UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Style and structure of the Historia Augusta

Burgersdijk, D.W.P.

Publication date

2010

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Burgersdijk, D. W. P. (2010). *Style and structure of the Historia Augusta*. [Thesis, externally prepared, Universiteit van Amsterdam]. Eigen Beheer.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

*Style and
Structure
of the*
**Historia
Augusta**

Diederik Burgersdijk
Amsterdam 2009

STYLE AND STRUCTURE
OF THE *HISTORIA AUGUSTA*

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

Ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus prof. dr. D.C. van den Boom
ten overstaan van een door het college voor promoties ingestelde commissie,
in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Aula der Universiteit
op 4 maart 2010, te 14.00 uur

door

Diederik Willem Peter Burgersdijk

geboren te Enschede

Promotor: Prof. dr. D. den Hengst

Overige leden: Prof. dr. R. Behrwald (Universität Bayreuth)
Prof. dr. J. Bloemendal (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
Prof. dr. L. de Blois (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen)
Prof. dr. F.J.A.M. Meijer (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
dr. D. Rijser (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

FACULTEIT DER GEESTESWETENSCHAPPEN

Paranimfen: Matthias Haentjens
Lyn Tjon Soei Len

parentibus
uxorique

© Diederik W.P. Burgersdijk, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. All rights reserved. No part of this thesis may be reproduced, distributed, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the author.

This version of the thesis is printed in 30 copies
Frontispicium: Piet van Bragt, Roermond
Lay-out: Myrte Jansen, Amsterdam

Acknowledgement

Before presenting my findings on the *Historia Augusta*, I should like to express my gratitude to some people and institutions without whose aid this study would never have come to fruition. The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) donated a triple grant for stays in the hospitable and studious atmosphere of the Fondation Hardt in Vandoeuvres, Switzerland, in the summer months of 2004, 2005 and 2006. NWO also made it possible for me to pay full attention to my research in the academic year of 2008-09. In the past two years I have profited from a visiting scholarship at the University of Amsterdam (UvA). I thank the staff of the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome (KNIR) for a hospitable stay in January and February 2009 during the final stages of work on this study. During these years I was given full support by colleagues and staff of the Hilversum Gemeentelijk Gymnasium.

Parts of this study were produced as papers at conferences: the paragraphs on Nepos (partly integrated into Chapters 3 and 4) at the Bamberg conference on the *Historia Augusta* (2005), the final part of Chapter 6 on documents in Macrinus' and Diadumenian's biographies at the Katwijk Conference of Greek and Latin linguistics (2007), chapter 7 on Hadrian's *Animula* at the Amsterdam Hobby Club of Latinists (2008) and the relationships with Pliny the Younger (§ 5.5.2) at the Conference on Pliny in Late Antiquity at the University of St Andrews (2009). I thank the participants for their useful comments and suggestions.

This study could not have been completed without the invaluable help of my senior colleague dr. Wim Lindeboom, who corrected the text intensively, going far beyond my moderate request to have a look at my English. Secondly, I wish to thank Alexander van Trigt, who helped me unwearyingly with technical problems and encouraged me to continue work in hard times. My father Peter Burgersdijk edited an electronic version of the *HA*, thereby providing precious groundwork for narratological analysis. With Johan Weststeijn I discussed narratological aspects of this study, especially those figuring in the introduction. Professor Daan den Hengst led me to the path of late antiquity and guided me through the unfathomable corridors of the labyrinth known as the *Historia Augusta*. His approach to classical texts will remain a guideline in my further studies. Other friends and colleagues know that I am grateful for discussions about details of this study and support during my research, not least among them the members of the board of the Zenobia Foundation, Willemijn Waal and Floris van den Eijnde in particular. The sole responsibility for any mistakes remains, of course, mine.

This study is dedicated, for reasons that I cannot explain in a nutshell, to my parents and to my wife Astrid – *quia vos cupidos veterum imperatorum perspexi*.

Amsterdam, January 2010

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and symbols used in the text (except for bibliographical issues)	9
Chapter 1 General Introduction	10
1.1 The Nature of the <i>Historia Augusta</i>	10
1.2 The Aim of This Study	12
1.3 Lines of Approach	13
1.3.1 Style and Structure.....	13
1.3.2 Textual Layers	15
1.3.3 Source Texts.....	16
1.3.4 Time and Historiography	18
1.3.5 Speeches and Documents	22
1.3.6 Paratext	23
1.4 Contents of this Study.....	25
1.5 Bibliographical Note	26
Chapter 2 Introduction to the <i>HA</i>	28
2.1 Contents	28
2.2 Structure	29
2.2.1 The Part of the Primary and Secondary Lives	30
2.2.2 The Parts of the Intermediary and Later Lives	33
2.3 Models	34
2.3.1 Cornelius Nepos	36
2.3.2 Other Models	38
2.4 Sources	40
2.4.1 Sources from the Third Century	40
2.4.2 Sources from the Fourth Century	42
2.4.3 Alleged Sources	43

Chapter 3 The Literary Design	47
3.1 Introduction	47
3.2 The Art of Biography.....	48
3.2.1 Biography Criticized	48
3.2.2 The Description of Cordus	52
3.3 The Contents of the <i>HA</i>	54
3.3.1 The Contents of the Primary and Secondary Lives	54
3.3.1.1 Categories of <i>Principes</i>	54
3.3.1.2 The Actual Contents of the Books	58
3.3.2 The Contents of the Intermediary and Later Lives	61
3.4 The Scope of the <i>HA</i>	63
3.4.1 The Beginning of the <i>HA</i>	65
3.4.2 The End of the <i>HA</i>	66
3.5 Style	70
3.6 Dedications	73
3.7 Time in the <i>HA</i> I	76
3.7.1 Time of the Story	77
3.7.2 Time of the Narrative	77
3.8 The Problem of the Lacuna	79
3.9 Concepts of History (<i>Car.</i> 1-2)	81
3.9.1 The Vocabulary of Human Life	82
3.9.1.1 The Theme of the <i>Aetates Romae</i>	83
3.9.1.2 Roman History as Surveyed in <i>HA</i> (<i>Car.</i>)	83
3.9.1.3 The Valerian–Probus Era	83
3.9.1.4 The Era from Romulus to Augustus	84
3.9.1.5 The Imperial Era from Augustus to Alexander Severus	87
3.9.1.6 The Imperial Era from Valerian to Probus	87
3.10 The Theme of <i>boni malique imperatores</i>	88
3.10.1 Good Emperors and Bad	88
3.10.2 Tyrants and <i>Fortuna</i> in the <i>HA</i>	92
Chapter 4 Structures in Individual Books	94
4.1 Introduction	94
4.2 Transitions from Preface to Narration	94
4.2.1 Transitions from Preface to Narration in the Earlier Lives	97
4.2.2 Transitions from Preface to Narration in the Intermediary Lives	99
4.2.3 Transitions from Preface to Narration in the Later Lives	101
4.3 The Changing Structure	103
4.3.1 Combined Emperors	105
4.3.2 Combined Tyrants	107
4.3.3 Book Division	109
4.4 Time in the <i>HA</i> II	110
4.4.1 Time of the Series	110
4.4.2 Time of the Story in the Primary Lives	111
4.4.3 Time of the Narrative in the Primary Lives	112
4.4.4 Time of the Narrative and Time of the Story in the Primary Lives	113

Chapter 5 The <i>Nomen Antoninorum</i> Theme	118
5.1 Introduction: Imperial Names	118
5.2 The <i>NA</i> Theme in the Earlier Lives	120
5.2.1 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>Ael.</i> , <i>AP</i> , <i>MA</i> and <i>V</i>	120
5.2.2 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>S</i>	124
5.2.3 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>Cc.</i>	129
5.2.4 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>G</i>	133
5.3 The <i>NA</i> Theme in the Intermediary Lives I	138
5.3.1 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>OM</i>	138
5.3.2 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>Dd.</i>	148
5.4 The Structure of <i>G</i> , <i>OM</i> and <i>Dd.</i>	160
5.4.1 The Structure of <i>G</i>	161
5.4.2 The Structure of <i>Dd.</i>	167
5.4.3 The Structure of <i>OM</i>	170
5.5 The <i>NA</i> Theme in the Intermediary Lives II	173
5.5.1 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>Hel.</i>	173
5.5.2 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>AS</i>	179
5.5.3 The <i>NA</i> Theme in <i>Gd.</i>	194
5.6 Conclusions about the <i>NA</i> Theme	198
5.6.1 Frequency and Duration	199
5.6.2 Motifs	202
5.6.3 Description of the <i>NA</i> Theme	203
5.6.4 The Origin of the <i>NA</i> Theme	204
5.6.5 The <i>NA</i> Theme and the Development of the <i>HA</i>	206
 Chapter 6 Documents and Biographical <i>Inventio</i>	 211
6.1 Introduction	211
6.2 Documents	211
6.3 Narrative Space of Prefaces, Documents and the <i>NA</i> Theme	219
6.4 A Document in Direct Speech (<i>OM</i> 6)	225
6.4.1 Macrinus' Letter to the Senate	225
6.4.2 Embedding in the Immediate Context	227
6.4.3 Relation to <i>Dd.</i>	229
6.4.4 Relation to the <i>HA</i>	230

Chapter 7 An Authentic Document: Hadrian's <i>Animula</i>	234
7.1 Introduction	234
7.2 Textual Issues (vss. 3 and 4)	235
7.3 Structure of the Poem (vss.1-5)	236
7.4 Models and Imitators	238
7.4.1 Catullus	238
7.4.2 Laevius	239
7.4.3 Septimius Serenus	240
7.4.4 Aulus Gellius	241
7.4.5 Ausonius	242
7.5 <i>Deminutiva</i> (vss. 1 and 4)	243
7.6 The Soul and the Underworld (v.4)	244
7.7 A Poetical <i>volta</i> (v.5)	246
7.8 <i>Animula</i> and the Poetry of its Time	248
Chapter 8 Conclusion	251
8.1 Style and Structure of the <i>HA</i>	251
8.2 Sources and Models	252
8.2.1 Shifts Between Source Texts	253
8.2.2 Nepos	254
8.2.3 Suetonius	255
8.2.4 Eutropius	255
8.2.5 Aurelius Victor	256
8.3 The Literary Design	256
8.4 Structures in Individual Books	258
8.5 The <i>NA</i> Theme	259
8.6 Narrative Space	261
8.7 An Authentic Document (<i>H</i> 25.9)	263
8.8 Further Research	264
Bibliography	267
Abbreviations	267
General Bibliography	267
Texts, Translations, Commentaries, Lexica	292
<i>Historiae Augustae Colloquia</i>	293
Primary Sources: Editions and Commentaries	294
<i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	296
Nederlandse samenvatting	297

Abbreviations and symbols used in the text (except for bibliographical issues)

av.	Average	LL	Later Lives
ch.	Chapter	NA	<i>Nomen Antoninorum</i>
DD	Direct Discourse	NS	Narrative Space
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i>	PL	Primary Lives
EL	Earlier Lives	Σ	sum
HA	<i>Historia Augusta</i>	SHA	<i>Scriptores historiae Augustae</i>
ID	Indirect Discourse	SL	Secondary Lives
i.e.	<i>id est</i>	TN	Time of the Narrative
IL	Intermediary Lives	TS	Time of the Story
ILS	<i>Inscriptiones</i>	v / vv	verse(s)
l.c.	<i>loco citato</i>	viz.	Visually

Chapter 1 General Introduction

1.1 The Nature of the *Historia Augusta*

It may come as a surprise to many students of classical literature that the *Historia Augusta* (henceforth: *HA*)¹ belongs to the most intensively studied works of classical historiography. The obvious explanation for this happy fact is that the *HA* is by far the most voluminous historiographical source still surviving for the imperial history of the third century and, in addition to authors as Herodian and Cassius Dio, provides valuable information about the second and third centuries. Hence, the *HA* has generally been studied from an historical point of view, as an indispensable source for this period.

Unfortunately, the anonymous author of the *HA*, writing at the end of the fourth century AD or somewhat later, only had a superficial knowledge of the preceding centuries. In spite of poor material, he undertook the ambitious project of describing all the emperors, as well as their colleagues and rivals from Hadrian to Diocletian, leading to a patchwork of texts, based on sources of varying reliability, put together in the format of a series of imperial biographies. The way in which he composed his work forced him to pay some attention to its presentation: he constructed a series in the tradition of Suetonius, whom he greatly admired. In contrast with his model, he felt a need to add much authorial comment, through which he attempted to clarify the style and structure of his work. In order to enhance the unity of the heterogeneous fragments, he used recurring themes throughout the biographies. In addition, he introduced elements of a purely literary character: dedications to two emperors from the early fourth century (Diocletian and Constantine), epilogues, fictitious authors and sources, and fake documents. Given these aspects, which occupy a substantial part of the total text of the *HA*, any reader of the work will understand that, apart from being a problematical source of historical knowledge, the *HA* is partly a work of fiction with literary pretensions, however varying its appreciation may be by those who study the *HA*.

This aspect of the *HA* is one that has attracted less attention in its investigative history, although in recent commentaries the literary art of the *HA* has received increasing consideration.² The general concern has been to distinguish between fact and fiction in the text of the *HA*. This has been effected not only by comparing its data with material

¹ Manuscript *P* (s.IX) labels the work, here referred to as the *HA*, as: *Vitae diversorum principum et tyrannorum*, which, according to Callu *e.a.* 1984/5, 97n4, was borrowed from the first words of the biography of Opilius Macrinus (*OM*). The catalogue of Murbach (s.IX) has *Vita cesaru(m) v(e)l tira(n)noru(m) ab helio adriano us(que) ad Car(u)m carinu(m) libri VII* (Callu 1985, 119, first described by Bloch 1901, 271n268). The name of *Historia Augusta* is given by Sylburg 1588 (followed by Casaubon 1603: Callu 1992, vii), who supposedly took it from the text of the emperor Tacitus' biography (*Tac.* 10.3). In title descriptions on frontispieces of the printed work or in bibliographies, the designation *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (or: *SHA*) came into use, a notation which passed out of use in the course of the twentieth century after the acceptance of Dessau's discovery in 1889 that the book is to be attributed to one author, instead of the six authors who were supposed to have composed the thirty books. Unfortunately, the authors' names are still in use in some bibliographies, catalogues and other systems of reference, a practice that should be discarded as it easily leads to mistakes.

² Particularly Paschoud 1996 and 2001; Fündling 2007.

sources (coins, papyri, inscriptions, artefacts, buildings) or by source criticism through comparison with other historiographical works, but also by studying important aspects such as authorship, date of composition, the author's social and intellectual circle, the aim of the work and, above all, sources.³ As historical approaches greatly predominate, much less attention has been paid to the internal composition of the work, such as style, structure and language.

After Dessau's essential discovery that a single author at the end of the fourth century had been responsible for the composition of the *HA* as we know it (which Mommsen in 1890 partly accepted, while Klebs and others rejected the theory fiercely), the studies by Hohl (starting from 1911) marked the beginning of a new stage that was characterized by a clear-cut acceptance of Dessau's insight.⁴ Hohl's advertisement of Dessau's view advanced further investigation of the treacherous parts of the *HA*. In the latter half of the twentieth century, Ronald Syme was the first to stress the importance of the more imaginative parts of the work, in an effort to obtain a clear picture of the author's conceptions of historiography and, following this, of the composition, structure and development of the work.⁵ Though not all of Syme's ideas have withstood the rapid progress of scholarship, modern studies and commentaries show that literary aspects are finally receiving due attention. The inventive mind of the author can no longer be neglected for a proper assessment of the imbroglia which is the *HA*. Syme's main readjustment of Dessau's thesis that the *HA* had been written by a 'Fälscher'⁶ is that the author can be characterized as a 'rogue scholar'. While Dessau declared at the end of his article that a mystery was involved,⁷ Hohl saw the *HA* as 'ein Stück Unterhaltungsliteratur',⁸ and Syme defined it as 'a garden of delights, with abundant refreshment', its author being a 'frivolous impostor' or a 'farceur'. Not so much forgery, then, but rather

³ A revival of this aspect of research has been seen in the past few decades, especially since Syme's and Barnes' important studies on the subject. In the nineteenth century, Enmann's theory about the *Kaisergeschichte* (*EKG*, Enmann 1884) provoked much discussion, and is still (though not entirely uncontested) a guiding principle in the discussions about sources today. The essence of his theory is, that the *HA* and the abbreviators Aurelius Victor and Eutropius all drew their information from the same source, now lost. For a recent overview of the discussion, see Burgess 2005.

⁴ In 1911, Hohl published a study about the *vita Taciti*, followed by an article on the authors' names Pollio and Vopiscus the year after. In 1915, in *Bursians Jahresberichte*, Hohl stated that Dessau's thesis should be the basis for any further research of the *HA*, which is indeed generally accepted nowadays. The discussion about single or plural authorship has revived in the past few decades, especially since the computer-based research initiated by I. Marriott in 1979. For an assessment of this discipline see Den Hengst 2002, Paschoud 2003.

⁵ Syme's studies and contributions to the *Historia Augusta Colloquia* have been collected in four volumes about the *Historia Augusta* that appeared in 1968 (*Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*), 1971 (*Emperors and Bibliography*), 1971 (*A Call of Clarity*) and 1983 (*Historia Augusta Papers*), the value of all of which can hardly be overestimated in today's research.

⁶ It is interesting to note that only one year before Dessau's contribution his main adversary Klebs came up with a harsh verdict about the author's composition of the life of Avidius Cassius (*AC*) and explicitly called him a 'Fälscher' (1888, 342), without perceiving the full consequences of this statement.

⁷ Dessau formulated the problem of the *HA* in his famous words at the end of his revolutionary contribution to the debate (1889, 392): 'Eine Mystifikation liegt vor; es ist nicht zu verwundern, wenn es uns nicht gelingt, die Persönlichkeit ihres Urhebers mit völliger Deutlichkeit zu erkennen'.

⁸ Hohl 1937, 141: 'Die *HA* ist doch kein Geschichtswerk, sondern ein Stück Unterhaltungsliteratur'. Cf. Syme 1971, 282: 'The *Historia Augusta* is a literary product. The primary task is to investigate its structure and genesis' (with reference to Hohl 1958, 152).

‘imposture’ or ‘impersonation’.⁹ It is the design and the underlying ratio of that work which we will study in the coming chapters.

1.2 The Aim of This Study

The present study is an attempt to analyse aspects of the literary art of the *HA*. It is true that the *HA* contains a large amount of fiction, if the elements that are meant to delude the reader in his search for historical facts may be called so. Such artifice, however, is sometimes meant to be understood by the reader, however complicated its instances may seem and however deeply they may be concealed under the surface of the text. There is a system to the seemingly arbitrary ways of describing the emperors, and many contradictions in the authorial comments are part of a literary game that is intended to be ultimately understood, not to remain hidden from the reader. The clues to uncovering the deception are there for him to find and can be found by reading between the lines.¹⁰ The *HA*’s ‘garden of delights’ is designed to be enjoyed, not to frustrate the reader in his quest for information about imperial history. Syme’s attempt, after Dessau’s example, was to unmask the impostor.¹¹ Here lies the point of departure of this study, and we shall try to show that examining the literary framework in which the historical content is enclosed will take us closer to an understanding of the *HA* as a whole. Our own lack of knowledge about the period in which the *HA* came into being often prevents us from fully realising where and when the author is weaving his illusions, on the added understanding that, at our great remove, we have far more difficulty in recognising the author’s subtleties than his own contemporaries.

Meanwhile, the subject matter of the *HA* is made out of imperial history. By investigating the form in which the chapters on the history of the second and third centuries are presented, our understanding of the reliability of their historical content may improve. Sometimes, information about the history of the era in question has the character of a literary imitation of earlier periods in Roman history and literature, while elsewhere the author incorporates anachronistic elements in his work by borrowing from contemporary authors of the late fourth century.¹² Studying style and structure and, to a

⁹ The characterisations are taken from Syme 1968, 4; 1971, 10, 13 and 284. A literary approach was advocated by Hasebroek 1916, 5; Hohl 1920, 307-10 and 1958, 152; Syme 1971, 263: ‘A rogue scholar saw the fun to be got from erudition. (...) An attempt might be made to put him [i.e. the author] in some literary genre, or at least in the vicinity’; Straub (1952, 7) states: ‘Hier beginnt die zweite Aufgabe, die ihrerseits wieder zwischen der Ermittlung der persönlichen Äusserungen und Kunstgriffe des Verfassers und deren Einordnung in die zeitgenössischen bzw. bildungs- und literaturgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zu unterschieden hat’; Straub (1976, xxxvi) characterises the author as ‘ein Literat, der (...) mit den Schätzen einer enzyklopedischen Gelehrsamkeit aufwartet, um (...) den Gebildeten zur anregenden Diskussion im launigen Ludus einzuladen und dem allgemeinen Leserpublikum die im Rahmen der historischen Erzählung willkommene Unterhaltung und Belehrung zu vermitteln’; Den Hengst 1981, 1-2; Scholtemeijer 1984, 4.

¹⁰ Syme 1968, 2: ‘And here and there, the deceiver lifts the veil, gently’. Also Dessau’s remark about the plurality of authorial names points in the same direction (1889, 392): ‘Der Gedanke, die Entdeckung der Fälschung dadurch schwieriger zu machen, dürfte ihm fern gelegen haben.’

¹¹ ‘...an attempt will be made to unmask that impostor. To stop short would be weak and miserable’ (Syme 1968, 4).

¹² For example, when anecdotes about earlier emperors are transposed to the lives of later emperors, which frequently occurs when the author uses Suetonius (Chastagnol 1972). Such cases may be called temporal

lesser extent, language is the method which the present study seeks to apply in order to better evaluate the historical data and the author's sources, for both historical fact and literary models. The evaluation of the component elements and parts of the *HA*, recognizable by sudden switches or striking breaks in the narration, sometimes produces a better insight into the author's use of sources and his aims for the entire work. Such a combined historiographical and philological approach to the *HA* will prove to be fruitful for a greater understanding of this enigmatic work. This study, though primarily intended to discuss problems of style and structure, intends to show how an investigation of the formal aspects of a historiographical work can advance historical knowledge, and how the progress that has been made during the past decades with regard to historical issues can contribute to improving our understanding of the internal composition and the aims of the *HA*.

1.3 Lines of Approach

1.3.1 Style and Structure

In this study, terminology from the field of literary theory will be applied, as this is an indispensable tool in a study that involves the literary aspects of a historiographical work. Specialists in the field of late antique historiography may not always be acquainted with its terminology. Studies about literary theory, however, have steadily grown in volume, theories have been proposed, discussed and rejected, but some concepts have entered the realm of research to stay. Starting from these insights, I hope to advance the discussion about time as a narratological device in ancient narrative, especially with regard to the structure of ancient biography, which type of text is particularly suited to temporal analysis. The terms used will always be accompanied by a definition and some theory, when necessary.

Before turning to the constituent chapters of this study, let me sketch a general outline of the approach adopted in this study. The words in its title, style and structure, serve to describe the angle from which the parts of the *HA* to be discussed will be viewed. Defining these complex notions inevitably meets with theoretical problems, though for our present purposes, the following two descriptions will suffice. Style¹³ is used with

analepseis. Anachronisms (or temporal *prolepseis*) occur when names from the later fourth century are given to characters in the narration, such as Toxotius or Ragonius Celsus (Dessau 1889, 351-3) or when events from later times are referred to, such as the reference to the statue of Petronius Probus (*Pr.* 24.2 and Chastagnol 1994, xcvi) and the Probus oracle, a prophecy of future greatness for the descendants of the emperor Probus (*Pr.* 24.2-3, an important passage on which Dessau 1889, 355 based his thoughts about the dating of the *HA*). Paschoud 2001, 162-5 points out that in this passage the author refers to the consulate of Olybrius and Probinus in 395 AD, basing his words on Claudianus *Paneg. in Ol.* 11-14. Another anachronism is the reference to Zenobia's descendants, as attested in Eutropius 9.13.2.

¹³ In the Penguin handbook by Cuddon (1998, 872) the term is defined as 'the characteristic manner of expression [...], how a particular writer says things', with regard to choice of words, figures of speech, shape of the sentences and of paragraphs, in short 'of every conceivable aspect of his language and the way he uses it'. Genette (1993, 141), whose narrative theory will be an important basis for this study (see below, § 1.3.2) tries to define style in a semiotic sense, and concludes that style pertains to all the details of a narrative, and their relations: 'The "phenomenon of style" is discourse itself'. By this definition, style becomes more or less synonymous with structure, a term which does not figure in Genette's theory. For an

respect to language (words, idioms and expressions) and how the author uses it, while structure deals with relations between words, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, chapters, books as constituent parts of the *HA*.¹⁴ The author himself repeatedly comments on the style of his narration (§ 3.5) and constantly draws the reader's attention to the design of his work (§ 4.3) through grammatical remarks. Of course, these comments only cover parts of the literary design, especially when the author thinks it opportune to direct the reader's perceptions and expectations.

Investigation of the structure and composition of separate books of the *HA* is important, as the division of the text into books offers better insights in the *HA* as a work of literature. The conventional use of the term 'structure' denotes the spread of the narrative material over the text and the dividing lines caused by transitions from one part to another.¹⁵ Structure, in other words, normally relates to the formal framework in which the narrative content is presented, on the added understanding that structure is determined by its content. We shall use the term 'structure' for any level of the text, from its smallest appearances on word-level to the overall structure of the *HA*, when dealing with words, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, chapters and books. In the end, though this is not our primary purpose, investigating the structure may well reveal something about the genesis of the work (for this aspect, see especially § 5.6.5).

Apart from style and structure, the term 'theme' will be used, which pertains to passages which can cover parts of the text that range from a few words to entire paragraphs.¹⁶ One of the characteristics of the *HA* is a high frequency of recurring themes, like that of the *boni malique imperatores*, considerations about biographical writing, hereditary emperorship, and, most of all, the *Nomen Antoninorum* (*NA*, chapter 5).¹⁷ The latter theme constitutes a kind of continuous essay ranging all over the Earlier and Intermediary Lives in the *HA*, from *Ael.* to *Gd.*, and has considerable consequences for the character of the entire *HA*.¹⁸ This theme is elaborated to such an extent that several sub-themes are developed. For our investigation, the relation with literary

impression of many different approaches towards style and the sheer impossibility to define it, see the volume edited by Chatman 1971 and its introduction (ix-xv).

¹⁴ Cuddon (1999, 871) defines structure as 'the sum of relationships of the parts to each other; thus the whole', in which the parts can either be words, sentences, paragraphs, chapters, books, etc. It is worth considering the etymology of word 'structure': this is derived from the Latin *struō*, 'to compose', 'to build' or 'to construct', which was also used for literary composition (*OLD* 3 abc). In narratological treatises, structure is used in a different way than the traditional term derived from classical idiom: the term concerns the elements needed for mental reconstruction by the reader of the narrative, or the elements used to build the narrative, such as actors, events, time and place, cf. e.g. Bal 1994, 193-5.

¹⁵ To mention an example, the treatment of structure by R. Syme, 'The Structure of Tacitus' *Annales*', in: *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958, 253-70. Many other examples of structure in prose works could be mentioned; in poetry, the term also includes technical matters such as metre.

¹⁶ Sometimes, in remarks about the literary art of the *HA*, the notions 'Leitmotif' and 'motiv' are used instead of 'theme' and 'sub-theme'. Abrams (1981, 111) defines 'Leitmotif' (or 'guiding motif') as 'the frequent repetition of a significant phrase, or set description, or complex of images...' in either one or several works, while 'theme' is defined by Abrams (*ibid.*) as 'an abstract claim, or doctrine, whether implicit or asserted, which an imaginative work is designed to incorporate and make persuasive to the reader'.

¹⁷ White (1967, 115-33) lists many themes with their occurrences in the *HA*.

¹⁸ Several sub-themes are developed, such as the popularity of the name, its divinity, the use of *cognomen* and *praenomen*, etc., as shown in chapter 5.

tradition is essential, as it is this which has determined the design and structure of the *HA* to a high degree.

1.3.2 Textual Layers

The genesis or developmental history of the work, that is, the order in which the text was constructed out of several elements, can partly be traced by the author's use of sources and models. Such investigation involves the field of the author's *inventio* (Gr. εὑρεσις), a term taken from classical rhetoric. After *inventio* come the processes of *dispositio* (Gr. τάξις, the ordering of the component parts) and *elocutio* (Gr. λέξις, the wording).¹⁹ In the majority of modern textual analyses, the development of the work is not of paramount importance but merely a facet, as narratology- as a discipline- is largely concerned with the text as it is, not with the processes that led to it as an end product. Although the points of departure between classical and modern approaches differ (classical rhetoric describes the way in which the text comes into being - the *officia oratoris* - while modern narratology theorises about the different layers of the text), the two approaches can be reconciled to some extent. In this study, the terminology as developed by Genette will be used.²⁰ In a narrative text, three different layers are discernible: the 'story', or the elements out of which the text is composed (such as time, place, actors and events in the chronological order in which they actually figured); the 'narrative', which is the way in which these elements are ordered and presented to the reader, and the layer of 'narrating', which consists of words, sentences and paragraphs. Thus, the 'story' is a hypothetical layer that can be reconstructed by reading the text. The categories in ancient and modern theories can be reconciled by considering the story as the result of the process of *inventio*, or the gathering of the narrative elements, while the narrative is the result of *dispositio* and the text itself, in its final format, one of *elocutio*. Thus, the text contains at least three different layers that can be analysed each in their own way.²¹

There is one further consideration that should be taken into account. Narratology is a discipline that has sprung from the analysis of narrative but non-historical texts, such as novels. This means that no distinction is made whether the component elements are fictional or based on fact. The elements of the sort of narrative that it deals with are not supposed to be historical fact. In recent times much work has been done on historical texts, as there is no reason why they should be considered unsuited to narratological analysis.²² The next few chapters will show that a literary approach may contribute to solving problems that thus far have been solely approached with the aid of historical

¹⁹ See for those central notions of classical rhetoric: Lausberg 1973² § 444-5 (p.244-5) and Leeman 1963, 27. The latter (following *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.3) defines *inventio* and *dispositio* as the *ratio rerum*, concerning subject matter, and *elocutio* as *ratio verborum*, which relates to form.

²⁰ In the present study, I have adopted Genette's terminology as a theoretical framework for two reasons: first, Genette provides an elaborate treatment of aspects of time, which will be the main concern of this study when it comes to narrative, and second, Genette's narrative system also encompasses the notion of paratext, which will be another important topic in my research.

²¹ Genette (1980, 27) describes 'story' as the signified or narrated content, 'narrative' as the signifier, statement, discourse or narrative text itself and 'narrating' as the narrative action.

²² Hayden White in his *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, London 1987. The book has a motto from R. Barthes: 'Le fait n'a jamais qu'une existence linguistique'. Narratological analysis in classical historiography has been developed particularly by De Jong 2007.

methods (especially source criticism). These problems concern the irregular structure of the *HA* (from separate to combined lives), the heterogeneity of the constituent parts within the individual books, the change of historical method as found in the first part to that of the second and third parts, the underlying *ratio* of the author's contradictory remarks about content and scope of his own work, his play with invented authors, his use of literary models that go beyond the historical scope of the *HA*, his conception of Roman history, the insertion of fake documents, and more, all of which will be described in the next section (§ 1.4).

1.3.3 Source Texts

One of the most distinctive traits of the *HA* as a literary work is the deliberate blend of fiction and historically reliable information. Though it does not matter narratively whether elements of the story are genuine fact or not, it still remains true that they may have a basis in historical information and parts of the narration can thus be characterized as reliable or false. This holds good for both literary fiction and historiography, though the premises in both types of text are notably different: a historiographer at least pretends that the historical information given is reliable, that all the reported events have actually occurred and the persons mentioned have really existed. A work of fiction does not have the pretence of depicting reality: both author and reader *a priori* accept that the narrative is not necessarily based on historical information, and that the characters in it do not exist in reality. The distinction between fact and fiction is therefore more relevant in historical texts than in novels e.g., and will be important in the course of this study for the evaluation of certain parts. In this connection, fiction is understood to be the result of the insertion of elements of an unhistorical nature into the narration, unhistorical pertaining to those elements that are not derived from historical facts or sources but exclusively based on the author's imagination or on some literary model.²³

Both the historical and fictional parts of the *HA* are often based on a source text that provided the material for the narration. These source texts can be texts from a predecessor, inscriptions, documents or any other kind of written text that found its way into the *HA*, either literally quoted, translated, adapted or distorted. Most of the time, the underlying texts are not made explicit, whether the author expects the reader to grasp the origin or not. In other cases, the author does mention a source, be it that these sources do not always exist in actual fact. We will encounter several types of references and allusions in the course of our research, which we will summarize and illustrate with examples in the concluding chapter.

More important for a theoretical approach is the question how the relation between the *HA* and other texts must be viewed. Naturally, the classical practice of citing and emulating predecessors, as well as alluding and referring to them (the concepts of

²³ This last addition to the definition (viz. fiction based on a model) particularly pertains to cases when information from a different context is transferred to the narration of certain (historical) events. Some examples were already given in § 1.2n12 (anachronisms), and we will encounter more cases in the course of our investigation. Genette (1993, viii) theorizes about the difference between 'fiction' and 'diction', the former pertaining to the imaginary nature of the content of a narration, the latter to the formal characteristics of the statement, or the text itself. On the basis of this distinction, he elaborates on the differences between fictional narrative and factual report, such as historiography.

imitatio and *aemulatio*) are crucial for the understanding of almost all classical texts. In literary theory, this practice has been baptised as ‘intertextuality’, the literal presence of one text within another.²⁴ For Genette, intertextuality is only one out of five manifestations of ‘transtextuality’, a system that he developed in his *Palimpsestes* (1982, tr. *Palimpsests* 1997b). One of the other four is ‘paratextuality’ (treated in the next section, § 1.3.4).²⁵ In studies of Latin literature, the notion of intertextuality has been paid much attention to, especially with respect to poetry, while Genette concentrates on his other four categories, for the very reason that ‘intertextuality’ has been treated quite extensively.²⁶

As remarked above, in the *HA*-studies much attention has been paid to source criticism, which in fact is a kind of study of intertextuality that is confined to the question from what texts the author derived his historical information. As the historical information features side by side with elements of a fictitious nature, it is important to pay attention to the relation between factual and fictitious parts within it. The elements (or *materia*) out of which the historiographical narrator moulds the story can be based on sources that treat the era described (either from a contemporary view or from a later era) or can be derived from models that do not treat or even belong to the period covered by the story. In the former case, we will speak of the source texts as ‘sources’, in the latter as ‘models’. The distinction between models and sources must be understood as an approximation of a problem that is actually more complex. What to make of a deliberate mistake by the author, derived from a source which he knew was wrong, or when historical information about an emperor is transposed and applied to the life of another? In the case of the *HA*, sources and models are often closely interwoven. When sources turn out to have been distorted deliberately, the distinction becomes somewhat tenuous, so that it will be necessary to evaluate such instances from case to case. In some instances, the author re-uses information that occurred earlier in the text of the *HA* in a different context. Here, when no exterior text can be indicated as the origin of a certain piece of information, earlier books serve as source texts for later books, a phenomenon which we can head under the label of ‘intra-textuality’. Finally, it is worth noting that the use of a certain source text can both be deduced from very short passages (consisting of only a

²⁴ The ‘literal presence’ manifests itself in several ways and in several degrees of similarity between the text and the source text, which varies from quotation (the unaltered rendering of words from another text) to superficial allusion (e.g., when using a similar theme) with a minimum of corresponding words. In the latter case, it is of course questionable whether or not vague references indicate direct textual relationships. Between these extremes, there are many variations, such as echoes (when words or clauses are used in more or less altered forms), translations (words or clauses that render the content of a text from another language, such as Greek), paraphrases (when words or clauses are meant to render the original meaning in a slightly altered form), summaries (when passages from another text appear in a much condensed form), imitations (when thematic or stylistic devices from an older text are employed to create a new text), parodies (imitation of a playful character), distortions (a deliberately false rendering of words from another text), *etc.*

²⁵ The other three manifestations are not taken into account in this study, but are worth mentioning in order to provide the full picture: ‘metatextuality’ (or the link between a commentary and the text it comments upon), ‘hypertextuality’ (or the superimposition of a later text on an earlier one) and ‘architextuality’ (which is a matter of genre, or the type of discourse to which a particular text belongs). A summary of Genette’s categories is provided by R. Macksey in Genette 1997, XVIII-XIX.

²⁶ An important contribution to the central notion of intertextuality and its manifestations in Latin poetry is Hinds 1998. Kelly (2008, 161-221) provides a useful treatment of allusion and intertextuality as encountered in the work of Ammianus.

few words) and, alternatively, whole sections. Shifts between different source texts, and the transitions and breaks that are caused by these shifts, determine the structure of the text. Thus, breaks in the textual structure may often indicate the use of different sources, as we will observe in the course of this study.

The *materia* out of which the historiographical narrator moulds his story is based on a historical source or a model for literary imitation. Besides these two categories, there is fiction – either derived from a model or entirely based on the author’s imagination. It should be remarked that fiction remains an extremely difficult concept (not least because there are considerable differences between modern and ancient views on the phenomenon), to which several studies have been devoted.²⁷

Examples of these categories in the *HA* will be provided in the concluding chapter. Apart from the relationships with other texts, there is another important factor that leaves its marks on the text, namely common knowledge, or the *materia* which is provided by contemporary events or persons. The influences of the author’s *Umwelt* on the text of the *HA* are no part of this investigation, as we will focus on the textual relationships with literature of the late republican and early imperial period, but there certainly are contemporary persons and events that found their way into the narrative.

1.3.4 Time and Historiography

An important characteristic of historiographical texts, or rather narrative in general, is the ordering of the material along chronological lines. The elements of the story which recount historical events are defined by certain historical markers and are therefore linked by temporal relationships. Before determining the exact relation between historical time and the time inherent in the story, a first requirement is for time on the level of the narrative and time on the level of the story to be specified. In an absolute sense, the time of the narrative can either be defined as the span of time that a narrator needs to tell his story (which can be expressed in number of words, verses, sentences, pages etc.) or the span of time that the reader needs to reconstruct the story by reading (expressed in such units of time as seconds, minutes and hours). The notion of ‘Time of the Narrative’ (the terminology developed by Genette in his *Narrative Discourse*, 1980) is derived from what Günter Müller in 1948 described as ‘Erzählzeit’, though the notion is often considered of limited use for narratological analysis.²⁸ The examples provided in this study, are meant to make clear that this view does not do justice to the insights that

²⁷ See e.g. Wiseman (1993, 122–46), who also treats the preface of *A* in the *HA* (pp.124–6) and Feeney (1993, 230–44). Fiction can be considered the counterpart of *veritas*, which also comprises ‘factual correctness’ (Den Hengst 2009, 3). A crucial passage regarding *veritas* in historiography is Cic. *De Or.* 2.62–4. Woodman 1988 (followed by Pekary 1990, Wiseman 1993 and Cape 1997) states that Cicero allows the historiographer, just like the orator, to add any kind of information, true or false, to embellish his narration, which has been contested by Leeman (1989, 235–41, see also 1985, 266–7). Another key-text is Quintilian *IO* 2.4.2, who discerns between myth (not containing truth), fictitious stories (*argumentum*, characterized by verisimilitude) and history (which reports facts), see Feeney 1993, 232. A discussion of the *veritas* problem is provided by Paschoud 1995b. For the notion of truth in Tacitus: Perkins 2003 and in Ammianus: Paschoud 1989 and Blockley 2001.

²⁸ The term was subject to critical considerations in the decades that followed Müller’s article. As written narrative has, in contrast with oral narrative, no measurable duration, Genette calls *Erzählzeit* a matter of *pseudo-temporality*, as, depending on specific circumstances, its duration differs.

further analysis of temporal structures in the narrative will produce. Research on temporal distribution within narrative Roman literature has hardly been done, though Greek literature, including Herodian and Plutarch, has been researched extensively in the volume *Time in Ancient Greek Literature (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative vol. II)*. For Roman literature, there is a world to be gained. The annalistic structure of Roman historiography, for example, raises numerous questions with regard to time distribution, and interesting conclusions may yet be drawn from its analysis, also in comparison with Greek literature.

In actual fact, Time of the Narrative (or: TN) mainly proves its value in relation to Time of the Story (or: TS), or so it is usually regarded.²⁹ Now the narrative, the length of which can be measured in words, moves forward in time (irrespective of the differences in pace, of which we shall come to speak later). In historiography, TS is closely connected with historical time, which can be expressed in years. The text in which historical events are described, can be measured in numbers of words (or eventually pages), and thus represents a quantity of space. This is why we can define a certain amount of text on the level of the narrative as Narrative Space (abbreviated as: NS). The relationship between text and the historical events described in it, and correspondingly the levels of the narrative and that of the story, is a relationship between spacial and temporal quantities, which practically always shows variations in the course of the narrating (or differences in 'narrative speed'). As for the macro-level of the narrative, there can be quite a regular pattern when it comes to the relationship between TN and TS. See the following example, in which the relationship between TN and TS is elucidated at the hand of Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* book 1, and then, of the whole of *BG*:

	TN (space: words)	TS (time: years)	TN / TS (space / time)
(1) Caesar <i>BG</i> 1	8180	1	8180 words a year
(2) Caesar <i>BG</i> 1-8	64158	8	8020 words a year

Figure 1.1: TN (in words) and TS (in years) in Caesar's *BG* 1 and of the entire *BG*.

The example makes clear that in *BG* the narrator devotes just over 8000 words on average to each year of historical time. The annalistic structure of *BG* makes the example easily understandable for anyone seeking to analyse the relationship between TN and TS (as a year corresponds with a book) and at the same time shows how narrative analysis adds to our understanding of temporal structures in historiography.

²⁹ Genette 1980, 87: 'By speed we mean the relationship between a temporal dimension and a spatial dimension [...]: the speed of a narrative will be defined by the relationship between a duration [...] and a length (that of the text, measured in lines and in pages)'. Paul Ricoeur (1985, 78, 83-4) defined 'Erzählzeit' as 'a matter of convention, a chronological time, equivalent to the number of pages and lines in the published work' or 'the equivalent of and the substitute for the time of reading, that is, the time it takes to cover or traverse the space of the text'. 'Let us admit with Genette that we can only compare the respective speeds of the narrative and of the story, the speed always being defined by a relation between a temporal measure and a spatial one'.

The example requires further elaboration, and a table may clear the temporal structures of historiography. The NS devoted to pieces of historical time and its distribution over the books of Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* is as follows:³⁰

Bk	year	TN
1	58	8180
2	57	4161
3	56	3593

Bk	year	TN
4	55	4574
5	54	7358
6	53	5477

Bk	year	TN
7	52	11487
8	51	6491
Total		64 158

Figure 1.2: TN (in words) in eight books of Caesar's BG

It should be noted that in the first column, TN is indicated by the numbers 1-8, which correspond with the books of BG. The second column shows the corresponding years of the Gallic War. These quantities of historical time provided the annalistic structure for the books: this is how historical time is turned into TN. In Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*, TS consists of 8 years (namely, the era of 58-51 BC). The narrative is broadly speaking chronological and perfectly linear, though some years are more elaborately described than others. One can illustrate the results of the analysis in the following diagram (words on the x-axis, years on the y-axis):

Figure 1.3: TN related to TS in eight books of Caesar's BG

The example of Caesar's works is given here as an introductory exercise for the more complicated distribution of time in the HA, to which we will return in § 4.4.

So far, we have studied the relation between narrative space and time (the narrative in words per year, in which time figures as the constant factor). The opposite

³⁰ It should be noted that the final book is by Aulus Hirtius but there is no compelling reason to exclude it from the series. For the rest, there are descriptive pauses caused by the winter break in Caesar's campaigns but this does not affect the overall design of the series.

effect occurs when varying amounts of time are treated in fixed spacial quantities.³¹ This idea can be expressed by dividing time in terms of space, which leads to conclusions of the following kind: ‘the narrator treats x unities of historical time in y words’, in which x denotes, e.g. years, and y a number of words, or books. This approach becomes significant when there are conspicuous breaks in the narrative speed, for which Ammianus Marcellinus’ *Res Gestae* may serve as an example. Ammianus treats 258 years (AD 96-353) in his first thirteen books (now lost), while 25 years (AD 353-78) are treated in eighteen books. So, in the earlier part, the author treats 20 years per book, while in the later part, the average is 1,4 years per book. This means a considerable retardation, or break in structure in the temporal relationship between TN and TS, in the middle of the collection. The break can be explained by the description of contemporary history in the later part, while the first part aims at summarizing the history between the end of Tacitus’ *Annales* and the beginning point of the narration about contemporary history. A comparable break can be observed in the case of the *HA*, to which we will return in § 3.7.

The examples concern the structure of books (Caesar’s *BG*, Ammianus’ *RG*) on a macro-level, without considering the internal *divisio* of the narrative content within the books. In Narrative Discourse, however, the scope is normally on a micro-level, especially in those instances when changes in the relation between TN and TS occur. Here we had best take a brief, closer look at the different forms in which the relationships manifest themselves. The effects of the change in relation between the TN and TS have been categorised as ‘summary’ (a large measure of TS told in a short span of TN, or $TN < TS$)³², ‘scene’ (TN and TS more or less correspond, the narration is produced in the same amount of time in which the elements actually must have occurred, or $TN = TS$)³³, ‘ellipsis’ (an amount of TS is not rendered in the narrative, or $TS = x / TN = 0$)³⁴, ‘pause’ (TN does not render TS, or $TS = 0$; $TN = x$)³⁵. Genette (1980, 93-112) calls the four temporal relationships ‘movements’ and treats them under the head of ‘duration’, though in his retrospective book *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, he prefers the term ‘speed’, or rather ‘speeds’ (1988, 34).

³¹ Genette (1988, 33) in his ‘Narrative Discourse Revisited’ calculates the average narrative speed of Balzac’s *Eugénie Grandet* (ninety days per page) and Proust’s *A la recherche du temps perdu* (5,5 days per page), but does not attach much value to the outcome (‘I make no claim of great significance for this external comparison’). Genette takes lines and pages as spatial unities, which are, however, subject to editor’s conventions. A first edition from a novel of the nineteenth century can take a totally different shape when it is reprinted a hundred years later in paperback, so that variations in narrative speed can only be measured within a book, while different books can hardly be compared to one another. The comparison between books is only possible when narrative space is measured in words (ultimately in letters and blank spaces), but not sentences, as they can vary in length without change of narrative space. Narrative space expressed in numbers of words represents an objective characteristic of texts that has been neglected in narratological theory, as it is generally held that TN only proves its value in relation with TS. The study of Narrative Space, therefore, offers opportunities for further research, such as an inventory of the lengths of books in ancient historiography, to mention just one instance.

³² Instances of ‘summary’ (Genette 1980, 95-9) in the *HA* are treated below, sub § 3.3.2: *Hel.* 35.2; *AS* 64.1-2, cf. *Tac. Ann.* 1.1.

³³ Instances of ‘scene’ (Genette 1980, 109-10) in the *HA* are acclamations (as in *C* 18.3-19.9) or the reading of the letter by Macrinus in the senate, *OM* 6 (see § 6.4), etc. See § 6.1.

³⁴ The most striking example of ‘ellipsis’ (Genette 1980, 106-9) in the *HA* is the *lacuna*: $TS = 16$ years; $TN = 0$. See § 3.8.

³⁵ Instances of ‘pause’ (Genette 1980, 99-106) in the *HA* are prefaces, in which no historical time is described. See §§ 4.1 and 6.1.

The difference between Genette's approach and the one adopted in this study is that Genette's theory is based on the practice in novels, while the *HA* in principle consists of historical material. With regard to TN there is no real difference in this respect. We have made a readjustment of Genette's view by assuming that TN can be measured in an absolute sense (namely, in number of words).³⁶ In § 3.7 it will be shown that it does make sense to measure TN by itself, as some interesting conclusions can be drawn from these measurements in absolute numbers. With regard to TS, however, an important extra factor plays a part. TS can be reconstructed by reading the text. Historical time, however, concerns the time in history in which events actually occurred and persons (who may make their appearance as characters in the narrative) actually lived. The *materia* out of which the story is constructed consists of historical events or persons; this is, at least, what the author pretends. So, TS in historiography is connected with historical time (and not, as in the novel, to time that only exists virtually), which adds an important extra factor to the analysis of TS in historiography. The layer of the story as historiography has a complicated nature, and so has TS.

1.3.5 Speeches and Documents

An important factor of temporal discontinuity in the *HA* is the presence of documents in direct discourse (or: DD).³⁷ The historical narration is often interrupted by speeches (such as the emperor's addresses to the senate or senators' speeches), acclamations, letters and abstracts from the the *gesta senatus* or *acta urbis*. These parts of the narration, consistently rendered in DD, are far from unusual in historiography, while in biography they are less common but certainly not absent from the corpus (see § 6.2).³⁸ In terms of temporal structure, these parts in DS lead to a slow-down, as they interrupt the historical narration (TN<TS) with a verbal report of the spoken or written words (TN=TS). Apart from that, the responsibility for the content of the words is shifted to someone other than the author (or to a written record by another person). This latter aspect of narratological structure, which is the introduction of another narrator is not part of our analysis, as we will focus on temporal aspects and the embedding of the content of the document in the narrative context. The way in which the author composes the documents reveals a lot about his methods of historiographic *inventio* in general. Since the number of documents and speeches in DD is high, and the NS they occupy in proportion to the total length of the text is large, they determine the character of the *HA* to a great extent. There are, however, considerable differences between the individual books when it comes to DD, which reveal something about the structure of the entire *HA*.

³⁶ Genette (1980, 86) states that the duration of a narrative 'can be nothing more [...] than the time needed for reading'. Yet, from the examples on p. 92, it appears that Genette deems it possible to measure TN in absolute quantities, namely pages (the objections to which are formulated above).

³⁷ I use the term 'direct discourse' following the theory as developed by Laird (1999, 87-101), who distinguishes between three different speech modes. In the case of the *HA*, DD is by far the most important speech mode, so that my treatment of speeches will be confined to the parts in DD (corresponding with the term *oratio recta* in traditional grammars).

³⁸ There is only one speech in indirect discourse (abbreviated as ID): Aurelius Victor Pinius' speech to the senate in *OM* 4.1-4.

In terms of temporal structure, documents show similarities with another conspicuous feature present in most of the books of the *HA*: prefaces. These, too, occupy a considerable part of TN, while also an internal development in the course of the narrative can be observed. The length and nature of the prefaces will be described in § 4.2, as well as the structural breaks when transitions to the historical narration occur, while in § 6.2 the NS they occupy will be compared with parts in DD. Though prefaces and documents are of a seemingly different character, they have in common that they can both be considered descriptions to substantiate the narrative, the former by reflection, the latter by the provision of evidence. As for temporal structure, prefaces, which mainly contain reflection on the narration itself, had best be regarded as ‘scenes’. Strictly speaking, there is only TN and no TS, as the content of the prefaces does in principle not consist of events. Genette (1980, 109-12) treats descriptions of this kind under the head of ‘scene’, considering that disquisitions as encountered in prefaces bring TS to a standstill while TN continues, while later (1988, 36-7) he revokes the idea: he states that the narrative in such cases ‘interrupts itself to give up its place to another type of discourse’, ‘in the manner more of a *fermata* [a full stop, DB] than a *rallentando* [a slow-down, DB]’, and introduces a fifth type of movement, that of ‘reflexive digression’. This idea comes close to the notion of paratext, which Genette introduced few years later.

1.3.6 Paratext

The author frequently comments upon the writing of his own work. In his programmatic remarks, the author deals with matters as content, structure and style. In the process, he frequently refers to predecessors in biography, historiography and other types of writing (§§ 2.3-4), through which he seeks to anchor the series in the history of Latin literature. To unite his somewhat diffuse collection, he uses cross references – a procedure which will also be illustrated in § 2.4. These elements occur in prefaces, intermediary remarks and epilogues and belong to the most fanciful parts of the *HA*. His comments mostly concern style and structure, the latter item of which has our special attention: a book or series of books is dedicated to a person or dedicatee, structure and contents of a book or series of books are explained in prefaces, intermediary remarks and epilogues, or he refers to other authors in order to clarify the contents and structure of his own books. All of these aspects can be headed under the term of ‘paratext’. Apart from programmatic remarks about the scope, content, style and order of treatment of the narrative, those elements must also be included which do not belong to the narration itself, but which are its ‘liminal devices’ between text and reader, such as titles, names of authors, dedications, prefaces and epilogues. Genette (1997, 1) coined the term and defined the function of paratext as ‘what enables a text to become a book and to be offered as such to its readers and, more generally, to the public’.³⁹

Apart from comments on the work itself, other devices of the book as a work of literary art also belong to the field of ‘paratext’. Book titles, authors’ names and dedicatees are part of what Genette (1997, 13) called the ‘peritext’ (the liminal devices

³⁹ Genette uses the term for the first time in *Palimpsestes* (1981, transl. 1997b) and devoted a study to it, *Seuils*, in 1987 (tr. 1997). For the purpose of this study, I use the English translations of Genette’s studies, in order to avoid terminological problems.

between author and reader within the book or its text, or appended to it). Peritext must be distinguished from ‘epitext’, which encompasses those elements that only have a slight relationship with the narrative text itself, but are still a guiding element in the interpretation of the *HA*. Both ‘peritext’ and ‘epitext’ are part of ‘paratext’. Epitextual elements are the devices between author and reader outside the text or narrative, yet still related to it, such as glosses in the manuscripts (originating from the first centuries of the *HA*’s existence), or the division into chapters (from the sixteenth century) or the indication of book chapters by abbreviations (twentieth century). Epitextual elements can be admitted to the peritext, when it becomes part of the text proper. Two examples: i) the catalogue of Murbach (s.IX) refers to the *HA* as: *Vita cesaru(m) v(e)l tira(n)noru(m) ab helio adriano us(que) ad Car(u)m carinu(m) libri*, which is an epitextual device outside and independent of the text of the *HA*, while still referring to it, and ii) the designation of Tacitus and his works in *Tac. 10.3 (scriptorem historiae augustae)*, which is an epitextual paraphrase of Tacitus’ works, has become part of the peritext of the *HA* through Sylburg’s designation of these works (see § 1.1n1). These examples are not only meant to elucidate Genette’s terminology or, reversely, to apply narratological terms to the *HA*, but are also meant to clarify how elements from outside a text can affect the interpretation of the text proper. To give just one further example: Casaubon’s division of the *HA* into chapters directs and influences the reader’s interpretations to a certain degree, as appears from summaries of books by commentators. It is important for this investigation that the text be studied free from Casaubon’s division, as sometimes his system may hinder a clear analysis of textual structure.

The study of paratext developed from the study of narratology: whereas narratology regards the text proper, the study of paratext concerns the aspects that are complementary to the text.⁴⁰ Before the term was introduced, Den Hengst (1981) was the first to study the prefaces in the *HA*, certainly the most elaborate part of the paratext. As he makes many observations in his discussion of these prefaces about the style and structure of the *HA*, his study has proven to be important for the study of the literary aspects of the *HA*. It was shown that a philological approach, as called for by Mommsen in 1890 and stressed by Hohl in 1958,⁴¹ is especially fruitful when applied to the paratext, as the *HA* is quite unique on the point of volume as well as the nature of its self-reflection. The problem is that the comments which underly this self-reflection are often ambiguous, as will be obvious to any reader of the *HA*. This is why in the present study the programmatic remarks will be reviewed thus: first, in their own right, as products of the author’s literary art, and second, as referring to the content, style and structure of the *HA*.

⁴⁰ Apart from the items mentioned, editor, mottos, colophons, marginalia, etc. also belong to this field of study. In classical texts, *subscriptions* are important as paratextual devices, just as the titles given to a book in manuscripts (see § 1.1n1)

⁴¹ Mommsen (1890, 281): ‘Wir brauchen einen Commentar, welcher für jede einzelne Notiz die in der Sammlung selbst so wie ausserhalb derselben auftretenden Paralellstellen vor die Augen führt oder auch deren Mangel constatirt, ...’; and Hohl 1958, 152.

1.4 Contents of this Study

Models and sources partly determine the structure of the *HA* or, alternatively, the structure of the *HA* allows us to perceive models and sources. Investigating its atypical structure with respect to the books, as well as the internal structure of the individual lives, will allow us to examine aspects of the author's aims in writing his series and the relation which the text of the *HA* has with other works dating from the classical era.

The next chapter will open with an introduction as to structure and content of the *HA* in general (§ 2.2), with reference to models (§ 2.3) and sources (§ 2.4). Also, the investigative history which has led to the current ideas about the internal structure and book division of the *HA* will be briefly described. It will appear that a division in three parts (Earlier, Intermediary and Later Lives, the first category consisting of Primary and Secondary Lives) provides a good point of departure for a structural analysis of the *HA*.

Next, in chapter 3, we will inspect the author's own remarks about the structure of the *HA*. The *HA* contains a considerable amount of paratext that not only reveals the author's aims, however difficult to demonstrate this may seem, but also directs the reader as to how to interpret the work. The type of text (§ 3.2), content (§ 3.3) and scope (§ 3.4) of the *HA* will be studied in the light of his own statements about these issues. Two models will be proposed for the use of paratext: Nepos and Tacitus (§ 3.1-3). His statements about his sources will be investigated (§ 3.5) and the way in which he presents the final results of his works to his dedicatees (§ 3.6). A narratological approach will be applied to the paragraphs §§ 3.7 and 3.8: the distribution of time (TS and TN) in the *HA* is investigated, and the question is posed to what extent the author used this time division deliberately. This has also consequences for our interpretation of the much discussed *lacuna* between the lives of Maximus and Balbinus (*MB*) and of the two Valeriani (*Val.*). In 3.9 a description will be given of the author's ideas about Roman history in general, which provided the main elements for his narration. The chapter ends with an overview of good and bad emperors in the *HA*, or the theme of the *boni malique imperatores* (§ 3.10).

Whereas in chapter 3 the *HA* as a whole will be taken as point of departure, in chapter 4 the internal structure of the books is studied: first, the link of one of the most remarkable features of *HA*, the prefaces, with the biographical account, is mapped in the three parts that constitute the *HA* (§ 4.2). This goes to show that the internal division of the books attests to different programs: whereas in the first part of the *HA* the author separates co-emperors from emperors and tyrants, in the second part he begins to combine two or more emperors in single books, a structure which is further developed in the third part: the reasons for this irregular division of the material will be looked into (§ 4.3). This leads us to the internal time division of the books, particularly the space the author devotes to the youth and early career of the emperors compared with that of their reign (§ 4.4).

The structure of the Intermediary Lives in particular is largely determined by the presence of the major theme in the *HA*: the *nomen Antoninorum* (henceforth: *NA* theme). The space devoted to this theme and the way that this theme enters into the text will be studied in detail. Such a close study of the *NA* theme will provide a better insight into the author's inventions and his reasons for using the theme, and will also prove to be revealing with respect to the developmental history of the *HA* in general. The study is

ordered along the same lines as the eight books in which the theme occurs: the *NA* theme in the earlier lives (§ 5.2), in the Intermediary Lives (§§ 5.3 and 5), while halfway an analysis of the link joining these parts is necessary (§ 5.4). Then, a conclusion about the *NA* theme with all its aspects will follow: frequency, motifs and models, the development of the *NA* theme and its origin, with due attention to the question what the *NA* theme tells about the *HA* in general (§ 5.6).

An even more notable aspect that marks the structure of the *HA* is the use of documents, such as speeches, letters and abstracts from the *gesta senatus* and *acta urbis*, which all have to be considered as documentary evidence (§ 6.2). First, the NS devoted to this element is outlined and compared with the NS of prefaces and the *NA* theme, as measured in chapters 4 and 5 (§ 6.3). Then, an example of a speech in DD will be treated in detail: the embedding of the *oratio* in OM 6 (Macrinus' letter to the senate after his acclamation as emperor by the soldiers) will be explored, in order to find out whence the author got his information – or how the process of *inventio* works in the case of this fanciful part of the *HA* (§ 6.4).

Another kind of document is provided by the poetic fragment in *H* 25.9, the well-known and much-debated address by the emperor Hadrian to his soul. Its investigative history and textual issues will be elucidated (§ 7.2 and 3), after which literary matters will be looked into: literary models (§ 7.4), language (§ 7.5), structure (§ 7.7) and the literary culture and tastes of Hadrian's times (§ 7.8). The conclusion will focus on the question whether Hadrian's poem can be accepted as authentic (§ 7.9).

In chapter 8, an overview will be given of the conclusions reached in the present research, per chapter as well as on the whole. Suggestions for further research will be made.

1.5 Bibliographical Note

The basis of modern scholarship on the *HA* was laid down in five epochal years 1888-1894, in which heated discussions took place between Klebs (1888, 1890, 1892), Dessau (1889, 1892), Mommsen (1890), Seeck (1890, 1894) and Wölfflin (1894), who all had their own share in a discussion whose intensity can only be compared with the *Homerische Frage*.⁴² New questions kept scholars debating during half a century, be it that in the second part of the twentieth century these *grundlegende Studien* were no longer always regarded as a basis for discussion.

The output of scholarship has grown enormously. In 1994, André Chastagnol's monumental and accessible *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des II et IIIe siècles* appeared in the Bouquin edition. This book, with its comprehensive introductions, translations, annotations, schemes, maps and indices in 1244 densely printed pages, provides a perfect introduction to the *HA* and its intricate problems. For a more extensive survey of sources, documents, authors' names, etc. I have made use of Lécivain's still very useful book *Études sur l'Histoire Auguste* (1904). In recent times, another monumental work has joined the *HA* library: Jörg Fündling's *Kommentar zur Vita*

⁴² Hohl (1958, 133) draws the same parallel when he calls Dessau, whom he supports without reserve, 'einem Friedrich August Wolf *mutatis mutandis* vergleichbar'.

Hadriani der Historia Augusta (Bonn 2006), in which both its history and investigatory progress are laid out in a vast introduction and accurate notes on individual passages.

Three series facilitate any scholar's work on the *HA* considerably: the commentaries in the French Budé series, notably the last two volumes by Paschoud (1996 and 2001), the commentaries in the German *Antiquitas*-series and the ever expanding series of the *Historia Augusta Colloquia* (*HAC*), from 1962 issued as the *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquia* (*BHAC*) in Bonn, and from 1990 onwards in Bari. Apart from the already mentioned works by Syme and the numerous articles dispersed in books and journals mentioned in the bibliography, it is these works especially that have provided invaluable information. Whenever I quote from the *HA*, this is based on Hohl's edition of the text of the *HA* (1927, 1965²) in the Teubner series, my sole departure being some text-critical symbols when they do not effect a good understanding otherwise. All other deviations from the text will be accounted for in notes. In individual chapters use is made of other publications not mentioned here, but they will get full attention and acknowledgement where and when needed.⁴³

One of the few studies exclusively devoted to the literary aspects of the *HA* is Den Hengst's dissertation *The Prefaces in the Historia Augusta* (1981). Successive contributions by his hand to the *Historia Augusta Colloquia* complement his thesis with studies on authorial comment, documents and other, mainly philological, subjects (recently gathered in the *Collected Essays*, Den Hengst 2009). The studies entitled 'Verba, non res. Über die Inventio in den Reden und Schriftstücken in der Historia Augusta' (1987) and 'Selbstkommentare in der Historia Augusta' (1995) are particularly worthy of mention in the light of the present study. Paschoud devoted a study to several literary and rhetorical techniques in 'L'inventio dans l'*Histoire Auguste*' (1997).

Finally, I wish to draw attention to a series of important articles devoted to the study of the *HA*. Three prominent scholars have described the development of the *status quaestionis* from time to time in voluminous articles, which are precious documents in the study of late antiquity: Hermann Peter inventories the period 1865-82 (Peter 1884), 1883-1892 (Peter 1893), 1893-1905 (Peter 1906), continued by Hohl for the period 1906-1915 (Hohl 1915), 1916-1923 (Hohl 1924), 1924-1935 (Hohl 1937), continued by Chastagnol for the period up to 1963 (Chastagnol 1964) and 1969 (Chastagnol 1970): more than one hundred years of investigative history in eight articles, a series that came to an end after the introduction of the *Historia Augusta Colloquia*. The attention paid to this enigmatic work, despite its unreliable content, demonstrates the central position of the *HA* in the study of late antique prose.

⁴³ Some other studies with an exclusively literary point of departure are Reekmans 1997, Cascón 1996 (both about 'humour' in the *HA*); Picón (1996, 279-95) gives a narrative analysis of the lives attributed to Julius Capitolinus; Picón 1996, 217-28 for the *vita Avidii Casii*. Poignault 2001 treats the tyrants from the *Quadriga Tyrannorum* as characters from a novel; Pausch 2009 treats the preface to *A* and related passages in a narrative framework. Bertrand-Dagenbach (1990, 19-20 and 50-3) treats passages in *AS* in accordance with Genette's 'fonctions du narrateur'.

Chapter 2 Introduction to the *HA*

The aim of this chapter is to provide some general information about the *HA*, as a practical *vademecum* in the discussion of an elusive work. At the same time it will be sketched what *communis opinio* holds about the structure and contents of the work. Where needed in the course of this overview extra information has been added.

2.1 Contents

The following table shows the books of the *HA* in their received order, their abbreviations according to the Lessing-Hohl system, the years of the reigns of the respective (co-) emperors and usurpers, the authors' names that grace the books and the emperors to whom the books are dedicated:

<i>Books</i>	<i>Reign</i>	<i>Attributed to</i>	<i>Dedicated to</i>
1 Hadrianus (<i>H</i>)	117 – 138	Aelius Spartianus	
2 Aelius (<i>Ael.</i>)	AD		Diocletian
3 Antoninus Pius (<i>AP</i>)	138 – 161		
4 Marcus Aurelius (<i>MA</i>)	161 – 180	Julius Capitolinus	
5 Verus (<i>V</i>)	161 – 169		Diocletian
6 Avidius Cassius (<i>AC</i>)	175	Vulcacius Gallicanus	
7 Commodus (<i>C</i>)	180 – 192	Aelius Lampridius	
8 Pertinax (<i>P</i>)	193	Julius Capitolinus	
9 Didius Julianus (<i>DI</i>)	193		
10 Septimius Severus (<i>S</i>)	193 – 211	Aelius Spartianus	Diocletian
11 Pescennius Niger (<i>PN</i>)	193 – 194		
12 Clodius Albinus (<i>ClA</i>)	196 – 197	Julius Capitolinus	Constantine
13 Caracalla (<i>Cc.</i>)	198 – 217	Aelius Spartianus	
14 Geta (<i>G</i>)	209 – 212		Constantine
15 Opilius Macrinus (<i>OM</i>)	217 – 218	Julius Capitolinus	Diocletian
16 Diadumenianus (<i>Dd.</i>)	218		
17 Heliogabalus (<i>Hel.</i>)	218 – 222	Aelius Lampridius	
18 Alexander Severus (<i>AS</i>)	222 – 235		
19 Maximini duo (<i>Max.</i>)	235 – 238		Constantine
20 Gordiani tres (<i>Gd.</i>)	238 – 244	Julius Capitolinus	
21 Maximus et Balbinus (<i>MB</i>)	238		
<i>Lacuna</i>	244 – 253		

22 Valeriani duo (<i>Val.</i>)	253 – 260	Trebellius Pollio	
23 Gallieni duo (<i>Gall.</i>)	253 – 268		
24 Triginta Tyranni (<i>T</i>)			
25 Claudius (<i>Cl.</i>)	268 – 270		
26 Aurelian (<i>A</i>)	270 – 275	Flavius Vopiscus	Tiberianus ⁴⁴
27 Tacitus (<i>Tac.</i>)	275 – 276		
28 Probus (<i>Pr.</i>)	276 – 282		Celsinus
29 Quadriga Tyrannorum (<i>Q</i>)			Bassus
30 Carus, Carinus, Numerian (<i>Car.</i>)	282 – 284		

Figure 2.1: (1) *The books of the HA in their received order and abbreviations (following the notae vitarum in Hohl 1965, xv and Lessing 1901-6), (2) the reigning years of the emperors, (3) authors and (4) dedicatees.*

The overview is based on an assessment of paratextual elements in the *HA*: book titles (in the form of their modern abbreviations) and subjects of the books, authors' names and dedicatees. The numbering of the books,⁴⁵ as well as the reigning years and abbreviations are part of editorial activity and literary analysis from later times (see on this § 1.3.6). All the items mentioned will be assessed in the next chapters: the tripartite structure of the *HA* and the models and sources used within the narrative.

2.2 Structure

Ever since the contributions by Dessau and Mommsen to the debate about the *HA* in 1889-90, the books mentioned in figure 2.1 are traditionally divided into three parts: the first part containing the Primary and Secondary lives (abbreviated, when taken as a group, as PL and SL), the second the Intermediary Lives (IL) and the third the Later Lives (LL). The Earlier Lives (EL) are the sum of PL and SL. There are good reasons to divide the heterogeneous collection of lives in this fashion, and the division is widely accepted. Before turning our attention to the consequences that this division has for our investigation of the *HA*, the reasons for the division will be mapped, as they are important arguments undershoring our conclusions about the structure of the *HA*.⁴⁶

To begin with, let us have a look at the distribution of the different books over its three sections, taking as our point of departure Chastagnol's lists (1994, XXVI-XLVI):

⁴⁴ The addressee in Hohl 1965, 150 ad *Aur.* 1.9: *Mi Pi<ni>ane*, though, as postulated in my 2007 paper (Burgersdijk 2007, 104), *Tiberiane* is the better option, cf. Peter 1884 ad loc.: *parui Tiberiani* and Syme 1968, 92-3, who expected the vita to be dedicated to Tiberianus, but 'the author dispels that notion, or abruptly changes his mind. Somebody else is addressed'. Cf. Pausch 2009, 5n22.

⁴⁵ In studies on the *HA*, it is not usual to refer to the books by their numbers, though in some listings, such as Lécivain 1904, 16-7 and Paschoud 1996, XXIX such numbering appears.

⁴⁶ Research with regard to structure is summarized by Chastagnol (1994, XXXVI-XLVI) and Fündling (2007, 9-11).

<i>First part</i>		<i>Second part</i>	<i>Third part</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>SL</i>	<i>IL</i>	<i>LL</i>
<i>H</i>	<i>Ael.</i>	<i>OM</i>	<i>Val.</i>
<i>AP</i>		<i>Dd.</i>	<i>Gall.</i>
<i>MA</i>		<i>Hel.</i>	<i>T</i>
<i>V</i>	<i>AC</i>	<i>AS</i>	<i>Cl.</i>
<i>C</i>		<i>Max.</i>	<i>Aur.</i>
<i>P</i>		<i>Gd.</i>	<i>Tac.</i>
<i>DI</i>		<i>MB</i>	<i>Pr.</i>
<i>S</i>	<i>PN</i>		<i>Q</i>
	<i>CIA</i>		<i>Car.</i>
<i>Cc.</i>	<i>G</i>		

Figure 2.2: The division of the books of the HA in three parts: (1) PL and SL, (2) IL (3) and LL.

In the first fourteen lives of *HA* (the series running from *H* to *G*) there is a clear division between lives of *Augusti* (Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Verus, Commodus, Pertinax, Didius Iulianus, Septimius Severus, Caracalla) on one hand and co-regents or *Caesares* (Aelius and Geta) and pretenders (Avidius Cassius, Pescennius Niger, Clodius Albinus) on the other. It is the explicit intention of its author to describe *non solum eos, qui principum locum (...) retentarunt (...), sed illos etiam, qui vel Caesarum nomine appellati sunt nec principes aut Augusti fuerunt vel quolibet alio genere in spem principatus venerunt* (*Ael.* 1.1), showing that he already makes a division between *Augusti* and co-regents as well as pretenders. The division is also clear in the literary quality of the lives and the historical reliability of their contents. The lives of the first nine *Augusti* are considered to be the best part of the *HA* in both respects. *OM* and *Dd.*, the fifteenth and sixteenth biographies, occupy a special place in the discussion of how the two groups relate to each other. In the next paragraphs I will discuss in chronological order the different points of view that have been brought forward to bear on this matter.

2.2.1 The Part of the Primary and Secondary Lives

Some of the lives in *EL* are dedicated to Diocletian, with the exception of the Secondary Lives *CIA* and *G*, and with the addition of *OM*. This is why Mommsen (1890, 246) styled the lives up to *Dd.* the ‘diocletianische Reihe’⁴⁷ on the understanding that they were written during his reign.⁴⁸ In the same article he speaks about ‘primäre’ and ‘secundäre’ biographies. It had at that time been recognized that the information in the so-called *Nebenviten* (or ‘secundäre Biographien’) was derived from the *Hauptviten* (or ‘primäre

⁴⁷ Dedications are wanting in *H*, *AP*, *C*, *P*, *DJ*, *Cc.* The exceptions within this series are *CIA* and *G*, which are dedicated to Constantine.

⁴⁸ Mommsen (1890, 246) divided the secondary lives into three groups: co-regents (*V*, *G*), *Caesares* (*Ael.*, *Dd.*) and pretenders (*AC*, *PN*, *CIA*). Note that Mommsen includes *OM* and *Dd.* in the earlier lives and excludes *V* from the primary lives, both categorizations later corrected by Barnes 1967, 65 and Syme 1971, 57.

Biographien') and supplemented by falsifications.⁴⁹ Dessau's hypothesis that the entire *HA* was composed by a single author stood on its head the orthodox view that the lives had been written in a collaborative effort by different authors (as the manuscripts themselves indicated, after all). For Mommsen the book of *OM*, however, is already a foreign body in his 'diocletianische Reihe', as it is full of fictitious elements. An example that he mentions is Macrinus's letter to the senate (see § 6.3). The distinct character of *OM* in the part of primary biographies leads him to remark that the biography could also be ranked with the 'maximinisch-gordianische Gruppe', which, like *OM*, also uses a Greek source. In spite of Dessau's appraisal of the elusive character of the dedications, Mommsen still hung onto their authenticity and used them as an argument to order the biographies: 'Die Widmung an Diocletian indess steht entgegen; und viel kommt überhaupt nicht darauf an.'⁵⁰

In the following decades, Mommsen's grouping became the standard, as seen, for instance, in a monograph by Lécirvain (1904), who modelled the chapters in his work on Mommsen's categories.⁵¹ The dividing line between the first and second parts, which Mommsen posited after *OM* and *Dd.*, was shifted by Syme to the the beginning of *OM*. As pointed out in § 1.1, Syme characterises the author not as a *Fälscher*, but a 'rogue scholar', 'impostor' and 'farceur',⁵² whose chief aim was to delude his public. 'The miserable *Macrinus* is in fact to be estimated one of the prime documents for the understanding of the *HA*, structure as well as authorship', Syme declared (1971, 58). What then does *OM* reveal? The change in literary quality after *Cc.*, noticed by many scholars, including Mommsen and Klebs, seems to indicate that the author could no longer rely on the sources that he had been using up to this point, whereafter he availed himself of a Greek source (Herodian), used some historical information from *Cc.* and, for the rest, mainly gave free rein to his imagination. In this view, the turning-point is marked by the appearance of a long programmatic preface (*OM* 1.1-5) and various kinds of fabrication (such as speeches, letters and poems). Prefaces are a regular feature in the

⁴⁹ Klebs 1890, 437n4. Klebs himself showed the dependance of *AC* from *MA*, in 1888, just one year before Dessau's contribution in *Hermes* 24, for *AC*, after which he firmly rejected Dessau's theory on a single authorship. Mommsen also demonstrated *AC*'s dependence on *MA* (1890, 246-7) and *PN*'s dependence on *S* (1890, 248-9), and conjectured *Dd*'s dependence on *OM*.

⁵⁰ 'Darauf', viz. to which group the *OM* should be reckoned; Mommsen 1890, 251n1. In the same year, Klebs (1890, 436-64) protested against the concessions that Mommsen had made to Dessau's hypothesis concerning the authorship and related themes of the *HA*. Klebs denies the exceptional character of *OM* in the first series of biographies: in his view, it is true that the *OM* lacks the sort of information that earlier lives in the series provide (such as Macrinus' background, 1890, 457n2). However, he allows that for the standard information which *OM* contains (documents from the senate, verses, anecdotes) two sources could be indicated: Herodian and the *KG*. If the secondary vita *Dd.* were more indebted to these sources than *OM*, this would show up Mommsen's theory that the secondary vitae (*i.c.* *Dd*) derive their information from the primary ones (*i.c.* *OM*). Klebs argues that Mommsen's notion that *OM* differs from the first series of biographies does not so much indicate any exceptional status of *OM* as prove him, Mommsen, to be wrong.

⁵¹ Lécirvain, 1904, 1-5: 'préface' and 447-52: 'table des matières'. Lécirvain questions the existence of the four authors for the primary lives, and proposes that there were no more than two. The unreliable Secondary Lives are held to have been written by the same author who wrote the lives *Hel.-MB* and felt it necessary to supplement them with the lives of *tyranni* (*CIA* and *G* are, like the lives in *Hel.*, dedicated to Diocletian). Another indication of less than four authors is the use of Herodian as a source, which already occurred in the secondary life of *CIA* (1.2, 12.14) but was extensively applied in *OM*, which at the time was still regarded as one of the early lives (1904, 182-90).

⁵² Syme 1971,13; 1971, 14; 1971, 10 respectively.

Secondary Lives, and so are fabrications, but not in the quantity in which they appear in *OM*. This was the starting-point for theories about the construction of the *HA*. In Syme's work the discussion about the structure of the *HA* became inextricably bound up with the question of sources. On the basis of the literary devices encountered in *OM* especially, Syme proposed the existence of an unknown source for the Primary *vitae*, whom he styled 'Ignotus'.⁵³ This unknown author supposedly compiled the 'Nine Vitae' (*H, AP, MA, V*⁵⁴, *C, P, DJ, S, Cc*), while staying close to his source for the factual information and supplementing them with his own fabrications. The chief aim of the author of the *HA* was to compose the Secondary Lives to complement the Primary Lives, a venture through which he sought to establish the originality of the work. This resulted in biographies of a Caesar (*Ael.*), a prince (*G*⁵⁵) and three pretenders (*AC, PN, CIA*), all linked to compilations on the real Augusti.⁵⁶

The author exercised his imaginative faculties fully when he came to write *OM*. The devices on whose basis Syme (1971, 49) stated that 'a line can be drawn between the *Caracalla* and the *Macrinus*'⁵⁷ are the programmatic preface,⁵⁸ the brief remarks about the accession of the new ruler,⁵⁹ the interpolated disquisition on the name of 'Antoninus' for Macrinus's son Diadumenian (2.5-3.9, see § 5.4 of this study), the passage (4.2) in which the words of an '*Aurelius Victor cui Pinio cognomen erat*' are quoted,⁶⁰ the employment of a Greek source for the first time,⁶¹ the bad structure of *OM* in general, and new types of fabrication.⁶² On these grounds, Syme (1971, 58) argues that *OM* is in line with the Secondary Lives, which also seems correct when its content is taken into consideration, as Macrinus is in many respects treated as a tyrant.⁶³ The long-established insight that the Secondary Lives are inferior in terms of historical and literary quality, was confirmed by Syme (1971, 67): 'the 'Nebenviten' disclose a literary personality – and a progression in the art of fraudulence. On sundry signs and symptoms they also look forward to the later *vitae*'.⁶⁴

⁵³ In Syme's own view (1971, 49), the idea of a sort of 'Ignotus' was already postulated by Lécirvain (1904, 191-2), but in too brief a fashion as to be noticed by scholars of his time. Lécirvain proposed as a source an unknown biographer who went so far as to include Macrinus.

⁵⁴ In *V* fabrications are absent and there is no reason why it should be excluded from the series of nine lives. As Verus was an Augustus reigning for eight years, it is highly probable that his biography was part of Ignotus' work: Barnes 1967, 65 and Syme 1971, 32-3.

⁵⁵ The author denies the fact that Geta was an actual Augustus (see Kienast 1996, 166).

⁵⁶ 'The primary lives were the secondary concern of the author', so Syme states (1971, 70n1), and: 'To supply their biographies {viz. of the pretenders} was one of the impostor's avowed claim to originality' (1971, 33).

⁵⁷ Or (1971, 57): 'The *Macrinus* proclaims a break with what went before: composition as well as accuracy. It is diffuse as well as careless and cynical. In fact, longer for a brief reign than the *Vita Caracallae*, where the author, tired with the task of compiling, compresses six years ruthlessly.'

⁵⁸ 'Various instructive and permitting sundry suspicions' (1971, 51)

⁵⁹ *OM* 2.1: *Opilius Macrinus...imperium arripuit*, whereas the early lives provide precise information about the background of the emperors. This was noted earlier by Mommsen and Klebs (see above).

⁶⁰ This man may well be a 'bogus character', whose name is derived from the historian who was *praefectus urbi* in 389 (Syme 1971, 50); see also § 6.4.4. Another bogus authority is found in the preface: Iunius Cordus (1971, 51 and § 3.2.1-2).

⁶¹ Herodian (for *OM* 8.3-10.3), whereas the early lives have 'Ignotus' as a source.

⁶² The letter to the senate (*OM* 6.2-9), verses (*OM* 11.4, 14.2), a quotation from Vergil (*OM* 12.9).

⁶³ Den Hengst 1981, 51 and 57n24.

⁶⁴ Hohl, E. *Klio* 11 (1911) 318 sqq.

2.2.2 The Parts of the Intermediary and Later Lives

Having established the location of the most conspicuous break in the structure of the books between the EL and the following sections, we can now take the second part into consideration, briefly: the lives from *OM* to *MB*. Compared to the EL and LL, this section stands out by its heterogeneous character. As was noted above, the structure of *OM* and *Dd.* should be linked with PL and SL in the first part of *HA*, while with regard to sources and content they are similar to the lives that follow. The next two lives, *Hel.* and *AS* are each other's counterparts: while Elagabalus was allegedly the worst ruler who ever reigned (see § 5.5.1), Alexander is presented as an ideal ruler. After these inextricably interwoven biographies, the author changes over to a new plan (see § 4.3): he begins to combine sets of rulers in one book (*Gd.*, *Max.*, *MB*). This makes the books of the Intermediary Lives very unequal in structure, as a result of their varying length and internal division, not to mention the different relationships between the biographies.

It is in the seven Intermediary Lives that we encounter the transition from the earlier individual lives to combined lives. Between IL and the series bearing the names of Trebellius Pollio and Vopiscus there is a lacuna. Here the lives of the emperors Philippus Arabs and his son (244-9), Decius and his son Hostilian (249-51), Trebonianus Gallus and Volusienus (251-3) and Aemilian (253) and the beginning of the life of Valerian (253-260) are lacking. If these lives ever existed (a question which will be addressed below, § 3.7), it would seem logical that these, too, constituted books in which the lives of more than one emperors were combined, as those both before (*MB*) and after (*Gall.*) each include two.

IL is separated from LL by a *lacuna*. The lives from *Val.* to *Car.* (LL) are more homogeneous in terms of style and structure than the earlier parts. The combining of lives continues, except those of *Cl.*, *Aur.*, *Tac.* and *Pr.*, although in two cases these also contain more than a single person as subject of their narration.⁶⁵ The tendency to combine lives is intensified: there is even a joint biography of thirty pretenders (*T*), while we further encounter one that deals with four rivals (*Q*)⁶⁶ and another that combines father Carus and his sons Carinus and Numerian (*Car.*), which concludes the *HA*. The nine books in this section are attributed, in two blocks, to Trebellius Pollio (*Val.* – *Cl.*) and Flavius Vopiscus (*A* – *Car.*).

In conclusion, the internal division of the three sections involved is very uneven: the first part consists of fourteen books, divided into nine Primary Lives and five Secondary Lives, whereas the other two are divided into seven and nine books respectively. In the final section the author tends to assemble several emperors in one

⁶⁵ The author states that he will treat the greater emperors in separate lives, and the book titles similarly indicate single lives (*Max.* 1.3: *Quod quidem non in uno tantum libro sed etiam in plurimis deinceps reservabo, exceptis magnis imperatoribus, quorum res gestae plures atque clariores longiorem desiderant textum*). Yet, in *T* 31.7 he admits to more lives in the book of *Cl.*: *de quo speciale mihi volumen quamvis breve merito vitae illius videtur edendum addito fratre singulari viro* (sc. Quintillus, *Cl.* 12.3-6), and to the life of Tacitus he added his brother Florian (*Tac.* 14.1-5). These statements are hardly in line with his actual practice, though admittedly the two brothers to the emperor are treated very superficially only.

⁶⁶ The first of whom, Firmus, is possibly fictitious, see Chastagnol 1970, 90 and 1994, 1107; Paschoud 2001, 204-7. Chastagnol reveals that this character shares some traits with the usurper Firmus under Valentinian I, about whom see Drijvers 2007, 129-55. For the literary aspects of the *vita*: Poignault 2001, 251-68. Fictitious tyrants: Paschoud 1997b, 87-98.

book, whereas in the first part emperors and co-emperors or rivals are dealt with separately. In § 4.3, I will define this phenomenon as a development from an analytical to a synthetical structure, and explain the reasons for this. The break between these two phases is found between *AS* and *Max.*, immediately after the first half of the narration.⁶⁷

2.3 Models

In the dramatic setting of the preface to *A*, the author (under his *nom de plume* Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius) states that some famous historiographers of the past, Livy, Sallust, Cornelius Tacitus and Pompeius Trogus⁶⁸, trifled with history, whereupon the person he is speaking to, Tiberian, states that the author can write the way he likes, *habiturus mendaciorum comites, quos historicae eloquentiae miramur auctores*. The author at least borrowed phrases from two of these *mendaciorum comites* in some passages as models for his work, Sallust and Livy (below, § 2.3.2). In the next paragraphs, the intertextual relationships with the authors that the author of the *HA* took as his models and sources will be investigated.

The main model of the *HA* was Suetonius, who introduced the concept of writing the lives of the successive emperors in Latin literature. His successor Marius Maximus, whose work is known only through quotations in the *HA*, is used not only as model, but also as a source for the lives of the emperors from at least Hadrian to Alexander Severus.⁶⁹ When we look at the sum of this small pool of models on a stylistic as well as a structural level and going by the era described in their works, we have two historiographers from republican times, one biographer for the first twelve emperors and his successor for those of the second and early third centuries. These biographers and historiographers, however, are certainly not the only ones whom the author took as his models: they all have their counterparts for the eras described. The republican biographer and initiator of Latin biography was Cornelius Nepos, whom the author never mentions.⁷⁰ Suetonius' historiographical counterpart was Cornelius Tacitus, mentioned three times (*A* 1.9, *Tac.* 10.3, *Pr.* 2.7).⁷¹ Marius Maximus had numerous colleagues in historiography,

⁶⁷ The part *H-AS* contains 55 percent of the narration, the part *Max.-Car.* 45 percent

⁶⁸ For Trogus (rediscovered in the late fourth century) as the author's 'equipollent', see Syme 1968, 109-10.

⁶⁹ Barnes (1967, 66n11) denies that the author used Marius Maximus as a source for *AS*.

⁷⁰ Which in itself does not give cause to single out Nepos as a model, as it is not unusual in classical literature to conceal sources, see e.g. the absence of explicit references to Livy, Tacitus and Gellius in Ammianus (Kelly 2008, 183). Kelly (2008, 184n78) rightly notes that 'the *Historia Augusta* might be a good place to look for deliberate concealment of allusions.' Examples of authors used but not mentioned are Apicius (Chastagnol 1994, LXXXVI) and Juvenal (*ibid.*), and, naturally, contemporary authors such as Ausonius, Jerome and Claudian (Chastagnol 1994, LXXXVI) and others, see § 2.3.2.

⁷¹ Tacitus was known as an author of imperial history from the later fourth century onwards, as attested by Sulpicius Severus, Jerome (*Ad Zachar.* 3.14, see below), and later Orosius and others: the partly outdated article by Haverfield 1916, 196-201 (placing the time of writing of the *HA*, after Mommsen, in 306 AD) gives an overview of authors who may have known Tacitus: especially in the fifth century AD Tacitus is increasingly referred to. Numerous echoes of Tacitus in Ammianus have been indicated, though Kelly 2008, 177-8 shows the difficulty of unambiguous allusions in Ammianus (2008, 177-9. To Kelly's list (178n56) Fletcher, *RPh* 63 (1937) 389-92 could be added). Hohl 1911, 290 ff. and Hartke 1951, 401 attempted to trace Tacitus in the *HA*, which met with scepticism on Syme's part (1968, 9 and 189). Baldwin (1980) states that Tacitus was not unknown to the centuries preceding the *HA* by indicating a parallel with the anonymous Panegyricus of 310 AD (*Pan. Lat.* 7.3.9 ~ *Tac. Agr.* 12.3-4).

Greek as well as Latin, among whom are Cassius Dio and Herodian, the former never mentioned, the latter at least ten times.

With the exception of Maximus, large tracts of these authors' works have been transmitted to modern times, which makes a comparison possible. Two authors, completing our picture of possible models, but neglected in the investigation of intertextual relationships, are Nepos and Tacitus. The case for either of these authors is different: Nepos may have served as an example, as he introduced biography in Latin literature, with its peculiar idiom and use of *topoi*. The transmitted works are mainly about Greek generals, two short biographies of Atticus and Cato and a fragment of a letter by Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, which makes that the contents of these works hardly invite comparison with the *HA*. For Tacitus, things are different: the author of the *HA* is certainly interested in imperial history and mentions him explicitly. Two factors complicate the comparison: attempts to identify Tacitus in the *HA* have been made, but never with full success.⁷² Tacitus appears to be hard to detect in late classical literature, apart from Ammianus, who states that he started where Tacitus left off (*a principatu Caesaris Nervae exorsus*, *RG* 31.16.9).⁷³ Jerome knew of Tacitus' works, but, according to Syme (1968, 9), never read him.⁷⁴ Still, the story of the emperor Tacitus, who ordered the works of his namesake to be placed in all libraries and ten manuscripts of his works to be copied for all libraries and archives every year, is tantalising.⁷⁵ It looks as if the author was concerned about the survival of Tacitus' works and projected his worries onto the similarly named emperor, *ne incuria lectorum deperiret*.⁷⁶

This study will pay special attention to the imitation of the works of Nepos and Tacitus, however odd it may seem for these stylistically opposed authors to be mentioned in one breath. Still, both may have left their marks in the text of the *HA*. The author of the *HA* must have been an antiquarian and a collector, 'maybe a librarian', and does not seem to worry about the reputations of these literary antipodes. To degrade Livy, Tacitus and Sallust to a status of historiographical rabble is typical of the author's lack of respect, just as is his complete silence about Cornelius Nepos, in contrast to Suetonius,⁷⁷ who is repeatedly praised for his work. The author of the *HA* differs from Suetonius through his extensive use of paratextual devices. Therefore, an inventory of this part of the transmitted text will be made, to be used in the analysis of Nepos as a literary model.

⁷² Chastagnol 1994, LXXXII about Tacitus : 'très peu utilisé, sinon jamais'.

⁷³ The indices in the commentaries by Den Boeft et al. (in the bibliography the commentary on book 26 is quoted) each show several parallels with and direct derivations from Tacitus.

⁷⁴ Jerome, *Comm. Ad Zach.* 3.14: *qui post Augustum usque ad mortem Domitiani vitas Caesarum triginta volumina exaravit*. In the monumental work by Hagendahl, *Latin fathers and the Classics* (1958), Tacitus is not named under the entry of Jerome.

⁷⁵ *Tac.* 10.3: *Cornelium Tacitum, scriptorem historiae Augustae, quod parentem suum eundem diceret, in omnibus bibliothecis conlocari iussit. ne lectorum incuria deperiret, librum per annos singulos decies scribi publicitus in evicos archiis iussit et in bybliotheis poni*. Chastagnol (1994, LXXXII) apparently understands an elliptic *statuas* or *imagines* (busts) with *conlocari iussit*, though on p.1047 he translates: 'il fit placer...les ouvrages de Cornélius Tacitus'.

⁷⁶ Zecchini 1991, 337-50; Velaza 1994, 241-53 in an evaluation of all the discovered parallels (e.g. Schwartz 1992, 251-3) about the use of Tacitus by the author of the *HA* ('les traces de Tacite sont trop faibles pour en extraire une conclusion définitive').

⁷⁷ Suetonius is mentioned five times in the *HA*: *H* 11.3 (as a historical person), *C* 10.2; *MB* 4.5; *Pr.* 2.7; *Q* 1.1-2.

2.3.1 Cornelius Nepos

The collection of books which constitute the *HA* seems at first glance a unique construction in the history of Latin literature.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, parts of the irregular structure are not without their antecedents in other works of a similar kind. The problem is that only a limited corpus of Latin biographical literature has come down from antiquity.⁷⁹ Nepos was the first Latin author to write individual biographies in their own right,⁸⁰ but references to the work of this biographer have so far been absent in publications on the *HA*. By its contents the *HA* is evidently linked more closely to Suetonius's *De Vita Caesarum* (*DVC*) than to Nepos's *De Viris Illustribus* (*DVI*) about great men from Greek and republican times. Apart from the question whether the author of the *HA* knew or imitated the work of Nepos, the position of the *HA* in the tradition of biographical literature needs some attention in order to identify *topoi*, vocabulary, language and structure that may be typical of biography. Leo (1901) was the first scholar to study the structure of biographies by Nepos, Suetonius and the *HA* in one book, dealing with the history of Greek and Roman biography, in which he stressed the dependence of some of the lives of the *HA* on Suetonius. That the author of the *HA* knew Suetonius's biographies is evident through the numerous borrowings from his *vitae*.⁸¹ In the next chapter, I will give evidence of Nepos' presence in the *HA*, namely in the programmatic remarks that accompany the comments on the structure of the books. For this, a brief introduction, focussing on the paratextual elements, to this uncited author in *HA* studies may be helpful.⁸²

Nepos' *De excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium*, written in the second half of the first century BC, is the only surviving complete book of the larger work *De Viris Illustribus*, in which the lives and characters of probably eight groups of famous men (such as kings, politicians, philosophers, grammarians, *etc.*) were described.⁸³ *De excellentibus ducibus*, preceded by a preface, contains the lives of nineteen Greek generals and one Carian, followed by twenty-two kings who were also generals and are found combined in one book (*Reges*). Then follow a twenty-second and twenty-third

⁷⁸ As confirmed by Syme 1971, 54: 'Nature in all her freaks and sports never brought forth anything like the *HA*. It is a monster' and 1971b, 9: 'From an inspection of the *HA*, the first reaction can only be bewilderment or alarm. The thing is portentuous, unexampled, unexplained: a *monstrum horrendum informe ingens, cui lumen ademptum*'. The words are reminiscent of Mommsen's disapproving remark (1890, 229) that 'diese Biographien eine der elendesten Sudeleien sind, die wir aus dem Alterthum haben.'

⁷⁹ Greek biographies are better represented in the corpus of classical literature, with authors such as Diogenes Laërtius and Plutarchus. Their works are hardly taken into consideration in the present investigation of the Latin models of the *HA*, but connections with Greek literature are certainly worth investigating, for example with regard to the use of *topoi* – though its author seems not to be familiar with the Greek classics (Syme 1968, 191). Nepos based his *De excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium* on Greek sources and thereby followed the conventions of Greek historiographical or biographical texts, which may have been the author's source for his biographical material and Greek history. For a survey of classical biographical literature, see Sonnabend 2002.

⁸⁰ Not counting the illustrated lexicon of persons by Varro: *Imagines* (Sonnabend 2002, 103-6).

⁸¹ Borrowings in the *HA* are discussed by Klebs 1892, 26-9; Leo 1901, 273-5; Hönn 1911, 185-92; Bird 1971, 129-34; Chastagnol 1970, 109-23; 1994, lxxxiv; Den Hengst 1981, *passim*; Fündling 2007, 158-63.

⁸² A recent monograph on Nepos is Anselm 2004, who explains the artful structure of the books.

⁸³ As reconstructed by several scholars. For an overview and problems in research see: Toher 2002. The textual transmission of Nepos' works is treated in Malcovati 1934; Marshall 1977; Burgersdijk 2007, 65-78.

book about the Carthaginian generals Hamilcar and Hannibal. The irregular elements in the series of nineteen Greek generals (the three foreigners Datames, Hasdrubal and Hannibal, and the collective book of *Reges*) are all explained in programmatic statements. First of all, Datames is introduced at the end of *Timoth.* (3.4-4.6): *Venio nunc ad fortissimum virum maximique consilii omnium barbarorum, exceptis duobus Karthaginiensibus, Hamilcare et Hannibale. De quo hoc plura referemus, quod et obscuriora sunt eius gesta pleraque et ea, quae prospere ei cesserunt, non magnitudine copiarum, sed consilii, quo tum omnes superabat, acciderunt: quorum nisi ratio explicata fuerit, res apparere non poterunt.* The ‘Carian exception’ is made because his deeds are less known (*obscuriora*) but his qualities excellent. In the introduction to the first exception in the series of Greek generals, made at the end of the preceeding biography, the ‘Carthaginian’ exceptions at the end of the whole series are already announced.⁸⁴ *Reges* ends with a justification for the addition of *Ham.* and *Han.* (3.5): *De quibus quoniam satis dictum putamus, non incommodum videtur non praeterire Hamilcarem et Hannibalem, quos et animi magnitudine et calliditate omnes in Africa natos praestitisse constat.* The series of twenty-three biographies is closed by the following formula (*Hann.* 13.4): *Sed nos tempus est huius libri facere finem et Romanorum explicare imperatores, quo facilius collatis utrorumque factis, qui viri praeferendi sint, possit iudicari.* Thus, *De ducibus exterarum gentium* has become a work of irregular structure: nineteen books about Greek generals, supplemented by one about a Carian, followed by a collection of kings who were also generals in one book, and rounded off with two Carthaginian generals. It should be kept in mind that the irregular collection of short biographies described here is itself part of a much larger collection of other *viri illustres*, now lost.

Apart from the programmatic statements that serve to add coherence to the series, Nepos also comments on the nature of his work. First, in his preface, in which the central theme in the work is mentioned, namely the cultural differences between Greeks and Romans. Second, in the preface to Epaminondas, in which the theme of cultural differences is repeated and the *dispositio* of the material is explained⁸⁵. Third, in this same biography the narration is interrupted by a programmatic remark about the whole work: *Epam.* 4.6: *Plurima quidem proferre possimus, sed modus adhibendus est, quoniam uno hoc volumine vitam excellentium virorum complurium concludere constituimus, quorum res separatim multis milibus versuum complures scriptores ante nos explicarunt.* Nepos speaks of the description of more excellent men *in one volume* (by which *De excellentibus ducibus* is meant), while other authors describe their deeds

⁸⁴ The addition of three non-Greeks to a collection of Greek generals, probably paired with a collection of Roman generals, has raised questions about the nature, design and genesis of Nepos’ total series of *DVI*. Some scholars have supposed that Nepos’ works were edited in several redactions (e.g. Leo 1901, 195), but nowadays a second redaction is widely rejected (see Toher 2002, 147, who enters deeply into the various aspects of the question about one or more editions. One of his arguments is that *edita* in *Att.* 19.1 has to be interpreted as ‘read’, not ‘published’).

⁸⁵ *Epam.* 1.3-4: *cum autem exprimere imaginem consuetudinis atque vitae velimus Epaminondae, nihil videmur debere praetermittere, quod pertineat ad eam declarandam. Quare dicemus primum de genere eius, deinde quibus diciplinis et a quibus sit eruditus, tum de moribus ingenii facultatibus et si qua alia memoria digna erunt, postremo de rebus gestis, quae a plurimis animi anteponuntur virtutibus.*

separatim, individually.⁸⁶ Fourth, in the frequently cited first sentences of *Pel.* about the differences between historiography and biography⁸⁷. Apart from a general preface (*praefatio* 1-8), Nepos adds intermediary prefaces, characterised by programmatic statements about the purpose and contents of the book and the organization of its material and other (topical) matters: *Epaminondas* (15.1.1-4), *Pelopidas* (16.1.1) and *Reges* (21.1.1). There is also a programmatic digression within the texts of *Epaminondas* (15.4.6). *Timoleon* (13.4.4-5) and *Hannibal* (12.4) have postscripts.

Our brief overview of paratextual elements in Nepos will help to better assess the paratextual devices in the *HA*. Many issues relating to the problematic nature of Nepos' works have not been treated, such as their significance for the introduction of Greek biography in Roman letters, the distinction made between Roman and foreign *viri illustres*, not to mention the distinction between historiography and biography. Due to scanty evidence in the biographical text genre, the questions are often too complex to be treated in a nutshell. The main thing to keep in mind from our summary are Nepos' ways of justifying the overall design of his irregular work, by explaining its *dispositio*, the combination of more than one persons in a book, the differences between historiography and biography, and the introduction of a leitmotiv.

2.3.2 Other Models

In the history of *HA* studies, imitations and echoes of many authors, from the republican and imperial periods, have been detected. Inventories have been made of the authors underlying the text of the *HA*, most recently by Fündling 2006. The resulting picture is one of an author who was an avid reader of every kind of literature that he got hold of, though not everyone shares the idea that he was an erudite scholar.⁸⁸ Hohl described him as a not very gifted grammarian, belonging to a *plebeia grammaticorum cohors*.⁸⁹ Syme portrays the author, in an assessment of his literary milieu, as a 'scholiast', a 'scholar', a

⁸⁶ For *separatim* also see Nepos *Cato* 3.5. Moles (1989, 231) rightly analyses *separatim* as 'the implication that Nepos is contrasting his own practice of including many biographies within a single volume with his predecessors' practice of producing single biographies of great length'. See Anselm 2004, 47 and 53 for Nepos' historiographical method.

⁸⁷ *Pel.* 1.1: *cuius de virtutibus dubito quem ad modum exponam, quod vereor, si res explicare incipiam, ne non vitam eius enarrare, sed historiam videar scribere; si tantummodo summas attigero, ne rudibus Graecarum litterarum minus dilucide appareat, quantus fuerit ille vir. Itaque utrique rei occurram, quantum potuero, et medebor cum satietati tum ignorantiae lectorum.* The key-words are *vitam* and *historiam*: by using these two terms, Nepos seems to make a distinction between the two types of text (Anselm 2004, 54-5). On this point Momigliano 1971, 98-9 (Nepos) and 1968/69, 423-36 and 1969, 286 (*HA*) only hesitatingly accepts a Roman awareness of the distinction, while Syme 1971b, 25-33 shows that there cannot be any doubt that the author of the *HA* clearly distinguishes between the two (which is indeed evident, see § 3.2). Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 1.1-2: οὐτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ βίους.

⁸⁸ Den Hengst 1991 considers the author's knowledge of the *quadriga* of canonical authors in classical education: Cicero, Vergil, Sallust, Terence. The outcome is that the author was not particularly versed in these authors.

⁸⁹ Hohl (1920, 302 sqq. and 308), who is not very enthusiastic about the literary quality of the *HA* or impressed by the learning of its author: 'Der Mann, der sich für Grammatiker und Rhetoren und deren Schriften (...) besonders interessiert, muss selbst mit seinem Wissen und Scheinwissen der *cohors grammaticorum* zugerechnet werden.'

‘librarian’, a ‘grammarian’, a ‘literary personality’, and more,⁹⁰ and has expressed the desirability of reconstructing his library at several occasions. That virtual library has grown in the past few decades. The presence of many authors from classical times has been detected; the following are the most important:

- Cicero:⁹¹ mentioned twenty times, though imitated and followed much more (Fündling 2006, 153: ‘etwa vierzig leicht veränderte Zitate’), especially his speeches.
- Sallust:⁹² one of the four *mendaciorum comites* (A 2.7), mentioned or followed at least seven times.
- Livy:⁹³ after Fündling’s commentary, the number of references has grown to about twelve echoes from Livy, who, in late antiquity, was mainly available in excerpts. The revision of Livy’s complete works was done by Symmachus and continued by Nicomachus Flavian’s son and grandson (Syme 1968, 109) in the early fifth century.⁹⁴
- Vergil:⁹⁵ the author’s (and his contemporaries’) favourite source text for quotation among the poets of classical times, as Vergil has always been. The quotations are largely taken from Aeneis 6.808-886 (six times), and occur especially in SL (five times) and IL (six times); and another three times in LL.
- Suetonius:⁹⁶ the main model of the *HA*. Mentioned six times,⁹⁷ twice as an example of brevity of style and reliability of content, in contrast with the historiographers Livy, Sallust, Tacitus and Trogus (*Pr.* 2.7, A 2.1) and other biographers such as Iunius Cordus (*MB* 4.5). The moments when he occurs in the *HA* are ‘quasiment innombrables’ (Chastagnol 1994, LXXXIV). Comparisons have been made between the internal division of Suetonius’ biography and that of the *HA*, mostly ending in the conclusion that the latter is often too irregular in structure as to indicate Suetonius as its normative model (especially Leo 1901, 273-5; Townend 1967, 84-6).

⁹⁰ Syme 1968, 176-91. Syme (1968, 127): ‘The *HA*, along with familiar items, exhibits pieces of rare and recondite erudition that betray the tastes and habits of a scholiast’; (1968, 183): ‘the author is a scholar, devoted to the techniques of research. He likes libraries’; ‘he frankly avows the professional interest of a grammarian’; (1968, 186): ‘he has the tastes of a scholiast, and a librarian’, *unus ex curiosis* (*Pr.* 2.8), (1968, 207): ‘a literary personality, therefore, with habits and procedures that can be grasped and analysed’, *etc.* Chastagnol 1994, XCIX: ‘Il nous apparaît comme un homme cultivé, proche du milieu des grammairiens et scolastes (...). Mais, s’il connaissait bien les auteurs classiques, il était aussi tout à fait au courant des auteurs anciens revenus à la mode, révisés et recommandés par les lettrés très liés également au milieu sénatorial.’ Brugisser (1998, 67) treats the author’s attitude towards grammarians at the hand of the use of the word *clipeus* (*CIA* 3.3), and interprets this as mocking the grammarians’ methods.

⁹¹ Syme 1968, 127; Chastagnol 1994, LXXVII; Paschoud 1996, 329 and 2001, 417; Fündling 2006, 153.

⁹² *H* 16.6; *S* 21.2, 21.10, 23.3; *MB* 7.7; *Q* 6.3. Syme 1968, 127-8 (adding *Cl* 5.4 ~ Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.2 to the list); Chastagnol 1994, LXXXI; Fündling 2006, 153.

⁹³ *H* 17.6; 25.1; *AP* 3.5; *P* 1.2; *CIA* 5.3; *OM* 7.2; *AS* 9.4, 50.5; 56.3-5; *Max.* 2.1; *A* 28.3; *Tac.* 1.5; Chastagnol 1994, LXXXII; Fündling 2006, 154

⁹⁴ On the revision of Livy, Sallust and other editing activities, see: Callu 1997, 83 and Velaza 1999, 291-300.

⁹⁵ *Ael.* 4.1-3; *CIA* 5.2; 5.4; *PN* 8.3; 8.6; *OM* 12.9; *Dd.* 8.7; *AS* 4.6; 14.5; *Max.* 27.4; *Gd.* 20.5; *Cl.* 10.4; 10.6; *Car.* 13.3; Chastagnol 1994, LXXIX; Velaza 1996, 297-305; Fündling 2006, 153-4; Den Hengst 2004, 172-88.

⁹⁶ Klebs 1892, 26-9; Bird 1971, 129; Chastagnol 1972, 109-23; 1994, LXXXIV; Fündling 2006, 158-62.

⁹⁷ *H* 11.3; *C* 10.2; *MB* 4.5; *Pr.* 2.7; *Q* 1.1-2 (*Q* 1.1: *emendatissimus et candidissimus scriptor*).

- Juvenal:⁹⁸ never named in the *HA*, but imitated several times. Cameron (1964, 363) found seven allusions. In due course, more have been added to the list, also in order to explain the names of the fictitious biographer Iunius Cordus⁹⁹ and of (Iulius) Capitolinus and (Trebellius) Pollio.¹⁰⁰ Juvenal is also important because Ammianus Marcellinus names him in one breath with Marius Maximus (28.4.14) as light entertainment for the aristocracy; the passage bears witness to the revival of Juvenal in the second half of the fourth century.¹⁰¹ It is a notable fact that Juvenal occurs in all parts of the *HA*, from EL to IL and LL and even in the names of authors: he proves to be an important model.

These were the authors of classical times followed most by the author of the *HA*. The focus in this study is on the classical legacy, though it must be kept in mind that early christian authors (Lactantius, Jerome), and contemporary pagan ones (Ausonius, Claudian, Ammianus Marcellinus)¹⁰² are also echoed in the work. Greek authors have been detected to a far lesser extent, apart from their use as sources.

2.4 Sources

Considerable progress has been made in the past few decades in the discussion about the sources the author used for the construction of his work.¹⁰³ We will not venture to pursue this matter further, not even by providing a *status quaestionis*, though an inventory of the sources named in this study will be expedient.

2.4.1 Sources from the Third Century

The basic source of the Primary Lives,¹⁰⁴ as well as large tracts of the first part of the life of *Hel.* (1-18), is Marius Maximus, so *communis opinio* still holds.¹⁰⁵ Marius Maximus

⁹⁸ *H* 16.3; 16.10; 17.1-3; 18.4; 21.3; *T* 29.1; *A* 50.4; *Tac.* 12.1; *Q* 8.3; Cameron 1964, 363-77; Syme 1971, 7; Schwartz 1966, 454-63; 1982, 634-44; Callu 1992, 10; Chastagnol 1994, LXXXVII-VIII; Fündling 2006, 158; See further Paschoud 1996, 332 and 2001, 424; Burgersdijk 2005, 150 on Juvenalian echoes in Zenobia's biography.

⁹⁹ Juvenal was also called Iunius, combined with *Sat.* 1.2: *rauci Theseide Cordi*: Syme (1968, 97n1). (Iulius) Capitolinus and (Trebellius) Pollio: Den Hengst 1981, 48-9, see further note 130.

¹⁰⁰ Den Hengst 1981, 48-9. Birley 2002, 33-47.

¹⁰¹ Hight 1954, 184-6. Dessau (1918, 389-91) already pointed out a reference to Juvenal in *PN* 1.3: Aquinum, the origin of Pescennius' family, was Juvenal's residence (with the telling remark: *quod quidem dubium etiam nunc habetur*), to which fact Syme (1971, 7n5) drew attention.

¹⁰² Lactantius: Chastagnol 1994, LXXXV; Hieronymus: XCIII-VII; Ausonius: LXXXVII-VIII; Claudianus: XCVII-IX (and 1970b, 444-63); Ammianus: LXXXIX-XC; Fündling 2006, 158-66.

¹⁰³ Barnes 1978 gives an analysis of the use of sources in the entire *HA*, supplemented by a contribution at the *Colloquium Maceratense* (Barnes 1995).

¹⁰⁴ Additional sources from the second century that were used to supplement the basic third century source may have been incidentally used, such as Hadrian's autobiography (Fündling 2006, 91-6) or Septimius Severus' autobiography (Chausson 1995, 183-9); for both: Chastagnol 1994, 10 and 306.

¹⁰⁵ As described by Schlumberger 1974, 124-33 and 1976, 210; *contra*: Barnes 1978, 98-102. Chastagnol 1994, LII-LIX (who gives the places of thirty-one quotations with reference to the life Marius Maximus is supposed to have written), Birley 1971, 308-26; 1995, 57-74; 1997 (in which all the relevant texts are quoted), Cameron 1971, 262-7; Bird 1999, 850-60; Fündling 2006, 97-111. Syme postulated as the main source for the primary lives (for which he used the term 'Nine Lives', 1971, 33) a 'good biographer' now lost, called *Ignotus* (cf. Benario 1997). This biographer provided the base for the compilations in the *HA*: *H*,

was *praefectus urbi* under Macrinus and consul under Alexander Severus.¹⁰⁶ He wrote a series of biographies of the emperors from Nerva to Elagabalus, which are postulated as Ausonius' source for the tetrasticha on the *Caesares* (see § 5.6). Ammianus bears witness to his popularity in the later fourth century (28.4.14). The main source for the content of his works is the *HA* itself, as thirty-two passages are referred to.

- From *OM*, the author of the *HA* starts to use the historiographer Herodian, Marius Maximus' contemporary, writing in the first half of the third century.¹⁰⁷ His works, in Greek and entirely transmitted, comprise the period from the death of Marcus Aurelius to the accession of Gordian III.¹⁰⁸ Herodian's report of Macrinus's fall and Elagabalus' rise is followed very closely (translated into Latin) in *OM* 8.1-10.2 (see § 5.3.1). His name occurs 10 times in the *HA*, and three times under the guise of Arrian.¹⁰⁹ Cassius Dio, just like Herodian a contemporary of Marius Maximus, wrote an extensive history of the Roman empire, which was transmitted in epitomes by Zonaras (up to AD 96) and Xiphilinus (96 AD to the reign of Alexander Severus). Only the period 69 BC-46 AD and parts of the reign of Macrinus (217-218) have been preserved.¹¹⁰ The relations between Herodian, Cassius Dio and the *HA* were subject of a study by Kolb,¹¹¹ who detects several echoes in the *HA*. Chastagnol (1994, LXI) perceives an echo of Dio's work in *Dd.* 1.7 (~ Dio 78.20.2), which is interesting for our research in § 5.3.2.¹¹² In general, the use of Dio is contested (Barnes 1978, 109).

Dexippus, the Athenian aristocrat in the second half of the third century and author of historiographical works about the Scythian wars in the crisis of the empire and of a world history up to 270 AD. Dexippus serves as a source for the middle decades of the third century, from the reign of the Gordiani (238, the year where Herodian ended) to the accession of Aurelian. Dexippus is quoted 18 times under his own name.¹¹³

AP, *MA*, *V*, *C*, *P*, *DI*, *S*, *Cc.*, which were added with aid of other sources, such as Marius Maximus, and supplemented with literary elements such as dedications and names of authors. Paschoud (1998, 241-54) called the existence of Marius Maximus into question. Studies about Marius Maximus that have reached a classic status are Müller 1870 and Barbieri 1954 (who preceded Syme and Barnes in denying that Marius Maximus was the main source).

¹⁰⁶ Fündling 2006, 98.

¹⁰⁷ Chastagnol 1994, LXI-LXIII

¹⁰⁸ G. Alföldy 1989, 240-69 on Herodian; Kolb 1972; more recent literature about Herodian in De Blois 2003, 148n1 and Hidber 2006 and 2007.

¹⁰⁹ Chastagnol 1994, LXII inventories the quotations (*CIA* 1.2; 12.14; *Dd.* 2.5; *AS* 52.2; 57.3; *Max.* 13.4; *MB* 15.3; 15.5; 16.5; *T* 32.1). Herodian is called Arrian three times (*Max.* 33.3; *Gd.* 2.1; *MB* 1.2), see for this question: Paschoud 1991, 220n10.

¹¹⁰ Millar 1964, 1-4 and 160.

¹¹¹ Kolb 1972, further discussed in 1995, 179-91.

¹¹² In this study, I refer to the numbers of the books as given by the Loeb Classical Library, edited by Cary, which I especially employed for reason of his accurate notes. The standard edition by Boissvain deviates from these numbers by one digit.

¹¹³ *AS* 49.3/5; *Max.* 32.3/5; 33.3; *Gd.* 2.1; 9.6; 19.9; 32.1; *MB* 1.2; 15.5; 16.3-6 (*quater*); *Gall.* 13.8; *T* 32.1; *Cl.* 12.6. Millar 1969, 12-29; Syme 1971, 235-6; Barnes 1978, 60-4; 109-11; Paschoud 1991, 217-69; Chastagnol 1994, LXIV-VI; Brandt 1999, 169-81.

2.4.2 Sources from the Fourth Century

Apart from the three sources for the period before Alexander Severus' reign that were mentioned above, there are some sources from the fourth century, which will be mapped out insofar as they are relevant for the present research.

- Aurelius Victor finished his work in 360, entitled 'Caesares', in which the period from Augustus to Constantius II is treated.¹¹⁴ Borrowings from Victor were detected by Dessau (1889, 363-7): S 17.5-19.4 ~ 20.1 and 20.10-30.¹¹⁵ This provides a *terminus post quem* for the dating of the *HA*. Victor is used frequently, and in every part of the *HA*.¹¹⁶ A namesake of this abbreviator occurs, surprisingly, in *OM* 4.2, as a senator uttering taunts against Macrinus, see chapter 6.4.4.

- Eutropius: Valens' *magister memoriae* who wrote a *Breviarium* about the beginning of the Roman empire up to the year 364, finished in 369-70.¹¹⁷ Dessau (1889, 368-70) detected a tract of his work in the *MA* 16.3-18.2, which is an important base for our investigations about the *NA* theme in chapter 5.2.1. Just as is the case with Aurelius Victor, some of his reports are rendered as anonymous sources such as *multi* and *alii...alii...*¹¹⁸

- A common source for Victor's and Eutropius' *breviaria* and the *HA* was postulated by Enmann in 1884, hence the (*Enmannsche*) *Kaisergeschichte*, abbreviated as (*E*)*KG*, on the basis of the many parallel texts in the three works.¹¹⁹ The *terminus ante quem* was 306 AD, the supposed date of origin of the *HA*. Dessau's thesis followed soon after in 1889, but the *EKG*-hypothesis survives until the present day, notwithstanding the fact that the questions have changed: on the basis of present knowledge, the *HA* could have used the *EKG*, Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, instead of the latter two using the *HA* as a source. This led to a shift of the postulated time of writing to 340 AD or even 350 AD.¹²⁰

- Festus:¹²¹ like Eutropius, he was Valens' *magister memoriae* and made a *Breviarium* published about 369 (again, like Eutropius). The use of this abbreviator by the author of the *HA*¹²² is perceived only sparingly, but his work remains an important source for comparison in studies of the *HA*. Festus is supposed to have used the *KG*, just as Victor, Eutropius and the author of the *HA*. Furthermore, a namesake occurs in the speech mentioned above in *OM* 4 by a certain Aurelius Victor Pinus.

- Dating from a few decades after Victor, Eutropius and Festus, at the end of the fourth century, is the anonymous *Epitome de Caesaribus*,¹²³ which uses at least Victor's

¹¹⁴ I have used the edition by Dufraigne 1975; see for further echoes of Victor in the *HA*: Chastagnol 1994, LXVI-VIII, Fündling 2006, 135.

¹¹⁵ For a bibliography: Chausson 1994, 97-113 (esp.98n2), to which Leo 1901 286-8n1 can be added.

¹¹⁶ Chastagnol 1994, LXVIII; Fündling 2006, 135-6.

¹¹⁷ Ed. J. Hellegouarc'h 1999.

