Annius Milo he stood unsuccessfully in the much delayed consular elections for 52, despite Pompey's earnest support, which resulted in Pompey's election as sole consul; he was then prosecuted in the same year under the newly enacted *lex Pompeia de ambitu* (see Gruen 1974: 236-8) and, partly due to his lack of Pompey's support, convicted; cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 55.6; App. *BCiv.* 2.24; Dio 40.53.1; Ascon. 33-56C; Seager 1979: 142-7. Multiple connections are attested for the Plautii to Pompeius; see Gruen 1974: 108 n. 65. He qualifies as a *nobilis* for V. because he had a consular ancestor (Gruen 1974: 107), and he himself had held a praetorship c. 55. The electoral campaign was notorious for its corruption (cf. Ascon. 30C; Dio 40.53.1-2)

**contumeliosa voce:** As in the previous *exemplum* it is the arrogant words which illustrate best the vice; cf. 9.11.praef.

**nihil enim eum ... suum moraretur respondit:** Pompey's insult and then indifference to Hypsaeus' plea must be read in light of his support of his father-in-law, Q. Metellus Scipio; he had supported both Hypsaeus and Scipio energetically in their bid for the consulship, but, after becoming the latter's son-in-law, treated them differently; and if Plutarch is right on the order of events, because Pompey had already saved his father-in-law, Hypsaeus might rightly have expected similar treatment.

**huius dicti conscius securo animo cenare potuit:** V. may be reporting Pompey's own words, which provide further evidence from his own lips of his heartless (and inconsistent) treatment of his friend. In the context of *impotentia*, V.'s *potuit* is surely ironic.

**ille vero etiam in foro:** With **vero** V. introduces a second, and closely connected, aspect to Pompey's insolence and also draws a contrast between the informality of the baths and the formality of the forum, stressed by his use of **etiam**. For both the forum and baths in one *exemplum* as sites of *insolentia*, see also 9.5.ext.4.

**non erubuit:** V.'s comment on Pompey's lack of shame in the face of the jury may be particularly pointed in light of the frequent portrayal of Pompey as one who blushed easily and excessively (Sall. *Hist.* 2.17McG, with McGushin 1992: 193, who traces this characteristic back to Varro; Münzer 1897: 283-4; Syme 1964: 206; cf. also Plin. *HN* 7.53, 37.14; Plut. *Pomp.* 2.1). Seneca (*Ep.* 11.4) relates that he had a sensitive countenance (*nihil erat mollius ore Pompei*) and that he would always blush in a *contio* (*numquam non coram pluribus rubuit, utique in contionibus*). On blushing's connection with shame at Rome, see Barton 1999: 212-234 and Kaster 2005: 54.

**P. Scipionem, socerum suum, legibus <ob>noxium quas ipse tulerat:** Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (cf. 9.1.8; *BNP* 2.880-1), whose daughter Cornelia had married Pompey most likely early in 52 (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 55.1-2; Ascon.

31.9C). He was prosecuted under Pompey's own *lex de ambitu*, probably as a deliberate target of Pompey's enemies, but was acquitted through Pompey's interference with the jury and then by being elected as co-consul with Pompey for the remaining months of 52 (MRR 2.234-5); he secured judicial immunity (Ascon. 30-31, 33-34, 43C, Plut. *Pomp.* 55; App. *BCiv.* 2.24; Dio 40.51.3, 40.53.1; Liv. *Per.* 107; Vell. 2.54.2; Gruen 1974: 344-6).

**in maxima quidem reorum illustrium ruina:** Cf. Dio 40.53.1: ἄλλοι τε οὖν ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ καὶ ἐάλωσαν, including Q. Pompeius Rufus and T. Munatius Plancus, albeit not for *ambitus*. Marshall (1985: 212-3) provides a useful list of known trials.

**muneris loco a iudicibus deprecere:** Cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 55.4: μεταπεμψάμενος οἴκαδε τοὺς ἐξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίους δικαστὰς ἐνέτυχε βοηθεῖν, ὁ δὲ κατήγορος ἀπέστη τῆς δίκης ἰδὼν τὸν Σκηπίωνα προπεμπόμενον ἐξ ἀγορᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν δικαστῶν; the details of which, Gruen calls dubious embellishment (1974: 345 n. 166). V.'s version adds the damning idea that the jurors' acquiescence was in the place of a wedding-gift.

**maritalis lecti blanditiis statum rei publicae temerando:** Pompey's actions are a reckless violation of the state, given the meaning of **temerando** (OLD 1); the verb, however can also mean 'to violate sexually' (OLD 2) or 'to violate (a marriage etc.)' (OLD 2b); this latter sense is suggested by V.'s linking of the blandishments of the marriage-bed with Pompey's political actions.

#### 9.5.4

**Taetrum ... convivium:** The opening word of the *exemplum* casts M. Antonius' actions in morally condemnatory language; most of its uses occur in Book 9.

**facto pariter ac dicto:** In line with his overall purpose, V.'s *exemplum* includes M. Antonius' offensive deed (having the head of a proscribed victim at the dinner table)

and words (in stating that the man was unknown to him); on the combination of words and deeds, see comment at 9.11.praef.

**M. Antonii:** Bloomer (1992: 225) claims a distinction between the treatment of M. Antonius and the other opponents of Augustus: the former does not receive 'outright condemnation' but 'is thoroughly maligned ... by being consistently presented as a murderer'. In fact Antonius' connection with various deaths, whether murders or lawful executions is mentioned only incidentally in relation to V.'s main point (cf. 4.7.; 4.7.6; 5.3.4; 9.13.3; 9.15.ext.2), as is his appearance in several *exempla* (1.1.19, 1.5.7, 1.7.7); V. celebrates his treatment of Brutus' corpse as the climactic *exemplum* of *humanitas* and *clementia* (5.1.11), and notes his sparing of a centurion loyal to Augustus (3.8.8). This *exemplum*, however, offers as straightforward a condemnation as could be imagined: Antonius was guilty of *superbia* and *impotentia* in both word and deed. An entire rhetoric of M. Antonius' transgressive (and tyrannical) dining habits developed post-Actium, see the discussion by Leigh 1996: 171-197; cf. also comment at 9.2.2 for discussion of M. Antonius' grandfather.

**nam cum ad eum triumvirum ... caput allatum esset:** V. regularly makes reference to the Triumvirs in the context of the proscriptions (cf. 5.7.3; 6.2.12; 6.7.2; 6.8.5; 7.3.9; 8.3.3; 9.11.5). Appian (*BCiv.* 4.29; cf. Dio 47.8.2-3) supplies the shameful background: in the context of the proscriptions of 43, Antonius' wife, Fulvia wanted the senator Caesetius Rufus' house, but he had refused to sell it, only to offer it to her later as a 'gift' once she had had him proscribed. The brevity of the exemplary process means that V. shifts the primary blame from Fulvia to Antonius, now guilty of Caesetius' proscription rather than a bemused 'victim'. Dio (47.8.2) claims that Antonius always viewed the heads, even while dining. On 'head-hunting', see Voisin 1984: 241-293.

**Caesetii Rufi senatoris:** Nothing else is known of him apart from his connection to this incident. A *Vicus Caeseti* has been identified in region XIII (*CIL* 6.975), which may derive its name from him, however, the location of the *domus* is unknown (*LTUR* II.74).

**aversantibus id ceteris ... 'notum non habui':** Seneca (*Ep.* 83.25) mentions Antonius identifying, at the dinner table, the hands and heads of those men whom he had proscribed; in V.'s *exemplum* Antonius is presented as even more outrageous, however, because he is unable to identify the victim; V. conceals the fact that this was because Antonius had not ordered the death and therefore could not identify the victim. The contrast between M. Antonius' intense inspection of the head (emphasised by the alliteration; **diu diligenterque consideravit**), and the rest of the company averting their eyes (**aversantibus id ceteris**), heightens the morally tense scenario.

**superba de senatore, impotens de occiso confessio:** Antonius' *superbia* is highlighted in regard to the status of the victim; his *impotentia* in relation to his proscription of an unknown. Alliteration (**superba ... senatore**) and anaphora (**de ... de**) provide a short, but pointed conclusion to the climactic *exemplum*.

#### 9.5.ext.1

This *exemplum* was probably taken from Pompeius Trogus, see Yardley and Heckel 1997: 310, 322.

**Satis multa de nostris: aliena nunc adiciantur:** As here, V. occasionally makes explicit his transition to foreign *exempla* within the first *exemplum*; cf. e.g. 1.5.ext.1; 2.10.ext.1; 4.6.ext.1; 5.3.ext.1; 6.5.ext.1; 8.11.ext.1; *alienus* is used in this way only five times (4.7.ext.1; 5.10.3; 6.9.ext.1; 8.14.xt.1; and here; see Lawrence 2006: 115). *Satis* reveals V. carefully rationing his *exempla* for best effect.

**Alexandri regis:** It is not unusual for V. to refer to Alexander as *rex*; cf. e.g. 1.7.ext.2; 3.3.ext.1; 3.8.ext.6; 7.3.ext.1; 8.11.ext.2. For him as an exemplar of vice, see 9.3.ext.1. For his *superbia* in Latin authors, cf. Cic. *Att.* 13.28.3 and Liv. 9.18.3. V.'s vocabulary (e.g. *virtus*, *rex*, *asciuit*, *cives* etc.) throughout the *exemplum* casts him as a specifically 'Roman' Alexander, or at least within a Roman interpretation of his deeds; the potential bibliography of Alexander's reception at Rome is large, for V., see Weileder

1998: 122-9; Haegemans and Stoppie 2004: 145-172; Wardle 2005a: 141-161; Spencer 2002; Spencer 2010: 175-191; Bellemore 2015: 299-316.

**virtus ac felicitas:** Plutarch (*Mor.* 326d-345b) wrote a two-book treatise on Alexander's fortune and virtue, debating the role played by each in his success. V.'s mention of these terms in conjunction with Alexander reveals an established *topos* in the moral tradition (Bowden 2013: 65). V., however, does not discuss *virtus* except in one of its parts (cf. 3.2.praef.) and *felicitas* not at all, although it had been very prominent under Augustus, see e.g. Thein 2009: 87-9. The pair are, however, the fundamental qualities of a successful general; for Alexander's *bellica virtus* see 5.1.ext.1a.

**tribus insolentiae evidentissimis gradibus exultavit:** The use of **gradibus** makes explicit the incremental rise in *insolentia* (Wardle 2005a: 155). For *exultare* and *insolentia* cf. e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 1.40, 2.25; *evidentissimis* underlines that the lines Alexander crossed were very clear to the Roman reader.

**fastidio enim Philippi:** V.'s choice of *fastidium* ascribes to Alexander the complete opposite of one of the most Roman of duties: the demonstration of *pietas* to one's father, see Worthington 2004: 218-21 and Wardle 2005b: 157. In the Roman context, the substitution of a divine for a human father was not without controversy, but paradigmatic: Augustus might show Alexander the way to achieve this – the human father, C. Octavius, was honoured by an arch and an *elogium* in the Forum Augustum (Wardle 2014: 87), although the adoptive nomenclature and filiation *divi filius* were what Augustus chose to proclaim. In fact Alexander did not publicly disavow Philip (Bosworth 1988: 283).

**Iovem Hammonem patrem ascivit:** V.'s version places the initiative for the 'adoption' with Alexander, rather than emphasising the divine acknowledgement of Alexander as son. In 331 Alexander made a lengthy detour to the desert oracle of Zeus Ammon at Siwah and was hailed as 'son of Ammon' by the officiating priest of the oracle (cf. Arr. *Anab.* 3.3-4; Diod. 17.49-51; Curt. 4.7.5-30; Justin 11.11.2-12; Strabo

17.1.43; Plut. *Alex.* 11, 17; Hamilton 1969: 68-70; most recently Ogden 2014: 9-14 and Bowden 2014: 43-53). His intention in visiting a shrine with strong mythological connections with his Argead ancestors, is plausibly attributed to a real belief in his divine parentage, see Bosworth 1977: 51-75; Anson 2003: 117-130; not for the legitimation of his seizure of the pharaonic throne; see Collins 2009: 179-205.

**taedio morum ... Persica adsumpsit:** By the end of 330 Alexander had adopted Persian dress, (cf. e.g. Arr. 4.7.4, 8.4, 9.9; Curt. 6.6.4, 10.5.33; Justin 12.3.8; Plut. *Alex.* 45.2; Diod. 17.77.5). In 327 attempted to persuade his Greek subjects to adopt the Persian custom of *proskynesis* (sources for this are collected and discussed by Bowden 2013: 55-77); cf. also Val. Max. 7.2.ext.11a. What V. represents as 'weariness' (*taedium*) had a serious purpose: the adoption of aspects of Persian dress and court protocol shortly after Darius' death was to counter the claims of the rebel Bessus (see Yardley and Heckel 1997: 203-5); the introduction of *proskynesis* was again primarily political – to secure the respect of his Persian subjects, particularly, the elite, Alexander had to require from his Greek followers the same form of greeting (Yardley and Heckel 1997: 232-3). From the Roman perspective abandoning one's national dress could amount to a rejection of identity; V. himself was hardly positive about Scipio's minor excursion into this field and Germanicus' behavior in AD 18 was a fresh example (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.59.1-2).

**spreto mortali habitu divinum aemulatus est:** At banquets nearing the end of his life, Alexander on occasion wore garments associated with various gods (e.g. Ammon, Hermes, Artemis and Heracles); cf. e.g. Ephippus *FGrH* 126 F5; Hamilton 1969: 120-1. Dressing as a god appears as a regular element of the *τροφή* of Hellenistic monarchs (e.g. Athen. 289c); such behaviour, even at parties, usually has negative connotations for authors of the early Empire (cf. Philo *Leg.* 78-113; Suet. *Aug.* 70.1, *Cal.* 52). What V. then embodies is the typical Roman rejection of divine *imitatio/assimilatio* during one's lifetime. V. has already indirectly criticised Alexander's request for worship during his life (7.2.ext.13); he does not reject

Alexander's claim to posthumous cult; given the basis for Augustus' claim to divinity seen in the *Res Gestae*, Alexander also deserved worship.

**nec fuit ei pudori filium civem hominem dissimulare:** Alexander's divine aspirations attracted many acidic, epigrammatic responses during his life (see Balsdon 1950: 383-4). V. has brought together three different elements, as Livy also had (9.18.2-4), perhaps in starker proximity through the asyndeton of *filium*, *civem*, and *hominem*.

9.5.ext.2

**Xerxes, cuius in nomine superbia et impotentia habitat:** A somewhat hackneyed theme in the Roman tradition. Xerxes' arrogance is a key aspect of his character as presented in Aeschylus (but see Papadimitropoulos 2008: 451-8 for the problem in pinning down what precisely his *hubris* was), Herodotus (e.g. 7.22-3, 35), and generally in Greek sources (see Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1989: 549-561), and in his Roman reception; cf. e.g. Sen. *Suas.* 2.22, 5.4-5; Sen. *Constant.* 4.2; *Ben.* 6.31.1-12; Curt. 3.10.8; Juv. 10.172-87. He is portrayed negatively, more generally, throughout V. (cf. 1.6.ext.1a; 2.10.ext.1; 3.2.ext.3; 9.1.ext.3; 9.13.ext.1).

**suo iure ... bellum:** Here **suo iure** seems to refer to Xerxes' supreme autocratic power – he could take decisions by himself; **indicturus bellum** is not a legal expression, indicating that right process was followed (Weileder 1998: 141).

**adhibitibus Asiae principibus:** Herodotus dates the Persian council to 485 (7.8). Pelling (2006: 109) rightly labels it 'a travesty of debate' from the democratic perspective of 5th c. Greeks: Xerxes had already decided to attack Greece and held the council merely so as to appear to adhere to Persian custom.

**ne viderer ... contraxi:** Herodotus' version of Xerxes' final words of his introductory speech has a similar structure to V., but is less tyrannical: ἵνα δὲ μὴ ἰδιοβουλέειν ὑμῖν δοκέω, τίθημι τὸ προήγημα ἐς μέσον, γνώμην κελεύων ὑμέων τὸν βουλόμενον

ἀποφαίνεσθαι. From what intermediate source V. has taken this *exemplum* is impossible to determine.

**mementote parendum ... suadendum:** These words are the kernel of Xerxes' *superbia*. His attitude towards his elite advisers is the antithesis of that of the good emperor to the senate. Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 29) proclaimed that he was the slave of the senate, and was disgusted by the lack of independence it displayed (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.65.3). Later emperors also struggled to get the senate to act as a true *consilium* (BGU 611). By comparison with Xerxes, even Tiberius was paradigmatic.

**arroganter, etiam si ... dictum an impudentius:** The contrast between Xerxes' arrogance in setting out for war with Greece and his subsequent shameful defeat is picked up in the declamatory tradition (Sen. *Suas.* 2.22, 5.4-5; Hardie 2007: 134-6). V.'s *dubitatio* is typical (see e.g. comment at 9.1.ext.1; cf. e.g. 9.3.1; 9.3.8; 9.5.ext.2; 9.6.ext.2; 9.11.1; 9.11.7) and rhetorically damns Xerxes with both *insolentia* and *imprudentia* (cf. 9.13.ext.1).

9.5.ext.3

The substance of this *exemplum* is widely cited in sources (cf. Cato *Orig.* F78 *FRHist* and L. Coelius Antipater F22 *FRHist* [both found quoted at Gell. 10.24.6; cf. Macrob. 1.4.26]; Liv. 22.51.1-4; Flor. 1.22.19; Amm. 18.5.6; Zon. 9.1.16; Plut. *Fab.* 17.1-2; Sil. 10.375ff). V., however, appears to be unique in turning the incident to highlight Hannibal's arrogance (Shackleton Bailey 2000: 338-9 n. 8), rather than his loss of strategic vision. It is likely that Livy is not V.'s source here, as he does have Hannibal respond to Maharbal and contains nothing that suggests exclusion from Hannibal's tent or the use of an intermediary.

**Hannibal ... Cannensis pugnae successu elatus:** Hannibal's arrogance is characteristic among Latin authors, in both historiography and poetry (e.g. Liv. 21.57.14; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.77-8); for his negative presentation in V. more generally, see 9.1.4. V., in accordance with the Livian tradition, places the incident after

Carthaginian victory at the battle of Cannae in 216. Hoyos (2000: 612-13), argues on logistical grounds that the incident occurred after the battle of Trasimene in 217, and that the relocation to Cannae was the invention of Coelius Antipater. The battle of Cannae in 216 had been one of Rome's major defeats to Hannibal – the 'incarnation of all horror to the Romans' in Daly's words (2002: 28); V. is fully in line with this when he takes Cannae as a paradigmatic example of a disastrous Roman defeat (cf. e.g. 3.2.11; 3.8.2; 7.2.ext.16; 9.11.ext.4).

**nec admisit quemquam ... per interpretem dedit:** Fabius Pictor had ascribed Hannibal's arrogance to his brother-in-law's example, and considered it a cause of the Second Punic War (Polyb. 3.8.1-4); that it affected his treatment of, and interaction with, his own countrymen in this way corroborates his characterisation.

**Maharbalem:** The Master of the Horse is unnamed in Cato (following his usual practice of not referring to military commanders by name); Gellius and Livy name him 'Maharbal', as here in V. Plutarch gives 'Barcas', and Silius, 'Mago'. The cavalry commanders at Cannae in Polybius are given as Hasdrubal and Hanno (3.114.7 and 3.116.6-8 respectively); see *FRHist* III.127. Despite the discrepancies, Maharbal was definitely at Cannae, probably in command of a reserve cavalry force (see Hoyos 2000: 610-14).

**ante tabernaculum suum clara voce adfirmantem:** V. presents Maharbal as an almost comic figure of an excluded officer shouting sage advice.

**prospexisse quonam modo ... Romae in Capitolio cenaret:** The ancient consensus is that had Hannibal followed Maharbal's advice Rome would have fallen to him (Hoyos 2000: 614: 'the most spectacular example of ignored wisdom in ancient history'). The detail of dining in Jupiter's temple like a Roman *triumphator* need not suggest a Roman invention (Hoyos 2000: 611-2).

**paucis diebus:** V.'s phrasing elides the archaic and precise *diequinti* of Cato and Coelius; cf. Livy's *die quinto* (22.51.3).

**adeo felicitatis et moderationis dividiuum contubernium est:** V.'s use of **contubernium**, recalling Hannibal's **tabernaculum**, plays with the word's meaning in the military context of the comradeship in sharing one's tent (*OLD* 1) and more generally as 'association' or 'fellowship' (*OLD* 2). V.'s comment can be taken as indirect praise of Tiberius who enjoyed huge military success and celebrated *moderatio* on his coins; for Tiberian *moderatio*, see comment at 9.3.3.

9.5.ext.4

**Insolentiae vero inter ... quasi aemulatio fuit:** The first word of the *exemplum* immediately isolates for the reader the moral failing in question of both senates. The two communities are connected in vice also at 9.1.ext.1.

**ille enim separato a plebe balneo lavabatur:** Public baths in Roman society were typically not segregated (Fagan 1999: 206 n. 53; Yegül 2010: 34-9).

**hic diverso foro utebatur:** There seems to have been a double-forum at Neapolis in which political activities were separated from commercial (Greco 1985: 125-135), but what V. (and his source) envisages is very different.

**quem morem Capuae ... Plautium scripta patet:** Perhaps because it would have sounded so absurd to his Roman audience, V. indicates the source of his information. C. Gracchus wrote a speech against Marcus Plautius Hypsaeus, the consul of 125 (see 9.5.1); V.'s phrasing, however, suggests that the speech only provides evidence for the two fora of Capua; see also Fraccaro 1913: 117. Linking *insolentia* to the public spaces of the *forum* and *balneum* recalls 9.5.3; as does the same name (Hypsaeus) of the person involved, despite the name not being mentioned here. On *superbia Campana*, see e.g. Aul. Gell. 1.24.2; Rowell 1949: 15-19.

## De Perfidia

*Perfidia*, in Latin literature generally, is a pre-eminently Carthaginian trait, which is evident in V.'s choice of solely Carthaginian examples in the *externa* section of this

chapter – one on the nation as a whole, and one on Hannibal specifically.<sup>171</sup> In contrast, his domestic examples, although they outnumber the external ones, all feature specific individuals who demonstrated the vice, but never a group or body, let alone the Roman state as a whole. This point is made conversely by V. in his chapter *De fide publica* (6.6), where he states that *fides* has always thrived at Rome (6.6.praef.) and been abundantly demonstrated (6.6.5). As Carlsen (2014: 109) has noted, while Tarpeia's treachery featured among the legends of early Rome, the latter three *exempla*, from the second half of the second century, are not usual features from Roman history. Velleius includes nine examples of *perfidia*, four by foreigners, including the Carthaginians (1.12.6) and four by Romans, including Tiberius' *inimicus* M. Lollius (2.102.1); there is no overlap between their *exempla*, but clearly the vice was relevant to Tiberian Rome.

9.6.praef.

**Occultum iam et insidiosum malum, perfidia:** Ovid preceds V. in describing *perfidia* as an *insidiosum malum* (*Met.* 7.742), while Tacitus (*Hist.* 3.49.1) links *occulta*; cf. Just. *Epit.* 30.1.10.

**latebris suis extrahatur:** This continues V.'s pattern of introducing vices by dragging them out and exposing them (cf. 9.4.praef.; 9.5.praef.), and of speaking of vice in bestial terms.

**mentiri ac fallere:** Hendiadys. While near synonyms, the former, **mentiri**, relates more to speaking falsely, while the latter, **fallere**, to deceptive deeds or tricks; the two terms, therefore, cover V.'s stated aim of recording *facta* and *dicta*; cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.79-81.

**fructus in aliquo ... nefariis vinculis circumdedit:** Alliteration enhances V.'s rhetoric (**aliquo admisso; consistit ... certus cum credulitatem ... circumdedit**). In

---

<sup>171</sup> This point is made even more explicit when one also considers Carthage's negative presentation in V.'s chapter on good faith (see 6.6.ext.1; 6.6.ext.2).

the associated vocabulary of *perfidia*, *scelus* is common; cf. e.g. Cic. *Rosc.* 109, *Dom.* 44, *Phil.* 11.5, *Att.* 2.22.2, 3.13.2; Sall. *Iug.* 107.2; Liv. 40.39.9; Val. Max. 3.2.ext.3. V. conjures up the image of entrapment (**nefariis vinculis circumdedit**).

**tantum incommodi humano ... illa laudis consequitur**: Elsewhere (6.6.praef.) V. personifies *fides* as goddess who extends her right hand as a pledge of human welfare (*salutis humanae*). On the broadness of *humanum genus*, cf. e.g. 4.3.praef.; 4.4.11; 5.2.ext.4; 9.11.ext.4; Weileder 1998: 56-7; and now Lawrence 2006. V. ends his prefatory remarks with a justification for treating the vice in the same way as *fides* in 6.6.

### 9.6.1

There are two distinct traditions of Tarpeia's interactions with the Sabines. In one tradition, she is held out as an example of perfidy (Fabius Pictor F7 *FRHist*; Cincius Alimentus; both = Dion. Hal. 2.38.2-40.3), while the other (Calpurnius Piso Frugi F7 *FRHist*, also in Dion. Hal. 2.38.2-40.3) provides a revisionist – and apologetic – reading casting her actions in an heroic light in order to reconcile them with the fact that she was celebrated in a local cult on the Capitol (Dion. Hal. 2.40.3); other variants also occur, cf. e.g. Plut. *Rom.* 17.5-7; see Ogilvie 1965: 74-5; Cairns 2011: 176-184; *FRHist* III.24-5; sources collected at *RE* 4A.2332. V.'s account follows Livy 1.11.6-9, gutting his narrative for key details: *Sp. Tarpeius Romanae praeerat arci. Huius filiam virginem auro corrumpit Tatius ut armatos in arcem accipiat; aquam forte ea tum sacris extra moenia petitum ierat. Accepti obrutam armis necavere, seu ut vi capta potius arx videretur seu prodendi exempli causa ne quid usquam fidum proditori esset. Additur fabula, quod volgo Sabini aureas armillas magni ponderis brachio laevo gemmatosque magna specie anulos habuerint ... Sunt qui eam ex pacto tradendi quod in sinistris manibus esset directo arma petisse dicant et fraude visam agere sua ipsam peremptam mercede*. For Welch (2012: 194) V. strips 'and sanitises' Livy's version, by removing variants that present a more positive spin on Tarpeia's action, but 'its exemplary force remains problematic'. In

contrast, V. presents a simple, unambiguous interpretation in which Tarpeia is an impious traitor; see also Maslakov 1984: 461-4; Welch 2013: 80-2.

**Romulo regnante:** A statement by V. to orientate his readers temporally; before the consular system, with no clear way of contextualising events, reference to an individual king's reign is used (cf. e.g. 7.3.1); however, V.'s contextualising is vaguer than Livy's (1.11.5), who clearly places it during the war following the rape of the Sabine women (Maslakov 1984: 461-3 along with n. 46).

**Spurius Tarpeius arci praeerat:** *Arx* suggests only a section of the *arx Capitolina* (that is, the northern area of the hill, and subsequent site of *Iuno Moneta*). However the usage is probably archaic and poetic, and refers more generally to the Capitol; see *LTUR* I.129-130. According C. Sulpicius Galba (see Plut. *Rom.* 17.5; *FRHist* III.531), Tarpeius was later convicted of treason by Romulus, but this plays no role in Livy or V.'s casting of the story (Welch 2012: 191).

**cuius filiam virginem aquam sacris petitem extra moenia egressam:** i.e. Tarpeia (on the name, see Calderini 1995-1997: 125-154); as in Livy her name has to be deduced from that of her father's (cf. Welch 2012: 191). V. labels her only as **virginem**; in some traditions (cf. Varr. *Ling.* 5.41; Prop. 4.4.15-18, 36; Plut. *Num.* 10.1; Festus 496L) she is presented as a Vestal, which accounts for her actions, as it was the daily duty of Vestals to draw water for cult purposes (Ogilvie 1965: 75); see also Cairns 2011: 181 n. 21. In comparison with Livy, V. has brought the **virginem** and water elements closer together, eliminating *forte* and perhaps deliberately making the connection clearer for his reader; having Vestal Virgins before Numa instituted their cult is problematic chronologically; see Garani 2011: 3.

**Tatius ut armatos ... secum reciperet corruptit:** Titus Tatius (*BNP* 14.163), the legendary king of the Sabines, waged war with Romulus over the rape of the Sabine women (Varr. *Ling.* 5.46; Liv. 1.10.1). Plutarch (*Rom.* 17.5) records a tradition ('not worthy of belief') that Tarpeia was in fact Tatius' daughter, living with Romulus under compulsion; V., however, has no interest in this tradition, but follows Livy

closely and, in fact, goes further than Livy in order to pursue his moral agenda in presenting Tarpeia as treacherous. With **corruptit** (which has the sense of being bribed; *OLD* 5a), Livy and V. indicate that Tarpeia's motive was her love of Sabine gold; in other versions (e.g. Plut. Rom. 17.5; Prop. 4.4) her motive was love. Ogilvie (1965: 74) finds the origin of similar motives in Hellenistic folk-tales. Welch (2012: 176) suggests that Livy, by making Tatius the subject, suggests that the treachery was a Sabine idea; even if so, this does not minimise Tarpeia's guilt for V.

**mercedis nomine pactam:** By suppressing Livy's reference to a variant tradition and by moving *merces* from the end of the sentence, V. alters Livy's emphasis and puts greater weight on the greed of Tarpeia.

**erant autem iis ... ex pondere auri:** On Sabine wealth, cf. Dion. Hal. 2.38.3 with *FRHist* III.24-5, 40-1.

**armis obrutam necavit:** Replacing Livy's *scuta* with *arma* aids V.'s overwrought wordplay – Tarpeia had wanted *armillae*, but she got *arma*. In somewhat laborious fashion, V. spells out that the Sabines, almost Punic in their treacherous twisting of their agreement, nonetheless kept their word in weighing her down with what they carried on their left arms.

**absit reprehensio ... vindicata est:** For *reprehensio* as deserved in relation to vice, cf. e.g. 5.3.ext.3; 6.2.praef.; 9.1.praef. On *perfidia*'s relationship with treason (**proditio**), see Wheeler 1988: 90. V. excuses the treachery of the Sabines because it brought about the punishment (**poena**) of Tarpeia's betrayal (**impia proditio**); cf. Livy 1.11.9. V.'s use of *impia* might suggest her violation of either her Vestal function or duty to the *patria*. Punishment of wrong (**vindicata**) is a keynote of V. from the Preface (1.praef.), essential to his moral system, and here worked out quickly (for slow *vindicatio*, cf. 1.1.ext.3).

9.6.2

There are two distinct traditions regarding Ser. Sulpicius Galba's 'massacre' of the Lusitanians in 150 (see Rubensohn 1981: 189). In the 'Livian' tradition, Galba followed up his victory in Further Spain with the massacre of some Lusitanians and the sale of others into slavery in Gallia (having summoned three Iberian communities to him), so V. and 8.1.absol.2; Liv. *Per.* 49; Cic. *De or.* 1.53, 227, *Brut.* 89-90, *Mur.* 59; Astin 1967: 58. In the 'Polybian' tradition, the Lusitanians were massacred, with only a small number of them escaping; their embassy approached Galba, who then divided them into three groups, so App. *Ib.* 59-60; Oros. 4.21.10; Suet. *Galb.* 3.2; with all sources also collected at *RE* 4A.762-3.

**Ser. ... Galba ... civitatum convocato populo:** Servius Sulpicius Galba (*BNP* 13.932-3), praetor in 151, campaigned against the Lusitani in Hispania Ulterior in that, and the following, year; he was later consul in 144. Cicero (*Brut.* 82; cf. Val. Max. 8.7.1; Suet. *Galb.* 3.2) refers to him as the best orator of his age. At 8.1.absol.2 V. mentions the trial that ensued because of Galba's actions in this *exemplum*, and his subsequent acquittal (but see Gruen 1968: 13 n. 11 for the historical reality that Galba never came before an actual *quaestio* and thus was never acquitted). Elsewhere in V. he is singled out for his greed (6.4.2).

**octo milia, in quibus flos iuventutis consistebat:** Suetonius (*Galb.* 3.2) gives the figure as 30 000; cf. also Julius Paris who states 108 000. V. alone comments on the age of the youths which adds a pathetic note.

**quo facinore:** V. uses *facinus* almost universally negatively (cf., however, 5.4.ext.3), whereas it has a history of good, or neutral, usage (usually archaic; see McGushin 1977: 43).

**maximam cladem barbarorum magnitudine criminis antecessit:** The concluding *sententia* provides neatly corresponding consonantal phrases through repetition (maximam cladem ... magnitudine criminis). The Lusitanians are referred to with the descriptor *barbarus* most of all peoples in V.'s work; cf. also 7.3.6 (Lawrence 2006: 110).

### 9.6.3

**Cn. autem Domitium, summi generis et magni animi virum:** Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (*BNP* 4.640-1) was consul in 122 and censor in 115 (2.9.9); for his family's pedigree, see Suet. *Nero* 1-5; Domitius had a consular father and grandfather and the family produced consuls in every generation after down to AD 16, and then in AD 32 (the Ahenobarbi remained prominent during Augustus' reign); Bradley 1978: 24 provides a useful stemma (cf. however Eilers 1991: 171-4). *Magnus animus* (cf. 4.8.5) is the positive aspect of *superbus* (Braund 2009: 226-7), and was ascribed to Tiberius as a virtue by the senate (*SCPP* 1.91). See also Carlsen 2014: 105-115.

**nimia gloriae cupiditas perfidum existere coegit:** The opening words recall Val. Max. 8.14, although the material that V. covers in that chapter is remarkably different; there he recalls nothing that derogates from the glory of Rome. The desire for glory (*cupido gloriae*) was one of the key motivators of the Roman elite (cf. e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 7.3-6), and is approved by V. (2.8.5). It could, however, also lead to disaster and earn V.'s criticism (cf. 1.6.9, 8.14.ext.5); here **nimia** explicitly discredits Domitius' actions.

