

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was scanned as received.

This reproduction is the best copy available.

ABBREVIATED HISTORIES : THE CASE OF THE

EPITOME DE CAESARIBUS (AD C. 395)

BY JEAN-LUC GAUVILLE,
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
MCGILL UNIVERSITY,
MONTREAL,

APRIL, 2005

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO MCGILL UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE DECREE OF DOCTOR IN PHILOSOPHY

©JEAN-LUC GAUVILLE, 2005



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-494-12846-1

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-494-12846-1

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

PRO ADMIRATIS IMPERATORIBUS

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	p. i v
SUMMARY	p. vii
ABBREVIATIONS	p. ix
INTRODUCTION	p. 1
CHAPTER I: THE <i>EPITOME DE CAESARIBUS</i> AND ITS READERS DURING THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES.....	p. 12
CHAPTER II: THE <i>EPITOME</i> AND ITS READERS FROM THE POST- CAROLIGIAN PERIOD TO THE RENAISSANCE.....	p. 49
CHAPTER III: THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN SCHOLARSHIP ON THE <i>EPITOME</i>	p. 64
CHAPTER IV: THE <i>EPITOME</i> AND THE HISTORICAL GENRE IN ANTIQUITY.....	p. 86
CHAPTER V: THE <i>EPITOME</i> AND ITS SOURCES.....	p. 97
CHAPTER VI: ETHICS AND EMPERORS IN THE <i>EPITOME</i>	p. 159
CHAPTER VII: RELIGIOUS IDENTITY AND THE EPITOMATOR....	p. 178
CONCLUSION	p. 215
APPENDIX 1 : THE <i>EPITOME</i> AND ITS READERS.....	p. 226
APPENDIX 2 : ITS MEDIEVAL LATIN VERSION AND THE ESTABLISH- MENT OF THE <i>EPITOME</i> TEXT.....	p. 234
APPENDIX 3 : PASSAGES ABOUT SELF-CONTROL.....	p. 243
APPENDIX 4 : ANDREAS SCHOTT AND THE <i>EPITOME DE CAESARIBUS</i>	p. 254
APPENDIX 5 : THE <i>EPITOME</i> DURING THE MODERN ERA.....	p. 265
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p. 270

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I began to show an interest in the *Epitome de Caesaribus* through the work associated with the thesis on Clodius Albinus for my Master's degree and through a German reading course, in which I had used an article written by Jorg Schlumberger as session work, translating the first five pages into French. After my Master's degree in history at the Université de Montréal, I pursued my interest in ancient languages completing a B.A. in classics. During the said undertaking, I began a translation of the *Epitome* into both French and English. At the same time, I began an acquaintance with Professor George Woloch and with Miss Mary McDaid. I arrived at McGill while the department of classics became a part of the department of history. It was because of the encouragements of Professor Woloch and Miss McDaid that I enrolled at McGill in the history graduate program in May, 1995. If it was not for them, there would not be a thesis on the *Epitome*.

Miss McDaid introduced me to Dr. Partner. First and foremost, I must acknowledge the exchange of ideas between my supervisors, Dr. Nancy Partner and Dr. Richard Burgess. With

Dr. Burgess, I shared a passion for late antiquity, and I discussed often with him the *Epitome* prior to enrolling at McGill. Dr. Partner took on the direction of thesis dealing with late Roman historiography, which was not her speciality. It was a strong vote of confidence, and unknown to me at the time she has had a great interest for this period and a great friendship with Dr. T.D. Barnes. She helped in more ways that I can thank her for the first two years, during my probation period and the completion of my comprehensive exam. Dr. Partner has often read my numerous papers given at colloquium that in turn became part of this thesis.

Despite a prior BA in history from Bishop's University, Cegep at John Abbott, and two years at Plattsburgh High school, my first language remained French, and most of my published research has been in that language. English at the Ph.D. level is a subtle instrument of discourse and integral part of the work. Because of a slight learning disability, this thesis could not have been produced in English without the help of my two editors: MM. Jeff Cuvillier and Clinton Fernandez. In this undertaking, I must acknowledge the Office For Students with Disabilities and the department of

history for the funding involved in the hiring of these two editors. I want to thank McGill university for allowing me to be a T.A. on numerous occasions. I also want to thank Dr. Schachter for the chance to be his research assistant in 1996/1997.

At McGill, I want to thank Professors Wallis, Schachter, Sherwood, and Digeser for their encouragement at various times during the completion of this thesis. Among the staff, I want to thank Colleen Parish and Georgy Mikela for their constant encouragement. I also want to say thank you to former classmates of mine, Mark Charpentier, Jerrold, and Thomas Cookson for their words of advice during my comprehensive exam.