¹¹⁸ See Chastagnol 1994, LXIX and § 8.4 of this study; for a survey: Fündling 2006, 136-7 and a similar opinion about the use of *alii...alii...*: 148. Articles that treat the history of the discussion about the author's use of Eutropius are Chastagnol (1968, 53-65) and Festy (1999, 121-33).

¹¹⁹ Fündling 2006, 130-4.

¹²⁰ Barnes 1970, 16-20: after 337 AD; Burgess 1996, 90: 357 AD and Bleckmann 1994, 36: 350 AD

¹²¹ Ed. J.W. Eadie 1967

¹²² Chastagnol 1994, LXXI.

¹²³ Ed. Festy 1999. An important study is Schlumberger 1974.

Caesares as a source.¹²⁴ There are also many correspondences with the *HA*, which, however, can be explained by the use of a common source like Marius Maximus or other abbreviators, as Schlumberger argues.

In the present study, the above-mentioned sources will be referred to from time to time, whenever it is necessary to reconstruct the historical events or facts that the author needed for his narrative. The following principle should be kept in mind: as the *HA* is presented as the work of a group of six authors (guided by the authors' names with which the individual books are fitted out), written in the first half of the fourth century (to judge by the dedications to Diocletian, Constantine and others), the author never explicitly mentions sources dating from the period after 337, or otherwise his pretence would be impossible to keep up.¹²⁵ The earlier group of sources from the third century are sometimes referred to, whenever the author feels like it.

2.4.3 Alleged Sources

Whereas models serve as examples for the literary design of the *HA*, sources are there to provide historical information. The use of sources by the author of the *HA* is a vexed question, which belongs to the field of historical investigation. He comes up with several kind of sources, some of which are fictitious, while others do exist but are used as a cover for false information. In other cases again, reliable information is given, though the source is not mentioned or incorrect. All of this has been a major stumbling block for the exercise of source criticism. The problem of the existence of the works by Marius Maximus is an example of recent debate,¹²⁶ which illustrates the difficulty of applying source criticism to data provided by the author of the *HA* himself. Often, the fiction of an author's name is so obvious that the fictitious status of the source is beyond doubt. These 'bogus' sources belong to the field of literary research, though there is always the possibility that there is a real author or person hidden behind a fictitious name. Reference to 'bogus authors', as Syme styled the non-existing sources that the author of the *HA* mentions (1983, 98), is one of the most remarkable and characteristic phenomena in the *HA*. The bogus authors have been listed several times and there are various studies on their names.¹²⁷ They deal with such questions as the reason for a certain name, or the reliability of the source mentioned.

One can discern the following categories in the use of author's names and sources:

- 1) Historical names of historical authors, such as Livy, Sallust, Pompeius Trogus, Suetonius, Tacitus, Herodian, Dexippus, etc.
- 2) Historical names of historical authors, whose works mentioned by the *HA* may never have existed, like Gargilius Martialis' biography of Alexander Severus.

¹²⁴ *Epit.* 1.11 follows Victor's *Caesares* closely: Fündling 2006, 146-8.

¹²⁵ As Chastagnol noted (1994, XCIX): 'il avait à sa disposition d' une façon ou de l'autre les oeuvres qui venaient de paraître, essentiellement en latin, et, s'il les utilisait, il ne donnait pas le nom des auteurs puisqu'il était censé écrire un siècle plus tôt.'

¹²⁶ Paschoud 1998, see above sub § 2.4.1.

¹²⁷ Peter 1906, clxxxviii ff., Schanz-Hosius III 1922, 87-8; Syme 1971, 1-16 ('Bogus Names'); 1983, 98-108 ('Bogus Authors'); Burgersdijk 2007, 95-6n1.

- 3) Historical names of historical authors with a *cognomen* added, like Suetonius Optatianus (*Tac.* 11.7) or Aurelius Victor Pinius (*OM* 4.1) – though both authors are said to have lived in another era than the original possessors of the names.
- 4) Fictitious names, behind which an historical person or author hides, like Aurelius Verus (*AS* 48.6), Eusthenius (*Car.* 18.5), Lollius Urbicus (*Dd.* 9.2).¹²⁸
- 5) Fictitious names of fictitious authors, like Iunius (or Aelius) Cordus,¹²⁹ Aurelius Festivus (*Max.* 1.1), Tattius Cyrillus, Valerius Marcellinus, Curius Fortunatianus (*MB* 4.5) or Fabius Cyrillianus (Paschoud 2001, 340).
- 6) The *scriptores Historiae Augustae*, who are heteronyms of the redactor of the series: Aelius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Vulcacius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio, Flavius Vopiscus.¹³⁰
- 7) Unidentified non-historical sources or informants, referred to as *alii*, *nonnulli*, *quidam* ('some' or 'other' authors) and *multi*, *plerique*, *plures*, *plurimi* ('many' or 'most' authors).

This last category is by far the most numerous, yet surprisingly no study has ever been devoted to this group. Presumably, the names of the numerous fictitious sources have caused so much debate that the unnamed majority has hardly been taken into account. The first question to be asked is why the author introduces so many fictitious authors, anonymous or otherwise. In view of the great many sources cited, it is even doubtful whether he merely sought to use his fake sources in order to enhance the historical credibility of his narrative. The fraud is sometimes so obvious that one may ask if the names and sources are perhaps rather a matter of literary play. As a result, historical credibility comes to look like mockery on the part of the author, which may have been meant to be detected by the reader.¹³¹ On the other hand, his mixture of real and fictitious sources may well be intended to mislead his reader. One could, for example, take the dialogue between Tiberian and Flavius Vopiscus (in the preface to *A*) as an example of parody of the most serious and respected historiography in Roman literature (cf. *Pr.* 2.7), in which Livy, Sallust and Tacitus are dismissed as a 'bunch of liars'.¹³² This passage can

¹²⁸ Aurelius Verus (~Aurelius Victor): Schlumberger 1976, 219; Eusthenius (~ the author of *EKG*): Paschoud 1995, 502-4; Lollius Urbicus (*Dd.* 9.2, in reality a senator under Antoninus Pius): Chastagnol 1994, CIX-CX; Syme 1971, 35.

¹²⁹ See § 3.2 on Nepos, and Lippold 1991, 84-93; Brandt 1996, 52-4; Fündling 2006, 130.

¹³⁰ Since Mommsen's amazed reaction '*cui bono?*' (1890, 229: 'und die Hypothese dass hier im mühsamen Fälscherconsequenz der Preis einer zur zeit der Abfassung ausgestorbenen Dynastie verkündet werde, wird einfach widerlegt für jeden Unbefangenen durch das *cui bono*, das bei litterarischen Producten dieser Art nicht trügen kann') several answers have been given to the question why the author sought to conceal his identity behind so many aliases. Syme (1984, 5) draws attention to the fact that Hadrian also assigned the writing of books about his own life to freedmen and permitted them to publish these under their own names (*H* 16.1), which may have provided the idea of pseudonymity ('multiple impersonation') to our author. Den Hengst (2002, 193) suggests that the author, under the name of Vopiscus, may have intended to remind the reader that he had copied the preceding lives from earlier biographers and historians. The different names under which he writes are reminiscent of the different characters in Cicero's dialogues. For further analysis of the authors' names: Chastagnol 1994, XLVII-VIII; Paschoud 1996, XXV-VI (Capitolinus); Hohl 1912, 482 (Pollio and Vopiscus); Birley 2005, 33-47; Burgersdijk 2007, 101 (on the *cognomen* Syracusius). See also note 99 and 253).

¹³¹ Burian 1977 treats the claims of historical reliability as part of the author's method.

¹³² Den Hengst 1981, 47.

be seen as characteristic of at least the last two parts of the *HA*, in which serious history is laid low with the aid of parody and forgery.

There is, however, however, a difference in the author's use of sources in the various parts of the *HA*. In the first part, from *H* to *G*, there are far fewer 'bogus authors', to use Syme's term, than in the second and third parts. The Primary Lives are at least partly based on Marius Maximus, which is reflected in the quotations from this author in *EL*. At the new beginning in *OM* a novel source is produced (the identity of the author behind it will be discussed § 3.1). The following diagram gives a brief idea of the distribution of the authors Marius Maximus and Iunius (sometimes called: Aelius) Cordus:

Figure 2.3: Number of entries mentioning Marius Maximus and Iunius Cordus in the books of the *HA*; based on: Chastagnol 1994, *LIII*, *CIX*.

The main conclusion that may be drawn from the diagram is that Iunius or Aelius Cordus takes over the role of Marius Maximus as either chief or supporting source, be it fictitious, for the author of the *HA*. Marius Maximus' life, as a historical person, ended during Alexander Severus' reign, which is why a new source had to be invented. Meanwhile, as a source 'Cordus' is responsible for the most gossipy parts of the *HA*¹³³ and in this respect an exaggerated version of his predecessor Marius Maximus. Already in *CIA* (the only life in which the two sources occur together) he is staged as the source for the *omina imperii* and invented *litterae* of the ruler Clodius Albinus. Just as Marius

¹³³ The themes which Cordus allegedly treats are summed up by Den Hengst (1981, 48): the emperor's attitude towards slaves and friends, his sexual behaviour, clothing, food and drink: all themes typical of biographical descriptions (see § 3.2).

Maximus is presented as the successor of Suetonius (and, according to *AS* 48.6, at least wrote a *vita Traiani*), so Cordus succeeds Maximus. The two occasions when the latter biographer is mentioned in the *HA*, *Pr* 2.7 and *Q* 1.1-2 are only backward references. Syme (1968, 98): 'The author has created 'Junius Cordus' as a scapegoat. Also a successor to Marius Maximus, who likewise wrote *mythistorica volumina*'. Stuffing his volumes with fables and fake documents is what the author does himself, and is why he stages Cordus as a negative example, presumably in order to anticipate his critics.

Chapter 3 The Literary Design

3.1 Introduction

The paratextual elements of the *HA* constitute an important means to direct (and, in the special case of the *HA*, to delude) the interpretation of the reader. This makes the *HA* especially interesting for an approach from a literary angle, as the paratextual elements of the work are, more than in any other work of classical literature, utterly confusing. Investigations of paratextual devices (though the term paratext is never used as such) have been numerous in *HA* studies, and surveys were given in several publications.¹³⁴ In the following paragraphs, we will study paratextual and formal aspects of the work:

- the author's attitude towards his own activity of writing biography (§ 3.2)
- the contents of the *HA* with the author's own remarks as our point of departure, as well as its internal development (§ 3.3)
- the scope of the *HA*: where the author begins his narrative and where he ends it (§ 3.4)
- style and its relation with content and beginning and end of the narrative (§ 3.5)
- the dedications to several persons, and the authors who are claimed to have produced them (§ 3.6)
- temporal aspects of the narrative (§ 3.7)
- the much-debated problem of the *lacuna*, with the aid of the notion of time in narrative (§ 3.8).
- the author's concept of Roman history as reflected in the preface to *Car.* (§ 3.9)

Besides being a study in the design and the internal coherence of the work, our investigation is an attempt to expand the domain of intertextual relationships with works from Latin literature, especially Nepos and Tacitus, which means an affirmation of the author's character as an antiquarian and a collector. Syme announced as one of the tasks of scholarship to 'round off the picture of the literary world, placing the *HA* in relation with other writings, notably history and panegyrics (in their various types), with antiquarian studies, and with the revival of the Latin classics'. By studying language, anachronisms, historical or contemporary allusions (however complex the notion of 'contemporaneity' is in the case of the *HA*), the use of other authors and influences from other writers, the literary *Umwelt* of the *HA* may be determined.¹³⁵ The 'revival of the Latin classics' must have been one of the author's motives in writing the *HA*, to which the number of authors imitated bears witness.

In this search for literary models, a warning has to be kept in mind: *topoi* and conventional ways of expression, developed in the long history of imperial prose, can impede the identification of valid models. There is an essential difference between a parallel and a direct borrowing, and one superficial similarity between passages does not suffice to indicate a derivation. In his study about the author's literary culture, Den

¹³⁴ A recent overview is A. Birley 2003. Birley 1967, 113-38 is still valuable for general matters. See also Birley 2006.

¹³⁵ Syme 1968, 214-6.

Hengst dissuades us from accepting as conscious imitations verbal similarities consisting of single words, set phrases and parallelisms without corresponding verbal similarities.¹³⁶ On the other hand, Den Hengst continues, ‘we may be assured of literary derivation if a number of verbal correspondences is clustered in one passage’. With these warnings in mind, an attempt will be made to evaluate the author’s paratextual expressions in the light of classical tradition. The evaluation and ultimately, acceptance of a verbal parallel, will differ from case to case. The probability of a borrowing also partly depends from the similarity of textual genre in which the parallels occur. Parallels tend to indicate borrowing when they occur within the same type of text. It is easier to imagine one biographer taking another biographer as his model, for imitation or parody (or simply because he has read him), than his skipping to a different type of text, although this, too, is not beyond credence.

3.2 The Art of Biography

Broadly speaking, biography distinguishes itself from historiography in that it not only contains facts and deeds (πράξεις) of famous men, but also pays attention to their character (ἦθος). In the case of the *HA*, there is a mixture of chronological account and structuring in terms of categories, *per tempora* and *per species*, as Suetonius called the two main facets of biography.¹³⁷ Exemplary biographies such as *H* and *AP* mainly follow the Suetonian scheme, and the similarly structured Secondary Lives of tyrants, as witness *AC* 3.1-3 *Sed nos hominis naturam et mores breviter explicabimus; neque enim plura de his sciri possunt, quorum vitam et inlustrare nullus audet eorum causa, a quibus oppressi fuerint. addemus autem, quemadmodum ad imperium venerit et quemadmodum sit occisus et ubi victus.*¹³⁸ The *natura et mores* are part of the biographical narration, while the other three elements are both biographical and historiographical. In *PN* 1.1-2 the author complains about the lack of data about short-lived rulers: ... *postremo non magna diligentia in eorum genere ac vita requiretur, cum satis sit audaciam eorum et bellum, in quo victi fuerint, ac poenam proferre*, in which the same division of biographical (*genus ac vita*) and historiographical (*audacia, bellum, poena*) material is made. It is important, in the author’s view, to investigate their lives thoroughly, and only to select those elements for the narration, that are worth recording.

3.2.1 Biography Criticized

The author of the *HA* explicitly comments on the type of his writings, which, in later times, is styled as biography. The author himself speaks about writing biography as *vitae*

¹³⁶ ‘Although we must be careful here, given the practice of most authors, when imitating, to substitute synonyms or near synonyms for terms found in the source’, so Den Hengst (1991, 168) adds.

¹³⁷ Suet. Aug. 9.1: *Proposita uitae eius uelut summa partes singillatim neque per tempora sed per species exequar, quo distinctius demonstrari cognoscique possint*, with which statement Suetonius marks the transition from the chronological part to the thematic part. See Wallace Hadrill 1983, 13-5 (‘Structure’); Pausch 2004, 268.

¹³⁸ The author echoes himself in *PN* 9.3, about Pescennius Niger and Clodius Albinus: *et ab eodem victi atque occisi sunt.*

edere (OM 1.3), in which *vita* denotes as much the life of an emperor¹³⁹ as the book written about that life.¹⁴⁰ The prefaces of the *HA* are full of *topoi* typical of biographical and historiographical texts, such as the mention of *memoratu digna*,¹⁴¹ criticism of biographical details, selection of sources, and references to predecessors. In the preface to *OM* (1.3-5), the author disapproves of trivial details in the biographical writing that his predecessor Iunius Cordus provided. The author mentions three examples of *indigna memoratu*, or *minima quaeque* (the opposite of *digna sunt, quae dicantur* and *digna cognitione*) as Ammianus Marcellinus (*RG* 26.1) does as a defence against his *examinatores intempestivi*. Nepos in his preface to *De Duc.* does the same.¹⁴² The topical character of the theme of *digna memoratu* (a term that also occurs in Livy¹⁴³, Valerius Maximus¹⁴⁴, Pliny the Elder¹⁴⁵, Tacitus¹⁴⁶, Aulus Gellius¹⁴⁷ and a few others¹⁴⁸), makes it hard to indicate a direct model.¹⁴⁹

In the preface to *OM*, the author expresses his views on biographical writing in a complex piece of reasoning, which can be paraphrased in this way: there is not much information about the rulers who did not reign for a long time, because there are not many things of interest to say about their daily lives.¹⁵⁰ They would not have been known at all, if they had not aspired to the throne. About their reigns, which they exercised only briefly, there is not much to say. Despite all this, we will produce some information from

¹³⁹ The term biography does not appear until the sixth century AD in Damascius's biography of Isidorus as βιογραφία (Bowersock 1998, 208). See for examples of *vita* as 'biography': Syme 1971b (*Comm.* 10.2; *AS* 5.4, 21.4, 30.6, 48.6, *Tac.* 11.7 (about Suetonius). Cf. *OLD* *vita* 6: 'a person's life together with its acts, circumstances, etc., the course of a life', e.g. *Hel.* (1.1): *Vitam Heliogabali Antonini (...) numquam in litteras misissem*, ..., in which the life denotes the material for biography.

¹⁴⁰ *OLD* 6b: 'a written or spoken account of a person's life', e.g. *H7.2 ...ut ipse (sc. Hadrianus) in vita sua dicit*.

¹⁴¹ Mouchova 1975, 12; Den Hengst 1981, 46. *OM* 1.1: *digna, quae dicantur...*; *memoratu digna...*; 1.2: *digna cognitione...*; 1.4: *indigna memoratu...*; *rerum vilium aut nulla scribenda sint aut nimis pauca*; cf. for *memoratu digna*: *HA Hel.* 18.4, *T* 2.4; 4.2; *A* 1.9; *Tac.* 16.5; *Q* 6.1; 13.6. The topos is fully explored by Den Hengst 1981, 44-6, who traces it back to its first manifestations in Latin literature (Cato *Or.* 4.1, Cic. *De Orat.* 2.63, Sall. *Cat.* 4.2, as well as the approximately contemporary Amm. Marc. 28.1.2). The Greek origin of the topos, with expressions as τὸ ἀξιόλογον (e.g. Hdt. 2.148 or Thuc. 1.1) and τὸ μνημόνευτον (e.g. Arist. *Rhet.* 1367^a 24) were studied by Avenarius 1956 and Herkommer 1968.

¹⁴² *Non dubito fore plerosque, Attice, qui hoc genus scripturae leue et non satis dignum summorum uirorum personis iudicent, cum relatum legent, quis musicam docuerit Epaminondam, aut in eius uirtutibus commemorari, saltasse eum commode scienter que tibiis cantasse.*

¹⁴³ Liv. *AUC* 4.43.1: *nihil dignum memoratu actum*; 25.1.5: *haud ullum dignum memoratu fecit*.

¹⁴⁴ Val. Max. 1.1.1: *dicta memoratu digna*; 8.11: *memoratu dignae res*; both in programmatical remarks.

¹⁴⁵ Plin. Maior *NH* 2.247, 3.7, 6.97; 15.136; 31.6 (*digna memoratu*) and 3.95 (*memoratu digna*)

¹⁴⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 4.32.1: *parua forsitan et leuia memoratu*; Agr. 1.2.1: *digna memoratu ...*; *H* 2.24.1: *crebra magis quam digna memoratu proelia*. Only *Ann.* 4.32.1 is a programmatic remark.

¹⁴⁷ Aul. Gell. *NA* Pref. 2.1; 2.9; 6.17; 7.19; 12.27 (in introductions); variations in 2.11 (*memoratu non inutilis*), 3.12 (*auditu atque memoratu digna*), 4.15 (*memoratu dignissima*), 16.34 (*lepida quaedam et memoratu et cognitu*) – in capitula, 19.11 (*non memoratu indigni*).

¹⁴⁸ Noteworthy are the *Epitome de Caesaribus* 20.6 (*aedibus memoratu dignis*) and Amm. Marc. *RG* 22.8.25 (*nihil memoratu dignum traditur*).

¹⁴⁹ Though Suetonius may be excepted in this respect: in his transmitted works, he does not use the theme, at least not in this wording. The opposite is found in Suet. *Cal.* 26 *leue ac frigidum sit his addere...*

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *PN* 9.1-2: authors normally do not report much about daily lives, (*cum satis sit audaciam eorum et bellum, in quo victi fuerint, ac poenam proferre*). The author of the *HA* does not deviate from this programme, as he makes clear in *AC* 3.3: *addemus autem, quemadmodum ad imperium uenerit et quemadmodum sit occisus et ubi victus*.

several sources, but only the important things. Everybody, it is true, does something every day, but biographers have to produce worthwhile information about lives of others. Iunius Cordus wanted to write biographies of lesser known emperors, but did so without success. He discovered few things worth mentioning, and promised to describe the tiniest details, as if it were important to know trivial details about even Trajan, Pius or Marcus. By collecting all this, he filled his books with gossip, while nothing or at least very little should be written about trivial things, unless they provide an insight into the character of the subject, which is indeed important to know.¹⁵¹ Still, we can gather some information from these trifles that is really worth knowing, but only partly, in order to obtain more information from these trifles.¹⁵² The author states that Iunius Cordus filled his volumes about lesser known emperors with fables but he himself has succeeded where Cordus failed, and in doing so he has produced an acceptable description on the basis of several sources. Thus, the author is superior to Cordus in that he uses more sources, and is more critical in the selection of his material.¹⁵³

In the paraphrase above, the *minor things* are specified as follows, OM 1.4: *quasi vel de Traiano aut Pio aut Marco sciendum sit, (1) quotiens processerit, (2) quando cibos variaverit et (3) quando vestem mutaverit et (4) quos quando promoverit*. It is remarkable that the three emperors Trajan, Pius and Marcus are mentioned in an example that concerns the works of Cordus, who is said to have been specialized in lesser known emperors.¹⁵⁴ This is why *vel...* cannot be but interpreted as ‘even’, and does not correlate with the following *aut...aut...*¹⁵⁵ The line of thought, then, is that, while *even about the*

¹⁵¹ The reasoning calls to mind Plutarch’s remarks in the preface to his *vita Alexandri* that we encountered in § 2.3.1n (οὔτε ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις πράξεσι πάντως ἔνεστι δῆλως ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας, ἀλλὰ πρᾶγμα βραχὺ πολλάκις καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ παιδιὰ τις ἔμφασιν ἤθους ἐποίησε μᾶλλον ἢ μάχαι μυριόνεκροι), where it is stated that a small word or joke can elucidate a person’s character more than the greatest historical events.

¹⁵² The last phrase is reminiscent of Plut. *Alex.* 1.1-2 ἐὰν μὴ πάντα μηδὲ καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐξεργασμένως τι τῶν περιβοήτων ἀπαγγέλλωμεν, ἀλλ’ ἐπιτέμνοντες τὰ πλεῖστα, μὴ συκοφαντεῖν.

¹⁵³ Cf. Dio 1.1.2 in his programmatic remark about his use of sources about distant history: ...συνέγραψα δὲ οὐ πάντα ἀλλ’ ὅσα ἐξέκρινα; Diodorus Siculus 1.3.5-8: ἐξετάσαντες οὖν τὰς ἐκάστου τούτων διαθέσεις ἐκρίναμεν ὑπόθεσιν ἱστορικὴν πραγματεύσασθαι τὴν πλεῖστα μὲν ὠφελῆσαι δυναμένην, ἐλάχιστα δὲ τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ἐνοχλήσουσαν. Marincola (1997, 105) remarks that ‘the methodology of non-contemporary history was to consult the tradition, what previous writers had handed down’. In this respect, the author adheres to the tradition, as he repeatedly states that he has gathered the material *ex pluribus libris*. In *PN* 1.1-2 and intermediary and later lives, he suggests that he also uses epigraphical and other kinds of (material and written) evidence (confirmed by Chastagnol 1994, CXXIII-XXXI). Only with regard to information from the recent past, the Herodotean principle of ἀκοή plays a role, presented in an imitation of Suetonius (*Cal.* 19.4, *Otho* 1-3): the author in his guise of Vopiscus says to have heard things from his grandfather (*A* 43.2, *Q* 9.4-5, *Car.* 13.3, 14). This is all to suggest that the time of writing is in the beginning of the fourth century, during the reign of Constantine.

¹⁵⁴ Turcan’s remark (1993, 117): ‘L’expression cadres mal avec les exemples de Trajan, d’Antonin le Pieux, de Marc Aurèle’ is right, but the passage can be understood when *vel* is interpreted rightly.

¹⁵⁵ Chastagnol 1994, 451 gives the right interpretation of the *quasi*-clause when he translates: ‘même pour un Trajan...’. The word *vel* is crucial and is not always expressed in translations: Magie 1924, 49-51 translates: ‘He openly declared that he would search out the most trivial details, as though, *in dealing with a Trajan, a Pius, or a Marcus*, it should be known how often he went out walking; Pasoli 1968, 47: ‘...egli, che asseriva essere sua intenzione di andare in cerca dei minimi particolari, *come se riguardo a Traiano o a Pio o a Marco* fosse indispensabile sapere quante volte sia uscito di casa...’; Birley 1976, 268: ‘...while he

great emperors minor things are not worth knowing, they are *a fortiori* unimportant for the lesser known rulers. The examples that the author mentions are elements typical of biographical writing. Cordus is quoted throughout the Intermediary Lives for his description of the emperor's attitude towards slaves and friends, clothing and food and drink, and other items.¹⁵⁶ These items are also to be found in the earlier biographies of the HA, such as MA 6.7 and 29.1 (Marcus' ways of promoting people are described, example 4),¹⁵⁷ and in AP 6.12 (the Antonine dress is commented on, example 3).¹⁵⁸ Two items are found in combination in H 22.2-4 (in which Hadrian *togatus processit*, example 1 and 3).¹⁵⁹ Finally, Hadrian's eating habits occur just before the latter passage, H 21.4.¹⁶⁰ What it looks like is that, as the author himself describes trivial biographical details, he attacks Cordus' writings in order to avert criticism of his own work.¹⁶¹

The example of H 21.4 (*inter cibos unice amavit tetrafarmacum, quod erat de fasiano, sumine, perna et crustulo*)¹⁶² needs further analysis, as it is repeated and amplified in the Secondary Life of Ael., 5.4: *huius voluptates ab his, qui vitam eius scripserunt, multae feruntur, et quidem non infames sed aliquatenus diffluentes. nam tetrafarmacum, seu potius pentefarmacum, quo postea semper Hadrianus est usus, ipse dicitur repperisse, hoc est sumen, fasianum, pavonem, pernam crustulatam et aprunam. De quo genere cibi aliter refert Marius Maximus, non pentefarmacum sed tetrafarmacum appellans, ut et nos ipsi in eius vita persecuti sumus.* The *pavo* is added to the recipe, which is apparently based on the author's own research. The author thus shows that he

declared that he would pursue all the smallest details, *as though, in the case of Trajan or Pius or Marcus*, one had to know how often he went out...'; Turcan 1993, 19: 'Il se fait fort d'exposer à fond certaines minuties: *comme si, à propos de Trajan, d'Antonin le Pieux ou de Marc Aurèle*, il importait de savoir combien de fois ils ont paru en public...'; Chastagnol 1994, 451: 'Il soutenait qu'il devait exposer les détails les plus infimes, *comme si, même pour un Trajan, un Antonin le Pieux ou un Marc*, il nous importait de savoir combien de fois ils se sont montrés en public...'.
¹⁵⁶ Den Hengst 1981, 48: attitude: CIA 11.6, Gd. 21.4; clothing: CIA 11.7, OM 1.4, Gd. 21.4; food and drink: CIA 11.2, OM 1.4, Max. 4.1.

¹⁵⁷ MA 7.6: *tantumque apud Pium valuit, ut numquam quemquam sine eo facile promoverit*; MA 29.1: *Crimini ei datum est, quod adulteros uxoris promoverit, Tertullum et Tutilium et Orfitum et Moderatum, ad varios honores, cum Tertullum et prandentem cum uxore deprehenderit.* Cf. Suet. Vesp. 16.2 *creditur etiam procuratorum rapacissimum quemque ad ampliora officia ex industria solitus promoveri*. The formula in OM 4.6: *ex quo officio ad amplissima quaeque pervenit* may be derived from this phrase in Suetonius (see § 9.2). The formula *vestem mutare* is used in Nepos' Pausanias 4.3.1: *non enim mores patrios solum, sed etiam cultum vestitumque mutavit*.

¹⁵⁸ AP 6.12: *visus est sane ab amicis et cum privatis vestibus et domestica quaedam gerens.* An example from Suetonius, Cal. 52.1: *saepe depictas gemmatas que indutus paenulas, manuleatus et armillatus in publicum processit; aliquando sericatus et cycladatus; ac modo in crepidis uel coturnis, modo in speculatoria caliga, nonnumquam socco muliebri; plerumque uero aurea barba, fulmen tenens aut fuscinam aut caduceum deorum insignia, atque etiam Veneris cultu conspectus est.*

¹⁵⁹ H 22.2-4: *senatores et equites Romanos semper in publico togatos esse iussit, nisi si a cena reverterentur. ipse, cum in Italia esset, semper togatus processit. ad convivium venientes senatores stans excepit semperque aut pallio tectus discubuit aut toga summissa.*

¹⁶⁰ H 21.4: *inter cibos unice amavit tetrafarmacum, quod erat de fasiano, sumine, perna et crustulo.* An example from Suetonius: Aug. 76.1 *cibi - nam ne haec quidem omiserim - minimi erat atque vulgaris fere.*

¹⁶¹ Chastagnol 1994, CVIII points out that many of the cases in which Cordus is cited, the text of another author is at stake: Gd. 14.7-8 ~ Cic. Cat. 3.12; Gd. 12.1 ~ Herod. 7.2.1-8; Gd. 23.4 ~ Suet. Caes. 89; Gd. 4.6 ~ Suet. Nero 11.1.

¹⁶² Which is in accordance with the recipe in AS 30.6; based on Apicius, see Chastagnol 1994, XLVIII. Syme 1971, 71 draws the conclusion that the life of Ael. was written after the life of AS. See also Den Hengst 1995, 160-1.

has a basic source (as followed in *H* 21.4) which he supplements with information from other sources (*Ael.* 5.4). When we combine this notion with the description in the preface to *OM* we can hardly fail to conclude that the author also launches a veiled attack on Marius Maximus, as Cordus is more or less Marius Maximus' successor as his source (§ 2.4.2).¹⁶³ We might carry this conclusion one step further: Cordus is the dark side of Marius Maximus, allegedly continuing Maximus' work on the topic of the lesser known rulers. The author states in the preface to his combined biography of usurpers *Q* 1.1: *Quid Marius Maximus, homo omnium verbosissimus, qui et mythistoricis se voluminibus implicavit, num ad istam descriptionem curamque descendit?* The clause *qui et mythistoricis se voluminibus implicavit* is important: this is exactly what Cordus is said to have done in *OM* 1.4. Meanwhile, it can be understood why the author refers to a biography of Trajan when summing up his examples: this is a reference to Maximus' biography of this emperor.¹⁶⁴ In attacking Cordus, he mocks Maximus, while at the same time explaining his own methods.¹⁶⁵

3.2.2 The Description of Cordus

Cordus' method is described rather elaborately in the preface to *OM*.¹⁶⁶ This fictitious source may well have been based on a famous Roman from republican times, namely *Cato maior*. Parallels in descriptions, supported by lexical similarities, show that the author of the *HA* knew Nepos and based his description of Cordus on Nepos' description of Cato, though reversing everything in the process. Compare *OM* 1.3-4 to Nepos, *Cato* 3.1-2, 4:

¹⁶³ Den Hengst (1981, 47) remarks that Cordus 'stands for the gossipy parts of imperial biography as found in Suetonius, and, as we may safely add, in Marius Maximus'.

¹⁶⁴ Maximus wrote Trajan's biography according to *AS* 48.6.

¹⁶⁵ Doubts about Cordus' authenticity were already raised in the nineteenth century. Klebs (1892, 22n1) acknowledged his unreliability, but did not doubt his existence: 'So wenig Cordus eine Zierde der römischen Litteratur ist: wir haben kein Recht sein Dasein zu bestreiten'. Mommsen (1890, 272) saw it better: 'Der Biograph hat für die anekdotischen Erfindungen (...) in diesem Pseudo-Cordus sich zugleich einen Gewährsmann und einen Prügelknaben geschaffen', which became the majority view (though not unanimously so). Syme 1968, 98: 'the author has created 'Junius Cordus' as a scapegoat' (§ 2.4.3). For the treatment of Cordus in recent literature, see Den Hengst 1981, 46-50; Lippold 1991, 84-93; Chastagnol 1994, CVIII-CIX; Brandt 1996, 52-4; Fündling 2006, 130). The fictional character of Cordus becomes clear on finding that his reports appear to be distortions from other sources: *Gd.* 14.7-8; *Cic. Cat.* 3.12, *Gd.* 12.1; *Herod.* 7.2.1-8; *Gd.* 33.4; *Suet. Caes.* 89, *Gd.* 4.6; *Suet. Nero* 11.1; *Max.* 4.4; *Suet. Tib.* 42.5, see Chastagnol 1994, cix. *OM* 1.3: Nepos *Cato* 3.2-4, as well as *MB* 12.4 can be added. See also Burgersdijk 2007, 97-9.

¹⁶⁶ Syme 1968, 97n1 suggests that the name of Iunius Cordus is based on the first *Satire* by Iunius Iuvenalis (*Sat.* 1.2).

Nepos, *Cato* 3.1-2, 4

...*cupidissimus litterarum fuit* (sc.Cato).
Quarum studium etsi senior arripuerat,
tamen tantum progressum fecit,
ut non facile reperiri possit neque de Graecis
neque de Italicis rebus, quod ei fuerit
incognitum. (...) reliquaque bella pari modo
persecutus est...

OM 1.3-4

Et Iunio Cordo studium fuit
eorum imperatorum vitas edere,
quos obscuriores videbat;
qui non multum profecit.
Nam et pauca repperit et indigna
memoratu adserens se minima quaeque
persequuturum, ...

Both passages deal with the writing of books: Iunius Cordus, who writes biography, appears to be the opposite of Cato, who writes history. Four of Nepos's words are followed by the author of the *HA* (*studium* → *studium*, *progressum fecit* → *profecit*, *reperiri possit* → *repperit*, *persecutus est* → *persequuturum*). Furthermore, grammatical structures occur in associative ways: *cupidissimus litterarum fuit*, followed by the relative *Quarum studium* is paralleled by *studium fuit* with the genitive *eorum imperatorum...*; Nepos's *tantum progressum fecit* becomes *non multum profecit* in the *HA*; *non facile reperiri possit* becomes *pauca repperit* and *reliquaque bella...persecutus est* becomes *minima quaeque persequuturum*.¹⁶⁷ The similarities between Cato and Cordus (the 'anti-Cato') suggest that those linking the *HA* and Nepos are directly related, especially since more remarks of a programmatic nature show similar parallels (see below, § 3.6 and § 4.3). Examples of biographical *trivia* as summed up in the preface to *OM* are also found in the preface to Nepos' *De duc.*, when he mentions things that the reader may consider *leve*. These *res viles* can be compared to Nepos' examples of *levia*: *Non dubito fore plerosque, Attice, qui hoc genus scripturae leve et non satis dignum summorum uirorum personis iudicent, cum relatum legent quis musicam docuerit Epaminondam, aut in eius virtutibus commemorari, saltasse eum commode scienterque tibiis cantasse*. Some words from Nepos' preface are paralleled in *OM*: *persequi* (8) is echoed in *persequuturum* (1.4)¹⁶⁸, *exorsus sum*¹⁶⁹ (8) in *orditur* (1.2), *moribus* (3, 4) in *mores* (1.5). The most important aspect is the similar defence against criticism that biography is *leve et non satis dignum summorum virorum personis* and that the biographer must limit himself to *memoratu digna*.

Cordus is not only invoked as an 'authority' for certain biographical data and historiographical information but also serves, in *MB* 4.5, as the purported model for *divisio* of the material. The verb *persequi* (cf. *persequuturum* in *OM* 1.4) is significant: Cordus appears six times in combination with a form of this verb¹⁷⁰. The only time that the author (like Nepos in *Cato* 3.4) uses the form *persecutus est* is in one of the last

¹⁶⁷ For an analysis of this type of rewriting, see § 8.7.

¹⁶⁸ Also in *CIA* 11.2, again with Cordus: ...*Cordus, qui talia persequitur in suis voluminibus, ...*

¹⁶⁹ Again in Nepos *Pelopidas* 16.1.4: *In quibus Pelopidas hic, de quo scribere exorsi sumus, pulsus patria carebat.*

¹⁷⁰ *OM* 1.4 *se minima quaeque persequuturum*; *CIA* 5.10: ...*Aelium Cordum legat, qui frivola ... cuncta persequitur*; 11.2: ...*Cordus, qui talia persequitur...*; *Max.* 27.7: ...*ut Iunius Cordus loquitur (harum rerum persecutor est)...*; *Max.* 31.4: *longum est omnia persequi, quae qui scire desiderat, is velim, ut saepe dixi, legat Cordum...* and here, *MB* 4.5: *eo modo quo Iunius Cordus est persecutus omnia*. Note the use of participium futuri activi, verbum finitum (in present and perfect), noun and infinitive. The *variatio* makes the impression of a deliberate literary figure.

instances of Cordus' name in *MB* 4.5: *Sed priusquam de actibus eorum loquar, placet aliqua dici de moribus atque genere, non eo modo quo Iunius Cordus est persecutus omnia, sed illo quo Suetonius Tranquillus et Valerius Marcellinus, quamvis Curius Fortunatianus, qui omnem hanc historiam perscripsit, pauca contigerit, Cordus vera tam multa, ut etiam pleraque vilia et minus honesta perscripserit.* This passage, which serves to explain the order and the way in which topics will be discussed, has been linked (along with other passages)¹⁷¹ to Suetonius *Jul.* 44.4:¹⁷² *de qua priusquam dicam, ea quae ad formam et habitum et cultus et mores, nec minus quae ad civilia et bellica eius studia pertineant, non alienum erit summatim exponere.* The programmatic statements in the *HA* could as well be linked to Nepos's words in *Epam.* 1.1: *De hoc priusquam scribimus, haec praecipienda videntur lectoribus, ne alienos mores ad suos referant (...)* and 1.3-4: *Cum autem exprimere imaginem consuetudinis atque vitae¹⁷³ velimus Epaminondae, nihil videmur debere praetermittere, quod pertineat ad eam declarandam. Quare dicemus primum de genere eius, deinde quibus disciplinis et a quibus sit eruditus, tum de moribus ingeniique facultatibus et si qua alia memoria digna erunt, postremo de rebus gestis (...).* The correspondence between *MB* 3.1 *de moribus atque genere* and *Epam.* 1.4 *primum de genere eius (...)* *tum de moribus* in particular seems to indicate a link with Nepos. In *MB* 8.1 the announced topic is closed with the words: *Haec de moribus atque genere*, whereafter the *acta* are discussed. Note again that, after Iunius Cordus in *OM* and Tattius Cyrillus in *Max.*, imitations of Nepos are accompanied by two fictitious biographers: Valerius Marcellinus and Curius Fortunatianus. For whatever reason, the author of the *HA* appears to try and hide his real model by quoting invented authors.

3.3 The Contents of the *HA*

3.3.1 The Contents of the Primary and Secondary Lives

3.3.1.1 Categories of *Principes*

The author repeatedly comments on the material that he has chosen in order to produce a series of imperial biographies.¹⁷⁴ The elements out of which the narrative is created (which belong to the field of historical *inventio*) are taken from the imperial history of the second and third centuries. Not satisfied with this, he also seeks to make his narration

¹⁷¹ There are other passages in which the author of the *HA* uses similar formulas: *CIA* 1.5: *sed priusquam vel de vita vel de morte dissero, etiam hoc dicendum est, quod (...)*; *G* 1.1: *de cuius priusquam vel vita vel nece dicam, disseram, cur (...)*; *AS* 29.1: *antequam de bellis eius et expeditionibus et victoriis loquar, de vita cottidiana et domestica pauca disseram*; *Gd.* 3.1: *sed priusquam de imperio eius loquar, dicam pauca de moribus (...)*. Cf. also *AC* 3.1: *naturam et mores breviter explicabimus*. For other cases of *dispositio*: *Dd.* 7.2; *AS* 6.1, 45.1; *Gd.* 3.1; and for *dispositio* as a literary term: Leo 1901, 274; Carozzo 1978, 43-78.

¹⁷² Wölfflin 1891, 470; Klebs 1892, 19, 26-8; White 1967, 118; Den Hengst 1981, 35; Brandt, H. 1996, 55 and 145 indicate Suetonius as the model.

¹⁷³ Cf. for Nepos' expression *imaginem consuetudinis atque vitae* in the formula, in which the core of biographical writing is expressed, *AS* 45.1: *prius tamen eius consuetudinem dicam*.

¹⁷⁴ The idea for this may have been taken from Suetonius. Syme (1980, 104) ascribes the invention of imperial biography, viz. the lives of succeeding emperors linked in a series, to Plutarch, who described the emperors from Augustus to Otho; only the *Galba* and the *Otho* have been transmitted.

look more sophisticated. After the first biography about Hadrian, he announces that he will change his plan (as opposed to his model Suetonius, cf. *Q* 1.1).¹⁷⁵ This plan is announced in the first paragraphs of *Ael.* (1.1-3) and has been assessed frequently in studies on the *HA*.¹⁷⁶ As the programmatic remarks with regard to content are often ambiguous, it is expedient to study the paratext by itself: idiom, motifs and style. Only after a proper assessment of the author's writings (in order to elucidate the contradictions that the passages contain in relation to one another) the relation with the actual content of the *HA* can be taken into consideration.

One of the difficulties in the description of the material and the terminology used, is that the author is not consistent in the way he distinguishes between rulers in different parts of the *HA*. Rösger has shown that *principes* is the general term for different kinds of rulers, such as *Augusti*, *Caesares* and *tyranni*.¹⁷⁷ This is concluded from the evidence provided by, e.g. *Ael.* 1.1 and *OM* 1.1. It is true that *principes* can denote all kinds of rulers, but this does not mean that whenever *principes* are mentioned all these classes are referred to. In the preface to *Ael.*, the author speaks about three groups of rulers (the groups are marked by numbers): *In animo mihi est, Diocletiane Auguste, tot principum maxime, non solum* (1) *eos, qui principum locum in hac statione, quam temperas, retentarunt, ut usque ad divum Hadrianum feci, sed illos etiam, qui* (2) *vel Caesarum nomine appellati sunt nec principes aut Augusti fuerunt* (3) *vel quolibet alio genere aut in famam aut in spem principatus venerunt cognitioni numinis tui sternere*.¹⁷⁸ According to Rösger, the first group contains the *Augusti*, the second the *Caesares* that were not *Augusti* (here *principes* is specified to *Augusti* by *aut*¹⁷⁹), and the third, *per*

¹⁷⁵ *Q* 1.1 *Minusculos tyrannos scio plerosque tacuisse aut breviter praeterisse, nam et Suetonius Tranquillus, emendatissimus et candidissimus scriptor, Antonium, Vindicem tacuit, contentus eo quod eos cursim perstrinxerat, et Marius Maximus, qui Avidium Marci temporibus, Albinum et Nigrum Severi non suis propriis libris sed alienis innexuit.* This sentence can be compared with *PN* 9.2: *Inde quod latet Vindex, quod Piso nescitur quod omnes illi, qui aut tantum adoptati sunt aut a militibus imperatores appellati, ut sub Domitiano Antonius, aut cito interempti vitam cum imperii usurpatione posuerunt,* in which the two examples of Vindex (pretender under Nero in 68) and Antonius, together with Galba's Caesar Piso, are mentioned. Interesting is *AS* 1.7: *nam et Pescennium Nigrum et Clodium Albinum et Avidium Cassium et antea Lucium Vindicem et L. Antonium et ipsum Severum, cum senatus iam Iulianum dixisset principem, imperatores fecerant,* in which the three usurpers from the second century in the *HA* are mentioned in one breath, and Vindex and Antonius also appear. Severus joins the team, as he was called imperator at the moment that the senate had already appointed Didius Iulianus.

¹⁷⁶ White (1967, 121); Rösger (1977, 363 and 1980, 179); Den Hengst (1981, 10-11); Stubenrauch 1981, 55; Paschoud 2001, 196.

¹⁷⁷ In contrast to most other writers of his time, the author uses the term *tyrannus* in a strictly neutral sense, without moral overtones, as 'rulers that aspired to the throne', as can be concluded from the analysis by Barnes 1996, 64-5. He is 'consciously and deliberately subversive' (cf. Rösger 1977, 376n71, 380n80 and 392-3). In classical times, the word was used for a 'monarch, sovereign' (often applied to rulers of the Greek city states), or a ruler 'who exercises authority in a cruel or oppressive way, a tyrant' (Barnes 1996, 56), while from the battle of the Milvian Bridge onwards, the word was used for political ends, to denote a defeated ruler, such as Maxentius or Licinius (1996, 60-4). Barnes does not treat the instances in the *HA* when the word is used in a pejorative sense, such as *OM* 7.4: *senatus in eum (sc. Caracallam) velut tyrannus invectus est* or *Hel.* 1.2 (about rulers such as Caligula, Nero, Vitellius and Heliogabalus): here, the word is used in the latter meaning.

¹⁷⁸ See Mouchova 1975, 50 for the interpretation of *vel...vel...* and the division in groups.

¹⁷⁹ *OLD* ad *aut*, 6a: 'introducing a modification of a statement or expression' / 'introducing a more accurate or corrected statement.'

eliminationem, the *tyranni*, for these are the groups that are treated in the *HA*.¹⁸⁰ In the second group, we see that *principes* is used as the general term for different kind of rulers, since a person who is called Caesar, is not yet *princeps* on the level of an *Augustus* (*qui vel Caesarum nomine appellati sunt nec principes aut Augusti fuerunt*). This means that *principes* in the dedication *Diocletiane tot principum maxime* (and also in *principum locum*) includes the *Caesares*, but subsequently requires a new definition, when *y principes* is used solely to mean the *Augusti*. The text continues with *Quorum* (in this case: the *principes* of the second category) *praecipue de Aelio Vero dicendum est, qui primus tantum Caesaris nomen accepit, adoptione Hadriani familiae principum adscitus*. This means that Aelius acquired the name of Caesar through his adoption into Hadrian's family, but never obtained the title of Augustus.

According to Rösger, whose first concern was the interpretation of *principes* in *tot principum maxime*, Diocletian as *maximus principum* ranks higher than the *Caesares*, others (vaguely defined as [*illos qui*] *quolibet alio genere aut in famam aut in spem principatus venerunt*) merely being pretenders. For the cited passages the reasoning that Diocletian ranks highest among all sorts of *principes* seems to hold up well.¹⁸¹ But the idea runs into trouble when other undiscussed passages, are taken into account. The problem is that the author changes his formulas in almost every single biography, or even within a biography. Compare for example: *Ael. 7.5: ...quia mihi propositum fuit omnes, qui post Caesarem dictatorem, hoc est divum Iulium, (1) vel Caesares vel Augusti vel principes appellati sunt, (2) quique in adoptionem venerunt vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt, singulis libris exponere, ...* The author mixes the groups together:

Ael. 1.1

Non solum (1) eos, qui principum locum in hac statione, quam temperas, retentarunt, (...), sed illos etiam, qui (2) vel Caesarum nomine appellati sunt nec principes aut Augusti fuerunt, (3) vel quolibet alio genere aut in famam aut in spem principatus venerunt,...

Ael. 7.5

Omnes, qui (...) (1) vel Caesares vel Augusti¹⁸² vel principes appellati sunt, (2) quique in adoptionem venerunt vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt.

¹⁸⁰ Confirmed by Den Hengst 1981, 10, *pace* White 1967, 121, who points out that in *Ael. 7.5* the *tyranni* are not mentioned. I think that the *tyranni* are actually mentioned, but that the author is, at this point of his narration, deliberately vague about this category, as it does not really fit into a series of *Augusti* and *Caesares*.

¹⁸¹ Rösger's idea of *principes* in *tot principum maxime* runs into trouble when the formula is compared with that in *PN 9.1: Diocletiane, maxime Augustorum*: the author seems to have forgotten about his carefully constructed pyramid of different *principes*. The designation of the highest position *principum locum* recurs in *Hel. 34.1* in an address to Diocletian: *Mirum fortasse cuipiam videatur, Constantine venerabilis, quod haec clades, quam rettuli, loco principum fuerit,* There, *principes* refers to the reigning *Augusti*, without specification or explanation of who are meant.

¹⁸² The inversion of hierarchy in *vel Caesares vel Augusti* is a case of insubordination that is also encountered in a formula such as *Pr.1.5 (usque ad Maximianum Diocletianumque)*. The author, for whom stylistic features as *variatio* and *inversio* are more important than historical exactness, does not seem to bother about seniority or imperial authority. Paschoud 2005, 104 explains this as a 'beabsichtigte Skurrilität' that reveals that *Pr.* was not written during the tetrarchy.

In the first instance, the categories are (1) the *Augusti*, (2) the *Caesares* and (3) the other *principes*, while in the second case they consist of (1) *Caesares*, *Augusti* and *principes*, (2) the adopted heirs, or rather (*vel*),¹⁸³ the *Caesares* who were *imperatorum filii aut parentes* honoured with the name of Caesar.¹⁸⁴ The first category in *Ael.* 7.5 combines the first two categories in *Ael.* 1.1 (namely *Augusti* and *Caesares*) with a slight change of terminology, while a third group (*vel principes*) may summarize the third category of *Ael.* 1.1.¹⁸⁵ The second category of *Ael.* 7.5 supplies a new group: the adopted heirs and fathers and sons of emperors.

The supplementary grouping can only be explained by the description in *Ael.* 2.1-2.¹⁸⁶ *Ceionius Commodus, qui et Aelius Verus appellatus est, quem sibi Hadrianus (...) adoptavit, nihil habet in sua vita memorabile, nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus* (cat. 2 of *Ael.* 1.1), *non testamento, ut antea solebat, neque eo modo quo Traianus est adoptatus, sed eo prope genere, quo nostris temporibus a vestra clementia Maximianus atque Constantius Caesares dicti sunt, quasi quidam principum filii, virtute designati augustae maiestatis heredes*. Since category (1) in *Ael.* 7.5 summarizes the first three categories of *Ael.* 1.1, category (2) sums up the following text *Ael.* 2.1-2, which concerns the adoptions from Diocletian's times onward. One becomes a Caesar in one of three ways: *testamento* (in line with the old tradition, probably referring to Caesar's adoption of Augustus), by adoption (along lines of Trajan's adoption by Nerva)¹⁸⁷ and the 'modern way' of inheritance, as found with Maximian and Constantius who acquired the name as sons of the emperors and heirs of the *augusta maiestas*). The author evidently has in mind Diocletian's tetrarchic system, under which the sons of the emperors were called *Caesares* as long as the *Augusti* were on the throne, and after their abdication or death became *Augusti* themselves.¹⁸⁸ An aspect that has not been noted before is that the formula *imperatorum filii* in the second category of *Ael.* 7.5 (thus corresponding with *Ael.*

¹⁸³ The author plays with the different meanings of the word 'vel', as we have seen before, in OM 1.4: in 'quasi vel de Traiano aut Pio aut Marco...' *vel* does not correspond with the following *aut... aut...*, but stresses the clause as a whole: 'even about Trajan or Pius or Marcus'. Here, the first three cases of *vel* are disjunctives introducing three alternatives, while in the second case it introduces 'a more correct or precise expression' (OLD ad *vel* 3: 'or rather') - which is used in the same way as *principes aut Augusti* in *Ael.* 1.1.

¹⁸⁴ Pace Chastagnol 1994, 79, who translates *consecrati* with 'divinisés' (while the more neutral 'hallowed' is enough) and correspondingly concludes that the extension of the programme with this third category is not reflected in the content of the *HA*. I believe, however, that only one category is formulated in *quique in adoptionem venerunt ... consecrati sunt*.

¹⁸⁵ Pace White (1967, 121, supported by Callu 1992, 138-9), who supposes that the *tyranni* are absent from both passages, *Ael.* 1.1 and 7.5: 'Spartianus here provides for a complete series of imperial biographies to Diocletian, with separate libri devoted to legitimate heirs, but not yet for accounts of the tyranni.'

¹⁸⁶ Den Hengst (1981, 10) denies that there is a correspondance between *Ael.* 1.1 (third category) and 2.1-2.

¹⁸⁷ According to Den Hengst, the difference between the adoption of Trajan and that of Aelius is, that Trajan was appointed co-emperor shortly after his adoption, cf. Plin. *Paneg.* 8.6: *simul filius, simul Caesar, mox imperator*. In A 14.6 the adoption of Hadrian by Nerva is mentioned, together with the succeeding emperors: *hoc igitur, quod Cocceius Nerva in Traiano adoptando, quod Ulpus Traianus in Hadriano, quod Hadrianus in Antonino et ceteri deinceps proposita suggestionem fecerunt, in adrogando Aureliano, (...) censui esse referendum* (see for these adoptions Paschoud (1996, 101-3: 'selon le méthode établi') and Den Hengst's deviating view (1998b, 417: 'after a proposal had been presented', viz. by the priest).

¹⁸⁸ Chastagnol 1994, 64-5: 'une mise en parallèle habile, mais artificielle'.

2.2: *quasi ... principum fili*¹⁸⁹) may correspond with *fili Augustorum* as a title borne by Constantine and Maximinus in the period 308-9 AD, as the *heredes augustae maiestatis* of Licinius and Galerius respectively.¹⁹⁰ The author presents Aelius as the first to have been appointed Caesar on these conditions, not only as an heir, but as a real son.¹⁹¹

It must be concluded that the author of the *HA* is not consistent in his programmatic remarks with regard to the contents of his work: he changes his categories of rulers according to the context of the book, while the categories of rulers covered by the term *principes* change every single instance. Let us examine now how these programmatic statements relate to the actual contents of the books.

3.3.1.2 The Actual Contents of the Books

Let us consider how the different categories in *Ael.* 1.1 correspond with the contents of the *HA*. The first category is that of the reigning *Augusti* in an equal position to Diocletian, the addressee. These are evidently the reigning *Augusti* up to and including Macrinus, Mommsen's 'Diocletianische Reihe', supplemented with the biographies of *Hel.* and *AS*, despite the fact that these are dedicated to Constantine. The following books are ordered along other lines: the author will no longer treat his categories *singulis libris* (*Ael.* 7.5), but combined in one book, for which a new program will be outlined in the preface to *Max.* (see § 4.3). The second category (*illos etiam, qui vel Caesarum nomine appellati sunt nec principes aut Augusti fuerunt*), elaborated in *Ael.* 2.2 (*non testamento... maiestatis heredes*) and repeated in *Ael.* 7.5 (*quique in adoptionem venerunt vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomen consecrati sunt*), is based on the figure of Aelius Verus in the first place.¹⁹² There are, however, others, viz. *G* and *Dd.*,

¹⁸⁹ *Quasi...visi* is here 'in ihrer Eigenschaft als gewissermaßen echte Söhne der Principes und designierte Erben der Kaiserwürde', so Kolb 1987, 12. Kolb 1987, 69-87 also treats the designation '*parens principum*' as an official title, as it occurs in e.g. *Gd.* 27.10 for Timisitheus.

¹⁹⁰ The title of *fili Augusti* had been granted to the Caesares Constantine and Maximinus in the period after Diocletian and Maximian's retirement in 306 and the conference at Carnuntum. With four candidates for the title of Augustus (Severus, Constantine, Maxentius and Maximian), a settlement was made that Licinius and Galerius were to act as Augusti, with Constantine and Maximian as their *Caesares* with the title *fili Augusti*. Maxentius was denounced as a usurper, when he took over power in Italy. By 309 AD the four rulers all aspired to the title of Augustus, with the final result that after the battle of the Milvian bridge only Licinius in the East and Constantine in the West remained *Augusti* (Barnes 1982, 6). In all probability, the author also regarded the title as suitable to Galerius and Constantius as Caesares (293-305) and Diocletian and Maximian (co-rulers from 286-305), who called themselves 'brothers'. Cf. *Cl.* 10.7: *...ut sit omnibus clarum Constantium sanctissimum Caesarem et Augustae ipsum familiae esse et Augustos multos de se daturum, salvis Diocletiano et Maximimiano Augustis et eius fratre Galerio* and *Car.* 18.3: *post quos Diocletianum et Maximianum principes dii dederunt, iungentes talibus viris Galerium atque Constantium (...). quattuor sane principes mundi fortes, sapientes, benigni et admodum liberales, unum in rem p. sentientes, semper reverentes Romani senatus, moderati, populi amici, persancti, graves, religiosi et quales principes semper oravimus* (Straub 1972, 36 comments on the author's knowledge of the tetrarchy; see also Kolb 1987, 10-11).

¹⁹¹ The author promises to include all the sons of emperors with the name of Caesar, but he breaks his promise in the case of the son of Pertinax: *filium eius senatus Caesarem appellavit. sed Pertinax nec uxoris Augustae appellationem recepit et de filio dixit: 'cum meruerit'*. No separate biography is devoted to this youth.

¹⁹² Note that *Ael.* 2.2: *qui* (sc. Aelius Verus) *primus tantum Caesaris nomen accepit, adoptione Hadriani familiae principum adscitus* contains the same elements as *Ael.* 7.5 (underlined): *quique in adoptionem*

that fit in the category mentioned. The three *imperatorum filii aut parentes*¹⁹³ (*Ael.*, *G*, *Dd.*) should be distinguished from the *tyranni* (*AC*, *PN* and *CIA*) mentioned in the third category in *Ael.* 1.1 in several respects. Not only do they constitute different categories (the *tyranni* are mentioned in the third one in *Ael.* 1.1 as {*eos*} *qui quolibet alio genere aut in famam aut in spem principatus venerunt*), but they also differ in length: *Ael.* (1431 words), *G* (1233 words) and *Dd.* (1677 words) belong to the shortest books of the entire *HA*,¹⁹⁴ while the tyrants' lives *AC* (2622 words), *PN* (2274 words) and *CIA* (2706 words) are considerably longer. In conclusion, the first category contains the lives of *H*, *AP*, *MA*, *V*, *C*, *P*, *DI*, *S*, *Cc.*, *OM*, *Hel.* and *AS*, the second contains the lives of *Ael.*, *G* and *Dd.*, and the third *AC*, *PN* and *CIA*.

Programmatic remarks occur in both the lives of the *tyranni* and of the *imperatorum filii aut parentes*. In *AC* 3.3 both series are found: *proposui enim, Diocletiane Auguste, omnes, qui imperatorium nomen sive iusta causa* (1) *sive iniusta* (2) *habuerunt in litteras mittere, ut omnes purpuratos, Auguste, cognosceres*.¹⁹⁵ The *imperatorium nomen* ('the title of emperor')¹⁹⁶ can either be acquired *iusta causa* (viz. by nomination by the senate, by testament or adoption) or *iniusta causa* (viz. by usurpation). A new division of rulers' classes is made, well-suited to the present circumstances (namely in the biography of a usurper): the new umbrella term is *purpuratus*.¹⁹⁷ In the biography of the next usurper, *PN* 9.2, the author states: *non enim facile, ut in principio libri diximus, quisquam vitas eorum mittit in libros, qui* (1) *aut principes in re p. non fuerunt* (2) *aut a senatu appellati non sunt imperatores* (3) *aut occisi citius ad famam venire nequiverunt*. First, it should be remarked that the classes of rulers occur in a different context, namely when the difficulty of finding information about the lesser known rulers is discussed (earlier occurring in *AC* 3.3 and *PN* 1.1, see sub § 3.5). The categories are, supposedly, explained in the following sentence: *...omnes illi, qui* (1) *aut tantum adoptati sunt* (2) *aut a militibus imperatores appellati (...)* (3) *aut cito interempti vitam cum imperii usurpatione posuerunt*.¹⁹⁸

venerunt vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt, while the adoption into Hadrian's family in the former quote corresponds with *imperatorum filii aut parentes*.

¹⁹³ In fact, *parentes* ('family members') is an unnecessary addition to *imperatorum filii*, because Geta and Diadumenus were the sons of Septimius Severus and Macrinus respectively, while Aelius Verus was adopted as a son. The author may have thought of his own formula in *Ael.* 1.1: *adoptione Hadriani familiae adscitus*: Aelius becomes a member of Hadrian's family. Even more important may be the fact that Aelius is Lucius Verus' father, who shared the emperorship with Marcus Aurelius. The biographies *Ael.* and *V* are the first two to be dedicated to Diocletian.

¹⁹⁴ Only *DI* (1595 words) and *Val.* (1006 words) are of comparable length; for the computational scheme, see below, § 3.7.

¹⁹⁵ With *proposui enim, Diocletiane Auguste,...* the author combines his earlier formulas *quia mihi propositum fuit* (*Ael.* 7.5) and *In animo mihi est, Diocletiane Auguste* (*Ael.* 1.1), after which there is again a different classification.

¹⁹⁶ Note that *imperator* is used as a synonym to *princeps* in *OM* 15.4: *Quae de plurimis collecta serenitati tuae, Diocletiane Auguste, detulimus, quia te cupidum veterum imperatorum esse perspeximus*.

¹⁹⁷ Compare the different classes of *principes* in the dedication of *Ael.* 1.1 with *ut omnes purpuratos... cognosceres* (*AC* 3.3) with *quia te cupidum veterum imperatorum esse perspeximus* (*OM* 15): the terms are used as synonyms; the author does not care about the exact designations. (Rösger 1980, 200).

¹⁹⁸ The examples which the author gives are Vindex (usurper under Nero and defeated under Galba), Piso (adopted *Caesar* under Galba for a very brief period, in January 69) and, in the second category, Antonius (usurper under Domitian).

PN 9.1

Eorum..., qui

(1) *aut principes in re p. non fuerunt*

(2) *aut a senatu appellati non sunt*
imperatores

(3) *aut occisi citius*

Ad famam venire nequiverunt.

PN 9.2

...omnes illi, qui

(1) *aut tantum adoptati sunt*

(2) *aut a militibus imperatores appellati (...)*

(3) *aut cito interempti*

vitam cum imperii usurpatione posuerunt.

Principes in PN 9.1 has the meaning of *Augusti*: it is hard to find information about adopted *Caesares* like Aelius (explained by *qui...tantum adoptati sunt* in 9.2), in contrast with information about the *principes*. The second category is defined by the usurpers, appointed emperor by the soldiers, not the senate. The third category is an afterthought about the same group, formulated in PN 9.1 with an echo of the third category in *Ael.* 1.1: (*illos, qui*) *quolibet alio genere aut in famam aut in spem principatus venerunt, ...* The clause *in famam ...venerunt* becomes *ad famam venire nequiverunt*, which causes a contradiction: whereas the author intends to describe *illos, qui ... in famam ...principatus venerunt*, information about tyrants like Pescennius Niger is difficult to find because *ad famam venire nequiverunt*. Immediately after this, the author announces the biography of Clodius Albinus '*qui quasi socius huius habetur*'. This links the two biographies strongly together.

Avidius Cassius, Clodius Albinus and Pescennius Niger may safely be regarded as a threesome, as they are mentioned together twice (*AS* 1.7, *Q* 1.1). The three *imperatorum filii aut parentes* are also strongly linked.¹⁹⁹ They do have some elements in common with *Ael.*, compare *Ael.* 2.1: *Ceionius Commodus, ... nihil habet in sua vita memorabile, nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus*, with *Dd.* 1.1 *Antonini Diadumeni pueri ... nihil habet vita memorabile, nisi quod...* *G* 1.1 has the excuse: *neque enim multa in eius vita dici possunt, qui prius rebus humanis exemptus est, quam cum fratre teneret imperium*. Thus, the second category of *Ael.* 1.1, as explained in *Ael.* 2.1, announces the lives of *G* and *Dd.* In the third category in *Ael.* 7.5, the group is specified as *qui...vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt*.

Although his emperorship is confirmed by the senate, which is also reported by the author of the *HA* (cf. *OM* 6-7), Macrinus is in many respects described as a tyrant.²⁰⁰ To begin with the opening words of his *vita*: in *Vitae illorum principum seu tyrannorum sive Caesarum*, the term *principes* refers to rulers in general, subdivided in two classes as *tyranni* and *Caesares*,²⁰¹ which makes Macrinus a *tyrannus*. Diadumenian is as a *Caesar*, according to Herodian: *OM* 10.5: *sciendum praeterea, quod Caesar fuisse dicitur, non Augustus Diadumenus puer, quem plerique pari fuisse cum patris imperio tradiderunt* and *Dd.* 2.5: *Herodianus Graecus scriptor haec praeteriens Diadumenum tantum Caesarem dicit puerum a militibus nuncupatum*.²⁰² In the two biographies, the title of

¹⁹⁹ The coherence of the lives of the usurpers and the lives of the *Caesares* led Callu (1992, XXIV-XXVII) to suppose that the addition of the two groups occurred in two different stages of redaction. Paschoud (1996, XXXIV) rejects Callu's claim, but it is to be regretted that he equally denies the differences between the two groups (like Syme 1971, 68; Barnes 1970, 30 and Den Hengst 1992, 158). In what stage the groups entered the *HA* is hard to say, but the differences can hardly be denied.

²⁰⁰ See above, § 2.2.1 (Den Hengst 1981, 51 and 57n24: *imperium arripuit*).

²⁰¹ Den Hengst 1981, 51, following Rösger 1980, 179-84.

²⁰² Which is indeed true: Herodian 5.4.12, see for a further discussion of the passage § 5.3.2.

Augustus in relation to Macrinus and Diadumenian is exclusively used in *Dd.* 8.5 and 9.1 in two fictitious letters. A further indication that the author treats Macrinus as a usurper, is that he is dealt with as a ruler about whom not much is known. This was a problem, according to *PN* 1.1-2²⁰³ and *PN* 9.2,²⁰⁴ in writing up tyrants. As we have seen, in his programmatic remarks the author hints at the contents of the book and the immediate context in which they occur, such as *Ael.* 1.1 and *PN* 1.1. Schwartz (1972, 265) notes that the emperor Macrinus fits none of the categories mentioned in *PN* 9.1-2,²⁰⁵ but his conclusion that the author was therefore badly informed about Macrinus's life cannot be drawn from this datum: rather, the author changes his categories depending on the subject at hand. It is important to note that the preface to *OM* does not cover the programme of the entire *HA*, but that the two following biographies only are introduced by this particular preface.²⁰⁶

3.3.2 The Contents of the Intermediary and Later Lives

OM and *Dd.*, both belonging to IL, are structured along the lines of PL and SL, and fit the announcement of the books in *Ael.* 1.1 and 7.4 (and thus treated under § 3.3.1). Some more remarks about IL and LL should be made. As we have seen, the tyrants' lives *AC*, *PN* and *ClA* are mentioned 'en groupe' in *AS* 1.7 and *Q* 1.1, while *Ael.*, *G* and *Dd.* are not referred to. The author's promise in *Ael.* 7.5 to treat rulers from several categories in separate books (*singulis libris exponere*) is abandoned from *Max.* onward, where rulers are combined: *Ne fastidiosum esset clementiae tuae, Constantine maxime, singulos quosque principes vel principum liberos per libros singulos legere, adhibui moderationem, qua in unum volumen duos Maximinos, patrem filiumque, congererem.* The perspective has shifted from the author (*exponere*) to the reader (*legere*), while the formula *singulis libris* remains unchanged. The content is changed into *principes vel principum liberos*, while *Ael.* 7.5 has *imperatorum filii aut parentes* (so: *imperatorum filii* becomes *principum liberos*). The tyrants, who are not named as a category any longer, are merged into a group containing all *principes*. In the sequel, separate categories are applied: thirty tyrants during the reign of Gallienus are collected in one book, while later in *Q* four tyrants are treated. Moreover, the author emphasizes a different description of

²⁰³ *Rarum atque difficile est, ut, quos tyrannos aliorum victoria fecerit, bene mittantur in litteras, atque ideo vix omnia de his plene in monumentis atque annalibus habentur. primum enim, quae magna sunt in eorum honorem, ab scriptoribus depravantur, deinde alia supprimuntur, postremo non magna diligentia in eorum genere ac vita requiretur...* This last item is what the author of the *HA* reproaches Cordus for: he did not search hard enough or find much.

²⁰⁴ *non enim facile, ut in principio libri diximus, quisquam vitas eorum mittit in libros, qui aut principes in re p. non fuerunt aut a senatu appellati non sunt imperatores aut occisi citius ad famam venire nequiverunt.* Macrinus seems to fit in the last category (described in *OM* 1.1 as *qui non diu imperarunt*; cf. *de imperio, quod non diu tenuerunt*).

²⁰⁵ Still, the formula *quos tyrannos aliorum victoria fecerit* does apply to Macrinus, who is killed only after one year of reign by the troops of Heliogabalus. The author's point is that there is only a slight difference between short-reigning emperors and tyrants who aspired to the throne.

²⁰⁶ Turcan (1993, 115) suggests that the preface was added in the final stage of writing, when the secondary lives were also written. Den Hengst 1981, 51 thinks that the preface serves as a program for a series of minor rulers, including Macrinus and Diadumenian (repeated in 1992, 166n55). Callu 1992, XXVII sees the preface to *Ael.* as the beginning of 'la vraie préface', continued in *PN* and *OM*.

his material, developed from the observation that *tyranni* do not hold power for long (PN 9.1: *occisi citius* and PN 9.2: *cito interempti*).

In the first of the Intermediary Lives, the author's changes in his programme go almost unnoticed: OM 1.1: *Vitae illorum principum seu tyrannorum sive Caesarum, qui non diu imperarunt, in obscuro latent,...* As we have seen in the preceding paragraph, the *tyranni* and *Caesares* primarily refer to Macrinus and Diadumenian respectively. He continues his narration with tyrants who became emperors, but not for long. This last notion is important, because it will return in many later books. The phrase reappears already in the continuation of the same sentence: (...*de imperio, quod non diu tenuerunt*). While in the lives of AC and PN, the lack of information about the tyrants was caused by the fact that they were defeated and consequently passed into oblivion,²⁰⁷ in OM the author is troubled by a lack of information because the subject of the book did not reign long. Macrinus's reign is a break in the Severan dynasty, but after Alexander Severus, the age of the short-lived emperors begins. At least eight instances of the theme in IL, and eight in LL can be counted.²⁰⁸ It looks as if the plan to treat the emperors and tyrants in separate books has made place for another design: the distinction between emperors and tyrants becomes ever more vague; the duration of the reign becomes a criterium to distinguish the emperor from the tyrant. Also striking is the use of the theme in connection with oracles and *omina* in IL: Dd. 1.1, 5.4, AS 13.3, Max. 30.2, Gd. 23.2.²⁰⁹

The most elaborate passage in which the theme of the duration of a reign occurs is AS 64.1-2: *Hactenus imperium populi Romani eum principem (i.e. Alexander) habuit, qui diutius imperaret, post eum certatim inruentibus et aliis semenstribus, aliis annuis, plerisque per biennium, ad summum per triennium imperantibus usque ad eos principes, qui latius imperium tetenderunt, Aurelium dico, et deinceps*. The author distinguishes between short-lived emperors and longer-lasting rulers and uses this notion in a

²⁰⁷ AC 3.1: *neque enim plura de his sciri possunt, quorum vitam et inlustrare nullus audet eorum causa, a quibus oppressi fuerint* or PN 1.1: *Rarum atque difficile est, ut, quos tyrannos aliorum victoria fecerit, bene mittantur in litteras...* : the rules of these tyrants could not be described adequately for fear of those who conquered them.

²⁰⁸ Dd. 1.1: *ei stupenda omina sunt facta imperii non diutini*; 5.4: *quare dixerunt mathematici et imperatoris illum filium futurum et imperatorem, sed non diu*; Hel.1.2: *simul intellet Romanorum iudicia, quod illi (i.e. Augustus and his successors) et diu imperarunt et exitu naturali functi sunt, hi (i.e. tyranni) vero interfecti, tracti, tyranni etiam appellati, quorum nec nomina libet dicere*; AS 13.2: *ex quo quidem haruspices dixerunt imperatorem quidem illum, sed non diu futurum et cito ad imperium perventurum*; 20.3: *'molliorem tibi potestatem et contemptabiliorem imperii fecisti', ille respondit: 'sed securiorem atque diuturniorem'*; AS 64.1, see below; Max. 30.2: *quando dixerunt haruspices duos imperatores non diuturnos ex una domo isdem nominibus futuros*; Gd. 23.2: *sed indicium non diu imperaturi Gordiani hoc fuit, quod eclipsis solis facta est*; Gall. 13.2 (about Zenobia): *ipsa suscepit imperium diuque rexit, non muliebriter neque more femineo*; 21.1 (about Macrinus): *Capto Valeriano, diu clarissimo principe civitatis*; 24.2: *et cum multa Tetricus feliciterque gessisset et diuque imperasset, ab Aureliano victus*; 26.3: (about Trebellianus): *aliquamdiu apud Cilicas; imperavit*; 27.1: *Zenobia usurpato sibi imperio diutius quam feminam decuit rem p. obtinuit*; 30.2: *nomine filiorum Herenniani et Timolai diutius, quam femineus sexus patiebatur, imperavit*; 31.4 (about Victoria): *quae quidem non diutius vixit*; Cl. 1.3: *...qui si diutius in hac esset commoratus re p., Scipiones nobis et Camillos omnesque illos veteres suis viribus, suis consiliis, sua providentia reddidisset. breve illius, negare non possum, in imperio fuit tempus, sed breve fuisset, etiamsi quantum hominum vita suppetit, tantum vir talis imperare potuisset*.

²⁰⁹ Two more oracles should be mentioned: PN 8.6 (*item cum quaereretur, quamdiu imperaturus esset, respondisse Graece dicitur: (...) ex quo intellectum Severum viginti annos expleturum*) and OM 3.2 (*sed credentibus cunctis, quod octo annis Antoninus Pius imperaturus esset, ...*). Oracles do appear to know a lot about the duration of reigns.

programmatic statement, like in *Hel.* 35.2: *scribere autem ordiar, qui post sequentur. quorum Alexander optimus et cum cura dicendus est annorum tredecim princeps, semestres alii et vix annui et bimi, Aurelianus praecipuus et horum omnium decus auctor tui generis Claudius semestres alii et vix annui et bimi*. The climax in the sequence *semenstribus* – *annuis* – *biennium* – *triennium* – *latius* in *AS* 64.1-2 is an amplification of *Hel.* 35.8 *semestres* – *annui* – *bimi* (apart from the *annorum tredecim* for Alexander). The character of a repetitive theme becomes clear in *MB* 15.7, where historiographical discussions about the duration of a reign are reported: *Imperarunt autem Maximus et Balbinus anno uno, cum Maximinus imperasset cum filio, ut quidam dicunt, per triennium, ut alii per biennium*.²¹⁰

The theme occurs most frequently in *T*. The contents of this book, thirty tyrants, require it: the brevity of their reigns is the reason why they are little-known. The imperial crisis of the third century²¹¹ manifests itself in a rapid succession of rulers; which leaves its marks on the structure of the books. In the preface of *Cl.* (1.1), the author calls the shorter reigning rulers *tumultuarios ... imperatores ac regulos*.²¹² It is interesting to compare the description of the rapid change with Herodian's account of the rulers after Marcus Aurelius' death (1.1.5): ὧν (sc. τυράννων τε καὶ βασιλέων) οἱ μὲν ἐπιμηκεστέραν ἔσχον τὴν ἀρχήν, οἱ δὲ πρόσκαιρον τὴν δυναστείαν· εἰσὶ δ' οἱ μέχρι προσηγορίας καὶ τιμῆς ἐφημέρου μόνης ἐλθόντες εὐθέως κατελύθησαν. What Herodian also seems to recognize is that there is only a minute difference between the official rulers who did not reign long and the 'tyrants' who almost made it.²¹³

3.4 The Scope of the *HA*

In the preceding paragraphs the author's material for his narration and his programmatic remarks have been outlined, so that now the time has come to consider the period from which the author took the elements of his narration. As we have seen, the material used in *Ael.* 1.1 and 7.5 exhibit considerable differences, while at the same time the narrative spectrum appears to have undergone significant alterations:

<i>Ael.</i> 1.1	<i>Ael.</i> 7.5
<i>in animo mihi est</i> [1]	<i>Quia mihi propositum fuit...</i>

²¹⁰ In *Hel.* 34.1, Heliogabalus' reign is measured in years: *Mirum fortasse cuipiam videatur, Constantine venerabilis, quod haec clades, quam rettuli, loco principum fuerit, et quidem prope triennio*.

²¹¹ The notion of crisis in the third century is a hotly debated topic, about which a huge amount of literature has appeared in the past decade. A recent overview in two volumes is John 2008, in which several scholars elucidate various aspects of the history of the era 235-84 (from the death of Alexander Severus to the accession of Diocletian), which is generally held to be a period of crisis in economic, governmental, military, moral and cultural respect. For an overview of the historical problems and many references to (recent) literature see De Blois 2006, 25-36.

²¹² Cf. the formula *minusculos tyrannos* in *Q* 1.1 and the discussion if the first tyrant, Firmus, should only be called a *latrunculus* (Paschoud 2001, 207-11).

²¹³ The same goes for Herodian, as expressed by Hidber 2007, 203: '...quick succession of reigns, bound up with the phenomenon of many adolescents succeeding to the throne, that is announced as the most noticeable feature of the period, deserving the narratees' special attention' (cf. Hidber 2006, 273-8).

<i>Diocletiane Auguste, tot principum maxime, (*) cognitioni numinis tui sternere. [2]</i>	<i>...singulis libris exponere, meae satisfaciens conscientiae, etiamsi multis nulla sit necessitas talia requirendi.</i>
<i>* non solum eos, qui principum locum in hac statione, quam temperas, retentarunt, (**), sed illos etiam, qui vel Caesarum nomine appellati sunt nec <u>principes</u> aut <u>Augusti</u> fuerunt, vel quolibet alio genere aut in famam aut in spem principatus venerunt, [3]</i>	<i>...omnes, qui (...) vel Caesares vel <u>Augusti</u> vel <u>principes</u> appellati sunt, quique in adoptionem venerunt, vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt...</i>
<i>** ut usque ad Hadrianum feci [4]</i>	<i>Post Caesarem dictatorem, hoc est divum Iulium</i>
<i>Quorum praecipue de Aelio Vero dicendum est, ... [5]</i>	<i>Haec sunt, quae de Vero Caesare mandanda litteris fuerunt.</i>

Figure 3.1: A comparison of the programmatic statements with regard to the HA's content in Ael.1.1 and 7.5

Many elements from the preface recur in one way or another in the epilogue, such as the intentions of the author [1], the various reasons for writing the *vitae* [2], the contents of the book [3], the *principes* described [4], the writing of a *vita Aelii* [5]. The words in bold type show the lexical similarities between the two texts and the way in which the author uses the same terms in different contexts, with more attention to style than to logic (*principes* aut *Augusti*, for example, recurs as *Augusti vel principes*, and *Caesarum nomine appellati sunt* is split into *appellati sunt* and *Caesarum nomine*). These interventions make it difficult to extract an underlying logic, though it is important to remember that in the *HA* style is often more important than content.

Meanwhile, there is another problem with the time spanned by the *HA*, as there are two different statements about the beginning of the series. The question at what point the *HA* originally began has been posed many times.²¹⁴ There are several reasons to suppose that the present beginning of the *HA*, the biography of Hadrian, was not the original one, especially as this book lacks a preface. Also, it would have been more logical for the author to have linked his series to the end of Suetonius' *De vita Caesarum*, which ended with Domitian's reign in the year 96. He could well have continued this series with Domitian's successor Nerva, who, moreover, was the founder of the system of adoptive emperors. The idea of linking a work to a famous predecessor has other precedents in historiography, such as Ammianus did, who began where Tacitus had left off.²¹⁵ In his survey (2006-I, 11-5) of diverging opinions about the two major questions (preface and

²¹⁴ Den Hengst 1981, 14-6 (followed by Chastagnol 1994, xxxv) considers the question useless, as the answer cannot be given on the basis of the data, opposed by Paschoud 1996, xxviii, 40n1 ('Je ne partage pas le point de vue de Chastagnol, qui pense que, puisque la question ne peut être tranchée avec certitude, il est inutile de la poser'). Hohl (1920, 297), Syme (1968, 207), Stubenrauch (1981, 59) Paschoud (*l.c.*) and Fündling (2006, 11-5) all suppose that the beginning is lost accidentally, not so: John 1976, 11n2; Callu 1992, xxiv; Meckler 1996, 364-75. Hartke (1951, 324-7) concludes from a statistical analysis of references to Augusti that there never was a *vita Traiani*. Dessau (1892, 587) says about the question: 'Dass der Anfang der Sammlung fehlt ist ohne dies sicher. Sie hat unmöglich mit Hadrian begonnen'.

²¹⁵ *A principatu Caesaris Nervae exorsus*, RG 31.16.9, see above, § 2.3. Marincola (1997, app. 6-7) treats the instances in which historiographers starting from Thucydides, link their narration to a predecessor.

beginning) Fündling concludes that in the present state of affairs no definite conclusion about the beginning can be drawn.²¹⁶ One obvious method of ascertaining whether any *vitae Nervae* and *Traiani* ever existed and were subsequently lost is by assessing internal references to earlier (lost) works. The problem is that many of the references identified can be interpreted in more than one way, as he (2006, 14-5) makes clear. In the next few paragraphs the author's programmatic statements about the beginning and the end of his work will be investigated in order to try and establish a system in his contradictory remarks.

3.4.1 The Beginning of the *HA*

The first preface in the *HA* is that of *Ael.*, which is closely linked to its epilogue. The author comments on the projected scope of his biographies, both with regard to its contents and the starting point of his series. Attempts to harmonize the contradictory remarks in the *HA* risk ignoring the nature of the work: the author consciously and frivolously changes details in his programmatic remarks by way of a literary game, but also as part of an apparent effort to impose order on a heterogeneous collection of biographies. Starting point and end shift continually throughout the series. The remarks on the work's beginning are gradually substituted by remarks on its projected end, just as Diocletian as a dedicatee is replaced by Constantine and others. Although there are many contradictions in the author's comments, there is some method to his farrago. He is much given to using the factor of time (TN in particular), whereby he seeks to delude the reader with seemingly consistent yet contradictory comments.

It has been remarked before that there is a difference between the claims made in *Ael.* 1.1 and 7.4.²¹⁷ The author pretends to come up with a consistent program, while what we find is that it has been changed subtly at the end of his narration about *Ael.* In the next biographies, up to *OM*, no remarks are found about the beginning of the *HA* (unless *AC* 3.3 *omnes purpuratos* is read as an indication of the scope of the *HA*).²¹⁸ In the preface to *OM* a new literary technique crops up. In his defence against his imaginary opponent the author uses the formula ...*quasi vel de Traiano aut Pio aut Marco sciendum sit*, ... (*OM* 1.4). This has the double effect of distancing himself from what has been said before, to the point of suggesting that he was not responsible for having written the preceding biographies, and associating Trajan with those of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This is suggestive: it hints at a biography of Trajan. A similar mystification occurs in *Hel.* 1.2: ...*compensationem sibi lector diligens faciat, cum legerit Augustum, Traianum, Vespasianum, Hadrianum, Pium, Titum, Marcum*... Whereas the biographies of Augustus, Titus, Trajan and Vespasian are not part of the actual *HA*, those of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius are – even if they are all mentioned in

²¹⁶ 'Als Fiktion ist die *HA* so einmalig, dass man sich damit schwertut, ihr Regeln und Grenzen des Möglichen vor zu schreiben'. All the same, Fündling tends to assume 'ohne weiteres' that the beginning has been lost in the textual tradition: 'Gleichwohl bleibt der offensichtliche Vorteil eines Prooemiums für den Rest des Werks das stärkste Argument zugunsten eines Anfangsverlustes.'

²¹⁷ Hartke 1951, 328; White 1967, 121; Den Hengst 1981, 15; Chastagnol 1994, xxxv. Stubenrauch's complex attempt to emend the passage *Ael.* 7.5 (1981, 64-81) in order to harmonize the disperse remarks in *Ael.* 1.1-2, 7.5 and *Q* 1 ignores the irregular nature of the *HA*.

²¹⁸ Den Hengst 1981, 15-6.

one breath (with Vespasian and Titus breaking up the chronological order). The author tries to veil the beginning of the *HA* in ambiguity and attempts to make the reader forget that he once began with Hadrian. We find much the same in AS 1.7, this time with respect to the rival emperors: *nam et Pescennium Nigrum et Clodium Albinum et Avidium Cassium et ante Lucium Vindicem et L. Antonium et ipsum Severum, ...* With the words *et ante* the author suggests that Lucius Vindex and L. Antonius have been treated in the same way as Pescennius Niger, Clodius Albinus and Avidius Cassius. In this way, he separates the threesome of tyrants treated in the *HA* from the earlier ones, but passes over the fact that they belong to the historical times described by Suetonius. In *Q* 1.1²¹⁹ he describes matters the other way round: Antonius and Vindex are mentioned as Suetonius' responsibility, and Avidius and Albinus and Niger are Marius Maximus' interest. Subsequently, under the guise of Vopiscus, he refers to his predecessor Trebellius Pollio (author of *T*), as if he is one of a kind with Suetonius and Marius Maximus. The actual beginning of the *HA* is not referred to even once, but constantly passed over.

The author's attempt to obscure the starting point for *Ael.* to *Hel.* may indicate that *H* was always his starting point. He tries to suggest that the starting point was *post Caesarem*, and does so by referring to the lives of Augustus, Titus, Vespasian, Domitian and Trajan. Given the fact that he seeks to shore up his authority by taking recourse to a group of fictitious fellow authors, he does not so much claim to have written these lives himself, as present these lives as part of a collaborative effort. On one hand, the author distances himself from the previous biographies by criticizing his alter ego Cordus, and, implicitly, Marius Maximus, on the other he tries to incorporate all history from Augustus to the time when the *HA* was allegedly written. A general preface, if it ever existed, would have nullified this effect of incorporation of the first century AD in the series. The same can be said about the conjecture that there ever was such a thing as a *vita Nervae* (*N) or *Traiani* (*Tr.). There is no sign that they ever existed. Without further evidence we have no choice but to accept the beginning of our familiar *HA* as its original one, though a definite answer cannot be given. We will return to this issue below, § 3.8.

3.4.2 The End of the *HA*

Something similar to the problems with the beginning of the *HA* is the case with its projected end. In *Hel.* 35.2, the author for the first time reveals something about its intended conclusion:

Hel. 35.2-6:
scribere autem ordiar, qui post sequentur.
Quorum Alexander optimus et cum cura
dicendus est annorum tredecim princeps,
semestres alii et vix annui et bimi, Aurelianus

AS 64.1-2:
Hactenus imperium populi Romani
eum principem (i.e. Alexander)
habuit, qui diutius imperaret, post
eum certatim inruentibus et aliis

²¹⁹ Minusculos tyrannos scio plerosque tacuisse aut breviter praeterisse. nam et Suetonius Tran-quillus, emendatissimus et candidissimus scriptor, *Antonium*, *Vindicem* tacuit, contentus eo quod eos cursim perstrinxerat, et Marius Maximus, qui *Avidium* Marci temporibus, *Albinum* et *Nigrum* Severi non suis propriis libris sed alienis innexuit. et de Suetonio non miramur, cui familiare fuit amare brevitatem.

*praecipuus et horum omnium decus auctor tui generis, Claudius. (...) His iungendi sunt Diocletianus, aurei parens saeculi, et Maximianus, ut vulgo dicitur, ferrei, ceterique ad pietatem tuam. Te vero, Auguste venerabilis, multis paginis isdemque disertioribus illi prosequuntur, quibus id felicior natura detulerit.*²²⁰ *His addendi sunt Licinius, Severus, Alexander atque Maxentius, quorum omnium ius in dicionem tuam venit, sed ita ut nihil eorum virtuti derogetur.*

semenstribus, aliis annuis, plerisque per biennium, ad summum per triennium imperantibus usque ad eos principes, qui latius imperium tetenderunt, Aurelianum dico, et deinceps.

De quibus, si vita subpeditaverit, ea, quae conperta fuerint, publicabimus.

In *Hel.* 35.2-6 Alexander, Aurelian and Claudius are mentioned among the emperors whose lives are included in the *HA* as we know it, while Diocletian, Maximian, Constantine, Licinius, Severus, Alexander²²¹ and Maxentius are beyond the scope of the actual *HA*. The reader at this point expects that the author will carry on at least to the point of Licinius' defeat in 324 AD. In *AS* 64.1-2, only Aurelian '*et deinceps*' are mentioned, with an unspecified ending. To restore the equilibrium, another motif from *Hel.* 35.2 is repeated and drastically amplified: the duration of the reigns succeeding Alexander's term is altered (*annorum tredecim princeps* → *qui diutius imperaret; semestres alii* → *et aliis semenstribus; et vix annui* → *aliis annuis; et bimi* → *plerisque per biennium*) and extended (*ad summum per triennium imperantibus usque ad eos principes, qui latius imperium tetenderunt*). The author has not only become wordier in his style, but also vaguer in his statements. Meanwhile, at the end of this last programmatic remark about the ending of the *HA*, a new motif is introduced: if he is granted the time to do so, he will add the lives of the tetrachs. The author thus lets us know that the *HA* is a work in progress.²²² In *Pr.* 1.5, he states: *...si vita suppetet, omnes, qui supersunt usque ad Maximianum Diocletianumque dicturus* (the projected end is placed at an earlier moment in time: *usque ad*, that is: 294 AD).²²³ At the end of the same *vita*, in *Pr.* 24.8, the motif is repeated: *post deinde si vita suppetit, Carum incipiemus propagare cum liberis*, which has the same result (294 AD), though Diocletian is not mentioned any longer. From this point onward the work's limits are not

²²⁰ *quibus id felicior natura detulerit*: others, better equipped to describe the times of the reigning emperor, should continue the work; Cf. Amm. Marc. *RG* 31.16.9 *scribant reliqua potiores aetate, doctrinis florentes, ...* (see Kelly 2007, 222 for text and explanation as a formula of humility). A further discussion of the meaning of the phrase is found in § 3.5.

²²¹ I.e. Domitius, the usurper of 308-10 in Africa, defeated by Maxentius: Chastagnol 1994, 545n1.

²²² Cf. also the author's elaborate remark in *Tac.* 16.7: *haec ego in aliorum vita de Probo credidi praelibanda, ne dies, hora, momentum aliquid sibi vindicaret in me necessitate fatali ac Probo indicto deperirem*. It is interesting that the 'motif of long life' is shifted to the subject of his narration in *Tac.* 16.6: *qui si diutius vixisset...* cf. Livy's remark about Hamilcar (*AUC* 21.2.1: *si diutius vixisset*) and Philippus (39.23.5 and 41.24.4-5: *si vixisset*). Cf. *Aur.* 24.8: *quae qui velit nosse, Graecos legat libros, qui de eius vita conscripti sunt. ipse autem, si vita suppetit atque ipsius viri favor viguerit, breviter saltem tanti viri facta in litteras mittam, non quo illius viri gesta munere mei sermonis indigeant, sed ut ea, quae miranda sunt, omnium voce praedicentur*.

²²³ Stubenrauch (1981, 90-3) interpretes *usque ad* as including the tetrarchy, an interpretation which is rejected by Paschoud 2001, 51n35 and 2005, 105. For a similar instance, though another signification (namely: inclusive) of *usque ad*: Amm. Marc. *RG* 31.16.9: *ad usque Valentis interitum*.

shifted any further, while references about the end become ever more explicit. In *Q* 1.4 the author states: *cum dicendi essent Carus, Carinus et Numerianus* and *Q* 9.4: *superest nobis Carinus, ...* From *incipiemus propagare* to *dicendi essent* and *superest nobis*, the author increasingly goes back on his promise. The following table shows the shifting boundaries of the *HA*, based on the author's own programmatic remarks:

Subject Matter	Period Covered	Actual Work	Projected Narrative Range
Caesar Domitian	44 BC -117 AD	(Suetonius)	<i>Ael.</i> 7.5 (<i>post Caesarem dictatorem</i>)
Nerva Trajan	96-117 AD	Ø	<i>Ael.</i> 1.1 (<i>usque ad Hadrianum</i>)
Hadrian Carinus	117-284 AD	<i>HA</i>	<i>H-Car.</i> <i>Pr.</i> 1.5 (<i>usque ad Maximianum Diocletianumque</i>) ²²⁴
Diocletian Constantine	284-324 AD	Ø	<i>AS</i> 64.1-2 (<i>Aurelianus et deinceps</i>) <i>Hel.</i> 35.2-6 (<i>his addendi sunt Licinius... Maxentius</i>)

Figure 3.2: The actual (in bold type) and projected scope of the *HA*

For the shift at the end of the *HA* there are some famous models in Latin literature. Authors sometimes wish to let the reader know that their writing is a work in progress, as for instance Livy (*AUC* 31.1). The prime example from Latin literature for the author of the *HA*, however, would have been Tacitus' *Annales* and *Historiae*, which largely overlap the era of Suetonius' *De vita Caesarum*. Just like the author of the *HA* (and unlike Suetonius), Tacitus comments on the beginning and the end of his works. If we assess Tacitus' works as a unity, covering the period *ab excessu divi Augusti* to the death of Domitian, and study his own remarks the projected end of his works, the following picture appears:

²²⁴ Apart from *Pr.* 1.5, *Pr.* 24.8, *Q* 1.4 and *Q* 9.4 indicate the actual ending.

<i>Subject Matter</i>	<i>Period Covered</i>	<i>Work</i>	<i>Time of Publishing</i>
Augustus	Up to 14 AD	Ø	(1)
Tiberius Nero	14-69 AD	<i>Annales</i>	ca. 120 AD
Galba Domitian	69-96 AD	<i>Historiae</i>	ca. 109-10 AD
Nerva Trajan	from 96 AD	Ø	(2)

Figure 3.3: The actual and projected scope of Tacitus' works (*Annales* and *Historiae*)²²⁵

The figure shows that Tacitus described the historical period from Tiberius to Domitian in two works, *Annales* and *Historiae*, which cover a continuous historical period.²²⁶ The scope of the narration is fluid. For example, in *Annales* 3.24, Tacitus plans to write about the times of Augustus, whereas his *Annales* only cover the period *ab excessu divi Augusti*: (1) *Sed aliorum exitus, simul cetera illius aetatis (sc. Augusti) memorabo, si effectis in quae tetendi plures ad curas vitam produxero*. With *cetera illius aetatis memorabo* Tacitus means a description of Augustus' reign, which comes down to transcending the boundaries of his own narration, while *effectis in quae tetendi* refers to the realization of his current project of the *Annales*. This plan was, as far as we know and for whatever reason, never realized (*si ... vitam produxero* is the unfulfilled condition which might have prevented Tacitus). The remark reveals something about the scheme the author had in mind: he intended to shift the beginning of his subject matter back to an earlier date in history. The end of the project is presented in the same way: in *H* 1.1.4 Tacitus states that, life permitting, he intends to continue his narration up to his own times, which is under Trajan's reign: (2) *quod si vita suppetet, principatum divi Nervae et imperium Traiani, uberiolem securiolemque materiam, senectuti seposui*.²²⁷ The formulas *quod si vita suppetet* and *senectuti seposui* are other ways of saying *si vitam produxero* in (1). Tacitus never got so far as to describe Nerva's or Trajan's reign (96-8 and 98-117 respectively), possibly prevented by his death around 120 AD. Note that when Tacitus looked ahead to the promised end of his *Historiae* the *Annales* had not yet been written – he chose to go back in time to describe the early decades of the first century AD.

What exactly does the similarity in writing procedure and programmatic remarks prove? It would be risky to conclude that the formulas in *Pr*.1.5 (he states: *... si vita*

²²⁵ As is well known, Jerome considered Tacitus' *Annales* and *Historiae* to be a unity, comprising thirty books (*Comm. ad Zachariam* 3.14).

²²⁶ The beginnings and endings of Tacitus' works and the authorial comments are comprehensively treated in Kraus/Woodman 1997, 88-97; cf. Leeman 1973, 169-208.

²²⁷ The promise to describe the reigns of Nerva (and eventually Trajan) is also made in *Agr*. 3.3 (*testimonium praesentium bonorum*): Chilver 1979, 37.

suppetet) and *Pr.* 24.8 (*post deinde si vita suppetit*) in *HA* are directly derived from the *Annales* 3.24 (*si ... vitam produxero*) and *H* 1.1.4 (*quod si vita suppetit*), when this kind of formula is also encountered in other works.²²⁸ Still, the composition of a historical work on a period in imperial history, in which the author transcends the borders of his own narration in order to sketch his (alleged) further plans, makes the comparison with Tacitus interesting. Suetonius does not have programmatic remarks of this kind, and Nepos does not organize his biographies along any specific chronological order, nor is his material related to his own lifetime. The system of Roman emperorship made it possible for historiographers to take imperial rule as a point of departure for their descriptions of historical time. Both Tacitus and the narrator of the *HA* took the termination of a reign and the beginning of another (the adoptive emperorship and the tetrarchy respectively) in which they lived, as the end of their narration. Such a program leads to promises and speculations about further writing that is presented in much the same form.

3.5 Style

With the formula *uberiorem securioremque materiam* Tacitus (*H* 1.1.4) promises a favourable description of the era of Nerva and Trajan, under whose reigns he writes.²²⁹ The promise to describe contemporary events can be compared to what the author of the *HA* writes in *Hel.* 35.5, although he pretends there that he will leave the description of the current reign to more talented successors (*quibus id felicius natura detulerit*). These more talented authors will describe Constantine *multis paginis isdemque disertioribus*. *Disertus* normally denotes ‘dexterous or skilled in speaking (or writing)’ – the question being here what the author exactly means with this indication of style. A clue is possibly found in *Q* 15.10: *Diocletianus et qui secuntur stilo maiore dicendi sunt*. This leads us to the question who are supposed to continue the narration *stilo maiore* and, in the second place, what type of text the author has in mind. First, the authors. Wölfflin (1891, 511) interpreted the remark as a promise to continue the narration *stilo maiore*, while on the other hand Den Hengst (1981, 74; 1992, 160) feels that the author did not intend to do so himself, as others were better equipped for this (as he stated in *Hel.* 35.5).²³⁰ The latter

²²⁸ E.g. Cic. *De Fin.* 1.4.11: *et scribentur fortasse plura, si vita suppetet...*; *Brut.* 245 (*si vita suppetitavisset*); *Phil.* 3.15; Livy 35.15.3; 40.56.7; Pliny the Younger *Ep.* 5.5.8 (Paschoud 1996, 142); contemporary parallels in Ausonius *ep.* 10: *fors fuat, ut si mihi vita suppetet, aliquid rerum tuarum quamvis incultus expoliam...* and *ep.* 16: *si vita suppetet* (Chastagnol 1994, LXXXVIII). Hieronymus *Ep.* 47.3: *si vita suppetit* (Velaza 1997, 251, taken from Schwartz 1966, 463-5). According to Velaza (*ibid.*) Tac. *H* 1.1.4 comes close to cases in the *HA* (*‘le locus similis le plus proche’*). Paschoud 2005, 109, quoting Syme 1958, 221, states that Tacitus did not intend to write the times of Trajan at all, but left the materia ‘to the crowd, to panegyrists or to poets’.

²²⁹ The reign of Nerva is praised in *Agr.* 3.1: *augeatque cotidie felicitatem temporum Nerva Traianus, ...*, those of Nerva and Trajan in *H* 1.1.4: *rara felicitate temporum, ubi sentire quae velis et quae sentias dicere licet. uberius materiam* denotes the ‘richer’ material for the historical narration, which particularly consists of Trajan’s expeditions in the east. *Uberius* often concerns style of writing, as in Cicero (*Orat.* 39, about Herodotus and Thucydides) and Ammianus Marcellinus (in the preface to *RG* 26.1.2: *cognitiones actuum variorum stili uberius explicatas*). *Securioremque* concerns the *libertas dicendi* in Trajan’s times (as can be inferred from Chilver 1979, 38 ad *rara ... licet*; OLD ad *securus* 2b: ‘(of conditions, places) free from anxieties, undisturbed, peaceful’).

²³⁰ Dessau (1889, 33) stressed the political impossibility of dedicating a series of biographies, including usurpers (and the emperor’s fiercest enemies), to the reigning emperor Constantine.

interpretation is certainly right for *Hel.* 35.5, but overlooks the fact that the author continues with *non ego id faciam...vera praedicare* (*Hel.* 35.7), in which he promises to describe the rivals of Constantine.²³¹ Moreover, the *HA* pretends to have a multiple authorship. The author constantly hides behind different personalities, and does not really distinguish between his own writings and those of (alleged) others – he just leaves matters undecided.

Next, style. The emperors succeeding Diocletian will be described *paginis... disertioribus*, a style which the author disapproves of himself, according to the preface to the *vita Probi* (*Pr.* 2.6-7): *illud tantum contestatum volo me et rem scripsisse, quam, si quis voluerit, honestius²³² eloquio celsiore demonstret, et mihi quidem id animi fuit, ut non Sallustios, Livios, Tacitos, Trogos atque omnes disertissimos imitarer viros in vita principum et temporibus disserendis, sed Marium Maximum, Suetonium Tranquillum, Fabium Marcellinum, Gargilium Martialem, Iulium Capitolinum, Aelium Lampridium ceterosque, qui haec et talia non tam diserte quam vere memoriae tradiderunt*. The author does not intend to adopt the style of grand historiography, but of the biographers from Suetonius to the *Scriptores historiae Augustae*, because a truthful account is preferable to a grand style (*qui haec et talia non tam diserte quam vere memoriae tradiderunt*).²³³ Just before the transition to the historical narration, he contradicts himself with (*Pr.* 2.9) *et ne diutius ea, quae ad meum consilium pertinent, loquar, magnum et praeclarum principem et qualem historia nostra non novit, arripiam*, which seems to announce a eulogy.

The remarks about continuation of the narration by others are reminiscent of the last programmatic remark (or ‘sphragis’) in Ammianus Marcellinus, *RG* 31.16.9: *scribant reliqua potiores aetate, doctrinis florentes, quos id – si libuerit – adgressuros procudere linguas ad maiores moneo stilos*. The author of the *HA* seems to combine a classic commonplace (he provides the material that others may use for historiography, here indicated as descriptions *eloquio celsiore*²³⁴) and the admonition to others to describe the

²³¹ In *Hel.* 35.6, the author promises to describe the emperors from Alexander to Claudius, whereafter he states: *His iungendi sunt Diocletianus (...) et Maximianus ...*. Others will have to describe Constantine, whereafter the author states (*Hel.* 35.6): *His addendi sunt Licinius, Severus, Alexander atque Maxentius...*. Then the author continues with saying (*Hel.* 35.7): *non ego id faciam, quod plerique scriptores solent,...*. So, if we follow the author’s line of thought, he will add the defeated rulers to the description of Constantine. It is interesting that in *Car.* 18.5, after he has apparently given up his plan to continue up to Diocletian’s times, he does mention one of those authors who will describe Diocletian’s reign: *quorum vitam* (i.e. the tetrarchs) *singulis libris Claudius Eusthenius, qui Diocletiano ab epistulis fuit, scripsit, quod idcirco dixi, ne quis a me rem tantam requireret, maxime cum vel vivorum principum vita non sine reprehensione dicatur*. Writing about recent emperors is hazardous, as tradition has it (Paschoud 2005, 107). Cf. *HA Car.* 18.5 *cum vel vivorum principum vita non sine reprehensione dicatur* and Amm. Marc. 26.1.1 (and Den Boeft et al. 2008, 8-9). Leeman 1963, 170 defines *securitas* in a political sense as ‘freedom from *cura* in the meaning of moral pressure’.

²³² *Honestius* is a manifestation of the much debated *veritas* topos in historiography. Cicero was the first to formulate the *prima lex historiae*: *Orat.* 2.62: *Nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat? Deinde ne quid veri non audeat?*; for a recent overview see Blockley 2001, 14-24; for Ammianus: Den Boeft et al. 2008, 9 and for Cicero: Leeman 1963, 171; Den Hengst 2009, 1-11, for Tacitus: Goodyear 1970, 29.

²³³ Cf. *T* 33.8 *da nunc cuius libellum non tam diserte quam fideliter scriptum*.

²³⁴ Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 262 about Caesar (*sed dum voluit alios habere parata unde sumerent, qui vellent historiam scribere*, interpolation by Kovacs 1989, 233 and a similar expression in Suet. *Div. Iul.* 56.2 (the most original turn of the topos can be found in poor Aulus Hirtius, *BG* 8.1). The expression *qui vellent*

reigning *princeps* in an elevated style. The parallel between *si quis voluerit* in *Pr.* 2.6 and *si libuerit* (*RG* 31.16.9) is striking: it is about the question whether there will be others prepared to undertake the task at all.²³⁵ Ammianus makes his remark because his narration deals with the dynasty of the reigning emperors, which demands a different style, as tradition prescribes.²³⁶ In fact, the author of the *HA* does himself what he suggests others should do, thereby breaking his promise to abstain from high style (*eloquium celsius*) and to provide facts (*rem*) only. About his own style, the author leaves no room for doubt. On several occasions, he states his intention to report reliable facts in a plain style (not *eloquenter*). *Eloquentia* is opposed to *fidelitas historica* in *T* 11.6-7 (equalled equated with the opposition *verba – res*)²³⁷, and to *res gestae* in *Pr.* 1.6.²³⁸ In *A* 2.2 *historica eloquentia* is attributed to the classical historiographers Livy, Sallust, Tacitus and Trogus as *mendaciorum comites*.²³⁹ At the very end of his work, he uses the notion of *eloquentia* in a different way: in *Car.* 21.2, he presents his work (*meum munus*) to the addressee (*mi amice*) and states that not *eloquentia*, but *curiositas* is what caused him to write the biographies (cf. *Pr.* 2.8: *sum enim unus e curiosis...*).²⁴⁰ It is not that he did not want to write *eloquenter*, but that he was not able to.²⁴¹ Others may use his inquiries in order to write more eloquently, about the same subject matter: *Habe, mi amice, meum munus, quod ego, ut saepe dixi, non eloquentiae causa sed curiositatis in*

historiam scribere hints at the same as *si libuerit* and *si quis voluerit*, cf. also *OM* 1.2 *qui vitas aliorum scribere orditur*) and Plin. *Ep.* 6.16.1 (ad Cornelium Tacitum): *Petis ut tibi avunculi mei exitum scribam, quo verius tradere posteris possis. Gratias ago; nam video morti eius, si celebretur a te, immortalem gloriam esse propositam...*. The idea expressed here is that Pliny provides the plain facts, from which Tacitus can take information for historiography (cf. also Pliny *Ep.* 7.33.10 and comments by Kraus 1997, 102). Often, this topos is used as a formula of modesty: the author pretends to leave it up to others to report the facts better, while in fact it is he who comes up with the end product. Paschoud 2001, 411 gives the contemporary example of Photios' message to Olympiodorus.

²³⁵ See the enlightening commentary by Kelly on this point: 2007, 240-1. The thought of later authors (*novi semper scriptores rerum*) is not unfamiliar to Livy, *praef.* 3: *si in tanta scriptorum turba fama in obscura sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler.*

²³⁶ See for example Jerome's *Chronicon*, *praef.* : *quo fine contentus reliquum temporis Gratiani et Theodosii latoris historiae stilo reservavi...*, Eutropius 10.18.3; Festus 30.1; in the *HA* itself: *PN* 11.5-6 (*denique cum imperatori facto quidam panegyricum recitare vellet, dixit ei: 'scribe laudes Marii vel Annibalis vel cuius vis ducis optimi vita functi et dic, quid ille fecerit, ut eum nos imitemur. nam viventes laudare inrisio est, maxime imperatores, a quibus speratur, qui timentur, qui praestare publice possunt, qui possunt necare, qui proscribere*, see Paschoud 2005, 107.

²³⁷ Paschoud (2001, 411) quotes from Cicero *De Or.* 2.63 *ipsa autem aedificatio (sc. historia) posita est in rebus et verbis.*

²³⁸ See Janson (1964, 134) about this passage as topos in prefatory remarks.

²³⁹ Den Hengst (1981, 72-3 and 1987, 157-74) comments on the opposition. *Eloquentia* has the property that it beautifies and amplifies plain facts, according to Cicero, *De Or.* 3. 104: *summa autem laus eloquentiae est amplificare rem ornando* (Leeman 1963, 173).

²⁴⁰ *Curiositas* is an *anticipatio* against critics: *A* 10.1: *Frivola haec fortassis cuipiam et nimis levia esse videantur, sed curiositas nil recusat* (Paschoud 1996, 85-6; 2001, 376-7 and 411 remarks that the word only occurs once in classical literature, in Cicero (namely *Ep. ad Att.* 2.12.2).

²⁴¹ A comparable formula of modesty is expressed by Tacitus: *Agr.* 3.3 : *non tamen pigebit vel incondite ac rudi voce memoriam prioris servitutis ac testimonium praesentium bonorum composuisse.* The author of the *HA* excuses himself for having a *pedestre adloquium*, for which see Den Hengst 1981, 72-3 and Paschoud 2001, 150-1. Note the difference he makes between writing *stilo historico et disertio* and *pedestri adloquio*, *T* 1.1: *Scriptis iam pluribus libris non historico nec disertio sed pedestri adloquio.* In *Pr.* 21.1 he apologizes for not keeping his promise to stick to the facts: *longius amore imperatoris optimi progredior quam pedestris sermo desiderat.*

*lumen edidi, id praecipue agens, ut, si quis eloquens vellet facta principum reserare, materiam non requireret, habiturus meos libellos ministros eloqui.*²⁴² *te quaeso, sis contentus nosque sic voluisse scribere melius quam potuisse contendas.* The distinction between writing about *tempora acta* and the present times is no longer made. As the series comes to an end, there is no prospect of any further continuation. The program now emphasises plain style (in the narration) as against eloquence (in praise of later emperors).

To conclude: the author invites others to continue his narration in high style (*Hel.* 35.6, *Q* 15.10) and, at the same time, to use the works that he has written himself as a source for works in high style (*Pr.* 2.6, *Car.* 21.2).²⁴³ The question that remains is what the author means with *stilus maior* or *eloquium celsius*. These commonplaces point in two directions: the two instances seem to indicate that panegyric writing is meant, as the era to be described is the alleged time of writing, which demands a favourable attitude to the reigning emperor (Constantine, in casu), in much the same way that Pliny addressed his *Panegyricus* to Trajan (100 AD), or Nazarius his eulogy to Constantine (321 AD).²⁴⁴ On the other hand, the author states his intention to provide facts for histories, in contrast with the *mendaciorum comites* Sallust, Livy and Tacitus.²⁴⁵ It looks as if the author does not really distinguish between the two:²⁴⁶ he is inexact in his expressions and ignores differences between the types of text, even in his own work, as the *vita Claudii* and *Taciti* are panegyrics in the guise of biographies.²⁴⁷

3.6 Dedications

If we are prepared to suspend our disbelief temporarily and accept the names of suspect *scriptores* and their dedications as genuine, we can say that Aelius Spartianus dedicates his *Ael.* and *Dd.* to Diocletian, that Julius Capitolinus dedicates his *MA*, *V* and *OM* to Diocletian, but his *ClA*, *Max.*, *Gd.* and *MB* to Constantine; that Vulcacius Gallicanus dedicates his *AC* to Diocletian and Aelius Lampridius his *Hel.* and *AS* to Constantine.

²⁴² Apart from the elements of *eloquentia* and *curiositas* that were mentioned before, the passage contains other idiomatic elements: *si quis eloquens vellet facta principum reserare* (cf. *Pr.* 2.6 *si quis voluerit*, and comm. above) and *eloquens / ministros eloqui* (cf. *Pr.* 2.6 *eloquio celsiore*).

²⁴³ One of the first instances of claiming to provide material for a higher style is in Cicero's much debated letter to Lucceius (*Fam.* 5.12, comm. Kraus / Woodman 1997, 18 and Leeman 1963, 173-4). It is interesting that Cicero says that a monography on a single subject (*i.e.* his consulship) demands a higher level of style.

²⁴⁴ The author excuses himself for the eulogizing *vita* of Claudius, the alleged ancestor of tetrarch Constantius Chlorus, father of Constantine (Chastagnol 1994, 920): *Cl.* 3.1: *In gratiam me quispiam putet Constantii Caesaris loqui, sed testis est et tua conscientia et vita mea me nihil umquam cogitasse, dixisse, fecisse gratiosum.*

²⁴⁵ This is what Jerome meant in his statement that the reigns of Gratianus and Theodosius must be described *latis historiae stilo* (*Chron. Praef.*, see Paschoud 2005, 111 ('ausführlichere Erzählweise') and Kelly 2007, 228-9). Eutropius (10.18.3: *reliqua stilo maiore*, on which Amm. Marc. 31.16.9 *ad maiores stilos* is based), on the other hand, aims at panegyric (Kelly 2007, 227); contra: Liebeschuetz 2003, 182n29. Leeman 1963, 180 describes historiography as a *munus oratoris*, closely akin to the epideictic genre in its ornate and fluent 'medium' style (Cic. *Or.* 66).

²⁴⁶ Pace Paschoud 2001, 289; 412; 2005, 111; Den Hengst 1981, 74 and 79n15. Kelly 2007, 228 argues in the case of Ammianus' *RG* 31.16.9 *ad maiores stilos* for an interpretation combining panegyric and historiography, which corresponds with the confusing use of our author.

²⁴⁷ Paschoud 2005, 104.

Trebellius Pollio does not dedicate any of his four books to an emperor, nor does Flavius Vopiscus, though in *A*, the latter addresses a certain Tiberian, while *Pr.* is dedicated to Celsinus and *Q* to Bassus.²⁴⁸ In narratological terms, the narrators are identified as authors from the first three decades of the fourth century, and their dedicatees the emperors of that era.²⁴⁹ In a few instances, allusions are made to the reader in general of the *HA*, though he is never addressed as such.²⁵⁰ The dedications are essential for the interpretation of the *HA* as a work of literary art, as these are the only explicit devices by which the reader is enabled to locate the *HA* in time, the early fourth century. The fact that this fictitious time is not in accordance with the historical time of writing is a different matter.²⁵¹

As the *HA* is a work of historical content, the reader is seduced into accepting its listing of the authors as equally historical, being persuaded to confuse narratological devices with historiographical data. What then is the literary virtue of the game the author plays? Clearly, he wants to give the impression that the *HA* is the result of a collaborative effort, produced at some time between the reign of Diocletian and the later years of Constantine or even after: the failure of the lives by Trebellius Pollio and Flavius Vopiscus to mention any emperors is remarkable. The inconsistencies in the dedications and the political impossibility of dedicating the collected works to the two emperors conjointly were important arguments for Dessau to postulate that the work was written by a single author, long after the reigns of the dedicatees. Nowadays, such a single authorship is still the basis for modern scholarship in studying the *HA*. The only aspect of the authors' names that are worth studying is the sources from which the author drew his imaginary fellow-writers, about which there has been much speculation.²⁵²

In the next few paragraphs, a special attempt is made to map out the dedications and their literary models. Dedications are found in all types of Latin literature, from *carmina* to letters and from historical prose to fiction.²⁵³ There is, however, an interesting

²⁴⁸ As we have seen before when discussing content and scope, a change of addressee has taken place between the beginning and the end of the book of *Ael.*: whereas in *Ael.* 1.1 (*cognitioni numinis tui sternere*) the books is purported to be written for the emperor's sake, at the end in *Ael.* 7.4 (*etiamsi multis nulla sit necessitas talia requirendi*) the author does not see any other purpose in his undertakings than his own pleasure (*meae satisfaciens conscientiae*). This same sentiment recurs in *Tac.* 16.8: *nunc quoniam interim meo studio satis factum arbitrans studio et cupiditati meae*: this sentence occurs in the later lives, which are not dedicated to the emperors..

²⁴⁹ Syme 1983, 28: 'The author now decided to take on several identities, but the labels were attached without care or discrimination'. Genette 1997, 46-54 heads this practice under the seventh category of 'pseudonymity': 'a real author attributes a work to an imaginary author, but does not produce any information about the latter except the name – he does not, in other words, supply the whole paratextual apparatus that ordinarily serves to substantiate (seriously or not) the existence of the imagined author'.

²⁵⁰ *Hel.* 1.2: *compensationem sibi lector diligens faciet* and *T* 31.5: the author combines thirty tyrants in one volume, in order to avoid boredom and things the reader (*lector*) cannot bear.

²⁵¹ The dedications to Diocletian can be found in *Ael.* 1.1, *MA* 19.12; *V* 11.4; *AC* 3.3; *S* 20.4; *PN* 9.1; *OM* 15.4; and to Constantine: *CIA* 4.2; *G* 1.1; *Hel.* 2.4; 34.1; 35.5; *AS* 65.1; *Max.* 1.1; *Gd.* 1.1; 34, 6. Dedications to emperors in prefaces are treated by Janson (1971, 100-6), who concludes that this kind of dedication doesn't differ in principle from other forms of dedication.

²⁵² Hohl (1912, 474-82) about Vopiscus and Pollio; Chastagnol 1994, XLVII-VIII (see note 130); Birley (2003, 145-6 and 2005, 33-47) gives an overview of research on the six names.

²⁵³ Genette (1997, 117 and 129) is not sure about the origin of the dedication in western literature, and places it in Latin antiquity. However, Van Dam (2008, 18 and 33) shows that Greek dedications preceded the Latin practice, with Isocrates as the first author to dedicate a work. Roman authors transformed it into a

difference between biography and historiography with respect to the meaning of a dedication. Wölfflin remarks that Sallust, Livy and Tacitus do not dedicate their works for reasons of preserving their independence.²⁵⁴ The three specimens of Latin biography below, on the other hand, all have their dedicatees: Nepos dedicated his *De ducibus* to Atticus (and also an extensive life of Cato, as appears from *Cato* 3.5), and Suetonius his *De Vita Caesarum* to Septicius Clarus, in a preface now lost. Where lives are described, there is sometimes a relation between the dedicatee and the contents of the work. A biographical work could be commissioned by a high-placed person or close friend in order to lay out the origins of a family. The author of the *HA* stresses that the life of Claudius is important, because Constantine wished to trace back his ancestry to this respected general and emperor.²⁵⁵ The aforementioned Atticus, a fervent *antiquitatis amator* (Nepos *Att.* 18.3), wrote a work about the family of the Iunii at the request of his friend Brutus.²⁵⁶

This is how the two dedications compare:

Nepos *Att.* 18.1

fecit hoc idem (i.e. familiarum originem subtexit) separatim in aliis libris, ut M. Bruti rogatu Iuniam familiam a stirpe ad hanc aetatem ordine enumeravit.

