DE GRUYTER

READING HISTORY IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Edited by Mario Baumann, Vasileios Liotsakis

MILLENNIUM STUDIES

Reading History in the Roman Empire

Millennium-Studien

zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.

Millennium Studies

in the culture and history of the first millennium C.E.

Band 98

Reading History in the Roman Empire

Edited by
Mario Baumann and Vasileios Liotsakis

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-076378-2
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-076406-2
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-076412-3
ISSN 1862-1139

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062

Library of Congress Control Number: 2021944261

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

In memory of Christoph G. Leidl

Preface

The present volume gathers the papers of the conference "Reading History in Antiquity: Audience-Oriented Perspectives on Classical Historiography", which was held on 21–22 April 2017 in Schloss Rauischholzhausen and hosted by the Institute of Classical Studies of Justus Liebig University of Giessen. The organizers of the conference and co-editors of this book would like to express their sincere gratitude to certain institutions and people who contributed the most both to the organization of the conference as well as to the publication of its proceedings. First of all, we warmly thank the Maria und Dr. Ernst Rink Foundation (Giessen) for their generous and vital support of the conference. We would also like to thank our keynote speakers, Professors Dennis Pausch and Antonis Tsakmakis, for honoring us with their presence and papers. As for the publication, we are deeply indebted to Professor Peter von Möllendorff for the kindness with which he embraced this project as editor of the series *Millennium Studies*. Thanks are also due to Marieke Fleck and Tina Herrmann for their help in indexing the manuscript. Finally yet importantly, we are grateful to all the contributors of the volume for their patience in all these years between the conference and the publication of their works in our volume.

We deeply regret that Christoph Leidl passed away while the work on this book was still going on. We will remember him as a teacher and colleague of immense learning and exemplary kindness, and we feel honored that his paper is published as part of this volume, which is dedicated to his memory.

Mario Baumann
Vasileios Liotsakis

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-001

Contents

Mario Baumann and Vasileios Liotsakis

Introduction

The twenty-first century could justifiably be deemed an era that was highly fertile to examining ancient readerships of classical historiography. This is because recent decades have contributed to the liberation of modern scholarship from the nineteenth century's persistently positivist outlook in scrutinizing the "objectivity" of ancient historians, which often led scholars to view them as no more than celebrated exemplars of critical acumen and scientific conscientiousness. As a counterpoise to this, if we try to summarize the prevailing modern perspectives on classical historiography, we can refer to a modern focus on four particular dimensions: (a) the ancient historians' views of the nature of historical development, (b) their goals in preserving the past by writing history, (c) the literary qualities of ancient historical accounts, and (d) the techniques which the ancient historians used in order to disseminate certain ideological and interpretive messages and to create specific emotions in their readers.

The questions emerging from these perspectives cannot be satisfactorily answered unless they are examined against the backdrop of the ancient readership of classical historiography. This is because the ancient historians' views of historical development are closely associated with several features of their readerships (e. g. current philosophical trends, the readers' interests in the past, and their awareness of natural science), while topics such as the literary qualities of classical historiography and the rhetorical strategies which ancient historians used in order to lead their audience towards certain ideological and emotional reactions cannot be fully interpreted if we neglect the readers' mentality, as well as their literary and linguistic competence, as is attested both in the historical works themselves and in theoretical treatises of antiquity.

The present volume applies this perspective of reader-response criticism to the field of historiography during the period of Late Republican and Imperial Rome.[1] The historical texts of the Roman Era are a particularly suitable topic for such a reader-oriented approach because of the double expansion which characterizes the development of historical writing in this period: the audiences of historiography widen, and the number of writers in the genre increases. This evolution of the field is well attested, among others by Cicero, Strabo, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Lucian.

1 For the most influential reader-response studies on Classical literature, see Liotsakis 2015, 281 n. 14 and 282–283 n. 29.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-002

1 The pleasure – and utility – of reading history

Many chapters of this volume refer to Cicero's comments about the readership of historiography in his own lifetime. This is not only because the Ciceronian corpus provides us with an extraordinary number of explicit statements about the reception of historical writings, which, when they are all taken together, almost assemble a reader-response theory of historiographical texts.[2] Moreover, Cicero's comments on reading history testify to two trends which form the backdrop against which the historians of Late Republican and Imperial Rome write: the audience of such texts has widened, both in number and in its sociological make-up, and reading history for pleasure is an established and, as it seems, common mode of reception. The famous question from Cicero's *de Finibus: quid, quod homines infima fortuna, nulla spe rerum gerendarum, opifices denique delectantur historia?*, "What of the delight that is taken in history by men of the humblest station, who have no expectation of participating in public life, even mere artisans?",[3] neatly links these two trends – even *opifices* read history, and they do it for pleasure, as do (according to the same passage of *de Finibus*) readers in general who are lured by the intrinsic appeal of historiographical accounts: *ipsi enim quaeramus a nobis [...] quid historia delectet, quam solemus persequi usque ad extremum: praetermissa repetimus, inchoata persequimur*, "Let us ask ourselves the question [...] why we derive pleasure from history, which we are so fond of following up, to the remotest detail, turning back to parts we have omitted, and pushing on to the end when we have once begun".[4]

The pleasure of history is also the focus of Cicero's reasoning in his letter to Lucceius, where he provides an explanation of the basic mechanism behind the *delectatio lectoris*: the reader is made *involved* by a good historical narrative, but he is also kept at a distance; the safety of his temporally and spatially removed position enables him to enjoy the depiction of past events. Or, in the words of Cicero, referring to his consulate which he wants to be treated by Lucceius in a historical monograph:[5]

> nihil est enim aptius ad delectationem lectoris quam temporum varietates fortunaeque vicissitudines. quae etsi nobis optabiles in experiendo non fuerunt, in legendo tamen erunt iucundae. habet enim praeteriti doloris secura recordatio delectationem; ceteris vero nulla perfunctis propria molestia, casus autem alienos sine ullo dolore intuentibus, etiam ipsa misericordia est iucunda.
>
> Nothing tends more to the reader's enjoyment than varieties of circumstance and vicissitudes of fortune. For myself, though far from desirable in the living, they will be pleasant in the reading;

2 For more detailed treatments of Cicero's view of historiography, see, among others, Fox 2007; Pausch 2011, 38–45 and 53–64; Baumann 2020b, 17–23. Cf. the chapters of Shaw, Pausch and Miquel in this volume for further bibliography.

3 Cic. *Fin.* 5.52 (transl. Rackham).

4 Cic. *Fin.* 5.51.

5 Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.4–5 (transl. Shackleton Bailey).

> for there is something agreeable in the secure recollection of bygone unhappiness. For others, who went through no personal distress and painlessly survey misfortunes not their own, even the emotion of pity is enjoyable.

The pleasure of *praeteriti doloris secura recordatio* stands at the core of Cicero's explanation, a point which is remarkably similar to models employed by the modern psychology of reading.[6]

That many Ciceronian passages highlight the aspect of historiographical *delectatio* does not mean, of course, that reading for utility is absent from the broad spectrum of interactions with historiography that Cicero – or characters in his texts – unfold. Rather, different readers of history who appear in the Ciceronian corpus engage with historiography in distinct and often very personal ways, at times leaning more to one side of the utility versus pleasure debate,[7] but often combining both approaches. We thus hear Antonius claim in *de Oratore* that he reads Greek historiographers *non [...] utilitatem aliquam ad dicendum aucupans, sed delectationis causa*, "not because I am on the look-out for aids to oratory, but just for pleasure",[8] while Cicero portrays himself in the *Brutus* as a reader with a multifaceted interest in historiography: he has read Atticus' *Liber annalis*, and this rather short summary of Roman history proved to be pleasurable as well as useful because it gave Cicero solace in a moment of crisis and motivated him to take up writing again.[9]

The picture of a diverse audience which emerges from Cicero's texts is mirrored in historiography itself: historical writers of the Roman Era are aware of the existence of multiple kinds of readers and often try to address as many of them as possible.[10] Two telling examples are Strabo and Dionysius of Halicarnassus who explicitly state this aim.[11] Strabo does so when he compares his *Geography* to his *Historical Treatise*:[12]

> Ἁπλῶς δὲ κοινὸν εἶναι τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦτο δεῖ καὶ πολιτικὸν καὶ δημωφελὲς ὁμοίως ὥσπερ τὴν τῆς ἱστορίας γραφήν. [...] ἔτι δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὅνπερ ἐκεῖ τὰ περὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεῖς ἄνδρας καὶ βίους τυγχάνει μνήμης [...], κἀνταῦθα δεῖ τὰ μικρὰ καὶ τὰ ἀφανῆ παραπέμπειν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐνδόξοις καὶ μεγάλοις καὶ ἐν οἷς τὸ πραγματικὸν καὶ εὐμνημόνευτον καὶ ἡδὺ διατρίβειν.

---

6 Cf. e. g. Thomas Anz's seminal book on the pleasure of reading. See especially his remarks on "the satisfaction about one's own safety" ("die Befriedigung über die eigene Sicherheit"), Anz 1998, 149. In the present volume, several chapters focus on the reading pleasures that can be derived from historiography (see especially Pausch and Liotsakis); Cicero's letter to Lucceius also figures in the contributions by Shaw and Duchêne.

7 See Marincola 2017, xlvi-l for a brief outline of this debate in historiography and related texts.

8 Cic. *de Orat*. 2.59 (transl. Sutton / Rackham). It is noteworthy that Antonius nevertheless admits that reading historiography "colours" his speech (§ 60).

9 Cic. *Brut*. 10 – 21. See Baumann 2020a for a detailed analysis (with further references).

10 For Sallust as a historian who deliberatly *restricts* his audience, see Shaw in this volume.

11 For Arrian as another example of a historian who writes for several types of readers, see Liotsakis in this volume.

12 Str. 1.1.22 (transl. Marincola). On the fragments of Strabo's *Historical Treatise*, see Ambaglio 1990.

> In short, this work [sc. the *Geography*] is meant to be both for the man in public life and useful to the common people, just as was my history. [...] And just as in that earlier work only that which concerned distinguished men and lives was remembered [...], so too here we must leave aside what is small and obscure, and spend time instead with what is renowned and great, or which has practical use, or is easily remembered, or affords pleasure.

Strabo in this self-referential comment combines a wide social definition of his audience with an extensive set of "bonuses" his various readers can expect from his works. In a similar vein, Dionysius of Halicarnassus envisages a broad readership for his *Roman Antiquities*:[13]

> σχῆμα δὲ ἀποδίδωμι τῇ πραγματείᾳ [...] ἐξ ἁπάσης ἰδέας μικτὸν ἐναγωνίου τε καὶ θεωρητικῆς, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς διατρίβουσι λόγους καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν φιλόσοφον ἐσπουδακόσι θεωρίαν καὶ εἴ τισιν ἀοχλήτου δεήσει διαγωγῆς ἐν ἱστορικοῖς ἀναγνώσμασιν, ἀποχρώντως ἔχουσα φαίνηται.
>
> The form I give my work [...] is a mixture of every form of public eloquence and theoretical reflection, so that those who dedicate themselves to political eloquence, as well as those who are engaged in philosophical contemplation, and (if there are any) those who want only undisturbed amusement when they read history, will find it advantageous.

Again a historian names a whole range of possible reasons for reading history and promises to cater for all these interests or needs.[14]

2 Readers turned into writers

Penetrating into the readership of history-writing in the Late Republican and Imperial Eras becomes even more intriguing in light of the fact that the expansion of a historical readership was achieved in such a way that it affected the very physiognomy of historical literature. Lucian, whose ideas about historical narratives are also exploited in the papers of this volume, reflects in a very illuminating way on how the widening of this historical readership, already pointed out by Cicero in the first century BCE, was consolidated until the second century CE as a dominant and formative parameter of historiography. First, according to Lucian, historians were fully aware of the fact that one of the audience's main motives in reading history is the pursuit of pleasure (*Hist. Conscr.* 9–10). Many authors thus colored their accounts with a laudatory flavor, poetic embellishments, myths, and plenty of other elements which they believed would render their works more attractive to readers (*Hist. Conscr.* 7–8, 22). Of course, in many cases Lucian's satirical eye is a misleading kaleidoscope of the likely truth, given that he often overstates the practices he wishes

13 D.H. 1.8.3 (transl. Marincola). On this concept of "mixture" and its various implications, see Fromentin 1993. Cf. also Schultze 1986 for a sociology of Dionysius' audience.

14 Cf. Miquel and Pulice in this volume for discussions of further texts of Dionysius.

to criticize in order to emphasize the flaws he finds in them. However, as a number of papers in this volume demonstrate, Lucian can also be taken as a trustworthy witness to the view that in the Imperial Era readerly demands dictated to a significant degree the thematic and stylistic orientation of Greco-Roman historical narratives.

Greco-Roman readerships also influenced the development of historiography as a literary genre in one further and much more energetic way. An increasing number of readers now venture out to embrace the challenge of becoming themselves authors of historical accounts. Lucian clarifies from the outset that the reason why he decided to compose a theoretical treatise on how to write history was the immense increase of the number of aspiring historians during the Parthian War of 161–166 CE (*Hist. Conscr.* 2). Individuals who were not already trained in composing historical accounts – described by Lucian (*Hist. Conscr.* 16 and 27) as ἰδιῶται – decided to move beyond the role of a reader of the classical models Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, and to actively follow in their footsteps by writing history. Among them is the doctor serving in the sixth legion of spearmen who decided to compose a military diary and give it the title *History of the Parthian War* (*Hist. Conscr.* 16). Lucian mentions philosophers too as one further class of non-specialist historians. Many of the ancient authors examined in this volume belong to this wide group of non-specialist historians that were originally readers who decided to write history (*Hist. Conscr.* 17). Included in this group are Pliny and the philosopher Arrian. These authors can be seen as readers who defined their works on the basis of their own readerly expectations and tastes. In the period covering the years between Cicero and Lucian, historians were stylistically and ideologically molded by the combination of two intellectual activities inextricably bound to each other: both the process of *writing* historical works and the simultaneous delight of *reading* those of others.

A special category of readers of history who affected its generic physiognomy the most is, of course, orators. In the Roman Era, individuals of a robust rhetorical education begin making themselves felt in the field of historiography both as writers of historical works as well as *litterati* who express in a systematic fashion their views on how to write history. We have already mentioned Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Lucian. All three of them at times explore historiography through stylistic and compositional criteria akin to those pertaining to oratory, a fact which justifies modern scholars co-examining, say, Lucian's *Teacher of Rhetoric* and *On how to write history* as two communicating vessels which elaborate on different but interconnected sub-genres of prose.[15] Equally plentiful are the passages in which Cicero analyzes the reasons why orators should read historical accounts and use history in their speech (*Brut.* 41–44), and recognizes the ways in which they can profit from their engagement with past narratives, either as readers (*Orat.* 120) or as authors (*de Orat.* 2.28–64). This realization, on those literate readers' part, that historiography and oratory have much in common and that these genres can establish numerous paths of

15 See, e. g., Fox's (2001) similar approach of Lucian (and Dionysius); cf. Billault 1997.

fruitful mutual communication contributed to the enrichment of the perspectives of reflection upon historical prose's style and its usefulness in a plethora of communicative situations in the lives of its readers.

3 Outline of the present volume

The contributions are organized in a chronological order. However, even chapters devoted to different authors or periods are closely linked by a number of common ideas and perspectives. First, many authors of this volume focus on the testimonies offered by the ancient readers themselves in non-historical works, such as treatises into literary theory, commentaries, and satirical prose (cf. especially the contributions by Aurélien Pulice and Pauline Duchêne). Greco-Roman literature offers a variety of passages in which these readers discuss their intellectual and affective reactions to past narratives, the process of reading them, and what they expected from such works with regard to issues of style and reliability. The treatises of literary theory, whose production had begun increasingly to flourish since the Hellenistic Era, can be seen as the first efforts, on the part of readers, to systematically penetrate their own evaluative mechanisms and their interaction with current literary genres, including historiography. These readers, who must have represented the Greek and Roman *litterati*, composed works that themselves constituted meta-reception, as it were, in which they aimed to coin terms to describe the emotions experienced by the audience of historical narratives as well as the qualities of the accounts that sparkled those emotional reactions and conveyed certain impressions of a historical work. By exploiting testimonies of this kind, the authors of this volume investigate certain aspects of reading as a procedure (oral recitation, use of past narratives in language courses), which aspects of historical accounts enthused or disappointed ancient audiences, as well as the influence of current intellectual trends on the reception of narratives involving the past.

Some other papers add to the aforementioned ones the complementary movement "from the text to the reader". This means that they engage in close readings of historical works and explore how these texts imply and "shape" a specific audience. To this end, the authors employing this perspective focus on the use of certain stylistic or narrative techniques which allow a definition of the texts' "imagined readers", and on explicit discussions of the readers' roles in prefaces or similar programmatic passages. In the context of the present volume, three findings are particularly important: (1) the texts analyzed in those studies all imply an active audience. Their narratives involve the reader, their style and programmatic statements call for critical reflection, and in the case of Pliny's letters (cf. Ari Zatlin's contribution) it is even up to the reader to create a history in the first place. (2) The writers of history consciously exploit the widening of the audience for historical texts in Republican and Imperial Rome, be it to make full use of the enlarged readership, as in Livy's case (cf. Dennis Pausch's contribution), or to deliberately restrict the audience, as Sallust does (cf.

Edwin Shaw's chapter). (3) Even texts which do not present the reader with a historical narrative may take up these "historiographical" modes of appealing to and activating the reader, in order to create their own specific audience.

Moreover, most contributors share the belief that the "implied reader" of historiography in (and of) the Roman Empire is an active one who is willing to engage with the text. In this respect, special emphasis is laid on what is arguably the strongest form of involving the readers, i.e. stirring their emotions. Chapters as e.g. Dennis Pausch's, George Baroud's and Vasileios Liotsakis' study a broad spectrum of affective responses which the texts stimulate; they range from feelings of insecurity and suspicion to sheer pleasure of reading. In doing so, these contributions show that the emotional reactions elicited by the texts form an inextricable part of the historians' strategies to make their audiences understand the historical processes.

Special attention is also paid to those cases in which readerly expectations dictated the authors of historical narratives to adopt manifold authorial masks. It is true that writing history in the Roman Empire was in many respects affected by the author's concern for a number of readerly demands. The treatises, for example, of literary theory reflect, if anything, on how literate a fashion readers expected historians and biographers to compose their works. Simultaneously, Roman monarchy imposed one further, and far more peremptory, agenda of what was "allowed" to be written down or not, and of how everything was supposed to be written. These, sometimes dangerous, readerly demands were to be respected especially by authors of non-Roman origins, who struggled through their accounts to defend their cultural identity while also showing the highest respect to their Roman readerships. The authors of this volume (especially Vasileios Liotsakis and Adam M. Kemezis) make the case that ancient historians and biographers took into serious consideration all these readerly expectations and defined their style and rhetoric on the basis of these demands. One from among their many tools in fulfilling this purpose was the fashioning of a multi-dimensional – and thus flexible – authorial "I", through which authors endeavored to satisfy (cf. e.g. Liotsakis' paper) or, sometimes, to play (cf. Kemezis' contribution) in the most provoking way with readerly tastes.

Last, two papers (those of Marine Miquel and Christoph G. Leidl) focus on descriptions or narrations of spaces (both in a geographical and in a topographical sense) in Latin historical texts. They explore the relation of such depictions to the texts' audiences by reconstructing the ancient readers' "horizon of expectations" (H.R. Jauss) as to geography and topography, thereby allowing them to interpret the specific – and, for modern readers, often peculiar – ways in which Roman historiography refers to spaces and places as strategies to engage with ancient audiences' expectations. These two contributions converge in one main result: historiographical descriptions or narrations of spaces mirror the experience of their Roman readers vis-à-vis the growing (cf. Miquel's chapter) or contested empire (cf. Leidl's contribution), and thus offer an interpretation of the contemporary state of affairs.

Here are the summaries of the papers: in his contribution, Edwin Shaw explores the idea that the form and content of Sallust's works imply – and construct – a par-

ticular audience of their own. Against the context of a fairly wide audience for various forms of historical writing in the late Republic, Sallust deliberately restricts access to his texts to an intellectual and political elite. He does so by setting up various "barriers to entry" within the text itself: (1) he emphasizes the difficulty of reading his works and thus explicitly problematizes the role of the audience; (2) he uses a difficult style characterized by broken syntax, a fondness for antithesis, archaic vocabulary and above all extreme *brevitas*; (3) by selecting Thucydides as a literary model, he marks off his texts as something which requires serious and sustained consideration; (4) he opens his monographs with prefaces whose content configures the texts right from the beginning as being aimed at a philosophically engaged audience. In light of these findings, Shaw concludes that the restriction of Sallust's audience to an educated elite serves to distinguish its lessons from the didactic model of Latin *annales* and exemplary memorialization, in order to highlight the need for critical reflection on the historical content, and to link it into a wider intellectual context, for example to texts such as Cicero's philosophy, which formed part of a contemporary literary exploration of Republican values.

Marine Miquel focuses on geographical descriptions in Latin historical works of the first century BCE. She reaches a twofold conclusion. First, she suggests that the historical texts of this century were intended for an audience who was no longer the political elite, but who consisted of a broader part of the general population. The latter now had access to common ethno-geographical knowledge which was conveyed by texts, by orally transmitted information, by the images located all over the cities, and by spectacles like funeral or triumphal processions. Miquel contends that the spatial depictions in historical works were destined for the same audience, and therefore that they contained the same common ethno-geographical knowledge. Historians seemed thus to try to shape their descriptions to fit to the expectations of their audience. Second, Miquel points out that both Roman and Italian audiences were eager to be told about unknown territories and longed for marvellous depictions, but also showed a deep interest for the new world that had been built by Roman conquest and most of all by the new ways of representing and looking at it. Ethno-geographical depictions were thus written by historians as a means to understand better the new setting of the world. They no longer taught the elite how to rule the empire; they rather offered to a broader audience debates and questions on the role that spaces had in the realization of Roman conquest and its future.

In his chapter on Livy's *Ab urbe condita*, Dennis Pausch takes a close look at how Livy narrates his version of the past and, in doing so, addresses the question of what kind of reader Livy had in his mind as the ideal counterpart in his conversation with his audience. Taking Livy's narration of Hannibal's crossing of the Alps as a model case, Pausch shows that the historian wrote for an "imagined reader" who wanted to gain useful knowledge from his reading of historiography as well as the pleasure of being involved in a good story. To both ends of utility and pleasure, Livy uses, as Pausch demonstrates, narrative techniques which activate the reader and make him wonder about the future course of events: by shifting the object of focalization,

Livy invites the reader to adopt the perspective of different characters or groups, especially the Carthaginians, while strongly focalized previews into the narrative future are meant to unsettle the reader and to shake his confidence about the assuredly "happy ending" of the story he is reading. In both cases, the resulting involvement in the narrative leads to pleasure, but it also enhances the understanding of history by teaching the reader about what in history is contingent and what perhaps is not.

Aurélien Pulice investigates how Thucydides was received by the Greco-Roman readership during the Julio-Claudian dynasty. His paper examines the commentary (ὑπόμνημα) of the *History* that is preserved in *P. Oxy.* 853 of the second century CE, and whose prototype is dated in the period between the very end of the first century BCE and the first decades of the second century CE. In light of the Byzantine scholia on Thucydides' work, Pulice estimates that the author of this relatively unexplored commentary deviated from the traditional interest in grammatical issues and transferred the focal point of interest to the rhetorical aspects of Thucydides' style. Drawing from both Greek and Latin sources of the period, Pulice contextualizes the rhetorical orientation of the commentary in question and propounds the stimulating idea that the ὑπόμνημα exemplifies a general shift of Thucydides' readership's interest in that period towards the rhetoric dimension of his style and its utility as a prototype in the procedure of acquainting oneself with the Attic language both in schools of rhetoric and generally in educational circles. As is the case with most ancient commentaries, the ὑπόμνημα of *P. Oxy.* 853, being written by an educated reader of Thucydides and addressed to scholars and young students, reflects the way in which the interests of Thucydides' readership influenced the development of scholarly treatises on his work.

Pauline Duchêne broadens the scope beyond the reception of the fifth-century BCE historians and examines how Seneca satirizes in his *Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii* the historians' inabilities of keeping up with current readerly demands in terms of reliability. Seneca programmatically explains to his readers that he will narrate the events pertaining to Claudius' end and what happened to him after his death. Although the *Apocolocyntosis* is a non-historical work, Seneca fashions himself as a caricature of contemporary historiographers, mocking their current typical declarations about their methodological pedantry and informative validity. The satirical attitude of Seneca as well as of other *litterati* of the Roman age (such as Tacitus and Lucian) against the ancient historians' pompous schemes of self-fashioning betray the current readership's familiarity with the fact that Greco-Roman historians, despite the traditional practice of emphasizing the validity of their accounts, were far from reliable informants.

Ari Zatlin analyzes the intersection between epistolography and historiography in Pliny's *Letters*. The key passage of his close reading of Pliny's text is a programmatic statement from the collection's opening letter: *collegi non servato temporis ordine (neque enim historiam componebam), sed ut quaeque in manus venerat* ("I have collected [the letters] here not as a slave to chronology – since I'm not writing history – but as each one came into my hands", 1.1.1). Zatlin interprets this sentence as an

expression of how to read the letters as a whole. In a first step, he shows that this opening statement contains a strong allusion to Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*, by which Pliny establishes his prose letters to be considered as a kind of poetry, and to be read not in isolation, but as a whole and polished book. Zatlin then turns to the effects of Pliny's rejection of historiography: letters like 6.16 and 6.20 (Pliny's account of his uncle's death on Vesuvius), taken on their own, stand as a kind of history; but when placed within their sequence, they betray their form as epistles, and in doing so, potentially withhold the notoriety, truth, and fame that they presented on first and separated inspection. Audiences, however, may take up the *Letters*, respond to them, and read and create from them a history that was never written. And this, Zatlin contends, is precisely what Pliny's epistolography calls for.

Tacitus' *Annals* and its infamously difficult language are the focus of George Baroud's chapter. Taking Tacitus' depiction of the "accession" of Tiberius (*Annals* 1.7) as a case study, Baroud zeroes in on three kinds of ambiguities: ambiguous chronology (the distortion of time), ambiguous grammatical constructions, and ambiguous diction. He argues that the resulting text is deliberately confusing, misleading and even deceptive – a puzzle that "reproduces" for the audience feelings of insecurity, ignorance, and suspicion that highlight the paranoia and confusion felt by contemporaries at this transitional and deeply uncertain moment in Roman history. Based on ancient theories of vividness – *enargeia* –, Baroud's proposition is that certain details and intricacies of Tacitus' language reflect and recreate the atmosphere of the time-periods in question, and are all designed to create a text so intensely vivid that the audience becomes implicated in the narrative itself. Thus, this style compels the audience to become active participants in the text and to undergo an analogous mental and emotional process to those which are experienced by the historical subjects themselves (as Tacitus presents them). Baroud concludes by contending that we must imagine both a private, solitary readership *and* a public audience *listening* to historical literature at recitations. He offers some examples of how these diverse modes of consuming historical literature might have conditioned the ways in which the historical writings were received.

In a second chapter devoted to Tacitus, Christoph G. Leidl analyzes the importance of the focalization of space in Tacitus' *Histories*. He highlights two main aspects of the *Histories*' narrative strategy: the spatial organization of the content is reflected in the narrative organization of the literary work, and multiple overlaying perspectives invite the reader and/or spectator to reflect on the narrative. The first effect is visible at the beginning of the *Histories*, where Tacitus hints at the limits of the annalistic scheme: it becomes more and more difficult to mirror the structure of Roman history in the structure of a literary text. His vision is that of a circle of provinces around a dominating, but no longer indisputable, Rome. Rather than the centre of power, Rome stands at the centre of narratorial perspective. Tacitus does not try to make chronological simultaneity the basic structuring principle of the book, but rather the spatial outline of the empire: events are presented to the reader's eye as they affect the city of Rome. This focalization points to a reader

who is sitting in Rome and whose experience of state affairs in his own time is mirrored by Tacitus in his book. A pertinent example of the second effect is Vitellius' visit of the battlefield near Cremona in Tac. *Hist.* 2.70 – 71.1: here, the reader is led to see the battlefield from three different points of view at the same time (Vitellius, his generals, the soldiers; as well as possibly the Cremonans too), none of which can be seen as the correct one. Moreover, Tacitus leaves it to the audience to pass their judgement on the intra-textual observers of the scene, all of whom will be consigned to a sorry destruction.

Vasileios Liotsakis examines Flavius Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander.* Liotsakis' main point of argument is that Arrian often composes the account of one and the same event by fashioning for himself multiple authorial *personae* in order to satisfy simultaneously a number of different, and very often colliding, readerly expectations. Liotsakis organizes his study in four sections pertaining to (a) the Homeric elements of the work, (b) geographical data, (c) the criticisms of Alexander, and (d) the exploitation of myth. On all these levels, Arrian very carefully seeks to render his work a multiply targeting composition, an effort which resembles and stems in many respects from the practices of the Second Sophistic rhetoricians who rendered their speeches attractive to as many listeners as possible from among their audiences.

Adam M. Kemezis takes the crux of the identity of *Historia Augusta*'s author and the work's generic peculiarities as starting points for an original, reader-oriented approach of the work. *Historia Augusta*, a collection of thirty *bioi* of Roman emperors and carrying the signature of six authors, has been the object of intense scholarly dispute mainly with regard to the identity of its author(s), with the most prevailing view being that the work is the product of a single author, who hides behind the fiction of multiple *scriptores*. Kemezis addresses the question of how ancient readers engaged with this puzzle concerning the origins and physiognomy of the work *in the process of* reading it. Kemezis proposes two hypothetical stages of reading *HA:* the first stage is that of initial contact. At this phase, readers will leaf through the codex and look for the contents and authors by selectively focusing on the *incipits*, *explicits*, and potential headings of each section. In this way, they are very soon faced with intriguing questions pertaining to the work (second stage): it was composed by more than one author, and, equally interestingly, it includes the lives of non-canonical emperors. As Kemezis puts it, "understanding how a text like the *HA* worked in its historical milieu can illuminate what people in that milieu thought of the relationship of literature to politics in constructing and deconstructing an authoritative past and indeed of the Roman monarchy itself as a continuing but ever-changing political institution".

Bibliography

Ambaglio, D. (1990), *"Gli Historikà Hypomnemata di Strabone.* Introduzione, traduzione italiana e commento dei frammenti", in: *MIL* 39.5, 377 – 425.

Anz, T. (1998), *Literatur und Lust. Glück und Unglück beim Lesen*, Munich.

Baumann, M. (2020a), "Q45 – Chronologie und das Erzählen von Geschichte II: Cicero, *Brutus*", in: R. Färber / R. Gautschy (eds.), *Zeit in den Kulturen des Altertums. Antike Chronologie im Spiegel der Quellen*, Wien / Köln / Weimar, 493 – 500.

Baumann, M. (2020b), *Welt Erzählen. Narration und das Vergnügen des Lesers in der ersten Pentade von Diodors* Bibliotheke, Göttingen.

Billault, A. (1997), "Lucien et la parole de circonstance", in: *Rhetorica* 15, 193 – 210.

Fox, M. (2001), "Dionysius, Lucian, and the Prejudice against Rhetoric in History", in: *JRS* 91, 76 – 93.

Fox, M. (2007), *Cicero's Philosophy of History*, Oxford.

Fromentin, V. (1993), "La définition de l'histoire comme 'mélange' dans le prologue des *Antiquités Romaines* de Denys d'Halicarnasse (I, 8, 3)", in: *Pallas* 39, 177 – 192.

Liotsakis, V. (2015), "Texts of Religious Content in Thucydides and the Implied Ancient Reader", in: *RFIC* 143, 278 – 317.

Marincola, J. (2017), *On Writing History from Herodotus to Herodian*, London.

Pausch, D. (2011), *Livius und der Leser. Narrative Strukturen in* ab urbe condita, Munich.

Schultze, C. (1986), "Dionysius of Halicarnassus and His Audience", in: I.S. Moxon / J.D. Smart / A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives. Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, Cambridge, 121 – 141.

Edwin Shaw

Sallust, the *lector eruditus* and the Purposes of History*

1 Introduction

According to Seneca, in the early Augustan period an enthusiasm for Sallustian style struck certain historians of Rome. His *Ep.* 114 describes the work of a certain L. Arruntius (an author known otherwise only through citation by Pliny), who took Sallust's characteristic style to extremes.[1] Seneca attacks Arruntius' overuse of characteristically Sallustian stylistic tics: while Sallust had used abstruse vocabulary sparingly in his works, Seneca criticises Arruntius for applying it throughout, such that "what Sallust reserved for occasional use, Arruntius makes into a frequent and almost continual habit."[2] Seneca describes Arruntius as *Sallustianus, et in illud genus nitens*; Sallustian historiography is a recognisable *genus* of its own, distinguished in part by its specific style.

Seneca's criticism is of Arruntius' superficiality, and his unthinking copying of Sallustian diction without its substance or originality; while Arruntius imitated the appearance of Sallust's text, he could not replicate its quality.[3] Indeed, that Arruntius' work was not a success is implied by its disappearance without trace after Pliny.[4] On the other hand, while Sallust himself came in for considerable criticism, particularly after the publication of Livy's monumental expression of a very different historical style, his histories continued to be read, despite their difficulty.[5]

Helpful *testimonia* on the status of Sallust's writing are provided by Quintilian.[6] In the *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian suggests that while Sallust was the greater his-

* My thanks to the participants of the conference for stimulating discussion of the paper on which this chapter is based, to Prof. Gesine Manuwald (who read an early draft of the paper), and to the anonymous reader for their helpful suggestions. *FRHist* refers to Cornell *et al.* 2013. Translations are taken from the Loeb editions throughout, unless otherwise noted.

1 Sen. *Ep.* 114.17–9. Arruntius is *FRHist* 58; on his identification as the consul of 22 BCE and the date of his work see *FRHist* 1.448–9.

2 *Ep.* 114.18 (trans. Gummere).

3 Seneca's specific criticism of Arruntius is about the mannered nature of his use of Sallustian diction, as opposed to the authenticity of Sallust's writing; Arruntius illustrates the danger of taking a failing as a model.

4 *FRHist* 1.450.

5 One of Sallust's most important readers was Tacitus, who terms him *rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor* (*Ann.* 3.30); cf. Macrob. 5.1.7; Mart. 14.191. Sallust's oddities of vocabulary and syntax were fortunately of interest to later grammarians, accounting for the preservation of many of the fragments of the *Historiae* (see McGushin 1992, 7–10). For criticism of Sallust's style see further below.

6 On Quintilian's attitude to Sallust generally see Hectaridis 1997.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-003

torian than Livy, his style made him much less suitable for the education of the young;[7] Quintilian elsewhere emphasises the difficulty and idiosyncrasy of Sallust's style. Quintilian highlights complexity and compression as virtues particular to Sallust, although in other writers and contexts these were problematic characteristics.[8] Sallust's writing, in Quintilian's terms, required both the flexibility available to a reader to re-read difficult passages – as opposed to the immediate clarity required of oratory – and a learned audience capable of understanding it (a *lector eruditus*); he opposes the audience of *eruditi* who read Sallust's works with the rustics to be found in the courts.[9]

In this chapter, I will explore in more detail the idea that Sallust's works demanded particular erudition of their reader, and consider the implications of this for his historiographical project more generally. I will suggest first that Sallust's historical works are addressed to a narrow and sophisticated audience; I will then go on to explore what this implied audience might mean for Sallust's purpose and for the lessons of his text, and the sense that by prompting his elite readership to engage in a very active process of reading, Sallust articulates a distinctive sort of historiographical lesson.

---

7 Quint. *Inst*. 2.5.19: *ego optimos quidem et statim et semper, sed tamen eorum candidissimum quemque et maxime expositum velim, ut Livium a pueris magis quam Sallustium (etsi hic historiae maior est auctor, ad quem tamen intellegendum iam profectu opus sit)*. "I think the best should come both first and always, but among the best the most straightforward and acessible: for example, Livy for boys rather than Sallust (Sallust indeed is the greater historian, but one needs further progress to understand him)." (trans. Russell).

8 Quint. *Inst*. 4.2.45: *vitanda est etiam illa Sallustiana (quamquam in ipso virtutis optinet locum) brevitas et abruptum sermonis genus: quod otiosum fortasse lectorem minus fallat, audientem transvolat, nec dum repetatur expectat, cum praesertim lector non fere sit nisi eruditus, iudicem rura plerumque in decurias mittant de eo pronuntiaturum quod intellexerit [...]*. "We must therefore avoid even the famous 'Sallustian brevity' (though in Sallust himself it counts as a virtue) and that abrupt sort of language which may perhaps not mislead a leisured reader, but which passes over the head of the hearer and does not wait to be called back. At the same time, readers are as a rule well educated, whereas the courts are often filled with juries sent up from the country, who have to give judgement on what they have managed to understand." (trans. Russell); cf. 10.1.32. On this passage see Heldmann (1993, 6–9), focusing on the difficulties of reconstructing the knowledge which an ancient audience brought to the text, and now Feldherr (2021, 225–226), emphasising the constant reminders to the audience of the textuality of Sallust's work.

9 This opposition is confused if we follow Wiseman's claim (1981, 384–386) that historical works were regularly subject to recitation at Rome, as both Pausch and Miquel reiterate in their contributions to this volume. However, the point remains unproven as regards Sallust: *testimonia* identify Asinius Pollio as the innovator of historiographical recitation, whose historical activity is subsequent to Sallust's (Suet. *Gram. et Rhet*. 10 implies that Pollio only started to write history after Sallust's death). Wiseman's references to Sallust's mentions of both reading and hearing history (Wiseman 2015, 99; 116) are I think better taken to refer to general expressions of historical traditions at Rome – such as the content of the *laudatio funebris* – than as an indication that his own work was regularly recited in public. In this chapter I consider Sallust's works primarily as written texts.

2 The audience: a history for whom?

Before considering Sallust's audience specifically, it will be useful first to assess briefly contemporary *testimonia* on the audience for historiography, in order to set Sallust's works in context.[10] As often in attempting to reconstruct the intellectual life of the late Republic, we are somewhat dependent on the partial picture provided by Cicero.[11] His treatments of previous Latin historiography in *de Legibus* and *de Oratore*, as has been extensively discussed, assess previous work in primarily rhetorical terms, focusing on the creation of a stylistically effective version to be read for pleasure as well as for profit.[12] Pleasantness, charm and polish are the foremost qualities Cicero identifies in Lucceius' work in the famous letter requesting monographic treatment of his consulship;[13] clarity, excellence of form and style (above any considerations of content) are Cicero's most highly praised aspects of Caesar's *Commentarii*.[14] History, in Ciceronian terms, might be *magistra vitae*; but it should also be pleasurably written.[15] Cicero's discussions of historiography clearly have a particular agenda in claiming the form for orators (neatly summed up in the famous rhetorical question in the *de Oratore*, in which Cicero – through the voice of Catulus – wonders who else but the orator could do the task justice),[16] but they are also echoed by other *testimonia* of the period, as when Livy invokes stylistic improvement on previous works as a possible motivation for historians.[17]

10 See further Pausch in this volume; Pausch's conclusions as to the audience for a popular author like Livy do not invalidate the points I make about Sallust here, and in fact emphasise the exceptional status of Sallust's work (in the same way as the *testimonia* from Quintilian). Pausch emphasises the necessity of considering the audience of each of the classical historians separately, on its own terms; with this paper I hope to do this for Sallust.

11 For this project see generally Rawson 1985. Pp. 215–232 deal specifically with historiography, although from the perspective of authors rather than audiences. Cf. Fantham 2006.

12 Cic. *Leg*. 1.5–7, where Cicero focuses on the historians' failure to make use of *erudita Graecorum copia*, "learned material of the Greeks", i.e. the teachings of rhetoric; *de Orat*. 2.51–64, Cicero's fullest statement of the relevance of oratorical considerations to historiography. See also *Orat*. 66 on the flowing and pleasant style appropriate to history. I cannot discuss the Ciceronian *testimonia* on history and rhetoric in detail (for the most important recent contributions, see Brunt 1980; Leeman / Pinkster / Nelson 1985, 248–269; Lichanski 1986; Woodman 1988, 48–116; Krebs 2009; Mehl 2011, 77–81; Woodman 2012, 1–16). It is enough for my current purposes that history was understood at least by one important reader as an activity to be assessed in the terms of stylistic and rhetorical effectiveness.

13 Cic. *Fam*. 5.12.

14 Cic. *Brut*. 262.

15 Cic. *de Orat*. 2.36.

16 Cic. *de Orat*. 2.36.

17 Liv. pr. 2, *novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt*; "new historians, who believe either that in their facts they can produce more authentic information, or that in their style they will prove better than the rude attempts of the ancients." (trans. Foster).

Linked to this idea of elegance and pleasure as an aim for historians in the Late Republic is the form's potential popular appeal: while it is hard to quantify the readership of history in the Late Republic, *testimonia* do suggest a potentially wide demographic.[18] As part of his *encomium* of reading in the *de Finibus*, Cicero stresses the universal appeal of reading histories, including to those far removed from public life, and claims that even craftsmen took pleasure in them: *quid quod homines infima fortuna, nulla spe rerum gerendarum, opifices denique delectantur historia?*, "What of the delight that is taken in history by men of the humblest station, who have no expectation of participating in public life, even mere artisans?"[19] Pliny recounts his famous story of the man from Cadiz, who travelled to Rome "moved by the name and glory of Titus Livy; and as soon as he had seen him immediately went home": while an extreme example, this also illustrates the potential fame to be won by historiographical writing, and again the breadth of the audience to which it might appeal.[20] The increasing importance of non-senatorial authors such as Valerius Antias and indeed Livy himself also points towards a wider audience, reiterating Cicero's point about the readership of history diversifying beyond those engaged in public business: such authors wrote not for those like Polybius' ideal reader, for whom the lessons of history could be put into political practice, but for a broader readership.[21] We might also consider the apparent popular appeal of forms adjacent to historiography, such as the biographies written by Varro and Nepos, or Atticus' *Liber Annalis* (a work of chronology); the prevalence of epitomes of historiographical works, suited to those who lacked either the time or access to fuller versions, also points towards an expansion of the readership for historical writings generally.[22]

Various *testimonia* thus suggest a potentially wide audience for historical writing in the late Republic. In contrast to this, I will suggest the idea that Sallust's writings instead address a more restricted audience, closing off his work from this wide readership and configuring it instead as a contribution intended for a more restricted constituency.[23] Sallust's works, I suggest, create literary "barriers to entry", draw attention to the failures of the historiographical audience, and position themselves intellectually in ways which require a sophisticated reader; I will argue in the second part of this chapter that this is related to the particular messages and purpose of Sallust's historiography.

18 See Marincola 1997, 28–29; Marincola 2009, 11–16.

19 Cic. *Fin*. 5.52 (trans. Rackham). See further the introduction and Pausch in this volume.

20 Plin. *Ep*. 3.2.

21 Plb. 9.1–2. Antias is *FRHist* 25; on the wide use of his work see *FRHist* 1.298–301.

22 E. g. Plu. *Brut*. 4.8 gives the anecdote of Brutus epitomising Polybius on the night before the battle of Pharsalus. On Brutus' epitomising activity see now Feldherr 2021, 25–27. On the audience for epitomes see Marincola 2009, 15.

23 On Sallust's audience see Scanlon 1987, 9–13. Scanlon emphasises Sallust's independence, and "his aims to find a broad spectrum of readers among educated and powerful Romans"; while I follow Scanlon on Sallust's constituency, his desire for a broad audience must remain hypothetical.

The starting-point for Sallust's construction of a particular audience is the more generally heterodox qualities of his history, which have been well studied in previous scholarship: scholars have identified characteristics of Sallust's writing which depart markedly from contemporary historiographical convention. Douglas Earl has highlighted the unusual quality of Sallust's prefaces, which begin not with conventional historiographical *topoi* but with discussions of the duality of mind and body and the proper ends of life (in the *Bellum Catilinae*) and the role of *fortuna* in human affairs (in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*);[24] as Earl notes, the opening lines of a written roll would make these look like works of moral philosophy rather than of history.[25] The relevance of the material in the prefaces to the historical matter of the rest of the monographs has been long disputed;[26] but the appearance of such unexpected material in these programmatic positions served as an immediate marker of the distinctiveness of Sallust's project, challenging the audience's expectations of the form and setting the intellectual tone for the rest of the account.[27]

Similarly, the confrontational quality of Sallustian style – with its difficult syntax, fondness for antithesis, archaic vocabulary and extreme *brevitas* – and its departure from the style recommended by Cicero and exemplified by Livy has also been well-studied.[28] Scholars including Ellen O'Gorman and William Batstone have suggested that Sallust's style reflects the fractured quality of Roman society after the Ides of March; we might also think of the pervasive theme of his work, echoing Thucydides, of words losing their meanings under the pressures of civil strife.[29] However, on an immediate level, the jarring and challenging quality of Sallust's style is another aspect of his subversion of contemporary expectations of the form; its distinctiveness is clearly illustrated in Quintilian's assessment of the idiosyncratic virtues of the Sallustian text.

These qualities contribute to a very overt and performative differentiation of Sallust's historiography from that of his contemporaries; they set his work apart from generic predecessors, establishing the distinctiveness of what is to come against ge-

24 *Cat*. 1–2, *Jug*. 1–2.

25 Earl 1971, 845–849.

26 The fullest assessment of the prefaces remains Tiffou 1973; see also Earl 1961. See also on the *Cat*., Feeney 1994; on the *Jug*., Hellegouarc'h 1987.

27 Earl 1971.

28 On Sallust's style see Kroll 1927; Syme 1964, 242–273; La Penna 1968, 370–406; on deviation from Ciceronian norms see especially Woodman 1988, 117–124. Sallust's writing was criticised by contemporary and later historians including Livy and Asinius Pollio for its difficulty: see e. g. Gel. 4.15.1, Suet. *Gram. et Rhet*. 10, Sen. *Con*. 9.1.13. The lack of clarity which sometimes resulted from Sallustian *brevitas* (cf. Gel. 3.1) also runs contrary to recommendations of the virtues appropriate to the *narratio* (on rhetorical *narratio* generally see Lausberg 1998, § 294; in historiographical terms see Lucian, *Hist. Conscr.* 43). Some readers recognised Sallust's style as a strength, contributing to the force of his works: see e. g. Macr. 5.1.7; Tac. *Ann*. 3.30; Mart. 14.191.

29 O'Gorman 2007; Batstone 2000. On Sallust's enthusiasm for this idea see Scanlon 1980, esp. 99–102; Büchner 1983; Canfora 1991.

neric norms. These features already suggest a particular audience for Sallust's works: in deviating from the rhetorically pleasing – as well as from the popular subject-matter of *res gestae* – they imply a different constituency than that suggested by Cicero's assessment. However, the sense in which Sallust's works imply a particular audience is not restricted to these well-studied aspects: other features develop the point in more specific ways, further marking-off the audience at which the historian aims.

One significant feature of both of Sallust's monographs is a consistent concern with the limitations and flaws of the historiographical audience; from the very beginning of his work Sallust's works repeatedly thematise failings of historical interpretation and understanding, illustrating the historian's concern for the sophistication and acuity of his audience. Early in the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust addresses an ostensibly familiar theme, the difficulty of the historian's task. This motif, understood either in terms of the effort required in research or in the difficulty of actually writing up the historical account, was well-worn;[30] however, Sallust's expression of these themes is distinctive, in that rather than focusing on the difficulties experienced by the historian himself, Sallust reverses them into a kind of attack on his readers:

> tamen in primis arduom videtur res gestas scribere; primum quod facta dictis exaequanda sunt, dehinc quia plerique quae delicta reprehenderis malivolentia et invidia dicta putant; ubi de magna virtute atque gloria bonorum memores, quae sibi quisque facilia factu putat, aequo animo accipit, supra ea veluti ficta pro falsis ducit.[31]
>
> The writing of history is an especially difficult task: first, because words must match the deeds recorded; next, because such criticisms as you make of others' faults are thought by most readers to be uttered out of malice and envy. But when you recount great merit and renown of good men, while everyone accepts with equanimity that which he thinks he could easily do himself, everything over and above he regards as false, tantamount to fiction.

For Sallust, the historian's task is difficult not because of the historian's own limitations, but primarily because of the failures of his readership to properly assess historical achievements; his expression of this historiographical *topos* is thus not so much a comment on the genre itself as a critique of the reader of history.[32] This view of the audience's role directly contradicts, for example, the claims to didacticism found in Livy's preface: while Livy's formulation (that the reader should select from the *exempla* provided those to emulate and those to avoid) places the interpretative onus on the reader themselves, Sallust attacks the capacity of his audience to

30 Marincola 1997, 148–158.

31 *Cat.* 3.2 (trans. Ramsey).

32 That this criticism was not properly an explanation of the difficulty of history, but rather of the lack of receptivity of the audience, was already noted by critics in antiquity (as reported by Aulus Gellius, 4.15.3–5); this highlights the distinctiveness of Sallust's treatment of the material. Feldherr (2021, 133) considers the passage as part of a broader Sallustian meditation on the complexity of historiography and its role.

bear such a responsibility.[33] The passage effectively reverses a traditional *captatio benevolentiae*, in which the author began by establishing his audience's goodwill; Sallust's version further distinguishes his historiographical approach, but also signals his concern with the reception of his works and of historiography generally.

This point is repeated some chapters later. In a brief aside from his summary treatment of earlier Roman history, Sallust includes a discussion of the caprice of historical renown, and complains of the inappropriate glory which had accrued to the Greeks because of their outstanding historians:

> sed profecto fortuna in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas ex lubidine magis quam ex vero celebrat obscuratque. Atheniensium res gestae, sicuti ego aestumo, satis amplae magnificaeque fuere, verum aliquanto minores tamen quam fama feruntur. sed quia provenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbem Atheniensium facta pro maxumis celebrantur.[34]
>
> But Fortune assuredly is master of every situation. It is she that makes all events famous or obscure according to her pleasure rather than in accordance with the truth. The acts of the Athenians, in my judgment, were fairly great and glorious, but nevertheless somewhat less important than fame represents them. But because Athens happened to have writers of exceptional talent, the deeds of the men of Athens are heralded throughout the world as unsurpassed.

The role of *fortuna* has wider relevance for Sallust's historical analysis (it recurs two chapters later as the catalyst for Rome's moral decline);[35] but again this is also a comment on the failures of the historiographical audience, too easily swayed into the misvaluation of historical events by insufficiently critical reading. The point is strengthened by the Thucydidean characteristics of Sallust's work (to which I will return); surely only the least attentive reader could take Thucydides' *History* simply as encomium of the exploits of the Athenians. Rather, the popularity of Thucydides' account (and those of the other Greek historians) in fact becomes a strike against it, in terms of its pernicious influence on historical understanding *per terrarum orbem*.

The theme of the inadequacies of the historian's audience also appears in the preface to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, where Sallust discusses the effect of wax *imagines* in stirring the Roman spirit to emulation of great deeds.[36] In the days of Maximus and Scipio, according to his account, the images of the past inspired great deeds in great Romans; *at contra quis est omnium, his moribus, quin divitiis et sumptibus, non probitate neque industria cum maioribus suis contendat?*, "By contrast, given today's morality, who in the world is there who does not vie with his ancestors in riches and extravagance rather than in uprightness and exertion?"[37] The active sense of *contendat* carries the point, which is again about the failure of the contemporary audience to properly interpret the lessons of the past: the point is not just that history is

33 Liv. pr. 10.
34 *Cat.* 8 (trans. Ramsey). On the passage and its relevance see Tzounakas 2005.
35 *Cat.* 10.1.
36 *Jug.* 4.5–7.
37 *Jug.* 4.7 (trans. Ramsey).

ignored, but that precisely the wrong lessons are learned and the wrong values imitated. Once again, the fault lies not in access to the Roman past, but in the audience's approach to it.[38]

It is thus striking how concerned Sallust is in these introductory passages with failures of the historiographical audience.[39] This commentary becomes particularly pointed in the light of the apparently wide appeal of forms of historical writing in Sallust's period: the implication of these repeated attacks on the readership of historiography must be that most are unwilling or unable to read history in an appropriately critical way. This thematisation of the difficulties of reading history, I think, is by extension a marking-off of the Sallustian text as one which will demand much more of its readership than those of other authors; the repetition of this theme reinforces the point that the text requires a specific readership, capable of engaging appropriately with the complexities of historical renown.

We can push this idea further by reference to the intellectual interlocutors selected in Sallust's writing. As commentators have noted since antiquity, Sallust's style draws on two models in particular, the Elder Cato in Latin and Thucydides in Greek.[40] The use of Cato is usually connected to that author's reputation for morality,[41] and – in stylistic terms – to the archaising tendency common to Republican historiography; Sallust was in fact criticised for having simply stolen much of his vocabulary from Cato's writings.[42] However, Sallust's selection also sets him apart from contemporary fashions. "As to Cato, where will you find a modern orator who condescends to read him – I might have said, who has the least knowledge of him?" asks Cicero in the *Brutus*; while this no doubt exaggerates for rhetorical effect, the direct influence of Cato in the historiographical tradition is perhaps surprisingly limited.[43] As predecessors such as Sisenna demonstrated, one could write in a

38 Recent scholarship has also highlighted the theme of the valuation of the past in Sallust's speeches: for example, much of the debate between Caesar and Cato revolves around the theme of the proper interpretation of the past: see Batstone 1988; Marincola 2010, 282–285; Feldherr 2012, 2021 (esp. 97–103); Seider 2014, 158–164. The same is true of the valuation of the Sullan period in the paired speeches of Lepidus and Philippus in the *Historiae* (1.49R, 1.67R), which requires Sallust to manipulate the chronological relationship between Lepidus' speech and Sulla's death (see Rosenblitt 2019, 93–101).

39 For criticism of the audience of historiography generally as found in Seneca and Lucian, see Duchêne, this volume; but Sallust's approach is distinguished by his own status as a practicing historian, rather than a critic. Sallust's criticism of his audience is diametrically opposed to (for example) Arrian's careful calibration of his historical text to the audience's interests (as demonstrated by Liotsakis, this volume).

40 E. g. Vell. 2.36.2; Suet. *Aug*. 86.3.

41 On moral resonances of Cato's account see Sklenar 1998; Levene 2000.

42 E. g. Quint. *Inst*. 3.8.29; Suet. *Gram. et Rhet*. 15.

43 Cic. *Brut*. 65; cf. *Leg*. 1.6, where Cato is among the historians criticised for poverty of style. While Cato's influence on the development of Latin prose was significant, his influence on historiography in particular was less so: see Astin 1978, 235–239. Cato's interest in *origines*, among other features of his

historiographically appropriate style without relying so heavily on Cato.[44] Sallust's heavy allusion to this specific model was not just a nod to a learned predecessor, but a further signal of an aspect of his work's position and agenda, in aligning himself with a more abstruse and less popular generic model.[45] As such, the selection of Cato as such a dominant presence in Sallust's text illustrates an historiographical self-location which contributes to the generally heterodox qualities of his work, but also articulates the complexity of the text and the erudition required to fully engage with it.

This point is yet more clearly made by Sallust's well-studied use of Thucydides, which illustrates the same sense of historiographical self-location.[46] Thucydidean elements in Sallust serve partly to express a shared historical perspective; perhaps Sallust, effectively disbarred from political life after political disaster, felt some sympathy with Thucydides' historiography of exile. However, as Thomas Scanlon has shown, Sallust's debt to Thucydides – and the imitation of key passages and themes – is felt on a primarily literary level, focused on style and historical analysis (as opposed, for example, to a methodological one).[47]

This is important in considering the audience which is required by his texts, in that the selection of Thucydides as a literary model aligns Sallust with a particular intellectual community in late Republican Rome, that of the Atticists. Cicero's discussion of so-called Atticism in the *Orator* ("so-called Atticism", in that Cicero distinguishes the Atticists whom he attacks from the reputable style of Demosthenes), identifies within that deplorable school a particular group, terming themselves "Thucydideans", *novum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus*, "a new and unheard-of group of ignoramuses".[48] Cicero attacks these orators' adaptation of Thucydidean forms to forensic ends; but in tandem with this attack he also criticises the obscurity of the speeches in Thucydides' historiography itself: *ipsae illae contiones ita multas habent obscuras abditasque sententias vix ut intellegantur; quod est in oratione civili vitium vel maximum*, "those famous speeches contain so many dark and obscure sen-

work, prompted few imitators in Latin; that Sallust could so regularly be called his continuator again highlights that the emphasis that Sallust placed on Cato was distinctive.

44 See Briscoe 2005 on the style of the Republican historians; Briscoe (e. g. 64, on Antipater) emphasises that historians did not archaise for its own sake but rather in the search of impressive effect.

45 Miller 2015, 244 reads Sallust's use of Cato as an indicator that the author's *persona* is not quite what it seems.

46 On Sallust's use of Thucydides generally see Scanlon 1980; Reddé 1980.

47 Scanlon 1980, especially 63 – 96.

48 Cic. *Orat*. 30 – 32 (trans. Hendrickson). On the Roman Atticists see Wisse 1995, tracing the movement back to C. Licinius Calvus in c. 60 BCE. On the reception of Thucydides in late Republican Rome more generally see Samotta 2012. Cicero does give qualified approval to Thucydides elsewhere (*Brut*. 287; *de Orat*. 2.56), although his view of Herodotus and Thucydides is mostly somewhat vague (Samotta 2012, 369). On the Atticists, Cicero's reception of Thucydides and the importance of this debate see further Pulice, this volume; Pulice's point on the "rhetoricisation" of Thucydidean receptions is clearly relevant to Sallust's use of his work.

tences as to be scarcely intelligible, which is a prime fault in a public oration." Even if Thucydides *were* an appropriate model, Cicero continues, none of those who claimed affinity with his style actually had the capacity to write like him: *huius tamen nemo neque verborum neque sententiarum gravitatem imitatur, sed cum mutila quaedam et hiantia locuti sunt, quae vel sine magistro facere potuerunt, germanos se putant esse Thucydidas*, "No one, however, succeeds in imitating his dignity of thought and diction, but when they have spoken a few choppy, disconnected phrases, which they could have formed well enough without a teacher, each one thinks himself a regular Thucydides."[49] For the Atticists, then, Thucydides in particular seems to have represented something of an intellectual talisman and point of identification; in the context of the contentious reception of Thucydides and the ongoing debates over Atticism, Sallust's close literary engagement with this model must also represent the signalling of a position in a contemporary literary debate.

The Thucydidean parallel might also be pushed further, with reference to the difficulty of Sallust's text. Thucydides' Greek was noted for its difficulty by contemporaries; to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing only a few years after Sallust, Thucydides' style (especially in the speeches) was a major subject of criticism.[50] The biographical tradition on Thucydides also focuses on his stylistic difficulty: Marcellinus claims that Thucydides' difficult Greek was a deliberate act of selectivity imposed by the historian upon his audience, restricting access to his work to those able to properly engage with its complexity.[51] While Marcellinus' sources for such a claim remain unclear,[52] that Thucydides could be envisaged as taking such a position in his work is a useful *testimonium* to the way his work was read.[53] If Thucydides' language was difficult even for the Greeks of the Second Sophistic, then it was more so for the Romans of the Late Republic, few of whom had the native fluency in the language of an Atticus; indeed, it is worth noting that before his adoption by the Atticists Thucydides had little direct influence on Roman historiography.[54] The selection of such a notably difficult model should I think be seen as another way of marking off Sallust's work as intended for a specific audience; the kind of reader who would recognise, for example, that Sallust's digression on the state of Rome in the

49 Cic. *Orat.* 32 (trans. Hendrickson).

50 D.H. *Th.* 21–51 deals with style. See further Pulice, this volume, for a Greek response to Dionysius' criticism which is close to contemporary with Sallust's reading.

51 Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 35.

52 On the content and reliability of Marcellinus' work see Maitland 1996.

53 Dionysius makes this same point about the inaccessibility of Thucydides' work, likening this quality of Thucydides' text to the government of a *polis* under oligarchy or tyranny: D.H. *Th.* 51.

54 Samotta 2012 attempts to dismiss the theory that only with Sallust did Thucydides come to stylistic prominence at Rome, and identifies parallels between Thucydides' account and those of historians including Fabius Pictor and Aelius Tubero: however, these are mostly articulated through Polybius rather than demonstrating direct stylistic influence of Thucydides on the Romans.

70s and 60s closely follows Thucydides' discussion of Corcyraean *stasis*,[55] and that Sallust's symptoms of Roman immorality in the *Bellum Catilinae*, *ambitio* and *avaritia*, are precisely the πλεονεξία and φιλοτιμία to which Thucydides refers in his discussion.[56] The selection of Thucydides as interlocutor is thus not simply a learned allusion and demonstration of the author's historiographical sympathies; it also signposts the expertise which the author requires of the readership at which his work is predominantly aimed.

In this light, we might return to Quintilian's assessment. Quintilian's frame of reference (as befits his background, and the purpose of the *Institutio Oratoria*) is primarily stylistic: his discussion of the *lector eruditus* refers to Sallust's stylistic compression and complexity. However, Sallust's work also demands a different kind of erudition: by assuming a particular corpus of knowledge and drawing attention to the challenges of histogriographical reading, Sallust's work deviates from the model of history as pleasurable form with potentially wide appeal to something which communicates to – and requires – a sophisticated and critically engaged readership. It is worth noting that (in contrast again to Livy, whose preface again provides a useful point of comparison), nowhere does Sallust talk about history as pleasurable;[57] as we have seen, he frames it rather in the terms of its political and social importance. Sallust's work I think decries the kind of wider audience suggested by the *de Finibus*, in favour of producing a deliberately difficult text, which thematises its own complexity and directs its lessons at a narrower and more sophisticated intellectual elite.

3 The *lector eruditus* and the purposes of history

The unconventional aspects of Sallust's work are I think related to the historian's purpose, and to a particular expression of historiography's didactic value. In this second part of the chapter, I will explore the idea that Sallust's focus on a particular audience is related to his placement of his works within a wider context of elite political discourse; in this sense, consideration of Sallust's audience contributes to our assessment of the agenda of his historiographical project.

It is first worth considering the demographics of the group at which Sallust's text appears to be aimed. As we have seen, Sallust's work seems to presuppose an erudite

55 Compare *Cat*. 36.4–39.5 with Th. 3.82–84. Scanlon 1980, 99–102 compares Thucydides on Corcyraean *stasis* with *Cat*. 10, on the degeneration of morals, as well as this digression; cf. Büchner 1983.

56 *ambitio* and *avaritia: Cat*. 10; πλεονεξία and φιλοτιμία: Th. 3.82.8. Cf. Scanlon 1980, 99.

57 Liv. pr. 4; cf. Moles 1994. Again cf. Pausch, this volume, on the pleasures of reading history for men such as Cicero. Concessions to the pleasurable in Sallust are I think few and far between; Syme (1964, 193) claimed that such was the purpose of the geographical digressions in the *Historiae*, but the text is too fragmentary to warrant such a conclusion.

reader, familiar with contemporary intellectual developments and willing to approach the text critically. In the late Republican context, this intellectual elite overlapped heavily with a political one: figures like Cicero, Caesar and Brutus clearly straddle the two fields, but even men like Varro – better known for literary endeavours than politics – had political backgrounds.[58] To judge from Cicero's correspondence, an interest in philosophy and the intellectual debates of their period was very common among the "political class" (it is worth remembering that the claim to Thucydideanism itself was one expressed in the basically political context of oratory); of the intellectual elite of the period, even those not themselves engaged in politics were likely to be connected to those who were, through relationships of patronage or friendship (exemplified by men like Atticus, in close contact with powerful allies across the political spectrum,[59] or in the philosophical or literary patronage exercised by men as different as Cato and Asinius Pollio).[60] As such, the elite audience implied by the distinctive characteristics of Sallust's works is also a distinctively political one; the works' barriers to entry imply that he had something to say predominantly to this sophisticated and politically engaged constituency (again deviating from the model implied by Cicero's remarks in the *de Finibus*).

This view of Sallust's intended audience is supported by consideration of the distinctively political tone of his work, and the particular way in which he presents its relevance. It follows from the *testimonia* above (on misreadings of the past and its ability to inspire emulation) that Sallust, like other Roman historians, considered history to have an important didactic role;[61] however, Sallust's discussion of this idea is distinguished by a particular focus on the political. The relevance of this is most clearly stated by the preface to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, in which Sallust explains that, while some readers might criticise him for separating himself from public activity, nonetheless his literary activity represented a contribution to the good of the state.[62] In making this point, Sallust engages again with historiographical tropes,[63] and puts a positive gloss on a removal from political practice which was of course hardly his own decision;[64] but his justification of his chosen activity here is distinctive and worth closer consideration. The passage is as follows:

58 E. g. App. *BC* 4.47, on Varro's praetorship and military record.

59 E. g. Nep. *Att*. 6.

60 E. g. Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 20 (Cato's retinue of philosophers); Sen. *de Ira* 3.23.4 – 8 (Pollio's hospitality to the historian Timagenes). Cf. Rawson 1985, esp. 66 – 115; Crawford 1978.

61 Cf. most obviously Liv. pr. 10 with Chaplin 2000; cf. also Sempronius Asellio's discussion of the ability of history to teach moral lessons at *FRHist* 20 F1 – 2, with comm. *ad loc*. Cf. generally Mehl 2011, esp. 17 – 26.

62 *Jug.* 4.4; cf. *Cat*. 3.1.

63 See Marincola 1997, 43; Fornara 1983, 105 – 119.

64 Sallust played no further role in politics after the corruption of his governorship of Africa: D.C. 43.9 (cf. *Cat*. 4.2). On Sallust's early career see still Syme 1964, 29 – 42.

> ceterum ex aliis negotiis quae ingenio exercentur, in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum. cuius de virtute quia multi dixere, praetereundum puto, simul ne per insolentiam quis existumet memet studium meum laudando extollere. atque ego credo fore qui, quia decrevi procul a re publica aetatem agere, tanto tamque utili labori meo nomen inertiae imponant, certe quibus maxuma industria videtur salutare plebem et conviviis gratiam quaerere. qui si reputaverint, et quibus ego temporibus magistratus adeptus sim et quales viri idem adsequi nequiverint et postea quae genera hominum in senatum pervenerint, profecto existumabunt me magis merito quam ignavia iudicium animi mei mutavisse maiusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae venturum. [65]
>
> But among sundry intellectual pursuits, the recording of past deeds is especially serviceable. Yet I think I should keep silent because many have spoken of its merit, and also so that no one may suppose that out of arrogance I am inflating my own chosen pursuit with praise. I suppose, too, that since I have resolved to pass my life aloof from public affairs, there will be those who will apply to this arduous and useful employment of mine the term idleness, certainly those who think it is the height of industriousness to court the common people and curry favor by means of banquets. But if such men will recall in what times I gained public office, what sort of men were unable to attain the same honor, and what kinds of men have since come into the senate, they will surely believe that it is from justifiable motives, rather than from indolence, that I have changed my opinion, and that greater profit will accrue to our country from my inactivity than from activities of others.

The idea that one might contribute to the state through literary production is of course familiar from Cicero's philosophical works: Cicero articulates a set of arguments around the productive use of *otium* to supplement political activity (an important theme, particularly in the periods of Cicero's political eclipse in the 50s and under Caesar).[66] Like Cicero, Sallust emphasises the usefulness of his activity, and sets the value to be derived from his works in the terms of the *commodum rei publicae*. However, Sallust goes further than Cicero had, in that he frames historiography not just as a *supplement* to politics, but rather as a direct *replacement* for it, and indeed as a more productive alternative channel for statesmanlike activity.[67]

In introducing historiography here, Sallust pointedly frames it here not as an activity to fill his *otium* (in the Ciceronian manner), but in fact as its opposite, *negotium*; when he does return to the terminology of *otium* at the end of the passage, *ex otio meo* surely derives ironic bite from the opposition with the perverse *negotium* of debased politics. The whole chapter thus constitutes a departure from the "softer" Ciceronian idea of literature as supplement to political activity towards presenting historiography as an alternative path to precisely the same end, in a way better-suited to the complex political climate. This same redefinition of the role of the historian is implied in the presentation of the role of historiography itself: in framing history as direct contribution to the *commodum rei publicae*, the literary product itself is pre-

65 *Jug.* 4 (trans. Ramsey).

66 See e. g. Cic. *Off.* 1.1. Osgood 2006, 290 – 292 treats Sallust's prefaces as direct responses to Cicero's *de Officiis*; cf. Baraz 2012, 13 – 35 on justification of *otium* in Cicero and Sallust.

67 See Heldmann 2011 on the general themes of Roman historiography as politics by other means.

sented in the same explicitly political terms. As opposed to (for example) Sempronius Asellio's reference to history as *inspiring* Romans to act on behalf of the Republic,[68] Sallust again presents his activity as more directly *equivalent to* that of the statesman.

This reframing of the character of historiographical activity is, as suggested above, partly a means of diverting attention away from the disgraceful ending of Sallust's own political career; but it also signals that the content which follows should be understood as a form of political contribution in its own right, a particularly relevant theme in the light of the politically engaged elite implied by the text. With this justification of his project, Sallust engages with the expectations of the audience, redirecting assumptions about the role of the historian in order to reframe the potential contribution of his work in more active terms. Indeed, Sallust makes a virtue of the shift from politics to historiography as a medium for contribution to the health of the state: here, as in the preface to the *Bellum Catilinae* which had similarly distanced his writing from political activity,[69] historiography is sharply distinguished from the corruption and evil *mores* which dominated contemporary politics.

Sallust's redefinition of the status of historiography is in some senses comparable to Cicero's deployment of the idea of the *dux* or *consul togatus*, as displayed in the Catilinarian orations and throughout his subsequent career.[70] As Cicero had signalled his deviation from a dominant paradigm of statesmanship, expanding the field for distinction to encompass civic activities as well as military, so too does Sallust argue here for the validity of historiography as a means of direct service to the *res publica*. In each case, the author engages with established expectations about forms of political engagement in order to emphasise their own distinctive and path-breaking contribution.

Sallust's position is thus distinctive, in the emphasis he places on the validity of historiography to articulate political messages. This, I suggest, is carefully judged in relation to the audience at which his works seem predominantly directed: the focus on the political aspects and the reframing of historiographical activity are means of establishing the historian's authority among this audience in particular, pre-empting any criticisms of the form as an inadequate substitute for an active political contribution. Sallust's emphasis here restates the historian's competence in this field, even in the light of his own failed political career, and configures historiography as an appropriate medium to address questions of state in a way which goes beyond the traditional claims to relevance of the genre.

These considerations around the audience suggested by Sallust's texts, as well as the way in which their didactic value is formulated, and the construction of a partic-

68 *FRHist* 20 F2; cf. similarly Livy's discussion of history pointing out behaviour to emulate and avoid (pr. 10) or Cicero's famous characterisation of history as *magistra vitae* (*de Orat*. 2.36).

69 *Cat*. 4.2.

70 See e. g. Cic. *Cat*. 2.28, 3.23; on this strategy see Nicolet 1960. I am grateful for this point to the anonymous reader.

ular kind of political authority, should I think be taken as a prompt to consider their position within a wider late Republican context. Considering Sallust's work in the light of the erudition which he expects of his audience I think points towards a reading of his work as a contribution to contemporary intellectual discourses, in a way which again distinguishes these works from more popular forms: rather than the kind of elegant narrative which might appeal to a broad audience, the distinctive aspects of Sallust's texts emphasise his engagement with deeper issues. Sallust, I suggest, targets an educated elite precisely to frame his work's lessons as argumentative contributions requiring critical consideration, rather than according to the traditional Roman historiographical poles of emulation and avoidance: the point, I think, is to use historiography to contribute to the kind of wider questions which were of interest to this demographic, rather than for the more conventional purposes of moralising or memorialising narrative. In that Sallust's works diverge so clearly from historiographical norms, we should read them against a wider set of contemporary discourses, with the interests of his restricted audience as a unifying factor; if Sallust constructs a distinct community of readers, our readings might consider how his work might respond to questions and ideas current within that specific community. That Sallust's work appeals in the prefaces specifically to a group of readers engaged with philosophical ideas, for example, justifies reading it as *responding* to such ideas. Sallust's works use the genre of history as a means to advance wider points; it is thus worth considering them through the preoccupations of the elite community which they address.[71]

This assessment of Sallust's audience and its relevance justifies approaches to his text which focus on its sophistication; the problematisation of historiographical reading in particular supports readings of the author's work which seek to take the complexities and sometimes contradictions of his text not as weaknesses, but as argumentative contributions in their own right aimed at provoking critical thought in his audience.[72] In addition, it emphasises the importance of considering the themes of Sallust's historiography against other contemporary works across a variety of genres. I will briefly sketch two possible examples which stress the elite community of Sallust's readership, and how placing Sallust's works explicitly within the context of a wider set of themes of the late Republican period might illustrate their contemporary significance. I cannot here develop these connections in detail, but it is nonetheless valuable to highlight how aspects of Sallust's work might usefully be read against contemporary debates; this will, I hope, serve to demonstrate the value of

71 I consider the idea of Sallust's work as contribution to contemporary discourses from a perspective less focused on the audience at Shaw (forthcoming).

72 William Batstone's works are particularly important here (especially 1988, 2000); stressing the sense in which Sallust's work constructs its own intellectually engaged audience provides effective justification for readings which emphasise the contested and challenging aspects of Sallust's historiography.

viewing Sallust's work as a means of engaging with questions of interest to his elite audience.

One set of Sallustian themes to benefit from consideration within contemporary context are the historian's remarks on the nature of Rome's empire. The morality of Rome's imperial sway, including both her relations with the Italian allies and her military expansion, is a repeated theme in Sallust's works: it is most clearly expressed in the letter of Mithridates in the *Historiae*, and in Jugurtha's attacks on Rome's imperialism in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*.[73] These passages express a way of reading Rome's empire which is focalised through barbarian eyes, but which nonetheless communicates to a Roman audience in terms with which they were familiar. In both of these pieces of composed barbarian speech, Sallust stresses the abuses of Rome's empire, and in particular her tendency towards making brutal use of her power to subjugate all other peoples, ignoring even alliances and existing relationships of friendship in favour of a lust for imperial domination.[74] Elements of this focalised analysis are also apparent in passages where Sallust speaks *in propria persona*, in both the *Bellum Catilinae* and *Historiae*: Sallust refers to the abuses of imperial expansion in general in the opening chapters of his first monograph, and specifically in relation to Rome in both texts.[75]

It is too simplistic to view Sallust simply as a critic of Roman imperialism; but in the light of my suggestions as to the audience Sallust constructs for his works it is particularly important to consider them in the light of wider contemporary debates about the nature of imperial power.[76] Cicero provides a helpful interlocutor, in illustrating the currency of these themes in a late Republican context: in particular, the fragmentary third book of his *de Republica* illustrates precisely the relevance of debates about Rome's empire as expressed in moralistic terms, within wider discussions about justice and morality. In the discussion of justice between Scipio, Laelius and Furius Philus in that book, Philus is called upon to play devil's advocate, to put the argument that justice is incompatible with self-interest and successful govern-

73 *Hist*. 4.60R; *Jug*. 81. See Adler 2006 on the letter of Mithridates in particular; Adler 2011 on the tropes of barbarian speech in Roman historiography more generally.

74 See especially *Hist*. 60.17R. Adler 2006, 396 reads the letter of Mithridates as expressing "a cogent criticism of Rome's foreign policy", while remaining non-committal on how far the author himself necessarily agreed with these ideas.

75 Among the opening themes of the *Bellum Catilinae* is the degeneration of powerful states into greedy expansionism, with the examples of Cyrus the Great, Athens and Sparta: *Cat*. 2.1. *Cat*. 5.9 attacks the degeneration of Rome's constitution, expressed particularly in relation to her empire; cf. *Hist*. 1.17–18R, 1.21R on Rome's treatment of the Italians.

76 See McGushin 1994, 173–199 (with discussion of earlier bibliography). Heldmann 1993 locates Sallust's thought in the *Bellum Catilinae* in the context of historiographical themes of imperialism in Hellenistic historiography, based mostly on Polybius.

ment.[77] After dismissing the ideas of justice held by each of the major philosophical schools, Philus moves on to discuss the primacy of wisdom, which he defines in the terms effectively of expediency: this adds up to a justification of self-interest, and a defence of what might conventionally be considered injustice in international politics. Philus in fact frames his wisdom (specifically in relation to the winning of Rome's empire) in the following terms:

> sapientia iubet augere opes, amplificare divitias, proferre fines – unde enim esset illa laus in summorum imperatorum incisa monumentis, 'fines imperi propagavit', nisi aliquid de alieno accessisset? – imperare quam plurimis, frui voluptatibus, pollere, regnare, dominari.[78]
>
> Wisdom tells us to increase our resources, to pile up riches, to expand our borders – for from where else does that praise come which is scratched into the monuments of our greatest magistrates, 'he extended the borders of the empire', if not from taking something of another's? – to rule over as many as possible, to exercise our desires: to be successful, to rule, to master.

Cicero's discussion illustrates how in a contemporary context discussions about Rome's empire might be framed in the terms of justice and injustice, and that the morality of Rome's imperial position might genuinely be the subject of debate; the morality of Rome's empire was up for discussion among the elite constituency at which Cicero's philosophy was aimed, and a relevant example against which to formulate wider moral and philosophical questions. It is worth reading Sallust's discussion of the morality of Rome's empire, and his formulation of criticisms against Rome's vicious application of self-interest through Mithridates and Jugurtha, against the contemporary interest in the question demonstrated in Cicero's dialogue: we might consider Sallust's formulations as part of a wider discussion, almost as a kind of supplement or historical gloss to the same themes demonstrated in Philus' argumentation. Sallust's barbarian speakers – like Tacitus' Calgacus – provide historical exemplification of the consideration of Rome's empire in the terms of expediency.

Reading Sallust's audience as a signal to direct engagement with important contemporary questions also provides new ways to understand some of the most difficult aspects of his historiography. For example, the complexities and contradictions of Sallust's value-system (including his remarks on *virtus* and *gloria*), as a number of scholars have noted, cannot be reduced to a neatly formulated philosophical schema.[79] Rather, and in the context of the philosophical interests of his audience

77 The book is incomplete and Philus' argument complex; but its main lines can be reconstructed from the fragments and the summary of Lactantius (*Inst*. 5.16). Powell's recent *OCT* edition of the text (2006) is fundamental; I use his numbering and arrangement of the fragments.

78 Cic. *Rep*. 3.18P (my trans.). In his response to Philus' arguments at *Rep*. 3.24–26, Laelius discusses the *iura belli*; this suggests that Philus also perhaps treated this subject in more detail.

79 See generally Batstone 1988; the neat formulations of Earl 1961 (esp. 11 on *bonae artes*) are too simplistic. On Sallustian *gloria* see Thomas 2006; on *virtus* see Büchner 1982, 115–120 and now Balmaceda 2017, 48–82.

which Sallust gestures to in the prefaces, it is worth considering their complexity against the contemporary moral philosophy of Cicero – this time the *de Officiis*, near-contemporary to Sallust's work and which includes sustained consideration of the problematic value of *gloria* within a Republican system, together with an attempt to redefine the quality in a more socially constructive direction (as Antony Long has shown).[80] Again, thinking about the complexities of Sallust's work through the prism of the interests of his erudite audience provides important context for his discussion; in this light, the mutability of Sallustian values might thus be read as a contribution to another wider debate, current among the restricted audience at whom his works are aimed.[81] As with the example of imperial injustice, thinking through the interests of Sallust's intellectually engaged audience provides new perspectives on Sallust's place within a wider context: a reading which focuses on Sallust's response to the currency of these wider questions, and stresses the sense in which his histories articulate a wider historical contribution, provides a new assessment of the historian's position.

4 Conclusion

I have suggested in this chapter that we should take seriously the judgement that Sallust's works demanded an erudite reader, and think through the implications of that claim: emphasising that the author writes for a community of elite readers highlights the argumentative significance of his work and justifies approaching his works as responses to important contemporary themes. Sallust's work, as we have seen, differentiates itself sharply from the main stream of contemporary historiography: the restriction of the historian's audience to an educated elite further distinguishes its lessons from the didactic model of Latin *annales* and exemplary memorialisation, highlighting the importance of critical reflection on the historical content. A reading which stresses the distinctive erudition demanded of the audience places Sallust's work clearly within wider intellectual and political debates, in the context not just of a historiographical *continuum* but a wider world defined by the interests and intellectual horizons of the text's sophisticated readership.

Bibliography

Adler, E. (2006), "Who's anti-Roman? Sallust and Pompeius Trogus on Mithridates", in: *CJ* 101, 383 – 407.

80 Long 1995. On the project of the *de Officiis* see also Dyck 1996, 29 – 36; Gabba 1979; Samotta 2009, 136 – 147.

81 See now Shaw (forthcoming) for detailed discussion of Sallust's engagement with the Ciceronian idea of *gloria*.

Adler, E. (2011), *Valorizing the Barbarians: Enemy Speeches in Roman Historiography*, Austin.
Astin, A.E. (1978), *Cato the Censor*, Oxford.
Baraz, Y. (2012), *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*, Princeton.
Balmaceda, C. (2017), *Virtus Romana: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians*, Chapel Hill.
Batstone, W.W. (1988), "The Antithesis of Virtue: Sallust's *Synkrisis* and the Crisis of the Late Republic", in: *ClAnt* 7, 1–29.
Batstone, W.W. (2000), "Intellectual Conflict and Mimesis in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*", in: J.W. Allison (ed.), *Conflict, Antithesis and the Ancient Historian*, Athens, 112–132.
Briscoe, J. (2005), "The Language and Style of the Fragmentary Republican Historians", in: T. Reinhardt / M. Lapidge / J.N. Adams (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, New York, 53–72.
Brunt, P. (1980), "Cicero and Historiography", in: M.J. Fontana / M.T. Piraino / F.P. Rizzo (eds.), *Φιλίας Χάριν. Festschrift E. Manni*, Rome, 309–340.
Büchner, K. (1982), *Sallust* (2nd ed.), Heidelberg.
Büchner, K. (1983), "*Vera vocabula rerum amisimus*: Thucydides und Sallust über den Verfall der Wertbegriffe", in: H. Zehnacker / G. Hentz (eds.), *Hommages à Robert Schilling*, Paris, 253–261.
Canfora, L. (1991), "Vera vocabula rerum amisimus", in: M. Pani (ed.), *Continuità e trasformazioni fra repubblica e principato: Istituzioni, politica, società*, Bari, 103–108.
Chaplin, J.D. (2000), *Livy's Exemplary History*, Oxford / New York.
Cornell, T.J. *et al.* (2013), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, Oxford.
Crawford, M.H. (1978), "Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Aristocracy in the First Century BC", in: P.D.A. Garnsey / C.R. Whitaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 193–207.
Dyck, A. (1996), *A Commentary on Cicero, de Officiis*, Ann Arbor, MI.
Earl, D. (1961), *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge.
Earl, D. (1971), "Prologue-Form in Ancient Historiography", in: H. Temporini (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 1.2, Berlin / New York, 842–856.
Fantham, E. (2006), *The Roman World of Cicero's de Oratore*, Oxford / New York.
Feeney, D.C. (1994), "Beginning Sallust's Catiline", in: *Prudentia* 26, 139–146.
Feldherr, A. (2012), "*Magna mihi copia est memorandi*: Modes of Historiography in the Speeches of Caesar & Cato (Sall. *BC* 51–4)", in: J. Grethlein / C. Krebs (eds.), *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the "Plupast" from Herodotus to Appian*, Cambridge / New York, 95–112.
Feldherr, A. (2021), *After the Past: Sallust on History and Writing History*, Hoboken.
Fornara, C.W. (1983), *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece & Rome*, Berkeley.
Gabba, E. (1979), "Per un'interpretazione politica del *de Officiis* di Cicerone", in: *RAL* 34, 117–141.
Hectaridis, D. (1997), "Salluste lu par Quintilien", in: R. Poignault (ed.), *Présence de Salluste*, Tours, 83–93.
Heldmann, K. (1993), *Sallust über die römische Weltherrschaft*, Stuttgart.
Heldmann, K. (2011), *"Sine ira et studio": das Subjektivitätsprinzip der römischen Geschichtsschreibung und das Selbstverständnis antiker Historiker*, Munich.
Hellegouarc'h, J. (1987), "Le prooemium du *Bellum Jugurthinum*: actualité et signification politique", in: *Kentron* 1, 7–16.
Krebs, C.B. (2009), "A Seemingly Artless Conversation: Cicero's *de Legibus* (1.1–5)", in: *CPh* 104.1, 90–106.
Kroll, W. (1927), "Die Sprache des Sallust", in: *Glotta* 15, 280–305.
La Penna, A. (1968), *Sallustio e la "Rivoluzione" Romana*, Milan.
Lausberg, H. (1998), *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, Leiden.
Leeman, A.D. / Pinkster, H. / Nelson, H.L.W. (1985), *M. Tullius Cicero, De Oratore Libri III. Kommentar. 2. Band: Buch 1, 166–265, Buch II, 1–98*, Heidelberg.

Levene, D.S. (2000), "Sallust's Catiline and Cato the Censor", in: *CQ* 50, 170–191.
Lichanski, J.Z. (1986), "Historiographie et théorie de la rhétorique de l'antiquité au moyen âge", in: *Europa Orientalis* 5, 21–48.
Long, A.A. (1995), "Cicero's Politics in *de Officiis*", in: A. Laks / M. Schofield (eds.), *Justice and Generosity: Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy*, Cambridge / New York, 213–240.
Maitland, J. (1996), "Marcellinus' Life of Thucydides: Criticism and Criteria in the Biographical Tradition", in: *CQ* 46, 538–558.
Marincola, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge / New York.
Marincola, J. (2009), "Ancient Audiences and Expectations", in: A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*, Cambridge / New York, 11–23.
Marincola, J. (2010), "The Rhetoric of History: Allusion, Intertextuality and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches", in: D. Pausch (ed.), *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der Antiken Historiographie*, Berlin / New York, 259–289.
McGushin, P. (1992), *Sallust: the Histories. Volume I*, Oxford.
McGushin, P. (1994), *Sallust: the Histories. Volume II*, Oxford.
Mehl, A. (2011), *Roman Historiography: An Introduction to its Basic Aspects and Development* (trans. H.-F. Mueller), Malden, MA.
Miller, J. (2015), "Idealisation and Irony in Sallust's *Jugurtha*: the Narrator's Depiction of Rome before 146 BC", in: *CQ* 65, 242–252.
Moles, J. (1994), "Livy's Preface", in: *PCPhS* 39, 141–168.
Nicolet, C. (1960), "*Consul togatus*: remarques sur le vocabulaire politique de Cicéron et de Tite-Live", in: *REL* 38, 236–263.
O'Gorman, E. (2007), "The Politics of Sallustian Style", in: J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*, Malden, MA, 379–384.
Osgood, J. (2006), *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge / New York.
Rawson, E. (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London.
Reddé, M.M. (1980), "Rhétorique et histoire chez Thucydide et Salluste", in: R. Chevallier (ed.), *Colloque histoire et historiographie. Clio*, Paris, 11–17.
Rosenblitt, J.A. (2019), *Rome after Sulla*, London / New York.
Samotta, I. (2009), *Das Vorbild der Vergangenheit: Geschichtsbild und Reformvorschläge bei Cicero und Sallust*, Stuttgart.
Samotta, I. (2012), "Herodotus and Thucydides in Roman Republican Historiography", in: E. Foster / D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides & Herodotus*, Oxford / New York, 345–378.
Scanlon, T. (1980), *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust*, Heidelberg.
Scanlon, T. (1987), *Spes Frustrata: A Reading of Sallust*, Heidelberg.
Seider, A.M. (2014), "Time's Path and the Historian's Agency: Morality and Memory in Sallust's *BC*", in: *Epekeina* 4.1–2, 141–175.
Shaw, E. (forthcoming), *Sallust and the Fall of the Republic: Historiography and Intellectual Life at Rome*, Leiden.
Sklenar, R. (1998), "La République des Signes: Caesar, Cato, and the Language of Sallustian Morality", in: *TAPhA* 128, 205–220.
Syme, R. (1964), *Sallust*, Oxford.
Thomas, J.-F. (2006), "La représentation de la gloire dans le *De Catilinae coniuratione* de Salluste", in: *VL* 175, 89–103.
Tiffou, E. (1973), *Essai sur la pensée morale de salluste à la lumière de ses prologues*, Paris.
Tzounakas, S. (2005), "A Digression in a Digression: Sall. *Cat.* 8", in: *Eranos* 103, 125–131.
Wiseman, T.P. (1981), "Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography", in: *History* 66, 375–393.