Last, I want to thank my mother and sister for their constant support throughout my studies.

Sincerely,

Jean-Luc Gauville

.

Abbreviated Histories: the Case of
the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (c. AD 395)

Abstract

The dissertation offers a critical analysis of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, a fourth-century Latin series on the lives of the emperors from Augustus to Theodosius (c. AD 395), and consists of seven chapters defining the text, the genre, its sources, its religious milieu, and its political and social ideas. The political ideas in the *Epitome* were deeply marked by the influence of the ascetic ideal honouring moderation in drink, food, sleep, sex, and emotions such as anger. Within the fourth-century Roman Empire, the epitomator offers moderate pagan views which show interest about dreams, asceticism, and the providential nature of the divinity. The dissertation proposes to see the *Epitome* as a literary artefact which, through comparison with contemporary authors, allows one to extract from a bland text ideas found among fourth-century elites in the emperor Honorius' Italy (395-423).

Résumé

Cette dissertation présente une analyse critique de l'*Épitomé des Césars*, une série de vies d'empereurs en abrégé, écrit en latin allant d'Auguste à Théodose (c. 395 ap. J.-C.) et, comprend sept chapitres définissant le texte, le genre, les sources, le milieu religieux et les idées politiques et sociales de l'auteur. Ses

idées politiques sont imprégnées de l'idéal de l'ascétisme, honorant la modération dans la boisson, la nourriture, le sommeil, le sexe et les émotions comme la colère. Dans le cadre de la fin du quatrième siècle, l'oeuvre de l'abrégiateur contient des idées modérées qui s'arrêtent sur l'interprétation des rêves, l'ascétisme et la nature providentielle de la divinité. La dissertation propose de voir l'*Épitomé* comme un artefact littéraire qui permet d'extraire d'un texte aride les idées qui existaient parmi les élites de la fin du quatrième siècle dans l'Italie de l'empereur Honorius (395-423).

Introduction:
Abbreviated Histories: The case of
the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (c. AD 395)

In 1974, Jorg Schlumberger, the first modern author to devote a book to the *Epitome*, stated his reason for studying the *Libellus de Vita et Moribus imperatorum breuiatus ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris a Caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium* (the title in sixteenth of the manuscripts of the work including the Gudianus 84), better known as the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (AD c. 395), - place the last pagan Latin historian in his historical context through an analysis of the epitomator's historiographical method and his sources.¹ He devoted little energy to consider the political and religious ideas of the *Epitome*, in which I am particularly interested. I began to be interested in the *Epitome* through a reading exercise which required translating one of Schlumberger's articles on the *Historia Augusta*, used later in my Master's thesis on Clodius Albinus (c. AD. 140-197).² This Ph.D. dissertation examines the epitomator's ideas, and offers some new insights into the history of the text and the reconstruction of the sources.

The general structure of this anonymous work, the *Libellus de Vita et Moribus imperatorum* or *Epitome de Caesaribus*, deserves

¹ Jorg Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Vestigia 18 (Munich, 1974), p. 1.

² Jean-Luc Gauville, *Un aspirant à l'Empire, Clodius Albinus (+ ap. J.-C. 197): une études historiographique* (Maîtrise, Université de Montréal, 1991), pp. 113-120.

comment. The 1970 Teubner edition of Latin the text contains forty-four pages, and consists of forty-eight condensed biographies of Roman emperors from Augustus (31 BC - AD 14) to Theodosius (AD 379-395).³ The *Epitome's* authorship is a mystery, and thus the work is anonymous. The *Epitome* offers only the following clues about its nature: a date of composition between the death of Theodosius in AD 395 and that of his son, Arcadius, in AD 408 and a manuscript tradition beginning in the ninth century of which nineteen copies survived. Very little in the work reveals the author's identity or the context in which it was composed. In the early Middle Ages (VIIth century), the work became confused with Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* (AD 361) because most readers misunderstood the *incipit* or title *Libellus (...) breuiatus ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris* - and believed that it named the author instead of a source.⁴

Thirty years after Schlumberger's pioneering work, one can examine the questions raised by his work in the reviews of his book and later works on the *Epitome*. The reviews focused on

³ Aurelius Victor, Sextus. *De Caesaribus Praecedunt De Viris illustribus urbis Romae et liber Origo gentis romanae; subsequitur Epitome de Caesaribus*. Recens. F. Grundel (Teubner, Leipzig, 1970), pp. 133-176; Pseudo-Aurelius Victor, *L'Epitome de Cesars, texte etabli et traduit par Michel Festy* (Paris, 1999), pp. 2-57.