HA Claud. 1.1

Ventum est ad principem Claudium, qui nobis intuitu Constanti Caesaris cum cura in litteras digerendus est.

The persons mentioned here (*M. Bruti rogatu, intuitu Constanti Caesaris*) have like motives for their request, namely a study into the origins of their families,²⁵⁷ and the authors. Nepos and the author of the *HA* dedicate the biographies to the persons who commissioned them. Atticus similarly researched the family trees of the Marcelli, Fabii and Aemilii, in their turn commented on by Nepos – which again may have been the model for the author of the *HA*, this time in his dedication to Diocletian:

Nepos *Att.* 18.4

Quibus libris nihil potuit esse dulcius iis, qui aliquam cupiditatem habent notitiae clarorum virorum.

HA OM. 15.4

quae de plurimis collecta serenitati tuae, Diocletiane Auguste, detulimus, quia te cupidum veterum imperatorum esse perspeximus.

The author of the *HA* adapted the words *cupiditatem ... notitiae clarorum virorum* into *cupidum veterum imperatorum* for his own purposes, thus creating his own dedication. Knowledge about famous men was treated before by Nepos in *Att.* 18.2:

literary art, with many variations on the phenomenon: Seneca maior, for one, repeats his dedications in every preface of his books on orators, and Columella has a similar practice.

²⁵⁴ Wölfflin 1892, 466.

²⁵⁵ Many studies have been devoted to this subject: Syme 1983, 64; Chastagnol 1994, 920-4; Bird 1997; Festy 2005, 181-93; De Beer 2005, esp. 297-9; *et alii*.

²⁵⁶ A tribute to their friendship is Cicero's *Brutus*, which is cast in the shape of a conversation between Cicero, Brutus and Atticus.

²⁵⁷ Cf. *HA Gall.* 14.3: *is enim est Claudius, a quo Constantius, vigilissimus Caesar, originem ducit.*

Nepos *Att.* 18.2

Sic familiarum originem subtexit, ut ex eo clarorum virorum propagines possimus cognoscere.

HA AC 3.3

Proposui enim, Diocletiane Auguste, omnes, qui imperatorium nomen sive iusta causa sive iniusta habuerunt, in litteras mittere, ut omnes purpuratos, Auguste, cognosceres.

Nepos' *ut... possimus cognoscere* is changed to *ut... cognosceres* in the same way that the author of the *HA* changed *reperire possit* in Cato 3.2 to *pauca repperit* in *OM* 1.4 (see above). Thus, we may conclude that elements from the brief passage in Nepos' *Att.* 18.1-4 recur in three different places in the *HA*, all of them dedications.

3.7 Time in the *HA* I

The dedications pin down the time of writing during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, the narrator being a contemporary historian or rather a group of biographers. The real time, however, has been difficult to pinpoint exactly and escapes us even now. After Dessau, who dated it to the later years of Theodosius in approximately 395 AD, Seeck (1890), inspired by Dessau's findings, shifted the date to the first decade of the fifth century. After three decades of vehement discussion, Baynes acquired much support for his view of the *HA* as a work of propaganda for the emperor Julian (361-3). Ever since the beginning of the *Historia Augusta Colloquia*, a majority has returned to Dessau's proposal of approximately 395 AD, though in recent times later dates have again been proposed.²⁵⁸ As long as time of origin and authorship remain unknown, references to the author's contemporaneous world elude definition, while their meaning remains obscure. Anachronisms and the use of certain sources may provide clues about the time of writing (by way of a *terminus post quem*), and a study of the author's historical and literary *Umwelt* may contribute to determining of the era when the *HA* was written. Historical time, in the sense of defining the time when it was composed, lies beyond the scope of this study, whose chief concern is with the *HA* as a literary work of fiction, for all that the material is historical, genuine or not.

This brings us to an analysis of time as it is presented in the *HA*. The elements treated in the preceding paragraphs, on biographical writing, material, scope and dedications, were entirely controlled by the author. This does not hold good for the notion of time, as the distribution of temporal aspects is partly the result of coincidence in every work of art. We will evaluate these aspects in the work as it has been transmitted, in order to use our conclusions for further observations in the subsequent chapters. Often, the question will arise whether the author intended to create the work as we know it, or whether coincidence played a role in the process. The dividing lines between deliberate design and accidental outcome are sometimes very hard to draw, but the questions will be faced and, where possible, answers will be proposed. Time will be the subject of the next paragraphs, as a factor that determines a good deal of the literary design of the series,

²⁵⁸ Festy (2007, 183-96) ascribes the *HA* to Nicomachus Flavius junior in the thirties of the fifth century on the base of the dedication in *Hel.* 35.3.

since the author constructed a complex work in which time works on several levels. The contents (or *materia*) of the *HA* are taken from a limited period in time (second and third centuries), while there is also the era in which the author pretends to write (first quarter of the fourth century) in his *persona* of narrator.

3.7.1 Time of the Story

The Time of the Story of the *HA* as it has come down to us, is the period from the reign of Hadrian up to the death of Carinus and the beginning of the reign of Diocletian, which is a period of 167 years (AD 117 – 284). There is a sixteen-year *lacuna* covering the emperors in the years 244 – 260 and the first half of Valerian's reign. When the scope of the *HA*, as dealt with above, is considered in terms of TS, it can be concluded that there is a considerable discrepancy between the projected TS and the actual TS: the author suggests in his programmatic remarks that TS will be from the death of Julius Caesar (*Ael.* 7.5) to the sole reign of Constantine (*Hel.* 35.8). This would mean that the TS of the series spans almost four centuries, whereas in actual fact the books of the *HA* occupy approximately 170 years only. The maximum of TS is presented to us in the middle books of the series: if we could only dispose of *Hel.*, in the knowledge that it once had been part of a vast series, we would have believed that the *HA* consisted of biographies from Augustus to Constantine. The author goes back on his promise to describe the reigns of Diocletian in the course of his narration, either counting on the forgetfulness of his readers, and thus playing a literary game, or because he realised that he would never achieve his aim (with the excuse of *si vita suppetit...*). The former option is the most probable, and can be explained as literary imitation of Tacitus.

3.7.2 Time of the Narrative

With regard to the relation between TN and TS in the *HA*, two different points of view can be taken: either the time of the individual books (related to the life or the reign of an emperor, co-emperor or rival) can be studied, or the collection (or parts of this) as a whole can be taken into account. In the author's comments TN plays an important part: he shows his awareness of what we now call narrative time, as for instance in *T* 1.1: *scriptis iam pluribus libris (...) ad eam temporum venimus seriem...* ('after having written many books already, we have now come to that period in history...'). The author first summarises his preceding account in a formula that actually refers to TN, namely *scriptis iam pluribus libris*, in which *iam* is the particle that marks the progress of the series. Next, the formula *ad eam temporum ...seriem* contains a reference to TN in the current book, which treats the thirty tyrants during the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus (*seriem, in qua per annos, quibus Gallienus et Valerianus rem p. tenuerunt, triginta tyranni...extiterunt*). Also, such remarks as *longum est innectere* (*A* 20.1), which are

found in many varieties, testify to the author's awareness of time as an important narrative aspect.²⁵⁹

The advantage of the concept of TN is that it can be measured by way of counting the words devoted to a certain topic. The time which the narrator took for books devoted to the lives of emperors (some of which including more than one, cf. chapter 4), as represented in the three different sections of the *HA*, is laid out in the following table:²⁶⁰

	<i>PL</i>	<i>SL</i>	<i>IL</i>		<i>LL</i>	
<i>Book</i>	<i>Words</i>	<i>words</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>words</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>words</i>
<i>H</i>	5 124		<i>OM</i>	2 495	<i>Val.</i>	1 003
<i>Ael.</i>		1 433	<i>Dd.</i>	1 679	<i>Gall.</i>	3 647
<i>AP</i>	2 245		<i>Hel.</i>	5 782	<i>T</i>	6 637
<i>MA</i>	5 500		<i>AS</i>	10 701	<i>Cl.</i>	2 979
<i>V</i>	2 057		<i>Max.</i>	5 431	<i>A</i>	7 803
<i>AC</i>			<i>Gd.</i>	5 563	<i>Tac.</i>	3 094
<i>C</i>	3 466		<i>MB</i>	3 153	<i>Pr.</i>	4 136
<i>P</i>	2 596			<i>Q</i>	2 333	
<i>DI</i>	1 594			<i>Car.</i>	2 751	
<i>S</i>	4 215					
<i>PN</i>						
<i>CIA</i>						
<i>Cc.</i>	2 033					
<i>G</i>		1 231				
<i>Total</i>	28 830	10 264				
<i>Total</i>	39 094			34 804	34 383	

Figure 3.4: *NS* of the thirty books of the *HA* and of the parts of *PL*, *SL*, *IL* and *LL* in absolute numbers (representing the number of words).

²⁵⁹ An interesting aspect is that the author also comments on the time needed to produce his work, in *T* 33.8 – a passage which does not refer to the time when he wrote his work so much, as to the time which it took him to come up with it. The quote falls outside the distinguished categories, but adds an interesting item to the mentioned aspects of time. The author states: ...*hos libellos, quos de vita principum edidi, non scribo sed dicto, et dicto ea festinatione, quam...sic perurgeo, ut respirandi non habeam facultatem* ('these books, which I published about the lives of the leaders, I did not write by hand but dictate, and I dictate them at such a speed ... that I am so pressed that I cannot take a breath'). This remark may reveal something about the author's practice in composing his books. The switch from the perfect (*edidi*) to the present tense (*scribo, dicto*) is interesting, and indicate that *edo* has to be interpreted as meant in *ThLL* V.2 89.45 *sqq.* (*indicatione, quae fit sive scribendo sive dicendo notum reddere, fere i.q. indicate, exponere, pronuntiare, enarrare sim.; saepius i.q. dicere (...), i.q. tradere*) rather than *publicatio* or *divulgatio* (under which head *Cc.* 8.1, *OM* 1.3 (*imperatorum vitas*) and *Q* 1.3 are placed, *ThLL* V.2.89.4-8). Cf. Toher 2002, 147 (see note 84) for *edita* in *Nepos Att.* 19.1. *Magie's perurges* (instead of *perurgeo*) does not make much sense (see *ThLL* X.1.1889.13-4: *c. acc. actionis perseverandae, III perseverando, insistendo qualibet actione*, cf. *Symm.Ep.* 9.70). The passage is an exaggeration of the *festinatio* that authors sometimes claim to have (*Nepos Praef.* 8: *festinatio ut ea explicem quae exorsus sum*). Comparable is the quote in *Max.* 29.10, where the author refers to Cordus for further information (*nos enim hoc loco finem libri faciemus, ad alia, ut iubetur velut publico iure, properantes*).

²⁶⁰ The results in figure 3.4 were reached by analyzing the individual books of the *HA* (Teubner text) in the system 'Microsoft Office Word 2003' (option 'wordcount'). See the introduction about TN (§ 1.3.4).

When we compare TN to TS, the following picture occurs:

	<i>PL (SL)</i>	<i>IL</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>HA</i>
TN	39 094 (10 264)	34 804	34 383	108 281
TS	101 years ²⁶¹	28 years	25 years	154 years
TN / TS	387 wds / year	1243 wds / year	1375 wds / year	703 wds / year

Figure 3.5: TS and TN in the PL, SL, IL and LL and their relationship.

The correspondence between TN in IL and LL is remarkable: approximately a quarter of a century, narrated in little over 34 000 words altogether. The new beginning, which Syme discerned in the preface to *OM* (chapter 2), turns out to be fully confirmed by the literary design of the *HA*. The relation between EL, IL and LL when it comes to TN is 36 - 32 - 32 per cent, while TS shows a distribution of 66 - 18 - 16 per cent respectively. So, 66 per cent of TS is told in the first 36 per cent of TN. There is a clear break in the relation TN-TS between the EL and IL, while the two parts at both sides of the lacuna, which determines the borderline between the IL and LL, are strikingly similar in design. The transition from EL to IL is marked by a slowing-down of the narrative. This phenomenon might be explained by the sources the author had at his disposal: whereas the information in the EL is at least partly based on Marius Maximus, the IL and LL are subject to the author's expanding fictions, characterised by *amplificatio* and the progressive use of documents.²⁶² The measuring of TN may be helpful in resolving some other problems, such as that of the lacuna.

3.8 The Problem of the Lacuna

As we have seen, the lacuna separates IL and LL in such a fashion that the two parts occupy almost the same volume in books and number of years treated in them. The inference that the lacuna is deliberate and part of the literary design of the *HA* corresponds with what a majority of scholars conclude nowadays.²⁶³ Casaubon suggested (1671, II 166) that Philippus, impiously treated by the author, and Decius' persecutions of the Christians, led a later editor of the *HA* to delete these books.²⁶⁴ Birley's proposition that the author himself was responsible for the omission has found much support in recent

²⁶¹ Actually, TS should be measured from Hadrian's birth in January 76 onwards, not from the beginning of his reign in 117 – we will treat this problem in § 4.4.

²⁶² In the introduction, it has been remarked that the works of Ammianus Marcellinus also show an abrupt slowdown after the thirteenth books: in that case, 91 per cent of TS (258 years) is told in 42 per cent of TN (13 books), while in the second part 9 per cent of TS (25 years) is told in 58 per cent of TN (18 books). It is normal practice that contemporary history is described more elaborately than the earlier history.

²⁶³ The main views that have been put forward are the following (favoured by the scholars between brackets): the preface and the vitae *N and *Tr and the books in the lacuna were lost in the textual transmission (Hohl); the loss of the preface and the lives of *N and *Tr are accidental, the lacuna is deliberate (Paschoud 1996, xxix; Stubenrauch 1982, 100-104; Birley 1967, 125-6; 2003, 133; Fündling 2007, 15); the lack of a preface is deliberate, the loss *N and *Tr are accidental, the lacuna is accidental (Syme 1971, 284; 1971, 199-203); there is a *non liquet* about a lost beginning, the lacuna is deliberate (Den Hengst, 1981, 14; Chastagnol 1994, xxxv); the lack of a preface and the lives of *N and *Tr are deliberate, as well as the lacuna (Hartke 1958, 324 *sqq.*).

²⁶⁴ Followed by Peter 1907, 36 and Mattingly 1946, 213 (Den Hengst 1981, 70).

decades, in the face of Syme's assertion that Christianity was not one of the author's main concerns.

The author himself, meanwhile, seems to give no apparent clues as to the existence of the lacuna. References to the emperors supposedly treated in the lacuna are few (*Gd.* 29-34, 30.9, *A* 42.6), and the fact that he is silent on most of them suggests that he may have wanted the lacuna to look like an accidental loss in the manuscript's transmission (which leads one to suppose that, as an avid collector and imitator of texts, the author himself had suffered from such partial loss of texts in his own collection or was, at least, familiar with the phenomenon). Still, there is one clue that cannot be left aside: the story is picked up again in *Val.* 1.1 with the capture of the egregious emperor Valerian by the Persian emperor Sapor. This was a tremendously dramatic moment in the imperial history of the third century. This same moment is stressed at the immediate beginning of the biography of *Gall.* (1.1): *Capto Valeriano - enimvero unde incipienda est Gallieni vita, nisi ab eo praecipue malo, quo eius vita depressa est...*²⁶⁵ Just as Elagabalus and Alexander Severus produce a sequence of a bad emperor followed by a good one, so the good emperor Valerian was succeeded by his bad son Gallienus, who should have avenged his father's capture. Gallienus, however, did not manage to hold the empire together, which provokes the scorn of the author of the *HA*. This implies that the tale of Valerian's capture was also meant to serve as part of an ideological message that the *HA* seeks to propound (see § 4.3). When after the lacuna the narration is picked up again with the letter of the fictitious king Velsolus, in which the defeat of the Romans is celebrated, this is a further argument in favour of supposing the lacuna to be deliberate, as it perfectly fits the author's program.²⁶⁶

The evidence suggests that the lacuna is deliberate, an observation implying that the *HA* as it has come down to us is a complete version.²⁶⁷ Though the problem of the lost beginning is of a different nature, the deliberateness of the lacuna may reveal something about the enigmatic beginning of the *HA* with *H*, which may once have been preceded by the lives of Nerva (**N*) and Trajan (**Tr.*) as links to Suetonius' biographies.²⁶⁸ It may be true that Marius Maximus' works were a sequel to Suetonius' *De vita Caesarum*, as can be inferred from Ausonius' *Caesares* e.g., but this does not automatically mean that the author of the *HA* also took this as his starting point. The *HA* is a work of irregular structure, though not without some system. The author may have started his narration with *H*, deliberately ignoring the convention of linking the series to his famous predecessor. Even so, a preface may have been deliberately omitted. Syme (1971, 284) advanced that 'the missing preface of the whole work might have been just such another piece of elegant play, leaving no doubt even in the minds of the obtuse'. Many scholars attempting to impose order on the *HA* have gone along with the idea that it once included

²⁶⁵ Note that this same formula is found in the biography of Macrianus, *T* 12.1 *Capto Valeriano, diu clarissimo principe civitatis, fortissimo deinde imperatore, ad postremum omnium infelicissimo...*

²⁶⁶ *Val.* 1.1: *Sapori rex regum Velsolus: 'si scirem posse aliquando Romanos penitus vinci, gauderem tibi de victoria, quam praefers'*. Den Hengst 1981, 71 came up with the argument that lacunas in general are unlike those encountered in the *HA*: there are no frayed edges (as, for instance, in the lacuna in Tacitus' *Annales*) and the 'fresh start' is indeed remarkable.

²⁶⁷ As Hartke 1958, 324 *sqq.* supposes.

²⁶⁸ The two problems have been linked before, witness Hohl (1937, 131), who thinks that both the *vitae* before *H* as the *vitae* in the lacuna were lost in the textual transmission.

a general preface, as well as the lost lives of **N* and **Tr*.²⁶⁹ Birley (1976) even ‘reconstructed’ these two lost lives, while Paschoud has recently come up with a reconstruction of its preface. Whatever the merits of such efforts, the real question is whether the author needed a general preface for his literary design or, in the final consequence, what the preface could have contained that is not written in the prefaces of, e.g., *Ael.*, *OM* or *A*.

A deliberate omission of books (viz. the lives from **Phil.* to *Val.*) seems a likely scenario. It could well have been meant to pretend that the *HA* is an incompletely transmitted work. This provides us with an argument to suppose that the lost beginning may also be a mystification, whereby the lacuna is a complementary trick to mislead the reader into accepting the loss of the beginning. Problems in reconstructing and editing texts are matters that are hardly new, and the irregular composition of the *HA* may well reflect this, one of the reasons why it is far from easy to model the *HA* along lines that a modern reader would appreciate.

3.9 Concepts of History (*Car.*1-2)

In the preface to *Car.*, the author treats a well-known theme in Latin historiography: the *aetates Romae*. The theme was extensively elaborated by such earlier authors as (in chronological order) Seneca, Florus (*praef.* 1.4), Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* 7.15.4) and Ammianus (14.6.4).²⁷⁰ Haüssler (1964, 317-9) concluded after a thorough investigation that the description in *HA*, just like that of Lactantius (*Inst.* 7.5.14-5), was based on the lost description of the Seneca Maior, whereas Ammianus modelled his *aetates* after Florus, who did not have the same source as Seneca.²⁷¹ Much research has been done on the subject, also regarding the preface to *Car.* (see the elaborate commentary by Paschoud 2001, 324-37), to which we shall add a few new observations about the comparison of the stages of the Roman empire with human life within the biographical type of text. The investigation of the literary presentation of the stages (*aetates*) also prepares for the treatment of *fatum*, *fortuna* and *fors* in the subsequent paragraphs.

One thing that seems particularly interesting in the case of the *HA* is that the preface to *Car.* is the only instance in which the theme of the *aetates Romae* occurs in a biography. The author chose to take the lives of his characters, the rulers of Rome, as a point of departure for his description of Roman history, which makes a treatment of the *aetates Romae* in the final preface appropriate. The method and corresponding vocabulary that are used for descriptions of lives are now used for a compartmentalization of ten centuries of Roman history. This method is a characteristic common to all authors who describe the *aetates Romae* (even a *conditio sine qua non*, an

²⁶⁹ If these lives ever existed, they would have contained approximately 7660 words (20 years x 383 words, the average TS for PL). Hohl 1920, 297; 1914, 702-3; 1937, 131 supposes that the *HA* once had the lives, just as the lives in the lacuna, which was the *communis opinio* up to the early twentieth century (Fündling 2007, 12).

²⁷⁰ Béranger (1976, 42n141) provides an overview of passages (in addition to the list above: Polybius 6.51; Cic. Rep. 1.5; 2.3.21; Liv. Praef. 4.9) and relevant literature.

²⁷¹ After the study by Haüssler, more studies appeared about the theme of the *aetates Romae* (or ‘Lebensaltervergleichnis’), most recently by Paschoud 2001, 323-37; Den Hengst 2000; Brodska 1998, 56-64; Barnes 1998, 173-5. For the reception of the idea in later times: Demandt 1978, 37-45.

indispensable part of the theme). The author of the *HA* may well have included the theme, in which the Roman empire is personified, in this last preface so as to provide as a fitting complement to his conclusion of the lives. It is worth investigating the exact vocabulary used in the descriptions of the separate stages of Roman history and compare this to that of biography. Finally, a comparison is made with Tacitus' preface to his *Annales*, which we encountered before in this study (§ 3.3)

3.9.1 The Vocabulary of Human Life

In order to get a clear picture of the vocabulary of biography, Nepos as the first Roman biographer should be taken into account. Though his works are certainly not the only or even a prime source for every author who describes the life of a person, his descriptions may serve as an example of how a Roman author proceeds in describing a person's life. In general, a biographer may remark something about the *origo* of his subject, either his parentage or his *patria*. Second, the education of the subject is treated, after which, third, the different stages of *pueritia*, *adulescentia* or *iuventus* are taken into account.²⁷² *Senectus* is generally treated after a much longer description of *mores*, closely linked to the *res gestae*, which are often expanded by a description of the physical appearance of the subject.

This very broad outline of Roman biography may be illustrated at the hand of some biographies by Nepos. His most consistently designed *vita* is that of Epaminondas, in the preface to which he gives a *divisio* of his book: *quare primum dicemus de genere eius, deinde quibus disciplinis et a quibus sit eruditus, tum de moribus ingeniique facultatibus* (...) *postremo de rebus gestis, quae a plurimis animi anteponuntur virtutibus*. In short, the reader can expect remarks about (1) *genus*, (2) education, (3) *mores* and (4) *res gestae*. In *Epaminondas* 2.1 Nepos elaborates on the first two aspects, using words like *natus... genere honesto; eruditus* and *doctus est*, and describes the various stages of his youth with *adulescens* and *postquam ephebus est factus*. A comparable method is used in *Alcibiades* 1.2-2.3: *Natus... summo genere; educatus est* and *eruditus; ineunte adulescentia; posteaquam robustior est factus*. Finally, his *Atticus* is worth noting: in 1.1 the *genus* is mentioned: *ab origine ultima stirpis Romanae generatus...*; in 1.2: *omnibus doctrinis quibus puerilis aetas impertiri debet filium erudit* (sc. his father), in 1.3: *in pueritia*; in 2.1: *adulescentulus* and 3.4: in *adulescentulo* and, finally 21.1: *extremam senectutem*. Thus, Nepos separates several remarks about the growing up of the described person at the hand of a fixed scheme of stages and corresponding vocabulary. As pointed out before, *senectus* is generally (and logically) only treated after the *res gestae*, in the later parts of the book (see *Att.*21.1). The three aforementioned examples from *Epaminondas*, *Alcibiades* and *Atticus* are the most exemplary ones; in other biographies one finds only elements of the various possibilities of categorizing lives (youth in particular).

²⁷² The division of human life in several stages (ranging from three to seven) and its vocabulary in classical as well as later Latin literature is elaborately described by Eyben (1973, 150-90).

3.9.1.1 The Theme of the *Aetates Romae*

The theme of *aetates Romae* is essentially a personification of Roman history, divided along the various stages of human life. Not surprisingly, these stages and the words used to describe them show clear correspondences with a biographer's vocabulary. Florus divides Roman history in *infantia*, *adulescentia*, *iuentus*, *senectus*, *quasi reddita iuventute*. Lactantius (writing in Diocletian's times) has *infantia*, *pueritia*, *adulescentia* (divided in two parts: *quasi adulta* and *adulescentia eius terminata* respectively), *iuentus*, *senectus* (*prima eius senectus*, *quasi ad alteram infantiam*, *consenuit*) and Ammianus Marcellinus, in RG 14.4.6, has the following division: *ab incunabilis primis ad usque pueritiae tempus extremum - deinde aetatem ingressus adultam - in iuvenem erectus et virum - vergens in senium - ad tranquilliora vitae discessit*. The problem for any author who describes Roman history in terms of human life, is that human life has a natural end, whereas history is a never-ending process. To deal with this problem, both Florus and Lactantius make use of a formula concerning Rome's old age, which does however not fully make clear how the metaphor is meant to be applied to the times to come: *quasi reddita iuventute* and *quasi ad alteram infantiam* respectively. The formulas can be explained twofold: in old age, Rome is to regain the strength of her youth, or, alternatively, a new stage of history is about to begin. While showing an awareness of the problem which their metaphor provides, the authors are not clear about its solution.

3.9.1.2 Roman History as Surveyed in *HA* (*Car.*)

The author of the *HA* uses the same *aetates* metaphor as his predecessors, but solves the problem differently: he simply abandons the metaphor halfway through his survey of Roman history, while replacing it by considerations about the mutability of Fortune. This replacement is obscured by a literary tactic that we have come across before: he tries to evade the issue that Lactantius and Florus were confronted with: that history continues where life ends sooner or later. He does so, by introducing a second metaphor, which is all about shipwrecks and storms when bad times afflict the state. In chapter 1.1-4, the three elements (fate, shipwreck and human life) are introduced and applied to the times from Valerian to the death of Probus (which is 253 to 282 AD). In passage 2.1-3.1 the theme of the *aetates Romae* prevails, as applied to the times from Romulus to Augustus (753 BC-14 AD). Passage 3.2-8 is chiefly concerned with the theme of the vagaries of fate in the imperial period, from Augustus to Probus (14-282 AD). The aim of this part of my study is to unravel the three themes in order to get a clear idea of the author's literary technique. These three aspects will be dealt with below, after which a comparison will be made with the historian whom the author probably followed: Tacitus.

3.9.1.3 The Valerian–Probus Era (253-282)

The preface of the *HA*'s last book, *Car.*, comes after the eulogy on Probus in *Pr.* and its counterpart on the four tyrants *Q.* In the author's conception of history, Probus' death initiates a new period of insecurity after the reign of the good emperors Claudius, Aurelian and Probus. The preface ends with the question whether the next emperor

should be considered ‘bad’ or ‘good’ (*Car.* 3.8). The vicissitudes and uncertainties of history give rise to a diachronic survey of the most important upheavals in Roman history. The presence and place of precisely this theme in the last preface of the *HA* suggest that the author is seeking to bring his series of biographies to an appropriate conclusion.

The preface begins with the statement that the Roman state is governed by fate (*Car.* 1.1): *Fato rem p. regi...Probi mors satis prodidit*. This notion is elaborated in a series of antitheses in passage 1.2 (the underlined words representing the negative side):

(1) <i>nunc ad summum evehi</i>	<u><i>nunc ad minima retrahi</i></u>
(2) (<i>variis... motibus</i>) <i>vel erecta</i>	<u><i>vel adflicta</i></u>
(3) <u><i>nunc tempestate aliqua</i></u>	<i>nunc felicitate variata</i>
(4) <u><i>post diversitatem malorum</i></u>	<i>iam secura continuata felicitate</i> <i>Mansura</i>

The fourth element in the figure refers to the period of Valerian and Gallienus and their thirty rival tyrants (*diversitas malorum*), which, after a tumultuous period under Aurelian, was brought to an end by the reign of Probus (*iam secura continuata felicitate mansura*).²⁷³ Meanwhile, the metaphor of history depicted in terms of human life is introduced in 1.2: *omnia prope passa est, quae patitur in homine uno mortalitas*, which is: good times and bad. In 1.3 the workings of fate after Probus’s death is, among other things, compared to a shipwreck, an image strongly linked with the fate theme: *sed ruina ingens vel naufragii modo vel incendii accensis fataliter militibus...* In 1.4 the Roman state is again personified by the attribution of human feelings to it: *...in ea re publica, quae recentibus confossa vulneribus ...maeruerit*, whereas the thirty tyrants try to avenge the state’s *caesa...membra*.

3.9.1.4 The Era from Romulus to Augustus (753 BC – 14 AD)

Such personification allows for a description of the Roman state in terms of the development of a human being, which is what the *aetates Romae* come down to. Though not excluding the other two elements of fate and shipwreck, it is this metaphor that predominates in the description of the times from Romulus to Augustus:

²⁷³ The notion of the empire’s *felicitas* is often, but certainly not exclusively (as the earlier lives attest), linked to fate, as in *T* 10.15 (*mirabile autem hoc fuit in Valeriano principe, quod omnes, quoscumque duces fecit, postea militum testimonio ad imperium pervenerunt, ut appareat senem imperatorem in diligendis rei p. ducibus talem fuisse, qualem Romana felicitas, si continuari fataliter potuisset sub bono principe, requirebat*) or gods, as in *MB* 17.8 (*di praestent praestabuntque hanc orbi Romano felicitatem*) and *Cl.* 10.1 (*exprimenda est sors, quae Claudio data esse perhibetur Commagenis, ut intellegant omnes genus Claudii ad felicitatem rei p. divinitus constitutum*). In *Tac.* 41.7, the notion is presented in a passage in which the empire is personified in a speech by the emperor Tacitus: *respirare certe post infelicitatem Valeriani, post Gallieni mala imperante Claudio coeperat nostra res p..*

<i>Era (aetas)</i>	<i>Metaphor 1 (human life)</i>	<i>Metaphor 2 (shipwreck / storm)</i>
<i>a Romulo incipiam</i>	<i>Vero <u>patre ac parente</u> rei p. fundavit, constituit <u>roboravitque</u> rem p.</i>	
<i>quid deinde Numam loquar...?</i>	<i>fremmentem bellis et <u>gravidam</u> triumphis civitatem munivit</i>	
<i>usque ad Tarquinii Superbi tempora</i>	<i><u>viguit</u>...nostra res p.</i>	<i>passa <u>tempestatem</u> de moribus regiis <u>non sine gravi exitio</u></i>
<i>usque ad tempora Gallicani belli</i>	<i><u>adolevit</u> deinde... plus prope mali <u>sensit</u> quam tum habebat boni</i>	<i>Sed <u>quasi quodam mersa</u> <u>naufragio</u> capta praeter arcem urbe</i>
<i>Punicis bellis ac terrore Pyrrhi</i>	<i>...ut <u>mortalitatis mala</u> <u>praecordiorum timore</u> <u>sentiret</u>.</i>	
<i>victa Carthagine trans maria missis imperiis</i>	<i><u>crevit</u> deinde...</i>	
<i>usque ad Augustum</i>	<i>sed socialibus <u>adfecta</u> discordiis, extenuato <u>felicitatis</u> <u>sensu</u>...bellis civilibus <u>adfecta</u> <u>consenuit</u>.</i>	

Figure 3.6: Metaphors of Roman history in the passage Car. 2.1-3.1: as human life (metaphor 1) and as shipwreck/storm (metaphor 2)

In Car.2.1, Romulus is described as the father of the Roman state, which derives from Lactantius (by whom *infantia* is placed *sub rege Romulo*), Florus (*sub regibus*) and Ammianus (who skips *infantia* and places *pueritia* in the first three hundred years). Romulus as the father and educator of the state seems to be an original conception, unless it was derived from Seneca's lost description. Still, the notion is perfectly suited to biography, which, as we have seen in the examples taken from Nepos, further also pays attention to the education of his subjects. For Alcibiades' youth and education Nepos uses *educatus est* and *eruditus* and later *posteaquam robustior est factus*.... The author of the *HA* also treats 'the education of Rome': ...*qui (i.e. Romulus) fundavit, constituit roboravitque rem p.* At this point, it is said that Romulus acted not only as founder, but also as father of Rome (*pater patriae*), by way of substitute for the natural children that he did not have. This notion, too, has a counterpart in Nepos's works, namely in Epaminondas' biography (10.1), in which the latter says that he leaves as his offspring the battle of Leuctra (*neque vero stirps potest mihi deesse; namque ex me natam relinquo pugnam Leuctricam, quae non modo mihi superstes, sed etiam immortalis sit necesse est*). The theme of infamous sons of great men is well represented in the *HA*, and also occurs in this passage in Nepos: Pelopidas, who himself had a son with a bad reputation, criticized Epaminondas for his lack of offspring, to which he was given the cunning answer which was cited above. The conception of Rome as Romulus' real son looks

original (unless it derives from Seneca), but does have its equivalents in biographical literature.

The rest of Rome's growing-up is described, though the stages of its life are not mentioned explicitly. Even so, the author seems to divide Rome's history along the usual lines of biography within the *aetates* theme: the clause *ab ortu* suggests *infantia* (cf. Livius' *ab urbe condita* and Ammianus' *ab incunabilis primis*), the words *patre ac parente rei p.* and *fundavit, constituit roboravitque rem p.* belong to the stage of *pueritia*, *viguit* and *adolevit* revoke *adulescentia*, *reddidit se in integrum* and *crevit* may belong to the stage of *iuventus*, and, finally, *consenuit* corresponds with *senectus*. The stages of Roman history are thus subdivided in this table:

<i>Stage of human life</i>	<i>Era in Roman history</i>	<i>Corresponding period</i>
<i>Pueritia</i>	Time of the kings (Romulus, Numa e.a.)	From 753 BC onwards
<i>Infantia</i>	Time of the kings up to Tarquinius Superbus	Up to the Republic (509 BC)
<i>Adolescentia</i>	Up to the Gallic invasion	Early Republic, 509 – 395 BC
<i>Iuventus</i>	Recovery Punic wars and war with Pyrrhus Victory over Carthage and expansion of the empire	Middle Republic, 395 onwards
<i>Senectus</i>	Civil wars up to Augustus	First century BC

Figure 3.7: Division of Roman history in terms of stages of human life in the passage *Car. 2.1-3.1* (*aetates Romae*)

It is my impression that the author is deliberately vague about the exact division, in order to delude the reader when he quits the theme in *Car. 3.2*, intending that it will pass unnoticed that he does not solve the problem inherent in the metaphor of the mortality of a human's life when ranged against the eternity of history.

3.9.1.5 The Imperial Era from Augustus to Alexander Severus (27 BC-235 AD)

The theme of the *aetates Romae* comes to an end in *Car.*3.1, even if the comparison with human life is still present.

<i>Emperors</i>	<i>Metaphor 1: humanized res publica</i>	<i>Corresponding Period</i>
Augustus (Tiberius-Claudius)	<i>reparata, libertate deposita domi tristis fuit, apud exterar gentes effloruit</i>	The Julio-Claudian house 27 BC – 68 AD
Nero and Predecessors Vespasian	<u><i>Passa</i></u> <u><i>extulit caput</i></u>	The Julian-Claudian and Flavian houses, 14 – 79 AD
Titus Domitian	<u><i>felicitate laetata</i></u> <u><i>vulnerata immanitate</i></u>	The Flavian house, 79 – 96
Nerva, Trajan to Marcus Aurelius, Commodus	<i>solito melior</i> <i>vecordia et crudelitate lacerata est</i>	The adoptive emperors, 96 – 196
After Commodus	<i>nihil ...<u>sensit</u> bonum</i>	Approximate era of the Severan dynasty, 198 – 235

Figure 3.8: The stages of Roman history from Augustus to Alexander Severus and the personification of the *res publica*, *Car.* 3.1-4

It is clear that the underlined texts belong to the field of personification (such emotions as for example *felicitate laetata* and *sensit* being typical only of living beings). The texts that are not underlined are not necessarily personifications of the *res publica*, but in the light of the other texts, they can certainly be interpreted as such. Especially interesting is the phrase *extulit caput*, with respect to Trajan's reign – after all, in the Roman conception, the best emperor ever.²⁷⁴ The first three stages of the era described above, belong to the period in Roman history as described by Tacitus. Especially the formula *reparata, libertate deposita domi tristis fuit, apud exterar gentes effloruit* has often been related to Tacitus.²⁷⁵

3.9.1.6 The Imperial Era from Valerian to Probus (253-282 AD)

Note that the author skips the era from 235 (the end of Alexander Severus's reign) to 253 (the start of Valerian's reign) in his survey. It is telling that in the epilogue of *Hel.* (35.2)

²⁷⁴ See Syme 1971, 89-112. According to Paschoud the formula *extulit caput* is taken from Verg. *Ecl.* 1.24, *G* 2.341, 3.553, 4.352, *A* 1.127.

²⁷⁵ See also Kelly 2008, 169n26. Tacitus in *HA*: Hartke (1951, 401) suggests that *Car.* 2 *sqq.* is based on a Tacitean idea of history, an idea which was earlier ventilated by Hohl 1911, 290 ff.; Syme (1968, 9 and 189) rejects it. Velaza 1997, 246 follows Hartke regarding *Car.* 3.2, but accepts it for *Car.* 3.1.

the author also eschews this period, and even bypasses the emperors Valerian and Gallienus: *scribere autem ordiar, qui post sequentur. Quorum Alexander optimus et cum cura dicendus est annorum tredecim princeps, semestres alii et vix annui et bimi, Aurelianus praecipuus et ...Claudius*. Just before this passage (in 34.6) the author mentions the Gordiani, whom he includes in the description because they allegedly bear the Antonine name. Apart from this, the whole era is summarized as *semestres alii et vix annui et bimi* – which might again indicate that the lacuna between *MB* and *Val.* is deliberate.

<i>Emperors</i>	<i>Metaphor 1 (human life)</i>	<i>Metaphor 3 (fortuna)</i>	<i>Corresponding time</i>
Valerian Gallienus	<i>uti ...non potuit per annos quindecim passa est</i>		253 – 268 AD
Claudius Aurelian Tacitus Probus		<i>invidit...longinquitatem imperii amans varietatum {et} prope semper inimica iustitiae <u>fortuna</u>. ...ut appareat nihil tam gratum esse <u>fortuna</u>e, quam ut ea quae sunt in publicis actibus, eventuum varietate mutantur.</i>	268 – 282 AD

Figure 3.9: The stages of Roman history from Valerian to Probus and the personification of the res publica, Car. 3.1-4

3.10 The Theme of *boni malique imperatores*

3.10.1 Good Emperors and Bad

Throughout the series, the theme of *boni malique imperatores* is frequently called upon: the good emperor Marcus Aurelius is succeeded by the bad emperor Commodus, if only because good men never produce good sons (as stated in *S* 21.5 in Marcus' case). The bad emperor Elagabalus is succeeded by the good emperor Alexander Severus. The usurper Maximinus, who had a good son, was succeeded by the good senatorial emperor Gordian. The two senatorial emperors Maximus and Balbinus succeeded him, but did not reign long. The ideal emperor Valerian was succeeded by his bad son Gallienus, who was not able to avenge his father and during whose reign there appeared more than thirty rival rulers. Thereafter, some perfect rulers followed: Claudius, Tacitus and Probus. After a brief interlude of Carus and his good son Numerian and his bad son Carinus, the *Maximus Augustorum* Diocletian, to whom the *HA* is dedicated, gets holds of the throne. This leads to the following list of good and bad emperors in the vicissitudes of fortune in the Roman empire:

AD	Good, bad and neutral emperors		
117-138	<u>Hadrian</u>		
138-161	<u>Antoninus Pius</u>	235-238	Maximinus and son
161-180	<u>Marcus Aurelius</u>	238	<u>Gordian</u> and sons
161-169	Verus	238	<u>Maximus et Balbinus</u>
176-192	Commodus	(<i>lacuna</i>)	<u>Valerian</u> and son
193	<u>Pertinax</u>	253-260	Gallienus and son
193	Didius Iulianus	253-268	<u>Claudius</u> and Quintillus
193-211	<u>Septimius Severus</u>	268-270	Aurelian
198-217	Caracalla	270-275	<u>Tacitus</u> and Florianus
217-218	Macrinus	275-276	<u>Probus</u>
217-218	Diadumenian	276-282	<u>Carus, Numerian</u>
218-222	Elagabalus	282-283/4	Carinus
222-235	<u>Alexander Severus</u>	283-285	

Figure 3.10: *Good, neutral and bad emperors and bad in the HA.*

It is not difficult to make up the balance, as the author repeatedly comments upon the qualities of the emperors. The good emperors are Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Pertinax, Septimius Severus, Alexander Severus, Gordian and his two sons, the co-emperors Maximus et Balbinus, Valerian, the senior emperors Claudius, Tacitus and Probus, and finally Carus and his son Numerian.²⁷⁶ In the end, they will be succeeded by the *Maximus Augustorum* Diocletian. Marcus Aurelius is the first one to be styled *bonus princeps*, and many successors will follow, sometimes with variations (e.g., *optimus* for Alexander and *omnibus melior* for Valerian).

The bad emperors are Commodus, Caracalla, Macrinus, Elagabalus, Maximinus, Gallienus and Carus' son Carinus. There is no such designation as *bonus princeps* for their negative counterparts: the expression of *malus princeps* occurs not as frequently as *bonus princeps*, and moreover, it is only used as a designation of a bad ruler in general (e.g. AS 65.4), except for the case of Gallienus.²⁷⁷ It must be made up from the description of their lives that the rulers are very bad. For Commodus and Caracalla, there is an obvious explanation of their baseness: they are the natural born sons of the

²⁷⁶ AP 2.2 (*in cunctis postremo laudabilis et qui merito Numae Pompilio ex bonorum sententia comparatur*); 13.2 (*decreti etiam sunt omnes honores, qui optimis principibus ante delati sunt*); MA 19.10 (*boni principis vita*), P 15.2 (*amore boni principis*), S 19.6 (*iudicium de eo post mortem magnum omnium fuit*), AS 64. ... (*Alexander quidem et ipse optimus fuit*); AS 68.4 (*Hi sunt, qui bonum principem Surum fecerunt*); Gd. 5.3-4 (*'...virum nobilem, ...bonum' et reliqua. Ex quo apparet, quantus vir eo tempore Gordianus fuerit*); 13.1, about Gordianus iunior (*bonitatis insignis*); 31.5, about Gordianus tertius (*fuit iuvenis laetus, ... nobilis, prorsus ut nihil praeter aetatem deesset imperio*); MB 15.1 (*boni imperatores*); Val. 5.4 (*qui est omnibus melior*); T 10.15, about Valerian: *sub bono principe*; Car. 3.8 (*virum et inter bonos magis quam inter malos principes conlocandum et longe meliorem, si Carinum non reliquisset heredem*); Car. 9.4 (*bonum principem Carum fuisse*). The egregious emperors Claudius, Probus and Tacitus are treated in the higher style, see Paschoud 2002 and 2005.

²⁷⁷ Gall. 5.1: *vel malus ... vel dissolutus... imperator*; Gall. 21.1: *Nunc transeamus ad viginti tyrannos, qui Gallieni temporibus contemptu mali principis extiterunt*.

preceding emperors, Marcus Aurelius and Severus respectively.²⁷⁸ In the *vita Severi* (21.1-7), a long disquisition about this problem is included. The same holds for Elagabalus (Caracalla's alleged son), Valerian's son Gallienus and Carus' son Carinus (his 'good' son, Numerian, just like Caracalla's brother Geta, was killed before he was able to reign with his brother). For tyrant-murderer Macrinus, things are different: he is *crudelis, sanguinarius* and *luxoriosus*,²⁷⁹ and the only good measure he took is to grant his son the imperial name of *Antoninus*. Maximinus had the characteristic of *crudelitas* too, as opposed to his son's *bonitas*.²⁸⁰ A variation on the designation of *malus princeps*, again about emperors in general, is found in *Hel.* 34.4: *deinde illud, quod clementia tua* (sc. Constantini) *solet dicere, credidi, esse respiciendum: 'imperatorem esse fortunae est.' nam et minus boni reges fuerunt et pessimi.*²⁸¹

The first emperor to escape the dichotomy is Lucius Verus, *V* 1.3: ... *Verus Antoninus... neque inter bonos neque inter malos principes ponitur*. Didius Iulianus does not receive a final verdict, but his biography ends with a balance of his *vitia* and *virtutes* (*DI* 9.1-3), with emphasis on the former category. Macrinus' son Diadumenian, who was cherished by the soldiers because of his Antonine name, is excused by Alexander Severus himself.²⁸² Finally, the important emperor Aurelian, whose reign took place in between three extraordinary rulers, does not belong to the best.²⁸³ The brothers and destined successors of Claudius (viz. Quintillus, *Cl.* 12.3), Probus (viz. Florianus, *Pr.* 14.1-2) receive a positive assessment, but their reigns are not treated in separate books.

The author of the *HA* likes to embellish his narration with lists of good and bad emperors. The first of these lists is in *MA* 28.10, in which Marcus Aurelius on his deathbed wishes his son Commodus to die as well, as he was worried about the state of the empire when the latter would become emperor.²⁸⁴ These emperors represent the nadir of Roman morality in government. Commodus would soon join their ranks, which results in the debasement of his name in the rest of the *HA*.²⁸⁵ Commodus became the first *exemplum pravitatis* in the *HA* (followed by Elagabalus) and is named for the last time in *Tac.* 6.4, in which the senior emperor Tacitus in eulogized.²⁸⁶ The author varies in his

²⁷⁸ *S* 20.4: *et reputanti mihi (...) neminem facile magnorum virorum optimum et utilem filium reliquisse satis claret, denique aut sine liberis viri interierunt aut tales habuerunt plerique, ut melius fuerit de rebus humanis sine posteritate discedere eqs.*

²⁷⁹ See for a portrait of Macrinus and the negative depiction of his person: Mouchová 1983.

²⁸⁰ *Max.* 24.1: *Hic finis Maximinorum fuit, dignus crudelitate patris, indignus bonitate filii.*

²⁸¹ Compare the words with a quote concerning Diocletian in *A* 43.6: *quid multa? ut Diocletianus ipse dicebat, bonus, cautus, optimus venditur imperator. haec Diocletiani verba sunt, quae idcirco inserui, ut prudentia tua sciret nihil esse difficilius bono principe.*

²⁸² *AS* 9.3: *Diadumenus autem nec tempus habuit nec aetatem et arte patris hoc nomen incurrit. Cf. OM* 10.5: *occisus est etiam filius, cui hoc solum attulit imperium, ut interficeretur a milite; Val.* 8.2 about Valerianus' son of the same name: *nihil habet praedicabile in vita, nisi quod est nobiliter natus, educatus optime et miserabiliter interemptus. Cf. Gall.* 19.1, about Gallienus' son Saloninus: *occisus deinde non sua sed patris causa.*

²⁸³ *A* 37.1: *Hic finis Aureliano fuit, principi necessario magis quam bono.*

²⁸⁴ *feritur filium mori voluisse, cum eum talem videret futurum, qualis exstitit post eius mortem, ne, ut ipse dicebat, similis Neroni, Caligulae et Domitiano esset.*

²⁸⁵ For example in *AS* 7.3: *...peior Commodo solus Heliogabalus... or 9.4 ...luxurie Nerones, Vitellios, Commodos vinceret....*

²⁸⁶ *enimvero si recolere velitis vetusta illa prodigia, Nerones dico et Heliogabalos et Commodos seu potius semper Incommodos, certe non hominum magis vitia illa quam aetatum fuerunt.*

enumerations and creates canonical lists of bad emperors.²⁸⁷ The same holds for the good emperors. Highest praise goes to Augustus, the *Antonini*, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius²⁸⁸, but above all Trajan.²⁸⁹ Trajan occurs for the first time, in AC 8.6, in a list of emperors that have not been killed by their enemies: *denique non Augustum, non Traianum, non Hadrianum, non patrem suum a rebellibus potuisse superari*,... After this first occurrence, the name of Trajan will be celebrated seventeen times in *HA*. The total number of occurrences of emperors in enumerations comes to 180, 150 of which are in *IL* and *LL*. The most mentioned emperors are Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius and Commodus.

In *Hel.* 1.1, an enumeration of bad emperors is followed by a series of good emperors: bad emperors such as *Caligulas et Nerones et Vitellios* and the good emperors *Augustum, Traianum, Vespasianum, Hadrianum, Pium, Titum, Marcum*. The author formulates the lesson that same earth produces *venena* and *frumentum atque alia salutaria, eadem serpentes et cicures*. In *Aur.* 42.4 the best emperors from an *index publicus* are mentioned: Augustus, Vespasian, Titus, Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Alexander Severus, Valerian, Claudius and Aurelian. The good emperors can be inscribed and depicted in one ring, as a *scurra* from Claudian's times wittily remarked.²⁹⁰ The bad emperors (*series malorum*), on the other hand, are the *Vitellios, Caligulas et Nerones* and *Maximinos et Filippus* (*Aur.* 42.6). In these two examples, the good emperors are called by their own names,²⁹¹ while the bad emperors are mentioned in a generic plural.²⁹² The habit of mentioning exemplary persons is found frequently in the *Panegyrici Latini* in case of republican heroes.²⁹³

Apart from the instances in which the good and bad emperors are called by their own names, there are frequent passages in which the alternation between good and the bad are only mentioned in general. The last words of Septimius Severus, who tried to raise both of his sons to the throne, are (*S* 23.3): *'turbatam rem p. ubique accepi, pacatam etiam Brittanis relinquo, senex ac pedibus aeger firmum imperium Antoninis meis relinquens, si boni erunt, inbecillum si mali'*, thus making a difference between the good and the bad emperors, who reign over a strong and a weak empire respectively.²⁹⁴ In *Hel.*

²⁸⁷ Nero, Caligula, Domitianus in *MA* 28.10; Nero, Vitellius, Commodus in *AS* 9.4 and Nero, Heliogabalus and Commodus in *Tac.* 6.4, etc.

²⁸⁸ Often, the *Antonini* are mentioned as a group, as in *Cl.* 18.4, *Tac.* 16.6, *Pr* 12.2 and 22.4. The plural refers to different emperors unlike the generic plural in e.g. *Nerones* etc. These *Antonini* concern more emperors (Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius are meant), which is a different use of the plural as e.g. *Nerones* or *Heliogabalos*, which means 'emperors like Nero or Heliogabalus'.

²⁸⁹ In Roman literature, Trajanus is praised ever since his reign, see Syme 1971, 89-112 ('The fame of Trajan'). Cf. for a comparable jingle in Symmachus *Epp.* 1.13.1, Syme 1971, 91): *bonus Nerva, Traianus strenuus, Pius innocens, Marcus plenus officii temporibus adiuti sunt, quae tunc mores alios nesciebant*. Another catalogue of exemplary rulers in Pacatus' *Pan.* 11.6.

²⁹⁰ *Augustus, Vespasianus, Titus, Nerva, Traianus, Hadrianus, Pius, Marcus Antonini, Severus Afer, Alexander Mammaeae, divus Claudius et divus Aurelianus. Valerianum, enim, cum optimus fuerit, ab omnibus infelicitas separavit. vides, quaeso, quam pauci sint principes boni...*

²⁹¹ The only two exceptions are *Hel.* 2.4 and *Tac.* 6.9 (Den Hengst 1981, 59).

²⁹² This use is also found in Cic. *Ver.* 2.15.4: *praeclarum imperatorem nec iam cum M. Aquilio..., sed vero cum Paulis, Scipionibus, Mariis conferendum* (the example is given in Leumann-Hoffmann-Szantyr II 19 (28)).

²⁹³ In *HA* only once, *Cl.* 1.3: *Camilli, Scipiones*. Den Hengst 1981, 61n3 mentions some examples: *Pan. Lat.* 1.3.14; 2.7.4; 2.9.5; 2.20.3; 2.46.2; 3.19.2; 3.20.1.

²⁹⁴ See Straub 1964, 171-2 for a treatment of Septimius Severus' *ultima verba*.

10.4, Elagabalus' representative Zoticus is characterized as a man who abuses the emperor's trust in him, whereafter a general observation about amici principis follows: *ut sunt homines huius modi, qui, si admissi fuerint ad nimiam familiaritatem principum, famam non solum malorum sed et bonorum principum vendunt et qui stultitia vel innocentia imperatorum, qui hoc non perspiciunt, infami rumigatione pascuntur.*

3.10.2 Tyrants and *Fortuna* in the *HA*

Besides the emperors, the tyrants are also measured along lines of good and bad in the *HA*. The first of the three tyrants to whom individual lives are devoted, Avidius Cassius, is assessed positively in *AC* 13.9-10.²⁹⁵ There is only a slight difference between the emperor and the tyrant: Avidius Cassius would have been a *bonus imperator*, if he had not been defeated by Marcus Aurelius. Even so, Pescennius Niger is portrayed in a favourable light in his biography (*PN* 6.10 in particular²⁹⁶) and Clodius Albinus is only hated by his enemies Septimius Severus (10.1), Commodus (14.4) and Pertinax (14.6), but not by Marcus (10.4-12) or the senate.²⁹⁷

The combining of thirty tyrants in *T* and four in *Q* is a consequence of the author's plan to include more lives in one book, and not to treat *singulos quosque principes... per libros singulos* any more. The perfect emperors Claudius, Aurelian, Tacitus and Probus are flanked by two collections of tyrants and usurpers, *T* and *Q*. The inclusion of the former is justified by the necessity to show the host of usurpers during the reign of the bad emperor Gallienus,²⁹⁸ while the latter is composed in order not to spoil the biography of the good emperor Probus.²⁹⁹ In the case of this biography, the author comments on the small difference between a *latro* or *latrunculus* ('brigand') and a tyrant who calls himself *Augustus*. Often, a usurper merely gets the status of brigand just because he is conquered by the reigning emperor, while he did present himself as an Augustus. This matter, first introduced in *PN* 1.1-2, is elaborated in *Q* 2 and 13.

In the preface to *Q*, the author praises his alleged colleague in biography Trebellius Pollio: *Q* 1.3: *Atque contra Trebellius Pollio ea fuit diligentia, ea cura in edendis bonis malisque principibus, ut etiam triginta tyrannos uno breviter libro concluderet...*. The theme of *boni malique principes* is explicitly mentioned, and is indeed especially important for the construction of *Val.*, *Gall.* and *T*. The designation of *malus princeps* is reserved for Gallienus in the *HA*, other than as a general term for a bad ruler. Gallienus' father is depicted as a *bonus princeps* (*Val.* 5.4 *omnibus melior*) in *T*, for whom a

²⁹⁵ *qui si optinuisset imperium, fuisset non modo clemens sed bonus, sed utilis et optimus imperator.*

²⁹⁶ *PN* 6.10: *fuit ergo miles optimus, tribunus singularis, dux praecipuus, legatus severissimus, consul insignis, vir domi forisque conspicuus, imperator infelix;...*

²⁹⁷ 12.1: *a senatu tantum amatus est, quantum nemo principum...*; 13.3. Clodius Albinus pleads for the restoration of the senate's authority in appointing the emperors in *ClA* 13.5-10: *'si senatus p. R. suum illud vetus haberet imperium nec in unius potestate res tanta consisteret, non ad Vitellios neque ad Neronem neque ad Domitianos publica fata venissent. essent in imperio consulari nostrae illae gentes Ceioniorum, Albinorum, Postumiorum, de quibus patres vestri, qui et ipsi ab avis suis audierant, multa didicerunt.* Here, the bad emperors are opposed to the senatorial families (!).

²⁹⁸ *Gall.* 21.1: *Nunc transeamus ad viginti tyrannos, qui Gallieni temporibus contemptu mali principis extiterunt*

²⁹⁹ *Pr.* 24.8: *non enim dignum fuit, ut quadrigae tyrannorum bono principi miscerentur*

successor has to be found. The book of *T* is written in scorn of Gallienus (*Gall.*21.1)³⁰⁰ and contains many passages in which a new *bonus princeps* is sought. One of the qualities of a good prince is that he is able to choose the right successor. Valerian, too, possessed this quality.³⁰¹ Fortune, however, prevented the generals from attaining supreme power.³⁰² Ballista, one of Valerian's generals, tried to find a good successor.³⁰³ Another general, Saturninus³⁰⁴ spoke to his soldiers after his acclamation as emperor, *T* 23.3: '*commilitones, bonum ducem perdidistis et malum principem fecistis*'. It may be concluded from these passages, that the *malus princeps* Gallienus, who was the *bonus princeps* Valerian's bad son, was not good for the empire and that a better successor had to be selected among the men that Valerian had appointed general, but *Fortuna* decided otherwise. The search for a better emperor is thus reflected in the structure of the books: during Gallienus' reign, the search for an optimal successor continued.

³⁰⁰ See § 4.3.2.

³⁰¹ *T* 10.15: *mirabile autem hoc fuit in Valeriano principe, quod omnes, quoscumque duces fecit, postea militum testimonio ad imperium pervenerunt, ut appareat senem imperatorem in diligendis rei p. ducibus talem fuisse, qualem Romana felicitas, si continuari fataliter potuisset sub bono principe, requirebat.*

³⁰² *T* 10.16: *sed nimis sibi Fortuna indulgendum putavit, quae et cum Valeriano bonos principes tulit et Gallienum diutius quam oportebat rei p. reservavit.*

³⁰³ *T* 12.4-5: *...et ego, quod negare non possum, bonum principem quaero sed quis tandem est, qui Valeriani locum possit implere,....*

³⁰⁴ *T* 23.1: *Optimus ducum Gallieni temporis, sed Valeriano dilectus Saturninus fuit...*

Chapter 4 Structures in Individual Books

4.1 Introduction

In chapters 2 and 3, we studied the structure, content, scope, style and time of the *HA* as a whole. In the present chapter, we will examine some elements that determine the structure of the series on the level of the three parts generally distinguished (*H-G*, *OM-MB*, *Val.-Car.*) as well as on the level of the individual books. We will focus on the temporal relationships between TN and TS, and the distribution of the *materia* over the books. In order to achieve a description of temporal relationships within (groups of) individual biographies, the following issues will be treated:

- the transitions from preface to narration, the former containing the author's reflections on his own work (Genette's 'fifth movement', see § 1.3.4-5), the latter containing the historiographical narration proper (§ 4.2).
- the changing structure from *Maximini duo* onwards, determined by the transition from separate to combined emperors and tyrants (§ 4.3), which does not run parallel with the tripartite structure.
- a temporal analysis of structure in serial biography, illustrated at the hand of the Primary Lives (§ 4.3).
- a conclusion to chapter 4.

4.2 Transitions from Preface to Narration

With regard to the individual books, the prefaces figure among the most conspicuous features of the structure of the *HA*, especially in the second and third parts. In this respect, the *HA* is far from unique, as presenting the content of a book to the reader is an art that was practiced in numerous works in Greek as well as Latin literature, and in every type of text. Latin historiographical literature provides numerous examples of prefaces.³⁰⁵ Yet this is not the case for biographical works, as only Suetonius (whose preface is lost) and Nepos can, in this respect, serve as material for comparison with the *HA*. When it comes to paratext, it is especially Nepos who serves as a model, as was shown in the previous chapter, for the simple reason that there is a larger amount of paratext in the works of the latter. Like the author of the *HA*, Nepos frequently comments on the nature of his own work. Yet not the presence of the prefaces in the *HA* themselves is remarkable, but their number and distribution throughout the work: prefaces occur all

³⁰⁵ Sallust, Livy, Tacitus in historiography and Valerius Maximus in his description of famous men, to name just a few examples. See Avenarius 1956, Herkommer 1968, Janson 1974, Den Hengst 1981. According to Syme (1968, 207 and 1971, 95); Paschoud (1996, XXVII-VIII) and Stubenrauch (1981, 59-104), the *HA* once had a preface, now lost. The question should be separated from the question whether there were lives of Nerva and Trajan, treated above, § 3.4.1.

over in various lengths and content. The following passages can be considered prefaces to the books to which they belong:³⁰⁶

			<i>IL</i>		<i>LL</i>	
<i>Book</i>	<i>wds</i>	<i>SL</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>Words</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>words</i>
<i>H</i>	0		<i>OM</i> 1.1-5	177	<i>Val.</i>	Ø ³⁰⁷
<i>Ael.</i>		92	<i>Dd.</i> 1.1	36	<i>Gall.</i>	0
<i>AP</i>	0		<i>Hel.</i> 1.1- 3	89	<i>T</i> 1.1- 2	131
<i>MA</i>	0		<i>AS</i>	0	<i>Cl.</i> 1.1- 3	125
<i>V</i>	42		<i>Max.</i> 1.1- 3	73	<i>A</i> 1.1- 2.2	352
<i>AC</i>		0	<i>Gd.</i> 1.1- 5	87	<i>Tac.</i> 1.1-6	204
<i>C-S</i>	0		<i>MB</i>	0	<i>Pr.</i> 1.1- 2.9	401
<i>PN</i>		64			<i>Q</i> 1.1- 2.4	311
<i>CIA</i>		0			<i>Car</i> 1.1-3.8	442
<i>Cc.</i>	0					
<i>G</i>		56				
Total	42 0.1 %	212 2.1%				
Total	254 (0.6%)		462 (1.3%)		1966 (5.7%)	

Figure 4.1: NS of the prefaces (measured in words) in EL (PL and SL), IL and LL, and their relative NS in percentages (in proportion with the entire NS of the HA).

The table makes it clear that the prefaces increase in number and length in the course of the HA (0.6, 1.3 and 5.7 per cent of the total narrative in the three parts respectively). In PL, only *V* is introduced by prefatory remarks, while three out of five in SL begin with a preface. In IL, five out of seven lives contain a preface, and in LL, seven out of nine. Like their number, the prefaces also steadily increase in length: in EL, only four lives have a preface (containing less than one hundred words), in IL, the lives begin with lengthier prefaces (*OM*: 177), while only two out of seven biographies lack a preface. In LL seven out of nine books have a preface, ranging from 131 (*T*) to 442 (*Car.*) words.

It is interesting to inspect how the prefaces are attached to the *vita* to which they belong, in order to discover where the author decided to pad out his biographies. For this, it should first be asked what is meant by a preface in terms of the HA. A preface is the introductory paragraph of a book, in which the author reflects on his own work, before the narration of the subject's *vita* actually begins.³⁰⁸ Prefaces can, among other characteristics, be recognized by the programmatic remarks which they contain. Not only that: there are certain themes that recur at the beginning of some biographies (and

³⁰⁶ I take as my point of departure the prefaces indicated by Den Hengst in his *Prefaces*, 1981 (see table of contents, p. i-iii.). Note that both Den Hengst and Paschoud (2001, XXIX) do not consider the introductory remark in *Dd.* a preface (*pace* Stubenrauch 1981, 52n16 does), while they do so in the case of a comparable introduction in *G* (see § 5.4) – both remarks are derived from the first remark of this kind in *Ael.* 2.1.

³⁰⁷ As the narration begins in the middle of the emperor Valerian's *vita* (as a result of the *lacuna*), it can, strictly speaking, not be determined whether the *vita* had a preface.

³⁰⁸ Den Hengst (1981, 2): 'Those opening passages which contain programmatic statements and reflections of a general nature in which the author speaks in the first person.' This definition rules out the introductory remark of *Dd.*

elsewhere, both in intermediary programmatic remarks and in epilogues) and share the reflective character of the programmatic remarks. It is necessary to stay with this subject for a while, as in some cases it is far from easy to determine where the line between preface and biographical narration should be drawn.

In Latin literature, explicit reflection on the transition from preface to *vita* is a topos in itself.³⁰⁹ The author of a historiographical or biographical work often tells the reader what he is going to treat in his work, what selection he will make, and in what order or style he will do so. In biography, there are in principle two main topics to be treated: the life (birth, origins, ancestors, *pueritia*, character, sayings, physical appearance, death) and activities (*res gestae*) of the subject. The first biographer in Latin literature, Nepos, takes Epaminondas as an example of his treatment of Greek generals in his preface, and at the end of his programmatic preface, he states: *Sed hic plura persequi cum magnitudo voluminis prohibet tum festinatio, ut ea explicem, quae exorsus sum. Quare ad propositum veniemus et in hoc exponemus libro de vita excellentium imperatorum*,³¹⁰ after which the series actually begins. The transition from preface to narration is clearly marked by an authorial statement.

Before treating the ways in which the author moves from preface to narration, it is worth quoting two examples from the *HA*, which show that he follows the usage of marking the transition. In *Ael.* 1.3 the author states at the end of the preface: *Et quoniam nimis pauca dicenda sunt, nec debet prologus inormior esse quam fabula, de ipso iam loquor* and in *A* 3.1 *Ac ne multa et frivola prooemiis odiosus intexam, divus Aurelianus...* In both of these instances the transition from preface (*prologus*, *prooemium*) to narration (*fabula*) is explicitly indicated, since the subject immediately follows (*de ipso, divus Aurelianus*). And yet, while he seems to keep his promise, in the case of the *HA* something unexpected often occurs, as will be shown below. In the next paragraphs, the way in which he turns from preface to narration will be investigated, in *PL* and *SL*, *IL* and finally *LL*.

³⁰⁹ I use the term 'transition' in the sense in the sense used by Paschoud (2001, 44) ad *Pr.* 2.9: 'transition vers le début du récit'. In the case of *Pr.*, this means the passage from preface to narration, whether or not explicitly indicated by the author. The term is explained by Genette (1980, 98-9) as a 'change of movement', which is the change from one temporal relationship between *TN* and *TS* division in a certain passage to another. In the case of the *HA*, *TS* in the prefaces is (in general) non-existent, as it concerns a description consisting of self-comment, while *TN* can be measured in words. At the beginning of the biographical narrative *TS* is determined by the lifetime of the subject. There are, however, exceptions to the rule: the preface of *A* has a dramatic setting in which a visit is paid to the *Templum Solis*, which means that *TS* can be measured. The preface to *Car.* does, strictly speaking, not contain *TS*, but the description of the history of the Roman empire still denotes historical time.

³¹⁰ There are several topical themes in this sentence, for example the 'plan' (*propositum*), cf. Val. Max. *Praef.*: *Et quoniam initium a cultu deorum petere in animo est, de condicione eius summam disseram.* and Tac. Ann. 1.1 *Inde consilium mihi pauca de Augusto et extrema tradere, ...* Cf. *HA Ael.* 1.1 (*in animo mihi est*) and 7.5 (*quia mihi propositum fuit*) and *Gd.* 1.1 (*propositum fuerat*). For the theme of *festinatio*, cf. *HA*, *T* 33.8 and note 260. Words such as *incipio*, *exordior* ('to begin to speak (write)'): *OLD* 2b) are typical of prefaces. The urge to begin is also encountered in Plut. *Alex.* 1.1-2: διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὑποκειμένων πράξεων οὐδὲν ἄλλο προερούμεν ἢ παραιτησόμεθα τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας.

4.2.1 Transitions from Preface to Narration in the Earlier Lives

One of the ways to distinguish between preface and biographical narration is to determine at what point the author's narration about the emperor in question begins. He uses certain techniques to set the biographical part into motion (sometimes referred to as *res*, in contrast with the preface).³¹¹ The Primary Lives provide a very clear picture of his procedure. Where there is no preface (which applies to all the Primary Lives with the exception of V), he immediately begins by treating the origins of the emperor, who is consistently referred to in either the genitive or the dative case, mostly the latter.³¹² Only in the case of S 1.2 and Cc.1.2 does the second sentence discuss the ancestors, which is not very surprising. To begin with Cc.: this biography resembles C with its reference to an earlier biography for information about ancestors. This is perfectly understandable, as in both cases they share ancestors with imperial fathers who have already been described in the HA. Compare Cc.1.2 *De cuius maioribus frustra putamus iterandum, cum omnia in Severi vita satis dicta sint*³¹³ with C 1.2: *De Commodi Antonini parentibus in vita Marci Antonini satis est disputatum*. Severus' biography, it may be noted, shows a procedure that appears to have provided a model for many of the subsequent biographies. This resides in its method of summarizing the preceding biography in the shape of a brief ablativus absolutus, S 1.1: *interfecto Didio Iuliano Severus Africa oriundus imperium obtinuit*, which is comparable to the formula in DI 1.1: *Didio Iuliano, qui post Pertinacem imperium adeptus est, ...* Returning to our question of how and where the author begins the narration of his *vitae*, so as to enable us to distinguish between preface and biographical narration, it may be said that a listing of ancestors is a normal beginning, at least in the Primary Lives.

The only exception in the Primary Lives is the life of V. Though equipped with a preface, it poses a problem. Here, the distinction between preface and actual beginning of the *vita* is unclear. Not until V 1.6 are the *maiores* introduced in line with the procedure followed in the other Primary Lives: *Huic naturalis pater fuit Lucius Aelius Verus...*, while the preface seems to be finished after 1.2 (in which the author seeks to justify the order in which the emperors are dealt with). The passage 1.3-6 contains much material that is also found in the lives in the second part of the HA, such as the theme of the *boni malique principes* (in V 1.3, cf. chapter 6 on AS). It is true that the narration about Verus begins in V 1.3, so that V 1-2 should be considered the preface, but before the author starts recounting his *vita*, a theme is introduced that concerns the entire series of the HA: their order. This theme recurs in Cc.11.1-2 (about the order in which Caracalla and Geta are treated) and Q 10.1 (about Carinus and Numerian).³¹⁴ The presence of a preface in the Primary Life of V may indicate that the author's source treated the two adoptive brothers,

³¹¹ T 33.8, Pr.1.6.

³¹² H 1.1: *origo imperatoris Hadriani*, AP 1.1: *Tito Aurelio Fulvo Boionio Antonino Pio patrum genus e Gallia Transalpina...*; MA 1.1: *Marco Antonino... pater Annius Verus...*; C 1.1: *De Commodi Antonini parentibus...*, P 1.1: *Publio Helvio Pertinaci pater libertinus Helvius Successus fuit...*, DI 1.1: *Didio Iuliano...proavus fuit Salvius Iulianus...*, S 1.2: *Cui civitas Lepti, pater Geta, maiores equites Romani...*; Cc.1.2: *De cuius maioribus...*). This is also the way in which Nepos normally begins his biographies, though he does so only with a very short indication of names, ancestry and origins.

³¹³ See for the beginning of Cc. § 5.4.1.

³¹⁴ See for this topic Den Hengst 1981, 17-8 and White (1967, 120), the latter of whom accepts the related passages as a sign of single authorship.

Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, in one book, which made it necessary to add a preface to the second 'split-off'.³¹⁵

The Secondary Lives differ from the regular pattern that characterises the Primary Lives. Only *AC* and *CIA* do not have a preface; the former begins with a listing of the subject's ancestors, though his name is rendered in the nominative, *AC* 1.1: *Avidius Cassius...ex familia Cassiorum fuisse dicitur per matrem, homine tamen novo genitus Avidio Severo....* The nominative is also used in the vita of *PN*, immediately after the preface, *PN* 1.3: *Pescennius ergo Niger, ... patre Annio Fusco, matre Lampridia....* In *PN*, there is also a reference to the preceding biography (like in *DI* 1.1 and *S* 1.1, see above) but only after a short description of the subject's character, namely in *PN* 2.1: *is postquam comperit occisum Commodum...* If we consider the listing of ancestors as the beginning of the biographical narration, then *CIA* differs, as this part is replaced by some introductory remarks and the required information does not occur until *CIA* 1.3: *Fuit autem Clodius Albinus familia nobili, Hadrumetinus tamen ex Africa.* After some considerations about his *nobilitas*, supported by a letter, a *contio* and Marius Maximus' judgement, this item is continued in *CIA* 4.1. The beginning of the book contains a sketch of the situation after Pertinax' death, *CIA* 1.1: *Uno eodemque prope tempore post Pertinacem, qui auctore Albino interemptus est, Iulianus a senatu Romae, Septimius Severus ab exercitu in Syria, Pescennius Niger in oriente, Clodius Albinus in Gallia imperatores appellati.* While it is not remarkable at all that the first biography of a rival emperor in the *HA* contains a description of the chaotic situation in the empire,³¹⁶ it must be remarked that this is a deviation from normal procedure: information about his ancestors is scattered over *CIA* 1.3 and 4.1. Another difference from the lives up to *CIA* is that Herodian is for the first time mentioned as a source in the *HA*, namely in *CIA* 1.2. This biography is markedly different from the Primary Lives and no longer follows the usual lines of biographical writing up to *S*, or even *PN*.

While this concludes our discussion of the biographical opening of the Secondary Lives *AC*, *PN* and *CIA*, there is also *Ael.* 1-2, where it is not clear at what point the preface actually stops, as the author states in 1.3 *et quoniam nimis pauca dicenda sunt, nec debet prologus inormior esse quam fabula, de ipso iam loquar.* After this, he continues with remarks of the kind that he uses in other prefaces to introduce his subject - which sheds a different light on the firm statement just encountered, in which he uses terms that other authors do in fact use to mark a transition. The author seems to play with prefatory conventions, since he simply continues to produce prefatory matter while stating that he will begin narrating the subject's *vita*. Only in 2.7 are the *maiores* brought up: *huic pater Ceionius Commodus fuit,....* In the last of the Secondary Lives, *G*, the author did not need

³¹⁵ Den Hengst (1981, 17) suggests the same when writing 'When the author had planned to separate Verus from Marcus and Geta from Caracalla, ...': he evidently followed a source, but changed his plan by describing two emperors in two separate books. This explains the presence of introductory remarks in *V* as well as *G*, see § 5.4.

³¹⁶ When identifying the prefaces, *CIA* provides a problem: as the description of his origin begins in 1.3, one could consider *CIA* 1.1-2 as prefatory matter with a summarising account of the situation in the empire after Pertinax's reign. These remarks, however, do not reflect on the *HA* as a literary work, as is required in our definition, nor does the author speak in first person. The theme of the four emperors is taken up in *PN* 2.1: *Is postquam comperit occisum Commodum, Iulianum imperatorem appellatum eundemque iussu Severi et senatus occisum, Albinum etiam in Gallia sumpsisse nomen imperatoris, ab exercitibus Syriacis, quos regebat, appellatus est imperator,....*

to elaborate on ancestors, as these were identical to those of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. Still, in *G* 2.1, there is an appropriate beginning of the biographical part with the listing of the ancestors after whom Geta was named (*G* 2.1: *Geta autem dictus est vel a patris nomine vel avi paterni, ...*). Surprisingly, this time the author does not refer to the life of Septimius, as he did in the case of Caracalla in *Cc.* 1.2, but to Marius Maximus: *cuius vita et moribus in vita Severi Marius Maximus primo septenario satis copiose rettulit*. The author plays havoc with biographical conventions by needlessly referring to another source, while in earlier cases (*C* 1.1 and *Cc.* 1.2) his own works sufficed. The formula *primo septenario satis copiose* in particular smacks of *hyperbole*.

So far, it can be concluded that the biographical parts of the books of the *HA* set out with an account of ancestry, either at the start of the book (the Primary Lives except *V*, and the Secondary Life of *AC*) or immediately after the preface (the Secondary Life of *PN*).³¹⁷ The lives of *Ael.* and *G* contain variations on this convention, while the lives of *V* and *CIA* differ from the pattern through the intrusion of other themes before the biographical part actually begins. While it could be expected that the biographical part should begin immediately after the preface, one is deceived in the cases of *Ael.*, *V*, *CIA* and *G*. The author plays with the reader's expectations in the Secondary Lives of *Ael.* and *CIA* by repeatedly postponing the beginning of his biographical narration, while he strongly exaggerates the motif in *G*. Essentially, the technique is a much exaggerated application of the figure of *variatio*.

4.2.2 Transitions from Preface to Narration in the Intermediary Lives

As we have seen, most of the biographical narrations begin with the subject's origins and ancestry. In *DI* and *S*, there is also reference to the preceding lives, in *S* 1.1 by way of an *ablativus absolutus*. In this paragraph, the procedure in *IL* and *LL* will be mapped out, beginning with *OM*. After the preface, the subject's life is introduced by an *ablativus absolutus*:

³¹⁷ This procedure is in accordance with Suetonius' manner of beginning his narrative; cf. Leo 1901, 272-5.

	Reference to preceding <i>vita</i> (abl. absolutus)	Subject	Origin / ancestors	Continuation of the sentence
OM 2.1	<i>occiso ergo Antonino Bassiano</i>	<i>Opilius Macrinus</i>	<i>...humili natus loco...</i>	<i>imperium arripuit...</i>
Dd. 1.1	<i>occiso Bassiano factione Macriniana</i>	<i>Antonini Diadumeni pueri...</i>	<i>quem cum <u>patre</u> Opilio Macrino teneret imperium</i>	<i>nihil habet in vita memorabile, nisi quod...</i>
Hel. 1.4	<i>Igitur occiso Macrino eiusque filio</i>	<i>in Varium Heliogabalum</i>	<i>Idcirco quod Bassiani <u>filius</u> diceretur</i>	<i>imperium conlatum est</i>
AS 1.1	<i>Interfecto Vario Heliogabalo</i>	<i>Aurelius Alexander</i>	<i>urbe Arcena genitus</i>	<i>accepit imperium</i>
Max. 1.4	<i>...sub Alexandro imperatore enituit.</i>	<i>Maximinus senior</i>	<i>1.5: hic de vico Threiciae vicino barbaris, barbaro etiam <u>patre</u> et <u>matre</u> genitus...</i>	(Max. Iunior, 27.1: <i>De huius genere superius dictum est</i>)
Gd. 2.2	<i>2.4: post consulatum, quem egerat cum Alexandro... (cf. 5.1)</i>	<i>... Gordianus senior</i>	<i>natus est <u>patre</u> Maecio Marullo, <u>matre</u> Ulpia Gordiana...</i>	
MB 1.1	<i>Interemptis in Africa Gordiano seniore cum filio....</i>	<i>1.2: Maximus et Balbinus</i>	<i>5.1: Maximo <u>pater</u> fuit Maximus, unus e plebe...; 7.1: Balbinus nobilissimus...</i>	

Figure 4.2: The passages in the Intermediary Lives in which the biographical narration about the subjects of the book is introduced by an account of their ancestors and/or origins (lives with a preface are in bold face).

The table draws a clear picture: in five out of seven Intermediary biographies (*OM*, *Dd.*, *Hel.*, *AS* and *MB*) the narration is linked to the preceding biography by an ablative absolute, after the example of *S* 1.1. The other two (*Max.*, *Gd.*) mention the main activities of the subject under the preceding emperor, which produces a link of a more implicit kind. Secondly, the practice of referring to the subject in a case other than the nominative has been replaced by nominatives in five of the seven biographies (*OM*, *AS*, *Max.*, *Gd.*, *MB*), a practice which corresponds with that of the Secondary Lives (*AC*, *CIA*, *PN*, *G*). This may have been prompted by the source the author used (probably the *Kaisergeschichte*), as all the Primary Lives, along with *Hel.* (but *S* excluded), deal with the emperors in either the genitive or dative. In the third place, in the historical context of the third century, it becomes increasingly important to indicate whether an emperor is

low-born or of noble stock. While there was no need to mention the nobility of the Antonine emperors,³¹⁸ there was no guarantee that either the emperors of the third century or their rivals were of noble birth (after Pertinax, Macrinus was the first emperor decribed in the *HA* as being of low birth (*humili natus loco*, *OM* 2.1) and the very first plebeian to become emperor, *OM* 7.1)³¹⁹. This again corresponds with the practice of the three pretenders in the Secondary Lives (*AC* 1.1: *homine tamen novo genitus*, *CLA* 1.3: *familia nobili*, *PN* 1.3: *ut alii, modicis parentibus, ut alii, nobilibus fuisse tradunt*).

Unlike *SL*, the transitional procedure from preface to narration in *IL* is too diffuse to allow a clear conclusion: while in case of *Gd.* and *Max.*, like *PN*, the narration immediately follows the preface, in *Hel.* the narration starts as erratically as in *Ael.* and *G.* The use of the ablativus absolutus, however, in *S* 1.1 and in the Intermediary Lives is striking and novel. This particular use of the ablativus absolutus occurs when there is a sequence from one emperor to the other, which explains why in the *vitae* of the rivals and pretenders, who do not operate along lines of successive dynasts, this use of the ablativus absolutus is absent.

4.2.3 Transitions from Preface to Narration in the Later Lives

When we take the three characteristic elements in the Intermediary Lives into account (the use of the ablativus absolutus, the emperor in question in the nominative case and the mention of his background), there are some changes to be discerned in the Later Lives. The use of the ablativus absolutus as a marker of the transition to the next emperor only occurs in *Gall.* 1.1, and is commented on by the author: *Capto Valeriano (enimvero unde incipienda est Gallieni vita, nisi ab eo praecipue malo, quo eius vita depressa est?) nutante re p. (...), Gallienus comperta patris captivitate gauderet...* In this final occurrence of the ‘imperial ablativus absolutus’ in the *HA*, the author asks where he could better begin the life of Gallienus than with the capture of Valerian, which was the moment that his son Gallienus became sole ruler.³²⁰ A second reference to the preceding life (*comperta patris captivitate*), and the emperor’s name in the nominative (*Gallienus*), are also present.

For the rest, the Later Lives are especially atypical when compared to the structural characteristics of the Intermediary Lives. Apart from *A* 3.1 (...*divus Aurelianus*,

³¹⁸ This practice is already present in the primary lives, cf. *H* 1.2: *atavus Maryllinus, qui primus in sua familia senator populi Romani fit* and for Didius Iulianus, *DI* 1.1: *proavus fuit Salvius Iulianus, ..., quod magis eum nobile fecit*.

³¹⁹ It is logical that the ancestors of Diadumenian and Heliogabalus were only mentioned in a reference to Macrinus (*pater*) and Caracalla (*Bassiani filius*). Note that in the cases of Maximinus senior and Gordian senior both *pater* and *mater* are named in the ablative. In the case of their sons fresh mention of their origins was unnecessary. The absence of any need to trace their ancestry, as family members, partly explains why these emperors are dealt with together in a single book in the intermediary lives. Only *OM* and *Dd.* are exceptions to this practice. In the cases of Maximus and Balbinus, the former (*MB* 5.1) is of low birth and the latter (*MB* 7.1) a noble.

³²⁰ The author stresses this point in Gallienus’ life again in *Gall.* 27.1 and expands it with a variation on a philosophical statement (by Anaxagoras, according to Cicero (*Tusc.* 3.30 and 58: Chastagnol 1994, 828n1): *ubi de Valeriano patre comperit quod captus esset, id quod philosophorum optimus de filio amisso, dixisse fertur: ‘sciebam me genuisse mortalem’*.

ortus, ut plures loquuntur, Sirmii familia obscuriore, ut nonnulli Dacia ripensi)³²¹ and 4.1 (*modicis parentibus ortus*) and Pr. 3.1 (*Probus, oriundus e Pannonia, civitate Sirmiensi, nobiliore matre quam patre*) with the emperors in the nominative, the places of birth and their nobility, the usual elements crop up only sparingly. The reasons for this change differ from case to case. In *T*, there is a collection of thirty tyrants, rivals and pretenders, most of them historical, some fictitious. Another collection of rivals is *Q*, in which the various lives are properly introduced by exemplary beginnings (*Q* 3.1 *Firmo patria Seleucia fuit*;³²² *Q* 7.1 *Saturninus oriundo fuit Gallus...*; *Q* 12.1 *Proculo patria Albingauni fuere...*; *Q* 14.1 *Bonosus domo Hispaniensi fuit, origine Britannus...*).³²³ In the biography of *Tac.*, no information at all is given about the emperor's origins. In *Cl.*, the emperor's origins are given only in chapter 11.9: it is uncertain whether the emperor's ancestors are from Dalmatia or Asia Minor.³²⁴ The author parodies uncertainty regarding the place of birth, which parallels Suetonius' biography of Caligula (Suet. *Cal.* 8, in which it is said that some authors favour a more prestigious place of birth out of flattery).³²⁵ This variation on the normal practice of providing sources also occurs in *A* 3.2-5 and *Car.* 4.1 (*Cari patria sic ambigue a plerique proditur, ut...*).

In conclusion, it may be said that the biographies in LL contain a variety of ways in which the biographical narration is introduced. In general, there is a clear distinction between preface and narration, but the narration itself is not always introduced by the usual biographical elements. Sometimes, especially in *Cl.* and *Tac.*, origins are not mentioned until late in the biography, presumably because the author had other preoccupations while writing the life. The place of origin is discussed in *A* and *Car.*, which is not meant as a serious source study but as an attempt to polish up the emperors' origins. This is in contradiction with the author's statement in *T* 33.8: *neque ego eloquentiam mihi videor pollicitus esse, sed rem...* Not only does he sometimes begin hesitantly, but he also seems to end his preface twice in *Pr.* 1.6 (*neque ego nunc facultatem eloquentiamque polliceor sed res gestas, quas perire non patior*) and *Pr.* 2.9 (*et ne diutius ea, quae ad meum consilium pertinent, loquar, magnum et praeclarum principem et qualem historia nostra non novit, arripiam*). While he promises *res*, not *eloquentia* (as in *T* 33.8), he continues with other themes about historiography in general, after which he again promises to get on with his subject, as something that he wishes describe in terms of praise (*Pr.* 2.9: *magnum ...non novit*). The *HA* is full of contradictions, and the author, clearly intending to show up some of his own distortions, leaves it to the reader to make the best of this.

³²¹ Both fictitious, according to Paschoud 2001, 71.

³²² The description continues with: *tametsi plerique Graecorum alteram tradunt*. It is, however, not clear at all which Firmus is meant exactly (see § 2.2.2).

³²³ The last collection of *Car.* does not follow the same procedure, as here a father and two sons come into play. After the introduction of father Carus, Numerian is indicated in *Car.* 11.1 as *Numerianus, Cari filius* ..., and Carinus in *Car.* 16.1 simply as *Carinus, homo omnium contaminatissimus...*

³²⁴ *In quo bello, quod a Claudio gestum est, equitum Dalmatarum ingens extitit virtus, quod originem ex ea provincia Claudius videbatur ostendere, quamvis alii Dardanum et ab Ilo Troianorum auctore atque ab ipso Dardano sanguinem dicerent trahere*. Note that this remark only occurs in the thirteenth chapter. It is important for the contents of the *HA*, as it is this emperor to whom Constantine traces his origins. The biography of Claudius is not a normal one, as it is in a panegyric style and does not follow the usual lines of biography. Yet, interestingly and as if to return to the standard biographical style, the author continues with: *ne ea, quae scienda sunt, praeterisse videamur*.

³²⁵ Bird 1971, 131; Den Hengst 2005, 437.

4.3 The Changing Structure

When we review the thirty books that constitute the *HA* in their received order, we are faced with some striking structural features. Still, there is some regularity in its evolving composition: the first half of the series of biographies, as we have seen in § 2.2, consists of descriptions of *Augusti* (in the Primary Lives *H*, *AP*, *MA*, *V*, *C*, *P*, *DJ*, *S*, *Cc.*) as well as their heirs, co-emperors and rivals (in the Secondary Lives *Ael.*, *AC*, *PN*, *CIA* and *G* respectively). *OM* and *Dd.*, which have two co-emperors (father and son) for their subject, have the outward appearance of Primary and Secondary Lives but are typical of the Secondary Lives in many respects.³²⁶ After two lives with an Augustus as their subject (*Hel.*, *AS*, which seem to continue the regular scheme), the programme changes: the books from *Max.* down to the end of the *HA* alternately contain separate books about single emperors (*Cl.*, *A.*, *Tac.*³²⁷ and *Pr.*) and books combining two (*Max.*, *MB*, *Val.*, *Gall.*) or even three (*Gd.*, *Car.*) related emperors, not to mention combinations of four (*Q*)³²⁸ and even thirty-two (*T*)³²⁹ pretenders in one book. In summary, the first half of the work (*H* – *AS*.) discusses the lives of the emperors and their heirs, co-emperors and even rivals separately, while in the second part (beginning with *Max.*) the author combines sets of rulers of the same type (the reigning emperors, or their pretenders) in single books.

This change takes place in the section of the Intermediary Lives. In view of the irregularities that occur within the evolving structure, every attempt to draw an exact line between the first half of separate lives and the second half of combined lives, will be open to dispute but, as there certainly is a difference between the parts, an attempt should at least be made:

³²⁶ A new beginning in the series is made at the start of *OM*, as was pointed out above, §2.2. Macrinus holds the middle between emperor and usurper.

³²⁷ *Tac.* combines the reign of Tacitus and his brother Florian, though the latter is treated as a usurper (*Tac.* 14.1: *Hic frater Taciti germanus fuit, qui post fratrem arripuit imperium, non senatus auctoritate sed suo motu, quasi hereditarium esset imperium*). The author himself seems to consider *Tac.* as a combined life, as witness his wording in *Q* 1.4: *...Aureliano, Tacito et Floriano, Probo etiam...*, while in the preface of *Tac.* he only speaks of one emperor. A denial of the fact that a combined life is involved in the case of *Cl.* (about the brothers Claudius and Quintillus) is found in *T* 31.6: *de quo speciale mihi volumen quamvis breve merito vitae illius videtur edendum addito fratre singulari viro...*. All the same, the series of four (placed between two books about tyrants) seems to constitute a relative unity, as the rulers are all eulogized by the author (see below sub 3.1).

³²⁸ On the number of four: Chastagnol 1994, 1105-6 (*quadriga*) and Bird 1971, 130-1.

³²⁹ Zecchini 1997, see §§ 3.4.2 and 3.10.2.

<i>EL</i>			<i>IL</i>			<i>LL</i>		
	Primary Lives	Secun- dary Lives					Sepa- rate lives	Com- bined lives
1	H	<i>Ael.</i>	15	OM	<i>Dd.</i>		<i>lacuna</i>	Val. (2) Gall. (2) <i>T</i> (32)
2			16					
3	AP		17	Hel.				
4	MA		18	AS				
5	V					22		
6		<i>AC</i>				23		
7	C					24		
8	P					25	Cl.	
9	DJ					26	A	
10	S					27	Tac.	
11		<i>PN</i>				28	Pr.	
12						29		<i>Q</i> (4)
13	Cc.	<i>CIA</i>	19		Max. (2)	30		Car.
14		<i>G</i>	20		Gd. (3)			
			21		MB (2)			

Figure 4.3: Changes in structure in the thirty books of the HA: from Primary and Secondary Lives to separate and combined lives in EL, IL and LL (the reigning emperors in bold face; in brackets the number of rulers treated in the book).

An important break occurs in the middle of the Intermediary Lives: the author will no longer treat the emperors in separate books (as he had announced in *Ael.* 7.5), but starts combining emperors in single books, as he explains in the preface to *Max.* This does not mean that the *HA* as a whole can be divided into two parts since there are other conspicuous breaks: after *OM* and *Dd.* the structure of emperors and their sons is abandoned, whereafter *Hel.* and *AS* appear as two inextricably connected counterparts (the former the lowest of creatures, the latter a model for his successors). Apart from that, the tripartite division remains a relevant factor in the structure of the *HA*. The different angles from which the division into parts can be approached only go to show the complexity of the books' internal relationships and of the structure of the whole.

The author shows his awareness of the major structural change that distinguishes the first and second halves, since he accompanies this with an authorial comment in his prefaces. The structure of the *HA* looks unique at first glance, but elements of it may not be without precedent in the history of Latin literature. Structure as well as authorial comments appear to be based on models that the author had at his disposal. In the following pages, an attempt will be made to find an explanation for the apparent deviations from the historiographical and biographical tradition by comparing the series of the *HA* and its predecessors, with the aid of what the author states about his own method.

4.3.1 Combined Emperors

A conspicuous break in the construction of the *HA*, the transition from single lives to combined ones in the middle of the series, starting with *Max.*, is introduced by an explanatory preface (*Max.* 1.1-3). Whereas from the start all the emperors, *Caesares* and pretenders were discussed separately, as the author stresses repeatedly, henceforward the emperors and pretenders are to be dealt with together (with the exception of *Cl.*, *A.*, *Tac.*, *Pr.*). The programme of *singulos quosque principes vel principum liberos per libros singulos legere* (*Max.* 1.1) will be abandoned. The justification for the change is a desire not to bore the addressee, in this case Constantine. He starts by discussing two emperors, father and son Maximinus, in one *volumen*. Both the wording and the changing structure have precedents in the biographical tradition. Compare the following sentences from *Max.* 1.1 and Nepos' *Epam.* 4.6:

Max. 1.1:

*Ne fastidiosum esset clementiae tuae,
Constantine maxime, singulos quosque
principes vel principum liberos per libros
singulos legere, adhibui moderationem,
qua in unum volumen duos Maximinos,
patrem filiumque, congererem;*

Nepos *Epam.* 4.6

*plurima quidem proferre possumus, sed
modus adhibendus est, quoniam uno hoc
volumine vitam excellentium virorum
complurium concludere constituimus, ...*

The formula *adhibui moderationem* in *Max.* parallels *modus adhibendus est* in *Epam.* 4.6, while *in unum volumen...congererem* corresponds with *in uno hoc volumine ...concludere*. The verb *concludere* was changed to *congererem* but returns elsewhere in *HA* in a comparable context, *Q* 1.3: *ea fuit diligentia*³³⁰ ... *ut etiam triginta tyrannos uno breviter libro concluderet*. Two elements from one sentence in Nepos were re-used, while a third element occurs elsewhere, conforming to a technique that the author uses more often.³³¹

Parallels with Nepos especially occur in programmatic statements, in which the author, as in the preceding example, reflects on his own method. The sequel to the words quoted above (*Max.* 1.1: *adhibui...congererem*), in which he makes an exception to his proposal to combine more rulers in one book, also contains variations on Nepos. Compare *Max.* 1.3 to Nepos *Reges* 1.1:

³³⁰ The word *diligentia* appears in the paragraph from Nepos about Cato's work, on which the Iunius Cordus paragraph *OM* 1.3 is based: *In omnibus rebus singulari fuit industria* (3.1) and *in quibus multa industria et diligentia comparet, nulla doctrina* (3.4).

³³¹ See § 9.2. This is normal procedure in the *HA* in cases when the author repeats himself, e.g. *AS* 16.1: *iuris peritis et doctissimis viris isdemque disertissimis*, two elements of which are repeated in *doctos et disertos*, while a third element recurs in *senes (...)* *locorum peritos* (16.3).

Max. 1.3

Quod quidem non in uno tantum libro sed etiam in plurimis deinceps reservabo, exceptis magnis imperatoribus, quorum res gestae plures atque clariores longiorem desiderant textum.

Nepos Reg. 1.1

Hi fere fuerunt Graecae gentis duces, qui memoria digni videantur, praeter reges: namque eos attingere noluimus, quod omnium res gestae separatim sunt relatae.

The same pattern is seen: *exceptis magnis imperatoribus* parallels *praeter reges* and *quorum res gestae* parallels *omnium res gestae*. *Praeter reges* is replaced by the ablativus absolutus *exceptis magnis imperatoribus*, which as a grammatical form is borrowed from the programmatic remark at the end of Nepos *Timoth.* 4.5: *venio nunc...exceptis duobus Carthaginiensibus*,³³² while *magnus imperator* appears in *Cato* 3.1 (the passage on which the Iunius Cordus of *OM* 1.3 is based, § 3.2). *In uno...libro* echoes *Epam.* 4.6 *in uno hoc volumine*.³³³ This is the same wording, except for the change from *volumine* to *libro*, which, as was demonstrated in *Max.* 1.1, occurred before: *in unum volumen*. In these last instances the contents of Nepos' words are restated with grammatical structures and words taken from other places in Nepos.³³⁴ The author states that he will continue to combine emperors' lives, according to the instruction given to the otherwise unknown Tattius Cyrillus, *Max.* 1.2: *servavi deinceps hunc ordinem, quem pietas tua etiam ab Tattio Cyrillo, clarissimi viro, qui Graeca in Latinum vertit, servari voluit*. Tattius Cyrillus is not known from other sources and undoubtedly invented by the author. He is a translator (*qui Graeca in Latinum vertit*) from senatorial stock (*clarissimi viro*) and uses a certain 'ordo' (*hunc ordinem*) in his works.

Meanwhile, the comparison with Nepos makes clear another important and meaningful aspect of the structure of the *HA*. The author's formula *exceptis magnis imperatoribus* (in *Max.* 1.3) appears to be based on Nepos' *Timoth.* (3.4-4.6): *Venio nunc ad fortissimum virum maximique consilii omnium barbarorum* (sc. Datames), *exceptis duobus Karthaginiensibus, Hamilcare et Hannibale*. From several statements by Nepos it appears that he greatly admires these two Carthaginians, even though they led Rome to the brink of collapse. The same goes for the author's appreciation of the emperors Claudius, Aurelian, Tacitus and Probus (see numbers 25 to 28 in figure 4.2 above), who are described in encomiastic terms. The idea of devoting separate books to these four emperors is a way to extol them even higher. In other words, the separate books are a tribute to their greatness. On the other hand, the combination of several lives in one book is also used to bring down the reputation of others, as in *T* 1.1, in which the number of tyrants – no less than thirty in a single book – that appeared during the reign of Valerian and Gallienus serves to slate their reputation.³³⁵ In *Pr.* 24.8 a variation on the same

³³² Leo 1901, 196 supposes that these words

³³³ *Volumen* and *liber* are clearly used as synonyms (see *ThLL* VII.2, 1272.82-73.17, where the examples of Nepos *Att.* 16.2 and *Gell.* 14.16.1 are given).

³³⁴ The theme of *memoria digna* in *Max.* 1.3 occurs in many places in the *HA*, though never in these terms (*memoratu digna* is found instead). The slightly different wording fits the patterns sketched here, but the theme is too common in historiographical literature to base any conclusions on.

³³⁵ The real figure is in fact thirty-two *T* 1.1: *ad eam temporum venimus seriem, in qua per annos, quibus Gallienus et Valerianus rem p. tenuerunt, triginta tyranni ... extiterunt, cum Gallienum non solum viri sed etiam mulieres contemptui haberent*. and *Gall.* 21.1: *Nunc transeamus ad viginti tyrannos, qui Gallieni*

principle is encountered with regard to the *Quadriga Tyrannorum*, the combination of four pretenders in one book: *non enim dignum fuit, ut quadrigae tyrannorum bono principi miscerentur*. Here, the combination of four pretenders in one book is traceable to the eulogy on Probus. The change of the *HA* from an analytical composition (PL and SL) to a synthetical one (combined lives) seems to serve a purpose in the last part: amidst all the combinations of emperors (*Gall.* and *Car.*) and tyrants (*T* and *Q*), four emperors, honoured by separate books, stand out by their greatness (*Cl.*, *A*, *Tac.* and *Pr.*). It may be surmised that the author uses Nepos' vocabulary to back up this choice.³³⁶ The laudatory intention of the separate lives may help to explain the irregular structure of the books of the *HA*.³³⁷

4.3.2 Combined Tyrants

The author wished not only to combine several emperors in one book, but also tyrants. Whereas in *EL* three tyrants were treated separately (*AC*, *ClA*, *PN*), after *Gall.* the author decided to combine thirty (or, in fact, thirty-two) tyrants. Now that the change from separate to combined lives has been shown to be inspired by Nepos, the next problem is the one posed by the exceptional book about the thirty tyrants. In much the same way that the Secondary Lives of *Caesares* and pretenders were linked to the Primary Lives of the emperors, the book of the assorted tyrants is related to the combined emperors (*Val.* and *Gall.*). The book is announced in four places in *Gall.*: 16.1,³³⁸ 19.6-7³³⁹ (twice) and 21.1-2,³⁴⁰ in which passages a figure of twenty is mentioned. In *T* itself, the number

temporibus contemptu mali principis extiterunt. de quibus breviter et pauca dicenda sunt; neque enim digni sunt eorum plerique, ut volumen talium hominum saltem nominibus occupetur, quamvis aliqui non parum in se virtutis habuisse videantur, multum etiam rei p. profuisse. It is well known that the author sometimes mentions the number of twenty (*viginti*), sometimes of thirty (*triginta*). *Viginti*: *Gall.* 16.1; 19.6; 21.1-2; *triginta*: *Gall.* 19.7; *T* 31.5; *Cl.* 1.1; *Q* 1.3; *T* 33.7. Zecchini (1997, 266n5) conjectured that the figure of thirty could have been inspired by the thirty tyrants who governed Athens. This topic occurs in Nepos' biography of Thrasybulus, *Thr.* 1.2: *huic contigit ut a triginta oppressam tyrannis e servitute in libertatem vindicaret; 1.5: nam cum triginta tyranni praepositi a Lacedaemoniis servitute oppressas tenerent Athenas...* and 3.1: *ne qui praeter triginta tyrannos...*

³³⁶ This does not necessarily work the other way round: Valerian, for example, is a good emperor, though he appears together with his son in a combined book. Still, the combination of the lives of *duo Valeriani* and the *duo Gallieni* are in fact rather forced. The author took Gallienus' son, Valerian junior, to supplement both his life of Valerian and his life of Gallienus in order to create two double lives. In both of these lives, the author commits a historical error: in *Val.*, it is not the son but the grandson of the emperor at hand who is described (*Val.* 8.1-5), while in *Gall.* (19.1-20.4) Gallienus' son Saloninus (apparently the same person who in *Val.* did not bear the name of Gallienus) is produced in order to come up with *duo Gallieni* (*Gall.*). Chastagnol's analysis (1994, 781), who states that 'Les confusions de l' H.A. sont difficiles à expliquer', shows that the situation is even more complicated, but for our present analysis it suffices to establish that the author needed two Gallieni and two Valeriani for his literary purposes. It is ironical that the lives of *Cl.* and *Tac.* are in fact better suited to serve as double lives than *Val.* and *Gall.*

³³⁷ Bughersdijk about panegyric in the *HA* (forthcoming).

³³⁸ *Gall.* 16.1: *orbem terrarum viginti prope per tyrannos vastari fecit...*

³³⁹ *Gall.* 19.6-7: *Fuisse autem et alios rebelliones sub eodem proprio dicemus loco, si quidem placuit viginti tyrannos uno volumine includere, (...). Nam et multa iam in Valeriani vita dicta sunt, multa in libro, qui de triginta tyrannis inscribendus est, iam loquemur, quae iterari ac saepius dici minus utile videbatur.*

³⁴⁰ *Gall.* 21.1-2: *Nunc transeamus ad viginti tyrannos, qui Gallieni temporibus contemptu mali principis extiterunt.*

encountered is thirty, in 1.1, 31.5³⁴¹ and 31.7, 31.11 and 33.7. In *Cl.* 1.1³⁴² and *Q* 1.3³⁴³ this figure is repeated. In all, a figure of twenty is mentioned thrice, that of thirty seven times. In two passages in the final chapters of *T* (31.11³⁴⁴ and 33.7³⁴⁵) the author speaks of an *integer numerus*.

The combination of two or more pretenders in a single book is an important novelty, expressed in words that call to mind the formula in *Max.* (see above): *Gall.* 19.6 (*uno volumine includere*), *T* 1.2 (*in unum eos libellum contuli*), *T* 31.5 (*Quos ego in unum volumen idcirco contuli, ne...*) and *Q* 1.3 (*...uno breviter libro concluderet*). It was suggested long ago that the figure of thirty was prompted by the well-known fact that Athens was dominated by a group of thirty Spartan tyrants at the end of the fifth century BC³⁴⁶. The question whether the author of the *HA* was familiar with this episode in Greek history³⁴⁷ can be answered positively if he did actually follow Nepos. In the latter's *Thrasylbulus* the thirty are mentioned.³⁴⁸ Though the number may be explained as an imitation, the existence of a book with so many lives remains exceptional. Again, the solution can be found in the work of Nepos. After twenty lives of Greek generals, there follows a book about kings who were also good generals: It has already been shown that the author of the *HA* followed certain words in the preface to *Max.*; in *T* he also followed Nepos' example of adding a book treating a great many rulers who differ from the others (in the *HA* tyrants amidst emperors, in *De Duc.* kings amidst generals). The remarks by which this procedure is announced are surprisingly similar in *De duc.* and the *HA*. In these statements there is also a claim to originality implied. For example, Nepos' *Epam.* 15.4.6: *Plurima quidem proferre possumus, sed modus adhibendus est*³⁴⁹, *quoniam uno hoc volumine vitam excellentium virorum complurium concludere constituimus, quorum res separatim multis milibus versuum complures scriptores ante nos explicarunt*. Emphasis is laid on the description of several excellent men in one volume (i.e. *De duc.*), while other writers or poets describe them *separatim*, in more volumes. This last theme recurs in Nepos *Reges* 21.1.1-2: *Hi fere sunt Graecae gentis duces qui memoria digni videantur, praeter reges; namque eos attingere nolimus, quod omnium res gestae separatim sunt relatae. Neque tamen ii admodum sunt multi*. The exact content of Nepos' *DVI* is no longer known. The quotation in 21.1.1-2 may indicate that he wrote a book *De regibus exterarum gentium* (on a par with *De ducibus exterarum gentium*) in which the *res gestae* of kings are described.³⁵⁰ In the present book, however, *duces* are the subject, which he supplements with an enumeration of foreign kings. The idea of the author of the *HA* to

³⁴¹ *T* 31.5: *Haec sunt quae de triginta tyrannis dicenda videbantur*.

³⁴² *Cl.* 1.1: *...scripseram eo libro, quem de triginta tyrannis edidi*.

³⁴³ *Q* 1.3: *ea fuit diligentia ... ut etiam triginta tyrannos uno breviter libro concluderet*.

³⁴⁴ *T* 31.11 *Habent integrum numerum ex arcanis historiae in meas litteras datum*.

³⁴⁵ *T* 33.7: *Habes integrum triginta numerum tyrannorum, qui cum malevolis quidem sed bono animo causabaris*.

³⁴⁶ Chastagnol 1994, XLII-III suggests Xenophon and Thucydides as examples, though the use of Nepos makes this less plausible.

³⁴⁷ Zecchini 1997, 266n5

³⁴⁸ *Thr.* 1.2: *huic contigit ut a triginta oppressam tyrannis e servitute in libertatem vindicaret*; 1.5: *nam cum triginta tyranni praepositi a Lacedaemoniis servitute oppressas tenerent Athenas...* and 3.1: *ne qui praeter triginta tyrannos...*

³⁴⁹ Also the words *modus adhibendus est* were followed in the *HA*, see § 4.3.1.

³⁵⁰ In both cases *separatim* means 'apart from each other or the rest, separately, individually' (*OLD*). Rolfe (1994, 249) translates in 15.4.6: 'individual deeds', in 21.1.1 *separatim* means 'apart from this book'.

combine rulers of a different kind in his *Triginta tyranni* (and *Quadrigae tyrannorum*) amidst the lives of emperors is comparable. In *T* he boasts of combining thirty tyrants in one book: *T* 1.2: *in unum eos libellum contuli*. Compare this clause with *T* 31.5 (*de triginta tyrannis...*) *quos ego in unum volumen idcirco contuli, ne, de singulis singula quaeque narrarem*. Nepos' *uno hoc volumine* recurs here as *in unum volumen*, while *separatim* recurs periphrastically as *de singulis singula quaeque*. Only Nepos' verb *concludere* is not imitated, but that word occurs in *Q* 1.3, where the author states of his fictitious colleague Trebellius Pollio, author of *T*: *ea fuit diligentia ... ut etiam triginta tyrannos uno breviter libro concluderet*. Nepos had the idea of combining lives of kings in his book on *duces*; the author of the *HA* follows this by combining thirty tyrants in his series of books about emperors and borrows the terminology from his predecessor with slight variations:

	<i>Epam.</i> 4.6	<i>HA</i>
I	<i>Plurima quidem proferre possimus, sed modus adhibendus est</i>	(<i>Max.</i> 1.1 <i>adhibui moderationem</i>)
II	<i>quoniam uno hoc volumine vitam excellentium virorum complurium concludere constituimus</i>	(<i>Max.</i> 1.1 <i>qua in unum volumen duos Maximinos... congererem;</i>)
		<i>Gall.</i> 19.6 <i>si quidem placuit viginti tyrannos uno volumine includere</i>
		<i>T</i> 1.2: <i>in unum eos libellum contuli</i>
		<i>T</i> 31.5 <i>quos ego in unum volumen idcirco contuli</i>
III	<i>quorum res separatim multis milibus versuum complures scriptores ante nos explicarunt.</i>	<i>Q</i> 1.3: <i>ut etiam triginta tyrannos uno breviter libro concluderet.</i>
		<i>T</i> 31.5 <i>de singulis singula quaeque</i>

Figure 4.4: Comparison of Nepos *Epam.* 4.6 and passages from the *HA* (*Max.* 1.1, *Gall.* 19.6, *T* 1.2 and 31.5, *Q* 1.3).

Nepos' phrase in *Ep.* 4.6 is followed by the author of the *HA* in at least 7 different places, the middle part of which is of special importance for the explication of the *divisio* in books. Mind the sequence *uno volumine* – *in unum libellum* – *in unum volumen* – *uno libro*, combined respectively with the verbs *includere* – *contuli* – *contuli* – *concluderet*, all based on Nepos' *uno hoc volumine ... concludere*. The *variatio* cannot be but deliberate.

4.3.3 Book Division

So far in our investigation of the sources followed by the author of the *HA*, only the works of Nepos have been taken into consideration. The more obvious models, however, as already pointed out in § 2.3, are certainly Suetonius, and Marius Maximus, who

continued the Suetonian series.³⁵¹ For that reason, the former has been postulated as the main source for the author of the *HA* for the Primary Lives and *Hel.*. Hence, a brief survey of the structure of Suetonius' works in comparison with the *HA* seems in order. It is no great problem to consider Suetonius' *De Vita Caesarum* (*DVI*) as a biographical series of Caesares, Augusti and pretenders, in which a development from separate to combined lives may also be discerned. The author of the *HA* praises Suetonius as an eminent *scriptor* of biographies, but berates him for not having written separate lives of tyrants (*Q* 1).³⁵² He refrains, however, from mentioning that Suetonius did actually combine more than one ruler in just one book: the first six books of *De vita Caesarum* (*Jul.*, *Aug.*, *Tib.*, *Cal.*, *Cl.*, *Nero*) are all devoted to single rulers of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, while the seventh (*Gall.*, *Otho*, *Vit.*) and eighth (*Ves.*, *Tit.*, *Dom.*) books include three emperors each. Suetonius even explicitly comments on the similarity of the three emperors in Book Seven and treats them as a group: *Rebellionem trium principum et caede incertum diu et quasi vagum imperium suscepit firmavitque tandem gens Flavia, obscura illa quidem ac sine ullis maiorum imaginibus, sed tamen rei publicae nequaquam paenitenda* (*Ves.* 1.1). By the words on which the eighth book opens *rebellionem trium principum*, the three emperors of Book Seven are combined and characterized as *rebelles*.³⁵³ Furthermore, the three emperors of the *gens Flavia* are also presented as a unit in the passage quoted. Two further elements characteristic of the *HA* have precedents in its famous model: the joint treatment of more than one emperor in one book and the characterization of the beginning of their reign as a *rebellio*. These observations are not intended to prove that the author of the *HA* knew Suetonius (on which point there can be no doubt) or imitated him, which seems likely, but to show that the irregular structure of the *HA* is not without precedent.

4.4 Time in the *HA* II

4.4.1 Time of the Series

In § 3.7, we studied the relations between TS and TN in three parts of the *HA*. There we took the entire *HA* as point of departure, without considering the time distribution in individual books. One example suffices to make the point clear: the *HA* treats the emperors from Hadrian to Diocletian, and thus we can say that the time span of the narrative of the *HA* is the period from 117 to 284 AD. The individual biography of Hadrian, however, treats his birth (and provides information from before that point in time: *H* 1.1: *Origo imperatoris Hadriani vetustior...*, and 2.1: *Natus est Romae...*), his reign and death, so the span of time of *H* is the period of 76-138. It would be wrong to say that the *HA* treats the period of 76 to 284 AD, as the organising principle of the series

³⁵¹ Syme (1968, 90 and note 1), who invoked Ausonius' *XII Caesares* as the clue for the scope of Maximus's works.

³⁵² *Q* 1.1: ...Suetonius Tranquillus, emendatissimus et candidissimus scriptor, Antonium, Vindicem tacuit, contentus eo quod eos cursim perstrinxerat, ... Other passages in which Suetonius is mentioned or praised are: *H* 11.3, *C* 10.2, *MB* 4.5, *Pr.* 2.7.

³⁵³ The word *rebellio* (*AP* 5.5; *MA* 29.4; *AC* 7.5, 9.11; *PN* 6.2; *Gall.* 13.10, 19.6; *T* 5.1-2, 26.7; *A* 33.5, *Pr.* 9.1) as well as *rebellis* (*H* 5.2; *AC* 8.6; *ClA* 5.4; *T* 26.1; *Cl.* 11.8, *A* 38.3, *Pr.* 18.4) occurs frequently in the *HA*.

is determined by the reigns of the emperors.³⁵⁴ Herodian's history from the death of Marcus death to the accession of Gordian III can serve as material for comparison. This historian takes the reigning emperors as his point of departure for the line of his narrative, thereby providing information about the origins of all the main actors in his book.³⁵⁵ The difference with biography is that the inception of the reign of an emperor is the point of departure, while in TS there is a constant return to its subject's origins at each beginning of a biography.

4.4.2 Time of the Story in the Primary Lives

One problem deserves special attention, which concerns the way in which the series is constructed. The biographies in the *HA* describe full lives of emperors, so that each new life results in a shift back in time. For instance, after the death of Antoninus Pius in *AP*, the narrative goes back to the birth of Marcus Aurelius.³⁵⁶ While the successive reigns of the emperors provide a regular structure for the series, the recounting of their lives results in a constant overlap of historical time. This overlap is also part of the author's literary game: he often links facts from the early years and career of his subject emperors to the reigns of earlier emperors, as for instance Gordian's declamation in the Athenaeum, which Pertinax is claimed to have attended (*Gd.* 3.4 ~ *P* 11.3). Another example is the duplication of narration of certain events, e.g. Aurelian's triumph in *T* 30.24-6 and, more elaborately, *A* 33-34.³⁵⁷ This kind of repetition is typical of the series. The result of this structure is a persistent overlap of historical time: periods of historical time are treated over and again. TS can be visualized in a diagram, to illustrate our observations. As an example, we select a relatively coherent group of books from the series, that of *PL*, from which an interesting picture evolves. A distinction is made between the lives up to the accession (dotted lines) and the reign of the emperor (continuous lines):³⁵⁸

³⁵⁴ By the notion of 'series' I mean: a collection of linked chapters or books that are held together by a similar structure or content.

³⁵⁵ Hidber (2007, 197-211) treats the temporal aspects in Herodian's works, see note 333.

³⁵⁶ On the whole, most of the narrative time in the *vitae* is concerned with ruling years, the early years of childhood getting much less attention. As the majority of material comes from historiographical sources, the biographer is largely dependent on these for what there is to found about this period in the life of any of his subjects. Not surprisingly, this sometimes fails to work. For instance, Macrinus's biography consists of almost nothing but his reigning period, not counting a few flashbacks to an earlier career (*OM* 4, Aurelius Victor's speech), and the events that led to his reign, as well as his death. In this biography, the time of the narration roughly coincides with his reigning time.

³⁵⁷ As noted by Pausch 2009, 13-4. This is what Genette (1980, 121-2) calls the 'pseudo-iterative': the narrative tells several times something that happened only once (in this case, there is an amplification in *A* 33-4 of the story told in *T* 30.24-6).

³⁵⁸ The years of birth, accession and death of Hadrian are: 76, 117, 138 AD; Antoninus Pius: 86, 138, 161; Marcus Aurelius: 121, 161, 180; Lucius Verus: 130, 160, 169; Commodus: 161, 180, 192; Pertinax: 126, 193, 193; Didius Iulianus: 137, 193, 193; Septimius Severus: 145, 193, 211; Caracalla: 188, 211, 217 (all data according to Kienast 1996).

Figure 4.5: *TS in PL, as found in the earlier careers and reigns.*

In historical time, and consequently TS, the earlier lives of the emperors consist of many more years than their reigns. This aspect will prove to be important for our temporal analysis when TN is taken into account as well.

4.4.3 Time of the Narrative in the Primary Lives

It is an inherent characteristic of imperial biography, as written by Suetonius and the *HA* - and, we may safely add, Marius Maximus - that the lives of the emperors are taken as point of departure, which leads to an interesting use of time in the series. Whenever the author ends the description of an emperor's reign, he is forced to go back in time to describe the origin and youth of the next emperor. Meanwhile, TN is not in accordance with TS. Just as it would be against one's expectation if someone wishing to describe the lives of the ten last American presidents in one series was to pay as much attention to George W. Bush's early career as to his presidential years, the author of the *HA* treats the reigns of the emperors in greater detail than their early careers, even if the totality of their *vitae* remain the ostensible subject of his narration. Though TS of the earlier careers of the emperors is generally much longer than the time of their reign, much more space in the narrative is dedicated to the latter, as can be seen in the bracketed relative numbers that denote NS devoted to the two parts of each individual life:

Life	<i>capita</i>	TN (words)	<i>capita</i>	TN (words)	total TN (words)
<i>H</i>	1-4	773 (15 %)	5-27	4 351 (85 %)	5 124
<i>AP</i>	1-5.2	737 (33 %)	5.3-13	1 508 (67 %)	2 245
<i>MA</i>	1-6	1 138 (21 %)	7-29	4 362 (79 %)	5 500
<i>V</i>	1-2	385 (19 %)	3-11	1 672 (81 %)	2 057
<i>C</i>	1-2	392 (11 %)	3-20	3 074 (89 %)	3 466
<i>P</i>	1-3	502 (19 %)	4-15	2 092 (81 %)	2 596
<i>DI</i>	1-2	356 (22 %)	3-9	1 238 (78 %)	1 594
<i>S</i>	1-4	656 (16 %)	5-24	3 559 (84 %)	4 215
<i>Cc.</i>	1	16 (8 %)	2-11	1 873 (92 %)	2 033
Total:		5 099 (18 %)		23 729 (82 %)	28 828

Figure 4.6: TN in PL, divided into early lives and reigns in absolute and relative numbers.

This means that the narrative is primarily meant to describe the reigns of the emperors and their *mores*, their earlier careers having second place only. Meanwhile, the descriptions of the earlier careers of emperors are essentially what separates biography from historiography. This is taxing for the biographer, who has to come up with information about origins and earlier career. We will return to this subject at the end of the chapter.

