

THE PICTURE OF MARIUS IN VALERIUS MAXIMUS¹⁾

Amongst writers of the first century A. D. proper Valerius stands out as presenting far and away the largest corpus of historical data on the Republic. Moreover Marius is one of the Republican figures in whom he is especially interested²⁾, events in Marius' career engrossing an attention which is out of all relation to the chronological proportion which they constitute of the *exempla* as a whole³⁾. Furthermore Valerius' standpoint in regard to Marius differs markedly, in its non-partizan viewpoint⁴⁾, from the bias of the only three other sources —

1) The text cited is that of C. Kempf (Teubner, 1888; the second edition), whose indices have been supplemented from my own observations in reading Valerius. For a more recent appraisal of textual studies in Valerius see D. M. Schullian in *TAPA* 65, 1934, 35—47; *CP* 32, 1937, 70—72 and 349—59 and *AJP* 61, 1940, 202—206.

2) Scipio Africanus with 46 mentions (the figure indicates the number of times a name, or relevant cognate adjective (e. g. *Marianus*, *Sullanus*) is cited in Kempf's *Index Nominum et Rerum*; as his footnote to p. 625 indicates, repetitions in the same section are not counted), is easily Valerius' favourite character. Caesar, Hannibal and Pompey, with 38 mentions, come next, in a group to which Marius belongs (Kempf's reference to p. 144, 1.7 is in error for p. 142, 1.6 which involves repetition within the section, so Kempf's figure of 38 must be reduced to 37). Next come Scipio Aemilianus and Sulla (30 and 28 respectively); figures such as Cato Uticensis, Ti. Gracchus, Cato the Elder and C. Gracchus come only in fifth place with 18, 15, 13 and 12 citations respectively.

3) This study is based on 95 passages (of which one, *Nepot. Epit.* 21, 3, cannot be said with certainty to belong to the Valerian corpus). Statistics are as follows:

	Rom.	Ext.	Total
Number of <i>exempla</i> sections:	665	303	968
Number relevant to Marius' career:	93	1*	94
Percentages:	13.8	.3	9.7

(i. e. about $\frac{1}{7}$ th.)

* Sections styled *Mil. Rom.* — 9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1—2 — have not been classified under external *exempla*, being regarded as parallel, e. g., to 8, 1, *Damn.* 2.

4) E. g. of Valerius' chapter headings Marius is mentioned, as central to the incident, under: 'De superstitionibus'; 'De ominibus'; 'De institutis

two partizan, one bitterly inimical — which deal with Marius *in extenso*⁵). And, it should be observed, the sum of Valerius' references to Marius' career, when systematically collated and arranged, is of such dimensions and importance as virtually to constitute another major source⁶). Valerius moreover differs significantly from the other important sources on Marius in regard to his date of composition⁷). So, just as his relatively uncommitted viewpoint⁸) provides the only touchstone by

antiquis' (twice: 2, 2, 3 and 2, 3, 1); 'De iure triumphandi'; 'De maiestate'; 'De fortitudine'; 'Qui... licentius sibi... indulserunt'; 'De gratis'; 'De pietate erga... patriam' (*in det.*); 'De pudicitia'; 'De mutatione... fortunae'; 'De privatis iudiciis insignibus'; 'Qui quae in aliis vindicarant ipsi commiserunt'; 'Quae cuique magna contigerunt'; 'De crudelitate', and 'De iis qui infimo loco nati mendacio se clarissimis familiis inserere conati sunt' (Herophilus). Discussion under these chapter-headings shows a fair, but not uncritical, assessment of M.'s career (i. e. citation under the following heads might also have been possible: 'De simulata religione'; 'De disciplina militari'; 'De his qui humili in loco nati clari evaserunt'; 'De fiducia sui'; 'De paupertate'; 'De ingratis'; 'De fide publica' (*in det.*); 'Strategemata'; 'De repulsis'; 'De cupiditate gloriae'; 'De ira aut odio'; 'De perfidia'; 'De vi et seditione' (the *exemplum* does not centre upon Marius); 'De ultione' and 'De mortibus non vulgaribus').

5) On the partizan sources, for Cicero see Carney, 'Cicero's Picture of Marius', *WS* 73, 1960, 85—86; 97—98; 103 and 121—22; for all his favourable intentions, Sallust, on the other hand, presents a negative picture of Marius because he had to employ for the Jugurtha sources uniformly hostile to him: *CAH* 9, 1951, 115—16; *RE* Suppbd. VI, Marius 14, s. 1364. Plutarch drew on these sources and on Posidonius (cf. K. von Fritz, *TAPA* 74, 1943, 166—67), who had formed an intense dislike of Marius (*OCD* 722; cf. A. Passerini *Ath.* 12, 1932, 358 n. 3); this source-bias conspired with Plutarch's distaste for Marius' attitude (cf. *Mar.* 2, 2—4 and 45, 10—46, 1) to produce a most hostile depiction of the latter's career.

6) For the statistics see n. 3; Valerius' text covers 472 Teubner pages. A similar study of Cicero's references to Marius, which also are extensive, has been carried out at *WS* 73, 1960, 83—122, to which this study is complementary.

7) Between 31 and 37 A. D.: *RE* Valerius Maximus, 93; J. W. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 1960, 55. The works of Cicero and Sallust are of the first century B. C. and Plutarch's monograph of the second century A. D. (or very close to the end of the first century: K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia*, 1949, 71—72).

8) Valerius is rather more antipathetic to Sulla than to Marius, but sometimes uses sources favourable to the former (cf. 9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1 and 8, 6, 2); on the other hand his predisposition for Scaurus and Metellus is slight. As to his sources, C. Bosch's view that he merely reworked two collections of *exempla*, one of Ciceronian date, the other Hyginus' (*Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus*, 1929, 109—111) has been shown as untenable by A. Ramelli, who indicates as sources a collection of *exempla* of Augustan date, possibly Pomponius Rufus' ('Le fonti di Valerio Massimo', *Ath.* 14,

which to test the antithetical bias of the other sources, his medial position allows the dating of accretions to the tradition concerning Marius⁹). This is particularly important as Valerius, as a work of reference, is heavily drawn upon by contemporary and subsequent authors¹⁰); thus identification of his contribution to the development of the tradition means surer assessment of that tradition.

The object of this study is, by collating Valerius' references to Marius, personalities connected with him, and situations in which he was involved¹¹), to integrate a mass of

1936, 135—36), Cicero's *De Senectute*, *De Divinatione*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Finibus* and *De Consolatione* (138—46), Livy (146—50) and Varro (150—52). Writing without knowledge of this monograph, R. Helm (Valerius Maximus, Seneca und die Exemplassammlung, *Herm.* 74, 1939), who also scouts Bosch's views (131), stresses Valerius' direct dependence on Cicero, especially the *De Consolatione* (132—34; 136—37 and 143—44); he emphasizes that Valerius drew on a multiplicity of sources (131, 140 and 153—54; cf. Duff 58), including Verrius Flaccus, Scaurus (Helm, 140), Varro (140 and 154; cf. *RE* Valerius Maximus 110—111) and Hyginus (Helm, 150), but argues against the use of Livy or a collection of *exempla* (153 — making the valid point that many similarities are owed to the common educational background of Valerius and Seneca: 148; cf. 132 and 142). This last contention goes too far in reaction against Bosch: evidence for the use of a collection of Augustan date is too strong to be argued away (M. L. Paladini, *Rapporti tra Velleio Patercolo e Valerio Massimo*, *Lat.* 16, 1957, 239; 248 and 249, n. 3; there is evidence of acquaintance also with Augustus' autobiography: *ib.* 244) and the employment of at least a synoptical version of Livy seems indicated (236—37; 239; 245; cf. Ramelli 147, n. 1).

9) E. g. the prophecy spoken by Aemilianus before Numantia first appears in Valerius (8, 15, 7) and the detail of Marius' electoral defeats at Arpinum (6, 9, 14) only in Valerius, whose contribution to the conceptualization of Marius as the type-figure of the paradoxical working of fortune was to have a markedly distorting effect upon the whole subsequent tradition (see n. 28; on the tradition of the first century B. C. see *WS* 73, 1960, 98; on that of the second century A. D. see Carney, 'Plutarch's Style in the Marius', *JHS* 80, 1960, 26).

10) Ramelli 119 and n. 1; *RE* Valerius Maximus 114 and Duff 58—59; on the appeal of the anecdote to the Roman mind see E. H. Haight, *The Roman Use of Anecdotes in Cicero, Livy and the Satirists*, 1940, 4—6. The history of one of Valerius' most paradoxical *exempla* in subsequent literature is indicated in n. 9.

11) The personalities so treated are Antonius (the orator), Catulus, Cinna, Crassus (the orator), Drusus, Marius the younger, Octavius, Rutilius, Saturninus, Scaurus, Strabo, Sulla and Sulpicius; the incidents discussed are those of the period 134—86 (the *index Nominum* under e. g. Cimbrī, Minturnenses etc. being used to supplement passages culled from general reading in the text).

unconnected references in a unified and readily accessible body of original material. Such collation greatly increases the value of Valerius' evidence (of its nature discontinuous and generally excerpted *in vacuo* for supplementary illustration of details reviewed individually), in that, from the coordinated, comprehensive picture which emerges, Valerius' overall estimate of Marius' character and achievements appears, along with the figures with whom he unconsciously associated Marius¹²). Equally important, in view of the detail in which Valerius comments on the period, are the incidents omitted and the views to which he subscribes or which he fails to notice. Accretions to the earlier tradition and areas of distortion can readily be made out, and it becomes no longer a matter of arbitrarily weighing the balance of probabilities between irreconcilably opposed partizan viewpoints when a coherent, non-partizan picture is available to off-set them¹³).

First, however, an assessment of the value of the facts provided by Valerius is necessary¹⁴). The task of collation reveals shortcomings both in procedure and in attitude. As to procedure, Valerius seems to have had no system of cross-reference¹⁵); hence some inconsistencies¹⁶) — though his

12) Details on *amici* or *inimici*, when all of Valerius' evidence is coordinated into a complete picture, can date the defection of renegades, a topic of perennial difficulty. Moreover larger issues, such as the genuineness of Marius' religious feelings, can only be approached from full background knowledge. Furthermore, Valerius' overall assessment of Marius, which is based on a general tradition, when contrasted with those of Cicero and Plutarch indicates which is the more biased from that tradition and in what respects this bias operates.

13) This process of comparison is possible in view of the fact that a similar work of reconstruction has established Cicero's views (*WS* 73, 1960, 83—122). With the present study the development of the tradition over three centuries, in the writings of Cicero, Valerius and Plutarch respectively, can be studied synoptically.

14) Valerius is not primarily an historian: "è lo scopo moralistico che logicamente appare predominante" (Paladini, n. 1 to p. 232, where see discussion; cf. Duff 60—62).

15) This is perhaps most strikingly shown by his failure to connect Scaevola's attempted defence of Marius (3, 8, 5) with Marius' protection of Scaevola (9, 11, 2); some of the *exempla* indicated at n. 4 as not elsewhere cited under relevant headings may indicate the lack of a system of cross-reference: cf. e. g. 6, 9, 14 and the heading 'De repulsis' and 9, 2, 2 and that of 'De ira aut odio'. Valerius may, however, have avoided re-use of an *exemplum* as he was providing only a representative selection from a superabundance of *exempla*: 4, 1, 12; cf. 6, 4, *init.* Though little is known of his technique of composition (see *RE* Valerius Maximus 102; Ramelli 119;

presentation of Marius is not seriously marred by factual contradictions¹⁷). Moreover, the *exempla* themselves, meant to convey rhetorical point, are sometimes distorted in antithesizing over-simplification¹⁸). In viewpoint Valerius is against democratic rule and in favour of the Principate¹⁹); he has the superstitious temper of his times²⁰), and he lauds *Romanitas* and patriotism, in keeping with his prepossession with morality, to the detriment of historical objectivity²¹). However, for the Marian period at all events, he draws on sources which do not all have an optimum, Romanocentric viewpoint²²). His knowledge of Republican history is not profound; as is usual in the political quietism induced by the Principate²³), he has little appreciation of the intrigue-ridden relationships of Republican

130; 133; n. 1; Helm 153, and Duff 56—77 and 58), his care to maintain parity in citations of figures whom he regarded as of commensurate importance (cf. n. 2) indicates that the latter is the preferable explanation.

16) See discussion below on Valerius' references to Marius' social background. As Valerius seems to have knowledge of a wide range of sources (cf. n. 8), the magnitude of the task of excerpting (believed beyond him by Bosch, 2) rendered some inconsistency inevitable (*RE* op. cit. 102).

17) Errors of fact involve minor confusions of closely related dates or personalities (see nn. 56 and 75—76; in general see *RE* Valerius Maximus 100—102); errors in interpretation tend seriously to misrepresent, without, however, falsifying facts (though an intentionally misleading emphasis may be put upon them: cf. nn. 35—36 with discussion thereto, and, in general, *RE* op. cit. 102).

18) The classical instance of this occurs at 6, 9, 14; as Duff rightly says: "Eagerness to make a point renders him indifferent to healthy doubt" (61; cf. n. 1 and the comments on Valerius' "passion for the epigrammatic" at p. 64). Good examples of epigrams in which historicity has been sacrificed to hyperbole occur at 3, 1, 2 and 8, 6, 4; cf. in general *RE* op. cit. 93—94 and 111.

19) On his opposition to democratic rule see 4, 7, 2; 5, 4, 3 f.; 7, 2, 6; 9, 4, 3; on his support for Caesarism see n. 78; in general cf. Duff 59—60 and Paladini 233.

20) See n. 63 and discussion in the text; on the prevailing climate of religious belief see C. Bailey, *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*, 1932, 248—54; cf. E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 1956, 248—49 and 252—53 and *CAH* 10, 505—506.

21) Cf. Duff 57—58; Paladini 232.

22) See n. 76 and discussion in text. The terms '*popularis*' and '*optimatus*' are used in this study in the meanings outlined by R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 1952, 16 and 22, as qualified by von Fritz, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*, 1954, 273.

23) On the contemporary climate of thought see C. G. Starr, *Civilization and the Caesars*, 1954, 203—232 and cf. Duff 59.

public life²⁴). Occasional anachronisms indicate that his grasp on *minutiae* was superficial²⁵). In view of all this an attitude of some reserve must be adopted towards his ascriptions of motivation or his explanations of facts, where these seem subjective. In regard to fact, however, he is, in the main, remarkably consistent, considering the discursive, rhetorical nature of his writings. Consequently, facts added to the tradition by Valerius can be accepted, once allowance has been made for tendentious interpretation of their background in one of the ways indicated above.

Some inconsistency is apparent in Valerius' references to Marius' social background. Marius is not employed as a type-figure under the heading 'De his qui humili loco nati clari evaserunt' (though Scaurus, for example, is: 4, 4, 11); Valerius does not, apparently, think of him as born in straightened circumstances. Where he gives facts, this assumption is born out: Marius was assigned, as *contubernalis* under Aemilianus at Numantia, to the cavalry in his first military service (8, 15, 7), a combination of factors all indicating a well-to-do social background. This Valerius failed to perceive, as he regularly fails to appreciate the significance of family connections in Republican politics²⁶). Again, Marius' kinsman, Lusius, holds a commission in 104 (6, 1, 12) and must also therefore have been of equestrian rank. Members of the *gens Gratidia*, another of the three leading families in Arpinum, are subsequently closely connected with Marius: M. Gratidius in 88 (9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1) and Gratidianus (adopted by Marius' brother) in 82 (9, 2, 1; cf. MRR 2, 72)²⁷). Two

24) E. g. Cicero's defence of his *inimici* Gabinius and Vatinius, undertaken under pressure from the dynasts Caesar and Pompey (*CAH* 9, 621), is explained by Valerius as an instance of Cicero's *humanitas*, in terms of the morality of private life and without appreciation of the amoral political pressures to which Cicero was subjected as a public figure. Such *naïveté* renders many of Valerius' subjective reconstructions valueless: cf. e. g. 2, 3, 1; 6, 5, 5 and 9, 7, 2 (examples abound).