⁴ Schlumberger (1974), p. 2-3; A recent writer still associates the epitomator with Aurelius Victor - James J. Clauss, "An Attic-speaking crow on the Capitoline: a literary émigré from the Hecate," *Zeitschrift für Epigraphie und Papyrologie* 96 (1993): 167-173.

Schlumberger's schema of sources, the end product of all *Quellenforschung* studies, either taking issue with or are in agreement with Schlumberger's major contention that Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* (c. 366/389) was the *Epitome's* main source.⁵ Barry Baldwin is the only one among recent scholars to have shown any interest in questions other than the *Epitome's* sources.⁶ His article on the first-century material and style of the *Epitome* clearly demonstrates that he is not in agreement with Schlumberger, who is of the view that the *Epitome* was an impersonal compilation nearly devoid of autobiographical elements and of personal commentary. In recent years, there have been several translations of the *Epitome*, notably by Michel Festy, Thomas Banchich, and H.W. Bird. Such renewed interest is a strong

⁵ T.D. Barnes, "The *Epitome* and its sources," *Classical Philology* 71 (1976): 258-268 (against); François Paschoud, "Deux ouvrages récents sur l'*Epitome* de Caesaribus et Aurélius Victor," *Revue des Etudes Latines* 53 (1975): 86-98 (for); D. Nellen, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Gymnasium* 83 (1976): 111-113 (against); L. Bessone, "Recensione di Jorg Schlumberger' *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Rivista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* 105 (1977): 78-80 (for); R.Ph. Green, "A review of Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1979): 225-229 (critical); Guilermo Ballaira, "Recensione di Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1976), *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* (1977): 229 (for); Anonymous, "Compte-rendu du livre de Jorg Schlumberger," *Byzantium* 45 (1975): 177 (against); D. Nellen, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 70 (1977): 123-127 (against); B. Mouchová, "Recensione di Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Eirene* 16 (1978): 143-144 (neutral); Wilhelm den Boer, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974), *Gnomon* 51 (1979): 165-167 (against).

⁶ Barry Baldwin, "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* from Augustus to Domitian," *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 43 <72> (1993) : 81-101

indication that the *Epitome* needs more study.⁷

To modern historians of antiquity such as Schlumberger, the *Epitome de Caesaribus* has shown itself to be colourless with respect to personal commentary and autobiographical material. Only Peter Brown and Andreas Alföldi have shown any interest in the epitomator's ideas.⁸ The latter was intrigued by the *Epitome*'s passages dealing with the education of emperors. The epitomator, unlike Aurelius Victor or Eutropius, did not place much emphasis on the power of education, but stressed good sense and practical experience for emperors as more important:

Gratian had been instructed far from poorly in making poems, speaking beautifully, and arranging debates in the manner of rhetoricians (...), and he would have been full of all the good <qualities>, if he had lent his mind to knowing the science of ruling the state, about which he was almost a stranger not only willingly but also purposely.⁹

Naturally, Alföldi made much of this passage, which discusses the

⁷ M. Festy(1999); *A Booklet of the Lives and Manner of Life of the Emperors from Augustus to Theodosius*, Transl. By Thomas M. Banchich, (Buffalo, 2000) (or [Http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm](http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm)). *The Epitome de Caesaribus*, translated and annotated by H.W. Bird, A Translated text for Historians (Liverpool, upcoming).

⁸ Andreas Alföldi, *A Conflict of Ideas in the Later Roman Empire. The Clash between the Senate and Valentinian I*, tr. by Harold Mattingly (Oxford, 1952), pp. 112-114, 119-122; Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, 1992), p. 66.

⁹ *Fuit autem Gratianus litteris haud mediocriter institutus: carmen facere, ornate loqui, explicare controversias rhetorum more (...). Cunctisque esset plenus bonis, si ad cognoscendam reipublicae regendae scientiam animus intendisset, a qua prope alienus non modo voluntate, sed etiam exercitio fuit. Epitome, 47.4-5.*

attitudes of the elites towards education in the fourth century. In his search for statements where anger management is mentioned, Peter Brown noted the *Epitome's* material - remembering the Greek alphabet backward to create a delay in order to stop his anger.¹⁰ Brown used this passage from the *Epitome* as an example to illustrate the way in which fourth-century elites abhorred the irascible nature of their emperors and governors. These philosophical ideas found in the *Epitome* explain, in part, the work's continued popularity between late antiquity and the nineteenth century. The epitomator influenced Carolingian political thinkers like Sedelius Scottus (c. 850) in his *De Rectoribus Christianis* and pamphleteers such as Robert Codrington during the English Civil War in his translation of the *Epitome*.¹¹ His humour also played a role in the survival of the *Epitome* since he inserted witty jokes found in his sources about Tiberius, Claudius, Philip the Arab, and Constantine, and he appreciated Theodosius' ability to mix humour and seriousness in his