4.4.4 Time of the Narrative and Time of the Story in the Primary Lives

When we compare TS and TN, it turns out that there are differences between the recounting of the earlier careers and the reigns of the emperors:

Life	I Earlier Career		Wds/year	II Reign		Wds/year
	TS1	TN1	TN1/TS1	TS2	TN2	TN2/TS2
Hadrian	41	773	19	21	4 351	207
Antoninus P.	52	737	14	23	1 508	65
M. Aurelius	40	1 138	28	19	4 362	229
Lucius Verus	31	385	12	6	1 672	279
Commodus	19	392	21	16	3 074	192
Pertinax	66	502	8	0.25	2 092	8 368
D. Iulianus	56	356	6	0.16	1 238	7 725
S. Severus	48	656	13	18	3 559	198
Caracalla	23	160	7	6	1 873	312
Total	376	5 099	(av.) 14	109	23 729	(av.) 218

Figure 4.7: Distribution of TS (in years) in relation to TN (in years) in PL, distinguishing between early career (I) and reign (II) in absolute Numbers.

It appears that disproportionally little attention is paid in the narrative to the earlier careers of the emperors when compared to the duration in historical time: 376 years of historical time (78 per cent of the total of TS) is recounted in 5099 words (18 percent of

the total of TN), while 109 years of historical time (22 per cent of TS) is recounted in 23729 words (82 per cent of TN). In other words, TN is inversely proportional to TS when the two periods of TS (earlier careers and reigns) are compared ($TS1 : TS2 = 78 : 22$ and $TN1 : TN2 = 18 : 82$), as appears from the following summary:

	TS	TN	TN / TS
Earlier careers	376 years (78 %)	5 099 words (18 %)	14 wds / year
Reigns	109 years (22 %)	23 729 words (82 %)	218 wds / year
Total	485 years (100%)	28 828 words (100%)	58 wds / year

Figure 4.8: Distribution of TS (in years) in relation to the TN (in years) in the Primary Lives, distinguishing between early careers and reigns in absolute and relative numbers.

Looking at the individual lives, we can say that some biographies are more balanced than others. Let us take as an example Marcus Aurelius' biography: 229 words a year are devoted to his reign against 28 words a year for his earlier career, a proportion of $229 : 28$, which we might call the 'biographical factor'. This factor, which can be considered a fraction ($229 / 28 = 8.2$), denotes the proportion between the attention paid to the emperor's reign ($TN2 / TS 2$) and his earlier career ($TN 1 / TS 1$) and indicates the balance between the parts. For the Primary Lives, the computation of the fractions provides the following results:

Life	TN/TS1	TN/TS2	Factor
<i>H</i>	19	207	10.9
<i>AP</i>	14	65	4.6
<i>MA</i>	28	229	8.2
<i>LV</i>	12	279	23.3
<i>C</i>	21	192	9.1
<i>P</i>	8	8 368	1046.0
<i>DI</i>	6	7 725	1287.5
<i>S</i>	13	198	15.2
<i>Cc.</i>	7	312	44.6
Average	14	218	15.6

Figure 4.9: Biographical factors (or the proportion between the attention paid to early career and reign) in the Primary Lives

This overview shows its worth when the factors of the individual biographies are compared to one another. Some biographies are more balanced when it comes to the description of the two aspects distinguished here than others (the factors between brackets are rounded off): *AP* (5) – *MA* (8) – *C* (9) – *H* (10) – *S* (15) – *LV* (23) – *Cc.* (45) – *P* (1046) – *DI* (1288), while the average factor is 16.

The observation that, on average, 16 times as much attention is paid to reigns than to earlier careers shows that the narrative in PL mainly follows lines of succeeding emperors. It must be noted, of course, that sometimes the emperor's character is also subject of the narration, but also this theme in biography is connected with the reign of the subject. The main line becomes clear when the results of the counting of TN

compared with TS (see figure 4.5 and 4.6) is shown schematically, just as we did with TN in the books of *De Bello Gallico* (§ 1.3.4):

Figure 4.10: TN in relation with TS in the Primary Lives (TN in words on the X-axis, TS in years on the Y-axis).

What this shows is that, when analysing the relation of TS and TN in the *HA*, a distinction must always be made between earlier lives and reigns when it comes to NS. We can safely assume that this must also hold good for the main source of these lives. The organising principle of the series is the succession of reigns. The distinctive art of biography is to describe the lives of the emperors before their accession, though this item remains subordinate to the reigns. There is an acceleration at each beginning of a new book, and a slowing-down at the time of the accession.³⁵⁹

³⁵⁹ Hidber (2007, 209-10) draws interesting conclusions with regard to Herodian's narration about the emperors (note, however, that Herodian does not distinguish between early lives and reigns in his narrative: he presents the early careers as analepseis in the narration): 'Rhythm undergoes dramatic changes. The slowest pace is always found in the passages that recount changes - the death of an emperor and the accession to the throne of his successor.', 210: 'Scenes are normally linked by short summaries which often cover several years of *fabula*-time [= TS, DB]. Administrative and juridical actions, everything related to 'normal' home affairs, and, in short, all the quiet years of easy reign are dealt with in such 'summaries'.

In his treatment of nature and purpose of historiography (defined by type of narrative, focalisation, chronological limits and arrangement, and subject matter) Marincola (1999, 304-5) distinguishes an annalistic pattern (κατ' ἔτος, *suum quaeque in annum referre*), a structuring according to reigns (κατ' ἄρχοντας καὶ βασιλέας) and an arrangement according to area or category (κατὰ γένος).³⁶⁰ Biography (not treated as a separate category by Marincola) of the type of the *HA*, results from the second category mentioned: the arrangement according to years, which in Roman historiography is a further development of the first category of annalistic structure. In imperial times, the consular years as an indication of historical time became subordinate to those marking the reigns of emperors. Thus, whereas Tacitus still uses consular years to indicate at what time certain events happened (just as Livy and Sallust did before him), these indications are virtually absent from Suetonius and the *HA* as a structuring indication of the time of events described.³⁶¹ This makes that both series of *vitae*, Suetonius and the *HA*, constitute a class of their own in the corpus of biographical literature in antiquity. In both works, the emperors' reigns are the guiding line of the series, while the lives of rulers (consisting of elements such as origins, birth, education, youth, character), which determine the division of the material over the books, are a further elaboration of the central theme, which is the successive reigns.³⁶² Imperial biographies mainly follow the structure κατὰ χρόνους καὶ δυναστείας, which makes the type a blend of historiography and biography in its proper sense.

Finally, we should pose the question whether the structure of the Primary Lives is also applicable to other biographies. Some remarks are in order. Of course we are speaking about imperial biography in the manner of Suetonius, whose work *De Vita Caesarum* lends itself for an analysis comparable to the one above. We may suppose that the structure as encountered in the Primary Lives strongly reflects the one in the sources of these lives, *Ignotus* or Marius Maximus. With regard to the other lives in the *HA*, not based on biographical sources, the observed structure seems to be present even more clearly, for the point of departure from *OM* onwards is mostly the death of the preceding emperor, rendered in the *ablativus absolutus* (see above, § 4.2.2). In these books, the similarities with historiographical sources seems to be stronger than in the case of the Primary Lives. Imperial biographies, linked in series, have not been transmitted in any great number, so that the evidence as provided by the Primary Lives is precious. It can

Thus, hardly anything is said about the administrative actions taken by Macrinus during the year of his reign, but both his accession and his sad ending are depicted in scenes.'

³⁶⁰ I have not been able to trace the origin of the Greek terms, neither in Marincola's book nor in Greek historiographical texts.

³⁶¹ Suetonius sometimes mentions consuls, but seldomly as an indicator of time; in the *HA*, an exception has to be made for the consular years which are mentioned in the passages taken from Dexippus (see Paschoud 1990 and § 2.4.2 *ad* Dexippus).

³⁶² The other side of the medal is that historiography also shows biographical tendencies. Cassius Dio, for one, shows a remarkable blend of annalistic and biographical structure when he reaches the early principate, as Pelling (1997, 117 *sqq.*) points out. Characters dominate the descriptions of historical time, also within the descriptions of the reigns of the successive emperors, which procedure Pelling terms 'biostructure' (1997, 118). See also Hidber 2006, 146 ('Der Einfluss des Biographischen. Die Gliederung κατὰ δυναστείας').

serve as a basis for further research of temporal analysis in biography, which, in its turn, provides material for comparison with historiographical texts.

Chapter 5 The *Nomen Antoninorum* Theme

5.1 Introduction: Imperial Names

Imperial names belong to the author's favourite themes.³⁶³ The first preface in the *HA*, that of *Ael.*, contains a programmatic digression in which the author announces his intention to describe rulers who came close to attaining the principate, but never held this position. Some of these are indicated as *Caesares*, the first of whom was Hadrian's intended successor Aelius. *Quorum praecipue de Aelio Vero dicendum est, qui primus tantum nomen Caesaris accepit* (*Ael.* 1.2, see § 3.2) is the statement of the author. Meanwhile, he distorts the names given to these rulers, since Aelius (who was named Caesar as an heir, and whose juvenile name was Lucius Ceionius Commodus) never bore the name of Verus, though in the biography the name is attributed to him (see quotation above).³⁶⁴ The actual beginning of the biography runs thus (*Ael.* 2.1): *Ceionius Commodus (...) nihil habet in sua vita memorabile nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus*. The *nomen Caesaris* theme is presented as the main reason for a biography about Aelius in the series. In *Ael.* 2.3, the author further builds up his program by adding some thoughts about the name of Caesar: *Et quoniam de Caesarum nomine in huius praecipue vita est aliquid disputandum, qui hoc solum nomen indeptus est...*, after which a digression follows on the etymology of the name of Caesar.³⁶⁵

The author's treatment of the *nomen Caesareum* may be considered a preliminary to the theme of the *nomen Antoninorum*. He may even have derived the idea of continuing the *nomen Antoninorum* as a theme from his disquisitions on the *nomen Caesaris*, for which he took the information from other sources. A development in the author's considerations about the *nomen Caesareum* (or *Caesareanum nomen*, as *ClA* 13.4 and 9 have it) can be observed in the earlier lives, though no research has been done on the subject so far. To give just two examples: in *Ael.* 2.5 the name of Caesar is extolled: *certe quaecumque illa, felix necessitas fuit, unde tam clarum et duraturum cum aeternitate mundi nomen effloruit*, which is important, as the theme will be replaced by another one, that of the *nomen Antoninorum*, in the course of the earlier and the intermediary lives, to which far more space will be devoted than to the present theme. The theme is continued until the vita of Clodius Albinus, who not only refuses the *nomen Caesareum* (*ClA* 13.3-10) conferred upon him by the emperor Commodus, but also

³⁶³ The recurrence of the theme among different *scriptores* was one of Dessau's arguments (1889, 384) that the *HA* had not been written by the authors named in the manuscripts, nor in the alleged era. Hohl 1950 made an important contribution in a fine piece of philological erudition, by showing that not all the imperial names should be attributed to the same source or stage of composition: for example, the jokes on the names of Lucanicus and Germanicus are from an earlier date or source than those about Sarmaticus, Parthicus, Gothicus, etc., whom the author of *HA* invented.

³⁶⁴ Chastagnol 1994, 62 for the explanation of the distortion; Kienast 1996, 131 for factual information.

³⁶⁵ The *nomen Caesaris* theme was popular also in other works in late antiquity, like Servius, Festus and Nonius, see A. Alföldy *BHAC* 1966-1967, 9-18. No explanation by Suetonius of the precise use of the name of Caesar is left; possibly, the lost opening chapters of his *Div. Iul.* provided several later authors with the information – though this is only a matter of conjecture.

wishes that nobody should ever accept the name from that emperor (13. 9: *Di faxint, ut ne alii quidem velint*). His argument is that the senate rules the empire, and he emphasises that the *nomen Caesareum* (which originated with the senator who later became a dictator, *CIA* 13.7) was granted him by Commodus, not the senate.

The name of Caesar, emphatically introduced in *Ael.*, seems to have fallen from grace in the author's narration about Clodius Albinus. Caesar's name makes way for another, purportedly more important name: that of Antoninus, a prestigious name since the days of the wise and beloved Antoninus Pius. This is not the right place to discuss all the appearances of the former theme, that of Caesar's name, but one more quotation may reveal what the author based his ideas on. Here is what Aurelius Victor's *Breviarium* (13.12) says concerning Trajan's adoption of Hadrian: *Abhinc divisa nomina Caesarum atque Augusti, inductumque in rem publicam, uti duo seu plures, summae potentiae dissimiles, cognomento ac potestate dispari sunt*. The author may have borrowed the theme and adapted it for his own purposes (surprisingly, with a better historical account as the outcome)³⁶⁶ as he does with other quotations from either Aurelius Victor or Eutropius on the subject of imperial names.

Originally Caesar was a personal name that became a *cognomen* of the *gens Iulia* when Octavianus Augustus adorned his adoptive sons Caius and Lucius with it, later to become a title when Claudius and Nero were called thus. With Galba, who granted his adoptive son Piso the name of Caesar, the name was first used to designate the successor to the throne³⁶⁷ - a usage which was adopted by Hadrian when he nominated Aelius as his intended successor. The origin of the name of Caesar should be distinguished from that of Augustus, which always was a title granted by the senate to a new emperor,³⁶⁸ a procedure which was in principle continued into the second century AD. By that time, the Antonine name had come to play an important part. Originally a personal name, it came to bear all the hallmarks of an imperial title on March 7th 161, when it was transferred to Marcus Aurelius on the occasion of his accession to the throne. In the author's conception, Antoninus was to be the most important imperial name and imperial title in the course of the second century and the first quarter of the third.

Aelius' successor as Hadrian's heir was Antoninus Pius, or rather T. Aurelius Fulvus Boionius Arrius Antoninus, who became T. Aelius Caesar Antoninus on the day of his adoption on 25th February 138 AD and was invested with the names of Augustus and Pius on the 10th of July, the day of his accession to the throne.³⁶⁹ After he had become emperor a new pair of imperial names gained authority, the personal name *Antoninus* and the cognomen *Pius* as a title³⁷⁰: *post hunc (sc. Aelium) denique Hadrianus*

³⁶⁶ Dufraigne 106n27 remarks that *HA* is more accurate in pinpointing the moment of this measure, namely at the time of Hadrian's adoption of Aelius, *Ael.* 1.1-2.

³⁶⁷ Kienast 1996, 24.

³⁶⁸ Kienast 1996, 25.

³⁶⁹ For convenience sake, I will refer to the emperors by their traditional names, unless their other names are required for the argument. Thus, Marcus Aurelius instead of M. Annius Verus or Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Verus instead of L. Aelius Aurelius Commodus, etc.. For name changes in different stages of the rulers' lives, Kienast 1996 is essential reading.

³⁷⁰ For a digression on this name, see *AP* 2.3-7 (*Pius cognominatus est a senatu, vel quod... {vel quod repeated 5 times}*), by which the author's interest in imperial titles is attested another time. Cf. also the digressions on the *Caesareum nomen* in *Ael.* 2.3, though here the etymology of the name is subject of the narration.

diu anceps quid faceret, Antoninum adoptavit Pium cognomine appellatum (Ael. 6.9)³⁷¹. Stress is laid on the *cognomen* by the participle construction *Pium cognomine appellatum*. In *H* 24.1 a similar formula *qui postea Pius appellatus est*, is found, after which in *H* 24.3-5 a digression on the name of Pius emphasises the importance of the theme, to be repeated in *AP* 2.3-7. Though no new dynasty had been initiated, Pius' other name of Antoninus became almost a title, in particular when the founder of the next dynasty, the emperor Septimius Severus, in 196 chose to adopt Marcus Aurelius Antoninus as his father (and, incidentally, Commodus as his brother)³⁷² and granted the Antonine name to his son Bassianus.³⁷³ This fact appealed to the author, since he took it as a theme for contemplations on the continuity of the Roman emperorship. Apart from this, he used the theme to build up his own series, thereby exaggerating the importance of the Antonine name in the imperial succession by making it weigh as heavily as those of Caesar and Augustus, or even heavier.

The attention that the author paid to the name of Antoninus has resulted in one of the most elaborate themes in the *HA*. Aspects of the theme of the *nomen Antoninorum* have been treated by several scholars,³⁷⁴ beginning with Tropea (1899), whose chief contribution was the collection of individual passages. Syme (1971, 78-88) paved the way with an inventory of relevant passages with an analysis of the peculiarities of each of them. The main concern in this chapter will be the way in which the *NA* theme is integrated in the structure of the *HA*. Related questions, such as the sources, models and origin of the theme, and the internal developments in the use of the theme, will be treated subsequently. Finally, some conclusions about the genesis of the books in which the theme occurs will be drawn. The *NA* theme is prepared for in the biography where the name of Antoninus begins to play a role: the secondary *vita* of *Ael.*, which uses the name even before the noble Antoninus Pius had gained the throne. The theme is continued in the primary *vitae* of *AP*, *MA*, *S* and *Cc*. It reaches a peak, at least in volume, in the biographies of *G*, *OM* and *Dd*. The books *Hel.* and *AS*, about the second era of the Severan dynasty, continue the theme, until it comes to an end in *Gd*. The importance of the *NA* theme can hardly be underestimated, as it covers nineteen out of thirty books.

5.2 The NA Theme in the Earlier Lives

5.2.1 The NA Theme in *Ael.*, *AP*, *MA* and *V*

The author's preoccupation with the name of Antoninus is first attested in a remarkable passage in *Ael.* 5.12-3: *Eius est filius Antoninus Verus, qui adoptatus est a Marco, - vel certe cum Marco – et cum eodem aequale gessit imperium. Nam ipsi sunt qui primi duo Augusti appellati sunt, et quorum fastis consularibus sic nomina praescribuntur, ut dicantur non duo Antonini, sed duo Augusti*. It appears that he takes for granted that both

³⁷¹ Antoninus only received the name of Pius when he became emperor in AD 138 (Kienast 1996, 134), see *AP* 5.2: *Pii appellationem recepit* (sc. a senatu).

³⁷² Cassius Dio 76.7.4; Herodian only makes general mention of the family ties (3.10.5).

³⁷³ Kienast 1996, 162: in the year 195 or 196, Septimius conferred the name of Caesar on his son M. Aurelius Antoninus. Birley (1988, 117) seems to opt for the earlier date.

³⁷⁴ Reusch 1931, 53; Barnes 1978, 48; Den Hengst 1981, 28-35; Scholtemeijer 1976 and 1981.

adoptive sons of the first Antoninus, viz. Antoninus Pius, were named Antoninus.³⁷⁵ In that case, the author suggests, it would have been logical if the *fasti consulares* had simply called them the sons of Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, but the novelty of joint emperorship caused them both to be named *Augustus*.³⁷⁶ A typical aspect of the author's style is his extension of this remark, namely that some *fasti consulares* start with the two *Augusti* (*tantumque huius rei et novitas et dignitas valuit, ut fasti consulares nonnulli ab his sumerent ordinem consulum*, *Ael.*5.14).

The remark is an elaboration and partial imitation of *MA* 7.6: *Atque ex eo pariter coeperunt rem publicam regere. Tuncque primum Romanum imperium duos Augustos habere coepit, cum imperium sibi relictum cum alio participasset*, which in its turn is derived from Eutropius 8.9.2³⁷⁷ in an amplified form. The most innovative element in this last quote is the addition *non duo Antonini*, as there were no two Antonini: Lucius Verus was never officially called by that name, though it is so mentioned in *AP* 4.5.³⁷⁸ In the author's view, the remark in both *MA* 7.5 and *Ael.* 5.12-3 is historically important because of *huius rei et novitas et dignitas* (*Ael.*5.14), but in the case of *Ael.* of particular interest for the construction of the *HA*, as the author intended to describe *eos, qui principum locum in hac statione, quam temperas* (sc. Diocletian), *retentarunt* (*Ael.*1.1). That the Secondary Lives were all composed after the compilation of the Primary Lives, has been hypothesized before (Syme 1971, 54-75), and that the author used information from the Primary Lives for the composition of the Secondary, may be deduced from a host of examples.³⁷⁹

With the echo from *MA* in *Ael.*, a typical trait of the Secondary Lives as opposed to the Primary Lives becomes clear: a certain theme, that of the first *duo Augusti*, recurs in a slightly changed and often amplified form. When we investigate the changes in greater detail, it becomes clear that the author uses several methods to reformulate his messages. He uses techniques like *antithesis* (*cum alio* in *MA* 7.6 becomes *cum eodem* in *Ael.* 5.12-3), *variatio* (a change of casus: *duos Augustos* becomes *duo Augusti* (twice), *synonymia*

³⁷⁵ Just like Eutropius (8.10.1), Orosius associates the name Antoninus with Verus (7.15.2-3). Note that Eutropius' contemporary Festus also has in 14.4: *sed post sub Antoninis duobus, Marco et Vero, ... quater amissa, quater recepta Mesopotamia est* and 21.1: *Antonini duo, Marcus et Verus, hoc est socer et gener, pariter Augusti, imperium orbis aequata primum potestate tenuerunt*. This indicates a common source for Eutropius, *HA*, Festus and Orosius (probably the *KG*), though the question why Aurelius Victor disregarded the name is difficult to answer. Neither Eadie (1967, 140, for Festus) nor Arnaud-Lindet (1991, 47 and 138 for Orosius; 1994, 46 for Festus) comments on Verus' Antonine name; they probably accept the designation *Antonini* as 'members of the Antonine dynasty'. Similarly, Callu (1992, 139n9) in his commentary on *Ael.* and Hellegouarc'h (1999, 213) on Eutropius, are silent on this matter. Walentowski 1998, 177 *ad AP* 4.5 'Der Irrtum der *HA* mag darauf zurückzuführen sein, das Marc Aurel seit 161 den Namen Antoninus führte' does not provide a solution to the problem. Callu (1992, 144n41) does observe that *Ael.* 5.12-3 is the first manifestation of the *nomen Antoninorum* theme.

³⁷⁶ After the death of Antoninus Pius, his two adoptive sons Marcus and Lucius became consuls, Kienast 1996, 139 and 144.

³⁷⁷ Eutropius 8.9.2, see below.

³⁷⁸ Kienast 1996, 143; Callu 1991, 100 *sqq.* On *AP* 4: Pflaum 1966, 144 ('mauvaise source', 'également erroné') and Syme 1971, 40 ('erroneous') and 87 ('patent additions') – though in this latter case it is not explained what exactly an 'addition' is, or what it is based on.

³⁷⁹ For example, see Mommsen (1890, 246-9) about the relation of *MA* – *AC* and *S* – *PN* (cf. Lécivain 1904, 245-63 for all the secondary lives and Klebs 1888, 321 *sqq.* for *AC*). See for the discussion about the relation between primary and secondary lives § 2.2.1 of this study; and § 5.4.1 (below) for the verbal parallels in *Cc.* – *G.*

(*rem publicam* becomes *imperium*, while *pariter coeperunt rem publicam regere* becomes *aequale gessit imperium*), *repetitio* (the word *primi* ('as the first') is an echo of *primum* ('for the first time')). The inventory is important. It helps us to understand how the author proceeded when rewriting texts, either working within the series of the *HA* or drawing from a source outside the work. These techniques may be normal practice for any historiographer following or seeking to condense a source (studies on this aspect do, to my knowledge, not exist), but in case of a cumulation of correspondences and lexical similarities the particular use or distortion of a source can still be demonstrated, while the author's particular working procedure may be distilled through an analysis of his method of rewriting texts. In the case quoted above, the author rewrites a text from *MA* (or its source). To give another instance of the same procedure, compare Eutropius 8.9.2 as a postulated source³⁸⁰ with the remaking in *MA* 7.6, which proves the direct borrowing from Eutropius:

Eutropius 8.9.2

*Tuncque primum Romana res publica
duobus aequo iure imperium
administrantibus paruit, cum usque ad
eum singulos semper habuisset Augustos.*

MA 7.6

*Atque ex eo pariter coeperunt rem
publicam regere. Tuncque primum
Romanum imperium duos Augustos
habere coepit, cum imperium sibi
relictum cum alio participasset.*

The author reveals his source implicitly by the repetition of *tuncque primum* (*tuncque primum Romana res publica duobus ...administrantibus paruit* becomes *tuncque primum Romanum imperium duos Augustos habere coepit*). Note how he changes the original thought of Eutropius to something more to his own liking:

<i>Romana res publica</i>	→	<i>rem publicam</i>	change of casus
<i>imperium</i>	→	<i>Romanum imperium</i>	shift of adjective, <i>repetitio</i>
<i>aequo iure</i>	→	<i>pariter</i> ³⁸¹	<i>synonymia</i>
<i>usque ad eum</i>	→	<i>ex eo</i>	temporal inversion
<i>duobus...administrantibus;</i>			
<i>singulos...Augustos</i>	→	<i>duos Augustos</i>	<i>variatio</i> , shift of adjective
<i>semper habuisset</i>	→	<i>habere coepit</i>	temporal inversion

³⁸⁰ The question whether Eutropius (who published his *Breviarium* in 369-70) could have served as a source of *HA* has been discussed ever since Dessau (1889, 161 *sqq.*) used it as an argument to date *HA* (basing himself especially on a comparison of *MA* 16.3-18.1 and Eutropius 8.9-14). The evidence brought forward by Hasebroek (1916, 73) was not accepted by Hohl (1950, 17). For a discussion see Fündling 2006, 136-7 (Eutropius) and Chastagnol 1994, LXVIII and 141n7. Schmid 1964, 124-5 and Chastagnol 1967, 85-97 affirmed the direct use of Eutropius by the author of *HA*, which is now widely accepted (Ratti 1996, 26-7).

³⁸¹ Some caution is required here, because *pariter* 'at the same time, together' is not necessarily the same as *aequo iure* 'with equal authority', see Fündling 2006, 1018 (K 501) and Hartke 1951, 157-8. Perhaps Schwendemann, meant the same with 'unkorrekte Ausdrucksweise' (1923, 29). Festus (21.1: Eadie 1967, 63 and Arnaud-Lindet 1991, 29) distinguishes the two clearly: *Marcus et Verus, (...) pariter Augusti, imperium orbis aequata primum potestate tenuerunt*. It should however be questioned whether the author of *HA* is very mindful of the distinctive terms, as in *S* 20.1 he writes *duos Antoninos pari imperio* and *OM* 10.4: *...quem plerique pari fuisse cum patris imperio tradiderunt*, which cases come close to *aequo iure*: is it subversive to suppose that it is rather a question of style than exact terminology for our author (thus:

These changes are typical aspects of the author's style: with the use of repetition, synonymia (*res publica, imperium*), antitheses (*usque ad eum, ex eo*) and combinations (*Romanus* shifts from *res publica* to *imperium*; *duobus administrantibus* and *singulos Augustos* becomes *duos Augustos*) something new is created. Note also the shift of perspective from past to future (*usque ad eum singulos semper habuisset Augustos* becomes *ex eo pariter coeperunt rem publicam regere* and *duos Augustos habere coepit*).

The mistaken attribution of the name of Antoninus to Lucius Verus is repeated in the life of Marcus Aurelius (MA 7.7): *Et quasi pater Lucii Commodi esset, et Verum eum appellavit addito Antonini nomine filiamque suam Lucillam fratri despondit*. This passage shows the disparity in *auctoritas* of the two new Augusti, though they were both appointed emperor: Marcus grants his name Verus to his colleague, whose name was at that moment Lucius Aelius Aurelius Commodus, and tightens the imperial bond by giving his daughter in marriage.³⁸² The historical error resides in the *addito Antonini nomine*. Exactly the same can be stated for a similar passage dealing with the adoption by Antoninus Pius, in AP 4.5: *...ita sibi ille adoptaret M. Antoninum, fratris uxoris suae filium, et L. Verum, Aelii Veri, qui ab Hadriano adoptatus fuerat, filium, qui postea Verus Antoninus est dictus*. The structure of the sentence itself betrays that the relative clause *qui...dictus* is a loose addendum to the nucleus: subj. (*ille*) – verb (*adoptaret*) – obj. (*M. Antoninum* + apposition, *L. Verum* + apposition), after which historically incorrect information about Verus' names is given (which may have been meant to clear up the complicated situation resulting from such adoptions). The same thing happens in AP 6.10:³⁸³ *Annium Verum, qui postea dictus est Antoninus, ante tempus quaestorem designavit* (sc. Antoninus Pius). The insistence that he shows in giving Lucius the name of Antoninus is suspect and has, according to Syme, all the characteristics of a piece of interpolated historical invention.³⁸⁴

Sometimes, the author is over-zealous in explaining which person or family is meant, as in MA 5.5: in *Tunc primum pro Annio Aurelius coepit vocari, quod in Aureliam* (sc. *familiam*), *hoc est Antonini, adoptionis iure transisset*. For the rest, he just adds the Antonine name to his subject: AP 10.3 (*Verum Antoninum post quaesturam consullem fecit*) and in Verus' own life (V 1.3): *Igitur Lucius Ceionius Aelius Commodus Verus Antoninus, qui ex Hadriani voluntate Aelius appellatus est, ex Antonini coniunctione Verus et Antoninus, neque inter bonos neque inter malos principes ponitur*, as well as in the designation in the Secondary Life of Ael. (2.9): *Et de huius* (sc. Lucii Veri) *quidem familia plenius in vita Lucii Aurelii Ceionii Commodi Veri Antonini (...) disseremus*. In

pariter = *aequo iure* and *pari imperio* and *aequale imperium*)? The terms are rather commonplace in the sources: Aurelius Victor called the emperors Hadrian and Aelius *potestate dispari*, in which *dispar* means 'of unequal authority', the opposite of *aequata potestate* or *pari imperio*.

³⁸² See Schulze 1907, 77, Birley 1966, 153-4 and Fündling 2008, 73-4 and for an explanation of the relations between the two Augusti. Although the emperors reigned with equal rights, Marcus was the sole 'Antoninus'.

³⁸³ On the historical names of Verus in connection with AP 4 and 6.10 see Pflaum (1966, 144sq.), who shows that the names attributed by the author to Marcus Aurelius are also inaccurate. For further discussion and different forms of Verus' names: Callu 1991, 101-22.

³⁸⁴ 'The first four of these are patent additions', as Syme (1971, 87) perceived in the case of AP 4.5, 6.10, 10.3 and MA 7.7 (see above).

these passages the names are, in agreement with the way the Secondary Lives are composed, derived from the Primary Lives of *AP* and *V*.

It becomes increasingly clear that the author has a predilection for the name of Antoninus, which he stresses both when an emperor really bears that name, such as Caracalla, and when he wishes an emperor to be called thus, as in Verus' case. The question to be answered is why the author, deliberately or not, neglects historical fact and what he seeks to achieve in this way. The author of the *HA* copies faulty names from Eutropius, whether or not in the knowledge that his source was wrong.³⁸⁵ Whereas his use of Eutropius is contested for the section of Primary and Secondary Lives (Chastagnol shows no signs of hesitation, while Fündling is very cautious),³⁸⁶ the parallels between *MA* 7.6 and Eutropius 8.9.2 do show a direct use of Eutropius. The author of the *HA* supplements his basic source with historical information from Eutropius, including the latter's faulty epithets. This procedure explains how Verus acquired the name of Antoninus: this is an error for which Eutropius served as authority. That Orosius has the same error has been explained as an indication that a common source underlies the *HA*, Eutropius and Orosius, which must have been the *KG*. With regard to the present point, the dependence of the *HA* on Eutropius sheds a different light on the question – Orosius may also have derived his information and formulation from Eutropius: 7.15.2: *hi primi rempublicam aequo iure tutati sunt*. Presumably, the remark about the *duo Augusti* found its way to *HA* by way of direct use and imitation of Eutropius. The echoes are to be found in *Ael.* 5.12-3 (see above), and also in *H* 24.2: *Hi sunt qui postea duo pariter Augusti primi rem publicam gubernaverunt*. It has been suggested that this passage is an echo of Festus³⁸⁷, though no persuasive parallels can be shown apart from his use of the same well-known theme. It should rather be supposed that this remark, too, was borrowed from Eutropius, to occur again in *Ael.* 2.1 and *MA* 7.6. The intrusive character of the passages is also clear from the next sentence, *H* 24.3-5, as witness formulas like *et... quidem*³⁸⁸ and *idcirco... quod*.³⁸⁹ The expansive character of the *NA* theme was made possible by a constant addition of imperial names, first Caesar, then Pius, and the first appearances of the *nomen Antoninorum*.

5.2.2 The NA Theme in *S*

The emperor to close the series of adopted dynasts was Marcus' natural born son Commodus, who inherited the Antonine name. The author does not pay much attention to his name Antoninus, though one passage, *C* 8.1 is devoted to the titles granted to him, in which the names Pius, Felix, Britannicus and Romanus Hercules are mentioned. His

³⁸⁵ We have to differentiate between the procedure in the earlier lives on the one hand, and intermediary and later lives on the other. As shown by Schmid (1964, 123-33) on the name of Lollianus (9.9.1 – *HA Tr.* 5) and Regilianus (*HA Tr.* 10) and Damsholt (1964, 138-50) for *Sarmatosirin* (*H* 5.4). In *MB* 15.4-5 and 16.7 and *Max.* 33.3 Herodian and Dexippus are criticised for assigning the name of Maximus to Puppianus, in *Gd.* 2.1 there is similar censure when only two Gordiani are mentioned instead of three. The errors are ascribed to the *inperitia* of the authors.

³⁸⁶ Chastagnol 1968, 59-60, repeated in 1994, LXVIII.

³⁸⁷ Baldwin 1978, 208: 'twice closely followed in *HA*' (namely in *H* 24.2 and *MA* 7.6).

³⁸⁸ Fündling 2006, K 502. Wölfflin (1891, 513 f.) saw *H* 24.3-5 as an 'Interpolation des Lesers' of *AP* 2.

³⁸⁹ Den Hengst 2008, 172 on the subject of *idcirco*: 'Ich habe den Eindruck, dass es sich hier um Zusätze handelt (...), womit der Redaktor die wenig aufregenden Hauptviten gleichsam aufpoliert'.

successors Pertinax and Didius Iulianus were no Antonini. The next dynasty, that of the Severi, showed a keen interest in the Antonine name. Septimius Severus, assumed the titles of *Divi Marci Pii filius* and *Divi Commodi frater*.³⁹⁰ Septimius reserved the name Antoninus for his son Bassianus Caracalla - the relevant texts in *HA* will be treated below. The first appearance of the *NA* theme is in *S* 10.3-5, which passage is quoted here in its context, *S* 10.3-7, as the accompanying text reveals aspects of the author's procedure. The passages dealing with the Antonine name are underlined: (3) *Et cum iret contra Albinum, in itinere apud Viminacium filium suum maiorem Bassianum adposito Aurelii Antonini nomine Caesarem appellavit, ut fratrem suum Getam ab spe imperii, quam ille conceperat, summovertet.* (4) *Et nomen quidem Antonini idcirco filio adposuit, quod somniaverat Antoninum sibi successurum.* (5) *Unde Getam etiam quidam Antoninum putant dictum, ut et ipse succederet in imperio.* (6) *Aliqui putant idcirco illum Antoninum appellatum, quod Severus ipse in Marci familiam transire voluerit.* (7) *Et primo quidem ab Albinianis Severi duces victi sunt.*

This passage is confusing, as two Getae and two Antonini are treated simultaneously. In *S* 10.3, Severus deprives his brother (*fratrem suum*) Geta of the prospect of a co-emperorship, while in *S* 10.5 Severus's son Geta is called Antoninus with the promise that he will succeed his father as an emperor. The earlier Geta may have hoped to share the emperorship with his brother, as mentioned before in *S* 8.10: *occurrit ei et statim Geta frater suus, quem provinciam sibi creditam regere praecepit aliud sperantem*.³⁹¹ Secondly, the place where Caracalla was appointed Caesar in either 195 or 196,³⁹² is interesting, as Viminacium is in the province of Lower Moesia, the province where Severus' brother Geta had been appointed governor. Possibly, the province entrusted to him (*sibi creditam*) refers to that same province,³⁹³ which may have been the reason for Septimius Severus to grant his elder son the title of Caesar and the name of Antoninus in that very province, in order to deprive his brother Geta of his hopes for the emperorship.³⁹⁴

Then, the name of Antoninus. As *adposito Aurelii Antonini nomine*³⁹⁵ is historically correct (just as the time of the granting of the name may be right),³⁹⁶ the author apparently based his information on a reliable source. Still, the speculation about the dream that led

³⁹⁰ In the spring of the year 195 AD (Kienast 1996, 156). See Arrigoni Bertini (1980, 189 and note 10) for the dynastic aspects of the assumption of the name of Antoninus, also by Severus' successors (1980, 189-93).

³⁹¹ If the two texts, *S* 8.10 and *S* 10.3 are related, Birley's supposition (1988, 109) that *aliud sperantem*, 'a cryptic statement', refers to Geta's hopes for a field command might be wrong, as he clearly hoped for a share in the reign. The Geta mentioned here is Severus' brother, as Birley's translation (1976, 210) confirms: 'This was in order to destroy the hopes which Severus' brother Geta had conceived of gaining the imperial position.' Whittaker in his Loeb edition of Herodian, interpretes the texts *S* 8.10 and 10.3-4 correctly when he states that P. Septimius Geta, Severus's brother, hoped for a share of power (1969, 197n4 and 328n2).

³⁹² Kienast 1990, 162.

³⁹³ Chastagnol 1994, 320n3; *pace* Birley 1988, 109. Soon afterwards he was appointed governor of Dacia.

³⁹⁴ The passage is superficially reminiscent of *H* 24.6-7, where Catilius Severus, who prepared himself for the emperorship, was deprived of his prospects by Hadrian's adoption of Antonius Pius.

³⁹⁵ *Adposito* being a variation on *MA* 7.7 *addito Antonini nomine*.

³⁹⁶ Kienast 1996, 162 and Whittaker 1969, 328n2. Cf. Cassius Dio 76.7.4 *μάλιστα δ' ἡμᾶς ἐξέπληξεν ὅτι τοῦ τε Μάρκου υἱὸν καὶ τοῦ Κομμόδου ἀδελφὸν ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε*, Septimius had adopted the titles of *Divi Marci Pii filius* and *Divi Commodi frater* (Kienast 1996, 156).

Severus to his decision certainly belongs to the more fanciful parts of Severus' *vita*, but does not break up the narrative flow.³⁹⁷ The next section, however, is particularly confusing. First of all, without any preparation, Severus' son Geta son is introduced and is granted the Antonine name, which is historically incorrect. This makes the next remark, that other sources are of a different opinion, difficult to follow. Why not *eos Antoninos appellatos*, instead of the singular form? *Illum* must refer to Caracalla, and might have been *eum* if the remark about Geta had not been added. We will return to this issue when we come to *G*.

The next mention of the name of Antoninus for Geta is in *S* 16.3-4: *Ob quae etiam filium eius Bassianum Antoninum, qui Caesar appellatus iam fuerat, annum XIII. agentem participem imperii dixerunt milites. Getam quoque, minorem filium, Caesarem dixerunt, eundem Antoninum, ut plerique in litteras tradunt, appellantes*. The scene takes place on 28 January 198 and is historically correct,³⁹⁸ save, again, for its final line. A false message is added to the nucleus of the sentence with a participle construction *appellantes* with *eundem* as an object. *Harum appellationum causa*, the first words of the following text, refers to the appointments of Caracalla as *Augustus* and Geta as *Caesar*. The interpolation contains elements of fiction. Note the essential difference with the preceding passage in 10.5: whereas the earlier passage reads *quidam Antoninum putant dictum*, here *plerique* are mentioned as a source, which makes matters even more deceptive.

In *S* 19.2, the fiction of the Antonine name is continued with a new passage imitating Eutropius (8.19.2).³⁹⁹

Eutropius 8.19.2

Decessit Eboraci admodum senex. (...) Nam filios duos successores reliquit, Bassianum et Getam, sed Bassiano Antonini nomen a senatu voluit imponi.

S 19.2

Perit Eboraci... iam senex. Reliquit duos filios, Antoninum Bassianum et Getam, cui et ipsi in honorem Marci Antonini nomen inposuit.

When comparing the two texts, one sees that the name of Antoninus is added to that of Bassianus, which exposes the fraud: *sed Bassiano* is replaced by *cui et ipsi*, referring to *Getam*. Then, *a senatu voluit imponi* is changed into *inposuit*, while *in honorem Marci* is added (as a distortion of *aliqui putant idcirco illum Antoninum appellatum, quod Severus ipse in Marci familiam transire voluerit, S* 10.6-7, here referring to Caracalla).

In *S* 10.6 it was stated that some reported (*aliqui putant...*) that Septimius wished to be part of Marcus' family. This, of course, is true – bearing in mind the titles of *Divi Marci Pii filius* and *Divi Commodi frater* – but the present statement is closer to the report given by Herodian (3.10.5-6): τὸν δὲ πρεσβύτερον (...) Σεβήρος Ἀντωνῖνον ὠνόμασε, Μάρκου θελήσας αὐτὸν προσηγορίαν φέρειν...⁴⁰⁰ It was Marcus Aurelius who

³⁹⁷ According to Den Hengst (1981, 29), as based on a report from Marius Maximus 'who paid much attention to Severus' measures concerning his succession (*CIA* 3.4-5; 9.2)'.
³⁹⁸ Chastagnol 1994, 400 and Kienast 1996, 162 and 166.

³⁹⁹ Dessau 1889, 371n1: *iam senex* ≈ *admodum senex* indicates insertion from Eutropius; Chastagnol 1968, 58.

⁴⁰⁰ Cassius Dio does not explicitly mention the bestowal of the name of Antoninus to Caracalla; he pays even less attention to this than Herodianus (leaving aside for the moment that the author of the *HA* also

inspired Septimius to call his son Antoninus, according to Herodian. Apart from the fact that the author of the *HA* calls both of Septimius' sons Antoninus, this report corresponds with contemporary historiographical sources.

However, our author comes up with a new idea in *S* 19.3, occurring in a passage that Dessau indicated as a close imitation of Aurelius Victor.⁴⁰¹ The consequences of granting the Antonine name to Caracalla, in itself historically correct, are much overrated. In the figure below, on the left the model, on the right its counterpart in the *HA*:

Aur. Vict. 20.30	<i>HA S</i> 19.3
<i>Illatumque Marci sepulcro,</i>	<i>Inlatus sepulchro Marci Antonini,</i>
<i>quem adeo percoluerat,</i>	<i>quem ex omnibus imperatoribus tantum coluit,</i>
<i>ut eius gratia Commodum inter</i>	<i>ut et Commodum in divos referret</i>
<i>divos referre iusserit,</i>	
<i>fratrem appellans,</i>	∅
<i>Bassianoque Antonini vocabulum</i>	<i>et Antonini nomen omnibus deinceps quasi</i>
<i>addiderit...</i>	<i>Augusti adscribendum putaret</i>

Note how the author reformulates the words of his source:

<i>Illatum... Marci sepulcro</i>	→	<i>Inlatus sepulchro Marci Antonini</i>
<i>quem ... percoluerat</i>	→	<i>quem...coluit</i>
<i>adeo</i>	→	<i>(ex omnibus imperatoribus) tantum</i>
<i>ut...referre iusserit</i>	→	<i>ut ...referret</i>
<i>Commodum inter divos</i>	→	<i>Commodum in divos</i>
<i>Antonini vocabulum</i>	→	<i>Antonini nomen</i>
<i>Bassiano</i>	→	<i>omnibus deinceps</i>
<i>addiderit</i>	→	<i>adscribendum putaret</i>

Whereas in Victor's *Bassianoque Antonini vocabulum addiderit* only Caracalla is called Antoninus, the author of the *HA* suggests that Severus wished all future emperors to bear this name. With *Antonini nomen...quasi Augusti* the author tries to elevate the name of Antoninus to an equal status with Augustus, an attempt that already showed up in rudimentary form in *Ael.* 5.13. Meanwhile, the responsibility for the attempt is ascribed

granted the name of Antoninus to Geta). The name first appears in 77.1.2: ...οἱ γάμοι τοῦ τε Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Σεουήρου καὶ τῆς Πλαυτίλλης τῆς τοῦ Πλαυτιανοῦ θυγατρὸς. The wedding took place in 202 (Kienast 1996, 162), few years after the bestowal of the name of Antoninus (though Herodian places the wedding immediately after the report about the name of Antoninus).⁴⁰¹ Dessau (1889, 363) turned matters upside down: before, the parallels between *HA* and Eutropius and Victor were discussed when *HA* was still considered a possible source for the other two (Peter 1884, 173). The *KG*, too, could have served as a common source (see § 2.4.2). A vexed question that occupied scholars during the decades after Dessau was whether *S* 17.5-19.4 might be a direct imitation of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* 20.1 and 10-30 or whether the texts are based on the same source, notably the *KG*. Nowadays, there is consensus on the direct use of Eutropius and Victor by the author of *HA*; see Brandt (1996, K 57-60) and Chausson 1997. Lippold (1991, K118n126) and Walentowski (1998, 45-6: 'der entgültige Beweis ist jedoch bis heute nicht gelungen') are unnecessarily sceptical. There can be little doubt that the author of *HA* directly followed Aurelius Victor, as can be seen in the examples given in this chapter.

to Septimius, who is said to have been the one to turn Antoninus into an imperial title, on a par with Augustus or Caesar.

The next moment when an old argument about the *nomen* recurs is *S* 20.1, which is the beginning of a passage that has been recognised by Syme as fraudulent, an interpolated passage in a relatively reliable context:⁴⁰² *Legisse me apud Aelium Maurum Phlegontis Hadriani libertum memini Septimium Severum inmoderatissime, cum moreretur, laetatum, quod duos Antoninos pari imperio rei publicae relinqueret exemplo Pii, qui Verum et Marcum Antoninos per adoptionem filios rei publicae reliquit, ...* The author's authority for the authenticity of Geta's name of Antoninus is shifted to the fictitious Aelius Maurus, who is supposed to have produced ghost-written books under Hadrian's name.⁴⁰³ The responsibility for the Antonine name for Geta is ascribed to Septimius, who is thought to have followed the example of Antoninus Pius by leaving two Antonines to rule the empire.⁴⁰⁴ This is the first time the author states that Antoninus Pius inspired Septimius to call both of his sons Antoninus: *exemplo Pii*. The formula *duos Antoninos pari imperio* reminds us of Eutropius 8.9.2 again (*nam filios duos successores reliquit*), presumably repeated from *S* 19.2, while *pari imperio* is a variation on *Ael.* 5.12-3: *cum eodem aequale ... imperium* combined with *pariter ... rem publicam regere* in *MA* 7.6, both referring to Marcus and Verus. In all these cases, Eutropius (8.9.2) was the source of inspiration, as shown above. Indeed, the name of Antoninus was also mistakenly added to Verus, Marcus brother, and now to Geta, Caracalla's brother: the second wrong attribution of the name of Antoninus.

The Phlegon account continues with a passage that combines the *NA* theme with another theme dear to the *HA* author: the adoptive emperorship and the *fili imperatoris*. In several places he shows his conviction that real sons are worse successors to the throne than adopted sons (for example: Marcus' son Commodus was the worst ruler of his time).⁴⁰⁵ Septimius Severus, however, was of a different opinion, *S* 20: *hoc melius quod ille filios per adoptionem, hic per se genitos rectores Romanae rei p. daret: Antoninum scilicet Bassianum quidem ex priore matrimonio suscepit et Getam de Iulia genuerat. sed illum multum spes fefellit. nam unum parricidium, alterum sui mores rei p. inviderunt, sanctumque illud nomen in nullo diuturne mansit*. In the words *ille filios per adoptionem* ↔ *hic per se genitos rectores* the contrast between real sons and adoptive successors is expressed – the theme occurs for the first time in *Ael.* 1.1 and 2.2 (see § 3.2). Then, a surprising move is made: Caracalla and Geta did not have the same mother.⁴⁰⁶ The author needs this element in his story to elaborate a tale of jealousy in the biography of *G*, to which we shall return when dealing with that passage (*G* 1.5). Note

⁴⁰² Syme (1971, 61 and 82) calls it a notoriously bad passage; Hasebroek (1921, 147), more credulously, treats the similarities with messages in *Cc.*.

⁴⁰³ *H* 16.1 and Fündling 2006, K 345.

⁴⁰⁴ Septimius, however, did better because he left two Antonines of his own flesh, while Pius was dependent on adoption (*S* 20.2) – this statement forms the beginning of elaborate considerations about the benefits of adoptive vs hereditary emperorship.

⁴⁰⁵ Theme of real sons: § 3.9.1.4.

⁴⁰⁶ A 'notoriously bad passage' (Syme 1971, 61). In *S* 20.2 Julia is mentioned as Geta's mother. The historical error (Julia Domna was mother of both sons: Kienast 1996, 162, 166-7) is due to Aurelius Victor 21.3, according to Chastagnol 1994, 334n1. Also wrongly mentioned in *Cc.* 10.1 and *G* 7.3, but not in *S* 3.9. The report in *Cc.* 10.3 is suspect: although Julia is called Caracalla's stepmother, in 10.4 the author states *matrem enim – non alio dicenda erat nomine – duxit uxorem et ad parricidium iunxit incestum*, suggesting that Julia was actually Caracalla's real mother.

that the name of Antoninus is called *sanctum* here. The passage continues with a dedication to Diocletian and a consideration about real sons of great men, which extends as far as 21.12.

At the end of the much debated passage 20.1-21.12 a further small passage occurs which is removable – the line of thought gains nothing through its addition, as is clear when the interjection is left out: *S* 21.11 *vixit denique in odio populi diu Antoninus, nomenque illud venerabile diu minus amatum est, quamvis et vestimenta populo dederit, unde Caracallus est dictus, et thermas magnificentissimas fecerit*. It could even be said that the sentence is better off without the parenthesis. The theme of Antoninus as a beloved name, as expressed in this interpolation, will be further elaborated in *OM* 3.9. The qualification of the name as *venerabile* is reminiscent of *sanctum illud nomen* in *S* 20.3.

At the end of *S*, the author has amply prepared the reader for the *NA* theme. While in the first lives (*Ael.*, *AP*, *MA* and *V*) the *nomen Antoninorum* was erroneously conferred on Verus, in *S* the name was unhistorically attributed to Geta. The reasons given for Caracalla's historical name of Antoninus was Septimius' dream that he would be succeeded by an Antoninus (possibly based on an account by Marius Maximus) and his wish to pose as a relative of his famous and venerable predecessor Marcus⁴⁰⁷ (which is well attested in several sources). Fiction comes in with Geta's *nomen Antoninorum*: first, some (*quidam*) say that he was given the name too in order to ensure his succession to the throne, which is later confirmed by many sources (*plerique*). A simple testimony from Aurelius Victor about Caracalla's name is amplified in *S* 19.3 to apply to a whole dynasty, or even eternity. Suddenly, the reason for the bestowal of the *nomen Antoninorum* is changed: in *S* 20.1, Septimius appears to imitate Antoninus Pius in naming both his sons *Antoninus*. His admiration of Marcus is not mentioned any longer. Amplifications, distortions and contradictions begin to appear in the slowly increasing theme of the *nomen Antoninorum*.

5.2.3 The *NA* Theme in *Cc*.

At the very beginning of Caracalla's biography there is a remark on the *Nomen Antoninorum*, the basis for which was laid in the preceding books, *Cc*. 1.1: *Ex duobus liberis, quos Septimius Severus reliquit [Getam et Bassianum]⁴⁰⁸, quorum unum Antoninum exercitus, alterum pater dixit, Geta hostis est iudicatus, Bassianum notum optinuisse imperium*. On the basis of our earlier conclusions, it can be assumed that the text in bold is an addition to the source followed by the author. Meanwhile, a new element has entered the theme: while Caracalla was hailed as an Antoninus by the army, Geta was called Antoninus by his father. Eutropius is almost certainly the source, as is indicated by the following texts:

⁴⁰⁷ Which is normal in dynastic thought: Constantine claimed descent from Claudius Gothicus and Theodosius from Trajan.

⁴⁰⁸ The Teubner edition by Hohl, based on the *Palatinus* 899 manuscript, has [*Getam et Bassianum*], which had been omitted by Jordan in his 1864 edition (Berlin). On logical grounds, *Bassianum et Getam* was to be expected (cf. *unum...alterum*), and compare Eutropius 8.19.2: *nam filios duos successores reliquit, Bassianum et Getam, ...*, which is the probable source of this passage.

(Cc 1.1)

Ex duobus liberis, quos Septimius Severus reliquit [Getam et Bassianum],

Ø

Ø

*quorum unum <Antoninum>*⁴⁰⁹

exercitus,⁴¹⁰

alterum pater dixit,

Geta hostis est iudicatus,

Bassianum autem <notum> optinuisse imperium.

Eutr. 8.19.2

Nam filios duos successores reliquit, Bassianum et Getam,

sed Bassiano Antonini nomen a senatu voluit imponi.

Itaque dictus est M. Aurelius Antoninus Bassianus patrique successit.

Ø

Nam Geta hostis publicus iudicatus confestim periit.

Nothing in Eutropius goes to show that Severus called his second son Antoninus – the text even seems to exclude Geta from the title (*sed Bassiano...*). Furthermore, if the relative clause *quorum...dixit* is left out of *HA*'s text, the reasoning is unimpaired: there are two sons, the second of whom is declared a public enemy, and the first acquires the throne. The text, then, agrees with Eutropius' version, who dwells longer on Caracalla's appointment as emperor. Again, the *NA* theme exhibits signs of a textual interpolation.

The same holds good for *Cc* 8.10, the second passage on the *nomen Antoninorum* in *Cc*.: *Qui* (sc. Macrinus) *cum filio factus in castris imperator filium suum, qui Diadumenus vocabatur, Antoninum vocavit, idcirco quod a praetorianis multum Antoninus desideratus est*. Chastagnol supposes that *Cc*. 8.10 is an interpolation of a later date, while Reusch shows that the entire passage ending with the remark at hand (*Cc*. 8-10) is an intrusion.⁴¹¹ The *NA* passages all seem to indicate a break in the narration: the remarks on the *nomen Antoninorum* often have hardly any bearing on its context. In the present case there is only the mention of Macrinus, to which an afterthought is added, ending in a contemplation on the name of Antoninus for Macrinus's son Diadumenian. This addition is attached to the previous sentence by the relative *Qui* (cf. *Cc*. 1.1 *quorum* or *AP* 4.5 or 6.10, where the theme is similarly added in the form of a relative clause, a technique very suggestive of interpolation). The theme develops: the sixth Antoninus enters the stage, namely Macrinus' son Diadumenian. This time the name does not serve to honour a predecessor, but is bestowed at the request of the pretorians. Septimius Severus called his son Geta Antoninus on his own initiative (*S* 10.4, 19.2, *Cc*. 1.1), while Geta in *S* 16.4 was hailed Antoninus by the soldiers. In the present passage the soldiers themselves urge the new emperor Macrinus to call his son Antoninus. The source is Aurelius Victor, as we shall find in *OM* 3.9.

⁴⁰⁹ The addition <Antoninum> is by Petschenig.

⁴¹⁰ Note that Eutropius (8.19.2) states that Septimius wanted to refer the bestowal of the appellation of Antoninus to the senate: *sed Bassiano Antonini nomen a senatu voluit imponi*. Cf. *S* 19.3, where it is implied that the responsibility for the appellation was not the senate's.

⁴¹¹ Chastagnol (1993, L): 'Nul doute que ce passage ait été inséré dans la biographie postérieurement à la rédaction de la Vie de Macrin.' When exactly the redaction took place, will be discussed later. Reusch 1931, 54; cf. Syme 1971, 86 ('patently an addition').

In Cc. 9.2 the eighth and last Antoninus crops up: *Filium reliquit qui postea et ipse Marcus Antoninus Heliogabalus dictus est; ita enim nomen Antoninorum inoleverat, ut velli ex animis hominum non posset, quod omnium pectora velut Augusti nomen obsederat*. It is striking that, after S 20.1-2, this passage is encountered once again in the *filius imperatoris* theme: it is introduced in the following context: *filius reliquit, qui postea et ipse Marcus Antoninus Heliogabalus dictus est (...)*. *Fuit male moratus et patre duro crudelior*, after which the narration continues with Caracalla's *mores*. The NA theme *vires acquirit eundo*: not only do the descriptions of its popularity become more substantial but the message increases in strength, and exaggeration is applied on a large scale. Whereas in Cc. 8.10 the soldiers were the ones who yearned for the *nomen Antoninorum*, here the name *velli ex animis hominum non posset*: it is in the heart of all the inhabitants of the Roman world.⁴¹² That the emperor bearing the name is one of the most debased rulers ever is no obstacle to the popularity of his name. The notion introduced in S 19.3 (or in a rudimentary form in Ael. 5.13) that all the emperors should be called Antoninus finds its fullest expression here. Note that *qui postea et ipse Marcus Antoninus Heliogabalus dictus est* is an echo of two earlier NA passages, namely AP 4.5: *qui postea Verus Antoninus est dictus* and AP 6.10: *qui postea dictus est Antoninus*.

The *vita Caracalli* begins with a repetition of previously introduced elements, repeated from passages added to S. Later, two further Antonini are announced, namely Diadumenian and Elagabalus, and the motivation for this is ever more elaborate. For Caracalla's own title as Antoninus, no reasons are given – these were already added in the Severus *vita*. The passages mentioned in Ael., AP, MA, V, S and Cc. are only the beginning of a much larger design.

⁴¹² Reusch 1931, 55 ad Cc.9.2: 'Der Bemerkung über die Beliebtheit der Antoninusname ist wertlos. Hier lässt der Fälscher wieder seine Auffassung durchblicken, dass der Antoninusname die Herrschaft bedinge.'

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Nomen Antoninorum</i>	<i>Source mentioned or postulated</i>	<i>Motivation</i>
<i>Ael.</i> 2.9; 5.12-3; <i>MA</i> 7.7; <i>AP</i> 4.5; 6.10; 10.3; <i>V</i> 1.3	Mistakenly attributed to Verus	Ø	Ø
<i>S</i> 10.3	attributed to Caracalla	Ø	Ø
<i>S</i> 10.4		Ø (Marius Maximus?)	<i>quod somniaverat Antoninum sibi successurum.</i>
<i>S</i> 10.6		<i>aliqui</i> (Cassius Dio?)	<i>quod Severus ipse in Marci familiam transire voluerit.</i>
<i>S</i> 10.4	erroneously attributed to Geta	<i>Quidam</i>	<i>ut et ipse succederet in imperio.</i>
<i>S</i> 16.4		<i>Plerique</i>	Ø
<i>S</i> 19.2		Ø	<i>in honorem Marci</i>
<i>S</i> 19.3	attributed to Caracalla	Aurelius Victor	<i>Antonini nomen omnibus deinceps quasi Augusti adscribendum putaret</i>
<i>S</i> 20.1-2	Erroneously attributed to Caracalla and Geta (and Marcus and Verus)	<i>Aelius Maurus</i> (Aurelius Victor)	<i>exemplo Pii</i>
<i>S</i> 21.11	attributed to Caracalla		<i>nomenque illud venerabile diu minus amatum est</i>
<i>Cc.</i> 1.1	attributed to Caracalla and erroneously to Geta	Eutropius Ø	Ø
<i>Cc.</i> 8.10	attributed to Diadumenian	Ø	<i>idcirco quod a praetorianis multum Antoninus desideratus est</i>
<i>Cc.</i> 9.2	attributed to Elagabalus	Ø	<i>quod omnium pectora velut Augusti nomen obsederat.</i>

Figure 5.1: Survey of the passages with the NA theme in *Ael.*, *MA*, *AP*, *V*, *S* and *Cc.*

5.2.4 The NA Theme in G

The introduction to the Secondary Life of *G* is reminiscent of the preface to *Ael.* and similarly includes a remark on the *nomen Antoninorum*. The author defends his decision to write the life of Geta thus, *G* 1.1-2: *Scio, Constantine Auguste, et multos et clementiam tuam quaestionem movere posse, cur etiam Geta Antoninus a me tradatur (...). Neque enim multa in eius vita dici possunt, qui prius rebus humanis exemptus est, quam cum fratre teneret imperium.* He does not answer the question, but the answer is already known from such passages as *Ael.* 7.5: *quia mihi propositum fuit omnes, qui (...) vel Caesares vel Augusti vel principes appellati sunt,... vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt, singulis libris exponere (...).* In the middle of this statement he adds a remark on the structure of the text as a whole: *De cuius priusquam vel vita vel nece dicam, disseram, cur et ipsi Antonino a Severo patre sit nomen adpositum.*⁴¹³ He makes explicit that, before treating the life and death of Geta, he will discuss something else: why Geta is also called Antoninus.⁴¹⁴ Again, this is a sentence added in the form of a relative clause with *cuius* (see my remarks on *AP* 4.5, 6.10, *Cc.* 1.1 and 8.10). The theme looks like an extraneous element of the *vita* or, more simply, an interpolation.

The content of the *vita Getae* is described by the author in the second half of *G* 1.1 (*cuius...adpositum*, henceforth: *G* 1.1') in a passage of *divisio*: *de cuius priusquam vel vita vel nece dicam, disseram, cur et ipsi Antonino a Severo patre sit nomen adpositum.* He appears to stick to his plan, when the overall structure of *G* is considered: 1. preface (1.1-2), 2. *nomen Antoninorum* (c. 1.3-3), 3. *vita* (c. 4-5), 4. *nex* (6-7).⁴¹⁵ The division, made by the author himself, is a successful attempt to structure three major themes in the biography: *vita*, *nex* and *nomina*. Still, there are some conspicuous breaks in the narrative flow that do not follow from what the author says on the subject, for the passages about the *nomen Antoninorum* are interwoven in several places with the first part of the *vita*.

1.1-2	dedication and introduction (paratext)
1.3-2.5	<i>nomen Antoninorum</i>
2.6-9	horoscope
3.1-9	birth and omnia
4.1-5.8	character and youth
6.1-8	Bassianus' cruelty after Geta's death
7.1-6	Geta's funeral and Bassianus' attitude

There are four *nomen* passages concerning Geta: 1.1', 1.3-7, 2.2-5, 3.5-9, 5.3. A considerable part of NS is devoted to the *nomen* theme. Apparently, ignorance of relevant

⁴¹³ For the figure of *divisio* with *priusquam* see Den Hengst (1981, 35), who indicates Suet. *Div. Iul.* 44.4 as the model (repeated in *AS* 29.1, *Gd.* 3.1, *MB* 4.5) and my remarks in § 3.1.

⁴¹⁴ Cf. *S* 19.2 ... *Getam, cui et ipsi in honorem Marci Antonini nomen inposuit*; the formula also occurs in *Cc.* 9.2: *qui postea et ipse Marcus Antoninus Heliogabalus dictus est* with regard to Elagabal.

⁴¹⁵ Casaubonus' division in chapters led Chastagnol (1994, 427) to the following description: 1: the name of Antoninus; 2: the names of Geta and his deification; 3: birth and *omina*, 4: character and youth, 5: Geta Caesar, 6: *damnatio memoriae*, 7: burial and Caracalla's attitude. However accurate these descriptions of the contents at the hand of his division in chapters may be, the structure of the books is better determined without any special consideration of Casaubon's division in chapters.

facts about Geta, due to a scarcity of sources, caused the author to write a short life and to try to expand it by drawing on his imagination.⁴¹⁶

This is not all that there is to say about the structure and contents of this peculiar life. The first appearance of the NA theme after the announcement in G 1.1 is in G 1.3, in which the dream in S 10.4 is referred to: *Septimius Severus quodam tempore cum consulisset ac petisset, ut sibi indicaretur, quo esset successore moriturus, in somnis vidit Antoninum sibi successurum. Quare statim ad milites processit et Bassianum, filium maiorem natu, Marcum Aurelium Antoninum appellavit.* The account is an elaboration of S 10.4 (*quod somniaverat Antoninum sibi successurum*), which message is a product of the author's own invention.⁴¹⁷ The two passages deserve to be studied more closely, as there are many verbal and thematic parallels:

S 10.3-6

et cum iret contra Albinum, in itinere apud Viminacium filium suum maiorem Bassianum adposito Aurelii Antonini nomine Caesarem appellavit.*(1) *ut fratrem suum Getam ab spe imperii, quam ille conceperat, summo veret. et nomen quidem Antonini idcirco filio adposuit, (2) quod somniaverat Antoninum sibi successurum. (3) unde Getam etiam quidam Antoninum putant dictum, (4) ut et ipse succederet in imperio. aliqui putant idcirco illum Antoninum appellatum, quod Severus ipse in Marci familiam transire voluerit.*

G 1.3-5

Septimius Severus quodam tempore cum consulisset ac petisset, ut sibi indicaretur, quo esset successore moriturus, in somnis vidit Antoninum sibi successurum. (3) quare statim ad milites processit et Bassianum, filium maiorem natu, Marcum Aurelium Antoninum appellavit.*(1) *quod cum fecisset (2) ex paterna cogitatione vel, ut quidam dicunt, a Iulia uxore commonitus, quae gnara erat somni*⁴¹⁸ *quod minori filio hoc facto ipse interclusisset aditum imperandi, etiam Getam, minorem filium, Antoninum vocari iussit. (4)*

The underlined passages are the parallels between S 10.3-6 and G 1.3-5.⁴¹⁹ The following picture appears: (1) *filium suum maiorem (Bassianum adposito Aurelii Antonini nomine) Caesarem appellavit* becomes *Bassianum, filium maiorem natu, Marcum Aurelium (Antoninum) appellavit* with the notion that in the first case the words in brackets are an addition to the followed source, while in the second case the name is no extra addition, as it is part of the NA theme. Next, (2) *et nomen quidem Antonini idcirco filio adposuit, quod...* becomes *quod cum fecisset*; and (3) *quod somniaverat Antoninum sibi successurum* becomes (3) *in somnis vidit Antoninum sibi successurum*, while (4) *unde Getam etiam quidam Antoninum putant dictum* becomes *etiam Getam, minorem filium, Antoninum vocari iussit*.

Now, a most surprising rewritten passage appears: the reason for Geta's title of Antoninus in S 10.5 is *ut et ipse succederet in imperio*, while in G 1.5 the motivation is *a Iulia uxore commonitus*, with a reference to the passage in S 20.1. It is suggested that, by giving the name of Antoninus to Caracalla, Septimius (*hoc facto*) wanted to keep his

⁴¹⁶ Chastagnol 1993, 426.

⁴¹⁷ According to Syme 1983, 88.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. for the formula *quae gnara erat somni...*: G 2.6: *Severus, gnarus geniturae illius*.

⁴¹⁹ See also Hasebroek (1916, 74) for a comparison between the two passages.

younger son (*minori filio*) away from the throne. This surprising message must have been caused by a misunderstanding of the earlier passage in *S* 10.3 *fratrem suum Getam ab spe imperii, quam ille conceperat, summooveret*, where the author of the *HA* must have understood *fratrem eius* (viz. Caracalla's brother) instead of *fratrem suum* (viz. Septimius' brother), an error caused by the fact that both Septimius' brother and Caracalla's brother are called Geta.

The author continues his narration with *Itaque semper ab eo in epistulis familiaribus dictus est, cum si forte abesset, scriberet: 'salutate Antoninos filios et successores meos'.* *Sed nihil valuit patris cautio, nam ei solus ille successit, qui primus Antoninus nomen accepit. Et haec de Antonini nomine.* The deception persists and even gains strength: the popularity of the *NA* is illustrated by a new literary device, the letter: the reader is confronted with a letter from the emperor to his two *Antonini* (the *duo Antonini* motif, as we have seen, originates from *MA* 7.6, inspired by Eutropius 8.9.2).⁴²⁰ This technique, the recurrence of a single theme in several literary guises, will be further explored in *Dd*. The author suggests that Septimius emulates Antoninus Pius in his letter, as the latter did not leave sons of his own as successors to the throne, but adopted ones: in *S* 20.1, in the Phlegon account, it is stated that *Septimium Severum inmoderatissime, cum moreretur, laetatum, quod duos Antoninos pari imperio rei p. relinqueret exemplo Pii, qui Verum et Marcum Antoninos per adoptionem filios rei p. reliquit, hoc melius quod ille filios per adoptionem, hic per se genitos rectores Romanae rei p. daret.*, while the present letter has *Antoninos filios et successores meos*. Ultimately, the theme derived from Eutropius 8.9.2 occurs here in the shape of the theme of the adopted sons combined with the *NA* theme.

Considering that *G* 1.5-7 is an addition to a basic source, it can be concluded that *G* 2.1 *Geta autem dictus est ...rettulit* is, narratively, linked to *G* 1.4, in which Caracalla's title is explained – *autem* marking the continuation. In *G* 2.2 fiction rears its head again: *Fuit autem Antoninus Geta etiam ob hoc ita dictus, quod in animo habuit Severus, ut omnes deinceps principes quemadmodum Augusti, ita etiam Antonini dicerentur, idque amore Marci, quem patrem suum semper dicebat et cuius philosophiam litterarumque institutionem semper imitatus est. Dicunt aliqui non in Marci honorem tantum Antonini nomini delatum, cum id Marcus adoptivum habuerit, sed in eius, qui Pius cognominatus est, Hadriani scilicet successoris, et quidem ob hoc quod Severum ille ad fisci advocationem delegerat ex formularia forensi, cum ad tantos processus ei patuisset dati ab Antonino primi gradus vel honoris auspiciu, simul quod nemo ei videretur felicius imperator ad commodandum nomen eo principe, cuius proprium nomen iam per quattuor principes cucurrisset.* The motifs within the *NA* theme begin to pile up: in *G* 2.2, *Antoninus* is stressed as an imperial name on a par with *Augustus*, which first happened in *S* 19.3 (*et Antonini nomen omnibus deinceps quasi Augusti adscribendum putaret*). The motif of love for Marcus, which first occurred in *S* 10.6, is repeated (with the use of *amplificatio*). In *G* 1.3, the adoption is repeated, and the second reason for the Antonine name is also mentioned (repeated from *S* 20.1: *exemplo Pii*), but a novel argument is added: Septimius Severus owed his position as a *advocatus fisci* to Antoninus Pius.⁴²¹ The

⁴²⁰ In *S* 23.3 the two sons are also called *Antonini*, in the plural, and the designation also appears in a citation: *senex ac pedibus aeger firmum imperium Antoninis meis relinquens...* says the dying Severus in his *ultima verba* in a variation on Sallustius (21.10, see Chastagnol 1994, 338n3).

⁴²¹ The *advocatus fisci* was instituted by Hadrian (*H* 20.6). Chastagnol (1994, 432n1) calls the report about Septimius' investiture of this function 'bien peu crédible'. For the institution of the *advocatus fisci*, see

source for this dubious report may be either Aurelius Victor (20.30-1: ...*quod ex illo, post multos dubiosque eventus, auspicia honorum cepisset patrocinio fisci*) or Eutropius (*hic* (i.e. Septimius Severus) *primum fisci advocatus, mox militaris tribunus, per multa deinde et varia officia atque honores usque ad administrationem totius rei publicae venit*), although Aurelius Victor provides the closest resemblance to the passage in *G*, as he explicitly states that the *advocatio fisci* had been acquired thanks to Antoninus Pius.⁴²² Finally, in *G* 2.5, a further motif makes its appearance: the number of *Antonini*, with an honourable mention of the first emperor bearing this name. The four emperors referred to are Antoninus Pius and his two sons Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and Commodus.

With *de hoc eodem* in *G* 2.6 the author picks up his narrative about Geta, which had been left behind in *G* 2.1, interrupted as it was by speculations about the name of Antoninus, which are partly based on Aurelius Victor. Without the addition, the passage on Marius Maximus (*G* 2.1) precedes the stories about the horoscope. It might be supposed that the more fanciful stories about horoscopes and *omina* are derived from this author,⁴²³ which corroborates the suspicion that *G* 2.6 is the natural sequel to *G* 2.1.

The fourth and final *nomen* passage in in *G* 5.3: *Post Parthicum bellum pater cum ingenti gloria floreret, Bassiano participi imperii appellato Geta quoque Caesaris et Antonini, ut quidam dicunt, nomen accepit*. The quote is strongly reminiscent of *S* 16.3-4 (... *Getam quoque, minorem filium, Caesarem dixerunt, eundem Antoninum, ut plerique in litteras tradunt, appellantes*). In the *G*-passage, *plerique* is substituted by *quidam*, like in *S* 10.4. The passage is totally out of place in a description of the character, habits and physical appearance of the young Geta, so that it can safely be assumed that the text is an addition to the primary source. Still, a problem occurs in the assessment of this detachable passage: in itself, the account *post Parthicum bellum pater cum ingenti gloria floreret, Bassiano participi imperii appellato Geta quoque Caesaris (...) nomen accepit* is historically true, while the addition, marked by the coordinator *et*, contains the fictional elements: *et Antonini, ut quidam dicunt*. Exactly the same thing occurs in the model, in *S* 16.3-4: (... *Getam quoque, minorem filium, Caesarem dixerunt...* is historically true, while *eundem Antoninum, ut plerique in litteras tradunt, appellantes* is a fictitious element. Ch.1.3-7, which was identified as an *NA* passage, also exhibits this dichotomy: *G* 1.3-4 treats the part probably based on Marius Maximus (reporting the dream in which Antoninus is named as his successor), *G* 1.5-7 contains the fictional account about Geta. We have to deal with additions to the name of Antoninus on two levels: historically accurate information taken from the primary source, supplemented by fictional elements

Brunt 1966, esp. 84 ('The duty of *advocatus fisci* was to represent the claims of the 'fiscus' in judicial proceedings') and 85n62 (about the *HA*). Barnes (1967b, 91-2) proves that reports of Septimius' tenure of the post of *advocatus fisci* are suspect in both Eutropius (8.12.2) and Aurelius Victor (20.30), as they are always combined with false details. See also Hartke (1951, 159-60) for the same conclusion.

⁴²² Syme (1971, 81) notes that Victor's unusual expression '*auspicia honorum*' is changed into '*honoris auspicium*' in the *HA*, which suggests a direct derivation.

⁴²³ Witness the attestations collected by Birley 1997. It is important to note that among the *omina* one is a variation on the dream that an Antonine would succeed Septimius: ...*audissetque ille* (i.e. *quidam* Antoninus, plebeius homo) *ab aruspice post Severum Antoninum imperaturum...*, the same prediction which had been given to Septimius in a dream (*G* 1.3: *in somnis vidit Antoninum sibi successurum* and *S* 10.4: *quod somniaverat Antoninum sibi successurum*). This shows that Severus' dream does not belong to the invented parts of the *NA* theme, but that Marius Maximus was the source.

of the author's own making. The passages involving the author's inventions we define as the *NA* theme. We will return to this topic in § 5.6.1.

After this passage, the author does not interfere any more in the primary text with remarks concerning the *nomen Antoninorum*. In the chapter about *omina*, there are two interesting events reported about the prediction that an Antonine was destined to succeed Septimius Severus: a plebeian called Antoninus killed a lamb (*G* 3.5) and a *popa* called Antoninus killing a sacrificial victim (*G* 3.7-8). In these passages, as well as later on, Geta is referred to by his own name of Geta, while Caracalla is called Bassianus or Antoninus, as may be seen in the lines: *Mirum sane omnibus videbatur, quod mortem Getae totiens etiam ipse fleret, quotiens nominis eius mentio fieret, quotiens imago videretur aut statua. Varietas autem tanta fuit Antonini Bassiani, immo tanta sitis caedis, ut modo fautores Getae, modo inimicos occideret, quos fors obtulisset. Quo facto magis Geta desiderabatur*. This is striking: it looks as if the author totally forgot about the name for the younger of the two brothers, while the first two chapters are almost entirely devoted to Geta's name of Antoninus. Furthermore, to call Caracalla simply by the name of Antoninus, here, in the *omina* passages and elsewhere,⁴²⁴ is confusing in a biography that purports to be primarily devoted to Geta. This observation can only lead to the conclusion that the source used for the chapters 3-7 (save the addition in *G* 5.3) did not treat Geta as an Antoninus. The opening chapter shows indeed that the name of Antoninus is only a supplementary theme to the *vita* and *nex Getae*, not the essential reason of the composition of a separate book. We shall return to this subject in § 5.4.

When we dissect the three parts according to the *divisio* given by the author in *G* 1.1' (*nomen* on one hand, and *vita* and *nex* on the other), this results in the following picture: of the 1231 words in *G* as many as 213 words in five passages are concerned with the *NA* theme, which is 17 per cent of its total text. When the two parts of *G*, the *NA* theme and *vita* plus *nex*, are studied separately, we can state that only in the *NA* passages in the first two chapters, Geta is designated as Antoninus, and that in the following chapters in every single case when Antoninus is referred to, Caracalla is meant. The only instance outside the *NA* passages when Geta is called Antoninus, is at the very beginning of *G*, in 1.1: *cur etiam Geta Antoninus a me tradatur...* It is not hazardous to suppose that the author simply added the name of Antoninus to his subject, a practice that he drops after the first two chapters. These findings show that in the primary text, Geta was no Antoninus. The author must have derived Geta's name of Antoninus either from another source or invented it himself, but the theme that he created around it is certainly one of his own making.

⁴²⁴ E.g. *G* 5.6 (*Sereni Sammonici libros familiarissimos habuit, quos ille ad Antoninum scripsisset*) and *G* 7.4 (*fuit praeterea eius inmanitatis Antoninus...*).

5.3 The NA Theme in the Intermediary Lives I

5.3.1 The NA Theme in *OM*

That *OM* with its elaborate preface, its use of a Greek source (Herodian) and high degree of literary invention marks a break in the construction of the *HA* has been explained in § 2.2. The section of *EL* has ended and a new beginning is made. On the other hand, the author stays with the structure as laid out in the Primary and Secondary Lives. Just as Caracalla Augustus had his brother Geta as co-ruler, Macrinus had his son as his companion in government, which results in a similar structure. Both the biographies of Geta and Diadumenian are ‘satellites’ to the ‘planets’ of Caracalla’s and Macrinus’ biographies, and the factual information in both is based on the biographies which they complement.

After the transition from preface to narration, the name of Antoninus is mentioned in *OM* 2.1: *...seque nunc Severum nunc Antoninum, cum in odio esset omnium et hominum et militum, nuncupavit...* These words occur in a summary⁴²⁵ of the *vita* listing its many elements (name, origin, career, character and usurpation) – again, a perfect opportunity for the author to add some remarks about his imperial names. The former title, *Severus*, must be seen as Macrinus’ attempt to link his own family to that of Septimius Severus, while the other seeks to link him to the dynasty of Antoninus Pius.⁴²⁶ Macrinus’ name of Antoninus is not historical, and not even paralleled in the *HA*. The clause *cum...militum*, however, is in line with some earlier remarks, namely the popularity of the name of Antoninus among soldiers (*milites*, *S* 16.4, *Cc.* 1.1, 8.10, *G* 1.3 concerning Caracalla) and the people (*homines*, *Cc.* 9.2 concerning Elagabal). The name was granted to Macrinus’ son Diadumenian, not to Macrinus himself.

Then, in *OM* 2.5, a new motif is introduced: *Et mirum omnibus fortasse videatur*⁴²⁷, *cur Diadumenus filius Macrini Antoninus voluerit nuncupari, cum ille auctor necis Antoninianae fuisse dicatur*. Macrinus is accused of having been Caracalla’s murderer, yet calls his son Antoninus. There are some serious problems about the long digression on the name of Antoninus that follows immediately (*OM* 3.1-7) after the question posed in the passage just cited. It says that during the reign of Antoninus Pius a *vates Caelestis* near Carthage had uttered the name of Antoninus eight times.⁴²⁸ At first, this was understood to mean the number of years of ‘the reign of Antoninus Pius’, but

⁴²⁵ We are talking here about a summary not only in the sense of ‘table of contents’, as assessed in the passage below, but also in the narratological sense defined by Genette (1980, 95-9) as a vast domain of TS in a limited narrative space.

⁴²⁶ Turcan (1993, 119) for the historical background and references to literature.

⁴²⁷ Cf. *G* 2.6: *mirum mihi videtur, ... Geta noster divus futurus...*

⁴²⁸ Barnes (1970b, 96-101) convincingly shows that the oracle, that is mentioned nowhere outside the *HA*, is a product of the author’s fantasy, for which no source can be indicated, apart from a passage in *P* 4.2: *dein pro consule Africae factus est. in quo proconsulatu multas seditiones perpessus dicitur vaticinationibus <eum reddentibus> certum, quae de templo Caelestis emergunt*. The goddess also occurs in *T* 29.1 in the context of the appellation of the African usurper Celsus: *Celsum imperatorem appellaverunt peplo deae Caelestis ornatum*.

after his eighth year (AD 146), a new explanation had to be found.⁴²⁹ The number was now (*vel tunc vel postea*) taken, to apply to the emperors called *Antoninus*.⁴³⁰ This tallies with the number of Antonines mentioned in the preceding books, *OM* 3.3-4: *denique adnumeratis omnibus, qui Antonini appellati sunt, is Antoninorum numerus invenitur. enimvero Pius primus, Marcus secundus, Verus tertius, Commodus quartus, quintus Caracallus, sextus Geta, septimus Diadumenus, octavus Heliogabalus Antonini fuere*. As was argued earlier, Verus and Geta are mistakenly called Antoninus (see above, § 5.2.4), after the fashion of some fourth century authors (Eutropius, Festus).⁴³¹ The oracle in *OM* 3 is probably the author's invention,⁴³² but the fact that Verus and Geta are labelled as Antonines strongly suggest a 4th century origin of the fiction.

A related theme is introduced next: it is not only the emperors up to Elagabalus (Heliogabalus) who get to be called Antoninus, but also their successors, the Gordiani, be it that they were allegedly either called *Antonii* or only bore *Antoninus* as a *praenomen* instead of *nomen proprium*. Just as in other cases, when coming up with a name like Regilianus or Lollianus (see note in § 5.2.1), the author makes light of the historiographical tradition, in which names are sometimes transmitted in different forms. The author plays his *praenomen* card and extends the theme of the name of Antoninus even beyond the reign of the *ultimus Antoninorum* Elagabalus, be it by denying that the Gordiani ever belonged to the Antonini: *nec inter Antoninos referendi sunt duo Gordiani*. Nor is the past safe from the author's expansive inventions: in a typical move, he incorporates in retrospect all of the emperors who succeeded Antoninus Pius by claiming that Severus, Pertinax, Didius Iulianus and Macrinus similarly called themselves Antoninus, like the Gordiani, as a *praenomen*.⁴³³ Source: *plurimi* ('many authors').⁴³⁴ By

⁴²⁹ The oracle is thus interpreted in the same way as the passage in *PN* 8.5, as referring to the number of years of the reign: *item cum quaereretur, quamdiu imperaturus esset* (sc. Severus), *respondisse Graece dicitur: 'bis denis Italum conscendit navibus aequor: / si tamen una ratis transiliet pelagus.'* *ex quo intellectum Severum viginti annos expleturum*. For models of this oracle in *PN*, see Den Hengst 1981, 52; 1991, 165; 2002b, 86.

⁴³⁰ A textual parallel with *Cc.* 6.3 could provide the model for numbering the emperors as eight: Caracalla selects some people to be executed in the gymnasium of Alexandria, after the example of Ptolemy Euergetes, who reigned till his death in 116 BC: *exemplo Ptolemaei Euergetis qui octavus hoc nomine appellatus est*. The detail in the rather complex periphrasis *qui...est* that Ptolemy was the eighth ruler of that name may be significant. The Romans were not acquainted with the system of numbering their own rulers, unlike later European practice. In classical times, this principle was only known from other cultures, such as Egypt, and the author may have had in mind this interesting idea when counting the Antonines.

⁴³¹ Syme 1971, 80 and 89, and above § 5.2.1.

⁴³² Den Hengst (1981, 42) supposes that the story of the oracle is based on Marius Maximus (see for a refutation of this viewpoint § 5.6.4). Barnes (1970b, 99) supposes the oracle is the author's invention, partly based on a report in *P* 4.2 and possibly combined with historical facts. Syme (1971, 82-3) does not comment on the origin, but only refers to the passage in *P* 4.2.

⁴³³ One of the topics in the discussion about the passage is the interpretation of *inde est quod*. Pasoli (1968, 33) suggested that the oracle led the emperors to call themselves Antoninus (provided that we take the Gordiani passage as a parenthesis), a conclusion shared by Den Hengst (1981, 33). This explanation is unsatisfactory. Following the author's line of thought, our conjecture must be that the emperors knew about the oracle or thought that they understood it, whereas only after eight Antonini had reigned, the meaning became clear: *denique adnumeratis omnibus qui Antonini appellati sunt, is Antoninorum numerus invenitur*. This can only have happened after Heliogabalus reign. Before that, nobody could have known for sure what the oracle meant, except for the notion: *constitit apud credentes vel tunc vel postea per vatem aliud designatum*. Therefore, the formula *inde est quod* refers to *quia praenomen tantum Antoninorum habuerunt* (this also goes for three former emperors Pertinax, Iulianus and Macrinus, the last of whom calls himself

way of an escape route, the author lets Antoninus as a *praenomen* serve as an epithet for the emperors not called Antoninus, thus extending the theme to all the successors of Antoninus Pius, even beyond the *ultimus Antoninorum* Elagabalus. In doing so, he seems to explode his carefully constructed Antonine system at the end of the day, but the author calls himself to order, *OM* 3.7: *sed ab ipsis Antoninis qui veri successores Antonini fuerunt, hoc nomen magis quam proprium retentum est.*⁴³⁵ Here the name has even become more important than the emperors' (*veri successores*) own names, which they often discarded at the time of their adoption or accession to the throne.

The story of the oracle must be accepted as the first of three answers to *OM* 2.5 *Et mirum omnibus fortasse videatur, cur Diadumenus filius Macrini Antoninus voluerit nuncupari, cum ille auctor necis Antoninianae fuisse dicatur*, because *haec alii*, the formula with which the passage is rounded off corresponds with the following clause *sed alii idcirco Antoninum Diadumenum a Macrino patre appellatum ...*, which suggests that the first answer to the question has been given. A more accurate answer to the question in *OM* 2.5 follows in two versions, marked by *sed alii... alii vero*. In chapter 6 of this study the structure of the presentation is analysed. For the present, texts and sources should suffice. First, we encounter a speculation about Macrinus' murder of Caracalla, corresponding with *Cc.* 8.10:⁴³⁶ *Sed alii idcirco Antoninum Diadumenum a Macrino patre appellatum ferunt, ut suspicio a Macrino interfecti Antonini militibus tolleretur*. Macrinus' direct responsibility for the murder of Caracalla is mentioned neither by Aurelius Victor nor by Eutropius, the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, or Festus. It is Herodian 4.13 and Cassius Dio 79.5 who write about Macrinus's involvement in the plot. It was stated several times in *Cc.* 6.6: *insidiis a Macrino praef. praet. positis, qui post eum invasit imperium*, 6.9: *nam Macrinus Antoninum occidit, ut supra exposuimus* and *Cc.* 11.5 *a Macrino, qui eum occiderat, ... inter deos relatus est*. Herodian pays very little attention to Diadumenian (only in 5.4.12, when he and his father die), and has no knowledge of Diadumenian's title of Augustus. Cassius Dio states (79.19.2) that Macrinus calls his son Antoninus to please the soldiers' love of his predecessor. But there is no suggestion anywhere of the reason which the author of the *HA* gives for the appellation, namely to avert suspicion that Macrinus was responsible for Caracalla's

Antoninus according to *OM* 2.1, apparently using it not as *nomen* but as *praenomen*), as the same is stated in *Dd.* 6.3: *unde etiam quidam et Severum et Pertinacem et Iulianum Antoninorum praenominibus honorandos putant*, a parallel quoted by Hartke (1951, 124). Of course, Pasoli's interpretation is prompted by the introduction *et mirum... dicatur* in *OM* 2.5, which leads one to think that the emperors called themselves Antoninus because of the oracle (cf. Lécirvain 1904, 183). When the passage is interpreted from that starting point, Pasoli's interpretation is a good option, but it is more likely that *OM* 2.5 is meant as a preparatory step to *OM* 3.8-9, as may be deduced from the clause *cum... dicatur*. The entire passage *OM* 3.1-7, as rounded off by *haec alii*, looks as if it was meant as a parenthesis. Klebs (1892, 34) mentions three instances of *inde (est) quod* ('die bei Cicero beliebte Wendung', 'verbreitete Schulphrase') in *PN* 9.2, *OM* 3.6 and *Pr.* 1.2 and remarks that the clause also occurs several times in the *Panegyrici*.

⁴³⁴ I follow the conjecture put forward by Jordan that we should read *ut plurimi ferunt* instead of *et plurimi fuerunt*, because the latter option does not really make sense if only three emperors (who are not likely to be referred to as *plurimi*) are mentioned. Both *et* and *fuerunt* are errors by anticipation. Mind the parallel *Dd.* 6.3: *unde etiam quidam putant*.

⁴³⁵ The term *proprium nomen* is already mentioned in *G* 2.3, which is also the first occurrence of the 'number of Antonines' theme: *simul quod nemo ei videretur feliciores imperator ad commodandum nomen eo principe, cuius proprium nomen iam per quattuor principes cucurrisset*.

⁴³⁶ *Qui cum filio factus in castris imperator filium suum, qui Diadumenus vocabatur, Antoninum vocavit, idcirco quod a praetorianis multum Antoninus desideratus est*.

death. This seems to be an element of the author's own making, despite his feeble and unreliable attempt at pretending to several sources at his disposal: *alii*.

The source of the author's other reason for the *nomen Antoninorum* is better attested. It resides, as several scholars find,⁴³⁷ in a remark by Aurelius Victor (*Caesares* 22.1-2):

Aurelius Victor (*Caesares* 22.1-2)
Quibus eo quod *ingens amissi principis*
desiderium erat, adolescentem
Antoninum vocavere....

HA OM 3.9
alii vero tantum desiderium nominis
huius fuisse dicunt, ut, nisi populus et
milites Antonini nomen audirent,
imperatorium non putarent.

Thus, *ingens... desiderium* is regarded to have served as a model for *tantum desiderium*, while, unexpectedly, *amissi principis* was changed into *nominis huius*. The author interprets the longing for the deceased and beloved emperor as a general yearning for his name. This idea falls in with Severus' alleged wish to call all the emperors to succeed him by the name of Antoninus (*S* 19.3), which is also a distortion of Aurelius Victor. Here the author of the *HA* tries once again to enhance the name's authority. The motif of the soldiers' desire for the name was earlier formulated in *Cc.* 8.10: *qui (i.e. Macrinus) cum filio factus in castris imperator filium suum, qui Diadumenus vocabatur, Antoninum vocavit, idcirco quod a praetorianis multum Antoninus desideratus est.* We may safely assume that the afterthought introduced by *idcirco quod* is an insertion (see note ad § 5.2.1) dating from the time when the author laid his hands on Aurelius Victor.

As we have seen, Aurelius Victor was used in the insertion in *S* 19-21. In the case of *OM*, it is very difficult to determine whether these passages can also be characterised as an insertion, as *OM* consists of a patchwork of texts (see chapter 6).⁴³⁸ The *NA* theme is present everywhere in the *vita*, though in varying degrees. *OM* 4, which is mainly a single senator's speech, does not include any *NA* elements. *OM* 5 opens on the commencement of Macrinus' rule and the designation of Diadumenian as his co-ruler,⁴³⁹ which makes the chapters 3-5 a flashback, as the narrative point of departure is the moment when Macrinus seized power in *OM* 2.1. A small *NA* addition to the historical narrative is made in *OM* 5.1: *Statim denique arripuit imperium filio Diadumeno in participatum adscito, quem continuo, ut diximus, Antoninum appellari a militibus iussit.* The formula is strongly linked to the report in *Cc.* 8.10 quoted above, to which *ut diximus* refers.⁴⁴⁰ In *OM* 5.7, a silly joke with regard to Macrinus' and Diadumenian's imperial names is

⁴³⁷ Reusch 1931, 45-5; Syme 1971, 85-6; Dufraigne 1975, 135; Béranger 1976, 41; Barnes 1978, 55; Den Hengst 1981, 30; Chastagnol 1994, CLVIII. Barnes (1972, 65) holds a different opinion when supposing that Marius Maximus served as a source, as the *ingens desiderium* (a 'natural expression') was a historical fact (*Dio* 79.32.2).

⁴³⁸ Mommsen 1890, 251: 'hybriden Charakter'.

⁴³⁹ *OM* 5.1: *Statim denique arripuit imperium filio Diadumeno in participatum adscito, quem continuo, ut diximus, Antoninum appellari a militibus iussit.* In reality, Macrinus was hailed as emperor in April 217, Diadumenus as *Caesar* and *Antoninus* in May 217 and *Augustus* in May 218, see Kienast 1996, 170-1.

⁴⁴⁰ It is interesting to note that the words just before the passage in *Cc.* 8.10 are *nam Macrinus Antoninum occidit, ut supra exposuimus*, referring to *Cc.* 6.6 *insidiis a Macrino praef. praet. positus, qui post eum invasit imperium, interemptus est.* The formula *invasit imperium* resembles *imperium arripuit*, as attested in *OM* 2.1 and the present passage, 5.1. See also *OM* 5.4 *imperium, quod raptum ierat.* All these related passages bear the fingerprint of the same author or source.

mentioned.⁴⁴¹ In Macrinus' letter to the senate after having been hailed as emperor by the troops, one passage is devoted to Diadumenian's name of Antoninus, beginning with *item infra* (OM 6.6, see ch.6).⁴⁴² The following phrase starts with *Antonino autem divinos honores et miles decrevit* – which is about another Antonine, namely Caracalla. The fragmentary character of the letter does not really repair the break in the narrative continuity that is caused by the remarks about Diadumenianus' name of Antoninus.

A telling passage in which various motifs are taken up appears in OM 7.5-8, the second in length (106 words) after OM 2.5-3.9 (227 words): first, a repetition of the motif in OM 3.8: *Filium sane suum, (...), ut suspicionem occisi a se Antonini removeret, Antoninum vocavit, Diadumenum antea dictum*. Note the variation on *ut suspicio a Macrino interfecti Antonini militibus tolleretur* and the reversal of the usual *qui postea...dictus est*, which is here *antea dictum*. For the first time since Cc 9.2, Elagabalus' Antonine name is brought up, OM 7.6: *Quod quidem nomen etiam Varius Heliogabalus, qui se Bassiani filium diceret, homo sordidissimus et ex meretrice conceptus, idem postea nomen accepit*, but now in a pejorative sense. It is suggested that the name of Antoninus has suffered a gradual degeneration, which is supported by reference to a poem, in which seven out of eight canonical *Antonini* are mentioned (in bold; only Geta is missing): *Denique versus extant cuiusdam poetae, quibus ostenditur Antonini nomen coepisse a Pio et paulatim per Antoninos usque ad sordes ultimas pervenisse, si quidem solus Marcus nomen illud sanctum vitae genere auxisse videatur, Verus autem degenerasse, Commodus vero etiam polluisse sacrati nominis reverentiam. Iam quid de Caracallo Antonino, quidve de hoc⁴⁴³ potest dici? Postremo etiam quid de Heliogabalo, qui Antoninorum ultimus in summa impuritate vixisse memoratur?* The motif of degeneration is underlined by the formula *usque ad sordes ultimas pervenisse*, as well as the two contrasting verbs *auxisse* and *degenerasse*, and finally *polluisse*. The motif as such is based on a poem, which is mentioned but not cited. Still, the thought that Elagabalus as the *Antoninorum ultimus* polluted the name badly is attested in a distichon by Ausonius (Caesares 97-8): *Tunc etiam Augustae sedis penetralia foedas/ Antoninorum nomina falsa gerens*.⁴⁴⁴ Parallels between the passage in OM and Ausonius' fragment have caused much scholarly debate,⁴⁴⁵ which centers on the question to what extent Marius Maximus may have served as a source and model for the HA. Ausonius' *Caesares* are thought to be inspired by Marius Maximus, who is supposed to have written the lives from Trajan to Elagabalus.⁴⁴⁶ If with the *versus cuiusdam poetae* Ausonius' *Caesares* are

⁴⁴¹ OM 5.7: *Infulsit praeterea in nomen Severi, cum illius nulla cognatione tangeretur. unde iocus extitit: 'sic Macrinus est Severus, quo modo Diadumenus Antoninus.'*

⁴⁴² OM 6.6: *'Diadumenum filium meum vobis notum et imperio miles donavit et nomine, Antoninum videlicet appellans, ut cohonestetur prius nomine, sic etiam regni honore. quod vos, p. c., bono faustoque omine adprobetis petimus, ne vobis desit Antoninorum nomen, quod maxime diligitis.'*

⁴⁴³ Hoc refers to Diadumenus, the subject of the present narration.

⁴⁴⁴ The last two verses of the quatrain are lost.

⁴⁴⁵ For the discussion, see especially Green 1981, 234 and 1999, 576-8. Barns (1967, 70) came up with the parallel. See further Syme 1968, 57; Chastagnol 1994, LIV. Schwartz (1972, 268-70) treats the similarities in detail; Den Hengst (1992, 165) provides for corroborating evidence by the parallel T 31 ~ Aus. *Caes.* 2 (*memor historiae*).

⁴⁴⁶ Opinions about the use of Marius Maximus as a basic source differ, but the extent of his program, up to Elagabalus, is widely accepted (though contested by Paschoud 1998).

meant, the paraphrase is inaccurate.⁴⁴⁷ This is a topic that will be further explored below, in *OM* 11.6 and *Dd.* 2.3. For the present, another observation should be made: the *nomen Antoninorum* turns out to be *sanctum* and has *sacraei nominis reverentiam* (which was mentioned before in *S* 20.3 *sanctum illud nomen*, cf. *nomenque illud venerabile* in *S* 21.11), at which time only the hearts of men were overwhelmed by the authority of the name. It looks as if a new climax is coming up.

A new development occurs in the part that follows Herodian very closely.⁴⁴⁸ The author must have been pleased to have Herodian at his disposal, because the fragment provides practically the only genuine information in the entire biography. The passage is revealing about the author's literary techniques. It shows how he juggles his sources in order to strengthen the unity of his work – if we interpret it with some good will. In a passage that follows an excerpt from Herodian very closely the *nomen Antoninorum* theme is interwoven in the text:

Herod. 5.3.1

ἐχρῆν δὲ ἄρα Μακρῖνον ἐνιαυτοῦ
μόνου τῇ βασιλείᾳ ἐντροφήσαντα
ἅμα τῷ βίῳ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν
καταλῦσαι, μικρὰν καὶ εὐτελεῖ
πρόφασιν τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐς ἃ
ἐβούλοντο τῆς τύχης παρασχούσης.
Μαῖσα ἦν τις ὄνομα, τὸ γένος
Φοίνισσα, ἀπὸ Ἑμέσου καλουμένης
οὕτω πόλεως ἐν Φοινίκη·

OM. 8.4-9.1

*Inde cum se Antiocham recepisset ac
luxuriae operam daret, iustam causam
interficiendi sui praeuit exercitui (ac
Bassiani, ut putabatur, filium sequendi,
id est Heliogabalum Bassianum Varium,
qui postea est et Bassianus et Antoninus
appellatus). Fuit aliqua mulier Maesa
sive Varia ex Emisena urbe...*

The parallels between the text of *OM* and its source are clear: first, *luxuriae operam daret* is based on ἐντροφήσαντα, second, *iustam causam interficiendi sui praeuit exercitui* derives from πρόφασιν τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐς ἃ ἐβούλοντο τῆς τύχης παρασχούσης and third *Fuit aliqua mulier Maesa sive Varia ex Emisena urbe* is based on Μαῖσα ἦν τις ὄνομα, τὸ γένος Φοίνισσα, ἀπὸ Ἑμέσου καλουμένης οὕτω πόλεως ἐν Φοινίκη. The passage in *OM*: *ac Bassiani ... Antoninus est appellatus*, quoted between brackets above, is not paralleled by the source of its context: the *NA* theme functions here as a repetitive element to embellish the historical narration.

⁴⁴⁷ Inaccurate, because only the poem on Elagabalus comes up with the name of Antoninus, though it is the author's habit to exaggerate such things. A second incongruence is that the author names Verus, to whom Ausonius did not devote a poem.

⁴⁴⁸ As observed by Mommsen *Hermes* 25, 27n2; Klebs *RhM* 45, 458; Lécivain 1904, 187; Hönn 1911, 11; Kolb 1972, 135; Barnes 1967, 70 and 1978, 56; Turcan 1993, 133n50.

A similar instance occurs in the immediate sequel:

Herod. 5.3.3

ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῇ θυγατέρες δύο·
Σοαιμὶς μὲν ἢ πρεσβυτέρα
ἐκαλεῖτο, ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα Μαμαία.
παῖδες δὲ ἦσαν τῇ μὲν πρεσβυτέρῃ
Βασιανὸς ὄνομα, τῇ δὲ νεωτέρῃ
Ἀλεξιανός. (...) ἰέρωντο δὲ αὐτοὶ
θεῷ ἡλίῳ· τοῦτον γὰρ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι
σέβουσι, τῇ Φοινίκων φωνῇ
Ἑλαιογάβαλον καλοῦντες.

OM 9.2

Huic erant duae filiae, Symiamira et
Mammaea, quarum maiori filius erat
Heliogabalus (et Bassiani et Antonini
nomen accepit). Nam Heliogabalum
Foenices vocant solem.

Here, *huic erant duae filiae* is based on ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῇ θυγατέρες δύο, *Symiamira et Mammaea* on Σοαιμὶς μὲν ἢ πρεσβυτέρα ἐκαλεῖτο, ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα Μαμαία, and *quarum maiori filius erat Heliogabalus* on παῖδες δὲ ἦσαν τῇ μὲν πρεσβυτέρῃ Βασιανὸς ὄνομα..., Finally *nam Heliogabalum Foenices vocant solem* is based on τῇ Φοινίκων φωνῇ Ἑλαιογάβαλον καλοῦντες. The only element in the passage that is not derived from Herodian is the formula *et Bassiani et Antonini nomen accepit*, which resembles the added formula quoted above, in OM 8.4: ...*id est Heliogabalum Bassianum Varium, qui postea est et Bassianus et Antoninus appellatus*. The element *et Bassiani et Antonini* is an echo from *et Bassianus et Antoninus*, while *nomen accepit* is no more than a variation on *est appellatus*.

The examples are instructive with regard to the author's procedure: from the comparison between Herodian and the HA it appears that the author freely added his favourite theme to an existing text (in a paraphrased or abbreviated form). In much the same way, it can be imagined that the longest passage on the *nomen Antoninorum*, OM 3.1-9, was added to a source about Macrinus in order to expand the scarce information about this 'lesser-known' ruler. Indeed, once OM 2.5 – 3.9 is removed, the structure of the text seems to be unaffected and more even, OM 1.3-4.1: *Quamvis senatus eum imperatorem odio Antonini Bassiani libenter acceperit, cum in senatu omnibus una vox esset: 'Quemvis magis quam parricidam, quemvis magis quam incestum, quemvis magis quam impurum, quemvis magis quam interfectorem et senatus et populi.'* (OM 2.5-3.9: *Nom. Ant.*) *Et de Macrino quidem in senatu multis, (...) ea dicta sunt, ut appareat ignobilem, sordidum, spurcum fuisse.* Once the *nomen Antoninorum* passage (indicated between brackets) is deleted, the text produces a much smoother account than the final version of HA. The same applies to OM 7.5-7: *Denique statim Macrino et proconsulare imperium et potestatem tribuniciam detulerunt.* (OM 7.5-7: *Nom. Ant.*). *Appellatus igitur imperator suscepto bello contra Parthos profectus est magno apparatu...* Within this same passage, some remarks are reminiscent of the added passages in OM 3.8, 8.4 and 9.2: *Varius Heliogabalus, qui se Bassiani filium diceret... idem postea nomen accepit.*

Compare OM 7.5 to 3.8:

7.5: *Filium sane suum, ..., ut suspicionem occisi a se Antonini removeret, Antoninum vocavit, Diadumenum antea dictum.*

3.8: *Sed alii idcirco Antoninum Diadumenum a Macrino patre appellatum ferunt, ut suspicio a Macrino interfecti Antonini militibus tolleretur.*

and OM 7.6 to 8.4 and 9.2:

7.6 : *Quod quidem nomen etiam Varius Heliogabalus, qui se Bassiani filium diceret, ..., idem postea nomen accepit.*

8.4: - ...*Bassiani (...) filium...*
- *id est Heliogabalum Bassianum Varium*
- ...*qui postea est et Bassianus et Antoninus appellatus*
9.2 : ... *et Bassiani et Antonini nomen accepit*

OM 7.5 is very similar to OM 3.8: *filium sane suum Antoninum vocavit, Diadumenum antea dictum* is a variation (caused by a change of perspective from Macrinus to alii) on *Antoninum Diadumenum a Macrino patre appellatum ferunt*, while *ut suspicionem (occisi a se Antonini) removeret* is based on *ut suspicio (a Macrino interfecti Antonini) ...tolleretur*. Much the same can be said about the formula *Diadumenum antea dictum* that recurs in the next sentence - though in a different context - as *idem postea nomen accepit*, and in 8.4 as *qui postea est... appellatus*. The discussed paragraphs in OM, 2.5-3.9 and 7.5-8 clearly correspond with one another and seem to interrupt a historical narration. They also have verbal connections with other, more briefly related formulas (8.4 and 9.2). One more remark should be made at this point. We concluded that the clause in bold is an addition: ...*iustam causam interficiendi sui praebeuit exercitui ac Bassiani, ut putabatur, filium sequendi, id est Heliogabalum Bassianum Varium, qui postea est et Bassianus et Antoninus appellatus*. That being so, the remarks about the love for Antoninus in OM 10.2⁴⁴⁹ may well be loose additions of the NA theme, thematically connected with the passage in OM 3.9 and Cc. 9.1, in which it is reported how much the name of Antoninus was loved.

After OM 10.4, the author takes leave of Herodian for new considerations about imperial names (*sciendum praeterea...* is typical of the author's idiom, see ad § 3.2) and the joint rulership of Macrinus and Diadumenian (OM 10.5: ...*quem plerique pari fuisse cum patris imperio*), a theme that is known from MA 7.6 (see § 5.2.1). In OM 10.6 again, a brief remark on Diadumenian's name of Antoninus is made (a variation and exaggeration of G 1.1 and Ael. 1.2)⁴⁵⁰: *non enim aliquid dignum in eius vita erit, quod dicatur, praeter hoc quod Antoninorum nomini est velut nothus adpositus*. This has every

⁴⁴⁹ OM 10.2: *quibus cum Antoninus ostenderetur, miro amore in eum omnibus inclinatis occiso Iuliano praefecto ad eum omnes transierunt* and OM 10.3: *commissoque proelio Macrinus est victus proditione militum eius et amore Antonini*.

⁴⁵⁰ G 1.1: *neque enim multa in eius vita dici possunt, qui prius rebus humanis exemptus est quam cum fratre teneret imperium* and Ael. 2.1: *Ceionius Commodus, ... nihil habet in sua vita memorabile, nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus*, see § 5.3.2.

appearance of the author continuing with his usual themes after Herodian had run out as a source.

The next part concerns Macrinus' character, which the author inserts as a supplement to the historical narrative in order to produce a biography in the Suetonian tradition. The narration becomes increasingly fluent, in that interruptions in the text, as we have come across above, seem to diminish, apart from considerations on the imperial names of Severus, Pertinax, Pius and Felix in *OM* 11. An elegiac epigram mocking the assumption of the names of Severus, Pertinax and Felix and the refusal of the name of Pius by Macrinus follows, after which the description of Macrinus' behaviour is continued. In *OM* 14.2 Diadumenian is graced with some other verses, in hexameters this time, in which the *NA* theme occurs again: *Vidimus in somnis, cives, nisi fallor, et istud: / Antoninorum nomen puer ille gerebat, / qui patre venali genitus sed matre pudica, / centum nam moechos passa est centumque rogavit. / ipse etiam calvus moechus fuit, inde maritus: / en Pius, en Marcus, Verus nam non fuit ille*. Several echoes from classical authors are to be found in the poem.⁴⁵¹ Some further observations should be made about the remarkable beginning (apparently *medias in res*, to judge by the words *et istud*) about the first person point of view determined by *vidimus*, and the apostrophe *cives*. The form *vidimus* is used in the way that T.E. Page has described as 'graphic *vidimus*', as pointing 'to something actually visible to the Romans in Rome...', i.e. the flooding of the Tiber.⁴⁵² This same use of *vidimus* is often used for the introduction of funny street scenes in satire, especially Juvenal, normally in depreciatory sense.⁴⁵³ In this sense, *vidimus* fits the author's intention perfectly, though he gives the word an original twist: it is placed in the perspective of a dream, *in somnis*. Note that in v.2 the *Antoninorum nomen* is mentioned for the first time in exactly such a fashion, possibly derived from Ausonius' *Caesares* 98 on Elagabalus: *Antoninorum nomina falsa gerens*. A triplet of Antonines is summed up in the last verse *en Pius, en Marcus, Verus nam non fuit ille*, Antoninus Pius and his two adoptive sons Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, the latter of whom provides the pun: Diadumenian was never to be a *verus Antoninus*. As Diadumenian is presented as a bastard son of an adulterous slave (*patre venali, calvus moechus*), the name *Antoninus* is *velut nothus adpositus*, as was stated in *OM* 10.6.

Also important is the way in which the epigram is introduced and fitted into the context, *OM* 14.1: *...inita factione illum occiderunt cum puero filio Diadumeno, scilicet Antonino cognomine, de quo dictum est, quod in somnis Antoninus fuisset. unde etiam versus extant huiusmodi:...* Note how the poetical fragment follows a careless *scilicet Antonino cognomine*, after which the introduction to the verses follows. Later, the

⁴⁵¹ Den Hengst (1995b, 143) sees an allusion to Catullus 11.17-8 in the fourth verse: *cum suis vivat valeatque moechis / quos simul complexa tenet trecentos*. In the fifth verse, *calvus moechus* has been seen as an echo from Suetonius' distichon in *Div.Iul.* 51: Salmassius 1620 *ad loc*, Cameron 1964; Baldwin 1978, 53; Den Hengst 1995, 143. Cazzaniga (1972, 140) emphasises the use of *calvus* as a characteristic of *liberti*, which Macrinus, according to the author (*OM* 4. 3) would have been. *Patre venali* in v.3 refers to the same connotation.

⁴⁵² T.E. Page *ad Hor. Od.* 1.2.13, London 1964, 138.

⁴⁵³ For example Iuv. *Sat.* 3.6: *nam quid tam miserum, tam solum vidimus...*; cf. Hor. *Serm.* 2.8.90 and Lucilius *Sat.* v.1324. Also in the late fourth-century the *Carmen contra paganos* v.103-4 the form is used in a satirical sense: *vidimus argento facto iuga ferre leones, / lignea cum traherent iuncti stridentia plaustra,...* The singular *vidi* is used by Tibullus in his elegies to provide some examples from own observation, c.1.2.89, 1.4.33. Cf. also *PN* 6.8: *Hunc...videmus sacra Isidis ferentem* for a variation on 'graphic *vidimus*' in the present tense.

narrative is resumed in *OM* 14.1 with *Genus mortis, ut diximus, tale fuit: ...* In the introduction to the connecting verses, the author, as usual, takes some elements from the cited document⁴⁵⁴ (...*quod in somnis Antoninus fuisset*). The epilogue is traditional: *et isti versus ex Graeco translati sunt in Latinum, nam Graece sunt disertissimi, videntur autem mihi ab aliquo poeta vulgari translati esse*. This is certainly untrue, as a play on words with *verus Antoninus* could never have been made in Greek, as Den Hengst 1995, 143-4 has pointed out, while Cazzaniga's attempt (1972, 142n12: 'restituito *per iocum*') to reconstruct the original is as ingenious as it is useless. All the elements have come up before: the Greek original (*PN* 12.5: *extat etiam epigramma Graecum, quod Latine hanc habet sententiam*), the superiority of the Greek version (*OM* 7.3: *unde in eum epigramma non infacetum Graeci cuiusdam poetae videtur extare, quod Latine hac sententia continetur:...*), the bad translator (*OM* 7.7: *sed non minus risui est habitus quam poeta ille, qui de Graeco Latine coactus est scribere*). The alleged answer by the emperor is a traditional one also (*PN* 12.7-8; *OM* 11.5: *Quibus acceptis Macrinus his versibus respondisse fertur: ... OM* 11.7: *his versibus Macrinus ... respondisse se credit...*). Macrinus' lost answer is referred to thus: *Quod cum Macrinus audisset, fecit iambos, qui non extant; iucundissimi autem fuisse dicuntur*. The word *iucundus*, like *lepidus*, often denotes lighter, epigrammatic verse in Catullus' times, and later for Martial and his colleagues (see § 7.4 and 7.8). Then, a funny explanation is given for the loss: *Qui quidem perierunt in eo tumultu, in quo ipse occisus est, quando et omnia eius a militibus pervastata sunt*. There are two constant elements in the author's disclaimers: the version that he quotes is always inferior to the other (Greek or Latin)⁴⁵⁵ original, and the unquoted verses that he only refers to, are *non infacetum* or *iucundissimi*. So it happens that Macrinus in *OM* 14.7 is able to compose *iucundissimi* verses (*qui non extant*), while in *OM* 11.7 *versibus...longe peioribus* are quoted.⁴⁵⁶ Needless to say, the author excuses himself for his own bad products but they serve a purpose: he tries to ridicule the traditional formulas of modesty by writing really bad poetry and immediately apologizing for it.

With this, we have finally come to the end of the analysis of the *NA* theme in a biography that shows multiple variations on the same theme: the *nomen Antoninorum* numbered in an oracle and the occurrences as *nomen* and *cognomen* (*OM* 3.1-7), as an excuse for Caracalla's murder (2.8), as a variation on Aurelius Victor (2.9), as a joke on names (3.7), in a letter to the senate (6.6-7), in a description of a poem (7.5-8), as intrusions in an historiographical account taken from Herodian (8.4, 9.2 etc.), in a programmatic statement (10.6) and finally in an epigram (14.2). All of these passages suggest that they were added to an already existent text. In that sense, they function as 'Lückenbüsser', padding, as has been observed before by several scholars.⁴⁵⁷ In the course of this, we have examined how and where exactly the additions were made.

⁴⁵⁴ Conform the author's habit: Den Hengst 1987.

⁴⁵⁵ A Latin poem is compared to another Latin poem in *OM* 11.3-7: *longe peioribus, quam illi Latini sunt*.

⁴⁵⁶ Other verses in *AS* 38.3-6; *Gd.* 20.5; *T* 1.2; *Aur.* 6.5, 7.2, all quoted by Baldwin (1978, 50-8); the verses in *Dd.* 7.3 are treated below.

⁴⁵⁷ For example, Den Hengst 1981, 38, though he adds the thought that the *NA* passages are Lückenbüsser 'on a par with e.g. the divagations about *omina*'. As my analysis makes clear, I believe that 'on a par' must be modified in that the *NA* theme is the author's fabrication based on two passages in Eutropius (see paragraph on *Ael.-V*) and Aurelius Victor (see on *S*, *Cc.* and *OM* 3.9), whereas the *omina* are based on a different source, possibly Marius Maximus.

Statistically, in accordance with the analysis above, the 2495 words of *OM* contain twelve fragments totalling 584 words, which were added to the earlier text, amounting to 23.4 per cent (cf. 17.3 per cent of *G*). The fragments differ in length from 225 words (*OM* 2.5-3.9), 115 words (14.1-5), 106 words (7.5-8), 41 words (5.7), to some smaller interpolations of twenty words or less in *OM* 2.1; 5.1 and 7; 8.4; 9.2; 10.2, 3 and 6. The author took his information about Macrinus' life from Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, the source of *Cc.*, at least some passages from Herodian and a poem by Ausonius.⁴⁵⁸ To these disparate sources, the author added long passages about the *NA* theme, which is not paralleled by any other source, from either the third or fourth century AD.

5.3.2 The *NA* Theme in *Dd.*

The inclusion of a separate biography on Macrinus' teenage son Diadumenian has a twofold justification: *Antonini Diadumeni pueri (...) nihil habet vita memorabile*, (1) *nisi quod Antoninus est dictus et* (2) *quod ei stupenda omina sunt facta imperii non diutini...* (*Dd.* 1.1, the first two words of the biography mark the main theme). The formula contains verbal repetitions, though with slight variations, of the remark about Aelius quoted before (*Ael.* 2.1: *Ceionius Commodus (...) nihil habet in sua vita memorabile nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus.*). A similar remark was made in *OM* 10.6: *non enim aliquid dignum in eius vita erit, quod dicatur, praeter hoc quod Antoninorum nomini est velus nothus adpositus*. Another variation is found in *Dd.* 6.1: *cuius vitam iunxissem patris gestis, nisi Antoninorum me ad edendam puerili specialem expositionem vitae coegisset*. The *nomen Antoninorum* is used in *Dd.* in the same way as the *nomen Caesaris* in *Ael.*, to justify the writing of a separate biography.

Many elements in the introductory remark are echoes from earlier passages in *HA*: the *digna memoratu*-theme from the preface to *OM* (*nihil habet vita memorabile*), the theme of the short-lived emperor from the same preface (*imperii non diutini*), occurring for the first time in *PN* 1, and naturally the *NA* theme. Indeed, the theme is omnipresent in the biography, and is also essential to the passages devoted to the *omina imperii*, the second justification of the biography.⁴⁵⁹ Evidently, the main concern of the author in this biography is to integrate the *NA* theme in a number of narrative forms: historical narration, speeches, acclamations, letters and verses. Here is a survey of the theme and its appearances; the passages from which the theme is absent are underlined:

⁴⁵⁸ Barnes (1978, 55-6) identifies the various sources; see also chapter 6 in this study.

⁴⁵⁹ Apart from other things, the *omina stupenda*, described in *Dd.* 4 and 5, provide an explanation of the name Diadumenus or Diadematus, which may be inspired by the explanation of the *nomen Caesaris* in *Ael.*

Dd.1-2	NA (introduction, historical narration, speeches)
3.1-3	<u>physical appearance</u> (3.1-3)
3.4-5.6	<u>omina imperii</u> , NA theme 5.4-5
6.1	NA (programmatic remark)
6.2-10	NA (<i>nomen / cognomen</i>) ⁴⁶⁰
6.1, 6.5-8.1	NA (<i>epistula</i>)
6.2-4	NA (<i>versus</i>)
8.2-9.3	<u>epistulae</u>
9.4-6	NA (conclusion)

Dd. is the most conspicuous example of the figure of *amplificatio* in the *HA*. On three occasions, the author reminds the reader of the origin of the remark (see *Cc.* 9.2 and *OM* 3.9), for example in *Dd.* 1.5: *intellego praeterea desiderium ingens Antoniniani nominis apud vos manere*, are Macrinus's words in his speech to the soldiers. Then, in 6.10, there is a surprising shift: the original intention of Aurelius Victor's passage (22.1-2) is followed, in which the author suddenly shows his hand: *Post hoc ipse Diadumenus ut commendaretur exercitui senatui populoque Romano, cum esset ingens desiderium Bassiani Caracalli, Antoninum appellatum satis constat*. At the end of the biography, in *Dd.* 9.4, a variation on the theme is made when the soldiers are inclined to favour Elagabalus: *...in Marcum Aurelium Antoninum caritate nominis inclinavit exercitus. Is filius Bassiani Caracalli ferebatur*, cf. the small additions in *OM* 10.2 *miro amore in eum omnibus inclinatis* and 10.3 *et amore Antonini*.

