

THE *DE VIRIS ILLUSTRIBUS*: CHRONOLOGY AND STRUCTURE

MICHAEL M. SAGE

University of Cincinnati

Recently there has been a renewed interest in the text and sources of the *De viris illustribus*.¹ In the search for sources, however, the nature and character of the work itself have been obscured.² The *DVI* deserves to be examined on its own merits, because of its popularity in the Middle Ages and the light it throws on the late antique view of Republican history.

It is preserved in two major textual traditions.³ One tradition preserved in two manuscripts joins the *DVI* to the *Origo gentis Romanae* and the *Caesares* of Aurelius Victor in a *Corpus Triperitum*.⁴ The *Corpus* has also been extensively interpolated from the *Historia Miscella* of Landolphus Sagax written in the eleventh century.⁵ The second tradition consists of

¹L. Braccisi, *Introduzione al De viris illustribus* (Bologna 1973), and W. K. Sherwin, *Deeds of Famous Men (De viris illustribus)* (Norman 1973). (We will henceforth refer to the *De viris illustribus* as the *DVI*.)

²For bibliography until 1914, see M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 8.4.1 (1914²) 70–72; then W. Baehrens, *JAW* 208 (1926) 17–18. For a general bibliography since Baehrens, see Braccisi, *Introduzione*. An exception should be made for the groundbreaking analysis of A. Enmann, “Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*,” *Philologus*, Suppl. Bd. 4 (1884) 460 ff. See also W. K. Sherwin, *Reconstruction of the Text of the Archetype and Studies in Method of Composition of the Anonymous de viris illustribus* (Diss., The Ohio State Univ. 1966).

³Unfortunately there is not yet a satisfactory text of the *DVI*. The last major text was that of Pichlmayr in 1911 in the Teubner series. This was reissued with corrections by R. Gruendel in 1961 and 1965. However, Pichlmayr relied too heavily on codices of Class A, *o* and *p*, the only two manuscripts containing the entire *Corpus Triperitum*, and he failed to examine twenty manuscripts of the *DVI*. Sherwin’s text does not remedy the problem; see the review of G. V. Sumner, *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 209 f. The excellent work of S. D’Elia hopefully will provide us with a new text, “Per una nuova edizione critica di Aurelio Vittore,” *RAAN*, N. S. 43 (1968) 103–94; and “Per una nuova edizione critica di A. V.,” *Bolletino di Studi Latini* 3 (1973) 52–75.

⁴The manuscripts are *p* (*Cod. Bruxellensis* 9755–63 s. XV) and *o* (*Cod. Ox. Canonica* 131 s. XIV/XV); see Pichlmayr, *praef.* xv. The mysterious *Codex Metelli* seems to have belonged to the same family as *o* and *p*; see D’Elia, “Per una nuova edizione” (1973) 62.

⁵For a list of interpolations, see D’Elia, “Per una nuova edizione” (1973) 59. D’Elia sees the *Corpus Triperitum* as the union of two originally separate sections, the first containing the

more than seventy codices, which attest the popularity of the work outside the *Corpus*.⁶

Two versions of the extant text have been transmitted. Within the *Corpus Tripartitum* almost all of the first chapter is missing.⁷ Chapter 16 is also absent. It is only in the *Corpus*, however, that the last nine chapters are found.⁸ Both the *Corpus* and the manuscripts outside it appear to descend from a single archetype.⁹

The title of the work implies a series of biographies, but in fact the *DVI* is not strictly biographical in character.¹⁰ For example, chapters 14, 20–22, 25, 30, 36, and 46 concentrate on famous deeds or events. Among those chapters which are basically biographical in nature, two major categories exist: Romans and foreign adversaries of Rome. The foreign adversaries are:¹¹

Origo and the *DVI*, and the second the *Caesares* only. He would date the *Corpus*, the work of a grammaticus, to the late sixth century because Joannes Lydus in the *De Magistratibus* knows only Victor, not the other two works (pp. 64 f.). This is a weak argument since nothing is known of the fate of the portions of the *Corpus* in the Greek East aside from the stray references of Joannes.

⁶J. B. Titchener, "The A-Family in the Text Tradition of the Anonymous *Liber de viris illustribus*," *Classical Studies in Honor of W. A. Oldfather* (Urbana 1943) 184–89. Pichlmayr lists 61, *praef.* xv–xvi.

⁷See Pichlmayr 23. The original editor of the *Corpus* eliminated this section because of repetition of material in the *Origo gentis Romanae*. The *DVI* begins again with the words *ne quis vallum transsiliret*.

⁸For the implications of this, see below, p. 235.

⁹Titchener, "The A-Family," and Sherwin, *Reconstruction*.

¹⁰W. K. Sherwin, "The Title and Manuscript Tradition of the *De viris illustribus*," *RhM* N. F. 112 (1969) 285–86, argues that the archetype title has now been lost and that the earliest recoverable title is *De illustrium*. He suggests a title similar to the work of C. Julius Hyginus, *De vita rebusque illustrium virorum*. (However, in his 1973 edition, Sherwin assigns to the work the title *Liber de Illustrium Virorum Factis*.) Sherwin seems to be sceptical at this point. The parallel of Jerome is instructive. In the apparatus notes of R. Helm, *TuU* 14, 1 (1896) 1, the title variants are not unlike those for the *DVI*: *De viris illustribus* / *Liber virorum illustrium* / *Catalogus virorum illustrium*. Even Jerome himself is ambiguous, e.g., *Ep.* 112.3: *Ergo hic liber illustribus viris vel proprie de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis appellandus est*. The exact title is probably lost beyond hope of recovery.

¹¹Mettius (4.10) is not assigned a separate chapter by Pichlmayr, but the structure of the section, i.e., name and title (*dux Albanorum*), conforms to the standard introduction to a separate section. So 35.1, *Pyrrhus rex Epirotarum*; 42.1, *Hannibal Hamilcaris filius*; 54.1, *Antiochus rex Syriae*.

Ch. 4.10	Mettius Fufetius
11	Porsenna
35	Pyrrhus
42	Hannibal
48	Hasdrubal
54	Antiochus
71	Viriathus
76	Mithridates
86	Cleopatra

Women are the central figures in three sections:¹²

13	Cloelia
46	Claudia virgo Vestalis
86	Cleopatra

The arrangement of the chapters presents some problems. Imperial biographers, such as Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, were supplied with an obvious chronological framework by a succession of emperors.¹³ Republican biographers had a far more difficult task. They might choose any number of principles—year of birth, consular or other significant year.

The only other extant works which raise comparable problems to the *DVI* are Cicero's *Brutus* and Lucius Ampelius' *Liber memorialis*.¹⁴ In the *Brutus*, Cicero groups orators by periods (*aetates*). In each case one or two orators whom Cicero considers key figures in each *aetas* give their names to the entire period.¹⁵ However, the *aetas* was a variable period; it was sometimes a generation, half a generation, or only an interval of a few years.¹⁶ The basis of this chronology was Cicero's knowledge of birth dates and his inferences about birth dates from public careers.¹⁷

¹²However, only 86 approaches the general format of the other sections. Both Cloelia and Claudia are simply introductions to the events in which they figure. On Cloelia, see R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford 1965) 267–68; on Claudia, see *RE* 6 Claudius no. 435, col. 2899 (Münzer).

¹³The chronological difficulties of concurrent reigns such as that of the Gallic emperors are handled by dividing their accounts under successive Roman emperors. So Tetricus is mentioned both under Gallienus and Aurelian by Eutropius 9.10 and 9.13; and by Victor 33.14–15 and 35.4. The *HA*, Tyr. Trig. 31.7–9, simply jumbles together fictitious and genuine usurpers from the reigns of Maximinus, Claudius, and those who fall between Tacitus and Diocletian.

¹⁴Citations from Ampelius will be from the text of E. Assmann (Leipzig 1935).

¹⁵Cic. *Brut.* 127: *Huic successit aetati C. Galba*; 228: . . . *aetates Hortensi et Sulpici*.