¹⁰ *Irasci sane rebus indignis, sed flecti cito, unde modica dilatione emolliebantur aliquando severa praecepta. Habuitque a natura, quod Augustus a philosophiae doctore; qui cum vidisset eum facile commoveri, ne apserum aliquid statueret, monuit, ubi irasci coepisset, quattuor atque viginti Graecas litteras memoria recenseret, ut illa concitatio, quae momenti est, mente alio traducta parvi temporis interiectu languesceret. Epitome, 48.13-15 (cf. Brown, p. 66).*

¹¹ *The History of Justine, taken out of the four and forty books of Trogu Pompeius (...). Together with the Epitomie of the Lives and Manners of the Roman Emperors (of Aurelius Victor), tr. into English by Robert Codrington (London, W. Gilbertson, 1654 and 1666); the work was dedicated first to Oliver Cromwell and later to one of Charles II's minister, John Shaen.*

speeches.¹²

For different reasons, medieval copiers also attributed the *De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae* (fourth century) and the *Origo Gentis Romanae* (fourth century) to Aurelius Victor. The Michelsberg monks in twelfth-century Bamberg further reinforced the tradition by copying one codex containing all three texts (Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, the *Liber De Viris Illustribus*, and the *Origo Gentis Romanae*).¹³ The *Epitome* offers a different problem, and this is explained by the continuous misunderstanding of the *incipit* by medieval authors. This error was probably due to the fact that practically no one knew Aurelius Victor's real work, the *Caesares*, between AD 550 and AD 1453.¹⁴ Thus, the *Epitome* continued to be associated with Aurelius Victor, since practically no one in the Middle Ages had read Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*. Eventually, the discovery of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, through a brief notice in cardinal Bessarion's (c. 1453) catalogue of the books in his Venice library, gradually altered the commonly held perceptions regarding the *Epitome*. It must be pointed out, only in 1579, that this confusion began to end when a

¹² *Epitome*, 2.1, 4.8, 28.3, 41.17, 48.18.

¹³ Aurélius Victor, *Les Césars*, texte établi et traduit par P. Dufraigne (Paris, 1975), pp. vii-viii.,

¹⁴ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber De Caesaribus Praecedunt Origo Genis Romanae et Liber de Viris Illustribus Romae subsequitur Epitomes de Caesaribus*, ed. Franz Pichlmayr & R. Grundel, Bibliotheca Scriptores Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig, 1970), pp. xvii-xxii.

Belgian scholar named Andreas Schott issued the first edition of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*.¹⁵ He also published the *Epitome* along with the *De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae* and the *Origo Gentis Romanae*.¹⁶ With these editions, Andreas Schott studied and commented on the language of both authors and the different means of composition, and concluded that the two works were written by two different authors. Andreas Schott called the anonymous work *Epitome de Caesaribus* to distinguish it from Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, and the *Epitome* became the better-known title. Later editors used the work of Andreas Schott with their own commentaries.¹⁷ Nineteenth century scholars took on the task of comparing Aurelius Victor and the *Epitome*, adding keen observations about the sources and the *Epitome*'s text.¹⁸ However

¹⁵ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris de Caesaribus Liber*, ed. Andreas Schott (Antwerp, 1579).

¹⁶ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Breviarium Historiae Romanae* (...), rec. Andreas Schottus (Antwerp, 1579).

¹⁷ Samuel Pitisci, Dominico Machanei, Ianus Gruter, Anne Dacier, Johann Arntzen, J. Gruner; cf. W. Engelmann & E. Preuss, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum*, vol 2: *Scriptori Latini* (Leipzig, 1882), pp. 731-732 [nineteenth-century equivalent of *L'Année philologique*].

¹⁸ R. Armstedt, *Quae ratio intercedat inter undecim capita priora Sex. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et Epitomes*, Programm des Gymnasiums (Bückenburg, 1885); A. Cohn, *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et epitomes undecim capita priora fluexerint* (Diss. Berlin, Leipzig, 1884); W. Enman, "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*", *Philologus supp.* IV, (1884), Heft 3: 335-501; Ludwig Jeep, "Aurelii Victoris *De Caesaribus* e l'*Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Revista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* I (1873): 505-518; F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*, (Leipzig, 1901, ND Hildesheim 1965); Th. Opitz, "Quaestionum de Sex. Aurelio Victore capita tria," *Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis* 2, (1872): 197-278; E. von Woelfflin, "Die Latinität der *Epitome*", *Archiv. f. Lat. Lex.* XII

until the appearance of Schlumberger's book, Andreas Schott remained the last author to have undertaken a comprehensive study of the *Epitome*.