Despite the disgraceful act of treachery, Fabius celebrated his triumph over the Allobroges and Bituitus, earning himself the agnomen 'Allobrogicus' in 120. Domitius, either at the same time, or a year or two later, triumphed also, over the 'Gallei Arvernei' (*Fasti Tr.*; Liv. *Per.* 61; cf. also Suet. *Nero* 2.1 with discussion by Bradley 1978: 30-1). The *Fasti Triumphales*, Stevens (1980: 90-1) suggests, indicate imperial ambitions for Cn. Domitius, who wanted the whole Arvernian empire incorporated into Rome.

**Bituito, regi Arvernorum:** Bituitus (*BNP* 2.683) was the king of the Arverni (cf. App. *Celt.* 12, Allobroges; see Rivet 1988: 40). On the location and extent of the territories of the Arverni, see Rivet 1988: 39-40.

**iratus namque ... nave deportandum curavit:** As consul in 122, Cn. Domitius was victorious over the Allobroges (who had accepted the supremacy of the Arverni); his successor as consul for the following year, Quintius Fabius Maximus, was then also sent to put down the remaining Allobroges, along with the Arverni and Ruteni (cf. Caes. *BGall.* 1.45.2), which he did in August 121. It appears, from V.'s account, that Bituitus had attempted to negotiate with Fabius, but that Domitius, through false pretences was able to entrap him and send him to Rome; cf. Liv. *Per.* 61; Eutrop. 4.22; Athen. 4.152 and Strabo 4.2.3; Suet. *Nero* 2.1; Vell. 2.10.2, 39.1; Oros. 5.13.2; Flor. 1.37; Plin. *HN* 7.166; with Stevens 1980: 88-93.

**dexteram confugere:** For the phrase, cf. Val. Max. 4.7.5. The extension of a right hand offered a pact of hospitality linking Romans with foreigners (cf. e.g. Liv. 1.1.8); see Hölkeskamp 2000: 223-250. V.'s chosen formulation enables him to avoid saying explicitly that Romans broke *fides*.

**hospitioque exceptum:** V.'s language suggests the quasi-legal relationship of ritualised friendship (*hospitium*) between Domitius and Bituitus, which was then broken by Domitius' treachery.

**cuius factum senatus ... renovaret:** V. could have stopped the *exemplum* at **curavit**, but chooses, in effect, to justify Rome's treatment of Bituitus, placing himself in a difficult position, but not presumably Domitius – the senate did approve of his action.

**eum Albam custodiae causa relegavit:** After his capture by Cn. Domitius, he was sent by the senate to Alba (Liv. *Per.* 61; Eutrop. 4.2.2; Flor. 1.37; Oros. 5.14.1). Detention of kings in Italian communities rather than at Rome from the 3rd c. was common; Alba was used for at least three (Braund 1984: 167).

#### 9.6.4

**Viriathi etiam caedes duplicem perfidiae accusationem recipit:** Viriathus (*BNP* 15.453), having escaped Ser. Sulpicius Galba's massacre in 150 (see 9.6.2: *partim*

*trucidavit*), was appointed leader of the Lusitanians. After defeating Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus in 140, he signed a peace treaty with Rome and was recognised as a *socius et amicus populi Romani*. In both ancient and modern historiography Viriathus is presented as ‘a paradigm of barbarian virtue’ and as a foil to Roman perfidy (Rubinsohn 1981: *passim*; quote at 172; see also Bane 1976: 409-20). Livy (*Per.* 54), for example, refers to him as *vir duxque magnus* (cf. e.g. Flor. 1.33.15). V. highlights the ‘double treachery’ (**duplicem perfidiae**) enacted against him; he was assassinated in 139 by his own countrymen and friends, and Rome broke its treaty with him. This makes it a suitable climax for this section. **Etiam** appropriately links the *exempla*, as both are examples of abuse of a client king; cf. e.g. 9.1.ext.2; 9.2.ext.9; 9.11.4; 9.12.6; 9.12.ext.2; 9.12.ext.3.

**in amicis ... interemptus est:** The three friends who assassinated Viriathus, murdering him at night in his tent and in his armour, are recorded as Audax, Ditalco, and Minurus by Appian (*Iber.* 74), Audas, Ditalces, and Nicorontes by Diodorus (33.21), and Audax, Minurus, and Dita[lco] by Livy (*Epit. Oxy.* 197); the discrepancies are plausibly attributed to problems of Greek-Latin transliteration of Celtic names (Simon 1962: 131 n. 59). Other sources leave them unnamed and refer to them simply as friends or kinsmen (cf. Diod. 33.1; Liv. *Per.* 54; Vell. 2.1.3; Flor. 1.33.17; *vir. ill.* 71.3-4; Eutrop. 4.16.2; Oros. 5.4.14). All place their assassination of Viriathus at the instigation of Caepio, except for Diodorus (33.21), who claims that they approached Caepio out of fear for themselves, and in order to curry favour with the Romans.

**Q. Servilio Caepione consule ... impunitate promissa fuit:** Cf. App. *Iber.* 74: ἔδωκεν ἀδεῶς ἔχειν ὅσα ἔχουσι. Q. Servilius Caepio (*BNP* 13.327) was consul in 140. With the approval of the senate, he ultimately renewed hostilities with Viriathus, breaking the peace treaty set up by his brother Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus, and finally instigated the assassination of Viriathus, when he could not overcome him militarily

(cf. App. *Iber.* 70); this sets him out as an exemplar of perfidy for V. and others (cf. esp. e.g. Vell. 2.1.3).

**victoriamque non meruit sed emit:** V.'s judgement, which concludes the *exemplum* and the domestic examples, is brief but severe, alluding to the bribe that Caepio offered the assassins. In fact, Caepio may have even reneged on his promised bribe to the assassins for Viriathus' murder, see Eutrop. 4.16.2.

9.6.ext.1

**Verum ut ipsum fontem perfidiae contemplemur, Carthaginienses:** Punic perfidy was the nation's quintessential and defining characteristic in Roman eyes, and after the Punic Wars became a literary *topos* in Latin literature; cf. e.g. Sall. *Iug.* 108.3; Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.95; Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.49; Verg. *Aen.* 1.661; Liv. 21.4.9, 22.6.12, 24.1.10, 30.30.27, 42.47.7; cf. also Polyb. 3.78.1; App. *Pun.* 62-4; with Thiel 1954; Prandi 1979: 90-97; Devallet 1996: 17-28; Waldherr 2000: 193-222; Prag 2006: 1-37; it is also presented as a key attribute of Hannibal's character specifically, see comment at 9.6.ext.2. V.'s formulation not only allows a neat transition to foreign examples (**verum**), but also implies that, in treachery, Carthage was preeminent (**fontem**) and indeed worse than any of the Roman examples that he has already presented. Here V.'s rhetoric overwhelms historical logic, as the Tarpeia *exemplum* predates Roman interaction with Carthage by several hundred years. Perhaps what is more in view here, however, is that from their city's foundation the Poeni are believed to have cheated (cf. Scheid and Svenbro 1985: 328-342).

**Xanthippum Lacedaemonium ... in alto merserunt:** Xanthippus (*BNP* 15.793-4; Lazenby 1996: 102-6) was a mercenary leader on the side of Carthage in 256/5 (cf. Val. Max. 1.1.14 – *dux*; and Oros. 4.9.2 who, mostly likely incorrectly, refers to him as a king of Sparta). The tale that the Carthaginians drowned Xanthippus, or at least tried to, on his return to Greece is found also in Diod. 23.16; Sil. 6.682; App. *Pun.* 4;

Zon. 8.13; Tzetzes, *Hist.* 3.380-6; and is possibly hinted at in Polyb. 36.4. If this Xanthippus was the same as the one appointed as governor by Ptolemy III in 245 (Hieron. *in Dan.* 11.7-9), which is not certain (see Walbank 1957: 94), it would mean that he could not have been drowned in 255. Numismatic evidence also casts doubt on this alternate tradition (see Baldus 1988: 171-9).

**cuius optima opera ... Atilium Regulum ceperant:** Xanthippus' services (cf. 1.1.14) for Carthage were exemplary, as the minting of coins in his honour (mentioned above) testify. He was victorious over M. Atilius Regulus (Polyb. 1.32-6; Diod. 23.14-6; Cic. *Off.* 3.26; Liv. *Per.* 18; Flor. 1.18.23; Frontin. *Str.* 2.2.11, 3.10; Lazenby 1996: 102-6); on Regulus, see 9.2.ext.1.

**quid tanto facinore ... iactura inviolatum reliquissent:** In concluding the *exemplum*, V. poses a couple of successive rhetorical questions and claims that Carthage's glory was tarnished by its treachery; and that their treatment of Xanthippus stands as a reproach (**exstat nihilo minus, et quidem cum opprobrio**) to their immorality. On V.'s usage of *facinus*, see comment at 9.6.2.

**victoriae ... socius:** Carthage's use of mercenaries was widespread, notably in the 3rd c. (in the 256 campaign, for example, there is no mention of home-grown infantry); see Hoyos 2010: 155. Though high officers were usually Carthaginian except during the Punic Wars; Xanthippus was exceptional (Hoyos 2010: 161); this being the case, V.'s phrasing (**victoriae ... socius**) is suggestive. By contrast Rome's use of mercenaries in the strict sense was limited (cf. Krasilnikoff 1996: 7-20); the large-scale use of ethnic *auxilia* in V.'s time may explain his lack of *animus*.

**exstat nihilo minus, et quidem cum opprobrio:** V. is here, in effect, celebrating the exemplary method; Xanthippus' excellence lives on and the Carthaginians receive due obloquy for their vice.

9.6.ext.2

**Hannibal:** Hannibal is the most suitable exemplar for the concluding *exemplum* of the chapter because *perfidia* is his quintessential vice as presented in Roman sources; cf. e.g. Liv. 21.4.9, 22.6.12; Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.49, along with comment on the previous *exemplum* and at 9.2.ext.2; 9.3.ext.3; cf. also Val. Max. 7.4.4; 7.4.ext.2.

**porro:** Used by V. transitionally at the beginning of an *exemplum* as here; cf. 2.10.ext.2; 7.2.ext.14; 8.7.ext.6; 8.7.ext.15; 8.11.ext.2; also within an *exemplum* to move to another example by the same exemplar, see 9.2.11.

**Nucerinos, hortatu suo ... muris cinctam egressos:** Livy's account of Hannibal's capture of Nuceria (23.15.3-6), which occurred after the defection of Capua in 216, does not include the details provided in V.; the tale of suffocation is found, however, in Appian (*Pun.* 63), Dio (fr. 57.30) and Zonaras (9.2), but is a suspicious doublet of the treatment inflicted on Romans by the Carthaginians in the same year (Liv. 23.7.3; Pomeroy 1989: 171). Pomeroy (1989: 162-176) suggests that Valerius Antias may be the ultimate source for this and the Acerra tale in all the extant versions. V. fails to specify that the victims of suffocation were the town councillors only, thus exaggerating Hannibal's crime. Dio's account, along with Livy (23.15.3) records only a single garment; V. and Appian, two garments, which Pomeroy (1989: 163 n. 3) attributes to an unidentifiable intermediary source. The surrender provision itself, whether one garment or two, has precedents (e.g. Thuc. 2.70.2; Pritchett 1991: 299ff.) and cannot be considered unhistorical.

**vapore et fumo balnearum strangulando:** The existence of baths able to suffocate their victims (i.e. heated by a hypocaust system) during this period is an anachronistic fiction (Pomeroy 1989: 164-5, 171, 174-5).

**et Acerranorum senatum ... profunda puteorum abieciendo:** As with Nuceria, V.'s version of Hannibal's treatment of the senate at Acerra is absent from Livy (23.17.5-6); cf. Silius' 'poetic' account (*Pun.* 12.420-8). The episode is reminiscent of Herodotus' account of the Persian envoys who were thrown into wells by the Spartans (Hdt. 7.133.1; Pomeroy 1989: 169).

**nonne bellum ... praeclaris artibus gaudens:** V.'s claim, that Hannibal waged war against good faith itself, justifies his decision to include these stories here illustrating *perfidia*, rather than at 9.2.ext.2 exemplifying *crudelitas*. His claim also features as a part of a larger discourse surrounding Hannibal's presentation in Roman sources from as early, at least, as Fabius Pictor, that sought to stress that his victories were the result of his immoral conduct, in this instance, his *perfidia*; see the comments of Pomeroy 1989: 167-8. Again, V.'s rhetoric gets the better of him; war against *Italia* must be a Roman prejudicial construction; in practice Hannibal tried to win over Italians (cf. Hoyos 2010: 201-2). On Hannibal's deception (**fallacia**), cf. e.g. 3.8.1. He was credited with *praeclari artes* (cf. e.g. Val. Max. 3.7.ext.6).

**quo evenit ut ... haberi deberet poneret:** *Dubitatio*, a favourite Valerian device, concludes the *exemplum* and the chapter; cf. e.g. 9.1.ext.1; 9.3.1; 9.3.8; 9.5.ext.2; 9.6.ext.2; 9.11.1; 9.11.7 with further comment. Evaluations of Hannibal, both ancient and modern are numerous (cf. e.g. Polyb. 9.22; Lancel 1998: 216-224). **Quo evenit** is a device to permit V. to emphasise the outcome of the behavior he is discussing (cf. 3.3.ext.7, 6.8.7, 8.9.ext1), in effect the reward of penalty. V.'s **alioqui ... relicturus** is perhaps overreaching, and cannot possibly mean that had he not been treacherous, he would have had a great reputation; this would negate other instances, throughout his work, where he presents him as an exemplar of other vices.

### **De Vi et Seditioe**

The chapter heading is probably incorrect and should be *violentia et seditio* (cf. the synonyms used in 9.7.mil.Rom.2 and 9.7.mil.Rom.3), and the chapter differs from the previous one, where *perfidia* was committed by Roman individuals. Here *violentia* or *seditio* is perpetrated by the people as a whole, in their civilian capacity in Rome, or under arms. The chapter is also unique in Book 9, in that it deviates from V.'s usual organising principle of presenting domestic and foreign examples (cf. also 8.1), and instead provides examples distinguished by those acts carried out in the civil sphere

and those done in the military (giving greater space to the former; with 4 *exempla* as opposed to 3). V. makes a deliberate choice here not to include foreign *exempla*, although they could have been easily dredged from an author like Thucydides, whose discussion of στάσις was paradigmatic.

In the standard narrative of the history of the decline of the Roman Republic, violence and sedition are prominently given key roles. Violence was difficult to control precisely because Rome lacked the political organisation it needed to do so: it lacked any sort of police force; it denied the required executive powers to magistrates who would use them; and it had the leading classes, on the one hand, competing for power and wealth, and the growing, dissatisfied, lower classes on the other, easily bribed and provoked to violence.<sup>172</sup> In the 1<sup>st</sup> century legislation *de vi* was developed to deal with political violence, until these laws were superceded by the Augustan *leges Iuliae de vi*.<sup>173</sup> The deaths of military officers, certainly commanders at least, fell under *leges de maiestate*.

V.'s chapter, while arranged according to the spheres in which the acts of violence and sedition occur, also more or less chronologically follows the periods of violent turmoil from Saturninus to Sulla, mapping the foundations of civil war. What V. seems to be attacking is interference in the lawful activities of a magistrate (or a near-magistrate) that manifests itself in some degree of physical violence. The civil *exempla* also seem to be arranged in ascending order according to severity – as V.'s comment at 9.7.3 would seem to suggest.

### 9.7.1

---

<sup>172</sup> See esp. Lintott 1968.

<sup>173</sup> See Lintott 1968: 107ff.; on the Augustan legislation, see Cloud 1988: 579-595; Cloud 1989: 427-465.

As there are no verbal parallels between V. and Florus (2.4.1) it is difficult to prove a Livian link.

**ut violentiae <et> seditionis:** V. signals his transition to the next chapter simply; cf. e.g. 1.7.praef.; 3.7.praef.; 9.15.praef. He announces immediately, though, the vices in view. The pairing of vices is common; cf. 9.1.praef.; 9.3.praef.; 9.5.1.

**tam togatae quam etiam armatae facta referantur:** This chapter is unique in Book 9 in not providing foreign *exempla*. Instead, V.'s division is based on deeds done in civilian life (**togatae**) and those done in the military (**armatae**); cf. his comment at 9.7.mil.Rom.1. His focus is also exclusively on actions (**facta**) rather than words (*dicta*). V. is fond of using passive verbs at the beginning of a chapter (cf. e.g. 9.1.praef.), presumably to give the vice prominence as subject.

**L. Equitium, qui Ti. Gracchi filium simulabat:** Lucius Equitius (*BNP* 5.6; Floris 2008: 5-17) was tribune of the plebs. His *praenomen* is only recorded here; elsewhere V. refers to him only as 'Equitius' (3.2.18; 3.8.6; 9.15.1); *vir. ill.* 62 preserves the MS corruption 'Quintium', while Florus (2.4.1) uses his assumed 'Gaius Gracchus' (cf. *Cic. Rab. perd.* 7.20). Few other details of his biography are known: V. tells us that he came from obscure origins (3.8.6) and Firmum in Picenum (9.15.1), but most of the known L. Equitii from the Republican period come from Caere; *vir. ill.* 73.3 gives him the status of freedman (*libertini ordinis*), while Florus (2.4.1) indicates that he was not a Roman citizen. Some sources, probably biased by Optimate views, even suggest that he was a runaway slave (e.g. *Cic. Rab. perd.* 7.20; see Floris 2008: 8). He was passing himself off as the son of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, tribune of the plebs in 133, (cf. *Val Max.* 3.8.6; 9.15.1), from at least 102 (see below 9.7.2); perhaps even at Saturninus' instigation (cf. *vir. ill.* 73.3: *subornavit*). Impersonation, as is evident from chapter 9.15 (where Equitius also earns an appearance), is an important theme in V. with his concern for social status, possibly fuelled by the Clemens debacle in AD 16 (on which see e.g., *Tac. Ann.* 2.39; *Suet. Tib.* 25.1; *Dio* 57.16.3), or possibly the

emergence of the false Drusus in AD 31 (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 5.10; Dio 58.25.1) – both of which were embarrassments to Tiberius.

**tribunatumque adversus leges ... petebat:** If Equitius did not have the prerequisite ten years of military service and/or citizenship (see above), this should have disqualified him; and if he were a freedman, as is the claim at *vir. ill.* 73.3, he would have been precluded also (Treggiari 1969: 59 takes *libertini ordinis* to mean ‘son of a freedman’, however, and thus no disbarment). Nevertheless, he sought the tribunate (for the period 10 December 100 – 9 December 99 B.C.), successfully, as V.’s description of him as tribune *designatus* (3.2.18) shows. However he was killed on the day he took up office, see Beness and Hillard 1990: 270.

**L. Saturnino:** Lucius Ap(p)uleius Saturninus (*BNP* 1.904), the populist politician who had been tribune in 103 and 100, was a candidate with Equitius for the tribunate of 99 (see Cavaggioni 1998 and Cavaggioni 2004-2005: 325-337). For his death and the tumultuous events of the period, see Badian 1984: 101-147. V.’s presentation of Saturninus is wholly negative, and commonly in relation to his seditious actions (cf. 3.2.18; 3.84; 6.3.1c; 8.6.2; 9.7.3).

**a C. Mario sextum consulatum:** Briscoe has adopted *Pighius*’ emendation of **sextum** over the MS reading of *quintum* to date this to 100; V. probably errs in dating the event to 101, Marius’ fifth consulship; most scholars agree it should be dated to the following year, see Beness and Hillard 1990: 271 n. 14; Floris 2008: 11 n. 37.

**in publicam custodiam ductum:** On *coercitio*, see 9.5.2.

**populus:** Equitius’ appeal must have been particularly strong among the old political adherents of the Gracchi and the *plebs urbana*, those who had directly benefited from their reforms (Grünewald 2004: 154-5).

**claustris carceris convulsis ... animorum alacritatem:** Alliteration heightens the rhetoric. Floris (2008: 11 n. 36) suggests that the prison-break may be confirmed by Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 35 (*si carcerem refregisset*).

## 9.7.2

**Idemque:** V. links this *exemplum* with the previous one. Both provide examples of popular acts of ‘crazed’ sedition (in contrast to subsequent ones involving human death; cf. V.’s opening comment at 9.7.3).

**Q. Metellum censorem:** Quintus Caecilius Metellus Numidicus was censor in 102; the office continued sometime into 101 (cf. McDonnell 2006: 286), so the precise moment of the refusal cannot be fixed. V. presents Numidicus as a strict commander (2.7.2), upright governor (2.10.1), and crucially as a resolute opponent of Saturninus, preferring exile than supporting his *lex agraria* (3.8.4). V.’s support of Numidicus’ action as censor is clear.

**quod ab eo tamquam Gracchi filio censum recipere nolebat:** Metellus Numidicus refused to enter Equitius into the census lists, an action that is widely recorded (cf. Cic. *Sest.* 101; App. *BCiv.* 1.32-3; *vir. ill.* 62.1), most strikingly in the censor’s *elogium* in the Forum Augustum (*CIL* 6.40942; Floris 2008: 9-10). On the censors’ responsibilities for entering a person into the voter-roll, see Suolahti 1963: 38-9.

**lapidibus prosternere conatus est:** Stoning was a common form of popular ‘justice’ (Lintott 1968: 6ff.); cf. Oros. 5.17.3.

**adfirmantem tres tantummodo filios Ti. Graccho fuisse:** Little evidence for Tiberius Gracchus’ sons survive outside of this text. Reference by C. Gracchus to a *puer* (fr. 47, *ORF*<sup>4</sup>) is taken to be the son who died while on military service in Sardinia, perhaps between 126 and 124, when his uncle Gaius was quaestor and proquaestor (cf. Floris 2008: 16 n. 57), or later between 115 and 111 (Earl 1963: 67-9; see also Astin 1967: 319-321).

**post patris mortem:** Tiberius Gracchus was killed in 133; see e.g. Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 17.1-20.4.

**neque oportere clarissimae familiae ignotas sordes inseri:** Such impersonations are the subject of the entire final chapter of Book 9, where L. Equitius is again referred to in the first *exemplum* (9.15.1). The deed is caused, as V.’s indicates elsewhere

(9.15.praef.) and here, by *temeritas*, is immoral, and deserves opprobrium because it endangers not only the private, but the public as well.

**cum interim improvida ... petulantiae genere vexavit: Improvida**, as the opposite of the key imperial virtue of *providentia*, ties in nicely with V.'s extremely conservative position (cf. Weieder 1998: 178-9), going beyond normal Roman elite loathing for ochlocracy. The cause of the crowd's behaviour – *temeritas* – as seen above, is discussed in detail in the following chapter (9.8) by V. For **improvida ... temeritas** cf. 7.2.ext.17. The combination of **consulatum** and **censuram** suggests that V.'s closing *sententia* sums up both *exempla*. *Principes* is used of the Republican elite in V.; cf. e.g. 5.3.2a; 6.5.5; 7.5.2; 7.7.2; 8.2.2 etc.

### 9.7.3

The core elements of the *exemplum* are also found at Liv. *Per.* 69; Plut. *Mar.* 29.1; Flor. 2.3.16; App. *BCiv.* 1.28; *vir. ill.* 73; Oros. 5.17.3; cf. also Diod. 36.15.3.

**Vesana haec tantummodo, illa etiam cruenta seditio:** V.'s opening statement reveals a contrast with the previous *exemplum* and a move to a higher level of atrocity. *Vesania* is linked with vicious actions (cf. 1.6.7; 3.3.ext.2; 9.1.9; 9.2.4; 9.8.ext.2; 9.11.4).

**populus:** Continuing on from the previous two *exempla*, V. singles out the *populus* of Rome as the group excoriated in the 'domestic' section (cf. 9.7.1) of this chapter. Given that the murder takes place during the elections in the *concilium plebis*, plebeians might have been a better descriptor.

**Nunnius, competitorem Saturnini:** Aulus Nunnius (*RE* XVII 1473-4). His name is not certain; 'Nunnius' is given by V., the epitomator of Livy, and the *De viris illustribus*; 'Ninnius' by Florus; 'Nunius' by Orosius; and 'Nonius' by Plutarch and Appian. He is also given the praenomen 'Aulus' in some sources (*Periochae*; Florus; *De viris illustribus*; Orosius). Nunnius is mentioned only within the context of his competition with L. Appuleius Saturninus for the tribunate of 99. Evans (1988: 42-48)

offers a highly conjectural and tendentious argument which proposes that the sources have confused our Nunnius with the consular candidate for 100, C. Memmius, because they had followed the alleged account of P. Rutilius Rufus, who had wished to blacken Saturninus' reputation, and because the accounts provides a neat doublet. On Saturninus, see 9.7.1: **L. Saturnino**.

**novem iam creatis tribunis unoque loco duobus candidatis restante:** For the complexities of voting by tribes in the *concilium plebis* and the likelihood of some thirteen hours needed for the election of the ten tribunes, see Staveley 1972, esp. 175-90. The situation envisaged indicates that Saturninus was near the bottom of the electoral list in terms of votes received from the tribal units, and the slowness of the voting system presumably gave Saturninus' agents the time to eliminate Nunnius and leave Saturninus as the only candidate.

**vi prius in aedes privatas compulit, extractum deinde interemit:** Appian (*BCiv.* 1.28) specifies that Nunnius was stabbed in an inn (πανδοχείον). The epitomator of Livy (*Per.* 69), in contrast to all other sources, claims that Nunnius was killed by soldiers.

**ut caede integerrimi ... taeterrimo homini daretur:** V.'s continued stress on the people's agency in the vicious deeds of this chapter is maintained; this focus, while not as pronounced, is at least present in other sources (cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.28; Diod. 36.15.3). V. uses strong language in his condemnation of Saturninus; *taeter* is used throughout by V. of negative deeds, persons, as well as of things like diseases, cf. 1.2.21; 3.2.15; 3.5.praef; 3.8.3; 5.6.ext.2; 7.6.4; 7.8.8; 8.14.ext.5; 9.2.ext.1; 9.2.ext.9.

#### 9.7.4

Appian (*BCiv.* 1.54) provides the most detailed account of this incident from which V.'s account differs notably (see below); cf. also Liv. *Per.* 74. The basic story, however, has Sempronius Asellio killed by creditors, while trying to perform a

sacrifice, because he had attempted to offer relief to their debtors in the context of the debt crisis following the Social War.

**Creditorum quoque consternatio ... caput intolerabili modo exarsit:** V.'s simple **quoque** moves him quickly into the action of the next *exemplum*. His opening statement at once also directs his readers from the populace to a much smaller, financially privileged, group, which went as far as to commit sacrilege to protect its own financial interests. Creditors, although an occasionally contemptible group, nevertheless played an essential role in Roman society (see Andraeu 1999). Many of the creditors were likely to have been *equites* (Badian 1969: 477). The debt crisis that required Tiberius' action in AD 33 (Tac. *Ann.* 6.16-17) probably postdates the publication of V.'s work and cannot contribute to his thinking here.

**adversus Sempronii Asellionis praetoris urbani:** Aulus Sempronius Asellio (*BNP* 13.244) was urban praetor for 89; see also Badian 1968: 2-3, 1969: 475-481; Brennan 2000: 443. The financial crises caused by the Social War included a credit collapse, a debasement of the currency, and endangered the property of Roman aristocrats, placing debtors in a precarious position (App. *BCiv.* 1.54); they suspended payments and legal suits ensued; see Carney 1961a: 52-3; cf. Liv. *Per.* 74.

**quem, quia causam debitorum suscepit:** Asellio's revival of an obsolete law banning loaning at interest favoured the debtors in trials concerning unpaid debts (Badian 1969: 479-80); and through his support of the debtors he was able to retain popular support against the *equites*; see Evans 2007: 88-90.

**concitati a L. Cassio tribuno plebis:** V. alone names the instigator. Appian explicitly states that the murderers of Asellio were unknown, having been covered up by the creditors, despite the offer by the senate of reward. Badian (1969: 481 n. 101) wonders whether L. Cassius was a relative of C. Cassius, who helped bring about the Mithridatic War.

**pro aede Concordiae sacrificium facientem:** Appian specifies sacrifice to Castor and Pollux (the patrons of the *equites*; Badian 1969: 477), while the *Periochae* merely locate

that the action in the Forum. V.'s **pro aede Concordiae**, Badian (1969: 476) believes, was introduced for rhetorical and dramatic effect; the incident is certainly ironic, given that a socially divisive murder took place at shrine celebrating social harmony (cf. also Mueller 2002a: 126-7). If Appian's location is correct, the date is probably 27 January, the anniversary of the temple's dedication, when a magistrate sacrificed to the Dioscuri (Badian 1969: 476-7). However, it may be the proximity of the praetor's tribunal in the Comitium with the temple of Concord and the ideological connection of that temple with the problems of debt and social discord (Plin. *HN* 33.19) that is relevant (so David 1995, esp. 374-7). If so V. would not be introducing an ironic reference to Concord, but the temple was factually and symbolically important in the elimination of Asellio.

**ab ipsis altaribus ... latitantem:** V.'s **ab ipsis altaribus** underscores the impiety and sacrilege of the deed. Appian includes the added detail that Asellio first attempted to run for the temple of Vesta, but when prevented, made for a tavern, V.'s **tabernula**. In contrast to V.'s **extra forum**, cf. Appian's ἐν ἀγορᾷ μέσση.

**praetextatum discernserunt:** For the *praetexta* (the magistrate's distinctive bordered toga – here showing his piously fulfilling the religious dimension of his job) used as a sacrificial robe, cf. Quint. *Decl.* 340; Tac. *Ann.* 2.14.1; SHA *Hadr.* 26.6, *Alex.* 40.9 (Goodyear 1981: 222). For *discernere* used of the *populus'* action, cf. e.g. Val. Max. 9.9.1.

#### 9.7.mil.Rom.1

This story follows on directly from the former in Appian (*BCiv.* 1.55) also, dealing as it does with the first victim of the Civil War in 88 (cf. Oros. 5.19.4).

**Detestanda fori condicio ... magna orietur indignatio:** The location of the action of the last *exemplum* in the forum carries over in V.'s metonymic opening formulation. For the *forum/castra* antithesis as synonyms for civil/military, cf. 2.9.8; 3.2.17.

**C. Mario ... privato:** On Marius' presentation in V., see 9.2.2: **C. Marius.** V. emphasises Marius' status as *privatus* so that he is able to account in his moralising conclusion for the soldiers' indignation at having to exchange their service from one who held highest command to someone who held no office.

**lege Sulpicia provincia Asia, ut adversus Mithridatem bellum gereret ... decreta esset:** Mithradates had invaded Bithynia, Phrygia, and part of the Roman province of Asia; command in a justified war had been given to Sulla after the regular allocation of provinces by the lot. Marius, however, had desired command of the Mithriadic campaign (see Luce 1970: 161-194; Keaveney 1983: 53-4) and the tribune P. Sulpicius Rufus (cf. 6.5.7) engineered this through (secretly) drafting a bill, passed through the *concilium plebis*, that transferred command from Sulla to Marius (App. *BCiv.* 1.55; cf. Plut. *Mar.* 35, *Sull.* 8; Liv. *Per.* 77; Vell. 2.18; Powell 1990: 446-60).

**Gratidium legatum ... milites trucidarunt:** Gratidius (*BNP* 5.995); a member of the family from Marius' home-town of Arpinum, with whom Marius was closely related; he was a military tribune (Plut. *Mar.* 35, *Sull.* 8), whose death took place in Campania (cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.56; Plut. *Sull.* 8.4 – Nola) rather than before the walls of Rome (Oros. 5.19.4).

**L. Sullam consulem:** V. indicates Sulla's status in order to contrast his status with Marius' in the conclusion (see also comment above). On V.'s presentation of Sulla, see 9.2.1.

**procul dubio ... transire cogentur:** Carney (1961: 55 n. 253) rightly categorises V.'s explanation as 'a subjective interpretation ... quite out of keeping with the contemporary climate of military opinion on constitutional matters'. Appian (*BCiv.* 1.57) has the troops worry about losing the opportunity of a campaign in which they could enrich themselves if Marius brought in other troops (cf. Levick 1982: 505), but it is likely that Marius' reputation as a disciplinarian contrasted with the lax and generous Sulla explains their reluctance.

**sed quis ferat ... exitio legati corrigentem:** Fear of the involvement of the military in politics was a feature of the early empire (cf. e.g. Dio 52.27), which was minimised by Augustus (see Raaflaub 1980: 1005-25). Under Tiberius, however, this fear was justified in light of the mutinies of AD 14 (cf. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 1.16-30; Dio 56.12); cf. the language of the *SCPP* (ll. 52-5); Suetonius alleges that Tiberius felt insecure (*Tib.* 25.1-2). V. is technically correct (despite his rhetorical plural) on the technical status of Sulpicius' measure (*plebiscitum*) brought before the *concilium plebis*; correction of legislation was a function of the voting assembly not the troops.

#### 9.7.mil.Rom.2

Livy is the likely source (cf. *Per.* 77), as both he and V. ascribe to Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo a role in the death of Quintus Pompeius.

**Pro consule istud ... illud adversus consulem:** V. uses the office of consul as a transition to the next *exemplum*.

**Q. enim Pompeium, Sullae collegam:** Quintus Pompeius Rufus (*BNP* 11.566) was consul along with Sulla in 88. He is also mentioned incidentally by V. in his role as urban praetor in 91 at 3.5.2.

**senatus iussu:** Cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.63: Κόιντον δὲ Πομπήιον, τὸν ἕτερον ὕπατον, ὁ δῆμος οἰκτεῖρων τοῦ δέους ἐψηφίσατο ἄρχειν Ἰταλίας καὶ ἑτέρου τοῦ περὶ αὐτὴν στρατοῦ, τότε ὄντος ὑπὸ Γναίῳ Πομπηίῳ. Because of Sulla's constitutional reforms, nothing could be put before the popular assembly without prior consent of the senate (App. *BCiv.* 1.59), so both V. and Appian present a part of the truth here (cf. Keaveney 1982: 74). This proposal is likely to have been vetoed by the tribune C. Herennius (cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.63; Sall. *Hist.* 2.21McG cf., however, the comments of Keaveney 1983: 83-4 and McGushin 1992: 194-6).

**exercitum Cn. Pompeii ... invita civitate obtinebat:** After his consulship in 89, Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo (*BNP* 11.566-7; 5.2.9; 6.2.8; 6.9.9; 9.14.2) had retained control of his army in 88 as proconsul to complete mopping up operations against

the Vestini and Paeligni. He was, however, disliked by the people (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 1; Gran. Lic. 35.42-5 Cr.; Keaveney 1983: 83-4) but retained stern loyalty from his troops whom he incited to overthrow Pompeius Rufus (cf. Vell. 2.20.1).