¹⁶G. V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology* (Toronto 1973) 154.

¹⁷Sumner, *The Orators* 158.

The organization of the *Liber memorialis* is more complicated, and we will consider it at length to aid in our understanding of the structure of the *DVI*. The work is a skeletal compendium of general knowledge.¹⁸ Nothing is known of Ampelius besides his name nor is anything known of the time of composition.¹⁹ The sections dealing with Roman history are organized thematically.²⁰ Chapter 17 lists the seven kings in traditional order, but the structure of the Republican chapters is more difficult. A rough chronological order is adopted with certain deviations. Chapter 18, for example, is organized as follows:

Brutus-Valerius Publicola-Torquatus-
Cincinnatus-Camillus-Fabii duo (Q. Fabius
Maximus Rullianus and Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus)-
Papirius Cursor-Curius-Fabricius Luscinius-
Claudius Marcellus-Scipiones duo (Africanus and
Aemilianus)-Quintus Nero (C. Claudius Nero)-
Paulus (L. Aemilius Paulus)-duo Metelli
(Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus and Q. Caecilius
Metellus Numidicus)-C. Marius-Sulla-Sertorius-
Lucullus-Pompeius-C. Julius Caesar-Augustus.

Two fairly obvious principles are used: *floruit* and family. However, strange chronological mistakes intrude. Torquatus cos. I 347 is misplaced between Publicola and Cincinnatus. Rullianus and Cursor are not in exact order; however, both belong to the period of the Samnite wars, and the greater fame of the Fabii might explain their placement before Papirius Cursor. M'. Curius Dentatus belongs to the same period.

The principle of chronological succession accompanying family groupings is evident in chapter 19 which deals with men famous in civilian affairs; however, here too there are problems with chronology:

¹⁸*Praef.*, *Volenti tibi omnia nosse, scripsi hunc librum memorialem.*

¹⁹E. Woelfflin, *De Lucii Ampelii libro memoriali quaestiones criticae et historicae* (Diss. Gott. 1854) 47, dates the work to the reign of Pius using historical references. Others have used stylistic criteria. See D. Bo, "La lingua del *Liber memorialis* di Ampelio e la questione cronologica che lo riguarda," *Athenaeum* N. S. 39 (1961) 134-35, for a summary of previous views. Bo himself opts for a third century date. However, the fact that there is only a single manuscript (*Codex Monacensis Latinus* 10.383) with numerous lacunae makes stylistic evaluation difficult. The references to Trajan at 47.6 and 47.23 provide only a *terminus post quem*, as Ampelius is tracing the growth of the Empire rather than giving an historical account.

²⁰These are 17-29 and 39-50. On the original order of the work, see the convincing reconstruction of E. Assmann, "Der *Liber memorialis* des Lucius Ampelius," *Philologus* 94 (1939/40) 197-221 and 303-29.

Menenius Agrippa (Manius)-Appius Caecus-Ti.
 Gracchus cos. 177-D. Brutus Callaicus-M. Brutus-
 Livius Drusus-Lutatius Catulus (Q.)-Cato Censorius-
 Cato praetorius-Scaurus (M. Aemilius Scaurus)-Scipio
 Nasica (Corculum)-Cornelius Cethegus²¹-Cicero.

Scaurus and Nasica are inexplicably shifted.

The remaining chapters of the *Liber memorialis* contain the same occasional deviations from chronological order and family grouping. One might attribute this to ignorance on the part of Ampelius; however, the random nature of the mistakes tells against this. It may be that order is displaced because of function. If we take the title of the work seriously we may find that some mnemonic device is operating. The best illustration of this can be found in chapter 24 on the Scipios:

Scipio magnus Africanus qui vicit Hannibalem.
 Scipio minor Numantinus qui Numantiam et Carthaginem diruit.
 Scipio Asiaticus qui de Antiocho triumphavit.
 Scipio Nasica qui a senatu vir optimus est iudicatus.
 Scipio qui occiso Pompeio partes restituit et victus se interfecit.

The first two Scipios are naturally associated through their victories over Carthage as well as by the adjectives *magnus-minor*. Though the next two are in chronological order, the pattern of A-N-A-N in cognomina as a mnemonic device may explain the order. This method of arrangement operates elsewhere in Ampelius. A key word or concept is often selected and associations are built upon it. Hence the anomaly of Torquatus' position in chapter 18 may be explained on mnemonic grounds: Brutus and Valerius Publicola are linked by the key word *libertas*:

18.1	Brutus qui pro libertate
18.2	Valerius Publicola qui propter eandem libertatem

Torquatus is joined to this group by the exercise of another public virtue:

18.3	qui ad confirmandam castrorum disciplinam
------	---

Cincinnatus is cited for a different virtue and so follows Torquatus though chronologically out of place. He is joined to Camillus by the play on *delata-deleta*. Rullianus, Cursor, and Curius are all joined by their connection with the Samnite wars:

Samnitas-Samnites-legatis Samnitum

²¹Only known from this citation, but see Cic. *Brutus* 178.

Fabricius stands outside this schema, but he may be connected to Curius by the association of *et aurum habentibus imperare* with *quod decem pondo argenti possideret*. The next four, Marcellus, the Africani, and Quintus Nero (C. Claudius Nero) are connected by the theme of Hannibal and Carthage. Marcellus precedes Scipio Africanus because *Hannibalem primus in Campania proelio vicit* (18.10). Then Scipio *qui Hannibalem et in eo Africam debellavit* (18.11), followed by the natural association of Numantinus *qui Carthaginem . . . et in hac Africam . . . fregit*. Finally Q. (sic) Nero *qui Hannibalem*.

A new subject, the East, begins with Paulus, who is followed by Macedonicus and Numidicus. Both are followed by Marius. The action in Greece links Paulus and Macedonicus, though the substance of the anecdote is Macedonicus' activity in Spain. Numidicus is first identified by his action in Africa, the substance of which centers on Apuleius. Both of these then provide links to Marius, followed naturally by Sulla and the major figures of the civil wars: Sertorius, Lucullus, Pompeius, Julius Caesar, and Augustus.

The purpose of the above discussion is not to deny that the major organizing principle in Ampelius is chronological. Some form of historical source is evident from the chronological sections:

42	Ordo belli Mariani
43	Ordo belli inter Caesarem et Pompeium
44	De bello Macedonico
46	De tribus Punicis bellis ²²

The order of the *DVI* is also basically chronological, but like the *Liber memorialis* it contains anomalies.²³ The principle of family grouping is added to the basic chronological schema as with Ampelius. Hence the two Decii are grouped together (26, 27) as well as the three Metelli (61–63). The two Marii, father and son, are also joined. However, the father of the Gracchi, T. Sempronius Gracchus cos. I 177 is separated from his two sons, Tiberius and Gaius (father, 57; sons, 64 and 65).²⁴ Scipio Africanus is separated from his brother Asiaticus.²⁵ Julius Caesar and his adopted son follow one another (78, 79), but Cato the Censor is separated altogether

²²So also Assmann, "Der *Liber memorialis*" 327. Woelfflin (above, note 19) 42 cites Florus as the historical source.

²³H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen* (Leipzig 1897) 370, argues that the order of the *DVI* is "willkürlich" as is Jerome, and that such a compendium did not call for excessive care.

²⁴On this see below, p. 233.

²⁵Africanus, 49; Asiaticus, 53. But the *DVI* is aware of the relationship, see 53.1, *frater Africanus*.

from Uticensis (47, 80). There seems to be a more important principle operating which at times overrides the family schema, and that principle is a grouping of the lives about decisive historical events.²⁶

The order of the first eight chapters of the *DVI* is determined by the succession of the seven kings, with the addition of Mettius Fufetius at 4.10.