After studying the work in detail, I believe that Schlumberger's assessment of the *Epitome* was unfair. He made no serious attempt at understanding either the epitomator's political ideas or his authorial milieu. Recent studies of the anonymous *Historia Augusta*, Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, or Justin's *Epitome of Trogus' Philippicae* have shown without a doubt that compilations are rich in ideas and personal information about a writer.¹⁹ In the present thesis, I have undertaken to study, among other things, these elements in order to reconstruct the epitomator's social and political ideas and his religious views.

The epitomator is regarded by many scholars as the last Latin pagan historian, and Schlumberger believed him to be a lesser Nichomachus Flavianus who slavishly imitated his predecessor's views. Others, such as Georgio Bonamente, have shown that the epitomators were subtle defenders of pagan beliefs in the great religious debates of the fourth century between Christianity and

(1902): 445-452.

¹⁹ *Histoire Auguste. Les Empereurs des IIe et IIIe siècles*, ed., trad. et comm. par André Chastagnol (Paris, 1994); H.W. Bird, *A Historiographical Study of Aurelius Victor*, Arca 14 (Liverpool, 1984); Justin, *Philippic Histories*, transl. by John Yardley & notes by R. Develin (Atlanta, 1994).

paganism.²⁰ Paul the Deacon, in the preface of the *Historia Romana*, warns his Christian readers that Eutropius, an earlier epitomator, was a militant pagan.²¹ Eutropius, according to Bonamente, stressed *consecratio* [divine consecration of an emperor after his death by the senate] and through his work may have been partly responsible for the deification of Julian, whom Christians such as Gregory Nazarius declared to be under the *damnatio memoriae* (abolition of an emperor's legislation and political decisions by the senate).²² In his historical work, Aurelius Victor defended the business of selling sacrificial poultry in Rome as well as sacrifices in throughout his history.²³ The *Epitome's* material was less militant than that of the two other epitomators. At worst, he might have subtly reprimanded Constantine (306-337) for overspending on the development of Constantinople and the construction of churches, writing that "from which, he was called in a popular song *Trachala* (the thick-necked fellow), *praestantissimus* (the best) for the first ten years, *latro* (the brigand) for the next twelve years, and *pupillus*

²⁰ G. Bonamente, *Guiliano l'Apostata e il Breviario di Eutropio* (Rome, 1986), pp. 149-155.

²¹ Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, dans *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, vol. 51, ed. A. Crevelluci, (Rome, 1908) (letter to Alderberga) [Arnaldo Momigliano spread the ideas that epitomators were religiously neutral. By neutral, I suspect that Momigliano meant non-threatening to Christians and carrying the tone of polite debate ("Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century AD," *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, (Oxford, 1963), pp. 79-99].

²² G. Bonamente, *Guliano*, pp. 151-164.

²³ Aurelius Victor, 5.17, 14.4, 14.8, 26.4

(the ward) for the last ten years because of his extravagant spending."²⁴

The epitomator has little interest in imperial worship.²⁵ His view of the divinity is polytheistic, as he names Libera, Venus, the *Dirae* (the Furies), and Jupiter in the early part of the work. He, however, also liked to show the divine as an impersonal force writing: "I believe that it was bestowed divinely that, when the law of the world or nature gives rise to something unknown to men, <these things> are lessened by the counsels of rulers just like the remedies of medicine."²⁶ He discussed dreams (40.10, 44.2, and 48.1) and portents (43.8, 48.3). He probably knew something of Christianity since he may have alluded to Joseph's dream in Matthew's Gospel when describing those of Varronian and Theodosius the Elder. The epitomator's beliefs reveal the complexity of pagan ideas about the divinity and the strength of pagan religious practices at the end of the fourth century.

²⁴ *Unde proverbio vulgari Trachala, decem annis praestantissimus, duodecim sequentibus latro, decem novissimis pupillus ob profusiones immodicas nominatus. Epitome, 41.16*

²⁵ *Et quod de Romulo aegre creditum est, omnes pari sensu praesumpserunt Marcum caelo receptum esse. And because of what is credited about Romulus sickness, all took for granted that Marcus had been received into heaven." Epitome, 16.14*

²⁶ *Credo divinitus attributum ut, dum mundi lex seu natura aliudue quid hominibus incognitum gignit, rectorum consiliis tamquam medicinae remediis leniantur. Epitome, 16.4*

The thesis consists of seven chapters and five appendices. Chapter I examines the history of the text during late antiquity and the Carolingian era. Chapter II studies the history of the *Epitome* from the Post-Carolingian period to the end of the Middle Ages. Chapter III profiles the text during the modern era explaining the evolution of scholarship and discussing the text's continued popularity in modern literature. Chapter IV places the *Epitome* within the historical genre and fourth-century Latin historiography. Chapter V explores the complex questions surrounding the reconstruction of the *Epitome*'s sources. The last two chapters discuss the epitomator's religious, political, and social ideas. The thesis ends with a series of five appendixes: a list of the *Epitome*'s readers during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance; The *Victoris Epitoma* and the Establishment of the *Epitome* Text; a list of passages on the context of self-control; Andreas Schott and the *Epitome*; and The *Epitome* during the Modern Era.