Wiseman, T.P. (2015), *The Roman Audience: Classical Literature as Social History*, Oxford.
Wisse, J. (1995), "Greeks, Romans and the Rise of Atticism", in: J.G.J. Abbenes / S.R. Slings / I. Sluiter (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*, Amsterdam, 65–82.
Woodman, A.J. (1988), *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, London.
Woodman, A.J. (2012), *From Poetry to History: Collected Papers*, Oxford / New York.

Marine Miquel

The Audience of Latin Historical Works in the First Century BCE in Light of Geographical Descriptions

Liv. 9.2.6 – 8

Duae ad Luceriam ferebant viae, altera praeter oram superi maris, patens apertaque sed quanto tutior tanto fere longior, altera per furculas Caudinas, brevior; sed ita natus locus est: saltus duo alti angusti silvosique sunt montibus circa perpetuis inter se iuncti; iacet inter eos satis patens clausus in medio campus herbidus aquosusque, per quem medium iter est; sed antequam venias ad eum, intrandae primae primae angustiae sunt, et aut eadem qua te insinuaveris retro via repetenda aut, si ire porro pergas, per alium saltum artiorem impeditioremque, evadendum.

There were two roads to Luceria. One skirted the Adriatic, and though open and unobstructed, was long almost in proportion to its safety. The other led through the Caudine Forks, and was shorter, but this is the nature of the place; two deep defiles, narrow and wooded, are connected by an unbroken range of mountains on either hand; shut in between them lies a rather extensive plain, grassy and well-watered, with the road running through the middle of it; but before you come to it, you must enter the first defile, and afterwards either retrace the steps by which you made your way into the place, or else – should you go forward – pass out by another ravine, which is even narrower and more difficult.[1]

The well-known passage which introduces the episode of the battle and overwhelming defeat of the Roman army at the Caudine Forks has been the subject of various topographical studies. However, as N. Horsfall ironically underlined in his article "The Caudine Forks: Topography and Illusion",[2] the Livian depiction of the battle does not match the actual topography. Horsfall thus assumed that Livy had no knowledge of geography to speak of, moreover, that the historian did not care that he should give a realistic representation of an Italian space. The place of the Caudine Forks does not belong to any set of remote territories; it is not far from Rome itself. Yet, "[Livy's] geography of the Second Samnit War is a known nadir. That the terrain lay between Rome and Campania did nothing to stir an accurate interest in Livy".[3] N. Horsfall's harsh judgement is not uncommon, but rather a part of the longstanding tradition of Roman historiographical studies.

Opposition of hypercriticism and high-degree fidelity has now given way to new criticism which focuses on the narratological work of ancient historians,[4] following the shift of the "linguistic turn".[5] Yet, and even though the latest archaeological discoveries contribute to rehabilitate the historians' reliability, the view of ancient his-

1 Translation by Foster 1926. In this article I use the Loeb editions, unless otherwise specified.
2 Horsfall 1982.
3 Horsfall 1982, 50.
4 Miles 1995; Jaeger 1997; Feldherr 1998; Mineo 2006; Levene 2010.
5 White 1973 and 1987; Wiseman 1979; Woodman 1988.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-004

torians' lack of geographical and topographical knowledge still prevails. When they do not lament on ancient historians' lack of accuracy, or their lack of knowledge and interest in geography, researchers often claim that ancient historiography omits referential information and leaves only rhetorical images of typical places in order to serve a defined purpose. N. Horsfall thus tried to demonstrate that the episode of the Caudine Forks is framed with topical elements which belong to many other depictions in narratives of conquest. These stories indeed unfold the tactical space of a confined location, made of narrow defiles, hostile vegetation and steep slopes that hide ambushes which make it difficult for the army to progress, and, for example, the two narrow wooden passes (*saltus duo alti angusti silvosique*) recall to N. Horsfall the stories of Alexander the Great.[6] Three years later, in another paper about ancient geographical depictions' issues, he concluded:

> Such geography appeals to a taste for the curious, the mythical, the strange and the picturesque. Such information is meant to entertain rather than to instruct; a matter for enjoyment, not study. No expectation existed in Augustan Rome that the geographical information contained in a work of literature should be precise.[7]

Such dichotomy between enjoyment and study is surprising, and N. Horsfall seems to postulate too quickly here. It would certainly be helpful, as he discusses the expectations (specifically, the absence of expectations) of the Roman audience, to understand which type of audience (or audiences) there was in the Augustan period. In fact, I believe that the confusions and inaccuracies which the researchers identify in historical descriptions often illustrate a horizon of expectations built by the texts, which refers to the horizon of expectations of the actual audience, albeit not completely identical with it. Indeed, as H.R. Jauss pointed out, the audience must follow the reading strategies implied by the textual structures.[8] In this respect, should the "inaccuracy" and "errors" be regarded as the product of both the historiographical and ethnogeographical traditions[9] and the concerns and knowledge of the audience? In this article I intend to re-read the ethnogeographical passages of ancient historical works in light of various criteria of reception, in order to suggest that the forms and content of such descriptions, as well as their accuracy, may be determined by the geographical and ethnological knowledge of the audience and by its various expectations. As a result, I will at first try to understand what the re-

6 See Curt. 3.4.11 for the depiction of the Cicilian Gates and 5.3.18 – 19 for the representation of the Persian Gates.

7 Horsfall 1985, 199.

8 Jauss 1982.

9 See Engels 2008, 541: "In the ancient Greco-Roman world the boundaries between genres of prose literature remained fluid and blurred. This was especially true of the twin disciplines of geography and history and of cultural-geographical and historical works of literature." In this article, I will use the term "geography" in the contemporary sense to refer to the description of single areas, which was named "chorography" in Antiquity. See Jacob 1991, 128 commenting on Ptolemy 1.1.1.

searchers mean when they blame the "inaccuracy" and "lack of precise information" of such texts. This will require a study of the elaboration of some descriptions in the historical works of the first century BCE, such as the *excursus* of Sallust on Africa, the depictions of the Hercynian Forest in the *Bellum Gallicum*, in addition to Livy's picture of an Etruscan Italy and his narrative of Celtic migration in the fifth century BCE. These historical works are written in the specific context of the achievement of Roman conquest and the establishment of a world inventory,[10] with monumental or triumphal exhibitions of the conquered territories and peoples, while new and broader audiences emerge. This context will lead me, in a second part, to ask what the nature of the audience of such historiographical texts[11] and its various degrees of access to ethnographical knowledge could be. Lastly, I hope to rethink the purposes of Latin historiography and to problematise the traditional opposition between utility and pleasure in this particular social and cultural context.

1 "Inaccurate" depictions of the world: the ethno-geographical descriptions in Caesar, Sallust, and Livy

It can be useful to come back to the texts and to study their content, specific terminology and sources, in order to understand how they differ from our conceptions of geographical descriptions.

a Content and sources

When they focus on ancient ethnogeographical passages, scholars often become very judgemental: for instance, when alluding to the Hercynian Forest's depiction, L.A. Constans suggests that the description is so filled with incredible information that Caesar certainly delegated his work to his – far less skilled and cultivated – secretaries:

> So much is said [in book 5 of *Bellum Gallicum*] on the Hernicyan Forest's Fauna that we are reluctant to attribute it a mind like his [...]. Undoubtly Caesar wanted to offer to his lectorship information about remote lands where he first led the Roman army and appointed one of his secretaries to gather a few Greek geographers.[12]

10 Nicolet 1988.

11 Not forgetting that under the same label of "historical works" fall different texts, such as monograph, commentary and annalistic narrative, which are related to different purposes.

12 Constans 1926, XIV-XV.

Even if he believed that Sallust had a full understanding of African ethnogeography, since he had been the governor of the Roman province there, R. Syme enumerated the "errors" made by Sallust in his digression and stated that the historian let his "Greek erudition and fancies betray their usual devastating effects".[13] A similar assessment was given by P.G. Walsh on the *Ab urbe condita*:

> Livy's personal deficiencies as historian are considerable – weakness of geography, ignorance of military matters, lack of acquaintance with politics. He is thus incapable of rigorous evaluation or original interpretation in these fields. The main conclusion stands out inescapably: Livy's value for Roman history varies according the source followed.[14]

However, to which "errors" or "approximations" do these scholars refer to? For example, the description of the Hercynian Forest in the sixth book of the *Bellum Gallicum*, which follows a comparison between Gallic and German peoples and a long excursus on Germany, begins with information on its size (6.25):

> Huius Hercyniae silvae, quae supra demonstrata est, latitude nouem dierum iter expedito patet: non enim aliter finiri potest, neque mensuras itinerum nouerunt.
>
> The breadth of this Hercynian forest, above mentioned, is as much as a nine days' journey for an unencumbered person; for in no other fashion can it be determined, nor have they means to measure journeys.

Yet, this information is not numerical, which can confuse a modern reader; it is rather measured according to the journey of a lightly equipped traveller. Caesar adds a commentary in which he explains that there are no other ways to measure it, but in fact, the use of the dative *expedito* is a commonplace of historical narratives; it makes mention of a footman. Such measurement system is part of the Herodotean tradition: when he referred to the width of spaces in the *Histories* (1.72.3; 1.104.1 and 2.32.2), Herodotus mentioned the five days that it took to be journeyed by a lightly equipped man:[15]

> ἔστι δὲ αὐχὴν οὗτος τῆς χώρης ταύτης ἁπάσης: μῆκος ὁδοῦ εὐζώνῳ ἀνδρὶ πέντε ἡμέραι ἀναισιμοῦνται.
>
> Here is the narrowest neck of all this land; the length of the journey across is five days, for a man going unburdened.
>
> Ἔστι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαιήτιδος ἐπὶ Φᾶσιν ποταμὸν καὶ ἐς Κόλχους τριήκοντα ἡμερέων εὐζώνῳ ὁδός.
>
> It is thirty days' journey for an unburdened man from the Maeetian lake to the river Phasis and the land of the Colchi.

13 Syme 1964, 152–153.

14 Walsh 1961, 273.

15 See Briscoe's comment on Liv. 38.59.6 (2008, 206).

ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἐς Σινώπην τὴν ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ πόντῳ πέντε ἡμερέων ἰθέα ὁδὸς εὐζώνῳ ἀνδρί.

Whence it is a straight five days' journey for an unburdened man to Sinope on the Euxine.[16]

A second criterion could cause uncertainty for the modern reader: the location which follows the mention of the width of the Forest (*Gal.* 6.25):

Oritur ab Helvetiorum et Nemetum et Rauracorum finibus rectaque fluminis Danubi regione pertinent ad fines Dacorum et Anartium; hinc se flectit sinistrorsus diversis ab flumine regionibus multarumque gentium fines propter magnitudinem adtingit.

It begins in the borders of the Helvetii, the Nemetes, and the Rauraci, and, following the direct line of the river Danube, it extends to the borders of the Daci and the Anartes; thence it turns leftwards, through districts apart from the river, and by reason of its size touches the borders of many nations.

It only refers to the River Danube and German peoples, in sharp contrast to these of Strabo in the seventh book of his *Geography* (7.1.5), and of Pomponius Mela in the third book of his *Chorography* (3.25), both of whom use various natural elements, in order to help localisation:

Ὁ δὲ Ἑρκύνιος δρυμὸς πυκνότερός τέ ἐστι καὶ μεγαλόδενδρος ἐν χωρίοις ἐρυμνοῖς κύκλον περιλαμβάνων μέγαν, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ ἵδρυται χώρα καλῶς οἰκεῖσθαι δυναμένη, περὶ ἧς εἰρήκαμεν. ἔστι δὲ πλησίον αὐτῆς ἥ τε τοῦ Ἴστρου πηγὴ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ῥήνου καὶ ἡ μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν λίμνη καὶ τὰ ἕλη τὰ ἐκ τοῦ Ῥήνου διαχεόμενα. ἔστι δ' ἡ λίμνη τὴν μὲν περίμετρον σταδίων πλειόνων ἢ πεντακοσίων, δίαρμα δὲ ἐγγὺς διακοσίων. ἔχει δὲ καὶ νῆσον, ᾗ ἐχρήσατο ὁρμητηρίῳ Τιβέριος ναυμαχῶν πρὸς Ὀυινδολικούς. νοτιωτέρα δ' ἐστὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἴστρου πηγῶν καὶ αὕτη, καὶ ὁ Ἑρκύνιος δρυμός, ὥστ' ἀνάγκη τῷ ἐκ τῆς Κελτικῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑρκύνιον δρυμὸν ἰόντι πρῶτον μὲν διαπερᾶσαι τὴν λίμνην, ἔπειτα τὸν Ἴστρον, εἶτ' ἤδη δι' εὐπετεστέρων χωρίων ἐπὶ τὸν δρυμὸν τὰς προβάσεις ποιεῖσθαι δι' ὀροπεδίων.

The Hercynian Forest is not only rather dense, but also has large trees, and comprises a large circuit within regions that are fortified by nature; in the centre of it, however, lies a country (of which I have already spoken) that is capable of affording an excellent livehood. And near it are the sources of both the Ister and the Rhenus, as also the lake between the two sources, and the marshes into which the Rhenus spreads. The perimeter of the lake is more than three hundred stadia, while the passage across it is nearly two hundred. There is also an island in it which Tiberius used as a base of operations in his naval battle with the Vindelici. This lake is south of the sources of the Ister, as is also the Hercynian Forest, so that necessarily, in going from Celtica to the Hercynian Forest, one first crosses the lake and then the Ister, and from there on advances through more passable regions – plateaus – to the forest.[17]

Paludium Suesia, Metia et Melsyagum maximae, silvarum Hercynia et aliquot sunt, quae nomen habent, sed illa dierum sexaginta iter occupans, ut maior aliis ita notior.

16 Translated by Godley 1920.

17 Translated by Jones 1924.

> Of the swamps, the Suesia, the Metia, and the Melsyagum are the biggest. Of the forests, the Hercynian and some others that have names do exist, but because it covers sixty days' march, the Hercynian Forest is as much better known as it is bigger than the others.[18]

Moreover, the texts do not provide systematic knowledge but carefully selected items. In each one, common themes of historiography are involved: first, the theme of *origines gentium* (peoples' origins),[19] with the mention of migrations because of poverty and overcrowding (*Jug*. 18.11; 19.1; Liv. 5.33 – 34). Second, the evocation of settlements of groups who followed Hercules during his wandering all over the Mediterranean world, in Sallust (*Jug*. 18.3), is echoed by Livy's allusion to the legend of Hercules crossing the Alps (5.34.6). Third, the theme of the onset of decadence as a result of the onset of foreign influences and luxury (Liv. 5.33.11):[20]

> Alpinis quoque ea gentibus haud dubie origo est, maxime Raetis, quos loca ipsa efferarunt ne quid ex antique praetor sonum linguae, nec cum incorruptum, retinerent.
>
> The Alpine tribes have also, no doubt, the same origin, especially the Raetians; who have been rendered so savage by the very nature of the country as to retain nothing of their ancient character save the sound of their speech, and even that is corrupted.

On the contrary, peoples who remain in a rough territory are thought to keep their physical fitness in order to endure strenuous exertions (*Jug*. 17.5 – 6). Similarly, the Hercynian Forest, as an unreachable edge of the known world, stands for the virtues of the Germans, who were opposed by Caesar to the decadent Gauls in the previous paragraph (*Gal*. 6.25):

> Neque quisquam est huius Germaniae, qui se aut adisse ad initium eius silvae dicat, cum dierum iter LX processerit, aut quo ex loco oriatur acceperit.
>
> There is no man in Germany we know who can say that he has reached the edge of that forest, thought he may have gone forward a sixty days' journey, or who has learnt in what place it begins.

b Specific terminology

These geographical depictions are characterized by a specific terminology: *oriuntur*, *pertinet ad*, *se flectit* and *adtingit* are dynamic verbs, in that they convey the idea of movement or direction. They were often used in Latin geographical texts, as Th.

18 Translation by Romer 1998.

19 Bickerman 1952. It has already become a common theme in rhetoric; a century later Seneca used it in his *Consolatio ad Helviam matrem*, 7.2 – 4.

20 This theme goes back to Pl. *Lg*. 4.704b-705b and Arist. *Pol*. 7.1327. It is a commonplace in Rome: see Cic. *Rep*. 2.3.5 and the speech of Camillus in Liv. 5.54.

Becker already noted.[21] Nevertheless, apart from this dynamic perspective, the description seems to follow a hodological perspective. Directions and orientations are numerous but rather inaccurate, since they only shape an imprecise layout: *ab ... recta ... ad ... hinc ... sinistrorsus*. Similarly vague is the terminology: the word *fines* refers to unclearly defined territories,[22] and *regiones* or *gentes* are said simply to be plentiful and various (*multae*, *diversae*). In his famous depiction of Africa in his monograph on the Jugurthine War, Sallust also uses geographical terms for orientation – such as *ab occidente* and *ab ortu solis* –, yet also remains vague and uses generical terms such as *magna pars* or *pleraque*. Nor does he give accurate localisations. Indeed, the narrative goes from one place to another, in the same hodological line. The same structure can be found in Livy's depiction of Italy as well, in the fifth book of the *Ab urbe condita*, before the Gallic invasion. This passage is placed into a flashback, which narrates the first invasion of Italy, in the time of Tarquin, when northern Italy was mostly ruled by the Etruscan cities. Dynamic terms are also used, such as *cingitur* and *vergere*. The depiction does not choose the terminology of geographical ancient tradition – those of Eratosthenes, Hipparchus or Polybius – in which the audience is given geometrical descriptions where Italy stands for a triangle whose top is the headland of Cocynthos, in Bruttium, and whose base consists of the Po Valley and the Alps (Plb. 2.14.4):

> Τῆς δὴ συμπάσης Ἰταλίας τῷ σχήματι τριγωνοειδοῦς ὑπαρχούσης, τὴν μὲν μίαν ὁρίζει πλευρὰν αὐτῆς τὴν πρὸς τὰς ἀνατολὰς κεκλιμένην ὅ τ' Ἰόνιος πόρος καὶ κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς ὁ κατὰ τὸν Ἀδρίαν κόλπος, τὴν δὲ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν καὶ δυσμὰς τετραμμένην τὸ Σικελικὸν καὶ Τυρρηνικὸν πέλαγος.
>
> Italy as a whole has the shape of a triangle of which one or eastern side is bounded by the Ionian Strait and then continuously by the Adriatic Gulf, the next side, that turned to the south and west, by the Sicilian and Tyrrhenian Seas.[23]

c Sources

Scholars also criticized these historians' use of sources and dismiss the seriousness of the geographical information that they gave in their texts. Yet, ancient historians did not usually refer to their own experience, nor to a knowledge provided by the experience of travelling. They built their *personae* of a narrator/historian who possesses a serious knowledge, but a literary one: Sallust thus links the information he gave to his audience to a geographical work that must have been authoritative in the geography of Africa, namely the Punic books of King Hiempsal. Yet, surprisingly, he is very vague when he alludes to his other sources, with the term *plerique*.

21 Becker 1900.

22 See Trousset 1993.

23 Translation by Patton 1922, revised by Walbank and Habicht 2010.

The same inaccuracy can be found when Caesar mentions Eratosthenes and "Greek authors" (*quidam Graeci*): he sets himself in both the tradition of the great scholar of the third century BCE who was still the main reference for geographical knowledge in the first century BCE,[24] and of various unnamed geographers. Therefore, Caesar and Sallust did not mention their own experience of a space they knew perfectly already, as the former conquered it and the latter ruled it as a governor, and only offered bookish information. Livy may have also used a literary tradition: in truth, R.M. Ogilvie suggested that Livy's passage on northern Italy was also written in the *Tuscana Historia* and refers to the tradition of Etruscology.[25] Indeed, A. Feldherr[26] has recently noted that Latin historians gave up autopsy and investigation, which were major precepts in Greek historiography. He demonstrated that, in Roman historiography, the look is no longer a direct look on actual events. The perspective rather belonged to the audience, which acted as both the receptacle and the actor of the spectacle of great deeds.

To conclude this section, ethno-geographical depictions in these historiographical narratives of course do not satisfy the contemporary criteria of geographical depictions, as they had to meet very different expectations: those of an audience which was used to ancient historiographical tradition, to its specific vocabulary, themes and ways to refer to its sources. This audience of historiography was not interested in "scientific geography"[27], but rather in a knowledge of the territories which happened to belong to the new Roman Empire. In order to reach a better understanding of such audience's expectations, we will now investigate the model reader[28] who is mirrored by ancient historiographical texts.

2 Model reader and ethno-geographical knowledge

a A broader audience

In some historical works we find dedications which indicate that the works were devoted to characters who were mostly members of the political elite, such as the dedication of Hirtius, Caesar's lieutenant, to Lucius Cornelius Balbus (*Gal.* 8.1):

24 See Aujac 2001. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero refers to Eratosthenes as an exemplary model: Cic. *Att*. 2.6.2.

25 Ogilvie 1965, 703; Suet. *Cl.* 42.2 tells us that Claudius, who was also Livy's pupil, was the author of an Etruscan history. See Briquel 1988.

26 Feldherr 2009.

27 Clarke 1999.

28 We believe that these historical works of the end of the Roman Republic presented a single model of reader, in contrast with those of the Flavian Era, such as Arrian's *Anabasis*, which shows the concern of readerly diversity. On Arrian, see V. Liotsakis in this volume.

> Coactus assiduis tuis vocibus, Balbe, cum cotidiana mea recusatio non difficultatis excusationem sed inertiae videretur deprecationem habere, rem difficillimam suscepi.
>
> By your continual reproaches, Balbus, which seemed to regard my daily refusal not as a plea caused by difficulty, but as an evasion due to indolence.[29]

Through this form of dedication, people who oversaw political life could thus be informed of foreign affairs or were given lessons from history (as *magistra vitae*). In the first century BCE, however, Roman historiography experienced an important growth that is shown by the increasing number of historical works.[30] The historians' works therefore seem to have reached a larger audience. As Cl. Moatti[31] underlined, after the civil wars, Roman people experimented a genuine need for history, as they tried to strengthen the foundations of their knowledge of the past. A shift then occurred in the intellectual world. Historiography was no longer put forward as the natural prolongation of the political activities of the Roman elite but as a source of fame for historians who did not necessarily belong to the political field.[32] This is evidenced by a passage of Pliny the Elder, where Livy is said to have praised his own glory in the preface of a book which is now lost (*Nat.* pr. 16):

> Equidem [...] profiteor mirari me T. Livium, auctorem celeberrimum, in historiarum suarum quas repetit ab origine urbis, quodam volumine sic orsum: iam sibi satis gloriae quaesitum, et potuisse se desidere, ni animus inquies pasceretur opere. profecto enim populi gentium victoris et Romani nominis gloriae, non suae, conposuisse illa decuit.
>
> For my own part [...] I declare that I admire the famous writer Livy when he begins one volume of his History of Rome from the Foundation of the City with the words 'I have already achieved enough of fame, and I might have retired to leisure, did not my restless mind find its sustenance in work'. For assuredly he ought to have composed his history for the glory of the world-conquering nation and of the Roman name, not for his own.[33]

The historian, orator and politician made way for the professional rhetor; the listener of a *recitatio* did not inevitably belong to the familiar circle of the author[34] and the work then circulated beyond the network of friends or acquaintances.[35]

Furthermore, the importance of orality in Roman culture[36] enabled the oral circulation through the city of entire books or, rather, of selected excerpts. As speaking

29 Translation by Edwards 1917.
30 *in tanta scriptorum turba*, said Livy in the preface of his historical *opus* (pr. 3).
31 Moatti 1997.
32 See Ledentu 2004, "Conclusion".
33 Translation by Rackham 1938.
34 See Sen. *Con.* 3 pr. 12, and Videau 2000; de Franchis 2012.
35 See Valette-Cagnac 1997, 111–167.
36 See Harris 1989.

was a more important vector than writing,[37] the low literacy level in Roman society did not prevent people from accessing such texts:[38] while Pollio Asinius, as Seneca the Elder showed it in his *Controuersiae*, read his books in front of a selected audience,[39] Livy was indeed represented by Pliny the Younger as giving a public hearing, where an inhabitant of the remote Gades, from the border of the western world, came to see him and went back right away (*Ep.* 2.3.8):

> Numquamne legisti, Gaditanum quendam Titi Livi nomine gloriaque commotum ad visendum eum ab ultimo terrarum orbe venisse, statimque ut viderat abisse? ἀφιλόκαλον inlitteratum iners ac paene etiam turpe est, non putare tanti cognitionem qua nulla est iucundior, nulla pulchrior, nulla denique humanior.
>
> Have you never heard the story of the Spaniard from Gades? He was so stirred by the famous name of Livy, that he came from his far corner of the earth to have one look at him and then went back again. Only a boorish ignorance and a degree of apathy which is really rather shocking could prevent you from thinking it worth an effort to gain an experience which will prove so enjoyable, civilized, and rewarding.[40]

Moreover, an excerpt of Cicero also testifies to the spread of historiography beyond the small circle of Roman political elite: in fact, it even seems that lower sections of the population had current access to historical narratives (*Fin.* 5.51–52):[41]

> Ipsi enim quaeramus a nobis [...] quid historia delectet, quam solemus persequi usque ad extremum, praetermissa repetimus, inchoata persequimur. nec vero sum nescius esse utilitatem in historia, non modo voluptatem. quid, cum fictas fabulas, e quibus utilitas nulla elici potest cum voluptate legimus? quid, cum volumus nomina eorum qui quid gesserint nota nobis esse, parentes, patriam, multa praeterea minime necessaria? quid quod homines infima fortuna, nulla spe rerum gerendarum, opifices denique delectantur historia? maxime eos videre possumus res gestas audire et legere velle qui a spe gerendi absunt confecti senectute. quocirca intellegi necesse est in ipsis rebus quae discuntur et cognoscuntur invitamenta inesse quibus ad discendum cognoscendumque moveamur.
>
> Let us ask ourselves the question [...] why we derive pleasure from history, which we are so fond of following up, to the remotest detail, turning back to parts we have omitted, and pushing on to the end when we have once begun. Not that I am unaware that history is useful as well as entertaining. But what of our reading fiction, from which no utility can be extracted? What of our ea-

37 See Harris 1989, 226: "The heavy reliance for the Roman upper class on readers is familiar, and even for them it is clear that listening, instead of reading for oneself, always seemed natural."
38 According to M. Corbier, it did not prevent them from accessing public communication, as we can speak of a "poor literacy" of Roman society, i.e. some ability to read capital letters: Corbier 2006.
39 *Pollio Asinius numquam admissa multitudine declamauit, nec illi ambitio in studiis defuit; primus enim omnium Romanorum advocatis hominibus scripta sua recitavit* (Sen. *Con.* 4 pr. 2), "Asinius Pollio never let a crowd in when he declaimed; but he was not without scholarly ambition – indeed he was the first of all of the Romans to recite what he had written before an invited audience" (translation by Winterbottom 1924).
40 Translation by Radice 1919.
41 For a better understanding of this quotation considering the reading of Livy's work, see D. Pausch in this volume.

> gerness to learn the names of people who have done something notable, their parentage, birthplace, and many quite unimportant details beside? What of the delight that is taken in history by men of the humblest station, who have no expectation of participating in public life, even mere artisans? Also we may notice that the persons most eager to hear and read of public affairs are those who are debarred by the infirmities of age from any prospect of taking part in them. Hence we are forced to infer that the objects of study and knowledge contain in themselves the allurements that entice us to study and to learning.[42]

T.P. Wiseman suggested in his article "Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography" that in Rome historical texts were often read in front of large audiences, mostly in public spaces such as *fora* or baths:

> Public recitation, mass audiences, but no purpose-built *auditoria* – so where did the literary men of the late Republic perform? Horace gives us the answer: in the Forum, in the baths, and (after 55 BCE) in the theatre. The terraced steps of the Comitium, or the *gradus Aurelii*, would be an ideal spot on holidays when there was no public business in the Forum; the theatre, on the other hand, would be available on working days but not during *ludi scaenici*. The baths could be used any time, as could the *scholae* and *exedrae* of the public *colonna*.[43]

Literature – especially historical works – could thus be broadly received. One can wonder if this broader audience was extended to the provinces of the Roman Empire. In fact, given the spread of the use of Latin at the expense of indigenous languages – in particular, in the western part of the Roman Empire –, we can assume that in the first century BCE at least the provincial elite was able to understand Latin readings.[44]

Now, reading historical narratives aloud in public or private spaces may have conveyed a particular reception.[45] Even if this can only be speculated, as it is not possible to reconstitute a reading performance in Rome, it can at least be suggested that these practices, which took place in various settings, must have brought to Rome and all over the Empire images and sounds from other territories which were part of the *imperium Romanum*. I believe that they offered an overlap, or rather a conflation of spaces within the exact place of reception.

42 Translation by Rackham 1914.

43 See Wiseman 1981, 385. In addition to the excerpt of Cicero's *De Finibus*, he notably uses quotations of Hor. *Sat*. 1.4.73–76 and *Ep*. 1.19.41.

44 Harris 1989, 175–190.

45 As M. Corbier warns us, we must not expeditiously identify the audience of oral readings with popular ones, as oratory form clearly corresponds to elite culture. In fact, orality results from a constant dialogue between elite and mass: Corbier 2006, 73–75.

b Various kinds of ethno-geographical knowledge, belonging to different audiences

How can the ethno-geographical knowledge of such a broader audience be analysed? The letters of Cicero present him as an intellectual who actively compiled a network to purchase scholarly books, or who complained about the difficulties of gathering material and writing according to geographical criteria (*Att.* 2.6.2):

> Etenim γεωγραφικά quae constitueram, magnum opus est. ita valde Eratosthenes, quem mihi proposueram, a Serapione et ab Hipparcho reprehenditur. quid censes, si Tyrannio accesserit? et hercule sunt res difficiles ad explicandum et ὁμοειδεῖς nec tam possunt ἀνθηρογραφεῖσθαι quam videbantur.
>
> The geographical work I had planned is a big undertaking. Eratosthenes, whom I had taken as my authority, is severely criticized by Serapion and Hipparchus; and, if I take Tyrannio's views too, there is no telling what the result will be. Besides the subject is confoundedly hard to explain and monotonous, nor does it give one as many opportunities for flowers of fancy as I imagined.[46]

Yet, geographical written knowledge, in all its complexity,[47] is not the prerogative of the individual scholars. In the first century BCE, ethno-geographical information could come from multiple sources, such as reports from travellers, traders, generals or governors: the intensification of trade was of course the main source of geographical knowledge.[48] It was also compounded by the numerous military expeditions all around the Mediterranean Sea, as Cicero reminds us in his political oratory (*Prov.* 13.33):

> et, quas regiones quasque gentes nullae nobis antea litterae, nulla vox, nulla fama notas fecerat, has noster imperator nosterque exercitus et populi Romani arma peragrarunt.
>
> Other these regions and races, which no writings, no spoken word, no report had before made known to us, over them have our general, our soldiers, and the arms of the Roman People made their way.[49]

Cl. Moatti has underlined how much these new forms of knowledge were the result of a deliberate work of compiling and diffusing ethno-geographical expertise, which was led by the Romans during their conquests. She also reminded us that Polybius mostly drew his information from Laelius, who followed Scipio to Spain and Africa during the Second Punic War, from Cato, who was sent to Spain in 195 BCE, or from

46 Translation by Winstedt 1912.

47 Arnaud 2007.

48 Think of the epitaph of this first century BCE merchant in Brindisi: *Si non molestum est, hospes, consiste et lege. navibus velivolis magnum mare saepe cucurri, accessi terras complures*, "If it is not unpleasant, host, stay and read. I have often travelled in the open sea in sailing ships, I went to many lands" (Porte 1993, 18).

49 Translation by Gardner 1958.

Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, who was charged with many diplomatic missions in Greece and Asia.[50] The Roman people of the first century BCE were fully aware of the new developments in knowledge from such campaigns and traveling, as it can be seen in Varro's treatise on agriculture, in which a discussion takes place between members of the political elite on physical geography and ethnography (*R.* 1.7.8 and 2.10.8–9):

> In Gallia transalpina intus, ad Rhenum cum exercitum ducerem, aliquot regiones accessi, ubi nec vitis nec olea nec poma nascerentur, ubi agros stercorarent candida fossicia creta, ubi salem nec fossicium nec maritimum haberent, sed ex quibusdam lignis combustis carbonibus salsis pro eo uterentur.
>
> When I was in command of the army in the interior of Transalpine Gaul near the Rhine, I visited a number of spots where neither vines nor olives nor fruit trees grew; where they fertilized the land with a white chalk which they dug: where there had no salt, either mineral or marine, but instead of it used salty coals obtained by burning certain kinds of wood.
>
> Simul aspicit ad me et, 'Ut te audii dicere, inquit, cum in Liburniam venisses, te vidisse matres familias eorum adferre ligna et simul pueros, quos alerent, alias singulos, alias binos.'
>
> At the same time, turning to me, he said: 'As I have heard you say that you, when you were in Liburnia, saw mothers carrying logs and children at the breast at the same time, sometimes one, sometimes two.'[51]

Even if there is no point in seeking a political process of systematic inventory of the world in this period,[52] it can still be said that ethno-geographical forms of knowledge reached a broader and more varied public than before. This public included, beyond the circle of navigators, merchants, soldiers, and most of the population. In rhetorical schools, young people learnt common characteristics and names of foreign places: for instance, one instruction from the *Rhetoric for Herennius* asked students to praise the comparative advantages of different spaces of the new Roman world (3.2):

> Ut si Hannibal consultet, quom ex Italia Kartaginem arcessatur, an in Italia remaneat, an domum redeat, an in Aegyptum profectus occupet Alexandriam.
>
> If Hannibal, when recalled to Carthage from Italy, should deliberate whether to remain in Italy, or return home, or invade Egypt and seize Alexandria.[53]

Furthermore, travel narratives, such as *periegeseis* or *itineraria*, and pictures, if not maps,[54] made available geographical knowledge in the places of daily life. In ch. 1.2.1–3 of *Res Rusticae*, Varro's father-in-law and his friend, who is a philosopher,

50 Moatti 1997, 65.

51 Translation by Hooper 1934.

52 The inventory process must be situated within the Flavian Era. See Rouveret 1987.

53 Translation by Caplan 1954.

54 See Chevallier 1986 and Sherk 1974. These maps must have been distorted, as the method of projection that was used was inadequate. See Rambaud 1987.

could contemplate a map of Italy which is hung in the temple of Tellus. They tried to interpret it with their knowledge, which is characteristic of their social status:

> Sementivis feriis in aedem Telluris veneram [...]. offendi ibi C. Fundanium, socerum meum, et C. Agrium equitem R. Socraticum et P. Agrasium publicanum spectantes in pariete pictam Italiam [...]. cum consedissemus, Agrasius, 'Vos, qui multas perambulastis terras, ecquam cultiorem Italia vidistis?' inquit. 'Ego vero, Agrius, nullam arbitror esse quae tam tota sit culta. primum cum orbis terrae divisus sit in duas partes ab Eratosthene maxume secundum naturam [...].'
>
> On the festival of the Sementivae I had gone to the temple of Tellus [...]. I found there Gaius Fundanius, my father-in-law, Gaius Agrius, a Roman knight of the Socratic school, and Publius Agrasius, the tax-farmer, examining a map of Italy painted on the wall [...]. When we had taken our seats Agrasius opened the conversation: 'You have all travelled through many lands; have you seen any land more fully cultivated than Italy?' 'For my part', replied Agrius, 'I think there is none which is so wholly under cultivation. Consider first: Eratosthenes, following a most natural division, has divided the earth in two parts [...].'[55]

However, any passerby could have gone past the temple and attempted to compare Italy with other territories. Texts from Livy or Pliny the Elder mention maps or pictures which decorated temples or monuments:

> Liv. 41.28.8
> Eodem anno tabula in aede Matris Matutae cum indice hoc posita est [...]. Sardiniae insulae forma erat, atque in ea simulacra pugnarum picta.
>
> In the same year a tablet was set up in the temple of Mater Matuta with this inscription [...]. It had the form of the island of Sardinia, and on it representations of battles were painted.[56]
>
> Plin. *Nat.* 5.5.36 – 37
> Et hoc mirum, supra dicta oppida ab eo capta auctores nostros prodidisse, ipsum in triumpho praetor Cidamum et Garamam omnium aliarum gentium urbiumque nomina ac simulacra duxisse, quae iere hoc ordine: Tabudium oppidum, Niteris natio, Milgis Gemella oppidum, Bubeium, natio vel oppidum, Enipi natio, Thuben oppidum, mons nomine Niger, Nitibrum, Rapsa oppida [...] mons Gyri, in quo gemmas nasci titulus praecessit.
>
> There is also this remarkable circumstance, that our writers have handed down the names of the towns mentioned above as having been taken by him, and have stated that in his own triumphal procession beside Cydamum and Garama were carried the names and images of all the other peoples and cities, which went in this order: the town of Tibesti, the Niteris tribe, the town of Milgis Gemella, the tribe or town of Febabo, the tribe of the Enipi, the town of Thuben, the mountain known as the Black Mountain, the towns called Nitibrum and Rapsa [...] and Mount Goriano, its effigy preceded by an inscription that it was a place where precious stones were produced.[57]

55 Translation by Hooper 1934.
56 Translation by Sage and Schlesinger 1938.
57 Translation by Rackham 1942.

The dissemination of knowledge was therefore not specific to writing; it was also conveyed by orality, but above all by spectacles producing geographical information. Indeed, P. Zanker[58] and K. Galinsky[59] have insisted on the spectacular dimension of Roman society and on the use of images by Republican elites and then by the new Augustan power.[60] Both Republican and Augustan holders of power built their authority through public ceremonies such as collective meetings, justice courts, theatre, funeral or triumphal processions. The latter included the temporary exhibition of panels with geographical names or pictures, which were then permanently shown in temples, houses or libraries.[61] Augustus even built a monument to give a verbal map of the conquered world: while J. Scheid[62] has shown us that the *Res Gestae* may have been written for the elite who were able to decrypt the inscription or to ask for an explanation, the monument was also destined for the whole population of Rome, and moreover, for the citizens of the Empire, as it was duplicated in Ancyra, Antioch and Apollonia. Furthermore, the so-called map of Agrippa may have been a more explicit way to popularize geographical information within the Roman population. At the same time, while the *porticus Vipsania* was decorated by either a map or only by a list of territories, as P. Arnaud notes,[63] Augustus' lieutenant, Agrippa, moved geography down within the City and made it visible to everyone. Roman space was therefore saturated with representations of foreign territories. They may have had a more expressive function than a referential one, and the spectacular aim probably prevailed over the didactic one,[64] as they were designed to be seen from a distance. Yet, all these images provided pictures and sounds of the unknown and extended world: many sources testify to the universal accessibility of this geographical knowledge.

Even more, it seems possible that groups of citizens could have reproduced maps of countries on the ground, as the Athenian people are reported to have done so, according to Plutarch's account of the debate on an Athenian expedition to Sicily (*Nic.* 12.1):

> [...] πρὶν ὅλως ἐκκλησίαν γενέσθαι, κατασχόντος ἤδη πλῆθος ἐλπίσι καὶ λόγοις προδιεφθαρμένον, ὥστε καὶ νέους ἐν παλαίστραις καὶ γέροντας ἐν ἐργαστηρίοις καὶ ἡμικυκλίοις συγκαθεζομένους ὑπογράφειν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς Σικελίας, καὶ τὴν φύσιν τῆς περὶ αὐτὴν θαλάσσης, καὶ λιμένας καὶ τόπους οἷς τέτραπται πρὸς Λιβύην ἡ νῆσος καὶ σχήσοντες ἅμα Λιβύην καὶ ἐντὸς Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν θάλασσαν.

58 Zanker 1987, 1991 and 2000.

59 Galinsky 1996.

60 However, these images are not directly imposed by the power but implemented by elites and citizens all around the empire. See Zanker 1991, 193–220 and 2000, 211–245.

61 See Str. 5.3.8; Plin. *Nat.* 36.29; 38; 50.113–115; Vitr. 6.5; Cic. *Ver.* 4.6.

62 Scheid 2007, XXXIV-XXXVI.

63 Arnaud 2009.

64 See Mery 2012, 153.

> Before the assembly had met at all, Alcibiades had already corrupted the multitude and got them into his power by means of his sanguine promises, so that the youth in their training-schools and the old men in their work-shops and lounging-places would sit in clusters drawing maps of Sicily, charts of the sea about it, and plans of the harbours and districts of the island which look towards Libya. For they did not regard Sicily itself as the prize of the war, but rather as a mere base of operations, purposing therefrom to wage a contest with the Carthaginians and get possession of both Libya and of all the sea this side the Pillars of Heracles.[65]

This narration illustrates an increase of geographical knowledge. Similarly, an elegy of Propertius shows this broader access to geographical expertise. It portrays a woman who uses a sort of map and geographical information to mentally follow the journey of her husband Lycotas who had gone to war to the eastern edges of the world (Prop. 4.3.7–10 and 33–40):

> te modo viderunt iteratos Bactra per arcus,
> te modo munito Persicus hostis equo,
> hibernique Getae, pictoque Britannia curru,
> tunsus et Eoa decolor Indus aqua.
> [...]
> noctibus hibernis castrensia pensa laboro
> et Tyria in chlamydas vellera secta suo;
> et disco, qua parte fluat vincendus Araxes,
> quot sine aqua Parthus milia currat equus;
> cogor et e tabula pictos ediscere mundos,
> qualis et haec docti sit positura dei,
> quae tellus sit lenta gelu, quae putris ab aestu,
> ventus in Italiam qui bene vela ferat.
>
> Now you were seen by Bactra amid drawn bows, now by the Persian foe mounted on his mailed charger, by the northern Getans, by Britain with its painted chariots and the swarthy Indians pounded by orient waves [...]. I learn where flows the Araxes that you are to conquer, how many miles a Parthian horse can cover without water; and I am constrained to find out from a map the countries painted on it and the manner of this arrangement by the wise creator, what lands are sluggish with frost, what crumbling with heat, what wind will bring sails safely back to Italy.[66]

The characteristic inversion of Latin elegy, where the poet becomes a soldier of love, is here interpreted in a literal way, as the *puella* neglects her *pensum* to find out more about remote territories. Yet, it also evidences the accessibility of such information and the use of cartographic tools by ordinary citizens. The latter were therefore able to access actual geographical knowledge, far from a single rumour – the *vulgata opinio* – which was mostly based on *fama* and frequently mocked by the historians themselves. As one example of this, in the fortieth book of the *Ab urbe condita*, and when, because he relied on a widespread opinion, Philip of Macedonia decided to

65 Translation by Perrin 1916.
66 Translation by Goold 1990.

climb the Haemus mountain, Livy explains that he did so because he believed that he would be able to see the road that could lead his army to Italy (Liv. 40.21.2–22.5):

> Cupido eum ceperat in verticem Haemi montis ascendendi, quia volgatae opinioni crediderat Ponticum simul et Hadriaticum mare et Histrum amnem et Alpes conspici posse. [...] nihil vulgatae opinioni degressi inde detraxerunt, magis credo, ne vanitas itineris ludibrio esset, quam quod diversa inter se maria montesque et amnes ex uno loco conspici potuerint.
>
> The desire had seized him of climbing to the top of the Haemus mountains, because he had accepted the common opinion that from there could be seen all at once the Pontic and Adriatic seas, the Hister river and the Alps. [...] When they descended they did nothing to detract from the common opinion, rather, I suppose, to prevent the futility of the journey from becoming a subject of jest than because the different seas and mountains and rivers could be seen from one place.[67]

As a result of this evidence, I would suggest that these historical texts of the first century BCE were intended for a particular audience, who was no longer the political elite, but who consisted of a broader part of the Roman population – and undoubtedly of the provincial elite. The latter now had access to an ethno-geographical knowledge which was mostly conveyed by education and by the images located all over the cities. I believe that the spatial depictions in historical works were destined for the same audience. Historians seemed thus to try to shape their descriptions in order to fit to the expectations of such audience. Can these conclusions help us to rethink the well-known purposes of ancient historiography, i.e. pleasure and utility?

3 Considering the audience: rethinking the purposes of Latin historiography

a Pleasure and utility as Latin historiography's purposes

Even if each author may not have meant the same thing when he spoke about pleasure and utility, all the ancient historical works seem to proclaim them as their main purposes. Dionysius of Halicarnassus observed this, when he evoked Theopompus (*Pomp.* 6):

> καὶ γὰρ ἐθνῶν εἴρηκεν οἰκισμοὺς καὶ πόλεων κτίσεις ἐπελήλυθε, βασιλέων τε βίους καὶ τρόπων ἰδιώματα δεδήλωκε, καὶ εἴ τι θαυμαστὸν ἢ παράδοξον ἑκάστη γῆ καὶ θάλασσα φέρει, συμπεριείληφεν τῇ πραγματείᾳ. καὶ μηδεὶς ὑπολάβῃ ψυχαγωγίαν ταῦτ' εἶναι μόνον· οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ὠφέλειαν περιέχει.
>
> He has related the settlements of tribes, described the foundation of cities, portrayed the lives of kings and peculiarities of custom, and has included in his work everything remarkable or extra-

67 Translation by Sage and Schlesinger 1938.

> ordinary contained in every single land and sea. And nobody should suppose that this is purely for our entertainment: this is not the case, but the material contained in it is virtually for practical benefit.[68]

In this chapter, Theopompus is presented by Dionysius as a model for historians, as he reported to his audience the key information about the world. It can be supposed that Dionysius considered that he did so with clarity and order, as he opposed him to Thucydides, whom he vigorously condemned for his obscurity and his confusion (*Pomp.* 3):

> [...] γίγνεται Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀσαφὴς καὶ δυσπαρακολούθητος· πολλῶν γὰρ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ θέρος ἢ τὸν αὐτὸν χειμῶνα γιγνομένων ἐν διαφόροις ὡς εἰκὸς τόποις, ἡμιτελεῖς τὰς πρώτας πράξεις καταλιπὼν ἑτέρων ἅπτεται [τῶν κατὰ θέρος ἢ τὸν αὐτὸν χειμῶνα γιγνομένων]· πλανώμεθα δὴ καθάπερ εἰκός, καὶ δυσκόλως τοῖς δηλουμένοις παρακολουθοῦμεν ταραττομένης τῆς διανοίας.
>
> The result is that Thucydides is obscure and hard to follow, for since naturally many events occur in different places in the course of the same summer and winter, he leaves his account of earlier events half-finished and embarks upon others. Naturally we are bemused and feel annoyance as we try to follow the events he is describing because our minds are confused.[69]

As far as Dionysius is concerned, Thucydides does not seem to be a pleasant reading – except for the precise description of Sicily –, nor is he useful enough, as he is accused of losing his reader and of rejecting an ordered and organised textual structure. I believe that such a misunderstanding of Thucydides by the reader Dionysius stands for the purposes that, from Hecataeus of Miletus and Herodotus to the Roman tradition, the ancients expected from historiography in the first century BCE: they waited for the same ordered setting, with the same terminology and expectations, as R.F. Thomas summed it up in the introduction of his book on ethnography in Roman poetry:

> 1) Physical geography of the area
> 2) Climate
> 3) Agricultural produce, mineral resources, etc
> 4) Origins and features of the inhabitants
> 5) Political, social and military organisation
> The works of Caesar and Sallust stand as clear evidence that the Greek ethnographical tradition has, before the Augustan period, passed into the mainstream of Roman literature. The same form was adopted, and an equivalent diction, to be equally formulaic, came into being. [...] Together with the shape, the position of the land is invariably described with reference to the points of the compass [...]. And lastly, further definition is provided by mention of major physical features, notably coastlines, seas, rivers and mountain ranges.[70]

68 Translation by Usher 1935. See also Plb. 15.36.3 and Walbank 2002, 231; D.S. 1.3.5 and Sacks 1990.
69 Translation by Usher 1935.
70 Thomas 1982, 3.

b The need for clear geographical information on a new world: accuracy and *enargeia*

This audience did not expect to be surprised by new information or literary forms. Rather, each author had to make his depictions easily accessible; consequently, he carefully shaped his narrative and inserted explicative comments, in order to provide a better understanding of historical action: so much is said by Cicero in *De oratore* 2.63: *rerum ratio temporum desiderat, regionum descriptionem* ("the nature of the subject needs chronological arrangement and geographical representation"[71]). Caesar's depiction of the Hercynian Forest thus seems to be used as a narrative delay before introducing a more important passage. The historian indeed quickly skips the spatial description and moves on to the ekphrasis of different marvellous animals of the forest. These depictions of the fauna of the Hercynian Forest seem to represent the climax of the passage, as if the historian's purpose was to amaze and entertain his readership after a quite long ethnographical comparison. Similarly, in his digression on Africa, Sallust looks as if he cares about his audience's attention, as he tells them that he will not offer a long geographical discussion but only a few selected items (see the adjectives *pauci*, the superlative *paucissimi*, and the verb *attingere*). In fact, this statement is a lie, considering the actual length of the excursus, but this is not relevant: these introductive words fulfil their function of directing and easing the audience, in a conversational tone. The use of adverbs of time such as *deinde* ... *post* ... *dein* underlines this same desire to facilitate the reading.

Surprisingly, whereas the Caesarean and Livian texts narrate a conquest and describe the progress of Roman armies, the standard was not necessarily the pace of a soldier but, rather, that of a traveller who is "lightly equipped". This means that these spaces should not be read as strategical or tactical[72] where armies could unfold, but as spaces to picture.

Gone are the days when space was centred on a city. Now that Rome has become an Empire, Roman historians envisaged it by identifying *urbs* and *orbis*, the City and the world.[73] As a result, they wrote spatial depictions according to their view of this new world. K. Clarke demonstrated that Strabo, whose audience is the same as Caesar's, no longer used traditional models of periplus or scientific geography but rewrote the world by transforming the use of linear concepts of space in conjunction with a different spatial model in which each individual place leads right up to Rome:

71 Translation by Sutton 1942.

72 According to the terminology established by Rambaud 1987.

73 Ov. *Fast*. 4.255 – 256; on this enlargement of the Roman domination to the world, see Nicolet 1988. Still, historians of the Republican or Augustan times let the perspective centered on Rome, while historians of the Imperial times, such as Tacitus, present Rome as a foreign space in which perspectives became divergent. See Ch.G. Leidl in this volume.

> By presenting a picture of the world as it was now, as well as its transformations into that state, Strabo could claim to be educating the ruling Romans on the nature of their subjects and potential enemies, providing an account of the lands and peoples which were of interest to the Roman ruling elite.[74]

Caesar thus wanted to depict the new world shaped by his conquests in the east; accordingly, he created in the sixth book a moment of narrative pause before putting forth the marvellous depiction of the fauna. The forest, whose width is unknown, appears as a typical border area, where no one can venture: *non enim aliter finiri potest*. Livy took up the same feature in his evocation of the impenetrable Ciminian forest in the ninth book of the *Ab urbe condita* (9.36.1):

> Silua erat Ciminia magis tum invia atque horrenda quam nuper fuere Germanici saltus, nulli ad eam diem ne mercatorum quidem adita.
>
> In those days the Ciminian Forest was more impassable and appalling than were lately the wooded defiles of Germany, and no one – not even a trader – had up to that time visited it.[75]

And Florus did the same (*Epit*. 1.12.3):

> Ciminius interim saltus in medio, ante invius plane quasi Caledonius vel Hercynius, adeo tum terrori erat, ut senatus consuli denuntiaret ne tantum periculi ingredi auderet.
>
> Meanwhile the Ciminian forest, which lay between Rome and Etruria, and which was formerly as pathless as the Caledonian or the Hercynian forest, inspired such terror that the senate forbade the consul to venture to face its perils.[76]

Now the borders have been moved and are identified with Scottish Caledonia and the Germanic forests, but they still are characterised as impassable and unfamiliar. Through the Forest's depiction, Caesar thus mediated the relationship with the other – represented by Germanic peoples. Sallust wanted to underline the importance of North Africa; consequently, he adapted Thucydides' ethnogenesis on Sicily and framed it with common geographical considerations on the world's division into two or three areas. Moreover, he placed his narrative on the same level as the Punic Wars: yet, nearby the space of Carthage, he tries to depict Western Africa as the laboratory of the development of a new age of decadence. On his part, Livy took advantage of a Gallic invasion to remind his audience of the existence of an empire in Italy before the Roman domination, and, in this fifth book, which focuses on re-foundation, to replace the *imperium Romanum* for continual universal history. Yet, in the same way Strabo creates a focus on the Greek East and aligns himself intellectually with the world of Asia Minor.[77] Livy only uses the geometrical vocabulary of the sci-

74 Clarke 1999, 204.
75 Translated by Foster 1926.
76 Translated by Foster 1929.
77 Clarke 1999, 243.

entific geography (see *angulum* and *circumcolunt*) to refer to the Venetian shores, in order to stress an area of northern Italy, his region of origin. All these historians thus provide their audience with spaces that they can easily recognize and picture, in order to provide a global vision of the new Roman imperial world.

Therefore, it is no coincidence that one of the scarce commentaries on excerpts of historical works explicitly discusses the depiction of the battle in the Great Harbour of Syracuse by Thucydides, in ch. 7.71. Plutarch selected it because, in contrast with other passages of the Athenian historian, he believed that this description looked like a picture and that, through *enargeia*, Thucydides allowed the audience to experience the feelings of people who had seen or lived the event (*Glor. Ath.* 347a-c). Even if the Chaeronean author is writing at a later date, I still believe that his choice is emblematic of Roman expectations in the first century BCE. Such an experiment of clear and accessible depictions, with topical narrative frames and the guidance of the figure of an authoritative narrator/historian, could be presented to a broad audience.

In conclusion, I would like to go back to the opinion of N. Horsfall with which I began my paper: the researcher assumed that entertainment was chosen over instruction and accuracy. On the contrary, I tried to demonstrate that expectations existed towards precise geographical information in Rome in the first century BCE and that such accounts could be both instructive and pleasant. In fact, Roman audiences were of course eager to be told about the unknown territories and longed for marvellous depictions. A contemporary historian, Diodorus, hence offers to his Greek audience a survey of the *paradoxa* of the most remote parts of the oikoumene.[78] Yet, at the same time, they also show a deep interest for the new world that had been built by the Roman conquests and most of all by the new ways of representing and looking at it. The generic difference with the poem of Propertius might help us to understand better the specific purpose of historiographical texts. It is typical of Augustan poetry, where enumerations of peoples and names of remote places can often be found as a means of underlining Rome's universal power and the part the *princeps* played in it. An ordinary citizen could use his imagination to discover and travel throughout the whole world, and universal space had thus become the frame for elegiac declarations of love. But, quite differently, ethno-geographical depictions were written by historians to understand better the new setting of the world. They no longer taught to the elite how to rule the empire; they rather offered to a broader audience debates and questions on the role that spaces had in the realisation of the Roman conquest and its future.

78 D.S. 3.18 – 48; see Baumann 2018.

Bibliography

Arnaud, P. (2007), "Introduction. La géographie romaine impériale, entre tradition et innovation", in: G. Cruz Andreotti / P. Le Roux / P. Moret (eds.), *La invención de una geografía de la Península Ibérica, II La época imperial*, Actas, 13 – 46.

Arnaud, P. (2009), "Texte et carte de Marcus Agrippa: historiographie et données textuelles", in: *GeorgAnt* 18, 57 – 110.

Aujac, G. (2001), *Ératosthène de Cyrène, le pionnier de la géographie*, Paris.

Baumann, M. (2018), "Wunderlektüren: Paradoxa und die Aktivität des Lesers in Diodorus *Bibliotheke*", in: T. Blank / F.K. Maier (eds.), *Die symphonischen Schwestern. Narrative Konstruktion von ‚Wahrheiten' in der nachklassischen Geschichtsschreibung*, Stuttgart, 227 – 240.

Becker, T. (1900), "Weg und Gelände in der Sprache", in: *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* 14, 331 – 337.

Bickerman, E.J. (1952), "Origines Gentium", in: *CPh* 47, 65 – 81.

Briquel, D. (1988), "Claude, érudit et empereur", in: *SAI* 132, 217 – 232.

Briscoe, J. (2008), *A Commentary on Livy. Books 38 – 40*, Oxford.

Chevallier, R. (1986), "Les cartes dans les sources historiques romaines", in: *Caesarodunum* 22, 158 – 166.

Clarke, K. (1999), *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*, Oxford.

Constans, L.A. (1926), *César, La Guerre des Gaules*, Paris.

Corbier, M. (2006), *Donner à voir, donner à lire. Mémoire et communication dans la Rome ancienne*, Paris.

de Franchis, M. (2012), "Tite-Live et l'habitant de Gadès (Pline le Jeune, Lettres, 2, 3, 8)", in: P. Humel (ed.), *De Fama, Études sur la construction de la réputation et de la postérité*, Paris, 23 – 46.

Engels, J. (2008), "Geography and History", in: J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden, MA / Oxford, 541 – 552.

Feldherr, A. (2009), *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*, Princeton.

Galinsky, K. (1996), *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton.

Harris, W.V. (1989), *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge.

Horsfall, N. (1982), "The Caudine Forks: Topography and Illusion", in: *PBSR* 50, 45 – 52.

Horsfall, N. (1985), "Illusion and Reality in Latin Topographical Writing", in: *G&R*, 32, 197 – 208.

Jacob, C. (1991), *Géographie et ethnographie en Grèce ancienne*, Paris.

Jaeger, M. (1997), *Livy's Writen Rome*, Ann Arbor.

Jauss, H.R. (1982), *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, transl. by T. Bahti, Minneapolis.

Ledentu, M. (2004), *Studium scribendi. Recherches sur les statuts de l'écrivain et de l'écriture à Rome à la fin de la République*, Louvain.

Levene, D.S. (2010), *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford.

Méry, L. (2012), "La carte et le territoire. Les *excursus* ethnographiques chez César et Salluste", in: M. Briand (ed.), *La Trame et le Tableau. Poétiques et rhétoriques du récit et de la description dans l'Antiquité grecque et latine*, Rennes, 139 – 154.

Miles, G.B. (1995), *Reconstructing Early Rome*, Ithaca.

Mineo, B. (2006), *Tite-Live et l'histoire de Rome*, Paris.

Moatti, C. (1997), *La raison de Rome. Naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République*, Seuil.

Nicolet, C. (1988), *L'inventaire du monde. Géographie et politique aux origines de l'empire romain*, Paris.

Ogilvie, R.M. (1965), *A Commentary on Livy*, Oxford.
Porte, D. (1993), *Tombeaux romains. Anthologie d'épitaphes latines*, Paris.
Rambaud, M. (1987), "L'espace dans le récit césarien", in: *Autour de César*, textes de M. Rambaud réunis par M. Bonjour et J.-C. Fredouille, Lyon, 273 – 289.
Rouveret, A. (1987), "'*Toute la mémoire du monde*': La notion de collection dans la *NH* de Pline", in: *Helmantica* 38, 115 – 133.
Sacks, K.S. (1990), *Diodorus Sicilus and the First Century*, Princeton.
Scheid, J. (2007), *Res gestae divi Augusti*, Paris.
Sherk, R.K. (1974), "Roman Geographical Exploration and Military Maps", in: H. Temporini / W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, II, 1, Berlin / New York, 534 – 562.
Syme, R. (1964), *Sallust*, Oxford.
Thomas, R.F. (1982) *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry. The Ethnographical Tradition*, Cambridge.
Trousset, P. (1993), "La frontière romaine et ses contradictions", in: *La Frontière. Séminaire de recherche sous la direction d'Yves Roman*, Lyon, 25 – 33.
Valette-Cagnac, E. (1997), *La lecture à Rome, rites et pratiques*, Paris.
Videau, A. (2000), "Mutations de l'auditoire à la charnière entre la République et l'Empire et décadence de l'éloquence selon Sénèque le Père", in: G. Achard / M. Ledentu (eds.), *Orateurs, auditeurs, lecteurs. À propos de l'éloquence romaine à la fin de la République et au début du Principat. Actes de la table ronde du 31 janvier 2000*, Paris, 91 – 101.
Walsh, P.G. (1961), *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge.
Walbank, F.W. (2002), *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World. Essays and Reflections*, Cambridge.
White, H. (1973), *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Baltimore.
White, H. (1987), *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore.
Wiseman, T.P. (1979), *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester.
Wiseman, T.P. (1981), "Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography", in: *History* 66, 1981, 375 – 393.
Woodman, A.J. (1988), *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography. Four Studies*, London.
Zanker, P. (1987), *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, Munich.
Zanker, P. (1991), "Immagini e valori collettivi", in: A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma*, II, 2, Turin, 193 – 220.
Zanker, P. (2000), "Il mondo delle immagini e la comunicazione", in: A. Giardina (ed.), *Storia di Roma dall'antichità ad oggi. Roma antica*, Bari, 211 – 245.

Dennis Pausch

Livy, the Reader Involved, and the Audience of Roman Historiography

1 Introduction: From amateur historian to amateur readers*

Modern approaches to ancient literature tend to disregard the author as a person outside his text as much as possible. Given the fact that we do not know very much about most of our writers, this is a rather easy task for the larger part of classical literature. Nevertheless, in the case of historiography, the extra-textual status of the author remains relevant not only for the simple knowledge of events, but also for certain matters of their presentation, as is especially evident in the case of autopsy.[1] The same overlap between inter-textual and extra-textual experiences, however, exists on the part of the reader. It is, therefore, to be expected that individual readers react differently to the narration of a given event in an historical text according to their own past and to their actual life. To adduce no more than one example: Even the most rhetorical description of the sack of a city, as depicted in the handbooks for prospective orators like in Quintilian's *Institutio*,[2] must have affected someone who had actually witnessed the capture of a city very differently from someone who had never seen any such thing. This holds true even if the witness had been on the victorious side: that not only the victim, but also the aggressor is affected by the events of war has been rightly highlighted as part of the attempts to use the concept of posttraumatic stress disorder for a better understanding of ancient societies.[3]

For this reason, in order to fully understand how ancient historiography works, we would need to know who the people actually were that took these scrolls into their hands and subsequently unrolled them, and why they continued to do so and what they thought and felt about it. This is, of course, far beyond our reach.[4] What can be done in terms of an empirical analysis of the reception of ancient his-

* It has been an honour to be asked to deliver one of the two key note speeches, but it has been an even greater pleasure to return to Rauischholzhausen and to be part of such an inspiring conference. Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr Glenn Patten for reading the paper and polishing my English in various ways.

1 This holds true, of course, for modern historiography in a similar way. A specific narratology for factual texts, however, still has to be developed. For useful approaches already existing see, above all, Genette 1990 and Cohn 1999, especially 109–131; for further references see Pausch 2011, 9–12.

2 Cf. Quint. *Inst*. 8.3.67–69; see further Paul 1982.

3 See especially Meineck / Konstan 2014.

4 For attempts to define the ancient audience of classical historiography in general terms, see e. g. Momigliano 1978; Verdin / Schepens / de Keyser 1990, and Marincola 2009.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-005

toriography in antiquity, has been done recently by Marietta Horster.[5] Her thorough analysis of the relevant papyri, inscriptions and citations in the work of authors from other genres suggests, however, that we have no sufficient reason to suppose that history was read in antiquity on a larger scale at all.

While these quantitative arguments are hard to refuse, in what follows I intend to take a more qualitative approach. In doing so, I will try to put together some of the external evidence that we have and to combine it with the imagined reader emerging from the works of the historians. To be sure, this has to be done for every single writer separately, and within the limits of this paper I will focus on Livy. Nevertheless, I hope that the results presented might be of some use for the discussion of other authors as well. In contrast to the book *Livius und der Leser. Narrative Strukturen in* Ab urbe condita,[6] it is not my aim here to study the narrative techniques with the help of the reader, but to learn more about this very reader with the help of the narrative techniques employed by Livy.

While doing so, I will take for granted that readers of historiography both in our times and in antiquity are interested in historical knowledge for its own sake and – above all – for its practical and moral value, as Lisa Hau has recently shown convincingly.[7] I will place special emphasis, however, on the circumstance that there are – beside these motives related to utility – clear signs that it was also perfectly acceptable, at least in Late Republican Rome, to read the work of a historian because it provided for entertainment – or for *delectatio*, if you prefer the wording used by Horace in his famous juxtaposition of *aut delectare aut prodesse*.[8]

Livy, of course, has been severely criticised precisely for his willingness to acknowledge pleasure as a part of the historian's task. But instead of blaming him for being an amateur historian once more, I would like to shed some light on his amateur readers, so to speak. For this purpose, we will take a close look at how Livy narrates his version of the past, assuming that this can tell us something about his ideas who his readers might have been and what motives he thought they had for reading his work on Roman history (and not the work of one his many rivals). Prior to this, however, I will try to give a short survey of the state of the discussion about how to write history in the time Livy decided to take up his pen and to spend his life writing *Ab urbe condita*.

5 See Horster 2018; for the papyrological remains especially from Livy see Funari 2011.
6 Cf. Pausch 2011.
7 See Hau 2016.
8 Cf. Hor. *Ep*. 2.3.333 – 334.

2 Reflecting about reading history in the Late Republic

Although it remains true, of course, that our knowledge about the audience for historiography in antiquity is fairly limited compared to modern standards, we can get a few glimpses of what the contemporaries regarded as possible reasons for reading a work of history.[9] Again, I will not dwell on the practical usefulness of the knowledge of the past,[10] but will instead focus on the other part of the spectrum.

It is, as so often, Cicero who must raise his voice for the vast majority of his fellow Romans whose words and thoughts have been silenced by the fortuities of transmission. And indeed, he praises history for her benefiting effects on human life in general, as, for example, in his famous eulogy in *De oratore*.[11] More intriguing is that the same Cicero, when it comes to historiography as a literary genre, shifts his focus from *utilitas* to *delectatio*. This holds true for his much-debated prescriptions for how history should be written, namely in the right style and ideally, of course, by an orator pretty much like himself.[12] The same modification, however, can also be observed in his remarks on how history should be read. Above all, two passages out of his many works have proved to be of great value to anyone trying to reconstruct the Late Republican 'state of the art', so to speak. More prominent is his letter to the historian Lucceius, but we will start with a section of his dialogue *De finibus* for now.

During the summer months of 45 BCE, Cicero wrote – among other things – five books *De finibus bonorum et malorum*.[13] In contrast to his usual practice, he chose three different settings for his conversations about what one could call a theory of ethics. This means that the passage relevant to us here, since it forms a part of the fifth book, stems from a discussion that Cicero claims to have had during his first visit to Athens back in 79 BCE with several of his fellow students. One of them, M. Pupius Piso Calpurnianus, is given the opportunity to expound his peripatetic views on human nature in a detailed argumentation. Among the points that Cicero especially wants him to bring home is the assumption that the quest for knowledge is deeply rooted in our soul and thus not motivated by utilitarian reasons alone. Admittedly, the focus of interest here clearly lies on philosophical knowledge, but inter-

9 For a similar analysis of later texts, see the contributions by Pauline Duchêne and George Baroud to the present volume.

10 As highlighted, for example, by Sallust; on his remarks about the purposes of history and his intended readers, see the contribution by Edwin Shaw in the present volume.

11 Cf. Cic. *de Orat*. 2, esp. 36: *historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia, nisi oratoris, immortalitati commendatur?*

12 Cf. Cic. *de Orat*. 2.51–64 and *Leg*. 1.6–7; see further e. g. Feldherr 2003, 196–212, and Fox 2007, 134–144.

13 For the part historiography plays in Cicero's philosophy in general, see Fox 2007.

estingly enough, Cicero seems to think that he can use – among others – the example of historiography as an obvious argument in order to prove the more controversial case for philosophy. This is what happens in our passage (Cic. *Fin*. 5.51–52):[14]

> sed quid attinet de rebus tam apertis plura requirere? ipsi enim quaeramus a nobis stellarum motus contemplationesque rerum caelestium eorumque omnium, quae naturae obscuritate occultantur, cognitiones quem ad modum nos moveant, et quid historia delectet, quam solemus persequi usque ad extremum, <cum> praetermissa repetimus, inchoata persequimur. nec vero sum nescius esse utilitatem in historia, non modo voluptatem. quid, cum fictas fabulas, e quibus utilitas nulla elici potest, cum voluptate legimus? quid, cum volumus nomina eorum, qui quid gesserint, nota nobis esse, parentes, patriam, multa praeterea minime necessaria? quid, quod homines infima fortuna, nulla spe rerum gerendarum, opifices deinque delectantur historia? maximeque eos videre possumus res gestas audire et legere velle, qui a spe gerendi absunt confecti senectute. quocirca intellegi necesse est in ipsis rebus, quae discuntur et cognoscuntur, invitamenta inesse, quibus ad discendum cognoscendumque moveamur.
>
> But what is the point of inquiring further into matters so obvious? Let us ask ourselves the question, how it is we are interested in the motions of the stars and in contemplating the heavenly bodies and studying all the obscure and secret realms of nature; why we derive pleasure from history, which we are so fond of following up, to the remotest detail, turning back to parts we have omitted, and pushing on to the end when we have once begun. Not that I am unaware that history is useful as well as entertaining. But what of our reading fiction, from which no utility can be extracted? What of our eagerness to learn the names of people who have done something notable, their parentage, birthplace, and many quite unimportant details beside? What of the delight that is taken in history by men of the humblest station, who have no expectation of participating in public life, even mere artisans? Also we may notice that the persons most eager to hear and read of public affairs are those who are debarred by the infirmities of age from any prospect of taking part in them. Hence we are forced to infer that the objects of study and knowledge contain in themselves the allurements that entice us to study and to learning.

The second part of this passage is cited more often,[15] since it contains some of the few hints we can use if we want to come to a more refined description of the readership of historiography in social terms.[16] On the one hand, it fits nicely into the argument of Tim Wiseman's sweeping book on *The Roman Audience*, since it highlights the fact that hearing is an equivalent form of reception of history in antiquity.[17] On the other hand, the words put into the mouth of Piso here can be taken as an important proof for the final phase of a longer lasting development, namely the enlargement of the readership for historical works during the Republic, not only due to the expansion of the Roman Empire and the subsequent growth of the number of Latin-speaking contemporaries, but also due to a widening of potential readers with regard to different groups within the same society.[18] The usual and rather dis-

14 Text by Schiche 1961; translation by Rackham 1961.

15 Cf. e. g. Malitz 1990, 339–340; Walter 2004, 212–213, and Marincola 2009, 13.

16 For further discussion, see now de Franchis 2014, 192–194.

17 See Wiseman 2015, especially 98–102 (Caesar); 115–118 (Sallust); 129–131 (Livy).

18 Cf. e. g. Pausch 2011, 65–70, and de Franchis 2014, 194–199.

missive reaction to this observation is the one reflected here by Cicero's Piso, too: why do people who will never be able to make history read history at all? Since *utilitas* is beyond their reach, for them it must be all about *delectatio*. Hence, they are (part of) the reason for the decline of historiography as it should be – at least in an ideal upper-class world of properly educated soon-to-be statesmen.

Since Cicero is aiming at something completely different here, he only uses the elements of this traditional picture, and gives them another direction. This already becomes apparent when Piso mentions the similar problem resulting from readers of history who are so aged that their active life already lies behind them. But it is above all the first part of the passage that is at odds with such expectations: before even starting to differentiate possible readers into groups, Cicero lets his Piso argue for the pleasure (using the word *voluptas*, an even more striking expression than *delectatio*) resulting from reading history as no less important than *utilitas* for him personally and for everyone that he can imagine as his reader, and this surely comprises all of his peers, future generals and statesmen alike.

The impression that Cicero knows about a classification into professional and amateur readers of historiography, but readily incorporates both himself and his own readers under the second heading gets even stronger when we now turn to his famous letter to the historian L. Lucceius, who had been *praetor urbanus* in 67 BCE.[19] Written in 56/55 BCE, this rather long letter follows one clear goal: Cicero wants Lucceius to write an historical monograph about his consulship, with due regard to his suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy.[20] Lucceius apparently refused (or the work is lost without leaving any traces), but Cicero cannot be blamed for not giving his very best to try to convince him. Again, the argumentative context is of great importance for a proper understanding of Cicero's remarks about reading history (Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.4 – 5):[21]

> multam etiam casus nostri varietatem tibi in scribendo suppeditabunt plenam cuiusdam voluptatis, quae vehementer animos hominum in legendo te scriptore tenere possit. nihil est enim aptius ad delectationem lectoris quam temporum varietates fortunaeque vicissitudines. quae etsi nobis optabiles in experiendo non fuerunt, in legendo tamen erunt iucundae. habet enim praeteriti doloris secura recordatio delectationem; ceteris vero nulla perfunctis propria molestia, casus autem alienos sine ullo dolore intuentibus, etiam ipsa misericordia est iucunda. quem enim nostrum ille moriens apud Mantineam Epaminondas non cum quadam miseratione delectat? qui tum denique sibi evelli iubet spiculum postea quam ei percontanti dictum est clipeum esse salvum, ut etiam in vulneris dolore aequo animo cum laude moreretur. cuius studium in legendo non erectum Themistocli fuga redituque retinetur? etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet quasi enumeratione fastorum; at viri saepe excellentis ancipites variique casus habent admirationem, exspectationem, laetitiam, molestiam, spem, timorem; si vero exitu notabili concluduntur, expletur animus iucundissima lectionis voluptate.

19 It is only in this letter, however, that we hear about his profession as historian; see e. g. Fleck 1993, 199 – 202.

20 See further, e. g., Hall 1998 and Fox 2007, 256 – 263.

21 Text by Shackleton Bailey 1988; translation by Shuckburgh 1908 – 1909.

> For my vicissitudes will supply you in your composition with much variety, which has in itself a kind of charm, capable of taking a strong hold on the imagination of readers, when you are the writer. For nothing is better fitted to interest a reader than variety of circumstance and vicissitudes of fortune, which, though the reverse of welcome to us in actual experience, will make very pleasant reading: for the untroubled recollection of a past sorrow has a charm of its own. To the rest of the world, indeed, who have had no trouble themselves, and who look upon the misfortunes of others without any suffering of their own, the feeling of pity is itself a source of pleasure. For what man of us is not delighted, though feeling a certain compassion too, with the death-scene of Epaminondas at Mantinea? He, you know, did not allow the dart to be drawn from his body until he had been told, in answer to his question, that his shield was safe, so that in spite of the agony of his wound he died calmly and with glory. Whose interest is not roused and sustained by the banishment and return of Themistocles? Truly the mere chronological record of the annals has very little charm for us – little more than the entries in the *fasti*: but the doubtful and varied fortunes of a man, frequently of eminent character, involve feelings of wonder, suspense, joy, sorrow, hope, fear: if these fortunes are crowned with a glorious death, the imagination is satisfied with the most fascinating delight which reading can give.

In the reminder of the letter, Cicero discusses at length the problem of how the commemoration of his own person might be achieved without bending the *leges historicae* too much. What is entirely missing, however, in this array of arguments that he deemed suitable to convince Lucceius to write about him, is anything related to the *utilitas* of the events he would so much have liked to be described by the historian. This is even more astonishing, since it would have not been too difficult to illustrate the usefulness for further magistrates of the knowledge how the *res publica* had been saved from a serious threat in the shape of the conspiracy of the Catilinarians. But instead, he strongly focuses on the *delectatio* and *voluptas* that the reading of historiography causes in the mind of its readers as the key argument to win over Lucceius' favour.

Of course, both Lucceius as a writer and Cicero as a reader might have been exceptions with particularly bad taste.[22] But if we rule out the praetor of 67 BCE and the consul of 63 BCE as not serious enough, it will prove rather difficult to find many professional readers of historiography in Rome at all. To be sure, Lucullus seems to have read *res gestae* on his way to his command in Asia Minor, in order in prepare himself for the task against Mithridates (at least according to Cicero),[23] and Sallust's Marius criticizes his noble predecessors for trying to learn their politics from books.[24] Cicero's insistence on the entertainment resulting from historiography, however, seems to have been part of the usual expectations readers had towards this genre.

---

22 For assuming a fondness of 'tragic historiography' on the part of Cicero, see e. g. Reitzenstein 1906, 84 – 91, and Foucher 2000, 782 – 785; for a good survey, see Nicolai 1992, 164 – 176.

23 Cf. Cic. *Ac.* 2.1.2: *itaque cum totum iter et navigationem consumpsisset partim in percontando a peritis partim in rebus gestis legendis, in Asiam factus imperator venit, cum esset Roma profectus rei militaris rudis.* Cicero also mentions that Scipio read the *Cyropaedia*: cf. Cic. *Q. fr.* 1.1.23; see further Hose 1994, 36 – 37.

24 Cf. Sal. *Jug.* 85.12 – 13; see further Marincola 2009, 12 – 13.

In this context, it is no minor point that Cicero's relevant remarks are written before the civil war and the end of the republic. This may look like splitting hairs, but it contradicts the traditional view that the focus on *delectatio* instead of *utilitas* is the result of the lost opportunity to participate in politics and thus prevailed at Rome not before the beginning of the empire. Cicero, however, already highlights the entertaining aspects of history in the years of his ongoing political career.

Before moving on towards Livy, we will take one quick step back to Polybius. It is, of course, an obvious idea to compare the developments at Republican Rome to those that took place some hundred years ago in the Hellenistic World. In both cases, the 'social downgrading' of writers and readers of historiography alike has been used as a handy explanation for the incorporation of more literary elements into the works of history.[25] This view has been widely accepted, not least because it was put forward by the contemporaries themselves. Polybius, for example, in a much-cited passage from the proem of the ninth book of his *Histories* distinguishes between three different kinds of typical readers of historiography (Plb. 9.1.2–5):[26]

> οὐκ ἀγνοῶ δὲ διότι συμβαίνει τὴν πραγματείαν ἡμῶν ἔχειν αὐστηρόν τι καὶ πρὸς ἓν γένος ἀκροατῶν οἰκειοῦσθαι καὶ κρίνεσθαι διὰ τὸ μονοειδὲς τῆς συντάξεως. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι συγγραφεῖς σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, εἰ δὲ μή γ', οἱ πλείους, πᾶσι τοῖς τῆς ἱστορίας μέρεσι χρώμενοι πολλοὺς ἐφέλκονται πρὸς ἔντευξιν τῶν ὑπομνημάτων. τὸν μὲν γὰρ φιλήκοον ὁ γενεαλογικὸς τρόπος ἐπισπᾶται, τὸν δὲ πολυπράγμονα καὶ περιττὸν ὁ περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας καὶ κτίσεις καὶ συγγενείας, καθά που καὶ παρ' Ἐφόρῳ λέγεται, τὸν δὲ πολιτικὸν ὁ περὶ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων καὶ δυναστῶν. ἐφ' ὃν ἡμεῖς ψιλῶς κατηντηκότες καὶ περὶ τοῦτον πεποιημένοι τὴν ὅλην τάξιν, πρὸς ἓν μέν τι γένος, ὡς προεῖπον, οἰκείως ἡρμόσμεθα, τῷ δὲ πλείονι μέρει τῶν ἀκροατῶν ἀψυχαγώγητον παρεσκευάκαμεν τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν.
>
> I am not unaware that my work owing to the uniformity of its composition has a certain severity, and will suit the taste and gain the approval of only one class of reader. For nearly all other writers, or at least most of them, by dealing with every branch of history, attract many kinds of people to the perusal of their works. The genealogical side appeals to those who are fond of a story, and the account of colonies, the foundation of cities, and their ties of kindred, such as we find, for instance, in Ephorus, attracts the curious and lovers of recondite lore, while the student of politics is interested in the doings of nations, cities, and monarchs. As I have confined my attention strictly to these last matters and as my whole work treats of nothing else, it is, as I say, adapted only to one sort of reader, and its perusal will have no attractions for the larger number.

Although the influence not only of Polybius' practice, but also of his methodological remarks on the development of Latin historiography from the middle of the 2nd century BCE onwards,[27] can hardly be underestimated, this passage turns out to be a disappointment.[28] It is not too hard to guess that it is mainly intended to show another juxtaposition of his own πραγματικὴ ἱστορία, beloved only by the happy few of his

25 Cf. e. g. Malitz 1990, 323–327; for a more nuanced view, see Hose 2009, especially 191–192.
26 Text by Büttner-Wobst 1995; translation by Paton 1993.
27 On Polybius' 'paradoxical impact' on Latin historians, see Pausch 2018 (with further references).
28 For a more positive assessment, see e. g. Nicolai 2007, 23–24, and Näf 2010, 185–187.

fellow πολιτικοί, and the kind of history allegedly written by anyone else, hugely successful with the ignorant crowd. Admittedly, this second group is further differentiated into those who love to hear good stories, the φιλήκοοι, and those who are interested in remote historical details, the περιττοί, albeit these details will usually be presented in the form of a good story. On closer inspection, though, the whole division fails to convince. If we take Cicero as a test case and are willing to accept the motives he named in the passages above, he would fit perfectly into every single one of the three categories presented by Polybius.

Given the lack of further testimonies, it is, of course, hard to decide if Cicero is a typical reader of historiography in the Late Roman Republic or if he rather is an exceptional figure, too interested in literature and too prone to yield to his emotions while hearing a good story.[29] What we can do, however, is have a look at the way Livy writes his version of Rome's history during the following years and, in doing so, address the question of what kind of reader he might have had in his mind as the ideal counterpart in this conversation. In doing so, my idea is not to prove that a Cicero revived would have been the perfect incarnation of Livy's imagined reader, not least because the same question put the other way around, namely whether Cicero would have appreciated Livy's work, has been asked and answered in various ways already.[30] For all the importance Cicero surely had, I will use him here only as one known reader of history in the Late Republican Rome and not as a fascinating person in his own right.

3 Writing to engage the reader: Livy on Hannibal

When we now turn to Livy's *Ab urbe condita*, one would expect that the *praefatio* might be the place the author uses to define both his own role in the following conversation and the type of reader he has in mind as his ideal counterpart.[31] If we take him at his word here, however, he indeed desires to be nothing more than another pragmatic historian in the fashion of Polybius writing for the πολιτικοί in the first place.[32] To be sure, he mentions the *voluptas* of his readers and his own pleasure in dealing with the remote past in passing,[33] but the bulk of the *praefatio* is about

29 Cf. Vitr. pr. 5.1: *historiae per se tenent lectores; habent enim novarum rerum varias expectationes*.

30 Cf. e. g. Leeman 1955; Moles 1993, 146 – 147; Feldherr 2003, 204, and Mineo 2006, 20.

31 For an analysis of the *praefatio* asking for whom Livy claims to write, see now in general de Franchis 2014.

32 There are some hints, however, that his intended audience might be more comprehensive; see de Franchis 2014, 207: "Il propose donc paradoxalement à ses lecteurs une histoire pragmatique, dans la lignée de celle de Polybe, mais avec la différence fondamentale que les leçons qu'on peut en tirer sont accessibles à tous (*omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri*), et non destinées à une minorité."

33 Cf. Liv. pr. 4 – 5: *et legentium plerisque haud dubito, quin primae origines proximaque originibus minus praebitura voluptatis sint, festinantibus ad haec nova, quibus iam pridem praevalentis populi*

the usefulness of historical *exempla* as well as the greatness of both the city of Rome and her inhabitants.[34] In other words, it pays a kind of 'lip service' to the principles of serious historiography on the one hand and to the usual local patriotism of classical writers on the other hand, and does both in a way that might be expected from the kind of newcomer on the field that Livy was at this stage of his career.

To be sure, the expectations raised by this 'advertising text' are truly fulfilled in the work that follows. There are, however, numerous passages even in the surviving parts of *Ab urbe condita* that do not lend themselves to classification in this vein and, thus, give rise to serious doubts about whether the thoughts expressed in the *praefatio* really were at the heart of his project as a whole. Furthermore, it is not even clear for which part of the ultimately 142 books Livy wrote this *praefatio* was originally intended. There is some reason to believe that it was designed to open up the first pentad alone.[35] But even if it was meant for the entire project the young historian started around 27 BCE, it seems only natural that some changes might have occurred in the more than forty years to come. The most obvious explanation for the differences between *praefatio* and work proper, however, is that statements made by an historian – like by any other writer – about his own text are not always as reliable as we would wish.[36]

This is the reason why we will now leave the methodological remarks made by Livy in his *praefatio* as well as in a few other passages behind and move on to the way he narrates history itself. Out of the large number of suitable examples, I have chosen the perhaps most obvious, namely the way he presents the war against Hannibal (217–201 BCE) which forms the content of the so-called third decade of his work. These ten books, 21 to 30, have survived the centuries without any significant losses, bearing witness to their ongoing fascination even for readers in much later times. This success surely has to do with the dramatic events themselves, but it is also due to the way Livy tells them. This already applies to the structure of the whole decade which proves to be a carefully constructed narrative[37] beginning with its own preface,[38] showing an increasing line of Carthaginian successes and pre-

vires se ipsae conficiunt: [5] *ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca tota illa mente repeto, avertam, omnis expers curae quae scribentis animum, etsi non flectere a uero, sollicitum tamen efficere posset*; see further Liv. 31.1.1–5 and 43.13.2; for the unusualness of the second thought, see Marincola 1997, 45–46: "Indeed, Livy's uniqueness is that [...] he presents the history as undertaken mainly for his personal pleasure."

34 For a reading of the *praefatio* in this vein, see now especially Vasaly 2015, 22–31, esp. 30–31.

35 For the longstanding discussion of the date, see e.g. Moles 1993, 151–152; Burton 2000; Pausch 2011, 32–33, and most recently Vasaly 2015, 3 (all of them with further references).