1	Proca
2	Romulus
3	Numa Pompilius
4	Tullus Hostilius
4.10	Mettius Fufetius
5	Ancus Marcius
6	Lucius Tarquinius Priscus
7	Servius Tullius
8	Tarquinius Superbus

A series then follows which deals with the expulsion of the kings and the foundation of the Republic:

9	Tarquinius Collatinus
10	Iunius Brutus
11	Porsenna and Horatius Cocles
12	Mucius Cordus
13	Cloelia
14	The Fabii ²⁷
15	Lucius Valerius, Volesi filius ²⁸
16	Lacus Regillensis

The connection between the Tarquins and the foundation of the Republic is emphasized by a constant repetition of the name of the former.²⁹ Within the major series relating to the Tarquins, there is a minor series based upon Porsenna's attempt on Rome, hence chapters 11–13 are each linked by the appearance of Porsenna's name. Chapter 14 on the Fabii and 15 on Valerius are joined to this series on the basis of a series of wars with the

²⁶H. Behrens, *Untersuchungen über das anonyme Buch de viris illustribus* (Heidelberg 1923) 28–29, would add to the family series of biographies both the Appii (Caecus, 34; Caudex, 37) separated by Pyrrhus, 35, and the excursus over Vulsinii, 36. He would as well link the two Atilii, Regulus, 40, and Calatinus, 39. But these are illustrations of the readiness on the part of the *DVI* to abandon the family schema for historical arrangement.

²⁷See below, p. 240.

²⁸L. Valerius should be P. Valerius. For *Volesi filius*, see Livy 1.58.

²⁹9.1: *Tarquinius Collatinus, sorore Tarquinii Superbi genitus*; 10.1: *Iunius Brutus sorore Tarquinii Superbi genitus*; 11.1: *Porsenna rex Etruscorum cum Tarquinius in urbem restituere temptaret*; 16.1: *Tarquinius electus*.

Etruscans, here the Veientes. The more natural order would have been to follow Brutus with Valerius, but the author was drawn into the present arrangement by his concentration on the Tarquins. The war with Porsenna allowed him to digress on the war with Veii and the Fabii and provided a transition formed by Valerius' triumph over the Veientes.³⁰ The structure of these first chapters is reminiscent of Ampelius, though without his broad mnemonic deviations. An historical point is chosen and by the repetition of key phrases succeeding sections are joined; occasionally, as in chapters 14 and 15, absolute chronology suffers.

The chronological deviations are most extreme in chapters 17–22:

17	L. Quinctius Cincinnatus (<i>o, p</i> read Quintus)
18	Menenius Agrippa Lanatus
19	Cn. Marcius Coriolanus

Chapters 20–22 do not have the normal biographical structure but narrate three separate incidents:

20	background to C. Licinius Stolo's legislation, the opening of the consulate to plebeians, and the land law
21	the incident of Virginia and Appius Claudius
22	the arrival at Rome of the cult of Aesculapius

Since there was no central organizing principle for chapters 17–22, except internal dissension at Rome in the period after the founding of the Republic, the order is particularly obscure. Three possibilities for the peculiar arrangement suggest themselves. The fame of Cincinnatus may have persuaded the author to place him first in this series of two men who aided the Republic, followed by one who threatened it. A second possibility is suggested by the order of Ampelius. There Cincinnatus occurs in chapter 18 on famous Roman military leaders, while Agrippa is mentioned in chapter 19 on men famous in civil life. This raises the possibility that Agrippa was added from another section of the *DVT*'s source after the military figures of Postumius and Cincinnatus. The different rôle of Coriolanus, a threat to the Republic, would explain his position in last place. A third but least likely explanation is that the *DVI* was using a consular list and confused Agrippa Menenius Lanatus cos. 503, who delivered the speech during the secession, with Agrippa T. f. Agrippae n. Lanatus, consul during the second dictatorship of Cincinnatus in 439.³¹

³⁰15.1–2: . . . *primo de Veientibus . . . triumphavit.*

³¹For the consul of 439, see *MRR* I, 56.

The use of a consular list seems doubtful, however, given the disregard for consular succession elsewhere.³² The first suggestion, which demands the least accuracy, appears the most likely.

Chapters 20–22 have caused the most difficulty for those who see an attempt by the *DVI* to maintain chronological sequence.³³ The *DVI* rarely departs grossly from the chronological schema and the extent of the error in this series calls for a close examination. The three chapters are not all out of place. Chapter 21 on the Decemvirate is in approximate order and forms the starting point for our attempt to explain the positions of 19 and 22. The central section is the traditional tale of the attempted violation of Virginia by Appius Claudius.³⁴ The decemvir Appius supplies the clue for the position of 20. The story takes place in the period preceding the Licinian-Sextian rogations of 367/6. According to the *DVI*, the motivating force behind these laws was the embarrassment of one of the two daughters of M. Fabius Ambustus³⁵ caused by the actions of her haughty sister who was married to a patrician. Her own husband, Licinius Stolo, therefore passed a law as soon as he became tribune that one of the two consuls should be plebeian. Licinius was then elected as the first plebeian consul.³⁶ The key to the position of this chapter is provided by 20.1–2:

Lex resistente Appio Claudio tamen lata.

This Appius Claudius was Appius Claudius Crassus Inregillensis dict. 362 and cos. 349.³⁷ The author had no fixed point or career as a dating method;

³²26, P. Decius Mus cos. 340; 28, T. Manlius Torquatus cos. I 347; 33, M'. Curius Dentatus cos. 290; 34, Appius Claudius Caecus cos. 307.

³³Behrens (above, note 26) 29 saw the number 10 as the only link among the three chapters. H. Hildesheimer, *De libro qui inscribitur de viris illustribus urbis Romae quaestiones historicae* (Diss. Berlin 1880) 33, thinks the perverse order of the chapters was a result of the *DVI* following Florus 1.17.23–25. Hildesheimer was following a suggestion made earlier by L. Spengel, "Ueber die Geschichtsbücher des Florus," *Abh. d. bayer. Akad.* 9,2 (1861) 348–49, note 2. J. Rosenhauer, *Symbolae ad quaestionem de fontibus libri qui inscribitur de viris illustribus urbis Romae* (Diss. Erlangen 1882) 29–30, argues the lack of order is the result of the addition of these sections from a collection of *exempla*. C. J. Vinkesteyn, *De fontibus ex quibus scriptor libri de viris illustribus urbis Romae hausisse videtur* (Diss. Leiden 1886) 33–34, attacks the conjectures of Rosenhauer and Hildesheimer, but he offers none of his own. Braccesi, *Introduzione* 28, seems to ascribe the problem to the biographical source which he postulates. In my opinion, the question of the specific sources of the *DVI* is beyond solution.

³⁴Livy 3.44–9; D. H. 11.28–44. On Virginia, see Ogilvie (above, note 12) 476 ff..

³⁵Censor, 363; see *RE* 6.2, no. 43 (Münzer); also Florus 1.17.26 for the same story. See also Livy 6.34.5 ff..

³⁶The *DVI* is full of errors such as the statement that Licinius was the first consul; on this episode, see K. von Fritz, "The Reorganization of the Roman Government in 366 B.C. and the so-called Licinian Sextian Laws," *Historia* I (1950) 1–44.

³⁷See *MRR* I, 117, 128. Livy 6.40.2 calls him the grandson of the decemvir. Sherwin, *Reconstruction*, was the first to notice the confusion.

in an attempt to date it correctly, he fixed on Appius Claudius and in fact confused both of them. The position of chapter 20 before 21 may be explained by the fact that the Decemvirate was followed by the death of Appius in prison (21.3). The only alternative was to date the previous chapter before the events of 21.