Chapter I: The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its Readers during the Early Middle Ages

The *Epitome de Caesaribus* is one of four Latin historical epitomes that have survived the difficult conditions of textual transmission during the Middle Ages. The readers and the manuscripts of the anonymous *Epitome de Caesaribus*, its modern title, or *Libellus De Vita et moribus imperatorum breviatus ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris ab Augusto Caesare ad Theodosium*, as it is called in medieval manuscripts, present an interesting medieval and Renaissance era textual history.

This chapter will briefly examine authors who consulted the *Epitome de Caesaribus* during Late Antiquity and the Carolingian period. Many of the medieval authors, such as Paul the Deacon, who referred to the *Epitome* did so because the text contains a useful summary of Roman history and the interesting philosophical ideas of the anonymous author. Also to be considered is one of the most interesting features of this text's history, the *Epitome's* continued attribution to Aurelius Victor.

The *Epitome* during Late Antiquity

The *Epitome* was apparently little known in late antiquity, and what we do know of its dissemination and readership comes to us through *Quellenforschung* analysis (source criticism).

Quellenforschung is a critical technique used by modern historians to determine the sources of a particular author writing in any period of history. Because the approach depends on large samples and careful analysis to achieve credible results, I incorporate elements from Orosius' *Historia Adversus Paganos* (c. 417), Jordanes' *Romana* (c. 552), and the anonymous author of the *De Terminatione Provinciarum Italiae* (c. 620) for discussion here. I also draw upon arguments taken from the works of Salvatore D'Elia (1968), Jean-Pierre Callu (1985), and Michel Festy (1999).¹

Any discussion on the dissemination of an ancient text must begin with two elements: its date and place of composition. The exact date of composition of the *Epitome* is not known, but modern scholars, such as Callu and Festy, have offered an adequate solution to the problem. The earliest possible time of composition is postulated from the last datable event mentioned in the *Epitome* - the burial of the emperor Theodosius in Constantinople, which is dated November 395 in later histories.²

¹ Other readers such as Rufinus of Aquileia (c. 402) and John Lydus (c. 550) have not been included in this discussion because of a lack of numerous tenable parallels, but for another opinion see P. Michelotto, "A proposito di *Epit. de Caesaribus* 32.1 cognomento *Colobius*," *Rendiconti di Istituto Lombardi* 114 (1980): 197-205; Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi*, pp. 21-25; Barry Baldwin, "John Lydus in Latin on Augustus," *Latomus* 55 (1995): 527-528.

² Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 6.1; T.D. Barnes, "The *Epitome* and its Sources," *Classical Quarterly* 71 (1976): 266; Michel Festy, "De l'*Epitome de Caesaribus* à la *Chronique de Marcellin*: l'*Historia Romana* de Symmaque le Jeune," *Historia* 52.2 (2003), 251-255.

The epitomator also gives us the *terminus ante quem* (the latest possible date of composition) as being 408 - by saying that Arcadius (383-408) was still alive.³ Thus, the work could only have been produced between 395 and 408.

Other internal evidence suggests that the *Epitome* was probably composed in Rome since the epitomator mentions the Lateran palace as still standing: Quippe qui [Severus] Lateranum, Cilonem, Anullinum, Bassum ceteros alios ditaret aedibus quoque memoratu dignis, quarum praecipuas videmus, Parthorum quae dicuntur ac Lateranum/ Moreover he gave to Lateranus, Cilo, Anullinus, Bassus, and other supporters seats of residence worth remembering, of which the most important I saw with my own eyes, the villa of the Parthians which is called the palace of the Lateran.⁴ He also discusses many features of the cities surrounding Rome listing specific buildings: the *pontium sanguinarium* at Spoletum and the temple of Fortune near Placentia.⁵ He shows a great deal of interest in Rome's food and water distribution, which he discusses in the biographies of various emperors.⁶ The epitomator also refers to some memorable food riots which had taken place in the past:

³ *Epitome*, 48.19; Festy (1999), pp. liii-lviii.

⁴ *Epitome*, 20.6; Festy (1999), p. xlviii.

⁵ *Epitome*, 31.2. & 35.2.