**ambitiosi ducis illecebris corrupti:** Livy (*Per.* 77) and Velleius (2.20.1) also blame Strabo for the murder; Appian (*BCiv.* 1.63), explicitly, does not. Strabo's *ambitio* was a feature of his whole career (see Gruen 1968: 227). V. also condemns Sp. Albinus (2.7.2) as an *ambitiosus*, and too indulgent to his troops. V. and his readers might well have thought of Piso, a glaring recent example of a general who over-indulged his troops and corrupted Roman discipline (*SCPP* II. 53-7).

**milites sacrificare incipientem adorti in modum hostiae mactarunt:** V. alone mentions that the soldiers killed him like a sacrificial victim while he was beginning to perform a sacrifice; cf. Appian (*BCiv.* 1.63), who states that the soldiers gathered round him under the pretence of listening to him. This setting provides a religious context for V.'s moral condemnation (see Mueller 2002a: 127), and prepares the way for his neat rhetorical conclusion.

**curia castris cedere se confessa, inultum abiit:** An alliterative final sentence concludes the *exemplum*. Strabo was probably prosecuted for *maiestas* under the *lex Varia* for his role in Pompeius' murder (cf. Ascon. 79 C; Gruen 1965: 71), but not convicted – rather than an acquittal, it may be that the trial reached no formal conclusion. Strabo was again in command of his troops in 87 (*MRR* 2.48-9). Strangely, V. makes nothing out of his death by lightning (see Watkins 1988: 143-150), which could easily have been exploited for rhetorical effect as 'divine' punishment for a life of treachery.

### 9.7.mil.Rom.3

Given the parallel with Granius Licinianus (36.8-9 Cr.), Livy is a likely source for the *exemplum*.

**nefarie violentus:** *Nefarie* continues the religious language of the conclusion to the previous example, and **violentus** underlines the theme of the chapter.

**C. Carbonem, fratrem Carbonis ter consulis:** Gaius Papirius Carbo (*BNP* 10.485) was tribune of the plebs in 89, praetor in 81 (but cf. Brennan 2000: 382), and Sulla's legate in 80, during the events of this *exemplum*. He was the younger brother of Gnaeus Papirius Carbo (*BNP* 10.486), who was consul in 85, 84, and 82, and the greatest enemy of Sulla. Shackleton Bailey (1977: 328) has suggested that the relationship was actually that of cousin (i.e. *frater patruelis*), the implication being that Sulla did not advance someone very closely related to his enemy.

**propter bella civilia ... rigidius astringere conatum:** Ill-disciplined legions were a feature of this period of civil war; see Gruen 1974: 372-3. The *SCPP* (ll. 52-3) celebrates Augustus for his restoration of military discipline after the slackness of the later civil wars and Tiberius for his maintenance of it; Velleius celebrates Aemilius Paullus (2.5.3) and Augustus (2.78.2) for their concern for military discipline and explicitly links revolt with loss of discipline (2.81.2); Tiberius is portrayed unambiguously as a strict disciplinarian of his troops (Suet. *Tib.* 19.1: *disciplinam acerrime exegit animaduersionum et ignominiarum generibus ex antiquitate repetitis ...*). V. strongly supports the imposition of military discipline (see 2.7), but the comparative adverbs show that Carbo's methods were too harsh and provoked a revolt. So V. is entirely in line with contemporary thought.

**privavit vita:** Granius Licinianus (36.8-9 Cr.: *Volaterrani se Romanis dediderunt ante occiso per seditionem lapidibus Carbone praetorio, quem Sulla praefecerat [is Cn. Carbonis frater fuit]*) specifies stoning, but the ablative absolute conceals the agent – for V. to be correct it must be the Roman army under Carbo's command sent by Sulla to force the surrender of Volaterrae, which was the last stronghold of Marius' supporters. Brennan (2000: 382), however, blames the Volaterrani.

**satiusque duxit maximo ... taetros mores mutare:** Cf. Liv. *praef.* 10 for the preference of disease over cure; **coinquinari** is largely a medical term (*OLD* 2; cf. its use at Val. Max. 6.1.6).

### **De Temeritate**

Aristotle (*EN* 1115b) claimed that being over confident, being rash in one's action, was a vice. Cicero claimed that every action of the moral man must be made free from *temeritas* (*Off.* 1.101). Because rash actions are not made with the requisite amount of due rational thought (hence V.'s emphasis on the speed at which the impulses of temerity effect the minds of men), they are open to error. *Temeritas*, however, is different from general *error* in V.'s definition because it is carried out voluntarily (9.9.praef.; cf. also examples from outside the chapter: 1.6.6; 2.9.6b; 4.1.praef.; 6.2.8; 6.2.11). The noun and its cognates appear 38 times in the work, indicating that it was a significant failing.

The division of *exempla*, again, as often, gives the lion's share to domestic examples, with three Roman, but only two foreign ones. In each half the final *exemplum* provides an example where a group displays the vice, while in the three other *exempla* an individual is condemned. V.'s comment at the opening of 9.8.ext.1 could suggest that he has lower moral expectations of foreigners than of their Roman counterparts (see, however, commentary *ad loc.*). Although others regarded *temeritas* as typical of barbarians (cf. e.g. Caes. *BGall.* 7.42.2), V. attributes it unquestionably also to Romans in this chapter. In this he stands firmly within the historical and moral tradition and in line with his contemporary Velleius: for Livy *cautus* is a term of praise and *incautus* a vice (see Moore 1989: 116-18); Sallust has Marius criticize *temeritas* as a common failing of Roman generals (*Iug.* 85.47) and then display it himself (*Iug.* 94.7); Velleius criticises *temeritas* displayed by Annius Milo (2.68.3) and C. Caesar (2.102.2); Brutus' assassination of Caesar was his one act of *temeritas* and

most significantly exculpates Tiberius of it by implication (2.112.5). Given Augustus' preference for cautious generalship (seen e.g. at Suet. *Aug.* 25.4), as well as Tiberius' own ultra cautious campaigning methods (e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 18), V. is safe in discussing this particular vice. Notably all of V.'s *exempla* are in the military context, a far narrower scope than Greek moralists/philosophers had in mind, but one that fits the Roman pattern well.

The chapter features a number of recurring ideas which mark it off as a unit. Firstly, the setting of a water-crossing is found in three of the *exempla* (9.8.1; 9.8.2; 9.8.ext.1), the motif of stormy weather and rough seas occurs in three of the *exempla* (9.8.2; 9.8.ext.1; 9.8.ext.2), and finally, man's actions are subjected to necessity in two of the *exempla* (9.8.2; 9.8.ext.2).

9.8.praef.

**Temeritatis etiam subiti ... aestimatione prosequi valent:** With **etiam** V. implies a connection, or similarity, in the impulses experienced which cause a person to act rashly and violently. The hallmarks of these impulses are that they are sudden and severe (**subiti et eheementes**; cf. Sen. *Q Nat.* 2.27.3); cf. 9.4.praef. where *moderatio* is its distinct opposite. The speed at which a rash action is made is relational to the amount of time that a person has reflected on the appropriateness of the action itself (cf. Cicero's reasoning at *Off.* 1.101); **nec sua pericula discernere** applies particularly to the *exempla* of Africanus and Caesar, **nec aliena facta iusta aestimatione** to the failing of Albinus' army.

9.8.1

V. offers a simplified version of Scipio Africanus' crossing, probably taken from Livy 28.17.10-12, despite few significant verbal parallels. Having driven the Carthaginians out of Spain after the battle of Ilerda, Scipio wanted to put pressure on Carthage

within Africa. Accounts of Africanus' meeting in 206 with Syphax the Numidian king of the Masaesylians are found also at Polyb. 11.24a.4; App. *Hisp.* 29.116-30.119; Sil. 16.117-276; Zon. 9.10.1. The tension in the historical episode, which V. fails to mention, but Livy's account indicates, was increased also by Hasdrubal's presence at Syphax's court.

**Quam enim temere se:** Livy does not use *temeritas* or any of its cognates in relation to this episode, but characterises Scipio's thinking (28.17.11) as involving great danger (see below).

**Africanus superior:** Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus (BNP 3.821-2), the celebrated general, referred to as *superior* by V. to distinguish him from his adopted grandson (cf. e.g. 2.7.12; 2.10.2a; 3.5.1a; 4.5.3; 5.2.5; 5.3.2b; 5.4.2; 5.6.7; 6.6.4; 7.3.3; 8.14.1; 8.15.1).

**ex Hispania duabus quinqueremibus ad Syphacem traiecit:** Cf. Livy 28.17.10-13: *finibus etiam regni apte ad Hispaniam quod freto exiguo dirimuntur, positis. Dignam itaque rem Scipio ratus quae, quoniam non aliter posset, magno periculo peteretur, L. Marcio Tarracone M. Silano Carthagine Noua, quo pedibus ab Tarracone itineribus magnis ierat, ad praesidium Hispaniae relictis ipse cum C. Laelio duabus quinqueremibus ab Carthagine profectus tranquillo mari plurimum remis, interdum et leni adiuuante uento, in Africam traiecit.*

**ad Syphacem ... in unius Numidiae infidis praecordiis:** Syphax's (BNP 14.39) constantly changing alliances justifies V.'s *infidus*; according to Livy he had become an *amicus* of Rome in 210 (27.4.6), but later allied himself with Carthage by marrying Hasdrubal's daughter (Polyb. 14.1.4, 7.1-6; Liv. 28.7, 17-8; Diod. 27.7; Dio 17.57.51; Zon. 9.11-2), and broke relations with Rome (Liv. 29.23; Frontin. *Str.* 2.7.4).

**itaque exiguo momento maxime rei casus fluctuatus est:** The contrast of *exiguus* and *maximus* provides V. with a rhetorical commonplace which he has adapted from Livy's introduction to the episode; cf. Liv. 28.17.10: *Magnum in omnia momentum.*

**utrum interfector an captivus Scipionis Syphax fieret:** V.'s rhetorical question is ironic, but forced. Syphax was later to become a prisoner of Rome (Val. Max. 6.2.3),

but in 206 this was hardly the case; he was defeated and captured by Massinissa at Cirta in 203, taken to Rome and died at Tibur (Polyb. 15.4.4; Diod. 27.10.1; Liv. 30.11.1-12.22, 17.1-14; Val. Max. 6.9.ext.7; cf. also 5.1.1b).

### 9.8.2

As the penultimate *exemplum* of the domestic examples, Julius Caesar is not presented as the worst exemplar, despite the episode being the last *exemplum* chronologically; the climactic position is given to Albinus, because the rashness of the soldiers led to his death. Accounts of Caesar's attempted crossing of the sea in 48, from Dyrrachium to Italy, are numerous. Caesar himself omitted the episode from his own account (*BCiv.* 3.25-7), which has led some scholars to consider it a fiction (e.g. Weinstock 1971: 112-27), but it rapidly appeared in Pollio's histories (Matthews 2008: 307-18, Pelling 2011: 344), and was frequently taken up widely thereafter (cf. e.g. Luc. 5.497-677; Plut. *Caes.* 38, *Mor.* 206c-d, 319b-c; Suet. *Iul.* 58.2; Flor. 2.13.37; App. *BCiv.* 2.56-58; Dio 41.46.2-4; Amm. 16.10.3). Livy's account is lost, but is the likely source of V.'s version.

**C. Caesaris:** Caesar's presentation in V. is almost wholly positive; this *exemplum* is a rare exception of his inclusion among exemplars of vice (see Bloomer 1992: 207-26; Wardle 1997: 323-345); and even so, it is worth noting that V. minimises the damage by not presenting the ferocious criticism that Caesar's actions aroused from his troops (evident e.g. at Plut. *Caes.* 37.7, 38.7), and by giving the decision to return to Caesar; cf. also App. *BCiv.* 2.58.1 where Caesar's actions are deemed more fitting of a common soldier than of a general. For contemporary criticism of his *temeritas*, cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.26. Abbreviated nomenclature in V. is the rule, and the simple *praenomen* and *cognomen* for Caesar is one of V.'s standard forms of address for him (Wardle 1997: 324-5); cf. this designation elsewhere also at 1.6.12; 2.10.7; 3.2.22; 3.2.23; 4.5.6; 4.6.4; 6.6.15; 8.3.2; 8.11.2; 9.9.1; 9.15.1.

**anceps conatus:** Cf. Plut. *Caes.* 38.1: δεινὸν ἐβούλευσε βούλευμα. To fit the category of *temeritas* the undertaking must be of uncertain outcome; V. emphasises this despite the amelioration of the next clause.

**etsi caelestium cura protectus est:** V. here, probably, has in mind the *fortuna* of Caesar (concealed behind the alliterative **caelestium cura**), as presented in the other sources; see especially Luc. 5.497-503, 672-7; Plut. *Mor.* 319b-c; Weinstock 1971: 116-123; Pelling 2011: 346-7. Tiberius possibly attempted to associate himself with Caesar's *fortuna* by dedicating a temple to Fors Fortuna in the *horti Caesaris* (Tac. *Ann.* 2.41.1). V. frequently underlines the divine favour shown to Caesar (cf. 1.6.12, 6.9.15). In this and most strikingly at 9.11.ext.4 where Tiberius too is protected by a divine apparatus, he reflects and actively supports the contemporary view that the *domus Augusta* was divinely protected (cf. e.g. *SCPP* l. 129; Vell. *Pat.* 2.131.1; Ov. *Fast.* 2.63ff.).

**non tamen vix sine horrore animi referri potest:** V.'s statement reveals his imperial bias.

**impatiens legionum tardioris a Brundisio Apolloniam traiectus:** Caesar had been waiting in Epirus for his troops from Brundisium, who were under the command of M. Antonius, and he believed that, despite it being winter, they had missed several opportunities of calm in which they could have sailed across to join him (cf. *Caes. BCiv.* 3.25-7; Luc. 5.497-677; Plut. *Caes.* 38, *Suet. Iul.* 58.2; Flor. 2.13.37; App. *BCiv.* 2.56-58; Dio 41.46.2-4). V. singles out Caesar's impatience as the cause of his rash actions (cf. Flor.'s *adeo impatiens erat*). Apollonia is a port city, up river by some distance, as Appian suggests (see the map in Pelling 2011: 348).

**per simulationem adversae valetudinis convivio egressus:** The circumstantial detail about dinner appears in Appian (*BCiv.* 2.57) but not in Lucan (5.507). For **adversae valetudinis** ('ill-health'), cf. Val. Max. 9.2.ext.11; the phrase is commonly used throughout Celsus' *De medicina*; cf. e.g. 1.pr.4; 2.pr.1; 2.pr.2; 2.10.10; 3.2.5. Appian (*BCiv.* 2.57.1) states the Caesar arose from dinner pretending to be fatigued.

**maiestate sua servili veste occultata:** Plutarch (*Caes.* 38.2) also has Caesar disguise himself as a slave (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 319c); Appian and Dio, as a private person pretending to be a messenger sent by himself; cf. Luc. 5.538: *plebeio ... amictu*; Suetonius (*Iul.* 58.2): *obvoluto capite*.

V.'s use of *maiestas* is suggestive of the quasi-divine quality of the human Caesar; it certainly highlights the status difference between him and his slave clothes. V. uses the term in general of the state and state institutions (e.g. 1.8.1b; 2.2.8; 2.9.3; 3.4.6; 5.6.praef.; 6.3.3; 6.4.2a; 6.5.4; 8.15.ext.1; 9.2.3; 9.5.1), as well as of various *clari viri* (e.g. chapter 2.10), but also of Tiberius (5.5.3), and elsewhere of Caesar (3.7.11). He does not use it in the sense of treason that appears to have developed during Tiberius' reign (see Bauman 1974; Yakobson 2003: 75-84; however note especially p. 76: 'any attempt to define the exact scope of the crime of *maiestas* and its precise legal meaning during the reign of Tiberius is probably misguided').

**naviculam conscendit:** Most (Suetonius, Appian, and Dio), along with V.'s diminutive, give simply a 'small boat'; cf. Flor. 2.13.37, however, who has a 'scout boat' (*speculatorium navigium*; and V.'s later reference to the boat: *navigium*); Plutarch (*Caes.* 38.1; cf., however, *Mor.* 206c-d, 319b-c) specifies a twelve-oared boat; and Lucan has the poetic *carina* (5.503; cf. 514, 655; with Matthews 2008: 73-4).

**e flumine Ao<o> maris Hadriatici saeva tempestate fauces petiit:** the Aous river (modern, Vjosë) in northwestern Greece. The river is identified by Plutarch also; while an unnamed river is referred to by Appian. Lucan and Cassius Dio make no mention of a river, but only refer to the crossing of open sea. In both V. and Plutarch the MSS are emended; the Apsus river, further North of the Aous, has also been suggested; the Aous, however, is almost certainly meant, see Pelling 2011: 345-6.

**protinusque in altum ... tandem necessitati cessit:** V.'s passive (*iusso navigio*) minimises the fact that Caesar had ordered the dangerous expedition. For **contrariis ... fluctibus** 'adverse waves' cf. e.g. Val. Max. 1.8.ext.11; Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.27 (Whitton 2013: 253); Lucan (5.672-7) provides a bizarre picture of Caesar's return to the land

caused by a ‘tenth wave’ (created to stress his *fortuna*; Matthews 2008: 249); cf. also Plut. *Mor.* 206d. He had finally to allow the boat to return to Apollonia (App. *BCiv.* 2.57: ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ, τῷ δαιμονίῳ χαλεψάμενος ὡς φθονεῶν, ἐφῆκε τὴν ναῦν ἐπανιέναι) with great reluctance (Plut. *Caes.* 38.6: συνεχώρησε μάλ’ ἄκων τῷ κυβερνήτῃ μεταβαλεῖν). V. presents Caesar finally bowing to necessity, a dignified construction depicting Caesar as a kind of Stoic *sapiens*; Langlands (2011: 117), ‘in Valerius Maximus, like the external forces of Natura and Fortuna, [*Necessitas*] is neither a virtue nor a vice, but a constraint upon human behaviour and an imposer of difficult circumstances. It is an impersonal force acting upon the lives of men’; cf. e.g. 1.7.ext.4; 1.8.ext.10; 1.8.ext.18; 2.10.6; 4.3.7; 5.3.ext.3; 7.3.8; 7.6.praef.; 7.6.1a; 8.1.absol.6.

### 9.8.3

In 89, during the Social War, A. Postumius Albinus commanded a naval squadron in the campaign against Pompeii; his troops stoned and clubbed him to death for reasons that are disputed. V.’s account is the most detailed to have survived; cf. Liv. *Per.* 75; Plut. *Sull.* 6.16; Polyae. 8.9.1; Oros. 5.18.22; a fragment of L. Cornelius Sisenna may also allude to this event (see F91, with comment at *FRHist* III.403).

**Age:** The transitional devices of this chapter nowhere imply an ordering by V. of degrees of transgression; or a climactic structure, as in other chapters, e.g. 9.3; 9.5; however, as noted at 9.8.3, this *exemplum* does provide the worst outcome.

**illa quam execrabilis militum temeritas:** V. places the blame squarely on the shoulders of the soldiers; Orosius (5.18.22), however, blames Albinus’ unbearable arrogance. *Execrabilis* is high in V.’s emotive vocabulary (cf. 9.11.ext.4), and thus suitable for climactic *exemplum*.

**A. Albinus, nobilitate moribus honorum omnium consummatione civis eximius:** Aulus Postumius Albinus (*RE* XXII.1 909-10). Ogilvie (1965: 609) assumes him to be the consul of 99 (cf. Oros. 5.18.22); Münzer (cf. also Broughton, *MRR* 3.173),

however, is unsure given Plutarch's designation of him as a man of praetorian dignity (*Sull.* 6.16-17). V.'s formulation, especially **honorum omnium**, suggests that he had indeed held the consulship; **nobilitate** would also indicate membership of a family that had attained curule office; the Postumii were patricians.

**falsas et inanes suspiciones:** V.'s chosen adjectives again emphasise that he believes Albinus was innocent; Livy (*Per.* 75: *infamis crimine perduellionis*) indicates that treason was suspected. For the combination of **falsas** and **inanes**, cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 5.8.3; Sen. *Ep.* 110.5.6; Tac. *Ann.* 3.8.8; Serv. *Aen.* 1.392.7. Orosius (5.18.22), to very different effect, places the cause of his death firmly at his own door, his intolerable *superbia*.

**in castris ab exercitu lapidibus obrueretur:** Cf. Plut. *Sull.* 6.9, 16-7; Polyæn. *Strat.* 8.9.1. The historical stoning of this Albinus may affect the tradition of the similar fate of P. Postumius Albinus Regillensis (*BNP* 11.696), the consular tribune of 414 (Livy 4.49.8; Ogilvie 1965: 609). L. Cato narrowly escaped the same fate (Dio fr. 100); and Cinna was stabbed to death by his troops in 84 (e.g. Vell. 2.24.5).

**quodque accessionem indignationis ... potestas negata est:** The details are unique to V., as he formulates his conclusion to highlight the extremity of the action. Plutarch (*Sull.* 6.16-7) reports that Sulla did nothing in response to this crime, but instead passed it over, believing that it would spur his troops on to greater bravery, and bring himself more power (cf. also Polyæn. 8.9.1). For *indignatio* as an emotion to be directed against vice, cf. 5.3.3; 9.7.mil.1; 9.11.ext.4.

9.8.ext.1

The tale of Hannibal's savage and hasty treatment of his helmsman, Pelorus, probably comes to V. via Sallust (Serv. *Aen.* 3.411 = Sall. *Hist.* 4.25 McG); it is found also at Strabo 1.1.17; Mela 2.116, and in outline form in Isid. *Etym.* 14.7.4. The tale is indisputably unhistorical, at least so far as the etymology of the place is concerned, as Pelorus was so-called at least 200 years before Hannibal (cf. Thuc. 4.25.2: τὴν

Πελωρίδα), a name probably taken from the mussels found there (cf. *Elegiae in Maecenatem* 1.41). The story is probably based on the execution of Salganeus on the Euripus by the Persian general Megabates in 480 (Strab. 9.2.9).

**Itaque minus miror:** V.'s statement, which signals a change to foreign examples, could suggest that that he holds his Roman exemplars to a higher moral standard than their foreign counterparts; the idea is closely mirrored at 9.11.ext.3. Lawrence (2006), however, has shown that ultimately behaviour and not ethnic difference is a marker of morality across the work. Use of *miror* or *mirus* by V. expresses his lack of amazement at what he records, and is a recurrent theme (cf. 1.1.8; 1.6.8; 2.6.1; 2.10.2; 4.1.ext.2; 5.1.ext.1; 6.1.10; 6.2.4; 7.8.3; 8.7.ext.3; 8.11.ext.4; 9.11.ext.3; 9.12.2). Indirectly, at least, V. touches on the credibility of his account, reassuring in effect his readers.

**trucem et saevum animum Hannibalis:** For this combination, cf. e.g. Liv. 5.2.9; Sen. *HF* 936; SHA *Gord.* 7.2.2. On Hannibal in V., see 9.2.ext.2.

**defensionis locum innoxio gubernatori:** The descriptor of the as yet nameless helmsman heightens Hannibal's savagery. V. also constructs this *exemplum* to match the keynote of the previous one.

**a Petelia classe Africam repetens freto appulsus:** The Carthaginians had recalled Hannibal from Italy in 203 (Liv. 30.19.12; Diod. 27.9.1; App. *Hann.* 58); the route required by this story took him from Petelia in the Croton area through the Straits of Messina along the north coast of Sicily to the narrowest crossing to Africa, although Hannibal landed at Leptis Minor 160 km SE of Carthage which suggests a direct route from Bruttium down the east coast of Sicily, thus never entering the straits of Messina. Mela's account confuses Hannibal's journey in 195 from Africa to Syria (see Livy 33.48.2ff.) with this one (Shackleton Bailey 2000: 350 n. 4).

**dum tam parvo ... divisas non credit:** At its narrowest the Strait of Messina, which separates Italy and Sicily, measures roughly 3.1 kilometres in breadth. Sicily itself occupied a key vantage point within the Mediterranean because of its visibility (Gowers 2010: 76); and it was considered distinct from Italy in antiquity (cf. e.g. Cic.

*Agr.* 3.12; *Caes. BCiv.* 3.42.3; *Plin. HN* 35.147; Hutchinson 2013: 77). The story lacks credibility. The Carthaginians had hundreds of years of experience in Sicily, and good knowledge of Messina and the Mamertines. Hannibal had been campaigning in southern Italy for years and had besieged Rhegium in these very straits.

**velut insidiosum cursus rectorem interemit:** Strabo and Mela similarly have Hannibal think he has been betrayed.

**posteaque diligentius inspecta ... collocatum indicium est:** Strabo (1.1.17) mentions a memorial statue; cf. also Strab. 3.5.5 which mentions a tower. On the evidence of the Polla *elogium* (*ILLRP* 454), there may have been a complementary statute on the Italian side (Gowers 2010: 76 n. 51); see also Prestianni Giallombardo 2002: 149-151. Shackleton Bailey (2000: 350 n. 4) is right to label Ernst Wüst's *RE* (Peloros 3) entry 'wild', for he completely garbles the reference in Strabo 1.1.17. V.'s addition is to make the story an *exemplum* of Punic temerity. The memorial statue of Pelorus, which was set up by the Libyans according to Strabo (1.1.17), evokes a 'double memory', not only of him, but also Hannibal's rash act. The *temeritas* of an individual gets ascribed to the whole community in V.'s closing remarks (**Punicae temeritatis**), which prepares the reader for the next *exemplum* where the vice is a feature of the *demos*.

#### 9.8.ext.2

In the final *exemplum* of the chapter, V. criticises the Athenian community's actions in consigning its generals to a trial and death in the aftermath of their victory over Sparta at Arginusae in 406, because of their failure, due to stormy weather and rough seas, to rescue the Athenian survivors in the water and retrieve the dead; cf. *Diod.* 13.97-102; *Xen. Hell.* 1.6.27-7.34; see also Plato *Apol.* 32a4-c2; *Val. Max.* 1.1.ext.8. While V.'s intermediate source is unknown, it likely derives from Ephorus, and may go back even to the historian of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*; see Wardle 1998: 135; and Asmonti 2006: 1-21 (who provides the most recent bibliographical survey of the

secondary literature; see now also Hamel 2015). Because of the episode's rhetorical possibilities, it was used as a Greek declamatory exercise, see Stephens 1983: 171-180.

**Atheniensium civitas ad vesaniam usque temeraria:** Cf. 3.8.ext.3: *universa civitas Atheniensium, iniquissimo ac truculentissimo furore instincta*. The 'Athenian community' are also exemplars of *crudelitas* at 9.2.ext.8 (see further comment there); V. is no fan of Athenian democracy. Xenophon highlights that the Athenian *demos* acted contrary to custom (cf. *Hell.* 1.7.5, 12). They later regretted their rash actions and arrested Callixenus who proposed the motion of condemnation (cf. *Xen. Hell.* 1.7.35; *Diod.* 13.103.1; *Plato Apol.* 32b); see Rhodes 1981: 424.

**decem universos imperatores:** Cf. 3.8.ext.3. The Greek sources (*Diod.* 13.101.5-102.1; *Xen. Hell.* 1.7.30) reliably record that eight generals fought at Arginusae and six were executed: Pericles, Diomedon, Lysias, Thrasyllus, Aristocrates, Erasinides, Protomachus, and Aristogenes; elsewhere Xenophon states nine (*Mem.* 1.1.18, 4.4.2), while Plato (*Apol.* 32b), Ps.-Plato (*Axioch.* 368d), and Aristotle (*Pol.* 34.1; see Rhodes 1981: 423, who calls it an error) have ten. These must be thinking of the standard board of ten generals, see Krentz 1989: 159-160.

**a pulcherrima victoria venientes:** Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.6.34) puts Athenian losses at 25 ships and those of the enemy at over 70; Diodorus (13.99.6, 100.3) emphasises the rout of the Spartans and enumerates the respective losses at 25 and 77.

**capitali iudicio exceptos necavit ... mandare non potuissent:** Six out of the eight generals were condemned to death (*Diod.* 13.101.1). The remaining two (Aristogenes and Protomachus) escaped death by not returning to Athens. The fact of the stormy sea (*saevitia maris*) is made clear in the Greek sources as well (*Xen. Hell.* 1.6.35; *Diod.* 13.100.2); and is a recurring motif within this chapter, cf. 9.8.2; 9.8.ext.1.

**necessitatem puniens, cum honorare virtutem deberet:** V. again refers to the men's action in the face of necessity (cf. 9.8.2; see also 7.6, where V. takes an evenhanded approach to both Roman and foreign sufferings under necessity). The point that the generals were wrongly condemned for their actions which were influenced by

events beyond their control is also stressed in Xenophon's narrative (Krentz 1989: 151). *Virtus* is used here of the naval excellence displayed.

### De Errore

In the shortest chapter of the book, V. presents three 'Roman' *exempla* of fatalities brought about by human error; the final *exemplum*, however, has the Veientes as its subject, with Romans as their victims (the Veientes only appear in domestic *exempla* throughout V.; cf. 1.5.1; 1.6.3; 1.8.5; 4.1.2; 4.4.8; 5.3.2a; 5.5.2); and V. provides no indication of a transition to external examples.

Cicero (*Off.* 1.94), himself had presented *error* in terms of a moral schema; an idea which possibly went back to at least Socrates (cf. *Xen. Mem.* 3.9.6, where error is termed 'madness' only in matters of common knowledge). Wrong-thinking, he believed, led to immoral behaviour and injustice. V. continues with this Socratic idea when he states that error is brought about by 'vain imaginings' (*vanis ... imaginibus*); and each of his *exempla* demonstrate this – the harm that befalls each of the victims within the individual *exempla* is brought about through some error of judgement.

9.9.praef.

**Temeritati proximus est error, quem admodum ad laedendum par:** V.'s meaning is literal in so far as the victims of *error* in his *exempla* die, just as most of the victims of *temeritas* in the previous chapter did; error, though, is excusable because the wrongdoings caused because of it are not deliberate, but caused by wrong-thinking; see also comments above as well as at the introduction to 9.8. The linking of these vices is anticipated by Cicero, who also links the two nouns (cf. e.g. *Rep.* 1.52; *Acad.* 1.42; *Lucul.* 66).

**quia non sua sponte sed vanis concitatus imaginibus:** The implication of no intention (**non sua sponte**; i.e. *διανοία/voluntas*) is a key element of this vice in

earlier philosophical debate (e.g. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1135b). While V.'s language appears to be quasi-philosophical, it is too imprecise to pin down to a specific philosophical origin; an association with insanity, at least as medically defined (e.g. Celsus, *Med.* 3.18.3) is inappropriate; whether V. conceives of these *imagines* in as physical a way as the Epicureans did, for example, is unclear; for *vanis ... imaginibus*, cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.24.15; Plin. *Ep.* 2.1.12.

**qui quam late ... loquor sim obnoxius:** V.'s language seems forced. He is unclear as to why exactly he, himself, would be guilty of the vice under discussion if he attempted a broader discussion of it; possibly because he recognises his own intellectual limitations as well as the constraints of space within the work as a whole (both of which he is well aware of, as he makes clear in the *praef.* to the entire work). **in pectoribus hominum**, cf. 9.13.ext.2; V.'s choice of verb (**vagetur**) is wordplay linked to *error*, which implies a 'wandering about' (*OLD* 1) as well as a moral fault (*OLD* 6).

**paucos igitur eius lapsus referemus:** This chapter is the shortest in length within the ninth book; cf. 9.14.praef., where, however, V. makes a similar claim to relating few examples, but relates many more than here; cf. also 9.10.praef. *Lapsus* is a very mild word for *vitium*, but V. seems consistent in applying it (cf. 3.2.ext.5; 5.3.2a; 6.1.4).

### 9.9.1

**C. Helvius Cinna tribunus plebis:** Conclusively shown to be Gaius Helvius Cinna, the Neoteric poet and friend of Catullus, by Morgan (1990: 558-9), based on a couplet in Ovid's *Ibis* (539-40), *contra* Wiseman (1974); see also Courtney 1993: 212-224. Plutarch (*Brut.* 20.4) identifies him explicitly as a poet, however the other ancient sources for the incident do not: cf. Plut. *Caes.* 68.2; Suet. *Iul.* 85; App. *BCiv.* 2.147; Dio 44.50.4; Zon. 10.12. Cinna's tribunate in 44 (*MRR* 2.324) must have occurred at an older age than was usual (Courtney 1993: 213). The specification of Cinna's office

highlights the sacrilege of his murder – the sacrosanctity of a tribune was violated by the very people his office defended.

**ex funere C. Caesaris domum suam petens:** Cicero explicitly links Caesar's funeral with the *Liberalia*, celebrated on 17 March (*Att.* 14.10; *Phil.* 2.90; circumstantial details in Suetonius (*Iul.* 84) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 6.1.25-31) strongly support a connection with the festival, as does the most plausible interpretation of the schedule of senate meetings and other activities recorded by Plutarch, Appian, and Dio (see Carotta and Eickenberg 2011: 447-67). Plutarch (*Brut.* 20.9-11) relates that, despite having a portentous dream the night before, and suffering from a fever, Cinna was too ashamed not to be present on the day of Caesar's funeral, and that he went out into the crowd as it turned violent. V.'s neutral nomenclature here (**C. Caesaris**), although his most common form of address within the work (Wardle 1997: 324), is compounded by the lack of the usual divinising language. Perhaps even V. could not turn this episode to the praise of *Divus Julius*.

**populi manibus discerptus est:** The coincidence of the funeral falling on the *Liberalia* was exploited by the ancient writers, casting a suitably Dionysian shadow on the description of Cinna's death by emphasising the *sparagmos*-like treatment he received at the hands of the angry crowd; see Carotta and Eickenberg 2011: 458-467. V. fails to mention the *omophagia* element (cf. App. *BCiv* 2. 147; no remains of his corpse were found). Suetonius (*Iul.* 85.1) describes perpetrators as *plebs*.

**pro Cornelio Cinna:** Lucius Cornelius Cinna (*BNP* 3.811), the son of the notorious consul and supporter of Marius. He held a praetorship in 44 (*MRR* 2.320-1).