The passages dealing with the NA theme will be treated in the order in which they appear in *Dd.* The first section, 1.1-2, is a fine example of a single historical fact combined with a lot of authorial invention. In fact, these paragraphs are a form of amplification of the announcement in *OM* 5.1: *Statim denique arripuit imperium filio Diadumeno in participatum adscito, quem continuo, ut diximus, Antoninum appellari a militibus iussit*. The second half of the phrase, beginning with *quem continuo...* is an attempt by the author to make historical fact serve his purposes. The author keeps on making variations within the NA theme. Note for example the variation on *OM* 3.8, where, as we have seen, the Antonine name was granted to Diadumenian in order to suppress suspicion that Macrinus was involved in Caracalla's murder plot. Now the author states, *Dd.* 1.2: *...veritus, ne in aliquem Antoninorum, qui multi ex affinibus Antonini Pii erant inter duces, exercitus inclinaret, statim contionem parari iussit filiumque suum tunc puerum Antoninum appellavit*. It is suggested that Macrinus feared that the soldiers would side with some of his officers, who were related to Antoninus Pius. Meanwhile, the author gives us to understand that many leaders were prepared to use the name of Antoninus in order to seize power.⁴⁶¹ The explanation of the name of Antoninus in *OM* 3.8 (the name was given in order to avoid suspicion about involvement in Caracalla's murder plot) has been abandoned. The *contio* that follows again picks up

⁴⁶⁰ Chapter 6 is closely connected to *OM* 3 and 7.5-8, in which the emperors bearing the Antonine name are treated and preparation is made for the emperors yet to come, Heliogabalus in particular.

⁴⁶¹ Macrinus' fear is a recurring theme, which was also mentioned in *OM* 2.1 *iudicandi de se militibus...potestatem demit*, 5.4 *adcedebat etiam illud, quod militarem motum timebat, ne eo interveniente suum impediretur imperium*, 5.5 *timuit etiam collegam, ne et ipse imperare cuperet*; 5.7 *statim ad delendum militum motum stipendiumdedit*.

the motif of the popularity of the name of Antoninus, now in direct speech: *intellego praeterea desiderium ingens Antoniniani nominis apud vos manere*, which is in accordance with *OM* 3.9 (the popularity of the name among soldiers, earlier mentioned in *Cc.* 8.10). The soldiers respond with acclamations (1.6-8).⁴⁶² The most innovative part in the *NA* theme is provided by the end of the acclamations: *Antoninum habemus, omnia habemus. Antoninum nobis di dederunt*.⁴⁶³ The gods themselves have given us an Antoninus.

Macrinus' answer is an elaboration of *OM* 5.7 (*statim tamen ad delendum militum motum stipendium et legionariis et praetorianis dedit solito uberius*), in *Dd.* 2.1: *habete igitur, commilitones, pro imperio aureos ternos, pro Antonini nomine aureos quinos et solitas promotiones sed geminatas*. The clause *solito uberius*⁴⁶⁴ is specified and echoed and amplified in *solitas promotiones sed geminatas*. There is also an echo from Macrinus' letter to the senate in *OM* 6.6 (*et imperio miles donavit et nomine*), the double mention of *pro imperio* and *pro Antonini nomine*. The phrase is an example of how the author combines several texts, preferably with use of *amplificatio* and *hyperbole*. This latter figure is fully explored in *di facient, ut haec saepius fiant. dabimus autem per cuncta quinquennia hoc, quod hodie putavimus*. The gods will see to it that the gift is repeated every five years. Then the floor is given to Diadumenian with his maiden *contio* to the troops: *gratias vobis ... quod me et imperio donastis et nomine*, which, just a few words later, he repeats in *causa imperii, causa nominis*. The enumeration of emperors, familiar from *OM* 3.4, 7.5-7 and especially 14.2 (v.6) passes review again: *scio enim me Pii, me Marci, me Veri suscepisse nomen*. Finally, the last words by Macrinus are exaggerated again, *Dd.* 2.4: *interim tamen ... id omne quod pater et tantundem promitto honoribus, ut et venerandus Macrinus pater praesens promisit, duplicatis*.

The total dependence of *Dd.* on *OM* becomes even clearer when the author explicitly mentions Herodian as his main source for that book, for its factual information in *Dd.* 2.5 *Herodianus Graecus scriptor haec praeteriens Diadumenum tantum Caesarem dixit puerum a militibus nuncupatum et cum patre occisum*. Indeed, in his history (5.4.12), Herodian mentions the two facts in one breath, Diadumenian's promotion to Caesar⁴⁶⁵: τέλει μὲν δὴ τοιούτῳ Μακρίνος ἐχρήσατο, συναναιρεθέντος αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ παιδός, ὃν ἦν ποιήσας Καίσαρα, Διαδουμενιανὸν καλούμενον. With *haec praeteriens* the roguish scholar acts out his own fantasies and fools around with source criticism.

⁴⁶² The first occurrence of the formula *di te servant* is *AP* 3.1 ...*inter alias acclamations dictum est: Auguste, di te servant*. Also, in these acclamations the new emperor is wished long life. For this theme, see Burian 1980 and Baldwin 1981 for acclamations in general. The theme of the *senex imperator*, who cannot reign for long, recurs in *Tac.* 5.

⁴⁶³ The term *omnia* refers to 'un amour intense' or 'une dévotion religieuse au prince', according to Turcan (1981, 143), with reference to Versnel (1990, 214): persons on whom one sets all one's hopes or towards whom one directs all one's affection are (*unus*) *omnia*, e.g. Lucan. 3.108: *omnia Caesar erat*; Auson. *Grat. Act.* 3.13: *unus mihi omnia Gratianus*; cf. *Cod. Th. Gesta Senatus* 5 p.2 line 43, p.3 line 1 and Instinsky 1942b, 350n1.

⁴⁶⁴ See for this expression Suetonius *Galba* 16.2 and Gascou 1984, 752.

⁴⁶⁵ Herodianus does not seem to know about Diadumenianus' late installation as Augustus by the soldiers, as coins appear to witness; cf. Kienast 1996, 171 and Whittaker 1970, 37n2. The author of *HA* contradicts himself when *OM* 10.5 is taken into account: *sciendum praeterea, quod Caesar fuisse dicitur, non Augustus Diadumenus puer, quem plerique pari fuisse cum patris imperio tradiderunt*.

Then the focus shifts to the senate in Rome. The letter (*oratio*) that had been cited in *OM* 6 is mentioned (*missae ...ad senatum litterae*) and therefore no document in direct speech is inserted. One particular passage is mentioned (*quibus nomen Antonini indicatum est*), which is a reference to that particular *NA*-passage *OM* 6.6-7 in the letter. The reaction of the senators corresponds with *OM* 7.1 (*et mortem Antonini senatus gratanter accepit*), *Dd.* 2.7: *senatus imperium id libenter dicitur recepisse*: the words are similar, though not the object (*mortem Antonini* → *imperium id*). The same formula, however, had been used with the expected object: *OM* 2.3 *quamvis senatus eum imperatorem odio Antonini Bassiani libenter accepit*. The element missing in the other two phrases, *odio Antonini Bassiani*, crops up in the present passage as an afterthought ... *quamvis alii Antonini Caracalli odio id factum putent*. Note the inversion *odio Antonini Bassiani* → *Antonini Caracalli odio*, see above sub *Dd.* 1.5. The constant rearrangement of these elements may be shown schematically as follows:

<i>OM</i> 2.3 <i>quamvis senatus eum imperatorum <u>odio Antonini Bassiani libenter accepit</u></i>	<i>OM</i> 7.1 <i>et mortem Antonini <u>senatus gratanter accepit</u></i>	<i>Dd.</i> 2.7: <i>quare etiam senatus imperium id <u>libenter dicitur recepisse</u>, quamvis alii <u>Antonini Caracalli odio id factum putent</u>.</i>
--	---	--

The formula of *libenter accep(er)it* may well come from *Cc.* 2.11: *quod quidem nec senatus libenter accepit*, referring to the excuse by Caracalla (!) for the murder of Geta.

Our analysis of the *NA* passages shows that its contents are reshaped through the medium of a preface, historical narration, *contiones*, *acclamationes* and *senatus consulta*, but there are also a few novel elements. One of these is the protection of Antoninus by the gods, which is a further step in the amplification of the *NA* theme. But there is a further fabrication. In *Dd.* 2.6 coins are minted, the first issue of these bearing the name of Antoninus Diadumenianus, the second, after approval by the senate, that of Macrinus. In other instances, the ideas are derived from other biographies: in *Dd.* 2.8 dark-red *paenulae* (cloaks)⁴⁶⁶ are distributed named *Antoninianae* in honour of the emperor's son. Their distribution and naming after the giver is an imitation of Caracalla's offer of *Caracallae* to the people (*Cc.* 9.8).⁴⁶⁷ As Caracalla himself is named after such a cloak, the author adds the joke that Macrinus proposed the name *Paenuleus* or *Paenularius* for his son.

In *Dd.* 2.9, the author cites the text of an edict (with an adequate introduction) in which Macrinus expresses the wish to come to Rome in order to give a *congiarium* (distribution of largess) to the people in honour of Diadumenian (*vellem...iam praesentes essemus*).⁴⁶⁸ The text of the edict also includes the promise that *pueri Antoniniani* and

⁴⁶⁶ *Paenulae* were normally worn by *tribuni plebis*, see *H* 3.5 and Kolb 1972, 95-100.

⁴⁶⁷ *Cc.* 9.7-8: *Ipse Caracalli nomen accepit a vestimento, quod populo dederat, demisso usque ad talos. Quod ante non fuerat. Unde hodieque Antoninianae dicuntur caracallae huiusmodi, in usu maxime Romanae plebis frequentatae*. This passage may be an addition from a different source, as it occurs as an explanation of Caracalla's name in a passage about the emperor's building activities (*Cc.* 9.4-6: *opera Romae reliquit...* and 9.9-10: *Idem viam novam munivit...*). The use of the word *ipse* in 9.7 may be read as betraying the author's interpolation.

⁴⁶⁸ The literary fabrications do not mean that no *congiarium* took place at all, see for example Whittaker 1970, 37n2, who provides a brief historical reconstruction of such an event in Antioch.

puellae Antoninianae will be registered, in order to propagate the glory of this much beloved name (...*qui tam grati nominis gloriam propagarent*). This promise is reminiscent of Antoninus Pius' distribution of food for girls (*Faustinianae*, after his wife's name, *AP* 8.1: *congiarium populo dedit... Puellas alimentarias in honorem Faustinae Faustinianas constituit*) and Marcus Aurelius' comparable largess after the marriage of his daughter Lucilla and his brother Verus (*MA* 7.8: *ob hanc coniunctionem pueros et puellas novorum nominum frumentariae perceptioni adscribi praeceperunt*). The origin of the idea of food distribution to minors is already present in the first biography of the *HA*, that of *H* (7.8) which even refers to Trajan's act.⁴⁶⁹ In *AP* 8.1 and *MA* 7.8 distribution is linked to names of girls and boys, which results in again a new manifestation of the *NA* theme in *Dd*.2.8. The largess for the children is meant to glorify the favourite name (see *Cc*. 9.2 and *OM* 3.9 and above). The *NA* theme ends with the placing of *signa* and *vexilla* in the military camps devoted to the Antonine name, and the memory of Bassianus is honoured with gold and silver statues. On top of this a thanksgiving of seven days is granted (...*atque dies septem supplicatio pro Antonini nomine celebrata est*) - an extraordinary event in every respect, as this was normally restricted to great victories.⁴⁷⁰

⁴⁶⁹ See for these *alimentariae* *H* 7.8: *pueris ac puellis, quibus etiam Traianus alimenta detulerat, incrementum liberalitatis adiecit*. For an explanation of Trajan's measures, see Chastagnol 1994, 28n1. Garnsey (1988, 251-68) on food supply in the later empire, and especially Virlouvet (1995, 230-1) for *alimenta* and *frumentationes*. Pliny praises Trajan in his *Panegyricus* for his food distributions (*Pan.* 51.5); on Pertinax' food distribution (*P* 9.3) and references to general articles: Birley 1978, 87-90.

⁴⁷⁰ Halkin (1953, 126) treats the *supplicatio* in case, the duration of which he characterises as 'exceptionnel à l'époque impériale'. See further Freyburger 1978 about *supplicationes* in general.

Passage	Contents	Parallels (sources)
<i>praefatio</i> 1.1	Justification of <i>Dd.</i> : <i>NA</i> and <i>omina</i>	<i>Ael.</i> (<i>nomen Caesaris</i>), <i>G</i>
narration 1.2	<i>ingens desiderium</i> exaggeration: ... <i>quod cum eo Romanum esset imperium perituum</i>	<i>OM</i> 3.9 (← <i>AV</i> 20.1-2), <i>Cc.</i> 9.2 (← <i>Eutr.</i>)
narration 1.3	instalment of Diadumenian <i>veritus ne...inclinaret</i>	<i>OM</i> 2.5, 5.1, 6.6, 8.10 ↔ <i>Cc</i> 8.10; <i>OM</i> 3.8
<i>contio</i> 1.4-5	<i>desiderium ingens Antonini nomine</i> <i>pro imperio</i> ..., <i>pro Antonini nomine</i> ... <i>et solitas promotiones sed geminatas</i>	<i>OM</i> 3.9 (← <i>AV</i> 20.1-2), <i>Cc.</i> 9.2, <i>Dd.</i> 1.2 <i>OM</i> 5.7, 6.6
<i>acclamationes</i> 1.6-8	<i>Antoninum nobis di dederunt</i>	
<i>contio</i> 2.2-4	<i>et imperio donastis et nomine / causa imperii, causa nominis Pii... Marci ...Veri ... nomen honoribus duplicatis</i>	<i>OM</i> 6.6, <i>Dd.</i> 1.5 <i>OM</i> 3, 7.5-7 <i>OM</i> 5.7, 6.6, <i>Dd.</i> 1.5
<i>Source-criticism</i>	<i>Herodianus ...Diadumenum tantum Caesarem dixit...</i>	<i>OM</i> 10.4
narration (senate) 2.6-7	<i>missae ...ad senatum litterae quibus...indicatum est</i> <i>senatus...libenter dicitur recepisse</i> ... <i>Antonini Caracalli odio...</i>	<i>OM</i> 6 <i>OM</i> 6.6 <i>OM</i> 7.1, 2.3 <i>OM</i> 2.3
narration (puns) 2.8	<i>paenulas populo coloris russei... quae vocarentur Antoninianae</i>	<i>H</i> 3.5, <i>Cc.</i> 9.7-8
<i>edictum</i> 2.9-10	<i>congiarium sui nominis ...et pueros Antoninianos et puellas Antoninianas tam grati nominis</i>	<i>H</i> 7.8, <i>AP</i> 8.1, <i>MA</i> 7.8 <i>Cc.</i> 9.2, <i>OM</i> 3.9, <i>Dd.</i> 1.5
narration 3.1	<i>Et vexilla fieri Antoniniana iussit...</i> ... <i>atque diem septem supplicatio pro Antonini nomine celebrata est.</i>	

Figure 5.2: presence of the *NA* theme in *Dd.* 1.1-3.1 and its parallels

The next occurrence of the *NA* theme in *Dd.* is in the section on the *omina*, chapter 4. The theme of *omina imperii* is a well-known element in the lives before *OM* (Cf. the already cited passage in *AP* 3.1).⁴⁷¹ After mentioning the day of Diadumenian's

⁴⁷¹ *AP* 3.1: *huic... imperii omen est factum. nam cum tribunal ascendisset, inter alias acclamations dictum est: Auguste, di te servant. Omina* can be mainly subdivided in *omina imperii* and *omina mortis*, the former fewer than the latter. *Omina imperii*: Straub 1963, 125-82; De Kisch 1973, 190; *omina mortis*: Mouchova 1970, 111-49; Paschoud 1996, 314-5.

birth three times (*Dd. 4.1: die qua natus est... , 4.6 eadem die qua natus est... and 5.1 his diebus quibus ille natus est...*), the author states that Diadumenian was born on Antoninus Pius' birthday, *Dd.5.4: natus est praeterea natali Antonini et ea hora et signis prope concinentibus, quibus et Antoninus Pius; quare dixerunt mathematici et imperatoris illum filium futurum et imperatorem, sed non diu*. And again, *Dd.5.5: die qua natus est, quod Antonini esset natalis, mulier quaedam propinqua dicitur exclamasse: Antoninus vocetur*. Macrinus, however, is said to have refused the name (*abstinuisse nomine imperatorio*), because nobody in his family bore it, and the horoscope seemed to be ominous enough already.⁴⁷² Two more observations may be made here: it is in this place that the theme of an imperial father and son (in brief form: *et imperatoris illum filium futurum et imperatorem*⁴⁷³ crops up, as well as that of the length of a reign (*sed non diu*, cf. *OM 1.1*). The section on *omina* seems to come to an end with *Haec atque alia omina fuisse multi in litteras rettulerunt...*, but one more *omen* follows. The *omina* are reminiscent of the procedure in *OM 6*, where the division of the text into fragments introduced by *et infra* and *item infra* easily allow the addition of extra passages. This is also seen in *Dd. 4.1-5.5*, where in 4.1 *die qua natus est...*, 4.6 *eadem die qua hic natus est...*, and 5.1 *his diebus, quibus ille natus est...* are expanded by 5.4 *natus est praeterea...* and 5.5 *die qua natus est...*. These last two formulas appear to function as the basis to which more passages were added.

In *Dd.6.1* the next *NA* passage occurs, this time as a programmatic statement that repeats some elements from the preface: *Haec sunt quae digna memoratu in Antonino Diadumeno esse videantur. cuius vitam iunxissem patris gestis, nisi Antoninorum nomen me ad edendam pueruli specialem expositionem vitae coegisset*. The theme of *digna memoratu* is repeated from the preface to *OM 1.1* (*et ea quidem quae memoratu digna erunt*). *Vitam* denotes Diadumenian's life in biographic form, *patris gestis* is the narration about Macrinus' life. The author stresses again the importance of the *nomen Antoninorum*, also (and for the first time) for the construction of his book, which takes the form of a *specialis expositio*. *OM 10.6* closely conforms to this statement, though no comment is made there on the construction of the books.⁴⁷⁴ *Dd. 6.1* is a key-text for the understanding of the construction of *OM* and *Dd*. (see § 5.4).

The author takes up the issue of the love of the name of Antoninus again in *Dd.7.2: et fuit quidem tam amabile illis temporibus nomen Antoninorum, ut qui eo nomine non niteretur, mereri non videretur imperium*. This, of course, is a variation on *OM 3.9* again, with its emphasis on the popularity of the name. (*Alii vero tantum desiderium nominis huius fuisse dicunt, ut, nisi populus et milites Antonini nomen audirent, imperatorium non putarent*). The first occurrence of the theme was in *Cc. 8.10*. The question is whether *imperatorium* here refers to *Antonini nomen* or to an elliptic *eum*. Considering the passage *Dd.5.5*, just a few lines before the present passage, the first option is preferable: *sed Macrinus (dicitur) timuisse, quod nullus ex eius genere hoc nomine censeretur, et abstinuisse nomine imperatorio*. In *Dd.7.2*, however, the man who

⁴⁷² The phrase *simul quod iam rumor de vi geniturae illius emanasset* is reminiscent of *G 2.6: De hoc eodem, gnarus geniturae illius, ...*. A further similarity between the two *omen* passages is *clarum autem eventus ostendit* in *Dd. 5.3*, which corresponds with *ut postea satis claruit* and *ut postea ingens exitus docuit* in *G 3.6-7*, formulas that are to be expected in *omina* passages.

⁴⁷³ cf. *S 20.1-2*, *G 1.6-7* and § 5.2.2/4.

⁴⁷⁴ *OM 10.6: non enim aliquid dignum in eius vita erit, quod dicatur, praeter hoc quod Antoninorum nomini est velus nothus adpositus*.

bears the name is called *imperatorius* in a periphrastical way (*qui eo nomine non niteretur, mereri non videretur imperium*).⁴⁷⁵

In *Dd.* 6.1 the matter of names is brought up again. The author has in mind his formulas as expressed in *OM* 3.5 and deliberately alters his utterances:

OM 3.6

3.6'': *inde est quod se et Severus Antoninus*⁴⁷⁶ *vocavit ut plurimi ferunt*⁴⁷⁷, *et Pertinax et Iulianus et idem Macrinus.*

*Dd.*6.3

unde etiam quidam et Severum et Pertinacem et Iulianum Antoninorum praenominibus honorandos putant,

3.5': *Nec inter Antoninos referendi sunt duo Gordiani, aut quia praenomen tantum Antoninorum habuerunt aut etiam Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini.*

unde postea duos Gordianos, patrem et filium, Antoninos cognominatos putant.

First, it should be remarked that the sequence of thought is altered in a chiasmic fashion: the second part of the passage 3.5 is echoed first, and after that the first part. Next, in the model of 3.5 the series *Pertinax et Iulianus et idem Macrinus* is listed,⁴⁷⁸ while in the echo Severus joins the first two and Macrinus is left out: *Severum et Pertinacem et Iulianum*. Finally, sources are mentioned, though they remain entirely unspecified: *plurimi ferunt* in the model and *quidam putant* in the echo. In the second part of the echo, another opinion, voiced by *quidam*, is mentioned, namely that the two Gordiani can be called Antonini by way of *cognomen*, an option apparently not explored in the earlier list of Antonini, but by closer inspection the use of *cognomen* appears to be similar to that of *praenomen*.⁴⁷⁹ On the other hand, Pius and Marcus possessed it as *verum nomen* (cf. the

⁴⁷⁵ *OM* 3.9: Birley 1976, 270: 'they would not regard a man as imperial'; Chastagnol (1994, 453) and Turcan (1991, 23) also favour the second option (*eum*). *Dd.* 7.2: Birley 1976, 286: '...that those who did not have the support of that name, seemed not to have deserved imperial power.' In classical times, *imperatorius* is normally combined with non-animate entities (cf. *ThLL* 7.1, 560.64-561.37), in Cic. *Phil.* 14.12 with *nomen*. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.3: *Tiberium Neronem et Claudium Drusum imperatoris nominibus auxit* (sc. *Augustus*). In *HA*: AC 1.4: *oderat tacitum principatum nec ferre poterat imperatorium nomen dicebatque nil esse gravius nomine imperii, quod non posset e re p. tolli nisi per alterum imperatorem* and 3.3: *omnes, qui imperatorium nomen sive iusta causa sive iniusta habuerunt; Pr.*12.8: *decerno igitur, p. c., votis omnium concinentibus nomen imperatorium, nomen Caesareum, nomen Augustum....*

⁴⁷⁶ Note the erroneous nominative *Antoninus*, instead of *Antoninum*.

⁴⁷⁷ I follow Jordan's conjecture *ut plurimi ferunt, et...* (Pasoli 1968, 41), which is corroborated by the parallel with *Dd.* 6.3, see § 5.3.1 ad *OM* 3.6.

⁴⁷⁸ Macrinus called himself Antoninus according to *OM* 2.1: *seque nunc Severum nunc Antoninum ... nuncupavit*, see § 5.3.1.

⁴⁷⁹ Chastagnol (1994, 482) warns that in this passage *praenomen* is *nomen gentile* and *nomen* stands for *cognomen*, but it is rather the other way round. Chastagnol's interpretation would mean that Marcus (in *OM* 6.5), whose *cognomen* was *Verissimus*, adopted the name of Antoninus not as *nomen gentile*, but as *cognomen*. Yet the *verum nomen* also must be the *nomen gentile*, as the example of Antoninus Pius makes clear: *Nam Pius verum nomen Antonini habuit, cognomen Pii...*. Béranger (1976, 39) pointedly remarks that the *nomen Antoninorum* is used in several forms ('nom commun, nom propre, prénom, surnom, second surnom, titre') and also refers to *Pr.*4.3-4 (39n113), in which the *nomen Probus* could also have been the *cognomen*. The fact that the terms of *cognomen* and *praenomen* are interchangeable also corroborates our

veri successores Antonini in *OM* 3.6, who fostered the name more than their own name, *proprium nomen*). In the passage quoted next, *praenomen* is set against *ipsum nomen*, the latter term obviously being synonymous with (*verum*) *nomen* in this context: *sed aliud est cum praenomen adscitur, aliud cum ipsum nomen inponitur. nam Pius verum nomen Antonini habuit, cognomen Pii, Marcus verum nomen Verissimi habuit, sed hoc sublato atque abolito non praenomen Antonini sed nomen accepit. Verus autem Commodi nomen habuit, quo abolito Antonini non praenomen sed nomen accepit*. If indeed the Gordians had Antoninus as *praenomen* (*OM* 3.5), then Marcus and Verus are said to have taken it as (*ipsum*) *nomen*, which must denote the *nomen gentile*.⁴⁸⁰ The terminological disorder is treated extensively by Hartke (1951, 127-31), who concludes that the terms cannot be harmonised ('Letzen Endes geht daher alles durcheinander').

In the next four paragraphs, four emperors with the name of Antoninus are treated, after the aforementioned Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. In *Dd*.6.7: Commodus⁴⁸¹; in *Dd*.6.8, Caracalla; in *Dd*.6.9, Geta. And finally in *Dd*.6.10, we have Diadumenian. In the descriptions of these last three emperors, the usual themes are catalogued: in Caracalla's case, the dream: *vel somnii causa, quod Severus viderat, cum sibi Antoninum successorem praedictum sensisset* (mentioned in *S* 10.3-4, *G* 1.3, 5) and his acquisition of the name of Antoninus: *anno demum tertio decimo Antoninum dixisse* (copied from *S* 16.3-4, though historically incorrect, see § 5.2.2/4), and a corresponding remark about the imperial status of the man who acquired the rank of emperor, or of his name: *quando ei etiam imperatoriam addidisse dicitur potestatem* (see my remarks on *Dd*. 5.5 and 7.2 above). In Geta's case, the shared appellation in order to succeed his father: *eadem ratione qua Bassianum appellatum satis constat, ut patri Severo succederet, quod minime factum est*. (repeated from *S* 10.5; 16.4) and the admission that there is a controversy about the name of Antoninus: *quem multi Antoninum negant dictum* (see also *S* 10.5, 16.4, *G* 5.3). In Diadumenian's case, the popularity of the *nomen Antoninorum* is repeated again: *post hoc ipse Diadumenus ut commendaretur exercitui senatui populoque Romano, cum esset ingens desiderium Bassiani Caracalli, Antoninum appellatum satis constat*. (*Cc*.8.10, *OM* 3.9, *Dd*. 1.2, 4). The various pieces of information have become recurring formulas.

Two inventively interwoven documents follow: a letter and verses. The documents are, as usual, introduced by an accurate description of their contents. The document itself only follows after the quotation of the verses, preceded by a *dispositio* (*Quam epistolam priusquam intexam, libet versus inserere...*). There is something curious about these verses, as they concern Commodus. Of all the emperors called Antoninus mentioned in the catalogue above (Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, Commodus, Caracalla, Geta and Diadumenian), only Commodus did not receive special comments in the preceding parts of the *HA*. Now it is his turn: (*versus*) in *Commodum dictos, qui se Herculem appellaverat, ut intellegant omnes tam clarum fuisse*

analysis of *inde est quod...* in *OM* 3.5 (see § 5.3.1): the emperors mentioned there also called themselves *Antonini*, or were called so by others, because they bore the name as *cognomen* (whereas in *OM* 3.6 *praenomen* was mentioned: the author makes no difference between the two terms).

⁴⁸⁰ It is typical of fourth-century families to invest themselves with important sounding names, as Turcan explains in an appropriate note, referring to Syme 1971, 84 and Amm. Marc. 28.4.7: *praenominum claritudine conspicui quidam, ut putant, in immensum semet attollunt*. This consideration shows that the author was working from a contemporary perspective.

⁴⁸¹ *Commodum autem Marcus Antoninum appellavit atque ita in publicas edidit die natalis sui*.

*Antoninorum nomen, ut illi (sc. nomini) ne deorum nomen commode videretur adiungi.*⁴⁸²

This paradoxical statement is meant to prepare the reader for a new climax: the *nomen Antoninorum* is too sacrosanct to be combined with that of a god. In the verses, in *Dd.* 7.3 (*versus in Commodum Antoninum dicti*) the same thought is expressed: *Commodus Herculeum nomen habere cupit, / Antoninorum non putat esse bonum, / expers humani iuris et imperii, / sperans quin etiam clarius esse deum, / quam si sit princeps nominis egregii. / non erit iste deus nec tamen ullus homo.* The brainless Commodus thought that it was more glorious to be a god than to be an emperor with a glorious name. But he will be neither. *Herculeum nomen* is compared with *Antoninorum nomen*, the latter of which Commodus despised. The poem is in pentameters, a metre sparingly used in Latin poetry.⁴⁸³ It goes without saying that the verses are by the same hand as the verses in *OM* 14.2; a formal argument could be that *Antoninorum* in both poems occupies exactly the same position in v.2, as Baldwin (1978, 50) observed.

More interesting for our present purposes are the similarities with the poem in *OM* 11.4, which does not belong to the *nomen Antoninorum* theme. The second verse of this poem is *impius et felix sic simul esse cupit*,⁴⁸⁴ and the sixth and final one: *impius infelix est, erit ille sibi*. Apart from the fact that these are also pentameters (though as part of disticha) and that the poem is about imperial names, it should be observed that the pun is accentuated with a play on tenses: *est – erit*, just as in the Herculean poem *sit – erit* is part of the joke. Den Hengst (1995, 145) shows, that the *Epigrammata Bobiensia* also contain a poem, translated from the Greek (*AP* 11, 279), on a *grammaticus* called *Felix* which makes use of the same elements: play on names and a pregnant use of tenses. Obviously, epigrammatic conventions are exploited here. A second observation is the position of *cupit* in both verses (*nomen habere cupit* in v.1 of *Dd.* 7.3 and *sic simul esse cupit* in *OM* 11.4), both referring to a desire to be called by some epithet. The contents of the last verses of these poems are very similar: the emperors do not become what they wish to be. There is a high degree of probability that the poems in *Dd.* 7.3, *OM* 11.4 and 6, and *OM* 14.2 are by the same author, though the verses in *OM* 11, which are not about the *nomen Antoninorum*, may have come from another source.⁴⁸⁵

A disclaimer is added to the quoted verses, as the author normally does (which we first find in *H* 25.10 and repeated in *OM* 11.5 and 7 and *OM* 14.3). The verses have an unknown Greek origin and were translated by an unskilled Latin poet: *hi versus a Graeco nescio quo*⁴⁸⁶ *compositi a malo poeta in Latinum translati sunt.*⁴⁸⁷ Apart from these traditional elements, the wording is curious and reminds one of the introduction to the poem:

⁴⁸² *G* 2.3: ...*simul quod nemo ei videretur felicior imperator ad commodandum nomen eo principe, cuius proprium nomen iam per quattuor principes cucurrisset.*

⁴⁸³ Baldwin 1978, 50 and 57n3.

⁴⁸⁴ The first half foot after the caesura is missing, which is why some mss. add [*et*].

⁴⁸⁵ More about the verses in ch. 10 about repetition.

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. *OM* 11.3: *Graeci cuiusdam poetae*....

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. *OM* 11.7: ...*poeta ille, qui de Graeco Latine coactus est scribere* and *OM* 14.3: *videntur autem mihi ab aliquo poeta vulgari translati esse.*

Dd. 7.2

libet versus inserere in Commodum dictos, ...

ut intellegant omnes

tam clarum fuisse Antoninorum nomen,

ut illi ne deorum nomen commode videretur adiungi.

Dd. 7.4

hi versus ... quos ego idcirco inserendos putavi,

ut scirent omnes

Antoninos pluris fuisse quam deos,

*ac trium principum amore,
quo **sapientia, bonitas, pietas** consecrata sit,
in Antonino **pietas**,
in Vero **bonitas**,
in Marco **sapientia**.*

The changes (underlined) are clear. The end of both sentences diverge; the paradox of the first text is replaced by an artfully elaborated tricolon. Meanwhile, the religious dimension of the Antonine name is now explicitly expressed: *Antoninos pluris fuisse quam deos*. The words fit the climax that the author has been working up to ever since he introduced the NA theme. That the name is *sanctum*, *venerabile* and *sacratum* is expressed in *S* 20.3 (*sanctum illud nomen*), *S* 21.11 (*nomenque illud venerabile*) and *OM* 7.7 (*nomen illud sanctum*), while in *Dd*.7.2 the name is superior to the gods (*ut intellegant omnes tam clarum fuisse Antoninorum nomen, ut illi ne deorum nomen commode videretur adiungi*), an idea which is expressed more explicitly here (*pluris fuisse quam deos*). That an emperor called Antoninus is given by the gods is recorded in the acclamations in the first chapters of *Dd*. (*Antoninum nobis di dederunt*). The paradox in *Dd*. 7.2 puts the name on an equal level with the gods. In *Dd*. 7.4 the Antonines are rated even higher than the gods, as in *Dd*. 7.1, to be treated next. It should be taken into consideration that the three emperors were deified. *Sapientia*, *bonitas* and *pietas* are the virtues through which they earned their apotheoses.⁴⁸⁸

Macrinus' letter to his wife Nonia Celsa (*Dd*.7.5-7), an invention of the author's, is the first of a series of three letters, the second from Diadumenian to his father (*Dd*.8.5-8), the third to his mother (*Dd*.9.1). Only the first of these continues the themes that were treated in the NA passages. The letter was already announced in *Dd*.7.1, before the poems, apparently to upgrade the complexity of the narration (as explained below): *Extat epistola Opili Macrini, patris Diadumeni, qua gloriatur non tam se ad imperium pervenisse, qui esset secundus imperii, quam quod Antoniniani nominis esset pater factus, quo clarius illis temporibus non fuerat vel deorum*. The father-and-son motif crops up again, and the fact that Macrinus used to be *secundus imperii*, viz. *praefectus praetorio*, is brought up. Macrinus stresses the fact that it is even a greater honour to be the father of the Antonine name than to be a princeps. The wording that Macrinus is father *Antoniniani nominis* is surprising, a kind of *abstractum pro concreto*, adorned with the derivative form *Antoniniani* instead of the more obvious *Antonini* or *Antoninorum*. The central idea that is treated above in relation with ...*Antoninos pluris fuisse quam deos*,... is found in *quo clarius illis temporibus non fuerat vel deorum*.

⁴⁸⁸ The mention of imperial virtues in the form of tricola is repeated in *AS* 9, see my comments *ad loc*.

Redeo nunc ad epistolam Macrini Opilii (mark the inversion from *Dd.* 7.1 *Opili Macrini*) the author says next, and quotes the letter, *Dd.* 7.2-7: *Opilius Macrinus Noniae Celsae coniugi. Quid boni adepti sumus, mi uxor, caret aestimatione. Et fortassis⁴⁸⁹ de imperio me putes dicere - non magnum est istud, quod etiam indignis fortuna concessit, - : Antonini pater factus sum, Antonini mater es facta. O nos beatos, o fortunatam domum, praeclaram laudem nunc demum felicitis imperii. Di faxint et bona Iuno, quam colis, ut et ille Antonini meritum effingat, et ego, qui sum pater Antonini, dignus omnibus videar.* The letter contains several echoes, again, from ancient literature.⁴⁹⁰ The NA theme is further developed in Macrinus' remark that it is a greater honour to be the father of an Antoninus than to rule the empire – possibly in view of Severus' alleged appointment of his sons to Antoninus. The most direct reference to an earlier NA motif is contained in the final words *ut et ille Antonini meritum effingat, et ego, qui sum pater Antonini, dignus omnibus videar*: the soldiers are claimed to have shouted to Macrinus: *Puer Antoninus dignus imperio*, whereafter the boy himself replies in *Dd.* 1.2: *si quidem dignos et me et patrem meum duxistis, quos imperatores Romanos diceretis... . Et pater quidem meus curabit, ne desit imperio, ego autem elaborabo, ne desim nomini Antoninorum.* The author's fabrications often contain a pleasant mixture of homemade invention and classical tradition. *Hac epistola indicatur, quantum gloriae adeptus sibi videretur, quod vocatus est filius Antoninus* says the epilogue; *quantum gloriae adeptus sibi videretur* being an amplified and resounding distortion of *qua gloriatur* in *Dd.* 7.1, and *quod vocatus est filius Antoninus* an adaptation of *quod Antoniniani nominis esset pater factus*. The author enjoys observing things from different perspectives.

After this letter, the NA theme, which produces a considerable amount of text for *Dd.*, does not recur except for a brief concluding remark in the last paragraph: *interfectis igitur ambobus et capitibus pilo circumlatis in Marcum Aurelium Antoninum caritate nominis inclinavit exercitus* – the underlined words mark the NA theme, stemming from *Cc.* 8.10 and *OM* 3.9; the technique is the same as in *OM* 10.2 *miro amore in eum omnibus inclinatis* and *OM* 10.3 *et amore Antonini*: a minimal addition to the underlying text. The order of events is wrong: the army already preferred Elagabalus before the deaths of Macrinus and his son, as the author knew well enough (*OM* 8.2, 8.4, 10.3, 15.1). Even historical fact falls victim to the author's manipulations, temporal inversion in this case.

When we review all the passages treated in *Dd.*, it immediately becomes clear that the volume of NS devoted to the NA theme is enormous. Other than in *S*, *Cc.*, *G* and *OM*, the passages in *Dd.* are presented by the author (and in later studies) as the only justification for its inclusion in the series of *HA*.⁴⁹¹ These NA passages are, successively: 1.1-3.1 (preface, narrations and documents); 5.4-5 (*omina*); 6.1-10 (programmatic

⁴⁸⁹ *Fortassis* is a formal expression, used in letters, prayers and programmatic remarks (*Val.* 3.3, *Pr.* 4.3; *AS* 17.4 and *A* 10.1, *Pr.* 1.3, encountered particularly in the later lives): Den Hengst 1987, 162.

⁴⁹⁰ *O nos beatos, o fortunatam domum* has an unmistakably Ciceronian flavour, and may be indebted to *O fortunatam natam me consule Romam* (from *De consulate suo* 7), cited by Iuvenalis 10.122, as Turcan (1993, 152n42) proposes. Den Hengst (1987, 161) points to *Cic. Cat.* 2.10: *praeclarem laudem* and for *Di faxint* *Cic. Ver.* 3.81 *di faxint, ne sit alter...*, (for the form *faxint*, see Den Hengst 1987, 162), while *et bona Iuno* is borrowed from Verg. *A* 1.734. The derivations mark the *HA*'s character as a 'Fundgrube' of literary imitation.

⁴⁹¹ In *HA*: *OM* 10.6, *Dd.* 1.1, 6.1, which has been noticed by Lécivain 1904, 266-7: 'l'idée-mère de la biographie'; Turcan (1993, 149): 'leitmotiv qui domine *OM* et *Dd.*'

statement and case of names), 7.1-8.1 (letter and verses), 9.4 (*Antoninum caritate nominis*). They can fairly well be separated from the other parts: *Dd.* 3.2-4 (physical appearance and *divisio*), 4.1-5.3, 5.6 (*omina*), 8.2-9.3 (death, cruelty, two letters, one of them containing a quotation from Vergil's *Aeneid*), 9.4-6 (conclusion and announcement of the next book). It appears that the passages without the *NA* theme contain the more biographical parts. It is striking that Diadumenian is not called Antoninus in either of these, when the *nomen Antoninorum* is the central idea of the book. When the name of *Antoninus* (all cases) and its derivatives (*Antoninorum*, *Antoninianus* etc.) are mapped out, there is a clear outcome:

NA theme, varia (1.1-2.10)	<i>Omina</i> (5.4-5)	<i>Nom.</i> / <i>cognom.</i> (6.1-10)	Letters (7.1-8.1)	Epilogue (9.4)	physical appearance (3.1-3), <i>omina</i> (3.4-5.3, 5.6) letters (8.2-9.3), epilogue (9.4-6)
30	4	14	10	1	0
TOTAL 59					0

Figure 5.3: Frequency of the name of Antoninus and its derivatives in *Dd.*

Thus, all the instances of the name of Antoninus appear in the passages that have been indicated as belonging to the *NA* theme on the base of recurring motives, while in the other passages in the book about Diadumenian the name is not mentioned a single time. The author surely would have used the name Antoninus in, for example, the letters in paragraphs 8 and 9, if they were based on the same source as the *NA* theme. The author has not taken much effort to harmonise the different parts of the text in this respect. As a result, there is a clear difference between the two types of passages, to be discerned at the hand of the *NA* theme. Hardly any text is left if all the passages devoted to the theme (59.4 per cent of the total text of *Dd.*) were left out. This observation with regard to *Dd.* will, together with *G* and *OM*, be further elaborated in the next paragraphs, as these three biographies have much in common.

5.4 The Structure of *G*, *OM* and *Dd.*

The *NA* fragments, which occupy a third (33 per cent) of the total text of *G*, *OM* and *Dd.*, can be distinguished clearly from their context. They even turn out to be detachable from the text itself, without exception and without damage to (and often even to the advantage of) the narrative continuity of the text. This observation makes it interesting to investigate the remaining text as this is apparently based on other sources than the *NA* passages. In order to find out whether there is any coherency in the parts which do not include the *NA* theme, we shall have to determine what the structure of the three lives on both sides of the dividing line between EL and IL is like, beginning with a comparison of *G* and *Dd.*, the last of the Secondary Lives. To *OM* a separate chapter will be devoted (ch.6), as this book differs from the other two in that its subject is a single Augustus, in the series of legitimate emperors. Also, the structure of the book is quite different from the other two, as standard elements of biography such as physical appearance, origin, career, *mores* and death, are well represented. When the *NA* theme is left out completely, the following skeleton outline of the two biographies appears:

*G*⁴⁹²

- 1.1-2 preface (minus *cur...adpositum*)
- 1.3-4 dream of Severus
- 2.1 *origo* (Marius Maximus)
- 2.6-3.9 *genitura, omina*
- 4.1-5.8 *dicta, mores* (minus 5.3)
- 6.1-7.6 *crudelitas Caracallae*

*Dd.*⁴⁹³

- 1.1 preface (minus *quod...et*)
- 3.2-3 physical appearance
- 4.1-6 *omina* around birth (minus 5.4-5)
- 8.2-9.3 *crudelitas Diadumeni*, letters
- 9.4-6 epilogue

There are differences here as well as similarities. To begin with the latter: the *omina* in both biographies occupy a central position and in both cases consist of *omina imperii* and *mortis* simultaneously. Characteristic of both books is that they contain biographical elements, though they hardly can stand alone as biographies without the information from the *vitae* from on which they depend, as in the case of *Cc.* and *OM*. For example, Geta's death is described in *Cc.* 2.4, while his *funus* is only superficially referred to in *G* 7.1. It is a serious omission that Geta's death, announced by unmistakable *omina*, is not described in his own *vita*. For *Dd.* something comparable is found: here too, there is hardly any historical material about his boyhood, however short it may have been. Another feature of the biographies stands out: the paragraphs on *crudelitas*, conspicuously present in both biographies, are largely taken from the previous biographies, *Cc.* and *OM*. In *G* 6.1-7.6 there is a repetition of elements that were already recorded in *Cc.* with Caracalla as its subject. In *Dd.* 8.2-9.3, Diadumenian's letters to his father and his mother closely reflect the *crudelitas Macrini* in *OM* and even seem to be a direct continuation of *OM* 14.1.

5.4.1 The Structure of *G*

It may be a good idea to linger a little longer over the *crudelitas Caracallae* in *G*. The paragraph that deals with this is particularly interesting with respect to the construction of the original *G*, as it contains the bulk of factual information in that biography. The repetitions and variations of *Cc.* in *G* reveal the author's technique of rewriting. In the inventory below we take *G* 6 and *Cc.* 2.7-8 as a basis for comparing the texts with the passages in *Cc.* on which they are apparently based. Words in bold are the verbal similarities, the underlined ones are the parallels (*synonymia* or *variatio*). Bold and underlined combined represent those verbal similarities which have been transported to a different place from the original text:

⁴⁹² As we have seen the NA passages are: *G* 1.1 *de cuius ... nomen adpositum*; 1.5-7: *quod cum fecisset ... de Antonini nomine*; 2.2-5 *fuit autem ... principes cucurrisset*; 5.3 *...et Antonini ut quidam dicunt...*

⁴⁹³ As we have seen, the NA passages are: *Dd.* 1.1-3.1 *Antonini Diadumeni ... nomine celebrata est*; 5.4-5 *natus est ... illius emanasset*; 6.1-10 *haec sunt ... satis constat*; 7.1-8.1 *exstat epistola ... filius Antoninus*; 9.4 *caritate nominis*.

G 6.1 <u>Occiso eo pars militum</u> , quae incorrupta erat, <u>parricidium aegerrime accepit</u> , <u>dicentibus cunctis duobus se liberis fidem promisisse</u> , <u>duobus servare debere</u> , <u>clausisque portis diu non est imperator admissus</u> .	Cc.2.7-8 <u>pars militum</u> apud Albam <u>Getam occisum aegerrime accepit</u> , <u>dicentibus cunctis duobus se fidem promisisse liberis Severi</u> , <u>duobus servare debere</u> , <u>clausisque portis diu imperator non admissus</u> .
<p><i>occiso eo ...</i>, parricidium ← <i>Getam occisum</i> <i>se liberis fidem promisisse</i> ← <i>se fidem promisisse liberis</i> <i>non ... imperator admissus</i> ← <i>imperator non admissus</i></p>	
G 6.2 denique <u>nisi querellis de Geta editis et animis militum delenitis</u> , <u>inormibus etiam stipendiis datis Romam</u> Bassianus <u>redire non potuit</u> .	Cc. 2.8... <u>nisi delenitis animis</u> , non solum <u>querellis de Geta</u> et criminationibus <u>editis</u> , sed <u>inormitate stipendii militibus</u> , ut solet, placatis, atque inde Romam redit.
<p><i>nisi querellis de Geta editis</i> ← <i>nisi... querellis de Geta ... editis</i> <i>animis militum delenitis</i> ← <i>delenitis animis / militibus placatis</i> <i>inormibus ... stipendiis</i> ← <i>inormitate stipendii militibus</i> <i>Romam ...redire</i> (non potuit) ← <i>Romam redit</i></p>	
G 6.3 <u>post hoc denique et Papinianus et multi alii interempti sunt</u> , <u>qui vel concordiae faverant</u> vel <u>qui partium Getae fuerant</u> , ita ut utriusque ordinis viri <u>et in balneo et cenantes et in publico percuterentur</u> , ...	Cc.4.3 <u>isdem diebus occisi sunt innumeri</u> , <u>qui fratris eius partibus faverant</u> . occisi etiam liberti, <u>qui Getae administraverant</u> . Caedes deinde <u>in omnibus locis</u> . Et <u>in balneis factae caedes</u> , occisique nonnulli etiam <u>cenantes</u> , ...
<p><i>post hoc</i> ← <i>isdem diebus</i> <i>Papinianus et multi alii interempti sunt</i> ← <i>occisi sunt innumeri</i> <i>qui vel ... faverant vel qui partium Getae fuerant</i> ← <i>qui fratris eius partibus faverant</i> <i>qui Getae administraverant</i> <i>et in... et ...et in ...</i> ← <i>in omnibus locis</i> <i>et in balneo et cenantes ... percuterentur</i> ← <i>et in balneis factae caedes...etiam cenantes</i></p>	
G 6.3 <u>Papinianus ipse securi percussus sit</u> , inprobante Bassiano, quod non <u>gladio res peracta sit</u> .	Cc.4.1 dein in conspectu eius <u>Papinianus securi percussus a militibus et occisus est</u> . Quo facto percussori dixit: ' <u>Gladio te exequi oportuit meum iussum</u> .'
<p><i>Papinianus ... securi percussus sit</i> ← <i>Papinianus securi percussus ... et occisus est</i>. <i>gladio res peracta sit</i> ← <i>gladio exequi oportuit meum iussum</i></p>	
G 6.4 ventum denique est usque ad <u>seditionem urbanicianorum militum</u> , quos quidem non levi auctoritate <u>Bassianus compressit</u> tribuno eorum, ut alii dicunt,	Cc. 4.6-7 et cum idem Chilo sublata veste senatoria nudis pedibus <u>ab urbanicianis raptus esset</u> , <u>Antoninus seditionem compressit</u> .

<i>interfecto, ut alii, relegato.</i>	
<u>seditionem urbanicianorum</u> militum ← <i>ab urbanicianis Bassianus compressit</i> ← <i>Antoninus seditionem compressit</i>.	
G 6.5 ipse autem tantum timuit, ut loricam <u>sub lato</u> habens clavo etiam curiam <u>sit ingressus</u> <u>atque ita rationem</u> facti sui et necis Geticae <u>reddiderit</u> .	Cc. 8.5 tunc <u>sub veste senatoria</u> loricam habens cum armatis militibus curiam ingressus est . hos in medio inter subsellia duplici ordine conlocavit <u>et sic verba fecit</u> : ...
<u>loricam sub lato habens clavo</u> ← <u>sub veste senatoria loricam habens curiam sit ingressus</u> ← <u>curiam ingressus est atque ita rationem</u> ...<u>reddiderit</u> ← <u>et sic verba fecit</u>	
G 6.6 quo quidem tempore Helvius Pertinax, filius Pertinacis , ..., recitanti fausta praetori et dicenti 'Sarmaticus maximus et Parthicus maximus' dixisse dicitur : 'adde et Geticus maximus ', quasi Gothicus.	Cc. 10.6 (...), Helvius Pertinax, filius Pertinacis, dicitur ioco dixisse : 'adde, si placet, etiam Geticus Maximus ', quod Getam occiderat fratrem et Gothi Getae dicerentur,
<i>Helvius Pertinax, filius Pertinacis</i> ← <i>Helvius Pertinax, filius Pertinacis dixisse dicitur</i> ← <i>dicitur ioco dixisse 'adde et Geticus maximus'</i> ← <i>'adde, ..., etiam Geticus Maximus'</i>	
6.7 quod dictum altius in pectus Bassiani descendit, ut postea <u>nece Pertinacis</u> est adprobatum, nec solum Pertinacis sed <u>et aliorum</u> , ut supra dictum est, <u>passim et inique</u> . 6.8 Helvium autem etiam suspectum habuit adfectatae tyrannidis, quod <u>esset in amore omnium et filius Pertinacis imperatoris</u> . quae res nulli facile privato satis tuta est.	Cc. 4.8 Helvium Pertinacem , suffectum consulem, ob hoc solum, quod filius esset imperatoris, occidit . Neque cessavit umquam <u>sub diversis occasionibus eos interficere, qui fratris amici fuissent</u> .
<u>nece Pertinacis</u> ← <u>Pertinacem...occidit et aliorum</u> ← <u>eos...qui fratris amici fuissent</u> <u>passim et inique</u> ← <u>sub diversis occasionibus esset ...et filius ... imperatoris</u> ← <u>filius esset imperatoris</u>	

Figure 5.4: Rewriting in G 6.1-8 from Cc. (passim).

Apart from the techniques that the author uses in reassembling the original text into something new, the analysis makes clear that the contents of G 6 are based on several parts of the preceding biography. In short: G 6.1-2 ≈ Cc. 2.7-8; G 6.3 ≈ Cc. 4.1; G 6.4 ≈

Cc. 4.6-7; G 6.5 ≈ Cc. 8.5; G 6.6 ≈ Cc. 10.6; G 6.7-8 ≈ Cc. 4.8. Chapter G 7 will show evidence of comparable techniques, which will not be spelled out in detail.⁴⁹⁴

As for the rest of G, it is not so easy to say what the source of the author may have been. He either had some knowledge about Geta's *genitura* and the *omina* accompanying his birth or simply made them up. These elements he used for a separate biography, which was justified by the fact that Geta had been co-ruler with his brother (G 1.2: *neque enim multa in eius vita dici possunt, ... quam cum fratre teneret imperium*). The idea of splitting off this information must have been provided by his source in the shape of a combined biography about Caracalla and Geta, and plainly resulted in a considerable measure of repetition and a shifting of *omina imperii* and *mortis* to Geta's biography. These *omina*, after all, especially relate to Caracalla's savage treatment of his brother and may well have been part of Cc., in an earlier version. The *genitura* in G 2.6-8 is told in relation with Septimius Severus and Caracalla, and is not out of place in a narration about the relation of the two brothers. The greater part of the text of the original G is devoted to the *crudelitas Caracallae*, which mainly consist of rewordings of Cc. It suggests that the *omina* of G rather belong to the life and biography of Cc. There are two clear indications that this was the case. First, there is the beginning of Cc., 1.1: *Ex duobus liberis, quos Septimius Severus reliquit, Getam et Bassianum, (...) Geta hostis est iudicatus, Bassianum notum optinuisse imperium*. The biography begins with the announcement of two brothers inheriting the throne, the first of whom was declared a public enemy, as the author euphemistically calls it, while the second was to be emperor. The beginning of Cc. carries the suggestion that both brothers were treated in a single book.⁴⁹⁵ In this respect, the book of Cc. initially fulfills the expectations that are raised. Moreover, the first few chapters of Cc. stand out by their reliability⁴⁹⁶ and even provide some plausible information not known from other sources, such as the detail about Caracalla being refused entrance through the gates (Cc.2.8).⁴⁹⁷ This action was a result of the soldiers' anger about Caracalla's murder of his brother: *dicentibus cunctis duobus se fidem promississe liberis Severi, duobus servare debere* (Cc. 2.7). That phrase is a direct echo of the point of departure of the biography: *ex duobus liberis, quos Septimius Severus reliquit, ...*. The author of the original Cc. probably also dealt with Geta and treated Severus's sons in a single book, as several aspects of the biography indicate.

The source used by the author of the HA did not treat the emperors and their co-emperors separately. It must have contained at least nine lives of reigning emperors, and there was no reason to separate the *omina* with regard to the death of Caracalla's brother from Caracalla's biography. This explains the small volume of text devoted to *Geta per se* in his own biography, and why all of the *omina* concern Caracalla as well. Only Geta's *mores* and *dicta* in G 4.1-5.8 (minus 5.3) are about the boy himself, which could

⁴⁹⁴ Compare for example G 7.3 ≈ Cc. 3.3; G 7.6 ≈ Cc. 8.4. Similarities between G 6 and several passages from Cc. have been briefly indicated by Hasebroek (1916, 77). See also Lécivain 1904, 261, who makes the following observation: 'Entre les chapitres 5 et 6 il ya une lacune étrange sur l'assassinat de Geta'. This 'lacune' can be explained by the different character of the text in G 6-7, which is a compilation of several passages in Cc.

⁴⁹⁵ As we have seen in § 4.2, the author tends to begin his narrations with the theme of the book, which is the name of the emperor.

⁴⁹⁶ Reusch 1931, 63-5 ('Rekonstruktion der echten Überlieferung der Caracallavita'); Hohl 1950, 6.

⁴⁹⁷ Hohl (1950, 8 and 18n34) notes the special nature of that fact and indicates Marius Maximus as the source.

similarly have been based on the author's source, which may well have treated these elements together with Caracalla's.

Such a hypothesis requires us to investigate in what place the source could have treated the *omina* about Geta's birth and death. For the answer to this question, there is a clue in Cc. 11.1: *Occidendi Getae multa prodigia extiterunt, ut in vita eius exponemus*. The author justly remarks *occidendi Getae ... prodigia*, which is more apt than *omina mortis*, because the perspective is Caracalla's. It is not Geta's death that is the point of departure but his murder by Caracalla. This programmatic remark may well mark the transfer of the *omina*-passages to the next book. Immediately after, the author adds another note, Cc. 11.2: *nam quamvis prior ille e vita excesserit, nos tamen **ordinem secuti sumus**, ut qui et prior natus est et qui prior imperare coeperat, prior scriberetur*. This statement tallies with the statement in V 1.1-2: *Scio plerosque ita vitam Marci ac Veri litteris atque historiae dedicasse, ut priorem Verum intimandum legentibus darent, non **imperandi secutos ordinem** sed **vivendi**: ego vero, quod prior Marcus imperare coepit, dein Verus, qui supersitite perit Marco, priorem Marcum, dehinc Verum credidi celebrandum*. The author states in V, that he will treat Marcus Aurelius first, *quod prior Marcus imperare coepit*, and because he follows the *ordinem imperandi*. Consequently, in Cc. 11.2, he promises to write the life of Caracalla *qui prior imperare coeperat*. Strictly speaking, the clause *qui et prior natus est* is of no importance at all, and only confusing, because in V 1.2 the clause *qui superstite perit Marco* suggested that the *ordo vivendi* was about the date of the emperor's death, not his birth. Such changes of argument are characteristic of the author's lack of coherence. Style seems to be more important than logic, as witness the reformulations of the words (*plerosque ... secutos ordinem* → *nos ... ordinem secuti sumus*; *priorem legentibus darent* → *prior scriberetur*; *supersitite perit Marco* → *prior ille e vita excesserit*; *quod prior Marcus imperare coepit* → *qui prior imperare coeperat*). Plainly, the element *qui et prior natus est* does not tally with *qui ... perit*, and, what is more, is irrelevant in the present context.

Meanwhile, the statement is meant to announce a new biography. The author announces his intention with a formula based on the the biographies of Marcus and Verus, who were co-regents. In his own words, MA 7.6: *Atque ex eo pariter coeperunt rem publicam regere. Tuncque primum Romanum imperium duos Augustos habere coepit, cum imperium sibi relictum cum alio participasset*.⁴⁹⁸ Geta, however, never attained the emperorship, but the first sentence just quoted suggests that he was destined to reign, but effectively he never gained the throne: the *ordinem imperandi* is not relevant. In G 1.2 it is stated about Geta: *...qui prius rebus humanis exemptus est quam cum fratre teneret imperium*. Geta did not have a separate biography in the author's source, which is why he comes up with his own innovative program in Ael. 1.1 (§ 3.2). Only after this did the separate biography of G come into existence. In order to justify this proposal, the author rather inaccurately applied the formula of V 1.1-2, and shifted some elements from Cc. (*omina, dicta*) to the new biography. A preface was added: *Scio, Constantine Auguste, et multos et clementia tuam quaestionem movere posse, cur etiam Geta Antoninus a me tradatur. ... Neque enim multa in eius vita dici possunt, qui prius*

⁴⁹⁸ Derived from Eutropius 8.9.2, see § 5.2.1, recurring in Ael. 5.12-3.

*rebus humanis exemptus est quam cum fratre teneret imperium.*⁴⁹⁹ The author followed this up with a vast rewording of passages in Cc.

Next, a remark about the source of Geta's *origo* was added: *Geta autem dictus est vel a patris nomine vel avi paterni, de cuius vita et moribus in vita Severi Marius Maximus primo septenario satis copiose rettulit* (*cuius* referring to Septimius' son Geta). The remark in Cc. 1.2 serves as material for comparison, about Caracalla's ancestors: *de cuius maioribus frustra putamus iterandum, cum omnia in Severi vita satis dicta sint*, which is more apt, because in S 1.2 the ancestors are actually summed up. *G* begins with a superfluous amplification of the *origo*-theme. The scheme at the beginning of *G* is copied from S 1.2:

Geta 2.1 – 3.1

Geta autem dictus est vel a patris nomine vel avi paterni, de cuius vita et moribus in vita Severi Marius Maximus primo septenario satis copiose rettulit. (...)
Natus est Geta Severo et Vitellio consulibus Mediolanii, etsi aliter alii prodiderunt, VI. kal. Iunias (ex Iulia...)

S 1.2-3

Cui (sc. Severus) civitas Lepti, pater Geta, maiores equites Romani ante civitatem omnibus datam; mater Fulvia Pia, patris magni Aper et Severus, consulares, avus maternus Macer, paternus Fulvius Pius fuere. ipse natus est Erucio Claro bis et Severo cons. VI. idus Apriles.

This comparison makes clear that the source of *G* provided information about family and *origo*, as long as it is accepted that 3.1 is a continuation of 2.1 paralleling S 1.2-3, after which the NA passage (2.2-5) was added. The fabrication about Severus' knowledge of Geta's horoscope (2.6-9: *de hoc eodem...*) may have been based on the source, as a pseudo-biographical topic complementing its factual information. After the mention of Geta's birthday, the narration continues with the same kind of fictional elements as before: *...ex Iulia, quam idcirco Severus uxorem duxerat, quod eam in genitura habere compererat, ut regis uxor esset,...* The question how the various kinds of texts (factual information, biographical elements and NA theme) were unified cannot be answered readily, though distinct parts of the text are still clearly discernable.

In conclusion, the author composed *G* out of the following elements:

- the *omina* and *genitura* passages were composed with recourse to the source that also provided the information for Cc. (*G* 2.6-3.4).
- in order to upgrade *G* into a complete biography, the fictitious dream from S 10.6 was repeated, a remark on *origo* (3.1) was added, and *mores* and *dicta* (4.1-5.8, minus 5.3) were taken from the primary text. .
- a small preface (1.1-2) was added to explain why a separate biography is devoted to *G* (namely, that they were co-regents), which indicates that Caracalla and Geta were treated together in the source.
- the historical narration, especially about the *crudelitas Caracallae* (6.1-7.6), was based on parts of Cc.

⁴⁹⁹ Den Hengst (1992, 157) gives another analysis when he considers *de cuius priusquam...nomen adpositum* the answer to the first question. As the quoted clause appears to be an interjection, the author does not seem to answer the question at all, but only explains the question with *neque enim...teneret imperium*.

- the *NA* theme was added to link the biography to the other books, for which an extension of the preface (*G* 1.1') was required, a dream and letter (1.3-7), the *origo nominis* (2.2-5) and a small piece of historical narration (5.3).
- the biography was not rounded off properly by an epilogue, survey, dedication or anything similar.

5.4.2 The Structure of *Dd.*

The structure of *Dd.* shows similarities with *G*, which induces us to investigate the development of this book along similar lines. There is one important difference: the *NA* theme takes up the largest volume of NS by far in *Dd.* and is presented as the sole reason for its existence, in which it follows *G*. If all the passages in which the *NA* theme plays a part (999 words, which is 59 per cent) are lifted from the text (1679 words), only a few passages remain (680 words or 41 per cent), hardly enough for the justification of a separate biography that even in its final shape is one of the shortest in the *HA*. The passages outside the *NA* theme contain the biographical parts and documents but hardly any historical narration. For the latter one is obliged to take recourse to *OM*. Applying our observations about *G* to *Dd.*, we may surmise that the source treated father and son together in one book (if it treated Diadumenian at all).⁵⁰⁰

There are indications that the biographical parts in *OM* and *Dd.* are based on a biography that treated them together, as for instance the letters that show up Diadumenian's cruelty, which link the paragraph to Macrinus' *crudelitas* (*OM* 12.1-14.1). The texts are related, for example by the word *asper*: 13. 3 *in verberandis aulicis tam impius, tam pertinax, tam asper...* In *Dd.* 8.5-8 a letter is quoted (which contains, just as *OM* 12.9, texts from Vergil's *Aeneid* concerning the relation between father and son) which is concluded by (*epistulam ...*) *ex qua apparet, quam asper futurus iuvenis, si vixisset*.⁵⁰¹ The passage on Diadumenian's cruelty is introduced by the words (*Dd.* 8.3): *Quamvis etiam istum ultra aetatem saevisse in plerosque repperiam, ut docent litterae ab hoc eodem ad patrem missae*. It could be imagined that this sentence once closely followed *OM* 14.1: *Sed cum eius vilitatem homines antiquam cogitarent, crudelitatem morum viderent, hominem putidulum in imperio ferre non possent, et maxime milites, qui multa eius meminerant funestissima et aliquando turpissima, inita factione illum occiderunt cum puero filio Diadumeno...* The author uses examples of Diadumenian's cruelty (*etiam istum!*) for the separate biography, while he continues the biography of *OM* with: *scilicet Antonino nomine... etc.* In *Dd.* 8.1 the missing link between Macrinus' and Diadumenian's cruelty is found: *Hic tamen quarto decimo mense imperii ob*

⁵⁰⁰ Mommsen (1890, 249-51) conjectured *Dd.*'s dependence on *OM* (with objections by Klebs, see for the arguments: Klebs 1890, 458-9; one of the points being that *OM* 8.2 has *anno amplius imperavit* (Herodian 5.2.2: one year), *Dd.* 8.2 has *quarto decimo mense imperii (...)* *interfectus est cum patre (...)*). This improvement on *OM* is confirmed by Barnes 1978, 57.

⁵⁰¹ See also the first verse of *OM* 11.4: *histrion iam senior turpis, gravis, asper, iniquus...* Klebs (1888, 340-2) observed several parallels between the letters in *Dd.* and some in *AC*, e.g. Faustina's letter in *AC* 10.2: *non enim pius est imperator qui non cogitat uxorem et filium* / *Dd.* 8.5: *Non satis, mi pater, videris in amore nostro tenuisse tuos mores* and the epilogue to Avidius' letter *AC* 14.8: *haec epistula eius indicat, quam severus et quam tristis fururus fuerit imperator* / *Dd.* 8.9: *ex qua apparet, quam asper futurus iuvenis, si vixisset*.

incivilem patris atque asperum principatum interfectus est cum patre, non suo nomine,⁵⁰² the final words meaning ‘not on his own account’. Diadumenian’s letters in 8.1-9.3 are fabrications by the author, meant to fill up the biography in order to make the separation possible, on the model of *Cc.-G*. It is hard to say where Diadumenian’s *omina imperii* (*Dd.* 4.1-5.6) had a place of their own in the combined biography.

The distinction between the biography and the added *NA theme* can also be noticed in the programmatic statements. Turcan (1993, 142) rightly observes that the prefatory remark in *Dd.* 1.1 ...*et quod ei stupenda omnia sunt facta imperii non diutini, ut evenit*, is loosely linked to the previous line *Antonini Diadumeni...est dictus*. The author may have intended to write a full biography on the emperor Macrinus’ son, using the *omina*-passages that were already at his disposal. To this theme he added his own ideas about the *Nomen Antoninorum* (5.4: *natus est praeterea...*). In *Dd.* 3.4 the transition from one part to the other were marked by *Haec sunt quae de puero sint dicenda. Nunc veniamus ad omnia imperii, quae cum in aliis tum in hoc praecipue sunt stupenda*. The most revealing statement is in *Dd.* 6.1 (*cuius vitam iunxissem patris gestis, nisi Antoninorum nomen me ad edendam pueruli specialem expositionem vitae coegisset*). The author pretends that the *NA theme* forced him to come up with a different construction for the combined description of Macrinus and Diadumenian. In fact, he thought up the *NA theme* himself in order to be able to add an extra book to the series. The fraud is in *iunxissem*: in his source, the life of Diadumenian was told in a book devoted to Macrinus. In order to integrate the two letters by Diadumenian to his father (*Dd.* 8.3-9) and mother (*Dd.* 9.1-3), the author tries to delude the reader. First, he remarks that there is a letter (*extat epistula Opili Macrini...*), introduced by a paraphrase of the contents of the letter, as he normally does.⁵⁰³ Then comes the figure of *dispositio*, *Dd.* 7.2: *quam epistulam priusquam intexam, libet versus inserere,* After citing and commenting on the verses, the author continues: *redeo nunc ad epistulam Macrini Opilii:* By creating embedded structures the author tries to conceal the lack of coherency of the fragments.

This leads us to the following inventory of the book of *Dd.*:

- a preface in *Dd.* 1.1 and a programmatic statement in *Dd.* 6.1, both concerning the *Nomen Antoninorum*.
- a description of Diadumenian’s physical appearance, a traditional element in biography (*Dd.* 3.2-3).
- *omina imperii* in *Dd.* 4.1-6 (announced with a programmatic remark in *Dd.* 3.4) and 5.1-3, probably taken from a source that also provided information about other emperors⁵⁰⁴ (?) or simply invented by the author.

⁵⁰² It is interesting to see that this sentence was one of Klebs’ arguments in his discussion with Mommsen when he argued that *Dd.* leaned on a different source than *OM* on account of the differences in the length of the reign, *quarto decimo mense* in *Dd.* against *anno amplius* in *OM*. The difference should however be explained as a matter of stylistic variation, especially because another element from *OM* is repeated here as well: cf. *OM* 10.5: *occisus est etiam filius, cui hoc solum attulit imperium, ut interficeretur a milite*, echoed in *non suo nomine*. This leads us to conclude that the paraphrase of the duration of the reign is also an echo of that passage.

⁵⁰³ See e.g. *OM* 5.9, and Den Hengst 1987.

⁵⁰⁴ Barnes 1978 proposes the existence of a ‘book of *omina*’; Syme (1976, 302) calls the message ‘Plain fiction, the authors own’.

- documents in the form of verses (*Dd.* 7.2-4) and two letters from Macrinus to his wife (*Dd.* 7.5-8.1), by Diadumenian to his father (*Dd.* 8.3-9) and mother (*Dd.* 9.1-3) were produced, accompanied by introductions, commentary and programmatic remarks (e.g. *Dd.* 7.2: *quam epistulam priusquam intexam, libet versus inserere, ...*).
- the only historical fact of importance, which is that Diadumenian was killed together with his father, mentioned in paragraphs 8.2 and 9.4.
- the *NA* theme, which is used to pad up the biography and especially added to the beginning of the book.
- a repetition of Macrinus' and Diadumenian's deaths and an announcement of the next biography, which serves to rounded off the biography.

The main differences with *G* are that the *NA* theme is presented as a justification of the existence of the biography, and that no genuine information about the co-regent Diadumenian is given, apart from some very brief references to his death. The importance of the name of Antoninus is something the author invented, as his source probably did not mention more than what was described in *OM* 10.5: *occisus est etiam filius, cui hoc solum attulit imperium, ut interficeretur a milite*, in which the element of the name of Antoninus is missing.⁵⁰⁵ Let us consider the introductions to *G* and *Dd.* once more, and see how the *NA* passages and the other parts relate:

G 1.1

Scio, Constantine Auguste, et multos et clementiam tuam quaestionem movere posse, cur etiam Geta Antoninus a me tradatur. de cuius priusquam vel vita vel nece dicam, disseram, cur et ipsi Antonino a Severo patre sit nomen adpositum. neque enim multa in eius vita dici possunt, qui prius rebus humanis exemptus est quam cum fratre teneret imperium.

*Dd.*1.1

Antonini Diadumeni pueri, quem cum patre Opilio Macrino imperatorem dixit exercitus occiso Bassiano factione Macriniana, nihil habet vita memorabile, nisi quod Antoninus est dictus et quod ei stupenda omina sunt facta imperii non diutini, ut evenit.

The implicit justification of a separate biography of Geta is the fact that he was an emperor's son and heir to the throne (as a consequence of the author's promise in *Ael.* 5.7 (*omnes qui ...singulis libris exponere*), while the *NA* theme is supplementary. In *Dd.*, the *NA* theme is one of two reasons for the biography, while its historical contents are summarised in a subordinate sentence and the *omina* have a secondary importance only. This makes *Dd.* (59 per cent *NA* against 41 per cent other parts) an amplified negative of *G* (17 per cent *NA* and 83 per cent other parts).

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. *Val.* 8.2 about Valerianus' son of the same name: *nihil habet praedicabile in vita, nisi quod est nobiliter natus, educatus optime et miserabiliter interemptus.*

5.4.3 The Structure of *OM*

The life of *OM* is quite unique in the series of the *HA*, in that it contains, after the preface, a summary that functions as a table of contents: *Occiso ergo Antonino Bassiano Opilius Macrinus, praefectus praetorii eius, qui antea privatus curabat, imperium arripuit, humili natus loco et animi atque oris invecundi seque nunc Severum nunc Antoninum (...) nuncupavit statimque ad bellum Parthicum profectus* The narrative starting point is the moment when Caracalla dies (*occiso ergo Antonino Bassiano*), after which the subject of the narrative is introduced: *Opilius Macrinus, praefectus praetorii eius*. The biographical nature of the text leads to two cases of backtracking to earlier events in the subject's life (underlined in the text: *qui antea privatus curabat* and *humili natus loco* – concerning early career and birth), as well as a characterisation of his 'mores' (*et animi atque oris invecundi*), while the events during and briefly after his seizure of power are reported in the middle of these biographically prerequisite elements (1: *imperium arripuit*, 2: *seque nunc Severum nunc Antoninum (...) nuncupavit* and 3: *statimque ad bellum Parthicum profectus ...*). These three events reflect the most important historical parts of Macrinus' biography (the usurpation, the imperial names and the war with the Parthians), while the retracing of his earlier career and the description of his character constitute the biographical part. The narrative starting point, as has been said, is the moment of his bid for power. In chapter 4 we have seen that three of the following biographies (*Hel.*, *AS* and *MB*) have this same starting point, the moment when the new ruler seized the throne (see § 4.2.2), a phenomenon that is not encountered in the lives before *OM*.

What was announced in the summary of *OM* 2 is elaborated in the next chapters: in *OM* 3, there is a flashback to an oracle about the Antonine name, in *OM* 4 the early career of Macrinus is told by a senator called Aurelius Victor, in *OM* 5 Macrinus' first measures as emperor are reported, in *OM* 6 – 7.4 the letter which he sent to the senate is quoted, while in *OM* 7.5 considerations about the Antonine name echo the oracle in *OM* 3, after which in *OM* 8 - 10 the Parthian war and Macrinus' death are described. In *OM* 11-14 the historical order of events is abandoned, and descriptions of the character and mores of the subject are given. *OM* 15 rounds off the biography with a repetition of Macrinus' death and the announcement (in narratological terms: prolepsis) of the reign of the next emperor. The last two paragraphs *OM* 15.3 and 15.4 contain two specims of paratext again: the theme of *inventio* (see § 8.4) and the dedication to Diocletian respectively.

<i>Occiso ergo Antonino Bassiano</i>	4.7
<i>Opilius Macrinus</i>	<i>passim</i>
<i>praefectus praetorii eius</i>	4.7-8
<i>qui antea privatus curabat</i>	7.1
<i>imperium arripuit</i>	5.4
<i>humili natus loco</i>	5.5-6, 7.1
<i>et animi atque oris inverecondi</i>	11.1, 12, 13.3, 14.1
<i>seque nunc Severum nunc Antoninum...nuncupavit</i>	5.7
<i>cum in odio esset omnium et hominum et militum</i>	5.5, 13-14.1
<i>statimque ad bellum Parthicum profectus ...</i>	8-10

It is striking that the element to which most space is devoted is not announced: the *nomen Antoninorum*. None of the elements in *OM* 2.1-2 refer to any part of the *NA* theme. The table of contents, which, in all probability, reflects the textual situation before the insertion of the theme, shows that the emperor calls himself Antoninus and Severus, which is repeated in *OM* 3.6 (*inde est quod se et Severus Antoninus vocavit... et idem Macrinus*) and 5.7 (*Infulsit praeterea in nomen Severi*). In *OM* 7.2 and 5, however, only the names of Pius (*Pii nomine decreto*) and Felix are mentioned, while Macrinus' son Diadumenian is called Antoninus in 7.5. In *OM* 11.2 the name of Pertinax is added (*nam et Severum se et Pertinacem voluerat nuncupari*) and the names of Pius and Felix are repeated, though Macrinus refused the former (*...et cum illum senatus Pium ac Felicem nuncupasset, Felicis nomen recepit, Pii habere noluit*). This results in *OM* attributing the following names to the two co-regents:

<i>OM</i>	Macrinus	Diadumenian
2.1	Severus, Antoninus	
2.5*; 3.4, 8*		Antoninus
3.6*	Antoninus (as <i>praenomen</i>)	
5.7*	Severus	Antoninus
6.6-7*		Antoninus
7.2	Pius	
7.5	Felix	Antoninus
10.6*		Antoninus
11.2-4	Severus, Pertinax, Felix, (Pius) ⁵⁰⁶	
14.1-2*		Antoninus

Figure 5.6: The imperial names borne by Macrinus and Diadumenian as mentioned in *OM*.

What may be concluded from this is that in all the passages not belonging to the *NA* theme (2.1, 7.2, 11.1-4), Macrinus is called Severus (2.1, 11.2), Antoninus (2.1), Pius

⁵⁰⁶ Macrinus wished to bear the names of Severus and Pertinax, according to the author (*OM* 11.2: *voluerat nuncupari*), but it is not recorded whether he received them or not. Yet, the name of Severus is historical (Kienast 1996, 169). In the account of *OM*, Macrinus refused the name of Pius.

(7.2, 11.2), Pertinax (11.2) and Felix (7.5, 11.2). Two of these names are nullified in the text, namely Antoninus in 3.6, where it appears to serve only as a *praenomen*, and Pius in 11.2-4, where Macrinus refuses the name of Pius. Both names were borne by the emperor Antoninus Pius: it seems that the author does not want Macrinus to figure among the *veri successores Antonini*, as he puts it in *OM* 3.7. The removal of the name of Antoninus becomes even more striking when *OM* 11.2 is compared with *OM* 2.1. On the occasion of a remark about Macrinus' *severitas*, the author adds: *nam et Severum se et Pertinacem voluerat nuncupari*, a formula structured along the lines of *OM* 2.1: *seque nunc Severum nunc Antoninum (...) nuncupavit: et ...et* is changed into *nunc...nunc* and *nuncupavit* into *voluerat nuncupari* and *Antoninum* to *Pertinacem*. The latter name fitted the present passage better, because Macrinus' harshness had to be demonstrated: *...quae duo illi asperitatis nomina videbantur* (viz. Severus and Pertinax).⁵⁰⁷

The removal of the name of Antoninus corresponds with the author's opinion that Macrinus is only a usurper, as we have seen in § 3.2. It is not impossible that he initially styled Macrinus as an Antoninus (as is indicated by *OM* 2.1) but later corrected this in an added *NA* passage (*OM* 3.6), just as he did with the name of Pius (in 7.2, corrected in 11.2-4). The correction was necessary in order to crown Diadumenian exclusively with the name of Antoninus, as a justification for devoting a separate biography to the emperor's son. It should also be noted that Diadumenian does not play an important role outside the *NA* passages, which may indicate that in the author's source Macrinus is treated with only a bare mention of his teenage son.⁵⁰⁸ The source for Macrinus' life must have provided poor material. The author of the *HA* preferred to stress Diadumenian's name of Antoninus, which makes his treatment of Macrinus, who after all was only a usurper, more acceptable to the reader. In fact, the author inverts the importance of the two rulers: whereas Macrinus was only a tyrant and the father of the Antonine name, Diadumenian was a *verus successor Antonini*. In *AS* 9.3 the innocence of Diadumenian is stated explicitly: *Diadumenus autem nec tempus habuit nec aetatem et arte patris hoc nomen incurrit*.

The chief conclusion to be drawn from our comparison of the table of contents in *OM* 2.1 and the rest of the biography is that the *NA* passages are not in any way announced. Our earlier analysis of the *NA* theme showed that the *NA* fragments are loosely attached to the other parts of the text and exactly the same holds good here. The implications of these observations will be mapped out in the conclusion to this chapter (§ 5.6).

⁵⁰⁷ In *OM* 12.2, too, Macrinus praises Severus for his severity: *...incusans quin etiam superiorum temporum disciplinam ac solum Severus prae ceteris laudans*.

⁵⁰⁸ E.g. in *OM* 14.1: *...illum occiderunt cum puero filio Diadumeno...*, whereafter the *NA* theme is added.

5.5 The NA Theme in the Intermediary Lives II

5.5.1 The NA Theme in *Hel.*

After the preface, in which he justifies himself for devoting a book to the worst of emperors, Elagabalus, the author continues with a plain factual account of events (*Hel.* 1.4): *occiso Macrino eiusque filio Diadumeno, qui **pari potestate imperii Antonini etiam nomen acceperat**, in Varium Heliogabalum imperium conlatum est,...* The subclause in bold type contains, apart from its reference to the Antonine name, a repetition of the information given in *OM* 10.4: ... *Diadumenus puer, quem plerique pari fuisse cum patris imperio tradiderunt*.⁵⁰⁹

The next mention of the Antonine name contains two reasons for its adoption by Elagabalus' (*Hel.* 1.5): ...*Antonini sibi nomen adsciverat* (1) *vel in argumentum generis* (2) *vel quod id nomen usque adeo carum esse cognoverat gentibus, ut etiam parricida Bassianus causa nominis amaretur*. The first reason is proof of kinship with the emperor Caracalla (just as Septimius Severus wanted to be part of Marcus' family, *S* 10.6), the second the popularity of the name, now with a new element added: even a fratricide like Caracalla became popular with this name. In fact, the name of Antoninus was popular among the soldiers (*Cc.* 8.10), a message that must have been borrowed from the original source for that part of the text, but the notion that Caracalla owed his popularity to this name is an element that was not introduced until *Dd.* 6.10.⁵¹⁰ In *Cc.* 9.2 Elagabalus' assumption of the name was explained by the assertion that ...*omnium pectora velut Augusti nomen obsederat*. Then, his earlier names Varius and Heliogabalus are discussed and rounded off with (*Hel.* 1.7) *postremo cum accepit imperium, Antoninus appellatus est atque ipse in Romano imperio ultimus Antoninorum fuit*. The quoted elements, which all correspond in content with the preceding NA passages, are detachable from the text without damage to its narrative continuity.

At the end of the second chapter, something special in the development of the NA theme is found: the dedication to the emperor, Constantine in casu, is combined with the NA theme (*Hel.* 2.4): *sed de nomine hactenus, quamvis sanctum illud Antoninorum nomen polluerit, quod tu, Constantine sacratissime, ita veneraris, ut Marcum et Pium inter Constantios Claudiosque, velut maiores tuos, aureos formaveris adoptans virtutes veterum tuis moribus congruentes et tibi amicas caras*. An important theme in the ideological design of the *HA* is the emperor Constantine's descent from Claudius Gothicus, for reasons that will not be explained here.⁵¹¹ In the passage quoted, the first bearers of the *nomen Antoninorum*, Marcus and Pius, are on a par with the ancestors of

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. *S* 20.1 *duos Antoninos pari imperio*, on Caracalla and Geta.

⁵¹⁰ In other parts, it is the name itself that is popular, *OM* 3.9, 10.2, 10.3; *Dd.* 1.5, 2.10, 7.2, 9.4. This is in contradiction with a message such as *S* 21.11 *vixit denique in odio populi diu Antoninus, nomenque illud venerabile diu minus amatum est...*

⁵¹¹ Festy 2005; Bird 1997, 9-17; Syme 1983, 63-79 ('The Ancestry of Constantine'); Dessau 1889, 340-4.

the dedicatee Constantine.⁵¹² gold statues of the two are placed between Constantius, Constantine's father, and Claudius, who was adopted as an ancestor in 310 AD. Two major themes of *HA* are thus united, to the glory of both. Compare the formula *sanctum illud Antoninorum nomen ... , quod tu, ... ita veneraris, ut...* with the wording in *S* 19.3 (*Antoninum tantum coluit, ut Antonini nomen omnibus deinceps quasi Augusti adscribendum putaret*) and *S* 21.11 (*nomenque illud venerabile*). After acclamations, letters, prefaces, programmatic remarks, oracles, *omina*, etc., the *NA* theme is again used in a new literary context: the dedication.

A new combination of motifs appears in *Hel.* 3.1': *excitatisque omnibus ordinibus, omni etiam populo ad nomen Antoninum, quod non solum titulo, ut in Diadumeno fuerat, sed etiam in sanguine redditum videbatur, cum se Antonini Bassiani filium scripsisset, ingens eius desiderium factum est*. According to the author, Macrinus knew that there was a great desire for the Antonine name (*OM* 3.9) because Caracalla as a bearer of the Antonine name was sadly missed (as attested by Aurelius Victor, 22.2). The *ingens desiderium* returns, now with regard to Elagabalus. Not only Caracalla's name, but also a representative of his bloodline returns to the Roman throne, in contrast with Diadumenian's emperorship. This is the first time that the Antonine's bloodline is brought up, which indeed was an important justification of Elagabalus' claim to the throne. This claim is presented in a letter (*Romam nuntios misit, Hel.* 3.1)⁵¹³, as the subordinate clause *cum se Antonini Bassiani filium scripsisset* underlines. The letter was read in the senate (*Hel.* 3.3: *denique ubi in senatu lectae sunt litterae Heliogabali, statim fausta in Antoninum et dira in Macrinum eiusque filium dicta sunt, ...*). Unlike his quotation of Macrinus' letter in *OM* 6, the author does not produce any such evidence here. Its contents are not revealed, apart from the claim of Elagabalus' kinship with Caracalla.

In *Hel.* 8.4, the next mention of Antoninus' name, a confusing account conceals an interesting fact. The passage is quoted here in full, as only an analysis of its textual structure can clarify the logic of the narration⁵¹⁴: *insecutus est famam Macrini crudeliter, sed multo magis Diadumeni, quod Antoninus dictus est, Pseudoantoninum ut Pseudophilippum eum appellans, simul quod ex luxoriosissimo extitisse vir fortissimus, optimus, gravissimus, severissimus diceretur. coegit denique scriptores nonnullos nefanda, immo potius iniqua de eiusdem victu et luxuria disputare, ut in vita eius dictum*. According to the author, Elagabalus attacked Macrinus, but Diadumenian in particular, because of his Antonine name. The label Pseudantoninus was given to Elagabalus by Cassius Dio, but now applied by Elagabalus himself to Diadumenian. Pseudophilippum is a historical name that refers to the alleged son of king Perseus of Macedon, a usurper called Andriscos in 148 BC.⁵¹⁵ The passage that follows next (*simul quod...*) is suspect, as its contents are not in concordance with the previous biography *Dd*: there is no indication of

⁵¹² Diocletian's reverence for Marcus is attested in *Cod. Iust.* 5.17.5, where he addresses his predecessor with the words *divus Marcus, pater noster, religiosissimus imperator*. This is a topos in the literature of the fourth century: Van Sickle 1932, 52.

⁵¹³ The dispatch of the letter is confirmed by Dio 80.1.2, in which fragments are quoted – it appears that Heliogabalus spoke *dira* about his predecessor and his son. The reaction in the senate as attested in *Hel.* 3.3 may have been all about this vicious letter.

⁵¹⁴ I follow the conjecture [*iniqua*] by Zinsli (2007, 127) instead of Hohl's *impia*, based on ms. Σ.

<*Dictum*> at the end of the passage as supplemented in the edition of Chastagnol 1994, 514.

⁵¹⁵ Chastagnol 1994, 514n1.

Diadumenian being a *vir fortissimus, optimus, gravissimus, severissimus* (moreover, this Diadumenian is a *puer*, not a *vir*, see e.g. *Dd.1.1: Antonini Diadumeni pueri...*) nor is his wasteful lifestyle (*de eiusdem victu et luxuria*) described in his biography, as this passage seems to indicate. The chief question, however, is if *eiusdem* refers to Diadumenian.⁵¹⁶ It is more probable that *eius* refers to Macrinus and *eiusdem vita* to *OM*. There are several indications that serve to support this idea: Macrinus is indeed a *vir*, and there is a description of his base lifestyle in *OM* 4, interrupted by the remark (*OM* 4.5): *sed et haec dubia ponuntur, et alia dicuntur ab aliis, quae ipsa quoque non tacebimus*. Could it be that the author refers to the several sources about Macrinus' life (which include a fictitious senator named Aurelius Victor) when he says that Elagabalus forced some authors to write *nefanda, immo potius iniqua* about Macrinus? In that case, *eiusdem* refers to Macrinus, which is the author's normal way of referring to someone mentioned before when taking up the narration about that person again.⁵¹⁷ Moreover, there is indeed a mention of Macrinus's luxurious life in *OM* 8.5: *...ac luxuriae operam daret...*⁵¹⁸ The textual structure indicates that there is a passage added to the primary text: when the passage *sed multo magis ... appellans, simul* is left out, the account makes more sense. The addition about Diadumenian interrupts the narrative flow, and has even left a striking trace in the sentence structure: *simul quod...* indicates a redundant addition to the earlier *quod Antoninus...* in the same passage which the author thought appropriate in order to focus attention on Diadumenian's Antonine name. Thus, there is every reason to assume that *ut in vita eius <dictum>* is about *OM*.

In *Hel.* 9 a story about Marcus Antoninus (viz. Aurelius) is told, who through incantations and magical formulas made the Marcomanni permanent friends of the Romans (*Hel.* 9.1). Elagabalus wishes to undo the spell in order to wage war, but the formula was kept secret (*Hel.* 9.2). Then, an afterthought about the Antonines is added (*Hel.* 9.2): *...et idcirco maxime quod audierat responsum fuisse ab Antonino bellum Marcomannicum finiendum, cum hic Varius et Heliogabalus et ludibrium publicum diceretur, nomen autem Antonini pollueret, in quod invaserat*. The line of thought is difficult to follow: because Elagabalus had heard an oracle that an *Antoninus* should successfully conclude the war against the Marcomanni, he wanted to be both an Antonine and wage war in order to be the presaged victorious Antoninus. The problem, however, was that this was not one of his names, which were Varius and Heliogabalus. Being something of a public laughing stock as well, he has polluted the adopted Antonine name. The addition *idcirco quod...diceretur* is part of the story about the oracle, while *nomen ...in quod invaserat* seems to be typical of the *NA* theme.⁵¹⁹ The motif of the 'pollution' of the name occurred in *Hel.* 2.4: *sed de nomine hactenus, quamvis sanctum illud*

⁵¹⁶ As posed by Birley 1976, 297; 1997, 2693 and n20 (where Bireley suggests 'given the carelessness of the author of the HA' that the reference is to Maximus' *vita Heliogabali*'); Chastagnol 1994, 514n2; Zinsli 2007, 127 etc. Syme (1983, 57-8) proposes four options with regard to the author of the biography referred to, which shows the difficulty to press for logic in the phrase.

⁵¹⁷ See for example *G* 2.6: *De hoc eodem...*

⁵¹⁸ The trait of *luxuria* is typical in the description of tyrants. See for a treatment of this theme in the *HA*: Von Haehling 1991, Neri 1999.

⁵¹⁹ Note that *in quod invaserat* is a typical description of tyrants seizing power by force: *S* 19.6: *invadentibus multis rem p.*; *PN* 5.1: *Niger ... cum in imperium invasit, etc.* see Lessing ad *invado*. The same holds good for *adfectato* in *Hel.* 17.4.

Antoninorum nomen polluerit, which began with Commodus, witness *OM* 7.7 (*Commodus vero etiam polluisse sacrati nominis reverentiam* (sc. *videatur*)).⁵²⁰

The next variation on the *NA* theme is in *Hel.* 17.4, in a passage that treats the emperor's death, after which his corpse is dragged along and thrown into the Tiber (*Hel.* 17.1-2). This is why he was allegedly called Tiberinus later (*Hel.* 17.5: *Appellatus est post mortem Tiberinus et Tractatitius et Inpurus...*). The contemplations about Elagabalus' names inspires the author to add his own thoughts: the narration is interrupted, just before these names are introduced, by a report on Elagabalus' Antonine name (*Hel.* 17.4): *nomen eius, id est Antonini, erasum est senatu iubente emansitque Varii Heliogabali, si quidem illud adfectato retinuerat, cum vult videri filius Antonini*. That the *NA* theme is an addition here, becomes very clear when the parallel message in the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (23.5-7) is compared to the present text, as G. Alföldy (1976, 13-4) pointed out (the parallels are underlined):⁵²¹

HA Hel. 17.1-5

post hoc in eum impetus factus est atque in latrina, ad quam confugerat, occisus. tractus deinde per publicum. addita iniuria cadaveri est, ut id in cloacam milites mitterent. sed cum non cepisset cloaca fortuito, per pontem Aemilium adnexo pondere, ne fluitaret, in Tiberim abiectum est, ne umquam sepeliri posset. tractum est cadaver eius etiam per circi spatia, priusquam in Tiberim praecipitaretur. [nomen eius, id est Antonini, erasum est senatu iubente emansitque Varii Heliogabali, si quidem illud adfectato retinuerat, cum vult videri filius Antonini] Appellatus est post mortem Tiberinus et Tractatitius et Inpurus et multa, si quando ea erant designanda, quae sub eo facta videbantur.

Epit. De Caes. 23.5-7

Ipse tumultu militari interfectus est. huius corpus per urbis vias more canini cadaveris a militibus tractum est militari cavillo appellantium indomitae rabidaeque libidinis catulam. Novissime cum angustum foramen cloacae corpus minime reciperet, usque ad Tiberim deductum, adiecto pondere, ne umquam emergeret, in fluvium proiectum est.

vixit annos sedecim, atque ex re, quae acciderat, Tiberinus Tracticiusque⁵²² appellatus est.

The excursus about Elagabalus' names,⁵²³ based on a lost source that may have been Marius Maximus, was evidently thought a proper place to insert some new variations on the *NA* theme.⁵²⁴ Meanwhile, the interpolation shows that this same Marius Maximus is

⁵²⁰ And Elagabalus' 'pollution' in *Cc.* 9.2, *OM* 7.6, 7.8, *Hel.* 2.4, 9.2

⁵²¹ The relation between the two quoted texts was determined by Barnes (1972, 71 and 73), namely that Marius Maximus served as common source; the assumption is followed by Schlumberger (1974, 122-3: 'Nur Marius Maximus kann hier die gemeinsame Quellenbasis gebildet haben'), G. Alföldy (1976, 21) and Festy 1999, 137n11 ('...un récit très proche qui, comme celui de l'E., doit provenir de Marius Maximus').

⁵²² Note the difference *Tractatitius* (*HA*) – *Tractitius* (*Epit.*), see ed. Festy 1999, 32. Dio (80.21.3) calls Elagabalus Τιβεριός.

⁵²³ Dio 80.1.1 confirms the nickname of Tiberinus after Elagabalus' death.

⁵²⁴ Just as in *Hel.* 9.2, the additions occur on a place where a discussion about the names of the emperor is already present: the designations of *Varius*, *Heliogabalus* and *ludibrium publicum* in *Hel.* 9.2 and *Tiberinus*

not the source of the theme. Some well-known elements of earlier *NA* passages are repeated: that Elagabalus pretended to be the son of Caracalla was mentioned before in some passages with the *NA* theme, namely *Hel.* 1.5, *Hel.* 3.1 and earlier in *OM* 7.7.⁵²⁵ The senate's ordering the erasure of his name is the author's way to treat Elagabalus' *damnatio memoriae* after his death.⁵²⁶

The term *ultimus Antoninorum*, mentioned before in *Hel.* 1.7 (...*ipse in Romano imperio ultimus Antoninorum fuit*), recurs in *Hel.* 18.1, immediately followed by two repeated *NA* motifs: *Hic ultimus Antoninorum fuit (quamvis cognomine postea Gordianos multi Antoninos putent, qui Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini) vita, moribus, improbitate ita odibilis, ut eius senatus et nomen eraserit. quem nec ego Antoninum vocassem nisi causa cognitionis, quae cogit plerumque dici ea etiam nomina, quae sunt abolita*. The author denies that the Gordiani were called Antoninus, but says that they bore the name Antonius instead. It is interesting to trace the origin of this report. The first time that the Gordiani as Antonini are brought up is in *OM* 3.5: *nec inter Antoninos referendi sunt duo Gordiani, (1) aut quia praenomen tantum Antoninorum habuerunt (2) aut etiam Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini*. That the Gordiani were no Antonini is supported by two reasonings: they were either called Antoninus by way of *praenomen* or Antonius. In *Dd.* 6.3, the second instance, *praenomen* and *cognomen* are mixed up, and *quidam* is mentioned as a 'source'.⁵²⁷ This report is clearly meant to shore up the first option in *OM* 3.5. but the passage just cited rather tends to support the other option, as it brings to mind the confusion of *Antoninus* and *Antonius*. Meanwhile, an element from *Dd.* 6.3 has also slipped in, as *Antoninus* is labelled a *cognomen* here, not a *praenomen*, as in *OM* 3.5 (though the two terms seem to be used as synonyms within the *NA* theme). Also, the alleged source (or sources even, *multi*) is a variation on *quidam* in *Dd.* 6.3. In the author's conception, the entire exposition is necessary because Elagabalus would not have been the *ultimus Antoninorum* if the Gordiani also were Antonini – and so seeks to demonstrate that this was not the case. On the other hand, he rather wished that Elagabalus had been no Antoninus at all, which was actually made to come true (so the author says), when the senate erased his Antonine name from the record, as was also reported in *Hel.* 17.4. But historical scrupulousness (*causa cognitionis*)⁵²⁸ forces the author to call Elagabalus also by his abolished names (*nomina, quae sunt abolita*). The passage is attached loosely among other passages dealing with entirely different matters, namely the construction of the *opera publica* and the death of his mother Symiamira.

and *Tractatitius* in *Hel.* 17.4 are supplemented by the *Nomen Antoninorum*. As Hohl 1950 shows, the jokes on names of emperors can be taken from different sources, while Dessau dismissed most of them as the author's fiction (1889, 384-5).

⁵²⁵ *Hel.* 1.5: ...*Antonini sibi nomen adsciverat vel in argumentum generis...* and 3.1: (...*cum se Antonini Bassiani filium scripsisset*); *OM* 7.7: (*Varius Heliogabalus, qui se Bassiani filium diceret...*).

⁵²⁶ Kienast 1996, 172; Turcan (1993, 192) confirms on the base of inscriptions that the erasure of the names is historical. See also Lukaszewicz (1992, 44) about papyri proving Antoninus' bad reputation and the erasure of the name of Antoninus. Cf. Commodus' *damnatio memoriae* in *C* 17.6 (*sed nomen eius alienis operibus incisum senatus erasit*) and 20.5 (*nomenque ex omnibus privatis publicisque monumentis eradendum*).

⁵²⁷ *Dd.* 6.3: *unde etiam quidam et Severum et Pertinacem et Iulianum Antoninorum praenominibus honorandos putant, unde postea duos Gordianos, patrem et filium, Antoninos cognominatos putant*.

⁵²⁸ See the statement in *OM* 1.2: *sed eius qui vitas aliorum scribere orditur, officium est digna cognitione perscribere*.

There is no clear narrative line here, which must have made it easy to interpolate a new passage in the middle of the work.

Only in the last part of the work does the theme reappear, in *Hel.* 33.8 (*Hic finis Antoninorum nomini in re p. fuit, scientibus cunctis istum Antoninum tam vita falsum fuisse quam nomine*) and 34.6. *Hel.* 33.8 brings up the term *ultimus Antoninorum* again (attested in *Hel.* 1.7 and 18.1), now in the variation of *finis Antoninorum* after it memorised again how the corpse was thrown into the Tiber. The author also plays with the term Pseudantoninus (...*tam vita falsum fuisse quam nomine*). In *Hel.* 34.6: *et quoniam hic ultimus Antoninorum fuit neque postea hoc nomen in re p. loco principum frequentatum est, etiam illud addendum est, ne quis error oriatur, cum duos Gordianos narrare coepero, patrem et filium, qui se de Antoninorum genere dici volebant: non nomen in illis primum fuit sed praenomen; deinde, ut in plerisque libris invenio, Antoni dicti sunt, non Antonini*. Remarkable is the designation of *duos Antoninos* (like in two other *NA* passages: *OM* 3.5 and *Dd.* 6.3), as in other places the author not only shows his awareness (*Max.* 16.7; 20.2-3) that there are three of them (father, his son and his daughter's son) but also treats them in his book *Gd.*⁵²⁹

It is interesting to note that the *NA* passages only occur in the first half (*Hel.* 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 2.4, 3.1, 8.4, 9.2, 17.4, 18.1) and in the last part (*Hel.* 33.8, 34.6) of the biography of *Hel.* There is a clear distinction between chapters 1.1-18.3 on the one hand⁵³⁰ and 18.4-33.8 on the other, followed by a kind of epilogue in chapters 34-35. The difference, meticulously described by Barnes (1972, 73 and 1978, 56-6),⁵³¹ lies in the fact that the first part contains an accurate description of facts with a high amount of historical reliability, whereas the second part consists of the emperor's excessive behaviour, introduced by *De huius vita multa in litteras missa sunt obscaena. quae quia digna memoratu non sunt, ea prodenda censui, quae ad luxuriam pertinebant*, the wording of which is reminiscent of the preface to *OM* (1.1): *ea quidem quae memoratu digna erunt*. The author clearly marks the caesura in the biography, at this moment of changing to another source or, rather, his own mystifications. Barnes (1972, 72) notes the similarities with Suetonius, whose works provide some striking parallels.⁵³² It may well be that he reveals his source in his introduction *Hel.* 18.4 by mentioning three Suetonian emperors: *... quorum aliqua privatus, aliqua iam imperator fecisse perhibetur, cum ipse privatus diceret se Apicium, imperatorem vero Neronem, Othonem et Vitellium imitari*, that are partly repeated in *Hel.* 33.1: *... et omnis apparatus Tiberii et Caligulae et Neronis norat*,

⁵²⁹ Chastagnol 1967, 90; 1968, 60. The sources contradict each other on this figure: the abbreviators Aurelius Victor (27.1) and Eutropius (9.2.1-2) only mention two Gordiani, while the third-century sources Herodianus and Dexippus mention the correct number of three, which the author of *HA* follows in his books on the Maximini and Gordiani. Finally, the mistaken number of two Gordiani rests on a fourth-century tradition, attested in Aurelius Victor, Eutropius and the aforementioned *NA* passages (*OM* 3.5, *Dd.* 6.3) in the *HA*.

⁵³⁰ That the preface in *Hel.* 1.1-3 does not belong to this first part, will be made clear below, at the end of the paragraph.

⁵³¹ Chastagnol 1994, LVI-VII. This last conclusion, Marius Maximus being the main source of the primary lives from *H-Cc.*, is not in Barnes, as he follows Syme in assuming an unknown biographical source styled *Ignotus* (Syme 1971, 30-53, earlier postulated by Lécirvain 1904, 191-2); Müller 1870, 11 *sqq.* indicates Marius Maximus as the source of *Hel.*, but also of *AS* (1904, 208-11; 235-5), while Lécirvain supposes that Marius Maximus was the principal source for the first part of *Hel.*, up to 18.3 (1904, 210).

⁵³² Some examples proffered by Barnes (1972, 72): *Hel.* 24.4 ~ *Vit.* 1.3 *sqq.*; 31.5 ~ *Nero* 30.3; 32.9 ~ *Cal.* 11, *Nero* 26.1 *sq.*; 33.1 ~ *Tib.* 43.1, *Cal.* 16.1.

and though in a changed context, in *Hel.* 34.1: ...*cum Neroni, Vitellio, Caligulae ceterisque huius modi numquam tyrannicida defuerit*. All the parallels with the biographies of Tiberius, Caligula, Nero and Vitellius that are mentioned by Barnes (1972, 72) are implicitly present in the three imperial trios of emperors described by Suetonius (Nero, Otho, Vitellius / Tiberius, Caligula, Nero / Nero, Vitellius, Caligula). Meanwhile, the preface anticipates the theme (*Hel.* 1.1): *Vitam Heliogabali Antonini (...) numquam in litteras misissem, ne quis fuisse Romanorum principem sciret, nisi ante Caligulas et Nerones et Vitellios hoc idem habuisset imperium*. Apart from the factual content it is clear that the author wished to leave his own imprint on the biography. His signature is recognizable in the preface and the second and third parts as discerned by Barnes, as well as in the *NA* passages in the first part.

This brings us to the third and last part, *Hel.* 34 and 35, which consists of an epilogue, in which the biography is dedicated to Constantine (*Hel.* 34.1-5, 35.1-7), the *NA* theme is brought up again (*Hel.* 34.6), and programmatic remarks are made about the range of the whole series of *HA* (*Hel.* 35.2-7). Another pertinent remark may be made about the use of the *NA* theme in the biography of *Hel.*: it is linked directly to the dedication to Constantine in *Hel.* 2.4, resulting in a combination of two items (*NA* theme and dedications) that had not occurred before.⁵³³ The biography of *Hel.* gives us a clear picture how the author proceeds: using a biographical source in *Hel.* 1.4-18.3, he expands this with a preface (*Hel.* 1.1-3), the Suetonius-inspired sentence (*Hel.* 18.4), the gossip part as far as *Hel.* 33.7 and the epilogue with its dedications to Constantine as well as programmatic remarks about the scope of the *HA*. On top of it all, the *NA* theme is added (*Hel.* 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 2.4, 3.1, 8.4, 9.2, 17.4, 18.1, 33.8, 34.6) totalling 287 words, which is 5 per cent of the entire biography. In the biography of the emperor who was one of the chief reasons why the theme of the name of Antoninus was added (see conclusion, § 5.6), considerably less attention is paid to the Antonine name than in *G*, *OM* or *Dd.*, the former two subjects of which were not even called Antoninus historically. It is striking that the biography of *C* lacks the theme entirely, with the result that the two bad Antonini, Commodus and Elagabalus, only receive poor treatment with regard to the *nomen Antoninorum*. The author likes to turn things upside down, and surprises by adding the theme where it is least expected.

5.5.2 The *NA* Theme in *AS*

Alexander's biography opens, like the beginning of the factual part of other biographies,⁵³⁴ with an ablativus absolutus that links the biography to the previous life (*AS* 1.1-2): *Interfecto Vario Heliogabalo (sic enim malum dicere quam Antoninus, quia et nihil Antoninorum pestis illa ostendit et hoc nomen ex annalibus senatus auctoritate erasum est) ad remedium generis humani Aurelius Alexander (...) accepit imperium,...* The parenthesis (indicated with brackets by Hohl) dealing with the Antonine name is attached to the name of Varius Heliogabalus. The clause *ad remedium generis humani...*

⁵³³ The *NA* theme appears in *S* 20.1-3, after which a dedication to Diocleation follows (*S* 20.4), just before the theme of the *fili imperatoris*. There, however, they are not combined in a single passage, and the dedication follows on the *NA* theme.

⁵³⁴ Cf. *S* 1.1: *Interfecto Didio Iuliano Severus Africa oriundus imperium optinuit*; *OM* 2.1: *Occiso ergo Antonino Bassiano Opilius Macrinus ... imperium arripuit,...* see § 4.2.1-2.

echoes the preface to *Hel.* 1.2, in which the good and bad emperors are compared with *venena* and *frumentum* and *alia salutaria*: after the bad Elagabalus, the new emperor Alexander will bring health to humanity.⁵³⁵ The plain narrative style of the abbreviator is recognizable in *Interfecto Vario Heliogabalo (...) Aurelius Alexander accepit imperium*. The text between brackets returns the erasure of a name as a motif which was earlier brought up in *Hel.* 17.4 (*Nomen eius, id est Antonini, erasum est senatu iubente...*) and 18.1 (*...ita odibilis, ut eius senatus et nomen eraserit*).⁵³⁶ *Pestis illa* is a designation used before in *Hel.* 10.1 (*sed milites pestem illam imperatoris velari nomine pati nequierunt...*).

In AS 2.2, the name of Antonine in relation with Elagabalus turns up again, in a passage treating Alexander's appointment as Augustus: *huc accessit nimia et senatus et populi inclinatio post illam cladem, quae non solum Antoninorum nomen decoloravit, sed etiam Romanum dehonestavit imperium*. The words *Antoninorum nomen decoloravit* are a variation on the pollution motif, which first occurred in *Hel.* 2.4 and 9.2 and began with Commodus in OM 7.7.⁵³⁷ That people preferred Alexander was stated before in *Hel.* 10.1: *in Alexandrum omnes inclinantes, qui iam Caesar erat a senatu eo tempore...*. The main point in the passage AS 2.1-4 is the discussion about imperial names and offices to be granted to the new emperor (as just discussed above in AS 1.3),⁵³⁸ in which Elagabalus' Antonine name is a detachable interpolation. This theme will occupy a considerable part of Alexander's biography.

The defamation of the Antonine name by Elagabalus is replaced by a contrasting idea in Alexander's biography: the new emperor, who is credited with such virtues as *innocentia*, *prudentia*, *castitas* and *verecundia* (AS 10.6), should purify the name (AS 7.2). Despite the senate's wish that he accept the name Antoninus, Alexander refuses it because he thinks himself unworthy (AS 8.4-5).⁵³⁹ Moreover, the name was used by the basest of rulers, Elagabalus (AS 9.4). The author discusses the *nomen Antoninorum*

⁵³⁵ As Pliny puts it in *Pan.* 5.9: *Habet has vices conditio mortalium, ut adversa ex secundis, ex adversis secunda nascentur. Occultat utrorumque semina deus, et plerumque bonorum malorumque causae sub diversa specie latent*. Earth containing the seeds of good as well as evil, is a common idea, attested in Seneca *NQ* 6.28.1: *Multa autem terras habere mortifera vel ex hoc intellege, quod tot venena nascuntur non manu sparsa, sed sponte, solo scilicet habente ut boni ita mali semina*.

⁵³⁶ Note the repetition and the variation on the earlier passage (*senatus auctoritate erasum est* from *erasum est senatu iubente* in *Hel.* 17.4).

⁵³⁷ Hönn (1911, 165) acknowledges the similarities. *Hel.* 2.4: *...quamvis sanctum illud Antoninorum nomen polluerit...* and 9.2: *...nomen autem Antonini pollueret, in quod invaserat*; OM 7.7: *Commodus vero etiam polluisse sacrati nominis reverentiam* (sc. videatur).

⁵³⁸ Hönn (1911, 108) points at the similarities of the appointment procedure in the senate of AS 1.2-3 (*...et ius proconsulare et tribuniciam potestatem et ius quintae relationis deferente senatu uno die adsumeret*) and OM 7.4 (*denique statim Macrino et proconsulare imperium et potestatem tribuniciam detulerunt*), in which passages the offices of the new emperors are described (cf. also *Pr.* 12.8 for these and other corresponding elements).

⁵³⁹ The refusal of the names Antoninus and Magnus are the author's variation on the traditional *recusatio imperii*, which is traditional when an emperor accesses the throne. Huttner (2004, 151-2) finds it remarkable that the biography of Alexander Severus in the *HA* lacks this theme, and the author even seems to excuse himself for this behaviour of the good prince: *exponam causas, quibus id et senatus coactus est facere et ille perpeti. Non enim aut gravitati senatus congruebat omnia simul deferre aut bono principi raptum ire tot simul dignitates* (AS 1.4-5). Cf. Pliny *Pan.* 5.5, in which the *recusatio* is presented as a sign of good government: *recusabas enim imperare, recusabas; quod bene erat imperaturi*; and in *HA*: *Tac.* 7.7: *sed inde deductus huic senatus consulto interfuit, quasi vere privatus et qui vere recusaret imperium*. Béranger (1953, 139-40) gives a list of instances in which power is refused, see also MA 9.1 (below).

together with the name of Magnus, derived from Alexander's Macedonian namesake, which name Alexander refuses as well (AS 11.2-4). These themes are treated in an extensive description of the senate's acclamations and the emperor's answers to it in chapters 6-12, allegedly taken from the *gesta senatus* from March 6, 222 AD (see ch.6). The passages serve to give the *NA* theme a new impulse, both to contrast the good ruler Alexander to the bad emperor Elagabalus, and to round off the *NA* theme properly (apart from the Antonine coda in *Gd.*). Meanwhile, the *nomen Antoninorum* is related to Alexander Magnus, whom many *imperatores* from Pompeius Magnus on admired and imitated, most prominently of all Augustus and Trajan. Precisely these two emperors left their traces in the biography of Alexander Severus,⁵⁴⁰ which is even more reminiscent of Alexander the Great because of his name. This last theme is the point of departure in AS 5.

The association of Alexander Severus with Alexander Magnus in AS 5 is presented by way of an anecdote about the former Alexander's birth, as an *omen*. The author tells the fictitious story that Alexander Severus was born on the same day that Alexander the Great of Macedon died (AS 5.1-2). The story is interrupted by a phrase about the *nomen Antoninorum*, after which a consideration of its association with Alexander Magnus follows. This passage, too, ends on a remark about an imperial name, this time the *nomen Magni*. The two sentences concluding the first and second part of the story are much alike:

AS 5.3
delatum sibi Antonini nomen **a senatu**
recusavit.

AS 5.5
recusavit et Magni nomen, quod ei quasi
Alexandro est **oblatum senatus iudicio.**

It is clear that in the biography of Alexander, the title of *Magnus* is connected to the Antonine name. When we consider the place where the two phrases occur, it is striking that the clause in AS 5.3 is an unexpected temporal prolepsis, inconsistent with the course of the narration. When the passage is left out, the *si quidem...* phrase must be linked to <cum> *hic magis adfinitate Caracalli iungeretur quam ille subditivus...* So the original reasoning must have been that Alexander Severus is born in a temple dedicated to Alexander Magnus, on the day the latter died, which is why he received his name, and also why he is closer connected to Caracalla, who considered himself as the reincarnation of Alexander Magnus.⁵⁴¹ This is all true, the author reasons, if Marius Maximus is right in

⁵⁴⁰ Bertrand-Dagenbach 1990, 107-113. *Imitatio Alexandri* is an important phenomenon among Roman generals and a frequently studied object, see for examples (Pompeius, Caesar, Augustus, Germanicus, Traianus, Caracalla and Julianus), sources and bibliography: Den Hengst 1999, 3-24.

⁵⁴¹ Cf. *Hel.* 17.9 *porticus (...) quae postea ab hoc subditivo Antonino exstructae sunt...* - the designation *subditivus* for Heliogabalus must be based on the source used for the first part of *Hel.* The passage is reminiscent of the story told in *S* 3.9: *cum amissa uxore aliam vellet* (sc. Septimius Severus) *ducere, genituras sponsarum requirebat, ipse quoque matheseos peritissimus, et cum audisset esse in Syria quandam, quae id geniturae haberet, ut regi iungeretur, eandem uxorem petit, Iuliam scilicet, et accepit interventu amicorum. ex qua statim pater factus est.* Given the fact that in the clause <cum> *hic magis adfinitate Caracalli iungeretur quam ille subditivus...* two words from the biographical source are used (*subditivus, iungeretur*) are used, and that Hohl had to add <cum> to link the two sentences, only the words *delatum...recusavit* consitute the *NA* theme here. When we leave them out, it would make sense to replace <cum> by <ut>: '...so that he was more connected to Caracalla than that supposititious (*i.e.* Elagabalus).'

saying that Septimius Severus married a woman who was destined to be the wife of an emperor. The *nomen Alexandri* triggered the addition of the *N* passage, by which the author prepares the reader for the long disquisitions on the Antonine name in ch. 6-12. At the end of the passage, the author continues his considerations on the *nomen Antoninorum* in AS 5.5 with the *Magni nomen*. The passage on the *nomen Alexandri* (5.1-2 / 5.3'-4) and that on the *nomina Antonini* and *Magni* (5.3 and 5.5 respectively) have to be interpreted separately in order to reconstruct the original lines of thought.⁵⁴²

The two remarks which the author adds here are an introductory phase to prepare the reader for the elaborate documents in the next paragraphs, which are introduced in AS 6.1. Here, the two themes - the names of Antoninus and Magnus - are combined: *Interest relegere*⁵⁴³ *orationem qua nomen Antonini et Magni delatum sibi a senatu recusavit*. This is immediately followed by a remark about *divisio* AS 6.2): *quam priusquam praebeam, proferam etiam adclamationes senatus, quibus id decretum est*, postponing the promised document to a later moment in the text. This resembles the procedure in *Dd.* 7.1, where verses about the *nomen Antoninorum* are quoted (*Dd.* 7.1: *...quam epistolam priusquam intexam, libet versus inserere in Commodum dictos,...*) before the promised letter makes its appearance. In AS 7.1, however, it is the other way round: before the Antoninus/Magnus passage is presented, fragments from the *acta urbis* are quoted, which contain acclamations of the new Augustus (AS 7.2-5).⁵⁴⁴

The new acclamations in AS 7.1 follow the bestowal of the name of Augustus (AS 6.2-6). For the sake of analysis this passage has been arranged in seven sections:⁵⁴⁵

⁵⁴² Chastagnol (1994, 569n5) tries to explain the illogical passage about the relation of Alexander and Elagabalus to Caracalla, who are both related to their predecessor in the same degree of kinship. Bertrand-Dagenbach (1991, 88-9) rightly states that it is not the genealogical *adfinitas* that is paramount (as Magie 1924, 187n5 and Chastagnol 1994, 569n5 suppose), but the link with Alexander the Great. There is a sort of competition, brought about by the claim of the two sisters Soaemias and Mammaea that Caracalla was the father of their sons, between the two cousins about the legacy of Caracalla's Antonine name. The fact that Alexander's name is identical with his Macedonian predecessor and that the Antonines are associated with Alexander Magnus (by reincarnation, as Caracalla wanted to have it) make the claim of Alexander Severus' *adfinitas* with both Caracalla and Alexander more legitimate, hence: *...hic magis adfinitate Caracalli iungeretur quam ille subditivus* ('although this man was closer connected with Caracalla than that usurper of the name'). Bertrand Dagenbach's interpretation is confirmed, I think, in the quote in AS 11.3 *facilius fuit, ... ut Antoninorum nomen acciperem, aliquid enim vel adfinitati deferrem vel consortioni nominis imperialis*, in which *vel* introduces the interpretation: *consortio nominis imperialis*.

⁵⁴³ *Interest* + *inf.* is a typical formula for the author to introduce a document, cf. *interest scire* in AC 12.1, Cc. 10.1, OM 6.1; Max.25.1; *interest ... cognoscere* in Cl.4.1; *interest ... nosse* in Aur. 11.1. Also *interest* + *ut* + *conj.* (*interest ut senatus consultum litteris propagentur*) in Gd.11.1. Note that the instances only occur in the secondary life AC, the historically less reliable part of Cc. (capita 7-11: Barnes 1978, 48) and in intermediary and later lives.

⁵⁴⁴ The only instance in which the author pretends to derive his 'documents' from the *acta urbis*; in C 15.4 the *acta* are mentioned but not cited. In AS 56 the *acta senatus* are thought to have been the source (Peter 1892, 222). It should be questioned if he discerned between the *acta publica* and the *acta senatus* (probably not, in view of the use of *acta urbis* in AS 6.2 and the *acta senatus* in 56.2) which in the first century AD and in the works of Suetonius and Tacitus were clearly distinguished, see below.