25) See n. 77 and cf. nn. 56 and 75.

26) A striking instance of this in the period under discussion occurs apropos of Scaevola's support for Marius, his kinsman, in 88 (3, 8, 5) and Marius' subsequent protection of Scaevola (9, 11, 2). Again, Valerius is oblivious to the kinship of Marius with the Granius of Puteoli who opposed Sulla in 79 (9, 3, 8).

27) As this family might very well have associated itself with Marius only after his success, the connection cannot be used as conclusive evidence for Marius' standing in his early career. But as early as 115 M. Gratidius was implementing in Arpinum a policy similar to that advanced by Marius in

passages conflict with the picture thus unconsciously presented: 2, 3, 1 and 6, 9, 14. In the former Valerius, in interpreting Marius' introduction of volunteer enrolment, gives as reason Marius' desire not to be termed a "proletarian *imperator*", an explanation of such incredible *naïveté* in a Republican authority that one can only suppose that Valerius is here subjectively interpreting a source (whose use of the words *novitas* and *humilitas* as political catch-phrases he has apparently failed to understand). The latter is a straining after antitheses in an attempt to make of Marius a type-figure illustrating the mutability of fortune. This particular antithesis had a great vogue in the first century A. D. ²⁸), and Valerius has obviously elsewhere in this passage forced his facts to fit his antithesis (see discussion below), so that here too reliance cannot be placed on his reworking. The fact that Marius had the financial means to hold the offices indicated at 6, 9, 14 indicates just such a social background as is suggested by the passages which have not been "interpreted" by Valerius. Consequently, it would appear that the Marius of Valerius' sources was not remarkable for lack of financial means, although the political nonentity of his *gens* occasioned sneers.

Valerius makes few references to Marius' early career. The description of Marius as *litterarum gloriosissimum contemptorem* (2, 2, 3) is best not taken to imply lack of educational training ²⁹); it forms part of an hyperbolic antithesis as the climactic finishing *sententia* in its *exemplum*. Valerius must not be taken to mean more than he says (he is trying to imply a great deal more, for the purposes of his antithesis), which is that Marius would not submit to training in Greek *rhetoric* in his *old age*. This, in context, should date his attitude to the nineties, which was probably a period of Greek and Latin bilingualism never before or subsequently achieved by Roman

Rome in 119 (*RE Gratidius*, 2), and this when Marius was yet politically unknown, relatively speaking. Gratidius was certainly a Marian by 102, as is shown by his position on the staff of Antonius: E. Badian, 'Caepio and Norbanus', *Hist.* 6, 1957, 332.

²⁸) *Juv.* 8, 245—50; *Pliny, NH* 33, 11, 150; Seneca the Elder, *Controv.* 1, 6, 4; cf. 1, 1, 3 and 7, 2, 6; Seneca the Younger, *Brev. Vit.* 17, 6; *Benefic.* 5, 16, 2. Other passages at which it appears in Valerius are: 2, 10, 6 and 8, 15, 7.

²⁹) On Marius' connection with Plotius' literary group cf. E. Gabba, 'Politica e cultura in Roma agli inizi del I secolo a. C.', *Ath.* 31, 1953, 269 nn. 4 and 5; 270 and n. 23; 272. On Valerius' attitude see Duff, 57.

society³⁰), in which there would naturally be some pressure on the older generation to acquaint themselves with recent educational developments. Marius' resistance to such pressure, at this time of disenchantment with the *nobiles*³¹), from whom it presumably came, is best not ascribed to educational deficiencies (not attributed to him, specifically, by Valerius). The detailed knowledge shown by Valerius of this educational development corroborates Duff's impression, at page 56, that he was a *rhetor* by profession.

For Valerius Marius was a man of *rusticus rigor* (2, 2, 3; the term is strikingly reminiscent of Cicero's *rusticanus vir*: *T.D.* 2, 22, 53³²). But Marius' legal knowledge — and therefore training — is well illustrated by his decision in the case of Fannia and Titinius (and his choice by the parties as *index*): 8, 2, 3³³). His intimate acquaintance with religious ritual also argues a long schooling in the subject, which can hardly have been given to a person lacking a thorough formal education (1, 5, 5). As the Marii were a leading family in Arpinum (see discussion above on Marius' social background and *ESAR* 1, 296), Valerius' reference to Marius' failure to gain office there (6, 9, 14) — the only such statement in the sources, incidentally — is best examined carefully³⁴). As was the case at 2, 2, 3, the *exemplum* is worded very carefully and must not be pressed into meaning more than it actually says³⁵), though it implies

30) H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 1956, 258.

31) During the nineties many of the noblemen, who had associated themselves with Marius in the days of his ascendancy in the previous decade, abandoned him: *Hist.* 6, 1957, 336—43.

32) This and other striking similarities (e.g. 4, 1, *Ext.* 9 and *Deiot.* 13, 36; cf. 6, 5, 5 and *Deiot.* 11, 31.) corroborate the view that Valerius was intimately acquainted with Cicero as a source at first-hand: Helm, *op. cit.* 133—34; 136—37; 143—44; Ramelli 138—46; cf. 120—22.

33) See 5, 2, 8 and 6, 1, 12; in general on Marius' legal expertise see Carney, 'Two notes on Roman Republican law', *Acta Iuridica* 1959, 229 n. 4, 231 n. 13 and 233 n. 3.

34) Cf. A. Passerini, 'Caio Mario come uomo politico' *Ath.* 12, 1932, 12 and n. 1.

35) *Plut. Mar.* 3, 2, does not corroborate this passage, as (incorrectly) stated in the *Supplement to MRR* (p. 40); Marius' family was by no means so politically distinguished as to put him in the category of those equites allowed to stand for the military tribunate after only five years' service (cf. J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 1957, 2, 366 and J. Suolahti, *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period*, 1955, 52—53), which is what T. R. S. Broughton's thesis would require; Valerius' statement about Marius' tribunate is demonstrably incorrect.

far more, again for the sake of a rhetorical antithesis. It is known that Marius gained a quaestorship (cf. *MRR*, 1, 521), though Valerius' language here implies that he did not (without, however, categorically saying so). It is possible that he suffered a reverse before obtaining the tribunate of the plebs (so *MRR*, *Suppl.* 40) and that his candidature — on one occasion — was as unsuccessful as in the case of the two aedileships; even if this is so³⁶), the passage is deliberately trying to suggest more than it says. The fact that Marius' military service (cf. *Sall. Jug.* 63, 4—5) — not mentioned (here) by Valerius, to heighten the paradox — prevented him from standing for office in Arpinum meant that he did not ever hold office there. It would be perfectly in keeping with the misleading reportage of this part of the *exemplum* that this situation should be interpreted as *Arpinatibus honoribus indicatus inferior* — which does not categorically say that Marius suffered *repulsae*.

Of Marius' early offices gained at Rome (6, 9, 14 is the only reference to any office prior to his first consulship), Valerius knows nothing of his (elective) military tribunate, mentions the quaestorship, the tribunate of the *plebs* and his failure in candidacy for the aedileship. He does not seem to know of the double *repulsa* in the latter case or he would surely have mentioned it, both at this point — since he reports so fully on the praetorship, as this also helps heighten the paradox he is trying to create — and under the heading 'De repulsis'. Possibly he knew that Marius suffered two *repulsae* about this time and, not having sufficiently detailed grasp of the Republican constitution to apply them to the two varieties of aedileship, assumed that one concerned his tribunate of the *plebs*³⁷). Characteristically, he is not interested in the political activities of Marius in any of these offices, though his military interests lead him to indicate that Marius' service at Numantia

36) However, Plutarch knows nothing of this in spite of his detailed knowledge of the two *repulsae* for the aedileship (cf. *Mar.* 4, 1; 5, 1—3) and his version is borne out by Sallust (*Jug.* 63, 4—5) and the auctor *de viris illustribus* (67, 1). Moreover mistakes do occur in Valerius' references to offices held: cf. n. 75. On the intensity of the competition for office in the *municipia* see R. Andreotti, *Cajo Mario*, 1940, 18.

37) More probably, however, the explanation is simply that he made a mistake, as elsewhere in dealing with the gaining of offices: cf. Sulla's 'consulship' at 1, 6, 4 (cf. *MRR* 2,36), the reference to Marius' *fifth* consulship at 9, 7, 1 and the confusion of the titles of L. and C. Iulius Caesar at 9, 2, 2.

under Aemilianus had been distinguished (8, 15, 7). There is no mention of his Spanish proconsulship of 114, or his legateship of 109—108. But Valerius does provide valuable evidence on the political climate of the years following 120, indicating popular resentment towards the senate and senatorial conciliatoriness³⁸). Significantly, he interprets both incidents in terms of the morality of private life rather than the exigencies of factional politics.

Valerius next notices Marius' first consulship (6, 9, 14; cf. 2, 3, 1). Of the political eclipse that followed 114, Marius' subsequent indulgence in activities proper to a *publicanus* and marriage to Julia prior to the consulship, there is not a word. Valerius simply did not know of the implications of Marius' marriage, to which he nowhere makes even oblique mention, and thus could treat Marius very freely, although he was technically an ancestor of Tiberius, who is so very respectfully treated in Valerius' pages. Moreover there is no mention of a quarrel with the Metelli either in 119 or 108 (nor is Marius classed under the heading 'De ingratis'). This suggests that the latter point did not loom so largely in the body of the tradition as it did in Metellus' biography, otherwise, given Valerius' moralizing bent and disapproval of some of Marius' actions, it must surely have been noticed. Strikingly, in all Valerius' references to Numidicus, the only quarrel mentioned is that with Saturninus.

Valerius presents a clear and consistent picture of the Jugurthine War. Metellus (later Numidicus) had restored the morale and efficiency of the N. African army and won a string of successes of note (2, 7, 2; cf. 9, 1, 5). Significantly, though citing Numidicus under the heading 'De Disciplina Militari' at 2, 7, 2, Valerius never ascribes more than military spirit to Marius (8, 2, 3), whom he regards as something of a military demagogue, in that Marius' introduction of volunteer recruitment is ascribed to a wish not to have propertied conscript troops despise him as a leader (2, 3, 1). The passage indicates Valerius' utter lack of understanding both of the social changes of the second century and also of the resultant decline in Republican military efficiency. In fact, Valerius is not well informed on Marius' military achievements and does not men-

³⁸) 5, 3, 2 f and 7, 2, 6; cf. Badian, 'P. Decius P. f. Subulo' *JRS* 46, 1956, 94.

tion him in the section on *strategemata*³⁹). The only incidents mentioned in Marius' Jugurthine campaign centre on Sulla, to whom Marius objected strongly when allocated him as quaestor, because Sulla had previously led a life of dissipation; the latter however turned over a new leaf and secured Jugurtha's arrest (6, 9, 6; 9, 2, 1). Yet Valerius consistently attributes to Marius sole credit for this victory (6, 9, 14; 2, 2, 3 and 9, 2, 2), probably correctly⁴⁰). He is not aware of any claim by Numidicus to have been the real architect of victory, in fact he seems to date his trial to his return in 107 (2, 10, 1; see discussion on Numidicus below, at the year 100). Though Numidicus had solid military achievement in N. Africa — but no triumph — to his credit, he is never exemplified as an *imperator* (9, 1, 5 refers to his old-fashioned high standards of morality not his military virtuosity). Sulla did try to appropriate sole credit for Jugurtha's capture, but Valerius disbelieved his ambitious assertions (8, 14, 4). Significantly he seems to know nothing of the *Memoirs* at 8, 14, 4 (though previous sections mention similar writings: 8, 14, 1—3) — a passage which disregards the obviously over-drawn 6, 9, 6 which is very close to 6, 9, 14, source of much difficulty. The triumph over Jugurtha is thrice mentioned, with comments on its distinction and without misgivings as to Marius' meriting it: 3, 6, 6; 6, 9, 14 and 8, 15, 7.

39) He knows that the Jugurthine War involved Marius in great strategical difficulties (6, 9, 6) and, in general terms, that his military achievements won high praise (9, 2, 2). But he nowhere gives an instance of Marius' technical virtuosity as a general and, clearly, has not read any military handbook on Marius, on whom he comments throughout largely from a social or political viewpoint.

40) Valerius' two references to Numidicus as a general cite him as a type-figure of self-control and high morality (2, 7, 2 coming under the heading 'De disciplina militari' and 9, 1, 5 that of 'De luxuria et libidine'). Modern views agree with Valerius in this ascription of the credit for success in the war: M. Holroyd, 'The Jugurthine War: was Marius or Metellus the real victor?' *JRS* 18, 1928, 1—20, qualified by M. A. Levi, 'Chi ha vinto la guerra giugurtina?', *Atti del secondo congresso di studi romani* 1931, 1, 508—513; cf. G. de Sanctis, 'Quinto Cecilio Metello Numidico', *ib.* 343—51 — whence it emerges that Marius' enrolment of *capite censi* was the turning-point of the war, allowing the ample manpower necessary to its conclusion. This point, and the fact that the change was only a development of current trends in recruiting (cf. Gabba, 'Le origini dell' esercito professionale in Roma: i proletari e la riforma di Mario', *Ath.* 27, 1949, 197 and 203), indicate Valerius' complete lack of comprehension of the circumstances causing the reform: 2, 3, 1.

Marius' German war is mentioned by Valerius more frequently than any other single incident in his career. This war is in fact mentioned very frequently and in great detail by Valerius⁴¹), whose scattered references collate into a perfectly consistent account, which is corroborated in every detail by the historical sources proper. In consequence Valerius' evidence on this war is of great value.

Reference is made to Martha, Marius' Syrian prophetess, in terms which seem to indicate that Marius used her as a propagandist device (1, 3, *Nep.* 4) and to the court-martial in 104 over Lusius' death (6, 1, 12 — for its date cf. *MRR* 1, 561)⁴²). The Germans (cf. 2, 2, 3) were dealt with in two campaigns, the first against the Teutons, the second against the Cimbri: two armies are indicated at 3, 6, 6; 6, 1, 3 and 6, 9, 14, and separate campaigns at 6, 1, 12 (the Teutons) and 2, 10, 6; 5, 2, 8 and 5, 8, 4 (the Cimbri). There is no reference to the tactics of Aquae Sextiae⁴³) or in the *vercellae*, but the appeal of the Teutons' womenfolk after Aquae Sextiae is mentioned (6, 1, 3). There seems to be a reference to Battaces' visit and Marius' vow⁴⁴). The ferocity of the Cimbri in battle is twice mentioned and there is reference to the Camertine cohort which withstood their onset in the battle at the *vercellae* (5, 2, 8). Marius destroyed them completely (2, 10, 6), says Valerius, who everywhere gives Marius sole credit for both victories (2, 2, 3; 2, 10, 6; 3, 6, 6; 6, 1, 3 and 9, 2, 2; cf. 3, 8, 5). Marius' subsequent triumph is mentioned (2, 2, 3; 3, 6, 6 and 8, 15, 7), as are his trophies (2, 2, 3; 4, 4, 8 and 6, 9, 14; — where '*bina*' presumably refers to trophies for the Jugurthine

41) 18 of the 94 passages on which this study is based have to do with it.