**cum adfinis esset Caesaris:** He was Caesar's former brother-in-law. His sister, Cornelia Cinna, the daughter of Cinna, had been Caesar's first wife (cf. Suet. *Iul.* 6; Plut. *Caes.* 1.1).

**iratus ei quod ... impiam rostris orationem habuisset:** L. Cornelius Cinna, while not himself one of Caesar's assassins, after the deed was done, had made a speech on the *Ides* in favour of the 'tyrannicides', thus eliciting the anger of the crowd (cf. App.

*BCiv.* 2.147; *Plut. Brut.* 18.13; *Suet. Caes.* 85; Moles 1987: 124-8). V. labels the speech *impia*, because Cinna held his rank thanks to Caesar and thus was guilty of a failing of *pietas*.

**nefarie raptum:** V., in general, presents Caesar's death as parricide (Wardle 1997: 334ff.), thus meriting here the adverb **nefarie** (cf. e.g. the anti-Caesarean use of *iure caesus* at *Suet. Iul.* 76.1). V. was certainly conscious of the tradition of just slaying that was entertained briefly by M. Antonius in 44 (*Sen. Ben.* 5.16.6), but rejects it emphatically.

**caput Helvii ... circa rogam Caesaris fixum iaculo ferret:** Cf. *Suet. Iul.* 85.1; another clear parallel with Bacchic violence: Agaue had stuck the head of Pentheus on her thyrsus (*Eur. Bacch.* 1140).

**officii sui, alieni erroris piaculum miserabile:** V.'s concluding statement highlights the sense of duty felt by Helvius Cinna (cf. *Plut. Brut.* 20.9-11), which provides a sharp rhetorical contrast to the people's tragic error. V.'s concluding remarks on Cinna's death are intentionally ambiguous (referring to both; **sui, alieni**); a *piaculum* can mean both 'an act which demands expiation' (*OLD* 3) – as his death here certainly does – and the expiatory offering itself (*OLD* 1), here done **officii sui**. Mueller's translation (2002: 127) 'sin-offering' is overly Christianising.

### 9.9.2

V. is careful almost always to mention Cassius in relation to his guilt in Caesar's murder (e.g. 1.8.8), but not here. Bloomer (1992: 222 n. 48) suggests that the punishment of parricide is introduced and that Caesar has been praised enough in 9.9.1. The danger of praise for Cassius during Tiberius' reign was all too real, as the case of Cremutius Cordus demonstrates (*Tac. Ann.* 4.34-5). V. tows the imperial line, but (perhaps surprisingly) does not make Cassius' death a consequence of his parricide (unlike at 6.8.4).

**C. Cassium error a semet ipso poenas exigere coegit:** C. Cassius Longinus (*BNP* 2.1165-6), Caesar's assassin, appears in V. 'without redeeming characteristics' (Wardle 1998: 179); cf. 1.4.7; 1.5.8; 1.8.8; 3.1.3; 4.7.4; 6.8.4.

**inter illum enim pugnae quattuor exercituum apud Philippos varium ipsisque ducibus ignotum eventum:** At the first battle of Philippi in 42, M. Antonius (whom V. manages not to mention) defeated Cassius' forces and Brutus Octavian's (cf. e.g. Plut. *Brut.* 42-3; Liv. *Per.* 124; Plut. *Ant.* 22; App. *BCiv.* 4.113; Vell. 2.70), which V. represents here by **varium ... eventum** (cf. Dio 47.45.3-4 for the identical points expressed more rhetorically and with explanations: καὶ γὰρ ἐνίκησαν ἀμφοτέρου καὶ ἠττήθησαν ... τοῦ τε γὰρ πεδίου ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ἅτε καὶ πολλοὶ ὄντες, ἐπέσχον, ὥστε μὴ καθορᾶν ἀλλήλους ... καὶ ἀπὸ τε τούτου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ κονιορτοῦ ἀπλέτου γενομένου ἠγνόησαν τὸ τέλος τῆς μάχης). Plutarch (*Brut.* 42-3) brings out well the difficulties experienced by the two liberators because they did not know how the other was faring.

**missus ab eo Titinius centurio ... quonam in statu res M. Bruti essent:** Cf. Plut. *Brut.* 43.4. V. highlights the circumstances causing Titinius' delay, underscoring that he travelled at night, and by noting the effects of darkness on his speed; Dio in effect blames him for returning σχολῇ (47.46.4).

**exceptum ab hostibus omniaque in eorum potestate recidissee existimans:** cf. Plut. *Brut.* 43.5: ἔδοξε γὰρ ὁ Κάσσιος ἀληθῶς ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ἔχθεσθαι τὸν Τιτίνιον; Dio 47.46.5.

**finire vitam properavit:** In numerous passages V. praises suicide: cf. 2.6.14; 2.6.7; 2.6.8; 2.7.6; 3.2.12; 3.2.13; 3.2.14; 3.2.ext.1; 3.5.1; 4.6.1; 4.6.2; 4.6.3; 4.6.6; 4.7.5; 5.6.ext.3; 5.8.3; 5.8.4; 6.6.ext.1; 6.8.3; 6.8.4; 9.12.4; 9.12.5; 9.12.6; 9.12.ext.1 (see Grisé 1982: 227-8). Cassius, expecting the worst, had (prematurely) commanded his freedman Pindar to kill him; along with the accounts cited above, cf. 6.8.4. Unlike in Stoicism, suicide was not viewed wholly favourably by Epicureans, who saw it instead as a last resort (for a summary of Epicurean views on suicide, see Warren 2004: 205-212), but the

Epicurean Cassius *thought* he had no alternative. Under Tiberius suicide was generally viewed favourably (however cf. e.g. *SCPP* ll. 71-3), and was apparently frequent, especially among *maiestas* victims anticipating their death-sentences (cf. e.g. Dio 58.15; Griffin 1986: 193).

**castra hostium ... parte incolumes:** Brutus' forces had fared better, and he had taken Octavian's camp (cf. e.g. Plut. *Brut.* 42).

**Titinii vero non obliteranda silentio virtus:** Cf. App. *BCiv.* 4.113: Τιτίσιος ὡς βραδύνας ἑαυτὸν ἔκτεινε; Dio 47.46.5: ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος, μαθὼν ὅτι διὰ τὴν βραδυτῆα αὐτοῦ διώλετο, ἐπαπέθανεν. V.'s descriptions of Cassius' and Titinius' deaths are examples of the literary 'sub-genre' *exitus illustrium virorum* (see Plin. *Ep.* 1.17.3; 8.12.4). His detailed and unique description of Titinius' pre-death monologue, especially, affords his 'noble conduct' the space V. believes it deserves. V.'s celebration of Titinius' *virtus* reiterates his central project throughout his work, despite its position within a so-called vice chapter. Silence is also a motif elsewhere in V. (cf. e.g. 1.6.11; 1.7.5; 4.1.14; 5.4.ext.2; 8.2.1; 9.2.praef.; 9.13.2).

**'etsi imprudens', inquit, 'imperator, causa tibi mortis fui: Imprudens** recalls V.'s comments in the preface to the chapter of error's implication with guilt being involuntary (*non sua sponte*). Given its restriction in V.'s own time as a military title to members of the imperial family and Junius Blaesus (Tac. *Ann.* 3.7.4), V.'s use of *imperator*, while technically incorrect, is used generously by him of military commanders (cf. e.g. 9.3.5; 9.8.ext.2; 9.11.5); he does not hide Titinius' address of Cassius as *imperator* (cf. 4.7.4 where it is used even of M. Antonius).

**accipe me fati tui comitem:** Velleius (2.70.3) also includes direct speech (cf. Plut. *Brut.* 43.9); the sentiment expressed by Titinius in V. may suggest the *sacramentum militare* (cf. *OGIS* 532 ll.28-30).

**permixto utriusque ... pietatis haec, erroris illa:** Being 'united' in death is a common motif of romantic pairs (e.g. Pyramus and Thisbe, Hero and Leander). *Pietas* was a key Roman virtue, the subject of its own chapter in V. (5.4), as well as an

imperial virtue paraded by Tiberius (see Levick 1976: 87; cf. e.g. 5.5.3). The neat antithesis by which V. highlights the respective causes of their deaths (cf. 4.7.5) provides a clear conclusion to the *exemplum* and brings the 'vice' of Cassius' death into full view; V. continues the language of sacrifice, as in the previous *exemplum* (see Mueller 2002a: 127: 'a rhetorical paradigm for interpreting action according to moral codes').

### 9.9.3

The final *exemplum* of the chapter appears in Livy (4.17.1-6; cf. Cic. *Phil.* 9.4; Plin. *HN* 34.23), who may well be V.'s direct source (cf. Gag  1957: 231-2; *pace* Salamon 2003: 542). While there are clear verbal parallels (*in tesserarum prospero iactu; lusus; errorem*), V. uses the *exemplum* to somewhat different effect: while V. seems to offer full acceptance of the story and is eager to highlight the error that caused the deaths of the Roman envoys, Livy is incredulous and suggests that the tale was told to exculpate the king's actions (cf. comment at Val. Max. 9.6.1 where V. also does not transpose Livy's distancing of the anecdote).

**Ceterum falsa opinatio nescio an praecipuam iniuriam ... penatibus intulerit:** V. presents the error that caused the death of the Roman envoys as a violation of the hospitality granted by Lars' *penates* (for the link between *penates* and *hospitium*, cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 3.15; Cic. *Deiot.* 15). Salamon (2003: 542) misunderstands V.'s **nescio an** as introducing doubt on Tolumnius' guilt, but the *dubitatio* serves rather to underline the seriousness of the *exemplum*: it is 'eminent' (**praecipuam**), because the error led to multiple deaths, making it, therefore, the most calamitous of the *exempla* related.

**Lartis Tolumnii, Veientium regis:** Lars Tolumnius (*BNP* 14.775) was the king of the Veii. Livy's narrative makes clear that the town of Fidenae in Latium had joined with Veientes, who were hostile to Rome. Envoys had thus been sent to assess the situation, upon which Tolumnius had had them killed (see Manuwald 2007: 1056).

**tesserarum:** A small die-cube (*OLD* 1). Gagé (1957: 224-242) has attempted to explain away the story as a misinterpretation of *tesserae* as military signs or *tesserae hospitales* which would have been carried by Roman *legati*; Ogilvie (1965: 559-560; cf. Taillardat 1967: 153), however, argues for a game known by its Greek name πόλις in which the pieces of one's opponent could be 'killed' (see also Kurke 1999: 255-6, who is mistaken in thinking that it was played without dice).

**per iocum collusori dixisset 'occide':** The mistake has not been satisfactorily explained, as Shackleton Bailey (2000: 354 n. 3) notes. He argues that either the guards heard *occide* (die, i.e. give up) as *occide* (kill), despite their differences of accent and quantity, or that *occide* could be equivalent to 'beat that' in reference to his lucky dice roll. However, this explanation is problematic, if, as Ogilvie suggests, the king and his opponent were speaking Greek; in addition, in Latin at least, Shackleton Bailey's logic requires that the guards interpret a singular command as plural. V. and his source(s) could have calqued a bilingual term. Even more likely, though, is that the king was speaking Etruscan. See Gagé 1957: 224-242 and Ogilvie 1965: 558-560.

**Romanorum legati intervenissent:** Four envoys are named in the sources (Liv. 4.17.2; Cic. *Phil.* 9.5; Plin. *HN* 34.23) with slight variations on their names: Tullus Cluilius (Cloelius); Lucius Roscius; Spurius Nautius (Antius); and Gaius Fulcinius; see Ogilvie 1965: 559.

**satellites eius, errore vocis impuls, interficiendo legatos lusum ad imperium transtulerunt:** **Satellites** provides a negative connotation (cf. 3.3.ext.5; 5.1.ext.2b; 9.10.ext.1); V.'s abridged version also conceals that it was the Fidenates who killed the Roman envoys (see Diod. 12.80.6); **impuls** recalls *concitatus* (9.9.praef.). Killing envoys was a gross violation of the *ius gentium* (cf. Liv. 4.19.3) and thus perhaps the most exacerbating aspect of the *exemplum*.

## De Ultione

In Greek thinking, the act of revenge, while limited in various ways, both legally and philosophically, and at particular times and places, was a necessary and justifiable aspect of human social relations.<sup>174</sup> From as early as Homer (cf. e.g. *Il.* 24.33-54; *Od.* 22.45-67) we see its outworkings and its specific connection to anger. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1378a30-2), while noting this connection also, in particular linked it to a loss of honour. In Herodotus, revenge is a fundamental principle in the explanation of historical events; terms such as τιμωρία and τίσις are fundamental.<sup>175</sup> At Rome also, revenge was seen as necessary and at times justified, albeit not without criticism in certain periods. From the earliest times 'revenge' was the only way for people to gain justice, but the development of the criminal and private law systems restricted the areas in which self-help (i.e. revenge) was possible, and by the late Republic, certainly, there were major restrictions.<sup>176</sup> Lucretius (*DRN* 5.1148-50), for example, appears to suggest that opinion, at least, changed regarding vengeance, especially in terms of the increasing role of the law in limiting it.<sup>177</sup>

Philosophical perspectives, however, could differ substantially from political realities. The killing of Julius Caesar and the response to it by Octavian (the later Augustus) were crucial in the development of what became the imperial system. For V. there is no question that Caesar's death was considered a crime of the highest order, denominated by V. as parricide (see e.g. 1.5.7, 6.8.4; Bloomer 1992: 210-11). As soon as he acquired his first consulship in 43 Octavian had his colleague and relative Q. Pedius sponsor a lex Pedia de infectoribus Caesaris under the terms of which a special court was set up to try Caesar's murderers and their associates with the

---

<sup>174</sup> The bibliography on revenge in Greek thought and society is potentially vast, and in many cases addresses specific instances of its occurrence, e.g. within Greek tragedy; for a start, see McHardy 2008.

<sup>175</sup> See De Romilly 1971: 314-337.

<sup>176</sup> Jonca 2004: 44-51; this point is also well argued by Lintott 1968.

<sup>177</sup> See Harris 2001: 211-3.

penalty of *interdictio* and confiscation of all assets (see e.g. Bauman 1970: 171-2). Octavian enforced the law to its limits and more strictly than the loathed proscriptions – those condemned under it were not permitted to return from exile (e.g. App. *BCiv.* 5.72, Vell. Pat. 2.77.2) and in the *Res Gestae* (and the lost *De vita sua*) proclaimed unashamedly his justified revenge: *iudiciis legitimis ultus eorum facinus* (RG 2). The most striking physical monument to this was the temple of Mars Ultor which was the backdrop to the Forum Augusti (cf. e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 5.571-77; Suet. *Aug.* 29; App. *BCiv.* 3.13; Vell. 2.59.5, 2.65.1, 2.100.2). This was the official line, which probably did not secure universal support (for a nuanced literary attempt to undercut this official ethos, see Barchiesi 2002: 1-22; cf. also, for example, debates around Aeneas' slaying of Turnus as justified revenge; Burnell 1987: 186-200), but nonetheless remained the predominant view for the Augustan and Tiberian principates. By the time of Seneca the younger, however, it appears that disapproval of revenge (except in narrowly defined cases) as something inhumane, could be expressed (cf. e.g. *Ira.* 1.1.1, 2.32.1, 3.5.8), but the paucity of evidence should caution against over-generalising this into indications of a changing view of Roman society as a whole.

Tiberius, it appears, followed the official Augustan line regarding Augustus' *ultio paterna*, given the evidence in both V. (cf. e.g. 1.1.19; 1.5.7; 1.8.8) and Velleius Paterculus, who expressly comments on the completion of his mission of revenge (2.87.3), and on the penalty imposed by the *Lex Pedia* (2.69.5). More broadly the two extant works from the latter part of his principate present a similar picture: Velleius' work from the very first surviving paragraph presents the idea of revenge in such a way as to suggest that it was both broadly acceptable and also a duty, *but* that there were limits that could be transgressed and the motive had to be appropriate.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> C. Gracchus' revenge for his brother was proof that he had lost self-control (2.6.2); Opimius' notorious persecution of the Gracchans was seen to be motivated by private hatred rather than by a

Although V.'s own headline discussion of *ultio* is brief, with only two domestic examples, and an equal number of foreign ones, revenge appears as a motivating factor for a number of the deeds presented throughout the work outside of this chapter, where V. regularly speaks of it in positive, or at least neutral, terms (cf. e.g. 1.7.ext.10; 2.7.3; 2.7.15d; 3.2.11.3.3.1; 3.3.ext.3; 4.1.15; 4.7.6; 5.3.2b; 5.4.ext.3; 5.8.3; 6.1.7; 6.1.ext.2; 6.3.1a; 6.3.11; 7.3.ext.6; 8.1.amb.1; 9.3.praef.; 9.3.ext.4). Of these perhaps the example of Scipio Africanus who is praised for combining *ultio* with Tiberius' cardinal virtue of *moderatio* is most significant for V.'s overall acceptance of revenge. While *ultio* might be seen as necessary and, sometimes, appropriate or even laudable, neither V. nor any other Roman writer treats it as a virtue.

In thinking about revenge V. could reflect, as the contemporary *SCPP* (ll. 133, 167) and the later historian Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.18.2) did, on the *moderatio* displayed by the imperial family and by Tiberius in AD 20 when popular feeling was for harsher penalties against Piso, but he would also have to reckon with the very different situation that obtained after the discovery of Sejanus' conspiracy. The remaining sections of *Annals* 6 record a series of prosecutions and punishments of conspirators, accomplices, friends and family of Sejanus involving in some cases extreme penalties (e.g. the vitiation and posthumous exposure of Sejanus' daughter [5.9]). At 9.11.ext.4 V. expresses strong support for the elimination of Sejanus' family (*omni cum stirpe*), so it is hard to imagine that he was weak-stomached *per se*. Treason against the *princeps*, i.e. attempting his death, was a supreme atrocity deserving of exacerbated

---

desire to defend the state (2.7.6); Sulla's desire for revenge is not criticised and Velleius praises him for placing his concern for the security of the *res publica* above revenge. Related to the notion of *ultio* is that of vindication, seen in the noun *vindex* or verb *vindicare*: Velleius approves vindication of the *res publica* (e.g. 2.28.2, 2.29.1) and sees Tiberius as the ultimate *vindex imperii* (2.75.3, 2.104.2, 2.121.2, 2.126.4).

punishment, one determined by the Roman judicial system not individual whim. V. does not exhibit qualms about *ultio* per se. In the Roman context, especially for a writer under the early principate, the space for justified revenge was limited; if the legal system was running well and the *princeps* was providing justice, most wrongs would have been dealt with by the courts or imperial *cognitio*.

Skidmore (1996: 69-71) notes that V. can indicate to his readers where his subject matter is ambiguous (cf. e.g. 3.7.praef., 7.3.praef.) so that he can provide them with guidance and in specific connection with revenge writes 'he defines the moral nature of the quality, but does not lavish upon it the elaborate praise in the treatment of other virtues. This signifies perhaps a residual element of moral doubt, and also the lesser importance of these chapters'. While the smaller scale of the treatment of *ultio*, like that of *error* (9.9), may well suggest that V. considers it less important than *ira* or *crudelitas*, whether V. is exhibiting any sign of 'moral doubt' is questionable. Rather, what we may have in the two comparatively short treatments are topics that are akin to vices in their harsh consequences. While, as we have seen, V. does categorise *error* as a *vitium*, its pardonability and the crucial lack of intention mark it as a lesser failing. *Ultio* is preeminently an issue that involves intent and desire (*viz.* V.'s *cupientes*).

In each of the examples that he presents within the chapter, he provides the context of the cause for vengeance, for as he notes in the preface, injured peoples desire to balance the pain they receive (*acceptem dolorem pensare cupientes*); and so each *exemplum* outlines the cause of injury, i.e. he does not conceal the motivation for the revenge. In 9.10.1, it is the lack of mercy shown by the tribe Pollia against the Tusculans; in 9.10.2, it is the governor Hadrianus' avarice; and in 9.10.ext.1, which features the examples of two Eastern queens (already in Herodotus, revenge was a feminine and barbarian emotion; see e.g. Harris 2001: 176-8), it is the vengeance

sought by mothers at the deaths of their children. The final *exemplum*, 9.10.ext.2, is somewhat different in scale as the victims suffer (merely) a mild form of corporal punishment and V. himself admits that the act of revenge might not be 'balanced' (*an satis iusta ultio absumpserit ambiguae aestimationis*); it is still an act with an acknowledged cause but the punishment has been transferred from the one who actually inflicted the injury to the one who authorised it and crucially his death was a greater punishment than the physical pain warranted (*animi non corporis dolore poenae modum aestimantes*). V.'s special pleading reveals his unease, given his desire to limit himself to *exempla* in which the revenge is justified, and does not go beyond reasonable limits. It is this personal intrusion which may suggest the reason for V.'s inclusion of this chapter among his vices.

9.10.praef.

**Ultionis autem quemadmodum acres ita iusti aculei sunt:** V.'s choice of **quemadmodum** rather than *ut* as the correlative of **ita** is deliberate and appropriate, as it introduces the notion of limitation. *Acer* in its various forms is associated by V. with harsh, inappropriate actions (e.g. 2.7.15, 3.7.6), but can also have undoubtedly positive meanings (cf. Moore 1989: 23-6).

*Iustitia* itself, which appears for the first time as a coin legend on Tiberian coinage (BMC i. 131 no. 79; see Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 304, 320) and was praised by the senate as a specific quality of Tiberius (SCPP l. 133), is treated at length by V. (6.5) as a virtue; and throughout the work the notion of just punishment or reward is emphasized (e.g. 1.1.13, 1.1.14, 1.8.ext.8, 4.7.6, 5.3.ext.3, 6.2.ext.1); the specific notion of *iusta ultio* appears once (6.3.1a). In Roman thought and its whole legal system an essential element of justice was the punishment of those who had done wrong (e.g. the cowardly schoolmaster of Falerii – 6.5.1, the cowering L. Cotta – 6.5.4, Sulpicius Rufus' slave – 6.5.7). Velleius often refers to the paying of penalties, a just outworking in history (1.11.1, 2.4.1, 2.54.1, 2.64.1, 2.68.3, 2.87.3, 2.88.3, 2.100.5);

Valerius even more so (e.g. 1.1.19, 1.1.ext.3, 1.6.6, 1.7.3, 3.2.17, 5.3.2g, 6.3.9, 6.8.4, 7.2.ext.17, 7.5.6, 8.1.damn.2, 9.1.9, 9.9.2, 9.15.2).

V. uses *quemadmodum* and *ita* as correlatives 6 times, five times in this order (1.6.10, 2.2.8, 2.6.9, 2.9.1, 4.3.6) and one in the reverse order (4.1.ext.8); the *quemadmodum* clause is essentially concessive and the *ita* clause expresses the more weighty fact, 'nonetheless ...'; V.'s emphasis in the final *ita* clause is on the justness of revenge, but he has conceded (crucially) that it was harsh.

**laccessiti concitantur:** V. highlights revenge's reactive quality.

**acceptum dolorem pensare cupientes:** The notion of balance is a key aspect of revenge; enshrined in Roman law from the XII Tables onwards (for injury see Fest. 496L; *vim vi repellere licet*; e.g. Ulp. *Dig.* 43.16.1.27); cf. e.g. Sen. *Clem.* 1.21 for compensation as a logical development as the normal outcome for *ultio*; see also McHardy 2008: 4. Kempf's supplement <*dolore*> while unnecessary could provide a typical Valerian figure of speech; its omission could also be explained paleographically and the vast majority of V.'s uses of *penare* have an ablative; cf. e.g. 1.8.ext.3; 4.7.ext.1. In particular various *leges de vi* passed from 78 BC onwards had limited severely the need for a Roman to resort to *ultio*, as wrongs were now brought under the ambit of the civil and criminal law. Most recently from V.'s perspective the Augustan *Lex Iulia de vi* (on which see Cloud 1988 and 1989) defined acts of violence uncovered by previous murder and treason statutes even including actions that did not result in physical harm (see *Dig.* 48.7.7). It is not surprising that V.'s Roman *exempla* predate any of this legislation and the external *exempla* (of course) were not governed by Roman law.

**quos latius complecti non attinet:** For the need to provide only a few examples, cf. e.g. 9.9.praef.; 9.14.praef. This statement could appear to contradict V.'s preface (1.praef.: *apud alios latius diffusa sunt*), but the latter does not necessarily refer to the number of *exempla*, but rather the ease in collating such material.

### 9.10.1

V.'s *exemplum* features an act of revenge that was continued for near 300 years in response to a punishment on the Tuscans that never went beyond intent. V. gives no explicit verbal clues to indicate that the revenge was out of proportion to the wrong but the issue of balance is important and may be extracted from the juxtaposition in the conclusion between *sugffragia* and *vita ac libertas*. Taylor (1960: 302), on the basis that M. Flavius was of the tribe Pollia, suggested that Pollian support for the bill was an (unsuccessful) attempt to undermine the candidature of L. Fulvius Curvus, a Tusculanus, for the consulship of 322. If there was such a petty motive in the tribune's proposal V. utterly conceals it (or was ignorant of it, as it does not appear in his source). It is plausible that V. is saying that Papiria's revenge was justified (and acceptable) because it did not go too far – to withhold a vote from those who had sought to kill and enslave you was acceptable. The tribe Pollia's intention had been as harsh as could be imagined – it would have resulted in the complete extermination of the Tusculan community and ignored the suppliant plea (which should have been heeded, as it was by all the other tribes). At some later stage, when the Tuscans had gained full citizenship and were enrolled in the tribe Papiria, they took a protracted revenge in never voting for any candidate from the tribe Pollia.

V.'s source is Livy 8.37.8-12, which he abbreviates severely while retaining key elements (Oakley's 'possibly dependent' [1998: 755] is unjustifiably feeble): *Eodem anno de Tusculanis Flavia rogatione populi fuit iudicium. M. Flavius tribunus plebis tulit ad populum ut in Tusculanos animadverteretur, quod eorum ope ac consilio Veliterni Priuernatesque populo Romano bellum fecissent. Populus Tusculanus cum coniugibus ac liberis Romam venit. Ea multitudo veste mutata et specie reorum tribus circuit genibus se omnium advolvens; plus itaque misericordia ad poenae veniam impetrandam quam causa ad crimen purgandum valuit. Tribus omnes praeter Polliam antiquarunt legem: Polliae sententia fuit puberes verberatos necari, coniuges liberosque sub corona lege belli venire.*

*Memoriam eius irae Tusculanis in poenae tam atrocis auctores mansisse ad patrum aetatem constat nec quemquam ferme ex Pollia tribu candidatum Papiriam ferre solitum.*

**Tribunus plebis M. Flavius:** M. Flavius (*RE* VI 2528-9) was tribune of the plebs in 323 (*MRR* 1.149). He is probably the same M. Flavius, who, Livy (8.22.2-4) tells us, at the funeral of his mother, provided the people with a *visceratio* – possibly as a reward for his acquittal from the charge of adultery – which secured him the position of tribune; cf. Val. Max. 8.1.absol.7, where V. most likely records the wrong *praenomen* (see Oakley 1998: 625-7).

**ad populum de Tusculanis rettulit:** Livy specifies a *rogatio* before the *comitia tributa* (8.37.8; cf. 8.37.11: *antiquarunt legem*), but some elements of his language also suggests a trial (8.37.8: *populi ... iudicium*; 8.37.9: *specie reorum*; cf. V.'s **iudicaret**); Oakley 1998: 755: 'the technical details of the measure are probably beyond recovery ... speculation is probably futile'. The bill appears to be promulgated in order to attack the Tusculans (cf. Mommsen 1899: 74 n. 4; Taylor 1960: 214, 302) thus technically a *privilegium*.

**quod eorum consilio Veliterni Privernatesque rebellassent:** Velitrae (modern-day Velletri; *PECS* s.v. 'Velitrae') was a city in Latium, in the Alban Hills. It became a *municipium* after 338. Privernum (modern-day Priverno; *PECS* s.v. 'Privernum') was a Volscian town set in the Amaseno valley. V.'s **rebellassent** refers to earlier struggles with these peoples; Rome had fought with Privernum as recently as 329, and with Velitrae in the Latin War prior to 338. Hence, the date for this episode, especially thirteen years after 338, is 'bizarre' (Oakley 1998: 755).

**squalore obsiti supplices Romam † venissent:** V. takes *cum coniugibus ac liberis* directly from Livy (cf. Oakley 1998: 756) and replaces Livy's *veste mutata et specie reorum tribus circuit genibus se omnium advolvens* with a brief alliterative phrase that captures succinctly the substance of Livy's words and points up the religious dimension of the suppliant.

**securi percuti:** V. specifies beheading; cf. Livy's less defined *necari*; 8.37.11), making the official nature of the 'executions' clearer (i.e. beating with magisterial rods and then beheading with the axe).

**quam ob causam ... ipsa fuit, ademerat:** V. builds up Livy's short conclusion and makes the meaning clearer, but appears to place the granting of citizenship to the Tusculani after 323, which is the natural understanding of the past participle **recepti**. It had already been granted in 381 (see Oakley 1997: 357-8); also, by omitting Livy's note that the tribe Papiria stopped its boycott in the mid 1<sup>st</sup> century (8.37.12; see Taylor 1960: 302 n. 14), V. exaggerates the extent of the revenge.

### 9.10.2

V.'s second *exemplum* is striking for the explicit support he gives for the burning alive of a Roman governor: both the introduction and conclusion of the *exemplum* exonerate the killers of Hadrianus. It would be highly unlikely that by such approbation V. was justifying, or encouraging, such a response from the inhabitants of the Roman empire of his own day. In fact Tiberius' strict line against gubernatorial corruption and the many convictions that ensued during his reign (see the Introduction) made such behaviour unnecessary: the emperor himself would secure justice for his people, so a silent contrast with the situation prevailing in his own day is eloquent.

While Livy cannot be completely excluded (the *Periochae* [86] *C. Fabius in Africa propter crudelitatem et avaritiam suam in praetorio suo vivus exustus est* are frustratingly brief), given the close verbal parallels, Cicero is almost certainly V.'s source; cf. Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.70: *Ille, quod eius avaritiam cives Romani ferre non potuerunt, Uticae domi suae vivus exustus est, idque ita illi merito accidisse existimatum est ut laetarentur omnes neque ulla animadversio constitueretur*; cf. also Ps.-Ascon (Stangl p. 241); Diod. 38.11.1; Oros. 5.20.3; Poma 1981: 21-35; Brennan 2000: 543. Because it is unimportant to his readers V. omits Cicero's comparison with Verres, who was the bad governor *par excellence*

(*sic iste multo sceleratior et nequior quam ille Hadrianus aliquanto etiam felicior fuit*) - Hadrianus makes a better *exemplum* of the power of revenge and the reach of justice because he died rather than enjoyed a comfortable exile of a Verres.

**Illam vero ultionem et senatus et consensus omnium approbavit:** V. begins by indicating that this *exemplum* of revenge was completely justified – universal approval was forthcoming. Brennan (2000: 543) considers this ‘a dubious extrapolation’ by V. and there was a factional element to this: the senate was Sullan, and Hadrianus was looking after Cinnan interests in Numidia; see esp. Poma 1981: 21-35. Here V. fashions an introduction for his *exemplum* from the idea provided by Cicero’s *laeterentur omnes*, but investing it with a greater weight by his specifying of the *senatus* and *consensus*. **Consensus omnium** was an important idea in the imperial period, seen in its most extreme form in the preface to V.’s work where the *hominum deorumque consensus* has approved Tiberius’ reign (see Wardle 1998: 68 for bibliography). Variations of the idea appear throughout the work – e.g in Roman contexts Numidicus was recalled from exile *senatus et populi consensu* (4.1.13), Manlius was offered a consulship *omnium consensu* (6.4.1), similarly Galba was spared judicial condemnation (8.1.abs.2); Gracchus was condemned *totius senatus consensu* (4.71). In the Roman contexts *consensus* brings good results, but in the hands of a radical Athenian democracy sometimes not (5.3.ext.3f). V. is certainly aware of the acute factionalism of Rome in the late 80s, as his *exempla* on the cruelty of Marius and Sulla demonstrate (9.2.1-2) and his chosen formulation here serves to justify the extreme action of the killers of Hadrianus.

**Hadrianus:** C. Fabius Hadrianus (*BNP* 5.291), a Marian who, as praetor in 85/4 (*MRR* 2.60-1, 64, 69), drove Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius out of Africa. He continued until 83/2 as propraetor in the province (*MRR* 2.69; cf. Badian 1964: 98 n. 15), probably meeting his fate in 82.

**cives Romanos, qui Uticae consistebant:** While both Cicero and V. specify *cives*, Orosius (5.20.3) suggests that Hadrianus had aims to rule the province with a band

of slaves, whose masters then killed him; cf. Ps.-Ascon. (Stangl p. 241). Diodorus (38.11.1) claims that it was the Uticans who committed the act; see Poma 1981: 24ff. By following Cicero V. gives the perpetrators an unquestioned status that may contribute to the justification of their action.

**sordido imperio vexasset:** *Sordidus* implies money-grubbing (cf. 3.5.3); Diodorus blames Hadrianus' wickedness, Cicero his *avaritia*, and Livy his *crudelitas* and *avaritia*.

**idcircoque ab iis vivus esset exustus:** Cicero places the action of revenge *domi suae*; Livy in his *praetorium*. Orosius indicates that his whole household perished with him. Brennan (2000: 870 n. 142; citing Plut. *Pomp.* 3.1 and Cic. *Pis.* 93 as parallels) suggests that the burning of a commander's *praetorium* may have been a traditional form of revenge. Burning alive was a traditional Roman punishment that was prescribed in the Twelve Tables for arsonists, but by the time of Hadrianus the statutory penalty for *repetundae* (Hadrianus' crime) was deportation for perpetrators of high status (Garnsey 1970: 109), so Hadrianus got more than he strictly deserved in a form of capital punishment that was even by V.'s day not used for *honestiores*.