Chapter 22 concerns an embassy to Epidaurus of ten ambassadors headed by Q. Ogulnius Gallus in 292 to bring the serpent of Aesculapius to Rome.³⁸ This is a more serious chronological error than that which occurs in chapter 20 and cannot be explained as simple carelessness. We may find its explanation in a reading of the text. Pichlmayr's Class B actually reads Volumnio (Volumio, Volunio, Voluminio) at 22.2 and 22.3. Ogulnius is Pichlmayr's restoration to bring the text into line with the actual event.³⁹ What appears to have happened is a confusion similar to the previous one on Appius Claudius. The *DVI* has confused Ogulnius with P. Volumnius Amintinus Gallus cos. 461. In 458 Volumnius together with Q. Fabius Vibulanus and A. Postumius Albus demanded redress from the Aequi who had invaded Latin territory contrary to treaty (Livy 3.25.6–9; D. H. 10.22.4–6). The most reasonable explanation seems to be that the *DVI* has confused the two ambassadors. This is supported by the fact that they both bear the cognomen Gallus. It may be that the source of the *DVI* referred to a Gallus as leader of the expedition, and the *DVI* wrongly concluded which man was intended. Further, if the *DVI* were dependent upon a summary source there would be a tendency for names to be detached or to have dropped out. Hence Periochae 11 details the expedition to Epidaurus without a single detail about the ambassadors. The solution proposed agrees with the manuscript readings and saves the basic structure, although it leaves open the question of how the *DVI* could have confused the obscure episode of 458 with that of 292.⁴⁰

Chapters 23 and 24 are organized around the Gallic sack of Rome.⁴¹

23	Camillus
24	Manlius Capitolinus

³⁸See *MRR* I, 182. Sherwin, *Reconstruction*, thinks that the position of 22 is due to the confusion of the decemvir with another Appius Claudius who flourished c. 290 (presumably he means Caeccus). But the text gives no indication that this is the case.

³⁹Sherwin, *Deeds* 52, adds the fact not apparent from *p* that the actual reading of *o* and *p* is *Otulnio*, and yet he prints Pichlmayr's emendation.

⁴⁰For a further example, see below p. 227.

⁴¹Interestingly 23.7 provides the only calendric date given in the work: *die XVI Kal. August.; qui dies inter nefastos relatus*. Ogilvie (above, note 12) 717 states that "the battle of the Allia was fought on July 18. There is no surer date in Roman history." In fact Pichlmayr 40, 1.3, and Sherwin, *Deeds* 54, print *XVI Kal. Aug.* with the hint that this works out to July 17; perhaps this date is a copyist error. Th. Mommsen, *Hermes* 13 (1878) 526, had already noticed the problem.

Chapters 25–29 are organized on three basic thematic lines—the Latin War, filiation, and cognomina.

25	A. Cornelius Cossus and the <i>spolia opima</i>
26	Valerio Maximo et Cornelio Cosso consulibus
27	Publius Decius Mus
28	Titus Manlius Torquatus
29	appendix to 25–28

The central theme is that of the Latin War, which explains the grouping of P. Decius Mus cos. 340 and T. Manlius Torquatus cos. 347, 344, 340. The *devotio* of the elder Decius and the execution of Manlius' son for insubordination during the conflict are standard *exempla*.⁴² To the core of these two great *exempla* is necessarily added the son of Decius, conforming to filiation and the general tendency to join the two.

Chapter 25 is more problematic. The date of the exploits of A. Cornelius Cossus and his taking of the *spolia opima* was itself fluid. Three traditions are known depending on the office Cossus held.⁴³ Whatever date is assigned, the event traditionally preceded the Latin War by almost a century, and a chronological link is inexplicable.⁴⁴ The solution is similar to that of chapter 20. The author has been misled by the consular date in chapter 26 into assuming that the consul of 343, A. Cornelius Cossus Arvina, is the same individual as the dedicator of the *spolia opima*.

Although chapter 29 contains no material concerned with the Latin War, it forms an appendix to chapters 25–28 and was probably placed here because of the association of Manlius Torquatus and M. Valerius Maximus Corvus and the consular date in 26.1. The close association of the two is evident from chapter 22 of Ampelius where they follow one another under the chapter heading:

Qui provocati ab hostibus manu contenderunt⁴⁵

Valerius Maximus shows the standard link between Torquatus and Corvus in his section *De Fortitudine* 3.2.6:

⁴²Amp. 18.3, the death of the son; 20.6, Duo Decii. See H. W. Litchfield, "National *Exempla Virtutis* in Roman Literature," *HSCP* 25 (1914) 1–71, esp. 39 and 46–48. Litchfield noticed that the supposed *devotio* of the grandson at Asculum is noted only by Cicero.

⁴³See Ogilvie (above, note 12) 563. The *DVI* calls Cossus *magister equitum* as does Val. Max. 3.2.4.

⁴⁴In Florus 1.6.9, further Etruscan wars are linked closely to his description of the Latin War, which might allow a solution similar to that proposed by Spengel for chapters 20–22. But unlike the *DVI*, the Latin War precedes rather than follows the Etruscan wars.

⁴⁵The chapter headings are not original but they sufficiently convey the sense of the groupings.

Eodem et virtutis et pugnae genere usui sunt T. Manlius Torquatus et Valerius Corvinus . . .⁴⁶

The notion of an appendix is supported by the unconventional beginning of the chapter which, instead of starting with Corvus' name, begins *in medias res*.⁴⁷

The next unit, 30–33, has as its main theme the wars against the Samnites.

30	Caudine Forks
31	L. Papirius Cursor
32	Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus
33	M'. Curius Dentatus

Its first section is in fact not biographical but centers on the famous defeat at the Caudine Forks in 321.⁴⁸ Its impact is heightened by its being the only chapter that begins with a consular pair. This section in fact forms a prologue to the remaining biographical selections centered on this conflict.⁴⁹ The order of the following three sections is a natural one. It starts with L. Papirius Cursor who is closely linked to the following chapter on Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus. The core of the chapter on Papirius is formed by his relation to Rullianus (31.1–3). While Cursor was away at Rome to seek new auspices, Fabius had committed the Roman army to combat against Papirius' express orders.⁵⁰ In fury the dictator almost executed Fabius.⁵¹ This incident supplied the necessary link to chapter 32 on Rullianus himself.⁵² The first section of the chapter is in fact a less detailed though more accurate repetition of the previous chapter. Fabius' military exploits are given short shrift, while stress is laid upon his activities at home, his funeral, and his death.

The series on the Samnite War is appropriately concluded with M'. Curius Dentatus:

quos (Samnites) usque ad mare superum perpacavit (33.1)

⁴⁶For the variation between Corvus and Corvinus, see *RE* XIV.2, Valerius no. 137, col. 2413–14.

⁴⁷29.1: *Reliquias Senonum Camillus persequatur*.

⁴⁸For the source, see *MRR* I, 150–51.

⁴⁹The same mistake occurs in Eutropius 10.17.2 and Ampelius 20.10, where the Samnite leader is called Pontius Telesinus.

⁵⁰Papirius is mistakenly called consul (31.1). In fact he was dictator, with Fabius as his *magister equitum*, though the *DVI* gets it right at 32.1. See the remarks of Vinkesteyn (above, note 33) 89.

⁵¹For the sources, *MRR* I, 147.

⁵²The *DVI* has the form Rullus. On the correct form, see *RE* 6.2, Fabius no. 114, col. 1800.

This must be a reference to Dentatus' peringration of 290 and to the final triumph of the Samnite War.⁵³

Chapters 34–36 are puzzling.

34	Appius Claudius Caecus
35	Pyrrhus
36	Vulsinii

The arrangement of Appius Claudius Caecus and Pyrrhus follows the precedent that the author had established earlier with Mettius Fufetius.⁵⁴ Pyrrhus is introduced in a separate chapter that forms an appendix to the chapter on Appius. The chapter on Appius, mainly concerned with his actions in civil affairs, ends reasonably by recounting the famous speech against a conclusion of peace with Pyrrhus (34.9). This serves as a transition to 35 which details Pyrrhus' own life. His life then serves as a framework within which to recount the war which is basic to the arrangement.⁵⁵ However, the chapter on Vulsinii relates an incident which has nothing in common with the true order. Logically, it is an excursus and bears some similarity in this respect to chapters 22 and 14, but its particular position is unexplained.⁵⁶ Chronological accuracy is not one of the virtues of the *DVI*.⁵⁷ The dating of the episode is still a vexed question as well as its connection with Decius Mus.⁵⁸ The date seems to hover about the decade 275–65 and provides no firm basis to explain why it is placed where it is in the *DVI*. Its position in Florus may shed some light on the question. Although Florus assigns the action against the slaves of Vulsinii to Q. Fabius Maximus Gurgus (1.16.21), he begins his account by pointing out:

Postremi Italicorum in fidem venere Volsinii.