36 On this discrepancy as a part of classical historiography, see in general Pitcher 2009, 28–45.

37 See in general still Burck 1962 [1950] and now Levene 2010; for a more historical approach Walsh 1982.

38 Cf. Liv. 21.1–2.1.

senting a *peripeteia* in the middle[39] that changes the direction of events up to Hannibal's final defeat at Zama.[40] Of course, the plotline was written by history herself, so to speak, but its artful arrangement is further enhanced by a number of previews, flashbacks and other narrative techniques that are most suitable to establish coherence on the one hand and to create suspense on the other.

Even on this general level of analysis, it is clear that Cicero's observation "nothing is better fitted to interest a reader than variety of circumstance and vicissitudes of fortune"[41] is displayed to its full extent in this part of Livy's work. This becomes even more apparent when we now take a closer look at one of the many prominent events, namely Hannibal's passage to Italy and especially his crossing of the Alps.[42] This surprising move and decisive step of his strategy has been much discussed by ancient and modern historians alike. For the classical authors, the debate is also closely connected to the question of how this pivotal episode should be presented in narrative terms. It is, once more, Polybius' harsh critique of his predecessors that allows us to get a glimpse of this debate (Plb. 3.47.6 – 9; 48.8):[43]

> ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν γεγραφότων περὶ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς ταύτης, βουλόμενοι τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ἐκπλήττειν τῇ περὶ τῶν προειρημένων τόπων παραδοξολογίᾳ, λανθάνουσιν ἐμπίπτοντες εἰς δύο τὰ πάσης ἱστορίας ἀλλοτριώτατα: καὶ γὰρ ψευδολογεῖν καὶ μαχόμενα γράφειν αὐτοῖς ἀναγκάζονται. ἅμα μὲν γὰρ τὸν Ἀννίβαν ἀμίμητόν τινα παρεισάγοντες στρατηγὸν καὶ τόλμῃ καὶ προνοίᾳ τοῦτον ὁμολογουμένως ἀποδεικνύουσιν ἡμῖν ἀλογιστότατον, ἅμα δὲ καταστροφὴν οὐ δυνάμενοι λαμβάνειν οὐδ' ἔξοδον τοῦ ψεύδους θεοὺς καὶ θεῶν παῖδας εἰς πραγματικὴν ἱστορίαν παρεισάγουσιν. ὑποθέμενοι γὰρ τὰς ἐρυμνότητας καὶ τραχύτητας τῶν Ἀλπεινῶν ὀρῶν τοιαύτας ὥστε μὴ οἷον ἵππους καὶ στρατόπεδα, σὺν δὲ τούτοις ἐλέφαντας, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πεζοὺς εὐζώνους εὐχερῶς ἂν διελθεῖν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν ἔρημον τοιαύτην τινὰ περὶ τοὺς τόπους ὑπογράψαντες ἡμῖν ὥστ', εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἢ τις ἥρως ἀπαντήσας τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀννίβαν ὑπέδειξε τὰς ὁδούς, ἐξαπορήσαντας ἂν καταφθαρῆναι πάντας, ὁμολογουμένως ἐκ τούτων εἰς ἑκάτερον τῶν προειρημένων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐμπίπτουσι. [...].
> ἐξ ὧν εἰκότως ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς τὸ παραπλήσιον τοῖς τραγῳδιογράφοις. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνοις πᾶσιν αἱ καταστροφαὶ τῶν δραμάτων προσδέονται θεοῦ καὶ μηχανῆς διὰ τὸ τὰς πρώτας ὑποθέσεις ψευδεῖς καὶ παραλόγους λαμβάνειν.
>
> Some of the writers who have described this passage of the Alps, from the wish to impress their readers by the marvels they recount of these mountains, are betrayed into two vices ever most alien to true history; for they are compelled to make both false statements and statements which contradict each other. While on the one hand introducing Hannibal as a commander of unequalled courage and foresight, they incontestably represent him to us as entirely wanting in pruden-

39 The turn is mainly marked by the various elements of the 26th book that are aimed at summing up the course of events and at highlighting the new balance of power (cf. ch. 1.1 – 3.12; 19.1 – 9; 37.1 – 38.5 and 41.3 – 25).

40 Cf. Liv. 30.29.5 – 38.5.

41 Cf. Cic. *Fam*. 5.12.4 (for full quotation, see above).

42 Cf. Liv. 21.21 – 21.38; for the historical background, see Händl-Sagawe 1995 ad loc. and Hoyos 2003, 98 – 113; for the literary technique, see e. g. Witte 1910, 397 – 408; Burck 1962 [1950], 65 – 70; Gärtner 1975, 152 – 169; Feldherr 2009, esp. 317; Pausch 2011, 142 – 156, and Fabrizi 2015.

43 Text by Büttner-Wobst 1995; translation by Paton / Walbank / Habicht 2010.

> ce, and again, being unable to bring their series of falsehoods to any close or issue they introduce gods and the sons of gods into the sober history of facts. By representing the Alps as being so steep and rugged that not only horses and troops accompanied by elephants, but even active men on foot would have difficulty in passing, and at the same time picturing to us the desolation of the country as being such, that unless some god or hero had met Hannibal and showed him the way, his whole army would have gone astray and perished utterly, they unquestionably fall into both the above vices [...].
> The natural consequence is that they get into the same difficulties as tragic dramatists all of whom, to bring their dramas to a close, require a *deus ex machina*, as the data they choose on which to found their plots are false and contrary to reasonable probability.

As convincingly shown by David Levene in his book *Livy on the Hannibalic War* from 2010, the Roman historian was not only familiar both with Polybius' description of the Second Punic war and with his methodological remarks himself, but he also wrote his version of the events for readers with the same level of knowledge. The result is often the same as we have here, too: Livy refrains from using exactly the literary devices stigmatised by Polybius, but, nevertheless, finds a way to describe the events to a similar effect, like the historians criticised by Polybius – who, apart from that, contradicts his own verdicts in his very practice quite regularly.[44]

In this particular instance, therefore, Livy mentions no gods, be they mythological or dramaturgical, in the description of the crossing of the Alps itself. Contrary to Polybius, however, he lets his Hannibal pay a visit to the temple of Heracles (or rather the Carthaginian god Melqart, regularly identified with the Greek *heros*) at Cádiz before he starts his campaign against the Romans.[45] While this detail alone looks reasonable enough,[46] it is connected to his famous dream of a huge serpent by Livy's narrator, even if several other events have been mentioned in the meantime, by the explicit naming of Cádiz as his starting point (Liv. 21.22.6 – 9):[47]

> ab Gadibus Carthaginem ad hiberna exercitus rediit; atque inde profectus praeter Onussam urbem ad Hiberum maritima ora ducit. ibi fama est in quiete visum ab eo iuvenem divina specie qui se ab Iove diceret ducem in Italiam Hannibali missum; proinde sequeretur neque usquam a se deflecteret oculos. pavidum primo, nusquam circumspicientem aut respicientem, secutum; deinde cura ingenii humani cum, quidnam id esset quod respicere vetitus esset, agitaret animo, temperare oculis nequivisse; tum vidisse post sese serpentem mira magnitudine cum ingenti arborum ac virgultorum strage ferri ac post insequi cum fragore caeli nimbum. tum quae moles ea quidue prodigii esset quaerentem, audisse vastitatem Italiae esse; pergeret porro ire nec ultra inquireret sineretque fata in occulto esse.

---

44 On Hannibal's crossing of the Alps in particular, see Levene 2010, 149 – 155, esp. 154: "Livy is manifestly writing with Polybius' text directly in front of him, and moreover, assuming that at least some of his readers will realize that he is doing so. Polybius is Livy's source. Polybius is also Livy's target."
45 Cf. Liv. 21.21.9: *Hannibal cum recensuisset omnium gentium auxilia, Gades profectus Herculi vota exsoluit novisque se obligat votis, si cetera prospera evenissent.*
46 See especially Fabrizi 2015, 129 – 136, who offers a convincing interpretation of the use Hannibal might have made of this visit for the promotion of his campaign.
47 Text by Dorey 1971; translation by Foster 1929, both as in the following.

> From Gades Hannibal returned to New Carthage to the winter quarters of his army. Setting out from thence, he marched along the coast, past the city of Onusa, to the Ebro. It was there, as they tell, that he saw in his sleep a youth of godlike aspect, who declared that he was sent by Jupiter to lead him into Italy: let him follow, therefore, nor anywhere turn his eyes away from his guide. At first he was afraid and followed, neither looking to the right nor to the left, nor yet behind him; but presently wondering, with that curiosity to which all of us are prone, what it could be that he had been forbidden to look back upon, he was unable to command his eyes; then he saw behind him a serpent of monstrous size, that moved along with vast destruction of trees and underbrush, and a storm-cloud coming after, with loud claps of thunder; and, on his asking what this prodigious portent was, he was told that it was the devastation of Italy; he was therefore to go on, nor enquire further, but suffer destiny to be wrapped in darkness.

This dream surely is not invented by Livy, since it is already mentioned by Cicero in his dialogue *De divinatione* and explicitly described as part of the historiographical tradition on Hannibal.[48] It is missing, however, from Polybius' account for obvious reasons. Although Livy has decided to follow his predecessor's verdict about divine intervention during the crossing of the Alps in the strict sense, he nonetheless chooses to incorporate this element of godly help into his narration, if only in the doubly rationalized form of a dream Hannibal is said to have had. The reason for this deviation from the Polybian precepts might well be that previews like this one, not given by the narrator himself, but only by the partially unreliable authority of a deity in a dream, are especially apt to activate the reader and to make him wonder about the further course of events.[49] The resulting involvement into the story, however, leads to an enhancement of pleasure.

Another pleasure resulting from the reading of historiography can, at least according to Cicero, consist precisely "in the many quite unimportant details" (*multa praeterea minime necessaria*)[50] given by the narrator. This may look strange to a reader in our times, since we tend to consider too much elaborateness as a weakness of a story. For readers in antiquity, however, a detailed description, especially of foreign countries and people, offered an important stimulus to devote themselves to histor-

48 Cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.49: *hoc item in Sileni, quem Coelius sequitur, Graeca historia est (is autem diligentissume res Hannibalis persecutus est): Hannibalem, cum cepisset Saguntum, visum esse in somnis a Iove in deorum concilium vocari; quo cum venisset, Iovem imperavisse, ut Italiae bellum inferret, ducemque ei unum e concilio datum, quo illum utentem cum exercitu progredi coepisse; tum ei ducem illum praecepisse ne respiceret; illum autem id diutius facere non potuisse elatumque cupiditate respexisse; tum visam beluam vastam et immanem circumplicatam serpentibus, quacumque incederet, omnia arbusta, virgulta, tecta pervertere, et eum admiratum quaesisse de deo quodnam illud esset tale monstrum, et deum respondisse vastitatem esse Italiae praecepisseque ut pergeret protinus, quid retro atque a tergo fieret ne laboraret*; on the different functions in the works of the individual historians, see D'Arco 2002 and further Händl-Sagawe 1995, 142–144, and Levene 2010, 132–133.

49 See e. g. Fuhrmann 1983, 24: "Der Leser soll hier gewiß die hintergründige Ironie bemerken: das Traumgesicht sagt nichts Unwahres, es sagt jedoch nur die halbe Wahrheit." For an analysis of the internal focalisation in this passage, see further Tsitsiou-Chelidoni 2009, 537–538.

50 Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 5.52.

iography, as is suggested not least by the large number of geographic and ethnographic digressions even in otherwise sober works such as Caesar's *Commentarii*.[51]

Hannibal leading his army into the *terra incognita* of the Alps offers, of course, a very suitable topic for a writer to meet the supposed interests of his readers. Interestingly enough, Polybius, in strict accordance with his principle of writing for the πολιτικοί alone, refrains from a detailed depiction of the mountains and the designation of their inhabitants. He even explains his denial at considerable length, above all by stressing that it is difficult for the reader to memorise place names hitherto unfamiliar to him and thus to gain a practical utility from them.[52] Livy, by contrast, ignores in this case the example set by his predecessor and gives his readers what he assumes they want, as we see in our next example (Liv. 21.31.9–12):

> sedatis certaminibus Allobrogum cum iam Alpes peteret, non recta regione iter instituit sed ad laevam in Tricastinos flexit; inde per extremam oram Vocontiorum agri tendit in Trigorios, haud usquam impedita via priusquam ad Druentiam flumen pervenit. is et ipse Alpinus amnis longe omnium Galliae fluminum difficillimus transitu est; nam cum aquae vim vehat ingentem, non tamen navium patiens est, quia nullis coercitus ripis, pluribus simul neque iisdem alveis fluens, nova semper [per] vada novosque gurgites – et ob eadem pediti quoque incerta via est – ad hoc saxa glareosa volvens, nihil stabile nec tutum ingredienti praebet; et tum forte imbribus auctus ingentem transgredientibus tumultum fecit, cum super cetera trepidatione ipsi sua atque incertis clamoribus turbarentur.
>
> Having settled the contentions of the Allobroges, Hannibal was now ready for the Alps; but instead of marching directly towards them, he turned to the left, to the country of the Tricastini, and thence proceeded through the outer borders of the territory of the Vocontii to the Tricorii, by a road which nowhere presented any difficulties, until he came to the Druentia. This, too, is an Alpine river and by far the most difficult of all the rivers of Gaul to cross; for, though it brings down a vast volume of water, it does not admit of navigation, since, not being confined within any banks, but flowing at once in several channels, not always the same, it is ever forming new shallows and new pools – a fact which makes it dangerous for foot-passengers as well – besides which it rolls down jagged stones and affords no sure or stable footing to one who enters it. And at that time, as it happened, it was swollen with rains, and the crossing took place amidst the wildest tumult, for the men – besides their other difficulties – were confused by their own excitement and bewildered outcries.

For all its pseudo-accurate information, this description – like the remainder of Livy's account – has proved of little value for a reconstruction of Hannibal's exact route across the Alps. This question, however, has fascinated readers up to modern times and is still answered with a new solution on an almost regular basis both in more and in less academic publications.[53] The lasting interest in this taken by a broader public can give us a hint of the reactions of ancient readers as well. Contrary

51 Cf. Caes. *Gal*. 5.12–14 and 6.11–28; see e.g. Krebs 2006 and Woolf 2011, esp. 87–90. For an analysis of these digressions in the light of the possible audience of historical works in the Late Republic, see the contribution of Marine Miquel to the present volume.

52 Cf. Plb. 3.36–38, esp. 36.4–5.

53 Cf. Liv. 21.29.1–38.9; see e.g. Händl-Sagawe 1995, 193–248, and Hoyos 2006.

to the modern focus on the understanding of the exact route Hannibal and his soldiers have taken, their curiosity seems to have been directed not least towards the emotional experience of the crossing of a frontier to the unknown and perhaps to see how it is "to explore strange new worlds, to seek out new life and new civilizations, to boldly go where no man has gone before."

The adventures of the *Starship Enterprise* and its crew, of course, belong to the realm of fiction. Nevertheless, that what we call *belles lettres* forms an inseparable part of historiography in antiquity remains true, even if it has been said so often that one gets tired of hearing it again and again. It is, therefore, a reasonable assumption that people in ancient times could read historical works with the same attitude and similar expectations that we rather apply to books of fiction. More astonishing, however, is the circumstance that – if we maintain the awkward parallelization for a last moment – the Livian *Starship Enterprise* is manned by Carthaginians. Whereas it is often taken for granted that the Roman readers for whom Livy wrote would only be willing to identify themselves with their historical equivalents and forefathers, the impact of this passage and of several others in the third decade would be significantly diminished if we were to assume that Roman readers took the Carthaginians above all as their enemies hoping that they would fail and never reach Italy at all. Although this approach would be perfectly sensible in historical categories, it is apparently not the mode in which the narration is meant to be read.

This becomes even clearer when Hannibal's army finally reaches the foot of the Alps. The Carthaginians' further encounter with the high mountains is repeatedly, though not consistently, presented from their point of view. A shifting focalisation in this vein, however, is an important technique for inviting the reader to adopt the perspective of a certain character and, thus, both to make him more activated and to enhance his involvement in the further course of the events. We find an example for this narrative strategy in our next passage which additionally comprises several words connected to the semantic field of seeing which implicitly emphasize the effect of the focalisation (Liv. 21.32.6 – 8):[54]

> Hannibal ab Druentia campestri maxime itinere ad Alpes cum bona pace incolentium ea loca Gallorum pervenit. tum, quamquam fama prius, qua incerta in maius vero ferri solent, praecepta res erat, tamen ex propinquo visa montium altitudo nivesque caelo prope immixtae, tecta informia imposita rupibus, pecora iumentaque torrida frigore, homines intonsi et inculti, animalia inanimaque omnia rigentia gelu, cetera visu quam dictu foediora terrorem renovarunt. erigentibus in primos agmen clivos apparuerunt imminentes tumulos insidentes montani, qui, si valles occultiores insedissent, coorti ad pugnam repente ingentem fugam stragemque dedissent.
>
> Hannibal, leaving the Druentia, and advancing for the most part through a champaign country, reached the Alps without being molested by the Gauls who inhabited those regions. Then, though report, which is wont to exaggerate uncertain dangers, had already taught them what to expect still, the near view of the lofty mountains, with their snows almost merging in the

54 See further Tsitsiou-Chelidoni 2009; Pausch 2011, 149 – 152, and Fabrizi 2015, 136 – 140.

> sky; the shapeless hovels perched on crags; the frost-bitten flocks and beasts of burden; the shaggy, unkempt men; animals and inanimate objects alike stiff with cold, and all more dreadful to look upon than words can tell, renewed their consternation. As their column began to mount the first slopes, mountaineers were discovered posted on the heights above, who, had they lain concealed in hidden valleys, might have sprung out suddenly and attacked them with great rout and slaughter.

The last sentence offers a particularly good example, as two narrative techniques are combined: first, the Carthaginian are presented here in the form of a *dativus iudicantis* which is used again to highlight the circumstance that it is their perspective that we are following. Second, another literary device follows closely which is usually employed to create suspense and, in doing so, to relate the reader to the fate of the character in peril: the narrator imagines that something dreadful would have happened if some other thing had not occurred and saved the situation at the very last moment. Such elements of counterfactual history[55] or of possible worlds within a narration are used by Livy both at large – his digression on Alexander the Great's hypothetical war with Rome offering the best known example[56] – and on a smaller scale, as in our passage,[57] when nothing more than a contrafactual conditional clause is necessary to evoke the imagination of 'what almost happened' or of a 'Beinahe-Episode', as it has been called by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath in his study on the use of this technique in epic poetry.[58] Both forms, however, are usually employed from the perspective of the protagonist himself, who gets into danger and finally is rescued. But in our case the narrator apparently expects his reader to worry about the survival of the very same Carthaginians that later in the book will be the utmost threat to his fellow Romans. This alternation of identification looks strange in strictly historical terms, but it greatly enhances the pleasures of reading in the first chapters of Livy's third decade.

In the same vein, I would also like to read another famous passage of Livy's 'Hannibal crossing the Alps' section that usually is understood quite differently. I am referring to the speech that Livy has Hannibal deliver to his soldiers when they encounter even more severe difficulties on their way down on the Italian side. It is summarised in *oratio obliqua* by the narrator (Liv. 21.35.7–9):[59]

> per omnia nive oppleta cum signis prima luce motis segniter agmen incederet pigritiaque et desperatio in omnium voltu emineret, praegressus signa Hannibal in promunturio quodam, unde longe et late prospectus erat, consistere iussis militibus Italiam ostentat subiectosque Alpinis montibus Circumpadanos campos moeniaque eos tum transcendere non Italiae modo, sed

55 See in general Demandt 2001 [1984]; Suerbaum 1997 and Weber 2000.

56 Cf. Liv. 9.17.1–19.17; see e. g. Morello 2002, especially 83: "[...] traditional readings have underestimated the value of a counterfactual digression as a tool for historical thinking."

57 For more examples, see Pausch 2011, especially 200–202.

58 See Nesselrath 1992.

59 For the manifold historical problems attached to this passage, see Händl-Sagawe 1995, 235–236.

> etiam urbis Romanae; cetera plana, proclivia fore; uno aut summum altero proelio arcem et caput Italiae in manu ac potestate habituros.
>
> The ground was everywhere covered deep with snow when at dawn they began to march, and as the column moved slowly on, dejection and despair were to be read in every countenance. Then Hannibal, who had gone on before the standards, made the army halt on a certain promontory which commanded an extensive prospect, and pointing out Italy to them, and just under the Alps the plains about the Po, he told them that they were now scaling the ramparts not only of Italy, but of Rome itself; the rest of the way would be level or downhill; and after one, or, at the most, two battles, they would have in their hands and in their power the citadel and capital of Italy.

To be sure, Polybius reports a similar address in the same situation.[60] But, again according to his principles set out above, he has his Hannibal restrict himself much more to the necessary motivation of his men and, for that purpose, lets him point only to the most imminent future.[61] Livy, however, seizes the opportunity of this speech to give a much more pronounced preview of the events to come. Intriguingly, this outlook into the future is given from a clear Carthaginian perspective again. In this case, it applies not only literally to the point of view, since the speech is accompanied by a panoramic – although fictitious – view of the Italian peninsula, but also to the content itself, since Hannibal unfolds a very optimistic vision of the further course of the events for himself and his men. Even if this scenario will soon be refuted by the following narrative and it will turn out that the Carthaginians will have to face so much more than "one, or, at the most, two battles", in my opinion there is here more at stake than just a kind of 'tragic irony', easily detected by Roman readers and received with nothing more than 'Schadenfreude' at the cost of a general failing to keep the promises he made to his soldiers.

Passages like this one are rather meant to unsettle the reader and to shake his confidence about the assuredly 'happy ending' of the story he is reading. To be sure, after a moment of reflection he will be able to reduce the suspension he might have felt by invoking his historical knowledge. Nevertheless, such narrative strategies are very suitable to increase the pleasure one might get from reading an historical account. But even besides their contribution to the *delectatio* of the reader, the same techniques are relevant for the *utilitas* of a work of historiography, too. I will not go into detail here, but I think a plausible argument can be made that both the shifting of the point of view and the use of strongly focalized previews into the narrative future are pivotal elements which enhance the understanding of history as well.[62] This is especially the case when we are dealing with a development of events that is influenced by the decisions of the historical agents and thus has been open to

60 Cf. Plb. 3.54.1–3.

61 For further comparison of the both versions, see e.g. Fabrizi 2015, 140–143, and Pausch 2016, 317–319.

62 See Pausch 2011, 191–250.

take other courses as well. Multiperspectivity and focalisation, then, can help to teach the reader about what in history is contingent and what perhaps is not.[63]

4 Livy's imagined reader and the audience of historiography

Coming back to the topic of this present paper, however, I hope the passages discussed above have been able to show that Livy has written this part of his work at least for a reader who will experience the full emotional force of the events and thus will be able to receive the kind of pleasure named by Cicero as an important motive for reading historiography. That the purpose of this thrill and, thereby, presumably of the identification of Roman readers is formed – even if only at times and not continuously – by Hannibal and his Carthaginian soldiers, is a clear indication that Livy, for all his dutiful affirmation in the *praefatio*, in fact has written much more than a history *ad maiorem gloriam Romae*. The same applies to the putting of *exempla* at the reader's disposal, to which Livy's work is too often reduced. To be sure, we find a huge number of relevant passages in his monumental work that can be used in this way. But then, there are large parts of *Ab urbe condita* that – like the Hannibal's crossing of the Alps – do not contain any clear-cut examples waiting to be re-used by a prospective politician or general.

It is, therefore, legitimate to assume that history at this time was not written for Polybius' πολιτικοί alone, but either for an imagined reader with diverse interests or for different readers with their respective motives at the same time. The comparatively well-documented example of Cicero, however, suggests that the former might have been the rule: a reader that wanted to gain useful knowledge from his reading of historiography as well as the pleasure of being involved into a good story. That the opinions of Cicero and of his contemporaries correspond closely in this point suggests, furthermore, that the traditional picture of a degeneration of proper historiography into mere literature only after the end of the Roman Republic is nothing more than a gross simplification. This being said, it might be a fruitful approach to rethink the similar argument used to explain the literary value of historical works in other epochs as well. Despite the necessary differentiation, the understanding of classical historiography undoubtedly profits from the regular comparison of the approaches taken in the analysis of the individual authors.

63 See Maier 2012, 103–140.

Bibliography

Burck, E. (1962 [1950]), *Einführung in die dritte Dekade des Livius*, Heidelberg.
Burton, P.J. (2000), "The Last Republican Historian: A New Date for the Composition of Livy's First Pentad", in: *Historia* 49, 429 – 446.
Büttner-Wobst, T. (1995 [1893]), *Polybii historiae, vol. III, libri ix-xix*, Stuttgart.
Cohn, D. (1999), *The Distinction of Fiction*, Baltimore.
D'Arco, I. (2002), "Il sogno premonitore di Annibale e il pericolo delle Alpi", in: *QS* 55, 145 – 162.
de Franchis, M. (2014), "Pour qui écrit Tite-Live?", in: J.-C. Julhe (ed.), *Pratiques latines de la dédicace – Permanence et mutations, de l'Antiquité à la Renaissance*, Paris, 189 – 213.
Demandt, A. (2001 [1984]), *Ungeschehene Geschichte. Ein Traktat über die Frage: "Was wäre geschehen, wenn …?"*, Göttingen.
Dorey, T.A. (1971), *Titi Livi: ab urbe condita, Bücher 21 – 22*, Leipzig.
Fabrizi, V. (2015), "Hannibal's March and Roman Imperial Space in Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, Book 21", in: *Philologus* 159, 118 – 155.
Feldherr, A. (2003), "Cicero and the Invention of 'Literary' History", in: U. Eigler et al. (eds.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, Darmstadt, 196 – 212.
Feldherr, A. (2009), "Delusions of Grandeur: Lucretian 'Passages' in Livy", in: P. Hardie (ed.), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, Oxford, 310 – 329.
Fleck, M. (1993), *Cicero als Historiker*, Stuttgart.
Foster, B.O. (1929), *Livy: Books 21 – 22*, London.
Foucher, A. (2000), "Nature et formes de l' 'histoire tragique' à Rome", in: *Latomus* 59, 773 – 801.
Fox, M. (2007), *Cicero's Philosophy of History*, Oxford.
Fuhrmann, M. (1983), "Narrative Techniken im Dienste der Geschichtsschreibung (Livius, Buch 21 – 22). Eine Skizze", in: E. Lefèvre / E. Olshausen (eds.), *Livius. Werk und Rezeption, Festschrift für Erich Burck*, Munich, 19 – 29.
Funari, R. (2011), *Corpus dei Papiri Storici greci e latini. Parte B: Storici latini. 1: Autori noti. Vol. 1: Titus Livius*, Rome.
Händl-Sagawe, U. (1995), *Der Beginn des 2. Punischen Krieges. Ein historisch-kritischer Kommentar zu Livius Buch 21*, Munich.
Gärtner, H.A. (1975), *Beobachtungen zu Bauelementen in der antiken Historiographie besonders bei Livius und Caesar*, Wiesbaden.
Genette, G. (1990), "Fictional Narrative, Factual Narrative", in: *Poetics Today* 11, 755 – 774.
Hall, J. (1998), "Cicero to Lucceius (*Fam*. 5.12) in its Social Context: *valde bella?*", in: *CPh* 93, 308 – 321.
Hau, L.I. (2016), *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus*, Edinburgh.
Horster, M. (2018), "Geschichte und Geschichten im Alltag", in: A. Kolb (ed.), *Literacy in Ancient Everyday Life*, Berlin / Boston, 363 – 386.
Hose, M. (1994), *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio*, Stuttgart.
Hose, M. (2009), "'Exzentrische' Formen der Historiographie im Hellenismus", in: J. Frey / C.K. Rothschild / J. Schröter (eds.), *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie*, Berlin, 182 – 213.
Hoyos, D. (2003), *Hannibal's Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247 – 183 B.C.*, London.
Hoyos, D. (2006), "Crossing the Durance with Hannibal and Livy: the Route to the Pass", in: *Klio* 88, 408 – 465.
Krebs, C.B. (2006), "'Imaginary Geography' in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*", in: *AJPh* 127, 111 – 136.

Leeman, A.D. (1955), "Le genre et le style historique à Rome. Théorie et pratique", in: *REL* 33, 183–208.
Levene, D.S. (2010), *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford.
Maier, F.K. (2012), *Überall mit dem Unerwarteten rechnen. Die Kontingenz historischer Prozesse bei Polybios*, Munich.
Malitz, J. (1990), "Das Interesse an der Geschichte. Die griechische Geschichte und ihr Publikum", in: H. Verdin / G. Schepens / E. de Keyser (eds.), *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24–26 May 1988*, Leuven, 323–349.
Marincola, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge.
Marincola, J. (2009), "Ancient Audiences and Expectations", in: A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to The Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 11–23.
Meineck, P. / Konstan, D. (eds.) (2014), *Combat Trauma and the Ancient Greeks*, Basingstoke.
Mineo, B. (2006), *Tite-Live et l'histoire de Rome*, Paris.
Moles, J. (1993), "Livy's Preface", in: *PCPhS* 39, 141–168.
Momigliano, A. (1978), "The Historians of the Classical World and their Audiences: Some Suggestions", in: *ASNP* 3.8, 59–75.
Morello, R. (2002), "Livy's Alexander Digression (9.17–19). Counterfactuals and Apologetics", in: *JRS* 92, 62–85.
Näf, B. (2010), *Antike Geschichtsschreibung. Form – Leistung – Wirkung*, Stuttgart.
Nesselrath, H.-G. (1992), *Ungeschehenes Geschehen. 'Beinahe-Episoden' im Griechischen und Römischen Epos*, Stuttgart.
Nicolai, R. (1992), *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*, Pisa.
Nicolai, R. (2007), "The Place of Historiography in the Ancient World", in: J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, vols. I-II, Malden, MA, 13–26.
Paton, W.R. (1993 [1925]), *Polybius: The Histories. Vol. IV, Books 9–15*, London.
Paton, W.R. / Walbank, F.W. / Habicht, C. (2010), *Polybius: The Histories. Vol. II, Books 3–4* (revised edition), London.
Paul, G.M. (1982), "*Urbs capta*: Sketch of an Ancient Literary Motif", in: *Phoenix* 36, 144–155.
Pausch, D. (2011), *Livius und der Leser. Narrative Strukturen in* ab urbe condita, Munich.
Pausch, D. (2016), "On the Shoulders of Greeks? Future Time in Livy's *ab urbe condita*", in: A. Lianeri (ed.), *Knowing Future Time in and through Greek Historiography*, Berlin, 311–327.
Pausch, D. (2018), "Lost in Reception? Polybius' Paradoxical Impact on Writing History in Republican Rome", in: N. Miltsios / M. Tamiolaki (eds.), *Polybius and his Legacy*, Berlin / Boston, 357–380.
Pitcher, L.V. (2009), *Writing Ancient History: An Introduction to Classical Historiography*, London.
Rackham, H. (1961 [1914]), *Cicero: De finibus bonorum et malorum*, London.
Reitzenstein, R. (1906), *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig.
Schiche, T. (1961), *M. Tullius Cicero. Fasc. 43: De finibus bonorum et malorum*, Stuttgart (= Leipzig 1915).
Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1988), *M. Tulli Ciceronis epistulae ad familiares: libri I-XVI*, Stuttgart.
Shuckburgh, E.S. (1908–1909), *The Letters of Cicero*, London.
Suerbaum, W. (1997), "Am Scheideweg zur Zukunft. Alternative Geschehensverläufe bei römischen Historikern", in: *Gymnasium* 104, 36–54.
Tsitsiou-Chelidoni, C. (2009), "History beyond Literature: Interpreting the 'Internally Focalized' Narrative in Livy's *Ab urbe Condita*", in: J. Grethlein / A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin, 527–554.
Vasaly, A. (2015), *Livy's Political Philosophy: Power and Personality in Early Rome*, Cambridge.
Verdin, H. / Schepens, G. / de Keyser, E. (eds.) (1990), *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries BC*, Leuven.

Walsh, P.G. (1982), "Livy and the Aims of *historia*: An Analysis of the Third Decade", in: *ANRW* 2.30.2, Berlin, 1058 – 1074.

Walter, U. (2004), Memoria *und* res publica. *Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*, Frankfurt.

Weber, G. (2000), "Vom Sinn kontrafaktischer Geschichte", in: K. Brodersen (ed.), *Virtuelle Antike. Wendepunkte der Alten Geschichte*, Darmstadt, 11 – 23.

Wiseman, T.P. (2015), *The Roman Audience. Classical Literature as Social History*, Oxford.

Witte, K. (1910), "Über die Form der Darstellung in Livius' Geschichtswerk", in: *RhM* 65, 270 – 305 and 359 – 419.

Woolf, G. (2011), *Tales of the Barbarians. Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West*, Chichester.

Aurélien Pulice

From ἐξήγησις to μίμησις: Thucydides' Readership in the ὑπομνήματα from the Roman Period

Ὑπομνήματα were self-standing linear commentaries.[1] They used to be read alongside the text that they commented on. Being often elaborated upon by cultured readers, they were meant to be used by other readers of ancient texts – scholars, schoolmasters or even advanced students trying to get more familiar with an ancient author. Investigating ancient commentaries is therefore a good way to understand by whom and for what purposes a classical author was read.

This paper will explore some aspects of Thucydides' readership as exemplified by *P.Oxy.* 853, a 2nd century papyrus displaying the remnants of an anonymous commentary.[2] The extant text covers ch. 1–45 of Book 2 (i.e. years 431–430 BCE). In that it is the longest commentary on ancient Greek historiography which has been preserved,[3] *P.Oxy.* 853 provides a quite unique window into the ancient scholarship and readership of the classical historians. Nevertheless, its value has been quite neglected by scholars. In this paper, I hope to demonstrate that it was composed at a crucial time of Thucydides' reception, and that it is most likely to have been dedicated to readers who took a keen rhetorical interest in the historian's work. After a brief outline of the context in which our commentary has been written and/or compiled, a comparison with the Byzantine scholia will draw out that the papyrus' author has reshaped a Hellenistic source – doubtless a grammatical ὑπόμνημα influenced by Alexandrian scholarship – and transformed it into a more rhetorical commentary, which implies that his work was more specifically addressed to readers interested in Thucydides from a rhetorical perspective. Lastly, I will consider the apologetic dimension of this commentary, focusing precisely on the detailed refutation of criticisms formulated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise on Thucydides. We shall see that the author's response to Dionysius – which has no parallel in ancient

1 In this paper, I use ὑπόμνημα and "commentary" as synonyms and follow Del Fabbro's definition of the former: "tutti quei testi su papiro che, materialmente separati dall'edizione critica del testo commentato, sono stati scritti al fine di fornire un chiarimento al testo dell'autore, e che si presentano con una successione di lemmi e relative spiegazioni" (Del Fabbro 1979, 69). On the abusive use of the Greek word, see Arrighetti 1977.

2 Also known as *MP*^{3} 1536 or *TM* 62878. On this papyrus, see Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 107–149 (*editio princeps*); Voltz 1911; Fischer 1913, 2–19; Luschnat 1954, 25–29; Maehler 2007. See also the Trismegistos database (www.trismegistos.org/text/62878).

3 Concerning Herodotus, there are fragments of an Aristarchean ὑπόμνημα (*P. Amb.* 2.12) and pieces of another commentary mentioning Didymus (*P.Oxy.* 4455). There are two fragmentary (but substantial) commentaries on Thucydides: *P.Oxy.* 853 (Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 107–149) and *P.Vindob.* 29247 (Gerstinger 1925). I do not know of any commentary on Xenophon's historical works.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-006

literary sources – constitutes a crucial contribution to our understanding of Thucydides' reception during the Roman Empire.[4]

1 Date and context of *P.Oxy.* 853

P.Oxy. 853 consists of eight main fragments displaying about 600 lines of text divided into 19 columns that are unequally preserved, but that cover the first 45 chapters of Thucydides' Book 2. The commentary has been copied on the back of three documentary papyri which have been put together in order to make a new roll. One of these documents is dated from 131–132 CE, meaning that our commentary was copied after this date (*terminus post quem*) and doubtless composed beforehand. A paleographical analysis of the handwriting suggests that the copyist was clearly active before the end of the 2nd century (*terminus ante quem*).

The ὑπόμνημα was probably composed between the very end of the 1st century BCE and the first decades of the 1st century CE. Indeed, one of the first notes mentions Dionysius of Halicarnassus and summarizes a section of his treatise *On Thucydides,* which was probably published around 10 BCE (*terminus post quem*). This means that our commentary was written afterwards and can hardly be later than the time of Hadrian. It is generally assumed that its author was active during the Julio-Claudian dynasty,[5] at a time when Thucydides' rhetorical exemplarity was vividly debated.

By this time, Thucydides was already recognized as a major figure of historiography: his method but also his style – considered to be *dense* and *concise* [6] – had already been imitated several times by Greek and Latin historians such as Polybius or Sallust. But the fall of the Republic and the rise of the Empire (1st century BCE – 1st century CE) was also characterized by an important rhetorical turn in the reception of the historian. As is attested in both Greek and Latin sources from the period, it is closely related to the development of Atticism.

According to Cicero, Thucydides was almost his only way to access the oratory of 5th-century Athens.[7] He admired the historian, at least to a certain extent. On several occasions, he praised his *acumen* ("sharpness"),[8] this being (as closely related to the efficiency of *inventio*) an essential prerequisite to one who wanted to become a per-

4 As ὑπομνήματα address the issue of a literate audience, some connections can also be made with the contributions of Duchêne, Shaw, Pausch and Liotsakis.

5 Cf. Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 109: "[sc. its composition] can hardly have taken place later than Hadrian's time, and it is more likely that it was written soon after the beginning of the Christian era."

6 See, for example, Cicero, who describes his style as *subtilis, acutus, brevis sententiisque magis quam verbis abundans* (*de Orat.* 2.22.93), but also Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.73) or Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Th.* 24.10).

7 Cic. *de Orat.* 2.22.93; *Brut.* 29.

8 Cic. *Brut.* 65–66; *de Orat.* 2.22.93.

suasive orator.[9] But if Cicero was not particularly reluctant to support the *imitatio Thucydidis* in the field of historiography, he firmly advised against the intrusion of a Thucydidean style in forensic and deliberative oratory. As a matter of fact, his *Brutus* and *Orator* were written in 46 BCE, at a time when his eloquence was openly criticized by a group of young orators, labelled as *attikoi*. On many respects, these two treatises answer their criticisms. As opposed to the sophisticated Asianist oratory (as allegedly embodied by Cicero), these young *oratores* valued the ancient simplicity of the Attic orators. Some of them apparently had a predilection for Thucydides. But these *Thucydidii*, as Cicero calls them, in making the historian their favorite rhetorical paradigm – have pushed the *imitatio Thucydidis* too far (Cic. *Orat*. 8.30 – 31):

> Ecce autem aliqui se Thucydidios esse profitentur, *nouum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus!* nam qui Lysiam sequuntur, causidicum quendam sequuntur non illum quidem amplum atque grandem, subtilem et elegantem tamen et qui in forensibus causis possit praeclare consistere. Thucydides autem res gestas et bella narrat et proelia, grauiter sane et probe, sed nihil ab eo transferri potest ad forensem usum et publicum. ipsae illae contiones ita multas habent obscuras abditasque sententias uix ut intellegantur; quod est in oratione ciuili uitium uel maximum. [...] quis porro umquam Graecorum rhetorum a Thucydide quicquam duxit? at laudatus est ab omnibus. fateor, sed ita ut rerum explicator prudens, seuerus, grauis; non ut in iudiciis uersaret causas, sed ut in historiis bella narraret; itaque numquam est numeratus orator, nec uero, si historiam non scripsisset, nomen eius exstaret, cum praesertim fuisset honoratus et nobilis.
>
> And here come some who take the title "Thucydideans", – *a new and unheard-of group of ignoramuses*. Those who follow Lysias at least follow a pleader of sorts, not indeed grand and stately, but for all that refined and precise, and able to hold his own famously in the law-court. Thucydides, on the other hand, gives us history, wars and battles – fine and dignified, I grant, but nothing in him can be applied to the court or to public life. Those famous speeches contain so many dark and obscure sentences as to be scarcely intelligible, which is a prime fault in a public oration. [...] Furthermore, what Greek rhetorician ever took any examples from Thucydides? Every one praises him, I grant, but as an intelligent, serious and dignified commentator on events, – one to describe wars in history, not to handle cases in law-courts. Consequently he has never been classed as an orator, nor, to tell the truth, would his name be known unless he had written his history, although he was of noble birth and had been honoured with public office.[10]

The expression *novum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus* clearly suggests a characterisation of these writers as following a new fashion. This is why Cicero's testimony can be seen as a fairly good starting point for Thucydides' "début" as an oratorical *exemplum* (at least in Rome).[11] If Cicero disapproves of the use of Thucydides as a rhetorical paradigm, he admires him as a historian and does not blame the *imitatio Thucydidis* as long as it is restricted to historiography.

---

9 Cic. *de Orat*. 1.28.128; 1.38.172; 1.51.223; 2.35.147; *Brut*. 35; *Orat*. 5.18.

10 Trans. Hubbel.

11 Cicero's attitude towards the *Thucydidii* is moreover unchanging. See also *Brut*. 287 – 288; *Opt. Gen*. 15 – 16.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who arrived in Rome around 30 BCE and died after 8 BCE, goes one step further. No less than three of his rhetorical works are entirely or partly dedicated to Thucydides.[12] All are addressed to people who seemed quite fond of the historian. Dionysius, who does not really share their enthusiasm, is entirely aware that he goes against the tide.[13] He argues that not only aspiring orators but also historians – and this is a major difference with Cicero – should avoid blindly imitating Thucydides' uneven style. He recommends to separate the wheat from the chaff first, and to resort to a more cautious and moderate form of imitation. Now, getting into the details of Dionysius' evaluation of the *History* would lead me too far from *P.Oxy.* 853; but within the scope of this paper, it is enough to refer to the conclusion of the treatise *On Thucydides*, which provides a good synthesis of his point of view (D.H. *Th.* 55.2–5):

> Οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους ὑποτίθεσθαι τοῖς γε δὴ τὰς κρίσεις ἀδιαστρόφους ἔτι φυλάσσουσι, Δημοσθένει συμβούλῳ χρησαμένους [...]. ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἴπω, ἀμφότερα μὲν ἐπ' ἴσης ζηλωτὰ εἶναι, τά τε μὴ σαφῶς εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ συγγραφέως καὶ τὰ προσειληφότα σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς τὴν σαφήνειαν, οὐκ ἔχει λόγον· ἀνάγκη δὲ ὁμολογεῖν κρείττονα τῶν ἀτελεστέρων εἶναι τὰ τελειότερα καὶ τῶν ἀφανεστέρων τά γ' ἐμφανέστερα. τί οὖν μαθόντες ἅπασαν τὴν διάλεκτον τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ βιαζόμεθα λέγειν, ὅτι τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν οὖσιν ἀνθρώποις αὐτὰ ὁ Θουκυδίδης ἔγραψε συνήθη πᾶσι καὶ γνώριμα ὄντα, ἡμῶν δὲ λόγος αὐτῷ τῶν ὕστερον ἐσομένων οὐκ ἦν, οἳ δ' ἐκβάλλομεν ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἅπασαν τὴν Θουκυδίδου λέξιν ὡς ἄχρηστον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸ διηγηματικὸν μέρος αὐτῆς πλὴν ὀλίγων πάνυ θαυμαστῶς ἔχειν καὶ εἰς πάσας εἶναι τὰς χρείας εὔθετον, τὸ δὲ δημηγορικὸν οὐχ ἅπαν εἰς μίμησιν ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ μέρος γνωσθῆναι μὲν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις εὔπορον, κατασκευασθῆναι δ' οὐχ ἅπασι δυνατόν; τούτων ἡδίω μὲν εἶχόν σοι περὶ Θουκυδίδου γράφειν, ὦ βέλτιστε Κόιντε Αἴλιε Τουβέρων, οὐ μὴν ἀληθέστερα.
>
> I should not hesitate to suggest to students of political oratory – those, at least, who still try to keep their critical faculties unprejudiced – that they should take Demosthenes as their guide [...]. To sum up, it does not make sense for us to admire equally the passages in Thucydides which lack clarity and those which possess clarity in addition to his other virtues; for it must be admitted that perfection is better than imperfection, and clarity is better than obscurity. What reasoning, therefore, has led some of us to praise Thucydides' style as a whole, and to insist on asserting that he wrote his history for his contemporaries, and that the language in which it was written was familiar and comprehensible to all of them, but that he took no thought for us, his future readers; while others of us banish all his work from our law-courts and assemblies as being worthless, instead of agreeing that the narrative portions of it, except for very few passages, deserve to be admired and used for every sort of purpose, while the speeches, though they are not all suitable for imitation, contain a good proportion of passages which all men can easily understand, though they cannot all compose in the same style? I could have written an essay on Thucydides which would have given you more pleasure than this one does, my good Quintus Aelius Tubero, but not one which was more in accordance with the facts.[14]

12 *On Thucydides*, *The Second Letter to Ammaeus,* and *The Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*. In the last one a section of Dionysius' lost treatise *On imitation* (περὶ μιμήσεως) has been reproduced.

13 D.H. *Th.* 2.2.

14 Transl. Usher.

However relevant they may be, Cicero's and Dionysius' respective concerns apparently failed to convince the Thucydidean Atticists. As a matter of fact, the existence of a passionate *imitatio Thucydidis* in the specific context of eloquence is still attested in the first decades of the Empire. Let us briefly consider three examples, starting with a short epigram from the *Catalepton* generally assumed to belong to the Augustan period (Verg. *Cat*. 2):[15]

> Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
> iste, iste rhetor, †namque hactenus† totus
> Thucydides, tyrannus Atticae febris,
> *thau* Gallicum, *min* et *sphin* ut male illisit,
> ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.
>
> That lover of Corinthian words,
> that…that 'rhetor', Thucydides all complete,
> a tyrant with an Attic fever,
> look how bad he smashed to pieces the Gallic tau and min and sphin,
> and that is for his brother he mixed this way all these words![16]

This epigram mocks Annius Cimber, an Atticising *rhetor* known for his obscure style and abusive use of outdated words.[17] Interestingly he is here depicted as a passionate imitator of Thucydides (cf. *totus Thucydides*). From Latin texts, the first lines of Petronius' *Satyricon*, are also worth recalling (Petr. 2.6 – 8):

> Pace uestra liceat dixisse, primi omnium eloquentiam perdidistis. leuibus enim atque inanibus sonis ludibria quaedam excitando, effecistis ut corpus orationis eneruaretur et caderet. nondum iuuenes declamationibus continebantur, cum Sophocles aut Euripides inuenerunt uerba quibus deberent loqui. nondum umbraticus doctor ingenia deleuerat, cum Pindarus nouemque lyrici Homericis uersibus canere timuerunt. et ne poetas quidem ad testimonium citem, certe neque Platona neque Demosthenen ad hoc genus exercitationis accessisse uideo. grandis et, ut ita dicam, pudica oratio non est maculosa nec turgida, sed naturali pulchritudine exsurgit. nuper uentosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigrauit animosque iuuenum ad magna surgentes ueluti pestilenti quodam sidere adflauit, semelque corrupta regula eloquentia stetit et obmutuit. ad summam, quis postea Thucydidis, quis Hyperidis ad famam processit? ac ne carmen quidem sani coloris enituit, sed omnia quasi eodem cibo pasta non potuerunt usque ad senectutem canescere.
>
> With your permission I must tell you the truth, that you teachers more than anyone have been the ruin of true eloquence. Your tripping, empty tones stimulate certain absurd effects into being, with the result that the substance of your speech languishes and dies. In the age when Sophocles or Euripides found the inevitable word for their verse, young men were not yet being confined to set speeches. When Pindar and the nine lyric poets were too modest to use

15 On this, see Iodice Di Martino 2002, 345 – 348.

16 I follow Iodice Di Martino's text (Iodice Di Martino 2002, 345 – 348).

17 See, for example, Suet. *Aug*. 86. Quintilian quotes this epigram in order to prevent his reader from falling prey to all kinds of excessive sophistication and abusive use of archaic words (Quint. *Inst*. 8.3.27).

> Homer's lines, no cloistered pedant had yet ruined young men's brains. I need not go to the poets for evidence. I certainly do not find that Plato or Demosthenes took any course of training of this kind. Great style, which, if I may say so, is also modest style, is never blotchy and bloated. It rises supreme by virtue of its natural beauty. Your flatulent and formless flow of words is a modern immigrant from Asia to Athens. Its breath fell upon the mind of ambitious youth like the influence of a baleful planet, and when the old tradition was once broken, eloquence halted and grew dumb. In a word, who after this came to equal the splendour of Thucydides or Hyperides? Even poetry did not glow with the colour of health, but the whole art, nourished on one universal diet, lacked the vigour to reach the grey hairs of old age.[18]

Here the narrator attacks Asianists who, according to him, have killed eloquence. He speaks himself in favor of an Atticism exemplified by Plato, Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Thucydides!

Last but not least, it is no coincidence either that "rhetorical" anecdotes start to become more widespread in the historian's biographical tradition from the reign of Augustus onwards. Caecilius of Calacte, for example, inferred from Thucydides' good opinion about Antiphon that he used to be his disciple, as if it had become a necessity, at the beginning of the Roman Empire, to transform Thucydides into an Attic orator (T32):

> Καικίλος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ συντάγματι Θουκυδίδου τοῦ συγγραφέως καθηγητὴν *τεκμαίρεται* γεγονέναι ἐξ' ὧν ἐπαινεῖται παρ' αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀντιφῶν.
>
> Caecilius, in his treatise about him [i.e. Antiphon], *deduced* that he used to be the teacher of the historian Thucydides from the way Antiphon is praised in his work.[19]

Judging from both Greek and Latin documentation, the last years of the Republic and the first decades of the Empire represent an important rhetorical turn in the reception of the historian. Thucydides' exemplarity – both in the field of oratory and historiography – is highly debated. On the one hand, there is a fervent imitation of his style, and, on the other hand, there are those who try to temper this enthusiasm by showing the historian's weaknesses, especially his stylistic obscurity. If this last tendency is more frequently documented in our sources, it should not lead us to underestimate the number of historians, orators and rhetoricians ready to stand up for Thucydides' qualities against their detractors. The author of the commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853 was doubtless one of them.

18 Transl. Heseltine.

19 Woerther 2015, 15. See also T34 (ibid.): [...] Καικίλος δὲ Θουκυδίδου τοῦ συγγραφέως καθηγητὴν γεγονέναι φησι τὸν ῥήτορα.

2 From grammar to rhetoric

We do not know much about the ancient scholarship around Thucydides. Dionysius seems to be the first to mention ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικαί, which he describes as a necessary guidance to those who seek a perfect understanding of the *History*, regardless of their familiarity with classical Greek.[20] If we refer to the famous definition that Dionysius Thrax, a grammarian active between the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, gave of his own discipline, one can have a reasonably good idea of what these Hellenistic ἐξηγήσεις may have been (D.T. 1):

> Γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστιν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβὴς κατὰ προσῳδίαν, δεύτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὕρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.
>
> Grammar is an experimental knowledge of the usages of language as generally current among poets and prose writers. It is divided into six parts: first, trained reading with due regard to prosody; second, explanation according to poetical figures; thirdly, elucidation of *glossai* and *historiai*, fourthly, discovery of etymology; fifthly, an accurate account of analogies; sixthly, criticism of poetical productions, which is the noblest part of grammatic art.[21]

Ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικαί would have provided the reader with information about the way that the text used to be read aloud (i.e. pronounced) originally, elucidations of γλῶσσαι (i.e. rare words) and ἱστορίαι (i.e. historical or cultural information that the reader needs to know in order to understand properly the content of the text) and etymologies. They would also have clarified not only difficult forms by replacing them with their grammatical paradigm, but also longer passages by identifying a trope or a figure of speech and then by reformulating it. In other words, ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικαί were mostly intended to help the reader in his understanding of Thucydides' difficult Attic prose. They were certainly not primarily interested in the historian as a stylistic paradigm for imitation.

When talking about ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικαί, Dionysius may have in mind some kind of grammatical ὑπόμνημα, particularly given that he probably used one to write the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*.[22] A comparison of *P.Oxy.* 853 with the Byzantine scholia tends to confirm that such a ὑπόμνημα did exist in the Roman world by the time our commentary was written, being probably its main source.

20 D.H. *Th.* 51.1 and 55.2.

21 Transl. Davidson (modified).

22 See Usener 1889 and, more recently, de Jonge 2008.

P.Oxy. 853 provides us with 104 lemmata of which 10 have lost their comments.[23] Therefore, our comparison with the scholia involves the 94 remaining lemmata for which comments have been preserved. Following Voltz's first intuitions,[24] I have compared these notes with the scholia of the seven oldest manuscripts of the *History* (dating back to the 10th-12th centuries), which all belong to the same textual tradition, called Θ.[25] The lexical parallels that I have been able to identify are listed in *Appendix* 1. It turns out that 25 comments – out of 94 – match the Θ Scholia (i.e. 23.5%). It is remarkable that most of these parallels (22) deal with the same passage of the *History*. Given that a thousand years stand between the two corpora, these connections are too striking to be a mere coincidence. It has been convincingly demonstrated by Voltz and Luschnat that the commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853 was not at the origin of the Byzantine scholia but represented rather an independent redrafting of a common source.[26] As the 25 parallels deal with ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικαί, we can reasonably assume that our Hellenistic source was a grammatical commentary.

We must now try to characterize the specificity of the commentary displayed in *P.Oxy.* 853 with respect to this Hellenistic ὑπόμνημα by emphasizing the discrepancies that exist between the two of them. Focusing more precisely on two significant examples, I will first consider their respective approach to speeches, especially Pericles' Funeral Oration (Th. 2.35–46), and then I will examine a defense of Thucydides' οἰκονομία which is unparalleled in the Thucydidean scholarship and represents the greatest specific detail of *P.Oxy.* 853.

2.1 The notes on Pericles' Funeral Oration

I shall first specify that most of the parallels between *P.Oxy.* 853 and the Θ scholia are to be found in connection with the narrative sections of the *History* (17 cases).[27] This number drops when it comes to speeches (8 cases).[28] I believe that this reflects different attitudes towards the speeches. As a matter of fact, the few parallels to be found in connection with these speeches – namely Archidamos' speech before the first invasion in Attica (Th. 2.11) and Pericles' Funeral Oration (Th. 2.35–46) –, however

23 Lemmata without comment: Comm. Th. 2.8.2; 13.5b; 24.1; 40.5; extremely corrupted comments: Comm. Th. 2.2.1c; 14.1; 19.2b; 35.3; 40.3; 45.2a.

24 Cf. Voltz 1911, 37–42; see also Maehler 2007, 587–589.

25 On this textual tradition, see Kleinlogel 1965, 143–172; Alberti 1972, XL-LIII.

26 Cf. Voltz 1911, 37–42; Luschnat 1954, 25–29. Among other proofs, there are some cases (as we shall see) where Θ scholia convey more material than *P.Oxy.* 853. Note also that both scholars disagree on the nature of this common source: Voltz, who is very much influenced by Schwabe's thesis (see Schwabe 1881), favors the hypothesis of lexicographical works, whereas Luschnat supports the idea of a grammatical set of glosses on Thucydides.

27 Comm. Th. 2.2.4b; 2.3.3; 2.4.3; 2.4.7; 2.5.5; 2.8.1–2; 2.13.2c; 2.13.7b; 2.15.5a; 2.16.1a; 2.18.5a; 2.20.3b; 2.21.1; 2.21.3a; 2.22.2ab; 2.22.3.

28 Comm. Th. 2.11.9a; 2.35.2c; 2.37.1b; 2.37.2a; 2.37.3b; 2.8.1a; 2.39.1a; 2.39.4.

scarce they may be, can help us to understand how the Hellenistic grammatical ὑπόμνημα used to comment on the speeches, and to what extent our commentator deviated from it.

Pericles' Funeral Oration (Th. 2.35 – 46) is a famous eulogy of Athens but can also be read as a disguised criticism of Sparta. Both our commentary and the Θ scholia were aware of this "double entente", which culminates in ch. 39, when Pericles explicitly alludes to the Lacedaemonians (Th. 2.39.2):

Table 1

P.Oxy. 853	Θ Scholia (Hude)
NO MATCH	**Schol. Th. 2.37.1 τοὺς τῶν πέλας νόμους:** αἰνίττεται τοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, οὓς Λυκοῦργος ἔγραψε, μιμησάμενος τοὺς Κρητῶν καὶ Αἰγυπτίων νόμους ABFGc2 καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τὰ πλείω πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους (rec); **Schol. Th. 2.37.1 ὄνομα μέν …:** ἐπειδὴ φαῦλον δοκεῖ ἡ δημοκρατία καὶ ἐώρα τοὺς Λάκωνας σεμνυνομένους ἐπὶ τῇ ἀριστοκρατίᾳ, ἐπάγει λέγων ὅτι τῷ μὲν ὀνόματι δημοκρατία, τῷ δὲ ἔργῳ ἀριστοκρατία ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἡ πολιτεία ABFGc2 **Schol. Th. 2.37.1 οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους:** τοῦτο λέγει διὰ τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας βασιλεῖς τῶν Λακώνων, οἵτινες ἀπὸ μέρους ἦρχον διὰ μόνην τὴν εὐγένειαν, κἂν μὴ εἶχον ἀρετήν ABFGc2 **Schol. Th. 2.37.2 λυπηρὰς δὲ τῇ ὄψει ἀχθηδόνας:** τοῦτο λέγει, ἐπειδή ποτε οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, Ἀλκαμένη ἐν προαστείῳ θεασάμενοι μετεωρίζοντα, κακῶς ἐχρήσαντο. οἱ γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι σκυθρωποί εἰσι, διὰ παντὸς ἐπιείκειαν ὑποκρινόμενοι, καὶ τοὺς ἁβροτέρους κολάζουσι τὸ γὰρ τερπνὸν τοῦ βίου κώλυμα νομίζουσι τῶν ἀναγκαίων ABFGc2 **Schol. Th. 2.37.2 ἀνεπαχθῶς δέ …:** ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους αἰνίττεται ABFc2 **Schol. Th. 2.37.3 ἀνεπαχθῶς δέ …:** ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους αἰνίττεται ABFc2 **Schol. Th. 2.38.1 τὸ λυπηρόν:** αἰνίττεται πρὸς τοὺς ταπεινοὺς καὶ εὐτελεῖς Λακεδαιμονίους ABFGc2
Comm. Th. 2.39.1a τήν τε γὰρ [πό]λιν κοινὴν παρέχομεν: ἀκ-[ροβο]λίζει Λακεδαιμονίους.	**Schol. Th. 2.39.1 τῶν ἐναντίων:** τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ABFGc2 **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 ξενηλασίαις:** ὥσπερ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ABFGc2 **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 καὶ ἀπάταις:** πάλιν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, οἵτινες ἀπάτῃ τὸ πλέον καὶ γοητείᾳ γνώμης ἐκράτουν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ABFc2 **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες:** καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ἡλικίας εἰς τὰ πολέμια ἠὐτρεπίζοντο· καὶ εὐθὺς ὡς ἐτίκτετο τὸ παιδίον, ἐν ἀσπίδι ἐτίθεσαν αὐτὸ καὶ δόρυ πλησίον, καὶ ἐβόων ἢ τὰν ἢ ’πὶ τὰν, τουτέστιν, ἢ ταῦτα σῶσον, ἢ μετ’ αὐτῶν ἀναιρέθητι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ οὕτως ἐπιπόνως ἤσκουν, ὡς μηδὲ λουτρῶν ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἀρκεῖσθαι τῷ Εὐρώτᾳ ποταμῷ πρὸς τὸ λούσασθαι. ἀμέλει καὶ διαμαστιγώσεις ἐγίνοντο

Table 1 *(Continued)*

P.Oxy. 853	Θ Scholia (Hude)
	κατά τινα καιρόν, ἐν αἷς οἱ πλείονας ἐνεγκόντες ἀνδρειότεροι ἐνομίζοντο ABFGc2
Comm. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ [ῥᾳθ]υμίᾳ … φαίν[εσθα]ι: καίτοι ε[ἰ] ἐν ἀνέσει μᾶλλον [καὶ ῥ]ᾳστώνῃ ζῶμεν μὴ κακ[οπα]θοῦντες τῇ ἀσκήσει μηδ' ὑπὸ νόμων ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτο[ν] ἀνδρείαν ὑπο[φέροντες] τοὺς κινδύνους, [περ]ιέστ[αι ἡμᾶς πρ]ὸ τῶν δεινῶν [μὴ ταλαιπωρεῖσθ]αι καὶ ἐς τοὺς κιν[δύνους ἀπαντήσ]αντας μὴ ἀνανδ[ρ]οτ[έ]ρους τῶν αἰεὶ κακοπαθούντων φαίνεσθαι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Λάκωνες αἰεὶ πονεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων ἠναγκάζοντο, οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι παρὰ τοὺς κινδύνους ἐπονοῦντο.	**Schol. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ ῥᾳθυμίᾳ …:** πάντα συνάγει τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ὥσπερ ἀνάμνησιν αὐτῶν ποιεῖται ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος. αἰνίττεται δὲ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ABFGc2
NO MATCH	**Schol. 2.40.2 ἔνι τε τοῖς αὐτοῖς …:** οἷον τοῖς δημιουργοῖς καὶ γεωργοῖς καὶ κυνηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἰδιώταις καὶ χειροτέχναις. τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, ἐπειδὴ ὀλίγοι ἦσαν αὐτῶν οἱ τὰ πολιτικὰ σκοποῦντες, οἱ δὲ τὰ πολέμια πάντες ABFGc2

The Θ scholia provide us with much more material than *P.Oxy.* 853. The 13 comments are all grammatical in nature and provide the reader with cultural information about the Spartans (what Dionysius Thrax calls ἱστορίαι), or otherwise serve the purpose of making some hints more explicit, αἰνίττεται being the ordinary way to identify the trope of αἴνιγμα. Given the two parallels with *P.Oxy.* 853, we may assume that the Θ scholia listed above derive from their common Hellenistic source and reflect (to some extent) its exegetical work on the Funeral Oration.[29]

It appears from this comparison that our commentator – unlike his Hellenistic source – was not primarily concerned with providing grammatical ἐξηγήσεις such as ἱστορίαι to his reader, at least when he was commenting on a speech.[30] As I said before, grammatical comments on the Funeral Oration (but also on the speech of Archidamos) are very scarce and also very brief. In the present case, what we have

29 The second parallel (about Th. 2.39.4: καίτοι εἰ [ῥᾳθ]υμίᾳ …) suggests that the original comment has been summarized to the extreme in the scholia, and is better preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853.

30 Elucidations of ἱστορίαι are frequent in connection with narrative sections.

instead consists in a title – ἐπιτά]φιος[31] – followed by 20 meticulous paraphrases of Thucydides' text (out of 27 notes).[32] Here is a short sample of these reformulations:

> Comm. Th. 2.35.1 *[καὶ μὴ ἐν ἑνὶ ἀν]δρὶ πολλῶν ἀρετὰς [κινδυνεύεσθαι] εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰ[πόντι πιστευθῆναι*: καὶ μὴ ἐν ἑνὶ [ἀνδρὶ . . . τ]οσού[των ἀνδρῶν] ἀπο[θανόντω]ν τὰς ἀρετὰς κινδυνε[ύειν εὖ εἰ]πόντι καὶ κακῶς τοιου[τοτρόπου]ς πιστεύεσθαι ὡς ἂν [οὗτος ε]ἴπῃ.
>
> [2]τ]οσού[των ἀνδρῶν] Grenfell / Hunt | [2]Wilamowitz : [εἶναι τῶν] ἀποθανόντων | [3]κίνδυνο[ς γάρ Wilamowitz κινδυνε[ύειν vel κινδυνε[ύε]σθαι Grenfell / Hunt.
>
> *... and not that the valour of many [men] should be risked on one man to be believed, whether he spoke well or badly*[33]: and not to risk on one man ... the virtues of so many dead men, whether he spoke well or badly, and to believe all the sorts of things that this man would say.
>
> Comm. Th. 2.37.1b *μέτε[σ]τι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν ὡς ἕκαστος ἔν τῳ εὐδοκιμεῖ οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλέο[ν*: διάφορά νυν τὰ διαφέροντα· μ[ε]τέχουσι δὲ πάντες κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις συμβολαί[οι]ς ἰσηγορίας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν ὡς ἔν τινι ἔκ[α]στος λαμπρὸς νομίζεται ἐν το[ῖ]ς κοινοῖς, οὐ κατὰ τὸ μέρος τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἴσον αὐτῷ τῆς π[ολ]ιτείας πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τ[ι]μᾶται ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴ[ν ἢ ἐκ τ]ῶν [ἀ]ρετῶν οι[.] . κ[. . . .]ε . [. . . . .]νταξιν [. . . . .] ἕκαστος [. . . . . τῶ]ν νόμων [. . . . .]ι ἀρετὴ [. . . . .]ς.
>
> [6]οἶ[δ]ε κ[αταν]εμ[ηθησομένη]ν <τὴν> τάξιν [αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ πολιτείαι] ἕκαστος Bury.
>
> *as regards the law all men have a share equally when it comes to their private disputes, but as regards the value that each man holds in a certain respect, it is not greatly from [a particular] class* ...: 'disagreements', then 'points of disagreement'. As regards the law, all men have a share in equality of speech in their private covenants, and, as regards their dignity, as each man is considered to be illustrious in something related to public affairs, he is not honoured by the community according to the equal part of civil rights he inherited, but because of [his] virtue or from the virtues ...
>
> Comm. Th. 2.37.3a *ἀνεπα[χθῶ]ς δὲ τὰ ἴδια προσομιλοῦντες τὰ δ[ημ]όσια διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομ[οῦ]μεν*: ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἁπλ[ούστερον [ἀλλ]ήλοις συνόντες ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς [εὐλ]αβῶς καὶ νομίμως πολιτευό[με]θα.
>
> *But while we thus avoid giving offence in our private intercourse, in our public life it is chiefly through fear that we do not deviate from the law*: while in our private life, we are quite straightforward with each other, in our public life, we behave cautiously and in keeping with law.
>
> Comm. Th. 2.40.1a *πλούτῳ τε ἔργου μᾶλλον καιρῷ ἢ λόγου κόμπῳ χρώμεθα*: ὁ πλοῦτος ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἔ[ργ]ων ἐν καιρῷ φαίνεται, οὐ λόγω[ν ἀλα]ζονείᾳ λέγομεν πλουτεῖν.[34]
>
> *Wealth we treat rather as an opportunity for action than as a subject for boasting*: our wealth, when it comes to actions, appears at the right moment, we do not say that we are wealthy out of verbal chicanery.

31 Comm. Th. 2.35.

32 Comm. Th. 2.35.1; Comm. Th. 2.35.2bc; Comm. Th. 2.35.3; Comm. Th. 2.36.3; Comm. Th. 2.37.1ab; Comm. Th. 2.37.2ab; Comm. Th. 2.37.3ab; Comm. Th. 2.39.4; Comm. Th. 2.40.1ab; Comm. Th. 2.40.2ab; Comm. Th. 2.40.3; Comm. Th. 2.41.1; Comm. Th. 2.41.3a; Comm. Th. 2.45.2b. These paraphrases are very different from those which one can find in the Θ scholia. From this angle, the two corpora seem to have proceeded independently from their source.

33 All translations are my own.

34 The text of *P.Oxy.* 853 is based upon my own reading of the papyrus.

Why did paraphrases seem more important to him than the Lacedaemonian *realia?* Like tropes and figures, paraphrases are, to some extent, at a crossroads between grammar and rhetoric, between ἐξήγησις and μίμησις. They undoubtedly provide the reader with an alternative text that is easier to understand. Under the Early Empire, however, paraphrases were mainly school exercises that a student had to practice while learning eloquence. They were part of the assignments of a *rhetor*, and were closely related to the rhetorical notion of μίμησις (or *imitatio*). In theoretical texts, paraphrases were frequently used by rhetoricians to underline the qualities or defects of a classical author.[35] Interestingly, Aelius Theon (1st century) dedicated a specific chapter of his *Progymnasmata* to paraphrases – μεταθέσεις in Greek –, and recommends that student reformulate a speech by Lysias in order to make it more resemble a speech by Demosthenes. The idea is for the student to become more familiar with the Attic dialect by offering an alternative Attic text that can exist beside the original. He also argues that Demosthenes occasionally paraphrased Thucydides himself, which suggests that the speeches of the historian used to be taken as good examples of Attic oratory and were paraphrased at school at the same time that our commentary was composed![36]

The paraphrases displayed in *P.Oxy.* 853 perfectly illustrate the exercises documented in Theon's manual. If they undoubtedly make the speeches easier to read, they also provide the reader with an alternative Attic formulation of the same content. Being simple and clear both in terms of vocabulary and syntax, they try to reproduce the style and language of the Attic orators, and may therefore represent a set of examples that are to be used in the schools of rhetoric. The fact that *P.Oxy.* 853's paraphrases massively prevail over γραμματικαὶ ἐξηγήσεις among the notes concerned with the speeches (while being, on the other hand, utterly marginal when it comes to the narrative sections) is another argument in favor of their rhetorical nature. The prevalence of μεταθέσεις over γραμματικαὶ ἐξηγήσεις in the notes regarding the speeches commented on in *P.Oxy.* 853 exemplifies Thucydides' rhetorical reception during the Early Roman Empire, and denotes the impact of Thucydides' new readership on the development of scholarly works about the *History*. Since this readership became more and more interested in the historian from a rhetorical perspective, the Thucydidean scholarship, by paying particular attention to the speeches, more and more reflected a rhetorical approach of the *History*, accomplishing a progressive shift from ἐξήγησις to μίμησις.

35 To take only one example, Dionysius himself resorts to μεταθέσεις in three different kinds of situation: (1) most of the time, he uses them to correct what he considers to be wrong in the original text; (2) in his treatise *On Composition*, by contrast, he wants to emphasize the virtues of the original; and (3) lastly in his later works, his paraphrases consist in providing "a text that is neither preferable nor inferior to the original, but [which] offers an alternative that can exist beside the original"(see de Jonge 2008, 366 – 390). One might be tempted to be more specific and talk rather of an Attic alternative. This last type of μετάθεσις corresponds to the exercise that Aelius recommends.

36 Theon *Prog.* 139.21 – 142.10.

2.2 A defense of Thucydides' οἰκονομία against Dionysius of Halicarnassus

The clearest example of this new rhetoricized perspective (i.e. one which looks at Thucydides as an author to imitate, not only as an author to explain) is certainly to be found in a very long note commenting on Th. 2.1:

> Ἄρχεται δὲ ὁ πόλεμος ἐνθένδε ἤδη Ἀθηναίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων καὶ τῶν ἑκατέροις ξυμμάχων, ἐν ᾧ οὔτε ἐπεμείγνυντο ἔτι ἀκηρυκτεὶ παρ' ἀλλήλους καταστάντες τε ξυνεχῶς ἐπολέμουν· γέγραπται δὲ ἑξῆς ὡς ἕκαστα ἐγίγνετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα.
>
> At this point in my narrative begins the account of the actual warfare between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians and their respective allies. When it continued, they ceased having communication with one another except through heralds, and once they were at war they waged it without intermission. The events of the war have been recorded in the order of their occurrence, summer by summer and winter by winter.[37]

The note is attached to the lemma γέγραπται δὲ ἑξῆς ὡς ἕκαστα ἐγίγνετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα (the reader will find a translation of the whole text in *Appendix* 2).[38] It offers a detailed refutation of some criticisms formulated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise *On Thucydides*.[39] Summarized at the beginning of the note, these are all related to the οἰκονομία of the *History* (i.e. the way Thucydides organized his own narrative), and they all deal more precisely with its διαίρεσις (*divisio*, "division") and τάξις (*dispositio*, "arrangement").[40] Indeed, the discussion focuses on three main points: (1) the division by summers and winters; (2) the fragmentation of episodes covering more than a year of war; and (3) the τάξις of Book 1.

This refutation of Dionysius is isolated among the extant scholarship on Thucydides of the Roman period. It is generally assumed that it was written by the author of our commentary,[41] but, on my verdict, given that he proceeds (at least partly) by compilation, one cannot rule out the possibility that we are dealing here with an excerpt from a lost rhetorical treatise. Regardless of the hypothesis one would like to favor, the note still reflects the commentator's own view on Thucydides' exemplarity.

To offer a detailed analysis of every aspect of this note would lead me far beyond the scope of this paper. I will rather then focus on some salient features of the text. Following the three points discussed, I will first examine how the commentator summarized Dionysius' statements (and whether he did so faithfully or not); then I will analyze the way he disproved of his adversary (what arguments did he use? What

37 Transl. Forster Smith.

38 Comm. Th. 2.1c.

39 It is, as far as I know, the first mention of this treatise in ancient texts. On Lucius Annaeus Cornutus (2nd century AD), one of the first rhetoricians who quotes Dionysius of Halicarnassus as an authority, see Voltz 1911, 57.

40 D.H. *Th.* 9–11.

41 Cf. Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 111–112; Voltz 1911, 57–58; Luschnat 1954, 28.

kind of rhetorical techniques did he resort to?). It will appear that our commentator offers a formally perfect διάλυσις ("refutation") of Dionysius' view, although it is based upon an uneven summary of his statements, and that he tries to re-categorize Dionysius' own words and arguments in order to turn them against him, in the style of rhetorical antilogy. Moreover, even if the commentator's familiarity with the treatise *On Thucydides* goes without saying, I will argue that his *refutatio* also exhibits a comprehensive knowledge of the comparison between Herodotus and Thucydides displayed in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*.[42]

2.2.1 The division by summers and winters

Dionysius first criticized the historians' διαίρεσις by summers and winters. He could not understand why Thucydides did not follow his predecessors, who divided their narrative either κατὰ τόπους (like Herodotus and Hellanicus) or κατὰ χρόνους, "which the local historians had preferred, dividing their records according to the accession of kings or priests, or by the periods of the Olympiads, or by the appointment of civil magistrates to annual office". As he writes at greater length (D.H. *Th.* 9.2–4):

> Ἄρξομαι δ' ἀπὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως, προειπὼν ὅτι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων συγγραφέων ἢ κατὰ τόπους μεριζόντων τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ κατὰ χρόνους εὐπαρακολουθήτους ἐκεῖνος οὐδετέραν τούτων τῶν διαιρέσεων ἐδοκίμασεν. οὔτε γὰρ τοῖς τόποις, ἐν οἷς αἱ πράξεις ἐπετελέσθησαν, ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε τὰς διηγήσεις, ὡς Ἡρόδοτός τε καὶ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἐποίησαν· οὔτε τοῖς χρόνοις, ὡς οἱ τὴν τοπικὴν ἐκδόντες ἱστορίαν προείλοντο, ἤτοι ταῖς διαδοχαῖς τῶν βασιλέων μερίζοντες τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ ταῖς τῶν ἱερέων ἢ ταῖς περιόδοις τῶν ὀλυμπιάδων ἢ τοῖς ἀποδεικνυμένοις ἄρχουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐνιαυσίους ἀρχάς. καινὴν δέ τινα καὶ ἀτριβῆ τοῖς ἄλλοις πορευθῆναι βουληθεὶς ὁδὸν θερείαις καὶ χειμερίοις ὥραις ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε τὴν ἱστορίαν. ἐκ δὲ τούτου συμβέβηκεν αὐτῷ τοὐναντίον ἢ προσεδόκησεν. οὐ γὰρ σαφεστέρα γέγονεν ἡ διαίρεσις τῶν χρόνων ἀλλὰ δυσπαρακολουθητοτέρα.
>
> I shall begin with division and state by way of introduction that whilst the writers that preceded Thucydides adopted either topographical or chronological subdivisions that were easily followed, Thucydides did not see fit to adopt either of these divisions. In the division of his work he was guided neither by the places in which the events narrated took place, as were Herodotus and Hellanicus and some others of his predecessors, nor by the times after the manner chosen by those who published local histories, who determined their subdivisions by kingly or priestly successions, or by Olympiads, or by the appointees to annual offices. But Thucydides chose to follow a new path and one that had not been trodden by others, and divided his work by events of summers and winters. The effect of this was different from what he had expected. The chronological division has not become clearer, but it is more difficult to follow.[43]

42 D.H. *Pomp.* 3.2–21.

43 Transl. Pritchett.

In *P.Oxy.* 853, this passage was drastically simplified:

> Διονύσιος [ὁ] Ἁλικαρνασσεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ Θουκυδίδ[ου] συντάγματι περὶ οὐ πολλῶν μ[έ]μφεται τὸν Θουκυδίδην, τὰ δ' ἀν[ω]τάτω τρία κεφάλαια διέξεισιν, ὅ[τι] τε οὐκ ἄρχοντας καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα[ς ὡ]ς οἱ λοιποὶ προτέθεικε τῶν χ[ρόνω]ν ἀλλ' ἰδίως θέρη καὶ χει[μῶν]ας [...].
>
> Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise on Thucydides blames Thucydides on a few grounds, and discusses three chief points: first, that he has not fixed his dates by archons and Olympiads, like other historians, but according to a system of his own by summers and winters [...].[44]

The Dionysian distinction between a διαίρεσις κατὰ τόπους (to be found in Herodotus and Hellanicus) and another one κατὰ χρόνους (distinctive of local histories) was eliminated, and only the divisions by archons and Olympiads (which are only two examples among others of divisions κατὰ χρόνους in Dionysius' text) are preserved. In so doing, the commentator slightly distorted Dionysius' original statement: if the rhetorician certainly disapproved of Thucydides' division by summers and winters, he never wrote that he should have preferred Olympiads or archons in particular.

The commentator probably chose to focus on these two divisions because of their significance to several inconsistencies that he perceived in Dionysius' criticism of Thucydides' οἰκονομία (see below). First of all, these διαιρέσεις by archons and Olympiads were apparently not in use by the time Thucydides wrote his *History* (1), nor did a common system of calculation exist (2):

> Εἰκότως δ' ἄν τις πρὸς αὐτὸν προπετῶς οὕτως [μεμφόμενον ἀντεγκαλέ]σε[ι]εν [ὅ]τι. . . . . τοσο . . . . . ε . . τ . . . . . τῶν πραγμάτων σ . . . . . ν λογισμὸν ὃς καὶ α . . . . . νος παρέδωκεν ε . . . . . αν. ἡ γὰρ κατὰ ἄρχ[οντας διαίρεσις] καὶ κατ' Ὀλυμπιάδ[ας οὔπω ἐγεγόνει] ἐν πλάτει καὶ οὐ κ[οινὸς λογισμὸς ἦ]ν.
>
> In opposition to this rash criticism one might reasonably retort that [...]. Indeed, the division by archons and Olympiads had not yet come into common use, and there was not a common system of calculation.

Dionysius says that ancient historians (both prior and contemporary to Thucydides) used the division by Olympiads or archons in their local histories. The commentator argues the opposite. Given all that is lost from Classical Greek historiography, this dispute seems to be unverifiable. One can only observe that neither Herodotus, Thucydides nor Xenophon utilized them. In later historiography, however, Polybius resorts to an openly declared division by Olympiads.[45] Book 3 of his *History*, for example – which is the true beginning of his narrative –, exactly covers the four years of the 140th Olympiad (i.e. 220 – 216 BCE). As for the division by archons, one might think of Diodorus, who used it in his books dedicated to Classical Greece, but it is

44 Grenfell / Hunt's translation. See *Appendix* 2.

45 Plb. 3.1.11.

very likely that he was not the first to resort to this form of chronological narrative division.

As regards a common system of calculation, Thucydides' own narrative clearly suggests that there was no κοινὸς λογισμός in his own time. In Book 2, the historian uses no less than five different strategies of dating to locate the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (431 BCE) (2.2.1):

> Τέσσαρα μὲν γὰρ καὶ δέκα ἔτη ἐνέμειναν αἱ τριακοντούτεις σπονδαὶ αἳ ἐγένοντο μετ' Εὐβοίας ἅλωσιν· τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει, ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἄργει τότε πεντήκοντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης καὶ Αἰνησίου ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ Πυθοδώρου ἔτι τέσσαρας μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτειδαίᾳ μάχην μηνὶ ἕκτῳ καὶ ἅμα ἦρι ἀρχομένῳ Θηβαίων ἄνδρες ὀλίγῳ πλείους τριακοσίων (ἦγον δὲ αὐτῶν βοιωταρχοῦντες Πυθάγγελός τε ὁ Φυλείδου καὶ Διέμπορος ὁ Ὀνητορίδου) ἐσῆλθον περὶ πρῶτον ὕπνον ξὺν ὅπλοις ἐς Πλάταιαν τῆς Βοιωτίας οὖσαν Ἀθηναίων ξυμμαχίδα.
>
> For fourteen years the thirty years' truce which had been concluded after the capture of Euboea remained unbroken; but in the fifteenth year, when Chrysis was in the forty-eighth year of her priesthood at Argos, and Aenesias was ephor at Sparta, and Pythodorus had still four months to serve as archon at Athens, in the sixteenth month after the battle of Potidaea, at the opening of spring, some Thebans, a little more than three hundreds in number, under the command of the Boeotarchs Pythangelus son of Phyleidas and Deimporus son of Onetoridas, about the first watch of the night entered under arms into Plataea, a town of Boeotia which was in alliance with Athens.[46]

While the truce of Euboea and the battle of Potidaea are internal chronological markers (Thucydides mentions them in Book 1), the allusions to Chrysis, priestess of Argos, Aenesias, ephor at Sparta, and Pythodorus, archon at Athens, refer to local calendars that are very similar to those Dionysius talks about. Interestingly, Thucydides did not use Olympiads. Maybe this omission confirms what the commentator says: Olympiads were not particularly in use back to Thucydides' time, at least in historiographical texts.[47]

2.2.2 The fragmentation of episodes covering more than a year of war

Dionysius' second criticism is made as a direct consequence of the division based upon seasons. As an example that signifies Thucydides' fragmentation of the narrative, Dionysius describes how the historian intertwined the crisis of Mytilene with the siege of Plataea and the Corcyrean στάσις.[48] The commentator more faithfully summarized this part of the treatise:

---

46 Transl. Forster Smith.

47 The use of chronological markers in ch. 2.2.1 is aimed at emphasizing the gravity of the moment (the beginning of the war). On that matter, see Liotsakis 2015, 285–286.

48 D.H. *Th.* 9.6–9.

Table 2

D.H. *Th.* 9.6 and 8–9	Comm. Th. 2.2.1c (*P.Oxy.* 853)
Ἐν γοῦν ᾗ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ (ταύτῃ γὰρ ἀρκεσθήσομαι μόνῃ), τὰ περὶ Μυτιληναίους ἀρξάμενος γράφειν, **πρὶν ὅλην ἐκπληρῶσαι τὴν διήγησιν**, ἐπὶ τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων ἅπεισιν ἔργα· καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτα συγκορυφώσας, τῆς Πλαταιέων μέμνηται πολιορκίας· ἀφεὶς δὲ καὶ ταύτην **ἀτελῆ**, τοῦ Μυτιληναϊκου μέμνηται πολέμου· [...] Καὶ τί δεῖ πλείω λέγειν; ὅλη γὰρ ἡ βύβλος οὕτω **συγκέκοπται** καὶ τὸ διηνεκὲς τῆς ἀπαγγελίας ἀπολώλεκε. πλανώμεθα δή, καθάπερ εἰκός, καὶ δυσκόλως τοῖς δηλουμένοις παρακολουθοῦμεν, ταραττομένης **ἐν τῷ διασπᾶσθαι τὰ πράγματα** τῆς διανοίας καὶ τὰς ἡμιτελεῖς τῶν ἀκουσθέντων μνήμας οὐ ῥᾳδίως οὐδ' ἀκριβῶς ἀναφερούσης. χρὴ δὲ τὴν ἱστορικὴν πραγματείαν εἰρομένην εἶναι καὶ ἀπερίσπαστον, ἄλλως τε ἐπειδὰν περὶ πολλῶν γίνηται πραγμάτων καὶ δυσκαταμαθήτων.[49]	[...] καὶ ὅτι **διέσπακε** καὶ διή-[ρηκ]ε τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ **συγκό-[πτει] τὰ πράγματα** οὐκ ἀπα[ρ]τίζω[ν τ]ὰ[ς] περὶ ἑκάστων διηγ[ή]σεις ἀ[λλ]ὰ ἀπ' ἄλλων ἐπ' ἄλλα τρεπόμενος **πρ[ὶ]ν τελειῶσαι [...]**[50]

Here we see that he chose to keep διασπάω and συγκόπτω, two key verbs in Dionysius' text. What is more, the participial clause seems to borrow some of its vocabulary from the rhetorician's description of Book 3.[51]

The refutation of this second point is much longer but also more damaged than the previous one:

> οὐδ' ὡς Ἡρόδοτ[ος ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ α]ὐτοῦ συνεχῶς τ . . . . . κατὰ τόπο]υς ποικίλον . . . . . μον γράφω[ν . . . . .] οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ] ἐ[άσ]ας τοὺς Ἀ[θηναίους τὰ μὲν] Πλα[τ]αϊκὰ ἀπὸ [τῶν πρώτων] μέχρι τῶν ὑστάτων [εἴρειν πάν]τα, εἶτα πάλιν πάσας τὰς [ἐσ]-βολὰς τῶν Πελοποννη[σίων [ἐ]παλλήλους γράφειν, [τὰ] <δὲ> Κ[ορ]κυραϊκὰ ἐφεξῆς διαφέροντ[α] τοῖς χρόνοις. πάντα γὰρ ἂν συν[έ]χεεν ἢ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χ[ρό]νους ἀνέτρεχεν ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἑνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιρούς. καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ κατὰ ἄρχοντα<ς> ἔγραφεν, ἀνάγκη πάλιν ἦν διαιρεῖν τὰ πράγματα· ἐπ' ἄλλων γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ταῦτα ἀρχόντων συνέβαινεν· ὅταν δέ τις ἓν κεφάλαιον

49 D.H. *Th.* 9.6 and 8–9, transl. Pritchett: "In the third book (for I shall limit myself to this, needing no other) the author starts to write about the Mytileneans, but before completing the narrative passes on to Lacedaemonian affairs. Yet, without bringing these to a head, he mentions the siege of Plataea. Leaving this also unfinished, he speaks of the Mytilenean war. [...] But what need is there of saying more? The whole book has thus been chopped up into small bits and has lost the continuity of the narrative. We lose our way, as is natural, and it is hard for us to follow the narrative, our mind being confused by the tearing asunder of the events, and being unable easily and exactly to remember the half-finished reports it has heard. The events narrated in an historical treatise must follow without interruption, especially when the events are many in number and hard to follow."

50 "that he has disturbed and divided the narrative and breaks up the events, not completing his accounts of the several incidents, but turning from one subject to another before he has finished with it".