42) The name of the *miles* is variously given: Cicero, despite his full discussion at *Mil.* 4, 9, does not give a name; Quintilian calls him Arruntius (3, 11, 14) and Plutarch (*Mar.* 14, 5—7) terms him Trebonius; cf. Passerini 36—37 and n. 1—2 p. 37. Valerius is alone in naming him C. Plotius.

43) Ianuarius Nepotianus has a reference to Sertorius which concerns the campaign culminating in Aquae Sextiae: Sertorius loricated hastam fixam oculo gerens Rhodanum transnavavit (*Epit.* 21, 3). No reference to this incident is to be found anywhere in the surviving text of Valerius, so that it cannot be held with certainty to be excerpted from him. However, as the passage is associated with the Valerian corpus, it should be considered in a study such as this. The reference is to Sertorius' escape from the Roman defeat in 105 under Caepio: Plut. *Sert.* 3, 1; *MRR* 1, 555.

44) 1, 1, 1; cf. 1, 7, 5 and Broughton, 'Notes on Roman Magistrates', *Hist.* 2 1953, 210—11.

and Germanic wars respectively, in view of 2, 2, 3) and his temple in honour of the victory over the Cimbri (1, 7, 5). Marius' pride in his victories is commented on — adversely. Valerius sees the implications in Marius' adoption of the *cantharus* as his drinking vessel (3, 6, 6)⁴⁵ but not those in the firstlings offered Marius by a grateful populace (8, 15, 7). He does, however, realize that Marius had saved Rome from destruction at the hands of the Cimbri (3, 8, 5; cf. 2, 10, 6).

Valerius knows of the new-style gladiatorial training introduced by Rutilius in 105 but nowhere regards the latter as a man of note in military matters. Sulla is — rather pointedly, on one occasion (6, 9, 6) — not mentioned in connection with this war; Valerius disliked his greedy attempts to monopolize credit in such matters (8, 14, 4) and his feud with Marius (5, 2, 9). Hence the over-simplified antithesis at 9, 2, 1 — *dum quaerit victorias Scipionem (se) populo Romano, dum exercet, Hannibalem repraesentavit* — must be treated with the reserve found necessary in other such cases⁴⁶).

Catulus likewise receives scant credit for his part in the war (he is nowhere rated as a military commander). Valerius knows of his defeat on the Athesis, but not of Catulus' version — for him a rout, pure and simple, resulted (5, 8, 4). Likewise he does not know of Catulus' special pleading in the matter of the *spolia* taken from the Cimbri; whereas Marius' *tropaea* are repeatedly mentioned (2, 2, 3; 2, 5, 6; 4, 4, 8 and 6, 9, 14), Catulus' *spolia* (of lesser monumental significance) are mentioned only once (6, 3, 1 c). Valerius' political *naïveté* is strikingly illustrated in this reference, as he fails to see the significance of their siting (from the rest of his discussion at 6, 3, 1 c a political motive should have been obvious). Typically, he is unconscious of the personal inter-relationship of Marius and Catulus at 9, 12, 4 (cf. Badian, *Hist.* 6, 1957, 322—24), where he makes the senate assign Catulus a share in Marius' triumph — an attribu-

45) On the novelty of Marius' choice of deity with which to associate himself cf. J. L. Tondriau, 'Romains de la République assimilés à des Divinités' *SO* 27, 1949, 137; cf. 140; on current politico-religious thought and the thoroughness of Marius' presentation of his claims, see S. Weinstock, 'Victor and Invictus', *HTR* 50, 1957, 224 and nn. 80—87.

46) E. g. at 3, 1, 2: *ipsum Marium illo loco statuisses, celerius aliquid de sua fuga quam de Sullae nece cogitasset*. At no other point in Valerius is military genius ascribed to Sulla (cf. the review of his career at 6, 9, 6) or cowardice to Marius.

tion of credit which is, however, perfectly in agreement with his overall picture of Marius as the architect of victory.

Valerius provides some interesting facts on domestic politics in Rome during the German wars. Domitius' prosecution of Scaurus in 104 is described (6, 5, 5). Valerius' knowledge of the factual background to the affair is good, but the motivation he provides shows his usual lack of comprehension of Republican factional politics. Domitius' motive for bringing the prosecution was not, as Valerius naïvely puts it, to gain prestige, but revenge for not having been co-opted into the Pontifical college to replace his father (*MRR* 1, 559). Success would probably have meant for Scaurus the loss of his priesthood, which Domitius might have gained. As a candidate for the priesthood and defender of *moris antiqui*, Domitius could hardly use the treacherous evidence of a *fugitivus*⁴⁷; moreover, a gentlemanly gesture of abnegation would win much popular approval (and account for the failure of his prosecution, which Scaurus' influence would in any case assure). Such, at all events, was the sequel: quem (Domitium) populus cum propter alias virtutes tum hoc nomine libentius et consulem et censorem et pontificem maximum fecit (6, 5, 5). Valerius' explanation, iustitia vicit odium, clashes with the pettiness of character attributed to Domitius in bringing the charge, and is, in any case, utterly improbable in the public life of this time⁴⁸). Another case mentioned is the rescue of Caepio from prison in 103 by a friendly tribune, L. Antistius Reginus (4, 7, 3). Scaurus was deeply involved in this issue also (cf. *MRR* 1, 563—64, Norbanus), and subsequently arraigned Norbanus, the tribune who had prosecuted Caepio (8, 5, 2). It was probably in the next year that Scaurus prosecuted Memmius (8, 5, 2: Memmius' only provincial command occurred in 103: *MRR* 1, 564), who had accused him of treason in 111 (ib. 541). Typically, Valerius knows nothing of the personal animosities involved in these law-suits.

47) Cf. Cic. *Deiot.* 1, 3; *Mil.* 22, 59 where see A. B. Poynton's note (*Cicero, Pro Milone*, 1953, 52).

48) On the political atmosphere see von Fritz, 'Sallust and the Attitude of the Roman Nobility at the Time of the Wars against Jugurtha', *TAPA* 74, 1943, 134 f., esp. 160—68; on this case see E. Pais, 'M. Emilio Scauro: i suoi processi e la sua autobiografia' in *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto* 1918, 3, 154—55 and P. Fraccaro, 'Scauriana', in *Opuscula — studi sull' età della rivoluzione romana, scritti di diritto pubblico, militaria*, 1957, 135.

Another trial which is to be connected with this tourney of law-suits between Marians and their opponents is that of M. Antonius (3, 7, 9; 6, 8, 1 refers⁴⁹). There is a serious contradiction in the former passage, in that Antonius is thought to have been *quaestor* in 113, whereas Memmius' law was not passed until 111 (cf. *MRR* 1, 536 and 537 n. 4) — the year in which Cassius was *praetor*, as he is described by Valerius (3, 7, 9; see *MRR* 1, 540; cf. 537). Though Valerius is perfectly capable, as has been indicated above, of the anachronism of applying a law of 111 to 113⁵⁰, he is not familiar enough with the *minutiae* of Republican history, as has also been demonstrated above, to have introduced a mention of the law independently, by some form of cross-reference; moreover, if the case be dated to 113, the information on Cassius' praetorship becomes incorrect. A simple error is ruled out because the whole point is that Antonius is on his way to a provincial appointment, an assumption with which all the other facts fit perfectly. Valerius could, in fact, only have found reference to the law in a contemporary source — such as Scaurus, whom he claims to have consulted: 4, 4, 11 — which would not have made such a mistake. Valerius, of course, sees the case in terms of private morality. In fact, a prominent Marian was brought to trial before another Marian, who had previously, some thought from democratic bias, been particularly severe in judging optimates when arraigned on the score under which Antonius was now charged; moreover the trial was so timed as to bring into contempt the law of the tribune Memmius, as abetting corruption in overseas officials, the very point on which he had been attacking the optimates. All this is highly reminiscent of the way in which, e.g. Marius, the legislator against electoral corruption, was prosecuted for bribery in 116 by the Metelli (at whose head was Scaurus), or of the dexterous working of the constitution against the Gracchi and Saturninus (on which Scaurus prided himself: *Cic. Sest.* 47, 101; cf. *Vir. Ill.* 72,

49) On Antonius as a Marian cf. *Hist.* 6, 1957, 331—35 and 341—42, an article in which a full discussion of the factional alignment in the trials of Norbanus and Caepio's son is given (318—20, 327—28 and 334—35). Significantly, this section of Valerius' *exempla* and the two following (6, 8, 1—3) compose a group all culled from the careers of prominent democratic leaders.

50) It is perverse not to ascribe such a law to this Memmius, the only member of his family to this point to have interested himself prominently in such matters.

9). Presumably, then, Scaurus engineered this charge against Antonius to discredit the opposing faction and in particular his *inimicus* Memmius, and Antonius' quaestorship will have to be dated to 112⁵¹).

Valerius thus provides detailed evidence on a group of unsuccessful prosecutions of the years 112—102 (Antonius, Scaurus, Memmius)⁵²), involving little known personalities (L. Cassius Longinus, L. Antistius Reginus). In Valerius this must mean that he is drawing on a detailed source, which would be interested in such *minutiae*. All the trials concern Scaurus, about whose life Valerius is unusually well-informed (5, 8, 4; 4, 4, 11; a direct quotation of Scaurus' words is given at 3, 7, 8, and there are an unusually high number of references to him) — and towards whom he has a strongly favourable bias⁵³). These facts are conclusive internal evidence for his claim to have used Scaurus' autobiography as a source (4, 4, 11)⁵⁴).

Events centring on Saturninus' demagoguery in the year 100 are very fully referred to by Valerius (12 passages in all). First mentioned is Sempronia's resistance to a tribune's attempt to have her recognize Equitius as a relative (3, 8, 6), a reference to Saturninus' suborning of the freedman in 103 (*MRR* 1, 565,

51) The cardinal date is his propraetorship, assigned by *MRR* 1, 539 to 112, on M. Holleaux's dating in *REA* 19, 1917, 91—92. But Holleaux has to correct Valerius — Celui-ci n'était pas praetor, comme le dit à tort Valère Maxime, mais quaestor extraordinaire (n. 2 to p. 92) — without realizing the anachronism thus produced concerning the *Lex Memmia*, only to reach the conclusion: Le monument qu'ils firent élever à Délos date ou de 113 ou d'une des années immédiatement postérieures. It is simpler to assume that the charge of incest was resuscitated in 111 (though in point of fact there is no reference to a Vestal), since the hypothesis that Valerius is referring to the inquisition of 113 necessitates a double correction of the sources, and this when the inscriptional evidence cannot be dated exactly to the year 112. For Scaurus' enmity towards Memmius, originating in 111, see 8, 5, 2 and cf. *MRR* 1, 541; for these political intrigues see Pais, *op. cit.*, 121 and 131—32.

52) Other such cases are recorded in the nineties: 8, 1, *Damn.* 2; 8, 5, 2—3 and 3, 7, 8; cf. 5, 2, 8.

53) E. g. he records no gossip against him, though he had been involved in several scandals: cf. Fraccaro, 'Scauriana', in *Opuscula* 125—47.

54) See Helm 140—41. Pais ('M. Emilio Scauro', *op. cit.*) suggests that the following passages stem from Scaurus' *Memoirs*: 3, 2, 18; 3, 7, 8; 5, 8, 4; 6, 5, 5 and 8, 5, 2: pp. 91—93; cf. 95. That there seems to be some confusion with Scaevola at 3, 2, 18 (see Pais, 98 n. 1) is probably due to Valerius' inadequate system of cross reference combined with his lack of familiarity with the *minutiae* of Republican history.

n. 5). Next mentioned is Numidicus' refusal as *censor* to recognise Equitius' claims (9, 7, 2). Exact dating is impossible; the year of this event may be 102 or 101 (*MRR* 1, 567). Next mentioned is Marius' imprisonment of Equitius when the latter 'illegally' stood for the tribunate with Saturninus (9, 7, 1). Valerius dates this to 101: a C. Mario *quintum* consulatum gerente. This is contradicted by other sources, which indicate that Marius collaborated with Saturninus in 101 at the elections for 100 (*MRR* 1, 571). Anyway, it is difficult to see how Equitius' candidature was illegal unless Valerius' words *adversus leges* mean, as is possible, that he was a running mate in Saturninus' electoral campaign of 100 for 99, when the *praetor* Glaucia illegally stood for the consulship, Saturninus further compromising the campaign by murdering the latter's rival, Memmius (cf. *MRR* 1, 574 and 576)⁵⁵). Certainly the public violence implied in the rescue of Equitius from prison by a mob (9, 7, 1) suggests the riotous atmosphere of late 100 and is probably to be seen in the disturbances elsewhere attributed by Valerius to Equitius as tribune designate (3, 2, 18). Valerius is presumably in error in this dating⁵⁶).

Before the elections for 99 however Numidicus had opposed Saturninus, refusing to swear to his *sanctio* as a matter of personal principle (3, 8, 4; cf. *MRR* 1, 576) and had been forced into exile by the popular faction (4, 1, 13), which Valerius saw behind Saturninus throughout his demagogic career (9, 7, 1—3; 3, 8, 6). After the elections Scaurus urged Marius

55) Memmius was a Marian, as is shown by Scaurus' double attack on him (3, 7, 9 and 8, 5, 2), and had, by impugning optimate integrity in Africa, opened the way to Marius for his first consulship. Marius, for Valerius, is a type-figure of the *grata mens* (5, 2, 8) and, on another occasion, took vengeance for harm done to one of his followers by another former political associate (9, 2, 2). Consequently it may well have been Saturninus' murder of Memmius which led Marius to arrest Equitius; at all events, the generality of the sources indicate that this murder occasioned the suppression of Saturninus: see E. Valgiglio, *Plutarco, Vita di Mario*, 1956, 141. Plutarch seems to date criticism of Marius for his enfranchisement of the Camertes to this period (*Mar.* 28, 3; cf. 5, 2, 8); this may well have originated from Saturninus at Marius' opposition to him, which appears likewise to have been based on the letter of the law (9, 7, 1).

56) He likewise makes minor errors of dating in regard to the precedence of the condemnations of Titius and Decianus, (8, 1, *Damn.* 2—3) in this period; cf. also the confusion over the exact sequence of events, as indicated by the order in which the *exempla* are presented, at 9, 7, 1—3.

to take action as consul⁵⁷) and forthwith himself took up arms (3, 2, 18). Saturninus called upon the slaves, and Marius, acting in a statesmanlike fashion which won him renown, suppressed him (8, 6, 2). Saturninus was butchered and his house razed to the ground (6, 3, 1c). The wave of popular ill-feeling against Saturninus continued after his death. In 99 a public meeting condemned his sympathizer Titius (8, 1, *Damn.* 3; cf. *MRR* 2, 2); in 98 an attack upon Furius, who in 99 had proposed the confiscation of the properties of Saturninus' following, resulted instead in the condemnation of Decianus, Saturninus' kinsman who had launched it (8, 1, *Damn.* 2; cf. Badian in *JRS* 46, 1956, 95—96). In the same year the tribune Calpidius secured the recall of Numidicus, after the ground had been prepared by the latter's son, amid the rejoicing of senate and populace (4, 1, 13 and 5, 2, 7)⁵⁸). The razed site of the house of Flaccus, who had perished in circumstances similar to those of Saturninus' end, was built upon about this time by Catulus (6, 3, 1c), commemorating his victory against the Cimbri in a demonstration of optimate prestige (cf. Badian, *Hist.* 6, 1957).