⁵⁴⁵ We have the extraordinary opportunity to compare these acclamations with those in the *Gesta senatus* AD 438, as addressed to Theodosius and Valentinianus and preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Mommsen, Zürich 1971 (1904). In the following notes, the *Gesta senatus romani de Theodosiano publicando* AD 438 (pp. 1-4) is material for comparison. An important article dealing with imperial acclamations in late antiquity is Roueché (1984, 181-99), in which acclamations of a certain Albinus in Aphrodisias are analysed on the basis of epigraphic evidence. Baldwin (1981, 138-49) inventarises the

Et cum egisset gratias Alexander, adclamatum est: (1) 'Antonine Alexander, di te servant. Antonine Aureli, di te servant. Antonine Pie, di te servant. (2) Antonini nomen suscipias rogamus. praesta bonis imperatoribus, ut Antoninus dicaris. (3) nomen Antoninorum tu purifica. quod ille infamavit, tu purifica. redde in integrum nomen Antoninorum. (4) sanguis Antoninorum se cognoscat. iniuriam Marci tu vindica. iniuriam Veri tu vindica. iniuriam Bassiani tu vindica. peior Commodus solus Heliogabalus, nec imperator nec Antoninus nec civis nec senator nec nobilis nec Romanus. (5) in te salus, in te vita. ut vivere delectet, Antoninorum Alexandro vitam. ut vivere delectet, et Antoninus vocetur. (6) Antoninorum templa Antoninus dedicet. Parthos et Persas Antoninus vincat. sacrum nomen sacratus accipiat. sacrum nomen castus accipiat. (7) Antonini nomen di cognoscant, Antoninorum honorem di conservent. in te omnia, per te omnia. Antonine, haveas.'

The acclamations contain several well-known motifs from the NA theme, after (1) the address in the form of a tricolon in which the emperor is hailed by three different names: Alexander, Aurelius and Pius. The first two are his *praenomen* and *nomen gentile*, the third does not belong to his official titles; only in AS 4.5 is the name hinted at: *...ab aliis pius appellabatur, ab omnibus certe sanctus et utilis rei publicae*.⁵⁴⁶ The repeated wish that the gods see to the emperor's prosperity is traditional⁵⁴⁷, as witness the previous acclamations in AS 6.3 or Dd.1.6 (*Macrine imperator, di te servant. Antonine Diadumene, di te servant*).⁵⁴⁸ Then, (2) the senate asks to accept the name of Antoninus and be worthy of it.⁵⁴⁹ (3) That name has been polluted by Elagabalus (*infamavit*), to whom *ille* refers. The opposite of *polluere* is *purificare* or *in integrum reddere*, words normally used in connection with *sacra*.⁵⁵⁰ (4) The *sanguis* motif first occurred in *Hel.* 3.1 (*sed etiam in sanguine redditum videbatur, sc. nomen*). The injustice towards Marcus, Verus, and Caracalla must be undone, the degeneration of the Antonine line began with Commodus and ended with Elagabalus. The first Antoninus Pius and two other bearers of the name (in the author's conception), Geta and Diadumenian, are not mentioned.⁵⁵¹ (5) Alexander is placed in the dynastic line of the Antonini; two anaphorae (*in te, ...in te; ut vivere delectet...*, *ut vivere delectet...*⁵⁵² underline the claim. (6) The new emperor should

acclamations in HA; Lorient (1981, 225-35) studies the imperial acclamations of Alexander Severus and Gordianus III in inscriptions.

⁵⁴⁶ Kienast 1996, 177; however, the inscriptions cited in Lorient (1981, 225) do mention the adjective *pius* among the common designations in inscriptions.

⁵⁴⁷ Pliny the Younger elaborates on this habit in his *Panegyricus* 1.1, a laudatory speech which took place in the senate in praise of Trajan in 101 AD: *Bene ac sapienter, Patres Conscripti, maiores instituerunt, ut rerum agendarum, ita dicendi initium a precationibus capere*.

⁵⁴⁸ Cf. AP 3.1: *nam cum tribunal ascendisset, inter alias adclamationes dictum est 'Auguste, dii te servant'*.

⁵⁴⁹ Cf. Diadumenus, who says in his *contio* to the soldiers (Dd.2.3): *ego autem elaborabo, ne desim nomini Antoninorum*, and the corresponding words of the soldiers (Dd.1.8): *puer Antoninus dignus imperio*.

⁵⁵⁰ ThLL ad *polluo* (10.1, 2566.43 sqq., *dedecore, ignominia, infamia*) gives the example of *Hel.* 2.4; 9.2. With *nomen* as object: Gel. NA 9.2.10.

⁵⁵¹ Diadumenus mentions three of his predecessors in Dd.2.3: *scio enim me Pii, me Marci, me Veri suscepisse nomen, quibus satis facere perdifficile est*.

⁵⁵² The wish of (a long) life is traditional and also uttered in the acclamations of Diadumenus and his father: Dd. 1.6-7: *Antoninum diu vivum omnes rogamus. Iuppiter optime maxime, Macrino et Antonino vitam*. The

consecrate the temples of his ancestors, the Antonini.⁵⁵³ The conquest of the Parthian and Persian empire, which is a very glorious deed looked forward to ever since Trajan first undertook his campaigns in the East, is earnestly desired.⁵⁵⁴ Alexander should receive the holy (*sacrum*) Antonine name *sacrat* and *castus*,⁵⁵⁵ like a priest who handles sacred objects, in order to purify the name again. (7) The gods know the name and see to the preservation of the Antonines' honour.⁵⁵⁶ Formulas containing the word *omnia* are traditional in acclamations, cf. *Dd.1.8: Antoninum habemus, omnia habemus*.⁵⁵⁷ The concluding greeting *haveas*, reserved for generals, also occurs in *Cl.18.2*, in an acclamation: *Claudi, dux fortissime, haveas!*⁵⁵⁸

The emperor's answer in *AS 8.1 (et post acclamationes Aurelius Alexander Caesar Augustus: ...)* does not include a reaction to the offer of the Antonine name. The name *Aurelius Alexander Caesar Augustus* is repeated from *AS 6.3*, which suggests that the intermediate acclamations regarding the *nomen Antoninorum* are interpolations added to the basic text. The first words are *Gratias vobis, p.c., ...*, while in *AS 7.1* it was already stated *et cum egisset gratias Alexander* – thus suggesting that the word of thanks fits in better after the first acclamations in *AS 6.3-5*. The answer concerns Alexander's names (Caesar, Augustus) and *honores (pontificatus maximus, tribunicia potestas, proconsulare imperium)*, which again are a reaction to the penultimate acclamations and narration (*AS*

text corresponds with early fifth-century practice under Theodosius, see *CTh 2* line 45: *ut vivere delectet Augustos nostros semper*, which is repeated 22 times.

⁵⁵³ Bertrand-Dagenbach (1991, 97: '...étonnante acclamation qui ne trouve pas son équivalent dans les *gesta senatus*') sees in this item a reaction to Elagabalus' religious policy of replacing the cult of the deified emperors by his own god.

⁵⁵⁴ The mention of victories in the acclamations is traditional, cf. *Dd. 1.6: tu scis, Iuppiter, Macrinus vinci non potest. tu scis, Iuppiter, Antoninus vinci non potest*. The term *invictus* is traditional in acclamations, and also occurs in epigraphic sources with regard to Alexander Severus, e.g. an inscription from Noricum: *Imp(erator) Caes(ar) Mar(cus) Aurel(ius) Severus Alexander pius felix invictus Aug(ustus)...*, see Lorient 1981, 225-6. The victory titles *Parthicus Maximus* and *Persicus Maximus*, assigned to Alexander in the acclamation of the senate in *AS 56.9* are not historical (Kienast 1996, 178).

⁵⁵⁵ *Sacrat*: late antique (Southern); *castus*, connected to priests. Cf. *Hel.2.4: Sanctum illud Antoninorum nomen*. Addressing an emperor as *sacrat* / *sacratissimus* equates the veneration of the emperor to the worship of the gods (Seager 1983, 130). See also Gaius *Inst. 1.53: ex constitutione sacratissimi imperatoris Antonini*, from which appears that the designation was also applied to Antonius Pius. The combination *castus* – *sanctus*, as here *sacrat* and *castus*, also appears in Plinius' *Paneg. 1.3*, as well as the equation to gods: *Quod enim praestabilius est aut pulchrius munus deorum, quam castus et sanctus et diis simillimus princeps?* In *Hel. 2.4* Constantine is addressed as *sacratissime*, which was customary for the panegyrici in his and Diocletian's times, and honours *sanctum illud Antoninorum nomen*. This combination of *sanctum nomen* and *sacrat* *imperator* recurs here. *Sanctus* and *sacrat* are characteristics frequently attributed to Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius (*AP 4.3; 13.3; MA 1.1; 15.3; 19.6; 19.10; 19.12*). *Sacratissime* *imperator* or *sacratissime princeps* were normal addresses to the emperors at the beginning of panegyric speeches from Diocletian's times onwards (Lassandro 2000, 12).

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. *Dd. 1.8: Antoninum nobis di dederunt*. Divine protection is also attested in the *gesta senatus*, ed. Mommsen 1971, 2 line 41: *deus vos nobis dedit, deus vos nobis servet*.

⁵⁵⁷ See my note *ad loc.* about the religious devotion that this term implies.

⁵⁵⁸ Cf. *AP 3.3 ('ave pro consule' and 'have imperator')* and *AS 17.4 ('have, Alexander')*. *ThLL ad have* (2, 1301, 14-21) gives these examples, and *AS 7.6; Cl. 13.2; A 4.7; Q 13.2*. Cf. *Paneg. 11.29 (ave, consul amplissime)* and Suet. *Cl. 21 (have, imperator)*. For *aveas* in acclamations e.g. *Cod. Th. (o.c.) p.3 line 13: fauste, aveas*.

6.2: ...rogatusque esset Aurelius Alexander Caesar Augustus, ut consideret, ac primo recusasset, quod sciret de honoribus suis agendum,...).⁵⁵⁹

Then, the acclamations are about the *nomen Antoninorum* again (AS 8.2-5):⁵⁶⁰

(1) *et cum diceret, adclamatum: 'haec suscepisti, Antonini nomen suscipe. mereatur senatus, Antonini mereantur. Antonine Auguste, di te servant, di te Antoninum conservent. monetae nomen Antonini reddatur. templa Antoninorum Antoninus consecret.'*

(2) *Aurelius Alexander Augustus: 'ne, quaeso, p. c., ne me ad hanc certaminis necessitatem vocetis, ut ego cogar tanto nomini satis facere, cum etiam hoc ipsum nomen, licet peregrinum, tamen gravare videatur. haec enim nomina insignia onerosa sunt. quis enim Ciceronem dicat mutum? quis indoctum Varronem? quis impium Metellum? et, ut hoc di avertant, quis non aequantem nomina ferat⁵⁶¹, degenerantem⁵⁶² in clarissima specie dignitatum?'*

(1) *Haec* refers to the names and offices accepted by the emperor in AS 8.1, among which are *Caesar* and *Augustus* (historically false, as we have seen, since the *dies Caesaris* had already taken place in June 221 AD). The senate asks Alexander to accept the *nomen Antonini* also, as this is pleasing to the senate as well as his Antonine predecessors (cf. AS 7.2 *praesta bonis imperatoribus, ut Antoninus dicaris*), rhetorically arranged in a chiasmic construction (*mereatur senatus, Antonini mereantur*). The acclamations with use of *variatio* (*servent – conservent*): *Antonine Auguste, di te servant, di te Antoninum conservent* are variations on AS 7.1. The acclamations about coins with the Antonine name ('let the name of Antonine be struck on the coins again') ignore the fact that Elagabalus had coins struck with this name on the obverse side⁵⁶³, while it is also a fact that Diadumenian had coins struck with the Antonine name⁵⁶⁴ - either of which may have been the author's source of inspiration. The acclamation *templa Antoninorum Antoninus consecret* is a repetition of AS 7.6.

(2) The emperor asks the senate not to involve him in a match about names, which refers to his struggle to comply with the *nomen Antoninorum* (cf. *Dd.2.3: nomen, quibus satis facere perdifficile est*). His own name of Alexander (*licet peregrinum* 'be it from abroad') is already difficult to bear, as famous names are *onerosa* ('burdensome'). Then, a remarkable reasoning follows⁵⁶⁵: *quis enim Ciceronem dicat mutum? quis indoctum Varronem? quis impium Metellum?* Three famous men of the republican period are staged here. The adjectives attached to them do not correspond with their reputation, as

⁵⁵⁹ See AS 2.1, 2.3-4 for a description of the same (*nominum genera et potestate*) – another passage that is interrupted by the NA theme in AS 2.1.

⁵⁶⁰ Or, as Bertrand-Dagenbach (1990, 99) puts it: 'une nouvelle série d'acclamations interrompt les remerciements d'Alexandre'.

⁵⁶¹ I favour Soverini's reading *aequantem* (as a synonym of *satis facientem*) where Hohl conjectured *aequiperantem* (the mss. read *equitatem* in Σ or *equi antem* in P).

⁵⁶² Again Soverini's reading: *degenerantem* (as paralleled in *OM 7.7 degenerasse*) for the manuscript reading *digerentem* (Σ and P).

⁵⁶³ Bertrand-Dagenbach 1990, 99n136.

⁵⁶⁴ *Dd.2.6: ...statim apud Antiochiam moneta Antonini Diadumeni nomine percussa est*. Turcan (1993, 144-5, with numerous references to literature) deems it impossible that this happened in Antioch immediately after the appointment, though later there were such coins.

⁵⁶⁵ Peter 1892, 222 'retorisch ausgeschmückt', 'nicht überall ganz logisch'.

Cicero is all but silent; nobody calls Varro unlearned or Metellus a religious slacker. Alexander's ostensible reasoning in refusing the Antonine name must be that for such an humble man as he pretends to consider himself, the Antonine name is just as unsuited as the adjectives used here to characterise these three Romans. The *clarissima species dignitatum* refers to the titles and names just conferred upon the emperor, as reported in AS 8.1, whose implicit expectations he will hopefully fulfill.

The senate's answer is reported only indirectly (*item adclamata, quae supra*, the last word probably referring to AS 8.2-3). Then, the emperor's speech follows (AS 9.1-7), introduced by *item imperator dixit*:

(1) '*Antoninorum nomen vel iam numen potius quantum fuerit, meminit vestra clementia: si pietatem, quid Pio sanctius? si doctrinam, quid Marco prudentius? si innocentiam, quid Vero simplicius? si fortitudinem, quid Bassiano fortius? nam Commodi meminisse nolo, si quidem hoc ipso deterior fuit, quod cum illis moribus Antonini nomen obtinuit. Diadumenus autem nec tempus habuit nec aetatem et arte patris hoc nomen incurrit.*' *item adclamatum ut supra.*

(2) *item imperator dixit: 'nuper certe, p.c., meministis, cum ille omnium non solum bipedum sed etiam quadrupedum spurcissimus Antonini nomen praeferret et in turpitudine atque luxurie Nerones, Vitellios, Commodos vinceret, qui gemitus omnium fuerit, cum per populi et honestorum coronas una vox esset hunc inepte Antoninum dici, per hanc pestem tantum violari nomen.'*

(3) *et cum diceret, adclamatum est: 'di mala prohibeant. haec te imperante non timemus. de his te duce securi sumus. vicisti vitia, vicisti crimina, vicisti dedecora. Antonini nomen ornabis. tibi certe sumimus, bene praesumimus. nos te et a pueritia probavimus et nunc probamus.'*

(4) *item imp(erator): 'neque ego, p. c., idcirco timeo istud venerabile omnibus nomen accipere, quod verear, ne in haec vitia delabatur vita, aut nos nominis pudeat, sed primum displicet alienae familiae nomen adsumere, deinde quod gravari me credo.'*

(1) The word play *nomen-numen* corresponds with the divine dimension of the *nomen Antoninorum*, earlier brought up in Dd. 7.2. (*Antoniniani nominis [...], quo clarius illis temporibus non fuerat vel deorum*). The association of *nomen* with *numen* stands in a long tradition which is already attested in Accius' works (Trag. 646): *nomen et numen Iovis*, from which appears that a divine force (*numen*) may be connected with a name (*nomen*).⁵⁶⁶ The divinity of the Antonines is also linked to the *templa Antoninorum*

⁵⁶⁶ Prior to Accius, the notion of *nomen* is associated with *omen*, as attested in Plautus *Pers.* 625: *nomen atque omen* (Pötscher 1978, 371: 'Das *nomen* gilt dem Antiken nicht als ein *flatus vocis*, sondern als Inbegriff des Wesens'). The first attestation of the association of *nomen* with *numen* is in the quoted clause from Accius, about which Pötscher (1978, 369) remarks: 'Auch die Wortstellung in den beiden Accius-Fragmenten könnte eher auf eine Steigerung von *nomen* zu *numen*, also vom Götternamen zur göttlichen Wirkung, die in ihm mitbeschlossen ist, deuten und in zwei Aspekten die ganze Wirklichkeit des Gottes zum Ausdruck bringen'. Two later parallels are Varro *Ling.Lat.* 7.85: *multis nomen vestrum numenque ciendo* and 646 R (Nonius) 173.27: *alia hic sanctitudo est, aliud nomen et numen Iovis* (see Pötscher 1978, 357-8 for an analysis of the notion *numen* and *numen Augusti* in Roman religion). Wagenvoort (1947, 78-83) treats the development of the notion *numen* from Accius onwards. Whereas in first instance a *numen* is an abstract divine force, it is a name that can give the *numen* the identity of a god, p.78: 'The name gradually became a proper name and the *numen* a god, for it is the name that makes a *numen* a god, or

mentioned twice in the earlier acclamations (AS 7.5 and 8.3). The emperor addresses the senators with *vestra clementia*, as Macrinus did in OM 7.2. This title is also apt for addressing an emperor, as witness the address of Diocletian in Ael.2.2.⁵⁶⁷ Five ‘good’ Antonines and their virtues are summed up as examples of the potency of the name: Antoninus Pius (*pietas, sanctitas*), Marcus Aurelius (*doctrina, prudentia*), Verus (*innocentia, simplicitas*) and Caracalla (*fortitudo*).⁵⁶⁸ Commodus, who was not included in the ranks of the Antonines until Dd. 7.3, represents the opposite – Alexander would have been ashamed to name him. The duration of Diadumenian’s reign and his age did not enable him to show his qualities, but the name was only given to him *arte patris*, not on his own account. The total of seven Antonini (after the enumerations in OM 3.4; 7.7-8; Dd. 6.5-8; AS 7.3-4) prepare the ground for Alexander’s answer in AS 9.4, in which the *ultimus Antoninorum* is treated.

The emperor continues the enumeration of Antonines in his reply to the senators with a severe attack on his predecessor, who figures among such ‘bad emperors’ as Nero, Vitellius and Commodus. Triplets of bad emperors are frequent in the HA. The nearest example is in the preface of Hel.(1.1), where Caligula, Nero and Vitellius are mentioned and contrasted to Augustus, Trajan, Vespasian, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Titus and Marcus as exemplary rulers. Elagabalus is made out to have been the basest of men (*bipedes*) and even animals (*quadrupedes*).⁵⁶⁹ He is called *gemitus omnium* and *pestis*, the latter epithet repeating the interpolations in AS 1.1 (*Antoninorum pestis illa*) and Hel.10.1 (*pestem illam*), the first of which is in an NA passage. The violation of the name of Antoninus (*tantum violari nomen*) is comparable to its pollution by Antonini unworthy of the name (Commodus and Elagabalus). Elagabalus not only shares the qualification *spurcissimus* with his predecessor Macrinus (OM 4.1), but also his *turpitudine* (OM 11.4, 14.1) and *luxuria* (OM 8.4). These character traits are again summed up in the closing passage of OM (15.2).⁵⁷⁰

The acclamations by the senators are stylised, with use of *synonymia* and *variatio* (*haec – de his* (referring to *mala*); *te imperante – te duce*; *non timemus – securi sumus*; *certe – bene*), *anaphora* (three times *vicisti*) and *tricolon* in ‘wachsende Glieder’ (*vitia, crimina, dedecora*), *antithesis* (*dedecora – ornabis*; *a pueritia – nunc*), and *repetitio*

rather concludes its deification’. In the case of the *nomen Antoninorum*, the *nomen* is defined as a *numen* in AS, as if an unknown godhead was incorporated by the emperor’s use of this *nomen*.

⁵⁶⁷ Bertrand-Dagenbach (1990, 158) points to the fact that *clementia* is a characteristic shared by the emperor and the senate, for which she aptly refers to Marcus Aurelius’ words in AC 12.3: *nunc ... vos oro atque obsecro, p. c., ut censura vestra deposita meam pietatem clementiamque servetis, immo vestram ...*

⁵⁶⁸ Bertand-Dagenbach (1990, 158) sums up the places in HA where some of these virtues are mentioned: *pietas* in AC 12.3 and 7; C 18.9 and AS 11.1; *sanctitas* in Max. 18.2; A 20.5; 40.1; 41.2; *prudentia* in Val. 5.6; *fortitudo* in AC 2.7; Cl. 18.2; T 12.14. The first two are also attributed to Alexander (*pious* in AS 4.5, 20.4, 26.8; *sanctus* in AS 4.5). *Innocentia* (opposed in Hel. 10.4 to *stultitia*) is a virtue that occurs twice again in acclamations, AC 13.5 and AS 10.6, not counting the present passage (AS 9.1), and a total of ten times (*innocentia / innocens*) in HA, as against just once in Suetonius, *Vitellius* 5 (Bertrand-Dagenbach 1990, 92-4). Cf. the imperial virtues of *sapientia, bonitas, pietas* ascribed to Antoninus (*pietas*), Verus (*bonitas*) and Marcus (*sapientia*). All the instances are quoted in Lessing 1901-6.

⁵⁶⁹ Klebs (1892, 43) and Peter (1892, 222n1) point to the parallel with Cic. *De dom.* 18.48: *omnium non bipedum solum sed etiam quadripedum impurissimo*.

⁵⁷⁰ Also Commodus is called *turpis* in C 1.6: *nam a prima statim pueritia turpis, improbus, crudelis, libidinosus...* and C 15.4: *...ut omnia quae turpiter, quae impure, quae crudeliter, quae gladiatorie, quae lenonie faceret, actis urbis indi iuberet, ut Marii Maximi scripta testantur*.

(*sumimus* - *praesumimus*; *probavimus* - *probamus*). The emperor echoes some of the acclamations in his reply (*timemus* → *timeo*, *verear*; *vitia* → *vitia*). With *vitia*, it is clear that Elagabalus' excesses are meant; Alexander plays with words by linking it to the word *vita*.⁵⁷¹ The *venerabile nomen* (cf. the *NA* passage *S* 20.11) is refused not because Alexander fears to fall into vices or looks down on the name. Rather, he dislikes adopting the name of another family, and thinks that its burden will be too heavy for him to bear. The former argument is important in the light of Alexander's namesake Septimius Severus, who explicitly took the name in order to link his own family to that of Marcus Aurelius (*S* 10.6: *quod Severus ipse in Marci familiam transire voluerit*). The latter concerns the consideration that the bearer of the name may fail to live up to the high expectations that come with the name (cf. *AS* 8.4: *ut ego cogar tanto nomini satis facere, cum etiam hoc ipsum nomen, licet peregrinum, tamen gravare videatur haec enim nomina insignia onerosa sunt*, and *Dd.* 2.3). *Alienae familiae nomen* corresponds with *nomen, licet peregrinum* in the earlier answer by the emperor.

10.1-8

(1) *et cum diceret, adclamatum est ut supra. item dixit: 'si enim Antonini nomen accipio, possum et Traiani, possum et Titi, possum et Vespasiani.'*

(2) *et cum diceret, adclamatum est: 'quomodo Augustus, sic et Antoninus.'*
et imp(erator): 'video, patres conscripti, quid vos moveat ad hoc nobis nomen addendum. Augustus primus primus est huius auctor imperii, et in eius nomen omnes velut quadam adoptione aut iure hereditario succedimus; Antonini ipsi Augusti sunt dicti. sic Antoninus id est Pius Marcum et item Verum iure adoptionis vocavit, Commodus autem hereditarium fuit, susceptum Diadumeno, adfectatum in Bassiano, ridiculum in Vario.'

(3) *et cum diceret, adclamatum est: 'Alexander Auguste, di te servant. di faveant verecundiae tuae, prudentiae tuae, innocentiae tuae, castitati tuae. hinc intellegimus, qualis futurus sis, hinc probamus. tu facies, ut senatus bene principes eligat. tu facies optimum esse iudicium senatus. Alexander Auguste, di te servant. templa Antoninorum Alexander Augustus dedicet. Caesar noster, Augustus noster, imperator noster, di te servant. vivas, valeas, multis annis imperes.'*

(1) The emperor answers by referring to a trio of good emperors (*AS* 10.1): Trajan, Titus, Vespasian, in contrast to the bad emperors of *AS* 9.4 (Nero, Vitellius, Commodus). His reasoning is that he might just as well accept the names of these good emperors as that of the Antonines, thus implying that the name of the Antonines is a good name after all but should not be blown up to divine proportions.

(2) The senators reply with the acclamation of *quomodo Augustus, sic et Antoninus*, which means that someone who is called Augustus should also be called Antoninus, in other words, that the titles are equal. The emperor does not give in: Augustus is the founder of the empire and has given his name to all who succeed him, either by way of adoption or by heritance (*velut quadam adoptione aut iure hereditario*).⁵⁷² For the first

⁵⁷¹ The author associates word by likeness: *vita* ~ *vitia*, like *nomen* ~ *numen*.

⁵⁷² Praise for hereditary emperorship is found in Pliny *Pan.* 7. Hartke (1951, 23) sees the author's inclusion of the *NA* theme in the *HA* as an attempt to emphasise the dynastic lines from Antoninus Pius' reign onward, based on third-century sources.

time since the elaboration of the theme in Septimius Severus' biography, the Antonini are represented as successors of Augustus, the founder of the empire. *Sic* bears on the similarity between the namegiving of Augustus and that of Antoninus: just as the emperors from the early empire were all called Augustus, so the successors of Antoninus Pius are called Antoninus, as Septimius Severus' intention was described in *S* 19.3 ...*et Antonini nomen omnibus deinceps quasi Augusti adscribendum putaret*. Alexander's answer to the senate sweeps away his bold step to turn all the *Augusti* into *Antonini* as well, just as his reason for this - a desire to be part of Marcus' family - is rejected by Alexander in *AS* 9.7: *alienae familiae nomen adsumere*. With this, the theme almost comes to an end, but only after repeating the emperors who bore the name: Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, Commodus, Diadumenian, Caracalla, Elagabalus. The degeneration is marked by the sequens *hereditarium – susceptum – adfectatum – ridiculum*. Bassianus and Varius are emphatically called by their own names. Alexander Severus appears to be antagonistic towards Septimius Severus, whose two measures with regard to the Antonines he implicitly but unequivocally rejects.

(3) An enumeration of imperial virtues of *verecundia*, *prudentia*, *innocentia*, *castitas* confers a high level of respectability on Alexander: *verecundia* (modesty, restraint) may refer to his refusal of titles, which is considered a great virtue that Marcus Aurelius also displayed.⁵⁷³ The same goes for *prudentia*, with which Marcus is credited in *AS* 9.1, though not in his own biography.⁵⁷⁴ The virtue of *innocentia* was mentioned in *AS* 6.3 and *AS* 9.1 in the case of Verus (*si doctrinam, quid Marco prudentius? si innocentiam, quid Vero simplicius?*). *Castitas* appeared in *AS* 7.6 (see my remarks *ad loc.*). The virtues are summarised in a repeated *hinc*. The figure of *anaphora* is also used in *AS* 10.7: *tu facies...tu facies*, which may well be traditional in acclamations.⁵⁷⁵

The consultation of the senate in choosing emperors is important, as so many emperors seized power by force of arms or were appointed by their predecessors without any involvement of the senate. In *H* 4.9 it is told that Trajan presented a list of candidates for the senators to choose from,⁵⁷⁶ while Clodius Albinus went so far as to plead for the restoration of the senators' authority (*CIA* 13.3-10). It is a characteristic of a *bonus princeps* that he consults the senate. The rest of the acclamations mainly contain repetitions from earlier passages, and come to an end with the senators' wish that *multis annis imperes*. This is a traditional formula, attested in the *Codex Theodosianus*: *multis annis imperetis*.⁵⁷⁷ In *AS* 12.1 the senators once again raise their voices.

The final answer by the emperor runs thus (*AS* 11.1-4):

⁵⁷³ It is interesting to set off Marcus' refusal of names against the virtue of *verecundia*, *MA* 9.1: ...*delatumque Armeniacum nomen utrique principum. Quod Marcus per verecundiam primo recusavit, postea tamen recepit. profligato autem bello uterque Parthicus appellatus est. sed id quoque Marcus delatum nomen repudiavit, quod postea recepit. Patris patriae autem nomen delatum a fratre absente in eiusdem praesentiam distulit*. Béranger (1953, 139-40) gives a list of instances in which power is also refused.

⁵⁷⁴ *Prudens* / *prudentia* is typical of the biographies in the later part of *HA*, see the enumeration in Bertrand-Dagenbach 1990, 155.

⁵⁷⁵ Baldwin (1981, 144-5) states that it recurs on Suet. *Nero* 46.3: *cum ex oratione eius...recitaretur in senatu datus poenas sceleratos ac brevi dignum exitum facturos, conclamatum est ab universis: 'Tu facies, Auguste'*.

⁵⁷⁶ See Fündling (2006, 370-1, K 127), who thinks the report is the author's invention meant to stress the senate's authority and Trajan's positive approach towards the senators.

⁵⁷⁷ ed. Mommsen 1971, 2.

Alexander imperator dixit:

(1) *'intellego, p. c., me optinuisse, quod volui, et in acceptum refero, plurimas gratias et agens et habens enisurus, ut et hoc nomen, quod in imperium detulimus, tale sit, ut et ab aliis desideretur et bonis vestrae pietatis iudiciis offeratur.'*

(2) *post haec adclamatum est: 'Magne Alexander, di te servant. si Antonini nomen repudiasti, Magni praenomen suscipe. Magne Alexander, di te servant.'*

(3) *et cum saepius dicerent, Alexander Augustus:*

'Facilius fuit, p. c., ut Antoninorum nomen acciperem, aliquid enim vel adfinitati deferrem vel consortioni nominis imperialis. Magni vero nomen cur accipiam? quid enim iam magnum feci? cum id Alexander post magna gesta, Pompeius vero post magnos triumphos acceperit. quiescite igitur, venerandi patres, et vos ipsi magnifici unum me de vobis esse censete, quam Magni nomen ingerite.'

(1) The emperor accepts his office gratefully and will exert himself to make his name - that is, Alexander - beloved by others (to wit, his successors) and that the right honourable senate will grant it to them as an honourific.⁵⁷⁸ The word *intellego*, which was also used by the senators in AS 10.6 (*intellegimus*) seems to mark a reciprocal acceptance ('Je vous ai compris'). *Bonis vestrae pietatis iudiciis offeratur* can be interpreted as a reaction to the senators' wish in AS 10.7: *tu facies optimum esse iudicium senatus*. (2) Now that the emperor has declined the Antonine name, the senate, anticipating his acceptance of the *praenomen Magni*, addresses the emperor as *Magne Alexander*. (3) The emperor, however, states that it would be easier to accept the name of Antoninus, on account of its link with Caracalla (cf. the excursus on *adfinitas* in AS 5.3-4) and its aura as a *nomen imperiale*. The name of *Magnus* poses a more serious problem, as Alexander feels that he simply does not deserve so great a compliment as to be equated with his illustrious namesake through the bestowal of the *nomen Magni*.⁵⁷⁹ As the honourable senators themselves are *magnifici*, he had rather that they considered their new emperor one of them than grant him the name of *Magnus*.

After the final acclamations (AS 12: *post haec adclamatum est: 'Aureli Alexander Auguste, di te servant.' Et reliqua ex more*), the senate session is dismissed and Alexander returns home triumphantly, AS 12.2: *Dimisso senatu, cum et alia multa eo die essent acta, quasi triumphans domum se recepit*. The scene resembles the events described in Herodian 5.8.10, in which the soldiers accompany the emperor to his palace: οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται αὐτοκράτορα τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἀναγορεύσαντες ἐς τὰ βασίλεια ἀνήγαγον. The term αὐτοκράτορα is Greek for *imperator*.⁵⁸⁰ Historically,

⁵⁷⁸ The senators' virtue of *pietas* occurs earlier in AC 12.3 and 7; C 18.9.

⁵⁷⁹ Note that Alexander of Macedon ('the Great') acquired the honorific 'Magnus' many years, if not centuries, after his death (Den Hengst 1999, 3). The argument that Pompey (a prominent imitator of Alexander) only received the title *Magnus* after great triumphs contains a parallel with Hadrian, who refused the title of *Pater Patriae* because Augustus only received it late in his reign. H 6.4: *patris patriae nomen delatum sibi statim et iterum postea distulit, quod hoc nomen Augustus sero meruisset*. Note also the idiomatic wording *patris patriae nomen delatum sibi*, which corresponds with AS 5.3 *delatum sibi Antonini nomen*.

⁵⁸⁰ Alexander was hailed as *imperator* on 13 or 14 March 222; in HA this takes place on 6 March in the following terms: AS 6.3: *Alexander imperator, di te servant*; AS 10.8: *Caesar noster, Augustus noster, imperator noster, di te servant*. For a reconstruction of the historical events: Lorient 1984, 227.

the pretorians hailed Alexander as *imperator*; and *quasi triumphans* may be an echo of that happening. The next few sentences are laudations.⁵⁸¹ We should be aware that the passage AS 12.3: *multo clarior visus est alienis nominibus non receptis quam si recepisset* does not necessarily relate to the names of Antoninus and Magnus. As the whole NA theme here seems to be produced as an addition to other sources about Alexander Severus, the author may well have seized the opportunity to blend his message into the acclamations. There are other titles that Alexander refused (such as *dominus*, AS 4.1: *Dominum se appellari vetuit. epistolas ad se quasi ad privatum scribi iussit servato tantum nomine imperatoris*), reminding us that a refusal of imperial names in the senate is a traditional token of humility. The clause in AS 12.4 is well-placed, as far as it goes, though the connector *sed* is dubious: *sed quamvis senatu rogante non potuerit persuaderi, ut vel Antonini vel Magni nomina susciperet*.⁵⁸² If this should be an interpolated fragment, then AS 12.4 *tamen ob ingentem vigorem animi et mirandam singularemque constantiam contra militum insolentiam Severi nomen a militibus eidem inditum est* would originally have followed *senatus totus persuadere non potuit*, which makes sense, as the soldiers hailed the emperor as Severus, whereas the emperor rejected the names proposed by the senate.⁵⁸³

Thus, once the Antonine acclamations are left out, what is left are the acclamations *ex actis urbis* (AS 6.2-5) and the emperor's reply (AS 8.1). This situation is comparable to the passages *ex actis senatus* in AS 56.2: a speech by the emperor, acclamations by the senate, ending on a similar formula (AS 57.1: *dimisso senatu Capitolium ascendit...*) and in AS 12.2 (*dimisso senatu ... quasi triumphans domum se recepit*). Again, what this indicates is that the NA passages, this time presented by way of acclamations, are products not belonging to the composition of the biographies proper but inserted in places where these speeches were already present (AS 6.3-5). The following diagram maps the extent of the additions (rendered in dotted lines) to what may be assumed to have been the original passages (in continuing lines):

Figure 5.6: Acclamations by the senate (S) and answers by Alexander (A) in the passages in AS 6.3-12.1, and the NS that they occupy.

⁵⁸¹ Moreno-Ferrero (1999, 196n25) compares the passage to *Cl.6.3: sed credo, ut Claudii gloria adcreveret eiusque fieret gloriosior toto penitus orbe victoria* as an example of panegyric argumentation.

⁵⁸² Note the reformulations in the last sentence: *...senatus totus persuadere non potuit - ...senatu rogante non potuerit persuaderi...*

⁵⁸³ AS 12.5. The name of Severus, is according to Barnes (1978, 57) 'based on 59.4/5 or its source', which might be Aurelius Victor 24.2-3 or Eutropius 8.23.

The senate produces a total of 348 words on as many as 8 occasions, while Alexander uses 414 words on 9 occasions. The predominance of Alexander's speeches only appears in and after AS 9, after repeated requests by the senate to accept a number of specific names and offices. It is interesting to compare these figures to the number of speeches without the *NA* theme that are delivered in AS 56.2-10: Alexander speaks 148 words to the senators in AS 56.2-9, who need 52 words for the acclamation in AS 56.9-10. The speech and acclamations in this session comprise a total of 200 words, which is more or less comparable to the passages in AS 6.3-5 and 8.1, which consist of 121 words each. In these passages (italicised in the scheme), there are the acclamations by the senate followed by Alexander's word of thanks, which is mirrored by the speech in AS 56.2-9 (in which a *supplicatio* is asked) and after which the senate responds by acclamation. The mirror effect of these speeches has become obscured by the addition of a vast volume of *NA* passages in the early part of the life.

What can be the underlying reason for the inclusion of the *NA* passages in the guise of acclamations? In general, it may be said that the insertion of the acclamations and the emperor's replies corresponds with a development that, since the reign of Trajan, had been going on for centuries, namely that senatorial proceedings were made public. Roueché (1984, 181-4) describes the growing public access to the *acta* since Pliny wrote in his *Panegyricus* (75.2) that acclamations were always kept within the walls of the senate until Trajan's reign.⁵⁸⁴ The evidence of acclamations in papyri and epigraphic and literary documents adds to our knowledge of the procedures, of which the *Codex Theodosianus* is one of the finest examples. The inclusion of fictitious *acta senatus* reporting the acclamations and the emperor's answers, which in first century literature would have been hardly thinkable, reflects that development and the public nature of the senate's proceedings in late antiquity.

Pliny's words perfectly apply to the present acclamations in AS, which present us with the image of a *bonus princeps* Alexander.⁵⁸⁵ The *Panegyricus* addressed to Trajan is also meant to praise the new emperor, like the senatorial acclamations in AS. It is worth having a closer look at the passage in which Pliny makes clear the public nature of the *acclamationes* in the *acta publica* (Plin. *Pan.* 75.1-5):

Sed quid singula consector et colligo? Quasi vero aut oratione complecti aut memoria consequi possim, quae vos, patres conscripti, ne qua interciperet oblivio, et in publica acta mittenda et incidenda in aere censuistis. Ante orationes principum tantum eius modi genere monimentorum mandari aeternitati solebant, acclamationes

⁵⁸⁴ Note that Augustus forbade the publication of the *acta senatus*, Suet. *Aug.* 36.1: *auctor et aliarum rerum fuit, in quis: ne acta senatus publicerentur, ...*

⁵⁸⁵ As I argued in 'Pliny's *Panegyricus* and the *Historia Augusta*' (forthcoming), it was Pliny who provided the author with the notion of *bonus princeps*, that occurs all over the speech, also in contrast with *malus princeps*: *bonus princeps*: 7.2, 26.5, 36.4, 44.4, 45.3, 53.6, 59.5, 76.9; *bonus princeps - malus*: 45.5, 68.7, 88.9; *optimus - malos*: 74.3; *boni principes - mali*: 4.1, 53.3, 63.1, 68.7, 75.3, 90.2; *malus princeps*: 53.6, 67.3, 68.3, 94.2; *mali principes*: 40.3, 44.1, 53.3, 53.5, 46.3. *Bonus princeps* only occurs in Suetonius in *Tib.* 29.1 (*bonum ac salutarem principem*), and in Tacitus in *Ann.* 15.66.1, *H* 1.16.1, 2.37.2 and *H* 1.46.4. *Malus princeps* is read in *Agr.* 43.4 (...*ut nesciret a bono patre non scribi heredem nisi malum principem*), *H* 4.42.6 (*optimus est post malum principem dies primus*) and *Agr.* 42.4 (*posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse*). In the other panegyrici Latini a poor two occurrences in 5.2.2 (*boni sit principis*) and 5.7.5 (*boni principis est libenter suos videre felices*). The occurrences in the panegyrici (including Pliny) are based on Janson 1979.

quidem nostrae parietibus curiae claudebantur. Erant enim quibus nec senatus gloriari nec principes possent. Has vero et in vulgus exire et in posteris prodi cum ex utilitate tum ex dignitate publica fuit,

- (1) *primum ut orbis terrarum pietatis nostrae adhibetur testis et conscius,*
- (2) *deinde ut manifestum esset audere nos de bonis malisque principibus non tantum post ipsos iudicare;*
- (3) *postremo ut experimento cognosceretur et ante nos gratos, sed miseros fuisse, quibus esse nos gratos probare antea non licuit.*

At qua contentione, quo nisu, quibus clamoribus expostulatum est, ne adfectus nostros ne tua merita supprimeres, denique ut in posterum exemplo provideres! Discant et principes acclamationes veras falsasque discernere, habeantque muneris tui quod iam decipi non poterunt.

After a disquisition about the love of the gods for the emperor and the emperor's love for the senate, Pliny continues with the reasons for making the acclamations known to the public. Up to Trajan's time, only the emperor's decrees were published in the form of the *acta diurna*, initiated by Julius Caesar⁵⁸⁶, but the acclamations were kept within the senate's walls – if only because they were not something to be proud of. Now, the acclamations of the senators are made public for all the world to know, for present and future generations, in their general interest and for the sake of public dignity. There are three reasons underlying this: (1) the whole world should know about the senate's loyalty (*pietas*), (2) the senate is empowered to judge its rulers, and not merely after their deaths, (3) the senators appreciate being able to express their gratitude for the gift of such a ruler, whereas previously they were denied this opportunity. With an eager show of gratitude, the senate requests their ruler not to depreciate either its feelings or his own qualities, so that he may also set an example for his successor. By this example, future rulers may learn how to discern between false and honest acclamations.

There are many elements in Pliny's text that may have been imitated by the author of the *HA*. First, he boasts about his use of senatorial sources in two places in *AS*. In *AS* 6.1 he says *proferam etiam adclamationes senatus, quibus id decretum est* – an opportunity that was made possible by the publication of the acclamations since Trajan's times. The *acta senatus* mentioned in *AS* 56.2 also contain the senators' acclamations (*AS* 56.9). That its acclamations were made public and thus preserved for posterity (*Paneg.* 75.3) has proved to be useful also for the author of the *HA* with regard to Alexander's acclamations (which is of course what the author wishes us to understand). Secondly, the senate's virtue of *pietas* is echoed in a speech by Alexander (*AS* 11.1: *hoc nomen, quod in*

⁵⁸⁶ Suet. *Div. Iul.* 20.1. One should discern between the *acta senatus* and the *acta publica* – the latter is also referred to by Suetonius as *populi diurna acta* (*Div. Iul.* 20.1), *publica acta* (*Tib.* 5.2), *acta* (*Cal.* 8.5, 36.6), or *diurna* (*Claud.* 41.6); Tacitus designates the *acta senatus* also with *commentarii senatus* (*Ann.* 15.74.3: *reperio in commentariis senatus...*). Gascou 1984, 480-5 (*acta senatus*), 485-9 (*acta diurna*). The *acta* as a source open to the public is described in Suet. *Div. Iul.* 20.1: *inito honore primum omnium constituit, ut tam senatus quam populi diurna acta confierent et publicarentur*. Like the author of *HA*, Tacitus also made use of these *acta diurna*, in *Ann.* 3.3: *matrem Antoniam non apud auctores rerum, non diurna actorum scriptura reperio ullo insigni officio functam*. The author of the *HA* mentions the *acta urbis* in *C* 15.4 and *AS* 6.2, the *acta senatus* in 56.2, though probably not seeking to make a distinction between these two different kinds of *acta*. Cf. *Pr.* 2.1 *actis etiam senatus ac populi* (sc. *usus sum*). Baldwin 1979 traces the history of all kinds of *acta* and concludes that they were not existent anymore from the later fourth century.

imperium detulimus, tale sit, ut et ab aliis desideretur et bonis vestrae pietatis iudiciis offeratur). Meanwhile, the emperor wants to set an example for his successors by good government, presented in the acclamations of imperial virtues, just as the senate wished the emperor to do in Pliny's oration (...*denique ut in posterum exemplo provideres!*). The approval of the good emperor by the senate (Pliny: ... *ut experimento cognosceretur et ante nos gratos, sed miseros fuisse, quibus esse nos gratos probare antea non licuit*) is echoed in the acclamations of the senators in AS 10.6: *hinc intellegimus, qualis futurus es, hinc probamus*. It is clear that the senators are in a position to judge between (*iudicare*) *de bonis malisque principibus* (Pan. 75.3), a theme that plays an important part in the biography of AS. *Tu facies ut senatus bene principes eligat, tu facies optimum esse iudicium senatus* is the author's variation on Pliny's *de bonis malisque principibus iudicare*. *Discant et principes acclamationes veras falsasque discernere, habeantque muneris tui quod iam decipi non poterunt* is a lesson that Alexander should keep in mind as well: as a good prince, he will recognise his own morals in the speeches, in contrast with the bad prince, who will have to learn a lesson. In this way, the *speculum principis* as described by Pliny works both ways. *Acclamationes falsae*, on the other hand, are nothing but flattery.

5.5.3 The NA Theme in *Gd.*

After reading the first four of the Intermediary Lives, it should come as no surprise that the NA theme is rounded off in *Gd.*, as the author has given ample clues about his intention to end his series of Antonines with the biography of the three Gordiani.⁵⁸⁷ By relating the three Gordiani to the Antonines, the theme exceeds its limits, as the historical *ultimus Antoninorum* was Elagabalus.⁵⁸⁸ The author however paid much attention to the conclusion of his dealing with Antonine name by inserting acclamations in the biography of Alexander Severus, after whose *vita* the two Maximini follow. In *Gd.* it appears for a final time, as if the author cannot take leave of his theme. With regard to the content of *Gd.*, it can be said that the NA theme fits the author's intention to picture Gordianus as 'an old senator of cultivated tastes', as Syme⁵⁸⁹ put it, against the savage soldier Maximinus. A good deal of invention is required to get to this point, as the Gordiani were at no time called Antonini. This is why the author introduces a special motif of doubt about the cognomen of these emperors.

This, however, is not the only idea, as the author lets his subject, Gordian, produce an epic poem about the first two Antonines, *Gd.* 3.3: *scripsit praeterea, quemadmodum Vergilius Aeneidos et Statius Achilleidos et multi alii Alexandridos, ita etiam ille Antoniniados, hoc est Antoninum Pium et Antoninum Marcum, versibus disertissimis*

⁵⁸⁷ The three Gordians are in fact depicted as a dynasty, descending from Trajan: Arrigoni Bertini 1980, 201-2.

⁵⁸⁸ The number of three Gordiani is historically correct, while in *OM* 3.5, *Dd.* 6.3 and *Hel.* 34.6 the author speaks of two Gordiani. In *Gd.* 2.1 the author remarks that the number of two is erroneous '*ut quidam imperiti scriptores loquuntur*'; Mazarino (1966, 235) states that the author hints at some authors of the fourth century: Victor, Eutropius and the *KG*. See Syme 1983, 26.

⁵⁸⁹ Syme 1971, 253: 'various devices are enlisted to parade him as an Antonine ruler'.

*libris triginta vitam illorum et bella et publice privatimque gesta perscribens.*⁵⁹⁰ The word *praeterea* marks the fact that Gordian also wrote poems about subjects that Cicero wrote about before him in his poetry.⁵⁹¹ Just as Virgil composed his *Aeneis*, Statius his *Achilleis* and other poets their *Alexandridos*, Gordian wrote his *Antoniniados* when young. This work lends an epic dimension to the Antonines, which is both mythical (with the references to Aeneas and Achilles) and historical (the reference to Alexander the Great). A number of thirty books is very high for an epic poem. Its contents are suggested to have included his warfare (*bella*) as well as public and private behaviour (*et bella et publice privatimque gesta*), which are in fact the normal elements for biographical works to contain (cf. AS 29.1: *Antequam de bellis eius et expeditionibus et victoriis loquar, de vita cottidiana et domestica pauca disseram*).

The epic style is not the only one in which the author of the *HA* described the emperors, as he also wrote a prose eulogy about all the Antonines, *Gd.* 4.7-8, attached to a passage about plays that the emperor had staged: *scripsit et laudes soluta oratione omnium Antoninorum, qui ante eum fuerunt. tantum autem Antoninos dilexit, ut sibi quoque, ut multi dicunt, Antonini, ut plerique autem adserunt, Antonii nomen adscripserit. iam illud satis constat, quod filium, Gordianum nomine, Antonini signo inlustraverit, cum apud praefectum aerarii more Romano professus filium publicis actis eius nomen insereret*. That Gordian granted the name of Antoninus (source: *multi*) or Antonius (source: *plerique*) to himself is something that was recorded before only in *Hel.* 34.6,⁵⁹² while the earlier occurrences of the motif attributed the mistake to their sources.⁵⁹³ Thus *multi* think that Gordian was called Antoninus (*Hel.* 18.1, *Gd.* 4.7), while *plerique* assign the name of Antonius to Gordian (*Hel.* 34.6: *in plerisque libris, Gd.* 4.7); that Gordian bore the name of Antoninus as *praenomen* (*OM* 3.5, *Hel.* 34.6), *cognomen* (*Dd.* 6.3, *Hel.* 18.1) or *nomen* (*Gd.* 4.7) is recorded on the authority of *quidam* (*Dd.* 6.3) and *multi* (*Hel.* 18.1, *Gd.* 4.7), which is intended to convince the reader but has an extremely narrow basis in fact. The motifs of the *nomina* (Antoninus, Antonius) and their sources are widely scattered over various passages and regrouped in different compositions by virtue of *repetitio* and *variatio*. All the same, they reflect a development from a neutral speculation on the names (*OM* 3.5) to sources being brought to bear (*Dd.* 6.3, *Hel.* 18.1), and finally to the message that Gordian himself was responsible for the naming (*Hel.* 34.6, *Gd.* 4.7), because he esteemed his Antonine predecessors so highly (*Gd.* 3.1, 4.7). In the seemingly random variations, some system can nevertheless be detected. Gordian's own responsibility is certified by the fact that he himself had his son

⁵⁹⁰ Note the remarkable forms *Aeneidos*, *Achilleidos* and *Alexandridos*, the former of which is the Greek genitive of *Aeneis*, and the latter two are made up in analogy of the first, but function as accusativi pluralis.

⁵⁹¹ Note that many of the famous men mentioned here were also the ones who were gathered in Alexander Severus' *lararia*, AS 31.4-5: *Vergilium autem Platonem poetarum vocabat eiusque imaginem cum Ciceronis simulacro in secundo larario habuit, ubi et Achillis et magnorum virorum. Alexandrum vero Magnum inter optimos et divos in larario maiore consecravit*.

⁵⁹² *Hel.* 34.6: *duos Gordianos..., patrem et filium, qui se de Antoninorum genere dici volebant: non nomen in illis primum fuit sed praenomen; deinde, ut in plerisque libris invenio, Antoni dicti sunt, non Antonini*.

⁵⁹³ In *OM* 3.5 it is only stated that *aut ... praenomen tantum Antoninorum habuerunt aut etiam Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini*; in *Dd.* 6.3 ... *unde postea duos Gordianos, patrem et filium, Antoninos cognominatos putant*, with *quidam* as a source; in *Hel.* 18.1 ... *cognomine postea Gordianos multi Antoninos putent, qui Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini*. It is interesting to compare *Pr.* 4.3-4: *est (sc. Probus) adulescens vere probus; numquam enim aliud mihi, cum eum cogito, nisi eius nomen occurrit, quod nisi nomen haberet, potuit habere cognomen*.

inscribed in the *acta publica* as Gordianus Antoninus,⁵⁹⁴ the latter name serving as a so-called *signum* by which the author adds a new variation to the problem of nomenclature (Antoninus as *nomen*, *praenomen* or *cognomen*).⁵⁹⁵ It is remarkable that this report is allegedly taken from the *acta publica* and introduced with *iam illud satis constat*, while earlier passages seem to indicate a complex historiographical problem and deviant sources. In many dubious passages in the *HA* it may be questioned whether the author is merely careless or mendacious, but here, after this recital of considerations about the various versions of Gordian's names, the variations bear all the signs of literary artistry.

There is more to come. In *Gd*.9.3-4 it is told that Gordian was granted the surname of Africanus by youngsters, not because his reign had begun in Africa, but because he was supposedly related to Scipio Africanus. A short passage about the *nomen Antoninorum* follows: *in plurimis autem libris invenio et hunc Gordianum et filium eius pariter imperatores appellatos et Antoninos cognominatos, alibi vero Antonios*. The formula *pariter imperatores appellatos* corresponds with one of the very first occurrences of the *NA* theme in *Ael*. 5.12-3: *Eius est filius Antoninus Verus (...) et cum eodem aequale gessit imperium. Nam ipsi sunt qui primi duo Augusti appellati sunt,...*, that was based on the remark in *MA* 7.6: *Atque ex eo pariter coeperunt rem publicam regere...* (see above, § 5.2.1). As the source of the *cognomen* Antoninus the author mentions *in plurimis libris*, which is reminiscent of *Hel*. 34.6: *ut in plerisque libris invenio* – but what he found there is that father and son were called *Antonii*, not *Antonini*. In this instance, the account corresponds with *Dd*. 6.3 and *Hel*. 18.1, where the Gordiani have Antoninus as their *cognomen*. The report rendered on the authority of *alibi*, that they were called Antonius, corresponds with *OM* 3.5, *Hel*. 18.1, 34.6 and *Gd*. 4.7, but deviates in one respect from these four passages: the name of Antonius was never known as a *cognomen*, as it is here. It is worth repeating the two options in *OM* 3.5: *aut ... praenomen tantum Antoninorum habuerunt aut etiam Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini*, where doubt about the names is raised either because Antoninus was a *cognomen*, or because the Gordiani were called *Antonii*, but not both. That the Gordiani had Antonius as a *cognomen* is one of the author's variations.

In *Gd*.17.1-5, the beginning of the biography of Gordian junior, the *nomen Antoninorum* is again linked with the *nomen Africani*. The author does his best to prove that the family of the Gordians is an aristocratic breed, as he mentions no less than four families to prove their high birth:⁵⁹⁶ that of Scipio Africanus, whose success in Africa is linked to Gordian senior (*quod Africanus Gordianus senior appellatus est cognomine Scipionum*), that of Pompey, whose house he is said to have possessed in Rome (*quod*

⁵⁹⁴ Gordian's step of having his son's name recorded in the *acta publica* may be related with the passage in *MA* 9.7, where we find Marcus Aurelius' measure to have all freeborn children registered with a name by the *praefecti aerarii* within thirty days after their birth.

⁵⁹⁵ *Signum* is also used in *PN* 8.4-5: *item cum quaesitum esset, quis illi (sc. Septimio Severo) successurus esset, respondisse itidem Graeco versu dicitur: 'cui dederint superi nomen habere Pii.' quod omnino intellectum non est, nisi cum Bassianus Antonini, quod verum signum Pii fuit, nomen accepit*. Apparently, the author does not distinguish between *nomen* and *signum*. This use of *signum* is different from the use by senatorial families in the late antique aristocracy, such as Toxotius or Fasganius, to upgrade their stock (Syme 1968, 166-7: 'embodying weapons of war'; 1971, 8). Hartke (1951, 131) calls the *signa* 'quasi-gentilische Herkunftsbezeichnungen (also *originum insignia* = *verum signum*)'.

⁵⁹⁶ Which was customary for families at the end of the fourth century, Chastagnol 1994, 704n3 and Syme 1971, 12; 156-8; 169; Treucker 1966 gives several examples from the *HA* of families who claim to descend from famous ancestors.

domum Pompeianam in urbe habuit),⁵⁹⁷ that of the Antonini (*quod Antoninorum cognomine semper est nuncupatus*) and that of Marcus Antonius, who reigned in the East during the late republic, to whom the family name Antonius refers⁵⁹⁸ (*quod Antonium filium suum ipse significari voluit in senatu*). Three of the family names are taken from statesmen from the republican period, only the Antonines differ in this respect. Just as in many of the *NA* passages discussed, the *quod* sentence is detachable. The beginning of this part of the biography contains a similar addition, which is clearly recognizable in view of the vocabulary used, *Gd.* 17.1: *Hic Gordiani senis, proconsulis Africae, filius, qui cum patre et ab Afris et a senatu Augustus appellatus est, litteris et moribus clarus fuit praeter nobilitatem; [ut nonnulli, ab Antoninis, ut plurimi, ab Antoniis duxit.]* The sources of the report that Gordian took either Antoninus or Antonius as a *cognomen* are indicated as *nonnulli* and *plurimi*, corresponding respectively with the *multi* (*Hel.* 18.1, *Gd.* 4.7), *quidam* (*Dd.* 6.3) and *in plurimis libris* (*Gd.* 9.5) who call Gordian Antoninus, and *plerique* (*Hel.* 34.6, *Gd.* 4.7) or ‘*alibi*’ (*Gd.* 9.5) who assign the name of Antonius to Gordian. Note that *in plurimis libris* in *Gd.* 9.5 for the first version (Antoninus) is shifted to *plurimi* for the second version (Antonius), and *in plerisque libris* (*Hel.* 34.6) is similarly changed into *plerique* in *Gd.* 4.7. This kind of *variatio* is typical of the author’s literary technique.

If we leave out the report that Gordian wanted to trace his roots to the Antonine family, the following sentences ought to be interpreted in a slightly different fashion: *ex omnibus his familiis* (in *sed ego Iunium Cordum sequor, qui dicit ex omnibus his familiis Gordianorum coaluisse nobilitatem*) originally referred to the families of Scipio, Pompey and Antonius, to which the Antonines were added. The sentence *idem igitur natus patri primus ex Fabia Orestilla, Antonini pronepte, unde Caesarum quoque familiam contingere videbatur* contains a link with the Antonines of the second century. Though *Fabia Orestilla* is obviously a fictitious person⁵⁹⁹ and presented as the granddaughter of

⁵⁹⁷ For Pompey’s house, cf. *Gd.* 2.3 (*Romae Pompeianam domum possidens*), 6.5. *Gd.* 21.5 also makes a link with Pompey, and with Scipio Africanus, in the account attributed to the fictitious historiographer Vulcatius Terentianus. In addition to what Chastagnol (1994, CIII) suggests about the origin of the one of the six biographers of *HA*, namely the author of *AC*, I should like to point out that both names, Vulcatius / Vulcaci (Gd.21.5) and Gallicanus (Gd.22.8) are closely associated in the work. The name of Gallicanus is historical, and attested in Herodian 7.11.3-7 (cf. also *Max.* 20.6).

⁵⁹⁸ About the ancestry of the Gordians nothing definite is known, save that the family was of Anatolian stock. The family name Antonius is possibly derived from Marcus Antonius, who could have given citizen rights to the family, as Birley (1965, 56-60) supposes.

⁵⁹⁹ From *Gd.* 6.4 it can be distilled that Fabia Orestilla was the daughter of the similarly invented Annius Severus, Annius being the family name of Marcus Aurelius and Severus referring to Septimius Severus (Chastagnol 1994, 711n1, 722n2). Fabia is the name born by the daughter of Aelius Caesar (originally L. Ceionius Commodus), sister of Lucius Verus (V 10.3-4), and fiancée of Marcus Aurelius (*MA* 4.5, later dissolved, *MA* 6.3) before he became emperor (after the death of Marcus’ wife Faustina, Fabia again tried to marry him, *MA* 29.10). Her full name was Fabia Ceionia, and she may have been the basis for the author’s invention. Note that there is another invented granddaughter of an Antoninus (Chastagnol 1994, XVI does not explain why he indicates Marcus Aurelius as the Antoninus referred to) at the beginning of the biography of the younger Maximinus (*Max.* 27.6): *desponsa illi erat Iunia Fadilla, proneptis Antonini, quam postea accepit Toxotius...* (the latter, whose name is based on an historical figure from the fourth century, is similarly an invention and provided Dessau with one of his arguments (1889, 351) to date *HA* at the end of the fourth century). See Syme (1971, 12-3) for a portrait of Gordianus and the author’s attempts to link his family from both paternal and maternal side to famous’ ancestors (Antoninus, Trajanus, Gracchus), conform the fourth-century habit among the aristocracy to incorporate famous ancestors.

some Antoninus (*Antonini pronepte*, leaving unclear which Antoninus is meant), there is no need to assume that this link to the imperial family is part of the *NA* theme (a consideration confirmed by *Max.* 27.6 where there is also a granddaughter of an Antoninus). The particle *quoque* shows that beyond the three republican aristocratic families, there is also a link with the *Caesarum familia*, not necessarily by name but by bloodline. The last sentence of the passage, however, bears all the signs of an *NA* passage, as the names of Antoninus and Antonius are mentioned in one breath (just as in *OM* 3.5, *Hel.* 18.1, 34.7, *Gd.* 9.3-4, 17.1): *et primis diebus sui natalis Antoninus est appellatus, mox in senatu Antonii nomen est editum, vulgo deinde Gordianus haberi coeptus*. The fact that Gordian is called Antoninus shortly after his birth was already recorded in *Gd.* 4.8, and the use of this name in the senate is a repetition from *Gd.* 17.2.

The author extended the *NA* theme to include the Gordians, even though Elagabalus was his projected *ultimus Antoninorum* and the *vita* of Alexander Severus already contained sufficient passages enabling him to end and evaluate the theme. It was only the resemblance of the Antonine name with the family name of the Gordians (Gordian I was called M. Antonius Gordianus Sempronianus Romanus, Chastagnol 1994, 693) that induced the author to add extra thoughts on the theme, which had been awaiting their part since the first appearance of the Gordians in *OM* 3.5. The formula attested there (*aut ... praenomen tantum Antoninorum habuerunt aut etiam Antonii dicti sunt, non Antonini*) is echoed several times, as described above, and shows how the author planned to include this variation of his theme from at least *OM* onwards. The repetitions and variations bear all the signs of a carefully planned literary approach, which in all its variety and contradiction remains coherent, in that its basic elements constantly recur in different combinations. The inconsistencies (to name just two of them: the confusion between *nomen*, *praenomen* and *cognomen*, and the alleged sources) are far less important than the author's associative play of words. This is an insight that should always be kept in mind when reading the *HA*: unravelling its literary game should prevail over any desire to harmonise the contradictions. The logic of the *NA* theme resides not in its contents, but in the continuous regrouping of its basic elements and the addition of new variations. It is difficult to grasp the regularities in this chaotic collection of different motifs and the idiom that each time appears in different guises, sometimes slightly changed, sometimes literally repeated in different contexts. Still, a kind of system can be discerned, that not only characterises the *NA* theme, but occurs in more places in the *HA*.

5.6 Conclusions about the *NA* Theme

Now that we have encountered the *NA* theme in dreams, oracles, letters, *contiones*, *orationes*, *acclamations*, *omina*, poems, historical narrations, programmatic statements, prefaces, epilogues and dedications, let us examine all the constituent parts of the *NA* theme together. The theme will be reviewed both as a whole and in terms of its individual parts, internal correspondences and different motifs. As a first step, the *NS* that the author devotes to the theme will be mapped out, measured in words. This aspect falls under the heading of frequency and duration: frequency is the number of occurrences in the different books of the *HA*, while duration is the space (the sum as well as the individual

parts) which the theme takes up in the narrative.⁶⁰⁰ Next, the motifs within the theme, which is what determines the internal coherency of the *HA*, will be inventarised, as well as some traits from the *NA* theme with regard to individual emperors: the theme is often adapted to the emperor discussed. Finally, origins and sources will be investigated and some of the implications of our findings will be considered.

5.6.1 Frequency and Duration

Before summarising the *NA* passages, one note of caution must be sounded: not every passage in which the *nomen Antoninorum* occurs will be counted as belonging to the *NA* theme. This may sound odd but there are cases in which the *nomen Antoninorum* is mentioned without being part of this particular literary theme. For example: when in *G* 1.4 it is mentioned that Septimius Severus *statim ad milites processit et Bassianum, filium maiorem natu, Marcum Aurelium Antoninum appellavit*, this is not part of the theme, but simply a report based on the author's source.⁶⁰¹ Further considerations on the name are added in *G* 2.5, which is when the theme begins and marks the place where the author's imagination comes in.⁶⁰² Leaving these caveats aside, the following passages can be indicated as belonging to the *NA* theme:

Passages	Narrative space (words)	Total and percentage
<i>S</i> 10.5 <i>unde ... in imperio</i>	13	
16.4 <i>eundem Antoninum ... appellantes</i>	8	
19.2 <i>cui et ipsi ... nomen inposuit</i>	9	
19.3 <i>et Antonini nomen ... adscribendum putaret</i>	9	(6 frgm.)
20.1-3 <i>Legisse me ... diutine mansit</i>	85	131 / 4215
21.11 <i>nomenque illud ... amatum est</i>	7	= 3.1 %
<i>Cc.</i> 1.1 <i>quorum unum ... pater dixit</i>	7	(3 frgm.)
8.10 <i>Qui ... desideratus est</i>	22	48 / 2033
9.2 <i>ita enim ... nomen obsederat.</i>	19	= 2.4%
<i>G</i> 1.1 <i>de cuius ... nomen adpositum</i>	19	
1.5-7 <i>quod cum fecisset ... de Antonini nomine.</i>	74	(4 frgm.)
2.2-5 <i>fuit autem ... principes cucurrisset.</i>	115	213 / 1231
5.3 <i>...et Antonini ut quidam dicunt...</i>	5	= 17.3 %
<i>OM</i> 2.1 <i>seque nunc ... et militum</i>	14	
2.5-3.7 <i>et mirum ... non putarent</i>	225	
5.1 <i>quem continuo ... a militibus iussit</i>	9	
5.7 <i>infulsit praeterea...Diadumenus Antoninus</i>	21	
6.6-7 <i>item infra: Diadumenum ... maxime diligitis</i>	41	

⁶⁰⁰ The terminology is based on Genette 1980, 86 *sqq.* (duration) and 113 *sqq.* (frequency), see chapter 1.

⁶⁰¹ For the same reason, *PN* 8.5 (*quod omnino intellectum non est, nisi cum Bassianus Antonini (...) nomen accepit*) does not belong to the theme, as the passage provides a genuine fact concerning Caracalla's name of Antoninus.

⁶⁰² The same holds good for *S* 19.2 *reliquit filios duos, Antoninum Bassianum et Getam* and similar instances in, e.g., *S* 16.3-4. Also, the 'patent additions' (Syme) in the lives preceding *S* are not counted (treated in § 5.2.1), as these often only consist of a few words and are not really part of the literary theme.

7.5-8 <i>filium sane suum ... vixisse memoratur</i>	106	
8.4 <i>ac Bassiani ... appellatus</i>	19	
9.2 <i>et Bassiani ... nomen accepit</i>	6	
10.2 <i>miro amore ... inclinatis</i>	6	
10.3 <i>et amore Antonini</i>	3	(12 frgm.)
10.6 <i>non enim aliquid ... adpositus</i>	19	584 / 2495
14.2 <i>scilicet Antonino ... pervastata sunt</i>	115	= 23.4 %
Dd. 1.1-3.1 <i>Antonini Diadumeni ... nomine celebrata est</i>	486	
5.4-5 <i>natus est ... illius emanasset</i>	68	
6.1-10 <i>haec sunt ... satis constat</i>	202	(5 frgm.)
7.1-8.1 <i>exstat epistola ... filius Antoninus</i>	241	999 / 1679
9.4 <i>caritate nominis</i>	2	= 59.4 %
Hel. 1.4 <i>qui pari potestate ... acceperant</i>	8	
1.5 <i>atque Antonini ... nominis amaretur</i>	26	
1.7 <i>postremo cum ... Antoninorum fuit</i>	15	
2.4 <i>sed de nomine ... amicas caras</i>	38	
3.1 <i>excitatisque omnibus ... factum est</i>	34	
8.4 <i>sed multo magis ... appellans, simul...</i>	14	
9.2 <i>nomen autem ... quod invaserat</i>	7	
17.4 <i>nomen eius ... filius Antonini</i>	22	
18.1 <i>hic ultimus ... sunt abolita</i>	46	(11 frgm.)
33.8 <i>hic finis ... quam nomine</i>	18	287 / 5782
34.6 <i>et quoniam hic ... non Antonini</i>	59	= 5,0 %
AS 1.1 <i>sic enim ... erasum est</i>	22	
2.2 <i>huc accessit ... dehonestavit imperium</i>	22	
5.1 <i>delatum sibi Antonini nomen a senatu recusavit</i>	7	
5.5 - 6.1 <i>recusavit et ... a senatu recusavit</i>	25	
7.1-6 <i>et cum egisset ... Antonine haveas</i>	128	(7 frgm.)
8.2-11.4 <i>et cum diceret ... nomen ingerite</i>	581	799 / 10701
12.4 <i>sed quamvis ... nomina susciperet</i>	14	= 7.5 %
Gd. 3.3 <i>scripsit praeterea ... gesta perscribens</i>	36	
4.7-8 <i>scripsit et laudes ... nomen insereret</i>	53	
9.5 <i>in plurimis autem ... veros Antonios</i>	20	
17.1 <i>quam ut nonnulli ... ab Antoniis duxit</i>	9	(6 frgm.)
17.2 <i>quod Antoninorum ... in senatu</i>	15	153 / 5563
17.5 <i>et primis ... haberi coeptus</i>	20	= 2.8 %
Total	3214	(54 frgm.) 3214 / 32020 = 10 %

Figure 5.7: The passages constituting the NA theme in the HA, according to book order from S to Gd., together with their NS frequency and percentage of the total book.

The distribution of the *NA theme* over the books, together with the intervals between the passages, can be seen in the following diagram (the horizontal line renders the numbers of words):

Figure 5.8: The distribution of the passages and their duration constituting the *NA theme* in the *HA*.

When the resulting information about frequency and duration is put together, the following picture is the result:

A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
<i>S</i>	6	131	3.1	<i>Hel.</i>	11	287	5.0
<i>Cc.</i>	3	48	2.4	<i>AS</i>	7	799	7.5
<i>G</i>	4	213	17.3	<i>Gd.</i>	6	153	2.8
<i>OM</i>	12	584	23.4				
<i>Dd.</i>	5	999	59.4	total	54	3214	9.5

Figure 5.9: Books in the *HA* from *S* to *Gd.* with the *NA theme* (A) measured according to frequency (B), NS (C) and relative NS (D).⁶⁰³

The figures provides some interesting information: the frequency of the theme is high in *G*, *OM* and *Hel.*, which means that the motifs are distributed more widely over the narration than in the other *vitae*. The NS taken up, however, is significantly higher in *Dd.* (999 words) and *AS* (799), especially as a result of documents in direct discourse (see § 6.1.2). The briefness of the biographies of *OM* and *Dd.* make that in these lives the relative NS of the *NA theme* (as measured against the total length of the *vitae*) is higher than in other lives.

The only life that can hardly do without the theme is the life of *Dd.* Its use here shows that the author needed it to pad out a meagre subject and link *IL* to *EL* at the same time with a kind of ‘Leitmotif’. The section of *IL* is a transitional part of the *HA* in many respects: here we find the last pseudo-primary (*OM*) and pseudo-secondary lives (*Dd.*),

⁶⁰³ Relative narrative space is the part of narrative space in proportion to the total of narrative space in a life, so: 3.1 per cent of the narrative in *S* is devoted to the *NA theme*.

and the change from single lives (*Hel.* and *AS*) to combined ones (*Max.*, *Gd.* and *MB*), with the *lacuna* as their terminus. A striking aspect here is that precisely in the life of the *ultimus Antoninorum* Elagabalus relatively little space is devoted to the theme. The neglect of the theme in *Hel.* may have been part of the author's literary plan, as in the life of Alexander Severus, Elagabalus' moral antipode who went so far as to refuse the name, the theme returns in full force. This paradox is prepared for in the preceding books: the name is extolled ever higher, as the emperors who bore it after Marcus Aurelius' death were increasingly vile. The theme is absent in the life of Commodus, which fits in well with the author's disappointment about bad rulers called Antoninus.

5.6.2 Motifs

From the introduction of the *NA* theme to the end of the Gordiani, many motifs pass review. Together, they make up the theme, which shows a high degree of coherency owing to a constant repetition of the same information. In the recurrent motifs many of the same words are recycled, but often changed and distorted. Here is an enumeration of all the major motifs, together with a registration of their provenance:⁶⁰⁴

- In accordance with Septimius Severus' wish, all the emperors should be called Antoninus (*S* 19.3, *G* 2.2), with Antoninus equalling the title of Augustus (*Cc.* 9.2, *AS* 8.1, 10.3).
- An emperor cannot do without the *nomen imperatorium* of Antoninus (*OM* 3.9; *Dd.* 7.2).
- The honor of being father to an Antoninus (*S* 20.1-2, *G* 1.6, *Dd.* 7.1, 7.5-7).
- The *desiderium*, *amor* or *caritas* for the name of Antoninus among the soldiers (*Cc.* 8.10, *OM* 3.9, 10.2, 10.3; *Dd.* 1.5, 2.10, 6.10, 7.2, 9.4) and even in the hearts of all men (*Cc.* 9.2, *Hel.* 1.5, 3.1). The opposite is the sorrow about the lack of an Antoninus (*Dd.* 1.2 *ingens maeror*).
- The number of Antonini is determined (four in *G* 2.3, eight in *OM* 3.1-4) and they are mentioned in *enumeratio* (*OM* 7.7, *Dd.* 6.3-10, *AS* 7.3, 9.1-2, 10.5).
- The name is also used as *praenomen*, *cognomen* or *signum* (*OM* 3.5-6, *Dd.* 6.3-10, *Hel.* 18.1, 34.6, *Gd.* 4.8, 17.2) not *proprium nomen* (*G* 2.3), in *Hel.* 3.1 it is called a *titulus* (for Diadumenian).
- The pollution of the name is caused by Verus, Commodus, Caracalla and Elagabalus (*Cc.* 9.2, *OM* 7.6-8, *Hel.* 2.4, 9.2, *AS* 2.2, 9.4), the opposite process of purification is mentioned in *AS* 7.2.
- In contrast to the degeneration of the name, as caused by some of the emperors who bore it, the name is described as ever more sacrosanct: *S* 20.3 (*sanctum illud nomen*), *S* 21.11 (*nomenque illud venerabile*) and *OM* 7.7 (*nomen illud sanctum*), *Hel.* 2.4 (*sanctum illud Antoninorum nomen*, *AS* 7.6 *sacrum nomen*, 9.7 *istud venerabile omnibus nomen*). The gods protect an emperor called Antoninus (*Dd.* 1.8, as 7.6, 9.5-6).

⁶⁰⁴ It is interesting to take into account Hartke's short list of motifs in the acclamations in *AS* (1951, 137): purification of the name, ancestry, tradition, popularity, imperial interests.

- The name is even rated higher than the gods (*Dd.* 7.1, 7.2, 7.4). *Nomen* is *numen*: *AS* 9.1; similarly, the reference to the *templa Antoninorum* (*AS* 7.5, 10.7) attests the divine status of the Antonines.
- The *sanguis*-motif makes clear that the name of Antoninus is more than a simple title: it is divine blood that flows through the Antonines' veins (*Hel.* 3.1, *AS* 7.3, 8.3).

There are some emperors, to whom individual motifs are ascribed; here are the chief ones:

- Severus grants the name of Antoninus to Geta, because he wants to be part of Marcus' family and admires his predecessor (*S* 19.2-3, *G* 2.2), or out of love for Antoninus Pius (*S* 10.6, 20.1, *G* 2.3).
- Macrinus calls his son Diadumenian Antoninus, to avert suspicion of involvement in Caracalla's murder (*OM* 3.8, 7.5), because the name was popular among soldiers (*OM* 3.9) or because he feared that the soldiers followed Antoninus Pius' associates (*Dd.* 1.2). Macrinus may have called himself Antoninus as a *praenomen* (*OM* 3.6).
- Diadumenian is called *Pseudantoninus* (*Hel.* 8.4) by Elagabalus, while Cassius Dio (80.1.1) styles Elagabalus *Ψευδαντωνίνος*.
- Elagabalus was the *ultimus Antoninorum* (*Hel.* 1.7, 18.1, 34.6), and his name was erased (*Hel.* 17.4, 18.1, 2, *AS* 1.1). Cf. also *Hel.* 33.8: *Finis Antoninorum nomini in re p. fuit*. He is not styled Pseudantoninus, as Dio does, but there is an allusion to the name in *Hel.* 33.8: *scientibus cunctis istum Antoninum tam falsum fuisse quam nomine*.
- Gordian composes literature about the *Antonini* (*Gd.* 3.3, 4.7-8); they are also called *Antonii* (*OM* 3.5, *Hel.* 18.1, 34.7, *Gd.* 9.3-4, 17.1/5). He has his son inscribed as Antoninus in the *acta publica* *Gd.* 4.8 and wants him to be called Antoninus in the senate (17.2).

5.6.3 Description of the NA Theme

The books in which the *NA* theme occurs do not correspond with the books devoted to the canonical eight Antonines. *AP*, *MA*, *V*, *C* deal with Antonines, but the *NA* theme is absent from the books. In *Cc.*, *G* and *Dd.*, Antonines are treated but the theme, while increasingly present, hardly concerns Caracalla, the most prominent of these three alleged Antonines. In *OM* the theme is omnipresent, even if Macrinus was only the father of an Antonine, whose status seems to be as important for the author as an Antoninus himself. In *Hel.* the *NA* passages are surprisingly few for the last of the Antonines. Yet they reappear in full force in *AS* and *Gd.*, although the emperors in these books were no Antonini.

The author develops his theme artfully. He begins by using faulty information about Verus' name of Antoninus, and later he reckons Geta among the Antonines. In Verus' case, he merely adds the name of Antoninus, sometimes in a relative clause, to the basic text. In the life of Commodus, he surprisingly fails to insert any passages on the theme, while in later lives (from *OM*) Commodus is named as the first emperor to disgrace the name. In Severus's biography, he begins to elaborate on the theme with regard to Geta, while knowing that this is incorrect (as his source does not mention anything on the subject). For Caracalla's *vita*, he does not need the theme, as Caracalla

was actually named Antoninus, which would have made it a superfluous addition to his life of this emperor, apart from the *desiderium Antonini* that the author came up with when Macrinus gained the throne. The author finds it most interesting to make Septimius Severus the father of two Antonines, a theme that he developed ever since taking the idea from Eutropius 8.9.2 (echoed in *MA* 7.6 and *Ael.* 5.12.3). Accordingly, the theme is now expressed as a dual combination of *filii imperatoris* and co-emperorship. This is why he wants Geta to be an Antoninus (*G* 1.7, Septimius' address in a letter: *salutate Antoninos filios et successores meos*). Later, the venerability of the name is set off against the bad emperors bearing it. The *NA* theme enables the author to relegate Macrinus to second place with respect to his son: the latter was a real Antoninus, Macrinus merely a usurper. The responsibility for Caracalla's death has to be stressed, which causes some repetitive additions in *Cc.* Diadumenian's status among the Antonines as described by the good emperor Alexander Severus himself: Diadumenian was too young, and his father was responsible for the misuse of the name (*AS* 9.3: *Diadumenus autem nec tempus habuit nec aetatem et arte patris hoc nomen incurrit*). Just as in the case of Caracalla, relatively few words are devoted to the *NA* theme in the life of Elagabalus, who, though a real Antoninus, was seen as the worst of them all.

Then comes Alexander. In this book, many motifs come to an end, with occasionally surprising twists. In the first place: contrary to all expectations when considering the importance of the name and the quality of the emperor, Alexander refuses the name (*AS* 5.3/5, 6.1, 8.4-5, 9.1-4/7). In *AS* 10.4 something important happens: the name of Augustus is restored to its old glory: *Augustus primus primus est huius auctor imperii, et in eius nomen omnes velut quadam adoptione aut iure hereditario succedimus; Antonini ipsi Augusti sunt dicti*. The theme of adoptive and hereditary emperorship is brought up again, which was first encountered in *Ael.* 1.2 and 2.2. The clause *Antonini ipsi Augusti sunt dicti* proves that the name of Augustus prevails over that of Antoninus, and that Antoninus cannot compete with the founder of the empire. Alexander expresses the hope that there will be love and respect for the name of Alexander, by which he implicitly replaces the most important *NA* motif: the *desiderium nominis Antonini*, *AS* 11.1: *enisurus, ut et hoc nomen, quod in imperium detulimus, tale sit, ut et ab aliis desideretur et bonis vestrae pietatis iudiciis offeratur*. After the gratuitous *contiones* by Diadumenian, it is noticeable that an emperor himself seems to make an end to the *nomen Antoninorum* craze. We only have to call to mind the author's words in *Ael.* 3-5, in the digression of the *nomen Caesaris*: *Certe quaecumque illa, felix necessitas fuit, unde tam clarum et duraturum cum aeternitate mundi nomen effloruit*. Our point of departure on the treatment of the name of Antoninus was the *nomen Caesaris*, in § 5.1. The words uttered in *Ael.* were a premonition, a sign that the *nomen Antoninorum* would turn out to be less enduring than the names of Caesar and August. For all this, there is, as we have seen, a pause in the *vita Maximini*, after which the author continues the theme. While *AS* seems to make an end to the theme, the author still has something up his sleeve: the Gordians.

5.6.4 The Origin of the *NA* Theme

The importance of the *NA* theme raises the question what the author based his idea on. It may be supposed that it was either taken from a source or invented by the author and

dressed up along the lines of his literary models. If taken from a source, it must be asked whether this source was contemporary with the Antonines, that is to say: written in the time of, or briefly after, the *ultimus Antoninorum* Elagabalus. Was the *nomen Antoninorum* already recognised as a canonical, sacrosanct imperial name to the extent that the author suggests, leaving aside for the moment that the first three Antonines were deified and worshipped. Septimius Severus, in calling his son Bassianus Caracalla, fell back on the names of his predecessors, just as Macrinus did, but this was mainly in order to claim a place in the Antoninian dynasty. There was a tale about Septimius' dream that an Antonine was destined to succeed him, probably derived from Marius Maximus, who seems to have had a preference for such details and supernatural intervention in imperial affairs. Whether other contemporary historiographers or biographers ever paid attention to the name's popularity as a theme cannot be determined: no traces survive, apart from Dio's designation of Elagabalus as Pseudantoninus.

Many scholars have studied the books in which the theme occurs, and some the theme as such. Hartke (1951, 123) took the historical popularity of the Antonines for granted and saw this as the explanation of the *nomen Antoninorum* obsession in the *HA*. Syme (1968, 90) assumed that Marius Maximus was the source and described the theme as a thread running through Maximus' biographies: writing under Alexander Severus in a time of prosperity ('ostensible peace and good government'), Maximus may have looked back on evil reigns and conceived the idea of decline and fall. The *nomen Antoninorum* could have served as symbol of this decline, especially as Elagabalus had been the last and worst of a series of Antonines. Three years later, in his *Emperors and Biography*, Syme repeated the idea that the label *ultimus Antoninorum* might well have been taken from Marius Maximus.⁶⁰⁵ His earlier idea was adopted by Barnes (1972, 65 and 74), who gives it an even greater importance: 'taken up and developed by the *HA*, it may originally have been the major theme of the imperial biographies of Marius Maximus', though there are no traces left in the thirty-eight fragments that have been transmitted in the form of quotations in the *HA*.⁶⁰⁶

Not all scholars share the idea that the *NA* theme originates with Marius Maximus.⁶⁰⁷ There is indeed much to be said against it. First, the designation of Verus

⁶⁰⁵ This idea was formulated after Syme had brought up *Ignotus* as a source for the first nine primary lives, which caused him to separate *Hel.* from the preceding biographies with regard to used sources. In that context, the evidence for Marius Maximus' 'decline and fall' on the basis of the *Nomen Antoninorum* becomes weaker. Den Hengst (1981, 42) also assumes that Marius Maximus was the source: 'It was a momentous event [viz. Severus calling his son Aurelius Antoninus and himself *divi Marci fil.*] in the history of the third century, which must have dominated Maximus' work'.

⁶⁰⁶ Syme (1968, 90n1), after an idea from Barnes (1967, 66n11), argues that Ausonius may have based his twelve *Caesares post Tranquillum*, the poems about the emperors from Nerva to Elagabalus, on Marius Maximus' *vitae*. The last two transmitted verses, from the *Heliogabalus*, happen to contain the only formula that is reminiscent of the many Antonine variations in *HA*: *Antoninorum nomina falsa gerens...* (*Caesares* 98). Schwartz (1972, 269) on the other hand concludes that Ausonius' wording not necessarily depends on Marius Maximus, and that the author of the *HA* followed Ausonius in his formulations of the *NA* theme. Green (1981, 227) is also sceptical about Syme's reconstruction.

⁶⁰⁷ In general, Aurelius Victor is indicated as the origin of the theme, in connection with *OM* 3.8, see § 5.3.1.

and Geta as Antonini appears to be based on fourth-century sources,⁶⁰⁸ while in the early third century, the time of the *ultimus Antoninorum*, which is only half a century after Verus' death, such a mistake is less likely to have been made. This reduces the number of Antonini to six, which effectively shows that the oracle of the *vates Caelestis* in Carthage as described in *OM* cannot be based on Marius Maximus in its present form.⁶⁰⁹ Next, in the parts in which Marius Maximus sometimes serves as a source, Geta is not called Antoninus, as we have seen.⁶¹⁰ Finally, in the detachable fragments of the *NA* theme, Marius Maximus is not cited even once. There is not much evidence for Marius Maximus or any one of his contemporaries as the author's source, while there are several fourth-century models (Eutropius for joint emperorship and the designation of Verus and Geta as Antonini, Aurelius Victor for the *desiderium nominis* and Ausonius for the *ultimus Antoninorum*) that may have inspired the author of the *HA*. For the rest, the artfully elaborated theme, with its complex paradox of the increasing popularity of the *nomen Antoninorum* and its ongoing pollution by those who bore the name, mostly occurring in the lives of emperors who were not called Antoninus⁶¹¹, clearly remains the author's own product.

A final remark may be in order. In the section of *LL*, the Antonini sometimes crop up, but only in the shape of the first three. In *Cl.*, the biography of the eulogised *senex* Claudius, the Antonini are praised collectively, in one breath with the *optimus princeps* Trajan: *Cl.* 18.4, *Tac.* 16.6 or *Pr.* 12.2.⁶¹² Often, the *pietas* of Antoninus Pius is praised, e.g. in *Cl.* 2.3.⁶¹³ As a group, the eight Antonines disappear from the stage after *Gd.*, and with them the theme of the *nomen Antoninorum*.

5.6.5 The *NA* Theme and the Development of the *HA*

There is one very notable thing about the *NA* theme: in every single case, it can be omitted from the text, often to the advantage of the narrative flow. Interpolations of paraphrases of Herodian (*OM* 8.4 and 9.2) and the *Epitome* (*Hel.* 17.4) indicate that the theme has been added to these sources. On the other hand, the *NA* passages themselves never contain interpolations from other sources themselves. Meanwhile, scattered as they are, the fragments show a strong internal coherency. This situation may reveal something

⁶⁰⁸ Eutropius 8.10.1, Festus 14.4; from the fifth century: Orosius 7.15.2-3. These sources possibly derive their information from the *Kaisergeschichte*. See also *Pan. Lat.* 4.24.6, where Lucius Verus is called Antoninus.

⁶⁰⁹ Barnes 1970b considers the oracle an invention by the author, possibly taken from *P* 4.2 (see for bibliography on this passage Chastagnol 1994, 260n1).

⁶¹⁰ The *omina* in *G* 3 are *omina mortis* and do not belong to the *NA* theme.

⁶¹¹ 58 per cent of the narrative space of the *NA*-passages is found in the lives of the emperors who were, historically, not called Antoninus (Septimius Severus, Geta, Macrinus, Alexander Severus, Gordianus).

⁶¹² *Cl.* 2.3: *unum tamen tacere non debeo, quod illum et senatus et populus et ante imperium et in imperio et post imperium sic dilexit, ut satis constet neque Traianum neque Antoninos neque quemquam alium principem sic amatum*; *Tac.* 16.6: (*Probus*) *vir Aureliano, Traiano, Antoninis, Alexandro, Claudioque preferendus*; *Pr.* 12.2: *Si recte cogitemus, non nobis Aurelianus, non Alexander, non Antonini, non Traianus aut Claudius requirendi sunt*.

⁶¹³ *Cl.* 2.3: *in quo Traiani virtus, Antonini pietas, Augusti moderatio et magnorum principum bona sic fuerunt, ut non ille ab aliis exemplum caperet sed, etiamsi illi non fuissent, hic ceteris reliquisset exemplum*.

about how the author wrote parts of the *HA* and the order in which the different fragments entered the work: a difficult subject, requiring extreme caution. Still, the detachability of the *NA* fragments suggests that here lies an opportunity for distilling inferences about the development of the series. Accordingly, we shall consider the books in which the *NA* passages occur (as well as some in which they are lacking) and draw some tentative conclusions that may prove useful in the course of further research.

In the Primary Lives of *S* and *Cc.*, the picture is rather clear: thoughts about Geta as an Antonine and Severus being the father of two Antonines (*S*) and the popularity of the name (*Cc.*) are added to a basic text. In *S* 10.2-5, this leads to a confusing account in which two different Geta's are treated in one passage. Caracalla's appointment as Antoninus and Septimius' dream in *S* 10.4 are a reason for the author to add his faulty information about Geta here, apparently to prepare the reader for his massive fraud in the Secondary Life of *G*. In that biography, it appears that the author himself blended the information about Septimius' brother in his primary source with his own inventions about Septimius' son and brother's namesake (*S* 10.5 / *G* 2.5, see § 5.2.4). It is hard to say if this is deliberate, in an attempt to delude the reader, or whether it was an authorial slip. Still, the difference between the primary source and the author's addition is clearly discernible in the blending of the two passages in *S* in *G*. With regard to *Cc.*, the *desiderium Antonini* prepares the way for the theme in *OM* 3.9 and other places. It can be concluded that the *NA*-passages in *S* and *Cc.* were added to a basic source without much consequences for the overall structure of the books.⁶¹⁴

In § 5.4 on *G*, *Dd.* and *OM*, we concluded that in the primary source Caracalla and Geta must have been treated together. The detachability of the *NA* passages provides the opportunity to reconstruct an earlier stage of the two books. Consider the following: *Cc.* consists of 2033 words, the shortest of the Primary Lives after *DI*; the 1231 words of *G* result in the second shortest of all the lives in *HA*, with the exception of the incomplete *Val.* Without their *NA* passages *Cc.* and *G* are even shorter, consisting of 1985 and 1018 words respectively. The presence of a short prefatory remark in *G* (from which the *NA*-clause must be detached) that resembles the preface of *V* indicates that the author had already separated the short biographies of *Cc.* and *G* before the addition of the *NA* theme. Again, an earlier stage can be postulated. The information in the passage *G* 6.1-7.6 (341 words) was taken from *Cc.*, and consequently was no part of the source that treated Caracalla and Geta together. Neither was the prefatory remark (37 words). So, at least 378 words were added to construct a separate biography of *G*, whose subject, Geta, was treated together with his brother in the source (a procedure comparable to that of *MA* and *V*⁶¹⁵).

⁶¹⁴ Syme (1981, 87) drew a similar conclusion with regard to the additions of the *NA* theme to *S* and *Cc.*: 'He therefore [viz. the addition of the list of eight Antonini in *OM*] imported his new preoccupation into the *Vitae* had had already compiled'.

⁶¹⁵ Barnes (1967, 66) assumes that Marius Maximus did not write a separate life of Verus, while an unknown biographical source did (Syme's *Ignotus*: 1971, 33); Cameron 1971, 264-5 convincingly shows that the source must have treated Marcus and Verus together (be it in two books), as the author himself seems to indicate in *AC* 8.5. Schlumberger (1974, 133) agrees with this point of view, without reference to Cameron; See also Marriott 1979, 70; Den Hengst 1981, 38n16; Birley 1971, 317-21 (319: 'In fact, comparison of the Lives of Marcus and Verus in the *HA* shows that the material in the *Verus* could perfectly well have fitted into an original Life of Marcus.').

The reconstruction may well indicate that the two brothers were described together in the source (as attested in *Cc.* 1.1: *Ex duobus liberis, quos Septimius Severus reliquit...*).⁶¹⁶ The textual division also appears from *G* 1.1, in which the order of treatment (cf. *V* 1.1) is explained. The author must have inserted the *NA* passages - which he either had at his disposal already or invented as he went along - immediately after, and he added them to the first part of *G* (caput 1 and 2). As a result, he was obliged to add an extra element to the preface (*de cuius ... nomen adpositum*). Thus, the hypothesis may be ventured that in an earlier stage of their existence, *Cc.* and *G* were two lives of 1985 and 1018 words respectively, padded out with 48 and 213 *NA* words respectively to biographies of 2033 and 1231 words. The differences between the older parts and the *NA* parts are still discernible, as in the original biography of the two brothers Geta is never called Antoninus. The following figure shows the NS of the various parts:

	Basic Text	NA theme	Total
<i>Cc.</i>	1985	48	2033
<i>G</i>	1018	213	1231

Figure 5.10: NS of basic parts and additions of the *NA* theme in *Cc.* and *G*

Something comparable must have been the case with *OM* and *Dd.* (apart from the fact that almost nothing was known about the latter). *Omina* and letters concerning the emperor's son were already present in the basic text, and when the two biographies were separated, *Dd.* was incapable of standing by itself. Before the *NA* theme was added, *OM* and *Dd.* had 1911 and 680 words respectively, a sum of 2591 words (cf. 2625 words for the hypothetical *Cc.+G*).⁶¹⁷ After being split up and supplemented with *NA* elements (584 and 999 words), they now contained 2495 and 1679 words (cf. 2033 and 1231 words for *Cc.* and *G*). The break between the original parts and the *NA* theme is still visible, as discussed in § 5.4.2-3. The biographies can even be re-linked to one another, as shown in the structural analysis in that place.

	Basic Text	NA theme	Total
<i>OM</i>	1911	584	2495
<i>Dd.</i>	680	999	1679
<i>OM+Dd.</i>	2591	1583	

Figure 5.11: NS of basic parts and additions of the *NA* theme in *OM* and *Dd.*

The original parts and the additions from the *NA* theme in this part of the *HA*, the transition from *EL* to *IL*, can be pictured as follows (the basis parts in dark-grey, the *NA* additions in a brighter shade):

⁶¹⁶ The approximate length of this hypothetical biography in the source can be estimated thus: the basic texts of *Cc.* (1985 words) + *G* (1018) - prefatory remark (37) and rewritten part (341) = 3003 - 378 = 2625 words. The number is purely hypothetical, as it is not known what the source must have looked like: the author may have followed it more or less closely, or abbreviated the information he found in it.

⁶¹⁷ The number of 2625 is reached by subtracting the reformulated parts (341 words of *G* 6.1-7.6 and the 37 words of the short preface in *G* 1) from the sum of the basic parts of *Cc.* and *G* (1985+1018=3003), which results in a computation of the purely hypothetical base of the combined biography *Cc.+G*.

Figure 5.12: NS of the NA theme and basic parts in Cc., G, OM, Dd.

This analysis raises the question in what order the several redactions took place. So far, we can conclude that the author had at his disposal a source that consisted of at least nine lives (*H*, *AP*, *MA+V*, *C*, *P*, *DI*, *S*, *Cc.+G* and *Hel.*). The lives of *MA+V* and *Cc.+G* were split up at a certain stage of composition and were supplemented with information from other sources. In chapter 3, a distinction was made between the Secondary Lives of *AC*, *PN* and *CIA* and those of *Ael.* and *G*, as the first three are often mentioned together in the *HA*. Knowing that the lives of *G* and *Dd.* are announced in *Ael.* as a separate category, linking these two strongly together, and considering that *AC*, *PN* and *CIA* do not contain the NA theme, we may assume that the latter three were written before, or at least conceived separately from *Ael.*, *G*, *OM* and *Dd.* *Ael.* continues the *nomen Caesareum* theme from *CIA*, but only to prepare for its replacement by the NA theme. An original *Cc.+G* and *OM+Dd.* may have been present at the time that the Secondary Lives were added to the series,⁶¹⁸ but only after the NA theme was added.

The problems of the development of the *HA* are far from solved by this hypothesis, but one cannot simply turn a blind eye to the detachability of the NA theme, or what the structure of the text and the sharp breaks between its separate parts reveal about its genesis.⁶¹⁹ The NA theme, its function being to link EL and IL, must have been added at a late, if not final, redactional stage. In the Intermediary Lives of *Hel.* and *AS*, the NA theme also appears as an addition to an older textual nucleus. Still, the space that

⁶¹⁸ Mark, again (after § 5.4.2), the similarities Klebs (1888, 340-2), observed between *AC* and *Dd.* – but only with texts that we defined as the basic part of *Dd.*

⁶¹⁹ It has been postulated that the author went back for a second redaction after the writing of *AS*: Syme (1971, 87-8) states that ‘The writing of the ‘Nebenviten’ and the revision of the nine primary Vitae might fall, not after the Caracalla (...) but somewhat later. That is to say, after the series which ends with Severus Alexander.’ The moment the author went back for a revision has been discussed heavily, see e.g. Cameron (1971, 254-67), who suggests that the *HA* originally led off with *AS*, and Syme’s reaction in *JRS* 62 (1972), 123 sqq. (= 1983, 12-29: ‘The Composition of the Historia Augusta: Recent Theories’). Barnes (1970, 35 and 1978, 58) struggles with the question in which order the similar passages *AS* 26.5/6 and *PN* 7.4 were written (see also Syme 1983, 18). Den Hengst (1995, 166), in support of Cameron, suggests on the basis of the author’s cross-references that the author wrote the lives from *AS* to *Car.* before the inclusion of the secondary vitae in the series. Further evidence is provided by the fact that the bogus author Cordus, extensively introduced in the preface to *OM* (1.3, see § 3.3), already occurs in *CIA* 7.2. The quest for more redactional stages has been ventured by Honoré 1987 and Callu 1992, whose theories were refuted by Paschoud 1996, XX-XXXVII. The question remains undecided.

these passages occupy is negligible compared to the total. The addition of the theme did not result in an essential change of structure. This makes it hard to determine at what stage the interpolations were effected, whether they were inserted during the writing process and while using the sources, or whether they were added later. No programmatic remarks appear in these lives with regard to structure. As we have seen in chapters 3 and 4, a new ordering of the material, viz. the description of lives in combined books, begins with *Max*. It can be concluded from the discussed passages that the *NA* theme in *Gd.* still has the characteristic of detachability, but at the same time nowhere truly interrupts the narrative flow, as it often does in the lives from *S* to *Dd.*, and to a lesser extent in *Hel.* and *AS*. In my general conclusion we shall come to speak about the problem of the development of the *HA* and the various routes along it may have come into being. The present analysis of the *NA* theme may have contributed an extra element to the study of the *HA*, whether as a clue to the solution of a problem that may never be solved entirely or as a new complication. That element is that the *HA* as the product of a single redaction has become less probable, unless a better explanation for the striking inconsistencies of the *NA* theme and its accompanying text is provided.⁶²⁰

⁶²⁰ The idea that the *NA*-passages are mainly by one hand, and must be insertions, is not entirely new. It is interesting to revoke Lécivain's theory about the theme, though his conclusions were obstructed by the fact that he considered the names of the scriptores as genuine. Lécivain 1904 supposed that the *NA*-passages from *S* to *Cc* were composed by a 'second compilateur', namely *S* 10.5-6 (p.166), 16.3-4 (169), 19.2-3 (171), 20.1 (172) and *Cc* 8.3 (178), 8.9-10 (179) and that the *NA*-passages in *G* (260-1), *OM* (183) and *Dd.* were all by the bad author Capitolinus, who used the source of the *EKG*. So, Capitolinus intervened in the works of Aelius Spartianus, author of *G* and Aelius Lampridius, author of *Dd.*

Chapter 6 Documents and Biographical *Inventio*

6.1 Introduction

In chapter 5, it was shown how an analysis of structural devices in EL and IL of the *HA*, regarding the *NA* theme, contributes to a better insight in the sources, as well as the genesis of the *HA*. The *NA* theme covers almost 10 per cent of NS in the analysed books (see figure 5.7 and 5.9), and represents 3 per cent of the total NS of the *HA*.⁶²¹ This makes the *NA* theme an important factor in the narrative structure of the *HA*. The same holds for the prefaces, analysed in chapter 4, which occupy 3 per cent of NS.⁶²² The *NA* theme and the prefaces have in common that they supplement the historical narration, while there is no TS present in these particular parts. The author tries to add more weight to the historical narration by affixing these passages to his report of the course of events, thus expanding NS, and reflecting on the content of the narrative. For this same purpose, 'documents' are inserted in the narration as well. These documents, rendered in DD,⁶²³ cause breaks in structure by the fact that TN and TS are equal (in fact, TS is only present insofar as the text is said to have been read out or spoken by a character).⁶²⁴ The documents are often woven into the fabric of an historical account, which results in a lower narrative speed. These parts in DD are suggested to have come from documents that were at the author's disposal. We will first try to establish the way in which the author makes use of documents and the way he works them into his narration. Then, the extent will be mapped to which the three kinds of passages, the *NA* theme, prefaces and documents, are present in the three parts of the *HA*. The chapter ends with a case study of a document in *OM*, chapter 6, which reveals much about the author's working method.

6.2 Documents

Apart from the *NA* theme and prefaces, the prevalence of documents in DD is an important structural device of the *HA*.⁶²⁵ Nowadays, none of the documents is considered

⁶²¹ 3 214 words of the *NA* theme divided by 108 281 words of the entire *HA* = 2.97 percent.

⁶²² 3 250 words of the prefaces divided by 108 281 words of the entire *HA* = 3.0 percent.

⁶²³ I use the term direct discourse

⁶²⁴ From a narratological point of view, documents can be described as 'scene', in which the TN = TS (Genette 1980, 94-5 and 109-12). For theoretical problems regarding this viewpoint, see § 1.3.5 (these kind of reflective passages can also be regarded as a 'fifth movement'). Laird, who analyses speeches in direct discourse in classical historiography, states that 'When direct discourse is used, the time it takes to recount that speech on the narrative plane appears to become synchronized with the actual time it would take for that speech to be uttered in the world of the story. If 'narrative time' were ever equivalent to 'story time', it would have to be when direct discourse is presented' (1999, 90).

⁶²⁵ Studies have been devoted to the documents by Peter (1892, 153-231); Lécivain (1904, 45-99); Homo 1926-1927; Szelest 1971; Mouchová 1975, 39-47, Carozzo 1977, Baldwin 1981 (acclamations), Den Hengst 1987. Lécivain sums up 68 letters, 31 speeches to the people, soldiers and others, 30 *orationes* and letters to the senate, 20 *senatus consulta*, *acclamationes* and letters from the senate, 2 acclamations of the people, 2 *edicta*, 1 *brevis* (total 154). One decade before Lécivain, Peter (1892, 154-5) made another, less

as authentic, which indicates that they all belong to the domain of literary invention.⁶²⁶ In the following analysis, the narrative space occupied by the speeches and their distribution will be mapped out on the basis of Lécivain's inventory, and compared with the NS of prefaces and the *NA* theme. Documents are defined as those parts of the text in which a report in DD is given.⁶²⁷ This can either be an address or a letter from the emperor to family members, soldiers, people or the senate, or the other way round, sometimes in form of acclamations. Also other official-looking reports are also encountered:

exhaustive counting, though he included inscriptions: 77 *epistulae*, 31 *orationes*, 10 *contiones*, 3 other speeches, 7 inscriptions, 2 edicts (130 total, corresponding with Szelest's number: 1971, 325). Paschoud (2002, XXIX) has almost the same number of speeches as Lécivain, though there are three slight differences: in *A* Paschoud counts 21, while Lécivain gives the number of 23, in *Pr.* 14 instead of 13 and in *Q* 6 instead of 7. I adhere to the list as provided Lécivain for the reason that i) he lists and cites the speeches, which makes the counting verifiable; ii) differences in interpretation can cause deviations, e.g.: a reaction of a responding party to a speech can be either be counted as a separate speech or as part of the same document and iii) small deviations do not really matter for the narrative space or for the overall impression of the narrative, viz. the reader's experience.

⁶²⁶ This view has been shared in the last decades, though in the years following Dessau's revolutionary article some scholars still held that they might be authentic. For example, the acclamations in *AS* treated in § 5.5.2 were considered authentic by Lécivain (1904, 77-9)), while Alexander's responses were not. Hönn (1911, 158-9) rejected their authenticity altogether ('völlige Inhaltslosigkeit', 'willkürige Erfindung', 'offenkundige Wertlosigkeit'). An exceptional position in the discussion is taken by *C* 18.1-20.1, see § 6.4.1.

⁶²⁷ There are also pieces in direct discourse which are traditionally not reckoned among the documents, especially verses (Baldwin 1978, Den Hengst 1995b, 1997), in epigraphic form (*T* 11.5, see Chastagnol 1994, CXXIII and below) or as oracles (*PN* 8, see below).

Acclamations	
by the senate	<i>C</i> 18.3-16; <i>AC</i> 13.1-5; <i>OM</i> 2.4-5; <i>Max.</i> 16.3-7; 26.1-4 ; <i>Gd.</i> 5.7; 11.9-10; <i>MB</i> 2.9-12; 13.2; <i>AS</i> 6.1-5; 7.1-5; 9.5-6; 10.3, 6-8; 11.2; 12.1; 56.9-10; <i>Val.</i> 5.5-8 ; <i>Cl.</i> 4.3-4 ; 18.2-3; <i>Tac.</i> 4.2-4; 5.1-3; 7.4; <i>Pr.</i> 11.6-9, 12.8
by soldiers and the people	<i>Dd.</i> 1.6-8 (soldiers); <i>MB</i> 3.3; <i>AS</i> 57.5; <i>Q</i> 9.1 (people),
Speeches	
by the emperor to the senate	<i>AC</i> 12.1-10; <i>OM</i> 6.2-9; <i>Max.</i> 5.4; <i>AS</i> 8.1-5; 9.1-3, 4; 9.1-3; 9.7; 10.1; 10.3-5; 11.1, 3-4; 56.2-9; <i>T</i> 12.16-8; <i>Aur.</i> 30.4; <i>Tac.</i> 4.5-8; 9.1; <i>Pr.</i> 11.2-4
others to the senate	<i>C</i> 20.2-5; <i>Max.</i> 16.3-5; 26.5; <i>MB</i> 1.3-5; 2.2-8; 17.2; <i>Aur.</i> 19.1-2; 19.3-6; 41.3-14; <i>Tac.</i> 3.3-7; <i>Pr.</i> 12.1-8
by the emperor to soldiers	<i>CIA</i> 3.3-4; 13.5-10; <i>Dd.</i> 1.4-5; 2.1; 2.2-4; <i>Max.</i> 18.1-3; <i>Gd.</i> 14.1-4; <i>AS</i> 53.5-54.1-3; <i>Tac.</i> 8.5; <i>Pr.</i> 5.3
others to soldiers or people	<i>AC</i> 4.7; <i>Gd.</i> 8.1-3; <i>T</i> 8.7-13; <i>Tac.</i> 7.3; 8.4
the emperors to others	<i>Max.</i> 5.6-7; <i>AS</i> 17.4; 49.1; 57.1; 6.2-6; <i>Aur.</i> 13.2-4; 14.2-3
other	<i>Val.</i> 1.1-6; <i>T</i> 12.4-6; 12.7-8; 12.10; 12.11; 30.23; 30.23; <i>Aur.</i> 1.5-8; 14.5-7; <i>Tac.</i> 6.1-9; <i>Q</i> 10.2-3
Letters	
letters by the emperor to a family member and <i>vice versa</i>	<i>AC</i> 2.1-8; 9.7-8; 11.2-8; <i>PN</i> 3.9; <i>Dd.</i> 7.5-7; 8.5-8; 9.1; <i>Max.</i> 29.2-4; <i>Gd.</i> 14.7-8; 25.1-4; v.v: <i>AC</i> 1.6-9; 9.11-12; 10.1-10; <i>Gd.</i> 24.2-5
other letters by the emperor	<i>AC</i> 5.5-9; <i>PN</i> 4.1-3; 4.4; <i>CIA</i> 2.2-5; 7.3-6; 10.9-12; 10.6-8; 14.4-5; <i>Max.</i> 29.7; <i>Gd.</i> 13.2; <i>T</i> 3.9-11; 9.6-9; 10.10-2; 18.5-10; <i>Cl.</i> 4.6-9.2; 14.2-15; 15.1-4; 17.2-7; <i>Aur.</i> 7.5-8; 8.2-4; 9.2-7; 11.1-9; 12.1-2; 17.2-4; 23.4-5; 26.3-5; 26.7-9; 31.5-9; 38.3-4; 47.2-4; <i>Pr.</i> 4.1-2; 4.3-7; 5.5-8; 6.2-3; 6.6; 7.3-4; 10.6-7; 17.5; <i>Q</i> 8.1-10; 15.6, 7; <i>Car.</i> 4.6-7
letters by the emperor to the senate	<i>CIA</i> 12.6-13; <i>Max.</i> 12.6-10; 13.2; <i>Gd.</i> 5.3; 27.4-8; <i>T</i> 30.11; <i>Cl.</i> 7.2-5; <i>Aur.</i> 20.5-8; <i>Pr.</i> 15.1-7; <i>Car.</i> 5.2; 6.2-3
others	<i>PN</i> 11.5-6; <i>CIA</i> 4.6-7; <i>Val.</i> 1.1-6; 2.1-3; 3.1-3; <i>Cl.</i> 16.1-3; <i>Aur.</i> 41.1-2; <i>Tac.</i> 19.1-2; 19.3-5; <i>Q</i> 12.7; <i>Car.</i> 8.5-7;
letters from the senate	<i>Max.</i> 15.6-9; <i>Tac.</i> 18.2-6
Other	<i>Dd.</i> 2.10; <i>Q</i> 5.3-6 (<i>edicta</i>); <i>Max.</i> 16.1-2; <i>Gd.</i> 11.4-7; <i>T</i> 21.4; <i>Pr.</i> 11.5-9 (<i>senatus consulta</i>); <i>Q</i> 15.8 (<i>brevis</i>)

Figure 6.1: Documents in DD in the HA

The enumeration of documents is based on the listing by Lécivain (1904, 45-99), who presents the pieces in the order in which they occur in the HA. In the following paragraphs, we will explore how the documents are woven into the fabric of the historical narration, first by analysing words in the introductory remarks, then by tracing the (alleged) origin of the documents.

1) Introductory remarks

Most of the times, the author simply states *extat epistula...*, *extant litterae...*, *extat oratio...*, *extat adclamatio...*, after which the words are quoted.⁶²⁸ The author frequently uses verbs as *indo*,⁶²⁹ *insero*,⁶³⁰ *intexo* and *interpono*⁶³¹ to suggest that he quotes the documents *verbatim*.⁶³² A frequently used alternative is the verb *esse* or an elliptic formula,⁶³³ often combined with the anaphoric pronomina *haec* and *talìa*.⁶³⁴ For the same purpose, (parts of) documents are often denoted with the word *exemplum* or *capita*.⁶³⁵ In view of these introductions, there is no reason to suppose that the suggestion of literal quotation is absent in cases when the author only uses the word *verba* to present the content of a speech.⁶³⁶

2) The source of a document is explicitly mentioned

Marius Maximus is said to have quoted documents in his biographies, one of which the author uses for his own narration, the acclamations against Commodus in *C* 18.⁶³⁷ In *Gd.* 12.1, the author states to have borrowed acclamations from Iunius Cordus. At times, however, the author pretends to have direct access to public reports and senatorial archives himself, as appears from the passages treated in § 5.5.2: the *acta senatus* (*AS*

⁶²⁸ Lessing (1901-1906, 192) provides the instances: *extat epistula*: *AC* 5.4, 9.10, 14.1; *PN* 3.9; *CIA* 12.5; *Dd.* 7.1, 9.1; *Gd.* 5.2; 13.2; 24.1; *T* 9.5, 10.9; 30.4; *Cl.* 7.1; *A* 17.1; 26.2; *Pr.* 3.6; *extant epistulae*: *CIA* 10.4; *extant litterae*: *Q* 15.5, *Car.* 7.3; *extat contio*: *CIA* 3.2; *extat oratio*: *P* 2.8; *Max.* 13.2; *Gd.* 27.4; *extat adclamatio*: *Gd.* 5.6. The same holds for *extant dicta*: *Gd.* 20.6; *extant ioca*: *H* 20.8; *V* 7.4; *extant libri*: *Cc.* 4.4; *extant poemata*: *Max.* 27.6; *Gd.* 3.2; *extant versus, epigrammata, iambi*: *PN* 12.5; *OM* 7.7, 14.2, 14.4, 11.3; *Max.* 27.3; *T* 11.5. The quotation of *dicta, ioca, libri, poemata, versus, epigrammata* and *iambi* are interesting as they attest the same (alleged) activity in retrieving biographical facts and 'documents' as the longer *epistulae, litterae, contiones, orationes, acclamationes, etc.*: it just belongs to the biographer's task to uncover all these 'documents' (see the summary of the preface to *OM* in § 3.2.1).

⁶²⁹ *indo adclamationes*: *C* 18.2; *contionem*: *AS* 53.1; (*dictum*): *Max.* 28.10; *epistulam*: *CIA* 2.1; *Max.* 29.6; *Car.* 9.1; *A* 20.4; 27.1; *orationem*: *Gd.* 27.4.

⁶³⁰ *insero rem*: *H* 11.5, *A* 12.4; *litteras*: *Dd.* 8.5; *A* 41.1, *Q* 15.5; *epistulam*: *AC* 1.6; *CIA* 10.5; 14.3; *P* 15.8; *T* 10.9; *A* 8.1; *verba*: *A* 43.5; *versus*: *Dd.* 7.4.

⁶³¹ *intexo epistulam*: *Dd.* 7.2; *interpono epistulam*: *T* 9.5; see Szelest (1971, 336-7) for other expressions of the same kind.

⁶³² Cf. the author's explicit statement in *A* 8.1: *Inveni nuper (...) epistolam divi Valeriani de Aureliano principe scriptam. Ad verbum, ut decebat, inserui.* The author guarantees the authenticity of a letter in *T* 10.9: *quam (sc. epistula divi Claudii) ego repertam in authenticis inserendam putavi, fuit enim publica.* Other examples of *fides historica* in Burian 1977, 288.

⁶³³ Of the type: *item alia epistula*, see Szelest 1971, 337 and n57. If spoken words are the base of the written document, the word *dico* or *dissero* etc. are used.

⁶³⁴ Of the type: *haec verba habuit*, Szelest 1971, 336 and n43-4; *epistula talis fuit*, see Szelest 1971, 337 and n54.

⁶³⁵ E.g. *cuius epistulam hoc exemplum est*: ...; cf. *AC* 9.11, *CIA* 2.1, 3.3, 7.2, 10.9, 12.5, *Dd.* 8.4, *Max.* 13.2, 15.6, 18.1, *Gd.* 5.3, 12.2, 13.1, 13.2, 14.7, 24.1, 31.4, *A* 26.6, 27.1; *capita*: only in *OM* 6.1 and *T* 4.2 (the latter not followed by a quotation).

⁶³⁶ *P* 6.4 (*senatus consultum*), *Dd.* 2.10 (*edictum*), *AS* 56.1, *Max.* 5.4-5 (Alexander to the senate), 26.5 (Cuspidius Celerinus to the senate), 29.1 (Alexander's letter to his mother), *T* 12.3 (Ballista to the soldiers), *Cl.* 7.2 (Claudius to the senate), *A* 1.4 (Vopiscus to Iunius Tiberianus), *Tac.* 5.3 (Maecius Faltonius Nicomachus to the senate), 8.3 (Moesius Gallicanus to the soldiers), *Pr.* 5.3 (Valerianus' *contio*), *Q* 10.1 (Saturninus to his friends).

⁶³⁷ The acclamations are introduced by the words in *C* 18.1: *ipsas adclamationes de Mario Maximo indidi et sententiam senatus consulti*: In *H* 12.4 Marius Maximus is said to have quoted *verba ipsa* by Hadrian.

56.2) and the *acta urbis* (AS 6.1).⁶³⁸ The indication of sources (*acta senatus* or *urbis*) with or without intervention of a biographical source (Marius Maximus, Iunius Cordus) are elements subject to *variatio* without much value as to actual origin. We may suppose that the author pretends to have taken all the documents concerning senatorial meetings either from the mentioned *acta* or, otherwise, from another official or historiographer.⁶³⁹

This leads us to the question whether non-senatorial speeches and letters, which cannot have been found in official documents (such as the speeches in the book of the *Triginta Tyranni*) also purport to be based on written sources. Two examples. Ballista's words to the soldiers in *T* 24.1 are quoted on the authority of the evidently fictitious Maeonius Astyanax: *verba igitur Ballistae (quantum Maeonius Astyanax, qui consilio interfuit, adserit) haec fuerunt:* Maeonius Astyanax was present when the general Ballista addressed his soldiers, like Ammianus was at Julian's expedition. The same holds for Saturninus' words to his companions in *Q* 10.1 (*in haec verba disseruit*), the authenticity of which is 'confirmed' in 10.4: *Marcus Salvidienus hanc ipsius orationem vere fuisse dicit, et fuit re vera non parum litteratus. nam et in Africa rhetori operam dederat, Romae frequentaverat pergulas magistrales*. The conclusion is that also in case of speeches that were not officially reported, the author pretends to have used written documents at his disposal.⁶⁴⁰

3) *The source of a document is not mentioned*

Mostly, however, the author does not mention his sources. The reader is nevertheless invited to believe that he bases himself on written sources. When, for example, in *Gd.* 11.1 the author gives the text of a *senatus consultum*, this suggests that the document is literally quoted from senatorial proceedings found in an archive.⁶⁴¹ Interesting is the case of Zenobia's letter to Aurelian, that was translated by Nicomachus, *A* 27.6: *Hanc epistulam Nicomachus se transtulisse in Graecum ex lingua Syrorum dicit ab ipsa Zenobia dictatam. nam illa superior Aureliani Graeca missa est*. Obviously, the author likes to shift responsibility for the content of documents to invented intermediaries, which resembles the author's tactics when quoting poetry (see § 5.3.1).

⁶³⁸ The sources used for the discovery of documents are sometimes indicated: apart from the *acta senatus*, the *urbis* and the *acta senatus ac populi* (*Pr.* 2.1) and the biographers Maximus and Cordus (treated above), the author in the preface to *A* states to have made use of the *libri lintei* in the *Ulpia Bibliotheca* (*A* 1.8-10, cf. Paschoud (1996, 66-7), who calls it 'pure affabulation') This library also occurs in *A* 8.1, 24.7; *Tac.* 8.1, *Pr.* 2.1, *Car.* 11.3.). Peter (1892, 164-6) was already distrustful with regard to the authenticity of the author's sources, just as the great majority of scholars in the twentieth century (see especially Homo 1926, 195: 'nécessité est de conclure que ces pseudo-documents ont jamais existé comme tels et que les biographes de l'Histoire Auguste les ont fabriqués de toutes pièces').