51 See also D.H. *Pomp.* 3.14, where Dionysius says that Herodotus, contrary to Thucydides, οὐ διέσπασε τὴν διήγησιν.

γράφῃ, μόνον συνεχῶς εἴρει. ἑαυτῷ οὖν ἐ<ν>αντία λέγει ὁ Διονύσιος· καὶ γὰρ εἰ κατ' ἄρχοντας ἔδει γράφειν ὥς φησιν, ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν διαιρεῖν τὰ π[ρ]άγματα ἀκολούθ[ως τοῖς ἄρχ]ουσιν. [ἐ]άν γέ τοι συνείρῃ [τὰ πράγματ]α καὶ [μ]ὴ κωλύωσιν οἱ χρ[όνοι ἐφεξ]ῆς [ὁ Θου]κυδίδη[ς] διηγε[ῖται, οἷον . ι . . . . . τῇ ζ′ συν[εχῶς τὰ Σικελικὰ διηγεῖ]ται. οὐδ' εἰ τ . . . . . ροι κατο . . ι . . . . . .ικα κα[τ]οικι . . . . . [εἰς] πολλ[ὰ]ς κεφα[λὰς μεμερισμένα ἐξ]-ετάζειν. ὁ δὲ Δ[ιονύσιος . . . . .] ἔξωθεν παραβα . . . . . μεταβάσεις μεταξ[ὺ τῶν [πρασσομέν]ων οὐκ ἐπιτιμᾷ [Ἡροδότῳ . . . . .]ν προκειμένην ι′ . . . . . ν . . . . . τὰ Αἰγ[ύ]πτια καὶ Λυδ[ιακά, π . . δὲ ο . . . . . α . . ασῃ . λ . . . . . ἀκριβῶς . . . . . αχ . . . . . α.

Not even Herodotus ... in his book ... continuously ... by geographical areas ... diversified ... writing ... just like [it was impossible],[52] leaving the Athenians at the beginning of the war, to relate the Plataean affairs from first to last, and then go back to describe all the invasions of the Peloponnesians one after the other, and Corcyrean affairs continuously, differing as they did in date; for he would have thrown everything into confusion, or turned back again to periods which he had treated, in a fashion both unsuitable and unreasonable. For he was not dealing with a single subject or events at one time or one place, but with many subjects in many places and at many periods. Moreover, even if he had dated by archons, he would still have been obliged to divide the events, for these occurred some under one archon, some under another; it is when a person is only writing about a single subject that his narrative is continuous throughout. Hence Dionysius contradicts himself; for even if Thucydides ought to have dated by archons, as he asserts, he would have been equally obliged to divide events according to the archons. If however, the events are connected and the chronology offers no obstacle, Thucydides' narrative is continuous, as for instance ... in the seventh book where the Sicilian events are related continuously. Not even if ... explain ... divided into many points ... Dionysius ... doesn't blame Herodotus for his digressions in the middle of the events ... the events of Egypt and Lydia ... accurately ...

As we shall see, the commentator based his refutation on argumentative techniques which are typical of rhetorical ἀντιλογίαι, using Dionysius' own words against him. In so doing, he also demonstrates his intimate knowledge of other Dionysian treatises on Thucydides, namely the (now lost) Περὶ μιμήσεως and/or the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*.

First of all, one should notice that the whole passage is organized according to a ring-composition pattern,[53] which encapsulates in its centre the author's main point. There is thus a debilitating contradiction in Dionysius' claim:

A: First Σύγκρισις
a) Herodotus
b) Thucydides

B: Even a division by archons implies to break up the events
(καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ κατὰ ἄρχοντας ἔγραφεν, ἀνάγκη πάλιν ἦν διαιρεῖν τὰ πράγματα)

C: Hence, Dionysius contradicts himself
(ἑαυτῷ οὖν ἐ<ν>αντία λέγει ὁ Διονύσιος)

52 On the textual problems here, see Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 138.

53 For a concise introduction to ring composition, see Douglas 2007.

B: Even a division by archons implies to break up the events
(καὶ γὰρ εἰ κατ' ἄρχοντας ἔδει γράφειν ... ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν διαιρεῖν τὰ πράγματα)

A: Second Σύγκρισις
b) Thucydides
a) Herodotus

Two symmetrical comparisons between Herodotus and Thucydides frame this part of the *refutatio*. In the treatise *On Thucydides*, Dionysius barely mentions Herodotus twice.[54] In the *Περὶ μιμήσεως*, however, he formulated his conception of historiography through a comprehensive comparison (σύγκρισις) of the two historians, which is now to be found in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*. Our commentator's two συγκρίσεις doubtlessly echo Dionysius' evaluation of the two historians in these treatises. As these comparisons aim at emphasizing Thucydides' exemplarity against Herodotus (to whom Dionysius is characteristically more inclined), they are openly anti-Dionysian. The commentator used the same argumentative technique as an answer to his adversary.

Considering the words he used, some echoes ought to be mentioned. Most of them are located in the first half of the text. Table 3 lists at least some of them:

Table 3

Comm. Th. 2.2.1c (*P.Oxy.* 853)	
οὐδ' ὡς Ἡρόδοτ[ος ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ α]ὐτοῦ συνεχῶς τ . . . . . **κατὰ τόπο]υς ποικίλον** . . . . . μον γράφω[ν . . . . .] οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχὴ] ἐ[άσ]ας τοὺς Ἀ[θηναίους τὰ μὲν] Πλα[τ]αϊκὰ ἀπὸ [τῶν πρώτων] μέχρι τῶν ὑστάτων [εἴρειν πάν]τα, εἶτα πάλιν πάσας τὰς [ἐσ]βολὰς τῶν Πελοποννη[σίων [ἐ]παλλήλους γράφειν, [τὰ] <δὲ> Κ[ορ]κυραϊκὰ ἐφεξῆς διαφέροντ[α] τοῖς χρόνοις. πάντα γὰρ ἂν συν[έ]χεεν ἢ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χ[ρό]νους ἀνέτρεχεν **ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως.** οὐ γὰρ **μία ὑπόθεσις** ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἑνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ, **ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιρούς.**	Not even Herodotus ... in his book ... continuously ... by geographical areas ... diversified ... writing ... just like [it was impossible], leaving the Athenians at the beginning of the war, to relate the Plataean affairs from first to last, and then go back to describe all the invasions of the Peloponnesians one after the other, and Corcyrean affairs continuously, differing as they did in date; for he would have thrown everything into confusion, or turned back again to periods which he had treated, in a fashion both unsuitable and unreasonable. For he was not dealing with a single subject or events at one time or one place, but with many subjects in many places and at many periods.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	
– **κατὰ τόπο]υς:** ***Th.* 9.2–3:** ἄρξομαι δ' ἀπὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως, προειπὼν ὅτι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων συγγραφέων ἢ **κατὰ τόπους** μεριζόντων τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ κατὰ χρόνους εὐπαρακολουθήτους	

54 D.H. *Th.* 5.5 and 23.7.

55 "I shall begin with division and state by way of introduction that whilst the writers that preceded Thucydides adopted either topographical or chronological subdivisions that were easily followed,

Table 3 *(Continued)*

Comm. Th. 2.2.1c (*P.Oxy.* 853)
ἐκεῖνος οὐδετέραν τούτων τῶν διαιρέσεων ἐδοκίμασεν. **οὔτε** γὰρ **τοῖς τόποις**, ἐν οἷς αἱ πράξεις ἐπετελέσθησαν, ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε τὰς διηγήσεις, **ὡς Ἡρόδοτός** τε καὶ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἐποίησαν.[55]
– **ποικίλον: *Pomp.* 3.11 – 12:** Συνειδὼς γὰρ **Ἡρόδοτος**, ὅτι πᾶσα μῆκος ἔχουσα πολὺ διήγησις ἂν μὲν ἀναπαύσεις τινὰς λαμβάνῃ, τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀκροωμένων ἡδέως διατίθησιν, ἐὰν δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μένῃ πραγμάτων, κἂν τὰ μάλιστα ἐπιτυγχάνηται, λυπεῖ τὴν ἀκοὴν τῷ κόρῳ, **ποικίλην** ἐβουλήθη ποιῆσαι τὴν γραφὴν Ὁμήρου ζηλωτὴς γενόμενος.[56]
– **ἁπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως: *Th.* 10.1:** Αἰτιῶνται δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτοῦ τινες, ὡς οὔτε ἀρχὴν τῆς ἱστορίας εἰληφότος ἣν ἐχρῆν οὔτε τέλος ἐφηρμοκότος αὐτῇ **τὸ πρέπον**…[57]; ***Pomp.* 3.20:** Πασῶν ἐν λόγοις ἀρετῶν ἡ κυριωτάτη **τὸ πρέπον**· ταύτην ὁ Ἡρόδοτος ἀκριβοῖ μᾶλλον ἢ Θουκυδίδης.[58]
– **μία ὑπόθεσις: *Th.* 7.3:** Θουκυδίδῃ δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ **μίαν ὑπόθεσιν**, ᾗ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, οὐχ ἥρμοττεν ἐγκαταμίσγειν τῇ διηγήσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάτην ἁρμόττεσθαι τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων […][59]
– **ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιρούς: *Th.* 9.5:** ἐφ’ ᾧ θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, πῶς αὐτὸν ἔλαθεν, ὅτι **πολλῶν ἅμα πραγμάτων κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους γινομένων** εἰς μικρὰς κατακερματιζομένη τομὰς ἡ διήγησις οὐκ ἀπολήψεται τὸ “τηλαυγὲς φῶς” ἐκεῖνο “καὶ καθαρόν”, ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν γίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων φανερόν.[60]

As for the first (and much damaged) comparison with Herodotus, κατὰ τόπους probably alludes to Dionysius’ own classification of ancient historians according to their respective διαίρεσεις.[61] In the same passage, ποικίλον may well be a hint at the Herodotean device of ποικιλία, which Dionysius often praises, usually from a stylistic perspective, but also when he is dealing with οἰκονομία, as is shown by the excerpt

Thucydides did not see fit to adopt either of these divisions. In the division of his work he was guided neither by the places in which the events narrated took place, as were Herodotus and Hellanicus and some others of his predecessors.” (transl. Pritchett).

56 “Herodotus realised that any narrative that proceeds to a great length has a pleasant effect on the minds of its hearers provided that it contains a number of pauses, but that if it is confined to the same series of events, however successful it might otherwise be, it vexes the ears with a feeling of satiety; so he wished to give variety to his writing, thereby showing himself to be an eager admirer of Homer.” (transl. Usher).

57 “Some critics also find fault with his order (*taxis*), claiming that he has neither made a proper beginning nor brought it to a suitable close.” (transl. Pritchett).

58 “The most important of all literary qualities is propriety. Herodotus is more scrupulous about this than Thucydides.” (transl. Usher).

59 “On the other hand, it was not suitable for Thucydides, who chose just one subject in which he participated, to mix theatrical enticements with the narrative, or to practice the deceit against readers which those compilations customarily exhibited […]” (transl. Pritchett).

60 “What is a source of astonishment, is the fact that he failed to observe that ‘far-shining light’ and ‘pure’ would not light up his narrative if divided, like so much small change, into small sections, <but there would be a state of confusion> resulting from the fact that many events were occurring in many different places at the same time. This is clear from the events themselves.” (transl. Pritchett).

61 D.H. *Th.* 9.3.

from the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* mentioned in Table 3. One might also think of another passage from the same letter, where the rhetorician claims that Thucydides himself tacitly recognised the usefulness of a ποικίλον narrative (D.H. *Pomp.* 3.12):

> ἤδη δ' ὃ λέγω κἀκεῖνος ἐνεθυμήθη, ὡς ἡδὺ χρῆμα ἐν ἱστορίας γραφῇ μεταβολὴ καὶ ποικίλον, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν δύο ἢ τρισὶ τόποις ἐποίησεν, ἐπί τε τῆς Ὀδρυσῶν ἀρχῆς, δι' ἃς αἰτίας ἐγένετο μεγάλη, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ πόλεων.
>
> Even Thucydides in his day realised the truth of my contention, that change is a pleasant quality in an historical work, and gives it variety: he has had recourse to it in two or three passages, as when he is discussing the causes of the growth of the Odrysian kingdom to greatness, and again when he is describing the cities of Sicily.[62]

As Dionysius contrasts the Herodotean ποικιλία with Thucydides' monolithic and monotonous narrative in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*, and he never discusses variety from this perspective (i.e. the perspective of οἰκονομία) in the treatise *On Thucydides* (where it is involved in sections dedicated to style),[63] one might reasonably assume that our commentator used this term with the treatise *On Imitation* (or the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*) in mind, where Herodotus' οἰκονομία is better characterized than it is in other Dionysian treatises.

The three examples taken from Thucydides' *History* – the Plataean and Corcyrean affairs, and the Lacedaemonian invasions of Attica – all echo those to be found in the above mentioned description of Book 3.[64]

The use of the two adverbs ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως are a means of re-evaluating Thucydides' διαίρεσις against Dionysius, who considered it to be ἀπρεπές although he did not use the word when discussing the *History*'s division.[65] He employed it, however, in the section on τάξις.[66] According to Dionysius, Herodotus succeeded in effecting τὸ πρέπον more than Thucydides did.[67] Here again, the commentator takes a polemical stand against his adversary in rhetoric.

Interestingly, μία ὑπόθεσις appears only once in the treatise *On Thucydides,* at the beginning of the section dedicated to οἰκονομία, in a passage where Dionysius praises the way that the historian refused to focus on τὸ μυθῶδες (D.H. *Th.* 7.3):

> Θουκυδίδῃ δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν, ᾗ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, οὐχ ἥρμοττεν ἐγκαταμίσγειν τῇ διηγήσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν ἁπάτην ἁρμόττεσθαι τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων, ἣν ἐκεῖναι πεφύκασι φέρειν αἱ συντάξεις, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ὠφέλειαν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τῆς ἱστορίας δεδήλωκε [...].

62 Transl. Usher. On the Herodotean style of the Odrysian digression (2.95–101), see, most recently, Liotsakis 2016 (for further bibliography, see *ibid.*, 76–77 with nn. 13–16).
63 See, for example, D.H. *Th.* 23.7.
64 D.H. *Th.* 9.6–7.
65 See, for example, D.H. *Th.* 9.9–10.
66 D.H. *Th.* 10.1 (see above, Table 3).
67 D.H. *Pomp.* 3.20 (see above, Table 3).

> On the other hand, it was not suitable for Thucydides, who chose just one subject in which he participated, to mix theatrical enticements with the narrative, or to practice the deceit against readers which those compilations customarily exhibited, but to be useful, as he himself explained in the introduction to his history.[68]

Saying that there is no such thing as a single subject in Thucydides' *History* (cf. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἑνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ) might therefore be interpreted as another rhetorical tool used to contradict Dionysius by echoing his own words. And lastly, the words οὐδὲ ἐν ἑνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιρούς may be deliberate paraphrasings of some expressions used by Dionysius when he discussed Thucydides' διαίρεσις.

If we now try to sum up the commentator's point here, not only was it impossible, given the complexity of the subject matter – a long war with events happening in many different places at many different times –, to avoid chopping off the narrative, but also entirely irrelevant and pointless to prefer another διαίρεσις. What is more, the division by archons apparently suggested by Dionysius was ultimately doomed to exhibit the same defects as a division by summers and winters (cf. ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν διαιρεῖν). As a consequence, Dionysius' judgment is irrelevant.

As I have tried to demonstrate, our commentator's defense of the Thucydidean οἰκονομία subtly echoes Dionysian words and phrases which are directly borrowed from different passages of his treatises dealing with historiography (and not only the treatise on Thucydides, but also the comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides he found both in the treatise *On Imitation* and in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*). Those echoes have a rhetorical purpose: they are meant to turn Dionysius' arguments against him, as if the rhetorician was falling into his own trap, into the trap of his own words. This rhetorical use of echoes characterized ancient antilogies and, in general, the art of *refutatio,* as is shown by Thucydides' own speeches.[69]

The second comparison between Thucydides and Herodotus being very damaged, let us move to Dionysius' criticism of the τάξις of Book 1.

2.2.3 The organisation of Book 1

Dionysius sees in the observance of chronology one of the most important rules of historiography. As chronology reproduces the actual succession of events, it is closer to the exposure of historical truth than any other τάξις.[70] This is why he blamed Thucydides for not starting his narrative from the *Pentekontaetia*, which he claims to be the truest (and chronologically the first) cause of the war. Indeed, the historian first

68 Transl. Pritchett.

69 On paired speeches in Thucydides' *History,* see Romilly 1956, 180 – 239; Stadter 1973 (with further bibliogrpahy); Cogan 1981; Iglesias Zoido 1995.

70 D.H. *Th.* 11.1.

relates the causes "generally alleged" (Th. 1.23.6) – the Corcyrean and Potidean affairs –, which are posterior to the growth of the Athenian Empire.

Table 4

D.H. *Th.* 10.3	Comm. Th. 2.1c (*P.Oxy.* 853)
Προειπὼν γάρ, ὡς μέγιστος ἐγένετο τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πολέμων ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς χρόνου τε μήκει καὶ παθημάτων πολλῶν συντυχίαις, τελευτῶν τοῦ προοιμίου τὰς αἰτίας βούλεται πρῶτον εἰπεῖν, ἀφ' ὧν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε. διττὰς δὲ ταύτας ὑποθέμενος, **τήν** τε **ἀληθῆ** μέν, οὐκ εἰς ἅπαντας δὲ λεγομένην, *τὴν αὔξησιν τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως*, **καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἀληθῆ** μέν, ὑπὸ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων πλαττομένην, τὴν Ἀθήνηθεν ἀποσταλεῖσαν Κερκυραίοις κατὰ Κορινθίων συμμαχίαν, *οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ αὐτῷ δοκούσης τὴν ἀρχὴν πεποίηται τῆς διηγήσεως, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἑτέρας* [...][71]	καὶ ὅτι **τὴν ἀληθῆ** τοῦ πολέμου **αἰτ[ί]αν** ε‹ἰ›π{ι}ὼν ὡς σφόδρα αὐτὸς ἐξητακώς, ὅτι δι' εὐλάβειαν *τῆς ἰσχύος τῶν Ἀθηναίων* ἐπολέμησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ μὰ Δία διὰ τὰ Κορκυραϊκὰ ἢ Ποτειδαιατικὰ **καὶ τὰς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγομένας αἰτίας**, ὅμως *οὐκ ἀπὸ τούτων ὧν ἔκρινεν αὐτὸς διηγεῖται* ἐκ[ε]ῖθεν ἀρξάμενος ἀφ' οἵων πραγμάτων μετὰ τὰ Περσικὰ ηὐξήθησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, *ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς κοινὰς αἰτίας τρέπεται*.[72]

Once again, the commentator has provided a faithful summary of Dionysius' judgement. He followed the original text and even borrowed some phrases: εἰπὼν ὡς echoes προειπὼν ὡς; οὐκ ἀπό... ἀλλά... is borrowed from Dionysius, as is the phrase ἡ ἀληθῆς αἰτία. His refutation, which is partly incomplete, seems to be based upon three counter-arguments that reveal an utterly different conception of τάξις:

> Πρῶτον μὲν ῥητέον ὡς οὐκ ἔμελλε τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν προθ[έ]μενος συγγράφειν πόλεμον πλείους πολέμους ἀπὸ τῶν Περσικῶν αὐτῶν σχεδὸν ἀφ' ὧν πρώτων ηὐξήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεισάγειν ἐν προσθήκης μέρει· ἔξω γὰρ τέλεον τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐγίνετο. ἔπειτ' ἐνθυμητέον ὅτι πᾶς συγγραφεὺς ὀφείλει τὰς φανερὰς καὶ θρυλ[ο]υμένας αἰτίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν πρώτοις ἀκριβῶς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, εἰ δέ τινων ἀφανεστέρων ὑπονοεῖ τοῦτο ἐπι . . . . . σθαι ὁ δ[ὲ . . . . .]τοι κατ . . . . . καὶ πε . . . . . ἀνὰ μέσ[ον] . . . . . Ὁμηρικ[ὡς . . . . . χων α . . . . . [ἐ]πιεικῆ . . . . . συκοφ[αντ . . ..

71 "Having first stated that the Peloponnesian surpassed all previous wars in length and in the occurrence of many disasters, he desires at the close of his proem first to state the causes (*aitiai*) that led to the beginning (*arche*) of the war. These he claims to be two in number – first the true cause, which was not however stated to everybody, to wit, the growth of the Athenian state; the second cause, which was not the real one but was invented by the Lacedaemonians, was the dispatch by the Athenians of an auxiliary force to help the Corcyreans against the Corinthians. He does not, however, start his narrative what he himself believed to be the true cause of the war, but he begins with the other [...]" (transl. Pritchett).

72 "and that although he declares, as the result of his own elaborate examination, the true cause of the war to be this, that it was precaution against the power of the Athenians which induced the Lacedaemonians to make war on them, not really the Corcyrean or Potidaean affairs or the causes generally alleged, nevertheless he does not begin at the point which he has chosen and start with the events which led to the growth of Athens after the Persian war, but reverts to the commonly accepted causes".

> In the first place it must be remarked that it was not his intention, after setting out to write the history of the Peloponnesian War, to introduce by way of a supplement several other wars since the Persian War itself, which may almost be regarded as the origin of the growth of Athens; for that would have laid altogether outside his subject. Secondly it must be remembered that it is the duty of every historian to describe accurately first of all the obvious and commonly alleged causes of events, and if he suspects the existence of any more obscure reason [to add these afterwards ...] [...] in the middle ... with a Homeric fashion ... [...]

The *Pentekontaetia*, although it relates the truest cause of the war, is "altogether outside [Thucydides'] subject" (ἔξω τῆς ὑποθέσεως), meaning that it lies beyond the chronological limits of the historian's narrative, which is not a history of the Athenian Empire, but which rather focuses on a single war, the one waged by this empire against the Spartan league. It is therefore a complementary narrative to the main one, and an addition (προσθήκη). As a consequence, Thucydides was perfectly right (cf. οὐκ ἔμελλε) to skip over the period without providing a detailed account of the glorious era of mid-century Athens. There may be here a tacit justification of Thucydides' conciseness, an aspect of the *Pentekontaetia* that Dionysius criticized in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*.[73]

The second counter-argument focuses on the duty of any historian (cf. πᾶς συγγραφεὺς ὀφείλει) to describe τὰς φανερὰς αἰτίας first and move to more obscure reason(s) only afterwards. The authoritative tone of this sentence recalls Dionysius' no less authoritative statement on the necessity of following a τάξις commended by nature:

Table 5

D.H. *Th.* 10.11	**Comm. Th. 2.1c (*P.Oxy.* 853)**
Ἐχρῆν δὲ αὐτὸν ἀρξάμενον τὰς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου ζητεῖν πρῶτον ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἑαυτῷ δοκοῦσαν. **ἥ** τε γὰρ **φύσις** ἀπῄτει τὰ πρότερα τῶν ὑστέρων ἄρχειν καὶ τἀληθῆ πρὸ τῶν ψευδῶν λέγεσθαι, ἥ τε τῆς διηγήσεως εἰσβολὴ κρειττων ἂν ἐγίνετο μακρῷ, τοιαύτης οἰκονομίας τυχοῦσα.	ἔπειτ' ἐνθυμητέον ὅτι πᾶς συγγραφεὺς **ὀφείλει** τὰς φανερὰς καὶ θρυλ[ο]υμένας αἰτίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν πρώτοις ἀκριβῶς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, εἰ δέ τινων ἀφανεστέρων ὑπονοεῖ τοῦτο ἐπι . . . . σθαι.
He ought to have stated at the beginning of his enquiry into the true causes of the war the cause which he considered to be the true one: for not only was it a natural requirement that prior events should have precedence over later ones, and true causes be stated before false one[74].	Secondly it must be remembered that it is the duty of every historian to describe accurately first of all the obvious and commonly alleged causes of events, and if he suspects the existence of any more obscure reason [to add these afterwards ...]

73 Cf. D.H. *Pomp.* 3.9.

74 Transl. Usher.

Both texts reflect two antinomic visions of historiography. They could be synthesized as follows:

Table 6

	D.H. *Th.* 10.11	Comm. Th. 2.1c (*P.Oxy.* 853)
Paradigm	ἡ φύσις	τὸ ὄφειλον (cf. ὀφείλει)
Τάξις	Πρότερον / ὕστερον	Φανερός / ἀφανής
	ἀληθής / ψευδής	Θρυλούμενος / ∅
Implications	Chronological τάξις	Hermeneutical τάξις
	Re-transcription of the past	Elucidation of the past
	The historian narrates facts	The historian analyses facts

Against a Dionysian *ordo naturalis*, our commentator promotes an *ordo artificialis* where the obvious is placed before the obscure. This τάξις, which is more hermeneutical than chronological, is based upon a retrospective ranking of causes rather than one upon continuity and linearity. The distinction between *ordo naturalis* and *ordo artificialis* is well attested in rhetorical texts.[75] Our commentator may rely on a tradition which ultimately goes back to Thucydides, that a "rule" initially inferred from Thucydides' own work is here referred to in order to legitimate *a posteriori* the τάξις of Book 1. It seems obvious, in any case, that our commentator was somehow related to the rhetoricians, who are mentioned by at the beginning of the treatise on Thucydides, and who took the historian as a κανόνα τῆς ἱστορικῆς πραγματείας.[76]

One should also notice that there may be some irony in the commentator's statement, given that Dionysius explicitly praised Theopompus, in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*, for his ability to show both the obvious and the obscure motives of every action.[77]

75 On this, see de Jonge 2008, 253.

76 D.H. *Th.* 2.2.

77 D.H. *Pomp.* 6.7: τελευταῖον ἐστι τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ καὶ χαρακτηρικώτατον, ὃ παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἐξείργασται καὶ δυνατῶς οὔτε τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οὔτε τῶν νεωτέρων· τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστι; τὸ καθ' ἑκάστην πρᾶξιν μὴ μόνον τὰ φανερὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ὁρᾶν καὶ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐξετάζειν καὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν πραξάντων αὐτὰς καὶ τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς, ἃ μὴ ῥᾴδια τοῖς πολλοῖς εἰδέναι, καὶ πάντα ἐκκαλύπτειν τὰ μυστήρια τῆς τε δοκούσης ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγνοουμένης κακίας. ("His final and most characteristic accomplishment is something which no other historian, either before or since, has achieved with comparable exactness or effect. And what is this quality? It is the ability, in the case of every action, not only to see and to state what is obvious to most people, but to examine even the hidden reasons for actions and the motives of their agents, and the feelings in their hearts (which most people do not find it easy to discern), and to reveal all the mysteries of apparent virtue and undetected vice.", transl. Usher).

I will be brief on the last part of the note, as it is very incomplete. Ἀνὰ μέσον and Ὁμηρικῶς are certainly sound restitutions. These words made Sandys assume that a reference to a rhetorical τάξις called *dispositio Homerica* by Quintilian is being made (*Inst*. 5.12.14):

> Quaesitum etiam, potentissima argumenta primo ne ponenda sint loco, ut occupent animos, an summo, ut inde dimittant, an partita primo summo que, ut Homerica dispositione in medio sint infirma et a uicinis crescant. quae, prout ratio causae cuiusque postulabit, ordinabuntur, uno, ut ego censeo, excepto, ne a potentissimis ad leuissima decrescat oratio.
>
> The further question has been raised as to whether the strongest arguments should be placed first, to take possession of the judge's mind, or last, to leave an impression upon it; or whether they should be divided between the commencement and close of the proof, adopting the Homeric disposition of placing the weakest in the centre of the column, so that they may derive strength from their neighbours. But in the disposition of our arguments we must be guided by the interests of the individual case: there is only one exception to this general rule in my opinion, namely, that we should avoid descending from the strongest proofs to the weakest.[78]

Quintilian is here referring to a passage from the *Iliad*, where the poet describes how Agamemnon arranged (τάσσειν) his troops before battle.[79] However appealing this hypothesis may seem, I would rather like to suggest another possibility. Even if the commentator considers the *Pentekontaetia* as an "addition" (προσθήκη), he also recognizes its crucial importance as being the "truest" cause of the war. Therefore, I am not entirely sure that he would call the growth of the Athenian Empire Thucydides' "weakest" argument, which an allusion to Quintilian's *dispositio Homerica* implies. I rather suggest that our commentator is referring to the ἀναστροφὴ τῆς τάξεως (inversion of the natural order), that is interestingly exemplified by Homer and Thucydides (!) in Theon's *Progymnasmata* (Theon *Prog*. 86.7–20):

> τὴν δὲ ἀναστροφὴν τῆς τάξεως πενταχῶς ποιησόμεθα· καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων ἐστὶν ἀρξάμενον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀναδραμεῖν, εἶτα ἐπὶ τὰ τελευταῖα καταντῆσαι, ὅπερ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ Ὅμηρος πεποίηκεν· ἤρξατο μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων, καθ' οὓς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦν παρὰ Καλυψοῖ, εἶτα ἀνέδραμεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν μετά τινος οἰκονομίας γλαφυρᾶς· ἐποίει γὰρ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα τοῖς Φαίαξι τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν διηγούμενον· εἶτα συνάψας τὴν λοιπὴν διήγησιν ἔληξεν εἰς τὰ τελευταῖα, μέχρι τοὺς μνηστῆρας απέκτεινεν Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς γονέας αὐτῶν φιλίαν ἐποιήσατο. καὶ Θουκυδίδης δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ Ἐπίδαμνον ἀρξάμενος ἀνέδραμεν ἐπὶ τὴν Πεντηκονταετίαν, ἔπειτα κατῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον.
>
> We shall do the inversion of the natural order in five ways. It is possible to begin in the middle and run back to the beginning, then to jump to the end, which Homer did in *Odyssey*. He began with the period when Odysseus was with Calypso, then went back to the beginning in an elegant arrangement; for he had Odysseus narrate each of his own adventures to the Phaeacians; then, after taking up the rest of the narration, he continued to the end at the point where Odysseus killed the suitors and made friends with their relatives. Also, Thucydides, after starting with

78 Transl. Butler.

79 Hom. *Il*. 4.297–300.

> the events about Epidamnus, went back to the fifty years before the war and then took up the Peloponnesian war.[80]

Grossi recently connected Theon's passage to rhetorical traditions praising Thucydides' οἰκονομία (cf. μετά τινος οἰκονομίας γλαφυρᾶς).[81] As it does not imply an attempt to undermine the importance of the *Pentekontaetia* in the historian's narrative, it seems to me more likely that our commentator justified the τάξις of Book 1 by referring to the rhetorical technique of ἀναστροφὴ τῆς τάξεως, but given the incompleteness of our text here, this point is doomed to remain unverifiable.

3 Conclusion

I hope to have demonstrated that *P.Oxy.* 853 was composed at a crucial time of Thucydides' reception and was dedicated to readers who had a rhetorical interest in the historian's work. This papyrus was based upon an Hellenistic ὑπόμνημα mostly interested in providing γραμματικαὶ ἐξηγήσεις. These grammatical explanations were first meant to help readers to understand Thucydides' (difficult) Attic prose. The rhetorical shift of which our anonymous commentator is an excellent example implies a different point of view. It suggests that he read Thucydides as a rhetorical *exemplum* to imitate. The fact that paraphrases clearly prevail among the notes related to the speeches suggests that *P.Oxy.* 853 was intended to be circulated in the hands of schoolmasters and/or advanced students willing to improve their rhetorical skills. As a matter of fact, according to Marcellinus' *Life of Thucydides*, the study of the historian would start after the study of Demosthenes.[82] *P.Oxy.* 853 also exhibits an unparalleled rhetorical defense of Thucydides' οἰκονομία against the criticisms of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. As we have seen, the commentator's refutation of his adversary resorts to the rhetorical techniques of ἀντιλογία and reveals an intimate knowledge of Dionysius' treatises on Thucydides but also of the now lost *Περὶ μιμήσεως* (or at least what is left of it in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*). Its highly polemical tone makes it a unique testimony of the historian's popularity and exemplarity during the Early Roman Empire. We should then conclude that the commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853, by displaying a shift from grammatical ἐξήγησις to rhetorical μίμησις, acknowledges and exemplifies the "rhetoricisation" of Thucydides' readership during the Roman period.

80 Transl. Grossi 2016, 108–109.
81 Grossi 2016, especially 108–109.
82 Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 1.

Appendix 1: List of correspondences between *P.Oxy.* 853 and the Byzantine scholia[83]

***P.Oxy.* 853**	**Byzantine scholia (Hude)**
Comm. Th. 2.2.4b γνώμην δ' ἐπο[ιο]ῦντο κηρύγμασίν τε χρῆσθαι ἐπιτηδε[ί]οις: ἔγνωσαν δὲ φιλικοῖς κηρύγμασιν χρῆσθαι καὶ εἰς φιλίαν ὑπαγαγέσθαι·λέγουσι γὰρ ἐπιτηδείους τοὺς φί[λ]ους.	**Schol. Th. 2.2.4 ἐπιτηδείοις:** πρὸς φιλίαν (rec).
Comm. Th. 2.4.3 στύρακι ἀκοντίου: τῷ σαυρωτῆρι καλουμένῳ. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἔσχατον τοῦ δόρατος.	**Schol. Th. 2.4.3 στύρακι:** στυράκιόν ἐστιν ὁ καλούμενος σαυρωτὴρ τῶν δοράτων $ABFc_2$
Comm. Th. 2.4.7 ξυνέβησαν τοῖς Πλαταιεῦσι: συνέθεντο, εἰς συμβάσεις ἦλθον, μεταφορικῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰς ταὐτὸ βαίν[ει]ν τοὺς ἐν παρατάξει διεστῶτας ἀλλήλων.	**Schol. Th. 2.4.7 ξυνέβησαν τοῖς Πλαταιεῦσι:** ἀπὸ συνθήματος δηλονότι ABFc2 ἀπὸ συνθήκης δηλονότι (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.8.1 – 2 ἀρχόμενοι γ[ὰ]ρ πάντες ὀξύτ[ερον ἀντιλαμβάνονται: δῆλον ὡς [οὐ κατα]πεπληγμένοι οὐδὲ κεκακ[ωμένοι] ὡς μετανοῆσαι. ἐπιφέρει γοῦ[ν ὅτι ἡ] νεότης οὐκ ἀκουσίως ὑπ[ὸ ἀπειρίας] ἥπτετο τοῦ πολέμου. "Γλυκ[ὺς δὲ πό]λεμος ἀπείροισιν" ὥς φη[σι Πίνδαρος].	**Schol. Th. 2.8.1 – 2 ἀρχόμενοι γὰρ πάντες κτλ.:** ὥστε διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ὀξύτερον συνέβαινεν αὐτοὺς ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι $ABFGc_2$ **Schol. Th. 2.8.1 – 2 ἀντιλαμβάνονται:** περιέχονται. παροιμία "γλυκὺς ἀπείρῳ πόλεμος" $ABFGc_2$[84]
Comm. Th. 2.11.9a [κ]αὶ μεγίστην δόξαν οἰσόμενοι [το]ῖς τε προγόνοις καὶ ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς [ἐ]π' ἀμφότερα ἐκ τῶν ἀποβαινόν[τ]ων: εἰ μὴ προσέκειτο τὸ ἐπ' ἀμφότερα, ἦν [ἀκοῦ]σ[αι] τὸ μεγίστην δόξαν ἐπ[ὶ τῆς εὐδο]ξίας· νῦν δὲ δε[κ]τέον [ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπ]όληψιν, ὡς τοι[αύτην ὑ]π[όλψιν] ἔξοντες καὶ [ὑμεῖς] καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι ἢ χρηστὴν [ἢ ἐν]αντίαν ἐκ τῶν ἀποβαινόν[τ]ων ὁποῖοι <ἂ>ν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων [ἐ]φ' ἑκάτερον ὀφθῆτε.	**Schol. Th. 2.11.9 δόξαν:** ὑπόληψιν G Δόξα ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων, καὶ εὐκλείας καὶ δυσκλείας $ABFc_2$
Comm. Th. 2.13.2c [διὰ] χειρὸς ἔχειν: ἐν χερσὶν [ἔχειν, μ]εταχειρίζεσθαι διὰ τῆ[ς ἀεὶ δεο]ύσης ἐπιμελείας.	**Schol. Th. 2.13.2 διὰ χειρὸς ἔχειν:** δι' ἐπιμελείας, ἵνα μὴ ἀποστῶσι $ABFGc_2$

83 The text of *P.Oxy.* 853 is based upon my own reading of the papyrus. For the scholia, I have reproduced Hude's edition.

84 This case is a little peculiar, as the two quotations are different. In the scholia, it is considered to be a proverb and Pindar's name has disappeared. Given this, we can risk two hypotheses: either (1) the scholion does not rely on the same source as *P.Oxy.* 853 and the parallel is a mere coincidence (see Voltz,1911, 41); or (2) *P.Oxy.* 853 and the scholia rely on the same ancient source which is better preserved in the former text. As there is about a millennium of time between the papyrus and the scholia, the note may well have gone through so many sequential redraftings that it was already unrecognizable when it reached the Byzantine corpus. I tend to incline in favor of this second hypothesis.

Continued

P.Oxy. 853	Byzantine scholia (Hude)
Comm. Th. 2.13.7b Τοῦ τε γὰρ Φαληρικοῦ τείχους στάδιοι ἦσαν [π]έντ[ε] καὶ τρι[ά]κοντα πρὸς [τ]ὸν [κύκλο]ν τ[οῦ] ἄστε[ως: ἀ]ντὶ [τ]οῦ [ἕω]ς τοῦ κύ[κ]λου· ἦν [β′ τεί]χη τὸ μ[ὲ]ν Φαλήρ[ου τ]ὸ δὲ το[ῦ] Π[ειρα]ιέω[ς·] ἀπαριθ[μ]εῖται δὲ [το]σοῦ[το]ν τὸ διάστημα [ἀ]πὸ τοῦ Φαλήρ{ι[κ}ο]υ ἄχρι τοῦ κύκ[λο]υ τοῦ ἄστεως, [κ]ύκλον δὲ λέγει τὸν π[ε]ρίβολον τοῦ ἄ[στ]εω[ς, [κ]αὶ πάλιν ὁπόσον ἦν ἐ[κ Π]ει[ραιέως ἄ]χρι τοῦ κύκλου.	**Schol. Th. 2.13.7 πρὸς τὸν κύκλον:** ἕως τοῦ κύκλου ABFGMc$_2$
Comm. Th. 2.15.5a [τὰ π]λ[ε]ίστου ἄξ[ια] ἐχρῶντ[ο]: εἰς τὰ [πλείσ]τ[ου] ἄξια.	**Schol. Th. 2.15.5 τὰ πλείστου ἄξια ἐχρῶντο:** λείπει ἡ εἰς, ἵν’ ᾖ, εἰς τὰ πλείστου ἄξια ABFMc$_2$
Comm. Th. 2.16.1a [τῇ τ]ε οὖν ἐπὶ πολὺ κατὰ τὴ[ν χώραν [α]ὐτονόμῳ οἰκήσει: μετὰ το[ῦ μετεῖχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, διὰ τὴν κατὰ [τὴν χώραν αὐτόνομον ο[ἴ]κησιν ἀ[ντὶ <τοῦ> τῆς κατὰ τὴν χώραν [α]ὐτονόμ[ου οἰκήσεως. Εἴρηται δὲ ὑπερβατῶ[ς, τὸ γὰρ ἑξῆς ἐπὶ πολὺ μετεῖχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.	**Schol. Th. 2.16.1 τῇ τε οὖν … οἰκήσει:** ἐπανάληψις ABFMc$_2$ πτῶσις ἀντὶ πτώσεως, ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς τε οὖν κατὰ τὴν χώραν αὐτονόμου οἰκήσεως Ma$_2$c$_2$ ἀναλαμβάνει δὲ τὸν λόγον G ἀντίπτωσις G ἐπανάληψις, ἀντίπτωσις ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς τε οὖν (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.18.5a Τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον ἐν τῇ] καθέδρᾳ εἶ[χεν: . . . .]α μ[έλ]λειν καὶ [. . . . . κ]αθῆσθαι ἀργῶς [. . . . .]	**Schol. Th. 2.18.5 ἐν τῇ καθέδρᾳ:** τῇ ἀργίᾳ τῆς πολιορκίας δηλονότι (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.20.3b εἰ ἐπεξίασιν: ἀντὶ τ[ο]ῦ εἰ ἐπεξ[ελεύσονται], τὸν ἐνεστῶτα ἀντὶ το[ῦ μέλλον[τος ἐν]ίοτ<ε> ο[ἱ Ἀττ]ικοὶ τιθ[έασιν …	**Schol. Th. 2.20.3 εἰ ἐπεξίασιν:** εἰ ἐπεξελεύσονται οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς πόλεμον (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.21.3a κατὰ ξυστάσε[ι]ς τε γιγνόμενο[ι : συνιστάμενοι, συστρεφόμενο[ι κατὰ μέρη.	**Schol. Th. 2.21.3 κατὰ ξυστάσεις τε γιγνόμενοι:** οἷον κατὰ συστήματα καὶ πλήθη ABFGMc$_2$
Comm. Th. 2.22.2a ἐν Φρυγίοις: τόπος δήμου Ἀθμονέω[ν.	**Schol. Th. 2.22.2a ἐν Φρυγίοις:** τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς ABFGMc$_2$
Comm. Th. 2.22.2b τέλει ἑνί τῶν ἱππέων: τάγματι, ν[ῦν] μὲν δόρπον ἕλεσθε κατὰ στρα[τ]ὸν ἐν τελέεσσι.	**Schol. Th. 2.22.2 τέλει ἑνί:** τάγματι ἑνί ABFM
Comm. Th. 2.22.3 Φαρσάλιοι Πειράσιοι: ἀπ[ὸ] Πηρείας, τὰ[ς ἐν Πηρείῃ θρέψ’ ἀργ[υρότοξος. ἁμαρτάνουσι δὲ οἱ γρά[φοντες Παράσιο[ι]· ἔστιν γὰρ τῆς Ἀρκ[αδίας.	**Schol. Th. 2.22.3 Παράσιοι:** Παρράσιοι Ἀρκάδες, Παράσιοι Θεσσαλοί ABFMc$_2$
Comm. Th. 2.35.2c [ὅ τε ἄπειρός ἐστιν ἃ καὶ π]λεονάζεσθαι διὰ φθόνον εἴ τι ὑπὲρ] τὴν αὐ[τοῦ φύσιν ἀκούοι: οἱ ἀγν]οοῦντες [. . . . νο]μίσει[αν ἂν ἔνια πλεονάζεσθαι] εἴ	**Schol. Th. 2.35.2 ἔστιν ἃ καὶ πλεονάζεσθαι:** ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τὸ νομίσειεν ABFGc$_2$

Continued

***P.Oxy.* 853**	**Byzantine scholia (Hude)**
τινα ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς ἀκούοιεν· μόνο]ν γὰρ τὸ [. . . . . καὶ ὃ ἕ]καστος [αὐτὸς ἱκανὸς εἶναι δρᾶσαι] ἡγεῖται.	
Comm. Th. 2.37.1b μέτε[σ]τι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν ὡς ἕκαστος ἕν τῳ εὐδοκιμεῖ οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλέο[ν: διάφορά νυν τὰ διαφέροντα· μ[ε]τέχουσι δὲ πάντες κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις συμβολαί[οι]ς ἰσηγορίας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν ὡς ἕν τινι ἕκ[α]στος λαμπρὸς νομίζεται ἐν το[ῖ]ς κοινοῖς, οὐ κατὰ τὸ μέρος τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἴσον αὐτῷ τῆς π[ολ]ιτείας πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τ[ι]μᾶται ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴ[ν ἢ ἐκ τ]ῶν [ἀ]ρετῶν οι[.] . κ[. . . .]ε . [. . . . .]νταξιν [. . . . .] ἕκαστος [. . . . . τῶ]ν νόμων [. . . . .]ι ἀρετὴ [. . . . .]ς.	**Schol. Th. 2.37.1 τὰ ἴδια διάφορα:** τὰ διαφέροντα τοῖς ἰδιώταις ABFGc$_2$ **Schol. Th. 2.37.1 ἕν τῳ:** ἕν τινι ABFGec$_2$ **[Schol. Th. 2.37.1 οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους:** τοῦτο λέγει διὰ τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας βασιλεῖς τῶν Λακώνων, οἵτινες ἀπὸ μέρους ἦρχον διὰ μόνην τὴν εὐγένειαν, κἂν μὴ εἶχον ἀρετήν ABFGc$_2$]
Comm. Th. 2.37.2a [ἐλευθέρως δὲ τά τε πρὸς] τὸ κοινὸν [πολιτεύομεν καὶ ἐς τὴ]ν πρὸς [ἀλλήλους τῶν] καθ' [ἡμέ]ραν ἐπιτη[δευμάτων ὑπο]ψίαν [οὐ δ]ι' ὀργῆς [τὸν πέλας εἰ καθ' ἡ]δονὴ[ν] δρᾷ τι ἔχον[τες: ἐλευθέρω]ς φησὶν πολ[ι]τευόμεθα [ἔν τε τοῖς κοι]νοῖς καὶ π[ρὸ]ς ἀλλή[λους ἐν τοῖς κ]αθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιτη[δεύμασιν οὐ]χ ὑποπτεύ{σ}οντες τὸ[ν πέλ]ας οὐδ' ὀργ[ιζόμενοι εἰ πρ[ὸς ἡδ]ονήν τ[ι δρᾷ.	**Schol. Th. 2.37.2 ἐλευθέρως δὲ …:** ὡσανεὶ ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλοις ὕποπτοι ABFG οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλοις ὕποπτοι (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.37.3b τῶν τε α[ἰ]εὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσει: τῷ κατ[α]κούειν κα[ὶ] πείθεσθαι τοῖς ἄρχου[σι]ν.	**Schol. Th. 2.37.3 τῶν τε αἰεὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσει:** τῶν ἀρχόντων ABFc$_2$
Comm. Th. 2.38.1a καὶ θυσίαις [διε]τησίοις: οἷον δι' ὅλου τοῦ ἔτους. **Comm. Th. 2.39.1a τήν τε γὰρ [πό]λιν κοινὴν παρέχομεν:** ἀκ[ροβο]λίζει Λακεδαιμονίους.	**Schol. Th. 2.38.1 διετησίοις:** δι' ὅλου τοῦ ἔτους θύουσιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καθ' ἑκάστην πλὴν μιᾶς ἡμέρας ABFGc$_2$ **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 τῶν ἐναντίων:** τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ABFGc$_2$ **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 ξενηλασίαις:** ὥσπερ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ABFGc$_2$ **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 καὶ ἀπάταις:** πάλιν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, οἵτινες ἀπάτῃ τὸ πλέον καὶ γοητείᾳ γνώμης ἐκράτουν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ABFc$_2$ **Schol. Th. 2.39.1 εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες:** καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ἡλικίας εἰς τὰ πολέμια ἠὐτρεπίζοντο· καὶ εὐθὺς ὡς ἐτίκτετο τὸ παιδίον, ἐν ἀσπίδι ἐτίθεσαν αὐτὸ

Continued

***P.Oxy.* 853**	**Byzantine scholia (Hude)**
	καὶ δόρυ πλησίον, καὶ ἐβόων ἢ τὰν ἢ ’πὶ τὰν, τουτέστιν, ἢ ταῦτα σῶσον, ἢ μετ’ αὐτῶν ἀναιρέθητι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ οὕτως ἐπιπόνως ἤσκουν, ὡς μηδὲ λουτρῶν ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἀρκεῖσθαι τῷ Εὐρώτᾳ ποταμῷ πρὸς τὸ λούσασθαι. ἀμέλει καὶ διαμαστιγώσεις ἐγίνοντο κατά τινα καιρόν, ἐν αἷς οἱ πλείονας ἐνεγκόντες ἀνδρειότεροι ἐνομίζοντο ABFGc_2
Comm. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ [ῥᾳθ]υμίᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ πόνων μελέτῃ [καὶ] μὴ μετὰ νόμων τὸ πλέον ἢ τρόπ[ων] ἀνδρείας ἐθέλομεν κινδυνε[ύειν] περιγίγνεται ἡμῖν τοῖς τε μ[έλλο]υσιν ἀλγεινοῖς μὴ προκάμν[ειν] καὶ ἐς αὐτὰ ἐλθοῦσιν μὴ ἀτολμ[οτέρ]ους τῶν αἰεὶ μοχθούντων φαίν[εσθα]ι: καίτοι ε[ἰ] ἐν ἀνέσει μᾶλλον [καὶ ῥ]ᾳστώνῃ ζῶμεν μὴ κακ[οπα]θοῦντες τῇ ἀσκήσει μηδ’ ὑπὸ νόμων ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτο[ν] ἀνδρείαν ὑπο[φέροντες] τοὺς κινδύνους, [περ]ίεστ[ιν ἡμᾶς πρ]ὸ τῶν δεινῶν [μὴ ταλαιπωρεῖσθ]αι καὶ ἐς τοὺς κιν[δύνους ἀπαντήσ]αντας μὴ ἀνανδ[ρ]οτ[έ]ρους τῶν αἰεὶ κακοπαθούντων φαίνεσθαι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Λάκωνες αἰεὶ πονεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων ἠναγκάζοντο, οἱ δ’ Ἀθηναῖοι παρὰ τοὺς κινδύνους ἐπονοῦντο.	**Schol. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ ῥᾳθυμίᾳ ...:** πάντα συνάγει τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ὥσπερ ἀνάμνησιν αὐτῶν ποιεῖται ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος. αἰνίττεται δὲ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ABFGc_2

A few parallels with the Θ-scholia of Book I are also to be mentioned:

***P.Oxy.* 853**	**Byzantine Scholia (Hude)**
Comm. Th. 2.3.3 ἐδόκει οὖν ἐπιχειρητέα εἶναι: τῷ συνήθει σχήματι κέχρηται ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιχειρητέον.	**Schol. Th. 1.118.2 ἐπιχειρητέα:** τοῦ συγγαφέως ἡ λέξις· ἐχρῆν γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἐπιχειρητέον ABFGMc_2
Comm. Th. 2.5.5 [ὑ]ποτ[οπήσ]αντες: [ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπο]πτεύσαντες καὶ κ[. . . . .] τινὲς λέγουσι.	**Schol. Th. 1.51.1 ὑποτοπήσαντες:** ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποπτεύσαντες· οὕτω γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀναλύουσι τὴν λέξιν ABFGMc_2 **Schol. Th. 1.20.2 ὑποτοπήσαντες:** ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπονοήσαντες ABFGc_2 ὑπολαβόντες (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.21.1 Θριῶζε: τοπικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς τ[ὸ Θριάσιον πε{ι}δίον, συνήθ[ω]ς· ἠκολού[θει γὰρ ὡς Ὀλυμπίαζε καὶ οἴκαδε Θρι[ῶζε.	**Schol. Th. 1.114.2 Θρίωζε (codd.):** εἰς τὸ Θριάσιον πεδίον, ὡς Ἀθήναζε ABFGMc_2

Appendix 2: Comm. Th. 2.1c

Comm. Th. 2.1c [γέγραπ]ται δ’ [ἐξῆ]ς ὡ[ς ἕ]καστα ἐγίγνε[το] κατ̣[ὰ] θέρος καὶ χε[ι]μῶνα: Διονύσιος [ὁ] Ἁλικαρνασσεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ Θουκυδίδ[ου] συντάγματι περὶ οὐ πολλῶν μ[έ]μφεται τὸν Θουκυδίδην, τὰ δ’ ἀν[ω]τάτω τρία κεφάλαια διέξεισιν, ὅ[τι] τε οὐκ ἄρχοντας καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα[ς ὡ]ς οἱ λοιποὶ προτέθεικε τῶν χ[ρόνω]ν ἀλλ’ ἰδίως θέρη καὶ χει[μῶν]ας, καὶ ὅτι διέσπακε καὶ διή[ρηκ]ε τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ συγκό[πτει] τὰ πράγματα οὐκ ἀπα[ρ]τίζω[ν τ]ὰ[ς] περὶ ἑκάστων διηγ[ή]σεις ἀ[λλ]ὰ ἀπ’ ἄλλων ἐπ’ ἄλλα τρεπόμενος πρ[ι]ν τελειῶσαι, καὶ ὅτι τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ πολέμου αἰτ[ί]αν ε<ἰ>π{ι}ὼν ὡς σφόδρα αὐτὸς ἐξητακώς, ὅτι δι’ εὐλάβειαν τῆς ἰσχύος τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπολέμησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ μὰ Δία διὰ τὰ Κορκυραϊκὰ ἢ Ποτειδαιατικὰ καὶ τὰς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγομένας αἰτίας, ὅμως οὐκ ἀπὸ τούτων ὧν ἔκρινεν αὐτὸς διηγεῖται ἐκ[ε]ῖθεν ἀρξάμενος ἀφ’ οἵων πραγμάτων μετὰ τὰ Περσικὰ ηὐξήθησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς κοινὰς αἰτίας τρέπεται. τοιαῦτα μὲν ὁ Διονύσιος· εἰκότως δ’ ἄν τις πρὸς αὐτὸν προπετῶς οὕτως [μεμφόμενον ἀντεγκαλέ]σε[ι]εν [ὅ]τι . . . . . τοσο . . . . . ε . . τ . . . . τῶν πραγμάτων σ . . . . . ν λογισμὸν ὃς καὶ α . . . . . νος παρέδωκεν ε . . . . . αν. ἡ γὰρ κατὰ ἄρχ[οντας διαίρεσις] καὶ κατ’ Ὀλυμπιάδ[ας οὔπω ἐγεγόνει] ἐν πλάτει καὶ οὐ κ[οινὸς λογισμὸς ἦ]ν οὐδ’ ὡς Ἡρόδοτ[ος ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ α]ὐτοῦ συνεχῶς τ . . . . . κατὰ τόπο]υς ποικίλον . . . . . μον γράφω[ν . . . . .] οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ] ἐ[άσ]ας τοὺς Ἀ[θηναίους τὰ μὲν] Πλα[τ]αϊκὰ ἀπὸ [τῶν πρώτων] μέχρι τῶν ὑστάτων [εἴρειν πάν]τα, εἶτα πάλιν πάσας τὰς [ἐσ]βολὰς τῶν Πελοποννη[σίων [ἐ]παλλήλους γράφειν, [τὰ] <δὲ> Κ[ορ]κυραϊκὰ ἐφεξῆς διαφέροντ[α] τοῖς χρόνοις. πάντα γὰρ ἂν συν[έ]χεεν ἢ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χ[ρό]νους ἀνέτρεχεν ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἑνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιρούς. καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ κατὰ ἄρχοντα<ς> ἔγραφεν, ἀνάγκη πάλιν ἦν διαιρεῖν τὰ πράγματα· ἐπ’ ἄλλων γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ταῦτα ἀρχόντων συνέβαινεν· ὅταν δέ τις ἓν κεφάλαιον γράφῃ, μόνον συνεχῶς εἴρει. ἑαυτῷ οὖν ἐ<ν>αντία λέγει ὁ Διονύσιος· καὶ γὰρ εἰ κατ’ ἄρχοντας ἔδει γράφειν ὥς φησιν, ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν διαιρεῖν τὰ π[ρ]άγματα ἀκολούθ[ως τοῖς ἄρχ]ουσιν. [ἐ]άν γέ τοι συνείρῃ [τὰ πράγματ]α καὶ [μ]ὴ κωλύωσιν οἱ χρ[όνοι ἐφεξ]ῆς [ὁ Θου]κυδίδη[ς] διηγε[ῖται, οἷον . ι . . . . . τῇ ζ′ συν[εχῶς τὰ Σικελικὰ διηγεῖ]ται. οὐδ’ εἰ τ . . . . . ροι κατο . . ι . . . . . .ικα κα[τ]οικι . . . . . [εἰς] πολλ[ὰ]ς κεφα[λὰς μεμερισμένα ἐξ]ετάζειν. ὁ δὲ Δ[ιονύσιος . . . . .] ἔξωθεν παραβα . . . . . μεταβάσεις μεταξ[ὺ τῶν [πρασσομέ]ων οὐκ ἐπιτιμᾷ [Ἡροδότῳ . . . . .]ν προκειμένην ι′ . . . . . ν . . . . . τὰ Αἰγ[ύ]πτια καὶ Λυδ[ιακά, π . . δὲ ο . . . . . α . . ασῃ . λ . . . . . ἀκριβῶς . . . . . αχ . . . . . α. πρὸς δὲ τὸ [τὴν ἀρχὴ]ν τῆ[ς ἱστορί]ας μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶ[ν Ἀθ]ηνα[ί]ων αὐξήσεως πεποιῆσθαι τὸν [Θ]ουκυδίδην, ἥνπερ φησὶν ἀληθεστέραν αἰτίαν εἶναι τοῦ πολέμου, πρῶτον μὲν ῥητέον ὡς οὐκ ἔμελλε τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν προθ[έ]μενος συγγράφειν πόλεμον πλείους πολέμους ἀπὸ τῶν Περσικῶν αὐτῶν σχεδὸν ἀφ’ ὧν πρώτων ηὐξήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεισάγειν ἐν προσθήκης μέρει· ἔξω γὰρ τέλεον τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐγίνετο. ἔπειτ’ ἐνθυμητέον ὅτι πᾶς συγγραφεὺς ὀφείλει τὰς φανερὰς καὶ θρυλ[ο]υμένας αἰτίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν πρώτοις ἀκριβῶς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, εἰ δέ τινων ἀφανεστέρων ὑπονοεῖ τοῦτο ἐπι . . . . . σθαι ὁ δ[ὲ . . . . .]τοι κατ . . . . . καὶ πε . . . . . ἀνὰ μέσ[ον] . . . . . Ὁμηρικ[ῶς . . . . . χων α . . . . . [ἐ]πιεικῆ . . . . . συκοφ[αντ . . ..

[7]επιων Π[8] εἰπών Wilamowitz | | [15]διάθεσις *vel* διαίρεσις | [15]οὔπω ἐγεγόνει Bury | [15]οὐ κ[οινὸς λογισμὸς ἦ]ν Bury | [16]ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ α]ὐτοῦ Bury | [16]κατὰ τόπο]υς Bury | [17-18][οὐ γὰρ ἦν] ... [διεξελθόν]τα Wilamowitz οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ] ἐ[άσ]ας τοὺς Ἀ[θηναίους τὰ μὲν] Πλα[τ]αϊκα ... [εἴρειν πάν]τα Bury | [22]χρόνους *cum* και *supra* χρο *et* ρ *supra* ν Π[8] | [23]ταὐτὰ *mavult* Bury | [27]ἐφεξ]ῆς Wilamowitz & Bury | [28]συν[εχῶς Wilamowitz / Bury | [28][τὰ Σικελικὰ διηγεῖ]ται Bury | [29][εἰς] πολλὰς κεφα[λὰς μεμερισμένα ἐξ]ετάζειν Bury | [30]μεταξ[ὺ τῶν [πρασσομέ]ων οὐκ ἐπιτιμᾷ [Ἡροδότῳ Bury | [31]ι′ Π[8] ί Hude | [37]τας *cum* π *supra* τ Π[8] | [39]ὁ δ[ὲ] Pulice ὁ Δ[ιονύσιος] Grenfell / Hunt.

Translation (Grenfell / Hunt, with some modifications)

Comm. Th. 2.1c "all the events have been reported by summers and winters": Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise on Thucydides blames Thucydides on a few grounds, and discusses three chief points: that he has not fixed his dates by archons and Olympias, like other historians, but according to a system of his own by summers and winters; that he has disturbed and divided the narrative and breaks up the events, not completing his accounts of the several incidents, but turning from one subject to another before he has finished with it; and that although he declares, as the result of his own elaborate examination, the true cause of the war to be this, that it was precaution against the power of the Athenians which induced the Lacedaemonians to make war on them, not really the Corcyrean or Potidaean affairs or the causes generally alleged, nevertheless he does not begin at the point which he has chosen and start with the events which led to the growth of Athens after the Persian war, but reverts to the commonly accepted causes. Such is Dionysius' view.

In opposition to this rash criticism one might reasonably retort that [...] Indeed, the division by archons and Olympiads had not yet come into common use, and there was not a common system of calculation. Not even Herodotus ... in his book ... continuously ... by geographical areas ... diversified ... writing ... just like [it was impossible][85], leaving the Athenians at the beginning of the war, to relate the Plataean affairs from first to last, and then go back to describe all the invasions of the Peloponnesians one after the other, and Corcyrean affairs continuously, differing as they did in date; for he would have thrown everything into confusion, or turned back again to periods which he had treated, in a fashion both unsuitable and unreasonable. For he was not dealing with a single subject or events at one time or one place, but with many subjects in many places and at many periods. Moreover, even if he had dated by archons, he would still have been obliged to divide the events, for these occurred some under one archon, some under another; it is when a person is only writing about a single subject that his narrative is continuous throughout. Hence Dionysius contradicts himself; for even if Thucydides ought to have dated by archons, as he asserts, he would have been equally obliged to divide events according to the archons. If, however, the events are connected and the chronology offers no obstacle, Thucydides' narrative is continuous, as for instance ... in the seventh book where the Sicilian events are related continuously. Not even if ... explain ... divided into many points ... Dionysius ... doesn't blame Herodotus for his digressions in the middle of the events ... the events of Egypt and Lydia ... accurately ...

As for the charge that Thucydides has not made the beginning of his history start with the growth of the Athenians, which he asserts was the truer cause of the war, in the first place it must be remarked that it was not his intention, after setting out to

85 On the textual problems here, see Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 138.

write the history of the Peloponnesian war, to introduce by way of a supplement several other wars since the Persian war itself, which may almost be regarded as the origin of the growth of Athens; for that would have lain altogether outside his subject. Secondly it must be remembered that it is the duty of every historian to describe accurately first of all the obvious and commonly alleged causes of events, and if he suspects the existence of any more obscure reason [to add these afterwards ...] [...] in the middle ... with an Homeric fashion ... [...]

Bibliography

Alberti, G.B. (ed.) (1972), *Thucydidis Historiae*, Rome.

Arrighetti, G. (1977), "Hypomnemata e scholia: alcuni problemi", in: *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 2, 49-67.

Cogan, M. (1981), *The Human Thing: The Speeches and Principles of Thucydides' History*, Chicago.

Del Fabbro, M. (1979), "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea", in: *Studia Papyrologica* 18.2, 69-132.

Douglas, M. (2007), *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition*, New Haven / London.

Fischer, F. (1913), *Thucydidis reliquiae in papyris et membranis aegyptiacis servatae. Collegit Fridericus Fischer*, Leipzig.

Gerstinger, H. (1925), "Bruchstücke eines antiken Kommentars zur Archäologie des Thukydides im Papyr. gr. Vindob. 29247", in: *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften* 67.2, Vienna / Leipzig.

Grenfell, B.P. / Hunt, A.S. (eds.) (1908), *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*, London.

Grossi, V. (2016), "Thucydides and Poetry. Ancient Remarks on the Vocabulary and Structure of Thucydides' History", in: V. Liotsakis / S. Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History. Literary Perspective in Greek and Roman Historiography*, Berlin / Boston, 99 – 118.

Iglesias Zoido, J.C. (1995), *La argumentación en los discursos deliberativos de Tucidides y su relación con la normativa retórica del siglo IV a. C.*, Anejos del Anuario de Estudios Filologicos de la Universidad de Extremadura, Cáceres.

Iodice Di Martino, M.G. (ed.) (2002), *Appendix Vergiliana*, Classici greci e latini 137, Milan.

de Jonge, C. (2008), *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*, Leiden.

Kleinlogel, A. (1965), *Geschichte des Thukydidestextes im Mittelalter*, Berlin.

Liotsakis, V. (2015), "Texts of Religious Content in Thucydides and the Implied Ancient Reader", in: *RFIC* 143, 278 – 317.

Liotsakis, V. (2016), "Narrative Defects in Thucydides and the Development of Ancient Greek Historiography", in V. Liotsakis / S. Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History. Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography,* Berlin / Boston, 73 – 98.

Luschnat, O. (1954), "Die Thukydidesscholien. Zu ihrer handschriftlichen Grundlage, Herkunft und Geschichte", in: *Philologus* 98, 14-58.

Maehler, H. (2007), "Das Thukydides-Hypomnema P.Oxy. 853 und die Scholien", in: J Frösén / T. Purola / E. Salmenkivi (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th international congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1 – 7 August, 2004*, Helsinki, II, 587-593.

Romilly, J. (1956), *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide*, Paris.

Schwabe, E. (1881), "Quaestiones de scholiorum Thucydideorum fontibus", in: *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 4, 65-150.

Stadter, P.A. (1973), *The Speeches in Thucydides: A Collection of Original Studies with a Bibliography*, Chapel Hill.

Voltz, E. (1911), *Die Thukydidespapyri. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde einer Hohen Philosophischen Fakultät der Kaiser-Wilhelms-Universität zu Strassburg i. E.*, Strasbourg.

Woerther, F. (2015), *Caecilius de Calè-Actè. Fragments et témoignages*, Paris.

Pauline Duchêne

Historiography in the Margins and the Reader as a Touchstone

Studying the relationship between ancient historians and their audience is not always an easy task.[1] One way is to approach the matter from the author's point of view, by closely examining the passages that explicitly anticipate the possible reactions of their audience. One can thus form an idea of how a historical work could be received, keeping in mind, though, that this is the representation historians had or pretended to have, not necessarily how their readers actually were.

Another way consists in using the global trends that can be found in historical works as clues to the taste of the author, but also of the audience, for the literary dimension of the genre also implied to try and write in a manner that would make the work pleasant. This method is especially effective when some passages contradict the methodological claims made somewhere else: Tacitus is openly defiant towards portents,[2] but nevertheless mentions them, probably because his public would not accept a total omission.

Eventually there is a third way that implies to have a look somewhere else, examining texts that work as mirrors: they do not belong to the historiographical genre, but are related to it, because they parody, theorize or give instructions about it. Among them is the *Apocolocyntosis Diui Claudii* by Seneca, for its grotesque narration of what happened to the emperor Claudius after his death, particularly when alluding to Drusilla's deification, plays, as I will demonstrate, on many characteristics of ancient historiography and appears to be "a travesty of historical enquiry".[3] The result is a parody according to the modern sense of the word,[4] an imitative genre most useful when one wants to understand the reception of literature, because a parodist has to play with the commonly recognized characteristics of the imitated works, for the reader to identify them and enjoy the mocking.[5] A parody thus does not take up the way authors conceived what they wrote, but the way their audience received their works; especially it plays on the points that could raise criticism, for no audience likes something widely acknowledged to be mocked.

As a consequence, what does a text like the *Apocolocyntosis* tell about the reception of historical texts and the way their audience considered ancient historians? What can we infer about the declarations found in works of historiography? It

1 I am deeply grateful to V. Liotsakis and A. Kachuck for their suggestions and corrections. Of course, all remaining errors and inaccuracies are my own.

2 Cf. Grimal 1989.

3 Cf. Whitton 2013, 157.

4 Cf. Householder 1944 for its meaning in Antiquity.

5 Cf. Thompson 1986, 15 and 17–18 for the difficulty to fully understand this "encoding/decoding" process. The reference studies on parody in general are Rose 1979, Genette 1982 and Hutcheon 1985.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-007

seems that neither historians nor their readers were naive about the way history was actually written, with a remarkable continuity at least from Cicero's time to Lucian's.

***

The historical and the literary dimensions of the *Apocolocyntosis Diui Claudii* have already been much studied. Scholars have examined its genre, the Menippean satire,[6] the influence it had on successive authors,[7] its intended audience,[8] the details it contains about the circumstances of Claudius' death,[9] and the historical basis of his portrayal.[10] Yet, these perspectives do not seem to have been combined to investigate the historiographical field, in spite of possible comparisons with works like Tacitus' *Annales* or Suetonius' *Diuus Claudius*. Seneca's text does not claim to be historical, but its first part seems to parody the habits of historiography, with a very revealing beginning (Sen. *Apoc*. 1.1):

> Quid actum sit in caelo ante diem III. idus octobris anno nouo, initio saeculi felicissimi, uolo memoriam tradere.
>
> What happened in heaven on the third day before the Ides of October, on this new year that was the beginning of a most happy era, is what I want to pass on to the common memory. (translations are my own)

This sentence features many elements that are typical of historical prologues: a clause that announces the subject of the work,[11] a date quickly following,[12] and the use of *memoria*[13] and *tradere*[14] that are stock Latin words to designate historical activity.[15] Seneca is thus absolutely explicit about the genre he is about to imitate: even the presentation of the current reign as a new beginning and a most happy

6 Cf. Moretti 2003.
7 Cf. Renard 1937.
8 Cf. Whitton 2013.
9 Cf. Aveline 2014.
10 Cf. Fishwick 2002.
11 Cf. Th. 1.1.1: Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ("Thucydides of Athens wrote about the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, how they fought against each other").
12 Cf. Tac. *Hist*. 1.1.1: *Initium mihi operis Seruius Galba iterum, Titus Vinius consules erunt* ("The beginning of my work will be the second consulate of Servius Galba and the first of Titus Vinius").
13 Cf. Liv. pr. 3: *Vtcumque erit, iuuabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populo pro uirili parte et ipsum consuluisse* ("Whatever it be, however, I will be glad to have also dealt myself, in turn, with the memory of the accomplishments of the first nation in the world").
14 Cf. Tac. *Ag*. 1.1: *Clarorum uirorum facta moresque posteris tradere* ("To pass on to posterity the actions and the habits of great men"). This clause is also a quotation of the first sentence of Cato the Elder's *Origines*.
15 Cf. Duchêne 2020.

era is a *topos* of imperial historiography,[16] for emperors were the ones who gave or forbade free access to information[17] and afterwards decided whether the work should have an open diffusion or not.[18]

The parody goes on with the following sentences, that correspond to typical claims made by historians (*Apoc.* 1.1 and 1.3):

> Nihil nec offensae nec gratiae dabitur. haec ita uera [...]. ab hoc ego quae tum audiui certa, clara affero [...].
>
> Nothing will be presented either to offend or gain a favor. These elements so true [...]. I report confidently and clearly what I heard then from him [...].

Ancient historians very keenly denied having prejudices, especially at the beginning of their work.[19] Since ancient historiographical texts followed the evaluation criteria of rhetorics and were mainly based on verisimilitude,[20] being unbiased was very important,[21] for it assured the reader that the narration was as close to the facts as possible.[22] This importance of verisimilitude explains why, when incredible elements are to appear in their text, ancient historians very often try to prevent any accusation of forgery by insisting on the solidity of their information.[23] In the passage above, Seneca takes up all these "professional" claims, by affirming he has no other goal than saying what actually happened (*nihil nec offensae nec gratiae dabitur*), emphasizing the veracity of what he is about to tell (*haec ita uera*) and the fact that his text contains no distortion (*clara*).

This passage also exemplifies another characteristic of historiographical texts: allusions to the researches made before the redaction. The relative clause *ab hoc quae audiui* specifies that Seneca did not copy something he found in a book or heard from someone else, but really spoke with the alleged witness, playing here

16 Cf. Tac. *Ag.* 3.1: *Nunc demum redit animus; sed quamquam primo statim beatissimi saeculi ortu Nerua Caesar res olim dissociabilis miscuerit, principatum ac libertatem* ("Only now do we live again; but even though immediately, at the very beginning of this most blessed era, Nerva Caesar mixed things impossible to associate before, Principate and freedom").

17 Cf. Marincola 1997, 86 – 95.

18 Cf. the Cremutius Cordus affair in Tac. *Ann.* 4.34 – 35.

19 Cf. for instance the famous *sine ira et studio* at Tac. *Ann.* 1.1.3.

20 Cf. Woodman 1988, 70 – 76.

21 Cf. Marincola 1997, 158 – 175.

22 Of course, given the political use the ancients made of historiography (cf. Wiseman 1979), deformations were common, but they could not be obvious. For an example with Tacitus, cf. Devillers 1994.

23 Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 2.50.2: *Ut conquirere fabulosa et fictis oblectare legentium animos procul grauitate coepti operis crediderim, ita uolgatis traditisque demere fidem non ausim* ("As much as I would think far from the seriousness of the work I am starting to look for marvels and entertain with fictions the minds of my readers, I would not either discredit elements that have been diffused and passed on"). Tacitus here speaks about a bird which would not leave a sanctuary before Otho committed suicide.

with the famous Thucydidean insistence on privileging first-hand testimonies.[24] Indeed, a few sentences before, Seneca is able to explain how to question his man (*Apoc.* 1.3):

> Hunc si interrogaueris, soli narrabit. coram pluribus nunquam uerbum faciet.
>
> This man, if you want to question him, only privately will he tell you the story. In front of more people he will never say a word.

Such details on the precise circonstances needed should the reader interrogate the witness imply that this is how Seneca managed to actually hear him tell his story: thus, the use of *audiui* a bit later seems credible. In the meantime, he also highlights the value of his work – what he is about to tell is not a well-known tale: he had to tenaciously look for someone who knew it and find a way to have him talk.

But displaying brand new information[25] is only one side of the medal for ancient historians: they can also refuse to repeat something that is widely known, so as not to tire their audience.[26] It is then not surprising to also see Seneca refuse to give useless details about the imperial funeral (*Apoc.* 5.1):

> Quae in terris postea sint acta superuacuum est referre. scitis enim optime nec periculum est ne excidant quae memoriae gaudium publicum impresserit.
>
> It is useless to report what happened on earth afterwards, for you know it very well and there is no danger that the events which left the memory of such a public joy be forgotten.

He plays here on what his audience supposedly already knew, so as to avoid useless repetitions. This process is the basis of information display in ancient historical texts[27] and, by openly deciding what to tell and what to omit, he adopts the *persona* of a capable historian, able to evaluate his material in order to adopt a well thought narrative strategy.[28] Indeed, the rest of the text immediately alludes again to the source he will be using (*Apoc.* 5.1):

> In caelo quae acta sint audite: fides penes auctorem erit.
>
> Hear what happened in heaven: my source is responsible for the veracity of the story.

---

24 Cf. Th. 1.22.2. On the ancient historian's preference for eyes over ears in their preliminary researches, cf. Marincola 1997, 63–86. The distinction of course comes from Herodotus, whose position appears to be less naive than it is sometimes presented: cf. Miltsios 2016.

25 Cf. Marincola 1997, 95–117.

26 Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.63.3, about Seneca's last words, that had been published and were apparently widely known.

27 Cf. Duchêne 2017.

28 Cf. how Suetonius introduces his examples of Tiberius' cruelty, at Suet. *Tib.* 61.3: *Singillatim crudeliter facta eius exequi longum est; genera, uelut exemplaria saeuitiae, enumerare sat erit* ("It would be too long to list one by one the things he did out of cruelty; it will be enough to enumerate them by types, as examples of his brutality").

This sentence works as a diptych with the previous one, by way of the parallel *quae acta sint in terris / in caelo*, and again plays on how ancient historians inserted details whose credibility was not warranted by themselves, but by some source they consulted – a convenient way to tell borderline stories without being hold responsible for them.[29]

All these characteristics signify that Claudius is not the only one to be represented in the *Apocolocyntosis*: so are ancient historians. As a consequence, this work, even though not belonging to the historiographical genre, is nevertheless related to historiography: it is not at the center of historical practice, but still clearly linked to it. It is 'historiography in the margins', for its aim is not to tell historical events, but it nevertheless says something about the way they were told in Antiquity. The great advantage of these texts lies in the external point of view they provide: Seneca is not a historian explaining how he works; he rather imitates historians as he sees them work from the outside, as a reader. The *Apocolocyntosis* then allows us to see how the audience reacted to historical works, especially what was widely known about their conception. And it appears that readers were not blind to the flaws in the texts they read.

This is particularly obvious at the very beginning of the passage where Seneca discusses his sources (*Apoc.* 1.1):

> Haec ita uera si quis quaesiuerit unde sciam, primum, si noluero, non respondebo.
>
> These elements so true, if anyone asks me how I know them, at first, if I am not willing, I will give no answer.

This sentence alludes to the practice of mentioning the sources supporting some peculiar element. For instance, at *Ann.* 13.20.2, Tacitus explains that he will give the names of the authors he used when presenting divergent versions of the same event. But in spite of such a general claim, in all his work, he actually does so only in one other passage[30] and mainly omits allusions of this type, most of all the precise identity of his sources. A closer study of the way ancient historians identify and consider the sources they rely upon or criticize shows that a precise identification of where a piece of information came from actually did not matter this much.[31] Seneca's text confirms it: as a mock historian, he at first plainly refuses to say where he got the story he is about to tell, even if he emphasizes its veracity by starting the sentence with *haec ita uera*. The clause *si noluero* introduces an idea of arbitrary: if he is willing, he will give the name; otherwise, he will stay silent

29 Cf. Suet. *Nero* 34.6, about the emperor's behavior in front of his mother's corpse: *Adduntur his atrociora nec incertis auctoribus* ("To this are added more terrible details and by well known authors").

30 Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 14.2.1–2.

31 Cf. Duchêne 2017.

and nobody will make him utter a word. After that, he contemplates the possibility of speaking, but even then he openly disrespects any 'professional' rule (*Apoc.* 2.1):

> Si libuerit respondere, dicam quod mihi in buccam uenerit.
>
> If it pleases me to answer, I will say what will come to my mind.

This time, the arbitrary is emphasized by the clause *si libuerit respondere* at the beginning of the sentence and the mock historian still laughs at the request, giving any name that will come to his mind. It is thus not surprising that the witness he chooses to produce is of very questionable credibility (*Apoc.* 1.2–3):

> Tamen, si necesse fuerit auctorem producere, quaerito ab eo qui Drusillam euntem in caelum uidit: idem Claudium uidisse se dicet iter facientem 'non passibus aequis'. velit nolit, necesse est illi omnia uidere quae in caelo aguntur: Appiae Viae curator est, qua scis et Diuum Augustum et Tiberium Caesarem ad deos isse. hunc si interrogaueris, soli narrabit. coram pluribus nunquam uerbum faciet: nam, ex quo in senatu iurauit se Drusillam uidisse caelum ascendentem et illi pro tam bono nuntio nemo credidit, quod uiderit uerbis conceptis affirmauit se non indicaturum, etiam si in medio Foro hominem occisum uidisset.
>
> However, if I must produce an author, ask the one who saw Drusilla go to heaven: he is the same who will say he saw Claudius going 'with unequal steps'. Whether he be willing or not, he must see everything that happens in heaven: he is curator of the Via Appia, through which it is known that the divine Augustus and Tiberius Caesar joined the gods. This man, if you want to question him, only privately will he tell you the story. In front of more people he will never say a word, for, since the day he swore in the Senate he had seen Drusilla go up to heaven and, in exchange for such good news, nobody believed him, he took the solemn oath he would not tell what he saw, even if he had seen a man killed in the middle of the Forum.

The indication about Drusilla's death and the appointment as *curator Viae Appiae* identifies the witness Seneca claims to have questioned himself as the senator Livius Geminius. But he is precisely not a good witness, for his claim of having seen Caligula's sister go to heaven was a blatant lie, in order to win favor from the emperor. The specification *illi nemo credidit* underlines the extravagance of his allegations, for no one even feigned to believe him. The quotation from Virgil[32] *non passibus aequis* is an additional proof of the fictitious nature of anything he would say about Claudius, for the epic reference is an obvious way to ennoble the late emperor's limping and try to ensure for himself the favour of his heir. In such a context, the presence of the word *auctor* in the first sentence is rather ironic, for the man is anything but a guaranty.

Seneca is thus not only mocking the topical declarations of Roman historians; he also makes fun of their methodological claims, revealing that everybody knew they were not reliable: they mostly never specified the sources they used and, when they did, the credibility of their information could be quite shallow. One can even wonder

32 *A.* 2.724.

if the narrator really questioned his witness, for he seems to mainly produce him because he took care of the road that was used for the funeral processions of Augustus and Tiberius. Later after Seneca, in another work of historiography in the margins,[33] the *Historia Conscribenda*, Lucian was still denouncing false claims historians sometimes made (*Hist. Conscr.* 29):

> Ἄλλος, ὦ Φίλων, μάλα καὶ οὗτος γελοῖος, οὐδὲ τὸν ἕτερον πόδα ἐκ Κορίνθου πώποτε προβεβηκὼς οὐδ' ἄχρι Κεγχρεῶν ἀποδημήσας, οὔτι γε Συρίαν ἢ Ἀρμενίαν ἰδών, ὥδε ἤρξατο – μέμνημαι γάρ – "Ὦτα ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπιστότερα. γράφω τοίνυν ἃ εἶδον, οὐχ ἃ ἤκουσα." καὶ οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντα ἑωράκει ὥστε ἔφη [...] ταῦτα δὲ ἐφεστὼς ὁρᾶν αὐτός, ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ μέντοι ἀπὸ δένδρου ὑψηλοῦ ποιούμενος τὴν σκοπήν.
>
> Another man, dear Philon, is also, this time, much ridiculous. Not having ever set foot outside of Corinth, nor left for Cenchreae, nor certainly knowing Syria or Armenia, he began in this way – for I remember him: "Ears are less trustful than eyes. Thus I write what I saw, not what I heard." And he had seen everything so accurately that he said [...] and he said he saw this himself as a witness, but making his observation from the safety of a tall tree.

Here again, the historian's declaration and Lucian's criticism concern the Thucydidean insistence on first-hand witnesses, in this case the author himself:[34] he said he attended the battle, while he had not set foot out of Corinth. The remark about him certainly not knowing Syria or Armenia suggests that he did not even care about gathering information about them.[35] Nevertheless he insisted on his attendance (ἐφεστὼς αὐτός), giving additional details on his position. He observed everything safely from a tall tree, precision that enhances the *auctoritas* of his narrative, for such a standing point supposedly offered him a view of the whole battlefield.

This passage confirms that ancient historians could even lie and add false details in order to increase their own credit. What is most interesting in this case, however, is the final clarification Lucian gives about the circumstances of the reading (*ibid.*):

> Καὶ ταῦτα Κορινθίων ἀκουόντων ἀνεγίγνωσκεν τῶν ἀκριβῶς εἰδότων ὅτι μηδὲ κατὰ τοίχου γεγραμμένον πόλεμον ἑωράκει.
>
> And he read this while he was listened to by Corinthians who knew accurately that he had not even seen from the battlement the war he had written about.

33 Again, the *Historia Conscribenda* is not a work of history, but tells us something about the way history was written in ancient times.

34 For the links between this work and Thucydides' principles, cf. Billault 2010 and Trédé 2010.

35 The end of the paragraph also denounces his total lack of knowledge about military matters, so he does not even fulfill Polybius' criterium of experience: cf. Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 29 and Plb. 12.25 m. For parallels between Polybius and Lucian, cf. Georgiadou / Larmour 1994. Lucian (*Hist. Conscr.* 37) does not think that one must have experience in order to write history: knowing how things should be and are done is enough.

The situations of the historian and his audience are similar, yet antithetic in this passage: he refuses to rely upon ear-history, they are listening to him; he said he saw (ἑωράκει) accurately (ἀκριβῶς) what happened, they knew accurately (ἀκριβῶς again) that he actually saw nothing (μηδὲ ἑωράκει). The irony lies in the fact that, even though the audience is just listening and never attended the war, they have the only reliable information: he does not know what happened there, they know that what he pretends to report is actually very unlikely to have ever occurred this way.

The main target of Lucian's satire here is of course the failing historian, but his criticism can also be extended to the audience,[36] for they appear to let him speak as if they did not care about his lies. As a consequence, they too are responsible for the situation. The *Apocolocyntosis* already alluded to such a hypocrisy on the part of the reader. When refusing to give a name, Seneca comments *Quis coacturus est?* (*Apoc*. 1.1: "Who intends to make me?") and, when openly invoking the first person coming to his mind, he adds *Quis unquam ab historico iuratores exegit?* (*Apoc*. 1.2: "Who ever demanded of an historian sworn-in witnesses?"). His vocabulary is quite revealing: had he used the simple future *coget*, one could understand the sentence as implying a low probability of recourse to coercion. But he used the future participle *coacturus*, which means that it is a question not of probability, but intent. The narrator is perfectly aware that his audience is in no way willing to make him give a name. The verb *exegit* carries the same implication. Whatever his statements, no one will force him to prove them and the indefinite *quis unquam* implies that the situation never happened, at any moment, in the history of historiography. As a consequence, Seneca's audience is portrayed here as asking questions, but never really caring about the answers, another characteristic pointed out by his choice of a witness: why select someone credible, if no one actually cares? A known liar can perfectly make do.

Lucian is not as explicit as Seneca about the hypocrisy of the audience. It may come from the fact that his work is not limited to a satire of history writing:[37] its second part also gives concrete instructions on how history should be written. This is also a way to show the readers how they should evaluate historical texts, after having them laugh at the flaws of failing historians. But it all remains implicit, for Lucian mainly presents the matter from the writing side, speaking rather about the type of readers to aim at, not about how they should be.[38] He thus explicitly engages

36 Cf. Thompson 1986, 17, about *Don Quixote*, but relevant for any parody : "*Don Quichote* peut être considéré comme une parodie des romans de chevalerie et comme une satire dirigée contre le lecteur."

37 For this dimension, see the passage about the invocation of the Muses (Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 14) or the death of a soldier (Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 26). For the way Lucian uses satire in order to give serious historiographical advice, see Tamiolaki 2015.

38 A good example is Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 10, where he says that one should write for those who will read the work δικαστικῶς, because they will be as demanding as a money changer. Presenting the

would-be historians to think about posterity, not contemporary audience.[39] Such a statement is quite close to Thucydides' κτῆμα εἰς αἰεί, but it does not come from a will to produce a work whose worth would be forever admitted: it rather reveals that the reaction of the common public is not a suitable measure to achieve this goal. Lucian specifies the point even before speaking of audiences to come (*Hist. Conscr.* 10):

> Ἔτι κἀκεῖνο εἰπεῖν ἄξιον ὅτι οὐδὲ τερπνὸν ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ κομιδῇ μυθῶδες καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐπαίνων μάλιστα πρόσαντες παρ' ἑκάτερον τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, ἢν μὴ τὸν συρφετὸν καὶ τὸν πολὺν δῆμον ἐπινοῇς.
>
> It is also worthwhile to say this: to find in history things that are complete fiction or the type of praise that is very deeply biased does not please the audience either, if you do not care about the lowest and common part of the people.

The problem addressed here is a bit different from the one parodied by Seneca when he declared *nihil nec offensae nec gratiae dabitur*, for the people to please are not the powerful, but the common:[40] the alternative is between an immediate success[41] or one that would be delayed, but last forever.