Valerius thus presents a very full and detailed account of the demagogy of Saturninus, flawed only by one chronological error. In view of the tendentious interpretation of these incidents elsewhere in the sources, his attributions of censure and praise and his general attitude are therefore significant. His own political convictions result in bias against the part played by Saturninus' popular support (cf. especially 9, 7, 2; 3, 8, 6; 9, 7, 3; 9, 7, 1 and 3, 2, 18), antipathy for Saturninus and his associates (styled *seditiosissimorum* at 6, 3, 1c; cf. 3, 8, 6; 8, 6, 2 and 9, 7, 1), and sympathy for the reactionary nobility (3, 8, 4; 8, 1, *Damn.* 2 and 3, 8, 6). In less general terms he sees Saturninus as protagonist of the action, with Numidicus and Equitius of secondary, and Marius only of tertiary, importance;

57) Valerius elsewhere implies that Marius had been cooperative towards the senate in the previous year (9, 12, 4), but does not motivate Scaurus' request.

58) As it took a *privilegium* to secure Numidicus' recall from exile, it is probable that Saturninus' legislation of 100 B. C. was not, after all, rescinded (so Passerini, 'Epigrafiā Mariana', *Ath.* 17, 1939, 66; Gabba, in 'Ricerche su alcuni punti di storia mariana', *Ath.* 29, 1951, 13 does not refute Passerini's arguments for this view, as expressed at *Ath.* 12, 1932, 350—51; cf. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 1958, 210—12). Valerius makes no mention of the fate of this legislation, nor of the procedure by which Numidicus' exile was effected.

there are, respectively, 9 passages which refer to Saturninus' activity, 4 each to that of Numidicus and Equitius — in which the former plays a much more prominent role — and three concerning Marius. Valerius' viewpoint throughout is that of a moralist; i. e. he is not interested in the items of Saturninus' political programme and does not concern himself with the constitutional position of any faction or individual, assessing their actions primarily in moral terms. Such was the attitude of the primary biographical sources (and of Livy). But Valerius has no marked predilection for, or animosity against, any individual politician⁵⁹). His treatment of Marius and Numidicus thus represents the unbiassed viewpoint of a general tradition. Marius is not conceived as a treacherous opportunist (there is, e. g. no (adverse) mention of him in the section 'De fide publica'); there is, in fact, only one criticism of him, that his attitude in suppressing Saturninus for attempting to raise the slaves is hardly consistent with his own appeal to them in 88 (8, 6, 2). It is Scaurus, not Marius, who initiates counter-measures against Saturninus (3, 2, 18); consistently, in itemizing the major achievements of Marius' career elsewhere, Valerius does not bother to notice his suppression of Saturninus (6, 9, 14). But there is no suggestion of any calamitous drop in Marius' prestige; in fact, Valerius thought his action redounded to his credit: *cum magnum et salutarem rei publicae civem in L. Saturnino opprimendo egisset* (8, 6, 2).

Numidicus appears in Valerius' account as the mainstay of senatorial opposition to popular demagoguery. A survey of the passages in which Valerius makes mention of him shows that, as his son gained his political pre-eminence through his agitation for his father's recall, so Numidicus' fame in politics stemmed, fundamentally, from his exile (four of the seven passages which refer to him centre on this). There is no hint of a feud between Numidicus and Marius in this (or any other) year. Though a clear picture of Numidicus' character is drawn — he was efficient, strict and of an old-time continence in his standard of living (2, 7, 2 and 9, 1, 5), without a trace of self-

59) His strictures against Saturninus and Equitius are generalizations of much the same variety as can be found in his remarks on the Gracchi. There is, however, a slight bias in favour of Scaurus, who is represented as initiating the reaction against Saturninus when the situation, and senatorial inaction, had become intolerable (3, 2, 18). But, even so, Scaurus is only mentioned once.

seeking when in office (2, 10, 1), fearlessly opposed to ochlocracy (9, 7, 2), a man of unwavering principle, who would not go back on his word (3, 8, 4) and a stickler for etiquette who always preserved an impassive face before the public (4, 1, 13) — the inadequacy of detail in some of the incidents centred upon him, together with Valerius' ignorance of Rutilius' and Sulla's tendentious interpretation of his relations with Marius, is conclusive evidence that the general tradition of the history of these times, with which Valerius obviously was familiar, did not subscribe to the views of these primary sources. The Furius prosecuted unsuccessfully by Decianus (8, 1, *Damn.* 2), for instance, was subsequently lynched by the people precisely because he had opposed Numidicus' recall. He had acted for Marius in this, as in his legislation against Saturninus' following, so was safe when Decianus, Saturninus' kinsman, prosecuted him before a court composed of *equites*, as the latter supported Marius. In the assembly however, where the nobility had influence, Furius was killed out of hand when an optimate tribune mounted an attack on him (cf. *MRR* 2, 2, 4—5 and 6, n. 5). Valerius has no reference to any of these events. Equally, Numidicus' refusal to recognize Equitius when *ensor* (9, 7, 2) was accompanied by an attempt to remove Saturninus and Glaucia from the senate, an act that resulted in widespread public disorder and was open to serious criticism⁶⁰), all things to which Valerius makes no reference.

In regard to Numidicus' career, the scanty details of his trial for extortion (2, 10, 1), usually dated to follow his proconsulship after his praetorship (*MRR* 1, 539, n. 3; *RE* sv. Caecilius 97, ss. 1218 and 1220), seem rather to indicate a trial in 107. The attitude of Numidicus' jurors hardly suits the year of Memmius' attack on the optimates, which was when Numidicus returned from his first provincial command (*MRR* 1, 541; cf. von Fritz *TAPA* 74, 1943, 160—68). Moreover no criticism, in fact only praise, of this governorship is known (*Cic. Verr.* 2, 3, 209) and Valerius seems to consider Numidicus of *consular* standing when on trial (*quid plus tribui potuit consuli quam est datum reo Metello*, 2, 10, 1). On the other hand, it is known that the tribune Mancinus prosecuted Numidicus for his conduct in Africa on the latter's return in 107 (*MRR* 1, 551) and,

60) Cf. *CAH* 9, 167; Carney, *WS* 73, 1960, 98; De Sanctis, 'Quinto Cecilio Metello Numidico', *op. cit.* 350—51; cf. 346.

before this, Marius' smear campaign against him (Sall. *Jug.* 65, 4) had resulted in repeated clamours for his prosecution (ib. 73, 5). Hence Sallust's description of the unexpectedly friendly atmosphere which met Numidicus on his return (ib. 88, 1) could well refer to this trial, which Valerius regards as an indication of supreme good will. Furthermore, by classing it under the heading 'De maiestate', he suggests the standing achieved by Numidicus in 107 as a consular of renown, rather than that of the relatively junior *vir praetorius* of 111.

In a further reference to the year 100, Valerius comments on Marius' judgement in the Fannia-Titinius divorce under the heading of 'outstanding judgements given in private cases' (8, 2, 3; Plut. *Mar.* 38, 4 dates the case). The choice of Marius as *index* by these inhabitants of Minturnae is explained by archaeological discoveries which show Marius' influence in the region⁶¹). The connection of this incident with Fannia's hospitality to Marius during his flight, an isolated instance of cross-reference, suggests that Valerius' memory for striking occurrences was good, but that he had no systematized procedure for internal reference. Other references explain the scandal caused by Marius' behaviour at the ceremonies attending the consecration of the *aedes Iovis Mariana* built to commemorate his victory over the Cimbri (cf. Plut. *Mar.* 2, 2; this temple was so intimately associated with Marius that Valerius calls it simply 'his monument': 1, 7, 5). An illuminating comparison can be drawn from Numidicus' behaviour when great good news was unexpectedly brought to him while watching games at Tralles — cum ei forte ludos Trallibus spectanti litterae redditaessent, quibus scriptum erat maximo senatus et populi consensu reditum illi in urbem datum, non e theatro prius abiit quam spectaculum ederetur, non laetitiam suam proxime sedentibus ulla ex parte patefecit, sed summum gaudium intra se continuit (4, 1, 13) — quoted with approval as the deportment proper in a public figure in these circumstances. Valerius asserts that Greek-style games were *introduced* by Scaurus' son (2, 4, 7), at his aedilician games in 58, which were of outstanding magnificence (cf. *MRR* 2, 195), so that Marius' Greek spectacle of 100 must have been a novel venture and, surely, an attempt to associate himself with the cultured tastes of the

61) J. Johnson, *Excavations at Minturnae*, 1933, 2, 1, p. 47 n. 29; cf. R. Andreotti, *Cajo Mario*, 1940, 143.

nobility by whom he clearly at this point hoped to be accepted (as is indicated by the conciliatory gesture towards Catulus indicated at 9, 12, 4; cf. Badian, *Hist.* 6, 1957, 323).

References concerning Marius' activities in the nineties are few. His opposition to Numidicus' recall is not mentioned in discussions of that recall (4, 1, 13 and 5, 2, 7; cf. also 8, 1, *Damn.* 2, where his agent Furius is mentioned). There is no mention of his travels in the East, nor of the augurate to which he was elected *in absentia*⁶²). However, his ostensible purpose, that of paying a vow to the Magna Mater, may be obliquely referred to at 6, 1, 12, which is dated to this period by the surrounding context. Equally, 1, 5, 5, *alioquin etiam interpretandarum religionum peritissimus*, may refer to his augural skill. Actually, in religious matters, no clear picture of Marius is uniformly presented; Valerius' language is cautious; it would appear that there was no received view for him to draw on. Marius is depicted as an observer of the traditional religion, but this is not anywhere indicated as being a marked characteristic of his: thus the words *non protinus ad templa deorum et aras tetenderunt* of 2, 8, 7 merely mean in this context that, as was usual, Marius and Cinna did not hold triumph or *ovatio* for the victory gained in a civil war; at 6, 1, 12 the motive impelling Marius to stigmatise a kinsman's homosexual overtures is to be seen in *signa . . . militaria, sacrae aquilae et certissima Romani imperii custos, severa castrorum disciplina* of the previous section; there is no overriding religious motive in this. The temple erected by Marius, after the practice then customary for a victorious general, is mentioned at 1, 7, 5, but not with any emphasis on any religious motive behind its construction. The request of the wives to the defeated Teutons involved a decision concerning Rome's religious practices, but was directed to Marius in his capacity as victorious commander-in-chief in the field (6, 1, 3). Equally, Marius' visit to Pessinus does not seem to have occasioned comment as an outstanding act of piety (1, 1, 1). There is ample material in all this for a representation of Marius as an upholder of traditional religion, had Valerius found such a viewpoint in his sources (his own lack of a system of cross-reference, particularly noticeable in this matter, prevented any such reconstruction of his own). In this regard

62) See Broughton, *Hist.* 2, 1953, 211; *MRR* 2, 9 n. 7 and Badian, 'Sulla's Cilician Command', *Ath.* 37, 1959, 300—301; cf. *Hist.* 6, 1957, 333.

Valerius seems to have considered Marius as of conservative viewpoint in general, without marked religious views (cf. 2, 2, 3).

Valerius' one unequivocal statement, *interpretandarum religionum peritissimus* (1, 5, 5), is confirmed by contemporary sources (Cic. *Balb.* 20, 46). He represents Marius as believing in omens etc., mentioning him specifically under the headings 'De superstitionibus' and 'De ominibus' (1, 3, 4 and 1, 5, 5), twice commenting on his professed credence in the foretelling of the future (1, 3, 4 and 8, 15, 7) and once dilating on Marius' successful diagnosis of, and action on, an omen (1, 5, 5). He does not class Marius with his instances of *simulata religio* (where Sulla is featured at 1, 2, 3), although the incidents of 1, 3, 4 (particularly in view of the word *asserebat*) and 3, 6, 6, might very well be so classed. There is, in fact, some inconsistency in his depiction of Marius in this regard, as the impious pose of 3, 6, 6 can hardly be in accord with traditional beliefs and sanguine *contaminari mensae sacra passus est* of 9, 2, 2 is downright sacrilege.

The explanation of this inconsistency is patent in Valerius' own attitude towards these matters. Clearly, he himself believed in the foreshadowing of future events by omens and the like: relevant passages, written under the assumption of the efficacy of omens, concern Sulla in the Social War (1, 6, 4) and Octavius in the Civil War (1, 6, 10) — the latter passage being particularly striking, in that even the credulous Plutarch unhesitatingly classified Octavius' actions at this time as those of a foolish superstition (*Mar.* 42, 7—9). Valerius conceived Marius as the play-thing of Fortune (6, 9, 14) and the protected agent of her divine will (2, 10, 6)⁶³. Cicero's veridical dream concerning Marius no doubt confirmed him in both convictions, as indicating the *numen* of Fortune working through Marius, even after the latter's death, to produce an omen subsequently proved to have accurately foretold the future (1, 7, 5). Consequently, he interprets incidents concerning Marius in accordance with his own underlying preconceptions: significantly, both the Scipionic prophecy (8, 15, 7) and the omen from the ass (8, 15, 7)

63) This view of Marius enjoyed a great vogue in the rhetorical schools of the first century A.D. and thus the climate of contemporary thought may have predetermined Valerius' own ideas on the subject: see Lucan 2, 68—88; Manilius, 4, 43—49; cf. Silius 13, 857 and Sen. *Controv.* 1, 1, 3.

appear for the first time in Valerius' references to Marius, though such legends had gathered around him at a non-literary level from a very early date (cf. Cic. *Leg.* 1, 1, 2—5).

The facts presented by Valerius suggest a totally different interpretation from that which he puts on them, and one that involves no inconsistency, namely that Marius' religiosity was politically inspired. Clear cases of acts of piety turned to Marius' political advantage are his acquittal of Trebonius (6, 1, 12; cf. Plut. *Mar.* 14, 9), the dedication of the *aedes Iovis Mariana* (1, 7, 5; cf. *ESAR* 1, 286—87), his pilgrimage to the shrine of the Magna Mater (1, 1, 1; cf. Broughton, *Hist.* 2, 1953, 211) and the studied moderation after his victory in the civil war (2, 8, 7). His refusal of the request of the Teutons' wives could also be represented as a defence of the Vestals' traditional religious rites (6, 1, 3). All these actions publicised Marius' conformity to widely and strongly held religious views. The blatant disregard of religious sanctions attendant upon the murder of Antonius (9, 2, 2) and the impiety of Marius' pose as Liber Pater (3, 6, 6) are hardly indicative of sincere religious convictions, whereas the latter pose is a feature of *Religionspolitik* for which there were precedents in previous as in contemporary public life⁶⁴).

Related to this pose — possibly, even, the factor which led Marius to adopt it (cf. Plut. *Mar.* 27, 9) — are the libations offered to him by a grateful populace in Rome at the news of his victory over the Cimbri (8, 15, 7), the value of which for a policy of *Religionspolitik* is obvious. Valerius connects them with Aemilianus' tribute to Marius during the Numantine campaign. This story is possibly apocryphal, possibly an item of widespread gossip at a previously non-literary level⁶⁵), but,

64) Cf. Weinstock, *HTR* 50, 1957, 224; A. Alföldi, 'The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the Coins of the Republic' (in R. A. G. Carson and C. H. V. Sutherland, *Essays in Roman Coinage*, 1956), comments specifically on the crudity of contemporary claims to divine support, at pp. 79—80, and on the sudden development of such *Religionspolitik* in the first century B. C.: pp. 80—84. M.'s attitude of impassivity when Ancharius tried to invoke religious sanctions and constrain M. to save his life (cf. Carney, 'The Death of Ancharius', *Hermes* 88, 1960, 382—84) is quite conclusive in this regard.