**nec quaestio ulla in urbe hac de re habita nec querella versata est:** Here V. adapts Cicero's *neque ulla animadversio constitueretur*, in the process making it explicit that there was no formal process of investigation or punishment or a complaint brought (presumably) by Hadrianus' family for the punishment of the perpetrators. Had Hadrianus' case come to court it would have been held before the *quaestio de repetundis* with its newly constituted senatorial jury under the terms of the recent *lex Cornelia*, the penalty being *interdictio* and monetary restitution at 250% of what had been stolen (Keaveney 1982: 176-7). The fate of a Marianus before a Sullan jury would have been bleak. The force of the *exemplum* is not to encourage citizens of the empire to take things into their own hands and kill their governors. An implicit contrast is being drawn between the situation under Tiberius when governors could be successfully convicted and the chaotic period of the civil wars when governors

were subject to no effective surveillance. But, when provincials or Roman citizens believe that their cases will not be ignored by biased juries or corrupt leaders, they do not need to resort to revenge or extra-legal activities. V.'s readers may not have found the absence of a formal enquiry surprising as in AD 25 the governor of Hispania Citerior was assassinated, and a plot by the Termestini was suspected (Tac. *Ann.* 4.45), but Tacitus' account notes no formal investigation. V.'s expansion of Cicero's *animadversio* to include the absence of any *querella* may underline to his readers that Hadrianus' death was considered so just that even his family did not try to raise the issue. With a more cynical view of the historical realities we might conclude that there was no Marian voice brave enough to speak up (cf. Mitchell 1986: 191).

#### 9.10.ext.1

**Clarae ultionis utraque regina:** Two foreign queens are exemplars of vengeance in this *exemplum*; V. links their acts (**et Tomyris ... et Berenice**); both describe the vengeance of a mother over her son's murder. In these two cases which are presented in climactic order – in the first the queen merely orders an extreme punishment and in the second she herself kills her enemy – V. could be held to be presenting two 'classic' cases of revenge for the death of a child, which broadly speaking would fall within the category of 'justifiable' revenge. However, an underlying reason for his inclusion of them in his treatment of a vice may be that the avenger went too far – the posthumous violation of Cyrus' head and the stoning/running over of Caeneus were extreme. In reproaching Cyrus for his insatiable desire for blood Tomyris was demonstrating the same vice, behavior that Justin labels as *crudelitas* (see below).

**Tomyris, quae caput ... filii sui exigens:** Pompeius Trogus (Just. 1.8.13) is probably V.'s source for this section of the *exemplum*: *caput Cyri amputatum in utrem humano sanguine repletum coici regina iubet cum hac exprobratione crudelitatis: 'satia te' inquit*

'*sanguine, quem sitisti cuiusque insatiabilis semper fuisti*' (Crohn 1882: 8-9; Bloomer 1992: 103; Yardley 2003: 95); cf. Hdt. 1.206-14; Amm. 23.6.7; Ambr. *Ep.* 18.36; *De Mulieribus* 12 Gera; see also: Diod. 2.44.2; Frontin. *Str.* 2.5.5; Lucian, *Charon* 13; Polyæn. 8.28; Ampelius, *Lib. Mem.* 13.1; Oros. 2.7.1-6; Sid. *Apoll. Carm.* 9.30-7; further related references for Tomyris are gathered by Gera 1997: 187.

**Tomyris:** Tomyris (*BNP* 14.777), warrior queen of the Massagetae, the vengeful mother who defeated Cyrus; narrative elements which, undoubtedly, made her tale popular among ancient writers (Strabo 11.8.6).

**quae caput Cyri ... insatiabilem cruoris sitim:** The end of Cyrus' reign is confirmed by Babylonian commercial documents as August 530 (Asheri et al. 2007: 216). Sources disagree over the manner in which Cyrus died (see Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1985: 459-71): V. follows the tradition found first in Herodotus which stresses the motif of insatiability; Ctesias (*FGrH* 688 F 9 6-8) has Cyrus wounded by an Indian and Diodorus (2.44.2) has him crucified by the Queen of the Scythians; Onesicrates (*FGrH* 134 F 36) has death of a broken heart, and Xenophon (*Cyr.* 8.7) natural causes. Tomyris' actions towards Cyrus' corpse seem even more horrific in V., devoid as they are of their context (cf. Hdt. 1.212); scholars find parallels in the Scythian practice of drinking the blood of one's enemies (see Gera 1997: 202).

**simulque poenas occisi ab eo filii sui exigens:** Cf. Just. 1.8.8; Oros. 2.7.3. In Herodotus' account (1.213), Spargapises, Tomyris' son, once he regains sobriety (and thus had likely realised his situation, having been captured by Cyrus), commits suicide.

**Berenice, quae ... occultari arbitrabatur perrexit:** It is not clear whether V. continues his use of Trogus for this section of the *exemplum*; reference in Justin (21.1.1-2) is brief; cf. Polyæn. 8.50; Porph. *FGrH* F43 (= Hieron. *in Dan.* 11.6).

**Berenice:** Berenice 'Phernophoros' (*BNP* 2.600), was the daughter of Ptolemy II Philadelphus and Arsinoe, who was married to Antiochus II Theos of Syria in 252. She and her son were put aside in 246 when Antiochus died. A widespread tradition

alleges poison, possibly by Laodice: Porph. *FGrH* F43; App. *Syr.* 65; Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F24; Val. Max. 9.14.ext.1; Plin. *HN* 7.53; but Polyaeus (8.50) offers death from natural causes. Laodice and her children were then re-established in the palace. She was killed in 246/5, shortly after her son was murdered, before her brother Ptolemy III had come to her aid; see Ogden 1999: 127-132 for fuller discussion of these events.

**Laodices insidiis interceptum sibi filium graviter ferens:** Laodice (*BNP* 7.229-30) was the paternal half-sister and wife of Antiochus II Theos. After his marriage to Berenice in 252, she was reduced to the status of his concubine and presided over a rival court in Ephesus. V.'s presentation of her as treacherous (cf. also 9.14.ext.1) is confirmed by the other sources (cf. Polyaeus. 8.50; Justin. 27.1; Plin. *HN* 7.53).

**satellitem regium crudelis operis ministrum, nomine Caeneum:** Porphyry (*FGrH* 260 F43) reports that Laodice had the deed carried out by two rulers from Antioch, giving their names as Icadion and Gennaesus, the latter probably V.'s Caeneus. For *satelles* having a pejorative connotation in V., see comment at 9.9.3.

**quem hasta nequiquam ... occultari arbitrabatur:** The detail of this section of V.'s narrative finds no parallels in any of the other surviving accounts. V.'s **occultari arbitrabatur** may indicate what is also relayed by Polyaeus (8.50), that the killers of Berenice's son produced an imposter child in his place to deceive the people that the boy was still alive. Perhaps V. intends his readers to draw a parallel between Laodice's treatment of Caeneus' body with Tullia's treatment of her father's corpse (9.11.1).

9.10.ext.2

V.'s source for the murder of the *tagus*, Jason of Pherae, is unknown; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.30-2; Diod. 15.60.5; Ael. fr. 52 (Hercher).

**Iasonem Thessalum:** Jason of Thessaly (*BNP* 6.685-6; Mandel 1980: 47-77; Sprawski 1999); V. elsewhere refers to him as Jason of Pherae (1.8.ext.6). Ancient authorities

refer to him in various ways – as Sprawski (2004: 437-452) has noted, it is correct to refer to him as a ‘tyrant’ in that he attempted to achieve autocratic rule over Thessaly, but that he was actually tyrant of Pherae, and not only from there, is less certain.

**Persarum regi bellum inferre parantem:** There is little evidence that Jason made actual plans for war with Persia (see Sprawski 1999: 127-132, who in using Kapp’s 1823 compendium, appears to have confused Oliver’s *notae* for V.’s text). In Isocrates (*Philip* 119-120), to make a rhetorical contrast with Philip of Macedon, Jason is presented as often talking about war, without any real action; cf. also Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.12.

**an satis iusta ultio absumperit ambiguae aestimationis est:** V.’s introduction of the indirect question after earlier emphasis on **iusta** shows, along with the comparison of **parva** and **maximae**, that he does not believe Jason’s murder was justified; here he is not concerned with the morality of the *iuvenes*’ actions, but rather the outworkings of revenge.

**Taxillo ... gymnasiarcho:** (=γυμνασίουαρχος) the person in charge of the gymnasium; for the term’s use in Latin, cf. Val. Max. 9.12.ext.7; Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.92. Whether an actual gymnasium existed in Pherae at the time of Jason is unclear (e.g. Helly et al. 1979: 228). V. does not specify where Taxillus was gymnasiarch; Xenophon’s account (*Hell.* 6.4.31), however, places Jason’s assassination just after his inspection of the Pheraeian cavalry, which probably places the action in Pherae (Sprawski 1999: 116).

**a quibusdam iuvenibus ... plagas singulis imponeret:** The gymnasiarchic law of Beroia, for comparison, specifies a fine of 50 drachmas for insulting a gymnasiarch, and 100 drachmas for striking one, and liability to prosecution by public law (see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993: 21-22, 94).

**quo posteriore vindicta ... poenae modum aestimantes:** Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.4.30-2) has Jason killed at the Pythian games in Delphi in 370 by seven young men; Diodorus (15.60.5) relates that Jason was killed either, as Ephorus writes, by seven

young men seeking glory, or, as other (unnamed) historians say, by his brother, Polydorus; finally Aelian (fr. 52 Hercher) claims his death as punishment by the god for attempting sacrilegious plunder of the temple treasuries of Delphi; see Sprawski 1999: 115-8.

V.'s use of the synonymous **vindicta** instead of *ultio* (its only use within the chapter), given its etymological link with the rod used in slave manumission, may suggest the rod used by the gymnasiarch in carrying out the beatings. His attitude towards the beating although he indicates that in physical terms it was minor (**parvo irritamento**), is essentially Roman; it would be an unthinkable punishment for a Roman citizen, a violation of the *lex Porcia*. V. brings this out indirectly by the adjective *ingenui*. However, by using **modum** V. again brings before his reader the idea of scale and proportion.

**parvo irritamento ... maximae rei expectatio subruta est:** The juxtaposition of *parvus* and *maximus* is not just rhetorical, but builds on the fundamental point V. is making – the response of the young men was not only out of proportion to the wrong they had suffered, but also had a major (albeit to some degree hypothetical) consequence – the liberation of the Greek city states in Asia Minor was delayed for a generation. The ardent expectation that was building for this (see e.g. Isocr. *Paneg.* 99, *Phil.* 99), something that V. classifies as ‘a very great event’, was therefore crushed. So V. is asking his reader whether the grievance of a few young men was worth the delaying of freedom for many.

**opinione Graeciae ... effectu Alexandri:** By his opposition of *spes* and *effectus* V. again underlines to his reader the hypothetical nature of the comparison between Jason and Alexander, because the former was prevented from turning his plans into actions (cf. the counterfactual argument in Livy 9.17.1-19.17; see Oakley 2005: esp. 205-6). While *opinio Graeciae* might be considered something dubious from a parochial Roman perspective especially when contrasted with Roman knowledge, in this context it is not pejorative. Although for V. Alexander's desire for world rule

(e.g. 8.14.ext.2) is overshadowed by Rome's achievement of it, his defeat of the Persians is not downplayed (3.8.ext.6; 4.7.ext.2; 6.4.ext.3). For Alexander in V., see Weileder 1998: 122-9.

### **Dicta Improba Aut Facta Scelerata**

The *exempla* of this chapter, which are arranged chronologically (except perhaps in 9.11.ext.2 where V. may be confused), at first reading could appear to present a rather disparate set of stories. On closer reflection, however, they demonstrate key similarities with one another, which V. has undoubtedly selected based on a schema of certain recurring motifs.

The most important of these is parricide. In the first *exemplum*, Tullia, while not carrying out the actual deed of her father's murder was certainly behind it, as Livy (V.'s source for the *exemplum*) suggests in his narrative (1.48.4-5). V. refers to Catiline's conspiracy in 9.11.3 as a *parricidium*; and in two of the final three Roman *exempla* (9.11.5-6) – which form a unit on their own, each detailing an aspect of the proscriptions – the deaths of fathers are caused by their sons. The final *exemplum* of the domestic section (9.11.7) presents the fatal betrayal of Vettius Salassus by his wife. The first of the foreign examples (9.11.ext.1), similarly, presents not parricide but fratricide, within the context of dynastic succession. 9.11.ext.2 continues the theme of conflict over rule, returning to the arena of father-son strife, and hence patricide, as does 9.11.ext.3. The final *exemplum* (9.11.ext.4), presented as the climactic and concluding *exemplum* of the entire chapter, explicitly sets out Sejanus' conspiracy in terms of parricide, casting Tiberius as the *parens* of the Roman state, as well as continuing the conflict theme, here climactically over the rule of Rome and the whole world. Other recurring motifs are the dissolution of the bonds of friendship by criminal words and deeds (e.g. 9.11.4; 9.11.ext.4), and madness as

the motivating factor behind these words and deeds (e.g. 9.11.3; 9.11.4; 9.11.ext.1; 9.11.ext.4).

9.11.praef.

**Nunc ... cum bona tum etiam mala:** V. summarises the scope of his work, foregrounding the role of Book 9 in dealing with *vitia*. The combination of *dicta* and *facta* evokes the title of the work, providing support for the argument that this chapter forms a possible conclusion to the work as a whole, leaving the final chapters (9.12-15) as a kind of miscellaneous appendix. Two of these chapters, however, do cover *exempla* dealing with moral subjects, and therefore an argument against this chapter's significance within Book 9 could be made; see further comment in the Introduction.

**substitutis exemplorum imaginibus:** Cf. 4.6.praef.; 9.3.praef.; with comment in the Introduction.

**dicta improba et facta scelerata referantur:** The linking of words and deeds is an obvious hallmark of V.'s work as a whole; cf. 1.praef.; 4.1.12; 6.2.praef.; 6.4.praef.; 7.2.praef.; 7.3.praef.; 9.3.praef.; 9.5.4; Wardle 1998: 66-7. Here he is uniquely concerned with outrageous (*improbus*) words and deeds that are wicked (*sceleratus*). Throughout the chapter he highlights this frequently, cf. e.g. 9.11.1: '*voce monstri*', '*probrosa*', '*Sceleris*'; 9.11.2: '*factum et dictum*'; 9.11.3: '*dicente*'; 9.11.6: '*scelere nefarii iuvenis*'; 9.11.7: '*scelus*'; 9.11.ext.1: '*facinus*'; 9.11.ext.2: '*multo sceleratius*'; 9.11.ext.4: '*scelera*'.

9.11.1

The fullest account of Tullia's outrageous and impious deed is found in Livy 1.48.6-7; cf. also Dion. Hal. 4.39.3-5; Ov. *Fast.* 6.603-10, *Ib.* 363; Varro, *Ling.* 5.159; Fest. 450L; *vir. ill.* 7.17-19.

**Unde autem potius quam a Tullia ordiar:** *Dubitatio* provides a rhetorical introduction to the *exemplum* (cf. e.g. 9.1.ext.1; 9.3.1; 9.3.8; 9.5.ext.2; 9.6.ext.2; 9.11.7). Tullia (*BNP* 15.3-4) was one of the two daughters of Servius Tullius with this name. Unlike her sister, she was head-strong and ambitious (cf. e.g. Liv. 1.46.2, 7; 1.47.1-2); initially the wife of Arruns Tarquinius, she had him killed and then she united with his brother Lucius, who had been married to her sister (whom she had also had killed).

**quia tempore vetustissimum ... exemplum est:** V.'s asyndetic statement provides three justifications for allocating the primary spot to Tullia: **tempore vetustissimum** – dated to 534, chronologically it is the earliest *exemplum* in the chapter; **conscientia nefarium** (Briscoe's text, on the basis of A<sup>c</sup>G; cf. Liv. 1.48.7: *foedum inhumanumque inde traditur scelus*) – Tullia's parricide is certainly wicked in a religious sense; she not only demonstrates filial impiety, but also violates the Penates (cf. Liv. 1.48.7), and does it all deliberately (**conscientia**); **voce monstri** – direct speech for Tullia is given by Ovid (*Fast.* 6.607-8), which is excessively brutal (cf. also Dion. Hal. 4.39.5) but this is ostensibly odd for V.'s version where she is given no words. *Monstrum* is a word from the religious vocabulary of portents (*OLD* 1), here in an extended sense of 'othering' the target. For V.'s justifications of *exempla* more generally, see Skidmore 1996: 86-7.

**cum carpento veheretur:** Livy (1.48.6) has her returning to her own home from the forum, having reached the top of the Vicus Cyprius and turning right into the Clivus Urbis, which led up to the Esquiline (but cf. Ogilvie 1965: 192); one might infer from Dion. Hal. 4.39.2-3 that Tullia was going to her father's house, but this is not made explicit; cf. also Varro, *Ling.* 5.159. V., undoubtedly in order to blacken Tullia's immorality further, has her speeding along towards Tarquinius' embrace (i.e. in the wrong direction, as he had sent her home); both houses were situated on the Esquiline (*LTUR* II.178-9, 185). The *carpentum*, a light two-wheeled carriage used by women, was associated with *luxuria* and arrogance (Littlewood 2006: 181).

**et is qui iumenta ... vehiculum iussit:** cf. Liv. 1.48.6: *restitit pavidus atque inhibuit frenos is qui iumenta agebat, iacentemque dominae Servium trucidatum ostendit*. Servius Tullius (BNP 15.5-7), the sixth king of Rome, had been killed by men at Lucius Tarquinius' orders after fleeing the senate house (Liv. 1.48.4-5). If this was done at the suggestion of Tullia, as Livy suggests, a kind of 'parricide' has been perpetrated, rather than merely the mistreatment of a father's corpse. Livy (1.48.7) emphasises the transgressive nature of her deed by noting that some of her father's blood had splattered onto her, and that she, defiled in this way (*contaminata ipsa respersaque*), polluted her husband's and her own household gods (*ad penates suos virique sui*); see Lennon 2014: 96-7.

**quo celerius in complexu interfectoris eius Tarquinii veniret:** V. is unique in ascribing to Tullia a swift return to Tarquinius (cf. also his use of **festinatione** in the next sentence); in the other sources he had sent her away from the forum and himself (see above).

**qua tam impia tamque probrosa festinatione:** Tullia violated her duty of *pietas* to her father (**impia**), and incurred shame (**probrosa**); V. transposes the adjectives to her haste, but they condemn her.

**non solum se aeterna infamia sed etiam ipsum vicum cognomine Sceleris commaculavit:** Livy (1.59.13) tells us that Tullia was cursed by people wherever she went; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 6.610: *et aeterna res ea pressa nota*. V.'s rhetoric would indicate that places as well as people could be stained by parricide (Lennon 2014: 96); the road on which Tullia's deed occurred, the Clivus Urbis (on which see Ogilvie 1965: 192-4), became known as *Sceleratus Vicus* ('Wicked Way' or 'Sin Street'); a word-play is also likely, as the nearby *vicus*, the Cyprius, meant 'good' in Sabine according to Varro (*Ling.* 5.159). Although *infamia* was a common term in the Latin lexicon of condemnation (see e.g. Thomas 2007), V. uses it rarely, so its appearance here, compounded by the adjective *aeterna* (cf. 3.7.4, 6.1.ext.1, 6.3.1a) is weighty – the crime

lives on for V.'s readers enshrined in the topography of Rome; in this instance they do not even need *memoria*.

### 9.11.2

In his defence of Sextus Roscius in 80 against the charges of parricide, Cicero (*Rosc. Am.* 33) used Fimbria's attack on Scaevola the *pontifex* as an *exemplum*; the substance of which is V.'s clear source here.

**Non tam atrox C. Fimbriae est factum et dictum, sed si per se aestimetur, utrumque audacissimum:** Cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 34: *Estne hoc illi dicto atque facto Fimbriano simillimum?* V. indicates that while this *exemplum* is less atrocious than the previous one, presumably because death was not the result, both, judged on their own merits, represent extremes of audacity. Fimbria became an exemplar of *audacia* among later historians (Dyck 2010: 102); cf. e.g. Liv. *Per.* 82. For the negative connotations of the term *audacia*, and its use as a term of political abuse, see Wirszubski 1961: 12-22.

C. Flavius Fimbria (*BNP* 5.458), a supporter of Marius and Cinna, who had a number of the nobility murdered (including L. Iulius Caesar and P. Licinius Crassus) and flagrantly disregarded due process as is evident in this *exemplum* (Gruen 1968: 235). He was sent, possibly as quaestor to L. Valerius Flaccus, whom he succeeded, to the Mithridatic campaign; and committed suicide in 85 in Thyatira.

**Scaevola ... iugularetur:** V.'s excises Cicero's encomiastic praise of Scaevola (*Rosc. Am.* 33): *ut Q. Scaevola vulneraretur, vir sanctissimus atque ornatissimus nostrae civitatis.* Q. Mucius Scaevola (*BNP* 9.258), the *pontifex maximus*, narrowly escaped this attack, but was later assassinated in 82 by L. Junius Brutus Damasippus (cf. e.g. Cic. *De or.* 3.10, *Brut.* 311).

**in funere C. Marii:** Marius died 13 January 86 (cf. e.g. Plut. *Mar.* 45.4-46.6; Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.81; Diod. 37.29.3-4; Liv. *Per.* 80; Vell. 2.23.1; Flor. 2.9.17; App. *BCiv.* 1.75; *vir. ill.* 67.6; Oros. 5.19.23), which dates the *exemplum* to early 86.

**quem postquam ex vulnere recreatum comperit, accusare apud populum instituit:**

Cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 33: *diem Scaevolae dixit posteaquam comperit eum posse vivere*. This 'trial' never came to fruition (Gruen 1968: 235), which may explain V.'s **instituit**.

**interrogatus deinde quid ... reddi non posset:** Cf. Cicero's *cum ab eo quaereretur quid tamen accusaturus esset eum quem pro dignitate ne laudare quidem quisquam satis commode posset*. V. transposes Cicero's condemnation of Fimbria as a madman (*ut erat furiosus*) to his concluding remark (see below). Scaevola's **sanctitate morum** refers to his corruption-free governorship of Asia (cf. 8.15.6), dressed up by V. here with a religious term (cf. Mueller 2002: 148) that may also allude to Scaevola's pontifical status.

**quod parcius corpore telum recepisset:** That he is serious makes Fimbria's claim outrageous (*improbus*), rather than ludicrous (see Hutchinson 2005: 186); cf. Cicero: *quod non totum telum corpore recepisset*. Dyck (2010: 103): 'Fimbria models the situation after that of a defeated gladiator'.

**licentiam furoris aegrae rei publicae gemitu prosequendam:** V.'s *exclamatio* takes over Cicero's designation of Fimbria as a madman to provide a rhetorical close to the *exemplum* (cf. similar examples of *exclamatio* collected in Sinclair 1980: 95ff.); claiming that unrestrained madness was followed by further 'groans' within the state, the continued conflict between Sulla and the younger Marius, and Cinnan domination.

### 9.11.3

Cicero (*Mur.* 51) reports Catiline's words to Cato: *si quod esset in suas fortunas incendium excitatum, id se non aqua sed ruina restincturum*. While this may be his ultimate source for the event, V., along with Florus (2.12.7), also appears to follow Sallust (*Cat.* 31.9), who has Catiline utter these words to Cicero just before his departure from Rome; *Tum ille furibundus 'Quoniam quidem circumventus,' inquit, 'ab inimicis praeceps agor, incendium meum ruina restinguam'; quam ut hostis evaderet sequetur palam ac professe incendium suum restincturum ruina minaretur*. For Bloomer (1992:

109-10): 'Valerius' words arise from Cicero's text; his version of the events seems to follow Sallust's'.

**L. vero Catilina in senatu, M. Cicerone ... dicente:** Hyperbaton of names in V., when introducing an *exemplum*, is quite common; cf. e.g. 9.1.7; 9.2.4; 9.5.3; 9.6.2; 9.6.3; 9.13.2. For Catiline, see comment at 9.1.9. It is clear from Cicero's speech in defence of Murena, given in November 63, that Catiline's words were spoken to Cato, after he had threatened Catiline with legal action for corrupt campaigning, before Cicero's own confrontation with Catiline in the senate before the elections. Sallust (*Cat.* 31.9), however, in his 'need for the dramatic' (Genovese 1974: 174) presents Catiline's words to Cato, as his final desperate words to Cicero before leaving Rome; for the narrative effect of this transposition, as well as discussion of the historical sequence of events, see Genovese 1974: 171-177. Cicero, as well as being one of V.'s main sources (Bloomer 1992: 11ff.; Wardle 1998: 16), features occasionally as a personality within the *exempla*, both as subject (cf. 1.4.6; 1.7.5; 4.2.4; 8.5.5; 8.10.3) and as a secondary figure (cf. 2.2.3; 4.2.5; 5.3.4; 8.13.6; 9.13.ext.1; 9.12.7); it is worth noting that he is unique in being referred to as both exemplar and source, in comparison for example, with either of V.'s other two main sources: Varro (3.2.24; 8.7.3) and Livy (1.8.ext.19). The only other figure, who is also a 'man of letters', to appear in V.'s work with similar frequency is Plato (cf. 1.6.ext.3; 1.7.1; 1.8.ext.1; 4.1.ext.2a; [4.1.ext.2b]; 4.1.ext.3; 5.10.ext.2; 7.2.ext.4; 8.7.ext.3; 8.12.ext.1).

**incendium ab ipso excitatum:** V.'s compression makes it seem as if Catiline had started an actual fire; cf. the hypothetical phrasing in Cic. *Mur.* 51: *si quod esset ... incendium* in which the agency is concealed by the passive form of the participle; in context Catiline meant that any fire might be set by others against him.

**'sentio' inquit, 'et quidem illud, si aqua non potuero, ruina restinguam':** While in Cicero, it was *any* fire (*si quod esset ... incendium*; almost 'whatever' fire; Fantham 2013: 158), Sallust has made it Catiline's personal fire (*incendium meum*); see Genovese 1974: 175. V. may be picking up Sallust's line of thought here with **sentio**.

According to Ramsey (2007: 149) *ruina* in Sallust means ‘general destruction’ and is ‘an allusion to the practice of pulling down buildings in order to block the path of a fire that is burning out of control’ – presumably a vivid metaphor in a city plagued by fires; Genovese (1974: 175) suggests that removed from its political context in Cicero, *ruina* in Sallust may rather allude to ‘a cry of final desperation’, especially given his vocabulary which evokes the image of a trapped animal; V.’s concluding remark could support both of these views; see further below.

**conscientiae stimulis actum reum se incohati parricidii peregisse:** The answer to V.’s rhetorical question is made explicit. That Catiline was happy to expose his intentions, cf. e.g. Cic. *Mur.* 51: *Atque ille, ut semper fuit apertissimus, non se purgavit sed indicavit atque induit*; Flor. 2.12.7. The closing alliterative phrase (**parricidii peregisse**), once again throws up the *Leitmotif* of the chapter (see introduction to the chapter), and recalls Sall. *Cat.* 31.8: *obstrepere omnes, hostem atque parricidam vocare*. V. takes up Cicero’s characterisation of Catiline’s conspiracy as parricide (cf. *Cat.* 1.17; 1.33; cf. Val. Max. 9.1.9).

Although Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.6.2) interpreted an expression of Tiberius in a letter to the senate in AD 32 as a confession that he was a tormented soul (see Levick 1978: 95-101), and adduced the Platonic description of a tyrant in torment, there can be no allusion by V. here to this episode. But V. (like Sallust before him) is clearly drawing on the tyrant stereotype that goes back to Plato.

#### 9.11.4

P. Magius Chilo’s murder of his one-time friend, M. Claudius Marcellus in 45 is also mentioned at Cic. *Fam.* 4.12; *Att.* 13.10, 13.22; Liv. *Per.* 115. With no verbal borrowings from Cicero, Livy is likely to be V.’s source.

**Consternatum etiam Magii Chilonis amentia pectus:** V. retrojects madness as a cause of Catiline’s crime by linking the exempla with **etiam**; cf. his mental state at 9.1.9; see also Krebs 2008: 682-6.

P. Magius Chilo (*BNP* 8.162); Servius Sulpicius, writing to Cicero (*Fam.* 4.12.4), gives his name as P. Magius Cilo, referring to him as Marcellus' friend (*familiaris*; cf. also 4.12.15: *amicus*); Livy (*Per.* 115) gives him the *praenomen* Gnaeus and calls him a client. Cicero (*Att.* 13.10.10) attributes his action to madness (*furor*). The designations of *amicus* and *cliens* are not mutually exclusive, but the choice of *amicus* here by V. is intentional, as it foreshadows the crime of Sejanus later in the chapter, *amicitia fide extincta* (9.11.ext.4).

**qui M. Marcello datum a Caesare spiritum sua manu eripuit:** Marcus Claudius Marcellus (*BNP* 3.394), consul in 51, had supported Pompey in the civil war; his pardon in 46 at the senate's request was a paradigmatic instance of Caesar's *clementia* (Wardle 1997: 332; cf. *Cic. Fam.* 4.4; Gotoff 1993: xxx-xxxii), as Cicero's *Pro Marcello* also testifies. On his friendship with Magius, see above. He was buried within the grounds of the Academy in Athens (*Cic. Fam.* 4.12.9-16). V.'s avoidance of the controversial term *clementia* may recognize the problematic elements of Caesarian 'forgiveness'.

**vetus amicus et Pompeianae militiae comes:** Magius' service under Pompey may be V.'s invention; a confusion with N. Magius (*Cic. Att.* 9.13A.1). **Pompeianae militiae** recalls for V.'s reader the civil war context and by intimating that Marcellus had *fought* against Caesar reinforces the greatness of Caesar's generosity.

**indignatus aliquos sibi amicorum ab eo praeferri:** V. alone supplies this motive for Magius' attack; cf. *Cic. Att.* 13.10 for Cicero's dismissal of any suspicions (suggested by the letter of M. Junius Brutus) that Caesar was involved with his death.

**urbem enim a Mitylenis ... in Atheniensium portu:** Marcellus intended to return to Rome from his extended exile in Mitylene, and was thus at the Piraeus on 25 May 45 (see Shackleton Bailey 1977: 421-2); cf. *Cic. Fam.* 4.12.

**pugione confodit:** V. provides none of the detail of Cicero (*Fam.* 4.12.5): *pugione percussus esse et duo vulnera accepisse, unum in stomacho, alterum in capite secundum aurem.*

**protinusque ad irritamenta vesaniae suae trucidanda tetendit:** Shackleton Bailey (1977: 422) interprets V. as meaning that 'Magius went on to attack some of Marcellus' friends of whom he was jealous', but V. rhetorically describes only Chilo's suicide (cf. Walker's translation: 'Chilo went on to murder the source of his insanity', i.e. he committed suicide; confirmed by Cic. *Fam.* 4.12.7-8).

**amicitiae hostis ... interceptor ... acerba labes:** V.'s tricolon (ascending in order of atrocity and complexity) provides succinct judgements on Magius and his actions; an enemy of friendship (**amicitiae hostis**), an oxymoron, deserved as such, presumably, not only for killing his *vetus amicus* Marcellus, but also for his jealousy of Marcellus' other *amici*; one who rendered void Caesar's display of *clementia*.

**divini beneficii:** V. goes beyond Cicero's cautious qualification *paene divinam* (Marc. 1) from his later perspective, which attributes divinity almost always to Caesar (see Wardle 1997: 323-45, who makes no substantial comment on this example). Again V. avoids the controversial term *clementia*.

**publicae religionis:** V.'s moral vocabulary regularly contrasts this with private duty (cf. e.g. 1.1.10; 1.7.4; 3.2.3; 5.10.1; see Mueller 2002a: 141), but it is an extremely extended use of the terms in the context of a dictator's decree.

#### 9.11.5

This *exemplum* along with the subsequent two *exempla* form a neat unit, with each relating an instance of parricide (9.11.5; 9.11.6) or mariticide (9.11.7) during the proscriptions of the Triumvirate in 43. The proscriptions themselves were a difficult episode to cover in the historiography of the early principate given Augustus' role in them (e.g. Vell. 2.66.2); V. does not shy away from them (see 5.3.4; 5.7.3; 6.7.2; 6.7.3; 6.8.5; 6.8.6; 6.8.7; 7.3.8; 7.7.9), but never criticises Augustus' role. While V. does not shy away from discussing the triumvirs (cf. e.g. 5.3.4, 5.7.3, 6.7.2-3, 6.8.5-7, 7.3.8-9), he never criticizes Augustus' role; in the case of Toranius Augustus was criticised

severely for not assisting him (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 27.1): the loyalist V. here allocates blame firmly to the son. V.'s direct source is unclear.

**Hanc crudelitatem ... C. Toranius atrocitate parricidii superavit:** V.'s point must be that the murder of a father trumps the murder of a friend (**cui nihil adici posse videtur**). There is some confusion, it seems, in both the sources and in the secondary literature concerning the identity of the proscribed father; the victim in the *exemplum* appears to be the C. Toranius who was praetor probably in 62, or 60-58 and the guardian of Octavian (cf. App. *BCiv.* 4.12; Suet. *Aug.* 27.1; Oros. 6.18.9), and not C. Turranius, praetor in 44 (App. *BCiv.* 4.18); see Hinard 1985: 534-5; Ryan 1996: 207-210, *contra* Shackleton Bailey (2000: 362 n.5).

**triumvirorum partes:** V. may have in mind C. Turranius; cf. App. *BCiv.* 4.18. For *partes* as a political term, see Hellegouarc'h 1972: 112ff. V.'s use of the plural **triumvirorum** may hide Augustus' role.

**proscripti patris sui, praetorii et ornati viri ... senex:** Toranius senior was at least sixty by the time of his death (Ryan 1996: 209-10). V.'s portrayal of the father as *pious*, i.e. concerned for his son, heightens the atrocity. His use of *imperator* for the Triumvir is worth noting; M. Antonius was styling himself *imperator* on coinage from 44 (*RRC* 489); Augustus, first at Forum Gallorum in April 43 (cf. Ov. *Fast.* 4.673-6; Dio 46.38.1); and Lepidus also (see Cic. *Phil.* 5.40; Manuwald 2007: 690-1); V. appears to use this word broadly of generals, not necessarily those saluted as *imperator* (see the comment of Wardle 1998: 205).

**de filii magis ... filii indicio, occideris':** Again, V.'s narrative finds a remarkable parallel in the murder of C. Turranius (App. *BCiv.* 4.18); it is not impossible that V. may have combined elements of each proscription in confusion.

**protinusque pectus eius gladio traiecit:** Cf. 9.11.4: *protinusque ... trucidanda tetendit*.

**collapsus itaque est infelix, auctore caedis quam ipsa caede miserior:** *Adnominatio* – here, juxtaposition of an altered common noun – for aural effect is very common throughout V. (Sinclair 1980: 22-37 for further examples).