This type of passages shows that, when writing, ancient historians had in mind the future reactions of their audience and this partly or completely influenced their writing.[42] As a consequence, by examining what Lucian most strongly rejects, we can have a glimpse at what the common reader was looking for in historical texts.[43] His insistence on the difference between history and *encomium*, which would delight not only some general, but also the whole audience (Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 7, 9, and 11–12), implies that there must have been a strong inclination to celebration. The passage on the characteristics of poetry as opposed to history also suggests a particular literary taste for high style descriptions and dramatizations.[44] Tacitus already complained about this trend in his *Annales*, after he emphasized the political usefulness of knowing what happened and why (4.33.3):

---

matter from the audience's point of view would have resulted in directly saying that history readers should be as demanding as a money changer.

39 Cf. Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 40: ὅλως πῆχυς εἷς καὶ μέτρον ἀκριβές, ἀποβλέπειν μὴ εἰς τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα συνεσομένους τοῖς συγγράμμασιν ("in sum, the one axe and accurate measure is to look forward not to those who listen to you, but to those who, afterwards, will come across your work").

40 Lucian nevertheless addresses the problem of seeking favor from the powerful at Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 38, with the same position as Tacitus' *sine ira nec studio*. On this, see Porod 2009, 30–39.

41 The case of historians writing only to please their public is also addressed by Plb. 12.25j.

42 On this point, cf. also Liotsakis' contribution in the present volume.

43 For how the composition of audience and the different circumstances of public reading influenced Roman historiography, see Wiseman 1981.

44 According to Wiseman (1981, 380–381), this characteristic stems from the influence of Greek literature.

> Ceterum, ut profutura, ita minimum oblectationis adferunt. nam situs gentium, uarietates proeliorum, clari ducum exitus retinent ac redintegrant legentium animum; nos saeua iussa, continuas accusationes, fallaces amicitias, perniciem innocentium et easdem exitii causas coniungimus, obuia rerum similitudine et satietate.
>
> However, as useful these elements can be, they also bring very little entertainment. For the living places of peoples, the twists and turns of battles, the glorious deaths of generals catch and renew the attention of readers; but in my case, I present a series of cruel orders, continuous accusations, false friendships, falls of innocents and the same causes for their death, coming across monotony and disgust.

The elements that are listed here quite correspond to Lucian's developments. *Situs gentium* alludes to a taste for exoticism, *uarietates proeliorum* to suspense and dramatization and *clari ducum exitus* to celebration. Tacitus' problem is not with his material, but with its repetitive character (*easdem causas*; *coniungimus*; *rerum similitudine*). As the audience mainly wants to be entertained, not instructed (*ut profutura, ita minimum oblectationis adferunt*), it is bored (*satietate*) by the continuous return of the same events and circumstances.[45]

What Seneca's, Tacitus' and Lucian's texts point out is the existence of a dichotomy between what was officially expected of historians (a reliable narration, political lessons, a real knowledge of the subject and no bias) and what the audience actually waited for (entertainment through suspense and dramatization, celebration of deeds and heroes). One could think with Lucian that the divergent expectations were actually those of the lowest part of the public, its educated part really caring about the methodological principles,[46] but a remark by Tacitus suggests that even the aristocracy was not that uncompromising (*Ann.* 4.33.4):

> Tum quod antiquis scriptoribus rarus obtrectator, neque refert cuiusquam Punicas Romanasue acies laetius extuleris; at multorum qui Tiberio regente poenam uel infamias subiere posteri manent; utque familiae ipsae iam exstinctae sint, reperies qui ob similitudinem morum aliena malefacta sibi obiectari putent.
>
> Moreover, ancient historians seldom faced objections and nobody cares if one more largely celebrated the Roman or the Punic armies; but, of the many that were punished or defamed under Tiberius, some heirs remain; and even when the families themselves are already extinct, you will find people who, because of the similitude of habits, think that the others' misdeeds are reproaches to them.

Both reception problems underlined here suppose from the reader that the historian is necessarily biased. On the one hand, objections linked to the preservation of family memory imply that he should have written according to its interest, not according

45 For an example on how the expectations of different audiences could be handled by Arrian, cf. Liotsakis' contribution.

46 Cf. for instance Wiseman 1981, 387, who distinguishes "mass audiences" and "the educated minority".

to what happened.[47] On the other hand, people feeling he is implicitly reproaching them for something do not count on his objectivity either. The starting point of their reflection is that writing about the past is a disguised way to write about the present. Both cases involve upper-class readers, for only they had an interest in preserving the memory of their ancestors and a stainless reputation.

Such a dichotomy is certainly older than Tacitus' time, for it can be found as early as the works of Cicero. Theorizing the writing of history in what is maybe the most famous example of historiography in the margins,[48] the orator states very strongly the principles to follow (*De Orat.* 2.62–63):

> Nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat? deinde ne quid ueri non audeat? ne quae suspicio gratiae sit in scribendo? ne quae simultatis? haec scilicet fundamenta nota sunt omnibus
>
> For who does not know that the first law of history is to not dare to say something false? Then to not dare not to say something true? To not be suspected of writing in order to win favors? To satisfy a personal hatred? Without doubt, these principles are known to everyone.

The whole passage presents the statements as obvious. Two phrases proclaim that everybody knows this (*quis nescit*; *nota sunt omnibus*); two adverbs emphasize that everybody also agrees on the existence of this previous knowledge (*nam*; *scilicet*); and the series of rhetorical questions itself implies the obviousness of the remarks. Yet, when Cicero is actually dealing with the writing of history, namely that of his consulate, his attitude is quite different (*Fam.* 5.12.3):

> Itaque te plane etiam atque etiam rogo ut et ornes ea uehementius etiam quam fortasse sentis et in eo leges historiae neglegas gratiamque illam de qua suauissime quodam in prohoemio scripsisti, [...] si me tibi uehementius commendabit, ne aspernere amorique nostro plusculum etiam quam concedet ueritas largiare.
>
> This is why I ask you again and again, straightforwardly, that, at the same time, you bring these events out even with more passion than you may conceive them, and, in this, that you neglect the laws of history, do not despise the famous charm you wrote most suavely about in some proemium, [...] if its recommendation of me is too passionate for you, and give to your affection for me even a little more than the truth allows.

One can argue that the *De Oratore* and the letter to Lucceius belong to very different genres and that, as a consequence, it is wrong to compare them,[49] but the similarities between the texts invite us to see them as the two faces of the same coin.[50] Both in-

47 On this, cf. Wiseman 1979.

48 Cf. Rambaud 1953; Woodman 1988, 70–117.

49 So Rambaud 1953, 17–18. For Rambaud, the letter aims at propaganda, not historiography.

50 Woodman (1988, 70–76) recognizes that the letter is important in order to know Cicero's opinion about the way history should be written, but less important than *De Oratore*, which is a proper treaty, written seven months after.

voke the laws of history, perfectly know that truth should be the goal to follow, and deal with prejudice. Given, then, what will be written afterward by Seneca and Lucian, the dichotomy does not appear to be in Cicero's attitude, but in his audience's. The orator knows that, when theorizing, he must speak about methodological principles, just as Seneca is 'forced' by his readers to name his source. When actually dealing with how a historical event should be written, however, his aim is literature, not history.[51] In the end, the final touchstone remains the public's taste, not methodology: everybody knew this too, for Seneca's readers did not actually care about his witness and Lucian's public did not say anything in front of a blatant lie.

As a consequence, there seems to have been a sort of 'historiographical pact'[52] between the historian and his public. Methodological statements were expected in any case, for they guaranteed the *auctoritas* of the work and the author.[53] But on the other hand there was an implicit agreement that the main goal should be the pleasure of the reader:[54] this is why Tacitus is more anxious about a bored audience than about scarce sources on which to base his narration.[55] The counter-part on the public's side is then a suspension of disbelief: as far as methodological statements appeared, no further requirement would be made by the common reader in order to verify the coherence between theory and practice. This does not mean historians could lie and elaborate as they pleased, for the verb Cicero uses is *ornare*, not *fingere*: he wants Lucceius to resort to *inuentio*, the art of finding things that are or could be in the story.[56] It follows that the regime of enunciation in ancient historiography was quite similar, though not identical, to fiction: as no one would complain to a novelist because he/she wrote fiction, most common readers in ancient times apparently did not complain if historical narrations did not contain justifications for every detail or interpretation, because this was not their main criterium of evaluation: what mat-

51 Cf. Wiseman 1981, 381: "The subject matter is contemporary, the aim is expressly political, and yet Cicero's argument throughout is a literary and aesthetic one." On this point, cf. also the contribution by D. Pausch in the present volume.

52 The expression is modeled on Ph. Lejeune's autobiographical pact (cf. Lejeune, 1996 [1975]), which is mainly based on J.-J. Rousseau's *Confessions*: when writing an autobiography, the author commits to only speaking about things personally experienced, without omitting, inventing or improving the past; on the other side, the reader has to honestly and fairly judge the life thus presented.

53 In addition to historical conditions, this also explains why Marincola 1997 finds recurring declarations in ancient historians.

54 It does not mean that all historians only had success in mind: the targets of a parody are always successful or widely famous works (cf. Bertrand 2006, 9), so the image it conveys of the parodied genre does not necessarily apply to the whole production.

55 Thinking about the pleasure of the public is not necessarily to be avoided, for it helps the lessons of history to be passed on: cf. the contribution by V. Liotsakis in the present volume.

56 Cf. Wiseman 1981, 388 – 389, who also quotes Cic. *Inv.* 1.9: *excogitatio rerum uerarum aut ueri similium quae causam probabilem reddant* ("[*inuentio* is] the faculty of finding things that are or seem true, so that they make the cause plausible").

tered, at least for the authors of chronological works,[57] was the continuity and coherence of the narrative[58] and the problems to solve were mainly narrative 'gaps', to be filled by projections or extrapolations.[59] As a consequence, the way ancient historians and their readers dealt with historical truth was not only a matter of avoiding prejudice,[60] but also of being in a grey zone, where adjunct elements would be neither false, since nothing, especially coherence and verisimilitude, told the contrary, nor undoutedly true, since nothing positively testified their actual existence. That a Roman audience could apparently very well stand such an uncertainty is additional proof that they had a different relation to the past than us.

***

This study of works not belonging to the historiographical genre, but nevertheless dealing with it, shows that a step aside from canonical texts leads to a glimpse of how historical practice could be received. It is quite visible in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, for his intended audience was larger, but only in passing in Lucian's *Historia Conscribenda*, because he mainly aimed at would-be historians, not their public.

What appears then is an agreement between authors and readers, implicit but clearly known, according to which the *auctoritas* of the work had to be reinforced by methodological statements, but the main goal was the pleasure of the reader, even if it implied taking liberties with what was strictly proved. This explains the preference for verisimilitude over truth and leads to a peculiar relationship with what we would nowadays consider fiction: whereas today we would call out as falsity anything imagined by a historian, according to ancient standards, if it was plausible, then it was not wrong.

Such an actual practice gave birth to a very peculiar regime of enunciation, under which many 'oddities' fall: not sticking to historical truth was perfectly accepted and only objected when interfering with a version that was more convenient to someone else; extrapolations to add details and dramatize the narration were common, for they enhanced *euidentia* and delighted the audience; speeches could be entirely rewritten, even when the original had been published. As a consequence, nobody can consider Cicero a hypocrite because he asked Lucceius not to apply to his historical writing the rules later established in his *De Oratore:* he was perfectly coherent with a practice that was still widely diffused two centuries later.

57 It may have been different for authors of discontinuous narration: cf. Duchêne 2020 for a comparison between Tacitus and Suetonius.

58 Indeed, Lucian mostly deals with the way history should be written (hence the title of the *Historia conscribenda*), not the methodological principles fo the genre.

59 For the use of such a process in historical enquiry, see Devillers 1995.

60 Cf. Woodman 1988, 81–83.

Bibliography

Aveline, J. (2004), "The Death of Claudius", in: *Historia* 53, 453 – 475.

Bertrand, D. (2006), "Introduction: état des lieux", in: *Seizième siècle* 2, 7 – 19.

Billault, A. (2010), "Lucien et Thucydide", in: V. Fromentin / S. Gottland / P. Payen (eds.), *Ombres de Thucydides. La Réception de l'historien depuis l'Antiquité jusqu'au début du XX^e siècle*, Bordeaux, 199 – 209.

Devillers, O. (1994), *L'Art de la persuasion dans les* Annales *de Tacite*, *Latomus* 223, Bruxelles.

Devillers, O. (1995), "Tacite, les sources et les impératifs de la narration: le récit de la mort d'Agrippine" in: *Latomus* 54, 324 – 345.

Duchêne, P. (2017), "Les critères d'évaluation de Tacite et Suétone face à leurs sources", in: *REL* 95, 167 – 182.

Duchêne, P. (2020), *Comment écrire sur les empereurs? Les procédés historiographiques de Tacite et Suétone*, Ausonius Éditions, Bordeaux.

Fishwick, D. (2002), "The Deification of Claudius" in: *CQ* 52, 341 – 349.

Gassino, I. (2011), "Les *Histoires vraies* de Lucien, de la parodie au manifeste", in: R. Poignault (ed.), *Présence du roman grec et latin*, Clermont-Ferrand, 179 – 191.

Genette, G. (1982), *Palimpsestes. La Littérature au second degré*, Paris.

Georgiadou, A. / Larmour, D.H. (1994), "Lucian and Historiography: *De Historia Conscribenda* and *Verae Historiae*" in: *ANRW* 34.2, 1448 – 1509.

Grimal, P. (1989), "Tacite et les présages", in: *REL* 67, 170 – 178.

Householder, F.W. (1944), "ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ", in: *CPh* 39, 1 – 9.

Hutcheon, L. (1985), *A Theory of Parody. The Teachings of Twentieth Century Arts Form*, New York / London.

Lejeune, P. (1996) [1975], *Le Pacte autobiographique*, Paris.

Marein, M.-F. (2012), "Écriture fictionnelle de l'histoire dans la *Vie d'Apollonios de Tyane* de Philostrate", in: B. Morin (ed.), *Polumathès. Mélanges offerts à J.-P. Levet*, Limoges, 327 – 342.

Marincola, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge.

Miltsios, N. (2016), "Sight and Seeing in Herodotus", in: *Trends in Classics* 8 (1), 1 – 16.

Moretti, G. (2003), "I difetti fisici di Claudio (*Apoc.* 5.2 – 3) e la seconda prova del contrappasso (*Apoc.* 15.2): Claudio fra tradizione biografica e tradizione menippea", in: I. Gualandri / G. Mazzoli (eds.), *Gli Annei: una famiglia nella storia e nella cultura di Roma imperiale*, Como, 141 – 151.

Porod, R. (2009), "Lucian and the Limits of Fiction in Ancient Historiography", in: A. Bartley (ed.), *A Lucian for our Time*, Newcastle / Upon / Tyne, 29 – 46.

Rambaud, M. (1953), *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine*, Paris.

Renard, M. (1937), "Suétone et l'*Apocoloquintose*", in: *RBPh* 16, 5 – 13.

Rose, M. (1979), *Parody/Metafiction. An Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror of the Writing and Reception of Fiction*, London.

Tamiolaki, M. (2015), "Satire and Historiography. The Reception of Classical Models and the Construction of the Author's *Persona* in Lucian's *De Historia Conscribenda*", in: *Mnemosyne* 68 (6), 917 – 936.

Thompson, C. (1986), "Problèmes théoriques de la parodie", in: *Études littéraires*, 19, 13 – 19.

Trédé, M. (2010), "Thucydide et Lucien ou comment lire le traité de Lucien *Sur la manière d'écrire l'histoire?*", in: V. Fromentin / S. Gottland / P. Payen (eds.), *Ombres de Thucydides. La Réception de l'historien depuis l'Antiquité jusqu'au début du XX^e siècle*, Bordeaux, 191 – 199.

Whitton, C.L. (2013), "Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*", in: E. Buckley / M.T. Dinter (eds.), *A Companion to the Neronian Age*, Oxford / Malden, MA, 149 – 169.

Wiseman, T.P. (1979), *Clio's Cosmetics*, Leicester.
Wiseman, T.P. (1981), "Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography", in: *History* 66, 375 – 393.
Woodman, A.J. (1988), *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, London.

Ari Zatlin

A History in *Letters*? The Intersection of Epistolarity and Historiography in Pliny

The past twenty-five years have witnessed a significant evolution in scholarship on Pliny's *Letters*.[1] Mommsen, Syme, and Sherwin-White poured through the prosopographical treasure trove that Pliny left to posterity, leaving future generations of scholars to probe the letters for their "literary" merits.[2] The first nine books of the *Letters* – that is, those excluding the correspondence with Trajan – have been examined from manifold perspectives: Henderson's monograph on Pliny's treatment of the plastic arts; Gunderson's use of Pliny's correspondence as a fulcrum for investigating the correlation between prose epistles and Catullan poetry; Marchesi's meticulous work on allusion and intertextuality; and numerous uses of the *Letters* as a laboratory for self-fashioning investigations.[3] Central to this focus has been the recognition that the *Letters* present signs of intricate arrangement, both within and across book units. In this vein, Alessandro Barchiesi has remarked upon the parallel between the first and last addressees of the collection, Clarus and Fuscus, as an indicator of both Pliny's reputation and as a signal of near cosmic order. This relationship is one already recognized by earlier readers of the *Letters*, including Sidonius, who follows Pliny's lead when framing the bookends of his own collection of epistles.[4] This emphasis on the interconnectedness of individual letters, their tendency to answer one another as if in responsion, and their overall polish are approaches that have come full circle. A literary reading of Pliny that considers the *Letters* akin to a book of Hellenistic poetry is, now over fifteen hundred years post-Sidonius, once again the norm; as Gunderson reflects, "the question is how far one might go in such a direction, not whether or not it should be pursued at all."[5]

1 I would like to thank Mario Baumann and Vasileios Liotsakis for their work organizing the conference and in editing the present volume, and to all of the conference participants and the anonymous reviewer for their ready feedback and helpful critiques.

2 Mommsen 1869, Syme 1960 and Syme 1968, and Sherwin-White 1966.

3 Henderson 2002; Gunderson 1997; Marchesi 2008; and, e. g., Riggsby 1995 and Riggsby 1998.

4 Barchiesi 2005; Writing in the 5th-century CE, Sidonius produces his own nine-book collection of letters, beginning with a letter addressed to a "C" (Constantius) and ending with an "F" (Firmius). Sidonius' first letter echoes Plin. *Ep.* 1.1 explicitly: *Diu praecipis, domine maior, summa suadendi auctoritate, sicuti es in his quae deliberabuntur consiliosissimus, ut, si quae litterae paulo politiores varia occasione fluxerunt, prout eas causa persona tempus elicuit, omnes retractatis exemplaribus enucleatisque uno volumine includam, Quinti Symmachi rotunditatem, Gai Plinii disciplinam maturitatemque vestigiis praesumptiosis insecuturus. nam de Marco Tullio silere melius puto, quem in stilo epistulari nec Iulius Titianus sub nominibus illustrium feminarum digna similitudine expressit* (Sidonius, *Epistles* 1.1.1–2; text according to Anderson 1936).

5 Gunderson 2007, 3.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-008

But while this increased attention to the *Letters* has elevated the corpus from a niche text of prosopographical import to the ranks of those works more worthy of "literary" considerations, it has done so while largely obfuscating their fundamental form as letters. It is not my intention in this paper to push the dial back to the days of Sherwin-White or Syme or Mommsen, but instead to reemphasize and prioritize the epistolarity of Pliny's *Letters*. Letters, after all, like Hellenistic poems, have a tendency to answer one another. Indeed, in a society like 1st-century CE Rome, the advanced social commerce of epistolography demands that they receive their due response.[6] My interests are not in intertextual or intergeneric contacts between Pliny and his predecessors themselves, but instead in the significance of the epistle as the *site* of these interactions. This approach stresses that form – in this case letters – is inseparable from content. Letters can be thought of as the solution in which Pliny performs his self-fashioning, his self-monumentalization, his experiments with historiography. It stands to reason, therefore, that the characteristics of this medium will necessarily tinge and influence the results. Most essentially, I ask (and hope to answer) what are the effects of inscribing letters with other generic elements, how the use of the epistolary form as an intertextual bridge represents a unique hermeneutic challenge, and finally, how this reoriented approach affects our understanding of Pliny and his orientation towards his ancient readers.

I.

Any inquiry into the particular readings that letters can create raises the thorny issue of isolating what makes a letter a letter. The question "What is a letter?" invites a rash of complications surrounding theories of genre. Positivist approaches to genre involve a kind of hermeneutic circle; in order to make evaluations of what a letter, an epic poem, or a satire is, we begin from a place already understanding what that form is, however hazy it may be.[7] With letters, however, such a starting point leads both everywhere and nowhere. A quick glance at a recent anthology of ancient (Greek and Latin) letters includes examples from familiar prose writers including Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, Fronto, and John, various Greek epistles recovered at Oxyrhynchus written by and addressed to otherwise unknown personages, pseudo-epigraphic missives from "Phalaris" and "Aeschines," selections from Alciphron writing under the guise of Greek sailors and courtesans, and verse epistles from Horace, Ovid, and Martial. Very little apart from a tendency to use second-person forms of address ties these works together; even less binds them when we make demands

6 For the status of letters and letter books as a commodity of gift exchange, see particularly Wilcox 2012; more generally, on the status of the gift between across social strata in Rome, see Roller 2001, 129 – 212; and as regards the relationship between Pliny and Trajan, see Noreña 2007.

7 On the hermeneutic circle and genre, see for instance Garber, Orsini, and Brogan 1993.

upon their content.[8] The only standard that can be found that applies to each of these letters is that they were written. Derrida's assertion that "Mixture is the letter, the epistle, which is not a genre but all genres, literature itself" rings especially true when we survey the breadth of ancient source material.[9]

Ancient literary theory on letters – at least that which survives – is likewise light on answers and is mostly concerned with providing descriptive catalogues of letter types.[10] Demetrius' *de Elocutione*,[11] however, includes within its larger discussion of the plain (ἰσχνότητος) style a digression on the so-called ἐπιστολικὸς χαρακτήρ. Demetrius distinguishes his account from that of Artemon, the editor of Aristotle's letters, who regarded the letter as one of the two sides of a dialogue (εἶναι γὰρ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν οἷον τὸ ἕτερον μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου).[12] Demetrius thus stresses the letter as a point of communion between author and audience. A letter ought to avoid the oftentimes broken and halting structure of conversation, and with it, any possibility of obscurity. Length should be controlled, as well as stylistic range (λέξις); attaching a salutation (τὸ χαίρειν) to a lengthy tract of Plato or Thucydides does not a letter make. Only certain topics – namely those that convey friendly feelings (φιλοφρόνησις) succinctly – are appropriate. Likewise, gnomic sayings may be included, provided they express a quotidian philosophy, and again are imbued with φιλοφρόνησις.

But the crux of Demetrius' discussion centers on his point that "everyone writing a letter more or less composes an image of his own soul" (σχεδὸν γὰρ εἰκόνα ἕκαστος τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς γράφει τὴν ἐπιστολήν).[13] He goes on to note that it is possible to make such judgments from other forms of writing, but the letter holds primacy in this regard. Perhaps the question that we should ask, therefore, is not "What is a letter?" but instead "What possible valences of meaning are created when a text makes a claim to be a letter?" Or, more prosaically, what happens when I write "Dear so-and-so"? A letter from Cicero to Atticus and one of Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* may not find the kind of formal unity that is sought in aligning like texts under a cohesive rubric but, I suggest, each similarly foregrounds the relationship between author and audience by operating under an epistolary conceit of openness, familiarity, and honesty. The idea that letters are able to look *into* the soul may partially help to explain the popularity of the epistle as a means of talking *about* the soul. Among such "phil-

8 However, that has not stopped many from trying. Collections or commentaries on ancient letters contain *de rigeur* definitions (some looser than others) of the form. See for instance Trapp 2003, 1; Gibson and Morello 2007 very usefully push against texts of a more tenuous "epistolary" to tests the boundaries of the form, and argue for a more fluid approach.

9 Derrida 1987, 48; See also Altman 1982, 212 on the idea that "epistolary literature exposes the conflicting impulses that generate all literature."

10 Trapp 2003, 42–45; 180–93.

11 Text taken from Roberts 1969.

12 *Eloc.* 223.

13 *Eloc.* 227.

osophical letters," formal elements are disparate; what unite the letters of Epicurus, Horace, Seneca, and John are precisely their joint claims to be letters, and thus, their ability to co-opt and utilize the epistolary conceit that content is rendered to the reader without mediation and in such a way to be able to create community. Likewise, the quotidian, utilitarian nature of the letter – its tendency to directly engage, to ask of its addressee, and to invite an answer – further focalizes this relationship between writer and responsive reader.

At the same time, however, the *raison d'être* of the letter is the distance between that writer and reader. That distance can be physical – Cicero is at Rome while Atticus lives in Athens; Ovid is exiled in Tomis while his addressees remain enfranchised in Italy; or metaphoric – Seneca's use of the form, *sans* epistolary paratext, in order to simulate a philosophic journey; or temporal – for instance, Petrarch's adoption of the epistolary mode to answer Cicero's letters at the remove of some 1400 years, an example which also highlights the overweening impulse that letters ask to be answered.[14] In short, letters operate under a set of conflicting impulses, as both the bridge that makes possible communication over distance and across time, and the reminder that such separations exists, as such gulfs are otherwise unable to be spanned.

We might think of these distinct, and sometimes competing, qualities of letters as the particular set of "affordances" that letters have. In her monograph *Forms*, Caroline Levine borrows the term "affordance" from design theory, where it is employed "to describe the potential uses or actions latent in materials and designs." Just as we may describe glass as "affording" transparency and brittleness, she argues, we may also describe elegiac couplets, sonnets, or letters as affording certain qualities.[15] Affordances are, therefore, a convenient way of clarifying what literary forms are capable of doing and what potentialities lie latent within them. Taking our brief sketch of the generic scope and theoretic underpinnings of ancient letters, we might list as a possible set of epistolary affordances such ideas as "openness," "sincerity," "distance," "clarity," "prose," "poetry," "closeness," and "generic inclusivity," to name a few. Several of these affordances quite directly contradict each other – "distance"/"closeness" and "prose"/"poetry" most obviously – while others have no apparent relationship at all. For Levine, determining how these different affordances interact in anticipated and unexpected ways, as well as the hierarchical precedence one affordance takes over another, makes up the central basis of analytical work.

My focus on this interaction between forms, their particular affordances, and content is motivated not only by my own selfish interests, but also by Pliny's words themselves. In the opening sections of the *Panegyricus*, Pliny bemoans the difficulty he faces in bestowing sincere praise upon Trajan in the light of years of forced

14 Petrarch's famous critical, personal responses after reading Cicero's letters is a further indication of the priority given to letters as revealing an individual's true, unvarnished character; see also Hinds 2005 on Petrarch's use of the epistolary form in creating virtual communities.

15 Levine 2015, 6.

approbation under Domitian. Pliny's chief antithesis is between open (*palam*) and private (*secreto*) speech: under the tyrant, flattery was reserved as the public discourse for the singular audience of the Emperor, whereas hidden Roman hearths and hearts heard only scorn.[16] Pliny's wistful "solution" to the issue is as perverse as it is revealing of the extent to which the very idea of public praise has been broken by years of abuse:

> Queri libet quod in secreta nostra non inquirant principes nisi quos odimus. nam si eadem cura bonis ac malis esset, quam ubique admirationem tui, quod gaudium exultationemque deprenderes, quos omnium cum coniugibus ac liberis, quos etiam cum domesticis aris focisque sermones!
>
> We should like to complain that emperors do not inquire into our private affairs – except the ones we despise. But if the same interest belonged to both good and bad ones, how much admiration of yourself would you hear, how much joy and exultation, what conversations with our wives and children at our private altars and hearths would you everywhere find![17]

What Pliny describes is essentially the permanent disconnect between the form of the panegyric, if not public approbation as whole, and the content of that discourse. The premiere quality of imperial praise had become its insincerity, making honest assessments of "good" emperors impossible. Indeed, it is only an invasive breach of privacy that would allow Trajan to hear his praises – an act befitting of bad emperors and one that would therefore make that joy and exultation ring false.

I linger on this point here if only to raise the issue that Pliny is intimately concerned with the tension between form and content in the post-Domitianic world. Pliny understands well that it is not words themselves but the form in which they are delivered that most influences his audience's reception of them. If public discourse, in a time immediately following an era of *delatores*, censorship, and political violence, has lost any affordance of frankness, he understands that a new form is necessary to achieve that end. Of secondary interest is the fact that the remainder of this chapter will concern itself with letters – a presumably private discourse – that carry with them that same "window into the soul" through which an eavesdropping emperor might catch a snippet of "true" praise. With this in mind, I will focus mainly on a subset of epistolary affordances – "sincerity," "distance," and "generic inclusivity" – to test how these elements abut against the content of Pliny's letters, particularly as relates to historiographical subjects. Part II will look closely at *Letters* 1.1 and the way in which the opening epistle problematizes the relationship between epistolography and history at the outset, while Part III will trace this issue through a number of subsequent letters in the collection.

16 *Panegy.* 2.2; for an extended discussion on the public/private dynamic and the impossibility of sincere praise, see Bartsch 1994, 148–188.

17 *Panegy.* 68.7.

II.

Though among the briefest of his published epistles, *Letters* 1.1 displays the push and pull between proximity and distance, spontaneity and polish, and engagement and absence that is emblematic of the collection as a whole. The first of his 235 non-Trajanic letters,[18] *Letters* 1.1 is addressed to C. Septicius Clarus, a recipient of three other letters in the collection (1.15, 7.28, and 8.1), and himself the dedicatee of Suetonius' *Lives* (*Ep.* 1.1):

> C. Plinius Septicio <Claro> Suo. S.
> Frequenter hortatus es ut epistulas, si quas paulo curatius scripsissem, colligerem publicaremque. collegi non servato temporis ordine (neque enim historiam componebam), sed ut quaeque in manus venerat. superest ut nec te consilii nec me paeniteat obsequii. ita enim fiet, ut eas quae adhuc neglectae iacent requiram et si quas addidero non supprimam. vale.[19]
>
> Pliny to Septicius Clarus
> You have often urged me to collect and publish any letters that I have written with some care. I have collected them here not as a slave to chronology – since I'm not writing history – but as each one came into my hands. It's up to you not to regret having asked, and for me not to regret having listened. So let it be done; I will seek out any letters that still yet lie about, and I will not suppress any that I may write in the future.

Two points about the composition of the *Epistles* are immediately apparent from this letter. The first is the idea that Pliny is offering up letters that have been written "with some care" (*paulo curatius*). At the most basic level, the statement indicates that these are letters that have been curated. Pliny is elusively vague about in which direction or directions this idea of "care" is pointed – whether to letters that are written with tactful social or political care, or stylistically, to ones that have received more of his time and attention and thus have a more "literary" quality.

While it is obvious that Pliny would not voluntarily publish a letter that would breach the laws of decorum or reflect badly on his social standing, his admission that these letters may have been written with more care than others is cause for consideration. As has been pointed out by Sherwin-White and others,[20] this remark is suggestive of two immediate contemporary intertextual parallels with Quintilian and Statius. Quintilian, like his pupil Pliny, states at the opening of the *Instituio Oratoria* that his move to publication came as the result of outside pressure (*Efflagitasti*

18 *Ep.* 1.1 was initially written as a dedicatory letter for the first wave of publication of the *Epistles*, rather than for the nine books of letters to *familiares* as we have them; for more on the date of composition of *Ep.* 1.1, see Sherwin-White 1966, 85; on the legacy of 1.1 on the reconstruction of the publication schedule of the *Letters*, see Bodel 2015.

19 Text for the *Letters* is taken from Radice 1969.

20 Sherwin-White 1966, 2, 16, 42; see also Bodel 2015, 13, 18, 42–57 on the wider influence and stylistics of the dedicatory letter to which Pliny may be responding and how this relates to the organization of Book 1.

cotidiano convicio ut libros [...] iam emittere inciperem).[21] So, too, in the proem to the first book of the *Silvae* does Statius express his hesitancy in the publication of these poems (*Diu multumque dubitavi*), and writes that he only sanctioned their complete dissemination since they were already in circulation; Stella, to whom the *Silvae* are dedicated, and other friends are already in possession of the work (*quid quod et serum erat continere, cum illa vos certe quorum honori data sunt haberetis?*).[22] However, both Quintilian and Statius make a concerted effort to frame their efforts as underdeveloped, a feint that while a literary device nevertheless contextualizes the works within their authors' respective careers. The point is especially true for Statius, who contrasts the occasionality of the *Silvae* and the swiftness of their composition (*nullum enim ex illis biduo longius tractum, quaedam et in singulis diebus effusa*) against the authority of his *Thebaid*. The gambit is clear, as Statius is quick to point out that even in his day the *Culex* and the *Battle of the Frogs* are widely read. Statius will be no different from Vergil and Homer in offering up his light verse in tandem with his grand epic. Pliny's *paulo curatius*, however, lacks the tongue-in-cheek *recusatio* and on-the-nose self-aggrandizement of Statius. Granted, he avers a similar hesitancy over publication as both Quintilian and Statius do with his apprehension that he or Clarus may one day regret the production of the *Epistles*.[23] Within this context, Pliny appears to take a risk – he admits at the start that these letters have not been published against his will, that they are not a mere reflection of his greater works, and that above all, they have received their due attention.

In addition to these overt intertextual gestures, there is one further, unspoken contrast that Pliny makes with his declaration about the level of attention he has given to the curation of the *Letters* – indeed, inherent with their very publication at all. Though Pliny does not explicitly mention him in *Ep.* 1.1, Cicero stands as the most conspicuous antecedent against which to evaluate this collection of prose epistles. As we read through Pliny, it must be admitted that the Ciceronian corpus had significant impact on the shape and tenor of Pliny's collection, whether it be in letters where Cicero is explicitly mentioned – including the one that follows, *Ep.* 1.2[24] and *Ep.* 9.2, wherein Pliny explicitly recalls how Sabinus has suggested that Pliny follow Cicero as an example in his letter writing, and bemoans the fact that he lacks the same material with which to fill out his epistles,[25] – or in letters, or groups of letters,

21 Quint. *Inst.* pr. 1.1; text taken from Winterbottom 1970.

22 Stat. *Silv.* pr. 1; text from Shackleton Bailey 2015.

23 Quint. *Inst.* pr. 1.3 (*Multum autem in tua quoque fide ac diligentia positum est, ut in manus hominum quam emendatissimi veniant*); Stat. *Silv.* pr. 1.15–16 (*quam timeo ne verum istuc versus quoque ipsi de se probent!*).

24 At *Ep.* 1.2.4, Pliny states that in speech-writing, *non tamen omnino Marci nostri ληκύτηους fugimus [...]*.

25 The passage in question reads as follows: *Neque enim eadem nostra condicio quae M. Tulli, ad cuius exemplum nos vocas. illi enim et copiosissimum ingenium, et par ingenio qua varietas rerum*

that rely on more subtle readings of either the Plinian or Ciceronian collections. But Pliny signals that the most essential difference between his letters and those of Cicero is a matter of personal publication in the first sentence of 1.1 – *frequenter hortatus es, ut epistulas si quas paulo curatius scripsissem, colligerem publicaremque*. While there is significant debate over the date of publication of Cicero's letters and on the authorial intents of their publication (whether to publish at all, which letters to publish), it is clear that letters as we know them were not widely circulated at least until the mid-1st-century CE, and even then, it was likely done in a piecemeal fashion.[26]

We have then in the opening sentence of Pliny's *Letters* an intersection of familiar themes, a seemingly straightforward introductory passage. Leaning on similar presentations by Statius and Quintilian, Pliny presents his work as something in demand; these, he avers in case his reader has missed the opening salutation, are letters; they have been worked on, but perhaps not worked over. The tricolon of first-person verbs that concludes the sentence only adds further emphasis – "If *I* had written any, *I* would collect them and *I* would publish them." I think it safe to assume that by the late 1st-century CE any reader, Septicius Clarus among them, would understand that these prose letters by a consular Roman have a Ciceronian, and perhaps even republican, pedigree. But Pliny, unlike Cicero, here takes ownership over the project from the start – *he*, not Atticus, not Tiro, not any compiler of jokes or *sententiae* – is sending these letters out into the world a second time. This is not a document that has slipped away from its original author; it has been published according to his will.

But as with so much of the *Letters*, there is a complication at work that challenges the ways in which we read Pliny *vis-à-vis* his literary predecessors. The dedication of the work to Clarus is not only operative as an honorific, but contains within it a particular threat that goes beyond the standard obligations of such gift debts. If Clarus or any other reader were familiar with the *ad Atticum* and *Epistulae Morales* 21, they would not only understand from Cicero's letters the dear friendship between Cicero and Atticus, but would also glean from Seneca that Atticus' fame was only sustained by virtue of his famous friend – *Nomen Attici perire Ciceronis epistulae non sinunt*. Clarus is forced to reckon with a similar problem from Pliny's dedication – will he be remembered on his own merits, or merely survive as a reflection of Pliny's fame? That so many of the *Letters* deal explicitly with fame, and in particular, literary fame, underscores the point further. Through the act of addressing, Pliny places himself in a privileged position, taking control not only of how he will be remembered,

qua magnitudo largissime suppetebat; nos quam angustis terminis claudamur etiam tacente me perspicis, nisi forte volumus scholasticas tibi atque, ut ita dicam, umbraticas litteras mittere (*Ep.* 9.2.); for more on this letter and its implications, see below.

26 Cornelius Nepos is the first to cite Cicero's letters, doing so in his *Life* of Atticus (Nep. *Att.* 16.3); for a broad treatment of the early publication history of Cicero's letters, see Nicholson 1998.

but his *familiares* as well. If Clarus were ever to complain, Pliny has provided his response in the very first line – *Frequenter hortatus es [...]* – "Well, you asked for it."[27]

This sense of complication follows immediately in the next line, where Pliny (again, emphatically beginning where his previous sentence left off with a first-person verb) writes: *Collegi non servato temporis ordine (neque enim historiam componebam), sed ut quaeque in manus venerat* ("I have collected [them] here not beholden to chronology – since I'm not writing history – but as each one came into my hands"). While this sentence has historically been interpreted as indicating how Pliny wrote and organized the *Letters*, I think it is far more useful to see this statement as an expression of how to read them. The two elements of this statement – *collegi non servato temporis ordine [...] sed ut quaeque in manus venerat* and the parenthetical *neque enim historiam componebam* each suggest different strategies of reading and serve a programmatic role in interrogating the nature of the *Letters*, forcing readers (and rereaders) to question what kind of literary project the work as a whole represents. If we take Pliny at his word that the organization of the letters as we have them precludes them from being history, we must necessarily follow up: what *is* he writing? Pliny, at the start of his work, lays down an essential question about what force the organization of a collection of prose letters can have, and the kind of literary implications that these architectonics bear out.

Once again, Pliny's dense intertextuality helps support such a reading – in this case, Ovid and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. At the close of Book 3, Ovid issues a denial on consciously organizing the letters with some kind of purpose – *Postmodo conlectas utcumque sine ordine iunxi/hoc opus electum ne mihi forte putes*[28] ("Later collecting them, anyhow, I linked them regardless: in case you think perhaps this work was selected by me"). The allusion is a striking one on several counts. Most obviously, Pliny has invited another form of writing, here poetry, into the already crowded catalogue he has offered in just the first two lines of *Ep.* 1.1. We can now be even more confident in reading *sed ut quaeque in manus venerat* as heavily ironic, a learned wink that signals from the start that the arrangement of the letters is anything but accidental. Instead, rather than seeing the predecessors of these prose letters as Ciceronian (and thus organized by recipient) or the philosophically chronological (a Seneca), we ought instead to consider the *Letters* as a book of poetry with Hellenistic sensibilities much in line with the contemporary readings listed above and to seek thematic echoes intratextually that create a work that is greater than its individual parts.[29] From a further structural standpoint, Ovid's poem closes the third book of his *Epistulae*,

27 The last letter of Book 1 likewise addresses the theme of regret, where Pliny asks Baebius Hispanus to secure a fair price for an estate for Suetonius: *Haec tibi exposui, quo magis scires, quantum esset ille mihi ego tibi debiturus, si praediolum istud, quod commendatur his dotibus, tam salubriter emerit ut paenitentiae locum non relinquat* (*Ep.* 1.24.4).

28 Ov. *Pont.* 3.9.53–54; for text see Wheeler 1924.

29 For thematic cross-references in the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* see Galasso 1995, 17–39.

which at the time of its original publication was the final book of the work.[30] We are encouraged, therefore, to reflect on this statement in reverse, with a backwards glance over poems we have just read. According to Bodel and Sherwin-White,[31] Pliny's first batch of published letters also amounted to three books. Providing this allusion to Ovid at the start has us instead looking forward, serving as a kind of roadmap by which to navigate the letters. This single pointed reference to Ovid's own half-hearted denial of having any hand in organizing the *Epistulae ex Ponto* signals that Pliny has done just the opposite.

But while the alignment with Ovid on the one hand gestures toward a kind of control-through-randomness in terms of the arrangement, it at the same time establishes an uncomfortable parallel between Pliny and the figure of the exiled poet. The implications are beyond playful and border instead on gallows humor.[32] Ovid has recourse to the epistle because he is separated from Rome and his library; the letter activates, as it so often does, an expression of loss and a desire to bridge the disconnect between distant shores. Ovid writes letters because it is all that is left for him to write. Pliny is far more enigmatic. He does not tell us explicitly from whom, or perhaps, from when, he is exiled, though his aforementioned lament at *Ep.* 9.2 provides a strong indication. Writing in answer to Statius Sabinus' request for more frequent and longer letters, Pliny complains that there is simply not enough material for him to call upon (*Ep.* 9.2.2–4):

> Neque enim eadem nostra condicio quae M. Tulli, ad cuius exemplum nos vocas. illi enim et copiosissimum ingenium, et par ingenio qua varietas rerum qua magnitude largissime suppetebat; nos quam angustis terminis claudamur etiam tacente me perspicis, nisi forte volumus scholasticas tibi atque, ut ita dicam, umbraticas litteras mittere.[33]
>
> My situation is not the same as that of Cicero, whose examples you ask me to follow. His was a most expansive talent, and to match it was supplied a great variety of important issues. You know without my saying how I am confined by these narrow limits. Perhaps though I will send you an schoolboy's exercise that, so to speak, "plays the part."

30 Galasso 1995, 195.

31 On the publication periods of the *Letters*, see Sherwin-White 1966, 52–56 and Bodel 2015, 13–19.

32 Pliny is not the first writer in his family to begin a sprawling prose text with a reference to poetry – Pliny the Elder begins his *Naturalis Historia* with his own *licentiore epistula* reworking Catullus 1 (*namque tu solebas/nugas esse aliquid meas putare*) (Plin. *Nat.* pr. 1); see Rackham 1938 for text. The self-deprecation is familiar from Quintilian or Statius and though the esoterica of the *NH* may be written off as *nugae* for some, no one could confuse Pliny the Elder's 37 books for Catullus' *lepidum novum labellum*, or for that matter, Cornelius Nepos' *tribus [...] chartis, doctis [...] et laboriosis* of all Italic history.

33 For similar remarks on the paucity of contemporary material, see *Ep.* 3.20 and Tac. *Ann.* 4.32.

Now nine books and over 200 epistles in, we are told that these letters may just be an extended rhetorical exercise, Pliny writing *in persona Ciceronis*.[34] The political capital of these letters, first called into question by Pliny's self-alignment with Ovid at *Letters* 1.1, is seemingly confirmed as counterfeit as we near the end of the collection. With *Letters* 9.2, Pliny tells us he has mined Cicero's epistles like any good student of style, but he reminds us to look at his letters as written by an ersatz republican.

If Pliny's Ovidian reference suggests approaching the *Letters* as a book of Hellenisitic poetry, and one written mindful of the gulf between imperial present and republican past at that, his comment *neque enim historiam componebam* establishes a contrast between epistolography and history that likewise runs through the collection. The legacy of this statement has been concerned overwhelmingly with the content outside the parenthetical – *sed ut quaeque in manus venerat* – in efforts to reconstruct the internal chronology of the letters and to date their initial drafting and publication.[35] As in the case of the early modern attempts at the chronological reorganization of the Ciceronian letters, Mommsen and those scholars that followed his lead saw in Pliny's letters a unique opportunity to reconstruct his character and his past, much in the same way the Ciceronian corpus has been viewed as a window into its author's soul, a legacy that recalls Demetrius.[36] Even modern critical works that rightly reject such transparent readings of the *Letters* elide[37] Pliny's statement here – *neque enim historiam componebam* – and in doing so ignore a panoply of generic questions that are foregrounded at the start of his work.

It must be asked, if Pliny had arranged the letters chronologically, would the *Letters* be a form of *historia*? Such an equivocation between sequential organization and *historia* is highly reductive, and would do so to the exclusion of histories that do not conform to such strict guidelines. Furthermore, as Gibson has recently shown, only one major letter collection can be said in any sense to be chronological, the *Epistulae Morales*.[38] Even with Seneca, the letters exclude authorial datelines and rarely refer to secure events; they maintain a sequence to the extent that one builds on what has come before to blaze Lucillius' philosophical trail. This fact further underscores the irregularity of Pliny's statement – if these are explicitly *epistulae*, then why contend that they are not *historia?* If it was the standard in presentations of ancient letters to eschew chronology, then why make the statement at all?

---

34 The adjective *umbraticus* is quite rare; Cicero (*de Orat*. 1.157.6 and *Orat*. 64.2) uses the word to refer to specialized scholastic activities, as does Quintilian (*Inst*. 1.2.18.4); Petronius uses the word to refer to "learned" teachers of rhetoric (2.4).

35 Mommsen 1869 provided the initial framework for grappling with this question.

36 Shackleton-Bailey 1972, xii in his biography of Cicero likewise leans on the letters for their insight into character: "In Cicero's case, the materials do not allow a full and balanced biography, but there is enough to show the manner of man he was. The design of this book is to let him do that, as far as possible, for himself."

37 Sherwin-White 1966, 86; the heading for his note on this line tellingly reads: *collegi non servato temporis ordine [...] sed ut quaeque in manus venerat*.

38 Gibson 2012, 62.

Part of the answer to this question lies with Cicero, and the early reception of his letters. In his *Life* of Atticus, Nepos, after commenting on the usefulness of certain rolls of Cicero's correspondence in reconstructing the relationships between Cicero and both his *familiares* and Atticus, remarks of the letters: *quae qui legat, non multum desideret historiam contextam eorum temporum*[39] ("he who reads the letters would not want for a continuous history of these times"). Nepos goes on to state that the letters contain within them the mind-set and inclinations of the pivotal actors within the Republic during Cicero's life and that (mirroring the faith of so many modern editors) "everything within them is clear and it is easily understood that the wisdom within them is a kind of divination." Indeed, Nepos concludes, Cicero not only predicts the future (*futura praedixit*), but he does so "singing like *vates*" (*cecinit ut vates*).[40] In light of Nepos' comments, Pliny's movement away from *historiam* [*contextam*] is an implicit rejection of one way that Cicero's letters were read and interpreted after his death. Rather than provide a window to the soul, a clear picture of an era, and a prophetic view of the future, Pliny instead offers obfuscation. The paratextual elements of *Ep.* 1.1 and its companion, *Epistles* 9.40, the final non-Trajanic letter in the collection, only bring this motif into further relief, opening the collection with a letter to Clarus and closing with a missive to Fuscus.[41] The effect is one that moves from Pliny as protégé to Pliny as patron, and the movement from dawn to dusk casts the author as a master of time. However, in light of Nepos' comments and Pliny's rejection of the vatic elements of an "historical" reading of prose letters, one that is grounded in *historiam contextam*, Pliny's dateless letters that come to the reader *ut quaeque in manus venerat* are the opposite of the Ciceronian model. The more we read Pliny, the more clouded he, the world he inhabits, and the future becomes.

III.

As with his invocation of Ovid, the more we read through the collection and follow these threads, the more Pliny challenges the foundations of these generic models. Pliny may aver in *Letters* 1.1 that he is not writing history, but his consistent returns to the topic throughout the collection are cause for reevaluation. In what amounts to a condensed guide to historiographical writing, Pliny stresses in several letters that accuracy and truth are the essential elements of the genre. At *Letters* 7.17.3, defending the public performance of history, Pliny calls the genre one *quae non ostentationi sed*

39 Nepos, *Life of* Atticus 16; for text, see Rolfe 1929.

40 The entire passage reads (Nep. *Att.* 16.4): *Sic enim Omnia de studiis principium, vitiis ducum, mutationibus rei publicae perscripta sunt, ut nihil in his non appareat et facile existimari possit prudentiam quodam modo esse divinationem. non enim Cicero ea solum, quae vivo se accidertunt futura praedixit, sed etiam, quae nunc usu veniunt, cecinit ut vates.*

41 Cf. Marchesi 2008, 250 on the same relationships.

fidei veritati componitur. This same connection between historiography and accuracy is drawn in *Letters* 9.19, wherein Pliny quotes an anecdote from the early imperial historian Cluvius Rufus who, in asking for pardon from Verginius in case anything in Cluvius' work should offer offense, says: *Scis, Vergini, quae historiae fides debeatur* ("You know, Verginius, what fidelity is owed to history").[42] *Ep.* 7.33, a missive to Tacitus in which Pliny offers up a trial in which he participated for possible inclusion within Tacitus' work,[43] begins with language reminiscent of Nepos' comment on the effects of Cicero's letters: *Auguror nec me fallit augurium, historias tuas immortals futuras* ("I believe that your histories will be immortal; a prophecy which will surely prove correct"). He closes with the following (*Ep.* 7.33.10):

> Haec [res], utcumque se habent, notiora clariora maiora tu facies; quamquam non exigo ut excedas actae rei modum. nam nec historia debet egredi veritatem, et honeste factis veritas sufficit. vale.
>
> These affairs, however you see them, you can make more well-known, famous, greater. Do note, though, that I am not asking you to go beyond the due measure of the facts. History ought not to exceed the truth, and truth in turn suffices for honest deeds.

Once again, we have truth and accuracy – *veritatem [...] honeste [...] veritas* – as the essential components of *historia*. This kind of definitional consistency of history runs throughout the *Letters*,[44] as does the emphasis on making events *notiora clariora maiora*; indeed, the central element of that triptych, *clariora*, raises allusions to *Letters* 1.1 that are only intensified by the fact that the letter that follows, *Ep.* 7.23, is addressed to Septicius Clarus. The role of history, then, seems clear – its goals, its purpose, even its lofty position in the hierarchy of genres.[45] If we take Pliny's disavowal of history at *Ep.* 1.1 to heart, we are left to wonder to what extent he has jettisoned its effects along with it.

Nowhere is this tension between historiography and epistles more expressed than in *Ep.* 6.16 and *Ep.* 6.20, Pliny's account of his uncle's death on Vesuvius addressed to the most prominent historian of the day, Tacitus. These letters are perhaps the most enduring of Pliny's entire corpus, lively examples of the kinds of death nar-

42 *Ep.* 9.19.5; the entire section reads: *Ipse sum testis, familiariter ab eo dilectus probatusque, semel omnino me audiente provectum, ut de rebus suis hoc unum referret, ita semel aliquando Cluvium locutum: 'Scis, Vergini, quae historiae fides debeatur, proinde si quid in historiis meis legis aliter ac velis rogo ignoscas.' ad hoc ille: 'Tune ignoras, Cluvi, ideo me fecisse quod feci, ut esset liberum vobis scribere quae libuisset?'*

43 The account of the trial, which took place between 93 and 94 CE, had presumably not yet been reached by Tacitus' *Histories*. It is unclear if the episode was included.

44 For more on history and truth, see also *Ep.* 7.17, 8.13, 9.19.

45 At *Ep.* 9.27, Pliny writes: *Quanta potestas, quanta dignitas, quanta maiestas, quantum denique numen sit historiae, cum frequenter alias tum proxime sensi.*

ratives that pepper contemporary Latin historiography.[46] But at the close of *Ep.* 6.16 and *Ep.* 6.20, Pliny remarks on the incompatibility of history and the epistolary mode, both in terms of form and content (*Ep.* 6.16.21–22):

> Interim Miseni ego et mater – sed nihil ad historiam, nec tu aliud quam de exitu eius scire voluisti. Finem ergo faciam. unum adiciam, omnia me quibus interfueram quaeque statim, cum maxime vera memorantur audieram, persecutum. tu potissima excerpes; aliud est enim epistulam aliud historiam, aliud amico aliud omnibus scribere. vale.
>
> Meanwhile my mother and I were at Misenum – but this does not pertain to history, nor did you ask to know about anything other than my uncle's death. Therefore, I will finish, except to add one thing, that I have described everything for which I was present or which I heard immediately after, when events are most easily recalled as accurate. You select what is most useful; for there is a difference between what belongs in a letter and what suits a history, and to write to a friend versus for all.
>
> *Ep.* 6.20.20
> Nobis tamen ne tunc quidem, quamquam et expertis periculum et exspectantibus, abeundi consilium, donec de avunculo nuntius. haec nequaquam historia digna non scripturus leges et tibi scilicet qui requisisti imputabis, si digna ne epistula quidem videbuntur. vale.
>
> Not even then, despite the dangers we had experienced and were yet expecting, did the idea of leaving strike us until we heard news about my uncle. These details are not worthy of history, nor when you read them will you intent to write them down; but if they do not even seem fit to be recorded in a letter, you should blame yourself for asking for them in the first place.

While certainly playful, these closing statements appended to the heels of some of Pliny's longest and most narratively rich letters issue the same set of provocations as *Ep.* 1.1. Pliny comes perilously close to writing history, and all that seems to hold Pliny from slipping from the epistolary mode, quite literally, is his mother entering the scene – *Interim Miseni ego et mater.* Though the conceit stresses obedience to notions of epistolary stylistics (namely, focusing a letter on a single topic),[47] the separation of the *Ep.* 6.16 and *Ep.* 6.20 makes explicit the break between any notion of *historia contexta* and the *Letters*. Ash is certainly correct in characterizing *Ep.* 6.16 and *Ep.* 6.20 as a kind of "miniaturisation" of history within the collection,[48] an action that is itself echoed by Pliny's self-described actions at *Ep.* 6.20.5, wherein amidst Vesuvian discharges he reads and excerpts Livy.[49] These letters, then, on their own as individuals, stand as a kind of history; when placed in their sequence,

46 Cf. Sen. *Suas*. 6.21 on the popularity of *exitus* letters; note that Pliny's friend Suetonius closes each of the *Lives* with an account of the death of the Caesar; Tac. *Hist*. 1.3.1 remarks on this as well, as does *Ann.* 16.16.2; see also Pomeroy 1991 on the *exitus* scene in general, and Ash 2003, 222–225 on its position in Pliny in particular.

47 *Volui tibi multa alia scribere, sed totus animus in hac una contemplatione defixus est* (*Ep.* 2.1.12); for more on this idea of "thematic unity," see Sherwin-White 1966, 3–4.

48 Ash 2006, 224. Additionally, Ash suggests the possibility that the two letters were originally one, a point that gives further credence to the idea that the separation of these letters is emphatic.

49 *Posco librum Titi Livi, et quasi per otium lego atque etiam ut coeperam excerpo* (*Ep.* 6.20.5).

separated, betray their form as epistles, and in doing so, potentially withhold any of the notoriety, truth, and fame that they at first presented.

Borrowing from the terminology of affordances, we can observe how Pliny establishes an at times paradoxical work that problematizes a number of qualities at the intersection of epistolography and historiography. First, there is the affordance of sincerity – the latent openness of the letter, contrasted with the intricate arrangement and intertextual play that can only come from a polished, worked-over text. Second, the idea of distance, one that we have seen Pliny interrogate in two distinct ways: the physical distance as suggested by the gulf between the writer and addressee; and the metaphorical distance between Pliny's political and literary antecedents, some of whom – Ovid and Cicero most prominently – suffered their own literal and figurative isolation. Finally, there is the direct generic conflict that Pliny establishes between letters and history that baits the reader to evaluate and filter information through two competing hierarchies. Within each of these dynamics, Pliny does not allow for a simple resolution, nor can we confidently state the tenor of his program. Do the tensions that Pliny establishes in the *Letters* underscore the statement that he made in the *Panegyricus*, that certain forms of discourse are broken after years of abuse? Or, can we read his experimentation in a positive light – that what we have the *Letters* is precisely the new kind form that is the necessary rejoinder to all those years of bad emperors?

With all this in mind, what then may we say that history looks like for readers of Pliny, and how can his use of epistolography influence audience reception and experience of his work? The pessimistic view of Pliny's attempt at creating his "History in *Letters*" ignores one crucial aspect of the epistolarity noted above – the idea that letters, by their very nature, seek responses from their audience. Audiences may take up the *Letters*, respond to them as Nepos did to Cicero, and read and create from them a history that never was written. Indeed, at several points in the *Letters*, Pliny speaks of this very kind of reaction that he receive from his reading public, both among those works which he had already published prior to the *Letters*[50] and the *Letters* themselves. The success of the their publication even leads to one friend successfully requesting that he be addressed in a forthcoming volume of the correspondence.[51] To these must be added *Ep.* 9.23, in which Pliny reports on an anecdote from Tacitus', wherein an *equites* listening to the learned exposition of the historian at the Circensian games asks: *Tacitus es an Plinius?* But while these letters indicate that Pliny's readership appears to act positively towards his own self-memorialization and myth-making, it is necessary to point out his anxieties regarding how his contemporary audiences – and particularly audiences of history – respond and behave. At *Ep.* 3.16, Pliny writes to Maecilius Nepos relating the story of Arria, whose fame and famous words – *Paete, non dolet* – have spread throughout Rome. But while

50 *Ep.* 1.2
51 *Ep.* 9.11.

Arria and her courage in the face of Claudius will never be forgotten, Pliny bemoans the fact that she is remembered for the wrong reasons; instead, it is her resolve to die a noble death when her son-in-law Thrasea attempts to persuade her not to commit suicide that is more worthy of remembrance. His statement at the opening of his letter (echoed in its close) is nothing short of axiomatic: *Adnotasse videor facta dictaque virorum feminarumque alia clariora esse alia maiora* ("I think that I have stated before that among the famous deeds and actions of men and women, others are more noteworthy and greater"). The same sentiment is echoed at *Letters* 6.24, in which Pliny regrets that station, rather than actions themselves, are what affect fame and remembrance: *Quam multum interest quid a quoque fiat!* ("How much difference it makes by whom some deed is done!").[52]

But as I emphasized from the start, letters merit a response and seek to be answered. The *Letters* present a world where who and what history remembers is a fickle thing. Immortalization is contingent on opportunities to perform great and memorable deeds, and in a Rome pacified by benign autocracy of Trajan, such occasions for remembrance are few and far between. Indeed, for an individual like Pliny the Elder – or for a writer like his nephew – recourse for fame may be best sought outside the political sphere and in the natural world. And even if one is fortunate enough to qualify for inclusion in the work of a Tacitus, there still remain the capricious audiences of the moment. But if we are to consider the *Letters* holistically, I believe it is necessary to consider these utterances and plaints protreptically, in a similar vein as presented by Duchêne in this volume. Pliny calls on audiences to relearn how to consume and how to appreciate their history, and in doing so, creates a network of readers who must respond, write back, and create a history where there was not one before. His self-presentation in the *Letters*, much like the letter form, exists as a contradiction of itself. He performs the role of an active, engaged elite, hearkening back to republican Rome, a government insider with the ear of the emperor, the center of an expansive coterie of *familiares* representing the heights of contemporary power and culture, and himself the author of a work which unites poetry and prose, and with its balance between first and last addressee, imparts a sense of universal order. But at the same time, he stands as the ultimate outsider, the figure of Ovid at Tomis, writing back to the Rome that he has lost for help in bending the will of that most august emperor, a writer of prose letters exiled from a time when prose letters contained content that had actual import, an author and statesman who, despite indications to the opposite, nevertheless admits at the start of his work that its ultimate organizational power does not rest with him. Pliny's *Letters*, the relationships they depict, the interaction between epistles and history, function under the same set of tensions, the same push and pull, that is operative for all such epistolographic works. Pliny establishes his prose letters to be considered as a kind

52 *Ep.* 6.24; he goes on to state: *Eadem enim facta claritate vel obscuritate facientum aut tolluntur altissime aut humilime deprimatur.*

of poetry, to not be read in isolation, but as a whole, polished book. But whatever strength Pliny's epistles may gather from this holistic treatment is undermined by their relationship to historiography. These letters cannot offer the truth and fame that history offers, making the deeds of men and women *notiora clariora maiora*. These "snapshots," no matter how historical they may be, will nevertheless never be history, precisely because they are snapshots. Instead, they are doomed to represent Pliny as always existing at the margins, somewhere in the spaces outside his letters. But by reading, by responding, Pliny's audiences, contemporary and otherwise, are able to make his *Letters* history.

Bibliography

Altman, J.G. (1982), *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form*, Columbus.

Anderson, W.B. (1936), *Sidonius: Poems, Letters I-II*, Cambridge, MA.

Ash, R. (2003), "Aliud est enim epistulam, aliud historiam…scribere (Epistles 6.16.22): Pliny the Historian", in: *Arethusa* 36, 211–225.

Barchiesi, A. (2005), "The Search for the Perfect Book: A PS to the New Posidippus", in: K. Gutzwiller (ed.) *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 320–342.

Bartsch, S. (1994), *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, Cambridge.

Bodel, J. (2015), "The Publication of Pliny's Letters", in: I. Marchesi (ed.), *Pliny the Book-Maker: Betting on Posterity in the* Epistles, Oxford, 13–108.

Derrida, J. (1987), *The Post-Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*, A. Bass (tr.), Chicago.

Galasso, L. (1995), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum Ex Ponto Liber II*, Florence.

Garber, F. / Orsini, G.N.G. / Brogan, T.V.F. (1993), "Genre", in: A. Preminger / T.V.F. Brogan (eds.), *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton, 456–459.

Gibson, R.K. / Morello, A.D. (2007), "What is a Letter?", in: R.K. Gibson / A.D. Morello (eds.), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, Oxford.

Gibson, R.K. (2012), "On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections", in: *JRS* 102, 56–78.

Gunderson, E. (1997), "Catullus, Pliny, and Love-Letters", in: *TAPA* 127, 201–232.

Henderson, J. (2002), *Pliny's Statue: The Letters, Self-Portraiture, and Classics Arts*, Exeter.

Hinds, S. (2005), "Defamiliarizing Latin Literature, from Petrarch to Pulp Fiction", *TAPA* 135, 49–81.

Levine, C. (2015), *Forms: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network*, Princeton.

Marchesi, I. (2008), *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*, Cambridge.

Mommsen, T. (1869), "Zur Lebensgeschichte des jüngeren Plinius", in: *Hermes* 3, 31–136.

Noreña, C.F. (2007), "The Social Economy of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan", in: *AJP* 128, 239–277.

Nicholson, J. (1998), "The Survival of Cicero's Letters", in: *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History 9*, Brussels, 63–105.

Pomeroy, A. (1991), *The Appropriate Comment*, Berlin.

Rackham, H. (1938), *Pliny. Natural History, Vol. I: Books 1–2*, Cambridge, MA.

Roberts, W.R. (1969), *Demetrius on Style. The Greek Text of Demetrius de Elocutione*, Hildesheim.

Radice, B. (1969), *Pliny the Younger. Letters, Vols. I and II*, Cambridge, MA.

Riggsby, A. (1995), "Pliny on Cicero and Oratory: Self-Fashioning in the Public Eye", in: *AJP* 116, 123–135.

Riggsby, A. (1998), "Self and Community in the Younger Pliny", in: *Arethusa* 31, 75–97.
Rolfe, J.C. (1929), *Cornelius Nepos. On Great Generals. On Historians*, Cambridge, MA.
Roller, M. (2001), *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*, Princeton, NJ.
Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (1971), *Cicero*, London.
Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (ed.) (1980), *Cicero: Selected Letters*, Cambridge.
Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (1999), *Cicero: Letters to Atticus. Vol. I-III*, Cambridge, MA.
Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (2001), *Cicero: Letters to Friends. Vols. I-III*, Cambridge, MA.
Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (2015), *Statius. Silvae*. Revised C.A. Parrott, Cambridge, MA.
Sherwin-White, A.N. (1966), *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford.
Syme, R. (1960), "Pliny's Less Successful Friends", in: *Historia* 9, 362–379.
Syme, R. (1968), "People in Pliny", in: *JRS* 58: 135–151.
Trapp, M. (ed.) (2003), *Greek and Roman Letters*, Cambridge.
Wheeler, A.L. (1924), *Ovid. Tristia. Ex Ponto*. Revised G.P. Goold, Cambridge, MA.
Wieland, C.M. (1808), *M.T. Cicero's Sämmtliche Briefe*, Zurich.
Wilcox, A. (2012), *The Gift of Correspondence in Classical Rome: Friendship in Cicero's* 'Ad Familiares' and *Seneca's* 'Moral Epistles', Madison, WI.
Winterbottom, M. (1970), *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Libri Duodecim. Tomi I et II*, Oxford.

George Baroud

Readership and Reading Practices of Ancient History in the Early Roman Empire: Tacitus' Accessions of Tiberius and Nero as a Case Study in Affective Historiography

The exegetic methodology ushered in by the Linguistic Turn and Hayden White's *Metahistory,* and introduced by Wiseman and Woodman to Classics revolutionized, transformed, and then dominated the study of Greek and Roman historiography.[1] This study of the relationship between rhetoric and historiography has been incalculably fruitful, and has deeply illuminated our understanding of the nature, purpose, and meaning of ancient historical writing. In recent years, there has been a shift in Philosophy of History away from rhetoric towards affect – experientiality and Presence for presentism – with an analogous (but independent) shift in Classics to the roles of *ekphrasis* and *enargeia* in historiography.[2] One implication of this shift has been to move away from author-centered studies to concentrate instead on how audiences themselves may have experienced and understood historical writing – an enterprise that requires an understanding of the literary theories and social history that informed the reading cultures of Greece and Rome

In this chapter I seek to integrate these apparently disparate elements by considering how a historian's rhetorical strategies inflect and are inflected by the identity of the audience, their various modes of consumption of historical literature, and the social and literary contexts in which these were consumed.[3] Taking Tacitus' depiction of the accession of Tiberius at *Annals* 1.7 as a case study, I will zero in on three kinds of ambiguities: ambiguous chronology (the distortion or time), ambiguous grammatical constructions, and ambiguous diction. I will argue that the resulting text is deliberately difficult, confusing, misleading and even deceptive – a puzzle that 'reproduces' for the audience feelings of insecurity, ignorance, and suspicion that highlight the paranoia and confusion felt by contemporaries at this transitional, uncertain moment in Roman history. I provide as a contradistinction the accession of Nero, where the language is explicit, clear, and direct, and which communicates to us the open

1 White 1975; Wiseman 1979; Woodman 1988.

2 Some of the relevant bibliography in Philosophy of History on experientiality: Ankersmit 2005 and Carr 2014; on presence: Ankersmit 2006, Domanska 2006, and especially Gumbrecht 2003 and Runia 2006a, 2006b. For an overview, Ghosh and Kleinberg 2013. The work of Jonas Grethlein, especially 2013, provides the best example of the application of contemporary historical theory to Classics.

3 A point made forcefully by Pausch 2011. I take up this debate surrounding audience at greater length below.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-009

brutality and unabashed abuse of power with which Nero reigned.[4] My chapter will thus interrogate what it means to call ancient historiographical works like *Annals* didactic and entertaining: what historical, political, ethical, or other lessons can an ancient audience take away from a text that is this complicated, and what pleasure might be derived in struggling to find meaning in an elusive and apparently frustrating work?

This chapter attempts to answer both questions by arguing that ancient theories of vividness – *enargeia* – and a renewed focus on ancient audiences and their modes of interaction with historical literature in the early empire, are crucial for resolving this apparent dilemma.[5] My contention is that difficulties of language and complexities of style ought not be argued away: rather, my proposition is that details and intricacies of Tacitus' language – from minutiae such as grammatical constructions and diction to the larger structural architecture of the work – reflect and recreate the atmosphere of the time periods in question, and are all designed to create a text so intensely vivid that the audience becomes implicated in the narrative itself.[6] Thus this style compels the audience to become active participants in the text and to undergo an analogous mental and emotional process to those discussed in the material, cognitive experiences that help audiences grasp more fully the social, political, and historical 'reality' (as Tacitus presented it) and which are as integral a component to communicate as 'the facts' or the information.[7] I will then argue that the ancient sources, especially Quintilian's theories of reading and Pliny's descriptions

4 O'Gorman 2000 and Grethlein 2013 both illuminate our understanding of Tacitus' difficulties and ambiguities. But it is important to recognize that linguistic difficulty is not the only characteristic of the text; there is remarkable ease and clarity, and these too serve their purpose.

5 I will use the terms vividness and *enargeia* interchangeably; *enargeia* itself is one of several terms that refer to vividness. By 'audience' I refer here both to ancient readers *and* listeners. Both will be elaborated at greater length below.

6 Edwin Shaw's chapter on Sallust in this volume also takes as its interest how an audience would have engaged a difficult historical text, and demonstrates the variety of ways available to scholars for resolving such dilemmas. For Shaw, the distinctive Sallustian style is something of a shibboleth that demands an erudite reader, and therefore advertises itself to an elite and self-selecting group.

7 I explicate this more fully in my forthcoming monograph on *Annals*, tentatively titled "Tacitus' *Annals* and the Aesthetics of History". My premise is that in *Annals*, form and content, language and politics, are atomic – intimately, inseparably bound. Thus, despite strong structural, thematic, and linguistic parallels which prevail throughout the work, and despite many apparent similarities, treatment of these is idiosyncratic. Consequently, there is a marked – even if subtle – shift in the manner in which Tacitus describes each of the three extant reigns. The period covering Tiberius' reign is typified by ambiguous language (apparent contradictions, ambiguous agents, multiple perspectives), resulting in a text that is often misleading, confusing, and even deceptive. The language of Claudius' reign reinforces the notion that he is ignorant, passive, and manipulable; this can be seen by the fact that he is rarely the focal point of a passage (often serving as a deuteragonist in his own narrative) or the grammatical subject of the action, often relegated to a direct object or otherwise 'erased' by means of passive verbs and ablative absolutes. Thus grammatical subordination reflects his political invisibility. But under Nero, Tacitus deploys language that is clear and direct to communicate his transparently autocratic abuse of power.

of the contemporary literary scene suggest that ancient audiences were not only equipped to engage with, analyze, and interpret this kind of vivid, difficult writing, but indeed expected it. I will conclude by arguing that we must imagine both a private, solitary readership *and* a public audience *listening* to historical literature at recitations, and will offer some examples of how these diverse modes of consuming historical literature might have conditioned the ways in which the material was received.

Let us then turn to our case study in question, Tiberius' so-called accession to power at *Annals* 1.7, and see how this technique of vividness may help us understand the three aforementioned ambiguities that will now be our focus. My method will be to flag and offer a preliminary discussion of items that are ambiguous, but I will withhold any explanation until the end:

> At Romae ruere in servitium consules patres eques. quanto quis inlustrior, tanto magis falsi ac festinantes vultuque composito, ne laeti excessu principis neu tristior<es> primordio, lacrimas guadium, questus adulatione<m> miscebant. Sex. Pompeius et Sex. Ap<p>uleius consules primi in verba Tiberii Caesaris iuravere, apudque eos Seius Strabo et C. Turranius, ille praetoriarum cohortium praefectus, hic annonae; mox senatus milesque et populus. nam Tiberius cuncta per consules incipiebat, tamquam vetere re publica et ambiguus imperandi: ne edictum quidem, quo patres in curiam vocabat, nisi tribuniciae potestatis praescriptione posuit sub Augusto acceptae. verba edicti fuere pauca et sensu permodesto: de honoribus parentis consulturum, neque abscedere a corpore, idque unum ex publicis muneribus usurpare. sed defuncto Augusto signum praetoriis cohortibus ut imperator dederat; excubiae arma, cetera aulae; miles in forum, miles in curiam comitabatur. litteras ad exercitus tamquam adepto principatu misit, nusquam cunctabundus nisi cum in senatu loqueretur. causa praecipua ex formidine, ne Germanicus, in cuius manu tot legiones, immensa sociorum auxilia, mirus apud populum favor, habere imperium quam exspectare mallet. dabat et famae, ut vocatus electusque potius a re publica videretur quam per uxorium ambitum et senili adoptione inrepsisse. postea cognitum est ad introspiciendas etiam procerum voluntates inductam dubitationem: nam verba vultus in crimen detorquens recondebat.
>
> But at Rome consuls, senators, and knights sank to servility. The more eminent each was, the more false and frenetic, putting on a tranquil countenance; lest they seem happy in the death of a *princeps* or sadder in the beginning [of a principate], they were mingling tears and delight, complaints with flattery. Sextus Pompeius and Sextus Appuleius, consuls, first swore allegiance to Tiberius Caesar, by their side Seius Strabo and Gaius Turranius, the former the prefect of the praetorian cohort, the latter the prefect of the grain; next the senate and soldiers and people. For Tiberius was initiating everything through the consuls, as though under the old republic and as though he were in two minds about commanding: he did not even issue the edict, by which he was calling the senators into the *curia*, except by the title of tribunician power received under Augustus. The words of the edict were few and with a very moderate notion: they [i.e. the senators] would deliberate concerning the honors of his parent, and he would not leave the corpse, this the only thing from public duties he would seize. But after the death of Augustus he had given the password to the praetorian cohorts as *imperator*; nightwatches, weapons; other [features] of a court; soldiers were accompanying [him] into the forum, soldiers were accompanying [him] to the curia. He sent letters to the armies as though a principate were attained, and never did he delay except when he spoke in the senate. The chief reason was out of fear, lest Germanicus, in whose hand were so many legions, an immense number of allied support troops, and a marvelous goodwill amongst the people, might prefer to have *imperium* than to wait for it.

> Tiberius was also conceding to a rumor that he should seem invited and elected by the *res publica* rather than to have slithered in through uxorial ambition and senile adoption. Afterwards it was recognized that hesitation was introduced also for inspecting the desires of the nobles; for he was burying their words and expression, twisting them to a charge.[8]

The conveyed sequence of events in this passage is the following: after the nobles at Rome rush into servitude and mingle tears with flattery, the consuls, followed by the prefects of the guard and grain, and then the senate, soldiers, and Rome, swear an oath of allegiance to Tiberius. This is supposedly explained by the next sentence (beginning with the explanatory *nam*): that Tiberius was initiating everything through the consuls, as though the old republic still existed and as though he was unsure about ruling (*ambiguus imperandi* – an important phrase to which I shall return). This manipulation, hypocrisy and dissembling is then seemingly confirmed by what follows: even though the edict he issues is moderate in tone and scope (*verba [...] fuere pauca et sensu permodesto*), his actions speak louder than his words, and the contrast between the former and the latter is signaled by a strongly adversative *sed defuncto [...],* outlining a number of actions (for example seizing military prerogatives) that apparently betray his true, autocratic intentions. Thus, despite what Tiberius *says,* he gives the password to the praetorians as though he were emperor; soldiers accompany him (again, as though he were emperor), and he sends letters to the soldiers as though he had obtained the principate. In short, his hypocrisy and maneuvering is evident because he acts decisively in spheres which involve real, raw power (for example the military) but delays when he speaks to the senate – hesitation or moderation that are merely feigned.

Now, although this is indeed the impression the text makes, a careful reading betrays the large extent to which such an interpretation is partial (and therefore potentially severely flawed), and suggests instead other compelling hermeneutic possibilities. The most significant piece of evidence for this is the blatant distortion of time which, once corrected, reveals a very different sequence of events – consequently resulting in a very different impression.[9] Despite appearing first in 1.7, the first *chronological* action in the sequence *cannot* have been the consuls' oath (or the various oaths that follow) to Tiberius: we know *from this very passage* that *he has not yet called together a meeting.* This oath-taking, then, and the first meeting in general, must have taken place *after* Tiberius issued the edict summoning the senators, although we are only given that particular piece of information halfway through the section.

There is similar chronological ambiguity with Tiberius' 'seizure' of military prerogatives. *Sed defuncto Augusto* is relative and unspecified, telling us only that Tiber-

8 I have underlined phrases which I will particularly focus on, and which will be subject to retranslation. All translations throughout are my own unless otherwise noted. The Latin text is Heubner 1994.

9 On the discrepancy between fact and impression in Tacitus, see especially Walker 1968.

ius carried out these actions at some point *after* Augustus' death. But its narrative position and strongly adversative *sed* seems to undercut Tiberius' moderation (or, depending on the reader, "moderation") and suggests immediacy and sequentiality – although unless the praetorian guard had come down to Nola, or unless an intermediary had been deployed, it is difficult to see how Tiberius could have given them the password immediately from his location further south. In any case, even if we are to assume that after *ex publicis muneribus usurpare* and beginning with *sed defuncto Augusto* Tiberius was back in Rome, the presentation of time still does not cohere: the imperfect *comitabatur* is frequentative and thus cannot apply to a singular, specific historical moment in question: how can the soldiers *repeatedly* accompany Tiberius to the curia if he has just called the first meeting, and the next one will be held in approximately a month's time?[10] This, then, must be a generalizing statement describing Tiberius' movements broadly, and suggests several visits to the curia over a period of time.

As we have it, then, the text – especially the diction and narrative chronology – unmistakably encourage us to adopt a critical view of Tiberius. But a simple rearrangement so that the narrative and the chronological sequence of events cohere results in a highly different impression in which Tiberius is decidedly *not* power-hungry and manipulative, but simply going through the bureaucratic motions: (1) Tiberius issues an edict using the legal powers he already possesses, (2) an action then qualified, as we are told that he initiated all his actions through the consuls. (3) We are told what material the edict contains, (4) and then that various members of Roman society swore allegiance to him, (5) after which point he gave the password to the praetorian cohorts and was regularly accompanied by soldiers.

But syntactic and semantic ambiguities again suggest Tiberius' lust for power and his calculated behavior to obtain it. The two pivotal phrases in question are *nam Tiberius cuncta per consules incipiebat tamquam vetere re publica et ambiguus imperandi* ("for Tiberius was initiating everything through the consuls, as though under the old republic and as though he were in two minds about *imperandi*"), and *sed defuncto Augusto signum praetoriis cohortibus ut imperator dederat* ("but after the death of Augustus he had given the password to the praetorian cohorts as *imperator*").[11]

It is easy to see why readers might take these phrases as a slight on Tiberius. In the case of the former phrase, either of the two natural ways of understanding the sentence suggest that Tiberius' behavior is specious and hypocritical, intensified by the word *tamquam*, ("as if"): Tiberius pretends *as if* the old republic still existed ("but in actuality he immediately endorses an imperial system by assuming imperial

10 *Ann.* 1.11 ff. The conventional date is established as 17 September, CE 14 (Goodyear 1972, 169), although Wellesley 1963 claims a much earlier *dies imperii*, between the first and third of September, CE 14. For a select bibliography, see Goodyear 1972, 171.

11 It will become clear in a moment why I have not translated *imperandi*.

powers [...]"), *or* Tiberius *pretends* to be in two minds about being emperor ("but in fact desires that very thing and behaves accordingly [...]").

In fact, however, it is not clear whether *tamquam* governs *vetere re publica* or *ambiguus imperandi,* making it grammatically impossible to say definitively that Tiberius *was* behaving hypocritically. I will explain in a moment how the phrase *ambiguous imperandi* can be rendered innocuously; for now, if we take *tamquam* with *vetere re publica*, a neutral (or in fact favorable) impression of Tiberius is allowed to emerge, in which his hesitation is a statement of fact rather than disingenuous equivocation: "he behaved as though the republic still existed, and [consequently] he was in two minds about *commanding*".[12]

The second phrase – *ut imperator dederat* – is especially damning, and that Tiberius behaves like he has already attained the supreme position has indeed been repeated in the literature. Wellesley, who articulates 'the orthodox view' characterizes Tiberius as having "assumed control immediately" after Augustus' death, and even Woodman, who goes out of his way to show that Tiberius did not want to rule, writes that Tiberius' giving the password to the guards and writing to the soldiers (*litteras ad exercitus tamquam adepto principatu*, 1.7.5), were "manifestations of imperial behaviour."[13]

I have translated *ut imperator dederat* incompletely as "he had given the password to the praetorian cohorts as *imperator*". Woodman points out that *ut* can mean "as" or "as if".[14] The difference between these two is small but the nuance is important: if Tiberius gave the watchword *as if* he were *imperator*, then it would seem that Tacitus, in his authorial voice, is openly calling to question the legitimacy of this act ("Tiberius gave the command *as if* he were *imperator,* but he was not *imperator*"). If, however, Tiberius gave the watchword as *imperator,* then the phrase is merely factual: Tacitus is only reporting the actual and legal grounds on which Tiberius issued the password. The force of the statement – what is at stake for the audience – seems then to be whether or not Tacitus, in his authorial voice, is here casting a critical eye on Tiberius.

This finally brings us the lexical crux of *imperator/imperandi:* what does it actually mean that Tiberius behaves as an *imperator*? Woodman's clever rendition partially avoids the problem at hand: "he [Tiberius] had issued, like a Commander, the

12 There are a number of possible subtexts here; for example, he behaved as though the republic still existed (reactionary that he was) or that he behaved as though the republic still existed (optimistic fool that he was, not realizing this was in vain). On this reading, one can in the worst case accuse Tiberius of naivety or foolish optimism, but not of hypocrisy or evil.

13 Woodman 1998, 54 n. 41. cf. Wellesley 1963, 23. So Morello 2006, 333 who uses this passage to show the dichotomy in Tiberius' behavior: "Tiberius' decisiveness and commanding ease in the first letter to the army contrasts with his hesitancy of speech before the senate [...] Tiberius is playing to two audiences: the army, over which he wishes to assert swift control (as *princeps* even before the fact), and the senate, whom his apparent hesitancy allows him to gauge without self-revelation."

14 Woodman 1998, 54 n. 41.

password [...].” By rendering the Latin literally (an *imperator* is one who commands), Woodman does not engage with what exactly the word here means. That there is a tension, however, is indicated by his capitalizing the C, which conveys to us that this was some kind of formal position.[15] Cynthia Damon's rendition, on the other hand, is decidedly more committal: “But after Augustus' death Tiberius gave the Guards its watchword as emperor.”[16] But how can Tiberius issue a command as *emperor* if there is no empire, if he is a private citizen operating in a republican government?

The scholarly consensus suggests that the phrase betrays Tiberius' despotic ambitions or, at least, shows that he behaves monarchically before his formalization of powers at *Annals* 1.11. But there is a far more neutral, even banal, way of taking this sentence: that Tiberius gave the password in his capacity as *general* of the troops – *imperator* as a commander of armies – or, if you like, commander without a capitalized C, and thus in its technical, 'republican' sense with none of the monarchic baggage it may have acquired under Augustus.[17] We have already been told at 1.3.3 that Tiberius *is* a *collega imperii* and we know in any case that Tiberius *was* an *imperator* – as was Germanicus – insofar as they commanded armies: Tacitus might only be telling us, as he does with *tribuniciae potestatis praescriptione* a few sentences above, the capacity in which Tiberius is acting, i.e. the legal basis for his actions.[18] This sense of *imperator* can also be understood in the other instances where the word is used: when we are told that Tiberius gives the password *ut imperator,* this does not have to mean “like an emperor” and does not have to signify here “ruling” in a despotic sense but can mean “in his capacity as general”[19], and when we are told that he was *ambiguus imperandi* this might simply mean that he was in two minds about “issuing commands” or “governing” – activities we have reason to be-

15 Woodman 2004, 5.

16 Damon 2012, 7.

17 *OLD* s.v. 2: “A commanding officer, general.” Also s.v. 3, with several Republican examples: “A title of honour conferred on a victorious general by acclamation of his troops or by a vote of the senate.”

18 The dates for when Tiberius was granted his powers is murky, but what is certain is that by this point he had *imperium proconsulare* and *tribunicia potestas* (cf. Goodyear 1972, 112; also Wiedemann 1996, 204). In any case this episode raises another important point: the phrase apparently blackens Tiberius not just because he behaved *ut imperator*, but because *he* gave the password to the guards. But if not him, then who else? Griffin's 1995, 37 rhetorical question frames the issue nicely: “what had Tiberius done except exercise the powers that, by Tacitus' own account, he had been granted by Augustus?”

19 Given that Latin does not have definite articles, one can further communicate this neutral, factual sense of the phrase by rendering it thusly: Tiberius gave the password as a *commander* (vs. Tiberius gave the password as *The* Commander).

lieve Tiberius disliked if we accept what he himself says regarding his reluctance to rule at face-value.[20]

Before moving on, I want to identify a prominent ambiguity at *Ann.* 1.7 that nicely brings together the key threads of my discussion. In the aftermath of Augustus' death, consuls, senators, and knights rush around wearing studied faces (*festinantes vultuque composito*)[21] *ne laeti excessu principis neu tristior<es> primordio,* 1.7.1. There is no verb here, which must be supplied: this cannot be any other than *viderentur,* with the resulting literal translation: "lest they <seem> happy at the death of a *princeps* or sadder in the beginning." But there is a far more crucial difficulty, hinted at in my abrupt and incomplete translation: the beginning of what? It is easy enough to supply *principis* from a few words back: "lest they seem happy at the death of a *princeps*, and too sad at the beginning (*primordio*) [of a reign of a new] *princeps*." This seems unmistakably correct because the sense is indisputably clear: people want to balance happiness and sadness, to exhibit the appropriate amounts of grief at the death of Augustus and happiness at the accession of Tiberius. A tempting reading, to be sure, but even if the *sense* is clear, the rendition I have given above cannot but remain speculative – an interpolation. Because no verb is supplied by the author, no conclusive reading can be offered by the audience.

Nero's accession, a structural and thematic parallel to that of Tiberius, is a useful comparandum that evidences a different stylistic quality which lies not in ambiguous and difficult language but in transparency (*Ann.* 13.4):

> Ceterum peractis tristitiae imitamentis curiam ingressus et de auctoritate patrum et consensu militum praefatus, consilia sibi et exempla capessendi egregie imperii memoravit, neque iuventam armis civilibus aut domesticis discordiis imbutam; nulla odia, nullas iniurias nec cupidinem ultionis adferre. tum formam futuri principatus praescripsit, ea maxime declinans, quorum recens flagrabat invidia. non enim se negotiorum omnium iudicem fore, ut clausis unam intra domum accusatoribus et reis paucorum potentia grassaretur; nihil in penatibus suis venale aut ambitioni pervium; discretam domum et rem publicam. teneret antiqua munia senatus, consultum tribunalibus Italia et publicae provinciae adsisterent: illi patrum aditum praeberent, se mandatis exercitibus consulturum.
>
> Otherwise, after the imitations of mourning were completed, [Nero] entered the curia and, making some preliminary remarks about the *auctoritas* of the fathers and the consensus of the soldiers, he recalled his plans and the paradigms for brilliantly undertaking *imperium*, [and recalled] his youth was not tinged with civil wars or internal discord; he would bring no hatreds, no

20 For example at *Ann.* 1.12–14. The interpretation of *imperandi* I have argued for here might illuminate Tacitus' statement at *Ann.* 4.32.2, where he makes the self-deprecating assertion that his *Annals* is lesser than previous histories because he treats a *princeps proferendi imperi incuriosus erat*. The phrase might not mean "indifferent to extending (the borders of) the empire", as others have translated it (this is for example implied in Woodman's 2004 translation), but rather "indifferent to expanding his (executive/judicial) powers".