We know that the *DVI* does not directly depend upon Florus because of the difference in name of the Roman leader of the expedition; however, a source with a similar comment would have led the *DVI* to insert the notice here at the point before the author embarked on his account of the man concerned with Rome's first great foreign adventure.

⁵³For this, see E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge 1967) 276.

⁵⁴See above p. 223.

⁵⁵Behrens (above, note 26) 29 thinks that the Appii, Caecus and the consul of 264, are arranged by family and then separated by an insertion of the life of Pyrrhus; he sees 36 on Vulsinii as an excursus. The argument is rather weak. The separation and excursus convince me that the only reason they appear together is their association with Pyrrhus and the First Punic War.

⁵⁶See note 55.

⁵⁷See 35.8–9: Pyrrhus *A Curio et Fabricio superatus*; see also 20–22.

⁵⁸For the date and Mus, see *MRR* I, 202, and *RE* 4.2, col. 2284–86, Decius n. 17 (Münzer).

The next five chapters are clearly arranged in chronological order with the First Punic War as their common theme.⁵⁹

37	Appius Claudius Caudex
38	Cn. Duellius
39	Atilius Calatinus
40	M. Atilius Regulus
41	Q. Lutatius Catulus

They are arranged as follows:

- Claudius opens the war successfully.
- Duellius wins the first important naval battle.
- Atilius Calatinus pacifies Sicily.
- Atilius Regulus first invades Africa unsuccessfully.
- Lutatius Catulus wins the final naval battle and brings the war to a successful conclusion.

This is an obvious and probably traditional solution to the problem of relating this important historical event in biographical form. Ampelius 46.3 describes the war in approximately the same way with the variation of one name (Manlius for Calatinus) and a change in order (Duellius follows Regulus). The order in Florus 1.18.5–37 is identical to that of the *DVI*, if the less important figures are removed from the account.⁶⁰ Eutropius too, although not biographically oriented for the Republic, mentions and stresses the individuals who occur in the *DVI* in the same order (2.18–27). Whatever the source available, the *DVI* found an account of the war centered on the actions of individual commanders available for its purposes.

The next section, centered on the Second Punic War, is less well organized.

42	Hannibal
43	Fabius Maximus
44	P. Scipio Nasica
45	Marcus Marcellus
46	arrival of the <i>Magna Mater</i> at Rome
47	Cato the Censor

⁵⁹Behrens (above, note 26) 29 stresses the attempt of the *DVI* to link the two Atilii, but here there is a clear progression based on chronology.

⁶⁰This is of course to ignore the problem of sources. However, the question at issue here is what led the *DVI* to choose the order in the text, which is a different matter. See the immediately preceding discussion on Vulsinii.

48	Hasdrubal, brother of Hannibal
49	Scipio Africanus
50	Livius Salinator

Chapters 42, 43, 45, 46, and 48–50 are all sensibly included; but chapters 44 and 47 demand some explanation.⁶¹ In chapter 44 the *DVI* has confused the first Scipio Nasica with his son Corculum. The father was consul in 191 and the son cos. I 162.⁶² The father was selected by the Senate to receive the *Mater Deorum*.⁶³ The great play made by the *DVI* of Scipio's being the *vir optimus* finds its origin in the event narrated at length in Livy, but the *DVI* supplies its own circumstantial praise (44.5). The father and son are also confused by Ampelius 19.11. The basic activities related in the *vita* are from Corculum's career.⁶⁴ The confusion on the part of the *DVI* results from its selection of the entrance of the *Magna Mater* into Rome as the key to chronological placement. This incident seems to have especially attracted its attention. Chapter 46 retells the story of the vestal Claudia forced to prove her innocence; again Scipio is mentioned as *vir optimus* to whom the goddess is given *quasi hospiti datum* (46.3). Thus the inclusion of this notice in the section on the Second Punic War is not surprising. What is surprising is its position within the series.

The basic structure of 42–50 seems to be this: a balance with Hannibal at the beginning and Scipio Africanus at the end, with a pendant *vita* on Salinator. There is an attempt to sum up the course of the war by the citation of Fabius Maximus, M. Claudius Marcellus, and Hasdrubal who, rather than a biographical entry in his own right, stands for the crucial battle of the Metaurus.⁶⁵ Given this basic framework, an interest in religion

⁶¹See A. Klotz, "Der zweite punische Krieg bei Florus," *RhM* 89 (1940) esp. 125–26. Klotz sees a basic pattern in the portrayal of the Second Punic War common to the *DVI*, Ampelius and Florus. The pattern is represented in *DVI* 42 in the summary of Hannibal's victories, his degeneration at Capua, and the turn of fortune leading to his defeat. So Ampelius 46.4–6 and Florus 1.22.10 ff. The group of Roman generals at *DVI* 42.6 is equal to Florus' group of three plus Scipio. But Klotz wisely does not recognize a direct influence on the part of Florus (p. 126). He suggests Hyginus as the source for this plan (p. 127). What really seems operative here, however, is the tendency to reduce a complicated situation to one easily understood in terms of personalities and a few battles. This schema must have arisen early and in fact may have no definite literary source.

⁶²On both these men, see *RE* 4.1, Cornelius nos. 350 and 353, col. 1494 f. and 1497 f. The same confusion is evident in Livy, *Epit.* 49; Amp. 19.11; Aug. *De Civ. Dei* 2.5.

⁶³Livy 29.14.8.

⁶⁴See note 62 above.

⁶⁵48.1: *actumque erat de Romano imperio*. Amp. 18.12: *qui si se cum Hannibale iunxisset, dubitari non potest paria eis populum (sc. Romanum) facturum non fuisse*. More closely, Florus 1.22.50: *Actum erat procul dubio, si vir ille se cum fratre iunxisset*. So Behrens (above, note 26) 64 and others earlier had concluded a close relationship. Behrens (p. 65) opts for a common source.

on the part of the author of the *DVI* naturally led him to include chapters 44 and 46.⁶⁶

Chapter 47 on Cato the Censor presents a more difficult problem. Only the beginning of his career is concerned with the Second Punic War. In 214 Cato served as *trib. milit.* in Sicily under M. Claudius Marcellus (Nepos, *Cato* 1.2). Then in 204 he served as *quaestor* to Scipio in Africa.⁶⁷ These links with leading figures of the Hannibalic War, plus the later animosity of Cato toward the Scipios, may have served to persuade the *DVI* to place the *vita* in this series, although there seems to be no compelling reason for its inclusion there.⁶⁸

Chapter 50 is added to the series in the form of an appendix on the war. This appearance is further reinforced by the nature of the *vita*. It is only at 50.2 that the *DVI* mentions Salinator's participation in the battle of the Metaurus. The major portion of the *vita* centers on his condemnation and his activities as censor.

The next series centers Rome's wars in the second century in the East.

51	Quintus Flaminius (i.e., Flaminius)
52	Q. Fulvius Nobilior (M.)
53	Scipio Asiaticus (L.)
54	Antiochus
55	C. Manlius Vulso (Cn.)
56	L. Aemilius Paulus
57	Ti. Sempronius Gracchus cos. 177
58	Scipio Aemilianus
59	Aulus Hostilius Mancinus (C.)
60	L. Mummius
61–63	The Metelli: Macedonicus, Numidicus, Pius

Again the order is basically chronological with certain deviations. Instead of placing Nobilior after Asiaticus, he is linked to Flaminius as a pendant to the First Macedonian War.⁶⁹

The war against Antiochus is treated in chapters 53–55. Vulso's entry is not biographical in nature but simply serves to introduce the story of the wife of Orgiogo.⁷⁰

Chapter 56 on Paulus returns to the conflict with Macedon which is then concluded in 60 and 61. The order of the intervening chapters is less clear.