### 9.11.6

The murder of the proscribed L. Villius Annalis in 43, at the instigation of his son, is also found at App. *BCiv.* 4.18.

**Cuius fati acerbitatem L. Villius Annalis sortitus:** L. Villius Annalis was praetor in 43 (cf. Appian's στρατηγός), see Tansey 2013: 98-102.

**cum in campum ad quaestoria comitia filii descendens:** Appian's narrative fleshes out the details; he was accompanied by his lictors, as he was canvassing votes for his son's candidature for a quaestorship of 42 (given that the proscriptions began in November 43); see Tansey 2013: 98-9. V. specifies the Campus Martius.

**proscriptum se cognosset, ad clientem suum confugit:** Upon discovery of his proscription, Appian relates that his 'friends' deserted him, but that he found refuge in the house of one of his clients, located in the suburbs.

**sed ne fide ... prius iterum spectaculo:** V. heightens the son's wickedness by contrasting it with the loyalty (**fide**) of his father's client; and by placing the murder in front of the son's eyes (**occidendum eum in conspectu suo obiecit**); and in case he has not made this point clear enough, he enumerates it in his concluding paradoxical remark (**bis parricida, consilio prius, iterum spectaculo**).

V.'s compressed *exemplum* omits the reward that the son earned from his wicked deed – his father's fortune and an aedileship – and he also suppresses the rest of the anecdote, as recorded in Appian, where, the son, after a drunken argument is killed by the same soldiers. While presenting the son's fate as due punishment for his parricide might have been attractive (cf. 9.11.ext.1; 9.11.ext.4), V. prefers a simple rhetorical chiasmus following the paradoxical *bis parricida*.

### 9.11.7

**Ne Vettius quidem Salassus proscriptus parum amari exitus:** Appian (*BCiv.* 4.24) preserves a fuller account of Vettius Salassus' death in 43. V.'s vocabulary is

consistent in describing these deeds as bitter; cf. 9.11.6: *fati acerbitatem*; 9.11.4: *acerba labes*.

**quem latentem uxor interficiendum, quid dicam, tradidit an ipsa iugulavit:** V. feigns uncertainty at having to describe the wife's role in Salassus' death (the rhetorical device of *dubitatio*; common throughout V.; cf. e.g. 9.1.ext.1; 9.3.8, with comment and further examples cited there). His extreme compression of the narrative elements of the story, by comparison with Appian, however, also obscures that Vettius Salassus, upon seeing his wife approaching with those intending to carry out his murder, committed suicide by jumping off of the roof of his house. However, V.'s rhetorical question (**quanto enim levius est scelus cui tantummodo manus abest?**) may allude to this, as the crime instigated by his wife needed neither her hand, nor the hands of the murderers, in its undertaking. Elsewhere V. provides a contrasting *exemplum* of the fidelity of Turia towards her husband during the proscriptions (Val. Max. 6.7.2); see further Osgood 2014: 54ff. for paradigms of wifely behaviour.

#### 9.11.ext.1

This tale of 'fraternal' gladiatorial combat at Scipio Africanus' games in 206, in order to determine monarchical (cf. V.'s *rex* with Livy's *princeps*) succession is found also at Livy 28.21; Sil. *Pun.* 16.533-42; Zon. 9.10.3. Given that V.'s narrative differs from Livy's on a number of points (the position in dispute; the combatants' relationship; their response to Scipio's advice), it is unlikely that he is (at least) V.'s only source for the *exemplum*.

**Illud autem facinus, quia externum est, tranquilliore adfectu narrabitur:** V. expresses relief at turning to a foreign example; for similar distancing statements, cf. 5.3.ext.1; 9.2.ext.1; see Weileder 1998: 75 n. 206. *Externus* is the most common signifier of transition from domestic to foreign material in V.'s text as a whole; cf.

1.6.ext.praef.; 1.8.ext.2; 3.3.2; 3.4.ext.1; 3.7.11; 3.8.ext.1; 4.1.15; 4.3.ext.1; 4.5.ext.1; 4.7.praef.; 5.6.ext.1; 6.1.ext.1; 6.3.ext.1; 7.3.10; 9.12.ext.1; see Lawrence 2006: 115.

**Scipione Africano patris et patrum memoriam gladiatorio munere Carthagine Nova celebrante:** Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus (*BNP* 3.821-2; see 9.2.1: *quem...*), offered funeral games in 206 to commemorate his father, P. Cornelius Scipio (*BNP* 3.819) and uncle, Cn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus (*BNP* 3.823), who had both been killed in Spain in 211 (see e.g. Liv. 25.32.1-34.14, 25.35.1-36.16). New Carthage (modern-day Cartagena) is situated on the east coast of Spain. Scipio Africanus' own fraternal *pietas* towards Scipio Asiagenus, something which V.'s readers would surely recall, adds a contrasting context to the *exemplum* presentation; see Bannon 1997: 116-127.

**duo regis filii ... pugna sua facerent:** V. makes them brothers, as does Zonaras (9.10.3), Silius Italicus (*Pun.* 16.533-538) twins, Livy (28.21.6), cousins (*patruales fratres*); Corbis and Orsua, whose fathers had ruled successively.

**eos cum Scipio ... eius obtemperaret:** Scipio's sage advice is consistent with V.'s generally positive portrayal of him throughout the work. In Livy (28.21.8), neither brother heeded Scipio.

**minor corporis viribus fretus in amentia perstitit:** Livy's account contrasts the skill of the two; the older, presented relying on his skills with weapons and cunning (*maior usu armorum et astu*), while the younger, in the prime of his youth (*minor flore aetatis ferox*), full of brute strength; in Livy madness (*tanta rabie*) is ascribed to both brothers.

**initoque certamine pertinacior impietas Fortunae iudicio morte multata est:** V. labels the younger brother's deed as the more persistent impiety (**pertinacior impietas**); however, the comparative shows that both were guilty of *impietas*. On fraternal *pietas*, see Bannon 1997. For V. *fortuna* can be an active force (cf. e.g. 1.5.8, 1.7.ext.2, 1.8.ext.4); here the language is more legal than elsewhere – with a verdict and punishment (cf. 6.6.ext.1). The logic of the *exemplum* would demand that

Fortuna's verdict was not random or capricious: if *inito certamine* is understood causally, i.e. because he initiated the contest, the punishment becomes just.

#### 9.11.ext.2

Shackleton Bailey (2000: 364 n. 9) and Briscoe (1998: 614), following earlier editors (e.g. Gertz), wrongly posit that V. is confused here and that the 'murder' of Mithridates VI Eupator Dionysus in 63 by his son Pharnaces is meant (Mithridates was driven to suicide by his son; when poison failed to work, he enlisted the aid of a Gallic soldier Bitocus/Bituitus, who ran him through with a sword; cf. e.g. Liv. *Per.* 102; Vell. 2.40.1; Joseph. *AJ* 14.53; Plut. *Pomp.* 41; Flor. 1.40.26; App. *Mithr.* 110-1; Dio 37.12; Eutrop. 6.12.3; Oros. 6.5.4-6). However, if we assume V. preserves the name Mithridates correctly, as well as his role as son, then the *exemplum* probably refers to the Mithridates who betrayed his father, Ariobarzanes (*BNP* 1.1082-3), the Satrap of Dascylium, who was crucified by Artaxerxes in the 360s (cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* 8.8.4; Arist. *Pol.* 5.1312a; Harp. s.v. 'Ariobarzanes'; for fuller discussion, and chronology, see Weiskopf 1989: 53-4). This solution has the benefit of saving V. from contradiction between here and 9.2.ext.3 on how Mithridates died.

**Mithridates autem multo ... parem admirationem habet:** As the narrative of V.'s *exemplum* is much compressed, his immediate source unrecoverable, and all other parallel passages jejune in their descriptions of Mithridates' betrayal of his father, little can be said on the details V. provides; given his general reading patterns for foreign *exempla*, Pompeius Trogus is a likely guess as V.'s source. Certainly, his comment that the deed was more criminal (**multo sceleratius**) demonstrates that father-son strife was considered more wicked than fraternal discord. V. has so compressed this *exemplum* that the remaining two points that he highlights remain obscure: the son's accomplices and his irreligious invocation of the gods, and provide V. with a neat conclusion showcasing his moral condemnation of the deed.

### 9.11.ext.3

Appian (*Mithr.* 104) relates in more detail the attempts of Tigranes' sons to ascend his throne; V. is alone in mentioning this blood pact.

**Quamquam quid hoc quasi inusitatum illis gentibus miremur:** V.'s words indicate that familial succession squabbles among the 'barbarian' nations were not unfamiliar to his Roman readers. For the criterion of 'wonder' (*miror*), see 9.8.ext.1: *itaque minus miror*; for its role in V.'s moral teaching, and the purpose of its inclusion, see Skidmore 1996: 96.

**cum Sariaster adversus patrem suum Tigranem, Armeniae regem:** Appian (*Mithr.* 104) calls the son Tigranes. The Armenian form of his name may be Zareh (cf. Zariadres), and he may be Zareh, son of Artashes III (Marquart 1895: 654-5; see Boyce 1955: 466; Chaumont 2001-2002: 225-247, however, is probably correct in identifying the son as Tigranes Sariaster, the third son mentioned by Appian. Tigranes II (*BNP* 14.670-1), born in 140, ruled Armenia until his death in 55, latterly as *amicus et socius* of Rome, after his submission to Pompey.

**ita cum amicis ... eum invicem sorberent:** Forming partnerships by the drinking of blood commonly appears as a marker of typically 'barbarian' practice in Greco-Roman historiography (e.g. Lucian *Toxaris* 37); it is also used in instances where the author wishes to depict an individual in morally condemnatory way (e.g. Catiline; Sall. *Cat.* 22.1); see Oschema 2006: 279-282.

**vix ferrem pro salute parentis tam cruenta conspiratione foedus facientem:** Walker's translation (2004: 338) captures V.'s rhetorical comment: 'I could hardly bear it if someone arranged such a bloodthirsty pact, even to save his father's life'. The ideas of bloody and above all 'conspiracy' may be V.'s perfect lead-in to the Sejanus *exemplum*; the Romans were familiar with vows *pro salute alicuius*, above all for the emperor; here like Sejanus and his followers there was a pact to kill the *pater*.

### 9.11.ext.4

For the role of this passage in dating V.'s work and for the identification of the unnamed conspirator as Sejanus, see the Introduction. The best most recent discussions of Sejanus and his alleged conspiracy are Champlin 2012: 361-388 and Birley 2007: 121-150.

**Sed quid ego ista consector aut quid his immoror cum unius parricidii cogitatione cuncta scelera superata cernam:** For *consector* used by V. to move from one subject to the next, cf. 3.6.praef.; 4.8.4. The demonstrative pronouns (**ista; his**) must refer to the *dicta* and *facta* of the previous *exempla*. Alliteration (cum ... cernam) is pronounced as an element of rhetoric.

Although the representation of conspiracy as parricide goes back to the early 1st c. (cf. e.g. Cic. *Leg.* 3.36), it is as a part of Cicero's rhetoric of excoriation that it is most prominent (cf. *Vat.* 35, *Sull.* 6.12, *Phil.* 4.5). Cicero justifies it on the grounds that the *patria* is the *parens omnium* (*Cat.* 1.17). The term *parricidium* to designate Sejanus' conspiracy against Tiberius can be supported on a number of grounds, as more than merely 'empty rhetoric' (cf. Bellemore 1989: 79). Firstly, later in the *exemplum* V. refers to Tiberius as **princeps parensque noster**, which not only places any attempted plot to kill the emperor within the realm of the term's traditional use (i.e. the murder of a parent; Cloud 1971: 1-66), but also recalls its application to Caesar's assassination after the fact (see Wardle 1997: 334). And secondly, Seneca the Elder (*Controv.* 9.4.21) quotes Asilius Sabinus referring to Sejanus' imprisoned rich followers (*Seianianos locupletes*) as parricides (*parricidas*). For parricide as a *Leitmotiv* of the chapter, see the introduction to this section.

**omni igitur impetu ... valido adfectu rapior:** This example, as it concerns Tiberius and the safety of the Roman state, is clearly not external, and V. is unable to relate it in a calmer frame of mind (cf. 9.11.ext.1). *Indignatio* is the appropriate response to vice, cf. 9.8.3: *indignationis...*; Cic. *Invent.* 1.100; V.'s use of duty (*pietas*), while orthodox in moral and religious terminology more generally, here is used in the new sense of duty towards the emperor as father; and is consistent with the chapter, cf.

e.g. 9.11.ext.1: '*pertinacior impietas*'. Although dutiful, V.'s contrast of *pious* and *validus* indicates that his emotion is ineffective in punishing a deed such as Sejanus'; only Tiberius is able to achieve this; see comment at 9.1.praef. on V.'s moral objective. For *lacero* used of verbal attack in V., cf. e.g. 4.4.11; 4.7.3; 5.1.ext.2b.

**amicitiae fide extincta:** Cf. **violatis amicitiae foederibus** (below). An altar to *Amicitia*, flanked by both Tiberius and Sejanus, was dedicated in AD 28 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.74.2); Jeppesen (1993: 141-175) has also identified Sejanus linked to Tiberius by the personification of *Amicitia* on the Paris cameo. For V. on *amicitia* more generally, see Mueller 2002a: 131-9; Williams 2012: 7-17, 56; but it is not insignificant that it is only on the subject of friendship (4.7.ext.2) that V. steps personally into his work.

**genus humanum:** Cf. 7.3.1: *humani generis*; Weileder (1998: 62-3): '*Der römische Machtbereich umfaßt die ganze Welt; daher bringt ein verbrecherischer römischer Machthaber Gefahr und Untergang für die ganze Welt mit sich*'; cf. also further below: **mundus; totus orbis.**

**cruentis in tenebris sepelire conatum:** A cryptic description of the conspiracy's aims: 'bloody' suggest that the death of Tiberius was intended, which was doubtless the official version.

**tu videlicet efferatae barbariae immanitate truculentior habenas Romani imperii ... capere potuisti:** In the only use of apostrophe in Book 9 V. addresses the unnamed conspirator directly, but by leaving him unnamed, he effects a kind of *damnatio memoriae* upon him (cf. Dio 58.12.4-8; there was, however, no official *damnatio memoriae* against Sejanus; Champlin [2012: 366 n. 13] suggest 'memory sanction' as the more appropriate designation). V. casts Sejanus in two comparative roles, both equally damning: as more savage than the barbarian; because Sejanus was declared *hostis* (cf. *ILS* 157), he was worse than a barbarian (Weileder 1998: 62); and as less able than Tiberius in his imperial pretensions; for *habenae* (reins) used of governing the empire, see *TLL* vi.3, 2394.10. On **efferatae barbariae**, cf. 4.6.ext.2; 5.1.ext.6; 9.2.4; 9.2.ext.1; **immanitate**, appears only here in V.

**princeps parensque noster salutari dextera continet:** Cf. Val. Max. 5.5.3; *SCPP* (l. 165). Tiberius never adopted the title (perhaps more correctly, *cognomen*; cf. e.g. Suet. *Jul.* 76.1, *Aug.* 58.1; Tac. *Ann.* 11.25.4; Sen. *Clem.* 1.14.2; see Weber 1936: 264 n. 692) of *pater patriae*; on at least three occasions he is recorded as rejecting it: in AD 14-15 (Suet. *Tib.* 26.2, 67.2-4; Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.1; Dio 57.8.1); 19, after his intervention over the corn price (*parentis patriae*; Tac. *Ann.* 2.87.2); and after Sejanus' fall in AD 31 (Dio 58.12.8); it is likely that he was offered the title also in AD 33 also, after his currency reforms and suppression of informers (Dio 58.22.1; however the title is not specifically mentioned). The title, however, was used occasionally in inscriptions and on coins in the empire; e.g. an inscription found at Leptis Magna, which records the title; the editors suggest that the reason that the inscription bore this title was perhaps because it was cut soon after Augustus' death and before the official titles of the new emperor were known (*IRT* 329); cf. the Gytheion inscription, which also records this *cognomen* (*SEG* XI no. 922); see Grant 1950: 44 for further examples. While outside of Rome it appears that 'little attempt was evidently made to fall in with the official *moderatio* of Tiberius' (Grant 1950: 44; cf. Seager 2005: 119-20; Stevenson 2007: 121-22), V. fully appreciates official titulature, but is able to circumvent Tiberius' wishes by the cognate *parens*, in order to present him in heroic terms, as the saviour of Rome (Wardle 2002: 437); the title's associations include not only the Hellenistic σωτήρ (Stevenson 2009: 98), but also Romulus-like 'refounders' of Rome, who 'save' the city at a time of crisis (Alföldi 1971: 28-36). For Tiberius as parent, leader, and saviour, '*salutaris princeps*' cf. Val. Max. 1.praef.; 2.9.6; 8.13.praef.; Suet. *Tib.* 29; Weinstock 1971: 172. It would not be overreaching to suggest that Tiberius is acting like a god (see Mueller 2002a: 180-1).

**te compote furoris mundus in suo statu mansisset:** V.'s rhetorical question introduces his enumeration of key Republican disasters for Rome; on V.'s selection, see Coudry 1998: 47. His language, both here and throughout the *exemplum*, recalls Cicero's description of Catiline's conspiracy; see Weileder 1998: 62-3; for Catiline's

*furor*, cf. Val. Max. 4.8.3, picking up Cicero's regular application of the term to Catiline (principally, e.g. at *Cat.* 1.1-2, but throughout the *Catilinarians*). Much of V.'s rhetoric in this questioning, particularly the alliterative phrases and his cumulative use of synonymous words, recalls features of Roman *vota* (see Appel 1909: 160-2, 177-8) and is perhaps a deliberate allusion to this kind of language; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 28.1-2 with commentary by Wardle 2005b: 181-201 for a comparable example. On **mundus**, see comment above on **genus humanum**. Mueller (2002a: 180) makes the interesting point that all of the disasters that V. records were caused by divine anger, *pax deorum* broken, but under Tiberius the gods are fully on-side and protecting Rome.

**urbem a Gallis captam:** The Gallic sack of Rome occurred in 390; it features as a significant era-marking event in Roman history, seen for example by its placement in Livy's narrative (5.33-49) – it was, arguably, the worst defeat suffered by Rome and the only time the city was captured (see Ogilvie 1965: 719-20; Weileder 1998: 184-8).

**trecentorum inclutae gentis virorum strage foedatum Aliensem diem:** The addition, by Gertz, of *amnem Cremeram et* after **foedatum** is appealing, but unnecessary. The 'shameful' (*foedatus*) day of Allia, was so named because of the Roman defeat, by the Gauls, at this river on the 18 July 390 (cf. Liv. 5.37-8; Diod. 14.114.1-7; Plut. *Cam.* 18.4-7), 'perhaps the most notorious of Rome's unlucky days' (Oakley 1997: 396); cf. also e.g. Liv. 6.1.11; Verg. *Aen.* 7.717; Tac. *Hist.* 2.91.1; Varr. *Ling.* 6.32; Luc. 7.408; Cic. *Att.* 9.5.2; Macr. *Sat.* 1.16.23. For the contemporary resonance in imperial Rome of the *dies Alliensis*, cf. *ILS* 140 and Rowe 2002: 118 n. 40. The same date in 477 also saw the destruction of 306 members of the Fabian *gens* at the Cremera river (cf. e.g. Liv. 2.48-50; Dion. Hal. 9.15-22); Ogilvie 1965: 359-361 provides detailed discussion of the chronology.

**oppressos in Hispania Scipiones:** P. Cornelius Scipio (*BNP* 3.819) and Cn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus (*BNP* 3.823) were killed in Spain in 211, fighting the Carthaginians (see e.g. Liv. 25.32.1-34.14, 25.35.1-36.16).

**Trasumennum lacum:** Hannibal defeated C. Flaminius and his troops at Lake Trasimene on 21 June 217 (cf. e.g. Polyb. 3.80-5; Liv. 22.4-7; Ov. *Fast.* 6.765-8); referred to by V. also at 1.6.6; 3.7.ext.6; 4.8.ext.1; 9.12.2. Livy (22.7.2) places the Roman death toll at 15 000.

**Cannas:** Where in 216 Hannibal defeated the Romans (cf. e.g. Polyb. 3.113-7; Liv. 22.45-50); very frequently referred to by V., see 1.1.15; 1.1.16; 2.7.15c; 2.9.8; 3.2.11; 3.4.4; 3.7.10b; 3.7.ext.6; 3.8.2; 4.5.2; 4.8.2; 5.1.ext.6; 5.6.4; 5.6.7; 6.4.1a; 6.6.ext.2; 7.2.ext.16; 7.4.ext.2; 7.6.1b; 9.5.ext.3; for a modern account of Cannae, see Daly 2002.

**bellorumque civilium domestico sanguine manantes mucrones:** For the sake of sense, I follow Shackleton Bailey here, who adopts Kempf's conjecture of *mu<c>rones*; a general reference to the Civil Wars rather than to a specific battle (contra Watt and A<sup>o</sup>) is needed given the prominence that they have, especially in Book 9; Briscoe prefers to retain the obelised *furores* of G. For V.'s treatment of the Civil Wars generally, see Bloomer 1992: 147-184; Freyburger 1998: 111-117; Gowing 2010: 249-260.

**amentibus propositis furoris tui repraesentare et vincere voluisti:** V.'s uses of *propositum* and *voluisti* may suggest that the 'conspiracy' never got beyond the planning stages; *amentia* is used regularly of Catiline, cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 1.8.8-10, 1.25.3-4, 2.11.5-10, 2.25.11-3. Gunderson (2013: 204) sees Sejanus as V.'s 'inverted double' as he comments on V.'s use of *repraesentare*: 'the vivid words of Valerius have as their analogue the would-be deeds of [Sejanus]'; V. employs the term (and its derivatives) more than any other Latin author (Ker 2007: 355-8); in many ways the very purpose of *exempla*, here used of a dreadful reality.

**sed vigilarunt oculi deorum:** Much of the language of the following section finds parallels in 1.praef., and the following lemmata specifically deal with the idea of *caelestis providentia* which was an idea powerfully promoted under Tiberius. Weileder (1998: 64) rightly argues that V.'s reference here is not only to the Olympian pantheon but also to Julius Caesar and Augustus and to the living

Tiberius (cf. 4.3.3). The consequence is that *divi* are here subsumed under broader category of *dei* and are ascribed real power (cf. e.g. Wardle 2012: 307-26, esp. 326).

**sidera suum vigorem obtinuerunt:** Elsewhere, V. makes reference to both Caesar and Augustus as stars; (cf. 1.praef.; 2.1.10; 3.2.19; 6.9.15), but the natural interpretation here could be much wider to astrology. Although V. notes, with probable approval the expulsion of astrologers from Rome in 139 (1.3.2), and Tiberius himself expelled them in AD 19 (Mueller 2002a: 100-1, 223-4), the emperor's personal beliefs were different; his close reliance of Thrasyllus was well known (cf. e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 14.4, 69; and Cramer 1954: 99-108) and a sycophant could safely make a general statement like this although it could find no support in the official state religion. It is not as stars that V.'s *divi* have an effective *numen*, but because they are *dei* (cf. 1 praef.). V.'s belief in stars as divinities, and the power of astrology (e.g. 2.10.2; see Mueller 2002a: 104-5), more generally, is typical of his period; more generally, see also Green 2014, along with the Introduction.

**arae pulvinaria templa praesenti numine vallata sunt:** Whose the *praesens numen* is, exactly, is not entirely clear; as Wardle (2000: 491) has pointed out, although it could be understood more generally as the deity worshipped at each site (e.g. *arae, pulvinaria, templa*), it is more likely here, given this *exemplum's* parallels with the work's preface, a reference to Tiberius; cf. e.g. Val. Max. 1.praef. *praesenti fide*; in a fragmentary, contemporary inscription from Gortyn (*ILS* 158) Tiberius is apparently attributed with *numen*; divine epiphany is common, cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 2.19, 2.29 – V. is again building upon Cicero's Catilinarian invective (Weileder 1998: 62 n. 121 – also esp. in poetry (Wardle 1998: 71), e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.41, *G.* 1.10; *App. Verg. Ciris* 245; Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.2, *Ep.* 2.1.16; Ov. *Met.* 15.622, *Pont.* 1.1.6, 1.2.105; Calp. Sic. *Ecl.* 4.84; Man. *Astr.* 1.49. In every other Roman example, V. uses **pulvinaria** not as a generalisation, but specifically of the Capitol (cf. 3.7.1g; 4.1.6; 6.1.praef.), outside of a Roman context, he uses the term more generally (2.10.ext.1). V. in general distinguishes between

**templa** (inaugurated spaces) and *aedes* – in this respect his language is precise (Mueller 2002a: 80).

**nihil quod pro capite augusto ac patria excubare debuit torporem sibi permisit:** On Perizonius' emendation *augusto* over the reading of *G augusti*, followed by Briscoe, see Wardle 2000: 491 n. 71; cf. Val. Max. 4.3.3. By using the adjectival form and thus attributing the name to Tiberius only indirectly V. avoids direct contradiction of Tiberius' expressed wish not to be called Augustus (Suet. *Tib.* 26). By contrast Velleius avoids any form of attribution (see Cowan 2009a: 477). V. uses the **excubare** regularly, specifically on occasion of the gods' role regarding Rome (cf. e.g. 1.1.8; 1.8.1), as well as of friends (e.g. 4.7.7); this raises the possibility that V. here includes, obliquely, reference to unnamed human vigilance, for example, that of Sutorius Macro. For **patria** as a possible discreet allusion to title of *pater patriae*, see Weileder 1998: 267; the word, however, is frequent in V.

**in primis:** The culmination of V.'s list of protectors of the state is Tiberius himself.

**auctor et tutela:** V.'s designation of the emperor as **auctor** would, undoubtedly, make his readers think of Augustus and the meaning of his name, as well as the fact that it was a part of Tiberius' official nomenclature despite his expressed wishes (see e.g. Wardle 2005b: 190-2). In **tutela** V. use a key term associated with the role of the emperor in the early principate; used of Tiberius, cf. e.g. Vell. 2.105.3, 2.128.4; Tac. *Ann.* 1.12.1; elsewhere used of, for example, Caesar (1.6.13), the senate (2.7.praef.), the personification of Modesty (4.5.praef.), and Augustus (7.6.6); see also Weileder 1998: 61-71; Béranger 1953: 186-217, 257-9.

**merita sua:** Cf. Plin. *Paneg.* 55.10 for a celebration of imperial *merita*; Livia, too, was attributed with *meritae* to the *res publica* (SCPP 1. 115). Given that *merita* were the grounds for Augustus' formal deification (e.g. Bosworth 1999), their appearance here in a passage laden with sacralising language is appropriate.

**totius orbis ruina:** Reminiscent again of the language used of Catiline's conspiracy (cf. e.g. Val. Max. 9.11.3: *ruina restinguam*); see also Weileder 1998: 63.

**divino consilio providit:** Tiberius' *providentia* in dealing with Sejanus' 'conspiracy', evidenced in V.'s phrasing, prevented the collapse of the entire world; on Tiberius' *providentia*, see Martin 1982: 103-34; Charlesworth 1936: 111-113; Wardle 1998: 68; cf. e.g. Val. Max. 1.praef.: *caelestis providentia*; inscriptions from Interamna and Gortyn set up shortly after Sejanus' death indicate that empire-wide there was commemoration of Tiberius' *providentia* (ILS 157: *providentiae Ti. Caesaris Augusti ...sublato hoste perniciosissimo p. R*; ILS 158: [*num*]ini ac *providentiae [Ti. Caesar. Aug. ...]*). For *divinus* in Latin republican panegyric now, see Cole 2013: *passim*; post Caesar it can have the technical sense of belonging to a *divus*, but would be incorrectly applied to Tiberius while alive.

**itaque stat pax:** Introduces a series of asyndetic statements which present the world rightly ordered and peaceful because of Sejanus' suppression. *Pax* was a key component of the dominant Tiberian ideal of 'uninterrupted tranquillity' (Levick 1976: 86; Bellemore 1989: 74; Weileder 1998: 237-8); cf. e.g. Philo *Leg.* 141; Vell. 2.131.1; for its representation on coins, see Grant 1950: 77-83.

**valent leges:** An attested concern of Tiberius', see in Tacitus' account of his support of the *delatores* (*Ann.* 4.30.3); cf. Vell. 2.89.3: *restituta vis legibus* relating Augustus' achievements from 29 to 27. V. makes much of Tiberius as the bringer and guarantor of *tranquillitas* (8.13.praef), the same note as that struck by the senate in AD 20. (cf. SCPP II. 13-14).

**sincerus privati ac publici officii tenor servatur:** V. has a clear notion of *rectus tenor* (cf. 2.7.14, 7.3.7), but what precisely is meant here is unclear; presumably that the offices of state continue to be held properly and exercised and that non-magistrates also continue to perform their duties; public/private antithesis in V. is very common (cf. e.g. 1.1.10; 2.1.1; 2.1.1; 9.13.1; 9.15.praef.) – and likely signals a way of saying 'everything', that is, within all spheres of life.

**violatis amicitiae foederibus:** See above *amicitiae fide...*; for *amicitia* as a *foedus*, cf. e.g. Catull. 109.6; Man. *Astr.* 2.588.

**omni cum stirpe ... meretur supplicia pendit:** Most readers have understood V.'s **omni cum stirpe sua** to refer to Sejanus' offspring (e.g. Briscoe 1993: 402; Birley 2007: 141-2; however, cf. Bellemore 1989: 79). Tacitus (*Ann.* 5.9.1-2; cf. Dio 58.11.5) reports that Sejanus' younger son and daughter were placed in prison, the daughter violated by the executioner, and then both were strangled to death, with their bodies cast onto the Gemonian Stairs; the *Fasti Ostienses* record the names of the son and daughter as Capito Aelianus and Junilla (Vidman 1972: 42). They also record the death of the elder son, Strabo, by strangling on 24 October AD 31. Sejanus, himself, was placed in prison, harassed by the people, who also tore down his images; he was then executed on 18 October AD 31 and his body cast down the Gemonian Stairs (alluded to by V.'s **obtritus**). The corpse was abused by the people and finally tossed into the river (cf. Dio 58.11.1-5; Juv. 10.85-6; Sen. *Tranq.* 11.11). If there was any valuing of *humanitas* that did not permit hatred to continue after death early in Tiberius' principate (cf. *SCPP* ll. 61), in the case of Sejanus such scruples were rightly cast aside.

**apud inferos ... supplicia pendet:** Cf. the apostrophe of 7.7.4 where Septicia is blasted to the underworld, a punishment in effect administered by Augustus' judicial verdict. If this is the end of V.'s original project (with the final chapters as a miscellaneous appendix; see comments in the Introduction), it ends emphatically with the most powerful statement that the moral system works – Sejanus is consigned to eternal punishment; *vitia severissime vindicantur* (1.praef) indeed.

## Bibliography

Adams, J. N., 'The Vocabulary of the Later Decades of Livy' *Antichthon* 8 (1974), 54-62.

Appel, G., *De Romanorum precatationibus* (Gießen, 1909).

Alexander, M. C., *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC* (Toronto, 1990).

Alexander, M. C., 'The *commentariolum petitionis* as an Attack on Election Campaigns I' *Athenaeum* 97 (2009), 31-57.

Alföldi, A., *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken* (Darmstadt, 1971).

Andreau, J., *Banking and Business in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 1999).

Anson, E. M., 'Alexander and Siwah' *AncW* 34 (2003), 117-130.

Ash, R., 'Between Scylla and Charybdis?: Historiographical Commentaries on Latin Historians' in R. K. Gibson and C. S. Kraus (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory* (Leiden, 2002), 269-294.

Asheri, D., Lloyd, A., and Corcella, A., *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford, 2007).

Asmonti, L. A., 'The Arginusae Trial, the Changing Role of the *strategoï* and the Relationship between *demos* and Military Leadership in Late-Fifth Century Athens' *BICS* 49 (2006), 1-21.

Assar, G. F., 'A Revised Parthian Chronology of the Period 165-91 BC' *Electrum* 11 (2006), 87-158.

Astin, A. E., *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford, 1967).

Astin, A. E., *Cato the Censor* (Oxford, 1978).

Atkinson, J. E. and Yardley, J. C., *Curtius Rufus. Histories of Alexander the Great, Book 10* (Oxford, 2009).

Attanasio, D., Brillì, M., and Ogle, N., *The Isotopic Signature of Classical Marbles* (Rome, 2006).

- Badian, E., 'The Early Career of A. Gabinius (cos. 58 B.C.)' *Philologus* 103 (1959), 87-99.
- Badian, E., *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1964).
- Badian, E., 'M. Porcius Cato and the Annexation and Early Administration of Cyprus' *JRS* 55 (1965), 110-121.
- Badian, E., 'The Sempronii Aselliones' *PACA* 11 (1968), 1-6.
- Badian, E., 'Quaestiones Variae' *Historia* 18 (1969) 447-491.
- Badian, E., 'Roman Politics and the Italians (133-91 B.C.)' *DArch* 4-5 (1970-1971), 373-409.
- Badian, E., 'The Death of Saturninus: Studies in Chronology and Prosopography' *Chiron* 14 (1984), 101-147.
- Baldus, H. R., 'Zwei Deutungsvorschläge zur punischen Goldprägung im mittleren 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.' *Chiron* 18 (1988), 171-179.
- Balmaceda, C., 'The Virtues of Tiberius in Velleius' *Histories*' *Historia* 63 (2014), 340-363.
- Balot, R. K., *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens* (Princeton, 2001).
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D., 'The "Divinity" of Alexander' *Historia* 3 (1950), 363-388.
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D., 'Sulla Felix' *JRS* 41 (1951), 1-10.
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D., 'Fabula Clodiana' *Historia* 15 (1966), 65-73.
- Bane, R. W., 'The Development of Roman Imperial Attitudes and the Iberian Wars' *Emerita* 44 (1976), 409-420.
- Blank-Sangmeister, U., *Valerius Maximus: Facta et Dicta Memorabilia/Denkwürdige Taten und Worte* (Stuttgart, 1991).
- Bannon, C. J., *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal Pietas in Roman Law, Literature, and Society* (Princeton, 1997).

Bannon, C. J., *Gardens and Neighbours: Private Water Rights in Roman Italy* (Ann Arbor, 2009).