21 *composito*, literally "put together" means here "arranged", "contrived", "prepared". Some irony is derived from the tension that arises in light of this word's other meanings: "composed" (i.e. calm), "settled", "pacified" – none of which fit the turbulent context.

> injuries, no lust for vengeance. Then he prescribed the form of the future principate, turning away from these things especially, at which recent hatred was inflamed. For he said he would not be a judge over all affairs, so that with accusers and defendants shut within one house the power of the few might increase; nothing in his household was for sale or accessible to bribery; house and government would be discrete. The senate would keep old-time duties, Italy and the public provinces would attend the tribunals of the consuls: *they* (the consuls) would offer access to the fathers, *he* would deliberate about the military entrusted to him.

Whereas under Tiberius confusion reigns, necessitating two "accession debates" (1.7, 1.10 – 11), under Nero there are no false starts, and the situation is far more clear, the text far more concise and direct. Nor should this be surprising: Tiberius was in an unprecedented position, but Nero and the senate have paradigms they can follow, sufficiently implied by Nero's own *exempla capessendi [...] imperii memoravit*. And so all the actors know their roles: there is no *need* for Nero to use his tribunician power – or any other legal or constitutional mechanisms – to gather the senate; it is simply understood that he now has the authority and wields power. Nor indeed is there a need for him to summon the senators explicitly: they know what to do at the death of a *princeps*.[22]

The most striking, and emblematic, difference between the two *principes* and their two situations is brought out very nicely precisely by the word *praescribere* (*tum formam futuri principatus praescripsit*). This echoes *tribuniciae potestatis praescriptione [...] sub Augusto acceptae* (1.7.3), and reminds us that while Tiberius scrupulously followed the prescriptions of Augustus, Nero is here himself the agent. *Praescribere* can mean to describe – a definition the *OLD* provides (Nero "described" the shape of the future principate).[23] But it also means to prescribe, to command. Thus, unlike Tiberius, Nero explicitly *dictates* what the shape of the future principate will be.[24] Regardless of how we render the phrase, crucial here is that where Tiberius shows himself to be hesitant or ambivalent as to his own role and the role and responsibilities of the senate, Nero shows himself to be the opposite, actively sketching out the shape of his government and even articulating exact duties (*teneret antiqua munia senatus [...]*). In short, unlike Tiberius, who had to be asked by Asinius Gallus which part of the government he wants entrusted to him (*quam partem rei publicae*

22 The respective deaths of Agrippa Postumus (1.6) and Julius Silanus (13.1) offer another instructive parallel. Unlike the shadowy murder of Agrippa Postumus, here no questions surround the source for the orders, the motivation behind the decision, or the identity of the executioners – all of which are here transpicuous and thus serve as a strong contrast to the ambiguities in their Tiberian analogue (which remain the subject of much scholarly debate). See especially Detweiler 1970, Kehoe 1985, and Goodyear's 1972 commentary ad loc. for bibliography. Woodman 1995 offers a famous interpretation and is rightly indispensable.

23 *OLD* sv. 4 "To trace the outline of (for future use), mark in outline; (transf.) to outline in words".

24 *OLD* sv. 5 "To lay down (for a particular purpose), prescribe, appoint".

mandari tibi velis, 1.12.2);[25] Nero *himself* dictates to the senate what will be entrusted to him: *se* [i.e. Nero] *mandatis exercitibus consulturum*.[26]

The Neronian passage, with its lucidity and transparency, makes clear by contrast the extent to which its Tiberian counterpart is riddled with ambiguities. Tiberius is at once a villain and victim; an aspirant to tyranny and a diligent administrator bureaucratically following republican frameworks. Moreover, it is not entirely clear *when* he does what he does, rendering any understanding of chronology, causation, and indeed motivation extremely difficult.

These difficulties raise important questions about the nature and purpose of historical writing in imperial Rome – and how such writing was received by an ancient audience. History's special claim of expressing the truth, paired with its claims to be didactic and entertaining, seem to be undermined by this text, given that it offers no clear or easy precepts. How can an audience acquire the historical information the historian purports to offer if the text is so ambiguous, full of misdirection? How might such an audience have engaged with, understood, and interpreted this text? And what *effect* might this text have had on them?

The key to these questions lies in ancient theories of vividness. There is no unified or standard definition for vividness in antiquity – not surprising, since the concept is treated by various theoreticians (especially of rhetoric, pedagogy, and literature) over the course of centuries, in both Greek and Latin, and various terms have been used to refer to some variation of it, including φαντασία (*phantasia), descriptio, demonstratio, evidentia, illustratio, repraesentatio,* ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων ("bringing before the eyes"), *sub oculos subiectio,* ἐνάργεια *(enargeia),* and ἔκφρασις *(ekphrasis),* the latter two being the most well-known.[27]

The first definition of *ekphrasis* in the primary literature can be found in Aelius Theon (an approximate contemporary of Quintilian), who is also the source of the earliest extended account of compositional exercises known as *progymnasmata* ("preliminary exercises") – school exercises which would have preceded the learning

25 Does Gallus mean "republic" (the form of government that existed prior to the principate) or does he simply mean "the state", "the government"? Or is he aware of the ambiguity and slyly needling Tiberius?

26 Note that the verb of being is omitted: *esse* or *fore?* Again, Tacitus blends definitiveness and potentiality, and it is not clear if Nero is dictating or speaking hypothetically.

27 The Progymnasmatists, the *ad Herennium*, Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, and Quintilian all discuss (at least some of) these terms. For references to the primary literature and discussion, see especially Zanker 1981 and Webb 2009; cf. also Innocenti 1994 and Lausberg § 810 – 819. Evidently, techniques for vividness have multiple names, but the principle is always similar. See Quint. *Inst*. 4.2.64 – 65; 6.2.27; 6.2.29 – 36 and 8.3.61 – 73 (with 8.3.67 – 69 as an often-cited passage detailing how to effectively [and affectively] narrate the storming of a city); and 9.2.40. For a Latin source other than Quintilian, see *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* 4.39.51; 4.55.68 – 69.

of proper declamation in the schools of rhetoric.[28] In his *Progymnasmata*, Theon defines *ekphrasis* as "a descriptive speech that brings what is being portrayed vividly before the eyes" (Ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον, 118.7–8) a definition that is not unique to him but almost identically repeated in a number of the standard *progymnasmatic* handbooks, including the most influential text on the subject, authored by Aphthonius.[29]

As for the definition of this vividness, i.e. *enargeia* itself, the fullest account we have from antiquity comes from the historian and literary critic Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In his treatise on the rhetorical style of the orator Lysias, Dionysius describes *enargeia* as a certain power of bringing speech to the senses and further argues that nobody is so stupid so as not to be able to see the things that Lysias describes.[30]

At its most fundamental level, then, *enargeia* seems to be strictly 'ocular', and helps the audience visualize the material in question. But, as a number of the rhetorical treatises make explicit, this technique is not, and indeed cannot, be divorced from something far larger and more important: the evocation of affect and affective responsion; that is to say, emotional engagement and experientiality.[31] Plutarch and Quintilian, rough coevals of Tacitus, emphasize this latter point. In his discussion of Thucydides, Plutarch praises the historian for his powerful, hypnotic language and underscores its effects on the senses (*De glor. Ath.* 347 A):

> καὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν κράτιστος ὁ τὴν διήγησιν ὥσπερ γραφὴν πάθεσι καὶ προσώποις εἰδωλοσποιήσας. ὁ δ' οὖν Θουκυδίδης ἀεὶ τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς ταύτην ἁμιλλᾶται τὴν ἐνάργειαν, οἷον θεατὴν ποι-

28 Webb 2009, 13; Kennedy 2003, xii. *Progymnasmata* literally means "preliminary exercises" – preceding, that is, proper declamation in schools of rhetoric. The term first appears in *Rhetoric to Alexander* 1436a25. Kennedy, 2003 x-xii.

29 Aphth. 10.36.22: Ἔκφρασίς ἐστι λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων ἐναργῶς τὸ δηλούμενον. Cf. Kennedy 2003 xii. Aristotle (*Rh.* 1411b 24–25) says that metaphors can place material before the eyes, but he does not use the term *enargeia* (cf. Goldhill 2007, 3 n. 8).

30 ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐνάργειαν πολλὴν ἡ Λυσίου λέξις. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶ δύναμίς τις ὑπὸ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἄγουσα τὰ λεγόμενα, γίγνεται δ' ἐκ τῆς τῶν παρακολουθούντων λήψεως. ὁ δὴ προσέχων τὴν διάνοιαν τοῖς Λυσίου λόγοις οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται σκαιὸς ἢ δυσάρεστος ἢ βραδὺς τὸν νοῦν, ὃς οὐχ ὑπολήψεται γινόμενα τὰ δηλούμενα ὁρᾶν καὶ ὥσπερ παροῦσιν οἷς ἂν ὁ ῥήτωρ εἰσάγῃ προσώποις ὁμιλεῖν. ἐπιζητήσει τε οὐθέν, <οἷον> εἰκὸς τοὺς μὲν ἂν δρᾶσαι, τοὺς δὲ παθεῖν, τοὺς δὲ διανοηθῆναι, τοὺς δὲ εἰπεῖν. ("The diction of Lysias is especially full of *enargeia*. *Enargeia* is a certain power of conveying the things described to the senses of the audience, and it arises out of his grasp of circumstantial detail. Nobody who applies his mind to the speeches of Lysias will be so stupid, difficult to please, or slow in the mind that he will not understand that he can see the actions which are being described going on and that he is meeting face-to-face the characters the orator introduces"), D.H. *Lys.* 7.

31 Walker 1993 remains a prescient exception for recognizing that there is a component of *enargeia* other than the visual that is integral to classical historiography, namely, the emotional. But Walker's chief contribution was to examine how spectators *within* Thucydides' text are represented as reacting to events they saw, and how Thucydides' depiction of them is in effect a commentary on the process of reading and representation.

> ἦσαι τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ τὰ γιγνόμενα περὶ τοὺς ὁρῶντας ἐκπληκτικὰ καὶ ταρακτικὰ πάθη τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν ἐνεργάσασθαι λιχνευόμενος.[32]
>
> Thucydides is always striving for this vividness (*enargeia*) in his writing, since it is his desire to make the audience a spectator, as it were, and to produce vividly (*energasasthai*) in the minds of those who peruse his narrative the emotions of amazement and consternation which were experienced by those who beheld them.

Similarly, Quintilian, in his broader discussion of affect in Book 6 of his *Institutio Oratoria*, asserts that enargeiac language arouses emotions (*adfectus*) in the audience exactly as if we were present in the affairs themselves (*Inst.* 6.2.32):

> Insequetur ἐνάργεια, quae a Cicerone inlustratio et evidentia nominatur, quae non tam dicere videtur quam ostendere, et adfectus non aliter quam si rebus ipsis intersimus sequentur.
>
> *Enargeia* will follow, which is called *inlustratio* ('illustration') and *evidentia* ('clarity') by Cicero, which not only seems to *tell* but to *show*, and emotions will result as if we were situated in the affairs themselves.

These testimonies make it absolutely clear that *enargeia* either resurrects and revitalizes the material so that it unfolds again in the present (before our eyes), *or* transports the audience and firmly situates *them* in the middle of the action, where they not only '*see*' what is happening, but *partake* emotionally (and, to use a looser word, cognitively) in what is happening. And so by vividly presenting the material to the audience's eyes, the author seeks to recreate the experience for the reader or listener.

Now, until recently, the understanding amongst classical scholars of *ekphrasis* has been that it is a literary description of a visual piece of art. In a meticulous book on the subject, Ruth Webb points out that the modern definition is restricted, ruling out of its scope a large number of genres and themes for which the ancients would have used this term – the most important of which for us here is historiography.[33] This scholarly development comes at a time of growing recognition in Classics

---

32 ἀκροατήν is here tricky, since it can mean a listener, reader, or discipline; it seems intuitive to me to understand this, though, as "listener" (thus: "[...] it is his desire to make the *listeners* spectators"). But τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν in the next sentence must refer to readers. Does this latter phrase indicate to us the intended semantic shade of the former, or is Plutarch here speaking of two discrete groups, listeners *and* readers, whom he thinks Thucydides strives to engage? If we accept that ἀκροατήν refers to a listening audience, then it becomes clear to us that Plutarch assumed historical writing – at least of Thucydides – was also intended for auditory consumption.

33 For this modern assumption, see Webb 2009, 1. In her monograph, Webb shows that *ekphrasis* can broadly be understood as "a type of speech that worked an immediate impact on the mind of the listener, sparking mental images of the subjects it 'placed before the eyes.'" And, she goes on to argue, the key to understanding the nature and function of *ekphrasis* is *enargeia*, "the vividness that makes absent things seem present by its appeal to the imagination." *Enargeia* is thus the 'defining quality' of *ekphrasis*; if *ekphrasis* is a description of a scene, *enargeia* is the quality that 'brings it to life'. Webb 2009, 5; Webb 2009, 193.

of the important role affect plays in historical writing – both the strategies and ends to which historians seek to mobilize audience affect, as well as the importance of audience affect for understanding, and indeed enjoying, history.[34] Indeed, the passages from Plutarch and Quintilian above indicate that *enargeia* can be and is used by historians who, like poets, orators, and other writers, would have deployed techniques of vividness to bring their material before the eyes of their audience; to make their historical characters and events more realistic; and, indeed, to implicate their audience in the action itself – rousing their emotions such that they suffer, or experience, *with* the historical agents and feel themselves to have been present at the events.[35] And while it is true that there are no extant discussions from antiquity about *enargeia* in Tacitus, this is not surprising and not important: given that Tacitus was writing in the general time period that these theorists were active, and given that he would have received a traditional, rigorous training in rhetoric at Rome, it is practically a certainty that he was familiar with these theories of vividness, and his historical works indeed demonstrate that he had mastered them.

From this perspective, the various textual features I have flagged throughout – whether ambiguities and puzzles or lucidity and transparency – become meaningful, explicable, and their purpose self evident: they are powerful strategies for transporting the audience into Tiberian (or Neronian) Rome. To start with chronological distortion: its mimetic, immersive effects are obvious: by refusing to narrate events in chronological sequence – or, at least, in a chronologically consistent manner – Tacitus upsets what is perhaps the most basic expectation of an audience of a historical work: signposted chronological arrangement. In so doing, Tacitus deprives his audience of a major advantage they have over the historical audience: he denies his audience the privilege of neatly organized hindsight and, consequently, of a clear teleology, effectively situating readers (or listeners) firmly in the historical moment and challenging them to participate in experiencing – and reconstructing – the chaotic sequence of events. At the same time, he draws attention to the difficulties of this enterprise, thus emphasizing that this period was characterized by an unclear sequence of actions – and, an important consequence of this observation – unclear causation.[36] His prose here then obfuscates for his audience not only what happened when, but also *why* what happened happened – that is to say, the causal chain and relationship between various events and actions.

34 Walker 1993, Elsner 2002, and Goldhill 2007 all engage with the role of *enargeia* in evoking emotion. On emotions (especially in historiography) in the ancient world, see Levene 1997 and Marincola 2003 (esp pg. 285 n.1 for a large bibliography).

35 For example, Theon *Prog.* 60.19 – 22. cf. Webb 2009, 141.

36 There is a more important historiographic point to be made here. Fundamentally, Tacitus' non-linear chronology reflects more honestly the past specifically *because* it refuses linearity, which inherently reduces and simplifies. This passage tries to present time as it is experienced in the moment: total, anarchic, overwhelming.

Next, the semantic and syntactic ambiguities discussed above only intensify and complement the effects of Tacitus' chronological manipulation. There is no denying that the language Tacitus has used to couch these ideas about accession to and transition of power appear to be highly unfavorable to Tiberius. This may encourage audiences to direct suspicion towards Tiberius himself, and thus again to empathize with – and understand more fully – the putative thought processes and emotions of those bearing witness to the events. And so the linguistic features of the prose encourage the audience to experience paranoia and suspicion analogous to what (Tacitus implicitly asserts) characterized this historical moment. As I have shown, however, careful reading – or rereading – reveals that the text allows for multiple, even mutually exclusive interpretations that are nonetheless grammatically and substantively justifiable, consistent, and indeed compelling, and so we are again disallowed from formulating a neat narrative or a straightforward interpretation specifically because the text apparently endorses *both* a pro- and an anti- Tiberian reading. Which then should we choose?

Any attempt to commit to either interpretive pole is misguided and betrays a limited appreciation for the nuances and strategies of the text, especially because the ambiguities in question are not random or arbitrary, but relate to power and rulership, and help audience 'experience' this moment in Roman history. It is impossible to say definitively how phrases such as *tamquam re publica* or *ut imperator* or *ambiguus imperandi* 'ought' to be rendered. But rather than demand that the audience commit to any single interpretation, I believe that these ambiguities play a dual and complementary role: they record the multiple, competing attitudes towards Tiberius and his own relationship to imperial power while at the same time they help us understand more fully the struggle of contemporaries to identify and determine who *is* in power.

These disruptions provoke the audience to ask who *is* in control; what system of government actually *is* in place. Thus the deployment of different meanings of *imperium* or *imperator* signify the destabilization of the very meaning of those words and reflects vividly a historically factual ambiguity: that it is unclear in what *guise* Tiberius was behaving; as the next dynastic monarch, or simply as someone with extraordinary, but nevertheless republican constitutional, powers. Tacitus toys with his readers and their expectations, exploiting the ambiguity inherent in words whose republican meaning has transformed (not to say degenerated) to signify imperial concepts, imperial stations, and imperial power – a strategy that works precisely because an imperial audience may have come to favor or associate with the principate one lexical shade of the word over the other – a prejudice we have inherited. This strategy works because in those moments when republican meanings transform to constitute standard imperial vocabulary, Tacitus vacillates between their various definitions, leaving it unclear for the readers from which standpoint

he is deploying these words.[37] By deploying language in this way, Tacitus reveals and highlights the pressure points of the social, political and historical forces at play.

Similarly the effect of leaving *primordio* at the beginning of 1.7 unqualified, a blank phrase ("lest they seem happy in the death of a *princeps* or sadder in the beginning of [_____]"). In so doing, especially in a phrase such as this, where the audience's *expectation* is that the beginning of Tiberius' *principateship* is meant, Tacitus robs his audience of the comfort of a clear succession narrative, of a neat transition from Augustus to Tiberius. But Tacitus himself refuses to say the beginning *of what*. The grammatical ambiguity reflects the political ambiguity, and introduces alternative interpretative possibilities (a hint at virtual history) that include the reminder that the death of Augustus did not *necessarily* have to signal the beginning of a *new* principateship – or of a principateship at all.[38] This move disrupts the dominant succession narrative rather than confirms it, a small but pointed protest. Not just subversive, the diction here draws our attention to the failure or collapse of language; Tacitus does not name what it is that is beginning because the phenomenon has no name; the *vocabula* does not exist. After all, if we exist in a republic, there can be no succession. In this crucial moment in the text, Tacitus refuses to utilize Augustus' double-speak by talking of a *res publica* or a *principatus* (in the pre-imperial sense): there is no appropriate word because there is no appropriate concept – any other word would be a mistake or a lie. As for the audience – the linguistic difficulties and exegetic challenges intensify engagement with the text, and render the material all the more vivid. In this way it is *enargeiac*, since it places the 'accession' as though it were before our eyes, and at the same time involves us intimately in the constitution of the text (and therefore the historical narrative) since we are empowered (or compelled) to participate with the historian in its authorship.

But what evidence is there to suggest that an ancient audience would have interacted with historical literature in the manner I have been suggesting throughout? The interpretive model I have so far presented presupposes that an ancient audience would have approached the material carefully and critically, with a sensitivity for literary and substantive double meanings and deception, and an awareness of the rewards rereading offers. Quintilian, it turns out, in his admittedly idealizing discussion of reading early in Book 10, prescribes exactly this kind of reading (10.1.20 – 1):

> Ac diu non nisi optimus quisque et qui credentem sibi minime fallat legendus est, sed diligenter ac paene ad scribendi sollicitudinem nec per partes modo scrutanda omnia, sed perlectus liber

37 He thus exploits the rhetorical figure variously known as ἀντανάκλασις (Quint. *Inst*. 9.3.68), *traductio* (Quint. *Inst*. 9.3.71) or διάφορα (Rutilius Lupus 8.12 Halm), whereby "the same word is used in contrary meanings" (Quint. *Inst*. 9.3.68). This is potentially the rhetorical figure Gallus himself uses when speaking with Tiberius discussed in note 23 above. See also *amphibolia* ("double-entendre"), Quint. *Inst*. 6.3.47.

38 By supplying "Tiberius' *principateship*" – a word that is *not* in the text, we reveal to ourselves that we have accepted the neat succession narrative automatically, and betray to ourselves that we harbor the notion that this process was an inevitable one.

> utique ex integro resumendus, praecipueque oratio, cuius virtutes frequenter ex industria quoque occultantur. saepe enim praeparat dissimulat insidiatur orator, eaque in prima parte actionis dicit quae sunt in summa profutura; itaque suo loco minus placent, adhuc nobis quare dicta sint ignorantibus, ideoque erunt cognitis omnibus repetenda.
>
> And for a long time none other than the best author – one who will not betray the reader who trusts in him – should be read, but diligently, and almost with as much care as we give to writing. Nor should everything be analyzed piecemeal; but after the entire book has been read through, we should take it up again afresh, especially a speech, the virtues of which are often intentionally concealed. For often the orator anticipates, disguises, lays traps, and the things he articulates in the first part of the suit will prove themselves to be crucial only later; thus they are not pleasing in their own place, having been articulated while we are still ignorant as to their purpose, and so must be revisited once everything is known.

Quintilian asserts that we should read the best authors, and read them thoroughly – almost with as much care as we devote to writing. We must scrutinize the parts that make the whole (especially when we read oratory) and, once scrutinized, we ought to start over and reread – since the virtues of the material (literally: a speech, *oratio*) are often *intentionally* concealed. Indeed, the orator anticipates, dissimulates, and lays ambushes – all the more reason for the reader to parse the material carefully and to reread, since the significance of words become clear only in the end – which is why rereading is crucial for understanding.[39]

Now, although it is true that Quintilian singles out orators and oratory (*praecipueque oratio*) this phrase is simply emphatic, and his formulation does not disinclude others genres. Thus the same principles for reading can very well be applied to the reading of historiography, which in any case is closely linked with rhetoric. In fact, Quintilian asserts that rhetors should read *both* oratory and history with their students from the very inception of their training (*Inst.* 2.5.1–2).[40] Thus on Quin-

39 Indeed, even the simple practice of reading – knowing when to breathe, pause, when to read slowly or quickly – these mechanics are predicated for Quintilian on an *understanding* of the text even in boyhood (*Inst.* 1.8.1–2). Teachers will have pointed out to students the various parts of speech, 'barbarisms', details of meter, and the diverse meanings of words (*Inst.* 1.8.13–17). But students themselves become responsible for identifying and parsing these; Quintilian recommends choosing one student to read out loud (which he again emphasizes is important for understanding the substance), and making them responsible for explaining the details of the text, including its intention and *concealed artfulness* (or should we render *calliditas* as "cunning?") – *consilium et quam occulta calliditas*, (Quint. *Inst.* 2.5.6–8). Quintilian echoes these sentiments in the next lines, in his discussion of the rudiments of rhetorical education, where he emphasizes the importance for students to parse and analyze the multiple components of a text.

40 *interim, quia prima rhetorices rudimenta tractamus, non omittendum videtur id quoque, ut moneam quantum sit conlaturus ad profectum discentium rhetor si, quem ad modum a grammaticis exigitur poetarum enarratio, ita ipse quoque historiae atque etiam magis orationum lectione susceptos a se discipulos instruxerit* ("Meanwhile, because we are discussing the first beginnings of rhetorical training, I should not omit to warn how much the teacher will contribute to the advancement of his student if, just as detailed exposition of the poets is demanded of the *grammatici* (primary teachers), thus he himself also instruct students he has taken on with lectures on history and even moreso on oratory").

tilian's authority at least, an ideal, elite Roman audience would have been trained from youth to engage texts thoroughly and critically and, moreover, to *expect* various levels of interpretation and multiple meanings which can only be unlocked and appreciated through repeated engagement and refined analysis.

On this model, we are to imagine the historian and their reader engaged in deep dialogue. This is the very argument made by Dennis Pausch in his erudite *Livius und der Leser:* that the relationship between historian and reader is dynamic, and the ideal reader is conceived as an interlocutor (*Gesprächspartner*) with whom Livy is in conversation about Roman history. But it is not just then that the reader has an active role in this historical enterprise – Pausch goes on to say that *Livy,* well aware that he cannot completely control the text's meaning (and his reader's responses) *himself* reminds his audience of their active role in this communicative situation.[41] Part of what makes this role active is the special tension developed between author and reader, in which the historian engages readerly interest by deploying several of the strategies I myself discussed above, including manipulating audience expectation, distorting time, inviting us to consider alternative histories, *enargeia*, and more.[42] Following Pausch, we see similar historiographical strategies in *Annals:* the literary and historical riddles I have identified above are precisely what excite, entertain, and engage the reader, who is invited to reflect on, and interpret, the cruxes I have discussed above. We must then imagine as one mode of interaction with historical literature a 'private' reader, leaning on his rhetorical, literary, and historical training, poring over a historical work alone, reading and rereading, deriving practical political lessons and entertainment from this enterprise.

As a productive way of reading both Livy and Tacitus, Pausch's model is illuminating and invaluable. But it is focused on Livy and, by extension, Augustan historiography – a rather different social and political climate than *Annals* – and it is focused on, as the title suggests, a *reader.*[43] But the historical context in which Tacitus wrote, and the social context *for* which he wrote, invites us to consider other more public modes of consuming historical literature *alongside* models of individual, private readership. Although scholarship on this topic remains contentious, there is significant evidence for the existence of recitations of historical works in imperial Rome, and I will now to turn to consider how recitations and *listening* to history

41 Pausch 2011, 13.

42 Pausch's fifth chapter is of special interest, where he argues for the importance of tension/excitement/suspense (*Spannung*) as a strategy for involving the reader in the text, aptly entitled "Der involvierte Leser: Spannung als historiographische Strategie" ("The Involved Reader: Tension as a Historiographical Strategy"). In this volume, Pausch illuminates another important aspect of this relationship: the capacity for an ancient audience to respond affectively, and indeed sympathetically, even with non-Roman historical agents. Moreover, Pausch reminds us that the various techniques ancient historians deployed would have targeted, and appealed to, a wide variety of audiences whose diverse interests would have thus been engaged.

43 But see Pausch 2011, 38–45 for his overview both of historical audience and of recitations.

might have conditioned the ways in which an ancient audience received – and understood – historical texts.[44]

It is worth noting that Quintilian himself, in his discussion of oratory and speeches, distinguishes the diverse merits (and drawbacks) of *listening* versus reading. He argues that listening to a text is a more visceral experience, because how it is rendered (or, dare I say, performed) can be dramatic and powerful; moreover, each reading can be instructive, since it illuminates different aspects of the text based on how the reciter interprets the material. But Quintilian also maintains that social pressure prohibits us from formulating our own views on the material, since we are influenced by the attitudes of those around us – a pressure absent from private, solitary reading (*Inst.* 10.1.16–19):

> Alia vero audientis, alia legentis magis adiuvant [...]. excitat qui dicit spiritu ipso, nec imagine tantum rerum sed rebus incendit. vivunt omnia enim et moventur [...]. praeter haec vox, actio decora, accommodata ut quisque locus postulabit pronuntiandi vel potentissima in dicendo ratio, et, ut semel dicam, pariter omnia docent. in lectione certius iudicium [...]. pudet enim dissentire, et uelut tacita quadam uerecundia inhibemur plus nobis credere, cum interim et uitiosa pluribus placent, et a conrogatis laudantur etiam quae placent [...]. lectio libera est nec <ut> actionis impetus transcurrit, sed repetere saepius licet, siue dubites siue memoriae penitus adfigere velis.
>
> Indeed some things help listeners, other things help readers more. He who speaks [aloud] rouses us with his spirit and kindles us not only by the image of things but by their very substance.

44 Some of the difficulties that surround this topic include identifying distinguishing markers between recitations of historical works vs. other genres, e.g. poetry; in determining how a *recitatio* differed fundamentally from a *lectio* (if they differed at all); and how recitations in the early empire in Rome differed from readings in other times and places. There is also some confusion in the literature surrounding the word "audience" – in some cases, it means "intended target for whom the author wrote", in others, "those present at a reading" (though the second question begs the first). Amongst the questions that continue to be debated: How public were these readings (i.e. should we assume a mass, public audience, or a restricted elite? Who attended (were women included)? Where were these 'staged'? How performative and dramatic were they? What genres were 'performed'? What were the attitudes towards these recitations? How common was it for authors to read their own works? How are reading events in Rome different than those elsewhere in the empire? And how do our answers to each of these questions vary at different moments in the empire? Wiseman's 2015 study is diachronic and multi-generic, and argues for a wider culture of recitation than previously thought (arguments he had already made in the past, e.g. 1981; 1988). Johnson 2010, especially 42–56 is characteristically exciting and incisive. The main literature on the topic is Funaioli 1914; Quinn 1982, especially 140–165; Starr 1987; Salles 1992, 93–100; Binder 1995, Dupont 1997, Valette-Cagnac 1997, 111–169; White 1993, 59–63; 293–294; and Parker 2009. Werner 2009, a bibliographic essay focused on literacy, is helpful. As for recitations of history specifically, Asinius Pollio is thought to have been the first to have done so (Sen. *Con.* 4 pr. 2), although the exact meaning of this reference continues to be debated (see Dalzell 1955), and Suetonius reports that Claudius read out his histories (and had them read out by others, *Claudius* 41.1; 42.2). For snide remarks about recitations, Persius 1.13–23; Martial 9.83, 10.70.10; Tac. *Dial.* 9.3–4; Juv. 1.1–14, 7.39–47; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 1.14 for a criticism of this negative attitude. Marincola 2009 offers a solid, brief overview and focuses on historiography, as does Momigliano 1978. See also Kraus 2001a and 2001b.

> Everything is alive and is moved [...]. In addition to this, voice and dignified gesture are suited to each passage as it requires of those who declaim (indeed the most important rule in speaking) – and in a word, all of these are equally instructive. In reading, judgment is more certain, because [the judgment] of a listener is often torn away either by one's preference for a particular speaker or by the shouts of praise of others. For it embarrasses us to disagree, and we are restrained by a certain silent shame from trusting more in ourselves, when in the meantime faulty speeches are pleasing to the majority, and even those which are not pleasing are praised by those gathered [...]. Reading is independent and does not rush past us with the rapidity of oral delivery, and you are often at liberty to reread, whether you have a question or whether you want to fix something deeply in your memory.[45]

Quintilian's assertion has important implications for our understanding of *enargeia*, since it suggests that we are more susceptible to the vividness of a text – and hence for the power of its language to charm – if it is read aloud to us. This raises fundamental questions about the relationship between interpretation and phenomenology: how our understanding of a text might be shaped by the mode in which we experience it (in this case, how different interpretations may arise from *listening* to historical literature in a social setting versus *reading* it alone). And Quintilian's statement should also be taken seriously as an analysis of Roman social psychology: in a group setting, he suggests, individuals might formulate a normative and conformist interpretation of the art they experience.[46]

But despite Quintilian's preference for 'private' readership, his is not the only voice; the letters of Pliny indicate the presence of an amaneusis even in a private context (e. g. at a lunch in one's villa), and often portray an active literary scene with frequent readings at elite salons. And, rather than a passive audience or an audience easily seduced by a brilliant performance, we have evidence from Seneca to Martial to Aulus Gellius and beyond of listeners who often interrupt readings and actively engage in debate.[47]

Several of Pliny's letters outlining the daily regimen of the elite (notably *Ep.* 3.1, 4.23, and 9.6) demonstrate the (albeit Plinian, prescriptive, and idealizing) extent to which collective reading (broadly defined) was integrated in the social and political life of his community.[48] Pliny's letters show that it was not just the *act* of reading that

45 Cf. *Inst.* 2.5.6 ff and *Inst.* 2.5.10 ff, where Quintilian emphasizes the merits of reading bad speeches aloud so that students can better hear their faults.

46 Quintilian does not politicize his statement, but it is tempting to do so: the normativity he argues may have been as much a product of political pressure (explicit or implicit) as it was social.

47 e. g. Sen. *Ep.* 122.12 – 13; Martial *Epigr.* 10.70.10.

48 I am here heavily indebted to Johnson's work on reading and reading cultures in the empire, particularly his chapter on Pliny and his literary scene (Johnson 2010, but see also 2000; 2009). For Johnson, reading is not only a cognitive, neurophysiologically-based act, but is "a highly complex sociocultural system that involves a great many considerations beyond the decoding by the reader of the words of a text [and is] *the negotiated construction of meaning within a particular sociocultural context* [sic]." To that end, Johnson distinguishes between "reading" (i. e. the experience of reading itself, broadly conceived); "reading events" (i. e. the contextualization of a particular reading), and "reading

is central to the identity of this reading community and culture: absolutely fundamental is collective *studia*.[49] What this often means is a gathering of *amici* for critical engagement with literature which is read to them aloud and ensued by vigorous debate. His letters also highlight the crucial role literary salons played as venues that allowed the elite to accumulate social capital and indeed glory.[50] These served as venues for 'soft'- or 'pre'-publication – unfinished works could be recited before a sympathetic crowd who would contribute suggestions and emendations.[51] Whether then as a small group of elite men reading during their *otium* at a rustic villa, or whether at a more 'formal' recitation in Rome itself, both obviously required active attention,[52] and we must imagine an audience in a public (or semi-public) setting listening carefully and responding sensitively to literature that is read aloud.

This was Tacitus' milieu – at least as described by one of his intimate friends, and it is thus worth carefully thinking through how such a reading culture can inform our understanding of his text and its reception, especially by theorizing how a *listener* in a public (or indeed even in a private) setting may have perceived its enargeiac qualities. And while there is no hard evidence of *Annals* being performed in any such context, or of Tacitus offering readings and soliciting feedback from *amici*, yet another passage from Pliny confirms for us Tacitus' contemporary popularity and strongly suggests that he was even then being carefully studied – and not just by the senatorial elite, but by Roman Knights, too. In *Ep.* 9.23.2–3, Pliny describes his elation at an anecdote related to him by Tacitus:

> Narrabat [sc. Tacitus] sedisse secum circensibus proximis equitem Romanum. hunc post varios eruditosque sermones requisisse: "Italicus es an provincialis?" se respondisse: "Nosti me, et quidem ex studiis." ad hoc illum: "Tacitus es an Plinius?"
>
> Tacitus said a Roman Knight sat near him in the recent Circensian Games. After a wide-ranging and erudite conversation, the Knight asked: "Are you Italian or provincial?" Tacitus responded: "You know me and, as a matter of fact, from your studies." At this the Knight asked him: Are you Tacitus or Pliny?

Incidental remarks like this offer us insights into the murky identities of those who read historical literature in this period. And while this passage cannot reveal how *exactly* Tacitus was read, the phrase *ex studiis* obviously indicates that this would

culture" (i.e. the cultural construct that underpins behaviors in a reading event) (Johnson 2010, 11 n. 20; 12).

49 Johnson 2010, 36–39; 56–58, citing Pliny. *Ep.* 7.15.

50 I.e. that literature becomes one path to glory under an autocracy that monopolizes traditional avenues toward it, e.g. military triumphs. Cf. Johnson 2010, 57 n. 57.

51 Johnson 2010, but see recently Roller 2018.

52 Johnson 2010, 52–55. See also Gurd 2007; 2011.

not have been lazy or casual reading.[53] Nor is it is difficult to imagine *Annals* itself read aloud and subjected to the same kind of debates as poetry and oratory.

Imagine a recitation of *Ann.* 1.7 – the passage I analyze above – and consider how tone, emphasis, and gesture can completely transform the passage. As just one example, consider one of the key sentences discussed above: *Nam Tiberius cuncta per consules incipiebat, tamquam vetere re publica et ambiguus imperandi.* An artful rendition can flatten all ambiguities and center Tiberius as arch-hypocrite by sarcastically enunciating *cuncta, tamquam,* and *ambiguus* to emphasize his putative hypocrisy and equivocation. (Indeed, an exaggeratedly sarcastic performance might even render this passage comic – the humor at the thought that Tiberius – or any potentate – would have been ambivalent about ruling!).[54] Conversely, a reading might satirize the senators (recall the phrase *vultuque composito*, with its polyvalent meanings – and how the speaker's own facial expression might convey his own interpretation of the phrase). The list can go on: imagine how much life can be breathed into the uncompleted phrase *ne laeti excessu principis neu tristior<es> primordio* – perhaps with a dramatic silence after *primordio* indicating a telling ellipsis. Even with deliberate dramatic flourishes removed, *how* one reads the text aloud can condition the way the audience experiences – and interprets – it: breath and speed might make clear to an audience whether the speaker takes *tamquam* with *vetere re publica* or *ambiguus imperandi.* But beyond all that, a recitation of the kind I have been arguing for can also become an intellectual arena where the audience demonstrate their erudition, rhetorical mastery, interpretive wit, and critical acumen by asking incisive questions and generating debate amongst each other – or indeed by interrupting a lector to quiz him on the finer details of the language and substance.

Over the course of this chapter, I have advanced two major points. First, I argued that e*kphrasis* and *enargeia* provide us with the theoretical model that best helps illuminate the texture of *Annals. Enargeia* explains stylistic features that may at first seem inconsistent, contradictory, and variously problematic because it privileges vividness – and consequently the complexities and inconsistencies of the reality it seeks to bring before our eyes – over neat, mechanical, and inevitably reductive narrative structures. *Enargeia* as a literary strategy therefore has the power to liberate a text from the demands of rigid narrative constraints to which it might be shackled, and the implications for a historical text are patent: like other literary or rhetorical works that privilege gripping the reader and immersing them fully in the world they describe, historical texts then too must rely on those rhetorical and narrative devices that enthrall the audience, and so are no longer subject to the rules of (for example) chronological sequentiality to which historical writing is usually beholden.

53 And if we accept Johnson's analysis of *studia* as pre-publication readings, this would here suggest exactly the kind of public critical engagement outlined above. But cf. Sherwin-White 1966, 506 who asserts that *studia* here means forensic oratory.

54 Similarly, any of the ambiguous phrases discussed above can be manipulated, e. g. how one pronounces *ut imperator.*

Thus the text is obscure in moments of political obscurity; transparent in moments of political transparency, and that this is because the guiding ideological principle is that the language reflect the political 'reality', the result of which is our 'mimetic' text. *Enargeia* thus is intimately linked with Tacitus' *historiographic* theory.

My second and related point is that we must consider *how* ancient historical literature was consumed and experienced – especially how reading historical texts might differ fundamentally from listening to it performed. I am not asserting that the primary or exclusive way in which Romans consumed history was by listening, nor am I in principle trying to make any claims about recitation as a formal event as such. Nor again am I trying to argue that recitations were the exclusive mode of interacting with historical literature. I am simply trying to consider how different reading events and reading cultures may have resulted in varied experiences of a text and, consequently, in diverse interpretations of its substance. Given *enargeia's* power to mobilize emotion, we should pay special attention to its effects, since many of those engaging the material will have been elites who hold office and wield power. The power of history to mobilize their emotions and to effect action will have had material consequences, and is therefore a phenomenon especially worth studying.[55]

Bibliography

Ankersmit, F. (2005), *Sublime Historical Experience*, Stanford.

Ankersmit, F. (2006), "Presence and Myth", in: *History and Theory* 45, 328–336.

Binder, G. (1995), "Öffentliche Autorenlesungen. Zur Kommunikation zwischen römischen Autoren und ihrem Publikum", in: G. Binder / K. Ehlich (eds.), *Kommunikation durch Zeichen und Wort*, Trier, 265–332.

Braund, S. / Gill, C. (eds.) (1997), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, Cambridge.

Carr, D. (2014), *Experience and History. Phenomenological Perspectives on the Historical World*, Oxford.

Detweiler, R. (1970), "Historical Perspectives on the Death of Agrippa Postumus", in: *CJ* 65, 289–295.

Domanska, E. (2006), "The Material Presence of the Past", in: *History and Theory* 45, 337–348.

55 One argument against the recitation of history in the empire is that it is dangerous, especially susceptible to surveillance, delation, and reprisals if the material is deemed subversive, and Tacitus himself in the opening of his *Agricola* paints a dire picture of book-burning in Domitianic Rome. Yet we know from *Annals* (4.34–35) that the histories of Cremutius Cordus continued to be published after their suppression and his death (*[…] sed manserunt, occultati et editi*), and we know from the *Dialogus* that other, non-prose genres such as Roman drama (in this case Maternus' *Cato*) ran the same risks. This argument against recitations of history is therefore flawed, since we know from the time of Ovid (*carmen et error […]*) that all literature was liable to the accusation of being subversive, and potentates – themselves educated elites – were well-attuned to allegorical and metaphorical readings.

Dupont, F. (1997), "*Recitatio* and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse", in: T. Habinek / A. Schiesaro (eds.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge / New York, 44 – 59.
Elsner, J. (2002), "The Genres of Ekphrasis", in: *Ramus* 31, 1 – 18.
Feldherr, A. (ed.) (2009), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge.
Funaioli, G. (1914), "Recitationes", in: *RE* 1 A, 435 – 446.
Ghosh, R. / Kleinberg, E. (eds.) (2013), *Presence. Philosophy, History, and Cultural Theory for the Twenty-First Century*, Ithaca / London.
Goldhill, S. (2007), "What is Ekphrasis For?", in: *CP* 102, 1 – 19.
Goodyear, F.R.D. (1972, 1981), *The* Annals *of Tacitus*, vols. I-II, Cambridge.
Grethlein, J. (2010), "Experientiality and "Narrative Reference" with Thanks to Thucydides", in: *History and Theory*, 49, 315 – 335.
Grethlein, J. (2013), *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: 'Futures Past' from Herodotus to Augustine*, Cambridge.
Griffin, M. (1995), "Tacitus, Tiberius, and the Principate", in I. Malkin / Z.W. Rubinsohn (eds.), *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz*, Leiden / New York / Cologne, 33 – 58.
Gumbrecht, H.U. (2003), *Production of Presence. What Meaning Cannot Convey*, Stanford.
Gumbrecht, H.U. (2006), "Presence Achieved in Language (With Special Attention Given to the Presence of the Past)", in: *History and Theory* 45, 317 – 327.
Gurd, S. (2007), "Cicero and Literary Revision", in: *ClAnt* 26, 49 – 80.
Gurd, S. (2011), *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
Heubner, H. (1994), *P. Cornelii Taciti Libri Qui Supersunt*. Vo. I, Stuttgart / Leipzig.
Innocenti, B. (1994), "Towards a Theory of Vivid Description as Practiced in Cicero's "Verrine" Orations", in: *Rhetorica* 12, 355 – 381.
Iser, W. (1980), "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach", in: J.P. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism,* Baltimore / London, 50 – 69.
Johnson, W. / Parker, H. (eds.) (2009), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford.
Johnson, W. (2000), "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity", in: *AJPh* 121, 593 – 627.
Johnson, W. (2009), "Constructing Elite Reading Communities in the High Empire", in W.
Johnson / H. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies; The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 320 – 330.
Johnson, W. (2010), *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*, Oxford / New York.
Kehoe, D. (1985), "Tacitus and Sallustius Crispus", in: *CJ* 80, 247 – 254.
Kennedy, G.A. (2003), *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Atlanta.
Kraus, C.S. (2001a), "Forging a National Identity: Prose Literature Down to the Time of Augustus", in: O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*, Oxford, 43 – 51.
Kraus, C.S. (2001b), "The Path Between Truculence and Servility: Prose Literature from Augustus to Hadrian", in: O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*, Oxford, 176 – 183.
Lausberg, H. (1973), *Elemente der Literarischen Rhetorik*, Munich.
Levene, D.S. (1997), "Pity, Fear, and the Historical Audience: Tacitus on the Fall of Vitellius", in: S. Braund / C. Gill (eds.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, Cambridge, 128 – 149.

Marincola, J. (2003), "Beyond Pity and Fear: The Emotions of History", in: *AncSoc* 33, 285 – 315.
Marincola, J. (2009), "Ancient Audiences and Expectations", in: A. Feldherr (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 11 – 23.
Momigliano, A. (1978), "The Historians of the Ancient World and Their Audiences: Some Suggestions", ASNP 3rd series 8, 59 – 75, repr. in: A. Momigliano, *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome, I, 361 – 376.
Morello, R. (2006), "A Correspondence Course in Tyranny: The *Cruentae Litterae* of Tiberius", in: *Arethusa* 39, 331 – 54.
Nicolai, R. (2007), "The Place of History in the Ancient World", in: J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden, MA / Oxford / West Sussex, i.13 – 26.
O'Gorman, E. (2000), *Irony and Misreading in the* Annals *of Tacitus,* Cambridge.
Parker, H. (2009), "Books and Reading Latin Poetry", in: W. Johnson / H. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies; The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 186 – 229.
Pausch, D. (2011), *Livius und der Leser: Narrative Strukturen in ab Urbe Condita*, Munich.
Quinn, K. (1982), "The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age", in: *ANRW* II 30, 75 – 180.
Roller, M. (2018), "Amicable and Hostile Exchange in the Culture of Recitation", in A. König / C. Whitton (eds.), *Roman Literature under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian. Literary Interactions*, *AD 96 – 138,* Cambridge, 183 – 207.
Runia, E. (2006a), "Presence", in: *History and Theory* 45, 1 – 29.
Runia, E. (2006b), "Spots of Time", in: *History and Theory,* 45, 305 – 316.
Salles, C. (1992), *Lire à Rome,* Paris.
Sherwin-White, A.N. (1966, repr. 1998), *The Letters of Pliny: a Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford / New York.
Starr, R.J. (1987), "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World", in: *CQ* 37, 213 – 223.
Taplin, O. (ed.) (2001), *Literature in the Roman World*, Oxford.
Walker, A.D. (1993), "*Enargeia* and the Spectator in Greek Historiography", in: *TAPA* 123, 353 – 377.
Webb, R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Farnham / Burlington.
Wellesley, K. (1963), "The *Dies Imperii* of Tiberius", in: *JRS* 57, 23 – 30.
Werner, S. (2009), "Literacy Studies in the Classics: The Last Twenty Years", in: W. Johnson / H. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies; The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 268 – 287.
White, H. (1975), *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*,
Baltimore / London.
White, P. (1993), *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge,
MA.
Winsbury, R. (2009), *The Roman Book: Books, Publishing and Performance in Classical Rome*, London.
Wiseman, T.P. (1979), *Clio's Cosmetics*, Leicester.
Wiseman, T.P. (1981), "Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography", in: *History* 66, 375 – 393.
Wiseman, T.P. (1998), "The Publication of *De Bello Gallico*", in: K. Welch / A. Powell (eds.), *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*, London, 1 – 10.
Wiseman, T.P. (2015), *The Roman Audience: Classical Literature as Social History*, Oxford.
Valette-Cagnac, E. (1997), *La lecture à Rome: rites et pratiques*, Paris.
Woodman, A.J. (1988), *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*, London / Sydney / Portland.
Woodman, A.J. (1995), "A Death in the First Act: Tacitus, *Annals* 1.6", in: R. Brock / A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, vol. VIII, Leeds, 257 – 273.
Woodman, A.J. (1998), "Tacitus on Tiberius' Accession", in: A. Woodman, *Tacitus Reviewed*, Oxford, 40 – 69.

Woodman, A.J. (2004), *Tacitus: The Annals*, Indianapolis.
Zangara, A. (2007), *Voir l'histoire: Théories anciennes du récit historique. II^e siècle avant J.-C. – II^e siècle après J.-C*, Paris.
Zanker, G. (1981), "*Enargeia* in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry", in: *RhM* 124, 297–311.

Christoph G. Leidl †

Reading Spaces, Observing Spectators in Tacitus' *Histories*

1 Written spaces

"Topography, for Romans, perhaps played a greater role than chronology in making sense of the past": this statement by Catharine Edwards in her seminal book on "writing Rome"[1] might be contrasted with Marincola's (and others') opinion that geography played only a minor role in Roman historiography.[2] A distinction therefore seems necessary: in Roman historians, precision in geographical (and topographical) detail such as any modern historian would ask for in a historical work, is limited. And this holds true even for geographical/ethnographical digressions (which may again serve other, literary purposes beyond just setting the scene for historical events). Nevertheless, there is indeed a fair amount of references to geographical spaces and topographical places in histories, but, as will be argued, they are always tied to a specific narrative purpose, taking into account the knowledge and expectations of audiences. Geographical and topographical information, inserted strategically and modified according to narrative (and ideological) purposes, may exercise a strong influence on the readers' imagination,[3] thus shaping their perception and interpretation of historical events. The greater or smaller scale and detail of the spaces described is dependent on the focalization in particular passages of the text.[4] Sometimes it is sufficient to refer to a general structure of the *oikumene* or the Roman Empire in terms of East – West (Near East – Italy, Spain), North – South (Britain, Gaul, Germany – Africa, Egypt),[5] sometimes a schematic image of a scene for the action (a "spatial inventory"[6]) is created: an example is the Rhine insula as starting point for the Batavian revolt of Iulius Civilis in Tacitus (Tac. *Hist*. 4.12.2):[7]

1 Edwards 1996, 42. In her first chapters Edwards shows that topographical landmarks of the city of Rome formed the Roman's historical conscience (also as a source of knowledge about historical events) at least as much as literary texts (16 – 23. 27 – 43); on the imperial perspective (Tacitus and "the Capitol in flames") cf. Edwards 1996, 74 – 85 and below XXX).

2 Marincola 1997, 85: "there is little interest in geography evidenced by any of their major historians".

3 "Geography often turns out to be a state of mind rather than a collection of empirically verifiable facts" (Pomeroy 2003, 361).

4 More detailed reflection on the terms which are important in this context in Riggsby 2009. On the mutual dependance of the concepts of "space" and "place" cf. Tuan 1977, 6 (space is more abstract, makes movement possible, is open; place implies better knowledge, is endowed with values and more stable); through familiarity, space can experientially become place (73).

5 Cf. e. g. *Hist*. 1.2 and 8 – 11 with an overview of the situation in the Roman empire; Pomeroy 2003, 371.

6 Riggsby 2009, 154.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-010

> Batavi, donec trans Rhenum agebant, pars Chattorum, seditione domestica pulsi extrema Gallicae orae vacua cultoribus simulque insulam iuxta sitam occupavere, quam mare Oceanus a fronte, Rhenus amnis tergum ac latera circumluit.
>
> The Batavi were once a tribe of the Chatti, living beyond the Rhine. But an outbreak of civil war had driven them out, and they settled in a still unoccupied district on the frontier of Gaul and also in the neighboring island, enclosed on one side by the ocean and on the other three sides by the Rhine.

Riggsby calls this a "topological" description.[8] But that there is more to it than just stage-setting is made clear through the reference to the liminal position of this space at the border of Gaul in relationship to the Roman Empire and to the *oikumene* by using the Ocean as limit, stressing the emptiness of the space and its occupation as a result of civil strife: it is already charged with dangerous potential when seen from the Roman perspective. Therefore it is important to stress that spaces as we find them in historiography are always *written* spaces with particular structures, that is, they are created in the imagination of the reader/audience by linguistic/literary means.[9] The addressee of the description comes thus into view.

2 Readers and spaces

It is always awkard to try to define precisely the audience's knowledge and expectations in reader-response criticism, but as to the present theme, some assumptions seem appropriate. First, Tacitus' readership belongs primarily to the upper stratum of Roman society and we can reasonably assume a good knowledge of the city of Rome and the Italian landscape (Tacitus for example does not give any additional information even on small, otherwise insignificant Latin towns when mentioned in his work), and some knowledge of the general geographical layout of the Roman empire (e. g. that Pannonia is North-East of Rome and Britain in the far north). But one qualification is necessary which distinguishes these readers from any modern historian reading Tacitus: there were no maps in the modern sense. This is a somewhat contested field in modern research,[10] but it seems fair to assume that some of the

7 Quotations from Tacitus' *Histories* follow the edition of Heubner 1978 and the translation of Fyfe / Levene 1997.

8 Riggsby 2009, 155 f., elaborating on Riggsby 2006.

9 Therefore structural methods to describe the relationship of space and (narratological) point of view in literature are applicable also to historiography. In relation to the representation of space, a narrator may assume different positions, "standpoints" within the narrated world (between identification with a hero and authorial omniscience), sharing different spatial "identities" in different passages (van Baak 1983, 120 – 125).

10 The optimistic position is represented by Nicolet 1991, esp. 57 – 84 and 95 – 122 (Agrippa's map), sceptical Brodersen 1995, esp. 268 – 285, and Brodersen 2001. Of course, ethnography and geographical information form an important part in historiography (cf. Miquel in this volume). What is impor-

basic aspects of modern maps were unknown to Tacitus' readers: there were no maps with a unified orientation, no unified scale which would allow one to measure distances, no detailed rendering of shapes of coastlines, riverbeds, mountain ranges etc. What was available were itineraries, which present space as directional and relational: a string of places, with the distances inbetween written out, the connections (roads) marked, thus forming a kind of network.[11] These may just be texts with lists of place names and distances, or graphical representations of it (but these would be secondary to the text, they are visual representations of a text, not an abstraction based on a modern-style map). The classical late antique example is the Tabula Peutingeriana, the most quoted modern one the design of the London underground map by Harry Beck (originally from 1933, but in principle still in use). This concept of space perception involves also the possibility of movement: historical agents move along this string of places and have a certain goal (e. g. towards Rome or away from Rome).[12]

Second, Roman readers of historiography would be familiar, mostly but not necessarily by autopsy, but certainly through their historical conscience formed also by their literary experiences, with the great symbolic places of Roman history in the city of Rome, the Forum, the temples, the Capitol.[13] On the other hand, many places where important historical events narrated by the historian took place would in most cases have been unfamiliar to the readers, as for example battlefields, distant towns, remote territories, and could enter historical conscience only via the reading of their description in histories. And while the places in the first category would usually be charged with a historical meaning (the Forum, the Capitol) which the historian can use as a backdrop to his account without necessarily evoking explicitly these connotations, in unfamiliar, "new" spaces he has to make the meaning explicit through their presentation in the text with literary means.

Finally, this distinction also has some effect on the shape of the historiographical work itself. The most familiar effect is what is usually described as the "annalistic scheme", that of dividing sections of the text into affairs at home (*domi* etc.) and abroad (which is usually military, therefore *militiae, bello* etc.), to give a very simplis-

tant however, is that in historiography we are dealing with textual representations of these informations. On Arrian and geography cf. Liotsakis in this volume. For maps in early Greek historiography cf. Purves 2010, 21 f., 118 – 120 *et passim*. She stresses the fictional character of cartography in historiography (21).

11 For the geographical layout of Tacitus' *Histories* and its cultural connotations cf. Pomeroy 2003, *passim*, esp. 362. The concept of "hodological" vs. "cartographic" narrative in Greek historiography (Herodotus) may be compared, cf. Purves 2010, 144 – 158.

12 Riggsby 2009, 155 calls this type "strategic space"; on a smaller scale still would be the "tactical" space in descriptions of military operations (156) (an example from the battle at Bedriacum will be treated later XXX).

13 Cf. e. g. Ash 2007b, 224 – 236 on the role of buildings; for the theoretical background cf. Tuan 1977, 101 – 117.

tic version of it.[14] This involves another problem, that of the chronological order of the narrative: the historian is forced to use prolepses and analepses in the narrative or he has to split up the accounts, especially as the empire grows and simultaneous complex actions take place in Rome and in more than one place outside Rome and/or Italy. Thus the structure of the work may become a metaphorical reflection of its content as has been shown e. g. for Livy's first pentad where the city of Rome is both the content of his history and gives structure to its form in the recurring foundation stories related to the series of pentads continuing the history.[15] It will become evident how Tacitus, too, invites his readers' interpretations through the ordering of his account. When the historian describes how participants in historical events act in these two types of places ("at home" – "abroad"), and how their actions were observed by other persons, either involved with the events or, apparently at least, only acting as bystanders, he invites readers either to construct a relationship between their (presumably ideologically highly charged) vision of known places and the actions of the persons and the observations of the spectators, or to invest unknown places with historical meaning equivalent to that of the familiar venues for the spectacle of Roman history. Two approaches to reading Tacitus' texts are thus combined in these readings: the narratological approach of distinguishing different points of view suggested by the narrator of the text to his addressee and the interpretation of the representation of spaces and places in the historical text in order to mediate historical (and emotional) experience.

3 Observations and observers

Some examples in Tacitus' *Histories* will enable us to look at the relationship between historiographical space, action and explicit references to the observation of the action within these spaces (with particular emphasis on the reactions of the observers) as a way to influence the readership. First, two types of observation may be distinguished: first degree observation is directly concerned with the objects of observation, the observer creates the object through observation (e. g. the narrator of a historiographical work by describing it). Second degree observation is concerned with the way the observation (of a first degree observer) takes place (e. g. the narrator or any focalizer within a narrative commenting on the observation of a person within the narrative).[16] Now, three types of readers' reactions are possible, they can assume different roles within the construction of historical events: they can be drawn into the role of first degree observers or actors (in focalized narrative) of the events them-

14 Cf. Pomeroy 2012, 145 f.

15 Cf. Kraus 1994, 286 f. on Tacitus' reception of this concept in *Ann.* 15.43 (Neronian Rome after the fire).

16 The terminology uses concepts from Niklas Luhmann's "Systemtheorie" without fully endorsing all aspects of this sociological theory, cf. Krause 2005, 92–96.

selves, assuming the point of view of the observers within the narrative (identifying themselves with the observers, or, if they are not specified, with the authorial perspective).[17] They may become second degree observers (observing the spectators of events, either by identifying with second degree observers within the text or by distancing themselves from first degree observers, especially when the narrator marks the observer as unreliable, or morally flawed). Finally, they may on a third level observe the historical work as a literary and artistic object that represents both the spaces of the historical spectacular narrative and forms a spectacle in itself.[18]

4 Rome and the empire – the great perspective

At the beginning of the *Histories* Tacitus gives a survey of the situation after Nero's death and the events he will describe, "zooming in" as in a movie, until he reaches the centre, Rome (Tac. *Hist*. 1.2):

> Opus adgredior opimum casibus, atrox proeliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum. quattuor principes ferro interempti: trina bella civilia, plura externa ac plerumque permixta: prosperae in Oriente, adversae in Occidente res: turbatum Illyricum, Galliae nutantes, perdomita Britannia et statim omissa: coortae in nos Sarmatarum ac Sueborum gentes, nobilitatus cladibus mutuis Dacus, mota prope etiam Parthorum arma falsi Neronis ludibrio. iam vero Italia novis cladibus vel post longam saeculorum seriem repetitis adflicta. haustae aut obrutae urbes, fecundissima Campaniae ora; et urbs incendiis vastata, consumptis, antiquissimis delubris, ipso Capitolio civium manibus incenso. pollutae caerimoniae, magna adulteria: plenum exiliimare, infecti caedibus scopuli. atrocius in urbe saevitum: nobilitas, opes, omissi gestique honores pro crimine et ob virtutes certissimum exitium. [...] corrupti in dominos servi, in patronos liberti; et quibus deerat inimicus per amicos oppressi.
>
> The story I now commence is rich in vicissitudes, grim with warfare, torn by civil strife, a tale of horror even during times of peace. Four emperors slain by the sword. Three civil wars: often entwined with these, an even larger number of foreign wars. Successes in the East, disaster in the West, disturbance in Illyricum, disaffection in Gaul. The conquest of Britain, immediately given up; the rising of the Sarmatian and Suebic tribes. Dacia had the privilege of inflicting and receiving defeat at our hands, and a pretender claiming to be Nero almost deluded the Parthians also into declaring war. Now too Italy was smitten with new disasters, or disasters it had not witnessed for a long period of years. Towns along the rich coast of Campania were swallowed by the earth or buried from above. The city was devastated by fires, her most ancient temples were destroyed, and the Capitol itself was fired by Roman hands. Sacred rites were grossly pro-

17 The textually non-marked observation (presentation through the authorial voice of the text without explicit or implicit reference to an act of observation or a specific observer) implies a kind of simulated autopsy created by the historian through the use of *enargeia*. Scenes of spectatorship within the historical text may by a narratological *mise en abyme* be reflections on the historian's own situation as an "observer" of historical events, cf. Walker 1993, especially 370 – 375 and in this volume Baroud.

18 Cf. e. g. Shumate 1997. On the performance (through loud reading) of historical works cf. Baroud in this volume.

> faned, and there was adultery among the great. The sea swarmed with exiles, and cliffs were red with blood. Worse horrors reigned in the city. To be rich or well born, to hold office or refuse it, was a crime: merit of any kind meant certain ruin. [...] Slaves were bribed against their masters, freedmen against their patrons, and if a man had no enemies, he was ruined by his friends.

The antithetical scheme is immediately detectable (*civilia – externa*) and also structures the strategic view of the provinces which are presented in oppositions with Roman success and failure distributed between them. This contrast is supplemented by a movement from the periphery to the centre: from East, West, the boundaries of the Empire to Italy, then the centre, Rome, then within Rome, from public to private, to the household of the *pater familias*. The image of the empire is arranged in three circles: the provinces in the further distance, Italy as the immediate surroundings of Rome, Rome as the space where the potential observer has his home. And the closer to the centre the observer is led by the narrator, the greater the atrocities are. (The scheme is spelled out in more detail also in the overview of the state of the empire in the following chapters 1.4 – 11, with the same association of spaces and potential for political unrest.[19]) This scheme mirrors a recurrent structure of at least the first three books of the *Histories* which describe the fighting between the contenders for the imperial throne who either occupy the centre (Rome) and have to move out to defend it or move towards it to conquer it.[20] And this association of centripetal vs. centrifugal movement is a recurrent theme in the turbulent times of 69/70: for example, it is repeated when Galba, immediately after the introductory overview, moves towards Rome which is full of legionaries from the distant provinces of Britain, Germany, Illyrium (*Hist*. 1.6). In greater length, the troops in revolt from Germany are led by Valens and Caecina towards Italy in *Hist*. 1.63 – 66 and 67 – 70 (while Vitellius lags sluggishly behind: slow movement is a key characteristic of Vitellius),[21] with Caecina acting worse than Valens. In ch. 2.71.1 the principle in action is spelled out by Tacitus (*quantoque magis propinquabat, tanto corruptius iter [...]*, cf. full quotation below). Every centripetal movement of the historic agents is connected with (increasing) violence, culminating in the burning of the Capitol and Vitellius' death at the

19 It starts in Rome (ch. 1.4), with the attitudes towards Galba (1.5) and a recapitulation of his march on Rome, slow and violent (1.6), followed by the effect messages from Africa and Germany create in Rome; chs. 1.8 – 11 review the provinces clockwise around the Mediterranean: first those with military potential, Spain, Gaul, Germany, Britain, Illyricum, the East with Judaea, Egypt, Africa, then Mauretania and less important provinces (Raetia, Noricum, Thrace and the unspecified rest, cf. Damon 2003, 98 – 99). Tacitus' geographical treatment of Roman frontiers in his narrative on Germanicus in the *Annals* (Manolaraki / Augustakis 2012, 386 – 390) would be another example for using the reader's geographical imagination to suggest historical interpretations of the events. On *Histories*, Book V echoing the civil wars of 69 CE through parallels in topographical/geographical descriptions cf. O'Gorman 1995.

20 Pomeroy 2003, 364 – 369 analyzes in more detail the significance of the narratological organization (centre – periphery) of the geography of the empire for the political struggles in 69/70 CE.

21 On the details of this march (and Tacitus' imitation/parody of Caesar's *Commentarii*) cf. Morgan 1994b.

end of Book III: space has a message for the reader.[22] And if this reader happens to live on the trajectory of such movements, he might draw a rather bleak conclusion regarding his personal safety in future internal strife.

That this tension between periphery and center might be a key to the understanding of the civil war in 69/70 CE had been stated by Tacitus at the beginning of *Hist*. 1.4.2: *evulgato imperii arcano posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri* ("it had divulged a secret of state: an emperor could be made elsewhere than at Rome"). *Alibi* is a remarkably open expression which needs to be filled with concrete substance by the reader when following the course of the narrative.[23] And it proves rather too simple for an explanation of what happens: it can be (and in fact is) many places (Spain, Germany, Judaea). A dichotomy between Rome and the rest of the empire is not sufficient any more to structure the history – Tacitus hints at the limits of the annalistic scheme: it becomes more and more difficult to mirror the structure of Roman history in the structure of a literary text. His vision, which he puts into the mind of his readers, is that of a circle of provinces around a dominating, but no longer uncontestedly, Rome. Every time Tacitus gives a survey of the situation in the provinces, he seems to make a kind of circular movement around the Mediterranean, and rather than the center of power (which may already have shifted towards Germany or the East), Rome is a centre of narratorial perspective. Tacitus does not try to make chronological simultaneity the basic structuring principle of the book by precise synchronisms (instead, he is often rather vague: *interim* etc. occurs more often than exact dates), but rather the spatial outline of the empire: events are presented to the readers' eye as they affect the city of Rome. Temporal and spatial categories interact. Simultaneity of events is relative and only possible when the spatial focus is fixed at one point (e. g. Rome). One might compare the situation of the astronomical observer in the universe: the further distant a star is, the more its observer looks into the past. Ancient communication was much slower than modern telecommunication. Pomeroy, followed by Riggsby,[24] has suggested that the chronological and the spatial axes collapse in the *Histories*. This focalization would point to a reader who is sitting in Rome and whose experience of state affairs in his own time is mirrored by Tacitus in his book: this serves the purpose of a history which aims to teach the readers a (political) lesson. Again, this has its effect on the structure of the *Histories* as a book. Let three examples suffice: 1: As Galba is killed in mid-January 69, it is unknown in Rome that in the beginning of January the German troops had promoted Vitellius as their candidate. Tacitus reports the details of the Vitellian story only after the events surrounding Galba, and after a short hint that Vespasian is already lurking in the east, in chs. 1.51–60 (in ch. 1.12 he relates some rather imprecise news

22 Pomeroy 2006, 176–180; Ash 2007b, 218 f. with more examples of generals marching on Rome (e. g. Antonius Primus).

23 Pomeroy 2003, 365.

24 Pomeroy 2003, 366; Riggsby 2009, 159 f.: as information travels longer from distant places, the spatial extension simultaneously signals temporal sequence.

about troubles with the troops in Germany, but does not mention Vitellius). 2: As the beginning of the contest between Otho and Vitellius takes us to March 69 at the end of Book I (symbolically closing with Otho's departure from Rome, 1.71–90 – centrifugal movement), the beginning of Book II takes us back to July 68 to tell the early stages of the Flavian rebellion (2.1–9). 3: Book IV starts with the victorious Flavians in Rome (at the end of the year 69, 4.1–11), only to take us back to the beginning of the insurrection of Civilis in July of the same year in chs. 4.12–37.[25] Of course it is necessary to split the narrative of parallel events into several units, but the choice of the spatial/chronological intersections in relation to the structure of the book creates a literary effect for the reader[26], who will give beginnings and endings a privileged meaning in his interpretation of events.

5 Spectacles and spectators

The effects described so far may be regarded as more intellectual than emotional, but Tacitus is also capable of creating *enargeia* with stronger emotional appeal on the level of smaller narrative units, where the theme of visual perception of space and the different roles of observers become evident in the wording of the text. The theme of civil war in Books I-III of the *Histories* is closely associated with the question of what it means to be Roman: since the army is a decisive force in this fight and since the army has more and more soldiers with a non-Italian provenance, i. e. from the provinces (Germany, the east), the result is a mixture of Italian and non-Italian soldiers which can make it difficult to distinguish between Roman and non-Roman, let alone between foreign and interior enemies, of civil war and external war (as Tacitus had hinted at already in the preface of the *Histories*, cf. above). Let us consider a passage from the second battle at Bedriacum between Vitellian and Flavian troops. The fighting takes place at night (Tac. *Hist.* 3.22.3):

> proelium tota nocte varium, anceps, atrox, his, rursus illis exitiabile. nihil animus aut manus, ne oculi quidem provisu iuvabant. eadem utraque acie arma, crebris interrogationibus notum pugnae signum, permixta vexilla, ut quisque globus capta ex hostibus huc vel illuc raptabat.

25 Pomeroy 2003, 365–366; Ash 2007a, 8–12; Ash 2009, 88 f. speaks of a "top-heavy" structure of the *Histories*, concentrating the narrative on the fight for power in 69 in Books I-III, postponing e. g. the Batavian revolt to Book IV. It is also remarkable that even within this story-line, the Flavian bid for power is deliberately played down for much of the first two books – moved to the periphery both spatially (little information about the east), narratively (no extended narrative with causes and decisions) and structurally (in focus only from ch. 2.74). On the other hand, Domitian's entry at the beginning of book IV is quite ominous, cf. Babcock 2000, 576 f.

26 The reader's journey through a narrative could be compared to the way through a labyrinth (Jaeger 1999 on Livy), both on a larger scale and in the different perspectives on the city of Rome (cf. below, 'Roman sights').

> All the night the battle raged with varying fortune, never decided, always savagely contested. Disaster threatened now one side, now the other. Courage, strength were of little use: their eyes could not even see in front of them. Both sides were alarmed alike; the watchwords, constantly demanded, soon became known; the standards were all in confusion, as they were captured and carried off from one band to another.

The situation is perceived through the eyes of a combatant, and the reader is put in the same situation of not being able to form a mental image of the situation (*nihil [...] provisu*). This is also the authorial position as Tacitus had confessed shortly before our passage (3.22.3). But what had been a problem for the researching and reporting historian in the face of unreliable reports (giving the precise battle order), turns out to have been already a problem for the historical agents themselves: it was difficult to discern on which side one stood. With the rising moon the focalization changes (Tac. *Hist.* 3.23.3 – 24.1):

> neutro inclinaverat fortuna donec adulta nocte luna surgens ostenderet acies falleretque. sed Flavianis aequior a tergo; hinc maiores equorum virorumque umbrae, et falso, ut in corpora, ictu tela hostium citra cadebant: Vitelliani adverso lumine conlucentes velut ex occulto iaculantibus incauti offerebantur. Igitur Antonius, ubi noscere suos noscique poterat, alios pudore et probris, multos laude et hortatu, omnis spe promissisque accendens.
>
> Fortune had favoured neither side when, as the night wore on, the moon rose, revealing and deceiving the armies. Shining from behind the Flavians the moon was in their favour. It magnified the shadows of their men and horses so that the enemy took the shadow for the substance, and their missiles were misdirected and fell short. The Vitellians, on the other hand, had the moon shining full on them and were unaware that they were exposed to the Flavians, shooting as it were out of cover. Antonius was thus enabled to recognize his own men, and to be recognized by them. He fired some by taunting their honour, many by words of praise and encouragement, all by promising hope of reward.

First the Flavian soldiers are in the better (visual) situation, they can orient themselves within the space of the battlefield, then the focus is further narrowed down to the Flavian commander Antonius Primus, whose action is only possible because he now can recognize his own troops (*noscere, nosci*): only now is the enemy recognized and the moral exhortation can take place. I would regard this narrative detail as a symbol both for the general situation of political disorientation during the civil war and a reflection of the historian's task. The point of view of reader – soldier – narrator finally converges in this episode of the battle, while at the same time the authorial perspective over the course of the battle as a whole is preserved.[27]

While in this example the reader will share the disorientation of the spectator within the narrative, the next example gives the view of an observer which results

27 Another example of this narrative technique is the fighting over an island in the middle of a river between Othonian and Vitellian soldiers (*Hist.* 2.35.1–2): the emotions of the soldiers of both sides watching the fighting around the island could easily be shared by the reader.

in diverging evaluations: Vitellius visits the battlefield near Cremona after the first battle of Bedriacum (Tac. *Hist*. 2.70 – 71.1):[28]

> Inde Vitellius Cremonam flexit et spectato munere Caecinae insistere Bedriacensibus campis ac vestigia recentis victoriae lustrare oculis concupivit, foedum atque atrox spectaculum. intra quadragensimum pugnae diem lacera corpora, trunci artus, putres virorum equorumque formae, infecta tabo humus, protritis arboribus ac frugibus dira vastitas. nec minus inhumana pars viae quam Cremonenses lauru rosaque constraverant, extructis altaribus caesisque victimis regium in morem; quae laeta in praesens mox perniciem ipsis fecere. aderant Valens et Caecina, monstrabantque pugnae locos: hinc inrupisse legionum agmen, hinc equites coortos, inde circumfusas auxiliorum manus: iam tribuni praefectique, sua quisque facta extollentes, falsa vera aut maiora vero miscebant. vulgus quoque militum clamore et gaudio deflectere via, spatia certaminum recognoscere, aggerem armorum, strues corporum intueri mirari; et erant quos varia sors rerum lacrimaeque et misericordia subiret. at non Vitellius flexit oculos nec tot milia insepultorum civium exhorruit: laetus ultro et tam propinquae sortis ignarus instaurabat sacrum dis loci. Exim Bononiae a Fabio Valente gladiatorum spectaculum editur, advecto ex urbe cultu. quantoque magis propinquabat, tanto corruptius iter immixtis histrionibus et spadonum gregibus et cetero Neronianae aulae ingenio.
>
> Leaving Ticinum, Vitellius turned off to Cremona. There he witnessed Caecina's games and conceived a wish to stand upon the field of Bedriacum, and to see the traces of the recent victory with his own eyes. Within forty days of the battle, it was a disgusting and horrible sight; mangled bodies, mutilated limbs, rotting carcasses of men and horses, the ground foul with clotted blood. Trees and crops all trampled down: the countryside a miserable waste. No less heartless was the stretch of road which the people of Cremona had strewn with laurel-leaves and roses, erecting altars and sacrificing victims as if in honour of an Oriental despot. The rejoicings of the moment soon turned to their destruction. Valens and Caecina were in attendance and showed Vitellius over the battlefield: this was where their legions had charged: the cavalry launched their attack from here: this was where the auxiliaries had outflanked the enemy. The various officers each magnified his own exploits, adding a few false or, at any rate, exaggerated touches. The common soldiers, too, turned gaily shouting from the high road to inspect the scene of the struggle, gazing with wonder at the huge pile of arms and heaps of bodies. There were a few who reflected with tears of pity on the shifting chances of life. But Vitellius never took his eyes off the field; never shuddered at the sight of all these thousands of Roman citizens lying unburied. On the contrary, he was very well pleased, and, unconscious of his own impending doom, he offered a sacrifice to the local deities. They next came to Bononia, where Fabius Valens gave a gladiatorial show, for which he had all the apparatus brought from Rome. The nearer they drew to the city, the greater became the depravity of the march, which was now joined by troops of actors, eunuchs, and the like, all in the true spirit of Nero's court.

The "spectacular" aspect is more than obvious: before and after the visit to the battlefield, Vitellius attends actual gladiatorial spectacles organized by his generals Caecina and Valens (2.67.2; 2.71.1).[29] The battlefield serves as a kind of interlude between

28 On this frequently studied passage cf. e. g. Morgan 1992; Keitel 1992; Haynes 1996, 93 – 101 (88 – 147 on the "spectacular" in general); Manolaraki 2005; Ash 2007a, 270 – 279; Joseph 2012, 144 – 152.
29 And it may be an example of Tacitean irony that the equipment for the games at Bononia was transported from Rome (2.71.1), that Vitellius afterwards moves towards Rome in the company of ac-

these spectacles. Expressions for visual perception pervade the beginning of the text (*lustrare oculis, spectaculum, later intueri, mirari, flectere oculos*), references to the place of the battle are frequent (*via, spatia*). Vitellius is in fact repeating the act of gazing at his victim from Otho who had looked with great pleasure at the severed head of his enemy Piso,[30] and he will become himself a spectacle in his last moments, when his gaze is not free any more, but he is forced to lift his eyes to see the downfall of his statues and the places where his victims Galba and Flavius Sabinus died (3.85, cf. below).[31]

But most interesting is the way in which Tacitus makes a spectacle out of Vitellius watching a spectacle. First he deviates to Cremona (*flexit*), but he does not move his eyes from the horrible sight (*flexit*), when exactly the opposite actions would have been appropriate, as the word-play suggests. Tacitus gives first the gruesome details of decaying bodies, then contrasts them with the decorated roads in honour of Vitellius. The site is loaded with foreboding: the end of the Cremonans and of Vitellius. Both are not able to perceive this meaning of the sight, it is only visible for the observing reader alerted by authorial comments (70.3 and 4); both will themselves become spectacles.[32] But Tacitus adds another level by introducing the generals as tour guides who give as it were a reenactment of the battle for Vitellius (*hinc – inde*) (Tacitus had described it in detail 39 – 43, so the reader will remember his description[33]): the deviation spreads to the soldiers who deviate from their way and recognize the places where they had fought, but unlike Vitellius are now deeply moved.

The whole passage is a literal, narrative, and symbolic deviation or digression and offers multiple overlaying perspectives to the reader/spectator: Vitellius is the observer of the battlefield, but the meaning of the observation for the reader lies in the observation of how Vitellius performs the act of observation. As far as the reconstruction of the battle is concerned, Vitellius can be seen as a deceived observer as his generals distort the events: the reader is already familiar with Tacitus' description of the battle so that he would be able to correct the distortions. So Vitellius' deception and lack of compassion are what comes to the foreground, the latter hinted at as a possibility through the soldiers' reaction: the internal and the external observ-

---

tors and other disreputable people (2.71.2; 2.87.2) and that thus the spectacle returns to Rome together with his troops who enter the city like gladiators (2.88).

30 1.44.1: *oculis perlustrasse*, cf. Joseph 2012, 146. Another typical incident for the connection of Vitellius with viewing is the episode with Iunius Blaesus (*Hist.* 3.38 – 39.1) when Tacitus stresses that Vitellius himself boasted of his watching Blaesus' death: *se (ipsa enim verba referam) pavisse oculos spectata inimici morte iactavit*. On Vitellius and the concept of sight cf. McGillicuddy 1991, 160 – 171.

31 Keitel 1992, 349 f; Manolaraki 2005, 264.

32 Especially Vitellius, who becomes a "*foedum spectaculum*" himself in 3.83 f., cf. Borzsák 1973, 65; Perkins 1990; Keitel 1992; Joseph 2012, 147. But it is remarkable that in the whole chapter no direct verbal expression of active viewing is connected with Vitellius (Manolaraki 2005, 259).

33 For a detailed analysis of the divergences cf. Manolaraki 2005, 249 – 256 (also on intertextual links with Latin epic and historiography); the flawed vision is a characteristic of Vitellius' behaviour.

er share their view on the horrors of civil war.[34] The representation of the battlefield has little topographical detail, but is also not just a place of horror[35]: the reader is led to see it from three different points of view at the same time (Vitellius, his generals, the soldiers, possibly also the Cremonans), none of which can be seen as the correct one (in fact, not even Tacitus could claim autopsy for his version). Tacitus adds *atrox, foedum*, which could be interpreted in several ways: a) Either Vitellius is the first degree observer and this is his judgement, reported by the narrator, or b) it is the narrator's perspective (again first degree observer) who passes judgement on the object of his description, or c) it is the perspective of a second degree observer who judges the whole scene of the visit to the battlefield. The reader can now identify with both these roles: perceiving the battlefield as first degree observer results in *enargeia*, accepting the role as second degree observer hightens the emotional impact and suggests moral judgement. Finally, he can as a kind of third degree observer judge Tacitus' presentation of the scene as an element within the literary structure of the *Histories*. Tacitus leaves it to the audience to pass their judgement on the other observers on the scene, all of them doomed to destruction. And the intratextual connections suggest that this is something that has happened (Galba) and will happen again (Vitellius, Cremona): very similar complexities arise in other passages as *Hist*. 2.88.3 where the Vitellian (foreign, German) soldiers rushing to the Forum to the place of Galba's death are themselves a *saevum spectaculum*, and *Hist*. 3.83.3 where the people watching (*spectator populus* 83.1) the street-fighting during the Flavian invasion of Rome are *malis publicis laeti*.[36] Repetition is the true nature of civil war.[37]

34 Manolaraki 2005, 255; Levene 1997 shows how the absence of an explicit description of emotional reaction in the narrative can serve to rouse emotions in the reader

35 Furley 1996, 74–77 shows how, contrary to Tacitus' method, Thucydides gives sparce but precise and telling details of the topography of Sphacteria (Thuc. 4.3–39), which support and highlight his narrative concept (*enargeia*).

36 *Malis publicis* could be (first degree observation) a description of the atrocities in the city, but also (second degree) referring to the behaviour of the people, cf. Heubner 1963–1982, vol. 3, 195; Keitel 1992, 344–348. Quite unequivocally Tacitus calls Vitellius himself an *ostentum* in 3.56.2 (in the context of his centrifugal – centripetal movement away from and back to Rome); Vitellius' movements around Rome during his attempted abdication (3.67–68) furnish a further example of history as spectacle, cf. Haynes 1996, 122.

37 The "spectacular" behaviour where the reader/second degree observer might distance himself from the first degree observer recurs for example also in 3.32.2 (hatred against the Cremonans because of their role in the games) and the plebs of Rome; 1.32.1 (people flock in the Palatium as in the theatre or circus to demand the death of Otho); 3.68 (Vitellius attempted abdication). Often a spatial contrast has an ethical connotation, the opposition between foreign (almost un-Roman) soldiers or the rabble of the city (*vulgus*), behaving in un-Roman ways, and Roman places as embodiments of Roman history and virtue is played out.

6 Roman sights

The last passages treated here belong to the first category of places, those which readers will be most familiar with, in the city of Rome. Two examples will be considered: the death of Galba (*Hist*. 1.40 – 41), and the fire of the Capitol (*Hist*. 3.71). First, Galba:

> Agebatur huc illuc Galba vario turbae fluctuantis impulsu, completis undique basilicis ac templis, lugubri prospectu. neque populi aut plebis ulla vox, sed attoniti vultus et conversae ad omnia aures; non tumultus, non quies, quale magni metus et magnae irae silentium est. Othoni tamen armari plebem nuntiabatur; ire praecipitis et occupare pericula iubet. igitur milites Romani, quasi Vologaesum aut Pacorum avito Arsacidarum solio depulsuri ac non imperatorem suum inermem et senem trucidare pergerent, disiecta plebe, proculcato senatu, truces armis, rapidi equis forum inrumpunt. nec illos Capitolii aspectus et imminentium templorum religio et priores et futuri principes terruere quo minus facerent scelus cuius ultor est quisquis successit. Viso comminus armatorum agmine vexillarius comitatae Galbam cohortis (Atilium Vergilionem fuisse tradunt) dereptam Galbae imaginem solo adflixit: eo signo manifesta in Othonem omnium militum studia, desertum fuga populi forum, destricta adversus dubitantis tela. iuxta Curtii lacum trepidatione ferentium Galba proiectus e sella ac provolutus est. extremam eius vocem, ut cuique odium aut admiratio fuit, varie prodidere. alii suppliciter interrogasse quid mali meruisset, paucos dies exolvendo donativo deprecatum: plures obtulise ultro percussoribus iugulum: agerent ac ferirent, si ita <e> re publica videretur. non interfuit occidentium quid diceret.
>
> Galba was driven hither and thither by the tide of the surging mob. Everywhere the temples and public buildings were crowded with spectators, who viewed a sorry scene. No shouts came from the common people: astonishment was on their faces, and their ears open to every sound. There was neither uproar nor quiet, but the silence of strong anger and alarm. However, a report reached Otho that the populace was arming. He bade his men fly headlong to forestall the danger. Off went the Roman soldiers as if they were going to drag Vologaeses or Pacorus from the ancestral throne of the Arsacids – and not to butcher their own Emperor, a helpless old man. Savage and armed, they broke at full gallop into the Forum. Scattering the populace and trampling senators under foot. Neither the sight of the Capitol nor the sanctity of the temples towering above them, nor the thought of Roman emperors past and to come, deterred them from committing that crime which the next successor always avenges. Seeing the armed ranks now close at hand, the standard-bearer of the cohort to guard over Galba – tradition says his name was Atilius Vercilio – tore off the effigy of Galba and flung it to the ground. This signal clearly showed that all the troops were for Otho: the people fled, deserting the Forum, and swords were drawn against any who lingered. Near the Lacus Curtius Galba was precipitated from his chair by the panic of the bearers and flung to the ground. The accounts of his last words vary according as they are prompted by hatred or admiration. Some say that he begged and asked what harm he had deserved, imploring for a few days' respite to pay the troops their largesse. The majority say that he deliberately offered his neck to the blow and bade them, 'Come, strike, if it serves the country's need.' Whatever he said mattered little to his assassins.

In Galba's demise we encounter the familiar motive of the spectacle[38], but in a variant way: the reader watches an audience silent and inactive (it will take action only after the event, in ch. 1.43, in order to rush to the victor, Otho, and to congratulate him – in terms of historical causation a non-action). Action and movement are what characterize Otho and his soldiers. Soon the point of view is that of a person overlooking the Forum, which has almost undergone a mutation: as Roman soldiers enter the Forum, they act as if in a foreign space, in Parthia, and consequently they do not perceive the Capitol nor the temples as what they should be. Their perception and the perspective adopted by the narrator and the audience diverge. As the drama heightens, we have again a zoom-in effect (1.41.1) as we see Galba, and finally the spot of the killing, the Lacus Curtius – suggesting a sacrificial context for the death of Galba (and the day had started with a sacrifice performed by Galba himself).[39] Here the contrast between the motionless (or at best fleeing or trampled down) population and the individual who becomes a sacrifice, or the military mob, is mirrored in the change in scale of the observer's frame of visual perception (from the panorama of the silent crowded city center to the single dead body beside Lacus Curtius).

The significance of Galba's death is confirmed by the repetition of the theme of seeing in the forced gaze of Vitellius at his death with explicit reference to Galba's death near the same spot at the end of the book (3.85):[40] *Vitellium infestis mucronibus coactum modo erigere os et offerre contumeliis, nunc cadentes statuas suas, plerumque rostra aut Galbae occisi locum contueri, postremo ad Gemonias, ubi corpus Flavii Sabini iacuerat, propulere* ("With the points of their swords they forced Vitellius to hold up his head and face their insults, then to watch his own statues hurtling down, but above all to look at the Rostra and the site of Galba's murder. At last he was thrust along to the Gemonian Steps, where the body of Sabinus had lain"). The theme of obliterating traditional values in the course of civil strife becomes visible in the repetition of the act of gazing at the atrocities, drawing the reader as an observer into the process just as we saw in the scene at the battlefield of Bedriacum.