⁶³⁹ Other documents originating from Cordus: *CIA* 7.2; *Dd.* 9.2; *Max.* 12.5-8; *Gd.* 14.6-7. Other pseudo-authorities: Lollius Urbicus in *Dd.* 9.2, Acholius (*magister admissionum*) in *A* 12.4, Nicomachus in *A* 27.6 (see below). Much debate has been devoted to Hadrian's letter to Servianus in *Q* 8, quoted on the authority of Phlegon, who is an historical person, whereas the works the author states to quote from most probably never existed (see comm. Paschoud 2001, 242-7). Peter (1892, 188-9) already doubted the letter's authenticity.

⁶⁴⁰ Homo (1926, 192-6) divides the documents into two categories (documents based on other historiographers, documents based on archives) and concludes that 'Les documents de l'Histoire Auguste sont donc apocryphes et ont été composés par les auteurs des biographies eux-mêmes'.

⁶⁴¹ *Gd.* 11.1: *Interest, ut senatus consultum (...) litteris propagetur*.

The author seems to challenge his own claim of using written sources in *Cl.* 7.1: *extat ipsius epistola missa ad senatum legenda ad populum, qua indicat de numero barbarorum, quae talis est: 'senatui populoque Romano Claudius princeps.'* (*hanc autem ipse dictasse perhibetur, ego verba magistri memoriae non requiro*), etc. Contrary to the reader's expectations, the author states that he has *not* made use of a written document, even though there was one by the hand of the *magister memoriae*. This is a special kind of *variatio* which is in line with the author's tricks and can be styled *inversio*. After the introduction, the emperor Claudius makes an appeal on *veritas* when he mentions the number of 320.000 barbarians invading the Roman territory. The combination of themes (the insertion of documents and the historiographer's claim to *veritas*) are wittily combined here.

4) A document is mentioned but not quoted

The author likes to suggest that he only uses a small part of all the documents he knows. In the case of Marius Maximus, he only quotes the taunts against Commodus in *C* 18, but there are more documents to be found in this source. Three of them the author of the *HA* omits, two imperial speeches in *MA* 25.10 and *P* 2.8, and a letter in *P* 15.8.⁶⁴² The last one of these is not quoted for reasons of length: *quam ego inseri ob nimiam longitudinem nolui*. In *Tac.* 19.6, the author heaves a sigh about the host of documents he has: *Longum est omnes epistulas conectere, quas repperi, quas legi*. If verses may be brought under the same heading as written documents, there is also the case of a lost document in *OM* 14, where the author states that the verses were lost in the rebellion that made and end to Macrinus' life.⁶⁴³ There are more references to Greek originals of verses quoted in Latin: *PN* 8.1, 8.4, 8.6, 12.5, *OM* 11.3, *Dd.* 7.4, *T* 11.5.⁶⁴⁴ The commentary after the last passages is illuminating: *hos ego versus a quodam grammatico translatos ita posui, ut fidem servarem, non quo non melius potuerint transferri, sed ut fidelitas historica servaretur, quam ego prae ceteris custodiendam putavi, qui quod ad eloquentiam pertinet nihil curo*. Here, the principle of *fidelitas historica* is applied to verses, which puts them on a par with other documents. Apart from *fidelitas historica*, the quotation of verses (based on an inscription), a combination of an intermediate person (*quidam grammaticus*) and the theme of *eloquentia* crops up. The cumulation of recurring literary forms and figures takes a great flight in *LL*. Finally, attention should be drawn to the lost Greek verses by Hadrian, *H* 25.9: *tales autem nec multo meliores fecit et Graecos*. There is no reason to doubt that Hadrian wrote verses in Greek that are not quoted in the *HA*. To the question of the authenticity of the Latin version *Animula vagula blandula*, a separate chapter will be devoted (chapter 7). It is a safe guess that the quotation of this poem, including its accompanying remarks, provided the idea of inserting more verses in the biographies.

⁶⁴² *MA* 25.10: *seditiosos autem eos et oratio Marci indicat indita a Mario Maximo, qua ille usus est apud amicos*; *P* 2.8: *extat oratio apud Marium Maximum laudes eius continens et omnia, vel quae fecit vel quae perpersus est*; *P* 15.8: *horruisse autem illum imperium epistula docet, quae vitae illius a Mario Maximo apposita est*.

⁶⁴³ *P* 15.8: *horruisse autem illum imperium epistula docet, quae vitae illius a Mario Maximo apposita est. Quam ego inseri ob nimiam longitudinem nolui*; *OM* 14.4-5: *quod cum Macrinus audisset, fecit iambos, qui non extant; [...]. Qui quidem perierunt in eo tumultu, in quo ipse occisus est, ...*

⁶⁴⁴ A variation on the theme is *Max.* 27.4, in which the Latin original is quoted, unlike the Greek translation.

5) Other variations

5a) The inversion of a document

An interesting case is the so-called *senatus consultum tacitum* in *Gd.* 12.1-4.⁶⁴⁵ On a stylistic level, such a meeting seems a case of *inversio* of the *senatus consultum* in the first place: while normally the author is quite prepared to cite senatorial documents (such as the *senatus consultum* in *Gd.* 12.1-10 and the one in *Max.* 26.2-4), this time he is deliberately enigmatic. It is not surprising that Iunius Cordus is invoked as a source, whose presence should always make the reader attentive (§ 3.2.2). The author gives a lengthy description of the phenomenon (although he says '*brevi exponam*'), which ends with the words: *senatus consultum tacitum fieret, ita ut non scribae, non servi publici, non censuales illis actibus interessent, senatores exciperent, senatores omnium officia censualium scribarumque conplerent, ne quid forte proderetur*. By using this description, the author wishes to confirm that he normally extracts his information on senate's meetings from the official reports, with or without an intermediate person, but that in this specific case, this procedure is not possible.

5b) A document in Indirect Discourse

The only speech in ID, by a senator called Aurelius Victor, is introduced with the words *verba denique Aurelii Victoris (...) haec fuerunt:* These words, too, are purportedly taken from the *acta senatus*, as the speech is situated during a meeting of the senate after Elagabalus' death. The words that follow are utterly confusing, *OM* 4.5: *sed et haec dubia ponuntur, et alia dicuntur ab aliis, quae ipsa quoque non tacebimus*, as the author silently passes from the senate's meeting to a discussion about sources. That the senator at issue bears the name of a fourth century historian, immediately followed by a certain Festus (*OM* 4.4) who bears the name of another fourth-century author, makes the case even more disturbing.⁶⁴⁶

It is clear that in all the instances of DD, the author of the *HA* seeks to provide documentary evidence for his biographies. In this respect, no difference needs to be made between documents such as abstracts from the *acta senatus* or *acta urbis*, and letters, *contiones* or other official documents.⁶⁴⁷ This practice is meant to enhance the *fides historica* of his narration,⁶⁴⁸ and pretends, in contrast with normal historiographical

⁶⁴⁵ Kolb (1972, 21-2) supposes that a *s.c. tacitum* is a transposition of a *s.c. ultimum*, for which Herodian 7.10.3 served as a source. Chastagnol (1994, 716n2) calls on the phenomenon of meetings of the senate with closed doors (like those in *Cic. Phil.* 2.44.112 and 5.7.18), and mentions such a meeting after Maximinus' death (Herod. 7.10.5). See also Béranger 1986, 38-42.

⁶⁴⁶ See Turcan 1993, 122-3 and Chastagnol 1994, 454 and n1.

⁶⁴⁷ The use of *acta urbis* and *acta senatus* in the *HA* is explained in § 5.5.2.

⁶⁴⁸ Cf. *A* 20.4: *nam ipsam* (i.e. *epistula Aureliani*) *quoque indidi ad fidem rerum*; *A* 13.1: *quam* (sc. *rem*) *fidei causa* *inserendam credidi ex libris Acholi* and *A* 17.1: *extat epistula, quam ego, ut soleo, fidei causa, immo ut alios annalium scriptores fecisse video, inserendam putavi*. The emphasis on *fides* especially (though not exclusively, e.g. *T* 33.8: *da nunc cuivis libellum non tam diserte quam fideliter scriptum*) occurs in Aurelianus' biography, with its programmatic preface; see Burian (1977, 296) for a list of documents and their introductions.

practice, that the words of which the speeches consist have been literally uttered (either written or spoken).⁶⁴⁹ An emperor's letter, an *oratio* in the senate or a *contio* to the troops: we are asked to believe that they all have been retrieved from the *arcana historiae* (as the author puts it in *T* 31.11) in the way they are presented.⁶⁵⁰ This biographical practice is in the tradition of Suetonius, who cites *verbatim*, e.g. Caesar's speech about his aunt Julia in Suetonius' *Div. Iul.* 6.1,⁶⁵¹ or letters to the emperor or by the emperor, or other persons.⁶⁵² It is interesting to compare Suetonius' introduction to Caesar's letters (*Div. Iul.* 56.6): *Epistulae quoque eius ad senatum extant (...). Exstant et ad Ciceronem...* Suetonius suggests that he had access to private, though published letters, from which he cites *exempla* and *capita*.⁶⁵³ Suetonius' predecessor in biography Nepos already emphasised the importance of letters for the biographer, cf. *Att.* 16.3-4 about Cicero's letters, in which Cicero attests of his love for Atticus: *ei rei sunt indicio praeter eos libros, in quibus de eo facit mentionem, qui in vulgus sunt editi, undecim volumina epistularum, ab consulatu eius usque ad extremum tempus ad Atticum missarum: quae qui legat, non multum desideret historiam contextam eorum temporum. sic enim omnia de studiis principum, vitiis ducum, mutationibus rei publicae perscripta sunt, ut nihil in eis non appareat et facile existimari possit, prudentiam quodam modo esse divinationem.* The lesson comprised in the passage (especially *omnia de studiis principum, vitiis ducum, mutationibus rei publicae*) seems particularly applicable to the *HA*. Nepos himself, however, does not quote documents in the same extent as his successors, and is not as outspoken in adhering to literal quotation.⁶⁵⁴

⁶⁴⁹ In recent theory, the idea has been left that *oratio recta* renders the words with a maximum of authenticity or reliability, as if they have been uttered *verbatim*. Laird (1999, 110-1) differs on this point from Genette (1980, 170-1), who states that imitated discourse (the equivalent of direct discourse) suggests 'literary fidelity' and 'documentary autonomy' more than utterances in indirect style. In fact, this is only the case when written texts are 'excerpted and recontextualized' (to use Laird's words: 1999, 112), which is what the author of the *HA* pretends to do. This is not the place to elaborate on the relation between quotation and literal representation of *ipsa verba*; for a discussion of this field of research Beck's bibliographical references in her article about direct speech in the *Iliad* (2008, 162-5) may be consulted.

⁶⁵⁰ Zecchini's definition (1997, 266) is as adequate as it is useful: 'questi *arcana historiae* vogliono significare una tradizione storiografica consolidata e stereotipa, ma ormai abbastanza misteriosa nelle sue origini, come appunto si è appena osservato'.

⁶⁵¹ It is clear that from this speech Suetonius only quotes the relevant part concerning the origin of Caesar's family, in which Caesar emphasises his divine ancestry. This speech, therefore, is not inserted in the narration *suo iure*, but serves to support the research after Caesar's family, especially with a view to Caesar's future position as a dictator (Gascou 1984, 548 and 583). Other letters, like those by Augustus in *Aug.* 71.2-4, are meant to illustrate remarks made in the narration, and because they are written by the emperor's own hand (*autographa quadam epistula*, 71.2).

⁶⁵² Cf. Gascou (1984, 498-505) about Suetonius' use of documents.

⁶⁵³ Also Aulus Gellius quotes from letters by and to Augustus, one of which is introduced as follows (*NA* 15.7): *...exemplum adpositum epistulae divi Augusti ad Gaium filium*. Gascou (1984, 501) states that these letters are probably taken from a collection of *epistulae ad Gaium*. Other introductions in Suetonius are *Tib.* 21.6: *ex quibus (sc. epistulis) in exemplum pauca hinc inde subieci* and *Div. Claud.* 3.6: *...capita ex ipsius (sc. Augusti) epistulis posui...*; *Tib.* 67.3: *quod sane ex oratione eius, quam de utraque re habuit, colligi potest*.

⁶⁵⁴ Quotations by Nepos are encountered in *Paus.* 2.3-4, introduced with the words: *litteras regi...in quibus haec fuisse scripta Thucydides memoriae prodidit: ...*; and *Them.* 9.2-4: *Is autem ait ad Artaxerxen eum venisse et his verbis epistulam mississe: ...*. These letters concern adaptations from *Thuc.* 1.137 and 1.128 (Horsfall 1987, 233); Nepos, of course, did not have the originals at his disposal. Nepos' version of the letter by Cornelia, mother to the Gracchi, is probably slightly adapted from a model (see Horsfall 1989, 41-

The convention in historiography is that speeches in DD render words as they might have been spoken, whereas the author of the *HA* leaves no room to the reader who might think that the author constructed the speech himself on the basis of either an existing speech⁶⁵⁵ or when the narrative provides the occasion for the addition of a speech (e.g. the adhortative speech at the beginning of a battle).⁶⁵⁶ In the meantime, the author adds the speeches to his narration for specific reasons: the content of the speeches most often corresponds with the content of the historical narration, thus serving to enhance the claims made in the narration.⁶⁵⁷ Often, the author introduces a speech with a suggestion to the reader what the essential point of his document is, for which the verb *indico* is often used.⁶⁵⁸ Examples of supporting documents are the letters written by emperors in order to recommend their successors, which particularly happens in LL. These documents can be considered as ‘references’ about the quality of the next emperor in the time that he was still *privatus*.⁶⁵⁹ The letters support the idea expressed in *Hel.* 34.4, as voiced by Diocletian: *Imperatorem esse fortunae est*, an idea that was also elaborated by Pliny in his *Panegyricus* in the case of Trajan as *privatus* under Nerva.⁶⁶⁰ Before analysing one particular speech in detail, from which a conclusion about the author’s use of passages in DD will be drawn, first the NS that the speeches occupy, in comparison with prefaces and the NA theme, will be mapped.

6.3 Narrative Space of Prefaces, Documents and the NA Theme

In the following scheme, the documents in the *HA* are listed in combination with the NS that they take up, their frequency in the individual lives, their average length in words

2: ‘If Nepos’ ultimate originals were by Cornelia, they have been altered very discreetly; if they were not, then the author was very nearly a contemporary’). With regard to quoting literally, Horsfall (1987, 232) further remarks that ‘for the antiquarian or grammarian, Varro or Asconius, exact citation was essential and perfectly normal and the humble biographer may always have felt less stylistic disdain for quoted material than the lofty historian’.

⁶⁵⁵ A famous example is Tacitus’ report of Claudius’ decree concerning the admission of Gallic senators in *Ann.* 11.24, the content of which can be compared with the bronze tablet from Lyons (*ILS* 212): Leeman 1963, 353-5; Fornara 1983, 153; Horsfall 1989, 41; Marincola 2007, 129.

⁶⁵⁶ Marincola 2007, 128. Marincola (2007, 120) gives several examples of speeches written by the historiographer on the eventual basis of small historiographical evidence. ‘He is said to have spoken in this manner: ...’ is a stereotype introduction in such instances. Marincola observes that only in the case of short expressions or *dicta* words are said to be quoted *verbatim*.

⁶⁵⁷ See Szelest 1971, 326 (‘Zweckmässigkeit’); Den Hengst 1987.

⁶⁵⁸ *oratio indicat*: *MA* 25.10, *T* 30.12, *Car.* 5.1; *epistula(e) indica(n)t*: *AC* 1.6, 14.8, *CIA* 11.1, *Dd.* 8.1, *Cl.* 7.1, *A* 8.5, *Car.* 4.5, 6.2; *litterae indicant*: *A* 31.10, 11.10, *edictum indicat*: *Dd.* 2.9. The verb *appareo* is often used after an anecdote has been reported or after a *dictum* is quoted (e.g. *Ael.* 4.6, *PN* 4.8, *CIA* 12.13, *Gd.* 5.4, *S* 12.8 e.a.), only related to an *epistula* in *Dd.* 8.9.

⁶⁵⁹ E.g. *Cl.* 17.2-7 (Gallienus about Claudius), *A* 8.2-4, 9.2-7, 13.2-4 (Valerianus about Aurelian), 11.1-9 (Valerian to Aurelian), 17.2-4 (Claudius to Aurelian), *Pr.* 5.3 (Valerian about Probus), 5.5-8 (Valerian to Probus), 6.6 (Aurelian to Probus), 7.3-4 (Tacitus to Probus); *Car.* 6.2-3 (Probus about Carus). Cf. *PN* 4.8: Septimius’ judgement about Pescennius (*unde* (sc. Severus’ autobiography) *apparet, quod etiam Severi de Pescennio iudicium fuerit*) and *Ael.* 4.6 for Hadrian’s judgment about his destined successor *Aelius*.

⁶⁶⁰ Plin. *Pan.* 7.1: *sub bono principe privatus esse desiisti. Iam Caesar, iam imperator, iam Germanicus, absens et ignarus, et post tanta nomina, quantum ad te pertinet, privatus* and 9.4: *Magnum videretur, si dicerem: ‘Nescisti te imperatorem futurum’: eras imperator, et esse te nesciebas*. See Béranger 1985 on the future emperor’s role of *privatus*.

and the space that they occupy in relation to the book as a whole, in accordance with the three different parts in which the *HA* can be divided, in absolute and relative numbers (on the basis of figure 6.1):

Primary Lives

Books	Words	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>H</i>	5.124				
<i>AP</i>	2.245				
<i>MA</i>	5.500				
<i>V</i>	2.057	42			42
<i>C</i>	3.466		342		342
<i>P</i>	2.596				
<i>DI</i>	1.594				
<i>S</i>	4.215			131	131
<i>Cc.</i>	2.033			48	48
Total	28.830	42	342	179	563

Books	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>H</i>				
<i>AP</i>				
<i>MA</i>				
<i>V</i>	2,0%			2,0%
<i>C</i>		9,9%		9,9%
<i>P</i>				
<i>DI</i>				
<i>S</i>			3,1%	3,1%
<i>Cc.</i>			2,4%	2,4%
Total	0,1%	1,2%	0,6%	2,0%

Secondary Lives

Books	Words	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>Ael.</i>	1.433	92			92
<i>AC</i>	2.620		1.114		1.114
<i>PN</i>	2.274	64	201		265
<i>ClA</i>	2.706		855		855
<i>G</i>	1.231	56		213	269
Total	10.264	212	2.170	213	2.595

Books	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>Ael.</i>	6,4%			6,4%
<i>AC</i>		42,5%		42,5%
<i>PN</i>	2,8%	8,8%		11,7%
<i>ClA</i>		31,6%		31,6%
<i>G</i>	4,5%		17,3%	21,9%
Total	2,1%	21,1%	2,1%	25,3%

Intermediate Lives

Books	Words	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>OM</i>	2.495	177	234	584	995
<i>Dd.</i>	1.679	36	443	999	1.478
<i>Hel.</i>	5.782	89		287	376
<i>AS</i>	10.701		1.327	799	2.126
<i>Max.</i>	5.431	73	715		788
<i>Gd.</i>	5.563	87	759	153	999
<i>MB</i>	3.153		557		557
Total	34.804	462	4.035	2.822	7.319

Books	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>OM</i>	7,1%	9,4%	23,4%	39,9%
<i>Dd.</i>	2,1%	26,4%	59,5%	88,0%
<i>Hel.</i>	1,5%		5,0%	6,5%
<i>AS</i>		12,4%	7,5%	19,9%
<i>Max.</i>	1,3%	13,2%		14,5%
<i>Gd.</i>	1,6%	13,6%	2,8%	18,0%
<i>MB</i>		17,7%		17,7%
Total	1,3%	11,6%	8,1%	21,0%

Later Lives

Books	Words	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>Val.</i>	1.003		530		530
<i>Gall.</i>	3.647				
<i>T</i>	6.637	131	1.040		1.171
<i>Cl.</i>	2.979	494	984		1.478
<i>A</i>	7.803	352	2.246		2.598
<i>Tac.</i>	3.094	403	1.004		1.407
<i>Pr.</i>	4.136	401	1.053		1.454
<i>Q</i>	2.333	311	518		829
<i>Car.</i>	2.751	442	220		662
Total	34.383	2.534	7.595		10.129

Books	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
<i>Val.</i>		52,8%		52,8%
<i>Gall.</i>				
<i>T</i>	2,0%	15,7%		17,6%
<i>Cl.</i>	16,6%	33,0%		49,6%
<i>A</i>	4,5%	28,8%		33,3%
<i>Tac.</i>	13,0%	32,4%		45,5%
<i>Pr.</i>	9,7%	25,5%		35,2%
<i>Q</i>	13,3%	22,2%		35,5%
<i>Car.</i>	16,1%	8,0%		24,1%
Total	7,4%	22,1%		29,5%

Total

Books	Words	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
Σ	108.281	3.250	14.142	3.214	20.606

Books	pref	doc.	NA.	Σ
%	3,0%	13,1%	3,0%	19,0%

Figure 6.2: NS of three kinds of passages (prefaces, the NA theme and documents) in PL, SL, IL and LL, in absolute and relative numbers.

When we compare the three parts, we can observe the following characteristics with regard to NS and distribution of documents: in EL, only *C* contains two documents that belong to the longest of the entire *HA*: the *damnatio memoriae* of Commodus.⁶⁶¹ The Secondary Lives of *AC*, *PN* and *CIA* contain documents, in contrast with the Secondary Lives of the *fili imperatorum*, *Ael.* and *G.* In IL, only *Hel.* lacks documents, and in LL only *Gall.* has none. Comparing these three sections, we can say that the speeches conspicuously increase in number (27 – 41 – 86), while they do not really increase in length (93-98-88 words on average), and that SL corresponds with LL in terms of NS: in both cases, more than twenty percent of the total narrative.

In EL and IL, the presence of documents and the presence of the *NA* theme seems to exclude one another. By way of comparison, the lives with prefaces are also inventoried:

	<i>AC</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>CIA</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>Cc.</i>		<i>OM</i>	<i>Dd.</i>	<i>Hel.</i>	<i>AS</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>Gd.</i>	<i>MB</i>
<i>NA</i>					x	x		x	x	x	X		x	x
doc.	x	x	x	x				x	x		X	x	x	x
pref.			x					x	x	x		x	x	

Figure 6.3: The lives containing documents in EL and IL of the *HA* and the proliferation of the *NA* theme and prefaces (PL in bold face)

It is striking that the Secondary Lives of usurpers (*AC*, *PN* and *CIA*) stand out by the presence of documents, while the *NA* theme is absent. If the *NA* theme was indeed added during the last redaction of the *HA*, this suggests that the documents belong to an earlier stage. Furthermore, the difference with the Primary Lives is striking. These seem to be treated differently by the author than the Secondary Lives when it comes to documents. In EL, prefaces turn out to be characteristic of the Secondary Lives of *fili imperatorum* (*Ael.*, *G.*), a procedure which is continued in those Intermediary Lives that contain all kinds of descriptions (prefaces, *NA* theme and documents).

As we can observe in table 6.2, the very low number words devoted to prefaces, *NA* theme and documents sets PL apart from SL, IL and LL. We will have a closer look to this important fact. The relative NS occupied by the three recurring passages are presented in the following table:

⁶⁶¹ The acclamations in this passages have long been considered authentic, see e.g. Nesselhauf (1966, 133 and n13), who keeps open the possibility that they have been altered in a process of copying from the *acta senatus* and compilation. Following Nesselhauf, Syme (1971, 117) and Barnes (1978, 102), just as Szelest (1971, 325), accept the accuracy of the author's remark that he took the acclamations from Marius Maximus, who is said to quote documents at length (cf. e.g. *P* 2.8, 15.8). Heer (1904, 198-201) attempts to prove the authenticity of the documents in *C* 18-20.

	<i>Pref.</i>	<i>Doc.</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
PL	0,1%	1,2%	0,6%	2,0%
SL	2,1%	21,0%	2,0%	25,0%
IL	1,3%	12,0%	8,0%	21,0%
LL	7,4%	22,0%	0,0%	30,0%
T	3,0%	13,0%	3,0%	19,0%

Figure 6.4: Relative NS of prefaces, documents and NA theme in PL, SL, IL and LL, related to the total of NS of PL, SL, IL and LL (based on figure 6.2).

When we put these results in a bar diagram, the following picture occurs:

Figure 6.5: Bar diagram of the relative NS of prefaces, documents and NA theme in PL, SL, IL and LL and the entire HA (T), related to the total of NS of PL, SL, IL and LL (based on figure 10.1).

It appears that there is a correlation between SL and LL in terms of NS of documents (21 and 22 per cent respectively), while the NA theme is characteristic for IL and prefaces are characteristic of LL, at least quantitatively. PL stands alone viewed in terms of prefaces, documents and the NA theme.

In order to obtain a picture of the structure of the total HA when it comes to prefaces, documents and the NA theme, the presence of these items in the individual books may be measured. Firstly, we will provide the relative size of the individual books in relation to the entire HA (based on the numbers in figure 3.4), which will enable us to show the size of the books in relation to one another, and to place the relative NS of the

three investigated passages in a diagram. The relative size of the books of the *HA* related to the entire NS of the *HA* are as follows:

	PL	SL	IL		LL	
Book	Space	Space	Book	Space	Book	Space
H	4.7 %		OM	2.3 %	Val.	0.9 %
Ael.		1.3 %	Dd.	1.6 %	Gall.	3.4 %
AP	2.1 %		Hel.	5.3 %	T	6.1 %
MA	5.1 %		AS	9.9 %	Cl.	2.8 %
V	1.9 %		Max.	5.0 %	A	7.2 %
AC			Gd.	5.1 %	Tac.	2.9 %
C	3.2 %		MB	2.9 %	Pr.	3.8 %
P	2.4 %				Q	2.2 %
DI	1.5 %				Car.	2.5 %
S	3.9 %					
PN						
CIA						
Cc.	1.9 %					
G		1.1 %				
Total	26.6 %	9.5 %				
Total	EL 36.1 %		32.1 %		31.8 %	

Figure 6.6: NS of the thirty books of the *HA* and of the parts of *PL*, *SL*, *IL* and *LL* in relative numbers (in proportion to the entire NS in the *HA*).

The outcome of the measurement is that the parts of *IL* and *LL* are more or less equal in NS, while *PL* and above all *SL* stay behind. This leads us to an overview of all the treated kinds of passages in the *HA*, see the following diagram:⁶⁶²

⁶⁶² In *OM*, *Dd.* and especially *AS* there is an overlap between the category of *NA* passages and documents, because the *NA* theme appears in the guise of documents here. The upper light shade indicates the overlap.

Figure 6.7: Proportions of narrative space of prefaces, NA theme and documents in the HA in the individual books.

6.4 A Document in Direct Discourse (OM 6)

6.4.1 Macrinus' Letter to the Senate

The next paragraphs will focus on the author's pretended use of sources in *OM*, which will reveal how the author claims to be working from several sources, even though there is an evident lack of material.⁶⁶³ The passages that illustrate the author's *modus operandi* are taken from *OM* 6, which describes a session of the senate after Caracalla's death. The passage contains striking examples of *inventio*. Although Macrinus' and Diadumenian's lives are the first two of *IL*, they seem to continue the program that is found in *EL*: an emperor and his son treated in separate books. Facts about the life of Diadumenian as co-ruler with his father Macrinus, are largely taken from the preceding biography (see § 2.2), which in its turn borrows the more reliable part of its information from the preceding life of Caracalla. Not only historical facts, but also addresses in *DD* are strongly linked in *OM* and *Dd*, as will be shown. The first two chapters of *Dd*. contain a variety of such speeches: Macrinus' *contiones* (*Dd*. 2.4-5, 2.1) and Diadumenian's *contio* (*Dd*. 2.2-4), *acclamationes* by the soldiers (*Dd*. 2.6-8) and an *edictum* (2.10). *OM*, on the other hand, does not contain the same number of speeches, but has a far more elaborate speech or rather a letter by Macrinus that was read out to the senate in Rome after his acclamation as emperor by the soldiers in the east. We look more closely at the documents in these two biographies in order to describe the documents in their historiographical context and determine the mutual relationships of the documents. Such a close study enables us to see how the author proceeds when inventing sources to embellish his narration and to augment the *fides historica* of his biographies.

Macrinus' elaborate speech to the senate in *OM* 6 shows a clear structure. It begins with a *captatio benevolentiae* towards the addressees, which contains praise for the deceased emperor Caracalla. Next, the contents of the *oratio* are set out by the figure of *divisio*: *nuntiamus primum...*, *dein ...decernimus...* (6.3-4), corresponding with 6.5-7 (*quid de nobis exercitus fecerit*) and 6.8-9 (*honores divinos...decernimus ei viro*)⁶⁶⁴ respectively. While the introduction with its *divisio* seems to announce perfectly what the letter to the senate contains, there is an incongruency in the author's suggestion that the original letter had been much longer: the chapters 6.5, 6.6 and 6.8 are introduced by *et infra*, *item infra* and *item infra*. It is striking that the first few sentences are coordinated by clauses opening with words like *tunc demum* (6.2), *verum quia id* (6.2), *primum...dein* (6.3), (and *quae omnia* further on in 6.9), whereas such coordinators are absent from the sentences that are introduced by *infra*. This means that the author either left these coordinators out when citing from a longer speech, or that they were never present, which is the most probable interpretation: the fragments were invented by the author *as fragments*. The author suggests that the speech he quotes from is longer in reality, but

⁶⁶³ *OM* 6: Hönn 1911, 106, 139, 161, 233, 237, 240; Callu 1992, XLI; Béranger 1976, 31n15, Den Hengst 1987.

⁶⁶⁴ Mind the verbal repetition 6.4 *divinos honores* - 6.8 *honores divinos*. Another example of repetitio is 6.5 *imperatorio more* - 6.8 *imperatorio iure*.

that he only presents the main points. The *infra*-clauses serve to suggest that the author confines himself to the purpose of his writing, namely the rendering of *memoratu digna*, and that he presents a selection to the reader.⁶⁶⁵ In other words, the author suggests that TS is longer than TN by pretending to apply the figure of ‘ellipsis’, or skipping parts of the story in the narrative.⁶⁶⁶

The first word of the speech, the irrealis *vellemus*, immediately takes the reader to a desirable situation which does not exist in reality, namely that the sender of the letter Macrinus should return to Rome with the triumphant emperor Caracalla. For reasons of time (the emperor is now dead) and place (Macrinus is in Antiochia), this is not possible: the author of the *oratio* is not present, but speaks to the senate by means of a letter. In speech theory, this kind of message is styled a ‘delivery speech’ (in which an intermediate figure delivers the speech to the addressee), a type of speech which is distinguished from an ‘instruction speech’ or ‘dictation speech’, in which the sender speaks to an intermediate figure.⁶⁶⁷ These two kinds of speeches agree with one another in that they are rendered without immediate physical proximity of their originator.⁶⁶⁸ From Cassius Dio (79.16.4-5) we learn that a letter from the emperor was read out by a *quaestor*, which is not expressed explicitly here (with the introduction *capita ex oratione Macrini et Diadumeni*... the author suggests that he quotes from a source at his disposal), but with the conclusion *lectis in senatu litteris*, (compare Cassius Dio’s τῆς δ’ οὖν πρώτης ἐπιστολῆς ἀναγνωσθείσης ..., 79.17.1-3) it is clear that the letter is supposed to be part of the historical narration. Herodian also mentions a letter in 5.1.1: γενόμενος δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἀντιοχείᾳ ὁ Μακρίνος ἐπιστέλλει τῷ τε δήμῳ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῇ συγκλήτῳ, λέγων τοιάδε: ..., be it that tone and contents are in clear contrast to the words as rendered by the author of the *HA*. In Herodian’s version of the letter, Macrinus is very negative about his predecessor Caracalla. According to Cassius Dio, Macrinus is silent on his predecessor.⁶⁶⁹ For the author of the *HA*, neither Herodian’s negative view nor Dio’s neutral position is opportune, because that would destroy the image of Macrinus’ hypocrisy in attempting to hide his responsibility for Caracalla’s death.

⁶⁶⁵ See for the same procedure AS 9.1, 9.4. Suetonius uses *item* in *Div. Iul.* 80.1; cf. *Div. Cl.* 3.2: *Capita ex ipsius epistulis posui*; 4.4: *rursus alteris litteris*...; 4.5: *item tertiis litteris*...

⁶⁶⁶ ‘Ellipsis’: one of the four movements described by Genette 1980, 93-5, see § 1.3.5. The author also uses this figure in *Tac.* 8.4-5 (*post hoc... post hoc...*); 9.1-6 (*post hoc ... in eadem oratione ... in eadem oratione ... in eadem oratione ... addidit ... in eadem oratione... fertur denique dixisse*). It is interesting to see that the ellipsis is not explicit in *post hoc* and *addidit*, but it is in *in eadem oratione*: the author is conscious that there is a discrepancy between the suggestion of ellipsis and historical reality.

⁶⁶⁷ ‘Instruction speech’: De Jong 2004², 180-5; ‘dictation speech’: Laird 1999, 262.

⁶⁶⁸ An example of an instruction-speech is *Aur.* 27, a letter dictated by Zenobia and translated by Nicomachus, see above. Another example of a delivery-speech is found in *Dd.* 2.10 in the form of an edict: *vellem, Quirites, iam praesentes essemus...*, which is an echo of the current speech.

⁶⁶⁹ (79.17.1-3): τῆς δ’ οὖν πρώτης ἐπιστολῆς ἀναγνωσθείσης (...). τοῦ μέντοι Ταραύτου οὐδεμίαν μνείαν οὐτ’ ἐντιμον τότε γε οὐτ’ ἀτιμον ποιήσατο, πλὴν καθ’ ὅσον αὐτοκράτορα αὐτὸν ὠνόμασεν· οὐτε γὰρ ἥρωα οὐτε πολέμιον ἀποδείξει ἐτόλμησεν, ὥς μὲν ἐγὼ δοκῶ, ὅτι τὸ μὲν διὰ τε τὰ πραχθέντα αὐτῷ καὶ διὰ τὸ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων μῖσος, τὸ δὲ διὰ τοὺς στρατιώτας ὥκνησε πρᾶξαι, ὥς δὲ τινες ὑπώπτευσαν, ὅτι τῆς τε γερούσιας καὶ τοῦ δήμου τὴν ἀτιμίαν αὐτοῦ ἔργον γενέσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ἑαυτοῦ, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν ὄντος, ἠθέλησε.

Before turning to the relation of the speech and its context, one striking feature should be noted: whereas all the elements in the speech are announced in the *divisio* beginning with *nuntiamus primum...* (6.3), only the paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7, in which the *nomen Antoninorum* is granted to Diadumenian by the soldiers, are not explicitly covered by this announcement.⁶⁷⁰ We have already seen that the *NA* theme has only loose connections with its context, which is confirmed by the announcement in *OM* 6.3: the paragraphs 6.6-7 must have been added in second instance (see § 5.6.5).

6.4.2 Embedding in the Immediate Context

There is an elaborate introduction to the letter, in which repetition is a very prominent feature. Many of the essential elements of 5.9 recur in 6.1, which becomes clear from the following scheme (all clauses are in *OM* 5.9, unless differently indicated):

<i>Repetition in the introduction</i>			<i>References to the oratio</i>
1	<i>Litteras</i>	<i>oratio</i> (6.1) <i>capita ex oratione</i> (6.2)	
2	<i>ad senatum deinde litteras misit</i>	<i>cum ad senatum scriberet</i>	6.2 <i>p.c.</i> , passim
3	<i>de morte antonini</i>	<i>de caede illius / sceleri suo</i>	6.2 <i>Antonino nostro</i> , passim
4	<i>excusansque se</i>	<i>qua se excusavit</i> (6.1)	6.4 <i>ultorem caedis Bassiani / Vindicandam factionem</i>
5	<i>Periurium</i>	<i>sacrilegium</i> (6.1)	6.4 <i>in cuius vera iuravimus</i>
6	<i>a quo incipere decuit</i>	<i>a quo initium sumpsit</i> (6.1)	
7	<i>more hominum perditorum</i>	<i>impudentia hominis</i> (6.1)	
8	<i>hominem improbum</i>	<i>improbus imperator</i> (6.1)	

Figure 6.4: Comparison between the introduction to Macrinus' oratio to the senate (*OM* 5.9-6.1) and the content of the oratio (*OM* 6.2-9)

One of the two items that are essential in the *oratio* itself, namely *divinos honores decernimus* and *OM* 6.8, here referred to as *divum illum appellans*, is not stated in the introduction, whereas far less important clauses as *a quo incipere decuit* is reformulated as *a quo initium sumpsit*. The other dominant theme, *quid de nobis exercitus fecerit* (*OM* 6.3) is introduced with no ground-work at all. Other themes are clearly attributable to the author of the *HA*, such as *periurium*, *sacrilegium*, *impudentia* and *improbitas*. The emphasis in the introduction is not on the content of the letter, but on the author's own prejudicial comments. What we can conclude from the comparison of the letter and its immediate context is that there is a high degree of coherence between the two in terms of content as well as style (verbal repetition). In his introduction the author refers to the content of the letter, which is something that he consistently does, both here and in other parts of the *HA*.⁶⁷¹ Besides referring to its contents, the author also intimates how the

⁶⁷⁰ In this respect, the announcement parallels the summary in *OM* 2.1, in which the theme in *OM* is not announced either.

⁶⁷¹ Den Hengst 1987 for the passages *AS* 55-6, *OM* 5.9-6, *Dd.* 7.1-7, *Gd.* 26-7, *A* 10.

letter should be read. The reason for the insertion of the speech is explicitly mentioned with *ut et inpudentia hominis noscatur et sacrilegium*.

There are not only correspondences between the introduction and the speech, but also between the speech and the historical narration that precedes it, as may be seen in the following scheme:

	<i>Oratio (OM 6.2-9)</i>	<i>OM</i>
6.3	<u>per</u> tumultum militarem	4.8 <u>quasi</u> militaribus insidiis
6.3	quid <u>de nobis</u> exercitus fecerit	Ø*
6.4	dein <u>honores divinos</u> ... decernimus ei viro	Ø*
	<u>ultorem</u> caedis Bassiani	2.5: <u>auctor</u> necis Antoninianae
	praefecto eius	2.1: praefecto praetorii eius
6.5	quibus iam stipendium dedi et omnia <u>imperatorio more</u> iussi	5.7: ...stipendium et legionariis et praetorianis dedit <u>solito uberius</u> .
6.6	Diadumenum... filium meum et imperio miles <u>donavit</u> et nomine, Antoninum videlicet appellans...	5.1: filio Diadumeno <u>in participatum adscito</u> , quem continuo...Antoninum appellari a militibus <u>iussit</u> .

Figure 6.5: Comparison between Macrinus' oratio to the senate (OM 6.2-9) and the historiographical context (OM 2-5)

The correspondences between the content of the speech and the historical narration are in the phraseology, but especially by way of antonyms. These have been underlined in the scheme: the factual *per* in the speech parallels *quasi* in the narration; similarly, *auctor* in the narration appears as *ultorem* in the speech, while *solito uberius*⁶⁷² has been transformed in *imperatorio more*, as if this were a matter of normal procedure. The emperor tries to show his innocence, while the author has already stressed his guilt in the preceding chapter, in line with the aim of the letter: '*ut inpudentia hominis noscatur*'.

What we can conclude about its textual structure is that the *oratio* is closely linked with the preceding chapter 5 and the introductory chapter 2. It is doubtful whether *felices essemus* contains a reference to the name of Felix which the newly appointed emperor has acquired: this theme occurs in OM 7.5 and 11.⁶⁷³ Notably, the two main elements of the letter, *quid de nobis exercitus fecerit* (6.3) and *honores divinos* (6.4) are not in OM 5, nor in any other part of OM. In OM 5 it is merely stated that Macrinus *imperium arripuit* and in 2.1 *arripuit imperium* (in 5.1 and 5.4 *suum...imperium, quod raptum ierat.*). From what source the author derives this part of the speech will be explained below.

⁶⁷² *solito uberius*: cf. Suet. *Galba* 16.2 en Gascou 1984, 752.

⁶⁷³ Den Hengst (1987, 161) and Turcan (1993, 129) suppose that the clause contains a reference to the imperial name of *Felix*, as attested in OM 7.5: *cum ipse Felicis nomen recepisset*. The formula *felix essem*, however, is of a rather general nature, witness Suet. *Tib.* 21.4.
11.2: *Felicis nomen recepit...*; 11.3-4: *unde in eum epigramma...Graeci cuiusdam poetae videtur extare:....*

6.4.3 Relation to *Dd.*

In ch. 2.2 and 5.4 it was shown that the factual content of *Dd.* is mainly derived from *OM*. The documents also seem to be closely related to each other. Not only is Macrinus' letter firmly embedded in its immediate context, but echoes of the letter are to be found in other biographies as well, *Dd.* in the first place:

	<i>Oratio</i> (OM 6.2-9)	<i>Dd.</i>
6.2	Vellemus...vestram clementiam videre	2.10: verba <u>edicti</u> : 'vellem, Quirites, iam praesentes essemus...'
	<i>Quem nobis Antoninorum loco di dederant</i>	1.8: Antoninum nobis di dederunt.
6.4	<i>quid de nobis exercitus fecerit</i> (cf. 6.5 <i>detulerunt ad me imperium, cuius ego, p.c., interim tutelam recepi, tenebo regimen...</i>)	1.1: Antonini Diadumeni pueri, quem cum patre Opilio Macrino imperatorem dixit exercitus... 1.5: <u>adclamatum</u> : 'Macrine imperator...' 1.2: et me et patrem meum..., quos imperatores Romanos decernetis et quibus committeretis rem publicam
	<i>vindicandam factionem</i>	1.1 <i>factione Macriniana</i> ⁶⁷⁴
6.5	<i>quibus iam stipendium dedi</i>	2.1 Macrinus imperator <u>dixit</u> : 'habete igitur, commilitones, pro <u>imperio</u> aureos ternos, pro Antonini <u>nomine</u> aureos quinos et solitas promotiones sed geminatas.'
6.6	<i>Diadumenum... filium meum et imperio miles donavit et nomine (...)* ut cohonestetur prius nomine, sic etiam regni honore</i>	1.8: 'puer Antoninus dignus imperio.' 2.2: ...Diadumenus Antoninus imperator <u>dixit</u> : gratias vobis, commilitones, quod me et <u>imperio</u> donastis et <u>nomine</u> ... 2.3 et pater quidem meus curabit, ne desit <u>imperio</u> , ego autem elaborabo, ne desim <u>nomini</u> Antoninorum. 2.4 causa <u>imperii</u> , causa <u>nominis</u> 7.1 extat <u>epistula</u> Opili Macrini, patris Diadumeni, qua gloriatur non tam se ad <u>imperium</u> pervenisse, qui esset secundus imperii, quam quod Antoniniani <u>nominis</u> esset pater factus, ... (→ <i>Dd.</i> 7.5-6)
	* Antoninum videlicet appellans	1.3: statim contionem parari iussit filiumque suum tunc puerum Antoninum appellavit. ⁶⁷⁵ <u>Contio</u> : ... 2.7 Missae etiam ad senatum <u>litterae</u> , quibus nomen Antonini indicatum est... (→ OM 6.2-9)
6.7	<i>bono faustoque omine adprobetis</i> ⁶⁷⁶	2.7: quare etiam senatus imperium id libenter

⁶⁷⁴ Again, verbal correspondance with contrasted content (see figure 6.5).

⁶⁷⁵ cf. OM 5.2 filio Diadumeno in participatum adscito, quem continuo,..., Antoninum appellari a militibus iussit.

		<i>dicitur recepisse, ...</i>
6.8	<i>Tamen rogamus dicantes ei duas statuas...civili habitu duas</i>	<i>Dd.3.1 fecitque Bassiani simulacra ex auro atque argento</i>

Figure 6.6: Comparison of Macrinus' oratio to the senate (OM 6.2-9) and Dd.

Parallels with OM 6.2-9 are abundant in *Dd.*, almost all of them in documents in DD: *edictum Macrini* (2.10), *acclamatio militum* (1.5, 1.8), *contio Diadumeni* (1.2, 2.2-4), *contio Macrini* (2.1), *epistula Macrini* (7.1, 7.5-6). One of the few instances in *Dd.* in which a document is reported is in *missae...ad senatum litterae* in *Dd.* 2.7 but, curiously enough, this speech was already aired extensively in *OM* 6.2-9, Macrinus's speech to the senate. Conversely, the themes in the letter in *OM* (6.2-9) are elaborated in *Dd.* (esp. 1, 2 and 7) and generally so in documents in DD, which may be considered an *amplificatio* of the document in *OM*.⁶⁷⁷

6.4.4 Relation to the HA

The contrast between the author's commentary in his historical narration and Macrinus's words in his speech, shows that Macrinus tries to disclaim responsibility for Caracalla's murder. Historically, however, Macrinus's participation in the murder is far from certain. The stress on Macrinus's guilt is unparalleled in other sources. That is why the author puts a different emphasis on the events than his source for *Cc.* in a fashion that serves his purpose best. Compare the following fragments:

Cc. 6.6-7: *Deinde cum iterum vellet Parthis bellum inferre atque hibernaret Edessae (...) cum ad requisita naturae discessisset, (insidiis a Macrino praef. praet. positis, qui post eum invasit imperium), interemptus est. Conscii caedis fuerunt... inpulso Martialis.*

Cc. 7.1: *occisus est autem in medio itinere inter Carras et Edessam, cum levandae vessicae gratia ex equo descendisset (...). Denique cum illum in equum strator eius levaret, pugione latus eius confodit, conclamatumque ab omnibus est id Martialem fecisse.*

In line with a technique that is now becoming familiar, the author tells about Caracalla's murder twice with slight variations (see texts in bold). It is to be noted that in the former account, Macrinus is explicitly mentioned as a participant in the plot, whereas he is absent from the latter. All the elements occurring in *Cc.* 7.1 are present in 6.6, apart from the ablative absolute *insidiis...imperium*. The formula *qui post eum invasit imperium* is echoed in *OM* 2.1 as *imperium arripuit*. Two different versions, which are clearly recognizable in the structure of the text, seem to have been combined in these passages in *Cc.*

⁶⁷⁶ *Faustoque omine adprobetis* in *OM* 6.7 refers to an *acclamatio* (cf. Baldwin 1981, 144). That the senate welcomes the appointments, is confirmed in *OM* 2.4 *quamvis senatus eum imperatorem... libenter acceperit, ...*; in *Dd.* 2.7 *quare etiam senatus imperium id libenter recepisse...* (cf. *OM* 7.1).

⁶⁷⁷ For the figure of *amplificatio*, see Paschoud 1997, 119 and Peter 1892, 72-5 ('Erweiterungen', in the author's use of Herodian). Turcan (1993, 130) also relates *OM* 6.8 to *Dd.* 3.1; though it should be doubted if the *statuae* mentioned in these passages are the same.

We also find several hints at his motives in the letter ‘*quid de nobis exercitus fecerit*’ and ‘*divum illum appellans*’ (in bold):

Cc. 8.9-10: ...*nam Macrinus Antoninum occidit, ut supra exposuimus. Qui cum filio factus in castris imperator filium suum, qui Diadumenus vocabatur, Antoninum vocavit, idcirco quod a praetorianis multum Antoninus desideratus est.*

Cc. 11.4 *hic (sc. Caracalla) tamen omnium durissimus et, ut uno complectamur verbo, parricida et incestus (...), a Macrino, qui eum occiderat, timore militum et maxime praetorianorum inter deos relatus est.*

As we have seen, the element of the murder is not repeated in *OM*. Underlined are the words that prove Macrinus’s guilt. In the first quote, *ut supra exposuimus* must refer to Cc. 6.6-7. This is confirmed by the immediate sequel, a straight instance of the *nomen Antoninorum* theme, which, needless to repeat, is based on a different source. It is likely that with his story of Caracalla’s murder the author deviates here from his source, in an attempt to blame Macrinus and picture him as a usurper.

Finally, the element *timore militum et maxime praetorianorum inter deos relatus est* is also unparalleled in other historiographical and material sources and serves to emphasize Macrinus’s *impudentia*. In Herodian, Macrinus is very negative about Caracalla, in Cassius Dio 19.17 there is no mention at all: τοῦ μέντοι Ταράκτου οὐδεμίαν μνείαν οὐτ’ ἔντιμον τότε γε οὐτ’ ἄτιμον ἐποιήσατο... Therefore, it may be that the author overemphasizes Macrinus’s hypocrisy by mentioning that he deified his predecessor Caracalla.

The content of Macrinus’ letter can be characterized as stereotyped. The newly appointed emperor asks the senate to confirm his accession, just as Hadrian had done according to *H* 6.2: *Cum ad senatum scriberet, veniam petit, quod de imperio suo iudicium senatui non dedisset, salutatus scilicet praepropere a militibus imperator, quod esse res publica sine imperatore non posset.* The formula *cum ad senatum scriberet* only occurs in *H* 6.1 and *OM* 5.9. It is striking that the sending of the letter is mentioned twice in both passages: *H* 6.1 had *datis ad senatum et quidem accuratissimis litteris* and *OM* 5.9: *ad senatum dein litteras misit.*⁶⁷⁸ When we compare *H* 6.1-2 and *OM* 5.9-6.1 on other points, it can be observed that Hadrian’s request for *venia* for not having consulted the senate before his accession⁶⁷⁹ has been replaced by Macrinus’ excuse for Caracalla’s murder (assuming that *excusansque se* refers to that event), which may be considered an

⁶⁷⁸ Cf. AC 12.1-3: *Ad senatum autem qualem orationem miserit, interest scire* about Marcus’ letter to the senate.

⁶⁷⁹ Cf. the speech of the ‘good emperor’ Tacitus in *Tac.* 8.5: ‘(...) sanctissimi commilitones, primum vos, qui scitis principes adprobare, deinde amplissimus senatus dignum hoc nomine iudicavit: curabo, enitar, efficiam, ne vobis desint, si non fortia facta, at saltem vobis atque imperatore digna consilia.’ The old emperor explains that the soldiers choose the emperor, whereafter the senate confirms (the scene is in AD 275), but he also pleases the senate, *Tac.* 9.1: *ita mihi liceat, p.c., sic imperium regere, ut a vobis me constet electum, ut ego cuncta ex vestra facere sententia et potestate decrevi. Vestrum est igitur ea iubere atque sancire, quae digna vobis, digna modesto exercitu, digna populo Romano esse videantur.* Note the parallel of the former speech with speeches in *Dd.*: The soldiers are addressed with the title *commilitones* by Macrinus (*Dd.* 2.1) and Diadumenus (*Dd.* 2.2), who also says, also on behalf of his fater, to fulfil the expectations related with their status (*Dd.* 2.3: *et pater quidem meus curabit, ne desit imperio, ego autem elaborabo, ne desim nomini Antoninorum*).

act of *impudentia*. In Hadrian's biography no document is quoted after *cum ad senatum scriberet* to prove the historical reliability of the remark. Furthermore, *honores divinos* are granted to their direct predecessors, Trajan resp. Caracalla:

H 6.1-2:

Traiano divinos honores (...) postulavit et cunctis volentibus meruit, ita ut senatus multa, quae Hadrianus non postulaverat, in honorem Traiani sponte decerneret.

OM 6.4:

Antonino autem divinos honores et miles decrevit, et nos decernimus, et vos, p.c., ut decernatis, cum possimus imperatorio more praecipere, rogamus.

Apart from the correspondences (underlined), there is a subtle difference in the clause *sponte* and *cum possimus imperatorio more praecipere*: whereas Macrinus leaves the senate no room for deciding about or even opposing to the *divini honores*, the effect of Hadrian's moderate attitude is that the senate grants Trajan much more than was requested. Now that we are inventorying the differences in the light of the similarities, another parallel crops up, concerning the posthumous triumph that was granted to Trajan:

H 6.3 *Cum triumphum ei senatus, qui Traiano debitus erat, detulisset, recusavit ipse atque imaginem Traiani curru triumphali vexit, ut optimus imperator ne post mortem quidem triumphi amitteret dignitatem.*

OM 6.2 *Vellemus, p.c., et incolumi Antonino nostro et revecti cum triumpho vestram clementiam⁶⁸⁰ videre.*

Macrinus is said to have wished a triumph for Caracalla, were he still alive, while Hadrian rejects any triumph for himself and has an *imago* of the deceased emperor Trajan driven around in the triumphal car. Such granting of due honours to his predecessor is another point on which Hadrian scores positively. Assuming that the parallel is valid, the correspondences are *curru triumphali vexit* (*triumphum, triumphi*) → *revecti cum triumpho*; *optimus imperator* → *Antonino nostro*; *post mortem* → *incolumi*.

We may assume that the author took at least part of his information about the inaugural procedures from the source he used for the Primary Lives. Obviously, he imitated descriptions in EL in order to describe the procedures in IL and LL. Whether the parallels between *H* 6.1 and *OM* 5.9-6.9 are deliberate or not is hard to say, but the author may have looked at EL in order to describe Macrinus' accession. When we compare his accession with, say, that of the emperor Tacitus, other parallels are found, cf. *Tac.* 9.1: *Post hoc stipendium et donativum ex more promisit ...* with *OM* 6.5, the address to the senate: (*militibus*) *quibus iam et stipendium dedi et omnia imperatorio more iussi*. More parallels were quoted in the previous notes (*Dd.* 1-2 ~ *Tac.* 8.5 on the speech to the *commilitones*; *OM* 6.5-8 ~ *Tac.* 8.4-5; 9.1-6 on the structure of the speech), which reveals a strong relationship between the speeches in *OM* 6 and *Dd.* 1-2.

⁶⁸⁰ The term of *vestra clementia* applied to the senate also occurs in *AC* 12.3: *vos oro atque obsecro, p.c., ut censura vestra deposita meam pietatem clementiamque servetis, immo vestram neque quemquam ullum senatus occidat* and the intermediary life of *AS* 9.1: *Item imperator dixit: 'Antoninorum nomen vel iam numen potius quantum fuerit, meminit vestra clementia*. Den Hengst (1987, 161) calls this a case of 'Senatsverherrlichung'.

The chief conclusion to be drawn from our analysis of *OM* 6 is that the literary techniques of the speech reveal its entirely fictitious nature. Its structure suggests that the fragments are taken from a longer letter, though the announcements about their contents contradicts this. All the elements could easily have been borrowed from other parts of the *HA*, either from their immediate context or other parts of the work. The content of the letter and the historical narrative cohere firmly. The example may be valid for most of the pieces in *DD* in the *HA*. Although the author pretends to quote a great many documents *verbatim*, it is certain that he made up practically all of them himself.

Chapter 7 An Authentic Document: Hadrian's *Animula*

7.1 Introduction

In chapter 6, we have studied documents in DD, which turned out to be based on the author's imagination. It may be supposed that PL contains larger parts of reliable information when it comes to the historical content than IL and LL. Consequently, the verses in *H* 25.9, Hadrian's well-known nineteen-word propemptikon to his soul *Animula vagula blandula* (henceforth: *A*), need their own assessment, independent of the conclusions that have been drawn about the authenticity of the documents and verses (such as *OM* 11.4-6, 14.2, see § 5.3.1 and *Dd.* 7.3) in the part starting with *OM*.

The small size of *A* contrasts with the enormous amount of studies devoted to it. Still, unanimity about text and interpretation has not been reached yet. Its authenticity has been questioned in the past century, though nowadays a vast majority of scholars accept the poem as a product of Hadrian's own imagination.⁶⁸¹ When it comes to a literary assessment of the poem, opinions nowadays are mainly positive, as for example Von Albrecht's (1997, 1310), who sees the innovative qualities of Hadrian's poetry: 'We have a few poetic lines of Emperor Hadrian, in which he expresses his own restlessness and loneliness in almost modern terms; they give us an idea of the direction that Latin verse could have taken had it not subsided into a non-committal play on forms'.⁶⁸²

The point of departure in this chapter is that *A* is by Hadrian's own hand. An attempt will follow to show how Hadrian used classical models for his poetry and how Hadrian himself was followed by later poets. Comparison with the epigrammatic tradition to which the poem belongs proves to be a good way to approach the original text and establish a new interpretation. The study fills a gap in the numerous studies that have thus far appeared by placing the poem in the literary context of the second century AD⁶⁸³ and in a literary tradition that goes back to Hellenistic poetry as practised in the Latin literature of republican times. The poem follows conventions of epigrammatic poetry in Latin literature, the recognition of which may shed a new light on its interpretation and text. Conclusion will be corroborated by the imitations of Hadrian that appeared in later times.

⁶⁸¹ Hohl (1915, 41) posed the 'Echtheitsfrage' starting from the perceived ugliness of the verses and the unusual rhyme. Positions with regard to the authenticity diverge from rejection (Barnes 1968, 384-6) to acceptance (Baldwin 1970, 372-4; Birley 1994, 176-205), which last view strongly prevails nowadays. Still, if authentic, the question about the author's source is still valid. At the end of the nineteenth century Peter (1892, 30) thought, as well as Klebs (1892, 22n2), that Marius Maximus was the source, denied by Hohl (1915, 415), who thinks that the verses are the author's own fabrication.

⁶⁸² Compare this assessment with Norden's verdict of the poem as 'an schlaffer weichlichkeit und kindischer Tändelei ihres gleiches suchenden Verslein' (Norden 1909², 840n1).

⁶⁸³ Cameron 1980, Mattiacci 1982, Steinmetz 1982/9.

7.2 Textual Issues (vss. 3 and 4)

It is worth repeating the main questions to be answered with regard to the poem, for the purpose of which I quote the text without any interpunction, relying on the best branch of manuscripts (P), which provides a point of departure for interpretation and textual emendation:

animula vagula blandula
hospes comesque corporis
quae nunc abibis in loca
pallidula rigida nudula
 5 *nec ut soles dabis iocos*

Reading the verses as they are transmitted in the main branch of manuscripts, the first two lines do not seem to give rise to textual questions. The third line is grammatically and logically correct, but has raised questions because of the reading in the Σ -manuscripts, which have *quo* instead of *quae*.⁶⁸⁴ Moreover, when *quae* is interpreted as a relative pronoun, the sentence⁶⁸⁵ seems to lack a main verb following the vocative *animula*. This latter point in particular has led to some conjectures, ingeniously defended with the *varia lectio* from Σ *quo* as source of inspiration. A brief overview of the alternatives will be given below. The text as quoted above, however, is a good point of departure for an interpretation that is based on an assessment of the structure of the entire poem.

Its analysis allows for a reading of the third line without any change, while a small but essential emendation in the fourth line will be made. This line requires more explanation than the preceding line, as it is still unclear whether the adjectives belong to the immediate foregoing *loca* or to the poem's first word *animula* (on the provisional assumption that the three words in the tricolon are a unit).

The problems encountered in lines 3 and 4 concern the interpretation of *quae* and the status of the adjectiva *pallidula rigida nudula*. For *quae*, there are three possibilities:

- *quae* is a pronomen relativum, referring to *animula* in v.1.⁶⁸⁶
- *quae* is a pronomen interrogativum⁶⁸⁷ connected to *loca*, with a question as a result: *quae nunc abibis in loca?* The answer may follow (but not necessarily so) in v.4: *pallidula, rigida, nudula*.⁶⁸⁸
- *quae* is a pronomen exclamativum (*quae* ~ *qualia*), a possibility brought forward by Kraggerud (1993, 86): *quae...in loca...!*

⁶⁸⁴ Σ denotes a class of manuscripts from the humanist era, which should be distinguished from the ninth century manuscripts the *Bambergensis* (B) and the *Palatinus* (P). For further information about the manuscript tradition, see Ballou 1914, Hohl 1965², Callu 1985 and note 1 in this study.

⁶⁸⁵ I use 'period' to mean 'a single sentence complete with headclause and subclauses'

⁶⁸⁶ *Quae* as a relative pronoun: Birt 1913, 309.

⁶⁸⁷ *Quae* as an interrogative pronoun: Ribbeck 1913, 317; Steinmetz 1989, 273; Courtney 1993, 382.

⁶⁸⁸ This same idea, that v.3 contains a question, led Hohl (1965², 27) to follow the reading of manuscript Σ *quo* instead of *quae*. A result of this reading is that v.3 should be interpreted as a question *abibis (quo nunc abibis?)*, the answer to which is given in vss. 3-4 (*in loca ...nudula*). *Quo* instead of *quae* was followed by Mariotti 1970, 249. Hohl (1915, 413) also changed *loca* at the end of v. 3 in *locos* (in his standard-edition of *HA* he proposes *quos...in locos* ($\approx$ *quo locorum*)), see also Immisch 1915, 203 and 1915a, 416.

For the adjectives in line 4, the following options may be mentioned:

- In case of *quae* as interrogativum or as exclamativum, the three adjectives in v.4 are most probably attributive to *loca*.⁶⁸⁹
- in case of *quae* as relativum the adjectives in v. 4 may either depend on *animula*⁶⁹⁰, thus corresponding with and expanding the adjectives in v 1 (*vagula blandula*), or on *loca* in v.3.
- A third option is that some of the adjectives should be attributed to *animula*, and others to *loca* – or that the attribution is ambiguous.⁶⁹¹

There are objections to all of these options. If *pallidula rigida nudula* is attributed to *animula*, this leaves a very weak *loca*, signifying the underworld, in v.3.⁶⁹² If the tricolon is dependent on *loca*, the adjective *nudula* is problematic on logical grounds (meaning a place where beings are naked, or something similar). These considerations open the way for one of the possibilities in the third option mentioned, to which we will return below, § 7.6.

7.3 Structure of the Poem (vss.1-5)

In the options given thus far, no attention has been paid to the structure of the poem as a whole. This is why a new reading will be proposed. When the text in its most neutral appearance, as given above, is considered, *A* can be seen as a poem consisting of a single period with a structure consisting of several different parts: (1) an apostrophe with attributes (*animula vagula blandula*), (2) apposition (*hospes comesque corporis*), (3a) a relative clause (*quae nunc abibis in loca*) with (3b) a second series of attributes (*pallidula rigida nudula*) and (4) a coordinate expansion of the subordinate clause (*nec ut soles dabis iocos*). The addressee is rendered in the vocative (*animula*), to which no verb is attached (apart from the verbs in the subordinate clause (*abibis, dabis*) that are dependent on *quae*), which gives the addressee a relatively independent position in the period. Such an address starting with a vocativus is not exceptional in verses of a higher style and formal tone and occurs normally in religious or hymnic poetry when a divine instance is

⁶⁸⁹ v.4 corresponding with *loca*: Immisch 1915, 202; Mariotti 1970, 249; Kraggerud 1993, 83-5.

⁶⁹⁰ v.4 corresponding with *animula*: Gregorovius 1884, 341; Steinmetz 1989, 273; Courtney 1993, 382.

⁶⁹¹ Holzhausen (2003, 103) and Fündling (2006, 1057) suppose that the attribution is ambiguous.

⁶⁹² *Loca* for underworld is normal, see e.g. Verg. *A* 6.264, 434, 461 and Ovid *Met.* 4.432 about the way to the underworld; Ausonius *Par.* 27.4: *loca tacita Erebi*, but has been read as *loci* or (by Hohl, see above) as *locos*. There is no reason to doubt the manuscript transmission *loca*, which means the underworld, like Sajdak 1916 pointed out.

addressed.⁶⁹³ The expansion of the subordinate clause (*nec...* after *quae...nudula*) is an example of ‘appositional syntax’, which is a characteristic of archaic literature.⁶⁹⁴

Courtney’s objection that in the reading defended here, the poem consists of ‘an apostrophe with dependent clauses but no main verb’ can be solved by a comparison with other poems by Hadrian. *Fr.4 Courtney*⁶⁹⁵ is a poetic fragment on a horse’s gravestone which is ascribed to Hadrian. The subject is related to the hellenistic tradition of composing epitaphs on deceased animals - a type of poetry that is abundantly present in the *Anthologia Palatina*.⁶⁹⁶ The first nine verses (out of sixteen) are quoted here, as they show structural similarities with A:

	<u><i>Borysthenes Alanus,</i></u>	subject
	<u><i>caesareus veredus,</i></u>	apposition
	<i>per aequor et paludes</i>	
	<i>et tumulos Etruscos</i>	
5	<i>volare <u>qui</u> solebat</i>	relative clause
	<u><i>Pannonicos in apros,</i></u>	
	<u><i>nec ullus insequentem</i></u>	
	<i>dente aper albicanti</i>	<i>superflux</i>
	<u><i>ausus fuit nocere</i></u>	
10	<i>vel...</i>	

The example not only shows that a structure with subject – apposition – relative clause – *superflux*, is perfectly possible.⁶⁹⁷ If the structure of A is comparable to that of *Borysthenes Alanus* (henceforth BA) there are two elementary differences: whereas in BA a main verb follows the subordinate clauses (v.16: *hoc situs est in agro*), in A there is no verb to follow the clauses, at least in the A version that has come down to us. A second difference is that in BA the verbs appear in the third person singular, so that *Borysthenes Alanus* is a nominative. In A, the dying *Animula* is addressed in the vocative with matching second-person forms in the subordinate clauses, whereas no main verb follows. It is perfectly imaginable that the five verses of A were once the beginning of a longer poem, in which further subordinate clauses did follow. This would be in accordance with other poems of the same kind.

⁶⁹³ A famous instance is the *invocatio* of Venus by Lucretius in his *De Rerum Natura* (1.1-4 *sqq*): *Aeneadum genetrix hominum divumque voluptas, / alma Venus, caeli subter labentia signa / quae mare navigerum, quae terras frugiferentis / concelebras...*, in which *alma Venus* is preceded by apposition and followed by relative clauses, later to be continued with the address *te, dea* and the request for aid in creating poetry, 1.28: *da magis aeternum da dictis diva leporem*. From later times, the hymn by Tiberianus to Jupiter may serve as an example: *Omnipotens, annosa poli quem suspicit aetas, / quem sub millenis semper contutibus unum / nec numero quisquam poterit pensare nec aevo, / nunc esto affatus, si quo te nomine dignum est, ...* (Courtney 1993, 432) or Ausonius *Eph. 3: Omnipotens, solo mentis mihi cognite cultu, / ignore malis et nulli ignote piorum, / ...* (Green 1991, 8).

⁶⁹⁴ Quinn 1973, 92.

⁶⁹⁵ Courtney 1993, 384 = *CIL* xii.1122 = *CLE* 1522.

⁶⁹⁶ To mention just two examples: *AP* 7.195 en 7.196 (= *HE* Meleager XII 4058-65, I 219-20 en XIII 4066-73, I 220 – *edd.* Gow/Page 1965, 615-6).

⁶⁹⁷ Quinn 1973, 93: *superflux* is the phenomenon that the period continues at a point where it could also have been concluded.

7.4 Models and Imitators

7.4.1 Catullus

To compare the structure of A with its textual antecedents, another Latin poem in the Hellenistic tradition of shorter poems on animals may be quoted, Catullus' *Carmen* 2:

Passer, deliciae meae puellae,
quicum ludere, quem in sinu tenere,
cui primum digitum dare appetenti
et acris solet incitare morsus,
5 cum desiderio meo nitenti
carum nescio quid lubet iocari
et solaciolum sui doloris,
...

Catullus' poem, which consists of one sentence, can be divided as follows: (1) apostrophe (*passer*) with (2) apposition (*deliciae meae puellae*), after which (3) a passage with relative clauses (*quicum...morsus*) and a subordinate temporal clause (*cum...doloris*), after which the poem concludes with a final clause. V.4 *et acris solet incitare morsus* as a coordinate clause is striking in the structure of the period, in that a new relative (after *quicum, quem* and *cui*) is expected. This 'appositional syntax' is a feature of archaic literature, which sometimes takes the place of a second or even third relative clause. This is also an example of *superflux*. The main verb only follows in v.9: *tecum ludere sicut ipsa possem*, though it must be said that the text of this part of the poem is heavily contested.

In weighing the phenomena described here, it may be remarked that Hadrian's A and Catullus' c. 2 show striking structural similarities: the apostrophe, the relative clauses and the appositional syntax show that Hadrian and Catullus were writing in the same tradition, that of shorter, epigrammatic, poems. One could even go further. The two subjects in question, the *passer* and the *animula*, are small creatures that are addressed as if they were deities and cherished as something that the poet expects a blessing from (*ludere* and *iocos* respectively), which is in accordance with the Hellenistic tradition as attested in the Greek anthology. The similarities make it interesting to compare the contents of the two poems. The addressees have another thing in common: they are about to die, while in Catullus' *carmen* 3, which was conceived as inseparably attached to poem 2 from antiquity onward⁶⁹⁸, the *passer* is already dead. His death is described as *qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum*, whereas Hadrian says to his *animula*: *quae nunc abibis*⁶⁹⁹ *in loca*

⁶⁹⁸ As appears from the poem on the pet dog Myia, quoted by Quinn (1973², 96-7 = AL 2.2.1512), and Juvenalis *Sat.* 6.8 where elements of Cat. cc. 2 and 3 are combined in *turbavit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos*.

⁶⁹⁹ *Abire* is the normal verb for dying of the *anima* (see Ausonius *Parentalia* 27.1, Green 1991, 39) and Courtney: *Anima abit vel perit, obit homo vel bestia*. See Sept. Ser. *Fr.* 17 (Courtney 1993, 414): *animula miserula properiter abiit*, and below (§ 7.4.2).

/ *pallidula*...: two descriptions of the underworld, or the way leading to it (*iter* and *loca* respectively), expanded by related adjectives (*tenebricosum* versus *pallidula*...). Finally, the poets of both poems regard their lyrical object as something playful: *nec ut soles dabis iocos* (A 5) and *ludere...solet* (c.2.3-4) and *lubet iocari* (c.2.6). In brief, structure and contents of the two poems, Hadrian's *Animula* and Catullus' *carmen 2 annex 3*, show similarities which at least make clear that the two authors were writing in the same tradition. The following scheme sums up the similarities:

apostrophe+ apposition + rel. Clause	A 1 <i>Animula</i> (...) A 2 <i>hospes comesque corporis, / Quae...</i>	c. 2.1 <i>passer, deliciae meae puellae, / quicum...</i> ⁷⁰⁰
underworld + adjective	A 3-4 <i>quae nunc abibis in loca pallidula...</i> ⁷⁰¹	c. 3.11-2 <i>qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum</i>
Play	A 5 <i>nec ut soles dabis iocos</i>	2.4 <i>ludere...solet</i> / 2.6 <i>lubet iocari</i>

Figure 7.1: Comparison between the structures of *Animula* (H 25.9) and Catullus c.2

The similarities in wording, structure and contents may indicate Hadrian's use of Catullus' *carmen* as a model. The enormous popularity of Catullus' shorter poems, which were especially promoted by Martialis at the end of the first century AD, makes it quite likely that Hadrian did have *carmen* 2 and 3 in mind, just like many other poets before him when writing short poems about pets or other small creatures. Further evidence in support of this interpretation will be given below.⁷⁰²

7.4.2 Laevius

An older poet should be mentioned to whose works the poets of Catullus' times are heavily indebted and in whose works lies the origin of Latin brief poetry: Laevius. This immigrant from the East, who must have been active in the nineties of the 1st c.BC, set the tone for a new kind of poetry in Rome, which was characterized by epigrammatic and lyrical forms.⁷⁰³ Though certainly not the greatest in this type of literature, he certainly was the first and was intensively followed. Archaisms and neologisms were among his literary predilections, as were diminutives. The following hymn to Venus may serve as an example:⁷⁰⁴

*Venus o amoris altrix
genetrix cupiditatis
mihi quae diem serenum hila-
rula praepandere cresti, op-*

apostrophe + apposition
apposition
relative clause

⁷⁰⁰ Repeated in c. 3.4: *passer, deliciae meae puellae, / quem...*

⁷⁰¹ Forcellini 1868 (tomus IV, 318 *ad* 'nunc': 'nunc iungitur interdum cum verbis praeteriti et futuri temporis, et designat tempus, quod circa nos est') gives examples of *nunc* followed by a future tense, e.g. Catullus 8.16: *quis nunc te adibit?*, which comes close to Hadrian's v.3: *quae nunc abibis...*

⁷⁰² Catullus' cc. 2 and 3 have been (superficially) connected before by Immisch 1915, 201n1; see also Kraggerud 1993, 91n82.

⁷⁰³ For Laevius's place in Latin literature, Courtney 1993, 118, Ross 1969, 155.

⁷⁰⁴ *fr.* 22 Courtney 1993, 136.

*seculae tuae ac ministrae,
etsi ne utiquam quid foret
expavida gravis dura fera
asperaque famultas potu-
i dominio concipere
<sub>superbo ...*

apposition
coordinating clause

These diminutives are also present in *fr.* 4,⁷⁰⁵ a small poem in a iambic dimeter, which contains Hector's address to a wreath for his head, made by his wife Andromache:

*Te andromacha per ludum manu
lascivola ac tenellula
capiti meo, trepidans libens,
insolita plexit munera.*

Note the effect of tenderness by the use of the diminutives *lascivola ac tenellula* in enjambement with *manu*, and the renewed sequence in v.3 *trepidans libens*, which is comparable to Hadrian's use of diminutives in *Animula vagula blandula* and the tricolon *pallidula, rigida, nudula*. Though the assumption that Hadrian based his epigram on this specific fragment by Laevius is precarious, it should be noted that Laevius was one of the first poets to fully explore the possibilities of diminutives in short poems (iambic, in casu).

7.4.3 Septimius Serenus

Hadrian must have taken notice of Laevius' use of *deminutiva*,⁷⁰⁶ as did the second century poet Septimius Serenus in *fr.* 2: Courtney convincingly assumes that Serenus' *fr.* 17 (1993, 414) *animula miserula properiter*⁷⁰⁷ *abiit* is based on Laevius' *fr.* 19 (1993, 134) *cupidius miserulo obito*, as *miserulus* (a synonym for the common *misellus*) only occurs in these two fragments. Septimius evidently combined Laevius' hapax *miserulus* with Hadrian's hapax *animula*. There is another verse by Serenus, which may have preceded the verse quoted, to wit *fr.* 16 Courtney: *perit abit avipedis animula leporis*. Apart from the difference in tense between perfect and present in the two verses, there are strong arguments to link the two verses (Mattiacci 1982, 172). Whatever their origin and relation, it is remarkable that the hare (*lepus*) goes on bird's feet (*avipes*, which is an hapax analogous to *alipes* or *celeripes*).⁷⁰⁸ Is it that the image of the personalized hare's *animula* is based on the idea of Catullus' deceased *passer*? It would be fitting to follow the first poet of Hellenistic epigrams on dead animals in Latin and

⁷⁰⁵ Courtney 1993, 122.

⁷⁰⁶ Laevius is quoted several times in the works of Aulus Gellius (see below, § 7.4.4), e.g. NA 19.7.2-16, where his tragedies are discussed, and 19.9.7, where Laevius' works are called '*implicata*'.

⁷⁰⁷ *Properiter* is an archaic word, revived by Apuleius (Courtney 1993, 414), cf. Sueius *fr.* 2 *aspriter* (1993, 114) and Laevius *fr.* 6 *lasciviter* (1993, 122) and Leumann 499-500 on the formation. Also Ausonius *Parentalia* 27.1 (Green 1991, 39-40) uses the word, probably in imitation of Septimius Serenus: *Et amita Veneria properiter abiit*.

⁷⁰⁸ Courtney 1993, 413.

give the hare bird's feet. This would, at the same time, explain how Hadrian must have seen his *animula* passing away: as a bird that flies out of the body's cage.

7.4.4 Aulus Gellius

The second century author Aulus Gellius quotes in his *Noctes Atticae* (19.11.1-3) a friend's translation of an epigram by Plato.⁷⁰⁹ Here, the introduction, the original and the translation follow:

Celebrantur duo isti Graeci versiculi multorumque doctorum hominum memoria dignantur, quod sint lepidissimi et venustissimae brevitatis. Neque adeo pauci sunt veteres scriptores, qui eos Platonis esse philosophi adfirmant, quibus ille adulescens luserit, cum tragoediis quoque eodem tempore faciendis praeluderet:

Τὴν ψυχὴν Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν ἐπὶ χεῖλεσιν ἔσχον·

ἦλθε γὰρ ἡ τλήμων ὥς διαβησομένη.⁷¹⁰

Hoc distichon amicus meus, οὐκ ἄμουνος adulescens, in plures versiculos licentius liberiusque vertit. Qui quoniam mihi quidem visi sunt non esse memoratu indigni, subdidi:

*Dum semihulco savio
meum puellum savior
dulcemque florem spiritus
duco ex aperto tramite,
5 ἥanimaῖ et saucia
cucurrit ad labeas mihi,
rictumque in oris pervium
et labra pueri mollia,
rimata itineri transitus,
10 ut transiliret, nititur.
Tum si morae quid plusculae
fuisset in coetu osculi,
Amoris igni percita
transisset et me linqueret,
15 et mira prorsum res foret,
ut fierem ad me mortuus,
ad puerulum intus viverem.*

⁷⁰⁹ According to Dahlmann (1979, 8), the poem should be attributed to Apuleius. For the Platonic spirit in Apuleius' poems, see Courtney 1993, 396-7: 'Apuleius wrote amatory verses *Platonis ipsius exemplo facti* and quotes epigrams of Plato (Apol. 10-13)'. The HA mentions Apuleius in CIA 12.12, where Clodius Albinus' literary works are characterized as *inter Milesias Punicas Apulei sui et ludicra litteraria* (see Graverini 2006, 88-9 for a treatment of this passage). Apuleius himself calls some of his works *ludicra* (Apol.6: *legerunt e Ludicris meis epistolium de dentifricio versibus scriptum ad quendam Calpurnianum*), which show a strong Catullus spirit (Hunink 1997 II, 28).

⁷¹⁰ = Beckby 1965-8, Ep. 5.78-80.

The idea of the poem, just like that of Plato's epigram, is that the *anima* is on the lips of the lover when he intends to kiss his love: the *anima* is about to jump to the boy, which will result in the poet's death, while his *anima* will live on in the boy (*intus*). In order to restore the corrupt v.5, editors have supplemented *anima* with: *aegra* (Julien 1998, 137; Marshall 1968, 579), *male* (Rolfe 1928, III, 392n1, after Hosius 1903, 279 *app. crit.*) and *mea* (Hertz). Now, there are some striking similarities with Hadrian's A: the Latin poem is based on a Greek original⁷¹¹; the metre is a iambic dimeter; the *anima* is about to leave the poet (admittedly, not to the underworld, but to another being); there are several diminutives (*puellum, plusculae, osculi, puerulum*). Given these aspects, it is not hazardous to suppose that Gellius (or his *amicus* οὐκ ἄμυστος), about the same time as Septimius Serenus did, imitated Hadrian with another diminutive, and wrote *animula* in v.5.⁷¹² The *consensus codicum* determines the way that *aegra* is complemented: *animula aegra et saucia*. At the same time, we have another *testimonium* of imitation of Hadrian.

7.4.5 Ausonius

In the later fourth century, Ausonius imitated Septimius' poem in his *Parentalia* 27⁷¹³ (the correspondences, treated above, are underlined):

*Et amita Veneria properiter abiit
cui brevia melea modifica recino:
 cinis, uti placidulus ad opera vigeat,
celeripes adeat loca tacita Erebi.*

Special attention should be paid to the last words: *adeat loca tacita Erebi*, which might well be an echo of *quae nunc abibis in loca / pallidula ridiga nudula*, this last tricolon being replaced by *tacita* (while *placidulus* is reminiscent of the diminutives, especially *pallidula*) and explained by *Erebi*. The verb *adeat*, a variation of *abiit* in v.1, parallels *abibis* in A 3, a euphemism for death. Ausonius describes death as a journey to the underworld also in *Prof.* 22.16 (*supremum...iter*) and *Epigr.* 7.8 (*et gradere Elysios praepes ad alipedes*).⁷¹⁴

Schematically, the process of possible derivatons could be sketched thus:

⁷¹¹ Cf. *H* 25.10: *tales autem nec multo meliores fecit et Graecos*, a common practice in shorter poetry.

⁷¹² Carrio 1585 (*ed.* Herz 1886) was the first to propose *animula* in an emendation, followed in Forcellini's lexicon *sub* '*animula*' (1868, 282) and quoted in Marshall 1968, 579 (*app. crit.*) and Julien 1998, 137 (*app. crit.*). Hosius 1903, 279 neglects the emendation.

⁷¹³ Green 1991, 39-40 and comm. 325-7.

⁷¹⁴ Green 1991, 327.

Figure 7.2: Relations between Laevius, Catullus, Apuleius, Hadrian, Aulus Gellius, Septimius Serenus and Ausonius as to use of words, themes and poetic forms.

The conclusion, based on the form and vocabulary of the epigrams, must be that in the second century, there was a revival of the light poetry introduced in Latin literature in the late republic – and imitations were produced as late as the fourth century, as the example of Ausonius attests⁷¹⁵. Hadrian's *A* played a central role in the imitations.

7.5 *Deminutiva* (vss. 1 and 4)

If Hadrian took *cc.* 2 and 3 as models for his *A*, which is not improbable with regard to structure, the most striking and innovative addition is the host of diminutives in *vss.* 1 and 4: the substantive *animula* and the adjectives *vagula*, *blandula*, *pallidula* and *nudula*. If in *v* 4 Catullus' *iter / tenebricosum* was the model for *loca / pallidula...*, one may still question why Hadrian took three other adjectives (*pallidula*, *rigida*, *nudula*) to describe either the *animula* or the *loca*. It should first of all be remarked that in the poetry of Hadrian's times diminutives as a stylistic device underwent a revival, which started with the shorter poems written by Martial. Martial was an admirer and follower of Catullus, as he himself states in several epigrams.⁷¹⁶ The idea that the use of *deminutiva* (as well as the form and structure of the poems), is an imitation of Catullus would support the preceding conclusion about Catullus' poems as a model for *A*.

Gow (1932) studied the use of diminutives in Augustan poetry and could firmly conclude that the use of diminutives had greatly diminished, which also holds good for Flavian poetry. He ended his article with an intuition about the later use of diminutives, but didn't sketch its development, though Hadrian's *A* is referred to with the remark that '[I] do not even know whether the emperor Hadrian's orgy of diminutives is a harbinger or an isolated outburst' (1932, 157). The answer may be found when some larger collections of fragments of second-century poems are studied: both in Apuleius and Septimius Serenus, some twenty diminutives in ca. 120 verses can be counted, which is a

⁷¹⁵ In the same epoch, Ammianus Marcellinus (*RG* 28.1.4) uses the word *animula* for (evil) ghosts in the underworld: *dein quod nactus (sc. Maximinus) hominem Sardum (...) eliciendi animulas noxias et praesagia sollicitare larvarum perquam gnarum....*

⁷¹⁶ See Wiseman 1985, 246-59 for references to Catullus by Martialis.

relatively high amount.⁷¹⁷ Hadrian's diminutives (five in five verses) are striking as to their form and number, but are no 'isolated outburst' when seen in the light of the poetry of his times. Diminutiva as a stylistic feature regained the position they had in the poetry of Catullus's times. They had been used to create several effects, from a lighthearted and tender tone to dramatic and emotive effects. For example, in his firmly connected *carmina* 2 and 3, Catullus uses diminutives to express tenderness, pity and melodramatic effects (*solaciolum* 2.7, 3.6, *miselle* 3.16, *turgiduli... ocelli* 3.18).⁷¹⁸

To judge by the extant fragments of the second-century poets, Hadrian's poetry fits in the poetic modes of its time in terms of a preference for epigrams and the use of diminutiva. Similarly, its use of iambic dimeter is far from unique (Gellius, Septimius Serenus, Apuleius). As we have seen in the preceding paragraph, the structure of two of Hadrian's poems has traits in common with archaic poetry, which are also traceable in other poems of the time. One last remark about the poets of the second century should be made. It is true that there are some remarkable similarities in their poetry that distinguish them from poets writing in the first century. This has led some scholars to style them as *poetae novelli*,⁷¹⁹ who sought to continue the poetry of the νεώτεροι of Catullus's times. To define the *poetae novelli* as a group is as hazardous as taking the late-republican poets around Catullus to be one group, and warnings about these attempts have not failed to come.⁷²⁰ Still, from Martial's times onwards, Catullus underwent an enormous revival in the second century AD, which is expressed many times by the authors who followed him.⁷²¹ Perhaps the most famous author and poet of this era was Apuleius, whose works show a Catullan spirit in many passages.⁷²² The presence of a considerable amount of diminutives, both taken from the archaic period and in the form of neologisms, is a phenomenon that clearly indicates a return to pre-classical times. The same goes for Hadrian's works.

7.6

The Soul and the Underworld (v.4)

If Hadrian's poem is read as proposed above, as a small hymnic epigram with a carefully composed structure, the question arises what exactly is expressed in the poem. The poem

⁷¹⁷ The poetry of the second century AD, which has fragmentarily been transmitted, is brought together by Mattiacci in 1982 and Courtney 1993. In the more voluminous collections of fragments of the poets Apuleius and Septimius Serenus, I found the following diminutives: Apuleius *Apol.* 6: 4 *pulvisculum*, 5 *tumidulae gingivulae*, 8 *labellis*, fr. 6.12 *osculi*, 17 *puerulum*, fr. 7.10 *gemmulas*, 11 *lectulo*, 15 *voculas*, 18 *hortulo*, 20 *fessula* and Serenus fr. 1 *zonulam*, fr. 11 *canticulum*, fr. 15 *culicellus*, fr. 16 *animula*, fr. 17 *animula miserula*, fr. 19 *testula*, fr. 21 *navicula*, fr. 23.3 *stridula*, 5 *sacello*. For other diminutives, also in prose: Koziol 1988, 44-5. Hunink 1997, 30 links the use of the diminutive *pulvisculum* to the language of comedy (e.g. Plautus *Rud.* 845, *Truc.* 19). Apul. *Met.* 2.7 is quoted in Butler/Owen 1967, 19 to prove Apuleius' fondness of diminutives.

⁷¹⁸ See Hoffman-Szantyr (1965, 772-7) on stilistics of the *deminitiva*; Gow 1932, 150-8; Fordyce 1965, 95-6.

⁷¹⁹ Mattiacci 1982. The term is borrowed from the contemporary poet Terentianus (Courtney 1989, 302)

⁷²⁰ Cameron 1980, 127 and Courtney 1993, 372-4.

⁷²¹ See, for example, the first verses of a gentle poem by Q. Gellius Sentius Augurinus, proconsul of Macedonia under Hadrian's reign *Canto carmina versibus minutis / hos olim quibus et meus Catullus / et Calvus veteresque, sed quid ad me? / unus Plinius est mihi priores / ...*: Steinmetz 1989, 270-1.

⁷²² McCreight 1990, 49-56.

has the tone of a lamento and feeling of a propemptikon, in which a dying person (*i.c.* Hadrian) bids farewell to his soul. About these aspects of the poem, especially the conception of the soul, much has been said by others.⁷²³ The question should be linked to the interpretation of v.4, in which the *deminutiva* either belong to the soul (*animula*) or the underworld (*loca*). In both instances, the adjectives have a connotation with death. As I argued above, Catullus's *iter tenebricosum* may well have provided the model for *loca* / *pallidula*.... The question remains whether *rigida* and *nudula* can be conceived as adjectives applying to *loca* as well. Gallavotti 1971 made an attempt to separate the adjectives and connect *rigida* to *loca*, while consigning *pallidula* and *nudula* to *animula*, thereby neglecting Morawski and Sajdak's discovery⁷²⁴ of an echo from Ennius' *Andromache*, in which the *loca* of the underworld are called *pallida* (see §6). The best option of all is proposed by Holzhausen that the adjectives are linked to *loca* grammatically, but that the words also refer to *animula*, in other words, that the ambiguous reference is intentional.⁷²⁵

The idea is supported by a close investigation of the lexicon. The parallel with Ennius' *Andromache* detected by Morawski (1883) and later confirmed by Sajdak 1916 seems adequate: *Acherunsia templa alta Orci, pallida leto, nubila tenebris loca*.⁷²⁶ I would like to add to the observation that *pallidulum*, as a diminutive, only occurs twice in Latin literature, apart from the occurrence in A: Catullus c. 65.6 and Iuv. Sat.10.82.⁷²⁷ The former concerns Catullus's shortly deceased brother, of whom the poet remarks: *namque mei nuper Lethaeo gurgite fratris / pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem*. Quinn (1973, 353) in discussing *alluit unda pedem* takes special note of 'nuper – i.e. at the moment when his brother stepped into the waters of forgetfulness, to board Charon's boat', and further calls *pallidulum* a 'pathetic diminutive'. Note that *pallidulum* goes together with the brother's *pedem* and, though grammatically not with the underworld, the adjective is undeniably associated with death here. Also, Juvenal's use of *pallidulus* refers to someone in fear of death (10.82-6: ...*pallidulus* mi / *Bruttidius meus ad Martis fuit obvisus aram; / quam timeo, victus ne poenas exigit Aiax / ut male defensus curramus praecipites et, / dum iacet in ripa, calcemus Caesaris hostem*). Note also the passage in Cat.c.81.1: *hospes ... pallidior statua*, in which the paleness corresponds to *moribunda*. It does not seem improbable that Hadrian should refer to his *anima* as *pallidula*, half-way to the underworld, even if grammatically the word seems to be linked with *loca*.

These associations with death are continued in the words that come next. The peculiarity of the combination of words following *pallidulum* has never been duly noted. For this, a slight but essential interpretational emendation of the text is required: we will emend *rigida* to *frigida*,⁷²⁸ which opens new possibilities for the interpretation of the problematic verse. The combination of *frigida* and *nudula* has antecedents in earlier

⁷²³ Fontecedro 1997, Holzhausen 2000, for religious aspects Steinmetz 1982, 306 and Gwyn Griffiths 1984, 263-6

⁷²⁴ The parallel was put forward by Morawski in 1887, but only caught attention when Sajdak 1916 pointed out Morawski's discovery.

⁷²⁵ Holzhausen 2000 (approved by Fündling 2006, 1057).

⁷²⁶ It goes, however, too far to replace *nudula* in A4 by *nubila*, as Birley 1994 204 sq. wanted to have it.

⁷²⁷ The first of which had been remarked by Hollstein 1916, later by Kuhlmann 2002.

⁷²⁸ For which the metre is no objection, as the *muta* followed by *liquida* (in *frigida*) does not affect the length of the last *a* in *pallidula*.

poetry and contemporary literature, and is, like *pallidulus*, always connected with the brink of death. For example in Apuleius *Met.* 1.14.2: *At ego ut eram etiam nunc humi proiectus inanimis. Nudus et frigidus et lotio perlitus, quasi recens utero matris editus, immo vero semimortuus, verum etiam ipse mihi supervivens et postumus, vel certe destinatae iam cruci candidatus...* The person involved finds himself in a situation between life and death, as if he had just been born (*quasi...editus*) or is about to die (*semimortuus, mihi supervivens*) or even over the brink (*postumus*).⁷²⁹ The person lies on the ground (*nunc humi proiectus inanimis*), an element which underscores the association with death and the underworld. These same elements are found in Hadrian's poem when the poet says goodbye to his soul (involving such matters as a state of semi-death, being en route to the underworld, and, more in general, the mutability of fortune). The use of the word *frigidus* combined with *nudus*, often used to describe corpses, seems important.⁷³⁰

In conclusion, we find that, though the tricolon *pallidula rigida nudula* seems to be linked to *loca* grammatically, the meaning of the words unambiguously indicate a connection with *animula*, which can be shown to be semantically true for all of the three adjectives as long as we are prepared to read *rigida* as *frigida*. On first reading the tricolon the reader is unaware of any ambiguity, as he might initially be led to think that the words belong to *loca* (see the parallel with Ennius' *Andromache*). Later on he will come to appreciate that all the words refer to *animula*, just as *vagula* and *blandula* do. This option solves a problem already put forward by Deubner 1915, for which Holzhausen proposed a compromise that has seemed the best fitting solution thus far. The three words (*pallidula* on the one hand and the combination *frigida* and *nudula* on the other) are, apart from their link with *animula*, strongly associated with death and underworld (*loca*!), which makes the triplet a wonder of ambiguity. To this it may be added that the three adjectives combine the *animula*-theme as voiced in vss.1-2 and the *loca*-theme in v.3 in a most elegant fashion.

7.7 A Poetical volta (v.5)

After the *animula* (vss.1-2) and *loca* (v.3) and their ambiguous continuation (v.4), what could be on the poet's mind in the final verse? This verse seems to contain an assessment of the entire poem. The verse has often been seen as a sort of anti-climax after a wonderfully written miniature about the *animula*. This, however, is based on a wrong understanding of the word *iocos*, that often has been connected with humour, which would lead to a contrast with the most serious and melancholic tone of the first four verses. *Iocos*, however, refers to the poem itself as representant of the type of smaller poems, or epigrams, in general.

⁷²⁹ Keulen (2003, 258) comments on the passage by saying that the description is 'highly rhetorical (...) in the use of commonplace declamatory motifs of the mutability of fortune and frailty of men.'

⁷³⁰ There are other instances in which the combination *frigidus* / *nudus* appear, always with death-associations (see also Keulen 2003, 260). Ovidius *Ars. Am.* 2.238: *Saepe feres imbrem caelesti nube solutum / frigidus et nuda saepe iacebis humo* or Statius *Theb.* 9.895 (Dryas to his mother, before he offers his head to be cut off): *Frigidus et nuda iaceo tellure, nec usquam / tu prope, quae voltus efflantiaque ora teneres*. Cf. also Sen. *Suas.* 6.6; Lucr. 5.222 sqq.; Ov. *Pont.* 2.2.45: *iam prope depositus, certe iam frigidus, aeger*).

In Catullan verse, *ludere* or *iocari* can denote ‘to write poetry’, which becomes most apparent in c.50.1-5: *Hesterno, Licini, die otiosi / multum lusinus in meis tabellis / (...)/ scribens versiculos uterque nostrum / ludebat numero modo hoc modo illoc*⁷³¹ A similar interpretation of the *passer*-poem makes perfectly sense, when the wordings *ludere...solet* (c.2.4) and *lubet iocari* (c.2.6) are conceived as the writing or reading of poetry (Holzberg 2002, 66-7). As we have seen above, there is a correspondence in structure with *nec, ut soles, dabis iocos* in A 5. A prime sample of hendecasyllabic verse is provided by Pliny, who wrote two books of hendecasyllabi, and who comes up with this description (Ep.4.14.3): *his iocamur, ludimus, amamus, dolemus, querimur, irascimur, describimus aliquid modo pressius modo elatius,...* It thus appears that *iocari* and *ludere* are normal terms to describe ‘writing poetry’, be it in a lighter form.⁷³² The same applies for *ioci*, which have the same connotation as Catullus’s *nugae* (c.1). Pliny, again, distinguishes serious literature from light verse: *graviora opera lusibus iocisque distingo* (Ep. 8.21.2). A revealing passage is a description by Suetonius in his *De gramm. et rhet.* (21.1), about C. Melissus: *...libellos Ineptiarum, qui nunc Iocorum inscribuntur.*⁷³³ Suetonius, as Hadrian’s contemporary and even one of his closer assistants (*H* 11.3: *epistularum magister*), mentions a book that is called *Ioci* in his own times (*nunc!*). With a view to this remark by Suetonius it can be imagined that Hadrian also styled his own poems *Ioci*, which makes that the fifth verse of the poem with *iocos* relates to Hadrian’s own poetry. *Iocos dare* would, in this conception, denote ‘to make shorter poems/epigrams’ and *nec, ut soles, dabis iocos*: ‘you will not, as you like to do, produce *ioci* (like this one)’.⁷³⁴

One question has, as far as I know, never been posed: this is whether the five verses constitute the entire poem or are only the beginning of a longer piece. This last possibility must be taken seriously. As we have seen in a handful of examples in sections 3 and 4 (e.g. Laevius, Catullus, Hadrian’s *BA*, A. Gellius, Q. Gellius), the taste of the time was to spread long periods over a number of (short) verses, so that *...nec ut soles dabis iocos...* need not be the end of the poem: there was a tendency to join more clauses together by means of relative pronouns and other connectives.⁷³⁵ A is introduced by *et*

⁷³¹ The use of *ludere* and *iocari* for ‘writing poetry’ has become normal in the sec. c. AD, as appears from the text from Aulus Gellius, *NA* 19.11.2: *luserit, praeluderet*, quoted above, § 7.4.4.TLL ?

⁷³² OLD *lūdō* 8a (often with abl.): to spend one’s time idly or frivolously, amuse oneself, trifle (esp. w. ref. to the writing of lover poems and other of the lighter forms of literary composition) and b. (w. acc.) to write, produce, etc. (poems or sim.) for mere amusement. For *iocor* the OLD has no apart category for ‘writing’.

⁷³³ Bower 1974, 528 who traces the occurrences of *iocus*, *lusus*, *nugae* and *ineptiae*, concludes that the cited passage has to be interpreted as ‘books of *Ineptiae* (such as are) now called books of *Ioci*’, thus, the book written by Melissus formerly called *Ineptiae*, would in Suetonius’ times have been styled *Ioci*. Vacher (1993, 22 and 163), who agrees with Bower’s conclusion, remarks that *ineptiae*, *ioci*, *nugae* and *lusus* ‘semblent toujours s’appliquer à des vers’.

⁷³⁴ More examples in e.g. Martialis 7.8.9: *fas audire iocos levioraque carmina, Caesar / et tibi, si lusus ipse triumphus amat.*

⁷³⁵ For example Q. Tullius Maximus (Steinmetz 1989, 287), who, in one poem, uses the connectors *–que, ut, ut, ut, ut, ut, et, et*. Mattiacci 1982, 73sq. changed *nec* into *non* in order to restore the link with the main syntactical structure. Also Fündling 2006, 1058 is not happy with the connection of v.5 to the preceding lines: he calls it an ‘anspruchlose Parataxe durch *nec*’ and a ‘Komplement von v.1-4, nicht Höhepunkt des ganzen’. Shackleton Bailey (1985, 374), however, defends the normal *nec*: ‘...the connective *nec* has been a stumbling block (M. regards it as an equivalent of *non*). Is the difficulty real? ... (the adjectives) lead to and link up with the further statement in the last verse. *Datura* would have been syntactically smoother than *dabis*, but less forcible.’

moriens quidem hos versus fecisse dicitur (H 25.9) and followed by *tales autem nec multo meliores fecit et Graecos*. Nothing is said about an eventual fragmentary state of the verses. However, Yourcenar at the very end of her *Mémoires d'Hadrien* (1950) adds a proportional second half to a prose version of the poem, making A the first couplet of a poem consisting of two strophes.⁷³⁶ However ingenious the thought and beautiful the poem, I would rather plead for an extension that strongly fits the preceding lines, making the archaising apostrophe with appositions and *superflux* the beginning of a hymn to the departing soul.

7.8 *Animula* and the Poetry of its Time

Does this new interpretation of the poem, or rather the fragment, as a small hymn to the soul in Catullan style and with a poetical continuation, fit what we know about Hadrian's poetry in general? His biography in the *HA* notes his poetical activity: *Fuit enim poematum et litterarum nimium studiosissimus. (...) Iam psallendi et cantandi scientiam prae se ferebat. In voluptatibus nimius. Nam et de suis dilectis multa versibus composuit [amatoria carmina scripsit]*.⁷³⁷ Not much is known about his poems, as only three poems (of contested authenticity) have been transmitted.⁷³⁸ These three are characterised by a poignant and direct tone without much display of *doctrina*. Courtney (1993, 373) reckons Hadrian among the *poetae novelli*, whose poems are characterised by 'a strong tendency to affected simplicity, to a mingling of colloquialism, even vulgarism, with archaism (these two cannot always be kept apart)'. The *poetae novelli* are no well-defined group of poets, but are united by 'a lasting change of taste'. To these *poetae novelli* belong some poets of several generations, as Florus, Serenus and Apuleius. They agree in their rejection of Flavian mannerism and fall back on older forms and taste of poetry of the pre-classical era, though not shrinking from neologisms. Traces from Catullus are, among other poets, to be found in Apuleius.⁷³⁹

Ancient descriptions of Hadrian's poetry are not always in concordance with contemporaneous taste and usage. Hadrian with his *Catachannae* (H 16.2) has been interpreted as a follower of Antimachus of Colophon (active around 400 BC), who was well-known for his extreme obscurity and his ostentation of *doctrina*. The three transmitted poems ascribed to Hadrian are not of this type. According to Cassius Dio (69.4) Hadrian preferred Antimachus to Homer (a preference that is confirmed in H 16.6).⁷⁴⁰ According to his biographer, the author of *H*, Hadrian also preferred Ennius to Virgil (H 16.6), which is interesting in view of the aforementioned parallel with Ennius' *Andromache*. Hadrian, who is called *oratione et versus promptissimus et in omnibus artis*

⁷³⁶ Cf. Syme's assessment of Yourcenar's novel (1984) and Bruggisser 1997. It is striking that many readers suppose that Hadrian wrote the poem on his deathbed or while dying, which, of course, is not necessary at all. Barnes (1968, 384) even took it as an argument against its authenticity: '...and what is said [viz. in Dio 69.22.4, DB] of Hadrian's demeanour as he lay dying hardly suggests that he was capable of composing such verses'.

⁷³⁷ *HA* 14.9: The words between brackets may be a gloss: *glossema esse videtur omnibus codicibus inculcatum* (Hohl 1965, 16 ad H 14.4/5)

⁷³⁸ Zie Courtney 1993, 372-86 for introduction, text and commentary.

⁷³⁹ Courtney 1993, 373; Mc Creight 1990, 49-56.

⁷⁴⁰ *H* 16.6: *...eademque iactatione de Homero ac Platone iudicavit*.

peritissimus (H 14.4), is understood to have quarrelled with wise men: *libris vel carminibus invicem editis* (H 15.10-11). The poem *Ego nolo Florus esse* (H 16.3) is an example of polemic verse, the tone of which could well be based on Catullus's polemic poetry.

One important testimony of the judgment of Hadrian's contemporaries about his poetry is found in Apuleius' *Apologia* 11, written in 158 or 159 AD,⁷⁴¹ which is twenty years after Hadrian's death. In this work, Apuleius defends himself against a charge of *magia*. His plea begins with a literary topic: can the poet be identified with the contents of his poetry? As an example, Apuleius quotes three elegiac poems by the philosopher Plato, then two hendecasyllabic lines by Catullus and finally a one-line verse by Hadrian. The last two quotations are intended to indicate that an author's character cannot simply be assessed on the base of his poetry. Apuleius quotes Catullus 16.5-6: *Nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum, versiculos nihil necesse est*. Hadrian's verse is an epitaph on his colleague the poet Voconius and runs thus: *lascivus versu, mente pudicus eras*. Apuleius adds: *quod numquam ita dixisset, si forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiae habenda. Ipsius etiam divi Hadriani multa id genus legere me memini*.⁷⁴² Certainly, *multa id genus* refers to the *lepidiora carmina*, which is Hadrian's love poetry. Apuleius quotes Hadrian as an authority with regard to the experience that a poet of erotic verse is capable of leading a decent life,⁷⁴³ which characteristic, in this case, is applied to Voconius. This theme, both used by Catullus and Hadrian, suggests a link between the two poets, as witness Apuleius. Note that Catullus characterised his book of poems as a *lepidum novum libellum* (1.1), while Hadrian is taken to have written a work called *lepidiora carmina*.⁷⁴⁴ Tone, substance and technique of Catullus's poems must have appealed to Hadrian's temperament.

Returning to our initial question whether the author of the *HA* made use of an authentic document, it may be concluded that the poem fits remarkably well in the literature of the first half of the second century AD: idiom, structure and poetic forms are also encountered in contemporaneous poets and in preceding poetic traditions, while echoes of Hadrian's poem are found in later authors from the same century, Septimius Serenus and Aulus Gellius. The reconstruction of a dense web of relationships adds to the idea that the poem is authentic. It should rather be supposed that the author of the *HA* inserted an authentic poem in his biography of Hadrian than that he made up the poem himself, in imitation of the literary tastes of Hadrian's time⁷⁴⁵ - if only because that same author did not manage to produce anything of the same quality in his later biographies. Hadrian's poem inspired the author to add other imperial verses in his biographies, not unlike Suetonius' practice⁷⁴⁶ and that of Marius Maximus, who is said to have inserted much verse in his works, *C* 13.2: *versus ideo multi scripti sunt, de quibus etiam in opere suo*

⁷⁴¹ Hijmans 1994, 1713.

⁷⁴² The verses are introduced by the following sentence: *Divus Hadrianus, cum Voconi amici sui poetae tumulum versibus muneraretur ita scripsit:...*

⁷⁴³ The theme is also used by Pliny *Ep.* 4.14, who quotes the same lines by Catullus, Ovid *Tr.* 2.345 and Mart. 1.4.8. See Courtney 1993, 382 for further comments.

⁷⁴⁴ It is worthwhile to compare Aelius Caesar's predilections in poetry (Ovidius, Martialis), as attested in *Ael.* 5.9: *atque idem Apicii (ab aliis relata), idem Ovidii libros amorum in lecto semper habuisse, idem Martialem, epigrammaticum poetam, Vergilium suum dixisse*.

⁷⁴⁵ As Barnes (1968, 384-5) supposed.

⁷⁴⁶ Baldwin 1978, 57 (remark no.8); White 1967, 117n16.

Marius Maximus gloriatur. It is well possible that Marius Maximus is the one who is ultimately responsible for the transmission of Hadrian's propemptikon.⁷⁴⁷

⁷⁴⁷ Looking beyond the borders of *HA*, the idea of bilingual verses including formulas of modesty have been derived, as Den Hengst well observed (1995, 144) from Cic. *De Off.* 3.82, where Caesar quotes from Euripides' *Phoenissa* 3.82, translated by Cicero (disclaimer included): *incondite fortasse, sed tamen ut res possit intellegi*. The formula of modesty may have been derived from the quoted passage.

Chapter 8 Conclusion

8.1 Style and Structure of the *HA*

In the introduction to this study, we sketched the problems concerning the *HA* and the research since Dessau proposed that the *HA* was written by one author at the end of the fourth century AD. This viewpoint has never been challenged convincingly ever since, and has provided the point of departure for our investigation into style and structure of the *HA*. In addition, Syme's description of the author as a 'rogue scholar' or 'a frivolous impostor' helps us to understand the author's working method and the aim of his writing: at times he consciously seeks to delude the reader. Nevertheless, he made use of valuable source material about the imperial history of the second and third centuries AD. This means that historical as well as philological approaches may be applied to the *HA*.

In this study, it has been tried to cover several aspects of the heterogeneous nature of the *HA*. By taking style and structure as our point of departure, it has been possible to study many different elements within one framework. Moreover, comparing the many authorial comments which bear on style and structure with the actual form and content of the work has enabled the description of some of the recurring techniques in the composition of the work. Style was defined after Cuddon 1999, 872) as 'the characteristic manner of expression [...], how a particular writer says things', while structure is 'the sum of relationships of the parts to each other; thus the whole' (Cuddon 1999, 871). The difference between the two is a matter of level (style bearing on ways of expression, structure on how the narration is assembled) and in the relationships of the parts to one another, which, in these definitions, only concern structure.

In this study, structure has often been used to denote transitions from parts based on one source-text to parts based on another source-text. The chapter on the *Nomen Antoninorum* is an example of structural analysis of the text, on whose basis conclusions could be drawn about the origin of this particular theme and the developmental history of the text of the *HA*. In the introduction, distinction was made between sources and models, both being source-texts that provided the author with material for his narration. Sources were defined as those texts which provided the author with historical information about the described era while models are the texts which do not pertain to historical fact but which provided the author with formulas, expressions and ideas to embellish his narration. A third source of material for the narration is the author's own *inventio*.

Apart from shifts between models, sources and fictitious elements, use has been made of another important principle in the description of structure, which was borrowed from the field of Narrative Discourse as developed by Genette. The notions of time of the Story (TS), Time of the Narrative (TN) and Narrative Space (NS) were used to create a framework to study the *HA*'s structure, though Genette does not use the term 'structure' as such. In order to map the relationships between TN and TS on a macro-level, the definition of both terms was expanded by relating them to NS and historical time respectively. TN, measured in words, and TS, measured in temporal unities, can be analysed on the level of a book and of a series of books with fruitful results (see § 8.3-4).

That structure is an important aspect, in the sense of the relation between the different parts also within a book, may appear from the following example. In chapter 4, we studied the transitions from preface to biographical narration. These parts can be clearly distinguished in terms of temporal distribution. The same holds for transitions from historical narration to documents. The differences in temporal distribution enable us to distinguish different parts and the transitions between them, as well as the relations between the parts in terms of differences and contrasts. Two other examples may be taken from chapter 5 and chapter 6. The *NA* theme, which functions as an elaboration of the historical narration in which *TS* is absent (thus causing constant transitions to other ‘parts’), shows a wide internal coherence, in that there are many internal repetitions and variations within the parts, while there are only minor relationships with the direct narrative context. With regard to documents, as analysed in chapter 6, matters are the other way round: while in every single case there are clear transitions from one part to another (in temporal distribution, but also in speech mode), the continuity in narrative content, as determined by correspondence of historiographical material, is as good as complete. The documents appear to repeat much of what was said in the narration, be it in another speech mode and literary form.

Apart from the aforementioned uses of the term ‘structure’, namely the relationships between the parts determined by different source-texts and by switches in temporal distribution, the conventional use of the term, denoting the division of the narrative material over the books, has been faithfully applied. In chapter four, it was demonstrated how the author as a biographer took the life, or rather the reign, of an emperor, tyrant or co-emperor as point of departure for his biographical account. This structure was often commented upon by the author himself through programmatic remarks which especially occur in the prefaces. The notion of ‘paratext’, taken from Genette’s theory, has been used to analyse these particular parts in the structure of the *HA*. For further conclusions about this kind of ‘structure’, see below, § 8.4.

8.2 Sources and Models

Structure (in the sense of the distribution of the material over the books) has met with quite some attention in the investigative history of the *HA*.. This is hardly surprising, as its structure is so irregular that it invites closer inspection, in the hope of finding clues about the author’s use of sources. In the introduction, it has been sketched how the discussion about structure from Mommsen to Chastagnol developed: while Mommsen, followed by Lécivain, made a distinction between *Hauptviten* and *Nebenviten* (later indicated as Primary and Secondary Lives), while he also included *OM* and *Dd.* into the so-called ‘Diocletianische Reihe’, and recognised the different nature of the Earlier Lives as compared to the Intermediary and Later ones. Syme drew attention to the new beginning in the preface of *OM*, which marks the transition from *H* to *G* from the Intermediary Lives. Chastagnol 1994 described the *status quo* in the introduction to his edition of 1994, which serves as point of departure of our observations.

To the source texts used by the author in constructing his narrative, Cornelius Nepos has been added as an important model for the design of the series of biographies. Other models are Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Vergil, Suetonius, Juvenal, while sources of historical nature from the third century are: Marius Maximus, Herodian, Cassius Dio (to a

lesser extent), Dexippus, and from the fourth century: Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, their common ancestor Enmann's *KG*, and the *Epitome de Caesaribus*. There is a big gap between the sources and models that the author actually used and those that are mentioned in the *HA*: the narration is embellished with a large quantity of bogus sources (especially Iunius and Aelius Cordus, who fill the gap after the author took his leave of Marius Maximus). The bogus authors are part of an even larger number of bogus names, six of whom are the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* who grace the collection with their names. These fictional elements are characteristic of the construction of the *HA*: apart from the use of different sources and models, there are also the fictitious elements, all of which elements have left their mark on every level of the structure of the *HA*.

In chapters three, four and five, we have encountered several borrowings from Nepos, Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, the former used as a model in paratextual parts, the latter two as sources. A detailed analysis of the way in which the author borrowed words and clauses and rephrased them for his own use adds to our understanding of the author's stylistic principles. Therefore, we will sketch how the author proceeded in the combining of texts of different origin on a sentence level, taking our examples from the texts analysed in the chapters mentioned below. Only in the example taken from Suetonius (§ 8.2.4) new material is used in order to illustrate our point of view.

8.2.1 Shifts Between Source Texts

The first example is meant to illustrate how the author shifts from one source text to another, even if no interruptions in the narrative flow may be discerned in the text. V 1.3: *Igitur Lucius Ceionius Aelius Commodus Verus Antoninus, qui ex Hadriani voluntate Aelius appellatus est, ex Antonini coniunctione Verus et Antoninus, neque inter bonos neque inter malos principes ponitur*. The sentence is taken from the introduction to the life of Lucius Verus. In this phrase, there are several connections with other parts of the *HA*. The main component is the historical information which is also present in the Primary Lives of *H* 24.1, *AP* 4.5 and *MA* 5.1 and thus based on the main biographical source. The additions *Antoninus* and *et Antoninus*, underlined in the quotation, are the author's own additions, based on a fourth century tradition which assigns the *nomen Antoninorum* to Verus. The total is presented in the form of the *boni malique imperatores* theme, which plays a role throughout the *HA*, especially in SL, IL and LL. The sentence thus contains two transitions to parts based on 1) another historiographical tradition and 2) the author's literary *inventio*.

A second example shows how these three aspects of invention are intertwined in the narration, *OM* 4.6: *venatorem primo, post etiam tabellionem fuisse, deinceps advocatum fuisse fisci. ex quo officio ad amplissima quaeque pervenit. dein cum esset praefectus praetorii collega ablegato, Antoninum Caracallum imperatorem suum interemit tanta factione, ut ab eo non videretur occisus*. It may be supposed that the successive steps in Macrinus' career (*venator*, *tabellio*) are fictitious, reported on the authority of *plerique*.⁷⁴⁸ The function of *advocatus fisci* seems to be an imitation from *S* 2.4.⁷⁴⁹ The formula *ex quo...pervenit* is taken from Suetonius *Vesp.* 16.2 (see below, §

⁷⁴⁸ Turcan 1993, 125.

⁷⁴⁹ on its turn taken from Aurelius Victor 20.30-1 or Eutropius 8.18.2, thus Syme 1971, 81

8.2.3). The next sentence repeats what was said in *Cc.* 6.6-7 (see § 6.4). Thus, in these lines we find a succession of pure fiction, an imitation of *S*, an imitation of Suetonius and a repetition from *Cc.* The whole can be considered a construction made out of several processes of *inventio* of historiographical material.⁷⁵⁰ The structure is determined by various shifts between fiction, sources and models.

8.2.2 Nepos

In § 3.6, we encountered the following borrowings from Nepos in the dedications: Nepos *Att.* 18.2: *Sic familiarum originem subtexit, ut ex eo clarorum virorum propagines possimus cognoscere* was changed into: *Proposui enim, Diocletiane Auguste, omnes (...) in litteras mittere, ut omnes purpuratos, Auguste, cognosceres* (*AC* 3.3). Thus, *ut ...possimus cognoscere* has become *ut...cognosceres* with loss of the modal verb *posse*. This same principle is seen in Nepos *Epam.* 4.6: *plurima quidem proferre possumus, sed modus adhibendus est, quoniam uno hoc volumine vitam excellentium virorum complurium concludere constituimus*,... which is changed to *Max.* 1.1: *adhibui moderationem, qua in unum volumen duos Maximinos, patrem filiumque, congererem: concludere constituimus* is simplified and changed into *congererem*. The recurrence of the verb *concludere* in *Q* 1.3 proves that the changed element is still reused, but on another place: *atque contra Trebellius Pollio ea fuit diligentia, ea cura in edendis bonis malisque principibus, ut etiam triginta tyrannos uno breviter libro concluderet*,... The same occurs in the example encountered in § 3.2.2: Nepos, *Cato* 3.2: *tamen tantum progressum fecit, ut non facile reperiri possit* ... becomes *qui non multum profecit. Nam et pauca repperit*, in which *reperiri possit* is abbreviated to *repperit*.

In these modifications, it appears that the author of the *HA* normally chooses a simplified form in comparison with his model: *possimus cognoscere* → *cognosceres*; *concludere constituimus* → *congererem* / *concluderet*; *reperiri possit* → *repperit*. This principle corresponds with other changes, such as *modus adhibendus est* → *adhibui moderationem*; *progressum fecit* → *profecit*; *cupiditatem notitiae clarorum virorum* → *cupidum veterum imperatorum* (the last example taken from Nepos *Att.* 18.4 and *OM* 15.4). Taking into consideration that the number of examples is small, we may tentatively conclude that the author simplifies expressions when borrowing from a model. This indicates that the author may have known the sentences by heart, but not exactly *verbatim*. He comes up with variations on passages that he has read once, and uses them as a basis for his own simplified formulas.

⁷⁵⁰ Macrinus' function of *advocatus fisci* is an interesting case. Although the 'material' is derived from *S* 2.4 and in the end from Aurelius Victor 20.30-1 or eventually Eutropius 8.18.2 (Syme 1971, 81 calls the author's report 'total inadvertance, or rather wilful perversion'), the historiographical evidence, originally applicable to Septimius Severus (and dubious in itself already), becomes fiction by the transposition to another context, namely Macrinus' career. This shows how slippery the borderlines between historiographical evidence and fiction can be.

8.2.3 Suetonius

A parallel with Suetonius may elucidate the author's way of borrowing from models. In Suetonius' Life of Vespasian (16.2), it is told that the newly appointed emperor is generous in promotion of procuratores: *creditur etiam procuratorum rapacissimum quemque ad ampliora officia ex industria solitus promovere*. In OM 2.1 it was stated that Macrinus *privatas curabat*; in OM 7.1 he is *procurator privatae*, and is immediately admitted to the senatorial class.⁷⁵¹ In OM 4.6, it is told that *ex quo officio ad amplissima quaeque pervenit*. Nothing is known, historically, about Macrinus' position as a *procurator*, but given the close imitation of Suetonius in OM 4.6, we may assume that the immediate promotion of the *procurator* to the senatorial class is borrowed from that same place in Suetonius.