⁶⁶On this interest, see Behrens 11–32.

⁶⁷For the sources, see *MRR* I, 307.

⁶⁸For the later animosity, see Livy 38.54.1–2.

⁶⁹Florus 1.25.9 places him after the Syrian war. The *DVI* 52.2 knows the order: *Consul Aetolos, qui bello Macedonico Romanis affuerant, post ad Antiochum defecerant.*

⁷⁰Actually Ortiagon. The original source is presumably Livy 38.24.2. See *RE* 18.1, col. 1029.

Chapter 56 on Paulus returns to the conflict with Macedon which is then concluded in 60 and 61. The order of the intervening chapters is less clear. Chapter 57 is placed between 56 on Paulus and 58 on Scipio which should naturally fall together (58.1, *Paulli Macedonici filius*). Further, the leading statement of the *vita* is Tiberius' *inimicitia* with Scipio Asiaticus and his action despite this hostility as tribune in 184.⁷¹ Hence the *vita* ought to follow either 53 or 55. Perhaps the *DVI*, led on by the main theme of conflict in the East, was immediately attracted by Paulus and then retraced its steps to include Gracchus. The latter's inclusion would then appear to be an afterthought, perhaps influenced by the writing of Scipio's life in the next section. The carelessness in factual information and chronology in the *vitae* makes precise reconstruction difficult.

Chapter 58 on Aemilianus follows naturally from 56 and has attached 59 to it as a pendant.⁷² The immediate connection to Scipio's victory at Numantia in 133 with Mancinus' reverse in 137 explains the position of 59 reasonably.⁷³

The main series on the eastern wars ends with 60 and 61. However, a family series is then added comprised of the three Metelli. The author prepares for the addition by inserting a transitional paragraph at 61.6 describing the funeral of Macedonicus and the four sons who bore him to the grave, three of whom were consuls, adding that Macedonicus had even seen one of them celebrating his triumph.⁷⁴

With the end of the Metelli, the *DVI* begins its consideration of the background to the civil war. The series begins with three famous tribunes:

64	Ti. Gracchus
65	Gaius Gracchus
66	Marcus Livius Drusus

The inclusion of L. Apuleius Saturninus at 73 is curious, when he clearly belongs in this series of seditious tribunes and is chronologically prior to Drusus. It is possible that both Saturninus, M. Aemilius Scaurus (72) and

⁷¹For the sources, *MRR* I, 376.

⁷²The *DVI* has the praenomen "A" (Aulus) confusing the consul of 137 with the consul of 170. The aedile of 151 (*MRR* I, 455; 460, note 5) is less likely.

⁷³This seems more reasonable than a simple chronological placement as the *DVI* mistakenly calls Mancinus *praetor* when he was actually consul. The *DVI* is generally careless and inaccurate about offices and accords with the practice of Florus in not distinguishing promagistracies from magistracies.

⁷⁴The *DVI* is obviously unaware of the true family relationships. Numidicus is the son of L. Metellus Calvus cos. 142. See J. van Ooteghem, *Les Caecilii Metelli de la République* (Bruxelles 1967) stemma between pp. 22 and 23. The *DVI* is also wrong, see Cic. *De fin.* 5.82; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.11.3. See also Behrens (above, note 26) 29.

Viriathus (71) are later additions.⁷⁵ If they are removed, we have a smooth transition from the Gracchi and Drusus to the period of Marius and Sulla arranged in approximately chronological order. The rather haphazard selection of personages for treatment in the *DVI* lends some credence to this hypothesis. Later in the work, Crassus and Jugurtha are omitted for no obvious reason, and we have seen that chapters 14, 20–22, 25, and 36 are possible additions to the main series.⁷⁶

The next theme centers on Marius and Cinna.

67	Gaius Marius
68	Gaius Marius filius
69	Lucius Cornelius Cinna
70	Flavius Fimbria (C. Flavius Fimbria legatus 86–85)

The inclusion of Fimbria is explained by the introductory phrase:

saeuissimus, quippe Cinnae satellis

Chapters 71–73 are chronological within themselves.

71	Viriathus
72	Marcus Aemilius Scaurus
73	Lucius Apuleius Saturninus

They are clearly out of place in this series, however, as has been argued above.

Chapters 74–77 focus on Sulla and his associates.

74	L. Licinius Lucullus
75	Cornelius Sulla
76	Mithridates
77	Cn. Pompeius Magnus

The placement of L. Licinius Lucullus prior to Sulla may possibly be explained by the desire of the *DVI* to use Mithridates as the connecting link between Sulla and Pompey.⁷⁷

⁷⁵Sherwin, *Reconstruction* 100, argues that the position of Viriathus is due to a confusion on the part of the *DVI* with Sertorius. This is hardly likely, as the *DVI* rightly connects the elimination of Sertorius with Metellus Pius (63.2) and Pompeius (77.4–5). The *DVI* expressly assigns the end of Viriathus to Caepio, i.e., Q. Servilius Caepio cos. 140 and proconsul 139. See *MRR* I, 482.

⁷⁶On the question of additions, see Rosenhauer (above, note 33) 27, who saw their source in a *liber exemplorum*.

⁷⁷The end of the *vita* of Pompey presents problems. The manuscripts of Class B, which Pichlmayr considers superior, end with the words *ad Ptolomaeum Alexandriae fugit*.

The last nine *vitae* treat the period of the civil wars under Caesar and Augustus.

78	Gaius Iulius Caesar
79	Caesar Octavianus
80	Cato praetorius
81	Marcus Tullius Cicero
82	Marcus Brutus
83	Gaius Cassius Longinus
84	Sextus Pompeius
85	Marcus Antonius
86	Cleopatra Ptolomaei

These chapters have aptly been called “eine grosse Caesar-Biographie.”⁷⁸ It has been noticed that this section does not fit in with the rest of the *DVI*.⁷⁹ An attempt has been made recently to argue that it is not part of the original work but was added by the editor of the *Corpus Triperitum* as a transition between the *DVI*, which originally ended with Pompey, and the beginning of the *Caesares*.⁸⁰ Braccesi argues that the character of the last nine *vitae* cannot be dependent upon the *Elogia* of the Augustan forum, which he regards as the principal source of the *DVI*, and that it would be unthinkable for the author to abandon his method of composition at this point.⁸¹ This contention is far from proven, however. He offers a further argument from the nature of the source material, positing a Livian epitome of the age of Tiberius as the other major source of the *DVI* (and which is also the source for a section of Florus). He argues that there is no point of contact between chapters 78–86 and the Livian epitome tradition.⁸² However, he has missed

Pichlmayr's introduction (xv) and apparatus (p. 69) are not clear. He seems to say that the text ends after the word *Alexandriae*, but he cites Class B to support the reading of *fugit*. We can then assume that the texts of *o* and *p* ended with the word *fugit*. Yet Pichlmayr prints *confugit*. Sherwin, *Deeds* 178, rightly prints *fugit*. However, a further question arises over the words *Huius latus . . . curavit* which Pichlmayr, following Schottus, includes in brackets. Sherwin is certainly right to add this following Titchener's stemma.

⁷⁸Behrens (above, note 26) 29.

⁷⁹Peter (above, note 23) 378.

⁸⁰Braccesi, *Introduzione* 65 f. See my review of Braccesi in *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 308–9.

⁸¹Braccesi, *Introduzione* 66–67. This argument would be more compelling if it could be shown that the *DVI* actually was composed in this manner. But Braccesi has far from proven his case. Arguments against the use of the *Elogia* at least prove that the problem is more complicated than he allows. See Vinkesteyn (above, note 33) 3 ff.; Hildesheimer (above, note 33) 36–39; and Sherwin, *Reconstruction* 68 ff. I hope to deal with this question in a future article.