⁶ *Epitome*, 1.5, 1.29, 4.4, 35.6, 48.17

Nam et in adipiscendo principatu oppressor libertatis est habitus et in gerendo cives sic amavit ut, tridui frumento in horreis quondam viso, statuisset ueneno mori, si e provinciis classes interea non uenirent;/ Augustus appeared a great oppressor of freedom because of his desire for the principate and his passion for ruling his fellow citizens to the extent that one day he had decided to die by poison because of supplies for three days remained in the granaries if in the meantime the provincial fleets did not arrive.⁷

Usque eo autem mitis fuit ut, cum ob inopiae frumentariae suspicionem lapidibus a plebe Romana perstringeretur, maluerit ratione exposita placare quam ulcisci seditionem/ There was so much fear in him that, when he had been thrown rocks by the Roman plebs on the suspicion of shortage of wheat, he preferred to placate them through well-presented reasonings rather than to make promises.⁸

All these elements lead me to think that the epitomator knew Rome well enough to describe as vividly as Ammianus Marcellinus did in two famous digressions in his *Rerum Gestarum Libri* and Symmachus in his Correspondence.⁹ Rome was full of mansions similar to the Lateran palace, and the elites were constantly in fear of food riots because of the unreliability of the food distribution system. The Roman elite divided their time between living in Rome during the winter months and travelling in the neighbouring cities during the summer:

(Titus) Vixit annos quadraginta unum, et in eodem, quo pater, apud Sabinos agro (a villa at Aquae Cutiliae) febris interiit

⁷ Epitome, 1.29

⁸ Epitome, 15.9

⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus, 14.6, 15.7-13, 25.4.23; Symmachus, *Epistulae*, V.32, VI.32; Bertrand Lançon, *La ville de Rome pendant l'antiquité tardive (300-604)* (Paris, 1994), pp. 157-159; Stuart Cristo, *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus. A Political and Social Biography* (Diss. Fordham University, 1974), pp. 19-21 & 29-36.

(early fall of 81)/ Titus (...), died of fever in the countries among the Sabines. *Epitome*, 10.15

Igitur apud Lorios, uilla propria milibus passuum duodecim ab Vrbe, febri paucorum dierum post tres atque uiginti annos imperii (Antoninus Pius) consumptus est (late winter 161)/ However at Lorium, in his own villa, twelve miles from Rome Antoninus Pius died after three feverish days during his twenty-third year of rule. *Epitome*, 15.7

Maxentius imperator in uilla sex milibus ab urbe discreta, itinere Lavicano, (25 October, 306) (...). Maxentius was declared emperor in a villa six miles from Rome on the via Labicana. *Epitome*, 40.2

The last two passages are of interest because in the chapter on Antoninus Pius changes slightly the text of *KG* adding the distance, while he alone of his contemporaries mentions Maxentius' villa. Those details were of importance to the epitomator and perhaps to his audience.

Other facts about the epitomator are open to speculation since no other information, which would have named a patron or made mention of other enlightening personal details discovered about Eutropius or Jerome, is to be found.¹⁰ All we can do is hypothesize about the immediate dissemination of the text based on what we know of other ancient works.

Distribution of the *Epitome* probably began soon after it was composed, since such works were generally given to friends or read to patrons at public lectures. Beyond this the process of dissemination is uncertain, but we know that in antiquity, in

¹⁰Eutropius, *Breviarium Ad Urbe Condita, praefatio libri primi*; Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus, praefatio; Festy, p.xi-xii*.

general, but more particularly in the late fourth century, books were few in number and were not easily circulated - as the letters of Augustine and Jerome demonstrate.¹¹ In 397, Augustine wrote to Jerome, telling him of the reception of the latter's *De Viris Illustribus* (written in 392) stating:

It is not long since, among other things, a certain book of yours came into my hands, the name of which I do not yet know, for the manuscript itself had not the title written, as is customary, on the first page. The brother with whom it was found said that the title is *Epitaphium [De Viris Illustribus]*, - a name which we might believe you to have approved, if we found in the work a notice of the lives or writing of those only who are deceased. Inasmuch, however, as mention is there made of the works of some who are at the time when it was written, or are even now, alive, we wonder why you either gave this title to it, or permitted others to believe that you had done so. The book itself has our complete approval as a useful work.¹²

The manuscript passed through many hands and as a result suffered considerable damage in the process. This letter is dated AD 397, which shows that five years had passed between the time it was completed by Jerome's scribes in Bethlehem to the time it came into Augustine's hands at Hippo in North Africa. Given these problems it is not surprising that the only evidence regarding the *Epitome* that can be gathered comes as result of *Quellenforschung*.

¹¹ Augustine, *Letters*, 40, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 75, 82, 195, 202.