65) Valiglio (*Plutarco, Vita di Mario*, 1956, 16) suggests that this is an anecdote *post eventum* but notes other references to the esteem in which Marius was held by Aemilianus (Plut. *Mar.* 3, 2—4 and 13, 2). For their connection see L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, 1960, 306—308.

anyway, Valerius represents Marius as making the maximum propagandist capital out of the omen. Valerius' own language in describing Marius' reliance on his Syrian prophetess indicates doubts as to the sincerity of Marius' faith in her (1, 3, 4); again, such a ruse was common to practitioners of *Religionspolitik*. Marius' discernment that the ass's behaviour constituted an omen may have impressed the simple country-folk who had flocked to Minturnae to his rescue⁶⁶), but, even without such prompting, he must have seen that his only hope of safety lay in flight by sea to Africa, as the Italian mainland was obedient to the orders of the Sullan government. As Valerius has obviously interpreted these facts subjectively — and inconsistently — this reconstruction from the facts themselves is to be preferred, particularly as it is so much more appropriate to the political climate of the time, which Valerius, in this regard as in many others, manifestly failed to understand.

Valerius' pages contain a surprisingly large number of references to the nineties, some of which have already been discussed⁶⁷). From these it appears that the reaction against Saturninus continued in 99, when Titius, a supporter of Saturninus, proposed an agrarian bill in the *popularis* tradition but failed to carry it (8, 1, *Damn.* 3; on 'lata' cf. *Lewis & Short* II 8 b and *MRR* 2, 2). But the recovery of optimate political fortunes was still far from complete, for in this year Sulla failed in candidature for the praetorship (7, 5, 5; cf. Badian, *Ath.* 37, 1959, 280—84). 98 witnessed a dramatic resurgence of the optimates: Titius was convicted of *maiestas* for sympathies for Saturninus (8, 1, *Damn.* 3; cf. *MRR* 2, 3, n. 7); it was only because of an expression of sympathy for Saturninus that the tribune Decianus failed in an almost certain prosecution of Furius, a Marian ex-tribune⁶⁸) (8, 1, *Damn.* 2); Numidicus' son at last managed, after a campaign of tearful supplication (an act of piety from which he made considerable political

66) 1, 5, 5; for the composition of the crowd cf. *Cic. Sest.* 22, 50; *Planc.* 10, 26 (and Carney at *WS* 73, 1960, 113).

67) The chronology established by Badian ('Sulla's Cilician Command', *Ath.* 37, 1959, 279—303) is followed for this period, with the exception of the dating of Marius' augurate. His interpretation of the political background to the period ('Caepio and Norbanus', *Hist.* 6, 1957, 318—46) is also accepted, as providing the most coherent analysis of events.

68) Furius was so unpopular that he was lynched later in the year: *MRR* 2, 5.

capital), to amass enough support to secure his father's return (5, 2, 7; 4, 1, 13). Possibly to this time is to be dated the erection of Catulus' Cimbric *spolia* on the razed site of Flaccus' erst-while dwelling (6, 3, 1c), a monument to optimate prowess built upon a reminder of *popularis* failure. Valerius would seem to date to roughly this period Marius' disparagement of the philhellenism current in optimate circles (2, 2, 3), into which he had previously been trying to secure acceptance by conciliatory tactics. Possibly his change of heart resulted from this exclusive rejection of him by the optimates⁶⁹). There is a hint of his Eastern trip, undertaken in this year (1, 1, 1).

97 saw something of a revival of Marius' fortunes: Decianus, who had prosecuted the prominent Marians Furius and Flaccus, was exiled (8, 1, *Damn.* 2; cf. *MRR* 2, 4—5); there is a hint of Marius' election to an augurate *in absentia* (1, 5, 5)⁷⁰), and mention of the election of the Marian censors Antonius and Flaccus, who expelled the tribune Duronius from the senate for abrogating a sumptuary law (2, 9, 5). The trial of Norbanus in 95, "time of reckoning with Marius and his friends", is also mentioned (8, 5, 2; cf. Badian, *Hist.* 6, 1957, 320), as is that of another Marian, Marcellus (8, 5, 3; probably in 95: cf. Badian, *op. cit.* 329). There is a hint also, possibly, of the trial of Matrinius in the report of Marius' defence of his enfranchisement of the Camertes, a kindred issue⁷¹). Yet another trial is mentioned, that of the Marian Fimbria (8, 5, 2); this cannot be nicely dated but probably occurred in the litigation of the nineties. Significantly, though Scaurus, prosecutor of Fimbria and Norbanus, and Crassus, prosecutor of Marcellus, possessed widespread influence among senators and *equites* respectively, none of these prosecutions was successful (8, 5, 2—3; cf. 5, 2, 8). Hence the dynastic alliance of Crassus with Marius, in or about 94 B.C., hints of which appear in Valerius'

69) Titius' bill must have been in the interests of his veterans and Catulus' monument depreciated Marius' own claims to the credit of the Cimbric victory.

70) Cf. *MRR* 2, 9 n. 7; *Hist.* 6, 1957, 333. This signal honour is more appropriate to 97 than to 98, a year which saw the election of Sulla to a praetorship (cf. Badian, *Ath.* 37, 1959, 284) as well as the other optimate successes detailed above.

71) Cf. 5, 2, 8; cf. *Hist.* 6, 1957, 334 — on Reginus, mentioned as an optimate by Valerius, cf. 4, 7, 3. Criticism for illegality in regard to this act of enfranchisement may however have been directed at Marius late in 100; see discussion above to n. 55.

references to Scaevola's support for Marius in 88 (3, 8, 5) and Marius' defence of him in 87 and afterwards (9, 11, 2); characteristically, Valerius knows nothing of the subsistence of this personal tie (on which, see Badian, *op. cit.* 329).

In 92, with the condemnation of Rutilius Rufus for his part in the model governorship of the province of Asia, came Marius' retaliation for attacks on him via the courts (*cf.* Badian, *op. cit.* 343). Valerius knows nothing of Marius' participation in the prosecution, but is aware of the political nature of the trial: *Rutilio conspiratione publicanorum percusso* (2, 10, 5); *ordinum dissensione . . . reus factus* (6, 4, 4). Valerius comments approvingly on Rutilius' austere integrity, which could transcend even the claims of a friend's intercession, his dignified conduct under any circumstances, and his rigid observance of the letter of the law (6, 4, 4). A mention of his wife's name further indicates his aristocratic standing (*Livia*: 8, 13, 6). But Valerius nowhere attributes to Rutilius the type of military standing which Rutilius himself seems to have claimed (*cf.* *Front.* 4, 2, 2 and compare Valerius 2, 3, 2) and seems to have found that even his condemnation had occasioned little comment in the sources on which he himself drew, to judge by his two meagre references to it ⁷²). To complete the decade there is a reference to the tribunate of Livius Drusus (9, 5, 2). As in the case of Saturninus, Valerius has no conception of Drusus' actual proposals; he comments on an act of physical violence done to the consul Philippus and an act of formal impoliteness on Drusus' part (in summoning the senate to meet him rather than vice-versa). The reference shows the power and contumacy of Drusus late in his career as tribune, and explains optimate hostility to him. Philippus' own attitude to the senate seems to have been hardly more respectful, but draws only a mild reproof from Valerius at 6, 2, 2.

The events of the Social War elicit, relatively speaking, very frequent comments from Valerius. A pithily venomous comment on the activities of the tribune Varius is presumably drawn from Scaurus ⁷³). Though himself of doubtful citizenship (he was a

⁷²) See 2, 10, 5 and 6, 4, 4; for later elaboration of the incident — and its significance — *cf.* Seneca the Younger, *Lucil.* 3, 3, 4; 7, 5, 7; 13, 19, 14; 16, 3, 12; *Provid.* 3, 4; 3, 7; *Consol.* 23, 3; *Vit. Beat.* 18, 3 and *Tranq. An.* 16, 1.

⁷³) The obvious source of Valerius' detailed information concerning law suits; the personal rancour in the charge, its concentrated spite, and

Roman from Spain), Varius forced through a *Lex de Maiestate* (for an enquiry into the persons responsible for the revolt of the allies) in face of the opposition of his fellow tribunes (8, 6, 4). Scaurus was accused by him, under this law, of being bribed into treachery by Mithridates, but successfully repudiated the charge (3, 7, 8)⁷⁴. In the following year Varius fell victim to his own law (8, 6, 4; cf. *MRR* 2, 27) and Marius seems to have thought C. Iulius Caesar⁷⁵) sufficiently responsible for his death to have had the latter's corpse mutilated on Varius' tomb (9, 2, 2).

Valerius' statement that Varius caused the Social War is obviously anachronistic, as the latter's controversial law, by its terms of reference, post-dated the outbreak of the war, and, though the operation of the law further embittered party tensions, it was equally clearly rivalry between Marius and Sulla which precipitated the Civil War (cf. 9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1; 3, 8, 5 and 6, 5, 7), not a faction fight over Varius (8, 6, 4).

the exaggerated denunciation of Varius as the originator of both Social and Civil Wars all indicate the resentment of the aged Scaurus, who had been arraigned by Varius. Significantly, lengthy direct quotation, as reported here, is very infrequent in the *exempla*.

74) Scaurus seems to have frustrated the attempt of Marius and the *equites* to precipitate a war with Mithridates and to have been behind the model governorship of Asia (Badian, *Ath.* 37, 1959, 302). Significantly enough, it was equestrian support that enabled Varius to carry his bill (cf. *MRR* 2, 26). On Scaurus' tactics in defence see Pais, 'M. Emilio Scauro', 160—61; on his involvement with Mithridates see ib. 100, 103 and 112, and Gabba, 'Le origini della guerra sociale e la vita politica romana dopo l'89 a. C.', *Ath.* 32, 1954, 46.

75) Valerius refers to a 'C. Caesaris consularis et censorii' whom Broughton's index (*MRR* 2, 574) shows to be non-existent. The L. Caesar who answers to this description was indeed one of Marius' *inimici* who were killed in 87 (cf. *Hist.* 6, 1957, 337), but H. Bennett (*Cinna and his Times*, Diss. Chicago 1923, pp. 25—26 and n. 8) thinks that his brother is meant, Valerius having mistakenly transferred Lucius' titles to Gaius, whose offence was that he had used the eloquence for which he was famed against Varius. However the repeated slurs on Varius' citizenship (e. g. *propter obscurum ius civitatis Hybrida cognominatus* of 8, 6, 4 and 'Varius Severus Sucronensis' of 3, 7, 8) suggest, and may be justifications of, an obvious course of attack open to Lucius, censor in 89 when Varius fell. It must be borne in mind, however, that Valerius describes Sulla as consul in referring to an incident in 89 (1, 6, 4; cf. *MRR* 2, 36 — but this involves merely a minor anachronism and not an incorrect attribution of titles; cf. also 9, 7, 1). Moreover, whereas L. Caesar's execution in the purge is mentioned nowhere in Valerius, C. Caesar's execution (attributed to Cinna, apparently) is referred to again at 5, 3, 3. The balance of what evidence there is seems thus to support Bennett's conclusions.

Of other events in 89 reference is made to the murder of the *praetor* Asellio by a mob of creditors, enraged at his proposed protective measures for debtors and urged on by the tribune L. Cassius (9, 7, 4). This striking evidence of the financial crisis produced in Rome by the war has been interpreted as a move by indebted landlords violently countered by *equites* and small business-men (*ESAR* 1, 268—69). The parading of P. Ventidius in the triumph of the consul Strabo after his capture of Asculum (6, 9, 9; *MRR* 2, 32) is also mentioned. This is an interesting passage, in that it virtually focusses attention on an Italian by singling him out for mention in this way. It is, in this regard, strongly reminiscent of the passage glorifying the outspokenness of Castricius of Placentia in Cisalpina, which baffled the Marian consul Carbo in 84 (6, 2, 8; *MRR* 2, 60). Valerius again presents an Italian's viewpoint when he dilates upon the prowess of Pulto of Pinna, exercised against a Roman commander in an incident in the Social War (5, 4, *ext.* 7). Also, others of his *exempla* have implicit in them an awareness of the tragic human consequences of this civil war, an attitude which differs markedly from the Roman one, with its obsessive concentration on metropolitan politics considered from an administrative viewpoint. This can be seen in the pitiful little tale of Vettienus, who cut off the fingers of his left hand so that he might not have to participate in the Social War. Valerius, as a true adherent of Caesarism, has only contempt for the man and approval of the punishment visited on him by the senate (6, 3, 3; 5, 5, 4, which is similar in spirit, is considered below). Now Gabba's analysis shows a source of similar viewpoint behind Appian's narrative of the years 133—87 in his first book of *The Civil Wars*; employing an Italian's viewpoint (cf. Gabba, *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili*, 1956, 27—28 and 24), this source considers events in a way uncommon in Roman circles (ib. 73, 79) and stresses social factors (ib. 80). Gabba identifies it with Asinius Pollio (ib. 83), whom Valerius claims to have used as a source at 8, 13, *ext.* 4. As in the case of his claim to have consulted Scaurus, Valerius' citation of Pollio as a source is thus borne out by internal evidence⁷⁶).

It is at this point that Sulla, for the first time in Valerius' references to him, becomes a major figure in the action. As

76) Asinius will thus be the "Historiker der Bürgerkriege" upon whom Helm (146) has shown Valerius to have drawn; cf. *RE* Valerius Maximus 109—110.

there are some inconsistencies in Valerius' presentation of Sulla and as certain of his preconceptions distort his judgement of Sulla on several major issues, his evidence cannot be properly evaluated in detail, so an attempt will be made at this point to reconstruct his overall conception of Sulla, indicating areas of bias or distortion. Valerius makes very frequent reference to Sulla (24 passages have relevance to the following analysis), so that the grouping of references around the various incidents in Sulla's career in itself indicates where Valerius' interests, if not those of his sources, lay. Likewise the range of facets of character selected for illustration outlines Valerius' prejudices and intellectual limitations in historical understanding.

The accompanying table

<i>Incidents in Sulla's career to which reference is made:</i>	<i>Facets in Sulla's character noticed in Valerius' exempla:</i>
Jugurthine War, 6, 9, 6 and 8, 14, 4.	Hypocrisy in religiosity, 1, 2, 3.
Praetorship, 7, 5, 5 (the <i>repulsa</i>).	<i>Crudelitas</i> , 2, 8, 7 and 6, 8, 2.
Social War, 6, 9, 6 and 1, 6, 4.	<i>Iracundia</i> , 9, 3, 8.
March on Rome, 15, 5, 6; 6, 5, 7; 6, 9, 6; 8, 6, 2; 9, 7, <i>Mil. Rom.</i> 1 and 3, 8, 5.	<i>Feritas</i> , 9, 2, 1.
Mithridatic War, 6, 9, 6; 2, 8, 7; cf. 1, 2, 3.	Desire for vengeance, 6, 5, 7.
Civil War on return to Italy, 1, 2, 3; 2, 8, 7; 2, 10, 6; 6, 9, 6; 7, 6, 4; 9, 2, 1; 6, 8, 2; 5, 2, 9; cf. 3, 6, 6 and 6, 4, 4.	Jealous enmity towards Marius, 3, 8, 5; 8, 14, 4 and 5, 2, 9; cf. 9, 2, 1 and 6, 9, 6.
Proscriptions, 2, 8, 7; 9, 15, 5; 5, 3, 5 and especially 3, 1, 2; 9, 2, 1; cf. 7, 5, 5 and 6, 5, 5.	Selfish aims, 7, 6, 4 and 5, 6, 4.
Death, 9, 3, 8.	Contrast of youth with manhood, 6, 9, 6; cf. 9, 2, 1.
	Affectations of Hellenism, 3, 5, 3.
	Ingratitude, 9, 2, 1.
	Aristocratic conservatism, 9, 2, 1.

shows that the largest group of Valerius' references to Sulla concern the civil war on his return to Italy; the next most frequently cited incident is the Sullan proscriptions, to which, however, there are some references (e. g. 9, 2, 1 and 3, 2, 1)

which, for length and intensity of feeling, are without parallel in the remaining *exempla* culled from Sulla's career. The third largest group of references concerns the march on Rome; the Mithridatic War receives three mentions, one very oblique; the Jugurthine and Social Wars are each assigned a pair of notices, the *repulsa* in Sulla's candidature for the praetorship and Sulla's death each being mentioned only once. In fact Valerius, who shows little interest in socio-political issues or constitutional matters (the generalisations of 7, 5, 5 being nearest to an outline of Sulla's achievement in this regard), tends only to appreciate military achievement, which was much easier for him to evaluate. As Sulla's military achievements when in supreme command wreaked havoc in Italy, for Valerius the heart-land of the Empire, Valerius' assessment of his achievement is unfavourable (whereas that of Marius — in his foreign wars only — receives ready praise: contrast e.g. 6, 9, 6 with 6, 9, 14). It is to this bias that Valerius' failure to emphasize Sulla's military prowess, shown on his own evidence to be considerable (as e.g. at 6, 9, 6 and 1, 6, 4), is to be traced: 2, 8, 7 is typical in its depreciatory *cuius crudelissimi et insolentissimi successus fuerunt*. When Valerius does appraise Sulla's military merits it is only to damn them in an hyperbolic and rhetorical antithesis: *dum quaerit victorias, Scipionem (se) populo Romano, dum exercet, Hannibalem repraesentavit* (9, 2, 1). His description of Sulla as 'another Marius' at 8, 6, 2 — again a rhetorical antithesis — probably means to refer to Marius in his capacity of a defender of the constitution rather than of a general. In Valerius' case Sulla's shameless effrontery in trying to appropriate to himself credit for others' military success seems to have induced a considerable disinclination to accept any attribution to Sulla of credit in military matters (cf. 8, 14, 4) and he seems to delight in showing up Sulla's reliance on his subordinates, as e.g. at 5, 2, 9.