⁸²Braccesi, *Introduzione* 67–68. Again his arguments for this source are less than convincing. On the question of this Livian epitome made into a panacea by H. A. Sanders,

some of the more obvious similarities: Florus states that Augustus received the title of *dictator perpetuus* (2.34.65).⁸³ The *DVI* and Ampelius repeat this error.⁸⁴ Both Florus and the *DVI* confuse L. Antonius with M. Antonius as the defeated rival of Octavian in the Perusine War.⁸⁵ These common errors support the case that the final section of the *DVI* is no more removed from the Livian tradition than the earlier section of the work.⁸⁶ Without the firm proof of source derivation, Braccesi's arguments will not stand.

He further argues that the method of treatment in the final section differs from that in the rest of the work. He contends that the treatment of each *vita* throughout the *DVI* is narrowly determined by the subject's rôle as citizen and his *cursus honorum*. He compares this with the later chapters on Caesar and Brutus which stress the more disreputable sides of each man.⁸⁷ He also cites a difference in causality of events and in tone between the two sections.⁸⁸ He argues that the tendency toward the anecdotal in the second section separates it from the first section. However, the anecdotal nature of these chapters is in fact present throughout the entire *DVI*, as is evident from 34.2 on Caecus; 55.2 on Orgiagon; 59.2 on Mancinus; 71 on Viriathus; and 74.7 on Lucullus. Although the career provides a matrix in many of the *vitae*, it often serves merely to provide the occasion for anecdotal material. These passages cited refute Braccesi's assertion that the earlier section of the work possesses a hagiographical base.⁸⁹ The errors cited by him as characterizing the last section litter the *DVI* and therefore

"The Lost Epitome of Livy," *Roman Hist. Sources and Institutions, Univ. of Mich. Stud. Hum. Series I* (1904), see the convincing attack on Sanders' methodology made by C. M. Begbie, "The Epitome of Livy," *CQ N. S.* 17 (1967) 332–38.

⁸³So the texts of P. Jal and H. Malcovati. Mommsen conjectured *dictus imperator* along with Halm, but the manuscripts give *dict*.

⁸⁴*DVI* 79.7: *Dictator in perpetuum factus*; Amp. 18.21: *perpetua Caesarum dictatura dominatur*—this might be taken ambiguously, however.

⁸⁵Florus 2.16.5; *DVI* 85.2.

⁸⁶On Florus and the Livian tradition, see P. Jal, "Nature et signification politique de l'ouvrage de Florus," *REL* 43 (1965) 358–81; this is repeated in his Budé edition in a shortened form, Intro., xxiii ff. On the genre of these summary historical works, see the enlightening comments of A. J. Woodman, "Questions of Date, Genre and Style in Velleius: Some Literary Answers," *CQ N. S.* 25 (1975) 272–306.

⁸⁷Braccesi, *Introduzione* 67–68.

⁸⁸Braccesi, *Introduzione* 69. Braccesi cites 81.6: *Et cum triumviros se fecissent Caesar, Lepidus Antoniusque, concessa non aliter visa est inter eos iungi posse, nisi Tullius necaretur* . . . à propos of which he says, ". . . per toccar con mano quale insolita differenza di tono nel determinare la causa degli eventi, e quale inconsueta concessione alla bassa 'agiografia' . . ."

⁸⁹Braccesi, *Introduzione* 69.

do not provide a means by which to distinguish one section from the other.⁹⁰

Braccesi continues to argue that a terminus to the *DVI* after Pompey is supported by the different reasons given in the *vitae* of Pompey and Caesar for the outbreak of war and by the general contrast of their character portrayals.⁹¹ The second point is adequately answered above. More important is the weight Braccesi assigns to the different explanations for the outbreak of war.⁹² In the *vita* of Pompey the cause of the war is said to be Pompey's order to Caesar to relinquish his army; the *vita* of Caesar assigns the cause to a triumph denied by Pompey. Braccesi calls this a radical conceptual difference; however, it is better explained as a simple contradiction, which forms an element in earlier sections of the work. For instance, at 67.4 f. the *DVI* correctly assigns the *Sulpicia rogatio* and the attempt to transfer the army of Sulla to Marius to the period before the former's battles against Mithridates. The illegality of the transfer is emphasized by the use of *eripere*. However, in 75.8, Sulla's recall is dated after his victory over Mithridates, and he is said to have obtained victory by corrupting the armies of his adversaries.⁹³ The difference in the *vitae* of Pompey and Caesar is due more to the carelessness of the *DVI* than to any other factor. That such contradictions are infrequent is due more to the absence of interlocking lives in the *DVI* than to a difference in authorship.

The strongest of Braccesi's arguments for separate authorship is based on the manuscript tradition.⁹⁴ The last nine chapters are extant only within the *Corpus Tripertitum*, whereas all of chapter 16 and almost all of chapter 1 are omitted. Braccesi relies upon textual studies which point to a common archetype for all the extant manuscripts, arguing that the addition of 78–86 supports his contention that the chapters were added by the editor of the *Corpus* to connect chapter 77 of the *DVI* to the *Caesares* of Aurelius Victor, and that the omission of chapter 1 was due to the inclusion of the *Origo gentis Romanae*.⁹⁵

⁹⁰On this see Braccesi, *Introduzione* 70. See Vinkesteyn (above, note 33) 52–95 for a commentary pointing out the host of errors in the first 35 chapters of the *DVI*. Though no one disputes that there is authentic information in the *DVI*, it is worth quoting Hildesheimer (above, note 33) 63 on the *fides historica* of the work: "De Nostro (*DVI*) autem constat eius librum tam multis eisque non levibus erroribus foedari. . ."

⁹¹Braccesi, *Introduzione* 74.

⁹²Braccesi, *Introduzione* 76: ". . . contengano una radicale contraddizione concettuale."

⁹³75.8: *Mox cum rogatione Sulpicia imperium eius (Sulla) transferretur ad Marium, in Italiam regressus corruptis adversariorum exercitibus* . . .

⁹⁴For general remarks, see above pp. 217 ff.

⁹⁵Braccesi, *Introduzione* 86; A. Momigliano argues rightly (p. 147) that the title *Origo gentis Romanae* applies to the whole work and not simply to the first part of the *Corpus*. "Some Observations on the *Origo gentis Romanae*," *JRS* 48 (1958) 56–73 = *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome 1960) 145–76.

Braccesi leans heavily on the notion of the archetype to support spurious addition, but in fact it is hardly a necessary consequence of accepting this stemma for the *DVI*. The last nine chapters may well have dropped out of the tradition at some point to be preserved in *o* and *p*. D'Elia argues that *o* and *p* go back to a common manuscript, the *Codex Metelli*, which he dates about 1200, and this in turn goes back to a common archetype (*omega*) of the ninth century.⁹⁶ The last nine chapters could have been added at the time of the copying of *omega* or at any other point in the tradition. In fact, the absence of chapter 16 in Class A points to some problem in the textual tradition.⁹⁷ But an equally plausible argument can be made for a loss of these last nine chapters rather than for an addition. In sum, the argument must depend on the content and style of these chapters rather than on an inconclusive textual argument.⁹⁸

The chronological schema of the last nine chapters is reminiscent of the schema utilized earlier in the work. Chapters 78 on Julius Caesar and 79 on Octavian are grouped together by family. The link is stressed in the opening sentence of 79:

. . . ex Octavia familia in Iuliam translatus in ultionem Iulii Caesaris.