Finally, the destruction of the Capitol. Immediately after the description of the fire Tacitus gives us an obituary for the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitol which summarizes its meaning for Roman history. But also the detailed fighting description elucidates the way a well-known place can be made the object of an observation through the vividness of the description (*enargeia*). Even without explicitly suggesting a point of view for the reader (he may choose a standpoint from his experience of autopsy or from his imagination of the place formed through literature), the scene unfolds in dramatic detail (Tac. *Hist*. 3.71):

38 Cf. Morgan 1994a.

39 Tac. *Hist*. 2.29.1; cf. Damon 2003, 159, 183 f., comparing 2.55.1; 2.88.3; 3.85.1: usually annual vows for the emperor's safety were associated with this place.

40 Joseph 2012, 98.

Vixdum regresso in Capitolium Martiale furens miles aderat, nullo duce, sibi quisque auctor. cito agmine forum et imminentia foro templa praetervecti erigunt aciem per adversum collem usque ad primas Capitolinae arcis fores. erant antiquitus porticus in latere clivi dextrae subeuntibus, in quarum tectum egressi saxis tegulisque Vitellianos obruebant. neque illis manus nisi gladiis armatae, et arcessere tormenta aut missilia tela longum videbatur: faces in prominentem porticum iecere et sequebantur ignem ambustasque Capitolii fores penetrassent, ni Sabinus revulsas undique statuas, decora maiorum, in ipso aditu vice muri obiecisset. tum diversos Capitolii aditus invadunt iuxta lucum asyli et qua Tarpeia rupes centum gradibus aditur. improvisa utraque vis; propior atque acrior per asylum ingruebat. nec sisti poterant scandentes per coniuncta aedificia, quae ut in multa pace in altum edita solum Capitolii aequabant. hic ambigitur, ignem tectis obpugnatores iniecerint, an obsessi, quae crebrior fama, dum nitentis ac progressos depellunt. inde lapsus ignis in porticus adpositas aedibus; mox sustinentes fastigium aquilae vetere ligno traxerunt flammam alueruntque. sic Capitolium clausis foribus indefensum et indireptum conflagravit.

Martialis had hardly returned to the Capitol when the furious soldiery arrived. They had no general to lead them: each was a law to himself. Their column marched at full speed through the Forum and past the temples overlooking it. Then they advanced up the hill in front of them, until they reached the lowest gates of the fortress on the Capitol. In those days there was a series of colonnades at the side of this slope, on the right as you go up. Emerging onto the roof of these, the besieged overwhelmed the Vitellians with showers of stones and tiles. The attacking party carried nothing but swords, and it seemed a long business to send for siege-engines and missiles. So they flung torches into a projecting colonnade and, following in the wake of the flames, would have burst through the burnt gates of the Capitol, if Sabinus had not torn down all the available statues – the monuments of our ancestors' glory – and built a sort of barricade on the very threshold. They then attacked the Capitol by two opposite approaches, one near the 'Grove of Refuge' and the other by the 100 steps which lead up to the Tarpeian Rock. This double assault came as a surprise; but that by the Refuge was closer and more vigorous. Nothing could stop the Vitellians, who climbed up by some adjoining buildings, which in the days of prolonged peace had been raised to such a height that their roofs were level with the floor of the Capitol. It is uncertain whether the houses at this point were fired by the assailants or – the most common account – by the besieged in trying to dislodge their enemies who had struggled up so far. The fire spread to the colonnades adjoining the temple; and then the gables supporting the roof, which were made of very old wood, caught the flames and fed them. And so the Capitol, with its doors fast shut, undefended and unplundered, was burnt to the ground.

The Capitol, defended by Flavius Sabinus (Vespasian's eldest son), becomes the scene of fighting. The details of the topography are not commented on (with the exception of the porticoes, presumably not existing any more at the time of Tacitus' report[41]), but assumed as known and invested with meaning. All these elements are perverted in their usage: the statues of the *maiores* used as building blocks, the *Asylum* and the stairs to the Tarpeian rock are used as routes for attack (one may recall that Tarpeia had played her role in an abortive attack on the Capitol). Climbing the Capitol had been part of the attack of the Gauls: but that was old Republican Rome, when an *arx* still was an *arx*, not surrounded by peaceful buildings. So Tacitus' presentation of the attack on the Capitol already contains for a Roman reader all the

41 Wellesley 1972, 170.

signposts which the obituary in ch. 3.72 will spell out in more detail. And it invites him at the same time to imagine an older Capitol in an older Rome with a different constitution where this catastrophe would have been impossible (although old age is not everything: the old dry beams of the gable cause the fire to spread). And one can hardly avoid noticing the similarities in the description of space in this scene and in the scene of Galba's death (ch. 1.40: disregard for the temples, lack of discipline in the soldiers): the literal decapitation of Galba thus prefigures the metaphorical self-decapitation of Rome (the Capitol as *caput mundi*, *Hist*. 2.32.2).[42] It is only logical that the Capitol is treated like a human being and credited with an elaborate obituary.[43]

Conclusion

To conclude, some observations on the effect created through the literary construction of space for the reader may be summarized:

- All spatial orientation is provided through textual means, which can take into account pre-existing conceptions of spaces and places.
- The scale of spaces entails different modes of spatial representation (topographical – strategic – tactical), which nevertheless carry further significance beyond mere orientation (suggesting a point of view for the observer and a structure for the empire, depending on the point of view). Centripetal or -fugal movement may carry a message depending on the focus (standpoint) of the reader.
- The spatial organization of the content is reflected in the spatial organization of the literary work, and traditional schemes for ordering the material may become problematic as the spatial outlook changes.

The role of the observer can be used to give multi-perspective views of the same action, either putting the audience in the role of the authorial observer or into that of any participant of the action or even into several roles at the same time. In all these cases, emotional reactions and historical judgements ascribed by the historian to the observers in historical space challenge the reader to position himself in relation towards them. This need not necessarily entail identification with the values and evaluations expressed, but could equally well, due to the previously established symbolic meaning of spaces, result in a critical response. The recurrent theme of the observation of spectacular action throughout the text adds a dimension to the interpretation of the action through the motive of repetition: similar movements, similar

42 On the implicit personification of Rome's buildings and especially the significance of the Capitol, cf. Ash 2007b, 229 – 236. The Druids in Gaul had interpreted the fire of the Capitol as the end of Rome (*Hist*. 4.54.2), which in turn fired the Batavian revolt.

43 Döpp 2003; Joseph 2012, 99 n. 53.

scenes, similar places – in the case of the civil wars they make the reader wish he was *not* there.[44]

Bibliography

Ash, R. (ed.) (2007a), *Tacitus, Histories Book II*, Cambridge.

Ash, R. (2007b), "Victim and Voyeur. Rome as a Character in Tacitus' Histories 3", in: D.H.J. Larmour / D. Spencer (eds.), *The Sites of Rome. Time, Space, Memory*, Oxford, 211–237.

Ash, R. (2009), "Fission and Fusion: Shifting Roman Identities in the Histories", in: A.J. Woodman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, Cambridge, 85–99.

van Baak, J.J. (1983), *The Place of Space in Narration*, Diss. Groningen / Amsterdam.

Babcock, C.L. (2000), "Principe interfecto: Tacitus' Sense of Aftermath in the Histories", in: S.K. Dickison / J.P. Hallett (eds.), *Rome and Her Monuments. Essays in Honor of [...] Katherine A. Geffcken*, Wauconda, 563–586.

Borzsák, I. (1973), "Spectaculum. Ein Motiv der 'tragischen Geschichtsschreibung' bei Livius und Tacitus", in: *ACD 9*, 57–67.

Brodersen, K. (1995), *Terra Cognita. Studien zur römischen Raumerfassung*, Hildesheim etc.

Brodersen, K. (2001), "Neue Entdeckungen zu antiken Karten", in: *Gymnasium* 108, 137–148.

Damon, C. (ed.) (2003), *Tacitus, Histories Book I*, Cambridge.

Döpp, S. (2003), "L'incendio del Campidoglio. Sullo stile di Tacito, Hist. III 72", in: *Eikasmos* 14, 231–241.

Edwards, C. (1996), *Writing Rome. Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge.

Furley, W.D. (1996) "Natur und Gewalt – die Gewalt der Natur. Zur Rolle der Natur und der Landschaft bei Thukydides", in: G. Siebert (ed.), *Nature et paysage dans la pensée et l'environnement des civilisations antiques*, Paris, 69–78.

Fyfe, W.H. (transl.) / Levene, D.S. (revised and ed.) (1997), *Tacitus, The Histories*, Oxford.

Haynes, H. (1996), *Narrative Anxiety in Tacitus' Histories*, Ann Arbor.

Heubner, H. (1963–1982), *P. Cornelius Tacitus, Die Historien. Kommentar, Bd. 1–5* (Bd. 5 together with F. Fauth), Heidelberg.

Heubner, H. (ed.) (1978), *P. Cornelius Tacitus, Tom. II Fasc. 1, Historiarum Libri*, Stuttgart.

Jaeger, M. (1999), "Guiding Metaphor and Narrative Point of View in Livy's Ab urbe condita", in: C.S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, Leiden, 169–195.

Joseph, T.A. (2012), *Tacitus the Epic Successor. Virgil, Lucan and the Narrative of the Civil War in the* Histories, Leiden.

Keitel, E. (1992), "Foedum Spectaculum and Related Motifs in Tacitus Histories II-III", in: *RhM* 135, 342–351.

Kraus, C.S. (1994), "'No Second Troy': Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V", in: *TAPhA* 124, 267–289.

Krause, D. (2005), *Luhmann-Lexikon. Eine Einführung in das Gesamtwerk von Niklas Luhmann*, Stuttgart.

Levene, D. (1997), "Pity, Fear and the Historical Audience: Tacitus on the Fall of Vitellius", in: S.M. Braund / C. Gill (eds.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, Cambridge, 128–149.

44 I would like to thank William Furley for reading this text and for his many helpful suggestions. I am also indebted to my students in a seminar on Tacitus' *Histories* in summer 2016 for their contributions to the discussion of these challenging texts.

Manolaraki, E. (2005), "A Picture Worth a Thousand Words: Revisiting Bedriacum (Tacitus Histories 2.70)", in: *CPh* 100, 243 – 267.
Manolaraki, E. / Augoustakis, A. (2012), "Silius Italicus and Tacitus on the Tragic Hero", in: V.E. Pagán (ed.), *A Companion to Tacitus*, Oxford, 386 – 402.
Marincola, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge.
McGillicuddy, S.P. (1991), *Self and Other in the "Histories" of Tacitus,* Ann Arbor.
Morgan, M.G. (1992), "The Smell of Victory: Vitellius at Bedriacum (Tac. Hist. 2.70)", in: *CPh* 87, 14 – 29.
Morgan, M.G. (1994a), "A Lugubrious Prospect: Tacitus, Histories 1.40", in: *CQ* 44, 236 – 244.
Morgan, M.G. (1994b), "Rogues March: Caecina and Valens in Tacitus, Histories I 61 – 70", in: *MH* 51, 103 – 125.
Nicolet, C. (1991), *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor.
O'Gorman, E. (1995), "Shifting Ground: Lucan, Tacitus and the Landscape of Civil War", in: *Hermathena* 158, 117 – 131.
Perkins, C.A. (1990), "Vitellius the Spectaculum. A Note on Histories 3.84.5", in: *CB* 66, 47 – 49.
Pomeroy, A.J. (2003), "Center and Periphery in Tacitus' Histories", in: *Arethusa* 36, 361 – 374.
Pomeroy, A.J. (2006), "Theatricality in Tacitus's Histories", in: *Arethusa* 39, 171 – 191.
Pomeroy, A.J. (2012), "Tacitus and Roman Historiography", in: V.E. Pagán (ed.), *A Companion to Tacitus*, Oxford, 141 – 161.
Purves, A.C. (2010), *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Cambridge.
Riggsby, A.M. (2006), *Caesar in Gaul and Rome. War in Words*, Austin.
Riggsby, A.M. (2007), "Response", in: *Arethusa* 40, 93 – 99.
Riggsby, A.M. (2009), "Space", in: A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 152 – 165.
Shumate, N. (1997), "Compulsory Pretence and the 'Theatricalization of Experience' in Tacitus", in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* VIII, Bruxelles, 364 – 403.
Tuan, Y.-F. (1977), *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, London.
Walker, A.D. (1993), "Enargeia and the Spectator in Greek Historiography", in: *TAPhA* 123, 353 – 377.
Wellesley, Kenneth (1972), *Cornelius Tacitus, The Histories Book III*, Sidney.

Vasileios Liotsakis

How to Satisfy Everyone: Diverse Readerly Expectations and Multiple Authorial *Personae* in Arrian's *Anabasis*

In his *Ars Rhetorica*, Aristotle warns the aspiring speakers of his age that a rhetor is always invited to convince many different categories of listeners through the same words. The philosopher refers to the differences between three kinds of audiences – the young, the old, and the middle-aged – with regard to their character and mentality (*Rh.* 1388b-1390b). Although Aristotle focuses in this passage on the age of the listeners, there are of course several other criteria for differentiating an ancient audience, such as social and financial status, personal interests, sympathies or aversions, education, or even the place of residence. When Pericles exhorted the Athenians to rely on their Long Walls and not to spare their land about to be devastated by the Peloponnesians (Th. 1.143.3 – 5; 2.60 – 64), his advice must have sounded altogether more reasonable to an Athenian merchant than, say, to an Acharnian who based the prosperity of his *oikos* on this land itself.

Aristotle's thoughts are suggestive of the high importance allocated to the heterogeneity of the audience in the eyes of ancient rhetors, and this far the *Ars Rhetorica* is indeed useful for a student of ancient rhetoric. How relevant, though, can such speculations be to another literary genre of antiquity, classical historiography? Is there any gain from asking whether an ancient historiographer took into consideration the diversity of his readership to the same degree as a public speaker did with his audience? Most importantly, did such speculations determine the historian's choices in content and style, at the level of both narrative arrangement and vocabulary? In this paper, by elaborating on Arrian and his *Anabasis of Alexander*, I will answer these questions in the affirmative, by arguing that Arrian has a close eye on the various preconceptions and expectations of a heterogeneous audience.

In trying to apprehend how readerly diversity impacted upon Greek historiography of the Imperial Era, Flavius Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander* can serve for us as a highly illuminating starting point. Arrian, just like all Greek authors of the Second Sophistic, was particularly concerned about the impression his writings would make for many different kinds of readers. In his case, the Bithynian intellectual wished for his work to impress both his literate compatriots and his Roman readers (including the emperor himself), enabling him to develop his political career in the Roman world. In this respect, the *Anabasis* had to meet the stylistic, ideological, and political specifications of its intellectual environment and to present Arrian as a gifted writer and avid connoisseur of the Attic literature of the glorious Greek

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-011

past.[1] Furthermore, the very subject of the *Anabasis* targeted further disparate and very often colliding categories of readers. By undertaking the narration of the exploits of Alexander the Great, Arrian was initiating a dialogue with both the admirers of the Macedonian conqueror and those who criticized his vanity.[2] Last but not least, the double generic character of this work, drawing from classical historiography (as emblematized by Herodotus and Thucydides) as well as the biographical and encomiastic tradition of Xenophon and Isocrates,[3] invited not only eagle-eyed readers with regard to the critical scrutiny of data but also an audience which expected nothing more than the chance to satisfy their curiosity for anecdotes on Alexander's life.

In this context, the present paper will deal with four levels on which we discern Arrian's effort to affiliate himself with, or to oppose himself to, one or sometimes multiple of the likely categories of readers mentioned above. The levels, or aspects, in question are (a) Arrian's use of epic allusions; (b) his criticism of Alexander; (c) geographical descriptions; and (d) his use of religious myths. The following analysis will stress the consciously rhetorical nature of the *Anabasis*, which is captured above all in Arrian's visible efforts to satisfy many different expectations of his readers by using multiple authorial and ideological masks at the same time. The main focus of this study will thus be an examination of Arrian's rhetoric (through the means of narrative and stylistic techniques) by which he manages to satisfy these various readerly expectations.

1 Arrian's use of epic allusions

In undertaking the composition of Alexander's literary portrait, Arrian was no doubt invited to satisfy a heterogeneous readership which would often comprise conflicting expectations. With regard to his use of epic allusions, the readers of earlier and contemporary literature on Alexander were, on the one hand, fully accustomed with his identification with epic figures – above all, Achilles – and generally with the heroising representation of his feats. On the other hand, sources ranging from the Hellenistic Era up to Arrian's time betray readers' aversion to the inordinate use of poetic

1 For the efforts by Greek intellectuals of the Imperial Era to construct their identity by connecting themselves with the Greek past, and for the political dimension of these efforts, see, as a selection, Anderson 1993; Gleason 1995; Swain 1996, 4–13, 65–100; Goldhill 2001b, 8, 13–20; Preston 2001, 88–93 (with a special focus on Plutarch); Jones 2004; Whitmarsh 2005, 10–40; Wyss 2017. In particular for Arrian, see Swain 1996, 242–248; Carlsen 2014.

2 For ancient sources and bibliography, see Section 2 of this paper.

3 On Herodotus', Thucydides', and Xenophon's influence on Arrian in terms of style, scope and narrative arrangement, see Meyer 1877; Doulcet 1882; Boehner 1885; Grundmann 1885; Stadter 1981; Tonnet 1988. On the encomiastic orientation of the work, see Fears 1974, 122–123; Brunt 1977, 36–44; *HCA* I, 15–16; Stadter 1980, 89–114; Burliga 2013, 7–13. On the rhetoric schemes drawn by Arrian from the laudatory literature of the past and from that of his age, see Bosworth 1988, 135–156; *AAA* II, 658–665.

and epic elements in historical works. We need *not always* have in mind two different categories of readership, namely those who enjoyed reading epic descriptions and those who did not. Rather, these connote two divergent kinds of expectations which very often coexist in the mind of one and the same reader. The inclusion of epic elements had developed into a typical feature of classical historiography from Herodotus to Arrian,[4] and the continuation of this practice should also partly be attributed, apart from the authors' need to imitate and emulate traditional narrative models, to the popularity of the epic descriptions among the contemporary readership. Nonetheless, this does not entail that ancient readers did not expect the historians to avoid exaggeration or licence in the exploitation of epic motifs.

The Homeric 'plating' of the histories of Alexander constitutes an idiosyncratic sub-category of the general practice of incorporating epic elements into historiography. This feature stemmed from Alexander's admiration of the Homeric heroes and his desire to be compared with them.[5] Ancient readers were familiar with stories of Alexander's origins traced back to both Achilles (through his son, Neoptolemus) and the Trojans (through Neoptolemus' marriage to Andromache).[6] Equally popular was the comparison between Alexander and Achilles.[7] The Macedonian king was also presented as speaking the language of the Homeric heroes, while one further *topos* was the epic battle descriptions, which were aimed at foregrounding the king's bravery and military skills.[8]

The authors just cited already reveal that the connection of Alexander with the Homeric world was a common *topos* in sundry literary genres (history, geography, biography, and rhetorical exercises). The extraordinary durability of this association through time, and its simultaneous presence in a number of genres, suggests, if anything, its popularity with ancient readers. One may feel the ancient authors' fear

4 For ancient views on the relationship between Thucydides and Homer, see Grossi 2016. On Homer and historiography, see collectively the most general and seminal studies of Strasburger 1972 and Rengakos 2006. On Homer and Herodotus, see collectively Caskey 1941–42; Armayor 1977–78; Hollmann 2000; Bakker 2002; Boedeker 2002; Pelling 2006; Kim 2010; Wesselmann 2011; Grethlein 2012. For bibliography on Homer and Thucydides, see Liotsakis 2017, 15–16 n. 56. On Homer and Xenophon, see Howie 1996; Tsaggalis 2002; Yamagata 2012.

5 Arrian 7.14.4. For further ancient sources testifying this view and for further discussion on this subject, see Erskine 2001, 49 n. 13 and 229–232; Zeitlin 2001, 201–202.

6 On Alexander's Molossian descent, see Str. 13.1.27; Paus. 1.11.1; Plu. *Alex*. 2.1. On Lysimachus, Aristotle and his special edition of the *Iliad*, see Plu. *Alex*. 5.8 and 8.2; Ps. Call. 3.4E; *FGrH* 134 F 38.

7 On Alexander as the 'new Achilles', see Tarn 1948 II, 57; Edmunds 1971, 369–376 and 383; Hölscher 1971, 25–27; Brunt 1976, 464–466; Bosworth 1988b, 19–20 and 281–283; Ameling 1988; Mossman 1988 and 1992; Stewart 1993, 78–86; Cohen 1995; Baynham 2001; Koulakiotis 2006, 204–207.

8 See, for instance, Callisthenes (*FGrH* 124), F 25, F 28, F 31, F 32, F 35; *FGrH* 138 F 11 = Arr. *An*. 4.24.3–5 on Ptolemy's *aristeia*; the epic elements in the military narrative of Hegesias of Magnesia (*FGrH* 142, F 5); Plu. *Alex*. 15.8–9 on Alexander's admiration of Achilles' friendships and glory; Curt. 4.6.29, where Alexander drags Betis' body with his chariot as Achilles did Hector's body; Curt. 8.4.26, for a parallelization between Alexander's relationship with Rhoxane and Achilles' with Brisēis. For further parallels, see Chapter IV 'Arrian *Homericus:* Alexander, the epic hero' of Liotsakis 2019a.

that, if they avoid even the slightest connection of Alexander with the epic realm, their reference to him would be deemed lacunose, somehow insufficient or less attractive. This insecurity was certainly the imposition of ongoing readerly demands. Especially with regard to Arrian's age, the connection forged between the greatest Greek conqueror and the Homeric heroes, as originators of most glorious martial ideals of Greece, satisfied the Greeks' need to forget for a moment the fact that they were under Roman occupation and to feel again connected not merely with their glorious past (Alexander) but also with its most brilliant roots (Homer).[9]

On the other hand, the heroization of Alexander and the Macedonians by means of Homeric allusions often disappointed the audience's expectations for historical reliability. In his treatise *How to Write History*, Lucian opposes the unrestrained use of epic elements in laudatory contexts. Lucian argues that such elements distract history from its true goal, namely the faithful representation of truth (*Hist. Conscr.* 8–9). Within the framework of this criticism, Lucian cites an anecdote about Aristobulus, one of Arrian's two principal sources for the *Anabasis*. While exploring India, the story goes, and after reading Aristobulus' fictive account of the single combat between himself and Porus, Alexander threw the book into the river, saying to Aristobulus: "You deserve the same treatment, Aristobulus, for fighting single-handed duels for my sake like that and killing elephants with one throw of the javelin" (*Hist. Conscr.* 12).[10] Elsewhere, Alexander is presented as equally critical of another aspiring 'Homer', when he says to his anonymous chronicler that he would rather choose to be Thersites in Homer's *Iliad* than being Achilles in this author's epic (*FGrH* 72 T 27). Whether Alexander's criticism is aimed at the author's stylistic flaws or the distortive nature of his account, the anecdote is evidently colored with a derogatory tone towards his own epicising self-characterisation.

The passages from Lucian in particular, a contemporary of Arrian, indicate that Lucian was invited to write for – and train through his writings – readers who would have more demanding expectations towards the extent and quality of the Homeric elements to be found in Alexander's portrait. This need for a moderate and studied use of epic allusions for credibility's sake had already been shaped since the Hellenistic Era. In the 2nd century BCE, Polybius openly castigates Callisthenes for distorting the historical truth in his narrative of the battle at Gaugamela by fabricating epic scenes of fighting, such as the one between Alexander and Darius looking for each other in the battlefield (Plb. 12.22 = *FGrH* 124 F35).[11]

Arrian endeavored throughout the *Anabasis* to convey a balanced impression to the reader of his epic delineation of Alexander. His interest is most squarely focused simultaneously both on a need for reliability and on presenting the epic nature of

9 Although in antiquity Homer was diachronically questioned as a historical authority, his prestige in the Imperial age as a poet and representative of the Greek glorious past is irrefutable. See, selectively, Zeitlin 2001; Kim 2010, 5–13.

10 Translation by Kilburn 1959.

11 Although Polybius' "criticism is again petty" (*HCP* II, 376).

events. Let us examine three test-cases from different parts of the work (Books I, VI, and VII).

To begin with, the very way that Arrian introduces the reader to his work betrays his intention to respect these two divergent – for readers such as Lucian – goals. The *Anabasis* has two prefaces, each of which satisfies one of these goals. In the First Preface, Arrian draws the readers' attention to the trustworthiness and validity of his method in collecting his historical materials, in part by deliberately alluding to the authorities of Herodotus and Thucydides. He opens his prologue with the Herodotean word ἀξιαφηγητότερα to refer to the stories he included in his work (*Pro.* § 1), echoing Herodotus' like-minded use of the word in the introductory parts in his work (Hdt. 1.16.2; 1.177; 2.137.5). Furthermore, the first words with which Arrian describes his account are the verb συνέγραψαν and the noun ξυγγραφήν. These echo the verb ξυνέγραψε in Thucydides' preface (Th. 1.1.1) and the noun ξυγγραφῇ in Thucydides' opening remarks to his account on the Pentecontaetia (Th. 1.97.2).[12] Through these allusions Arrian relates his own methodology in terms of the collection of data and the composition of his account with those of the archetypal models of historiography, Herodotus and Thucydides. In this way, Arrian highlights the quality of his narrative as a historical work. This goal is also served by his programmatic clarifications to the reader of the criteria by which he has assessed the various sources he had at his disposal (*Pro.* §§ 1–2).[13]

In a strikingly different vein, in the Second Preface Arrian's interest shifts towards the laudatory dimension of his account. The historian confesses to the reader that he aspires to glorify the magnitude of Alexander's exploits as Homer did those of Achilles, and he audaciously chooses to present himself as Alexander's Homer when the king arrives at Troy.[14] What is more, the author introduces himself with epic language (1.12.5):

> ὅστις δὲ ὢν ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ γιγνώσκω, τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οὐδὲν δέομαι ἀναγράψαι, οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἄγνωστον ἐς ἀνθρώπους ἐστίν, οὐδὲ πατρίδα ἥτις μοί ἐστιν οὐδὲ γένος τὸ ἐμόν, οὐδὲ εἰ δή τινα ἀρχὴν ἐν τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ ἦρξα· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἀναγράφω, ὅτι ἐμοὶ πατρίς τε καὶ γένος καὶ ἀρχαὶ οἵδε οἱ λόγοι εἰσί τε καὶ ἀπὸ νέου ἔτι ἐγένοντο.
>
> Whoever I may be, this I know in my favor; I need not write my name, for it is not at all unknown among men, nor my country nor my family nor any office I may have held in my own land; this I do set on paper, that country, family, and offices I find and have found from my youth in these tales.

12 On further narrative loans from Herodotus and Thucydides in Arrian's First Preface, see Stadter 1981, 158 ff.

13 Stadter 1980, 60–62; *HCA* I, 43–44; *AAA* I, 301–304 and 301, with exhaustive bibliography.

14 Stadter 1980, 63–65; *HCA* I, 104–107; *AAA* I, 345–350.

As already observed, the sentence ἐμοὶ πατρίς τε καὶ γένος καὶ ἀρχαὶ οἵδε οἱ λόγοι εἰσί τε καὶ ἀπὸ νέου ἔτι ἐγένοντο is an echo of Andromache's words to Hector (*Il.* 6.429–430):[15]

> Ἕκτορ ἀτὰρ σύ μοί ἐσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
> ἠδὲ κασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης.
>
> Hector, thus you are father to me, and my honored mother,
> you are my brother, and you it is who are my young husband.

The presence of two prefaces, emphasizing the two goals of the work (reliability and heroization of Alexander's feats), clearly aims to introduce his readers to the two principles that determined the shaping of scenes and episodes of an epic nature: praise and scrutiny.

Arrian's effort to satisfy the ancient readers' twofold need for validity and epic coloring of the war narrative is also discernible in the episode of Alexander's heavy injury during the battle against the Malli (6.9.1–11.8). As a genuinely near-death experience in Alexander's distinguished career, this incident was repeated in many anecdotes and dramatized in many epic descriptions. The surviving sources (Diodorus of Sicily, Plutarch, and Arrian) reveal to us the ancient authors' eagerness to satisfy their readership's expectations for the inclusion of Homeric elements. Plutarch refers to the shimmering glow that emanated from Alexander's shield and struck his enemies with awe. In this depiction Plutarch creates a strong connection between the Macedonian king and Achilles, given that in the *Iliad* the word σέλας, denoting the bright shine of a hero's armor, is used exclusively for Achilles.[16] Diodorus, for his part, creates an echo between Alexander's thoughts and Hector's thoughts in battle.[17]

Arrian states that his purpose in narrating this event is to clarify once and for all which of those glorifying stories were valid and which were not. Again, the Thucydidean phrasing aims at highlighting the author's concern with the reliability of his account. At the same time, the fashioning of the authorial 'I' as a scrupulous researcher again coexists with a respect held towards the traditional epic orientation of the stories on this event. According to Arrian, Alexander (6.9.5):

> ἔγνω δὲ ὅτι αὐτοῦ μὲν μένων κινδυνεύσει μηδὲν ὅ τι καὶ λόγου ἄξιον ἀποδεικνύμενος, καταπηδήσας δὲ εἴσω τοῦ τείχους τυχὸν μὲν αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἐκπλήξει τοὺς Ἰνδούς, εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ κινδυνεύειν δέοι, μεγάλα ἔργα καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα πυθέσθαι ἄξια ἐργασάμενος οὐκ ἀσπουδεὶ ἀποθανεῖται – ταῦτα γνοὺς καταπηδᾷ ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους ἐς τὴν ἄκραν.

15 Brunt 1976, 53 n. 4; Moles 1985, 166; Bosworth 1988, 33; Gray 1990, 181 n. 7; Swain 1996, 244; *AAA* I, 349.

16 *Il.* 18.214; *Il.* 19.15–17; *Il.* 19.366–374; *Il.* 19.379. On the epic elements in Plutarch's portrait of Alexander, see Mossman 1988.

17 D.S. 17.99.1 // Hom. *Il.* 22.105.

> [sc. He] realized that by remaining where he was he would be in danger, while not even performing any deed of note, but if he leapt down within the wall he might perhaps by this very action strike the Indians with panic but, if not and danger was inevitable, he might do great deeds, worth hearing to men of later generations, and that glory would attend his death. On this decision he leapt down from the wall into the citadel.

Alexander's thoughts resemble Hector's words in *Il.* 22.304–305:[18]

> μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην,
> ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι.
>
> Let me at least not die without a struggle, inglorious,
> But do some big thing first, that men to come shall know of it.

Now, it is equally interesting to examine to what degree this emphasis on the Homeric flavor of the episode affected the way Arrian made use of his sources. In the paragraphs following the description of Alexander's *aristeia*, Arrian makes a digression in which he tries to correct some points of misinformation. The historian here proclaims the authority of his work, a proclamation intensified, as said above, by the Thucydidean echo ἀταλαίπωρον at the end of the digression (6.11.8; cf. Th. 1.20.3). This verbal loan suggests that the *Anabasis* was the result of assiduous research and sound acumen, while simultaneously inviting its readers to be equally careful and prudent when reading such stories.

In particular, Arrian touches upon three subjects. First, the details on the number and gravity of Alexander's wounds: while many say that Alexander received first a blow to the head, Arrian follows Ptolemy's version that the king was hurt only in the chest. We can observe a contrast between the many unreliable historians and the dependable Ptolemy. This contrast, resembling the first proem, signals Arrian's intention to convince his readers of the reliability of his account.[19] There is a similar juxtaposition involving two further topics, first the exact place of the battle and second whether Ptolemy was present or not. While some wrote that Ptolemy was the one who removed the arrow from Alexander's chest, Ptolemy himself explains that at that very moment he was conquering other tribes elsewhere (6.11.8).[20]

In comparison with his punctilio on these details, Arrian's indifference with regard to the accuracy of his information in the case of one of the protagonists in the episode, Abreas, is striking. Although Arrian admits that it is not clear whether Abreas stood by Alexander or not (6.11.7),[21] he still takes advantage of the testimonies

18 Cf. *AAA* II, 531; Muckensturm-Poulle 2010, 277–279.

19 *AAA* II, 535.

20 For this passage, see also Stadter 1980, 70.

21 The other sources do not mention this man. D.S. (17.99.4) includes only Peucestas; Plu. (*Alex.* 63) records that the man who died protecting Alexander was named Limnaeus and not Abreas; Curt. (9.5.14–15) names Peucestas, Timaeus, Leonnatus, and Aristonus. Among them, Timaeus was the one who died.

by including this man in the episode in order to compose a clearly Homeric scene of his death (6.10.1): "shot with an arrow in the face" (τοξευθεὶς ἐς τὸ πρόσωπον). Abreas' case characteristically exemplifies the way in which Arrian's intention to add epic coloring to his account was reconciled with his need for accuracy.

The same technique is discernible in the account of Alexander's mourning of Hephaestion. Arrian opens his narration with the typical words ἔνθα δὴ καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλα ἀνέγραψαν (7.14.2), which, just as in the First Preface and in Alexander's *aristeia* against the Malli, show to the reader that Arrian will adopt a critical and scrutinizing attitude towards the information he will report.[22] This preparation of the reader is confirmed immediately as Arrian hastens to make clear that those who circulated many of these anecdotes were not motivated by their need to discover and disseminate the truth, but by their desire to accuse or absolve Alexander of improprieties he committed in his immoderate sorrow for the death of his friend (7.14.2–3). With this in mind, Arrian records the following information on Alexander's mourning, which can be categorized in the following way:

i. Stories that Arrian neither accepts nor rejects. This material concerns the length of time that Alexander remained lying over Hephaestion's body and his decision to execute Glaucias, the doctor who was deemed responsible for Hephaestion's death (7.14.3–4). *ii.* Those stories that depict Alexander as imitating Achilles (cutting off his hair, etc.), which Arrian accepts, in the belief that Alexander may well have wanted to honor Hephaestion by imitating Achilles (7.14.4). *iii.* Rumors that present Alexander as behaving like a madman and/or in a hubristic fashion. For example, the king is said to have ordered the temple of Asclepius at Ecbatana to be razed to the ground. Arrian rejects this information because, in his view, this deed does not fit well with Alexander's character. It resembles instead Xerxes' whipping of the Hellespont (7.14.5). *iv.* Information offered by all sources. In light of Arrian's statement in the First Preface that stories related by the majority of sources should be deemed more trustworthy, we may conclude that Arrian indeed believes such anecdotes on Alexander's mourning. These anecdotes comprise the following: Alexander mourns for three days without eating; he orders the barbarians to participate in the mourning; he does not change the name of Hephaestion's chiliarchy; and he plans to hold athletic and musical games in honor of Hephaestion (7.14.8–10).

At first glance it might seem that Arrian aims here to distinguish historical truth from fictive stories. However, in looking more closely at Arrian's categorization of the anecdotes, we will see that the criterion by which he accepts or rejects the sources in this case is not only the degree to which they are mostly or completely in agreement with each other, but also whether they portray Alexander in a positive or negative

22 Cf. *Pro.:* ἄλλοι μὲν δὴ ἄλλα ὑπὲρ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀνέγραψαν, [...] ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ Πτολεμαῖός τε καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος πιστότεροι ἔδοξαν; 1.11.2: καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλα ἐπεθείαζον τῶν μάντεων, Ἀρίστανδρος δέ; 4.14.4: πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ὑπὲρ τούτων αὐτῶν ἄλλοι ἄλλως ἀφηγήσαντο, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ ταῦτα ἀποχρῶντα ἔστω ἀναγεγραμμένα, where the ἄλλοι ἄλλα undervalues the validity of the opinion of the many in contrast to one single individual's reliability.

fashion. Stories that present the king as behaving like a madman, being disrespectful to the gods, or showing arrogance towards men, are rejected, while those which stress his pain and piety and thereby cause the readers' sympathy and admiration are accepted.

In this spirit, Arrian seems to accept an anecdote that draws a parallel between Alexander's love for Hephaestion and Achilles' love for Patroclus. On his way to Babylon, Alexander meets envoys from many Greek cities, including Epidaurus. According to the sources, Alexander satisfied the Epidaurians' requests and gave them a votive offering to take back to Asclepius, telling them (7.14.6):

> καίπερ οὐκ ἐπιεικῶς κέχρηταί μοι ὁ Ἀσκληπιός, οὐ σώσας μοι τὸν ἑταῖρον ὄντινα ἴσον τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ κεφαλῇ ἦγον.
>
> Yet Asclepius has not been kind to me, in failing to save for me the comrade whom I valued as much as my life.

Alexander's phrasing ἴσον τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ κεφαλῇ echoes Achilles' words ἶσον ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ in *Il.* 18.82 (in mourning Patroclus).[23] This anecdote demonstrates Alexander's love for Hephaestion and his respect for the gods even during hard times in his life. Arrian invites us here to sympathize with Alexander and admire him for his piety and humanity in the face of adversity. In this way, this episode is used by Arrian as a counterargument against those who claim that Alexander had been disrespectful to Asclepius. What is more, as in the case of the Malli, the culmination of epic elements in Alexander's words to the Epidaurians matches with Arrian's superficial respect for historiographical conscientiousness.

2 Criticisms of Alexander

Arrian's efforts to satisfy the differing expectations of his audience are also evident in the way he castigates Alexander's choices. On the one hand, the historian gives serious consideration to the traditional criticism of some debated aspects of Alexander's character. On the other hand, he seems to be particularly cautious in expressing his complaints against Alexander, paying special attention to the restrictions 'imposed' by his contemporary Roman political environment.

Negative reactions towards Alexander's choices are traceable in a variety of sources, stemming already from the Hellenistic Era. We find pejorative comments on Alexander's arrogance and his immoderate lust for conquests in the texts of Stoics such as Seneca (*Ben.* 2.16.2), Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.1.9), Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 1.7.55), and Cicero (*Off.* 1.26.90). The Macedonian king's ethical flaws gradually became *topoi* in Greco-Roman literature, as testified by sundry passages from Latin

23 *AAA* II, 609.

works.[24] By Arrian's age, every writer who chose Alexander and his career as a subject matter was invited to adopt a position, either covertly or openly, on the popular debate surrounding the ambivalent features of the king's character. Arrian was no exception to this rule.[25]

On the other hand, the exercise of aiming criticisms against a king of the past was far from a safe practice in Rome. There are several examples of poets and prose writers who lost their lives because their works were interpreted as covert attacks against the Emperor. In Tiberius' reign, a poet was sentenced to death because he presented in a tragedy Agamemnon as a tyrant.[26] Again under Tiberius, the historian Aulus Cremutius Cordus faced the same fate for extolling Brutus and Cassius.[27] Three quarters of a century later, Helvidius Priscus the younger lost his life for writing a farce about Paris and Oenone, since his work was taken as an irony towards Domitian's divorce.[28]

Now, after his lifelong experience of Roman political life, Arrian must have been well aware of the dangers that his criticisms against Alexander could pose for the Roman aristocracy if read as an implicit attack against monarchy or, even worse, against the Emperor. Nor did he merely suspect that his oeuvre would be read by Roman politicians and the Emperor; this was in fact one of his purposes in writing his works. To mention only a few examples that signal this, after his circumnavigation of the Euxinus Pontus around 131 AD, he wrote a *Periplous* of the coastline and offered it as a gift to his friend and Emperor Hadrian. Some years later, inspired very plausibly by his success against the Alani during his legateship of Cappadocia (*c.* 135 AD), he wrote his *Ἔκταξις κατὰ Ἀλάνων*, a work on the battle arrangements against the Alani. What is more, both Photius and *Suda Lexicon* testify that he received some of his offices, including his consulship of *c.* 129/130 AD, due to his prestige as a literate man.[29] Although both sources are admittedly doubtful, I would agree with the view that "Arrian's military and cultural activities were concomitant".[30] Such an author could hardly ignore the danger of being misinterpreted by the Roman elite at points where his criticisms against Alexander would inevitably touch upon issues of monarchy.

In what follows, let us examine an episode in which Arrian is clearly shown to engage with the traditional debate concerning Alexander's flaws, which simultaneously demonstrates his respect to the institution of monarchy. This is the episode

24 For a discussion of these as well as further sources, see Fear's (1974) excellent discussion. Cf. Brunt 1977.

25 See Burliga (2013), who has recently offered a very comprehensive discussion of the way that Arrian opens a dialogue with the contemporary debate of Alexander's character.

26 Suet. *Tib.* 61.3; D.C. 58.24.3 – 4.

27 Tac. *Ann.* 4.34; D.C. 57.24.2 – 3; Suet. *Tib.* 61.3; *Cal.* 16.1; Sen. *Ad Marc.* 1.2.4; Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.104.

28 Suet. *Dom.* 10.3. For all three examples, see Fears 1974, 124 – 125.

29 Phot. 17b 15 – 17; Suid. s.v. *Ἀρριανός*.

30 Bosworth 1972, 165.

on the murder of Clitus in Book IV. Here is a summary of the unit: during a symposium in honor of the Dioscuri, some fellow diners were flattering Alexander by claiming that both the Dioscuri's feats as well as those of Hercules and Philip were far inferior to his own achievements. Clitus, who had always opposed Alexander's embracing of eastern customs, began to attack Alexander under the influence of wine, arguing that such boasts were hubristic towards the gods, an insult to Philip, and did not reflect the truth. At the height of his outburst, Clitus raised his right hand and shouted at Alexander that this was the hand that had saved him in the battle of the River Granicus, and not his divine origins. Finally, Alexander, unable to control his anger and similarly intoxicated, took a spear and killed Clitus (4.8.1–9.6). After making some comments exculpating Alexander and laying the blame on Clitus, Arrian mentions that a flatterer of Alexander, Anaxarchus of Abdera, observing how disconsolate the king was after his action, comforted him by saying that whatever a king does is just.

The apologetic coloring of this episode is indisputable. Alexander is presented as being regretful of his deed and is somewhat vindicated in the eyes of the reader due to Clitus' effrontery. Furthermore, the king, immediately after killing Clitus, tries to kill himself as well and cries for days for having killed one of his dearest friends.[31] However, once again, Arrian tries to maintain a balance between his intention to delineate a favorable portrait of Alexander and the demands of those readers who are disposed to castigate Alexander's arrogance. As for the Alexander 'haters', Arrian affiliates with them by opening his account of Clitus' death with the following words (*An.* 4.7.5–8.1):

> καὶ τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου μεγάλα πράγματα ἐς τεκμηρίωσιν τίθεμαι ὡς οὔτε τὸ σῶμα ὅτῳ εἴη καρτερόν, οὔτε ὅστις γένει ἐπιφανής, οὔτε κατὰ πόλεμον εἰ δή τις διευτυχοίη ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος, οὐδὲ εἰ τὴν Λιβύην τις πρὸς τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, καθάπερ οὖν ἐπενόει ἐκεῖνος, ἐκπεριπλεύσας κατάσχοι, οὐδὲ εἰ τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀσίᾳ τε καὶ Λιβύῃ τρίτην, τούτων πάντων οὐδέν τι ὄφελος ἐς εὐδαιμονίαν ἀνθρώπου, εἰ μὴ σωφρονεῖν ἐν ταὐτῷ ὑπάρχοι τούτῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὰ μεγάλα, ὡς δοκεῖ, πράγματα πράξαντι. ἔνθα δὴ καὶ τὸ Κλείτου τοῦ Δρωπίδου πάθημα καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπ' αὐτῷ ξυμφοράν, εἰ καὶ ὀλίγον ὕστερον ἐπράχθη, οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ καιροῦ ἀφηγήσομαι.
>
> [...] I take it that nothing is clearer proof than Alexander's great successes of the truth that neither bodily strength in anyone, nor distinction of birth, nor continuous good fortune in war, greater even than Alexander's – no matter if a man were to sail out right round Libya as well as Asia and subdue them, as Alexander actually thought of doing, or were to make Europe, with Asia and Libya, a third part of his empire – that not one of all these things is any contribution to man's happiness, unless the man whose achievements are apparently so great were to possess at the same time command of his own passions. At this point it will not be unseasonable to relate also the death of Clitus son of Dropides and what happened to Alexander after it.

31 On the apologetic tone of this account as well as of the entire digression of *An.* 4.8–14, see Brunt 1976, 532–544; Stadter 1980, 73–74; Hammond 1993, 241–242; *HCA* II, 96–97; *AAA* II, 414–415.

It has been rigorously argued that Arrian, in maintaining a critical stance towards Alexander, was influenced by the efforts of other historiographers in the Imperial era to stress the gradual corruption of the Roman emperors due to the great power they obtained by taking over the throne.[32] Nevertheless, we should not hasten to seek Arrian's influences *exclusively* in post-Classical literature. Examples such as those of Pausanias and Alcibiades suffice to prove that works elaborating on the prestigious Greek past, with which Arrian was familiar with, could have offered him equally striking models, thereby inspiring him to focus on the gradual corrosion of Alexander's character following his military success.[33] Besides, the more general issue of the inevitability of the fall of empires, that is also latent in Arrian's words, may have been a favorite subject of Imperial historiography, but it had also already been crystallised as a *topos* in the accounts of Arrian's classical models, Herodotus and Thucydides.[34] On the other hand, the contrast between a positive stance towards Alexander's vision to conquer the Persian Empire and the negativity towards the continuation of his expedition to India mirrors the feelings of many Macedonians who followed Alexander. This resentment of Alexander's local following for his imperialist aspirations was similarly deeply felt in the accounts of some of the earliest historians of Alexander, whom Arrian had certainly read.[35] So, even whilst in this case Arrian implicitly targets Roman monarchy, he also satisfies the traditional interest of the readers of historiography in the corruption of empires due to the power they come to enjoy. And, above these inherited factors, Arrian also engages with the traditional debate surrounding Alexander as an ethical exemplar.

At the same time, the episode of Clitus' murder is enlightening in terms of how Arrian's presentation of Alexander was shaped by the expectations of the Roman sociopolitical milieu. As demonstrated above, in the Imperial period, there was a constant production of works of all genres, written in both Greek and Latin, which aimed to expound and comment on the features of the ideal monarch. Arrian, who belonged to the intellectual elite of his age and was a conspicuous official of the Roman state and friend of the Emperor, characteristically endeavors to remind the Roman readership that he was more than familiar with, and respectful towards, this royal agenda. This strategy is exemplified by Arrian's criticism towards Alexander's flatterers (*An.* 4.8.3):

> καί τινας τῶν παρόντων κολακείᾳ τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρου, οἷοι δὴ ἄνδρες διέφθειράν τε ἀεὶ καὶ οὔποτε παύσονται ἐπιτρίβοντες τὰ τῶν ἀεὶ βασιλέων πράγματα, κατ' οὐδὲν ἀξιοῦν συμβάλλειν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τε καὶ τοῖς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργοις τὸν Πολυδεύκην καὶ τὸν Κάστορα.

32 Schwartz *RE* II, 1, col. 1235. Cf. most recently Carlsen's (2016) illuminating thoughts and discussion of sources.

33 For the connections that an ancient reader could make between Alexander, Pausanias, and Alcibiades, see Gribble 1999, 1–28.

34 Burliga 2013.

35 Arr. *An.* 7.14.2.

> Some of the company, that type of men who always have spoiled and always will continue to harm the interests of the reigning monarch, out of flattery to Alexander, gave out as their opinion that there was no comparison between Castor and Pollux and Alexander and his achievements.

This is also the case in Arrian's castigation of Clitus' effrontery (*An.* 4.8.6 and 4.9.1):

> οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἐπαινῶ τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ ἱκανὸν γὰρ εἶναι τίθεμαι ἐν τοιᾷδε παροινίᾳ τὸ καθ' αὑτὸν σιγῶντα ἔχειν μηδὲ τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐς κολακείαν πλημμελεῖν.
>
> I do not commend Clitus either; I rather think it enough, amid such drunkenness, for a man to keep his own views to himself, and so avoid the errors of flattery of the rest.
>
> Καὶ ἐγὼ Κλεῖτον μὲν τῆς ὕβρεως τῆς ἐς τὸν βασιλέα τὸν αὐτοῦ μεγαλωστὶ μέμφομαι
>
> I myself strongly blame Clitus for his insulting behavior towards his king.

I would thus say that, in the Clitus episode, Arrian intends to affiliate simultaneously with three different categories of readers: Alexander's haters, his admirers, and the imperial Roman circle.

3 Geographical considerations

Arrian's simultaneous interest in miscellaneous readerly demands is also discernible in his rich exploitation and presentation of geographical information. Also at this level, the handling of one and the same subject often aims at juggling and satisfying simultaneously divergent expectations of the audience and, in doing so, at eliciting multi-levelled reactions. At this point, however, in order to render our analysis as comprehensible as possible, we need first express some thoughts about the degree to which Alexander's expedition in Asia, and the literary rendition of this subject, contributed to the enrichment of the geographical knowledge of an ancient readership and to the development of the genre of geography.

It is common knowledge that Alexander radically changed the Greco-Roman audience's view of the world. First, the Macedonians visited lands and peoples that were up to that time totally unknown to the West. Furthermore, after the conquest of the East, even well-known areas of Asia would no longer be treated as bereft of interest, simply by being remote and foreign parts of the earth. Those lands now started attracting the interest of peoples from the West too, as they were for the first time seen as an equal part of the Greco-Roman world.[36] The first historians of

36 Roller 2010, 6–7; Gehrke 2011; Dueck 2012, 12–13; Bianchetti 2013, 79–82; Engels 2013, 88; Gehrke 2016; *HTGGS*, 15.

Alexander combined in forming a massive production of works rich in ethnographic and geographic details about the newly conquered lands.[37]

This compositional fever during the Hellenistic Era reaches its peak in Eratosthenes' *Geography*, written in the 3rd century BCE. Eratosthenes concluded that the readers of his age had to redefine their own view of the world. For him it was more than clear that Alexander's conquests and discoveries had permanently changed the contemporary audience's view of both the shape of the inhabited world and the distribution of its borders. The depiction of a new and greatly enlarged world-order thus emerged as one of the central goals of Eratosthenes' *Geography*[38] and his main sources for some areas of the world were the works of the first historians of Alexander themselves.[39]

Now, Arrian lived five centuries later than Eratosthenes, and by then a well-informed reader of Arrian's age was in a position to recognize that the geographic accounts found in the Hellenistic literature on Alexander were to a significant degree unreliable and outdated. Whether in order to magnify Alexander's and their own feats or to amuse their audience with exotic and sensational stories, these writers often distorted the geographic appearance of remote areas, altered their names, and offered exaggerated and 'caricatured' descriptions of the peoples they encountered during the expedition.[40]

Already in the Hellenistic period, Eratosthenes repeatedly warns his readers of the unreliability of such geographic and ethnographic descriptions and of their thinly veiled propagandistic goals (Arr. *An.* 5.3.1). Almost two centuries later, a similar kind of protectiveness shown by an author towards his readership is evident in Strabo's *Geography.* Strabo gives his readers alarm that, although the Scythians' territory extended mostly from the Danube to the Caspian Sea, including the areas crossed by the river Tanais (today, the Don), Alexander's historians, such as Polyclitus of Larissa, in their effort to argue that Alexander conquered these lands too, gave the river Jaxartes (today, the Syr Darya) the name 'Tanais' and identified it with the river Don, which was assumed to be the natural border between Europe and Asia (Str. 11.509 – 510 = *FGrH* 128, F 7). In this way, Alexander's victory over the Scythians on the banks of the Jaxartes was taken to prove that the Macedonian king conquered some parts of the area between the Black and the Caspian Seas. Now, as far as Arrian's age is concerned, we may mention Lucian's irony towards the incredible presentations of peoples in his *True Stories*, as well as Arrian's own derogatory comments on the fictive

37 On the geographical descriptions in the historical narrative tradition of Alexander, see, most recently, Bucciantini 2016 (on Nearchus, Onesicritus, Ptolemy, Aristobulus).

38 On Eratosthenes' purposes in writing his *Geography*, see Roller 2010, 15 – 37.

39 Roller 2010, 16 – 22.

40 Arr. *An.* 5.3.1.

core of the Macedonian stories about the Amazons (*An.* 7.13.4 – 6), and his exotic *fabulae* about Indian fauna and flora (*An.* 5.4.3 – 4; *Ind.* 3.4 – 6; 5.10 – 6.3; 9.4; 15.7).[41]

Such examples suffice to delineate the atmosphere of suspicion in which the readers of the Imperial Era treated geographical literature. Eratosthenes, Strabo, Lucian, Arrian, and many other writers who displayed a similar attitude towards imprecise geographic accounts should not be seen *only* as researchers and writers but also as readers. They represent a certain category of readership, whose distinctive feature is their high education and literary competence. To judge from the fact that we find such reactions in sundry authors, it would not be arbitrary to conclude that, at least from the Hellenistic Era up to Arrian's time, literate readers had been developing a tendency to reveal to less informed readers the false character of the descriptions of the 'new world' in the first histories of Alexander.[42]

In what follows, we can elaborate on one case where Arrian seems to have taken advantage of the different levels of geographical competence of his readers, in order to simultaneously achieve multiple goals. Specifically, we will examine his attitude towards the false naming by the Macedonians of Mt. Hindu Kush. Alexander crossed Hindu Kush in the spring of 329 BCE, during his pursuit of Bessus, the murderer of Darius and aspiring usurper of Alexander's throne. Although the name of the mountain was at that time Parapamissus, the Macedonians named it Caucasus, deliberately identifying it in this way with the Caucasus in the Caspian Sea, where Hercules was said to have freed Prometheus. Furthermore, many other accounts of the mountain had stated that they also found the very cave where the semi-god freed the Titan. The purpose of the falsifiers – and of Alexander too, their instigator – was to magnify in the army's minds Alexander's successful crossing of the mountain range, by conveying the impression that Alexander superseded even Hercules, given that he reached beyond the places visited by the god.[43]

To compare Alexander's feats with those of Hercules and Dionysus was a common practice in Macedonian royal circles during the expedition. This was in part a convenient way for Alexander and his close environment to keep the soldiers' morale high and to convince them that the expedition should be continued Eastwards.[44] Indeed at that time, Alexander needed such inspiring stories more than ever before in his march into Asia. He had already stricken a decisive blow upon the Persian army in his victory at Gaugamela, and, most importantly, Darius was already dead.

41 On Arrian's attitude towards the fabulous nature of the literature on India, see Liotsakis 2018 and 2019b.

42 Needless to say, the general practice of refuting one's predecessors has already been developed since Herodotus. Marincola's (1997) seminal study still remains an imposing benchmark for those studying this issue.

43 *HCA* II, 214.

44 On Alexander's relationship with Heracles, see also Hogarth 1887, 320, 326; Balsdon 1950, 377; Edmunds 1971, 372ff. On Alexander's use of Dionysus as a means to control both his men and the natives, see Bosworth 1996a, 121 – 126 and 1996b; Worthington 2014, 238 – 239.

Alexander was now the ruler of the Persian Empire, while the most powerful capitals of Asia had surrendered to him, offering him their treasures. All these successes had already combined to convey the impression to the soldiers that their hardships were coming to an end and that they would sooner or later be repatriated. However, Alexander had no intention to leave Asia, and with good reason. Bessus, satrap of Bactria and relative by blood to Darius, had rebelled against Alexander and was preparing an army of resistance to face the Macedonian forces. What is more, he had withdrawn to Bactria, northern of Hindu Kush, and lay there in waiting for Alexander. In order to leave Bessus no time to prepare the revolt, Alexander led his forces through the inhospitable highlands of Hindu Kush during spring, which made the crossing even harder for the Macedonians. The stories relating this crossing to Hercules' visit to the Caucasus of the Caspian Sea were thus aimed to console the Macedonian soldiers and convince them that they had not returned home yet – as their Greek companions of the Corinthian League had already done – but their labors would offer them individual and future *kleos*.

Arrian's first mention of the mountain comes in his narration of its crossing by Alexander and his men (3.28.4–7):

> Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τὸν Καύκασον τὸ ὄρος ἦγεν, ἵνα καὶ πόλιν ἔκτισε καὶ ὠνόμασεν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν· καὶ θύσας ἐνταῦθα τοῖς θεοῖς ὅσοις νόμος αὐτῷ ὑπερέβαλε τὸ ὄρος τὸν Καύκασον, σατράπην μὲν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐπιτάξας Προέξην, ἄνδρα Πέρσην, τῶν δὲ ἑταίρων Νειλόξενον τὸν Σατύρου ἐπίσκοπον ξὺν στρατιᾷ ἀπολιπών. τὸ δὲ ὄρος ὁ Καύκασος ὑψηλὸν μέν ἐστιν ὥσπερ τι ἄλλο τῆς Ἀσίας, ὡς λέγει Ἀριστόβουλος, ψιλὸν δὲ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ τό γε ταύτῃ. μακρὸν γὰρ ὄρος παρατέταται ὁ Καύκασος, ὥστε καὶ τὸν Ταῦρον τὸ ὄρος, ὃς δὴ τὴν Κιλικίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν ἀπείργει, ἀπὸ τοῦ Καυκάσου εἶναι λέγουσι καὶ ἄλλα ὄρη μεγάλα, ἀπὸ τοῦ Καυκάσου διακεκριμένα ἄλλῃ καὶ ἄλλῃ ἐπωνυμίᾳ κατὰ ἤθη τὰ ἐκάστων. ἀλλὰ ἔν γε τούτῳ τῷ Καυκάσῳ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ὅτι μὴ τέρμινθοι πεφύκασι καὶ σίλφιον, ὡς λέγει Ἀριστόβουλος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς ἐπῳκεῖτο πολλοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ πρόβατα πολλὰ καὶ κτήνη ἐνέμοντο, ὅτι καὶ χαίρουσι τῷ σιλφίῳ τὰ πρόβατα, καὶ εἰ ἐκ πολλοῦ πρόβατον σιλφίου αἴσθοιτο, καὶ θεῖ ἐπ' αὐτὸ καὶ τό τε ἄνθος ἐπινέμεται καὶ τὴν ῥίζαν ἀνορύττων καὶ ταύτην κατεσθίει. ἐπὶ τῷδε ἐν Κυρήνῃ ὡς μακροτάτω ἀπελαύνουσι τὰς ποίμνας τῶν χωρίων, ἵνα αὐτοῖς τὸ σίλφιον φύεται. οἱ δὲ καὶ περιφράσσουσι τὸν χῶρον, τοῦ μηδὲ εἰ πελάσειεν αὐτῷ πρόβατα, δυνατὰ γενέσθαι εἴσω παρελθεῖν, ὅτι πολλοῦ ἄξιον Κυρηναίοις τὸ σίλφιον.
>
> Meanwhile Alexander led his army to Mount Caucasus, where he founded a city he called Alexandria. There he sacrificed to the gods to whom he customarily sacrificed, and then crossed the Mount Caucasus, appointing as satrap of the district Proexes, a Persian, with Niloxenes son of Satyrus, one of the Companions, as overseer in command of troops. Mount Caucasus, according to Aristobulus, is as high as any mountain in Asia; most of it is bare, at least on this side. In fact it is a long mountain range, so that they say that even Mount Taurus, which forms the boundary of Cilicia and Pamphylia, is really a part of Mount Caucasus as well as other great mountains which have been distinguished from Mount Caucasus by various names traditional among the different peoples. In this particular Mount Caucasus, however, nothing grows save terebinths and silphium according to Aristobulus. But even so it was inhabited by a large number of people and many flocks and herds grazed there, since the flocks like the silphium, and if they noticed it ever so far away they run to it, nibble its flower, and dig up and eat the root. For this reason in Cyrene they drive their flocks as far as possible from the places where their silphium grows;

> some even hurdle off the area, so that even if the flocks approach they cannot get in, since silphium is very valuable to the Cyrenaeans.

Arrian seems to treat these consoling Macedonian accounts in a peculiar way, which has caused scholarly discomfort. As is stated from the passage just quoted, Arrian follows the Macedonians by naming the mountain Caucasus and without clarifying to the reader that the true name of the mountain was Parapamissus. In this way, the historian forces contemporary readers of limited geographical knowledge to believe – or at least to suspect – that the Macedonians visited the Caucasus of Heracles. Only in Book V and in his *Indikē* does he let the reader know that the name 'Caucasus' was in fact a fabrication of Macedonian propaganda and that the true name of the mountain range was 'Parapamissus'. Nonetheless, he shares with the reader his intention to keep calling it 'Caucasus'. Even for those readers of Arrian's age who knew that the mountain was named Parapamissus, Arrian's choice to follow the Macedonian name was certainly not a significant mistake Since its fabrication, the name 'Caucasus' had been consolidated as an alternative for Parapamissus and is also found in geographical works such as that of Strabo.[45] Nonetheless, most of the other surviving sources except Arrian that name Hindu Kush as Caucasus explain to their readers that this nomenclature was a fabrication. A literate reader of Arrian's age would thus very plausibly complain that Arrian should rather have offered his clarification about the fictive origins of the name in Book 3 and not in Book 5. The question is why he did not do so at the earlier point in his narrative.

It has been argued that Arrian, while composing Book 3, had not read Eratosthenes' account on the Macedonians' propaganda, and that he did so only when he reached at the point where he had to penetrate the Indian geography during the composition of Book V.[46] However, such a conclusion cannot stand. As Brunt writes, "*though aware of the facts* (my italics), A. prefers to use the nomenclature of his sources",[47] an observation which is also suggested by the structural and stylistic resemblances of a certain part of the digression to one of those passages where Arrian admits his knowledge of the case (3.28.5):

---

45 Arr. *An.* 5.3.1; Str. 2.5.39; 11.5.5; 15.1.11. For further ancient sources, see *HCA* II, 214, 217.

46 Bosworth (*HCA* I, 10) takes Arrian's silence about his own visit at Prometheus' cave as all but confirmatory proof that he wrote the *Anabasis* before his visit to the alleged place of Prometheus' punishment, which we learn about in *Peripl.* 11.5.

47 Brunt 1976, 524. Cf. Schwartz *RE* II, 1, col. 1239, who considers ch. 3.28.5 as "die leicht zu erkennenden Eratosthenescitate". Besides, to accept that Arrian was not aware of Eratosthenes' text when composing ch. 3.28 presupposes that he read his sources in the course of his writing, which is unlikely. Schwartz (*RE* II, 1, 1238) has aptly described the way Arrian must have worked on Ptolemy's and Aristobulus' accounts before choosing them as the most reliable; Arrian must have read them before starting composing his own account. This must have been the case with Eratosthenes and other sources too.

> Τὸ δὲ ὄρος ὁ Καύκασος ὑψηλὸν μέν ἐστιν ὥσπερ τι ἄλλο τῆς Ἀσίας, ὡς λέγει Ἀριστόβουλος, ψιλὸν δὲ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ τό γε ταύτῃ. μακρὸν γὰρ ὄρος παρατέταται ὁ Καύκασος, ὥστε καὶ τὸν Ταῦρον τὸ ὄρος, ὃς δὴ τὴν Κιλικίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν ἀπείργει, ἀπὸ τοῦ Καυκάσου εἶναι λέγουσι καὶ ἄλλα ὄρη μεγάλα, ἀπὸ τοῦ Καυκάσου διακεκριμένα ἄλλῃ καὶ ἄλλῃ ἐπωνυμίᾳ κατὰ ἤθη τὰ ἑκάστων.
>
> Mount Caucasus, according to Aristobulus, is as high as any mountain in Asia; most of it is bare, at least on this side. In fact it is a long mountain range, so that they say that even Mount Taurus, which forms the boundary of Cilicia and Pamphylia, is really a part of Mount Caucasus as well as other great mountains which have been distinguished from Mount Caucasus by various names traditional among the different peoples.
>
> ὄροι δὲ τῆς Ἰνδῶν γῆς πρὸς μὲν βορέου ἀνέμου ὁ Ταῦρος τὸ ὄρος. καλέεται δὲ οὐ Ταῦρος ἔτι ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ, ἀλλὰ ἄρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ὁ Ταῦρος τῆς κατὰ Παμφύλους τε καὶ Λυκίην καὶ Κίλικας παρατείνει τε ἔστε τὴν πρὸς ἕω θάλασσαν, τέμνων τὴν Ἀσίην πᾶσαν, ἄλλο δὲ ἄλλῃ καλέεται τὸ ὄρος, τῇ μὲν Παραπάμισος, τῇ δὲ Ἠμωδός, ἄλλῃ δὲ Ἴμαον κληίζεται, καὶ τυχὸν ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλα ἔχει οὐνόματα. Μακεδόνες δὲ οἱ ξὺν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ στρατεύσαντες Καύκασον αὐτὸ ἐκάλεον, ἄλλον τοῦτον Καύκασον, οὐ τὸν Σκυθικόν, ὡς καὶ [τὸν] ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Καυκάσου λόγον κατέχειν ὅτι ἦλθεν Ἀλέξανδρος. (*Ind.* 2.1–4)
>
> The northern boundary of the land of India is Mount Taurus. That is not the name given to it in this land: in fact, while Taurus begins from the sea by Pamphylia and Lycia and Cilicia and reaches as far as the Eastern Ocean, cutting right through Asia, the mountain has different names in different places; in one Parapamissus, in another Emodus, elsewhere Imaon, and perhaps it has all sorts of other names. The Macedonians who fought with Alexander called it Caucasus, a different Caucasus from the Scythian; so that the story ran that Alexander penetrated beyond the Caucasus.

In both passages, Arrian is aware that Hindu Kush is not the Scythian Caucasus (3.28.6: τούτῳ τῷ Καυκάσῳ // *Ind.* 2.4: ἄλλον τοῦτον Καύκασον, οὐ τὸν Σκυθικόν) and that the mountain range is called a different name from area to area. The sole difference is that, in the digression of Book 3 of the *Anabasis*, he does not mention the name Parapamissus, an omission which should certainly not be attributed to his ignorance.

To make arbitrary guesses about when and how Arrian read his sources does not help to offer a sufficient interpretation of Arrian's strategy in this case. By contrast, the approach pursued in this paper, namely to ask how an author endeavours through his work to affiliate himself with certain different kinds of readers, may offer much more felicitous answers. To begin with, we should keep in mind not only that the *Anabasis* has a laudatory character but also that Arrian composed it partly on the basis of the literature of Alexander.[48] Long before Arrian, a tradition of encomiastic accounts had been shaped and the authors of these accounts, such as Callisthenes of Olynthus, Onesicritus, and Arrian's three principal sources, Aristobulus, Ptolemy, and Nearchus, in their effort to extol their king, misrepresented the historical reality. One of the ways in which they did so was to fabricate stories about

48 On Arrian's sources in the *Anabasis*, see Schwartz *RE* II, 1, cols. 1237 ff.; Strasburger 1934; Kornemann 1935; Brunt 1976, xxix-xxxiii; *HCA* 16–34; Stadter 1980, 66–76; *AAA* I, XXI-XXXVII.

the places visited by Alexander. Although repeatedly castigating such strategies, Arrian very often allowed them to intrude into his own narrative, either unconsciously or on purpose. In this case, I believe, by choosing to name Hindu Kush Caucasus, Arrian wished to show to the reader that his oeuvre belongs to the historiographical tradition of Alexander which coined this name.

We should also take into consideration the relationship of the digression with Arrian's goals in both its immediate and wider context. At this point of the narrative, Alexander must be portrayed as the restorer of justice. The expedition is depicted as a struggle against the disrespectful and corrupted traitors of Darius.[49] Had Arrian included the hubris of Alexander and the Macedonians towards Heracles in his digression, the expedition would somewhat mutate in the reader's mind from a morally legitimate effort to reestablish justice into an arrogant pursuit of *kleos*. For this reason, Arrian waits for the proper moment, i. e. when he purposes to discuss the distortive effects of these military successes on Alexander's character. It is telling, in this respect, that the first time that Arrian engages with the theme of the Macedonians' hubris towards Heracles that led to the fabrication 'Caucasus' is in the Nyssa episode at the beginning of Book V, only after Alexander's hubris in the Aornus narrative against Heracles and his abuse of the rumors about Dionysus in the Nysa account have already prepared the ground for further such examples.[50]

Furthermore, by not mentioning Alexander's competitiveness towards Heracles during his stay in Hindu Kush, Arrian deliberately avoids offering the slightest piece of information to his readers about the inner turmoil in the Macedonian circles. This is because Alexander's boastfulness against Heracles and Dionysus also constitutes one of the main reasons why the king's relationships with some Macedonians duly turned sour. The visit to the oracle of Siwah and the crossing of the Hindu Kush offered Alexander the opportunity to boast that he is equal – if not superior – to Heracles. This is an argument Alexander must have repeatedly taken advantage of in his efforts to convince the Macedonians to follow him into Asia's depths.[51] The crossing of Caucasus, the mountain when Heracles freed Prometheus, was one further strong proof that Alexander himself came from divine stock, since his exploits outdid even those of Heracles. In this respect, this event is closely associated with Cleitus' and Callisthenes' complaints against Alexander's hubristic attitude towards Heracles in the digression of ch. 4.8 – 14. Arrian could have prepared the reader for this digression by noting that the crossing of Hindu Kush was one of the first feats that were interpreted by Alexander and his flatterers as evidence of his superiority over Heracles. However, he did not flag this comparison here, first because he intended not to touch upon these themes before Book IV, and second because at

49 See Chapter II ('March-narrative and characterization') in Liotsakis 2019a.

50 On Arrian's criticisms of Alexander's propagandistic abuse of the two gods in the events in Aornus and Nysa, see *HCA* II, 213 – 216. Cf. Chapter I ('Overall design: From praise to criticism') in Liotsakis 2019a.

51 *HCA* II, 55, 78 – 79.

this point in the narrative he wishes to portray Alexander as nothing other than the romantic avenger of Darius' murderers.

On the other hand, Arrian is fully aware of the fact that his work would also be read by readers who were more demanding of its historical validity, including, of course, its geographical descriptions. As we have seen, geographers such as Eratosthenes and Strabo long before Arrian had touched upon the propagandistic inaccuracies found in the geographical descriptions of the first histories of Alexander. And Arrian, both in his *Anabasis* and in his *Indikē*, repeatedly clarifies that he preferred to describe the Asian territory on the basis of more reliable works, such as those of Eratosthenes, Megasthenes, and Nearchus. In this way, he signalled his opposition to the flattering accounts of the Hellenistic era and to all those who followed them. For the latter, the name Caucasus was merely a means to glorify Alexander. By contrast, for Eratosthenes, Strabo (11.5.5; 15.1.11), and others it was nothing but a lie. Arrian chose to stand somewhere in the middle. By drawing this name and other similar elements from the first historians of Alexander, he presented his work as a legitimate continuation of the historiographical tradition of the king and served his own narrative goals without disappointing all of his more fastidious historical readers.

4 Religious myths

Arrian's interest in these multiple-level modes of engaging his contemporaries with his work is also evident in the way he uses religious myths. A myth, depending on how it is exploited by an author, may interact with its readers in a handful of different ways. First, by observing the way that a writer narrates a myth, readers may apprehend the writer's credence, or lack thereof, in the history of reception of the myth, and come to understand whether the author accepts the validity of a myth's content. At the same time, the effect that religious myths can have on readers depends on the readers' own piety. Rationalist readers or atheists often remain unmoved by such stories, as they take them to be untrue. Inversely, pious readers show greater respect to myths and are thus more interested in hearing or reading stories about the deeds of mythical figures and supernatural entities. For this reason, pious readers can often be very sensitive towards the didactic, moral, and ideological messages an author tries to convey through a myth. On the other hand, myths can sometimes amuse all types of readers, although again to different degrees depending on the special interests of each reader.

Let us examine these numerous functions of the religious myths in the famous story of the Gordian knot, as related by Arrian in the *Anabasis*.[52] Gordius, a poor Phrygian husbandman, notices one day that an eagle was standing on his wagon be-

52 Cf. Plu. *Alex*. 18.2–4; Curt. 3.1.14–18; Justin 11.7.3–16; Marsyas, *FGrH* 135/6 F 4. For bibliography on Alexander's untying the knot, see *HCA* I, 184 and *AAA* I, 397.

fore night-time. He consults a Telmissian girl about the meaning of the omen and what to do, and the girl advises him to offer a sacrifice to Zeus the King. Gordius follows her advice and later on marries her. The couple have a son, Midas. Meanwhile, after many years, and during a period of civil strife, the Phrygians receive an oracle which declares that political order will come only when a king comes to them in a car. When one day Midas, being escorted by his parents, arrives at the Assembly in his car, the Phrygians believe that he is the man to whom the oracle refers and they make him their king. Midas dedicates his car to Zeus the King as a sign of gratitude for fulfilling the omen of the eagle. What is more, according to the myth the man who would undo the knot of Midas' car would rule Asia. After relating this local myth, Arrian describes how Alexander untied the knot, and completes his account by saying that, during the very night after Alexander untied the knot, thunder and lightning filled the sky. Arrian takes for granted that these natural phenomena were omens sent by the gods to Alexander, who thanked them with sacrifices on the following day (2.3).[53]

The way Arrian relates this myth and the ensuing report of the untying of the knot and the divine signs reveals to the readers his faith in the validity of the myth and his piety.[54] Arrian's choice to narrate the myth in indirect speech might indicate his intention to distance himself from what he narrates.[55] However, the absence of any sign of doubt and the presentation of the thunder and lightning as divine omens to Alexander are very strong signs of Arrian's faith. Last, although the myth would probably not persuade a rationalist reader, it would certainly convince

53 On this and further similar cases indicating the gods' involvement in Alexander's affairs, see Stadter 1980, 73–74.

54 Arrian was undoubtedly a pious man. In his *Cynegeticus*, he writes that "nothing that happens without the gods turns out well for men. Those who sail the sea start with a prayer to the gods, at least those who care about their safety, and when they set home safe they sacrifice an offering of thanks to the gods of the sea, Poseidon and Amphitrite and the Nereids. Farmers sacrifice to Demeter and her daughter and Dionysus, craftsmen to Athena and Hephaestus, those in education to the Muses and Apollo leader of the Muses and Memory and Hermes, those interested in affairs of love to Aphrodite and Eros and Peitho and the Graces" (Arr. *Cyn*. 35.1–3. Transl. Phillips/Willcock). Similarly, in his *Periplus*, he shares with the Emperor Hadrian his hope that the god will help him force the Colcheans to pay the tribute to Rome (Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux*. 11.2.3). In this statement, according to Brunt (1976, xi), "there is an old-world piety".

55 Most scholars treat citations and indirect speech as strong signs of the ancient historians' doubts about or distancing from the events they narrate. See Cooper 1974, especially 23–31 on the intrusive infinitives in Herodotus (cf. Cooper 1971, 65–83 and Fehling's (1971, 87–174)); on Thucydides' λέγεται phrases, see Westlake 1977, 346, 349–356; Westlake 1977, 346 on Xenophon; For this approach in Plutarch, see Cook 2001, 329 n. 1 with exhaustive bibliography. On this scheme in classical historiography, see the general studies of Laird 1999, 116–152 and Sulimani 2008. However, indirect speech has a multidimensional function in classical historiography, depending on the occasion. See Cook 2001; Augoustaki 2005, 267–271; Gray 2011, 77–82.

pious readers of the period in which Alexander's conquest of Asia fulfilled the divine will, and would thereby confirm it as a legitimate act.[56]

Myths such as that of the Gordian knot leave the following question open: how can we know whether or not Arrian was concerned about different kinds of readers when composing such myths? The two following examples offer strong evidence that, as in the use of epic allusions and geographic data, Arrian made mention of myths while keeping in mind multiple types of readers and in a bid to create multilateral relations between his audience and a myth. The passages in question are the myth on Dionysus' conquests in India in Book 5 of the *Anabasis*, and the myth about the mysterious island of the Sun in the *Indikē*.

To begin with the first of these passages, when Alexander reached the area between the rivers Cophen and Indus, the Nysaeans sent their most distinguished citizen, Acuphis, to him. Acuphis delivered a speech in Alexander's presence in which he asked him to respect the autonomy of his homeland. At the core of Acuphis' argument was the idea that the independence of the city had its roots in Dionysus' visit to India. On his return to Greece, the god, according to the Indian noble, founded Nysa and inhabited it with the men who were unfit for service among his soldiers. He named the place Nysa in memory of his nurse Nyse and the mountain lying next to the city Merus (thigh), given that, according to the legend, Dionysus had been born out of Zeus' thigh.[57] Alexander accepted Acuphis' proposal and respected the autonomy of the Nysaeans, demanding only some horsemen in return. There were also rumors that he visited, in the company of his cavalry and infantry, Mount Merus, where the ivy was said to grow due to the presence of the god. The Macedonians crowned themselves with the ivy (5.1–3). This myth was exploited both by the Nysaeans, in their effort to convince Alexander not to harm their city, as well as by Alexander himself in his effort to convince the Macedonians to follow him before India, in places where not even Dionysus had reached.[58]

Although questioning the stories about the rituals organized by the Macedonians in honor of Dionysus, Arrian does not reject the myth itself about the god's presence in India. However, in contrast to the case of the Gordian knot, Arrian did not accept Dionysus' myth in order to impress the reader about Alexander's feats. The historian repeatedly criticizes Alexander for his emulation of Dionysus and foregrounds the hypocrisy with which the king took advantage of the Indian myth. Arrian's unwillingness to reject the myth rather derives from his piety and his intention to express his sympathy towards the tendency of certain readers to believe the content of such myths. This view is supported by the epilogue to the Nysaean episode (5.3.1–4):

56 On the degree to which the ancient readers' religious beliefs affected their reactions in myths included in historical works, see Liotsakis 2015.

57 On Alexander's use of Dionysus as a means to control both his men and the natives, see Bosworth 1996a, 121–126; Worthington 2014, 238–239.

58 *HCA* II, 207–208, and *AAA* II, 458–460, both with further bibliography.

> Καὶ ταῦτα ὅπως τις ἐθέλει ὑπολαβὼν ἀπιστείτω ἢ πιστευέτω. οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε Ἐρατοσθένει τῷ Κυρηναίῳ πάντῃ ξυμφέρομαι, ὃς λέγει πάντα ὅσα ἐς τὸ θεῖον ἀναφέρεται ἐκ Μακεδόνων πρὸς χάριν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐς τὸ ὑπέρογκον ἐπιφημισθῆναι. [...] ὅμοια δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ Διονύσου τῆς πλάνης ἀπιστεῖ Ἐρατοσθένης· ἐμοὶ δ' ἐν μέσῳ κείσθων οἱ ὑπὲρ τούτων λόγοι.
>
> However, these tales anyone may believe or not, taking them as he thinks fit. For my part I do not wholly agree with Eratosthenes the Cyrenaean, who says that all the Macedonians ascribe to the divine influence was magnified in this way to please Alexander. [...] Eratosthenes is similarly incredulous about the wandering of Dionysus. As far as I am concerned, the stories about these things must rest open.

Arrian has explained to his readers in advance his reluctance to indiscriminately question religious myths. For him, to use rational reasoning in order to explain myths on the divine constitutes a serious methodological error:

> πλήν γε δὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἀκριβῆ ἐξεταστὴν χρὴ εἶναι τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου ἐκ παλαιοῦ μεμυθευμένων. τὰ γάρ τοι κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ξυντιθέντι οὐ πιστά, ἐπειδὰν τὸ θεῖόν τις προσθῇ τῷ λόγῳ, οὐ πάντῃ ἄπιστα φαίνεται.
>
> Still, one must not be a precise critic of ancient legends that concern the divine. For things which are incredible if you consider them on the basis of probability appear not wholly incredible, when one adds the divine element to the story.

Arrian seems to be equally unwilling to reject the stories on Dionysus in India, also when touching upon them in his *Indikē* (*Ind.* 1.4–7):

> Νυσαῖοι δὲ οὐκ Ἰνδικὸν γένος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἅμα Διονύσῳ ἐλθόντων ἐς τὴν γῆν τὴν Ἰνδῶν, τυχὸν μὲν [καὶ] Ἑλλήνων, ὅσοι ἀπόμαχοι αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις οὕστινας πρὸς Ἰνδοὺς Διόνυσος ἐπολέμησε, τυχὸν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων τοὺς ἐθέλοντας τοῖς Ἕλλησι συνῴκισε, τήν τε χώρην Νυσαίην ὠνόμασεν ἀπὸ τῆς τροφοῦ τῆς Νύσης Διόνυσος καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτὴν Νῦσαν. καὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ πρὸς τῇ πόλει, ὅτου ἐν τῇσιν ὑπωρείῃσιν ᾤκισται ἡ Νῦσα, Μηρὸς κληίζεται ἐπὶ τῇ συμφορῇ ᾗτινι ἐχρήσατο εὐθὺς γενόμενος. ταῦτα μὲν οἱ ποιηταὶ ἐπὶ Διονύσῳ ἐποίησαν, καὶ ἐξηγείσθων αὐτὰ ὅσοι λόγιοι Ἑλλήνων ἢ βαρβάρων.
>
> The Nysaeans are not an Indian race, but [are] part of those who came with Dionysus to India, perhaps Greeks who became unfit for service in the wars Dionysus waged with the Indians, perhaps also volunteers of the neighboring tribes whom Dionysus settled there together with the Greeks. He called the country Nysaea from the mountain Nysa, and the city itself Nysa. The mountain near the city, on whose foothills Nysa is built, is also called Merus (thigh) because of the incident at the moment of Dionysus' birth. All this the poets sang of Dionysus; and I leave interpretation to learned Greeks or barbarians.

In the *Anabasis* Arrian's opposition to Eratosthenes' tendency to reject religious myths was declared straightforwardly and, in light of this passage, the words from the *Indikē* "and I leave interpretation to learned Greeks or barbarians" must also refer to Eratosthenes and be taken as ironic. Arrian does not altogether mean to distinguish himself from the 'learned' readers to whom he is referring. After all, in both prefaces to his *Anabasis* he has fashioned himself as a distinguished man of letters, which suggests that Arrian wrote the *Anabasis* fully aware of his noted reputation in

his intellectual environment.[59] He is rather attacking his 'peers' for being over-suspicious towards stories of a supernatural content. Arrian's words in the *Indikē* reflect his view that the most suspicious readers were those of deepest learning. Yet at the same time, Arrian expresses his faith in gods and encourages pious readers not to hesitate to accept such stories as true. He is also aware of the fact that some other readers, such as Eratosthenes, would probably hasten to deem his judgment naïve. For this reason, he avoids excessive dogmatism on either side; he clarifies that he does not disagree with *all* the objections of Eratosthenes and that he does not believe *all* the supernatural legends fabricated by Macedonian propaganda (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε Ἐρατοσθένει τῷ Κυρηναίῳ πάντῃ ξυμφέρομαι, ὃς λέγει πάντα ὅσα ἐς τὸ θεῖον [...] ἐς τὸ ὑπέρογκον ἐπιφημισθῆναι). Arrian is obviously endeavoring here to compromise two elements which must have often been considered by some readers as mutually contradictory: faith and rationalism.

The chapters of the *Indikē* on the sacred island of the Sun reveal one further reason why Arrian included mythical narratives in his oeuvre.[60] When Nearchus and his fleet visited the lands of the Fish-Eaters, the locals warned them that there was a mysterious island in those waters and that whoever entered its waters disappeared. After a short suspenseful episode, Arrian reveals to the reader that, in the end, Nearchus landed on the island safely. Arrian closes his account with a local myth which explained in some way the mysterious disappearances around the island (*Ind*. 31.6–8):

> ἀκοῦσαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλον λόγον ὑπὲρ τῆς νήσου ταύτης λεγόμενον, οἰκῆσαι τὴν νῆσον ταύτην μίαν τῶν Νηρηίδων· τὸ δὲ οὔνομα οὐ λέγεσθαι τῆς Νηρηίδος. ταύτῃ δὲ ὅστις πελάσειε τῇ νήσῳ, τούτῳ συγγίνεσθαι μέν, ἰχθὺν δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ποιέουσαν ἐμβάλλειν ἐς τὸν πόντον. Ἥλιον δὲ ἀχθεσθέντα τῇ Νηρηίδι κελεύειν μετοικίζεσθαι αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς νήσου· τὴν δὲ ὁμολογεῖν μὲν ὅτι ἐξοικισθήσεται, δεῖσθαι δέ οἱ τὸ πάθημα <παυθῆναι>. καὶ τὸν Ἥλιον ὑποδέξασθαι, τοὺς δὲ δὴ ἀνθρώπους οὕστινας [ἂν] ἰχθύας ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πεποιήκει κατελεήσαντα ἀνθρώπους αὖθις ἐξ ἰχθύων ποιῆσαι, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων τὸ γένος καὶ εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον κατελθεῖν.
>
> They heard another story current about this island, that one of the Nereids dwelt there, whose name was not told; she would have intercourse with anyone who approached the island, but then turn him into a fish and throw him into the sea. Helios became irritated with the Nereid and ordered her to leave the island, and she agreed to move, but begged that the misery she caused be ended; Helios consented and in compassion for the men she had turned into fishes turned them back again into human beings; they were the ancestors of the people of Fish-eaters down to Alexander's day.

59 Cf. Lucian (*Alex*. 2) (Arrian's younger contemporary), who praises Arrian as "a life-long devotee of letters" (transl. Harmon 1925, 177). On Arrian's life and literary development see Schwartz *RE* II, 1, cols. 1230–1236; Hartmann 1907; Wirth 1964; Bosworth 1972 and for further bibliography up to his time see 163, nn. 1 and 4; Brunt 1976, xix–xiv; Wheeler 1977; Stadter 1980, 1–18; Syme 1982; Vidal-Naquet 1984; Bosworth 1988, 16–37, especially on Arrian's historical production; Tonnet 1988, 1–101; Swain 1996, 242–248; *AAA* I, XI–XIX.

60 On this story and its significance for understanding Arrian's use of sensational tales, see Liotsakis 2018.

Arrian castigates Nearchus for doubting the myth (*Ind.* 31.9):

> καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι ψεύδεα ἐξελέγχει Νέαρχος, οὐκ ἐπαινῶ αὐτὸν ἔγωγε τῆς σχολῆς τε καὶ σοφίης, οὔτε κάρτα χαλεπὰ ἐξελεγχθῆναι ἐόντα, ταλαίπωρόν τε ὂν γιγνώσκων τοὺς παλαιοὺς λόγους ἐπιλεγόμενον ἐξελέγχειν ὄντας ψευδέας.
>
> Nearchus shows that all this is false, but I do not commend him for his learned discussion, as in my judgement, the stories are easy enough to refute and it is tedious to relate the old tales and then prove them false.

As in the myth of Dionysus, Arrian attacks here the habit of literate readers to make a show of their knowledge and intellectualism by questioning the validity of myths. What is more, this case reveals to us that Arrian's unwillingness to refute the content of supernatural tales is also motivated by one further goal, namely to induce the reader's pleasure. In the words "it is tedious to relate old tales and then prove them false" (ταλαίπωρόν τε ὂν γιγνώσκων τοὺς παλαιοὺς λόγους ἐπιλεγόμενον ἐξελέγχειν ὄντας ψευδέας) Arrian might very probably mean that it is boring for the author *too* to record such stories, in order merely to refute them. Nonetheless, Arrian also touches here upon the negative effect of such strategies on the *reader* as well. On my view, Arrian implies in this case that writers should leave open the possibility that such stories are true in order to keep the audience's interest unabated from beginning to end.