After a youth of debauchery Sulla showed real ability in his quaestorship, being instrumental (no more; cf. 8, 14, 4) in securing Jugurtha's capture (6, 9, 6 — a passage which gives in outline Valerius' conception of the significant achievements of Sulla's life; 9, 2, 1 also refers). Valerius seems to date Sulla's enmity for Marius from this point; it can be seen in Sulla's attempt jealously to monopolize all credit for the capture of Jugurtha, by the employment of a signet-ring which symbolically appropriated the credit to himself (8, 14, 4). Valerius

seems to connect Marius' anger at being allocated Sulla as *quaestor* in 107 and his disdain for Sulla on the latter's arrival with the origin of the quarrel (6, 9, 6), so it should, on this evidence, be datable to this time. For Valerius the enmity between Sulla and Marius appears as enmity stemming from Sulla's jealous rivalry, and Marius, who initially despised Sulla, appears rather as a passive figure in the feud (cf. 5, 2, 9; 8, 14, 4 and 6, 9, 6). But the first positive act of enmity is datable to Sulla only in 88 (3, 8, 5). Sulla's hatred for Marius followed the latter even beyond the grave, his ashes being scattered in the Anio (9, 2, 1) and his son pursued vindictively (6, 8, 2; for Sulla's gratitude to Pompeius for help against the Marians cf. 5, 2, 9) — as was Gratidianus, Marius' nephew by adoption (9, 2, 1). Significantly, Sulla is never mentioned in connection with the German War, and the next event recorded in his career, the *repulsa* in his candidature for the praetorship (7, 5, 5), well indicates his relatively minor standing at this point. Thus when Valerius claims that it was Sulla's success against the Samnites at Nola in 89⁷⁷) that inaugurated his subsequent success (1, 6, 4), this judgement is perfectly consistent with all his other evidence for the period: while assigning to Sulla responsibility for the successful conclusion of the Social War (6, 9, 6), Valerius omits all mention of Marius' achievements in the war (6, 9, 14).

To discuss Sulla's career further would involve repetition later in the narrative, as his actions become an integral part of the survey from this point; but assessment of Valerius' view of his character is essential to any evaluation of the facts and motivation presented by Valerius, whose picture is put in moralising and emotional terms, Sulla's character being largely assessed from the actions of the last years of his life. Sulla's

77) Though outlining the success of 89 (which won Sulla the consulship), Valerius describes him as 'consul' (*MRR* 2, 36; a somewhat similar confusion as to title occurs at 9, 2, 2 and at 9, 7, 1; see discussion on C. Caesar, above). It is noticeable that Valerius' grasp of *minutiae* of and sequence of events in the period 89—80 is shaky, particularly where Sulla is concerned, and especially in regard to the Social War, march on Rome, Mithridatic War, Cinnan régime and the war on Sulla's return: 9, 2, 2; 2, 10, 6; 1, 6, 4; and 6, 9, 6; cf. 9, 15, 5. However, as to larger issues, Valerius is supported by the source tradition in his late dating of the outbreak of active hostility on Sulla's part (see Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 231 and n. 4; Carney, *WS* 73, 1960, 111 and Gabba, *Ath.* 35 1957, 369) and of the latter's rise to eminence (see Carney op. cit. 108; Badian *Ath.* 37, 1959, 300 and Valgiglio, *Plutarco Vita di Silla*, 1954, 32).

dominant characteristics, as Valerius presents them, are all unpleasant: a hypocrite in religious matters (1, 2, 3), he was ungrateful in personal relationships (cf. C. Marii, cuius, etsi postea hostis, quaestor tamen aliquando fuerat, ... cineres ... sparsit of 9, 2, 1), given to violent anger (9, 3, 8), vindictive (non se tam incolumem quam Sulpicium Rufum perditum voluit: 6, 5, 7) and insatiably cruel withal (9, 2, 1; cf. 2, 8, 7 and 6, 8, 2). His Graecizing habits did not endear him to the patriotic Valerius (3, 5, 3) who could see nothing but selfish ambition in his career (7, 6, 4 and 5, 6, 4). Valerius' bias is obvious; even in an ostensibly favourable passage such as 7, 5, 5 the use of words such as '*dominus*' and '*potentiae*' indicate an underlying dislike, an attitude which appears even more strikingly in an aside on Sulla appended to a laudation of Rutilius Rufus (6, 4, 4, where the words in exilio, ne quid adversus leges faceret, remansit ... impotentis armis ... quod quidem Sulla rapuit tell the same story). But this bias is not consistently maintained; e.g. at 9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1 responsibility for resistance to Gratidius is attributed to the troops, not to Sulla (whereas 6, 4, 4 implies what was the case, in point of constitutional law, that Sulla's action was treason). A favourable tone appears also at 8, 6, 2. As both these passages are unfavourable to Marius, this inconsistency is perhaps best explained on the assumption that Valerius is here drawing on a source favourable to Sulla. There is an ideological element in this anti-Sullan bias, which has particular reference to the Sullan (and, to a lesser extent, Marian) purges; Valerius is concerned to demonstrate the contrast between the Sullan-type *Putsch* and the *Clementia Caesaris* of the Principate. On this subject he is blind to the distortion of history, as can be seen at 9, 15, 5 and in particular in the words postquam a Sullana violentia Caesariana aequitas rem publicam reduxit⁷⁸). Sulla, then, is done less than justice by Valerius' representation of him.

78) A classical example of the 'double-think' process which perfectly illustrates Valerius' mental conditioning occurs at 2, 8, 7, where, after listing Republican factional struggles, Valerius continues: piget taedetque per vulnera rei publicae ulterius procedere. lauream nec senatus cuiquam dedit nec quisquam sibi dari desideravit civitatis parte lacrimante. ceterum ad quercum pronae manus porriguntur, ubi ob cives servatos corona danda est, qua postes Augustae domus sempiterna gloria triumphant. Another instance of deference to Augustus' memory, likewise indicative of mental conditioning, is discussed by Ramelli at 133—34.

It has thus been established that Valerius, with perfect consistency, considered Sulla's success in 89 in the Social War as the foundation upon which his subsequent pre-eminence was based (cf. discussion to 1, 6, 4 above). For Valerius, Sulla in fact was responsible for victory in this war (Marius is nowhere mentioned in connection with it): 6, 9, 6; cf. 6, 9, 14. However, though Valerius knows of Sulla's propagandist use of his signet-ring, he fails to mention the Victory erected on the Capitol in 89, connected with Sulla's claim to the credit for ending the Jugurthine War and obviously pertinent to the passage in which he makes reference to the ring (8, 14, 4). This group of statuary may not have loomed so large in writers not heavily influenced by Sulla's *Memoirs*.

Of events in the year 88 mention is made of the capture and execution of Aquilius by Mithridates (9, 13, 1); as Aquilius had been Marius' tool in bringing on the Mithridatic War (cf. *MRR* 2, 35—36 and 43; Badian, *Hist.* 6, 1957, 330—31) this must have increased Marius' desire to take over control of operations. But of this Valerius knows nothing; for him it was factional wrangling over Varius that caused this civil war (8, 6, 4; cf. discussion above). Apart from a statement that Marius received his command by a law of Sulpicius' (9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1), there is no explicit indication of any connection between these two. However, Sulla's vindictive fury was, in the issue, directed especially at Marius and at Sulpicius, who had been the main source of trouble for him (3, 8, 5 and 6, 5, 7 respectively), facts which imply that the two had leagued against him. But it is the army which is represented as repudiating Marius' attempt to take it over. In the remark *procul dubio indignati, quod ab summo imperio ad eum qui nullo in honore versaretur transire cogere* (9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 1) appears a criticism of the constitutional propriety of Marius' action, which is corroborated by the implicit condemnation of Marius for calling upon the slaves in an attempt to stay Sulla's army from breaking into the city (8, 6, 2; both passages are discussed above). It is quite clear, however, that Valerius regarded Sulla's actions as unconstitutional: 6, 4, 4; cf. 2, 8, 7.

The *S.C.* which outlawed the Marians is repeatedly mentioned: 3, 8, 5 and 1, 5, 5; cf. 6, 5, 7; 6, 9, 6 and 6, 9, 14). Sulpicius was among those outlawed; he hid in his villa, but was betrayed and executed (3, 5, 7). There is a hint of Catulus' insistence on strong measures against Marius (9, 12, 4); Sulla,

too, eagerly desired them and Scaevola's was the only dissentient voice in the terrorized senate which passed the motion of outlawry (3, 8, 5)⁷⁹). Sulla's abortive legislation may be referred to at 7, 5, 5; characteristically, Valerius has little interest in such matters, though he is of opinion that Sulla was a champion of the rights of the nobility (9, 2, 1 — where the words *egregie . . . auctoritate nobilitatis defensa* probably, however, refer more specifically to the Sulla of 82).

Of Marius' romantic flight and exile the incident which caught Valerius' fancy was Marius' near execution at Minturnae, mentioned at length three times: 2, 10, 6; 1, 5, 5 and 8, 2, 3. Apart from this, however, there is little reference to this episode, so that only a discontinuous picture emerges from Valerius' *exempla*. Marius first appears near Minturnae; he had been caught in a marsh; he was dragged out and haled into Minturnae, the senate's ban of outlawry being observed. He was put under house arrest, but Fannia, a matron mindful of a *beneficium* experienced from Marius, volunteered her home for this purpose and showed him every kindness there (8, 2, 3). At this point some inconsistency, which is, however, more apparent than real, emerges. From one passage it appears that a public slave of Cimbric nationality was sent in to execute him, but panicked before the enormity of such a deed and fled, throwing his sword away. At this the inhabitants of Minturnae let Marius go free (2, 10, 6). Another *exemplum* has it that a mob gathered to assist Marius when it was discovered that he was under house arrest, and that Marius got them to take him to the coast (1, 5, 5). The former passage is marred by anachronisms: *nec fuit eis timori asperrima Sullae victoria, cum praesertim ipse Marius eos a conservando Mario abstertere posset* — where the *asperrima victoria* is surely that of 82 B.C. (cf. 9, 2, 1) and the reference to Marius must be to the vindictive figure who was to lead the Cinnan counter-coup in 87 — of neither of which developments can the 'Minturnenses' have had knowledge in 88. Moreover, there are rhetorical flourishes, which analysis has shown to be

79) Apparently the motion declaring the Marian leaders public enemies was the *S.C. ultimum*: cf. the parallel drawn between Marius' case and that of Saturninus in 100 at 8, 6, 2; the senate's decision, specifically cited at 3, 8, 5 and 1, 5, 5, is nowhere described as having been ratified by the assembly. Valerius accepts the propriety of this measure without misgiving (on its dubious validity see von Fritz, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*, 1954, 233—34 and 282—84; Valgiglio, *Silla e la crisi repubblicana*, 1956, 15 and Carney, *WS* 73, 1960, 112).

characteristic of Valerius' thought processes, in the references to the gods and fate. Presumably then Valerius has subjectively interpreted a hard core of fact centring round the Cimbric slave. As it is only the motivation for the release of Marius in 2, 10, 6 which clashes with the evidence of 1, 5, 5, the passages can be reconciled by a reconstruction based on the facts in either account: the authorities in Minturnae decided to obey the senate's decree and to have Marius executed. But the public slave baulked at his task, which had to be performed in a household of Marius' supporters surrounded by a large crowd of the lower orders which had flocked there to protect Marius, the saviour of Italy. In view of these circumstances, it was decided that Marius be escorted to the coast and provided with a ship for his proposed voyage to Africa. This flight to Africa, twice mentioned by Valerius (1, 5, 5 and 6, 9, 6), is the only other incident explicitly recorded by Valerius that is pertinent to this episode. Possibly, however, the behaviour of a certain Sextilius in the purge following upon the Marian-Cinnan counter-coup is to be connected with the hostile attitude to Marius at this point of a Sextilius, governor of Africa. Certainly the unprincipled ingratitude Sextilius showed to his benefactor C. Caesar, who had been proscribed as an *inimicus* of Marius', suggests a desperate attempt at conciliation which would be natural if he were the Sextilius who had thus shown Marius hostility in the recent past (5, 3, 3; cf. Plut *Mar.* 40, 7—9).

Of other events in 88 is recorded the murder of Q. Pompeius Rufus by the troops of Cn. Pompeius Strabo when the former, on the senate's instructions, proceeded to take over the latter's army, of which Strabo had irregularly retained command. Valerius states categorically that the troops were incited to this murder by Strabo (9, 7, *Mil. Rom.* 2; cf. *ib. Mil. Rom.* 1). There may be a reference to the agitations for Marius' return by the wealthy ladies of his faction in an aside upon Sulla's execution of women in the proscriptions (*adversus mulieres quoque gladios destrinxit, quasi parum caedibus virorum satiat*: 9, 2, 1). However, the next incident specifically mentioned is the armed conflict between Octavius and Cinna in 87. No explicit judgement is passed on the cause of strife or constitutional position of either faction; characteristically, Valerius was interested rather in Octavius' superstition (though he chose not to class it as such): 1, 6, 10; cf. Plut. *Mar.* 42, 7—9.

However, the words (Octavius) *armis cum collega suo dissidens* Cinna here used may just possibly imply that Octavius caused the quarrel. The suffect consulship of L. Cornelius Merula is also noticed (9, 12, 5). Two incidents in the ensuing civil war receive comment: the capture of Placentia from Octavius' commander there, P. Caelius (described as 'effected by the Cinnan forces': 4, 7, 5; cf. *MRR* 2, 51), and a battle between the forces of Strabo and Sertorius (5, 5, 4)⁸⁰, who is elsewhere favourably described as 'equally well endowed with physical and mental strength' (7, 3, 6). For Valerius Sertorius figures pre-eminently as the leader of the subsequent Spanish War (cf. 1, 2, 4; 7, 6, *Ext.* 3; 8, 15, 8 and 9, 1, 5); he is never mentioned in references to this, or any other, period of Marius' career⁸¹) and would, therefore, seem not to have been of foremost importance in Cinna's *consilium*.