Bannon, C., 'C. Sergius Orata and the Rhetoric of Fishponds' *CQ* 64 (2014), 166-182.

Baraz, Y., 'From Vice to Virtue: The Denigration and Rehabilitation of *Superbia* in Ancient Rome' in I. Sluiter and R. M. Rosen (eds.), *Kakos: Badness and Anti-Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden, 2008), 365-397.

Barchiesi, A., 'Martial Arts: Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum: A Verbal Monument with a Vengeance' in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium* (Oxford, 2002), 1-22.

Bar-Kochva, B., *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge, 1976).

Barton, C. A., 'The Roman Blush: The Delicate Matter of Self-Control' in J. I. Porter (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 212-234.

Barton, C. A., *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones* (Berkeley, 2001).

Bartsch, S., *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire* (Chicago, 2006).

Bauman, R. A., *The crimen maiestatis in the Roman Republic and Augustan Principate* (Johannesburg, 1970).

Bauman, R. A., *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome* (New York, 1992).

Baynham, E., *Alexander the Great: The Unique History of Quintus Curtius* (Ann Arbor, 1998).

Blake, M. E., *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus* (Washington, 1947).

Beagon, M., *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford, 1992).

Beagon, M., *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History Book 7* (Oxford, 2005).

Beard, M., *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, MA., 2007).

Beer, M., *Taste or Taboo: Dietary Choices in Antiquity* (Totnes, 2009).

Bellefleur, J., 'When did Valerius Maximus write the *Dicta et Facta Memorabilia*' *Antichthon* 23 (1989), 67-80.

Bellefleur, J., 'Valerius Maximus and His Presentation of Alexander the Great' in P. Wheatley and E. Baynham (eds.), *East and West in the World Empire of Alexander: Essays in Honours of Brian Bosworth* (Oxford, 2015), 299-316.

Benes, J. L., and Hillard, T. W., 'The Death of Lucius Equitius on 10 December 100 B.C.' *CQ* 40 (1990), 269-272.

Béranger, J., *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat* (Basel, 1953).

Birley, A., 'Sejanus: His Fall' in Nicholas Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdańsk, 2007), 121-150.

Bliss, F. R., *Valerius Maximus and his Sources: A Stylistic Approach to the Problem* (Diss., University of North Carolina, 1951).

Bloomer, W. M., *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill, 1992).

Bolchazy, L. J., *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy's Concept of its Humanizing Force* (Chicago, 1977).

Bonfante Warren, L., 'Roman Costumes. A Glossary and Some Etruscan Derivations' *ANRW* I 4 (1973), 584-614.

Bosch, C., *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Litteratur der historischen Exempla* (Stuttgart, 1929).

Boswell, J., *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago, 1980).

Boswinkel, E. and Pestman, P.W., *Les archives privées de Dionysios, fils de Kephalas* (Leiden, 1982).

Bosworth, A. B., 'Alexander and Ammon' in Konrad H. Kinzl (ed.), *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory: Studies presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the occasion of his eightieth birthday* (Berlin, 1977), 51-75.

- Bosworth, A. B., *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Bosworth, A. B., 'Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis' *JRS* 89 (1999), 1-18.
- Bowden, H., 'On Kissing and Making Up: Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great's "Experiment with *Proskynesis*"' *BICS* 56 (2013), 55-77.
- Bowden, H., 'Alexander in Egypt: Considering the Egyptian Evidence' in P. R. Bosman (ed.), *Alexander in Africa* (Pretoria 2014), 38-55.
- Bowersock, G. W., *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965).
- Boyce, M., 'Zariadres and Zarēr' *BSOAS* 17 (1955), 463-477.
- Bradley, K. R., *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An Historical Commentary* (Brussels, 1978).
- Braund, D., *Rome and the Friendly King: The Character of the Client Kingship* (London, 1984).
- Braund, S. and Gilbert, G., 'An ABC of Epic *ira*: Anger, Beasts, and Cannibalism' in Susanna Braund and Glenn W. Most (eds.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen* (Cambridge, 2003), 250-285.
- Braund, S. and Most, G. W. (eds.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Braund, S. M., *Seneca: De Clementia* (Oxford, 2009).
- Braund, S. M. and Gill, C. (eds.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Brennan, T. C., *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 2000).
- Bridges, E., *Imagining Xerxes: Ancient Perspectives on a Persian King* (London, 2015).
- Briscoe, J., *A Commentary on Livy, Books 34-37* (Oxford, 1981).
- Briscoe, J., 'Some Notes on Valerius Maximus' *Sileno* 19 (1993), 395-408.
- Briscoe, J. (ed.), *Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1998).

- Briscoe, J., 'Review of Andrea Themann-Steinke, *Valerius Maximus: ein Kommentar zum zweiten Buch der Facta et Dicta memorabilia*' *ExClass* 14 (2010), 379-382.
- Brizzi, G., 'Carthage and Hannibal in Roman and Greek Memory' in D. Hoyos (ed.), *A Companion to the Punic Wars* (Chichester, 2011).
- Brosius, M., *Women in Ancient Persia 559 – 331 BC* (Oxford, 1996).
- Broughton, T. R. S., *Candidates Defeated in Roman Elections: Some Ancient Roman "also-rans"* (Philadelphia, 1991).
- Brunt, P. A., *Italian Manpower, 225 BC – AD 14* (Oxford, 1971).
- Brunt, P. A., 'Stoicism and the Principate' *PBSR* 43 (1975), 7-35.
- Brunt P. A., *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford, 1990).
- Burck, E., 'Das Bild der Karthager in der römischen Literatur' in Joseph Vogt (ed.), *Rom und Karthago: ein Gemeinschaftswerk* (Leipzig, 1943), 297-345.
- Burnell, P., 'The Death of Turnus and Roman Morality' *G&R* 34 (1987), 186-200.
- Burton, P. J., 'Livy's Preface and its Historical Context' *Scholia* 17 (2008), 70-91.
- Cairns, F., 'Tarpeia Pudicitia in Propertius 1.16.2 – and the Early Roman Historians' *RhM* 154 (2011), 176-184.
- Calderini, A., 'I Sabini e "Tarpeia"' *AFLPer(class)* 18 (1995-1997), 125-154.
- Camporeale, G., *Gli Etruschi: Storia e civiltà* (Turin, 2004).
- Cantarella, E., *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* (New Haven, 1992).
- Canter, H. V., 'The Character of Hannibal' *CJ* 24 (1929), 564-577.
- Carlsen, J., 'Notes on Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus' Victory and Triumph over the Arverni' in C. H. Lange, F. J. Vervaet (eds.), *The Roman Republican Triumph: Beyond the Spectacle* (Rome, 2014), 105-115.
- Carney, E., 'The Death of Clitus' *GRBS* 22 (1981), 149-160.
- Carney, T. F., *A Biography of C. Marius: An Inaugural Lecture given in the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland* (Assen, 1961a).

- Carney, T. F., 'The Death of Sulla' *AClass* 4 (1961b), 64-79.
- Carney, T. F., 'The Picture of Marius in Valerius Maximus' *RhM* 105 (1962), 289-337.
- Carney, T. F., 'The Changing Picture of Marius in Ancient Literature' *PACA* 10 (1967), 5-22.
- Carotta, F. and Eickenberg, A., '*Liberalia tu accusas!* Restituting the Ancient Date of Caesar's *funus*' *REA* 113 (2011), 447-467.
- Carter, C. J., 'Valerius Maximus' in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II* (London, 1975), 26-56.
- Cavaggioni, F., *L. Apuleio Saturnino: Tribunus Plebis Seditiosus* (Venice, 1998).
- Cavaggioni, F., 'Il Saturnino di Floro: elementi di continuità, omissioni e incongruenze nel ritratto di un *seditiosus*' *ACD* 40-41 (2004-2005), 325-337.
- Castner, C. J., 'Difficulties in Identifying Roman Epicureans: Orata in Cicero *De Fin.* 2.22.70' *CJ* 81 (1986), 138-147.
- Cilliers, L. and Retief, F. P., 'The Sulla Syndrome' *AClass* 43 (2000), 33-43.
- Champlin, E., *Final Judgements: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C. – A.D. 250* (Berkeley, 1991).
- Champlin, E., 'Tiberius the Wise' *Historia* 57 (2008), 408-425.
- Champlin, E., 'Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins' *JRS* 101 (2011), 73-99.
- Champlin, E., 'Seianus Augustus' *Chiron* 42 (2012), 361-388.
- Champlin, E., 'The Odyssey of Tiberius Caesar' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 64 (2014), 199-246.
- Charlesworth, M. P., '*Providentia* and *Aeternitas*' *HThR* 29 (1936), 107-132.
- Charlesworth, M. P., 'The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of Belief' *PBA* 23 (1937), 105-133.
- Chaumont, M., 'Tigrane le Jeune, fils de Tigrane le Grand: révolte contre son père et captivité à Rome' *REArm* 28 (2001-2002), 225-247.

- Cheesman, G. L., *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army* (Oxford, 1914).
- Christ, K., 'Zur Beurteilung Hannibals' *Historia*, 17 (1968), 461–495.
- Christenson, D., 'Superbia in Vergil's *Aeneid*: Who's Haughty and Who's Not?' *Scholia* 11 (2002), 44-54.
- Classen, C. J., 'Virtutes Imperatoriae' *Arctos* 25 (1991), 17-39.
- Cloud, D., 'Lex Iulia de vi: Part I' *Athenaeum* 66 (1988), 579-595.
- Cloud, D., 'Lex Iulia de vi: Part II' *Athenaeum* 67 (1989), 427-465.
- Cloud, J. D., 'Parricidium, from the *lex Numae* to the *lex Pompeia de parricidiis*' *ZRG* 88 (1971), 1-66.
- Cole, S., *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome* (Cambridge, 2013).
- Collins, A. W., 'The Divinity of Alexander in Egypt' in Pat V. Wheatley and Robert Hannah (eds.), *Alexander & His Successors: Essays from the Antipodes* (Claremont, Calif., 2009), 179-205.
- Combès, R., *Valère Maxime: Faits et Dits Mémorables, Tome I* (Paris, 1995).
- Combès, R., *Valère Maxime: Faits et Dits Mémorables, Tome II* (Paris, 1997).
- Conley, D. F., 'The Interpretation of Sallust, *Catiline* 10.1-11.3' *CPh* 76 (1981), 121-125.
- Constant, P., *Valère Maxime: Actions et Paroles Mémorables, Traduction nouvelle avec introduction et notes* (Paris, 1935).
- Cooley, A., 'The Moralizing Message of the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*' *G&R* 45 (1998), 199-212.
- Corbeill, A., *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome* (Princeton, 2004).
- Coudry, M., 'La deuxième guerre punique chez Valère Maxime: un événement fondateur de l'histoire de Rome' in J.-M. David (ed.), *Valeurs et mémoire à Rome: Valère Maxime ou la vertu recomposée* (Paris, 1998), 45-53.
- Cowan, E., 'Tiberius and Augustus in Tiberian Sources' *Historia* 58 (2009a), 468-485.
- Cowan, E., 'Tacitus, Tiberius and Augustus' *ClAnt* 28 (2009b), 179-210.

- Cowan E. (ed.), *Velleius Paterculus: Making History* (Swansea, 2011).
- Crab, M. and De Keyser, J., 'Il commento di Guarino a Valerio Massimo' *Aevum* 87 (2013), 667-684.
- Crab, M., 'Theophilus Chalcondyles' Commentary on Valerius Maximus (1508): New Perspectives on the Conflict between Janus Parrhasius and Alexander Minutianus' *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 75 (2013), 291-318.
- Crab, M., 'Josse Bade's *Familiaris Commentarius* on Valerius Maximus (1510): A School Commentary?' in K. Enenkel (ed.), *Transformations of the Classics via Early Modern Commentaries* (Leiden, 2014), 153-166.
- Cramer, F. H., *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia, 1954).
- Crohn, H., *De Trogi Pompei apud antiquos auctoritate* (Strasbourg, 1882).
- Crook, J. A., 'Lex Cornelia de falsis' *Athenaeum* 65 (1987), 163-171.
- Culham, P., 'The Lex Oppia' *Latomus* 41 (1982), 786-793.
- Currie, S., 'Poisonous Women and Unnatural History in Roman Culture' in M. Wyke (ed.), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Body in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1998), 147-168.
- Dalby, A., *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z* (London, 2003).
- Daly, G., *Cannae: The Experience of Battle in the Second Punic War* (London, 2002).
- Damon, C., 'Comm. Pet. 10' *HSPH* 95 (1993), 281-288.
- Damon, C., 'Intestinum Scelus: Preemptive Execution in Tacitus' *Annals*' in B. W. Breed et al. (eds.), *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2010), 261-272.
- D'Arms, J. H., *Romans on the Bay of Naples: A Social and Cultural Study of the Villas and Their Owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400* (Cambridge, MA., 1970).
- Damsté, P. H., 'Lectiones Valerianae' *Mnemosyne* 42 (1914), 257-272.
- Daube, D., *Civil Disobedience in Antiquity* (Edinburgh, 1972).
- David, J-M., 'Le tribunal du préteur: contraintes symboliques et politiques sous la République et le début de l'Empire' *Klio* 77 (1995), 371-385.

Davies, J., 'The Historical Commentary' in C. S. Kraus and C. Stray (eds.), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford, 2016), 233-249.

De Jong, A., *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature* (Leiden, 1997).

Delia, D., 'Fulvia Reconsidered' in Sarah B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History* (Chapel Hill, 1991), 197-217.

Den Hengst, D., 'The Preface to Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*' in D. W. P. Burgerdijk and J. A. van Waarden (eds.), *Emperors and Historiography: Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire by Daniël den Hengst* (Leiden, 2010), 52-67.

De Romilly, J., 'La vengeance comme explication historique dans l'œuvre d'Hérodote' *REG* 84 (1971), 314-337.

Devallet, G., '*Perfidia plus quam punica*: l'image des Carthaginois dans la littérature latine, de la fin de la République à l'époque des Flaviens' *Lalies* 16 (1996), 17-28.

Di Fazio, M., 'Callimachus and the Etruscans: Human Sacrifice between Myth, History, and Historiography' *Histos* 7 (2013), 48-69.

Dittmar, H., *Aischines von Sphettos: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte der Sokratiker* (Berlin, 1912).

Dixon, S., '*Infirmitas Sexus*: Womanly Weakness in Roman Law' *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis/Legal History Review* 52 (1984), 343-371.

Dobson, B., 'The significance of the Centurion and *Primipilaris* in the Roman Army and Administration' *ANRW* II 1 (1974), 392-434.

Doignon J., 'L'enseignement de l'*Hortensius* de Cicéron sur les richesses devant la conscience d'Augustin jusqu'aux *Confessions*' *AC* 51 (1982), 193-206.

Dowling, M. B., 'The Clemency of Sulla' *Historia* 49 (2000), 303-340.

Dowling, M. B., *Clemency and Cruelty in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, 2006).

Dübner, F., 'Un mot sur Valère Maxime' *RPh* 1 (1845), 260-263.

Duncan-Jones, R., *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* (Cambridge, 1974).

- Duncan-Jones, R. P., 'The Heritability of the Consulship' *CR* 34 (1984), 270-274.
- Dunkle, J. R., 'The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic' *TAPhA* 98 (1967), 151-171.
- Dunkle, J. R., 'The Rhetorical Tyrant in Roman Historiography: Sallust, Livy and Tacitus' *CW* 65 (1971), 12-20.
- Dyck, A. R., *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis* (Ann Arbor, 1996).
- Dyck, A. R., *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus* (Ann Arbor, 2004).
- Dyck, A. R., *Cicero: Pro Sexto Roscio* (Cambridge, 2010).
- Edwards, C., *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Earl, D. C., *The Political Thought of Sallust* (Cambridge, 1961).
- Earl, D. C., *Tiberius Gracchus: A Study in Politics* (Brussels, 1963).
- Earl, D. C., *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome* (London, 1967).
- Edmondson, J., 'Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome' in J. Edmondson and A. Keith (eds.), *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture* (Toronto, 2008), 21-46.
- Ehlers, B., *Eine vorplatonische Deutung des sokratischen Eros: der Dialog Aspasia des Sokratikers Aischines* (Munich, 1966).
- Eilers, C. F., 'Cn. Domitius and Samos: A New Extortion Trial (IGR 4,968)' *ZPE* 89 (1991), 167-178.
- Elliott, J., 'Ennius' *Cunctator* and the History of a Gerund in the Roman Historiographical Tradition' *CQ* 59 (2009), 532-542.
- Epstein, D. F., *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics 218 – 43 BC* (London, 1987).
- Erskine, A., 'Hellenistic Monarchy and Roman Political Invective' *CQ* 41 (1991), 106-120.
- Evans, R. J., 'Catiline's Wife' *AClass* 30 (1987), 69-72.
- Evans, R. J., 'Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus' *AClass* 29 (1986), 99-103.

- Evans, R. J., 'Quis Erat Nunnius?' *AHB* 2 (1988), 42-48.
- Evans, R. J., 'The Sulpician Law on Debt: Implications for the Political Elite and Broader Ramifications' *AClass* 50 (2007), 81-94.
- Eyben, E., 'Fathers and Sons' in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1991), 112-43.
- Eyben, E., *Restless Youth in Ancient Rome* (London, 1993).
- Fagan, G. G., 'Sergius Orata: Inventor of the Hypocaust?' *Phoenix* 50 (1996), 56-66.
- Fagan, G. G., *Bathing in Public in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, 1999).
- Fantham, E., 'The Trials of Gabinius in 54 B.C.' *Historia* 24 (1975), 425-443.
- Fantham, E., 'Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome' *EMC* 35 (1991), 267-91.
- Fantham, E., *Cicero's Pro L. Murena Oratio* (Oxford, 2013).
- Faranda, R., *Valerio Massimo: Detti e Fatti Memorabili* (Turin, 1971).
- Fariselli, A. C., 'Il progetto politico dei Barcidi' *Pallas* 70 (2006), 105-122.
- Fears J. R., 'The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology' *ANRW* II 17.2 (1981), 827-948.
- Feldherr, A., 'Caeci avaritia: Avarice, History, and Vision in Livy V' in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VIII* (Brussels, 1997), 268-277.
- Fell, R. A. L., *Etruria and Rome* (Cambridge, 1924).
- Figueira, T. J., 'Aigina and the Naval Strategy of the Late Fifth and Early Fourth Centuries' *RhM* 133 (1990), 15-51.
- Fishwick, D., *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire* vol. 1.1 (Leiden, 1987).
- Floris, P., 'Lucius Equitius insitivus Gracchus' *AFLC* 26 (2008), 5-17.
- Flower, H. I., *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford, 1996).

- Fraccaro, P., 'Studi sull'età dei Gracchi' *StStorAntCl* 6 (1913), 42-136.
- Franco, G. F., 'The Use of *Poenus* and *Carthaginiensis* in Early Latin Literature' *CPh* 89 (1994), 153-158.
- Frandsen, P. J., *Incestuous and Close-kin Marriage in Ancient Egypt and Persia: An Examination of the Evidence* (Copenhagen, 2009).
- Fraser, P. M., *Ptolemaic Alexander* (Oxford, 1972).
- Frayn, J. M., *Markets and Fairs in Roman Italy: Their Social and Economic Importance from the Second Century BC to the Third Century AD* (Oxford, 1993).
- Frederiksen, M. (ed. N. Purcell), *Campania* (London, 1984).
- Freyburger, M.-L., 'Valère Maxime et les guerres civiles' in M. Chassignet and J.-M. David (eds.), *Valeurs et mémoire à Rome: Valère Maxime ou la vertu recomposée* (Paris, 1998), 111-117.
- Fulford-Jones, P. W., 'Calvus ex Nanneianis' *CQ* 21 (1971), 183-185.
- Gagé, J., 'Coup de dés du roi de Véies ou tessères des *legati* romains? (A propos de Tite-Live IV, 17)' *REL* 35 (1957), 224-242.
- Garani, M., 'Revisiting Tarpeia's Myth in Propertius (IV, 4)' *LICS* 10 (2011), 1-22.
- Garnsey, P., *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1970).
- Gauthier, P. and Hatzopoulos, H. B., *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* (Athens, 1993).
- Genovese, E. N., 'Cicero and Sallust: Catiline's "Ruina"' *CW* 68 (1974), 171-177.
- Gera, D., *Warrior Women: The Anonymous Tractatus De Mulieribus* (Leiden, 1997).
- Gibson, R. K. and Kraus, C. S. (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory* (Leiden, 2002).
- Glinister, F., 'Kingship and Tyranny in Archaic Rome' in S. Lewis (ed.), *Ancient Tyranny* (Edinburgh, 2006), 17-32.
- Goodyear, F. R. D., *The Annals of Tacitus: Books 1-6, Volume II* (Cambridge, 1981).

- Goodyear, F. R. D., 'Tiberius and Gaius: Their Influence and Views on Literature' *ANRW II* 32.1 (1984), 603-610.
- Gotoff, H. C., *Cicero's Caesarian Speeches: A Stylistic Commentary* (Chapel Hill, 1993).
- Gowers, E., *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature* (Oxford, 1993).
- Gowers, E., 'Augustus and "Syracuse"' *JRS* 100 (2010), 69-87.
- Gowers, E., 'Dangerous Sailing: Valerius Maximus and the Suppression of Sextus Pompeius' *CQ* 60 (2010), 446-449.
- Gowing, A., *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Gowing, A. M., "'Caesar Grabs My Pen": Writing Civil War Under Tiberius' in B. W. Breed et al. (eds.), *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2010), 249-260.
- Grant, M., *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius: Historical Comments on the Colonial Coinage Issued Outside Spain* (New York, 1950).
- Greco, E., 'Forum duplex. Appunti per lo studio delle *agorai* di Neapolis in Campania' *AION(archeol)* 7 (1985), 125-135.
- Green, P., *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley, 1990).
- Green, S. J., *Disclosure and Discretion in Roman Astrology: Manilius and His Augustan Contemporaries* (Oxford, 2014).
- Griffin, M., 'Philosophy, Cato, and Roman Suicide: II' *G&R* 33 (1986), 192-202.
- Grisé Y., *Le suicide dans la Rome antique* (Montréal, 1982).
- Gruen, E. S., 'The *Lex Varia*' *JRS* 55 (1965), 59-73.
- Gruen, E. S., *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts, 149-78 B.C.* (Cambridge, MA., 1968).
- Gruen, E. S., *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic<sup>2</sup>* (Berkeley, 1974).

- Gruen, E. S., *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton, 2011).
- Grünewald, T., *Bandits in the Roman Empire: Myth and Reality* (London, 2004).
- Guerrini, R., 'Moduli sallustiani in Valerio Massimo. Il capitolo *De luxuria et libidine* (IX, 1)' *RIL* 113 (1979), 152-166.
- Gunderson, E., 'Valerius Maximus and the Hysteria of Virtue' in V. Zajko and E. O'Gorman (eds.), *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self* (Oxford, 2013), 199-212.
- Haegemans, K. and Stoppie, K., 'Magni animi rex? Alexander the Great through Valerius Maximus' Eyes' in Gert Partoens et al. (eds.), *Virtutis Imago: Studies on the Conceptualisation and Transformation of an Ancient Ideal* (Leuven, 2004), 145-172.
- Hall, L. G. H., 'Hirtius and the *Bellum Alexandrinum*' *CQ* 46 (1996), 411-415.
- Hall, U., 'Notes on M. Fulvius Flaccus' *Athenaeum* 55 (1977), 280-288.
- Hamel, D., *The Battle of Arginusae: Victory at Sea and its Tragic Aftermath in the Final Years of the Peloponnesian War* (Baltimore, 2015).
- Hamilton, J. R., *Plutarch: Alexander, A Commentary* (Oxford, 1969).
- Hands, A. R., 'Land and Citizenship, 125-122 B.C.' *Mnemosyne* 29 (1976), 176-180.
- Hardie, P., 'Images of the Persian Wars in Rome' in E. Bridges et al. (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford, 2007), 127-143.
- Harris, W. V., *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford, 1971).
- Harris, W. V., 'A Roman Father's Power of Life and Death' in R. S. Bagnall and W. V. Harris (eds.), *Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller* (Leiden, 1986), 81-95.
- Harris, W. V., *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA., 2001).
- Harris, W. V., 'The Rage of Women' in S. Braund and G. W. Most (eds.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen* (Cambridge, 2003), 121-143.

- Harrison, S., "'Waves of Emotion": An Epic Metaphor in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*' in S. Harrison et al. (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel* (Groningen, 2005), 163-176.
- Heckel, W., *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London, 1992).
- Hellegouarc'h, J., *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République* (Paris, 1972).
- Helly, B. et al., '*La liste des gymnasiarques de Phères pour les années 330-189 av. J.C.*' *La Thessalie* (Lyon, 1975), 220-255.
- Helm, R., '*Valerius, Seneca und die Exemplassammlung*' *Hermes* 74 (1939), 130-154.
- Helm, R., '*Beiträge zur Quellenforschung bei Valerius Maximus*' *RhM* 89 (1940), 241-273.
- Henderson, J., '*Oxford Reds*': *Classic Commentaries on Latin Classics* (London, 2006).
- Hersch, K. K., *The Roman Wedding: Ritual and Meaning in Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2010).
- Higginbotham, J., *Piscinae: Artificial Fishponds in Roman Italy* (Chapel Hill, 1997).
- Hill, G. F., *A History of Cyprus* vol. I (Cambridge, 1940).
- Hilton, J. L., and Matthews, L. L. V., '*Veiled or Unveiled? (Plut. Quaest. Rom. 267B-C)*' *CQ* 58 (2008), 336-342.
- Hinard, F., *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine* (Rome, 1985).
- Hinard, F., *Sollana varia: Aux sources de la première guerre civile romaine. De l'archéologie à l'histoire* (Paris, 2008).
- Hinz, V., *Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput: Antike Phalarislegende und Nachleben der Phalarisbriefe* (Munich, 2001).
- Hoffmann, F., *Valerius Maximus: Sammlung merkwürdiger Reden und Thaten* (Stuttgart, 1829).
- Højte, J. M., '*The Death and Burial of Mithridates VI*' in Jakob Munk Højte (ed.), *Mithridates VI and the Pontic Kingdom* (Aarhus, 2009), 121-130.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J., 'Fides – deditio in fidem – dextra data et accepta: Recht, Religion und Ritual in Rom' in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400 – 133 B.C.* (Rome, 2000), 223-250.

Hope, V. M., 'Contempt and Respect: The Treatment of the Corpse in Ancient Rome' in V. M. Hope and E. Marshall (eds.), *Death and Disease in the Ancient City* (London, 2000), 104-127.

Hopkins, K., 'Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B.C. - A.D. 400)' *JRS* 70 (1980), 101-125.

Houston, G. W., 'Tiberius on Capri' *G&R* 32 (1985), 179-196.

Howell, P., *Martial: The Epigrams Book V* (Warminster, 1995).

Hoyos, D., 'Maharbal's *bon mot*: Authenticity and Survival' *CQ* 50 (2000), 610-614.

Hoyos, D., *Hannibal's Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247-183 BC* (London, 2003).

Hoyos, D., *Hannibal: Rome's Greatest Enemy* (Exeter, 2008).

Hoyos, D., *The Carthaginians* (London, 2010).

Hutchinson, G. O., 'Pope's Spider and Cicero's Writing' in T. Reinhardt et al. (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (Oxford, 2005), 179-93.

Hutchinson, G. O., *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford, 2013).

Indelli, G., *Filodemo: L'ira* (Naples, 1988).

Isager, J., 'The Hellenization of Rome. *Luxuria* or *Liberalitas*?' in P. Guldager Bilde et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Hellenism in Italy: Towards a Cultural Unity?* (Copenhagen, 1993), 257-275 (*Acta Hyperborea* 5).

Jehne, M., 'The Rise of the Consular as a Social Type in the Third and Second Centuries BC' in H. Beck et al. (eds.), *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge, 2011), 211-231.

Jeppesen, K. K., 'Grand Camée de France: Sejanus Reconsidered and Confirmed' *MDAI(R)* 100 (1993), 141-175.

- Jonca, M., 'Blood Revenge and Murder Trial in the Early Roman Law' *Eos* 91 (2004), 44-51.
- Jones, P. J., 'Cleopatra's Cocktail' *CW* 103.2 (2010), 207-220.
- Kagan, D., *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca, 1987).
- Kajanto, I., *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki, 1965).
- Kajava, M., 'Murenae, Oysters and Gilt-heads: Fish for Name, Table, and Show in Ancient Rome' *ACD* 34-35 (1998-1999), 253-268.
- Kaster, R. A., *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 2005).
- Keaveney, A., *Sulla: the Last Republican* (London, 1982).
- Keaveney, A., 'What Happened in 88?' *Eirene* 20 (1983), 53-86.
- Keaveney, A. and Madden, J. A., 'Phthiriasis and its Victims' *SO* 57 (1982), 87-99.
- Kelly, G., *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Kempf, C., *Valerii Maximi factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem* (Berlin, 1854).
- Ker, J., 'Roman Repraesentatio' *AJPh* 128 (2007), 341-365.
- Kleijwegt, M., 'Review of *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen. The Work of Valerius Maximus* by Clive Skidmore' *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998), 105-110.
- Klotz, A., 'Zur Litteratur der Exempla und zur Epitoma Livii' *Hermes* 44 (1909), 198-214.
- Klotz, A., 'Zu *Bell. Alex.* 55,5 und *Val. Max.* IX 4,2' *RhM* 74 (1925), 234.
- Kondratieff, E. J., 'Reading Rome's Evolving Civic Landscape in Context: Tribunes of the Plebs and the Praetor's Tribunal' *Phoenix* 63 (2009), 322-360.
- Konrad, C. F. 'Why not Sallust on the Eighties?' *AHB* 2 (1988), 12-15.
- Konrad, C. F., 'A New Chronology of the Sertorian War' *Athenaeum* 83 (1995), 157-187.

Krasilnikoff, J. A., 'Mercenary Soldiering in the West and the Development of the Roman Army' *ARID* 23 (1996), 7-20.

Krasser, H., '*Sine ullis imaginibus nobilem animum: Valerius Maximus und das Rom der neuen Werte*' in Andreas Haltenhoff et al. (eds.), *Römische Werte und Römische Literatur im Frühen Prinzipat* (Berlin, 2011), 233-251.

Kraus, C. S. and Stray C. (eds.), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford, 2016).

Krebs, C. B., 'Catiline's Ravaged Mind: *Vastus Animus* (Sall. BC 5.5)' *CQ* 58 (2008), 682-686.

Krentz, P., *Xenophon: Hellenica I-II.3.10* (Warminster, 1989).

Krieger, B., *Quibus fontibus Valerius Maximus usus sit in eis exemplis enarrandis, quae ad priora rerum Romanarum tempora pertinent* (Berlin, 1888).

Kunkel, W., *Herkunft und Soziale Stellung der römischen Juristen<sup>2</sup>* (Graz, 1967).

Kurke, L., 'Ancient Greek Board Games and How to Play Them' *CPh* 94 (1999), 247-267.

Kyle, D. G., *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome* (London, 1998).

Lacey, W. K., 'The Tribunate of Curio' *Historia* 10 (1961), 318-329.

Lacey, W. K., '*Patria Potestas*' in Beryl Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome* (London, 1986), 121-144.

Lambert, M., 'Alexandre vu par Valère Maxime' *LM* 23 (1970), 6-15.

Lancel, S., *Hannibal* (Oxford, 1998).

Lanciotti, S., 'Silla e la tipologia del tiranno nella letteratura latina repubblicana (I)' *QS* 3 (1977), 129-153.

Lanciotti, S., 'Silla e la tipologia del tiranno nella letteratura latina repubblicana (II)' *QS* 4 (1978), 191-225.

Langlands, R., *Gender and Exemplarity in Valerius Maximus* (Diss., University of Cambridge, 2000).

- Langlands, R., *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Langlands, R., ““Reading for the Moral” in Valerius Maximus: The Case of *Severitas*” *CCJ* 54 (2008), 160-187.
- Langlands, R., ‘Roman *Exempla* and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero *de Officiis*’ *JRS* 101 (2011), 100-122.
- Langlands, R., ‘Pliny’s “Role Models of Both Sexes”’: Gender and Exemplarity in the *Letters*’ *EuGeStA* 4 (2014), 214-237.
- Langlands, R., ‘Roman Exemplarity: Mediating Between General and Particular’ in Michèle Lowrie and Susanne Lüdemann (eds.), *Exemplarity and Singularity: Thinking through Particulars in Philosophy, Literature, and Law* (London, 2015), 68-80.
- La Penna, A. (ed.), *Scholia in P. Ovidi Nasonis Ibin* (Florence, 1959).
- La Regina, A., ‘L. Minucius Basilus ἐκ τῶν φίλων Κάϊσαρος’ *PP* 51 (1996), 321-334.
- Lawrence, S. J., *Inside Out: The Depiction of Externality in Valerius Maximus* (Diss., University of Sydney, 2006).
- Lawrence, S. J., ‘Dead on Time: Valerius Maximus 9.13 and Stoicism’ *Antichthon* 49 (2015), 135-155.
- Lazenby, J. F., *Hannibal’s War: A Military History of the Second Punic War* (Warminster, 1978).
- Lazenby, J. F., *The First Punic War* (London, 1996)
- Lebek, W. D., *Verba Prisca: Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung* (Göttingen, 1970).
- Lebek, W. D., ‘Moneymaking on the Roman Stage’ in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Society and Theatre: E. Togo Salmon Papers I* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 29-48.
- Le Bohec, Y., ‘L’Honneur de Régulus’, *Antiquités africaines* 33 (1997), 87-93.
- Léglu, C., ‘Translating Lucretia: Word, Image and ‘Ethical Non-Indifference’ in Simon de Hesdin’s Translation of Valerius Maximus’s *Facta et dicta memorabilia*’ in E. Campbell and R. Mills (eds.), *Rethinking Medieval Translation: Ethics, Politics, Theory* (Woodbridge, 2012), 61-83.