Our analysis offers strong evidence that Arrian took into consideration an abundance of readerly expectations when recording myths in the *Anabasis* and in the *Indikē*, and that he thereby aimed at eliciting several, different reactions from his contemporaries. For Arrian, an author should relate a myth without being naïve and whilst respecting the need of rationalist readers for logical scrutiny of such stories. On the other hand, Arrian seems to believe that an author should fearlessly admit his belief of such stories, when this is necessary, without being afraid of such sceptical readers. Last but not least, writers should by no means spoil these stories for the reader by scrutinizing their truthfulness. Arrian endeavors to preserve the balance between his readership's need for three elements: rationalism, respect for their religious faith, and pleasure.

CONCLUSION: The abundance of passages and the thematic areas analysed in this discussion leads to the conclusion that Arrian's concern for the issue of readerly diversity was one of the overarching compositional principles in the *Anabasis of Alexander.* It is not merely that different parts of the work satisfy different readerly needs. The author does much more than this; he frequently takes into consideration several readerly groups and a number of his audience's needs in the composition of one and the same episode. In this respect, I would say, an extremely cautious, multi-criteria approach of single events in the *Anabasis* is followed that aims at a constantly multi-targeted communication with the audience. This indefatigable inclination to juggle and balance as many readerly expectations as possible should be seen in light

of the rhetorical way of life endorsed by the Greek intellectuals of the Second Sophistic. The Greek *litterati* of the Imperial Era, especially those of similar political aspirations to Arrian's, saw their oeuvre as an integral part of their daily *ethopoiia*. Their prose writings, including historical accounts such as the *Anabasis*, thus demonstrate the same purpose as their rhetoric speeches: namely the wish to satisfy everyone. In the acme of literary criticism and in the suppressive atmosphere of the Roman monarchic arena, Herodotus' and Thucydides' relatively carefree compositions had already become a pie in the sky.

List of Abbreviations

AAA = Sisti, F. (2001–2004), *Anabasi di Alessandro*, vols. I-II, Milan.
FGrH = Jacoby, F. (1929–1930), *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Nr. 106–261 Text*, vol. II B and *Kommentar zu Nr. 106–261*, Berlin.
HCA = Bosworth, A.B. (1980–1995), *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, Oxford / New York.
HCP = Walbank, F.W. (1957), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Oxford.
HTGGS = Roller, D.W. (2018), *A Historical and Topographical Guide to the Geography of Strabo*, Cambridge.

Bibliography

Ameling, W. (1988), "Alexander und Achilleus: eine Bestandsaufnahme", in: W. Will / J. Heinrichs, 657–692.
Anderson, G. (1993), *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, London.
Armayor, O.K. (1977–1978), "The Homeric Influence on Herodotus' Story of the Labyrinth", in: *CB* 54, 68–72.
Augoustakis, A. (2005), "Nequaquam Historia Digna?: Plinian Style in Ep. 6.20", in: *CJ* 100, 265–273.
Bakker, E.J. (2002), "Khrónos, Kléos, and Ideology from Herodotus to Homer", in M. Reichel / A. Rengakos 2002, 11–30.
Bakker, E.J. / de Jong, I.J.F. / van Wees, H. (eds.) (2002), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden / Boston / Köln.
Balsdon, J.P.V.D. (1950), The Divinity of Alexander", in: *Historia* 1, 363–388.
Baynham, E.J. (2001), "Alexander and the Amazons", in: *CQ* 51, 115–126.
Bianchetti, S. (2013), "Il lavore del racconto di viaggio nell'opera geografica di Eratostene", in: K. Geus / M. Rathman 2013, 77–86.
Bianchetti, S. / Cataudella, M.R. / Gehrke, H.-J. (eds.) (2016), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography. The Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Tradition*, Leiden / Boston.
Boedeker, D. (2002) "Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus", in E. Bakker / I.J.F. de Jong / H. van Wees 2002, 97–116.
Boehner, A. (1885), *De Arriani dicendi genere*,
Borg, B.E. (ed.) (2004), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin / New York.
Bosworth, A.B. (1972), "Arrian's Literary Development", in: *CQ* 22, 163–185.
Bosworth, A.B. (1988a), *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation*, Oxford.

Bosworth, A.B. (1988b), *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge.
Bosworth, A.B. (1996a), *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph*, Oxford.
Bosworth, A.B. (1996b), "Alexander, Euripides, and Dionysos. The Motivation for Apotheosis", in: R.W. Wallace / E.M. Harris 1996, 140 – 166.
Brunt, P.A. (1976 – 1983), *Arrian Anabasis of Alexander*, vols. I-II, Cambridge / Harvard.
Brunt, P.A. (1977), "From Epictetus to Arrian", in: *Athenaeum* 55, 19 – 48.
Bucciantini, V. (2016), "Geographical Description and Historical Narrative in the Tradition of Alexander's Expedition", in: S. Bianchetti / M.R. Cataudella / H.-J. Gehrke 2016, 98 – 109.
Burliga, B. (2013), *Arrian's Anabasis. An Intellectual and Cultural Story*, Gdańsk.
Cairns, F. / Heath, M. (eds.) (1996), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar. 9, 1996. Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Poetry, Etymology, Historiography*, Leeds.
Carlsen, J. (2014), "Greek History in a Roman Context: Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander*, in J.M. Madsen / R. Rees 2014, 210 – 223.
Carter, J.P. / Morris, S.P. (eds.) (1995), *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, Austin.
Caskey, J.L. (1941 – 1942), "Herodotus and Homer", in: *The Classical Weekly* 35, 267.
Cohen, A. (1995), "Alexander and Achilles: Macedonians and "Mycenaeans"", in: J.P. Carter / S.P. Morris 1995, 483 – 505.
Cook, B.L. (2001), "Plutarch's Use of λέγεται: Narrative Design and Source in "Alexander"", in: *GRBS* 42, 329 – 360.
Cooper, G.L. (1971), *Zur syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren*, Zürich.
Cooper, G.L. (1974), "Intrusive Oblique Infinitives in Herodotus", in: *TAPhA* 104, 23 – 76.
Doulcet, H. (1882), *Quid Xenophonti debuerit Flavius Arrianus*, Paris.
Dueck, D. (2012), *Geography in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge.
Edmunds, L. (1971), "The Religiosity of Alexander", in: *GRBS* 12, 363 – 391.
Engels, J. (2013), "Kulturgeographie im Hellenismus: Die Rezeption des Eratostenes und Poseidonios durch Strabon in den *Geographika*", in: K. Geus / M. Rathman 2013, 87 – 99.
Erskine, A. (2001), *Troy between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford.
Fears, J.R. (1974), "The Stoic View of the Career and Character of Alexander the Great", *Philologus* 118, 113 – 130.
Gehrke, H.-J. (2011), "Alexander der Grosse – Welterkundung als Welteroberung", in: *Klio* 93, 52 – 65.
Gehrke, H.-J. (2016), "The "Revolution" of Alexander the Great: Old and New in the World's View", in: S. Bianchetti / M.R. Cataudella / H.-J. Gehrke 2016, 79 – 97.
Geus, K. / Rathman, M. (eds.) (2013), *Vermessung der Oikumene*, Berlin / Boston.
Gleason, M.W. (1995), *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.
Goldhill, S.D. (ed.) (2001a), *Being Greek Under Rome: The Second Sophistic, Cultural Conflict and the Development of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
Goldhill, S.D. (2001b), "Setting an Agenda: Everything is Greece to the Wise", in S.D. Goldhill 2001a, 1 – 25.
Gray, V.J. (1990), "The Moral Interpretation of the 'Second Preface' to Arrian's Anabasis", *JHS* 110, 180 – 186.
Gray, V.J. (2011), "Thucydides' Source Citations: "It Is Said"", in: *CQ* 61, 75 – 90.
Grethlein, J. (2012), "Homer and Heroic History", in: J.M. Marincola / L. Llewellyn-Jones / C.A. Maciver 2012, 14 – 36.
Gribble, D. (1999), *Alcibiades and Athens. A Study in Literary Presentation*, Oxford.
Grossi, V.M. (2016), "Thucydides and Poetry. Ancient Remarks on the Vocabulary and Structure of Thucydides' History", in: V. Liotsakis / S. Farrington 2016, 99 – 118.
Grundmann, H.R. (1885), "Quid in elocutione Arriani Herodoto debeatur", in: *Berliner Studien* 2, 177 – 268.

Hammond, N.G.L. (1993), *Sources of Alexander the Great. An Analysis of Plutarch's* Life *and Arrian's* Anabasis Alexandrou, Cambridge.
Hartmann, K. (1907), *Flavius Arrianus und Kaiser Hadrian*, Augsburg.
Hogarth, D.G. (1887), "The Deification of Alexander the Great", in: *HER* 2, 317 – 329.
Hollmann, A.J. (2000), ""Epos" as Authoritative Speech in Herodotus' "Histories"", in: *HSPh* 100, 207 – 225.
Hölscher, T. (1971), *Ideal und Wirklichkeit in den Bildnissen Alexanders des Großen*, Heidelberg.
Howie, J.G. (1996), "The Major Aristeia in Homer and Xenophon", in: F. Cairns / M. Heath 1996, 197 – 217.
Jones, C.P. (2004), "Multiple Identities in the Age of the Second Sophistic", in B.E. Borg 2004, 13 – 21.
Kilburn, K. (1959), *Lucian*, vol. VI, London / Cambridge (M).
Kim, L. (2010), *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*, Cambridge.
Kornemann, E. (1935), *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I. von Aegypten*, Leipzig – Berlin
Koulakiotis, E. (2006), *Genese und Metamorphosen des Alexandermythos: Im Spiegel der griechischen nichthistoriographischen Überlieferung bis zum 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Konstanz.
Laird, A. (1999), *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Spech Presentation in Latin Literature*, Oxford / New York.
Liotsakis, V. (2015), "Texts of Religious Content in Thucydides and the Implied Ancient Reader", in: *RFIC* 143, 278 – 317.
Liotsakis, V. (2017), *Redeeming Thucydides. Narrative Artistry in the Account of the Ionian War*, Berlin / Boston.
Liotsakis, V. (2018), "Narrative Suspense in Arrian's *Indikē* (29.9 – 31.9): The Portraiture of Alexander and the Exotic Tradition Intermingled", in: *Ariadne* 23/24, 61 – 82.
Liotsakis, V. (2019a), *Alexander the Great in Arrian's* Anabasis. *A Literary Portrait*, Berlin / Boston.
Liotsakis, V. (2019b), "Why Arrian Wrote the *Indikē:* Narrative Suspense as a Defense of Alexander", in: *RFIC* 147, 96 – 128.
Liotsakis, V. / Farrington, S. (eds.) (2016), *The Art of History. Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*, Berlin / Boston.
Madsen, J.M. / Rees, R. (eds.) (2014), *Roman Rule in Greek and Roman Writing*, Leiden / Boston.
Marincola, J.M. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge.
Marincola, J.M. / Llewellyn-Jones L. / Maciver, C.A. (eds.) (2012), *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, Edinburgh.
McGing, C. / Mossman, J.M. (eds.) (2006), *The Limits of Ancient Biography*, Swansea.
Meyer, E. (1877), *De Arriano Thucydideo*, Rostock.
Moles, J.L. (1985), "The Interpretation of the 'Second Preface' in Arrian's Anabasis", in: *JHS* 105, 162 – 168.
Montanari, F. / Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2006), *La poésie épique grecque: Métamorphoses d'un genre littérraire*, Geneva.
Mossman, J.M. (1988), "Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's Alexander", in: *JHS* 108, 83 – 93.
Mossman, J.M. (1992), "Plutarch, Pyrrhus, and Alexander", in P.A. Stadter 1992, 90 – 108.
Muckensturm-Poulle, C. (2010), "Alexandre chez Malles: techniques d'un récit dans l'Anabase d'Arrien", *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 4 Suppl. 4.2, 371 – 382.
Pelling, C.B.R. (2006), "Breaking the Bounds: Writing about Julius Caesar", in: B.C. McGing / J.M. Mossman 2006, 255 – 280.
Preston, R. (2001), "Roman Questions, Greek Answers: Plutarch and the Construction of Identity", in S.D. Goldhill 2001a, 86 – 119.
Reichel, M. / Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2002), *"Epea pteroenta". Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullman zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart.

Rengakos, A. (2006), "Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides", in F. Montanari / A. Rengakos 2006, 183 – 214.
Roller, D.W. (2010), *Eratosthenes' Geography. Fragments Collected and translated, with Commentary and Additional Material*, Princeton / Oxford.
Stadter, P.A. (1980), *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill.
Stadter, P.A. (1981), "Arrian's Extended Preface", in: *ICS* 6, 157 – 171.
Stewart, A. (1993), *Faces of Power. The Image of Alexander and the Hellenistic Politics*, Berkeley.
Strasburger, H. (1934), *Ptolemaios und Alexander*, Leipzig.
Strasburger, H. (1972), *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*, Heidelberg.
Sulimani, I. (2008), "Diodorus' Source-Citations: A Turn in the Attitude of Ancient Authors towards Their Predecessors?", in: *Athenaeum* 96, 535 – 567.
Swain, S. (1996), *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World. AD 50 – 250*, Oxford.
Tarn, W.W. (1948), *Alexander the Great, vols. I-II*, Cambridge.
Tonnet, H. (1988), *Recherches sur Arrien. Sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*, I-II, Amsterdam.
Tsagalis, C. (2002), "Xenophon Homericus: An Unnoticed Loan From the Iliad in Xenophon's "Anabasis" (1.3)", in: *C&M* 53, 102 – 122.
Wallace, R.W. / Harris, E.M. (eds.) (1996), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360 – 146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian*, Norman / London.
Wesselmann, K. (2011), *Mythische Erzählstrukturen in Herodots "Historien"*, Berlin / Boston.
Westlake, H.D. (1977), "ΛΕΓΕΤΑΙ in Thucydides", in: *Mnemosyne* 30, 345 – 362.
Whitmarsh, T. (2005), *The Second Sophistic*, Oxford.
Will, W. / Heinrichs, J. (eds.) (1988), *Zu Alexander dem Großen. Festschrift Gerhard Wirth II*, Amsterdam.
Worthington, I. (2014), *By the Spear: Philip II,* Alexander *the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire*, Oxford.
Wyss, B. (2017), "Σοφιστής in der Kaiserzeit: Gescholtener Lehrer oder gefeierter Redner?", in B. Wyss / R. Hirsch-Luipold / S.-J. Hirschi 2017, 177 – 212.
Wyss, B. / Hirsch-Luipold, R. / Hirschi, S.-J. (eds.) (2017), *Sophisten in Hellenismus und Kaiserzeit. Orte, Methoden und Personen der Bildungsvermittlung*, Tübingen.
Yamagata, N. (2012), "Use of Homeric References in Plato and Xenophon", in: *CQ* 62, 130 – 144.
Zeitlin, F.I. (2001), "Visions and Revisions of Homer", in: S.D. Goldhill 2001a, 195 – 266.

Adam M. Kemezis

Multiple Authors and Puzzled Readers in the *Historia Augusta*

The *Historia Augusta* is for modern scholars a polarizing text. Some regard it with fear and aversion, as bringing down massive interpretive headaches on anyone who tries to use it as a historical source. Others have found it compelling and irresistible as a puzzle. This split reaction is rooted in the text's uncertain authorial status, which calls into question the status of all the truth-claims it contains. We naturally process the authorship question with the mentalities and methodologies of modern philologists or historians seeking a particular kind of factual certainty, but we are not inventing the difficulty: key features of the *HA* itself present the text's origins as a problem or puzzle. In a volume dedicated to ancient reading practices and mentalities, I want to explore the authorship question, but with a reader-based approach that asks how the text functioned in its original setting, and what its first readers would have made of those features that have created so much controversy among their scholarly posterity centuries later.

The *HA*, to outline the question briefly, is a collection of thirty lives of emperors running from Hadrian (117–138) to Carus (282–283) and his sons. It claims to be the product of six otherwise unknown personages writing in the period roughly 290–330, who are conventionally referred to as the *scriptores*. Since the late 1800s, however, a near consensus has developed among modern scholars that it is in fact the product of a single author writing perhaps around the year 400.[1] This anonymous

The Latin of the *HA* is cited from Hohl 1971. Translations are my own. The notes of Casaubon and Salmasius are cited *ad loc*. from Hackius et al. 1671. I am most grateful to the conference organizers and editors for the opportunity to participate in such a stimulating conference and volume, as well as to the anonymous reader and to Antonio Pistellato and David Rohrbacher for their perceptive comments on a draft. Thanks also go to Martin Shedd for permitting me to cite unpublished work.

1 The initial statement of this hypothesis is Dessau 1889, and the best reassertion of it in the face of subsequent debates is White 1967. Pluralist dissenters in recent decades include Lippold 1998; Den Hengst 2002 and Baldwin 2010. Den Hengst in particular places much weight on the computer analysis of Gurney / Gurney 1998. That study, while opaque to the statistically uninitiated, does appear to demonstrate that there are significant differences of vocabulary usage among all six of the sets of lives attributed to the various *scriptores*. However, the study's authors give no indication that the test is able to distinguish between a genuine multiple-author situation and either (a) one author consciously varying style or (b) one author who incorporates varying amounts of unaltered source material. Most of White et al.'s arguments why the *scriptores* cannot be who they claim to be (shared fictions, thematic preoccupations, anachronisms etc.), are beyond the scope of the Gurney study and persist regardless of it. The most likely hypothesis is that the statistical results reflect the author's use of different degrees and kinds of source material and fictional documents. A subsequent computer study (Stover / Kestemont 2016) has detected less variation between *scriptores* but more between the earlier and later lives, consistent with a single author and changing source practices. None of this

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110764062-012

character has fabricated the six names, along with a large proportion of the content, including significant characters, earlier authors and documents. Modern scholars have wanted to deduce as much as they can about the personal characteristics and motivation of this presumed author, the better to use his work as a historical source. In posing the question "what kind of text is this and what can we do with it" one cannot help further asking "who on earth would come up with such a thing?" Was the *HA* author a deceptive forger, a religious or political ideologue, a literary joker, or what? Thus over the last hundred and more years a great deal of learned and rigorous scholarship has treated the *HA* as a puzzle to which the solution is an author. While this work has much to say about the intended audience of the *HA* based on the text's religious, ideological or social self-positioning, the text's formal literary characteristics have been considered almost entirely with reference to the author's intentions, be they deceitful, mischievous or propagandistic.

My aim here is to complement these approaches, by concentrating less on the text the *HA* "actually" is than on the text it claims to be, and how ancient readers approached its claims. In particular, I will examine the fiction of multiple authorship and what readers would have made of it. Modern readers can and do dispense with the *scriptores* very quickly as an obstacle to interpretive clarity. All of the self-referential passages I will be analyzing have been gone over in minute detail, but have typically been read as the voice of a single author/narrator describing his own practices, truthfully or otherwise.[2] This is natural enough because the issues raised in the various passages turn out to be relatively uniform, and one can indeed speak meaningfully of a single mentality and rhetorical stance common to most if not all of the

is to say the authorship issue is entirely simple. Several scholars have not unreasonably asked whether, given the amount of unaltered source material, one should speak not of a single author but of a redactor of a multi-layered corpus. But this is a separate question, and one of degree. What is crucial for our purposes is that the *HA* creates a specific scenario for its own creation, based on a series of claims that must be either true or false. Arguments from anachronism and thematic unity demonstrate that all or most of the claims cannot be true, and that the scenario as a whole is a fiction. Whoever is responsible for the *HA*, it cannot be, as the text asserts, six otherwise unknown contemporaries who just happened to write the same uniquely bizarre kind of biography. On the dating question, it suffices for my purposes to place the *HA* after 390, thus certainly later than Victor, Eutropius and Festus and probably later than Ammianus. Cameron 2011, 743–782 argues instead for a date in the 360s to 380s. Cases have recently been made for dates later in the 400s or into the 500s, see Mastandrea 2011; Savino 2017.

2 In what follows, I will be referring to the hypothesized *HA* author in the masculine, partly because using "they" would confuse the issue of unitary or multiple authorship. This implies no claims about the historical author, but the implied author is constructed within discourses (both in the fifth century and the twentieth) that would have assumed he was a man, and this is reinforced by the *scriptores*' names and grammatically masculine first-person statements, and the prefatory asides in which they imagine literary activity taking place in a male homosocial environment (e.g. *Trig.* 31.10 on women pretenders to the throne).

first-person statements.[3] Many scholars have found the six *scriptores* only superficially differentiated as literary personae, and have seen them as an afterthought carelessly imposed on a largely finished work that had originally had a single narrative voice.[4]

Nonetheless, any interpretation that takes ancient readers as its starting point must consider what starting point those readers took. They could not ignore the *scriptores*, at least at the outset. Rather it is above all through the fiction of the *scriptores* that they initially encountered the *HA*, and their first moves would have been to engage with that fiction, to ask a series of questions to which modern readers find the answers in scholarly introductions before they begin on the text. This is not to say they all credulously accepted the answers the text explicitly provides. Doubtless some did, and never questioned that Spartianus, Lampridius and so on were really who they claimed to be. Others picked up on the same cues (or different cues) that have allowed their modern successors to recognize the falsity of the *scriptores*, and they may have followed them to the same conclusion. But all began from the same place, taking the six *scriptores* as the primary author-narrators behind the *HA*'s numerous first-person statements.[5] What they made of these aspects of the text must be viewed as an essential part of the *HA*'s functioning.

This article is thus intended as a methodological call for more reader-focused work on the *HA*. Such work needs to properly consider the text's claims about its authorship and date, and to see them as parts of a unified fiction rather than as discrete bits of false data. This will, we may hope, allow for more methodologically varied approaches to the many existing interpretive cruxes, and open up new routes into territory already surveyed by so many distinguished scholars. Such work will also, and perhaps more importantly, make the *HA* into a better witness to its own time. The kinds of puzzles a given culture or subculture generates, and the approaches it

3 Den Hengst 1981 is a foundational study of narrative voice in the *HA*, along with Den Hengst 1995. For more recent narrative-based approaches, see Pausch 2009; Zinsli 2014, 141–153; Burgersdijk 2016; Van Nuffelen 2017 and Zinsli 2017. Of these, Burgersdijk makes an explicit argument for a unified narrative voice with multiple personae, while Zinsli treats the author as a primary narrator (in Genette's sense) and the *scriptores* as internal narrators. Such models are appropriate for readers who have already "solved the puzzle," but my assumption is that most readers will initially approach the text without that knowledge and that many of them will remain in that state and interpret the text accordingly. Such readers, while not fully knowing in an ironic sense, would still not be misreading to the same degree as, for example, a contemporary of Swift's who read the originally pseudonymous *Gulliver's Travels* as the authentic mariner's narrative it claimed to be.

4 Thus Syme 1968, 176: "The [*scriptor*] labels have been assigned without much thought. It is a gain to disregard them." Zinsli 2017, however, makes important observations about the distinct kinds of authorial statements associated with the different *scriptores*.

5 This is not taking into account any readers who "knew the secret" through connections with the author. An intermediate category likely existed of readers who came to the book already aware of its mysterious or questionable provenance. One may imagine this as an integral part of the book's contemporary reception, as with pseudonymous literature in more recent periods. For a comparison of the *HA* with a doubly pseudonymous French novelist, Romain Gary, see Ratti 2014.

takes in solving them, are valuable indicators of its overall mentality. This is the more true when the raw material for those puzzles is the defining political institutions and personalities of that culture. Better understanding how a text like the *HA* worked in its historical milieu can illuminate what people in that milieu thought of the relationship of literature to politics in constructing and deconstructing an authoritative past and indeed of the Roman monarchy itself as a continuing but ever-changing political institution.[6]

Thus my project is by turns negative and speculative. To imagine late antique readers of the *HA*, we have to unlearn much "knowledge" that we perhaps share with the author but not his original readers.[7] This does not, however, mean replacing knowing modern readers with uncritical ancient ones who act as a *tabula rasa* to be defined by the *HA*'s rhetorical techniques. The *HA* circulated in a world that had its own ways of addressing the issues the *scriptores* generate of incomplete knowledge, suspicious information and problematic attributions (similar problems can be seen in the "marginal" texts examined by Pauline Duchêne in this volume). It has long been recognized that the *HA* author's preoccupations resemble those of his grammarian and scholiast contemporaries.[8] Recent work, notably by Irene Peirano, has done much to show how pseudepigraphic literature such as the *HA* functioned in such a literary culture.[9]

One key insight of Peirano's work on "fake" Latin poetry has been that such material was generated in response to learned readers' demand for full, detailed narratives of the careers and works of canonical poets. Works such as those in the *Appendix Vergiliana* filled gaps suggested by the poets' biographical statements, supplied juvenilia to which existing poems gave back-references and generated new episodes in poets' patronage relationships. The *Historia Augusta* represents the same principle as applied both to the canon of Roman emperors and to the sequential tradition of Roman historiography and biography.[10] The idea that Rome's ruler was part of a line of functionally analogous characters going back to Caesar and Augustus remained a crucial ideological claim for emperors and subjects alike, and it was a natural literary expectation that there should be a corresponding sequence of historians and bi-

6 Issues of historiographical form as commentary on Roman politics can also be seen in Liotsakis' and Baroud's contributions to this volume.

7 One possible approach is to consider how humanist readers of the *HA* (above all Casaubon and Salmasius) approached questions of structure and authorship. In what follows I refer to them on the understanding that their particular reading agenda is interestingly different from ours but not necessarily similar to that of average fifth-century readers.

8 Notably by Syme 1968, 183–186.

9 See Peirano 2012, also the contributions in Martínez 2011 and Cueva / Martínez 2016.

10 In this article, I have consciously avoided making sharp generic distinctions between history and biography. Such distinctions are certainly present in the *HA*, but they serve less as objective categories than as terms in a discourse that the author manipulates in ways too complex to be dealt with here. For fuller consideration and references, see Rohrbacher 2016, esp. chapters 2 and 4, also Van Nuffelen 2017.

ographers to pick up where Tacitus and Suetonius had left off.[11] Both of these imagined sequences encountered problems in reality, especially when it came to the troubled years of the mid-third-century. It is to the literary portion of these problems that the *HA* ostensibly offers a solution in the form of a previously undiscovered Suetonius *continuatus* (or Marius Maximus *auctus*), but it describes that solution in complicated and inconsistent ways.[12] The inconsistencies in the *HA* that have led modern scholars to the single-author solution served for ironically aware ancient readers as markers pointing toward not an answer but rather a deconstruction of their initial ideological assumptions about the relationship of the Roman monarchy to the literary tradition.

The present article cannot hope to fully develop such a thesis. Rather my intent is to sketch an initial model of a reader-based approach to the major structural questions of the *HA*. Much of my argument will consist of a somewhat artificial exercise in which I imagine a two-stage reading process, at both stages of which readers have several options for how to process the corpus. The first stage is that of initial contact, where readers encounter a codex (or, less likely, a set of bookrolls) of whose contents they have little or no knowledge beyond that it contains lives of emperors. These readers do not "plunge straight in" to a full sequential reading, but instead try, by leafing through the codex and using whatever paratextual devices it provides, to establish the basics of what the *HA* covers and who produced it. The impression they thus develop determines what if any further engagement with the text they pursue. That engagement makes up the second stage, in which readers encounter the details of the various lives and use the *scriptores*' first-person statements to determine their characteristics as authors, especially their dates and the extent of their complete works. This model of mine is by no means intended as a definitive account of how the *HA* was read, but rather as a thought experiment to suggest the kinds of questions one might ask about that reading process. It is includes a great many assumptions and qualifications that others may correct or refine, and in many cases I reconstruct detailed scenarios which others will imagine with different details. There are also a number of important possibilities I have not considered. Particularly, for reasons of simplicity I assume a basically solitary reading experience, whereas in reality many, even most, readers will have processed the authorship question in social settings.[13] There is much that cannot be considered in one article, and my hope is very much to provoke discussion rather than conclude it.

---

11 I am influenced here by the arguments of Eigler 2003 that in late antiquity a blurring of lines takes place between the past as events and the canonical literature that records those events, albeit for Eigler this phenomenon is restricted to the pre-Augustan past.

12 For the *HA* as a solution to a perceived gap in the historical knowledge of the time, see Kemezis 2018.

13 I have also not engaged with any of the various specific identifications that have been proposed for the *HA* author, including recently Nicomachus Flavianus Senior (Ratti 2007), Naucellius (Thomson 2012) or Tascius Victorianus (Savino 2017). Each of these men's social circle would have differently

1 Methodological considerations

Before one can talk about how readers encountered a text, naturally one must define the text they encountered. The various complexities of the *HA* make it all the more necessary that I acknowledge certain assumptions of mine that, while shared in *HA* scholarship to varying degrees, still should not go unstated and untested. To spare the patience of readers who are uninterested in or all too familiar with the various controversies, I will be as brief as possible in giving my own rationales. Beyond the first key premise, which I have already discussed, is that the *HA* is indeed the product of a single anonymous author writing around or after the year 400, there are further assumptions regarding the *HA*'s readers, namely that: (a) the *HA* was written such that it could be read and understood by the general literate-elite public of Rome and the Latin provinces, rather than any smaller segment of that elite;[14] (b) the *HA* that readers encountered included the same thirty chronologically ordered lives that are found in modern editions, and only those thirty, with no substantial further material now lost; and (c) it also included the attributions to the *scriptores* as we have them now, along with adequate paratextual devices to convey them to readers.

Assumption (a) refers to the "implied readership" of the text rather than the actual readers, or a specific audience that a historical author may have had in mind. It is entirely possible that the author envisioned a particular small set of readers, and that some aspects of the text (e. g. coded religious polemic) are cued to them. It considerably less likely, however, that the text in reality remained within that small compass.[15] The important thing is that the meanings I propose for the text were available to a relatively wide range of reading publics (in ancient terms), even if it did also contain meanings that were available a small set of initiates and only to them. If there is a "secret meaning" to the *HA*, it is enclosed in a great deal of material that the uninitated could process, and how they processed it can lead us to inferences about the wider literary culture. The readers I have in mind would at a minimum be familiar

determined the initial reception of the *HA* by people who knew or suspected the author's identity. However, this effect would with wider circulation have diminished and given way to processes such as those imagined in my reconstruction.

14 The issue of a "generic reading public" is naturally problematic, for various approaches in this volume see the essays of Liotsakis and Duchêne.

15 As to actual readership, Thomson 2012, 103 – 114 argues that the *HA* originated in the family of the Symmachi and saw little further circulation before the eighth century, and related arguments are made by Mastandrea 2011. For the early transmission, see also Callu 1985. I am influenced by the arguments of Sánchez Vendramini 2018, that the evidence for ancient book-distribution practices suggests that keeping a text within a restricted circle was impracticable other than by drastically restricting the number of copies. Some of the arguments about he makes about Ammianus do not apply to a pseudonymous author, but the basic idea holds good that texts circulated as social currency in ways independent of the rhetorically constructed intended audience of a particular work. The related argument, that the *HA* represents covert anti-Christian propaganda, has a long history, see most recently Ratti / Nardelli 2014.

with canonical Latin authors and with the Roman historical tradition as represented by the fourth-century breviarists.[16] Other than that, however, they would have been far from uniform in their levels of education or religious-ideological position, and that diversity would have led them to different readings, but no one of those readings is "correct" in the sense of uncovering a true level of meaning that invalidates what is available to other readers.

Assumption (b) is more complicated and controversial. The *HA* as we have it has the appearance of incompleteness in two main respects. First, it begins with a seemingly complete *Hadrian* but one might have expected a preface and perhaps lives of earlier emperors as well.[17] Second and more clearly, a lacuna is evident between the *Maximus et Balbinus*, which is to all appearances complete, and the *Valeriani Duo*, which begins in the middle of a sentence.[18] The question is whether the material that would have filled these "gaps" ever existed, or whether the apparent incompleteness is a deliberate effect of the author's. Opinions on both questions are much divided and, short of a manuscript discovery, conclusive proof is unlikely to emerge. My own position is based on a balance of probability. The idea of a missing preface and a spurious lacuna are entirely consistent with the games the *HA* author plays elsewhere with the extent of the collection and the existence of spurious literary works.[19] However, it is still worth being cautious about constructing any interpretation that depends too heavily on assumptions in this area.[20]

Assumption (c) is evidently critical: there is no point in analyzing readers' response to features of the text unless those features were in fact perceptible to them. The names of the *scriptores* and the attributions to them of the various lives are known to us almost entirely from the paratextual apparatus of our manuscripts, which consist of *incipits* and *explicits* of varying content plus (in the case of our prin-

16 For the intellectual background to the breviarists, see Sehlmeyer 2009, esp. 73–114. The extensive study of Rohrbacher 2016 makes clear that the *HA* deploys a dense network of learned allusions, many of which would have been accessible to all Latin readers at a given level of education rather than any particular group of initiates, though Rohrbacher also imagines more specific allusions relevant to particular reading circles.

17 On the completeness or otherwise of the opening, see Chastagnol 1994, xxxv; Meckler 1996.

18 For the "lacuna question" see Birley 1976, Ratti / Desbordes 2000, vii-xxxviii, Rohrbacher 2016, 9–10 and (arguing for its authenticity) Savino 2017, 69–76, and most recently Stover 2020.

19 Rees 2014 has now argued that Ammianus also employs a "false incompleteness" technique by explicitly indicating (through text and paratext) the existence of thirteen "lost" books going back to Nerva, which (in Rees' view) never in fact existed.

20 As regards the ordering question, our principal (P) family of manuscripts does have several anomalies in the ordering of lives between the *Marc.* and *Alex.* Thomson 2012, 90–93 has argued that the non-chronological order of P was in fact original. This is thoroughly refuted by Paschoud 2013, see also Savino 2017, 98–103. In particular, the independent Σ family preserves an almost exact chronological ordering, a point on which Thomson is mistaken. We can be reasonably secure that the remaining deviations are the result of earlier accidents in transmission. Important discussions of the manuscripts include Hohl 1913; Callu et al. 1992, xciv-ciii and most recently Mayer 2016.

cipal manuscript family) an index.[21] That index as we have it must have been compiled at a later stage of transmission, and we cannot know whether the *HA* in its original form included such a device.[22] However, the scribes who compiled our surviving system of paratexts necessarily derived the names and attributions from somewhere, presumably a series of analogous devices going back to the original, and the relatively consistent way in which the scribes present them argues for those devices being relatively complete, and the attributions secure.[23]

The devices in question, colophons and perhaps running heads, and the ability to use them by leafing back and forth, are to a considerable degree features of the codex form as opposed to the roll.[24] We can be reasonably sure that the *HA* originally circulated as a codex, and its particular form of literary play was greatly facilitated by that physical medium.[25] Nonetheless, we can be quite certain that whatever paratextual devices existed were much less easy to use than those in a modern printed edition, requiring tedious leafing back and forth, with potential for error. Thus we cannot assume that, even if readers had the information required to fully deduce the *scriptor*-attributions, all of them always took the effort to do so. On the contrary, they would have needed reasons to bother, and some will have found more or different reasons than others. Thus in what follows, I will propose a continuum from those readers who fully engaged with the *scriptores* to those who entirely failed to notice

21 The only information given in the body of the text is (a) Aelius Spartianus' name at the start of a dedicatory letter to Diocletian (*Ael.* 1.1) and (b) Vopiscus' references to Capitolinus, Lampridius and Pollio (see fig. 2).

22 Notably, the index (printed in the introduction to Hohl 1971) reflects the disrupted ordering of P, as well as mistaken attributions and variant spellings seemingly derived from the *incipits* and *explicits*. See Ratti / Desbordes 2000, x.

23 The only significant inconsistency of attribution is that the P index (and to varying degrees the Σ tradition) attributes the *Val.*, *Gal.*, and *Trig.* to Capitolinus, although in the text (*Arln.* 2.1) Vopiscus attributes them to Pollio. The error is an effect of the lacuna before the *Val.* See Ratti / Desbordes 2000, vii-xix. Shedd 2021 has recently argued that the scriptor names are not original, but were added in the ninth century by the scribe of our earliest complete manuscript P (*Pal. lat.* 899) to a collection that lacked paratextual authorial attribution. Shedd does well to point out the constituent elements on which our modern system of attributions rests, but his argument relies too heavily on arguments from absence in the slight evidence for the tradition independent of P, and does not adequately explain how the P scribe came to invent some *scriptor*-names and to inconsistently apply those that are found in the text to particular lives. It remains more credible that the attributions are the work of the same person who invented the names (and so many other textual elements) in the first place, though the attributions may well have reached the P scribe in a form substantially different from the one he gave to them. Shedd should also be consulted for his arguments about the range of the *HA*'s lives and about the various apparent lacunae, though it has not been possible in this article for me to take full account of them.

24 On paratextual devices in late antique codices and their visual presentation, see Bischoff 1990, 78 – 79.

25 For the apparent dominance of the codex by the late fourth century, see Roberts / Skeat 1983 and now Harnett 2017. Thomson 2012, 99 notes that the *HA*'s own vocabulary in discussing books seems to reflect codex usage.

their existence, and many positions in between. With these preliminaries, then, we may proceed.

2 First impressions

Returning thus to our readers, we find them confronted with a codex of whose contents they have at best a hazy idea. They have likely found out about it through a social interaction with a friend or literary professional, and they may thus have learned something of its contents, but their first order of business will be to ascertain fully its authorship and characteristics, and complexities immediately present themselves. The codex, assuming that it has a title at all, is labelled generically as *Vitae principum* or *Vitae Caesarum*, though perhaps the range of emperors covered is specified.[26] If an index is provided, the process I am about to describe will be much simplified, but if not, readers will quickly realize that the collection's opening does not constitute any sort of general preface giving an overview of the whole. Any further inquiry will require relatively labor-intensive leafing-through of the contents and tracking of *incipits* and *explicits*, probably in sequential order at this stage, though we must allow for skimming and skipping.

Let us assume that readers do begin tracking authors sequentially through the paratext without reading far at this stage: the "problem" of the *scriptores* presents itself immediately and will shape their impressions of the text as a whole. One crucial function of the *scriptor* fiction is simply that of generating mystery and interest among readers in a culture that placed great importance on the identity of a text's author.[27] The apparent obscurity of the names will deter readers hoping for someone more famous, but the *HA* is evidently aimed at readers who are just as curious about unknown authors as about emperors. The names themselves may strike readers as unusual or signifying.[28] Simply by stating the *scriptor*-names, the *HA* declares itself a puzzle to be solved as well as a trove of new information.

That puzzle includes not simply the identities of the *scriptores* but also the process by which their writings came into readers' hands. As soon as readers realize they are dealing with a multi-author collection, the questions arise of how, when and by whom the collection was assembled. For the earlier lives, the problem presents itself

26 Our existing manuscripts have a variety of titles, most of which specify a range from Hadrian to Numerianus, see Chastagnol 1994, xi-xii. On the title, see also Thomson 2007. The question of an original title is connected with that of the "missing" preface, since the two would naturally have been lost together.

27 Dessau 1889, 392 in fact assumes that that author's main purpose in creating the six *scriptores* was to give his work wider circulation on the theory that six new authors stimulate more interest than one.

28 A common approach in modern scholarship has been to read them either as coded literary or historical allusions, or as references to the content of the works. See e. g. Honoré 1987; Birley 2002.

gradually and relatively simple answers suggest themselves. The first seven lives introduce the first four *scriptores* sequentially, as if the lives in question were all they had written. The first two (*Hadr., Ael.*) are by Spartianus, whose full name and Diocletianic date are both given in the opening lines of the *Aelius*. With the *Antoninus*, we switch to three lives by Capitolinus (*Ant., Marc., Verus*), then one by Gallicanus (*Av. Cass.*) and another by Lampridius (*Comm.*). Readers will notice the accelerating multiplicity of new names. Evidently some editor is pulling all of these items together, seemingly to maintain a continuing sequence. Such patterns of continuation, either conscious or imposed by a later editor, would be relatively familiar from collections such as the *Panegyrici Latini* or Jerome's and Rufinus' adaptations and continuations of Eusebius.[29]

The surprise then comes when the *Pertinax* turns out not to be by Lampridius or a fifth continuator, but rather by Capitolinus once again. Then Spartianus also returns for the *Julianus* and a long sequence of further lives interrupted only by Capitolinus' *Albinus* and later *Macrinus*. Lampridius is not heard from again until the *Diadumenus* followed by the *Heliogabalus* and *Alexander*, whereupon Capitolinus has the next three in a row (*Mxmn., Gord., Max.-Bal.*). Even relatively casual readers will notice the disintegration of the expected pattern of continuators. The more attentive will start to wonder if the *scriptores* were rather larger-scale authors than initially suspected. They may naturally infer that Capitolinus wrote a *Commodus* to fill in the sequence of his *Marcus, Verus* and *Pertinax*, or that Spartianus' *Julianus, Severus* and *Niger* would be rounded out with an *Albinus*. But these works, if they ever existed, have been replaced with the efforts of other *scriptores* by the anonymous editor, whose role now comes to include not just compilation but selection from a perhaps very large mass of available material. A further surprise then comes after the lacuna, when at some point during or after the mutilated *Valeriani* it becomes clear that we are dealing with a new *scriptor*, Trebellius Pollio, who then produces three more lives (*Gal., Trig., Claud.*) and cedes to Flavius Vopiscus as to a continuator, with no further alternation. Order seems to have returned, and readers can plausibly guess that the editor responsible for the collection is either the last *scriptor* Vopiscus or some combination of him and Pollio.

Readers in search of a date for the *scriptores* will even at this stage have had a few clues. We have seen the *Ael.* opening with an address to Diocletian. Readers who in their search for *incipits* also stop to notice at least the opening and closing lines of the various lives will see that Spartianus opens the *Geta* with an address to *Constantine Auguste*. Similarly Capitolinus addresses Diocletian at the end of the *Macrinus* and Constantine at the start of the *Maximini*.[30] This sets an approximate time and

29 On the *Panegyrici*, see Nixon / Rodgers 1994, 3–7, with discussion of paratextual devices. For Jerome and Eusebius, see Burgess 2002, 26–32; for Rufinus, Humphries 2008. Burgess 2005 also proposes multiple recensions for the *KG* history, presumably by continuators.

30 Readers would have to read further into a given life to find Gallicanus' mention of Diocletian (*Av. Cass.* 3.3) and Lampridius' several apostrophes to Constantine (*Hel.* 2.4, 34.1 and *Alex.* 65.1).

gives a plausible chronological progression for both *scriptores*. There is less to go on for the two last *scriptores* (and putative editors). Pollio in the opening of the *Claudius* mentions a "Constantius Caesar" as apparently still alive, and later in the text it becomes clear this means Constantius Chlorus, but readers at this first casual stage may well take it as being the future Constantius II.[31] At this point the identity of the authors is still more of a mystery than their chronology.

The question of just which rulers are (or originally were) included in the corpus similarly moves from a solvable puzzle to a more complex one as readers peruse the codex. The opening of the *Hadrian* points in a couple of directions. Its first words, *Origo imperatoris Hadriani vetustior a Picentibus, posterior ab Hispaniensibus manat*, and the discussion that follows all have a distinct Suetonian ring. This suggests a literary model, but also highlights the lack of a preface such as that with which Suetonius' *Caesares* originally began.[32] And further, if Spartianus (or his editor) is an imitator of Suetonius, may he not also be a continuator? That, however, would lead one to expect a *Nerva* and a *Trajan* that were perhaps lost along with the preface.[33] It also likely raises the question of the *HA*'s relationship to Marius Maximus, even before that author's name is repeatedly mentioned in the text. Maximus, a Severan-era senator, is usually credited by moderns with a set of twelve Antonine and Severan lives continuing Suetonius, which are now lost but were in circulation in the 390s.[34] Readers' expectations of the *HA* will have been heavily influenced by Suetonius, Maximus and the breviaries, and thus by the prevalent notion of a canonical sequence of rulers going back to Caesar and Augustus. These expectations the *HA* will alternately confirm and frustrate as readers go through its sequence.

On the one hand, all the rulers that should be there after Hadrian are there, except for the lacuna. The greater anomaly is that the collection includes characters one would not expect, because they were never canonical emperors. Some are heirs who never attained sole rule, others are unsuccessful aspirants whose defeat in civil wars led them to be labelled usurpers. Readers encounter this phenomenon

31 On this point see p. 238 below.

32 Suetonius' preface is mentioned by John Lydus, writing in the 500s (*De mag.* 2.6, see Garrett 2015, 133–134 for its possible contents). It contained a dedication to Septicius Clarus, and the fact that the *HA* mentions Suetonius and Clarus together in another context (*Hadr.* 11.3) may be a reference to that passage. For the *HA*'s relationship with Suetonius, see most recently Fry 2010; Rohrbacher 2016, 49–58.

33 The starting point would also have been suggested by Ammianus, and it is notable that Victor (11.12), Eutropius (8.1.1) and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (11.15) all make Nerva's accession the occasion for a formal period break, see Sehlmeyer 2009, 78–79. The omission in the *HA* is noted by humanist editors e. g. Salmasius (*ad Hadr.* 1.1), suspecting a lost opening.

34 The fullest treatment of what is known about Maximus is Birley 1997. Virtually nothing about this character is without controversy, however. See in particular Paschoud 1999, who doubts either that the author Maximus is the same person as the Severan consul or that his works consisted of imperial biographies. The dispute ultimately goes to whether Maximus can be seen as the principal source of accurate information for the *HA*'s primary lives, on which see most recently Rohrbacher 2013.

quickly, since the second life in sequence is that of Hadrian's would-be successor Aelius Caesar. Many will be uncertain who Aelius was, and they may pause at this point to read the preface in which Spartianus explains (to Diocletian) his having included such a figure. At all events, they will realize that their expectations based on the Suetonius/Maximus model will have to be modified. On an aesthetic level, this exposes a key tension and a potential division in the readership, that between completeness and selectivity. Are more lives better? Would even more be even better? Some readers will be anxious for more data, but others will find it distracting and time-consuming. The text of the *HA* will play with this question, at times reveling in *curiositas*, at other times shunning *fastidia*. But the whole form of the collection is calculated to raise the issue.

The aesthetic question also has a normative analogue: do these non-canonical figures deserve to be memorialized, and on what basis? These were questions Suetonius and Marius Maximus had answered quite conservatively, keeping their protagonists rather to a minimum.[35] The *HA* does the opposite, at least at the start, and readers may wonder what this signifies. They may interpret it differently depending on how they had recently answered analogous real-life questions of how to think and speak about Valentinian II, Magnus Maximus or Eugenius. The writing, circulation and reading of usurpers' lives could never be innocent of politics.[36] The question becomes all the more vexed when, after all these subsidiary lives, readers are then confronted with combined lives in the form of the *Maximini Duo, Gordiani Tres* and *Maximus et Balbinus*. All of these lives are ascribed to Capitolinus and the practice is continued by Pollio and Vopiscus, the former of whom takes it to its extreme with the *Triginta Tyranni*. The introduction of this controversy is the first of many points at which the *HA* equivocates on historical questions that may generate divisions within its readership (a related phenomenon can be seen with Arrian in Vasileios Liotsakis' contribution to this volume).

The editor's role in this process is less than clear. Is the "expanded canon" of heirs and usurpers ultimately of his shaping, if only through his not having omitted dubious candidates? For particularly alert readers, there is one final wrinkle. The *HA* in its current form has exactly thirty lives. This figure is not a predetermined natural result, since far more than thirty individuals are involved, and the flexible selection criteria of the *scriptores* or editor could easily have produced a different figure. The figure of thirty is the same as the number of books in the then-current edition of Tacitus, and one less than the total for Ammianus.[37] And readers who take into account

35 Birley 1997 credits Maximus with a canonical sequence of twelve from Nerva to Elagabalus including Macrinus but not Verus. Other structures and numbers have been suggested, but there is no reason to suppose that figures such as Aelius, Avidius Cassius, Pescennius Niger or Clodius Albinus received lives of their own.

36 For reflections of fourth-century civil wars in the *HA*, see Grey 2010.

37 Jerome *Comm. in Zach.* 3.14 mentions the thirty books of Tacitus, presumably obtained by placing the *Histories* after the *Annales*.

the ostensibly missing opening and lacuna will find the "original" total to have been thirty-six, thus three times Suetonius' or Maximus' total.[38] Such parlor games are not out of place in a world where the number of books in a work was a generic statement rather than an arbitrary total.[39] Moreover, the *HA* throws in a suggestive clue in the title of the *Triginta Tyranni*, an evident reference to the Athenian oligarchy that would have been familiar from Nepos or Cicero. Readers who venture into that fascinating volume will find much play around the arbitrariness of the canonical number.[40]

At this stage, however, such suspicions will not be dominant in many readers' minds. The *HA* has created for itself a relatively plausible *prima facie* impression of a collection written in the years around 300 and assembled by some combination of editors and continuators. These hitherto unknown characters follow in the tradition of Suetonius and Maximus, but with an unconventional interest in the losers and might-have-beens of history. Their apparent end point with Carus and sons makes sense if they began writing under Diocletian. Crucial prefatory information has been omitted, but much may still be deduced from the content. Readers have both a basic set of expectations to satisfy their conventional side and more than a whiff of the eccentric to whet their curiosity. Will the text as they find it satisfy or disappoint?

3 Further engagement

While the impression I have just sketched will be shared by a relatively wide segment of the *HA*'s readership, their next steps will be dictated by a diverse set of further reactions. Different readers will approach the text at different points with different questions, leading to many reading patterns beyond the strictly sequential. These will be greatly influenced by how readers use their basic knowledge of the new collection's contents to position it relative to their existing reading and interests.

Thus for some, the *HA* will be a continuation of Suetonius, and the natural starting point will indeed be the *Hadrian*, with due regrets for the missing *Nerva* and *Trajan* and perhaps little interest in the *Aelius* and its ilk. Those who are already acquainted and satisfied with Marius Maximus will by contrast be drawn either to the later lives that are beyond his range or to the minor lives that supplement his coverage of the earlier reigns. Their first proper introduction to the *HA* may be Spartianus' preface to the *Aelius*, or Lampridius' *in medias res* opening to the *Alexander*.

38 This assumes the lacuna contained four additional lives (see Fig. 1), those being (i) Philip and son; (ii) Decius and son; (iii) Gallus, with Volusianus and Hostilianus and (iv) Aemilianus. This version of the canon can be found in the breviaries, see Victor 28 – 31; Eutropius 9.3 – 6, *Epit*. 28 – 31.
39 Barnes 1998, 23 – 31 supplies examples.
40 For discussion see Kemezis 2018, 310 – 313. Callu et al. 1992, xlviii-lx also attaches much significance to the number, though with very different conclusions.

Those who set the work beside Ammianus or the breviary tradition may well take a fully sequential approach, but still others will select entry points based on personal preoccupations, the wish to track down a putative ancestor or a favorite anecdote. And those who see the imperial past through the prism of religious conflict will be disappointed to find no coverage of Philip the quasi-Christian, Decius the persecutor or the Tetrarchy. We should finally anticipate that some readers are focused more on author than subject and will choose first to read all the works of (say) Spartianus, then Capitolinus and so forth, even though this would seem to run counter to the editor's chronological scheme.[41]

These various entry points will create radically different experiences because of the *HA*'s uneven content. This is how ancient readers will likely perceive what for moderns is the distinction between the relatively factual, Suetonian "primary lives" (meaning largely those of sole-reigning emperors from Hadrian to Elagabalus), and the more fictional "secondary lives" (usurpers and heirs from the same period) and later lives (*Alex*. and after).[42] The most common modern interpretation of these distinctions is a developmental story in which the "primary" lives are written first and represent a norm from which the sole author progressively deviates into fiction or fraudulence as his sources and predilections change.[43] Moderns have taken the "primary" lives as normative in no small part because they are the most useful to us as historians and conform most closely to our classicizing expectations. This second reason will be shared by the part of the ancient readership that expects a Suetonian continuator. Others may in fact find the (pseudo-) documentary or epistolary approach of the minor and later lives more to their taste, even if they are eventually disappointed by the content of some of these letters and documents.[44] And finally, some segment, those who are familiar with Maximus or the Greek tradition but still choose to read the corresponding *HA* lives, will eventually realize how much of the *HA*'s earlier content is drawn wholesale from those authors, and how misleading are the *scriptores*' acknowledgements of that relationship.[45] This may provoke in them suspicions about the legitimacy of the collection as a whole.

Readers may be perplexed, however, because these stylistic variations in the collection's content map imperfectly on to the different *scriptores*. Those who range

41 One such reader would seem to have been the compiler of the florilegium found in *Vat. Lat*. 5114, for which see Hohl 1913, 411–414.

42 Various versions of these classifications go back to at least Mommsen 1890 and were systematized in particular by Barnes 1978.

43 Notable versions of this developmental approach can be seen in Syme 1968; Honoré 1987; Callu et al. 1992, xiv-lxx; Den Hengst 1995, 165–167 Savino 2017, 59–103.

44 Cameron 2011, 778–782 points out the *HA*'s links with such Greek works of pseudo-historiography as Ptolemy the Quail's *New History* or Ps.-Plutarch's *Parallela Minora*. One might add the works of Trojan revisionism (Dictys Cretensis and Dares the Phrygian) then emerging in Latin translations. Duchêne's contribution in this volume considers the relationship of parodic works to the genre of historiography.

45 On the relationship of Maximus and the *HA*, see note 34 above.

widely will notice that Capitolinus' *Clodius Albinus* is nothing like his *Marcus*, but curiously similar to Spartianus' *Aelius* or even Vopiscus' later works. Furthermore, the *scriptores*' statements about themselves will cause difficulties once readers try to assemble a coherent picture of who these authors were. Crucial questions include, first, the *scriptores*' dates and relationship to the events they narrate and, second, the extent and intent of their literary *oeuvre*, as mediated through the work of the anonymous editor. Many of these questions will play out differently for the first four *scriptores* (Spartianus, Capitolinus, Lampridius, Gallicanus) as opposed to the last two (Pollio, Vopiscus), but most readers will probably have at least some interest in all six, given their novelty and the vague interconnectedness of their work. Readers' approaches may owe less to the norms of historiography or biography than to ways in which they unravelled the stories told discontinuously in elegiac poetic cycles or epistolary collections (for the latter, see Ari Zatlin's contribution in this volume).

The dating question will revolve around the clearest cues, the many explicit mentions of living emperors.[46] The first stage of reading will have left all but the most cursory readers with some sense that the *scriptores* are located in the Tetrarchic or Constantinian period. This will disappoint those in search of contemporary testimony for Antonine or Severan events, but stimulate others' curiosity about the years of the mid-to-late-third century whose literature and history are probably less familiar than those of periods farther in the past. The latter readers in particular will naturally proceed to pin the *scriptores* down to some more precise time (or place) within that period of tumult, and to establish a relative chronology among the six: a disproportionate number of these readers may follow an author-based rather than chronological order.

As noted above, a cursory initial survey has probably given them a rough sense of the *scriptores*' dates. Further reading of the first four *scriptores* adds substance to this pattern, giving the impression that the four were more or less contemporaries who wrote the Antonine and early Severan lives under Diocletian and later ones under Constantine.[47] Spartianus addresses Diocletian three times (*Ael.* 1.1; *Sev.* 20.4; *Nig.* 9.1) and Constantine once in a subsequent life (*Geta* 1.1). Gallicanus' sole effort has an apostrophe to Diocletian (*Av. Cass.* 3.3). For Lampridius, on the other hand, all the addresses are to Constantine, but they all come in two relatively "late" lives (*Hel.* 2.4, 34.1; *Alex.* 65.1), so it is not clear if he is later than or contemporary with the *scriptores* who address both emperors.[48] Capitolinus is a slightly

46 Ancient readers would likely not, however, notice many of the smaller but conclusive details that led Dessau and others to discount the Tetrarchic-Constantinian date, e.g. the anachronism of attributing to Constantius Chlorus the dynastic fiction about Claudius Gothicus.

47 The *scriptores*' references to their own work uniformly support the assumption that lives are composed in chronological order, whether or not in reality this was the author's practice.

48 At *Hel.* 35.6 Lampridius refers to a series of Constantinian victories that was not complete until quite late in his reign, but to realize this requires an immediate command of absolute dating that

more complicated case. His six addresses to emperors are the most of any *scriptor:* the first two to Diocletian (*Marc.* 19.12; *Verus* 11.4) and the last two to Constantine (*Mxmn.* 1.1; *Gord.* 34.6) follow the established pattern. The middle two are out of sequence, however, since Constantine is addressed in the *Albinus* (ch. 4.2), only to have an unexpected return to Diocletian at the end of the *Macrinus* (ch. 15.4). The discrepancy will likely not go entirely unnoticed, especially given that the *Albinus* passage refers to senatorial families that were still prominent in the Theodosian period, but neither is it glaring enough to constitute a major crux.

The content of these various addresses gives only limited insight into the *scriptores*' own position. The addresses to the emperors are mostly generic and do not guarantee social or even physical closeness.[49] The deferential tone and quasi-dedicatory language will likely evoke courtier-historians such as Victor, Eutropius or Festus and signal distance from the classicizing tradition of an Ammianus or Tacitus.[50] Readers for whom Constantine's memory inevitably suggests religious change will again notice the utter absence of this topic in the apostrophes, but the abundant discussion of the imperial office itself and the appropriate qualifications and virtues of a ruler will resonate with those who know Constantine from the *Panegyrici Latini* as then circulating in Italy.[51]

The last two *scriptores* are once again clearly different. Neither one directly addresses an emperor, making their apostrophes instead to peers among the literate elite.[52] Vopiscus has overall the fullest personality of any *scriptor*, which, without giving any real evidence, furthers the impression that he is the final continuator and editor of the collection. That impression is strengthened by the prefatory passages in which Vopiscus explicitly refers first to Pollio (*Arln.* 2.1) and then to Lampridius and Capitolinus (*Prob.* 2.7), all seemingly as figures of the past. If readers already suppose from their initial perusal that Pollio has continued the works of the first four *scriptores* and Vopiscus has continued Pollio's, they can easily see Vopiscus' statements as confirmation. But readers who go beyond prefatory statements will encounter major difficulties of absolute dating. Both Pollio and Vopiscus refer in the third person to a "Constantius". Readers who only glanced at the *Claud.* preface might be unsure which Constantius was in question, but as they read deeper, it becomes clear that both *scriptores* mean Constantius Chlorus, and that as of the narra-

few ancient readers would have displayed. I cannot find any discussion of the point in humanist editions.

49 *Marc.* 19.12 (Capitolinus to Diocletian) and *Hel.* 34.4–6 (Lampridius to Constantine) mention remarks of the respective emperors that might be part of a private conversation, but they might equally be read as a pronouncement of the emperor's to some larger audience. For extended analysis of the Constantine-apostrophe, see Zinsli 2014, 815–876.

50 For the marked contrast with Ammianus and Tacitus, see Rohrbacher 2016, 62.

51 On the *HA*'s knowledge of the panegyrics, see Chastagnol 1994, xc-xci. Zinsli 2014, 254–264 argues that the *Hel.* in particular has strong intertextual links with Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*, which include Lampridius' self-presentation.

52 On these addressees, see Burgersdijk 2016.

tive present he and other Tetrarchic rulers are still alive and Constantine is not yet a figure of note.[53] This would place Pollio and Vopiscus squarely in the middle of the range of the first four *scriptores*, indeed twenty years earlier than Lampridius' statements in the *Hel.* Ingenious readers who really want to salvage the continuation model may devise at least a partial solution to the dilemma, but most, once they notice the problem at all, will find it baffling.

Those readers who have already encountered the various prefatory statements of the first four *scriptores* will realize that this bafflement has a larger context. The more readers engage with the *scriptores*' own statements, the more they will sense an iceberg of which the present collection is but the tip. For all the *scriptores* but Vopiscus, works are mentioned or implied beyond those that are extant. The most obvious instances are those of Spartianus (*Ael.* 7.5) and Gallicanus (*Av. Cass.* 3.3), each of whom claims to be planning a complete collection running from Augustus to the narrative present and including minor characters as well as sole rulers.[54] Spartianus in the *Niger* (9.2) anticipates writing a life of Clodius Albinus, but that emperor is in fact covered by Capitolinus, who claims (*Alb.* 1.4) to have already written a life of Niger. Lampridius (*Diad.* 6.1) likewise claims a *Macrinus*, thus also overlapping with Capitolinus. Furthermore, in the *Heliogabalus* he expresses (to Constantine) an intention of continuing on to Alexander, which he does, but also to the Gordiani (actually by Capitolinus), Claudius (by Pollio), Aurelian (by Vopiscus) and eventually to various Tetrarchic figures and Constantine himself, none of whom will actually fall within the collection at all.

On this question, the last two *scriptores* are a bit less problematic. Pollio does at one point (*Trig.* 31.8) imply that he intends to write lives up to and including Diocletian. In the *Aurelian*, however, Vopiscus helpfully informs us that Pollio wrote *a duobus Philippis usque ad divum Claudium et eius fratrem Quintillum imperatores*, leading us to suppose that Pollio's sequence has been terminated by his inactivity or death. This works nicely for the continuation hypothesis and allows Pollio to neatly fill the lacuna before the *Val.* Regarding his own writings, Vopiscus repeatedly tells us that the *Aurelian* is indeed his first effort. He further observes that no other Latin author has covered that ruler, which will raise suspicions that the earlier *scriptores* left their grand projects incomplete.[55] The question of a stopping point comes up against the problem of writing about living rulers. Lampridius has already broached (or, depending on the reader's viewpoint, will later broach) this topic, and anticipated continuing right up to his addressee Constantine (*Hel.* 34–35). Where he seems eager to rush in, Vopiscus fears to tread. In the *Quadr.*, he looks forward to writing of Carus and his sons, but adds that Diocletian and his colleagues "must be described in a grander manner" (*Quadr.* 15.10: *stilo maiore dicendi sunt*).

53 See in particular *Claud.* 13.2 and *Arln.* 44.4.

54 See also *Mxmn.* 1.3, where Capitolinus anticipates further lives of *magni imperatores* seemingly beyond his remaining two lives (*Gord.* and *Max.-Bal.*).

55 This is the assumption e. g. of Casaubon 1603.

Very similar language is used in the last chapters of Eutropius (10.18.3) and Ammianus (31.16.9) to beg off a task better suited to panegyrists.[56]

Working within the modern single-author hypothesis, this represents a relatively consistent picture. Nearly all these methodological statements can be read as referring to a single project that originally had a unified narrative voice. The fiction of the *scriptores* has, in this reading, been added on late and carelessly, hence the mistaken cross-references. Such a picture is not (at least initially) available to ancient readers, although some will be less thoroughly engaged with the authorship issue, and will tend to assume casually that Spartianus' and Gallicanus' very similar statements about usurpers' lives are by the same rather repetitious author, or that the *Niger* author did write the *Albinus* as well. Those who are more attentive may conclude that the editor has made mistakes in the ascriptions, without thereby being led to question the fiction as a whole.[57] They may, however, begin to see the inconsistencies not as individual anomalies to be smoothed out, but as cues toward some larger overall irony.[58] Conversely it may strike them, as it struck Casaubon, that while the specific statements of the *scriptores* are inconsistent, their general characteristics, both biographical and stylistical, are improbably similar.[59] And once one starts looking for ironic signposts in the *HA*, any number of discrete passages present themselves. To give one example, Lampridius, after announcing in the *Heliogabalus* his plan to continue on through Constantine, later in the *Alexander* (64.2) hedges, and says he will continue *si vita subpeditaverit*. The phrase is not an unusual one, but the most apposite use of it in earlier Latin is undoubtedly when Tacitus, in the *Histories* preface, promises to write of Nerva and Trajan *si vita suppeditet*.[60] He notably failed

56 On the Ammianus passage and its various intertextual links, see Kelly 2007.

57 Readers may find the "mistaken editor" hypothesis the more attractive in that reassigning the *Albinus* to Spartianus and the *Macrinus* to Lampridius would create unbroken sequences of six lives by Spartianus and then four by Lampridius. Humanist editors, working with variant manuscript traditions, generated many disputes over attribution, while Mommsen 1890, 242–252 was willing to rearrange several attributions in order to rescue his argument for separate "Diocletianic" and "Constantinian" sequences of lives, and Savino 2017, 76–78 has recently suggested a similar though less drastic move.

58 Van Nuffelen 2017 considers the authorial inconsistencies as part of an ironic strategy leading readers to the truth of single authorship, though for him the most important ironies have to do with the cultural prestige of biography as a genre. Similarly, Zinsli 2017 views the anachronisms as "entry-points" (*Einstiegstellen*) that make it inappropriate to speak of the *HA* as a "forgery."

59 Casaubon *ad Hadr.* 1.1, comes perhaps the closest of Dessau's predecessors to anticipating his solution, though with little sign of ironic awareness: *Satis enim mirum videtur nobis, quod de Aelio Spartiano, Aelio Lampridio & Julio Capitolino vulgati libri suggerunt: omnes hos tres cum sub Diocletiano coepissent florere, ad Constantini tempora durasse: omnes Imperatorum omnium vitas tempore eodem scribere aggressos (& quidem stylo ita parum dissimili, ut discrimen vix ullum liceat notare), pariter in opere instituto progressos, pariter defuisse. Ita plane est necesse, si vulgarium codicum non fallunt nos inscriptiones.*

60 *Hist.* 1.1. Although the *HA* refers to the historian Tacitus twice (*Arln.* 2.1; *Tac.* 10.3), scholars have generally doubted that this reflects any deep engagement with his text. For a more optimistic reading,

to do so, as the *HA*'s readers will likely know. The *HA* editor perhaps set out to remedy that omission, but if so his work is now incomplete through the loss of precisely the same two emperors. At what point do the neatly filled gap and its equally neat reopening become too neat? Readers may be nudged along the way when they encounter Vopiscus three times using the same words (with morphological variants) to describe his own future productions.[61]

However they pick up irony, though, all attentive readers will come to reflect on the work of the anonymous editor who may or may not be Vopiscus. Based on the *scriptores*' statements about themselves, this character seemingly had access to a very large mass of previously unsuspected literature, the more so if one considers that the *scriptores* in turn mention dozens of phoney authors.[62] His principles for selecting the *HA* lives seem at once simple (one life for each emperor) and opaque (separate vs. combined lives, why one *scriptor* over another?). He has greatly expanded the range of what can be known about emperors, but for some readers he has only created an appetite for more, not unlike that felt by humanists and later philologists.[63] How can we be satisfied with but one small sample of the vast literary output of Vulcacius Gallicanus? Others may find Gallicanus' *Avidius Cassius* to be of a mediocrity appropriate to its subject, and be glad that the editor has spared us all the wasted time of reading his further efforts.[64] Either way, however, the question of what constitutes a proper author worthy of readers' attention has been brought much to the foreground and been closely linked with that of what constitutes a proper emperor worthy of an author's attention.

4 Conclusion

The June 1939 issue of the American literary journal *Poetry* included a rather strange poem titled "Draft Ode for a Phi Beta Kappa Occasion," written by a poet named Rolfe Humphries, whose name regular readers of the journal would have recognized.[65] According to a prefatory note, the poem is "written in the tradition that there must be an average of one classical allusion to the line, and that the metre must be unrhymed iambic pentameter." From its first line ("Niobe's daughters

see Velaza 1997, with reference to this passage at 250 – 52. On the availability of Tacitus in the *HA*'s milieu, see Zecchini 1991.

61 *Arln.* 24.9; *Prob.* 1.5, 24.8.

62 On these characters, see Syme 1976; Chastagnol 1994, cvii-cxii.

63 Casaubon 1603 for one displays much animus toward the anonymous editor: *Atque ego non dubito istum Tribonianum cum hoc* [sc. the work of selection] *fecisset, visum sibi bellum hominem, qui erat saperda merus.*

64 I am grateful to Dennis Pausch for suggesting this view of the editor as anthologist giving readers access to only the best.

65 He is mainly remembered today for his translations of Lucretius, Virgil and Ovid.

yearn to the womb again") it amply fills that promise. Its twenty-eight lines contain at least that number of ancient names, but little other discernable meaning. The speaker in the last line apostrophizes the "Sons of Columbia" and seems to be trying to say something like "there are some very bad things going on in the world, and you need to rise to the challenge." Given the date, one can guess what troubles he has in mind, but what implications he draws about them are unclear to say the least and the poem as a whole is awful. That is until one reads it as an acrostic whose initial letters spell "NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER IS A HORSE'S ASS," referring to the then president of Columbia University, a Nobel Peace prize-winner and national icon of academic elitism.

The story became a minor scandal at the time, known and repeated by far more people than ever read the poem itself. Why, after all, should they have bothered, once its secret was public? Nonetheless, to a reader eighty years later, the poem itself is a not unappealing subject for cultural-historical reflection. One wonders naturally about Humphries' motives, but also about who figured the solution out and how, and what they thought the author was up to. The specific content has much to tell us on both fronts. The poem has many clues that it is a parody of some kind. The title and note are very odd (Why is a "draft" being published? What is this "tradition"?) and the style is not merely deficient in itself but quite unlike the poet's other work of the time. Many people (including perhaps the journal editors) perhaps detected elements of parody without noticing the acrostic, while it cued others to look closer for just such a trick.[66] Furthermore, inarticulate as the poetic speaker is, his words still position him within several cultural controversies of the time, about the aesthetics of modernist literature, about education and social class in New Deal America, and above all about the developing crisis in Europe. These were all questions on which Nicholas Murray Butler had public stances, often at odds with those of Humphries.[67] Between the multiplicity of issues at stake and readers' varying levels of ironic awareness, the range of possible readings of this short text is remarkable. Humphries cannot have intended or anticipated all of them, but their availability is still a telling reflection of the shape of cultural politics at the time.

66 Humphries himself, in a now-published letter (Gillman / Novak 1992, 163 – 164), draws a friend's attention to the poem, noting only that "There is a key to it, which I will expound if you have not, by the time I see you, discovered it." The August 1939 issue of the journal (294) contains an editorial note disavowing any knowledge of the prank, which apparently was only pointed out to the editors several weeks after publication.

67 Butler, then seventy-seven years old and president of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, was known for a reactionary taste in literature. Politically, he was a fierce anti-communist who had favored Chamberlain's diplomatic approach only to become a vocal advocate of U.S. entry into the war after September 1939. Humphries was more than thirty years younger and a left-wing activist known for his advocacy of the Republican side in Spain. See respectively Rosenthal 2006 and Limmer 1992.

Cultural historians of the 1930s, however, can choose from thousands of documents and artifacts on which similar exercises could be carried out. For them the Humphries prank can safely remain an amusing anecdote. Romanists have no such abundance, and must be grateful for what we get. The *Historia Augusta*'s enigmatic form can be an annoyance that we need to clear away before we can learn from it what we want. But from another perspective that form can itself be among the text's most revealing features. To reconstruct its meaning requires much speculation and often fails to yield satisfyingly definite answers. We cannot know what any actual author or reader thought of the *HA*, but we can map out what the text allowed them to think, the options it presented and framed for them, the discursive strands that it connected to and extended. In doing so, we can gain a little new perspective on a political and literary landscape of which our view is forever blurry and partial. The *HA* is remarkable for what it actually is, but perhaps even more for what in its own context it could be. To appreciate such a work, we need both multiple reading perspectives of our own and a consciousness of those perspectives in the ancient world.

Bibliography

Baldwin, B. (2010), "'Contemporary' Allusions in the *Historia Augusta*", in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History 15*, Brussels, 446–462.

Barnes, T.D. (1978), *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*, Brussels.

Barnes, T.D. (1998), *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca, N.Y.

Birley, A.R. (1976), "The Lacuna in the Historia Augusta", in: J. Straub (ed.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1972–1974*, Bonn, 55–62.

Birley, A.R. (1997), "Marius Maximus: The Consular Biographer", in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.34.3, 2678–2757.

Birley, A.R. (2002), "'Trebellius Pollio' and 'Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius'", in: G. Bonamente and F. Paschoud (eds.), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Perusinum VIII*, Bari, 33–47.

Bischoff, B. (1990), *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, D. Ó Cróinín and D. Ganz, trans., Cambridge.

Burgersdijk, D.W.P. (2016), "*Qui vitas aliorum scribere orditur:* Narratological Implications of Fictional Authors in the *Historia Augusta*", in: K. De Temmerman and K. Demoen (eds.), *Writing Biography in Greece and Rome: Narrative Technique and Focalization*, Cambridge, 240–256.

Burgess, R.W. (2002), "Jerome Explained: An Introduction to His *Chronicle* and a Guide to its Use", in: *Ancient History Bulletin* 16/1, 1–32.

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 Nature of the *Kaisergeschichte*", in: *Classical Philology* 100/2, 166–192.

Callu, J.-P. (1985), "La première diffusion de l'Histoire Auguste (vie-ixe s.)", in: J. Straub (ed.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/1983*, Bonn, 89–129.

Callu, J.-P. et al. (eds.) (1992), *Histoire Auguste: Tome I.1. Vies d'Hadrien, Aelius, Antonin*. Collection des universités de France, Paris.

Cameron, A. (2011), *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford.

Casaubon, I. (1603), *De sex istis scriptoribus historiae Augustae & de hac editione prolegomena*, Paris.
Chastagnol, A. (1994), *Histoire Auguste: Les empereurs romains des IIe et IIIe s.*, Paris.
Cueva, E.P. and J. Martínez (eds.) (2016), *Splendide mendax: Rethinking Fakes & Forgeries in Classical, Late Antique & Early Christian Literature*, Groningen.
Den Hengst, D. (1981), *The Prefaces of the Historia Augusta*, Amsterdam.
Den Hengst, D. (1995), "Selbstkommentar in der *Historia Augusta*", in: G. Bonamente and G. Paci (eds.), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Maceratense III*, Bari, 151–167.
Den Hengst, D. (2002), "The Discussion of Authorship", in: G. Bonamente and F. Paschoud (eds.), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Perusinum VIII*, Bari, 187–195.
Dessau, H. (1889), "Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der Scriptores Historiae Augustae", in: *Hermes* 24/3, 337–392.
Eigler, U. (2003), *Lectiones vetustatis: Römische Literatur und Geschichte in der lateinischen Literatur der Spätantike*, Munich.
Fry, C. (2010), "*Suetonianus quidam:* l'auteur de l'*Histoire Auguste* en utilisateur du style suétonien", in: L.G. Milić and N. Hecquet-Noti (eds.), *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense in honorem F. Paschoud septuagenarii*, Bari, 135–151.
Garrett, P. (2015), "Reconstructing the Lost Beginning of Suetonius' *Divus Iulius*", in: *Antichthon* 49, 110–134.
Gillman, R. and M.P. Novak (eds.) (1992), *Poets, Politics and Poetics: America's Literary Community Viewed from the Letters of Rolfe Humphries*, Lawrence, Kan.
Grey, C. (2010), "Civil War? What Civil War? Usurpers in the *Historia Augusta*", in: B. Breed et al. (eds.), *Citizens of Discord: Rome and its Civil Wars*, Oxford, 86–101.
Gurney, P.J. and L.W. Gurney (1998), "Authorship Attribution of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*", in: *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 13/3, 119–131.
Hackius, P. et al. (eds.) (1671), *Historiae Augustae scriptores VI. Aelius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Vulc. Gallicanus, Trebell. Pollio, Flavius Vopiscus. Cum integris notis Isaaci Casauboni, Cl. Salmasii & Jani Gruteri*, Leiden.
Harnett, B. (2017), "The Diffusion of the Codex", in: *Classical Antiquity* 36/1, 183–235.
Hohl, E. (1913), "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der *Historia Augusta*", in: *Klio* 13, 258.
Hohl, E. (ed.) (1971), *Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Editio stereotypa correctior*, Leipzig.
Honoré, T. (1987), "Scriptor Historiae Augustae", in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 77, 156–176.
Humphries, M. (2008), "Rufinus's Eusebius: Translation, Continuation, and Edition in the Latin *Ecclesiastical History*", in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16/2, 143–164.
Kelly, G. (2007), "The Sphragis and Closure of the *Res gestae*", in: J. Den Boeft et al. (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian*, Leiden, 219–241.
Kemezis, A.M. (2018), "The Fictions of Tradition in the Later Lives of the *Historia Augusta*", in: O. Devillers and B.B. Sebastiani (eds.), *Sources et modèles des historiens anciens*, Bordeaux, 307–318.
Limmer, R. (1992), "In the American Grain: A Biographical Essay", in: R. Gillman and M.P. Novak (eds.), *Poets, Politics and Poetics: America's Literary Community Viewed from the Letters of Rolfe Humphries*, Lawrence, Kan., 9–34.
Lippold, A. (1998), "Die Historia Augusta: Eine Sammlung römischer Kaiserbiographien aus der Zeit Konstantins", in: A. Lippold and G.H. Waldherr (eds.), *Die Historia Augusta*, Stuttgart, 1–14.
Martínez, J. (ed.) (2011), *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature – Falsificaciones y falsarios de la Literatura Clásica*, Madrid.
Mastandrea, P. (2011), "Vita dei principi e *Storia romana*, tra Simmaco e Giordane", in: L. Cristante and S. Ravalico (eds.), *Il calamo della memoria IV*, Trieste, 207–245.

Mayer, M. (2016), "Génesis y evolución del texto de la Historia Augusta: Consideraciones a propósito de la *Vita Pescenni Nigri*", in: J. Velaza (ed.), *From the Protohistory to the History of the Text*, Frankfurt am Main, 313 – 332.
Meckler, M. (1996), "The Beginning of the *Historia Augusta*", in: *Historia* 45/3, 374 – 375.
Mommsen, T. (1890), "Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae", in: *Hermes* 25/2, 228 – 292.
Nixon, C.E.V. and B.S. Rodgers (eds.) (1994), *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini*, Berkeley, Calif.
Paschoud, F. (1999), "Propos sceptiques et iconoclastes sur Marius Maximus", in: F. Paschoud (ed.) *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense*, Bari, 241 – 254.
Paschoud, F. (2013), Review of M. Thomson. *Studies in the Historia Augusta*, 2012, in: *Histos* 7, 362 – 373.
Pausch, D. (2009), "*Libellus non tam diserte quam fideliter scriptus?* Unreliable Narration in the *Historia Augusta*", in: *Ancient Narrative* 8, 115 – 136.
Peirano, I. (2012), *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context*, Cambridge.
Ratti, S. (2007), "Nicomaque Flavien Senior auteur de l'*Histoire auguste*", in: G. Bonamente and H. Brandt (eds.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Bambergense*, Bari, 305 – 317.
Ratti, S. (2014), "Les ancêtres d'Émile Ajar", in: *Médium* 40/3, 109 – 124.
Ratti, S. and O. Desbordes (eds.) (2000), *Histoire Auguste: Tome IV.2. Vies des deux Valériens et des deux Galliens*. Collection des universités de France, Paris.
Ratti, S. and J.-F. Nardelli (2014), "'Historia Augusta contra Christianos': Recherches sur l'ambiance antichrétienne dans l'*Histoire Auguste*", in: *Antiquité tardive* 22, 143 – 155.
Rees, R. (2014), "Intertitles as Deliberate Misinformation in Ammianus Marcellinus", in: L. Jansen (ed.) *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers*, Cambridge, 129 – 142.
Roberts, C.H. and T.C. Skeat (1983), *The Birth of the Codex*, Oxford.
Rohrbacher, D. (2013), "The Sources of the *Historia Augusta* Re-Examined", in: *Histos* 7, 146 – 180.
Rohrbacher, D. (2016), *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta*, Madison, Wis.
Rosenthal, M. (2006), *Nicholas Miraculous: The Amazing Career of the Redoutable Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler*, New York.
Sánchez Vendramini, D.N. (2018), "The Audience of Ammianus Marcellinus and the Circulation of Books in the Late Roman world", in: *Journal of Ancient History* 6/2, 234 – 259.
Savino, E. (2017), *Ricerche sull' Historia Augusta*, Naples.
Sehlmeyer, M. (2009), *Geschichtsbilder für Pagane und Christen: Res romanae in den spätantiken Breviarien*, Berlin.
Shedd, M.P. (2021), "The Historia Augusta Before Ms Pal. Lat. 899: Lost Manuscripts and Scribal Mediation", in: *Classical Quarterly* 71/1, 402 – 421.
Stover, J.A. (2020), "New Light on the Historia Augusta", in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 110, 167 – 198.
Stover, J.A. and M. Kestemont (2016), "The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta:* Two New Computational Studies", in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 59/2, 140 – 157.
Syme, R. (1968), *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, Oxford.
Syme, R. (1976), "Bogus Authors", in: J. Straub (ed.) *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1972 – 1974*, Bonn, 311 – 321.
Thomson, M. (2007), "The Original Title of the *Historia Augusta*", in: *Historia* 56/1, 121 – 125.
Thomson, M. (2012), *Studies in the Historia Augusta*, Brussels.
Van Nuffelen, P. (2017), "The Highs and Lows of Biography", in: B. Bleckmann and H. Brandt (eds.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Dusseldorpiense*, Bari, 175 – 187.
Velaza, J. (1997), "Tacite dans l'H.A.: Vers une révision", in: G. Bonamente and K. Rosen (eds.), *Historiae Augustae colloquium Bonnense*, Bari, 241 – 253.
White, P. (1967), "The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*", in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 57/1 – 2, 115 – 133.

Zecchini, G. (1991), "La fortuna di Tacito e l'Historia Augusta", in: G. Bonamente and N. Duval (eds.), *Historiae Augustae colloquium Parisinum*, Macerata, 337 – 350.
Zinsli, S.C. (2014), *Kommentar zur Vita Heliogabali der Historia Augusta*, Bonn.
Zinsli, S.C. (2017), "Fälschungs- und Erzähltechniken der *Historia Augusta*", in: W. Kofler and A. Novokhatko (eds.), *Verleugnete Rezeption: Fälschungen antiker Texte*, Freiburg im Breisgau and Vienna, 133 – 151.

Fig. 1.: The HA Lives and *Scriptores*
Titles as in Hohl's Teubner ed., **Extant lives;** ostensibly lost lives (* – inferred; ** – explicitly mentioned)

*Nerva** + *praef*?*	??	***Pescennius Niger***	Spartianus	*Decius (et fil.?)**	Pollio?
*Traianus**	??	***Vita Clodii Albini***	Capitolinus	*Gallus, Hostilianus, Volusianus**	Pollio?
De vita Hadriani	Aelius Spartianus	***Antoninus Caracallus***	Spartianus	*Aemilianus**	Pollio?
Aelius	Spartianus	***Antoninus Geta***	Spartianus	***Valeriani Duo (inc.)***	Pollio
Antoninus Pius	Julius Capitolinus	***Opilius Macrinus***	Capitolinus	***Gallieni Duo***	Pollio
Vita Marci Antonini Philosophi	Capitolinus	***Diadumenus Antoninus***	Lampridius	***Tyranni Triginta***	Pollio
Verus	Capitolinus	***Antoninus Heliogabalus***	Lampridius	***Divus Claudius***	Pollio
Avidius Cassius	Vulcacius Gallicanus VC	***Alexander Severus***	Lampridius	***Divus Aurelianus***	Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius
Commodus Antoninus	Aelius Lampridius	***Maximini Duo***	Capitolinus	***Tacitus***	Vopiscus
Helvius Pertinax	Capitolinus	***Gordiani Tres***	Capitolinus	***Probus***	Vopiscus
Didius Julianus	Spartianus	***Maximus et Balbinus***	Capitolinus	***Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus et Bonusus (i. e. Quadrigae Tyrannorum)***	Vopiscus
Severus	Spartianus	*Phillippi Duo***	Trebellius Pollio?	***Carus et Carinus et Numerianus***	Vopiscus

Fig. 2.: The *Scriptores*' Self-References

SCRIPTOR	LIVES	DATE BY EMPEROR	EXTENT
Aelius Spartianus	*Hadr.* *Ael.* *Did. Jul.* *Sev.* *Nig.* *Carc.* *Geta*	– Dedications and apostrophes to Diocletian (*Ael.* 1.1, *Sev.* 20.4, *Nig.* 9.1) – Address to Constantine (*Geta* 1.1)	– *Omnes, qui post Caesarem dictatorem, hoc est divum Iulium, vel Caesares vel Augusti vel principes appellati sunt [...] singulis libris exponere* (*Ael.* 7.5) – Accurate refs to own lives of Sev. and Geta (*Carc.* 1.2, 11.1)
Julius Capitolinus	*Ant.* *Marc.* *Verus* *Pert.* *Alb.* *Macr.* *Mxmn.* *Gord.* *Max.-Bal.*	– Apostrophes to Diocletian (*Marc.* 19.12, *Ver.* 11.4, *Macr.* 15.4) – Apostrophes to Constantine (*Alb.* 4.2, *Mxmn.* 1.1, *Gord.* 34.6) – Mentioned by Vopiscus (*Prob.* 2.7)	– Refers to life of Niger not in collection, extant life is by Spartianus (*Alb.* 1.4)
Vulcacius Gallicanus VC	*Av. Cass.*	– Apostrophe to Diocletian (*Av. Cass.* 3.3)	– *omnes, qui imperatorium nomen sive iusta causa sive iniusta habuerunt, in litteras mittere, ut omnes purpuratos, Auguste, cognosceres* (*Av. Cass.* 3.3)
Aelius Lampridius	*Comm.* *Diad.* *Hel.* *Alex.*	– Apostrophes to Constantine (*Hel.* 2.4, 34.1; *Alex.* 65.1) – Mentioned by Vopiscus (*Prob.* 2.7)	– Implies has written about Macrinus, extant life is by Capitolinus (*Diad.* 6.1) – Intends to write about Gordiani, Alexander; Aurelian; Claudius; Diocletian; Maximian; Constantine; Licinius; Maxentius (*Hel.* 34 – 35) – Will write about Aurelian *si vita subpeditaverit* (*Alex.* 64.2)
Trebellius Pollio	*[Phil.]* *Val.* *Gal.* *Trig.* *Claud.*	– Third-person refs to *Constantius Caesar*, seemingly as living (*Gal.* 7.1, 14.3, *Claud.* 1.1 etc.)	– Vopiscus says wrote *a duobus Philippis usque ad divum Claudium et eius fratrem Quintillum imperatores* (*Arln.* 2.1) – Vopiscus again praises his *diligentia*, mentions *Trig.* (*Quadr.* 1.3)

Fig. 2.: The *Scriptores*' Self-References *(Continued)*

SCRIPTOR	LIVES	DATE BY EMPEROR	EXTENT
Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius	*Arln.* *Tac.* *Prob.* *Quadr.* *Carus*	– Quotes young Diocletian's words as from father (*Arln.* 43–44) and assassination of Aper from grandfather (*Carus* 13.3) – Mentions *iam Constantius imperator*, seemingly as living (*Arln.* 44.5)	– Identifies self as writer of lives of Aurelian, Tacitus and Florian, and future author *usque ad Maximianum Diocletianumque* (*Prob* 1.5), mentions *Arln.* again (*Quadr.* 2.3) – Anticipates writing the *Carus*, but no further (*Prob.* 24.6–8, *Quadr.* 15.10, *Carus* 18.5)

Index locorum

Index nominum et rerum