There is no reference as to how, or why, Marius returned from Africa. When mentioning the fighting of this civil war Valerius seems to regard the issue as one between Octavius and Cinna (1, 6, 10 and 4, 7, 5). In regard to the bloodshed attendant upon the re-entry of Marius into Rome, however, his attribution of responsibility is not nearly so precise. His actual statements are recorded in the following table, but internal contradictions make the evidence unreliable in the respects indicated.

<i>Responsibility mutual.</i>	<i>Marius responsible.</i>	<i>Cinna responsible.</i>	<i>Individual⁽⁸²⁾ deaths.</i>	<i>Person responsible.</i>
2, 8, 7;	2, 10, 6;	1, 6, 10;	Antonius	Marius: 9, 2, 2, (but cf. 8, 9, 2).
4, 3, 14;	6, 9, 14;	5, 3, 3;		
(5, 6, 4);	9, 2, 2;	6, 9, 6.	Caesar	Marius: 9, 2, 2 (but cf. 5, 3, 3).
8, 9, 2;	9, 12, 4.			

80) As Valerius' introduction of this *exemplum* states, this honorific mention of a ranker is exceptional in his references to Rome's history, which concern the administrative class almost exclusively. An awareness of the sufferings of the lower orders, not usual in Valerius in a military context, is also evident. Other such passages have been discussed (n. 76 and discussion thereto) and Asinius Pollio has been suggested as their source.

81) The *exemplum* at *Nep. Epit.* 21, 3, referring to Caepio's defeat in 105, is not to be found in Valerius. His only reference to Sertorius which does not centre on the Spanish War concerns a pretender who claimed to be his son (9, 15, 3).

82) The account of Marius' receiving Antonius' head while actually at table (9, 2, 2) suggests the account of Mark Antony's receiving the head

9, 12, 5.	Catulus	Marius: 9, 12, 4.
	Merula	Both Marius and Cinna: 9, 12, 5.
	Octavius	Cinna (possibly): 1, 6, 10.

Of the first group of these passages, 2, 8, 7 and 4, 3, 14, speaking in general terms of the bloodshed, assign responsibility to Cinna and Marius and to Marius and Cinna respectively. 5, 6, 4 classes Sulla, Marius and Cinna as equally lacking in *pietas erga patriam*, presumably in this context referring to their readiness to wage civil war rather than sacrifice their lives to avoid it. 8, 9, 2 assigns responsibility for the killing of Antonius to both Marius and Cinna (in that order); as 9, 2, 2, however, intimates that Marius was alone responsible, this brings up the question of Valerius' accuracy, especially as 9, 2, 2 seems to assign the responsibility for C. (L?) Caesar's killing to Marius, whereas 5, 3, 3 seems to impute it to Cinna. It has been shown that Valerius had an imperfect grasp of the *minutiae* of this period and that he had no adequate system of internal reference in his work, so these discrepancies may simply be errors. However, Marius had a very good motive — given his *nimia cupiditate persequendi inimicos* (9, 2, 2) — for desiring the deaths of the renegades Antonius and Caesar, and the treachery to the latter of Sextilius seems to indicate an attempt at ingratiating by the ex-governor of Africa, who had reason to fear Marius' anger (see above on 5, 3, 3)⁸³. However, the

of Caesetius Rufus (9, 5, 4; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 83, 25): the latter tale so obviously caps the former that the atrocity-mongering of the propaganda war of pamphlets between Antony and Octavian is strongly suggested (see M. P. Charlesworth, 'Fragments of the Propaganda of Mark Antony' *C. Q.* 27, 1933, 172—77; cf. K. Scott, 'Octavian's Propaganda and Antony's *De Sua Ebrietate*' *CP* 24, 1929, 133—41). It may well be that Antony emphasized this action of M., Octavian's *popularis* ancestor, as part of his criticism of Octavian's shameful ancestry. Badian assembles a full list of the victims and attempts to indicate responsibility at *Hist.* 6, 1957, 339 and n. 177. For fuller discussion cf. Bennett, *op. cit.* 24—40 and C. Lanzani, *Storia interna di Roma negli anni 87—82 a. C.; parte prima: il VII consolato di Mario*, 1907, 96—124.

83) As Marius had large vested interests and much support in Spain (cf. respectively Carney, 'Coins bearing on the Age and Career of Marius', *N. C.* 19, 1959, 81 and Gabba, 'Le origini della guerra sociale e la vita politica romana dopo l'89 a. C.', *Ath.* 32, 1954, 81—89; cf. 61 f.) he might

point of 9, 2, 2 is not that Marius was responsible for the killings but that he rejoiced at the dismemberment of the corpses, so the inconsistency is more apparent than real. Bennett's explanation, that the fate of the Sullan leaders was decided at a conference of the leaders of the Marian-Cinnan group on security grounds (*Cinna and his Times* Diss. Chicago 1923, p. 25), best resolves the difficulty: the killings were effected under the *aegis* of Marius and Cinna (effectively the policy-formers as faction leaders — a realistic viewpoint) or of Cinna alone (a constitutionalist's viewpoint, reasoning from his senior magisterial status)⁸⁴. Hence, at 9, 12, 5 both leaders are assigned responsibility for Merula's death, although this, like Octavius', was more likely to have been desired by Cinna⁸⁵).

This explanation reconciles all the remaining inconsistencies, implicit or otherwise. In two passages, 6, 9, 14 and 2, 10, 6, Marius alone is mentioned in connection with responsibility for the proscriptions. 6, 9, 14 is an outline sketch of his career; an antithesis in highly rhetorical terms — *cui post exilium consulem creari proscriptoque facere proscriptionem contigit* (a straining after paradoxical antithesis suitable to its chapter heading — 'De mutatione morum aut fortunae' — makes the passage suspect for overstatement in other regards: see above, discussion on Marius' early career)⁸⁶ — the passage is far too generalized to be taken as explicitly singling Marius out for sole responsibility. The same applies to *ipse Marius eos a conservando Mario abstertere posset* of 2, 10, 6; likewise a rhetorical flourish involving overstatement (anachronism: see discussion, above, of Marius' flight). The reference to Catulus'

very well have used Varius as a tool (as e.g. he utilised Saturninus and Sulpicius; on the vested interests behind Varius cf. *MRR* 2, 26 and Pais, 'M. Emilio Scauro', 167) and so he might well have been concerned to avenge him (as Valerius claims he was, 9, 2, 2). On the renegades cf. *Hist.* 6, 1957, 323 and 336—37 for Caesar, and 321—23 with 341—42 for Antonius.

84) Valerius' uncertainty would, in this case, be perfectly explicable: he was not sufficiently versed in the constitution or factional life of the Republic to appreciate the failure of his sources to agree upon or specifically to assign responsibility.

85) Successful prosecution of Merula for high treason (cf. *C. A. H.* 9, 262) would retrospectively legalise Cinna's actions as well as satisfy his personal rancour (see also Lanzani, *op. cit.* 114; on Octavius cf. Bennett, 25).

86) Nn. 34—36 and discussion thereto. Moreover the term 'proscribe' originated in the Sullan *Putsch* of 82 (cf. H. Volkmann, *Sullas Marsch auf Rom*, 1958, 64) so, conceptually, Valerius is also guilty of anachronism.

death well indicates Valerius' tendencies to over-statement through over-simplification: without qualification Marius is said to have ordered Catulus' death, when it would appear that his remark that Catulus 'must die' was simply an adamant refusal to alter the decision of his faction although Catulus made intercession to him to do so⁸⁷). Valerius' remark that this incident *maximus Marianae gloriae rubor exstitit* agrees with the evidence of the contemporary tradition (cf. Carney, *WS* 73, 1960, 115—16) and would seem to limit the area of Marius' responsibility for the blood-letting. Moreover, Sulla's immolation of Marius' kinsman Gratidius on Catulus' tomb (9, 2, 1), after the fashion of Marius' mutilation of Caesar on Varius' (9, 2, 2), indicates that he felt that the responsibility for Catulus' death lay with Marius. There is possibly an implication in 1, 6, 10 that Octavius' death was connected with his quarrel with Cinna, but the passage is concerned with the fulfilment of the oracle and personalities are a secondary consideration, so it cannot be pressed. The remark at 6, 9, 6 that (Sulla) *Cinnae dominationem fregit* must likewise be interpreted carefully. The forced antitheses which Valerius apparently felt to be required under this chapter-heading ('*De mutatione morum aut fortunae*') have already occasioned difficulties, and this passage is flawed by anachronisms (shown in note 77, on Valerius' imperfect grasp of the chronology of this decade). Anyway the words *Cinnae dominationem* are better taken to refer generally to the latter's government during his four consulships (87—84) than to this period of blood-letting.

Valerius consistently speaks of Marius' conduct in terms of the strongest moral condemnation. In his excessive eagerness to pursue personal vendettas Marius gained himself more obloquy than he had gained praise for his military achievements: 9, 2, 2 (however, this passage, containing one serious error and much rhetorical overstatement, cannot simply be taken at its face value). His cruelty (*crudelium victorum* 2,8,7), savagery (*saevissimis ducibus*, 4,3,14) and insolence (*insolentissimis victoribus*, 9,12,5) are stressed (cf. 2,10,6 and 6,9,14). But there is mention of some moderation (2,8,7) and the fact that Scaevola was violently attacked immediately upon Marius'

87) Cf. Bennett, 27—28. However, as the execution of Catulus was clearly due to his vendetta with Marius, the latter was ultimately responsible for his suicide and Valerius' source may well have ignored the legal niceties and realistically given the basic, substantial truth.

death (9,11,2) indicates implicitly that Marius had protected him. Though Valerius elsewhere classifies Marius under the heading 'De gratis' (re the enfranchisement of the Camertes at 5,2,8), he fails to note this repayment of Scaevola's courageous stand in 88 (3,8,5). Consistently, however, Marius is not taken as a type-example under the headings 'De ingratis', 'De ira aut odio', 'De ultione' (or taken to task under 'De moderatione'), though, in view of Valerius' inadequate system of internal reference, such an argument can obviously not be taken to imply too much. Still, it is significant that, though this period of Marius' life receives very frequent mention in Valerius, where it is the second most frequently cited period, it comes a very poor second to that of the Germanic campaigns (principally 101), if frequency of mention can be taken to indicate the degree of significance which Valerius places on a matter. Further, comparison with Valerius' treatment of the Sullan proscriptions is informative (though Valerius' bias must be borne in mind). The Sullan proscriptions are easily the most frequently cited incident in Sulla's career. That this fact is significant is indicated by another, that they are given longer, fuller and more elaborate treatment than any other incident (cf. 3,1,2 and 9,2,1 — the latter is far and away the longest and most detailed comment on any incident of the whole period covered by this study — and also 7,5,5 and 9,3,8).

Passages in which reference is made to the Sullan proscriptions sometimes also cite those of (Cinna and) Marius: always the comparison is of the greater to the lesser: 2, 8, 7; 2,10,6 and 9,2,1—2. But the most striking feature in Valerius' reference to the Sullan, as opposed to the Marian, purge, is the readiness in the former case to give detailed statistics (9,2,1; 3,1,2 and 6,2,8), contrasted to vague references to the spilling of civilian blood in the latter case (*hauserunt quidem avidi civilem sanguinem*: 2,8,7; *in illa quoque procella, quam C. Marius et L. Cinna rei publicae inflixerant*: 4, 3, 14; *Marianos Cinnanosque mucrones civilis profundendi sanguinis cupiditate furentes*: 8,9,2; cf. 6,9,14 and 2,10,6, and compare the statistics of 9,2,1 with those of 9,2,2). Both themes are probably over-worked to emphasize the *Clementia Caesaris* but that of the Marian purge evidently is built upon a very limited number of killings of distinguished citizens, whereas Sulla's proscriptions obviously involved deaths in the five-figure numeral range.

Consistently with this, Valerius makes reference to the *abstinentia populi Romani mirifica* in refraining from pillage of the property of those executed, though this had apparently been allowed (4,3,14; Ammian corroborates this detail at 30,8,9). This indicates that the executions were confined to the upper class and that an atmosphere of good order was prevalent in Rome. Catulus' appeal to Marius should imply that some Marian leaders used their influence to save individuals among those marked down for execution. And, in fact, Valerius twice refers to one such case in 87: Cn. Carbo apparently exerted great efforts to save the life and property of the young Pompey, son of Strabo, who had opposed the Marian-Cinnan faction (5,3,5 and 6,2,8).⁸⁸ It would appear that Marius, too, used his influence in this way, inasmuch as Scaevola, his kinsman and supporter, was attacked at Marius' very funeral (9,11,2; cf. 3,8,5). This was, of course, in the second group of killings in 86, which Valerius does not distinguish; however, the remark *C. Cinna et C. Marius hauserant quidem avidi civilem sanguinem, sed non protinus ad templa deorum et aras tetenderunt* is not an erroneous statement made in ignorance of the death of Ancharius in this year (cf. Carney, *Hermes*, 88, 1960, 382—84), but, in this context, means merely that Marius and Cinna did not hold any formal triumphal-type procession. Valerius knows, of course, of Marius' consulship in this year but, characteristically, has no comment of a political or constitutional nature to make on it: 6,9,14. Marius' proposed campaign against Sulla is nowhere mentioned. Likewise Valerius knows of no special circumstances attendant upon Marius' death; it is not mentioned under 'De mortibus non vulgaribus', yet allusion is twice made to it in passing (at 9,2,1 and 9,11,2), so that the lack of further comment should indicate that, unlike Sulla's death (9,3,8), there were no noteworthy features attaching to it in the tradition available to Valerius.⁸⁹

88) See Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 239 n. 6 and 278 n. 2.

89) In view of the Plutarchean version (*Mar.* 45, 1—12), it is interesting to note that Marius is nowhere classed as a type-figure under the heading 'De cupiditate gloriae' and that Valerius does not seem to have regarded Sulla's achievement against Mithridates very highly, to judge by the fleeting reference at 6,9,6, so that, on Valerius' showing of their respective military abilities, Marius would scarcely have been afraid of an impending campaign against him. The reference to Marius' (presumed)

Valerius does, however, give statistics, with names, in his discussions of the Marian purge and the Sullan proscriptions, so this is an appropriate point to assemble his evidence for the composition of the Marian faction. But it must be borne in mind that Valerius was poorly informed of this aspect of Republican politics and also that the composition of the Marian faction changed radically during the nineties (cf. Badian, *Hist.* 6, 1957, 343). Consequently his evidence needs careful assessment; with particular attention to its chronology.⁹⁰⁾

Marius' *amici* number Aemilianus, with whom Marius, as *contubernalis*, must have been in a client relationship in 134—33 (8,15,7); he is the only *amicus* datable with certainty on Valerius' evidence prior to the period from 110. Prior to 104 the Lusii, his kinsmen, are to be so classed (6,1,12). Memmius, too, was a Marian of about this date,⁹¹⁾ along with Antonius (cf. above discussion of 3,7,9 apropos of the year 111), Domitius (6,2,8 and 6,5,5), Gratidius (9,7, *Mil. Rom.* 1 — an incident of 88, but see the discussion of Marius' social background at the beginning of this study) and Gratidianus (9,2,1 — an incident of 82, but the same applies).

As Marians possibly of this date are to be numbered Perperna, M. Brutus and Cn. Carbo (6,2,8), the latter family

terror before Sulla at 3, 1, 2, is too obviously a rhetorical hyperbole to be taken to substantiate Plutarch's view.