- Leigh, M., 'Varius Rufus, Thyestes and the Appetites of Anatomy' *PCPhS* 42 (1996), 171-197.
- Lennon, J. J., *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 2014).
- Lennon, J., 'Dinning and Obligation in Valerius Maximus: The Case of the *Sacra Mensae*' *CQ* 65 (2015), 719-731.
- Leppin, H., *Histrionen: Untersuchungen zur sozialen Stellung von Bühnenkünstlern im Westen des Römischen Reiches zur Zeit der Republik und des Principats* (Bonn, 1992).
- Levick, B. M., 'Mercy and Moderation on the Coinage of Tiberius' in B. M. Levick (ed.), *The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in Honour of C. E. Stevens* (Farnborough, 1975), 123-137.
- Levick, B. M., 'A Cry from the Heart from Tiberius Caesar?' *Historia* 27 (1978), 95-101.
- Levick, B. M., 'Propoganda and the Imperial Coinage' *Antichthon* 16 (1982), 104-116.
- Levick, B. M., 'Sulla's March on Rome in 88 B.C.' *Historia* 31 (1982), 503-508.
- Levick, B. M., *Tiberius the Politician* (London, 1976).
- Lewis, R. G., *Asconius: Commentaries on Speeches by Cicero* (Oxford, 2006).
- Liébert, Y., *Regards sur la truphè étrusque* (Limoges, 2006).
- Lindsay, H., *Suetonius: Tiberius* (London, 1995).
- Lindsay, H., *Adoption in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Lintott, A. W., *Violence in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1968).
- Lintott, A. W., 'Imperial Expansion and Moral Decline in the Roman Republic' *Historia* 21 (1972), 626-638.
- Lintott, A. W., 'Provocatio. From the Struggle of the Orders to the Principate' *ANRW I* 2 (1972), 226-267.

- Lintott, A. W., 'Cruelty in the Political Life of the Ancient World' in T. Viljamaa et al. (eds.), *Crudelitas: The Politics of Cruelty in the Ancient and Medieval World* (Krems, 1992), 9-27.
- Lintott, A. W., *The Constitution of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1999).
- Littlewood, R. J., *A Commentary on Ovid: Fasti Book VI* (Oxford, 2006).
- Lobur, J. A., *Consensus, Concordia, and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology* (New York, 2008).
- Loutsch, C. 'Procédés rhétoriques de la légitimation des exemples chez Valère Maxime' in J.-M. David (ed.), *Valeurs et mémoire à Rome: Valère Maxime ou la vertu recomposée* (Paris, 1998), 27-41.
- Lucarelli, U., *Exemplarische Vergangenheit: Valerius Maximus und die Konstruktion des sozialen Raumes in der frühen Kaiserzeit* (Göttingen, 2007).
- Luce, T. J., 'Marius and the Mithridatic Command' *Historia* 19 (1970), 162-194.
- Maiuri, A., *Passeggiate Campane* (Florence, 1950).
- Makin, E., 'The Triumphal Route, with Particular Reference to the Flavian Triumph' *JRS* 11 (1921), 25-36.
- Mallan, C. T., *A Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Book 57.1-17.8* (Diss., University of Oxford, 2015).
- Mandel, J., 'Jason: The Tyrant of Pherae, Tagus of Thessaly, as Reflected in Ancient Sources and Modern Literature: The Image of the "New" Tyrant' *RSA* 10 (1980), 47-77.
- Mankin, D., *Cicero: De Oratore III* (Cambridge, 2011).
- Manuwald, G., *Cicero, Philippics 3-9* (Berlin, 2007).
- Marasco, G., 'Un imprenditore di successo del I secolo a.C.: C. Sergio Orata' *AncSoc* 40 (2010), 69-78.
- Marquart, J., 'Beiträge zur Geschichte und Sage von Erān' *ZDMG* 49 (1895), 628-672.

Marshall, B., 'The Date of Catilina's Marriage to Aurelia Orestilla' *RFIC* 105 (1977), 151-154.

Marshall, B., 'Catilina and the Execution of M. Marius Gratidianus' *CQ* 35 (1985), 124-133.

Marshall, B. A., *A Historical Commentary on Asconius* (Columbia, 1985).

Martin, J., *Providentia deorum: recherches sur certains aspects religieux du pouvoir impérial romain* (Rome 1982).

Martin, R., *Tacitus Annals V & VI* (Warminster, 2001).

Marzano, A., *Roman Villas in Central Italy: A Social and Economic History* (Leiden, 2007).

Marzano, A., *Harvesting the Sea: The Exploitation of Marine Resources in the Roman Mediterranean* (Oxford, 2013).

Masi Doria, C., 'Uno scandalo del 52 a.C. e la problematica identità di due donne romane (Nota su Val. Max. 9.1.8)' in J. Hallebeek et al. (eds.), *Inter cives necnon peregrinos: Essays in Honour of Boudewijn Sirks* (Göttingen, 2014), 493-500.

Maslakov, G., *Tradition and Abridgement: A Study of the Exempla Tradition in Valerius Maximus and the Elder Pliny* (Diss., Macquarie University, 1978).

Maslakov, G., 'Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography. A Study of the exempla Tradition' *ANRW* II 32.1 (1984), 437-496.

Matthews, M., *Caesar and the Storm: A Commentary on Lucan De Bello Civili, Book 5 Lines 476-721* (Oxford, 2008).

Mayor, A., *The Poison King: The Life and Legend of Mithridates, Rome's Deadliest Enemy* (Princeton, 2010).

McDonnell, M., *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic* (Cambridge, 2006).

McGing, B. C., *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus* (Leiden, 1986).

McGing, B. C., 'Mithridates VI Eupator: Victim or Aggressor?' in J. M. Højte (ed.), *Mithridates VI and the Pontic Kingdom* (Aarhus, 2009), 203-216.

- McGinn, T. A. J., *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome* (New York, 1998).
- McGinn, T. A. J., *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World: A Study of Social History* (Ann Arbor, 2004).
- McGushin, P., *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary* (Leiden, 1977).
- McGushin, P., *Sallust. The Histories: Translated with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1992).
- McHardy, Fiona, *Revenge in Athenian Culture* (London, 2008).
- Millar, F., 'Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome Seen from Tomoi' *JRS* 83 (1993), 1-17.
- Mitchell, S., 'Requisitioned Transport in the Roman Empire: A New Inscription from Pisidia' *JRS* 66 (1976), 106-131.
- Mitchell, T. N., 'The *Volte-Face* of P. Sulpicius Rufus in 88 B.C.' *CPh* 70 (1975), 197-204.
- Mix, E. R., *Marcus Atilius Regulus: Exemplum Historicum* (The Hague, 1970).
- Moles, J., 'The Attacks on L. Cornelius Cinna, Praetor in 44 B. C.' *RhM* 130 (1987), 124-128.
- Moles, J., 'Livy's Preface' *PCPhS* 39 (1993), 141-168.
- Momigliano, A., 'Review of Benjamin Farrington, *Science and Politics in the Ancient World*' *JRS* 31 (1941), 149-57.
- Mommsen, T., *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig, 1899).
- Moore, T. J., *Artistry and Ideology: Livy's Vocabulary of Virtue* (Frankfurt, 1989).
- Mooren, L., 'The Wives and Children of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II' in B. G. Mandilaras (ed.), *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology* vol. 2 (Athens, 1988), 435-444.
- Morgan, J. D., 'The Death of Cinna the Poet' *CQ* 40 (1990), 558-559.
- Morgan, T., *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 2007).

- Most, G. W. (ed.), *Commentaries / Kommentare* (Göttingen, 1999).
- Mueller, H.-F., *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus* (London, 2002). [= Mueller 2002a].
- Mueller, H.-F., 'Review of D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*' *BMCR* 2002.06.35. [= Mueller 2002b].
- Münzer, F., *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (Berlin, 1897).
- Murphy, J. M. J., 'Hubris and Superbia: Differing Greek and Roman Attitudes Concerning "Arrogant Pride"' *AncW* 28 (1997), 73-81.
- Naiden, F. S., *Ancient Supplication* (Oxford, 2006).
- Newhauser, R., *The Early History of Greed: The Sin of Avarice in Early Medieval Thought and Literature* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Nguyen, V. H. T., *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians, Epictetus, and Valerius Maximus* (Tübingen, 2008).
- Nippel, W., *Public Order in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Noreña, C. F., 'The Communication of the Emperor's Virtues' *JRS* 91 (2001), 146-168.
- Noreña, C. F., *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge, 2011).
- Oakley, S. P., *A Commentary on Livy Books VI-X Vol. II* (Oxford, 1998).
- Oakley, S. P., *A Commentary on Livy Books VI-X Vol. III* (Oxford, 2005).
- Ober, J., 'Rock-Cut Inscriptions from Mt. Hymmetos' *Hesperia* 50.1 (1981), 68-77.
- Ogden, D., *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: The Hellenistic Dynasties* (London, 1999).
- Ogden, D., 'Alexander and Africa (332-331 BC and Beyond): The Facts, the Traditions and the Problems' in P. R. Bosman (ed.), *Alexander in Africa* (Pretoria, 2014), 1-38.
- Ogilvie, R. M., *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5* (Oxford, 1965).
- Oliensis, E., *Freud's Rome: Psychoanalysis and Latin Poetry* (Cambridge, 2009).

- Oost, S. I., 'Cato Uticensis and the Annexation of Cyprus' *CPh* 50 (1955), 98-112.
- Oschema, K., 'Blood-Brothers: A Ritual of Friendship and the Construction of the Imagined Barbarian in the Middle Ages' *Journal of Medieval History* 32 (2006), 275-301.
- Osgood, J., *Turia: A Roman Woman's Civil War* (Oxford, 2014).
- Pallottino, M., *The Etruscans*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1974).
- Pandey, N. B., 'Caesar's Comet, the Julian Star, and the Invention of Augustus' *TAPA* 143 (2013), 405-449.
- Papadimitropoulos, L., 'Xerxes' *hubris* and Darius in Aeschylus' *Persae*' *Mnemosyne* 61 (2008), 451-458.
- Parker, H. N., 'The Teratogenic Grid' in J. Hallett and M. Skinner (eds.), *Roman Sexualities* (Princeton, 1997), 47-65.
- Parker, H. N., 'Loyal Slaves and Loyal Wives: The Crisis of the Outsider-Within and Roman Exemplary Literature' in S. R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds.), *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture* (London, 1998), 152-173.
- Parkin, T. G., *Old Age in the Roman World* (Baltimore, 2003).
- Paul, G. M., *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum* (Liverpool, 1984).
- Pelling, C., 'Speech and Narrative in the *Histories*' in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge, 2006), 103-121.
- Pelling, C., *Plutarch: Caesar* (Oxford, 2011).
- Pemán, C., 'Nuevo ensayo de interpretación de la topografía del *Bellum Hispaniense*, V' in *Homenaje García Bellido*, V (Madrid, 1988), 35-80.
- Perruccio, A., 'Note sulla *moderatio* di Scipione Emiliano in Valerio Massimo' *A&R* 50 (2005), 49-66.
- Pestman, P. W., *The Archive of the Theban Choachytes (second century B.C.): A Survey of the Demotic and Greek Papyri contained in the Archive* (Leuven, 1993).

- Poma, G., 'Un appello agli schiavi ad Utica e il ruolo della provincia d'Africa negli anni della lotta tra Mario e Silla' *AntAfr* 17 (1981), 21-35.
- Pomeroy, A. J., 'Hannibal at Nuceria' *Historia* 38 (1989), 162-176.
- Pomeroy, S. B., *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves* (New York, 1975).
- Potter, D., 'Review of W. M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*' *BMCR* 1993 04.04.27.
- Powell, J. G. F., 'The Tribune Sulpicius' *Historia* 39 (1990), 446-460.
- Prag, J. R. W., 'Poenus plane est – but who were the “Punickes”?' *PBSR* 74 (2006), 1-37.
- Prandi, L., 'La *fides punica* e il pregiudizio anticartaginese' *CISA* 6 (1979), 90-97.
- Prestianni Giallombardo, A., 'Il Peloro nell'antichità: Miti Scienze Storia' in B. Gentili and A. Pinzone (eds.), *Messina e Reggio nell'antichità: storia, società, cultura* (2002), 141–84.
- Pritchett, W. K., *The Greek State at War, Part V* (Berkeley, 1991).
- Purcell, N., 'The *Apparitores*: a Study in Social Mobility' *PBSR* 51 (1983), 125-173.
- Raaflaub, K. A., 'The Political Significance of Augustus' Military Reforms' in W. S. Hanson and L. J. F. Keppie (eds.), *Roman Frontier Studies 1979: Papers Presented to the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies* (Oxford, 1980), 1005-1025.
- Ramsey, J. T., *Cicero: Philippics I-II* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Ramsey, J. T., *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae<sup>2</sup>* (Oxford, 2007).
- Ramsey, J. T. and Licht, A. L., *The Comet of 44 B.C. and Caesar's Funeral Games* (Philadelphia, 1997).
- Rawlings, L., 'Hannibal the Cannibal? Polybius on Barcid Atrocities' *Cardiff Historical Papers* 9 (2007), 1-30.
- Rawlings, L., 'The Carthaginian Navy: Questions and Assumptions' in: G. G. Fagan and M. Trundle (eds.), *New Perspectives on Ancient Warfare* (Leiden, 2010), 251-287.
- Rawson, E., 'Sallust on the Eighties?' *CQ* 37 (1987), 163-180.

- Reiter, W. L., 'M. Fulvius Flaccus and the Gracchan Coalition' *Athenaeum* 56 (1978), 125-144.
- Reynolds, J., 'Roman Inscriptions 1966-1970' *JRS* 61 (1971), 136-152.
- Rhodes, P. J., *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981).
- Richard, J. C., 'M. Laetorius primi pili centurio: à propos de la dédicace du temple de Mercure' in V. Lanternari et al. (eds), *Religioni e civiltà: Scritti in memoria di Angelo Brelich* (Bari, 1982), 501-9.
- Richardson, J., *The Language of Empire: Rome and the Idea of Empire from the Third Century BC to the Second Century AD* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Richardson, L., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, 1992).
- Richlin, A., *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*<sup>2</sup> (New York, 1992).
- Richlin, A., 'Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men' *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3 (1993), 523-573.
- Rivet, A. L. F., *Gallia Narbonensis: Southern France in Roman Times* (London, 1988).
- Rivière, Y., 'Carcer et vincula: la détention publique à Rome (sous la République et le Haut-Empire)' *MEFRA* 106 (1994), 579-652.
- Roberts, J. T., *Athens on Trial: The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought* (Princeton, 1994).
- Rodger, A., 'Concealing a Servitude' in: P. G. Stein et al. (eds.) *Studies in Justinian's Institutes in memory of J. A. C. Thomas* (London, 1983) 134-150.
- Rogers, R. S., *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius* (Middleton, 1935).
- Rohrbacher, D. S., 'Ammianus Marcellinus and Valerius Maximus' *AHB* 19 (2005), 20-30.
- Roller, M. B., 'The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture' in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historians* (Cambridge, 2009), 214-230.

Roller, M. B., 'The Consul(ar) as *exemplum*: Fabius Cunctator's Paradoxical Glory' in H. Beck et al. (eds.), *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge, 2011), 182-210.

Roller, M. B., 'Between Unique and Typical: Senecan *exempla* in a List' in Michèle Lowrie and Susanne Lüdemann (eds.), *Exemplarity and Singularity: Thinking through Particulars in Philosophy, Literature, and Law* (London, 2015), 81-95.

Roller, M. B., 'The Difference an Emperor Makes: Notes on the Reception of the Republican Senate in the Imperial Age' *CRJ* 7 (2015), 11-30.

Roman, D., 'M. Fulvius Flaccus et la frontière de la Gaule Transalpine' in Y. Roman (ed.), *La frontière: séminaire de recherche* (Paris, 1993), 57-66.

Römer, F., 'Zum Aufbau der Exempelasammlung des Valerius Maximus' *WS* 103 (1990), 99-107.

Rosati, G., 'Trimalchio on Stage' in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel* (Oxford, 1999), 85-104.

Rosivach, V. J., 'The Romans' View of the Persians' *CW* 78 (1984), 1-8.

Rossi, A., 'Parallel Lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade' *TAPA* 134 (2004), 359-381.

Rowe, G., *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees* (Ann Arbor, 2002).

Rowe, G., 'Reconsidering the *Auctoritas* of Augustus' *JRS* 103 (2013), 1-15.

Rowell, H. T., 'The Campanian Origin of Cn. Naevius and its Literary Attestation' *MAAR* 19 (1949), 15-34.

Rubinsohn, Z. W., 'The Viriatic War and its Roman Repercussions' *RSA* 11 (1981), 161-204.

Rüpke, J., *Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom* (Stuttgart, 1990).

Rüpke, J., 'Knowledge of Religion in Valerius Maximus' *Exempla: Roman Historiography and Tiberian Memory Culture* in Karl Galinsky (ed.), *Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity* (Oxford, 2016), 89-111.

Rutledge, S. H., *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian* (London, 2001).

Rutledge, S. H., 'Tiberius' Philhellenism' *CW* 101 (2008), 453-467.

Ryan, F. X., 'Four Republican Senators' *C&M* 47 (1996), 207-215.

Salamon, G., 'Les malheurs du roi Tolumnius' in G. Lachenaud and D. Longrée (eds.), *Grecs et Romains aux prises de l'histoire* (Rennes, 2003) vol. 2, 539-52.

Salido Domínguez, J., *Horrea militaria: el aprovisionamiento de grano al ejército en el occidente del Imperio Romano* (Madrid, 2011).

Sanford, E. M., 'The Career of Aulus Gabinius' *TAPhA* 70 (1939), 64-92.

Sancisi-Weerdenberg, H., 'The Death of Cyrus: Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* as a Source for Iranian History' *AI* 25 (1985), 459-471.

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H., 'The Personality of Xerxes, King of Kings' in L. De Meyer and E. Haerinck (eds.), *Archaeologica Iranica et Orientalis: Miscellanea in honorem Louis Vanden Berghe* (Ghent, 1989), 549-561.

Scheid, J., 'Contraria facere: Renversements et déplacements dans les rites funéraires', *AION(archeol)* 6 (1984), 117-139.

Scheid, J. and Svenbro, J., 'Byrsa: La ruse d'Élissa et la fondation de Carthage' *Annales(ESC)* 40 (1985), 328-342.

Schmeling, G., *A Commentary on the Satyrice of Petronius* (Oxford, 2011).

Schullian, D. M., 'A New Indirect Tradition for the Text of Valerius Maximus' *TAPhA* 65 (1934), 35-46.

Schullian, D. M. (ed.), 'The Excerpts of Heiric *Ex Libris Valerii Maximi Memorabilium Dictorum vel Factorum*' *MAAR* 12 (1935), 154-184.

Schullian, D. M., 'Valerius Maximus and Walter Map' *Speculum* 12 (1937), 516-518.

Schullian, D. M., 'A Neglected Manuscript of Valerius Maximus' *CPh* 32 (1937), 349-359.

Schullian, D. M., 'The Anthology of Valerius Maximus and A. Gellius' *CPh* 32 (1937), 70-72.

Schullian, D. M., 'Valerius Maximus in Certain Excerpts of the Twelfth Century' *AJPh* 61 (1940), 202-206.

Schullian, D. M., 'An Early *Ex Libris*' *CJ* 39 (1944), 290-293.

Schullian, D. M., 'A Preliminary List of Manuscripts of Valerius Maximus' in Lillian B. Lawler et al. (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Ullman: Presented to Him on the Occasion of his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Saint Louis, 1960), 81-95.

Schullian, D. M., 'A Revised List of Manuscripts of Valerius Maximus' in A. Campana, *Miscellanea Augusto Campana* (Padua, 1981), 695-728.

Schullian, D. M., 'Januarius Nepotianus' in F. Edward Cranz et al. (eds.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, V (Washington, DC, 1984), 251-252.

Schullian, D. M., 'Julius Paris' in F. Edward Cranz et al. (eds.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, V (Washington, DC, 1984), 253-255.

Schullian, D. M., 'Valerius Maximus' in F. Edward Cranz et al. (eds.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, V (Washington, DC, 1984), 287-403.

Schulz, F., *Classical Roman Law* (Oxford, 1951).

Schulze, W., *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904).

Scullard, H. H., *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World* (London, 1974).

Seager, R., *Tiberius*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 2005).

Seager, R., 'Paene omnium vitiorum expers, nisi...: Velleius on Pompey' in E. Cowan (ed.), *Velleius Paterculus: Making History* (Swansea, 2011), 287-307.

Seibert, J., *Hannibal* (Darmstadt, 1993).

Sekunda, N., 'Achaemenid Settlement in Caria, Lycia and Greater Phrygia' in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History VI Asia Minor and*

*Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire: Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop* (Leiden, 1991), 83-143.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Cicero's Letters to Atticus, Vol. I* (Cambridge, 1965).

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Cicero: Epistulae Ad Familiares, Vol. II 47-43 B.C.* (Cambridge, 1977).

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., 'Textual Notes on Lesser Latin Historians' *HSCP* 85 (1981), 155-184.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., 'On Valerius Maximus' *RFIC* 124 (1996), 175-184.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 2000).

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., 'New Readings in Valerius Maximus' *HSCP* 101 (2003), 473-481.

Shatzman, I., *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* (Brussels, 1975).

Shaw, B. D., 'Raising and Killing Children: Two Roman Myths' *Mnemosyne* 54 (2001), 31-77.

Siani-Davies, M., 'Ptolemy XII Auletes and the Romans' *Historia* 46 (1997), 306-340.

Siani-Davies, M., *Cicero's Speech: Pro Rabirio Postumo* (Oxford, 2001).

Simon, H., *Roms Kriege in Spanien, 154-133 v. Chr* (Frankfurt am Main, 1962).

Sinclair, B. W., *Valerius Maximus and the Evolution of Silver Latin* (Diss., University of Cincinnati, 1980).

Sinclair, B. W., 'Declamatory Sententiae in Valerius Maximus' *Prometheus* 10 (1984), 141-146.

Sinclair, P., 'Review of *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* by W. Martin Bloomer' *AJPh* 117 (1996), 151-154.

Skard, E., *Sallust und seine Vorgänger* (Oslo, 1956).

Skidmore, C., *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus* (Exeter, 1996).

Skutsch, O., *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985).

Smelik, K. A. D. and Hemelrijk, E. A., "'Who Knows Not What Monsters Demented Egyptian Worships?'" Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity as Part of the Ancient Conception of Egypt' *ANRW II* 17.4 (1984), 1852-2000.

Smith, W. (ed.), *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography* (London, 1854).

Sprawski, S., *Jason of Pherae: A Study on History of Thessaly in Years 431-370 BC* (Kraków, 1999).

Sprawski, S., 'Were Lycophron and Jason Tyrants of Pherae? Xenophon on the History of Thessaly' in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and His World: Papers from a conference held in Liverpool in July 1999* (Stuttgart, 2004).

Spencer, D., *The Roman Alexander: Reading a Cultural Myth* (Exeter, 2002).

Spencer, D., "'You Should Never Meet Your Heroes...": Growing Up with Alexander, the Valerius Maximus Way' in E. Carney and D. Ogden (eds.), *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives* (Oxford, 2010), 175-191.

Stafford, E., *Worshipping Virtues: Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece* (London, 2000).

Stangl, T., *Ciceronis Orationum Scholiastae* (Hildesheim, 1964).

Stephens, S. A., 'The Arginusae Theme in Greek Rhetorical Theory and Practice' *BASP* 20 (1983), 171-180.

Stephenson, A., *Public Lands and Agrarian Laws of the Roman Republic* (Baltimore, 1891).

Stevens, C. E., 'North-West Europe and Roman Politics (125-118)' in Carl Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II* (Brussels, 1980), 71-97.

Stevenson, T. R., 'The Ideal Benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought' *CQ* 42 (1992), 421-436.

Stevenson, T. R., 'Roman Coins and Refusals of the Title *Pater Patriae*' *The Numismatic Chronicle* 167 (2007), 119-141.

Stevenson, T. R., 'Acceptance of the Title *Pater Patriae* in 2 BC' in L. and P. Watson (eds.), *Roman Byways: Papers from a Conference in Memory of Charles Tesoriero* (Sydney, 2009), 97-108. [= *Antichthon* 43 (2009)].

Stocks, C., *The Roman Hannibal: Remembering the Enemy in Silius Italicus' Punica* (Liverpool, 2014).

Stockton, D., *The Gracchi* (Oxford, 1979).

Stronk, J. P., *Ctesias' Persian History* (Düsseldorf, 2010).

Sullivan, R. D., *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100-30 BC* (Toronto, 1990).

Sumner, G. V., *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology* (Toronto, 1973).

Suolahti, J., *The Roman Censors: A Study on Social Structure* (Helsinki, 1963).

Sutton, D. F., 'Aesopus and the Emotional Lability of Audiences' *QUCC* 48 (1985), 63-73.

Syme, R., 'The Stemma of the Sentii Saturnini' *Historia* 13 (1964), 156-166.

Syme, R., *Sallust* (Berkeley, 1964).

Syme, R., *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986).

Taillardat, J., *Suétone: Περί βλασφημιών. Περί παιδιών. Des termes injurieux. Des jeux grecs (Extraits byzantins)* (Paris, 1967).

Tansey, P. L., 'L. Villius Annalis Praetor 43 B.C. *in magistratu occisus est*' *RhM* 156 (2013), 98-102.

Tatum, J. W., *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher* (Chapel Hill, 1999).

Taylor, L. R., *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, 1931).

Taylor, L. R., *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: The Thirty-Five Urban and Rural Tribes* (Rome, 1960).

- Thein, A. G., 'Felicitas and the Memoirs of Sulla and Augustus' in C. Smith and A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography* (Swansea, 2009), 87-109.
- Thein, A., 'Reflecting on Sulla's Clemency' *Historia* 63 (2014), 168-186.
- Themann-Steinke, A., *Valerius Maximus: ein Kommentar zum zweiten Buch der Facta et Dicta memorabilia* (Trier, 2008).
- Thiel, J. H., *Punica Fides* (Amsterdam, 1954).
- Thomas, J. F., *Déshonneur et honte en latin* (Louvain, 2007).
- Thompson, D. W., *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (London, 1936).
- Thurn, N., 'Der Aufbau der Exempelasammlung des Valerius Maximus' *Historia* 129 (2001), 79-94.
- Tipping, B., *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus' Punica* (Oxford, 2010).
- Torrance, I. C., 'Oaths and "The Barbarian"' in A. H. Sommerstein and A. J. Bayliss (eds.), *Oath and State in Ancient Greece* (Berlin, 2012), 307-322.
- Torelli, M., 'History: Land and People' in L. Bonfante (ed.), *Etruscan Life and Afterlife* (Detroit, 1986), 60-1.
- Tougher, S., *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society* (London, 2008).
- Treggiari, S., *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969).
- Treggiari, S., *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford, 1991).
- Tsouna, V., 'Philodemus on the Therapy of Vice' *OSAPh* 21 (2001), 233-258.
- Tsouna, V., *The Ethics of Philodemus* (Oxford, 2007).
- Ullman, B. L., 'Cleopatra's Pearls' *CJ* 52.5 (1957), 193-201.
- Valvo, E., 'La rappresentazione di Annibale in Valerio Massimo' *Millennium* 5 (2008), 37-55.

Van der Blom, H., *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer* (Oxford, 2010).

Van Ooteghem, J. J., *L. Marcius Philippus et sa famille* (Brussels, 1961).

Van Nuffelen, P., *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History* (Oxford, 2012).

Vasaly, A., 'Personality and Power: Livy's Depiction of the Appii Claudii in the First Pentad' *TAPhA* 117 (1987), 203-226.

Versluys, M. J., *Aegyptiaca Romana: Nilotic Scenes and the Roman Views of Egypt* (Leiden, 2002).

Versnel, H. S., *Triumphus: An Inquiry in the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph* (Leiden, 1970).

Vogel-Weidemann, U. R. D., *Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14–68 n. Chr.* (Bonn, 1982).

Voisin, J., 'Les Romains, chasseurs de têtes' *Du châtement dans la cité: supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le monde antique* (Rome, 1984), 241-293.

Vössing, K., *Mensa Regia: Das Bankett beim hellenistischen König und beim römischen Kaiser* (Munich, 2004).

Wace, A., 'Tappeto' *AJA* 76 (1972), 438-440.

Walbank, F. W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* vol. I (Oxford, 1957).

Walbank, F. W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* vol. II (Oxford, 1967).

Waldherr, G. H., 'Punica fides – Das Bild der Karthager in Rom' *Gymnasium* 107 (2000), 193-222.

Walker, H. J., *Memorable Deeds and Sayings: One Thousand Tales from Ancient Rome* (Indianapolis, 2004).

Wallace-Hadrill, A., 'The Emperor and His Virtues' *Historia* 30 (1981), 298-323.

Wallace-Hadrill, A., *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge, 2008).

Walsh, P. G., *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961).

- Ward, A. M., *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic* (Columbia, 1977).
- Wardle, D., ‘“The Sainted Julius”: Valerius Maximus and the Dictator’ *CPh* 92 (1997), 323-345.
- Wardle, D., *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Deeds and Sayings, Book I* (Oxford, 1998).
- Wardle, D., ‘Valerius Maximus on the Domus Augusta, Augustus, and Tiberius’ *CQ* 50 (2000), 479-493.
- Wardle, D., ‘The Heroism and Heroisation of Tiberius: Valerius Maximus and his Emperor’ in P. Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux. 2, Prose et linguistique, médecine* (Brussels, 2002), 433-440.
- Wardle, D., ‘Valerius Maximus on Alexander the Great’ *AClass* 48 (2005a), 141-161.
- Wardle, D., ‘Suetonius and Augustus’ “Programmatic Edict”’ *RhM* 148 (2005b), 181-201.
- Wardle, D., *Cicero: On Divination, Book 1* (Oxford, 2006).
- Wardle, D., *Suetonius: Life of Augustus* (Oxford, 2014).
- Warren, J., *Facing Death: Epicurus and his Critics* (Oxford, 2004).
- Watkins, O. D., ‘The Death of Cn. Pompeius Strabo’ *RhM* 131 (1988), 143-150.
- Watson, P. A., *Ancient Stepmothers: Myth, Misogyny, and Reality* (Leiden, 1995).
- Watt, W. S., ‘Notes on Valerius Maximus and Velleius Paterculus’ *Klio* 68 (1986), 466-478.
- Watts, W. J., ‘Race Prejudice in the Satires of Juvenal’ *AClass* 19 (1976), 83-104.
- Weber, W., *Princeps: Studien zur Geschichte des Augustus* (Stuttgart, 1936).
- Weileder, A., *Valerius Maximus: Spiegel kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung* (Munich, 1998).
- Weinstock, S., *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971).
- Weiskopf, M., *The So-Called “Great Satraps’ Revolt”, 366-360 B.C.: Concerning Local Instability in the Achaemenid Far West* (Stuttgart, 1989).

- Welch, T., 'Perspectives On and Of Livy's Tarpeia' *EuGeStA* 2 (2012), 169-200.
- Welch, T., 'Was Valerius Maximus a Hack?' *AJPh* 134 (2013), 67-82.
- Welles, C. B., *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy* (London, 1934).
- Wesch-Klein, G., 'Commeatus id est tempus, quo ire, redire quis possit. Zur Gewährung von Urlaub im römischen Heer' in G. Alföldy et al. (eds.), *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit: Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley* (Stuttgart, 2000), 459-471.
- Westphal, H., 'Imperium suum paulatim destruxit: The Concept of Moderatio in Valerius Maximus' *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* 4.1' *AClass* 58 (2015), 191-208.
- Wheeler, E. L., *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery* (Leiden, 1988).
- Wheeler, E. L., 'The Laxity of Syrian Legions' in D. L. Kennedy (ed.), *The Roman Army in the East* (Ann Arbor, 1996).
- Whitehorne, J. E. G., *Cleopatra* (London, 1994).
- Whitton, C. L., 'Dubitatio comparativa: A Misunderstood Idiom in Pliny (*Natural History* 7.150), Tacitus (*Histories* 4.6) and Others' *CQ* 61 (2011), 267-277.
- Whitton, C., *Pliny the Younger: Epistles Book II* (Cambridge, 2013).
- Wiegand, I., *Neque libere neque vere: die Literatur unter Tiberius und der Diskurs der res publica continua* (Tübingen, 2013).
- Wikander, Ö., 'Senators and Equites 6. Sergius Orata and the Invention of the Hypocaust' *ORom* 20 (1996), 181-182.
- Williams, R. S., 'The Role of *Amicitia* in the Career of A. Gabinius (Cos. 58)' *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 195-210.
- Williams, C. A., *Roman Homosexuality<sup>2</sup>* (Oxford, 2010).
- Williams, C. A., *Reading Roman Friendship* (Cambridge, 2012).
- Williams, G., 'Testing the Legend: Horace, Silius Italicus and the Case of Marcus Atilius Regulus' *Antichthon* 38 (2004), 70-98.

- Wirszubski, C., 'Avdaces: A Study in Political Phraseology' *JRS* 51 (1961), 12-22.
- Wiseman, T. P. 'Two Friends of Clodius in Cicero's Letters' *CQ* 18 (1968), 297-302.
- Wiseman, T. P., *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays* (Leicester, 1974).
- Wood, N., 'Sallust's Theorem: A Comment on "Fear" in Western Political Thought' *History of Political Thought* 16 (1995), 174-189.
- Woodman, A. J., *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative (2.94-131)* (Cambridge, 1977).
- Woodman, A. J. and Martin, R. H. (eds.), *The Annals of Tacitus Book 3* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Worthington, I., *Alexander the Great: Man and God* (Harlow, 2004).
- Yakobson, A., 'Maiestas, The Imperial Ideology and the Imperial Family: The Evidence of the *Senatus Consultum De Cn. Pisone Patre*' *Eutopia* 3 (2003), 75-107.
- Yardley, J. C., *Justin and Pompeius Trogus: A Study of the Language of Justin's Epitome of Trogus* (Toronto, 2003).
- Yardley, J. C., and Heckel, Waldemar, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus: Books 11-12, Alexander the Great* (Oxford, 1997).
- Yegül, F., *Bathing in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 2010).
- Zanda, E., *Fighting Hydra-Like Luxury: Sumptuary Regulation in the Roman Republic* (London, 2011).
- Zschench, F., *De Cicerone et Livio Valeri Maximi fontibus* (Diss., Berlin, 1865).