The remaining lives are those of opponents or enemies of the *familia Julia*. The first group consists of Cato and Cicero who are, ideologically at least, the main Republican opponents of the older generation. (The reference to Cato as *praetorius* reoccurs in Ampelius 19.9.) The next section consists of Caesar's main assassins, Brutus and Cassius. The last three chapters treat the opponents of Octavian, Sextus Pompeius, M. Antonius, and Cleopatra. The arrangement is thematic and is used to deal with other complicated historical events such as the First and Second Punic Wars.⁹⁹

Thus the basic pattern of theme and chronology is evident throughout the entire *DVI*. It provides "ein nach Personen geordneter Abriss der römischen Geschichte."¹⁰⁰ The biographical element comes out most strongly in those sections that are, strictly speaking, not biographical in character. For example chapter 20, basically concerned with the passage of

⁹⁶D'Elia, "Per una nuova edizione" (1973) 56–63. On the *Codex Metelli*, see Momigliano 145 ff.; D'Elia, "Per una nuova edizione" (1968) 145–47; and S. Mariotti, "Il Codex Metelli nella tradizione dell'*Origo gentis Romanae*," *SCO* 10 (1961) 102–11.

⁹⁷See previous note.

⁹⁸The argument from language is the weakest of all. The disputes on the date of Ampelius should provide a warning about the use of linguistic criteria in such a short and isolated work. See Bo's summary (above, note 19) 134–68.

⁹⁹The similarity of procedure is not a compelling argument for authenticity, but it certainly does not argue against it.

¹⁰⁰F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (Leipzig 1901) 310.

the Licinian-Sextian rogations of 366, revolves around a central incident in the life of C. Licinius Stolo. The historical material is totally encompassed by the biographical element and represented merely as an incident in the protagonist's life. Victor and Eutropius perform the same feat on a similar scale for the imperial period.

The broad chronological and thematic arrangement that connects the *vitae* is matched by an attempt to structure each *vita* internally. Though the pattern is applied with varying degrees of consistency and coherence, a basic structure emerges in each *vita*.¹⁰¹ Enmann developed a schema parallel to that which he found in his reconstruction of the *Kaiser-geschichte*:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Name |
| 2. | Birth, homeland, family relationship |
| 3. | Summary assessment of character and effectiveness |
| 4. | Notices on death and burial ¹⁰² |

Enmann recognized that his schema applied most completely to the biographies of the kings.¹⁰³ However, the *DVI* evinces wider discrepancies in its biographical treatment than his schema allows. To illustrate this I have divided the chapters into two large categories, one basically biographical and the other basically historical.¹⁰⁴ The following are biographical, according to Enmann's criteria:

1-4	19	47
4.10 to end	24	49
5-8	26	50-54
10	27	57-58
15	32-35	60-86
18	37-45	

¹⁰¹The fundamental article on the structure of the *vitae* of the *DVI* is Enmann (above, note 2) 338-501, esp. 461-501.

Sherwin, *Reconstruction* 98 ff., posits seven patterns (but only six are mentioned) that the *DVI* follows in its individual sections: (1) the pattern of the *Elogia*, (2) chronology, (3) chronological format, (4) names, (5) biography, and (6) nicknames. Presumably the seventh is the absence of pattern. The schema is confused, however, and several so-called patterns are simply variations of one another. Sherwin's mistake is in his attempt to define the *DVI*'s method of composition too narrowly.

¹⁰²Enmann (above, note 2) 462-65. Enmann rightly observed that the fourth category was less consistently used than the others and that the *DVI* often ignored it (p. 465). See his detailed analysis of the life of M. Aemilius Scaurus (pp. 468-69).

¹⁰³Enmann (above, note 2) 468.

¹⁰⁴This division should not be confused with that postulated by Braccisi, *Introduzione* 30-31, who argues that there are two sources, a biographical and an historical one, that have

I have allowed chapters to be included in the listing, although some elements in Enmann's schema might be missing, if the character of the *vita* is not seriously altered. Chapters have been excluded if the information about individuals is given only to set the stage for a particular event that the *DVI* wants to record. An example of the second category is offered by the notice in the early section of the work on Tarquinius Collatinus.¹⁰⁵ Here the biographical introduction serves merely as a means to retell the main incident of the rape of Lucretia and the conspiracy against Tarquinius.¹⁰⁶ Even less biographical is chapter 30 concerning the Roman disaster at the Caudine Forks. The consuls who are named in the opening sentence do no more than supply a date and part of the cast of characters involved in the incident. No specifically biographical information is given. The chapter in fact is merely an introduction to the series which follows on the Samnite wars.¹⁰⁷

Non-Roman *vitae* are handled in the same manner. Chapters 11 on Porsenna and 48 on Hasdrubal rely on the biographical schema only for purposes of introduction. Name and title are given in all cases, but there the biographical treatment ceases.¹⁰⁸ The remainder of each *vita* deals with the figure's contact with the Romans. In both chapters the summary assessment of character is omitted. The death of Hasdrubal is related, but only because it forms part of the battle of the Metaurus which is the author's main concern.¹⁰⁹ Porsenna is hardly dealt with at all, being merely a chronological and thematic peg upon which to hang the stories of Horatius, Scaevola and Cloelia.¹¹⁰ The other non-Romans meet Enmann's specifications for biography in varying degrees: Cleopatra, Mithridates, Viriathus, Hannibal, Pyrrhus, and Mettius Fufetius. They are in fact more regular than the Roman lives. The explanation for this appears to be that they correspond more closely to a schema applicable to imperial *vitae*,

influenced the *DVI* in its treatment of material. My view is that in some cases the focus of the *DVI* is on the event rather than on the individual; this difference can lead to no supposition about the nature of the source employed for a particular section of the work.

¹⁰⁵See Livy 1.57–59; D. H. 4.64 ff..

¹⁰⁶Enmann (above, note 2) 464 noticed the concentration of the *DVI* on *cognomina* at the expense of other elements in the name.

¹⁰⁷See G. Bendz, "Eine lateinische Exemplabiographie," *Δρᾶγμα Μ. P. Nilsson dedicatum* (Lund 1939) 56–66, for an attempt to utilize this lack of biographical structure as proof that the *DVI* derives from *exempla* rather than from a biographical collection. He is rightly criticized by A. Klotz, *Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla* (Munich 1942) 78–80.

¹⁰⁸4.10: *Mettius Fufetius, dux Albanorum*; 11.1: *Porsenna rex Etruscorum*; 48.1: *Hasdrubal, frater Hannibalis*.

¹⁰⁹48.3–4: *Nero . . . caput Hasdrubalis ante vallum Hannibalis proiecit*.

¹¹⁰See above p. 223.

being complete in themselves and centering on a single figure. Their place in the collection, however, totally depends on their connection with Roman affairs.¹¹¹

The variation in the external structure of the *vitae* seems to be due to the framework imposed upon himself by the author of the *DVI*. At times the biographical arrangement interfered with his attempt to narrate important events in Roman history, and so he compromised by linking the events to a biographical context. This was done even when the author had a minimal interest in the biography of the personage involved. Often this meant no more than introducing the character and then narrating the incident of central concern.¹¹² Sometimes the biographical element essentially disappears and the interest centers on the incident alone, as in chapter 30 on the Caudine Forks.¹¹³

In general Enmann's schema holds true for the strictly biographical sections of the *DVI*. However, we have seen that the author consistently adopted a biographical approach when such an approach was really inappropriate. It tended to interfere with his basic intention which was to provide a thumbnail sketch of Roman history down to the Empire.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹It is useful here to contrast Eutropius' handling of the kings (1.1–8) with the Republic section of his work (1.9–7.7). Though not as full biographically as the *DVI*, the arrangement of the kings is by successive reigns, while the treatment of the Republic is that of a chronicle. For an attempt to stress the institutional and biographical content of Eutropius between 509–450, see M. Capozza, *Roma fra monarchia e decemvirato nell'interpretazione di Eutropio* (Rome 1973).

¹¹²For example, 11, 12, 13, 20, 46, 48, 55.

¹¹³Other examples are *DVI* 14, 21, 22, 25, 30, and 36. For criticisms of the application of too rigid a schema to ancient biography, in particular that of Leo, see W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie* (Munich 1951), and the qualifications of A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971) 19–20.

¹¹⁴I would like to thank Professors G. V. Sumner and C. Trahman for their kind assistance.