90) Only such names are given as appear among Marius' *amici* or *inimici* according to Valerius' own express statement or the internal evidence of his *exempla* (e.g. Crassus is not included because, though his prosecution of Marcellus is mentioned (8, 5, 3), Valerius nowhere indicates the factional affiliation of either).

91) This attribution arises from Scaurus' enmity to him (dated to 102 in the discussion, above, of metropolitan politics in that year) and other Marians (8, 5, 2; cf. 3, 7, 9 and discussion in text to Antonius in 111). Memmius' political activity began in 111 and was terminated by his murder by Saturninus in 100 (*MRR* 1, 576 and 2, 590) so his *amicitia* with Marius presumably falls within these dates. The enmity of the Marians for Scaurus can be seen from the prosecution of Scaurus by Varius (Marius' client: cf. 9, 2, 2) in 90 (3, 7, 8), and is corroborated by an attack on Scaurus by the Marian Domitius (cf. 6, 2, 8) in 104 (6, 5, 5); moreover, Fimbria, who was prosecuted by Scaurus (8, 5, 2), seems to have deferred to Marius in not attacking Scaevola until after Marius' death (9, 11, 2; cf. 3, 8, 5), and thus to have been a Marian. Valerius does not describe Scaurus as Marius' *amicus* when the former made his appeal in 100 (3, 2, 18); he might have done so as *princeps senatus* and in the knowledge of Marius' current conciliatoriness towards the optimates (cf. 9, 12, 4). Valerius' picture of Scaurus' relationship with Marius is thus consistently that of hostility but not of a bitter personal feud.

being especially prominent adherents (7,6,4 — though it did produce a turn-coat: 9,7, *Mil. Rom.* 3; cf. *MRR* 2,81), and Norbanus (8,5,2). In 100 Marius gained the adherence of Fannia, a lady of note in Minturnae, and lost that of her husband Titinius (8,2,3).⁹² All other adherents mentioned by Valerius are those of the years following 88 B. C. Marians of this epoch were Scaevola (3,8,5; cf. 9,11,2; he became a Marian about 94 as stated above), Sulpicius Rufus (necessarily Marius' associate because the anger of Marius' enemy Sulla was especially directed at them both: 6,5,7; cf. 3,8,5), P. Annius (9,2,2) and, at the end of this decade, Telesinus (6,8,2), Sertorius (7,3,6), M. Plaetorius (9,2,1) and Granius (9,3,8). Strikingly noticeable is Marius' following in the Italian municipalities (even of Sucro in Spain if Varius is anything to go by: 3,7,8 and 9,2,2; see discussion above), either as expressed in the active support of Minturnae (1,5,5) and Camerinum (5,2,8) — both partizan from c. 100 B. C. (general widespread posthumous support is indicated at 9,15,1), or reflected by opposition to Sulla at Praeneste (6,8,2 and 9,2,1); Puteoli (9,3,8), and elsewhere (2,8,7; 3,1,6; also indicated by the 4,700 proscribed of 9,2,1).

In 101 Marius had enjoyed great popularity with the urban plebs (8,15,7). This, like much of his support among the Roman aristocracy, was of an ephemeral nature;⁹³ the plebs were hostile in 87 (4,3,14). Evidence on his *inimici*, as was the case with that on his *amici*, is scanty for the period preceding 111 B. C. Scaurus' *inimicitia* has been shown to have been of long-standing, if not of great bitterness; Sulla's probably dates from his quaestorship in 107 (6,9,6; cf. 3,8,5; 5,2,9 and 9,2,1). The Lusii and Titinii would be enemies from 104 and 100 respectively (6,1,12 and 8,2,3). By late 100 Saturninus and Equitius (never mentioned as Marius' allies) must have become his bitter foes (8,6,2 and 9,7,1). By 87 Merula (9,12,5), C. Caesar (9,2,2; cf. 5,3,3), P. Caelius and L. Petronius (see on Placentia below), and Antonius, Catulus and Pompey (see

⁹² The relationship commenced by M.'s *beneficium*, as Fannia regarded his judgement in 100 (compare 8, 2, 3 with *Plut. Mar.* 38, 5—6), and was cemented by the marriage of Marius' son, for the sister of the bride's grandmother, Laelia the elder, was married into the Fannii.

⁹³ Renegade Marians amongst the aristocracy, on Valerius' showing, were Antonius (9, 2, 2; cf. 3, 7, 9), Catulus (9, 12, 4) and Pompey (saved by the Marian leader Carbo in 87 — 5, 3, 5 and 6, 2, 8 — he subsequently went over to Sulla: 5, 2, 9).

previous note) were also enemies; Cethegus' hostility (cf. 9,2,1) is not precisely dateable but presumably of this period. Hostile regions were (possibly) Arpinum (c. 130 B. C.; 6,9,14; but this passage is too rhetorical to be valuable as evidence) and Placentia, which fought against Cinna in 87 (4,7,5) and Carbo in 84 (6,2,8; cf. *MRR* 2,60).

Valerius' depiction of Marius' character is marred by much inconsistency, as might be expected from an excerptor who has to make facts fit into certain predetermined categories. It may be that occasional contradictions are caused by conflicting bias in the sources on which Valerius drew: e.g. at 2, 2, 3 Marius is lauded as the maintainer of ancestral customs, while at 2, 3, 1 he is criticised for wilfully changing them. Sometimes rhodomontade carries Valerius away; thus Marius, characterised as the possessor of great strength of mind at 6, 9, 14, and as having a bold and martial spirit at 8, 2, 3, is made less brave than a small child at 3, 1, 2, where a hyperbolic comparison is desired. Again, Valerius' political *naïveté* often leads him to analyse in the terms of private morality an action taken under the pressure of factional politics: 8, 6, 2 involves something of this and the inconsistency between Marius' piety at 6, 1, 12 and impiety at 3, 6, 6 and 9, 2, 2 is caused by Valerius' failure to appreciate that all three acts were politically inspired (see discussion above on Marius' religiosity). Moreover Valerius' nationalistic and conservative attitudes and general moralising bent make him regard certain actions of Marius' in an emotional rather than intellectual fashion, as is shown by the eulogizing remarks at 2, 2, 3 (for opposition to learning) and 5, 2, 8 (on a breach of constitutional practice) in contrast with the castigation of 2, 3, 1 (of an inevitable military reform).

However, if the facts rather than their motivation as supplied by Valerius be correlated, a vivid character-depiction results. Marius appears as a man of great physical and mental strength and unwavering determination (6,9,14 and 8,2,3).⁹⁴ He was strongly attached to traditional custom in regard to education and morality, especially where this involved discipline (2, 2, 3 and 6, 1, 12), but looked to the spirit rather than the letter of the law where these conflicted (8, 2, 3; 5, 2, 8 and

⁹⁴ The hyperbolic contrast of 3, 1, 2 is obviously an overstatement and is in conflict with all Valerius' other references to Marius' character, none of which imply cowardice. Consequently it is best not pressed into use as historical evidence, especially as no facts are advanced to support it.

6, 1, 12). Though he could disregard the claims of kinship to reach an equitable decision (6, 1, 12), he was a very emotional man where personal loyalties were concerned; though non solum praecipuus, sed etiam praepotens gratae (Marii) mentis fuit impetus (5, 2, 8), if crossed his excessive desire for vengeance knew no bounds: nimia cupiditate persequendi inimicos . . . sanguine contaminari mensae sacra passus est (9, 2, 2). Coupled with his determination, these strong emotions led to ruthless ambition (cf. 5, 6, 4), perhaps in overcompensation for a feeling of inferiority in regard to his social background:⁹⁵ 6, 9, 14; 3, 6, 6 and 8, 6, 2. Valerius' overall estimate of Marius, as shown e. g. in his use as a type-figure chosen to illustrate an *exemplum*, shows that his verdict was on the whole unfavourable; Marius is classified as a model instance only three times, as against some six mentions in depreciatory categories, thus:

Favourable classifications.

De institutis antiquis: 2, 2, 3.

De gratis: 5, 2, 8.

De pudicitia: 6, 1, 12.

Depreciatory classifications.

(but 2, 3, 1 castigates).

De superstitionibus: 1, 3,
Nep. 4.

Qui . . . licentius sibi quam
mos patrius permittebat
indulserunt: 3, 6, 6.

(De pietate (*in det. part.*):

5, 6, 4 — but Marius is not
really central to the
exemplum).

Qui quae in aliis vindicant
ipsi commiserunt: 8, 6, 2.

De crudelitate: 9, 2, 2.

It is impossible to estimate what the attitude to Marius of the sources used by Valerius was, as much of this classification is of Valerius' own contriving (e. g. the manifestly erroneous 2, 3, 1; the naïf 1, 3, 4 and 3, 6, 6). However this

⁹⁵ 2, 3, 1: novitatis suae conscientia vetustati non sane propitius. However this passage cannot be pressed as it involves a manifestly wrong explanation of Marius' initiation of volunteer enrolment and is in blatant contradiction to his entire indifference to popular censure as is strikingly shown in all other relevant passages in Valerius (3, 6, 6; 5, 2, 8; cf. patientia deinde repulsarum inrupit magis in curiam quam venit of 6, 9, 14; 2, 2, 3; 8, 2, 3 and 9, 2, 2); see discussion above on Marius' social background.

may be, the picture of Marius that emerges from Valerius' excerpting is that of a ruthless, *popularis*-type political adventurer with a Catoic pose as an old-fashioned military man.

As opposed to his picture of Marius' character, Valerius' estimate of Marius' achievement and failures is clearly and consistently expressed. As has already been indicated, he assigns to Marius the credit for the overthrowing of Jugurtha and the German invaders (2, 10, 6; 6, 1, 3; 6, 9, 14 and 8, 15, 7). As indication of the magnitude of the latter success in particular, he quotes a remark by a contemporary that Marius was the saviour of Rome and Italy (3, 8, 5); the Roman populace and Marius at the time, and, apparently, Valerius also, considered this a nearly godlike achievement (8, 15, 7; 3, 6, 6 and 2, 10, 6; cf. also 1, 7, 5 where Marius, god-like, appears in a dream — it behoved a writer of Tiberius' day not to underestimate the difficulties involved in military conflict with the Germans). He once cites the suppression of Saturninus as a glorious achievement (8, 6, 2), but his outline sketch of Marius' career, given at 6, 9, 14, is consistent with all his other references to the first century in not crediting Marius with responsibility for victory in the Social War⁹⁶) or the war of his return to Rome. This can be no accident because Valerius refers with great frequency to the Social War and to Marius' flight, exile and return; after the Germanic War and the Marian proscriptions they are easily the next most frequently cited incidents (the years 88 to 86 accounting for well over half of his references concerning Marius). Valerius associates Marius with Aemilianus in military prowess (8, 15, 7) and with Cicero in distinction (2, 2, 3; cf. 1, 7, 5 for the link between the two). Consistently, Valerius cites Marius as a type-figure under the heading 'De maiestate' (2, 10, 6) and 'Quae cuique magna contigerunt' (8, 15, 7). It is characteristic of Valerius' limited historical understanding and interests that Marius is only mentioned as frequently as Rutilius (once; cf. 2, 3, 1 and 2, 3, 2) and half as frequently as Numidicus (2, 7, 2 and 9, 1, 5) for his military reforms. Typically, the reform mentioned, though far more important than those of the other

96) 6, 9, 14 only states, of the war of Marius' return, that Marius succeeded in obtaining a consulship and in promoting a proscription after his exile; when compared to the description of Marius' actions prior to 100 B. C. (which precedes) there is no implication of military achievement in this.

two, is disparaged because Valerius conceives of moral objection to it.

It is to the application of this criterion of morality that Valerius' low valuation of Marius' overall achievement is to be ascribed. The statement *paene tanti victoriae eius non fuerunt, quarum oblitus plus criminis domi quam laudis in militia meruit* (9, 2, 2) is not a mere rhetorical flourish: the *Putsch* on Marius' return, which he exaggerates and always describes in emotional moral terms, obliterates Marius' military glory for Valerius (the only other unsuccessful/discreditable action which he ascribes to Marius is his calling upon the slaves to resist Sulla's march into Rome: 8, 6, 2). As the *maximus Marianae gloriae rubor* was Marius' adamance against pleas to rescind the sentence of death upon Catulus (9, 12, 4), Valerius is clearly not judging Marius' actions from the standpoint of their material contribution to the welfare of Rome and Italy in deeming them outweighed by the deaths decreed after Marius entered Rome in 87 (that he is not referring to the civil war as a whole is indicated by e. g. 4, 3, 14). Certainly, on Valerius' own showing, his judgement was not shared by the generation after Marius: 9, 15, 1.⁹⁷)

This demonstration of the over-riding importance of the moral criterion in Valerius' value-judgements is of fundamental importance to any assessment of historical references from the *exempla*. Major areas of distortion, as shown by inconsistencies (internal or otherwise), concern Marius' career (which is viewed as an illustration of the mutability of fortune), and the extent, nature and importance of the proscriptions of 87—86. It is not Valerius' reproduction of facts — which seem largely to be drawn from the sources he claims to have consulted, and moreover to be accurate except in a relatively small number of matters of detail — but his interpretation of these facts which tends to be distorted. The facts in correlation depict a Marius who is far closer to the Ciceronian picture (as reconstructed, e. g., in *WS* 73, 1960, 83—122) than to the subject of Plutarch's biography. Therefore, as Valerius was not acquainted with the works of Sulla or Rutilius, whereas Plutarch was (*Mar.* 25, 6 and 28, 10 respectively), the latter's bias

97) Among contemporaries Marius' popularity, as measured by influence, subsequent to the great foreign wars, is well illustrated by the impotence of leading nobles against his faction and himself in the courts: 5, 2, 8; 8, 5, 2—3.

towards the subjects of these works is clearly due to his reliance on these primary sources, as opposed to the general tradition which Valerius manifestly represents. In view of the known tendentiousness of these writers, Valerius' substantial agreement with Cicero means that the latter's picture of Marius must be given preference. It also, however, indicates areas of partizan bias for Marius in Cicero, especially in regard to Marius' career after the year 100, by differences in emphasis which its previous agreement throws into sharp relief.

University College
of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia

T. F. Carney

BEITRÄGE ZUM TEXT DER RÖMISCHEN ELEGIKER

1. Zu Propertius

2, 3, 45—6 *his saltem ut teneam iam finibus! aut mihi, si
quis
acrior, ut moriar, venerit alter amor!*

Scaliger hatte das Distichon hinter 2, 1, 48 gestellt, und dort blieb es, ohne daß die folgenden Editoren viel Worte verloren, bis Lachmann ihm endgültig seinen ursprünglichen Platz zurückgab. Allerdings wollte er hier, wie vor ihm Schrader, ein neues Gedicht beginnen lassen. Das läßt sich erwägen. Weniger geglückt scheint mir hingegen Lachmanns Vorschlag, *aut mihi* durch *hei mihi* zu ersetzen. Die Paraphrase, die Butler-Barber gegeben haben, ist im wesentlichen richtig: 'or let a fresh love, if any such may be, assail me to bring me to a yet bitterer death', obschon *acrior* eng zu *amor* gehört. Die Ellipse ist normal, wenn man statt *si quis (est)* naturgemäß *si quis (venerit)* ergänzt. Es liegt eine echte Alternative vor: Am liebsten möchte Propertius sein Leben lang im *assuetum servitium* verharren; sollte aber (was nie ganz auszuschließen ist), eine neue Leidenschaft von seinem Herzen Besitz ergreifen, dann soll sie gleich so heftig sein, daß er daran sterben muß. In Prosa würde dieser Gedanke lauten: *si mihi alter amor venerit, acrior venerit, ut*