There are three principles in rewriting Suetonius that play a role here. First, there is an exaggeration in the verbal echo (*ad ampliora* → *ad amplissima*), while *officia* is detached from its adjective *ampliora* and recurs as *ex quo officio*. Then, *quemque* recurs in *quaeque* purely for the sound of the words. The acc. masc. singular returns as acc. neutr. plural. The clauses are split and regrouped:

Suetonius:	(<i>rapacissimum</i>) <i>quemque</i>	<i>ad ampliora</i> OFFICIA	<u><i>ex industria</i></u>
HA:	<u><i>ex quo</i></u> OFFICIO	<i>ad amplissima</i>	<i>quaeque</i>

The words are maintained (*quemque*, *ampliora*, *officia*) but the forms changed (*quaeque*, *amplissima*, *officio*); the prepositions are shifted (*ex industria*, *ex quo officio*), while at the same time keeping others in their place (*ad ampliora*, *ad amplissima*). The echo indicates, again, that the author had a phrase of Suetonius in mind, which he uses and slightly alters.

8.2.4 Eutropius

There are numerous other examples of the same technique. Let us reconsider again the borrowing from Eutropius 8.9.2 in MA 7.6 (see § 5.2.1):

Eutropius 8.9.2	MA 7.6
<u><i>Tuncque primum Romana res publica</i></u>	<i>Atque ex eo pariter coeperunt rem</i>
<u><i>duobus aequo iure imperium</i></u>	<u><i>publicam regere. Tuncque primum</i></u>
<u><i>administrantibus paruit, cum usque ad</i></u>	<u><i>Romanum imperium duos Augustos</i></u>
<u><i>eum singulos semper habuisset Augustos.</i></u>	<u><i>habere coepit, cum imperium sibi</i></u>
	<u><i>relictum cum alio participasset.</i></u>

A change of casus (*res publica*, *rem publicam* and, though in the same outward appearance, *imperium* and *imperium*), and regrouping (*Romana* (A) *res publica* (B) and

⁷⁵¹ OM 7.1: *Opilium Macrinum ... primum in patricios allegit, novum hominem et qui paulo ante procurator privatae fuisset*; OM 7.4: *denique statim Macrino et proconsulare imperium et potestatem tribuniciam detulerunt*.

imperium (C) in Eutropius recurs as *rem publicam* (B) and *Romanum* (A) *imperium* (C) in HA, which results in a formula (the majuscule denoting the substantive, the minuscule the attribute): aB, C → B, aC. The example from Suetonius shows a similar change: *quemque* (A) *ad ampliora* (B) *officia* (C) → *ex quo officio* (C) *ad amplissima* (B) *quaeque* (A), so: A, bC → C, bA. If we try to harmonize the two formulas, the following formula is applicable to the principle of ‘regrouping’:

$$(Ab)C \rightarrow A(Cb)$$

in which the minuscule ‘b’ denotes the adjective dependent on a Head (‘A’), that later joins the clause of another Head (‘C’).⁷⁵² The order of the elements can differ: so (Ab)C → A(Cb) is not essentially different from (Ab)C → (Cb)A, or (bC)A, or other variants.

8.2.5 Aurelius Victor

In the borrowing from Aur. Vict. 20.30 (*Illatumque Marci sepulcro, quem adeo percoluerat, ut eius gratia Commodum inter divos referre iusserit, fratrem appellans, Bassianoque Antonini vocabulum addiderit...*) in S 19.3 (*Inlatus sepulchro Marci Antonini, quem ex omnibus imperatoribus tantum coluit, ut et Commodum in divos referret et Antonini nomen omnibus deinceps quasi Augusti adscribendum putaret* (see § 5.2.2), *ut...referre iusserit* was simplified to *ut ... referret*, conforming the principle as described above, § 8.2.2. In another case, the opposite occurs: *addiderit* becomes *adscribendum putaret*. The author had to adapt Victor’s statement to his own purposes: in the case of the HA, a future plan is expressed (*adscribendum putaret*), while Aurelius mentions a bare fact (*addiderit*). For the rest, the marked choice of words by Aurelius Victor is normalized by the author of the HA: *percoluerat* → *coluit*; *adeo* → *tantum*; *inter* → *in*; *vocabulum* → *nomen*.

The examples show how the author proceeds in adapting his source-texts. The procedures, which may be augmented by the rewriting of parts of Cc. in G as described in § 5.4, may reveal a more general practice in the use of source-texts, which invites further research. The HA provides valuable material for the analysis of borrowings in late antique historiography.

8.3 The Literary Design

In chapter 3, formal aspects of the narrative have been studied from many different angles. We have caught the author in the act of criticizing his fellow biographers, Cordus in particular, for their zeal in pursuing minor details in emperors’ lives, while the author himself is a prominent representative of this reprehensible practice. This is why his programmatic remarks regarding biography can be read as a kind of *anticipatio*.

A discontinuity between programmatic remarks and actual content is also seen in the description of the content of the HA, or the categories of *principes* indicated by the author. Sometimes, *principes* denotes all kinds of rulers (*Augusti*, *Caesares*, pretenders),

⁷⁵² For the term ‘Head’, see Pinkster 1990, 73.

sometimes only the *Augusti*, and in other places the pretenders are meant. Not always are all the categories mentioned, but the author varies his statements according to the context in which they occur.

Discrepancies occur in statements about the beginning and the end of the *HA*: in *Ael.*, the author suggests that his narration begins with Julius Caesar, while in *Hel.* he promises to continue as far as Constantine's reign, while in actual fact the transmitted text of the *HA* treats the emperors from Hadrian up to Diocletian. So, the author deliberately transcends the borders of the narrative in his programmatic remarks, for which Tacitus may have served as the example.

The author's statements about the style of the *HA* cannot be understood without keeping its ending in mind: he states that the (allegedly) reigning emperors have to be described in the lofty style which corresponds with historiographic practice. A difference with other authors, however, is the fact that he actually applies this lofty style in the lives of Claudius, Probus and Tacitus, whereas he states that he only provides the bare facts.

It can be easily understood that the *HA*, at least the earlier books, is dedicated to Diocletian, as his reign is the ending point of the series. The dedications are formulated with words borrowed from Nepos. From *Hel* onwards, the author addresses dedications to several persons (including Constantine). Combined with the use of several 'noms de plume' as pseudonyms, the variety of dedications suggest that the *HA* was written over a considerable period of time by several authors.

With regard to temporal aspects of the narrative, we have concluded that there is a conspicuous break in narrative speed between *G* and *OM*: a slowing-down occurs after the Earlier Lives, which corresponds with the historiographical practice to describe more recent times more elaborately, cf. e.g. Ammianus Marcellinus from *RG* 14 onwards. Tacitus in his introduction to his *Annales* does the same for the republican period. On the other hand, there is a perfect balance between IL and LL when it comes to the relation TN : TS.

Temporal analysis can shed a new light on the phenomenon of the *lacuna*: the evenness of NS in IL and LL may indicate a deliberate programme. More important may be the author's ideological aims for the *HA*: the narrative continues at a moment when the Roman empire was in a deep crisis, which underlines the bad government of the emperor Gallienus. The deliberateness of the lacuna can also be related to the 'lost beginning': the author may wish to make believe that there has been an accidental loss, while in fact he presents a truncated work to posterity, suggesting that he has described all the emperors from Julius Caesar onwards. The inclusion of a preface and the lives of Nerva and Trajan would undermine the author's claim that he took such an early beginning point for his narration.

Thus, we have examined many formal aspects of the narration, from outward appearance to types of text, content and style, while indicating models for these structures and examining what the author himself says about these aspects. With regard to this last aspect: discontinuity between authorial comment and actual practice is a characteristic trait in the literary design of the *HA*.

8.4 Structures in Individual Books

The point of departure of this chapter has been the observation that programmatic passages, especially prefaces, cause breaks in the structure of the books. There is a difference in temporal distribution between prefaces and the biographical narration, the former not containing TS, while the latter does. We have seen that prefaces are unequally distributed over the books of the *HA*: in PL, only V is equipped with a preface, while in SL three lives have a preface (*Ael.*, *PN* and *G*), and all books in IL (except for *AS* and *MB*) and all in LL (except for *Val.* and *Gall.*). The prefaces steadily grow in length. Often, the author marks the transition from preface to narration by an explicit statement (§ 4.1).

The biographical narration starts in general with a name in the dative or genitive in PL. In SL, the biographical narration begins with the subject's name in the nominative (*AC*, *ClA*, *PN* and *G*), except for the unclear beginning of *Ael.* In IL, however, the *ablatus absolutus* (denoting the death of the previous emperor) is the normal beginning of the narrative, while the emperor described is denoted in the nominative. In LL, the sequence '*ablatus absolutus* – emperor (in nominative) – *origo*' fades away, while the author increasingly seeks to vary the fixed structures. He embellishes his narration with discussions about place of birth (*A*, *Car.*) or, alternatively, seeks to postpone (in *Cl.* and *Tac.*) the essential information (§ 4.2).

The distribution of the content of the *HA*'s narrative is designed artfully: in the Earlier Lives, the lives of rulers from different categories (emperors, heirs and pretenders) are treated in separate books, a procedure which is continued in the first half of IL. This structure changes from *Max.* onwards, with the combination of father and son Maximinus, and continues in *Gd.* and *MB*. In LL, this phenomenon manifests itself in exaggerated form, combined with a structure taken from EL, namely the treatment of tyrants in separate books: combined emperors (*Val.*, *Gall.*, *Car.*) and combined tyrants (*T*, *Q*), as well as separate emperors (*Cl.*, *A*, *Tac.*, *Pr.*).

This chapter ends with a discussion of time in a narratological framework with regard to the series (which poses special problems in narratology), at the hand of an analysis of temporal distribution in PL. In historiography, as has been pointed out in the Introduction (§ 1.3.4), TN is more than an aspect of the story, since TS in historiography is strongly related to historical time. In biography, the lives of the emperors dictate the distribution of the *materia*, their births, accessions and deaths, thus providing and marking fixed moments in the narrative. If we compare the duration of the periods spanned by these three temporal markers (viz. those from birth to accession and from accession to death), it turns out that TN is inversely proportional to TS: while, on average, 18 per cent of TN is devoted to 78 per cent of TS in earlier careers, in the emperor's reigns 82 per cent is devoted to 22 per cent of TS. We introduced the term 'Biographical Factor' to denote the relation between the attention paid to earlier careers and to reigns. In the case of PL, attention paid to the reigns is 16 times higher than the attention paid to earlier careers.

This leads to the conclusion that the emphasis in serial biographies of emperors, at least in PL, is not so much on their lives, but rather on their reigns. This observation may be obvious, but is more important than it might seem at first glance, as the correspondences with historiography as a type of text may now be determined

objectively. In biography, the *materia* is distributed over the books in correspondence with the lives of the emperors but, in practice, there is only a slight difference with historiographers, such as Herodian, who structure their *materia κατὰ χρόνους καὶ δυναστείας*.

8.5 The NA Theme

After this repetition of the highlights, we will elaborate on the further consequences of the conclusion drawn at the end of chapter 5. The first occurrences of the name of Antoninus as a title is in *Ael.* 5.12-3, *AP* 4.5 and 6.10 and *MA* 7.6, while the *nomen Antoninorum* as a literary theme begins to play a role from *S* 10 onwards. We have to distinguish between the Antonine name based on historical evidence, for example the bestowal of the name to Caracalla, and the historically erroneous attributions of the name to Verus and Geta, who never bore the name of Antoninus. After *S* and *Cc.*, the name occurs as an expanding literary theme presented in dreams, oracles, letters, *contiones*, *orationes*, *acclamations*, *omina*, poems, historical narrations, programmatic statements, prefaces, epilogues and dedications. The *nomen Antoninorum* is a rhetorical exercise which functions as a method to hide the author's lack of information about some of the emperors (Geta, Macrinus and his son Diadumenian), or, from a formal point of view, to link the series of PL (together with *G*) to those of IL.

The passages which contain the NA theme are sharply distinguished from the historical narrative, which is based on a basic biographical source in PL, or on other sources, such as Herodian in *OM* 8-10, or the Epitome in *Hel.* 17 (or their common source), or fictitious passages in IL. In these and other instances, the omission of the theme would lead to a better narrative flow of the narration and cause a better understanding of some knotty problems. It also appears that the much discussed acclamations in *AS* 7-12 are additions to a text of a different nature, which may easily be observed by the fact that Alexander's answer in *AS* 8.1 is a reaction to the senate's words in *AS* 6.3-5, which indicates that the NA passage in *AS* 7 must be considered an addition. This also suggests that the NA passages in *AS* 7.2-12.1 are additions. When these passages are omitted, the length of the acclamations in *AS* 6 and 8 is comparable to those in *AS* 56.2-10, which passage contains Alexander's words and the senate's reaction to it. In *Gd.*, the passages mainly function as expansions of the historical narration: often, variations on the name of Antoninus appear as an addition to an enumeration of other items (such as the emperor's literary works (*Gd.* 3.3 and 7.8), or the question of names (*Gd.* 9.3-4; 17.1-5).

The NA theme appears in many variations distributed over the successive books, such as Septimius Severus' and Macrinus' reasons to call their sons Antoninus, the name as *cognomen* or *praenomen*, the popularity of the name, the number of Antonini and the pollution of the name. The growing praise of the name does not run parallel to the increasing vilification of the bearers of the name (especially Commodus and Elagabalus), which process ends in the refusal of the name by Alexander Severus, after which it regains strength, paradoxically, in Gordian's biography. It is striking, that in the biography of Commodus the theme is absent, while in Elagabalus' biography it only plays a minor role, whereas in the biographies of Geta (who was never called Antoninus

historically) and Macrinus (who only called his son Antoninus) the theme is omnipresent. This shows that the author did not really need an historical base to elaborate the theme, and that the literary function of the theme has to be sought elsewhere.

The measurement of the relative NS of the 54 *NA* fragments comes to 10 per cent of the total of the books in which the passages occur (which is the part running from *S* to *Gd.* minus *Max.*). There are clear incongruencies between the *NA* passages and the historical narration. This fact leads to the supposition that the passages in *G*, *OM* and *Dd.* (containing the largest *NA* parts in a relative sense) which do not pertain to the *NA* theme are based on other sources than the historiographical narration. The basic source must have contained a book in which the lives of Caracalla and Geta were combined. There are clues in the text of *OM* and *Dd.*, such as *Dd.* 8.1-3 (see § 5.4.2), which indicate that the lives of Macrinus and his son Diadumenian were also treated in one book, probably in an earlier stage of composition of the *HA*. There are, however, no signs that the lives were based on one identifiable source (apart from, e.g., Herodian), but the basic parts of *OM* and *Dd.* were probably invented by the author. This may explain the frequent occurrence of documents in *Dd.*, and to a lesser extent in *OM* (analysed in § 6.4).

Our conclusion that the parts of *OM* and *Dd.* not pertaining to the *NA* theme were part of a single book at an earlier stage raises questions about the relation of the two to other books. It looks as if a process of different redactions must have taken place between the first series of lives of reigning emperors, which Syme styled the 'Nine Lives' (*H*, *AP*, *MA*, *V*, *C*, *P*, *DI*, *S*, *Cc.*)⁷⁵³ and the final adding of the *NA*-theme (which in its turn was never interrupted by fragments based on other sources), including the resulting separation of *Cc.* and *G*, and *OM* and *Dd.* One of the questions was whether *Dd.* was a continuation of the secondary lives, or whether the secondary lives were composed after *OM* and *Dd.* fell apart, *Dd.* being the catalyst? This last option is less probable, as *G* must have existed already as a separate life before the *NA* theme was added (see the analysis of the structure of the preface in § 5.4), so the phenomenon of secondary lives, which do not contain *NA* passages, already existed before *Dd.* came into being. As the author originally had no intention to write a separate biography on Diadumenian, the combined *OM*+*Dd.* must have been the continuation of the series of emperors from Hadrian to Caracalla, beginning with *Occiso ergo Antonino Bassiano Opilius Macrinus ... imperium arripuit* (*OM* 2.1) in the plain style of an abbreviator. After the Nine Lives had been extended with secondary lives (*Ael.*, *AC*, *PN*, *ClA*, *G*), accompanied by documents, prefaces, dedications and programmatic remarks, the *NA* theme was introduced only after the adding of the preface, as becomes clear from the preface to *G*:.⁷⁵⁴ In order to create a new secondary life of *Dd.*, the *NA* theme was blown up to huge proportions, and *Dd.* was born out of the 'idée-mère' of that biography.

The key question is how we should imagine the way in which these additions were made. That the *HA* is full of loosely attached fragments can be easily noticed. A lot of material from biographical, historiographical texts or works of a different nature were at the author's disposal, apart from his taste for fiction. Given these characteristics, there are two different answers to the question how the *HA* attained its final form: either the *HA* grew in successive stages as the author added new material to an existing text, or the

⁷⁵³ Syme 1971, 52 and 73.

⁷⁵⁴ That the prefaces were written before the adding of the *NA*-theme also becomes clear from *Dd.* 6.1, in which elements of the preface to *OM* recur.

author used and combined several sources distorting and expanding these with fictional elements. The hypothesis that is maintained throughout this study, and which has not been rejected by the evidence, is that the *HA* is the work of a single author, using a number of heterogeneous sources and his own inventions, adding and correcting his text as he went on.⁷⁵⁵ Neither of the options provides the sole solution to the development of the *HA*, but the analysis of the *NA* theme does suggest that these parts were added at a later stage of redaction. The incongruencies between historical narration and the *NA* passages indicate that the latter were added to an already existing text, which the author did not always take the trouble to revise.

8.6 Narrative Space

After having studied two kinds of recurring passages, viz. the prefaces and the *NA* theme, another typical aspect has been inspected: the documents. The inventory of Lécivain 1904 was taken as point of departure, in which acclamations, letters, and official documents (such as abstracts from the *acta urbis* and *acta senatus*) were encountered. The category of letters to and from the emperors turned out to be the largest category of all. The documents can all be considered fictitious, even if the author suggests that they are all based on written evidence, like the documents inserted in Suetonius. We have investigated how the author applied all kinds of variations in the insertion of his documents (marked by words such as *indo*, *insero*, *intexo*, *interpono*, etc., or an elliptic construction (*haec, talia, exemplum, capita*, etc.)). In few cases, the source of the document, fictitious or not, is explicitly mentioned, in other cases the author just quotes the document. Sometimes, he mentions a document which he has at his disposal, or which has been lost in the course of history, and which he does not quote. Documents in *IS* are practically absent in the *HA*. The documents are mostly quoted to support the historical narration. Often, the purpose of the insertion of the document is explicitly mentioned in the introduction, or mentioned afterwards.

The documents, the *NA* theme and the prefaces (treated in chapters five and four respectively) have in common that they all are meant to support and embellish the historical narration. They also have in common that they cause considerable breaks in the relation of *TN* and *TS*, which may be described as retardation. In themes and prefaces, *TS* is absent, while in documents *TS* and *TN* are equal. Therefore, the three kinds of passages are major landmarks in the structure of the *HA*, occupying 3 per cent (prefaces and the *NA* theme) and 13 per cent (documents) of *NS* in the *HA*. The development of the structure of the *HA* from *H* to *Car.*, on the added understanding that the dispersed Secondary Lives were considered a unity in the analysis, was expressed in *NS* of the passages in the individual lives. The following table, which draws on the information as provided in figure 6.2, shows the distribution of the *NA* theme, prefaces and documents over *PL*, *SL*, *IL* and *LL*; the shade of the cells corresponds with the number words as shown in the legend:

⁷⁵⁵ As proposed by Paschoud 1996, xxxv-xxvi. This could either have been done by rewriting the texts with insertion of the glosses and side-productions, or eventually by dictating, as the author himself states in *T* 33.8: *...non scribo sed dicto, et dicto cum ea festinatione, quam (...) sic perurgueo, ut respirandi non habeam facultatem*, which was the usual procedure in the author's time (as Schlumberger 1976b defends).

<i>PL</i>					<i>SL</i>				
<i>Book</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>doc.</i>	<i>Pref.</i>	Σ	<i>Book</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>doc.</i>	<i>pref.</i>	Σ
<i>H, AP, MA</i>					<i>Ael.</i>				
<i>V</i>					<i>AC</i>				
<i>C</i>					<i>PN</i>				
<i>P, DI</i>					<i>CIA</i>				
<i>S</i>					<i>G</i>				
<i>Cc.</i>					Σ				2 595
Σ				563	<i>LL</i>				
<i>IL</i>					<i>Val.</i>				
<i>OM</i>					<i>Gall.</i>				
<i>Dd.</i>					<i>T</i>				
<i>Hel.</i>					<i>Cl.</i>				
<i>AS</i>					<i>A</i>				
<i>Max.</i>					<i>Tac.</i>				
<i>Gd.</i>					<i>Pr.</i>				
<i>MB</i>					<i>Q</i>				
Σ				7319	<i>Car.</i>				
					Σ				10 149
shade	NS (wds)	shade	NS (wds)	shade	NS (wds)				
	> 2000		1000-1500		250-500				<100
	1500-2000		500-1000		100-250				

Figure 10.1: NS of the NA theme, documents and prefaces in the individual books and in PL, SL, IL and LL (based on absolute numbers).

The table is based on countings of absolute numbers of words. The relative NS of the investigated passages in PL, SL, IL and LL, however, is 2, 25, 21 and 30 per cent respectively. This shows that PL is different from the other lives when it comes to the inclusion of these passages, which can be explained by the author's use of a different source in the first Nine Lives of reigning emperors. Two other striking results are the fact that documents and the NA theme exclude one another in EL and that the NA theme does not occur in the Secondary Lives of usurpers, AC, PN and CIA.

The last part of chapter six was devoted to a close analysis of a document, Macrinus' letter to the senate in OM 6. It appeared that there is a correspondance between the historical narration and the content of the letter, in other words, that elements of the historical narration served as *materia* for the composition of the letter. The materia was taken from the Primary Lives such as *H* (for Caracalla's desired triumph) and *Cc.* (for Caracalla's murder) and corresponds with the documents in Diadumenian's biography (e.g. the acclamations). The letter's perspective, namely Macrinus' view of his becoming emperor, caused elements from the historical narration to be reused in another function, namely to show Macrinus' perfidity.

In chapter 7, an attempt has been made to authenticate *A* by tracing the poem to the poetical fashion of the century in which it was supposedly written, the first half of the second century AD. Such authors as Martial, Apuleius and Septimius Serenus show that the work of Hadrian fits the taste of the time. All of these poets tend to fall back upon the poetry of the later republican era, in which poets such as Laevius and Catullus modelled their poetry on Hellenistic examples. The form of the epigrams and the use of diminutives are two features common to the poetry of the eras in question.

If one is prepared to take one further step, it could even be concluded that Hadrian's *Animula* is directly modelled on Catullus' second *Carmen*, in its chosen structure (with traits deriving from archaic poetry), theme (farewell to a small creature that is deceased or is about to die) and tone. As in *Cat.c.2*, the diminutives in *A* vary in tone from tender to dramatic. Whereas in v.1 *animula*, *vagula* and *blandula* show the poet's tender and loving attitude towards his soul, in v.4 the adjectives *pallidula*, *rigida* and *nudula*, on the contrary, have a dramatic tone, corresponding with the semantics of the words describing the condition of the deceased soul in the underworld.

Another conclusion concerns the much debated fourth verse: following Holzhausen and Fündling, I regard the attribution to *Animula* or *loca* as ambiguous: grammatically, they seem to be linked with *loca*, but their meaning points to an animate object (especially *nudula*). This is especially the case when *rigida* is read as *frigida*, resulting in a notable combination with *nudus*, which has connotations with *pallidulus* as an attribute for a being on the brink of death.

Two new proposals have been made. In the first place, the possibility of a poetical reading of *ioci* has been proposed: when this word is understood as 'light verse' or 'trifles' in a literary sense, the result is one of finding the author Hadrian to comment on his own poetry, which is a characteristic shared with many epigrams by Catullus and his follower Martial. The other notion introduced in this study is that the fifth verse is not necessarily the last one. It is even probable, especially in view of another epigram by Hadrian (*Borysthenes Alanus*), that the transmitted verses are only the first part of a longer poem.

The origin of these 'imperial poems' lies in *H* 25.9-10, where the famous *animula vagula blandula* is quoted. Contrary to the poems in, e.g., *PN* and *OM*, this concerns an authentic document. The example of an 'imperial poem' is provided by this first specimen by Hadrian, which ends as follows: *tales autem nec multo meliores fecit et Graecos*. This could well be true: producing epigrams in Greek and Latin was a common literary activity that flourished in the second century AD,⁷⁵⁶ based on an Hellenistic tradition from the first century AD. The emperor's polemics with contemporary poets are attested in *H* 16.3-4, the poetic correspondence between Hadrian and Flavius Florus. This kind of verse may have served as model for the mock-polemic verses in *PN*, *OM* and later biographies. The chapter ends with the suggestion that Marius Maximus may have served as a source for the verses of *A*.

⁷⁵⁶ See for many examples G. Nisbet 2003; Cazzaniga mentions as authors in the tradition of *Spottgedichte* Fronto and Numenius (1972, 138)

8.8 Further Research

Our investigation of style and structure of the *Historia Augusta* has produced, apart from a good deal of detailed observations, new ways of applying narratological analysis to historiographical texts. Above all, Narrative Space and the relation between Time of the Narrative and Time of the Story may invite further study. I hope to have demonstrated that a quantitative approach may be useful to investigate certain phenomena in the *HA*, such as the differences and the relations between its component parts from word-level to the level of the whole collection. The transitions between the parts may be researched in further detail, with due attention to linguistic characteristics. For example, the distribution of certain words with a high frequency or stylistic phenomena may be inventoried and the distribution over the books of the *HA* in order to find out whether there are striking differences between the books or the parts. The differences between the Primary Lives on one hand and the Secondary, Intermediary and Later Lives on the other have been shown to be beyond doubt, which may lead to a closer exploration of the question in what sense these parts exactly differ. We may, after all, suppose that the Primary Lives remain very close to an original source, possibly from the third century (as Dessau supposed).⁷⁵⁷ Closer analysis may lead to further understanding of the author's own additions to that text. Shifts between basic source and insertions may be found by tallying repetitions and the use of certain linguistic means to links the additions to their basic source (such as particles, pronomina relativa or anaphoric pronomina, type: *de hoc eodem*).

The method of comparing differences between the four parts may be applied in further detail by comparing the individual books or passages within the parts. After all, as we concluded (at the hand of the *NA* theme), the differences in style not only occur between the books, but also within them. It is worthwhile investigating stylistic and linguistic differences between related parts with their context. Therefore, a full inventory of all the themes encountered in the *HA* will be helpful. A closer investigation of the theme of the *boni malique imperatores*, treated in § 3.10, for example, may lead to a better understanding of the author's ideas behind the composition of the *HA* as a whole and its ideological background. I refrain, as I have done throughout this study, from relating this background to the historical situation in which the author wrote his biographies. At the same time, I hope to have shown that study of the literary art of the *HA* can be undertaken entirely independently from the vexed question of authorship and historical situation.

Several correspondences between the Primary Lives and the obviously different Intermediary Lives have been inspected. For example, the contrast of Macrinus' words to the senate in *OM* 6 (in *DD*) and Hadrian's words in *H* 6.1-2, or the *vates caelestis* in *P* 8 and *OM* 3 (see note 209). Other examples are the construction of the names of the fictitious *Annius Severus* and *Fabia Orestilla* in *Gd.* 6.4 and 17.4, based on several historical persons in *MA* and *V* (see note 599). The life of Marcus, in which it is said that he honoured his teachers with golden statues in a *lararium* (*MA* 3.5) may be equally the basis for Alexander Severus' *lararium* with venerated gods and Romans (*AS* 31.4-5). In

⁷⁵⁷ Dessau 1892, 601: 'Zu dem Besten, was sich in unseren Biographien findet, gehört der Abriss des Vorlebens einiger Kaiser des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. Und diese Abschnitte sind, wie sich Leicht beweisen lässt, unverändert übernommen einem Autor, der vor der Mitte des 3. Jahrhunderts geschrieben hat'.

these cases, the Primary Lives may have served as a source text for the composition of the narration in the Intermediary Lives. On a much larger scale, the same occurs in the Secondary Lives, where whole passages were copied from the Primary Lives (see the example of *G* in relation with *Cc.* treated in § 5.4.1 and the classical case of *AC* in relation with *MA* treated by Klebs and Mommsen). A full inventory of all such correspondences will show the relationships between the different parts.⁷⁵⁸

Apart from these suggestions for further research into the *HA*, the method used to measure NS provides a point of departure for further research in biography (especially Suetonius) and historiography. Comparison of the results with books outside the *HA* is certainly important to determine whether the *HA* is as unique in its design as often has been thought. Furthermore, comparison with other biographers such as Diogenes Laertius and Plutarch may lead to a better insight in classical biography. Studies about biography have flourished in the past decade, but the *HA* is often treated as a work *sui generis*, which it is indeed when the enormous problems it confronts us with are viewed. Still, the author must have had at his disposal such a wealth of treasures that classical literature produced in all its eras, that the text of the *HA* needs ever more and closer study, especially in its relation to other literary works.

⁷⁵⁸ Other examples are the murder of Caracalla in *Cc.* 8 and 10 and in *OM* 4, though here, the passages in *Cc.* may be additions to the text, instead of the other way round; viz. the imitation of *Cc.* in *OM*.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

AAWM	<i>Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz</i>
AAT	<i>Atti Accademici Torino</i>
AHB	<i>The Ancient History Bulletin</i>
AJPh	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AL	<i>Anthologia Latina</i>
AN	<i>Ancient Narrative</i>
AnTard	<i>Antiquité Tardive</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt</i>
AS	<i>Ancient Society</i>
BHAC	<i>Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
CLE	<i>Carmina Latina Epigraphica</i>
CM	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
CPh	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
GCN	<i>Groningen Colloquium on the Novel</i>
GR	<i>Greece & Rome</i>
HAC	<i>Historiae Augustae Colloquium</i>
JCPH	<i>Jahrbuch für classische Philologie</i>
JJP	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JThS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LF	<i>Listy Filologicché</i>
MEFR	<i>Mélanges de l'école française de Rome</i>
N.S.	<i>Nova Series</i>
PLLS	<i>Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar</i>
PP	<i>La parola del passato</i>
REA	<i>Revue des Études Anciennes</i>
REL	<i>Revue des Études Latines</i>
RH	<i>Revue Historique</i>
RhM	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Geschichte und griechische Philosophie</i>
RIFC	<i>Rivista di Istruzione e Filologia Classica</i>
RPh	<i>Revue de Philologie</i>
RSA	<i>Rivista Storica dell' Antichità</i>
RSI	<i>Rivista Storica Italiana</i>
SBA	<i>Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft</i>
SO	<i>Symbolae Osloenses</i>
YCS	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

General Bibliography

- ABRAMS, M.H. 1981⁴
 A Glossary of Literary Terms, New York 1981⁴
- ADAMS, J.N. 1972
 ‘On the Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*’ *CQ* 22 (1972)
- ALFÖLDY, G. 1976
 ‘Zwei Schimpfnamen des Kaisers Elegabals: Tiberinus und Tractatitius’, *BHAC* 1972/4, Bonn 1976, 11-21
- ALFÖLDY, G. 1989
 Die Krise des Römischen Reiches, Stuttgart 1989
- ALFÖLDI, A. 1968
 ‘Die Erklärung des Namens “Caesar” in den spätromischen Kompendien (zu v. Ael. 2,3-5)’, *BHAC* 1966/7, Bonn 1968, 9-18
- ANDRE, J.-M. 1993
 ‘Hadrien littérateur et protecteur des lettres’, *ANRW* II 34.1 (1993) 583-611
- ANDREONI FONTECEDRO, E. 1995
 ‘*Animula vagula blandula*’, *Aufidus* 9 (1995) 26: 7-27
- ANDREONI FONTECEDRO, E. 1996
 ‘*Animula vagula blandula*’, *Plutarco e la religione, atti del VI convegno plutarcheo* 1995, ed. I. Gallo, Naples 1996, 311-320
- ANDREONI FONTECEDRO, E. 1997
 ‘*Animula vagula blandula*: Adriano, debitore di Plutarco’, *QUCC* 55 (1997) 59-69
- ANSELM, S. 2004
 ‘Struktur und Transparenz: eine literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse der Feldherrnrviten des Cornelius Nepos’, *Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium*, Stuttgart 2004
- ARNAUD-LINDET, M.-P. 1991 (ed.)
 Orosius, *Histoires (contre les Païens)* tome III livre VII, , Paris 1991
- ARNAUD-LINDET, M.-P. 1994 (ed.)
 Festus, *Abrégé des hauts faits de peuple romain*, Paris 1994
- ARRIGONI BERTINI, M.G. 1980
 ‘Tentativi Dinastici e celebrazioni genealogiche nel tardo impero (III-IV Sec. d.C.)’, *RSA* 10 (1980) 187-205
- AVENARIUS, G. 1956
 Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung, Meisenheim, Glan 1956
- BAL, M. 1997²
 Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative, Toronto 1997²
- BALDWIN, B. 1970
 ‘Hadrian’s Farewell to Life: Some Arguments for Authenticity’, *CQ* 20 (1970) 372-4
- BALDWIN, B. 1978
 ‘Verses in the *Historia Augusta*’, *BICS* 25 (1978) 50-8
- BALDWIN, B. 1978b
 ‘Festus the Historian’, *Historia* 27 (1978b) 197-217

- BALDWIN, B. 1979
 'The *acta diurna*', *Chiron* 9 (1979) 189-203
- BALDWIN, B. 1981
 'Acclamations in the *Historia Augusta*', *Athenaeum* 59 (1981) 138-49
- BALDWIN, B. 1981b
 'Ausonius and the *Historia Augusta*', *Gymnasium* 88 (1981b) 438
- BALDWIN, B. 1980
 'Tacitus, the *Panegyrici Latini* and the *Historia Augusta*',
Eranos 78 (1980) 175-8
- BARBIERI, G. 1954
 'Mario Massimo', *RIFC* 32 (1954) 36-66; 262-75
- BARNES, T.D. 1967
 'Hadrian and Lucius Verus', *JRS* 57 (1967) 65-79
- BARNES, T.D. 1967b
 'The Family and Career of Septimius Severus', *Historia* 16 (1967) 87-107
- BARNES, T.D. 1968
 'Hadrian's Farewell to Life', *CQ* 18 (1968) 384-6
- BARNES, T.D. 1970
 'The Lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin Historical Tradition', *BHAC* 1968/9
 (1970) 13-43
- BARNES, T.D. 1970b
 'The Goddess Caelestis in the *HA*', *JThS* 21 (1970) 96-101
- BARNES, T.D. 1972
 '*Ultimus Antoninorum*', *BHAC* 1970 (1972) 53-74
- BARNES, T.D. 1972b
 'Some Persons in the *Historia Augusta*', *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 140-82
- BARNES, T.D. 1978
 'The Sources of the *Historia Augusta*', *Collection Latomus* 155, Brussel 1978
- BARNES, T.D. 1982
The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine, Cambridge,
 Massachusetts 1982
- BARNES, T.D. 1995
 'The Sources of the *Historia Augusta* (1967-1992)', *HAC Maceratense*, Bari
 1995, 1-34
- BARNES, T.D. 1996
 'Oppressor, Persecutor, Usurper: The Meaning of 'Tyrannus' in the Fourth
 Century', *HAC Barcinonense*, Bari 1996, 55-65
- BARNES, T.D. 1998
Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality,
 Ithaca New York 1998
- BASSETT, H.J. 1920
Macrinus and Diadumenianus, Wisconsin 1920
- BAYNES, N. 1926
The Historia Augusta. Its date and purpose, Oxford 1926
- BECK, D. 2008
 'Character-Quoted Direct Speech in the *Iliad*', *Phoenix* 62 (2008) 162-83

- BECKBY, H. 1965-8
Anthologia Graeca, Munich 1965-1968
- BEER, S. DE 2005
 'The Panegyric *Inventio*. A Rhetorical Analysis of *Panegyricus Latinus V*', in:
The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies, ed. K.A.A. Enenkel, I.L. Pfeijffer, Leiden 2005, 295-318
- BENARIO, H.W. 1997
 'Ignotus', the 'Good Biographer', *ANRW* II, 34.3, Berlin 1997, 2759-2772
- BERANGER, J. 1953
 'Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du Principat', *SBA* 6, Basel 1953
- BERANGER, J. 1976
 'L'Idéologie impériale dans l'Histoire Auguste', *BHAC* 1972/1974, Bonn 1976, 29-55
- BERANGER, J. 1985
 'Le *privatus* dans l'*Histoire Auguste* et dans la tradition historique', *BHAC* 1982/1983, Bonn 1985, 21-55
- BERTRAND-DAGENBACH, C. 1990
 'Alexandre Sévère et l'Histoire Auguste', *Collection Latomus* 28, Brussels 1990
- BIRD, H. 1971
 'Suetonian Influence in the Later Lives of the H.A.', *Hermes* 99 (1971) 129-34
- BIRD, H. 1997
 'The *Historia Augusta* on Constantine's Lineage', *Arctos* 31 (1997) 9-17
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1965
 'The Origins of Gordian I', *Britain and Rome: Essays presented to E. Birley*, Kendal 1965, 56-60
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1966
Marcus Aurelius, London 1966
- BIRLEY, A. 1967
 'The Augustan History', in: Dorey, T.A. *Latin Biography*, London 1967, 113-38
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1976
Lives of the Later Caesars. The First Part of the Augustan History, with Newly Compiled Lives of Nerva and Trajan, Harmondsworth 1976
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1978
 'Pertinax and the Alimenta', *BHAC* 1975/1976, Bonn 1978, 87-90
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1971
 'Septimius Severus. The African Emperor', London 1971
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1988²
 'The African Emperor. Septimius Severus', London 1988²
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1994
 'Hadrian's Farewell to Life', *Laverna* 5 (1994) 176-205
- BIRLEY, A.R. 1995
 'Indirect Means of Tracing Marius Maximus', *HAC Maceratense*, Bari 1995, 57-74

- BIRLEY, A.R. 1997
 'Marius Maximus: The Consular Biographer', *ANRW II*, 34.3, Berlin 1997, 2679-2757
- BIRLEY, A.R. 2002
 'Trebellius Pollio and Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius', *HAC Perusinum*, Bari 2000, 33-47.
- BIRLEY, A.R. 2003
 'The Historia Augusta and Pagan Historiography', in: G. Marasco, Leiden 2003, 127-49
- BIRLEY, A.R. 2005
 'Hadrian, *De vita sua*', *Antike Autobiographien* (ed. M. Reichel), Wenen 2005, 223-235
- BIRLEY, A. 2006
 'Rewriting Second- and Third-Century History in Late Antique Rome', *Acta (Brasil)* 19 (2006) 19-29
- BIRT, TH. 1913
Römische Charakterköpfe, Leipzig 1913, 309
- BLECKMANN, B. 1997
 'Überlegungen zur Enmannschen Kaisergeschichte und zur Formung historischer Traditionen in tetrarchischer und konstantinischer Zeit', *HAC Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 11-37
- BLOCH, H. 1901
 'Ein karolingischer Bibliothekskatalog aus Kloster Murbach', *Strassburger Festschrift zur XLVI. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner*, Strassburg 1901, 271
- BLOCKLEY, R.C. 1952
 'Ammianus and Cicero: The Epilogue of the *History* as a Literary Statement', *Phoenix* 52 (1998) 305-14
- BLOCKLEY, R.C. 2001
 'Ammianus and Cicero on Truth in History', *AHB* 15 (2001) 14-24
- BLOIS, L. DE 2003
 'The Perception of Roman Imperial Authority in Herodian's Work', in: *Impact of Empire 3: The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power*, (ed. L. De Blois et al.), Amsterdam 2003, 148-56
- BLOIS, L. DE 2006
 'The Onset of Crisis in the First Half of the Third Century A.D.', in: Johnes, K.-P. (ed.) 2006, 25-36
- BOEFT, J. DEN et al. 2007
 'Ammianus after Julian. The reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the *Res Gestae*', ed. J. den Boeft et al., *Mnemosyne, Monographs on Greek and Roman Language and Literature* vol. 289, Leiden 2007
- BOEFT, J. DEN et al. 2008
Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI, edd. J. Den Boeft, J.W. Drijvers, D. Den Hengst, H.C. Teitler, Leiden 2008
- BALLOU, S.H. 1914
The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta, Leipzig 1914

- BOLLANSÉE, J. 1994
 'Hadrian's Memoirs. An Imperial Epistolary Autobiography', *AS* 25
 (1994) 279-302
- BOWER, E.W. 1974
 'Ineptiae and ioci', *Latomus* 33 (1974)
- BOWERSOCK, G.W. 1998
 'Vita Caesarum. Remembering and Forgetting the Past', in: *La biographie antique. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, tome XLIV, Genève 193-215
- BRANDT, H. 1996
Kommentar zur Vita Maximi et Balbini der Historia Augusta, Bonn 1996
- BRANDT, H. 1999
 'Dexipp und die Geschichtsschreibung des 3.Jh. n.Chr.', in Zimmermann 1999, 169-81
- BRODSKA, D. 1998
Der Romideologie in der römischen Literatur der Spätantike, Frankfurt am Main 1998, 56-64
- BRUGGISSER, PH. 1997
 '«Patience d'un impatient», Hadrien à l'approche de la mort, de l'Histoire Auguste à Marguerite Yourcenar', *Historia Augusta Colloquium Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 39-70
- BRUGGISSER, PH. 1998
 'Pour parler comme les grammairiens', *HAC Argoratense*, Bari 1998, 67-82
- BRUNT, P.A. 1966
 'The 'Fiscus' and Its Development', *JRS* 56 (1966) 75-91
- BÜCHELER, F. / A. RIESE 1895
Anthologia Latina, Leipzig 1895
- BÜHLER W. 1978
 'Ein unbekanntes, Kaiser Hadrian zugeschriebenes Epigramm (Mitteilungen aus griechischen Handschriften, 6)', *ZPE* 31 (1978) 55-60
- BURGERSDIJK, D. 2004
 'De ziel van keizer Hadrianus', *Hermeneus* 76.5 (2004) 304-14
- BURGERSDIJK, D. 2005
 'Zenobia's Biography in the *Historia Augusta*', *TAAANTA* 36/37 (2004/5) 139-151
- BURGERSDIJK, D. 2007
 'Nepos in der *Historia Augusta*', *HAC Bambergense*, Bari 2007, 95-107
- BURGERSDIJK, D. 2008
 'De overlevering van Nepos' *De excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium*', *Kleio* 37.2 (2008) 65-78
- BURGERSDIJK, D. forthcoming
 'Plinius' *Panegyricus* and the *Historia Augusta*', Paper held at the Conference *Pliny the Younger in Late Antiquity*, University of St Andrews May 2010, *Arethousa*, forthcoming
- BURGESS, R.W. 1993
 'Principes cum Tyrannis: Two Studies on the *Kaisergeschichte* and its Tradition', *CQ* 43.2 (1993) 491-500

- BURGESS, R.W. 1995
 'On the Date of the Kaisergeschichte', *CPh* 90 (1995) 111-28
- BURGESS, R.W. 1996
 'Jerome's *Chronici canones*, Quellenforschung and Fourth-Century Historiography', *HAC* 6 (1996) 83-104
- BURGESS, R.W. 2005
 'A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the Epitome de Caesaribus Between 358 and 378, Along with Further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the Kaisergeschichte', *CPh* 100 (2005) 166-92
- BURIAN, J. 1977
 'Fides Historica als methodologischer Grundsatz der *Historia Augusta*', *Klio* 59 (1977) 285-98
- BURIAN, J. 1980
 'Die kaiserliche Akklamationen in der Spätantike', *Eirene* 17 (1980) 30 *sqq.*
- CALLU, J.-P. 1985
 'La première diffusion de l'Histoire Auguste (VIe-IXe s.)', *BHAC* 1982/3, Bonn 1985, 89-129
- CALLU, J.-P. 1991
 'Vérus avant Vérus', *HAC Parisinum*, Macerata 1991, 101-22
- CALLU, J.-P. 1992
Histoire Auguste tome I 1^{re} partie, *Vies d'Hadrien, Aelius, Antonin*, Paris 1992
- CALLU, J.-P. 1997
 '«Quellenforschung» et bibliothèques familiales', *HAC Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 71-84
- CAMERON, A.D.E. 1964
 'Literary Allusions in the *Historia Augusta*', *Hermes* 92 (1964) 363-77
- CAMERON, A.D.E. 1971
 Review of *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, by Ronald Syme, *JRS* 61 (1971) 255-67
- CAMERON, A. 1980
 'poetae novelli', *HSCPh* 84 (1980) 127-75
- CAMERON, A.D. 2001
 'The *epitome de Caesaribus* and the *chronicle* of Marcellinus', *CQ* 51 (2001) 324-7
- CAPE, R.W. 1997
 'Persuasive History: Roman Rhetoric and Historiography', in: *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, ed. W.J. Dominik, London 1997, 212-28
- CARLOZZO, G. 1977
 'Su alcuni procedimenti die composizione nella *Historia Augusta*', *Pan* 15 (1977) 43-78.
- CARRIO, L. 1886
In A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum libros commentario, Bratislava 1886 (ed. M.J. Hertz, or. Paris 1585)
- CASCÓN, A. 1996
 'El humor en la *Historia Augusta*: características literarias y función crítica', *HAC Barcinonense*, Bari 1996, 147-63

- CAZZANIGA, 1972
 'Gli Epigrammi contra Diadumeniano e Macrino (H.A.) e la tradizione epigrammatica', *PP* 27 (1972) 137-55
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1964
 'Le problème de l'Histoire Auguste: État de la question', *BHAC* 1963, Bonn 1964, 43-71
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1967
 'Emprunts de l'Histoire Auguste aux "Caesares" d' Aurelius Victor, *RPh* 41 (1967) 85-97
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1968
 'L'utilisation des *Caesares* d' Aurelius Victor dans l'Histoire Auguste', *BHAC* 1966/1967, Bonn 1968, 53-65
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1972
 'L'H.A. et les douze Césars de Suetone', *BHAC* 1970 (1972) 109-23
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1970
 'Les recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste de 1963 à 1969', *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste, Antiquitas Reihe 4 Band 6*, Bonn 1970, 1-37
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1970b
 'Le poète Claudien et l'Histoire Auguste', *Historia* 19 (1970) 444-63
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1985
 'Autour du thème du *princeps clausus*', *BHAC* 1982/3, Bonn 1985, 149-61
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1987
 'Rencontres entre l'Histoire Auguste et Cicéron (à propos d' Alex. Sev., 6, 2), *MEFR* 99 (1987) 905-19
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 1994 (ed.)
Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs Romains des IIe et IIIe siècles, Paris 1994
- CHATMAN, S. 1972 (ed.)
Literary Style: A Symposium, London 1971
- CHAUSSON, F. 1995
 'L'autobiographie de Septime Sévère', *REL* 73 (1995) 183-9
- CHAUSSON, F. 1997
 'Severus XVII,5-XIX,4: une identification?', *HAC Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 97-113
- CHILVER, G.E.F. 1979
A Historical Commentary on Tacitus' Histories I and II, Oxford 1979
- COURTNEY, E. 1993
The Fragmentary Latin Poets, Oxford 1993
- CROOK, J.A. 1955
Consilium Principis. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian, Cambridge 1955
- CUDDON, J.A. 1999
The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory, London 1999 (1977)
- DACK, E. VAN 'T 1985
 'Verus Antoninus. Le chapitre 4 de la Vita Macrini', *BHAC* 1982-1982, Bonn 1985, 177-97

- DAHLMANN, H. 1979
 'Ein Gedicht des Apuleius? (*Cell.* 19. 11)', *AAWM* 1979,8, 3-18
- DAM, H.-J. VAN 2008
 'Vobis pagina nostra dedicatur: Dedication in Classical Antiquity', *Cui dono lepidum novum libellum. Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia* vol. 23, ed. I. Bossuyt et al., Leuven 2008, 13-33
- DAMSHOLT, T. 1964
 'Zur Benutzung von dem Breviarium des Eutrop in der Historia Augusta', *CM* 25 (1964) 138-50
- DAMSTÉ, P.H. 1912
 'Ad Scriptores historiae Augustae', *Mnemosyne* 40 (1912) 259 sqq.
- DAVIDSON, T.S. 1946
 'A Problem of Senate Procedure in the Late Roman Empire', *AJPh* 67 (1946)
- DEMANDT, A. 1978
Metaphern für Geschichte, Sprachbilder und Gleichnisse im historisch-politischen Denken, München 1978, 36-55
- DESBORDES, O., S. Ratti 2000 (edd.)
Histoire Auguste tome IV 2^{ème} partie, *Vies des deux Valériens et des deux Galliens*, Paris 2000
- DESSAU, H. 1889
 'Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 24 (1889) 337-92
- DESSAU, H. 1892
 'Über die Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 27 (1892) 561-605
- DEUBNER, L. 1915
 'Hadrians Abschied vom Leben', *NJ* 18 (1915) 412-3
- DOMASZEWSKI, A. von 1909
 'Macrinus', *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser*, Leipzig 1909, 270-1
- DOMASZEWSKI, A. 1918
Die Personennamen bei den Scriptores historiae Augustae, Heidelberg, 1918
- DOMASZEWSKI, A. von 1918b
 'Die Consulate der römischen Kaiser', *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1918
- DRIJVERS, J. 2007
 'Ammianus on the Revolt of Firmus', in: Den Boeft *et al.* 2007, 129-55
- DUBUISSON, M. 2000
 'Un curieux moustique', *Latomus* 59 (2000) 673-675
- DUFRAIGNE, P. (ed.)
Livre des Césars, Aurelius Victor, Paris 1975
- EADIE, J.W. 1967 (ed.)
Festus, The Breviarium of Festus. A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary, London 1967

- ENMANN, A. 1884
 ‘Eine Verlorene Kaisergeschichte der Römischen Kaiser und das Buch *De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae*’, *Philologus Supplement Band* 4.3, Göttingen 1884, 337-501
- ENSSLIN, W. 1955
 rec. J.A. Crook 1955, *Historia* 4 (1955) 475-9
- EYBEN, E. 1973
 ‘Die Einteilung des menschlichen Lebens im römischen Altertum’, *RhM* 116 (1973) 150-90
- FEENEY, D.C. 1993
 ‘Towards an Account of the Ancient World’s Concepts of Fictive Belief’, in: *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, ed. C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman, Exeter 1993, 230-44
- FESTY, M. 1999
 ‘Aurelius Victor, source de l’*Histoire Auguste* et de Nicomaque Flavien’, *HAC Colloquium Genevense*, Bari 1999, 121-33
- FESTY, M. 1999 (ed.)
Pseudo-Aurelius Victor. Abrégé des Césars, Paris 1999
- FESTY, M. 2005
 ‘Réflexions sur l’ *Origo Constantini imperatoris* (Anonymi Valesiani pars prior)’, *HAC Barcinonense*, Bari 2005, 181-193
- FESTY, M. 2007
 ‘L’*Histoire Auguste* et les Nicomaques’ *HAC Colloquium Bambergense*, Bari 2007, 183-195
- FORCELLINI, A. 1858-1875
Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, Prato 1858-1875
- FORDYCE, C.J. 1965
Catullus, Oxford 1965 (1961)
- FORNARA, C.W. 1983
The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome, Berkeley 1983
- FREYBURGER, G. 1978
 ‘La supplication d’action de grâces sous le Haut-Empire’, *ANRW* 2.16.2 (1978) 1418-39
- FÜNDLING, J. 2006
Kommentar zur Vita Hadriani der Historia Augusta, Bonn 2006
- FÜNDLING, J. 2008
 ‘Marc Aurel’, *Gestalte der Antike*, Darmstadt 2008
- GALLAVOTTI, V.F. 1971
 ‘*Animula nudula*’, *Maia* 23 (1971) 297-302
- GARNSEY, P. 1988
Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World. Responses to Risk and Crises, Cambridge 1988
- GASCOU, J. 1984
Suétone Historien, École française de Rome 1984
- JANON, M. 2000
 ‘Les chevaux d’Hadrien’, *RAN* 33 (2000) 61-68

- GENETTE, G. 1980
Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method, Ithaca, New York 1980
- GENETTE, G. 1988
Narrative Discourse Revisited, Ithaca 1988
- GENETTE, G. 1993
Fiction & Diction, tr. C. Porter, Ithaca 1993
- GENETTE, G. 1997
 'Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation', tr. J.E. Lewin, *Literature, Culture, Theory* 20, Cambridge 1987
- GENETTE, G. 1997b
Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree, tr. Ch. Newman, C. Doubinsky, Lincoln Nebraska 1997
- GOODYEAR, F.R.D. 1970
 'Tacitus', *Greece and Rome. New Surveys in the Classics* no.4, Oxford 1970
- GOW, A.S.F. 1932
 'Diminutives in Augustan Poetry', *CQ* 26 (1932) 150-8
- GOW, A.S.F., D.L. PAGE, (edd.)
The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams, Cambridge 1965
- GRAVERINI, L. 2006
 'An Old Wife's Tale', in: *Lectiones Scrupulosae. Essays on the Text and Interpretation of Apuleius' Metamorphoses in honour of Maaike Zimmermann*, ed. W.H. Keulen e.a., Groningen 2006, 88-110
- GREEN, R.P.H. 1981
 'Marius Maximus and Ausonius' *Caesares*', *CQ* 31 (1981) 226-36
- GREEN, R.P.H. 1991
The Works of Ausonius, Oxford 1991
- GREEN, R.P.H. 1999
 'Ausonius' *Fasti* and *Caesares* revisited', *CQ* 49 (1999) 573-8
- GRIFFITHS, J.G. 1984
 'Hadrian's Egyptianizing Animula', *Maia* 36 (1984) 263-6
- HAEHLING, R. VON 1991
 'Der obstessende Kaiser: ein Paradigma für Luxuria in der Tyrannentopik der Historia Augusta', *BHAC* 1986/1989 (1991) 93-106
- HALKIN, L. 1953
 'La supplication d'action des grâces chez les romains', *Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège* fasc. CXXVIII, Paris 1953
- HARTKE, W. 1951
Römische Kinderkaiser. Eine Strukturanalyse römischen Denkens und Daseins, Berlin 1951
- HASEBROEK, J. 1916
Die Fälschung der Vita Nigri und Vita Albini in den Scriptorum Historiae Augustae (Berlijn 1916)
- HASEBROEK, J. 1921
Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Kaisers Septimius Severus, Heidelberg 1921

- HAÜSSLER, R. 1964
 'Vom Ursprung und Wandel des Lebensaltervergleichs', *Hermes* 92 (1964) 313-41
- HAVERFIELD, F. 1916
 'Tacitus During the Late Roman Period and the Middle Ages', *JRS* 6 (1916) 196-201
- HEER, J.M. 1901
 'Der historische Wert der Vita Commodi in der Sammlung der S.H.A.', *Philologus Supplement* 9 (1901) 1-208
- HELLEGOUARC'H, J. 1999 (ed.)
Eutrope, Abrégé d'histoire Romaine, Paris 1999
- HENGST, D. DEN 1981
The Prefaces in the Historia Augusta, Amsterdam 1981
- HENGST, D. DEN 1984
 'De Romeinse Keizerbiografie', *Lampas* 17.4 (1984) 367-80
- HENGST, D. DEN 1987
 'Verba, non res. Über die Inventio in den Reden und Schriftstücken in der Historia Augusta', *BHAC 1984/1985 Bonn* 1987, 157-74
- HENGST, D. DEN 1991
 'The Author's Literary Culture', *HAC Parisinum 1990*, Macerata 1991, 161-9
- HENGST, D. DEN 1994
 'Some Notes on the Vita Taciti', *HAC Genevense 1991*, Bari 1994, 101-7
- HENGST, D. DEN 1995
 'Selbskommentare in der Historia Augusta', *HAC Maceratense*, Bari 1995, 151-67
- HENGST, D. DEN 1995b
 'Graece hoc melius. Een schelm in litteris', *Schurken en schelmen: cultuurhistorische verkenningen rond de Middellandse Zee*, ed. A.M. van Erp Taalman Kip, Amsterdam 1995, 139-48
- HENGST, D. DEN 1997
 'Die Poesie in der Historia Augusta. Bemerkungen zur Opiliusvita', *Classica Cracoviensia* 3 (1997)
- HENGST, D. DEN 1998
 'Alexander en Rome', *Lampas* 32 (1998) 3-24
- HENGST, D. DEN 1998b
 Rec. Paschoud 1996, *Antiquité Tardive* 6 (1998) 415-9
- HENGST, D. DEN 2000
 'Senium Imperii', in: *Ultima Aetas. Time, Tense and Transience in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Jan den Boeft*, J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, C.H. Kroon (edd.), Amsterdam 2000, 61-71
- HENGST, D. DEN 2002
 'The Discussion of Authorship', *HAC Perusinum* (2002) 187-95
- HENGST, D. DEN 2002b
 'L'Empereur et les sortilèges. Littéraire orakels in de Historia Augusta', *Tesserae Latinae. Utrechtse historische cahiers* 23, 1 (2002) ed. J. Blok 80-93

- HENGST, D. DEN 2004
 ‘The Plato of Poets’: Vergil in the *Historia Augusta*, *Romane Memento. Vergil in the Fourth Century*, ed. R. Rees, London 2004, 172-88
- HENGST, D. DEN 2009
Emperors and Historiography. Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire by Daniël den Hengst (edd. Burgersdijk, D.W.P. and J.A. van Waarden), Leiden 2010
- HERKOMMER, E. 1968
Die Topoi in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtschreibung, Tübingen 1968
- HIDBER, T. 2006
 ‘Herodians Darstellung der Kaisergeschichte nach Marc Aurel’, *Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* Band 29, Basel 2006
- HIDBER, T. 2007
 ‘Herodian’, De Jong and Nünlist (edd.) 2007, 197-212
- HIGHET, G. 1954
Juvenal the Satirist, Oxford 1954
- HIJMANS, B.L.
 ‘Apuleius Orator: ‘Pro se de Magia’ and ‘Florida’, *ANRW* 2.34.3, Berlin 1994, 1708-1784
- HINDS, S. 1998
Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry, Cambridge 1998
- HOFMANN, J.B., A. SZANTYR 1972²
Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, München 1972² (1965)
- HOHL, E. 1911
 ‘Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaiser Tacitus’, *Klio* 11 (1911) 178-229 and 284-324
- HOHL, E. 1912
 ‘Vopiscus und Pollio’, *Klio* 12 (1912)
- HOHL, E. 1915
 ‘Das Problem der Historia Augusta’, *NJbb* 35 (1915) 413-5
- HOHL, E. 1915b
 ‘Bericht über die Literatur zu den Scriptores historiae augustae für die Jahre 1906-1915’, *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 171 (1915) 95-146
- HOHL, E. 1920
 ‘Über den Ursprung der HA’, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 296-309
- HOHL, E. 1924
 ‘Bericht über die Literatur zu den Scriptores historiae Augustae für die Jahre 1916-1923’, *JAW* 200 (1924) 167-210
- HOHL, E. 1924
 Review of: Stade, K. ‘Der Politiker Diokletian und die letzte grosse Christenverfolgung’ (Wiesbaden 1926), *Gnomon* 5 (1929) 105-9
- HOHL, E. 1934
 ‘Zur Historia-Augusta-Forschung’, *Klio* 27 (1934) 149-64

- HOHL, E. 1937
 ‘Bericht über die Literatur zu den *Scriptores historiae Augustae* für die Jahre 1924-1935’, *JAW* 256 (1937) 127-56
- HOHL, E. 1949
 ‘Maximini duo Iulii Capitolini’, *Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen* 172, Berlin 1949
- HOHL, E. 1950
 ‘Ein politischer Witz auf Caracalla’, *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1950 nr.1
- HOHL, E. 1955
 ‘Die *HA* und die *Caesares* des Aurelius Victor’, *Historia* 4 (1955) 220-8
- HOHL, E. 1958
 ‘Über das Problem der *Historia Augusta*’, *WS* 71 (1958) 132-52
- HOHL, E. 1965² (ed.)
Scriptores Historiae Augustae vol. I and II, ed. E. Hohl, Leipzig 1965 (1927)
- HOHL, E. 1976
Historia Augusta. Römische Herrschergestalten. Eingeleitet und übersetzt von Ernst Hohl, ed. E. Merten, A. Rösger, preface by J. Straub, Zürich/München 1976
- HOLFORD-STREVE, L. 2003²
Aulus Gellius, An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement, Oxford 2003²
- HOLLSTEIN, H. 1916
 ‘Ein Gedicht Hadrians’ *RhM* 71 (1916) 406-14
- HOLZHAUSEN, J. 2000
 ‘Hadrians nous und seine *animula*’, *RhM* 143 (2000) 96-109
- HOMO, L. 1926-1927
 ‘Les documents de l’Histoire Auguste et leur valeur historique’, *RH* 151 (1926) 161-98, 152 (1926) 1-31
- HÖNN, K. 1911
Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Viten des Heliogabalus und des Severus Alexander, Leipzig 1911
- HONORE, T. 1987
 ‘*Scriptor Historiae Augustae*’, *JRS* 77 (1987) 156-76
- HORSFALL, N. 1987
 ‘The “Letter of Cornelia”: Yet More Problems’, *Athenaeum* 65 (1987) 231-4
- HORSFALL, N. 1989
Cornelius Nepos. A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus, Oxford 1989
- HOSIUS, C. A. 1903
A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum libri xx, volumen alterum, Leipzig 1903
- HUNINK, V. 1997 (ed., comm.)
Apuleius of Madauros pro se de Magia, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1997
- HUTTNER, U. 2004
 ‘*Recusatio Imperii*. Ein politisches Ritual zwischen Ethik und Taktik’, *Spudasmata* Band 93, Hildesheim 2004
- IMMISCH, O. 1915
 ‘Hadrians Abschied vom Leben’, *NJ* 18 (1915) 201-3; 415-6

- INSTINSKY, H.U. 1942
 ‘Das angebliche Legionskommando in der militärischen Laufbahn der Kaiser Maximinus, Claudius Gothicus und Aurelianus’, *Klio* 34 (1942) 118-20
- INSTINSKY, H.U. 1942b
 ‘Kaiser und Ewigkeit’, *Hermes* 77 (1942) 313-55
- JANSON, T. 1964
Latin Prose Prefaces, Stockholm 1964
- JANOUSSEK J. 1984
 ‘Animula vagula blandula. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Gedichtes’, *ZJKF* 26 (1984) 49-52
- JOHNE, K.-P. 2006 (ed.)
Deleto paene imperio Romano. Transformationsprozesse des Römischen reiches im 3. Jahrhundert und ihre Rezeption in der Neuzeit, Stuttgart 2006
- JOHNE, K.-P. 2008
 (ed.)
Die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235-284), Berlin 2008 2 vols.
- JONG, I. DE, 2004²
Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad, Bristol 2004²
- JONG, I. DE, R. NÜNLIST 2007 (edd.)
 ‘Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative vol. II’, *Mnemosyne Bibliotheca Classica Batava vol. 291*, Leiden 2007
- JORDAN, H., F. EYSENHARDT 1864 (edd.)
Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Berlin 1864
- JULIEN, Y. 1998 (ed.)
Aulu-Gelle. Les Nuits Attiques, tome IV, livres XVI-XX, Paris 1998
- KELLY, G. 2007
 ‘The Sphragis and Closure of the *Res Gestae*’, in: Den Boeft *et al.*, 2007, 219-412
- KELLY, G. 2007b
 ‘“To Forge Their Tongues to Grandeur Styles”, Ammianus’ Epilogue’, in: Maricola 2007, 474-80
- KELLY, G. 2008
Ammianus Marcellinus. The Allusive Historian, Cambridge 1998
- KIENAST, D. 1996²
Römische Kaisertabelle, Darmstadt 1996²
- KLEBS, E. 1888
 ‘Die vita des Avidius Cassius’, *RhM* 43 (1888) 321-46
- KLEBS, E. 1890
 ‘Die Sammlung der Scriptores Historiae Augustae’, *RhM* 45 (1890) 436-64
- KLEBS, E. 1892
 ‘Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae’, *RhM* 47 (1892) 1-52, 515-49
- KOLB, F. 1972
 ‘Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der Historia Augusta’, *Antiquitas Reihe 4 Band 9*, Bonn 1972
- KOLB, F. 1987
 ‘Untersuchungen zur Historia Augusta’, *Antiquitas Reihe 4, Band 20*, Bonn 1987

- KOLB, F. 1997
 'Politische Terminologie und historisches Milieu: Kinderkaiser und *parens principis* in der *Historia Augusta*', *Historia Augusta Colloquium Bonnense*, Bari 1997,
- KOLB, F. 1995
 'Cassius Dio, Herodian und die Quellen der *Historia Augusta*', *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Maceratense*, edd. G. Bonamente, G. Paci, Bari 1995, 179-91
- KOVACS, D. 1989
 'Notes on Latin Prose Authors', *AJPh* 110 (1989) 233-6
- KOZIOL, H. 1872
Der Stil des L. Apuleius, Hildesheim 1988 (Vienna 1872)
- KISCH, Y. de 1973
 'Sur quelques *omina imperii* dans l'Histoire Auguste', *REL* 51 (1973) 190-207
- KRAGGERUD, E. 1993
 'Hadrian's *Animula vagula*. Diagnosis and Interpretation', *SO* 68 (1993) 72-95
- KRAUS, C.S., A.J. WOODMAN 1997
 'Latin Historians', *GR New Surveys in the Classics* 27, Oxford 1997
- KRAUS, C.S. 1999
 'The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts', *Mnemosyne supplementum* 191, Leiden 1999
- KYTZLER, B. 1998
 '*Animula vagula blandula*', *Festschrift K. Alt* (ed. J. Holzhausen) Stuttgart 1998, 157-169
- LASSANDRO, D. 2000
 '*Sacratissimus Imperator*. L'immagine del princeps nell' oratoria tardoantica', *Quaderni di Invigilata Lucernis, Collana del Dipartimento di Studi Classici e Cristiani dell'Università di Bari* 8, Bari 2000
- LAUSBERG, H. 1973²
Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft, München 1973² (1960)
- LEBEK, W.D. 2001
 'Florus und Hadrian', *WS* 114 (2001) 419-442
- LEEMAN, A.D. 1963
Orationis Ratio, Amsterdam 1963
- LEEMAN, A.D. 1973
 'Structure and Meaning in the Prologues of Tacitus', *YCS* 23 (1973) 169-208
- LEEMAN, A.D., H. PINKSTER, H.L.W. NELSON 1985
 Comm. ad M. Tullius Cicero *De Oratore Libri III*, 2. Band, Heidelberg 1985
- LEEMAN, A.D. 1989
 'Antieke en moderne geschiedschrijving', *Hermeneus* 61 (1989) 235-41
- LENTRICCHIA, F., TH. McLAUGHLIN 1995²
Critical Terms for Literary Study, Chicago 1995² (1990)

- LEO, F. 1901
Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form, Leipzig 1901
- LESSING, C. 1901-6
Scriptorum historiae Augustae lexicon, Leipzig 1901-1906
- LIEBESCHUETZ, W. 2003
 'Pagan Historiography and the Decline of the Empire', in: G. Marasco 2003, 177-218
- LIEBS, D. 1985
 'OM 13,1 und das Reskriptwesen in der Historia Augusta', *BHAC* 1982/1983, Bonn 1985, 221-37
- LIPPOLD, A. 1991
Kommentar zur Vita Maximini Duo der Historia Augusta, Bonn 1991
- LORIOT, X. 1981
 'Les acclamations impériales de Sévère Alexandre et de Gordien III', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 43 (1981) 225-35
- LUKASZEWICZ, A. 1992
 'Antoninos the κορυφος', *JJP* 22 (1992) 43-6
- LUKASZEWICZ, A. 2000
 'No Egyptian Reminiscence in Hadrian's *animula*', *Eos* 87 (2000) 287- 294
- LUKASZEWICZ, A. 2003
 'Culices rutundos — Gnats or ... Fleas ?', *Eos* 90 (2003) 47-48
- LYASSE, E. 2001
 'Le Principat et son Fondateur. L'Utilisation de la référence à Auguste de Tibère à Trajan', *Collection Latomus* vol. 311, Brussels 2008
- MAGIE, D. 1922
 'The Scriptores Historiae Augustae I', *Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), London (1922)
- MAGIE, D. 1924
 'The Scriptores Historiae Augustae II', *Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), London 2000 (1924)
- MAGIE, D. 1932
 'The Scriptores Historiae Augustae II', *Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), London (1932)
- MALCOVATI, E. 1934 (ed.)
 'Cornelii Nepotis quae exstant', *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum* 60, Turin 1934
- MARASCO, G. 1996
 'L'idéologie impériale de Macrin', *REA* 98 (1996) 187-95
- MARASCO, G. 2003
Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century AD, Leiden 2003
- MARIE, M.-A. 1984
Ammien Marcellin. Histoire, tome V, livres XXVI-XXVIII, Paris 1984
- MARINCOLA, J. 1997
Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography, Cambridge 1997

- MARINCOLA, J. 1999
 'Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography', in: Kraus 1999, 281-324
- MARINCOLA, J. 2007
A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography vol. II, Oxford 2007
- MARIOTTI, I. 1970
 'Animula vagula blandula', *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, Rome 1970, 233-49
- MARRIOTT, I. 1979
 'The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*. Two Computer Studies', *JRS* 69 (1979) 65-77
- MARSHALL, P. 1977
 'The Manuscript Tradition of Cornelius Nepos', *University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement* 37, London 1977
- MARSHALL, P.K. 1968 (ed.)
A. Gelli Noctes Atticae, tomus II libri XI-XX, Oxford 1968
- MARSHALL, P.K. 2001 (ed.)
Cornelius Nepos Vitae cum fragmentis, Leipzig 2001
- MATTIACCI, S. 1982
I frammenti dei poetæ novelli. Introduzione, testo critico & commento a cura di Silvia Mattiacci, Rome 1982
- MAYER, R.C. 1976
 'Two Notes on Latin Poets', *PCPhS* 22 (1976) 56-59
- MAZZARINO, S. 1966
 'Il Pensiero Storico Classico II 2', Bari 1966
- MCCREIGHT, TH. D. 1990
 'Invective Techniques in Apuleius' Apology', *GCN* 3, Groningen 1990, 35-62
- MECKLER, M. 1996
 'The Beginning of the *Historia Augusta*', *Historia* 45 (1996) 364-75
- MERKELBACH, R. 1983
 'Kein Epigramm Kaiser Hadrians', *ZPE* 53 (1983) 20
- MERTEN, E. 1983
 'Bäder und Badegepflogenheiten in der *Historia Augusta*', *Antiquitas* 4.16, Bonn 1983
- MERTEN, E. 1986
 'Stellenbiographie zur *Historia Augusta*', Band 2, *Antiquitas Reihe 4 Band 2*, Bonn 1986
- MILLAR, F. 1964
A Study of Cassius Dio, Oxford 1964
- MILLAR, F. 1969
 'P. Herennius Dexippus: the Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions', *JRS* 59 (1969) 12-29
- MOLES, J.L. 1989
 'Nepos and Biography', *CR* 39 (1989) 299-33

- MOMIGLIANO, A. 1954
 ‘An Unsolved Problem of Historical Forgery’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17 (1954) 22-46
- MOMIGLIANO, A. 1968/9
 ‘Ammiano e la *Historia Augusta* (A proposito del libro di Ronald Syme)’, *AAT* 103 (1968/9) 423-36
- MOMIGLIANO, A. 1969
 ‘L’*éta* trapasso fra storiografia medievale (330-550d.C.)’, *RSI* 81 (1969) 286-303
- MOMIGLIANO, A. 1971
The Development of Greek Biography: Four Lectures, London 1971
- MOMMSEN, TH. 1890
 ‘Die *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*’, *Hermes* 25 (1890) 228-92
- MOMMSEN, TH. 1971 (ed.)
Codex Theodosianus 1/2 (*Textus*), Zürich 1971 (1904)
- MORENO-FERRERO, I. 1999
 ‘Severus Alexander’ *severitas* and the Composition of the Life’, *HAC N.S.* 7, Bari 1999, 191-216
- MOUCHOVÁ, B. 1975
Untersuchungen über die Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Prague 1975
- MOUCHOVÁ, B. 1983
 ‘*Ignobilitas Macrini*’, *LF* 106 (1983) 173-7
- MÜLLER, J.J. 1870
Der Geschichtschreiber Marius Maximus, Leipzig 1870
- MÜLLER, G.
 ‘Erzählzeit und erzählte Zeit’, *Festschrift für Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider*, Tübingen 1948 (= *Morphologische Poetik*, ed. E. Müller, Tübingen 1968, 269-86)
- MÜLLER, F. 1995 (ed.)
 ‘*Eutropii breviarium ab urbe condita*’, *Palingenesia LVI*, Stuttgart 1995
- NERI, V. 1999
 ‘Considerazioni sul tema della *luxuria* nell’ *Historia Augusta*’, *HAC Genevensis* (1999) 217-240
- NESSSELHAUF, H. 1964
 ‘*Patrimonium* und *res privata* des Römischen Kaisers’, *BHAC* 1963, Bonn 1964, 73-93
- NESSSELHAUF, H. 1966
 ‘Die *Vita Commodi* und die *Acta Urbis*’, *BHAC* 1964/1965, Bonn 1966, 127-38
- NISBET, G. 2003
Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire. Martial’s Forgotten Rivals, Oxford 2003
- NORDEN, E. 1909²
Die antike Kunstprosa: vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance, Leipzig 1909²
- PASCHOUD, F. 1989
 ‘“Se non è vero, è ben trovato”: tradition littéraire et vérité historique chez Ammien Marcellin’, *Chiron* 19 (1989) 37-54

- PASCHOUD, F. 1991
 'L'Histoire Auguste et Dexippe', *HAC Parisinum* 1991, 217-69
- PASCHOUD, F. 1995
 Noms camouflés d'historiens du 4^e siècle dans l'Histoire Auguste', *Historia* 44 (1995) 502-4
- PASCHOUD, F. 1995b
 'Mendacii splendor: formes d'entrée en matière et protetstations de vérédicité dans la littérature de fiction', *Latomus* 54 (1995) 262-78
- PASCHOUD, F. 1996 (ed.)
Histoire Auguste tome V 1ère partie: Vies d'Aurélien, Tacite, Paris 1996
- PASCHOUD, F. 1997
 'L'Inventio dans L'Histoire Auguste', *Cassiodorus* 3 (1997) 117-30
- PASCHOUD, F. 1997b
 'Le tyran fantasmé : variations de l'Histoire Auguste sur le thème de l'usurpation', in: Paschoud, F. and J. Szidat (edd.) *Usurpationen in der Spätantike (Historia Einzelschrfte 111)*, Stuttgart 1997, 87-98
- PASCHOUD, F. 1999
 'Propos sceptiques et iconoclastes sur Marius Maximus', *HAC* 7 (1999) 241-54
- PASCHOUD, F. 2001 (ed.)
Histoire Auguste tome V 2ère partie: Vies de Probus, Firmus, Saturnin, Proculus et Bonose, Carus, Numérien et Carin, Paris 2001
- PASCHOUD, F. 2002
 'Les Panégyriques latins et l'Histoire Auguste: quelques réflexions', in: *Hommages à Carl Deroux II : Prose et linguistique, Médecine*, ed. P. Defosse, *Collection Latomus* vol. 267 (2002) 347-56
- PASCHOUD, F. 2003
 'La question de l'unicité ou de la multiplicité des auteurs de l'Histoire Auguste. Intérêt et limites des méthodes d'analyse de textes d'attribution douteuse assistées par les moyens électroniques modernes', *AnTard* 11 (2003) 329-30
- PASCHOUD, F. 2004
 'Ammien 31,16,9: une recusatio?', *REL* 82 (2004) 238-48
- PASCHOUD, F. 2005
 'Biographie und Panegyrik: wie spricht man vom lebenden Kaiser?', in : K. Voessing (ed.), 'Biographie und Prosopographie. Internationales Kolloquium zum 65. Geburtstag con Anthony R. Birley', *Historia Einzelschriften* 178, Stuttgart 2005, 103-18
- PASOLI, E. 1968 (ed.)
Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Iulius Capitolinus, Opilius Macrinus, Bologna 1968
- PAUSCH, D. 2004
Biographie und Bildungskultur. Personendarstellungen bei Plinius dem Jüngeren, Gellius und Sueton, Berlin 2004
- PAUSCH, D. 2009 (forthcoming)
 'libellus non tam diserte quam fideliter scriptus? Unreliable Narration in the *Historia Augusta*', *AN* 8 (2009)

- PEKARY, TH. 1990
 'Unkonventionelle Gedanken zur römischen Geschichtsschreibung', in:
*Geschichte und Geschichtsbewußtsein. Festschrift Karl-Ernst Jeisman zum 65.
 Geburtstag*, ed. P. Leidinger, D. Metzler, Münster 1990, 61-74
- PELLING, C. 1997
 'Biographical History? Cassius Dio on the Early Principate', in: M.J. Edwards, S.
 Swain (edd.) *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin
 Literature of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1997, 117-44
- PERKINS, C.A. 2003
 'Truth in Tacitus', *SLLRH* 11 (2003) 419-27
- PETER, H. 1884
 'Die *Scriptores historiae Augustae* in den Jahren 1865-1882', *Philologus* 1884,
 137-94
- PETER, H. 1865 (ed.)
Scriptores Historiae Augustae vol. I and II, Leipzig 1884 (1865)
- PETER, H. 1892
Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Sechs litterar-geschichtliche Untersuchungen,
 Leipzig 1892
- PETER, H. 1893
 'Bericht über die Litteratur zu den *Scriptores historiae Augustae* in dem Jahrzehnt
 1883-1892', *JAW* 76 (1893), 119-61
- PETER, H. 1906
 'Bericht über die Literatur zu den *Scriptores historiae Augustae* in den Jahren
 1893-1905', *JAW* 130 (1906) 1-40
- PETRIKOVITS, H. von 1938
 'Die Chronologie der Regierung Macrins', *Klio* 31 (1938) 103-7
- PETSCHENIG, M. 1885
 'Zur Kritik der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*
 63, Vienna, Leipzig 1885
- PFLAUM, H.-G. 1966
 'La valeur de la source inspiratrice de la *Vita Pii* al la lumière des personnalités
 nommément cités', *BHAC* 1964/1965, Bonn 1966, 143-52
- PFLAUM, H.-G. 1960
 'M. Opellius Macrinus', *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-
 empire romain*, Paris 1960, 667-72
- PICÓN, V. 1996
 'Los comentarios de autor/narrador en las *vitae* de la *HA* atribuidas a Julio
 Capitolino', *Historia Augusta Colloquium Barcinonense*, Bari 1996, 279-95
- PICÓN, V. 1997
 'Los comentarios de autor/narrador y la composición de la *Vita Casii*', *Historia
 Augusta Colloquium Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 217-28
- PINKSTER, H. 1990
Latin Syntax and Semantics, London 1990
- POIGNAULT, R. 2001

- ‘Les usurpateurs du *Quadriga des Tyrans* dans l'*Histoire Auguste*: des personnages de roman?’, in: Bernard Pouderon (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec. In collaboration with Christine Hunzinger and Dimitri Kasprzyk. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen* 29, *Série littéraire et philosophique* 7. Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée - Jean Pouilloux, Lyon 2001, 251-68
- PÖTSCHER, W. 1978
 ‘*Numen*’ und ‘*Numen Augusti*’, *ANRW II* 16.1 (1978) 355-92
- PÖTSCHER, W. 1978b
 ‘Das Römische Fatum-Begriff und Verwendung’, *ANRW II* 16.1 (1978) 393-424
- QUINN, K. 1973²
 Catullus. The Poems, London 1973²
- RATTI, S. 1996
Les empereurs romains d'Auguste à Dioclétien dans le 'Bréviaire d'Eutrope: les livres 7 à 9 du 'Bréviaire d'Eutrope', Paris 1996
- REEKMANS, T. 1997
 ‘Notes on Verbal Humour in the *Historia Augusta*’, *AS* 28 (1997) 175-207
- REEVES, M.B. 2005
The 'Feriale Duranum'. Roman Military Religion and Dura-Europos: A Reassessment, State University of New York at Buffalo 2005
- REUSCH, W. 1931
 ‘Der historische Wert der Caracallavita in den *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*’, *Klio Beiheft* 24 (*Neue Folge Heft 11*), Leipzig 1931
- RIBBECK, O. 1913
Geschichte der römischen Dichtung, Band 3. Stuttgart, Berlin 1913
- RICOEUR, P. 1985
Le temps et le récit, time and narrative, vol. 2, tr. K. McLaughlin, D. Pellauer, Chicago 1985
- ROLFE, J.C. 1928 (ed.)
 ‘The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius’, vol III, *Loeb Classical Library*, London 1928
- ROLFE, J.C. 1997-1998 (ed.)
 Suetonius ‘Lives of the Caesars’ vol. I en II, *Loeb Classical Library*, London 1997-1998 (or. 1913-1914)
- ROSEN, K. 1991
 ‘Die angebliche Samtherrschaft von Marc Aurel und Lucius Verus. Ein Beitrag der *Historia Augusta* zum Staatsrecht der Römischen Kaiserzeit’, *HAC Parisinum* 1991, 271-85
- RÖSGER, A. 1977
 ‘Usurpatorenviten in der *Historia Augusta*’, *Bonner Festgabe Johannes Straub zum 65. Geburtstag am 18. oktober 1977*, (*Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher* Bd. 39, Bonn 1977, 359-93
- RÖSGER, A. 1980
 ‘Zur Herrscherterminologie in der *Historia Augusta*: *Princeps* und *Purpuratus*’, *BHAC* 1977/78, Bonn 1980, 179-201
- ROUECHÉ, CH. 1984

- ‘Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire: New Evidence from Aphrodisias’,
JRS 74 (1984) 181-99
- SABBAH, G. 1978
La méthode d’Ammien Marcellin. Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae, Paris 1978, 13-29
- SAJDAK, J. 1916
 ‘Hadrians Abschied vom Leben’, *Berlin.philol.Woch.*36 (1916) 765-7
- SALAMA, P. 1964
 ‘L’empereur Macrin Parthicus Maximus’ *REA* 66 (1964) 334-52
- SCHILLER A. A. 1971
 ‘Vindication of a Repudiated Text: Sententiae et epistolae Hadriani, II’
La critica del testo (1971) 717-27
- SCHLUMBERGER, J. 1974
Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n.Chr., München 1974
- SCHLUMBERGER, J. 1976
 ‘Die Epitome de Caesaribus und die Historia Augusta’, *BHAC* 1972/4, Bonn 1976, 201-19
- SCHLUMBERGER, J. 1976b
 ‘Non scribo sed dicto (HA T 33.8): hat der Autor der Historia Augusta mit Stenographen gearbeitet?’, *BHAC* 1972/4, Bonn 1976, 221-38
- SCHMID, W. 1964
 ‘Eutropsuren in der HA’, *BHAC* 1963, Bonn 1964, 123-33
- SCHOLTEMEIJER, J. 1976
 ‘Historia Augusta: Nomen Antoninorum’, *Acta Classica* 19 (1976) 105-13
- SCHOLTEMEIJER, J. 1980
 ‘n Literêre analise van die Nomen Antoninorum-tema in die Historia Augusta’,
 Unisa 1980
- SCHOLTEMEIJER, J. 1980
A literary Analysis of the Nomen Antoninorum in the HA, Pretoria 1980
- SCHOLTEMEIJER, J. 1984
 Historia Augusta. *Knolskrywer(s)... òf knollesers ... òf knolle vir lesers*, Pretoria 1984
- SCHOLTEMEIJER, J. 1993
 ‘Historia Augusta: The ‘Nomen Antoninorum’ Theme’, in: *Charistion CPT Naudé*, edd. U. Vogel-Weidemann, J. Scholtemeijer, *Miscellanea Generalia* 15, Pretoria 1993, 99-112
- SCHULZ, O.T. 1907
Das kaiserhaus der Antonine und der letzte historiker Roms, nebst einer Beigabe Das Geschichtswerk des Anonymus, Leipzig 1907
- SCHUSTER, M. 1928
 ‘Bericht über die nachaugusteischen heidnischen Dichter von 1915-1925, II. Teil: Die Jahrhunderte II-IV n.Chr., Hadrianus’, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 54 (1928) 1-5
- SCHWARTZ, J. 1966

- ‘Arguments philologique pour dater l’Histoire Auguste’, *Historia* 15 (1966) 454-65
- SCHWARTZ, J. 1972
 ‘La Vita Marci 17.4 et ses développements (problèmes de composition et de polémique anti-chrétienne’, *BHAC* 1970 (1972) 249-70
- SCHWARTZ, J. 1982
 ‘L’Histoire Auguste, Suétone et Juvenal’, *Romanitas-Christianitas*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit, ed. G. Wirth, Berlin 1982, 634-44
- SCHWARTZ, J. 1992
 ‘L’Histoire Auguste utilisait-elle aussi Tacite ?’, *Historia* 41/2 (1992) 251-3
- SCHWENDEMANN, J. 1923
Der historische Wert der Vita Marci bei den Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Heidelberg 1923
- SEAGER, R. 1983
 ‘Some Imperial Virtues in the Latin Prose Panegyrics. The Demands of Propaganda and the Dynamics of Literary Composition’, *PLLS* 4 (1983) 129-65
- SEECK, O. 1890
 ‘Studien zur Geschichte Diocletians und Constantins III. Die Entstehungszeit der Historia Augusta’, *JCPH* 36 (1890) 609-39
- SEECK, O. 1894
 ‘Zur Echtheitsfrage des Scriptores Historiae Augustae’, *RhM* 49 (1894) 208-24
- SHACKLETON-BAILEY, D.R. 1985
rec. Mattiacci 1982, *Gnomon* 57 (1985) 373-5
- SICKLE, C.E. VAN 1932
 ‘Conservative and Philosophical Influence in the Reign of Diocletian’, *CPh* 27 (1932) 51-8
- SIJPESTEIJN, P.J. 1974
 ‘Macrinus’ *Damnatio Memoriae* und die Papyri’, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 219-27
- SKUTSCH O. 1979
 ‘Zu dem neuen Epigramm auf den Nachruhm Achills’, *ZPE* 33 (1979) 34
- SOMVILLE, P. 2005
 ‘Deux joyaux poétiques’, *AC* 74 (2005) 21-28
- SONNABEND, H. 2002
Geschichte der Antiken Biographie. Von Isokrates bis zur Historia Augusta, Stuttgart 2002
- SOUTHERN, P. 2001
The Roman Empire from Severus to Constantine, London 2001
- SOVERINI, P. 1983
Problemi di critica testuale nella Historia Augusta, Bologna 1981
- STADTER, PH. 2007
 ‘Biography and History’, in: Marincola 2007, 528-40
- STEINMETZ, P. 1989
 ‘Lyrische Dichtung im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.’, *ANRW* II 33.1, Berlin 1989, 259-302
- STERN, H. 1953

- Date et destinataire de l' Histoire Auguste*, Paris 1953
- STRAUB, J. 1963
Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik in der christlichen Spätantike, Bonn 1963
- STRAUB, J. 1964
 'Die *Ultima verba* des Septimius Severus', *BHAC* 1963, Bonn 1964, 171-2
- STRAUB, J. 1972
Regeneratio Imperii: Aufsätze über Roms Kaisertum und Reich im Spiegel der heidnischen und christlichen Publizistik I, Darmstadt 1972
- STRAUB, J. 1976
Römische Herrschergestalten, München 1976 (*vide sub* Text and Commentaries, above)
- STROHEKER, K.F. 1970
 'Princeps Clausus. Zu einigen Berührungen der Literatur des fünften Jahrhunderts mit der *Historia Augusta*', *BHAC* 1968/9, Bonn 1970
- STUBENRAUCH, K.H. 1982
Kompositionsprobleme der HA, Göttingen 1982
- SYME, R. 1968
Ammianus and the Historia Augusta, Oxford 1968
- SYME, R. 1971
Emperors and Biography. Studies in the Historia Augusta, Oxford 1971
- SYME, R. 1968
 'Ignotus, the Good Biographer', *BHAC* 1966/1967, Bonn 1968, 131-53
- SYME, R. 1970
 'Three Jurists', *BHAC* 1968/1969, Bonn 1970, 309-23
- SYME, R. 1972
 'The Son of the Emperor Macrinus', *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 275-91
- SYME, R. 1970
 'The Secondary Vitae', *BHAC* 1968/1969, Bonn 1970, 285-307
- SYME, R. 1980
 'Biographies of the Caesars', *Museum Helveticum* 37 (1980) 104-28
- SYME, R. 1983
Historia Augusta Papers, Oxford 1983
- SYME, R. 1984
 'Fictional History Old and New. Hadrian', *A James Bryce Memorial Lecture delivered in the Wolfson Hall, Sommerville College on 10 May 1984*, Oxford 1984
- SZELEST, H. 1971
 'Rolle und Aufgaben der Reden und Briefe in der 'Historia Augusta'', *Eos* 59 (1971) 325-38
- TOHER, M. 2002
 'Nepos' Second Edition', *Philologus* 146 (2002) 139-49
- TOWNEND, G.B. 1967
 'Suetonius and His Influence', in: T.A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Biography*, London 1967, 79-111
- TREUCKER, B. 1966

- ‘Kriterien der Aktualisierung in der *Historia Augusta*’, *BHAC* 1964/5, Bonn 1966, 273-92
- TROPEA, G. 1899
 ‘Antonini nomen negli ‘Scriptores Historiae Augustae’’, *Rivista di Storia Antica* 4 (1899) 233-41
- TURCAN, R. 1993
 Histoire Auguste tome III 1^{ère} partie, Vies de Macrin, Diaduménien, Héliogabale, Paris 1993
- ULLMANN, S. 1971
 ‘Stylistics and Semantics’, in: Chatman 1971, 133-55
- VACHER, M.-C. 1993 (ed.)
Suétone, grammariens et rhéteurs, collection Budé, Paris 1993
- VELAZA, J. 1996
 ‘El texto de Virgilio en la H.A.’, *Historia Augusta Colloquium Barcinonense*, Bari 1996, 297-305
- VELAZA, J. 1997
 ‘Tacite dans l’HA: vers une revision’, *Historia Augusta Colloquium Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 241-53
- VELAZA, J. 1999
 ‘Activité éditrice et circulation de livres dans le milieu culturel de l’HA’, *Historia Augusta Colloquium Genevense*, Bari 1999, 291-300
- VERSNEL, H.S. 1990
 ‘Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism’, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion I, Studies in Greek and Roman Religion* 6, Leiden 1990
- VIRLOUVET, C. 1995
 ‘Tessera frumentaria: les procédures de distribution du blé public a Rome à la fin du république et au début de l’Empire’, *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome* 286, Rome 1995
- VOGT, J. 1924
 ‘Macrinus’, *Die Alexandrinische Münzen. Grundlegung einer Alexandrinischen Kaisergeschichte*, Stuttgart 1924, 173-5
- WAGENVOORT, H. 1947
Roman Dynamism. Studies in the Ancient Roman Thought, Language and Customs, Oxford 1947
- WEGNER, M. 1971
 ‘Macrinus bis Balbinus’, *Das Römische Herrscherbild*, Berlin 1971, 131-145
- WHITE, P. 1967
 ‘The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*’, *JRS* 57 (1967) 115-33
- WINTERFELD, P. VON 1902
 ‘Satzschlussstudien zur *Historia Augusta*’, *RhM* 57 (1902) 549-58
- WISEMAN, T.P. 1985
Catullus and his World. A Reappraisal. Cambridge 1985
- WISEMAN, T.P.
 ‘Lying Historian: Seven Types of Mendacity’, in: *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, ed. C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman, Exeter 1993, 122-46

- ZINSLI, S.C. 2007
 'Textkritisches zu *HA v.Hel.8,5*', *Museum Helveticum* 64 (2007) 125-8
- ZECCHINI, G. 1991
 'La fortuna di Tacito e l'*Historia Augusta*', *Historia Augusta Colloquium Parisinum*, Macerata 1991, 337-50
- ZECCHINI, G. 1997
 'I *Triginta Tyranni*: la scelta di un numero e le sue implicazioni' *Historia Augusta Colloquium Bonnense*, Bari 1997, 265-74
- ZIMMERMANN, M. 1999 (ed.)
 'Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3.Jh. n.Chr.', *Historia Einzelschriften* 127, Stuttgart 1999

Texts, Translations, Commentaries, Lexica

Texts

Jordan 1864
 Peter 1884² (1865)
 Hohl 1965² (1927)
 Magie 1922-32
 Chastagnol 1994

Translations

French: Chastagnol 1994
 English: Magie 1922-32, Birley 1976
 German: Hohl 1976
 Italian: Soverini 1983

Commentaries

Antiquitas

H Fündling 2006
AP Walentowski 1998
MB Brandt 1996
Max. Lippold 1991

Others

OM Pasoli 1968
Max. Hohl 1949

Budé

H, Ael., AP Callu 1992
OM, Dd., Hel. Turcan 1993
Val., Gall. Desbordes/Ratti 2000
A, Tac. Paschoud 1996
Q, Car. Paschoud 2001

Lexicon

Lessing 1901-6

General

Lexica

Forcellini 1958-75
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae

Grammars

Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr 1965

Historiae Augustae Colloquia

Antiquitas Reihe 4, Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquia

<i>Band</i>	<i>Colloquium</i>	<i>Editors</i>	<i>Published</i>
2	Bonn 1963	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1964
3	Bonn 1964/5	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1966
4	Bonn 1966/7	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1968
7	Bonn 1968/9	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1970
10	Bonn 1970	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1972
11	Bonn 1971	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1974
12	Bonn 1972/4	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1976
13	Bonn 1975/6	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1978
14	Bonn 1977/8	A. Alföldy, J. Straub	Bonn 1980
15	Bonn 1979/81	J. Straub, A.Chastagnol	Bonn 1983
17	Bonn 1982/3	J. Straub, A.Chastagnol	Bonn 1985
19	Bonn 1984/5	J. Straub, A.Chastagnol	Bonn 1987
21	Bonn 1986/9	K. Rosen, A. Chastagnol, J. Straub	Bonn 1991

Historiae Augustae Colloquia, Nova Series

I	Parisinum 1990	G. Bonamente, N. Duval	Macerata 1991
II	Genevense 1991	G. Bonamente, F. Paschoud	Bari 1994 (1) ⁷⁵⁹
III	Maceratense 1992	G. Bonamente, G. Paci	Bari 1995 (4)
IV	Barcinonense 1993	G. Bonamente, M. Mayer	Bari 1996 (7)
V	Bonnense 1994	G. Bonamente, K.Rosen	Bari 1997 (9)
VI	Argoratense 1996	G. Bonamente, F. Heim, J.-P. Callu	Bari 1998 (11)
VII	Genevense 1998	F. Paschoud	Bari 1999 (13)
VIII	Perusinum 2000	G. Bonamente, F. Paschoud	Bari 2002 (18)
IX	Barcinonense 2002	G. Bonamente, M. Mayer	Bari 2005 (22)
X	Bambergense 2005	G. Bonamente, H. Brandt	Bari 2007 (27)
XI	Genevense 2008		Bari 2009
XII			
XIII			
XIV			
XV			

⁷⁵⁹ Between brackets the number in the Edipuglia *Munera* series

Primary Sources: Editions and Commentaries

Ammianus Marcellinus	Marié 1984
<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>	Gow / Page 1965
<i>Anthologia Latina</i>	Bücheler / Riese 1895
Aurelius Victor	Dufraigne 1975
Aulus Gellius	Hosius 1903; Rolfe 1928; Marshall 1968; Julien, Y. 1998
Ausonius	Green 1991
Cassius Dio	Cary 1927, Boissevain 1895-1931
Claudianus	Birt 1892
Codex Iustinianus	Krüger 1877
<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>	Mommsen 1971 ² (1904)
<i>Epitome de Caesaribus</i>	Festy 1999
Eutropius	Müller 1995, Hellegouarc'h 1999
Festus	Eadie 1967, Arnaud-Lindet 1994
Herodian	Whittaker 1969-70
Nepos	Malcovati 1934, Marshall 2001
Orosius	Arnaud-Lindet 1991
Suetonius	Rolfe 1997-1998 (1913-1914)

Curriculum Vitae

Diederik Willem Peter Burgersdijk was born on 9 June 1973 in Enschede, The Netherlands. In 1991 he graduated from the Ichthus College in Enschede (Gymnasium A) and took up the study of Greek and Latin Languages and Cultures in Amsterdam (University of Amsterdam). In 1998 he obtained his Master's Degree in Greek and Latin with a thesis about a late antique invective in hexameters, the so-called *Carmen contra paganos*. One year later he graduated from the post-doctoral teacher's course at the University of Amsterdam. From this time onwards, he taught at three gymnasia, the Sint Ignatiusgymnasium at Amsterdam (1998-2000), the Gemeentelijk Gymnasium Hilversum (2000-2008), while at present he is employed at the Barlaeusgymnasium at Amsterdam. In the academic year 2008-2009 he profited from a scholarship granted by the Dutch Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO) in order to finish his PhD-thesis, on which he had begun work in 2002. Besides his occupations as a teacher, he has published several articles about Latin literature and its reception (both poetry and historiographical prose) and ancient history (with a focus on the imperial and urban history of Rome). He is a member of the editorial board of the Amsterdam based journal *Talanta. Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society*. In 2008, he initiated a foundation called Stichting Zenobia (The Zenobia Foundation, www.stichtingzenobia.nl), in order to promote research which combines the classical legacy with eastern studies. Recently, he acted as a co-editor, in cooperation with J.A. van Waarden, of *Emperors and Historiography. Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire by Daniel den Hengst*, published at Brill, Leiden.

Nederlandse samenvatting van ‘Style and Structure of the *Historia Augusta*’

Hoofdstuk 1

Dit proefschrift bevat een analyse van structurele en stilistische aspecten van de *Historia Augusta*. Traditionele kwesties als auteurschap en ontstaanstijd worden daarbij buiten beschouwing gelaten. De door Dessau in 1889 geformuleerde thesen dienen als basis: er is sprake van slechts één auteur (in weerwil van de zes fictieve auteursnamen die de dertig biografieën sieren), die het geschrift aan het eind van de vierde eeuw heeft voltooid. Voor de gekozen literaire benadering is het geschrift als zodanig belangrijker dan zijn ontstaansgeschiedenis, ofschoon bestudering van de structuur bij kan dragen aan reconstructie van de verschillende fasen waarin het werk is ontstaan, en wat daarvoor de bronteksten waren.⁷⁶⁰

In de onderhavige studie is getracht, stijl en structuur van de tekst als zodanig te beschrijven. Daarbij wordt de historische stof waaruit de vertelling is samengesteld uitsluitend gezien in het licht van de vertelling. Soms baseert de auteur zich op feitelijke informatie (die voornamelijk betrekking heeft op de keizers van de tweede en derde eeuw). In dat geval wordt in deze studie van ‘bronnen’ gesproken. Voorts vult hij het feitenmateriaal aan met mededelingen van eigen makelij. De literaire voorbeelden die hij daarvoor gebruikt worden ‘modellen’ genoemd. Deze werkwijze resulteert in een mengelmoes van fantasie en historische feiten. De analyse van de tekst leidde tot deze tweedeling, die niet in alle gevallen even strict te handhaven is, maar toch kenmerkend is voor de *HA* als historiografisch werk.

Een van de bestudeerde elementen in de structuur van de *HA* is de verhouding tussen verteltijd en vertelde tijd, in de beschrijving waarvan het werk van Genette als basis dient. Een afwijking van de theorie is de weergave in absolute eenheden van verteltijd, wat in verteltheorie niet als een bruikbaar instrument wordt gezien. Verteltijd als narratologisch begrip wordt doorgaans slechts zinvol geacht in het geval van veranderingen in de verhouding tussen verteltijd en vertelde tijd - anders gezegd: versnelling en vertraging. Toch blijkt dat het weergeven van verteltijd in absolute eenheden in het geval van de *HA* tot belangrijke conclusies omtrent structuur en ontstaansgeschiedenis kan leiden. Het verschil in benadering komt voort uit het gegeven, dat narratologische theorie voortkomt uit en veelal wordt toegepast op fictieve teksten, zoals de roman. Een verschil met historiografie is dat vertelde tijd in laatstgenoemde tekstsoort direct verband houdt met historische tijd. Daarnaast is er een verschil in de herkomst van het materiaal waaruit de vertelling is opgebouwd, die voor de historiograaf uit historische bronnen bestaat. Deze bronnen kunnen worden gezien als een extra laag in de tekst naast het gevestigde onderscheid in ‘story’, ‘narrative’ en ‘narration’. Een

⁷⁶⁰ De benadering bouwt bovenal voort op het werk dat Ronald Syme (1968, 1971 en 1983) heeft geleverd teneinde de literaire context en de ontstaansgeschiedenis nader te bepalen. Symes belangrijkste bijdrage, afgezien van de vele detailkwesties die hij behandelde, is dat hij het literair-fictieve karakter van het geschrift heeft benadrukt. Een filologisch-historische methode werd gekozen door Den Hengst (1981), die daarmee voortging in de door Syme aangegeven richting. In recentere werken als de door Chastagnol bezorgde tekst van de *HA* (1994), Paschouds commentaren op de laatste vijf boeken (1996, 2001) en Fündlings commentaar op de biografie van Hadrianus (2006) krijgen literaire aspecten opvallend meer aandacht dan voorheen. De toegenomen belangstelling voor filologische aspecten getuigt van een bijstelling van de voornamelijk historische oriëntatie die *HA*-studies sinds Dessau te zien gaven, en waarvan de *Historia Augusta Colloquia* (1963 tot heden) de voornaamste resultaten zijn.

categorie apart vormen die passages waarin de historische vertelling wordt becommentarieerd. Deze auteurscommentaren worden aangetroffen in voorwoorden, tussentijdse opmerkingen en epilogen en bestaan uit opmerkingen over de inhoud, vorm, stijl van het werk en geschiedkundige opvattingen van de auteur / verteller. Ook de opdrachten aan Diocletianus, Constantijn en anderen kunnen hiertoe worden gerekend. In de beschrijving hiervan wordt de terminologie uit Genettes 'paratext' gevolgd.

Hoofdstuk 2

Hoofdstuk twee biedt een overzicht van de inhoud van de *HA* en de indeling in boeken inclusief paratextuele gegevens als auteursnamen en opdrachten. In de onderzoeksgeschiedenis is vanaf Mommsen 1890 een consensus ontstaan omtrent de indeling in boeken, waarvan de ontwikkeling wordt beschreven. In het eerste deel van de *HA*, de biografieën van Hadrianus tot en met die van Geta, wordt er onderscheid gemaakt tussen primaire en secundaire levens: de eerste behandelen de negen regerende keizers in de periode van Hadrianus tot en met Caracalla en de tweede de vijf mede- en tegenkeizers uit diezelfde periode. Behalve op grond van verschil in materiaal, is het onderscheid in primaire en secundaire levens gemaakt op basis van de inhoudelijke waarde van de biografieën. Het blijkt dat de historische informatie in de secundaire levens voornamelijk ontleend is aan die in de primaire levens, die op hun beurt vermoedelijk nauw bij een derde-eeuwse bron aansluiten. Aanvullingen van de auteur in de primaire levens zijn gering in aantal, maar komen in de secundaire levens veel voor. De middenlevens, van Macrinus tot en met Maximus en Balbinus, worden gekenmerkt door een grote diversiteit in lengte, structuur en inhoud. In dit gedeelte is er een overgang te zien van aparte levens naar gecombineerde levens. De vertelling wordt na een lacune weer opgevat bij Valerianus. Het derde deel, dat van de late levens, bevat de biografieën van de Valeriani tot en met Carus, Carinus en Numerianus. De auteur heeft gebruik gemaakt van bronnen en modellen, waarvan sommige expliciet worden vermeld en andere niet. Hoogst opmerkelijk is daarnaast het in grote mate voorkomen van fictieve auteurs, waarvan Iunius Cordus de meest geciteerde is. De 'rogue scholar', zoals Syme de auteur typeerde, laat zich hier ten volle gelden.

Hoofdstuk 3

Hoofdstuk drie bevat een behandeling van formele en inhoudelijke aspecten van de *HA*. Er zijn incongruenties tussen de uitlatingen van de auteur over zijn werk en de daadwerkelijke vorm en inhoud van de *HA*. Daarom is in de behandeling steeds gekozen voor een scheiding tussen die twee aspecten. Grote delen van het auteurscommentaar, zoals toelichting op het biografisch genre en de opdrachten aan Diocletianus en Constantijn, zijn wat woordkeus betreft gebaseerd op de werken van Cornelius Nepos.

Wat betreft de inhoud en vormgeving van het werk als geheel, doet de auteur dubbelzinnige uitlatingen. Zowel voor het begin-als het eindpunt geldt dat de auteur een veel grotere vertelling suggereert of belooft dan hij in werkelijkheid aanbiedt. Hij kijkt zodoende over de grenzen van zijn eigen vertelling heen, een idee dat hij mogelijk aan Tacitus heeft ontleend. Uitlatingen over de stijl van zijn werk zijn al evenmin in overeenstemming met de daadwerkelijke stijl. Ook op dit punt spelen beschouwingen over het vervolg een rol. Diocletianus, Maximianus en de keizers na hen moeten immers, getuige *Q* 15.10, in hogere stijl worden beschreven. Maar in wezen doet de auteur dit al

in zijn eigen werk met de lovende beschrijvingen van Claudius, Tacitus en Probus. De tegenstrijdige en onjuiste uitlatingen van de auteur zijn imitaties van historiografische topoi en parodieën op zijn eigen program.

De historische stof waaruit de vertelling is samengesteld beslaat de tijdsspanne 117 – 284 nC (Hadrianus' regering tot de dood van Numerianus). Er is een lacune in de jaren 244-260. Wanneer we de drie hoofddelen van de vroege, midden- en late levens bezien, valt op dat het eerste gedeelte de meeste jaren bevat (101), terwijl de twee latere delen 28 respectievelijk 25 jaren beslaan. Dit terwijl de verteltijd 39.000, 34.800 en 34.400 (afgerond op honderden woorden nauwkeurig) beslaat, wat een opmerkelijke breuk tussen de vroege en middenlevens te zien geeft. De evenwichtige verhouding tussen de latere twee delen zou erop kunnen wijzen dat de lacune een bewust ingevoegde opschorting van verteltijd is, evenals het moment waarop de auteur zijn vertelling hervat, namelijk bij de gevangenneming van Valerianus.

De auteur eindigt de proloog van het laatst boek, *Car.*, met een overzicht van de gehele Romeinse geschiedenis. Hierin worden verschillende metaforen voor de beschrijving van die geschiedenis gebruikt, zoals die van de *aetates Romae*. De groei en de lotgevallen van het Romeinse imperium worden beschreven aan de hand van stadia uit het menselijk leven, wat vooral in een serie die bestaat uit biografieën toepasselijk is. Opvallend is dat de auteur de periode 235-253 achterwege laat, een periode waarin ook de ontbrekende keizerlevens van de lacune geplaatst moeten worden. Het hoofdstuk eindigt met een overzicht van de keizers en tegenkeizers die als goed, slecht of neutraal gekenschetst kunnen worden, wat een leidmotief in de *HA* blijkt te zijn.

Hoofdstuk 4

In hoofdstuk 4 worden verschillende delen van de *HA* beschreven in het licht van verteltijd en vertelde tijd. In de eerste plaats wordt de verteltijd van de prologen in absolute getallen (namelijk aantallen woorden) gemeten. Hieruit blijkt dat de prologen in aantal en lengte aanzienlijk toenemen in de drie gedeelten waaruit de *HA* bestaat. Aan de manier en het punt waarop de historische vertelling in de boeken begint, valt op dat (1) in de primaire levens de onderwerpen van het boek in de vorm van keizer namen in het algemeen in de genitivus of dativus staan, (2) in de secundaire levens de onderwerpen meestal in de nominativus staan, (3) in de middenlevens de sequens 'ablativus absolutus' – 'keizer naam in nominativus' – 'afkomst van de keizer' het normale patroon is en (4) in de late levens geen vaste patronen te herkennen zijn, en zelfs het begin van de biografische vertelling vaak moeilijk aan te wijzen is. De overgangen van voorwoord naar vertelling laten duidelijke verschillen tussen de onderscheiden delen van de *HA* zien. Naast de driedeling is er een nieuwe breuk halverwege de middenlevens te constateren, namelijk die van aparte naar gecombineerde levens, die de auteur met aan Nepos ontleende woorden beschrijft.

In het laatste gedeelte van hoofdstuk 4 wordt de structuur van de *HA* op het niveau van het boek onderzocht aan de hand van verteltijd en vertelde tijd. Als materiaal voor deze theoretische beschouwing zijn de primaire levens genomen. Er blijkt gemiddeld zestien maal zoveel aandacht besteed te zijn aan de regeringen van de keizers als aan hun voorafgaande carrières (voor welke verhouding het begrip 'biografische factor' geïntroduceerd werd). Het onderscheid tussen de biograaf en de historiograaf is dat de taak van eerstgenoemde ligt in het beschrijven van het totale leven van een keizer,

terwijl de geschiedschrijver de achtereenvolgende regeringen als uitgangspunt neemt voor de opzet van zijn werk. Toch blijkt in de praktijk dat de verschillen klein zijn. De berekening van biografische factoren laat zien, dat de levens van Lucius Verus, Marcus Aurelius en Commodus het meest evenwichtig zijn.

Hoofdstuk 5: Het *Nomen Antoninorum*

De naam Antoninus werd gedragen door enkele keizers uit de tweede en derde eeuw nC, van wie Antoninus Pius de eerste was. Na hem volgden Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Caracalla, Diadumenianus en Heliogabalus. In de *HA* is de naam Antoninus een literair thema (het *nomen Antoninorum*, ofwel *NA*-thema), en worden ook Lucius Verus en Geta tot de keizers met de Antoninusnaam gerekend. De aandacht die in de afzonderlijke boeken aan de naam wordt besteed, is niet in overeenstemming met de relevantie van de naam: in *AP*, *MA* en *C* (de eerste drie Antonini) is het thema afwezig, maar in *OM* wordt er zeer veel ruimte voor gereserveerd, met als enige reden dat Macrinus zijn zoon Antoninus noemde. Ook de Gordiani werden niet met de naam getooid, maar in *Gd.* is het thema desondanks op enkele plaatsen aanwezig. In *Cc.* en *G* zijn de verhoudingen omgekeerd: Caracalla werd door zijn vader Antoninus genoemd, zijn broer Geta niet. De ruimte echter die in de biografie van laatstgenoemde wordt besteed aan het thema, is vele malen groter dan die in de biografie van Caracalla. Niet bij de eerste drie Antonini, maar pas vanaf de biografie van Septimius Severus krijgt het *NA*-thema inhoud en volume. Daarvóór heeft het toekennen van de naam Antoninus nog niet het karakter van een uitgewerkt thema, maar komt het slechts voor in de vorm van losse opmerkingen.

Barnes (1967) en Syme (1968) hebben verondersteld dat de keizerbiografieën van Marius Maximus de bron van het *NA*-thema zijn geweest. Maar mede omdat in derde-eeuwse bronnen als Herodianus en Cassius Dio geen sporen te vinden zijn van Verus en Geta als Antonini, moeten we aannemen dat de auteur van de *HA* het thema niet aan een derde-eeuwse bron heeft ontleend. Verbale parallellen tussen Eutropius en *MA* tonen dat de auteur zich verlaat op een traditie waarin Marcus Aurelius en Lucius Verus beiden Antoninus heten; deze traditie wordt ook in andere vierde-eeuwse teksten aangetroffen. Het gehele thema, zoals zich dat ontwikkelt in de loop van de biografieën van Septimius Severus tot die van Caracalla, moet worden gezien als een amplificatie van enkele terloopse opmerkingen bij andere auteurs.

De auteur heeft met de naam van Antoninus een omvangrijk thema ontwikkeld dat de structuur van de boeken van de *HA* in het betreffende gedeelte in hoge mate bepaalt. Het thema wordt onder meer gebruikt om korte boeken meer volume te geven. Opvallend is dat bij weglating van het thema de voortgang van de vertelling niet wordt onderbroken, en deze soms zelfs aan duidelijkheid wint. Dit doet vermoeden dat alle *NA*-passages zijn toegevoegd aan een oudere tekst, die al bestond voor het thema in de *HA* werd geïntroduceerd. Vermoedelijk heeft er een gecombineerde biografie van Caracalla en Geta alsook van Macrinus en Diadumenianus bestaan. Vanaf *OM* neemt de fantasie omtrent het thema een steeds hogere vlucht, en doen steeds meer motieven hun intrede. In *Hel.* is het *NA*-thema niet nadrukkelijk aanwezig, ondanks het feit dat Heliogabalus de *ultimus Antoninorum* was. In *AS* komt het thema voor in de vorm van acclamaties in de hoofdstukken 6-12. Ook in deze laatste twee boeken blijkt het *NA*-thema een aanvulling op een gebruikte bron of oudere tekst. Het is opvallend dat het thema in allerlei verschillende vormen is verwerkt: historische vertelling, brieven, poëzie, *omina*,

acclamaties, opdrachten aan de keizers Diocletianus en Constantijn en programmatische opmerkingen. Dit geeft de indruk dat achter het thema een concept schuilt, en dat het meer is dan een reeks willekeurig ingevoegde passages. Het *NA*-thema dient als de schakel tussen de primaire en de middenlevens.

Hoofdstuk 6

Een opvallend kenmerk in de structuur van de *HA* wat betreft de relatie verteltijd – vertelde tijd is de aanwezigheid van documenten: brieven, acclamaties, speeches en andere teksten in directe rede zorgen voor een onderbreking van de historiografische vertelling doordat verteltijd en vertelde tijd overeenkomen. De conclusie die uit de bestudering van al deze stukken in samenhang getrokken wordt, is dat de auteur de stukken presenteert als onbewerkt archiefmateriaal. Dit in tegenstelling tot wat de historiograaf doet, die alleen de strekking, niet de bewoordingen van zijn bronnen pleegt weer te geven. Tevens kunnen alle passages in directe rede als eigen makelij worden geïdentificeerd, behalve de acclamaties in *C* 18.3-16, die mogelijk teruggaan op Marius Maximus. Soms worden de verzonnen bronnen expliciet vermeld, soms helemaal niet, en in weer andere gevallen worden zogenaamd geraadpleegde stukken genoemd maar niet geciteerd. Door allerlei variaties parodieert de auteur op de historiografische praktijk.

Wanneer we naar de distributie van de documenten in directe rede kijken, dan valt op dat deze zich vooral bevinden in de secundaire levens (21 % van de verteltijd) en late levens (22 %), en verder in de tussenlevens (12 %), maar nagenoeg niet in de primaire (1 %). In absolute getallen neemt de verteltijd toe van 342 woorden (primair) naar 2170 (secundair) naar 4035 (middenlevens) naar 7596 (late levens). Wanneer we deze gegevens vergelijken met het *NA*-thema en de voorwoorden, kan gesteld worden dat de documenten domineren in de secundaire en late levens, het *NA*-thema in de middenlevens (en afwezig in de late) en voorwoorden in de late levens (en bijna afwezig in de primaire levens).

Er zijn aanzienlijke verschillen tussen de inbedding van voorwoorden (zie *H* 4), het *NA*-thema (*H* 5) en documenten (*H* 6). Tussen voorwoorden en historische vertelling in de vroege en middenlevens is vaak een duidelijke scheidslijn te trekken (dit in tegenstelling tot de late levens). De stof waarmee het *NA*-thema is uitgewerkt, heeft nauwelijks of geen relatie heeft met de omringende vertelling. Daarentegen zijn documenten stevig ingebed in de context van de vertelling, omdat zij samengesteld zijn uit aan de historische vertelling ontleend materiaal. .

Hoofdstuk 7

Een ander type document in de *HA* zijn citaten en poëtische fragmenten. In dit hoofdstuk wordt de vraag gesteld of een veelbesproken poëtisch fragment uit de primaire levens, te weten Hadrianus' *Animula* (*H* 25.9), als authentiek beschouwd kan worden, en al dan niet teruggaat op een bron uit vroeger tijd. Na een bespreking van de onderzoeksgeschiedenis en de tekstuele problemen die het gedicht biedt, wordt een poging ondernomen het gedicht in de literaire context van de tweede eeuw te plaatsen. Idioom en structuur van het gedicht blijken verwant aan gedichten van Laevius en Catullus. Bij de tweede-eeuwse auteurs Apuleius, Septimius Serenus en Aulus Gellius zijn gedichten te vinden die teruggrijpen op het werk van zowel Laevius als Catullus. Dat vormt een aanwijzing dat *Animula* als een authentiek tweede-eeuws gedicht beschouwd moet worden. Inhoud en

vorm van *Animula* zijn goed in overeenstemming te brengen met wat wij weten van de poëzie van Hadrianus en die van zijn tijd. Hoogstwaarschijnlijk heeft de auteur van de *HA* het fragment aan een oudere en betrouwbare bron ontleend, mogelijk Marius Maximus.

Hoofdstuk 8

De in deze studie gedane observaties over stijl en structuur maken een veel bediscussieerde vraag in het onderzoek naar de *HA* actueel, namelijk hoe de *HA* tot stand is gekomen. De breuken in de structuur van de *HA* kunnen verklaard worden door de diversiteit van het bronnenmateriaal dat door de auteur is gebruikt en nagevolgd. De grootste verschillen zijn te zien tussen de primaire levens enerzijds en de secundaire, midden- en late levens anderzijds. Op grond hiervan kan worden aangenomen dat voor de primaire levens een bron is gebruikt die sterk verschilde van de bronnen en modellen die gebruikt zijn voor de andere drie delen. Overigens zijn ook binnen die drie delen weer verschillende bronnen en modellen aan te wijzen, zoals is gebleken uit de analyse van het *NA*-thema. De vraag die zich voordoet is bovenal hoe de auteur te werk is gegaan in het combineren van de verschillende delen: heeft hij een bestaand werk aangevuld met toevoegingen van eigen makelij, of heeft hij vanaf het begin bronteksten afgewisseld met eigen commentaar aangevoegd? Het ontlenen van informatie in de secundaire, midden- en late levens aan de primaire levens, alsook de abrupte overgangen die zijn geconstateerd bij de inbedding van het *NA*-thema, wijzen in de richting van eerstgenoemd procédé. Dit wil zeggen dat aan de uiteindelijke versie van de *HA* verschillende redacties zijn voorafgegaan. Verder onderzoek zal de verschillen tussen genoemde gedeeltes exacter in kaart moeten brengen. Deze studie naar stijl en structuur is een aanzet tot de identificatie van de verschillende fasen waarin de *HA* tot stand is gekomen. Het werk als geheel geeft blijk van een grote, zij het ongeordende kennis van de klassieke literatuur, getuige het palet aan bronnen en modellen dat onderzoek inmiddels heeft aangetoond in dit nog altijd raadselachtige werk.