¹² Letter 40.2 - AD 397.

This form of source criticism follows a clear methodological approach, drawing numerous verbal, contextual, and chronological parallels as well as highlighting common errors while attempting to determine the precedence of one of two authors through a comparison of their works.¹³ In the absence of detailed evidence, benchmarks need to be established for such works as the *Epitome*. In cases where parallels are few, one should examine whether the said parallels are contained within a narrow chronological time frame (i.e. the reign of Theodosius), and then determine whether or not the later author used similar language to describe the same facts. If this is so, the later author chronologically speaking is using one source for these phrases. But this realisation does not prove that the later author is using the work of the earlier author. To prove direct derivation, one needs to see if these parallels find no echo beside the two authors studied in these parallels in an earlier author, a common source -known or lost, through careful comparison or if no intermediary author between the two authors studied can be discovered through the mention in the later author

¹³ R.W. Burgess, "Jerome's *Chronici Canones*, *Quellenfors-chung*, and Fourth-Century Historiography," in Giorgio Bonamente, François Heim, and Jean-Pierre Callu, *Historia Augusta Colloquium Argentoratense, H.A.C. nova Series*, VI (Bari, 1998), pp. 84-87; David S. Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian* (London and New York, 1999), pp. 90-95.

of details fitting an intermediary period. It is only once these steps have been taken that one can defend a case of direct derivation.

Through *Quellenforschung*, it would seem that Orosius is the earliest author whose work can be considered in relation to the *Epitome*. Drawing on six parallels, Michel Festy puts forth the view that in 417, Orosius was already familiar with the *Epitome*.¹⁴ On the basis of these parallels, one could argue as does Festy that Orosius may have known the *Epitome*.¹⁵ Festy begins his discussion by saying that both Orosius and the epitomator compare Theodosius' virtues favourably with those of Trajan.¹⁶ Drepanius Pacatus Latinus (388) and Quintus Aurelius Eusebius Symmachus (391), in their panegyrics, offer the same comparison.¹⁷ Likely Festy means by this that both the epitomator and Orosius were working in the same cultural environment.

¹⁴ Festy, pp. lxix-lxx.

¹⁵ I have looked for other possible sources for Orosius, such as the *Descriptio Consulium* (c. 390), and found only four factual parallels. There may be two more parallels about the deaths of Maximus and Eugenius, but these are not close. See *D.C.* 379.3 = *Ep.* 48.5, *Oros.* 7.34.5; 384.1 = *Ep.* 48.5, *Oros.* 7.34.8; 388.2 = *Ep.* 48.6; 388.3 = *Ep.* 48.6, *Oros.* 7.35.10; 392.2 = *Ep.* 48.7, *Oros.* 7.35.10; 395.2 = *Ep.* 48.19, *Oros.* 7.35.23. The linguistic similarities, however, point to a possible use of the *Epitome* by Orosius.

¹⁶ *Epitome*, 48.8-10 = Orosius, VII.34.2

¹⁷ Symmachus, *Oratio*, 9.1; Pacatus, *Laus Theodosii*, (Pan. Lat.),

The next three of Festy's six parallels deal with chronology, and only show that Orosius and the epitomator saw these facts as essential to their narratives on Theodosius' reign:

Theodosius, genitus patre Honorio, matre Thermantia, genere Hispanus, originem a Traiano principe trahens, a Gratiano Augusto apud Sirmium imperator effectus regnavit annos decem et septem, *Epitome*, 48.1 = (...) qua quondam legerat Nerua Hispanum uirum Traianum, per quem respublica reparata est, legit et ipse Theodosium aequae Hispanum uirum (...) praefecit imperio (...). Orosius, 7.34.2

Nam Hunnos et Gothos, qui eam sub Valente defatigassent, diversis proeliis vicit. *Epitome*, 48.5 = (...) hoc est Alanos Hunos et Gothos, incuntanter adgressus magnis multisque proeliis uicit. Orosius, 7.34.5

(...) cum Persis quoque petitus pacem pepigit. *Epitome*, 48.5 = In isdem etiam diebus Persae (...) ultro Constantinoplim ad Theodosium misere legatos pacemque supplices poposcerunt; ictumque tunc foedus est, quo uniuersus Oriens usque ad nunc tranquillissime fruitur. Orosius, 7.34.8

These parallels deal with elements of Theodosius' reign (assumption of power and foreign policy successes), and bare little similarity in vocabulary - proeliis vicit. His fifth and sixth parallels, however, present those criteria essential to *Quellenforschung*, in that both texts show some degree of linguistic similarity. The fifth parallel establishes that both Orosius and the epitomator described Theodosius as *propagator*.¹⁸ The sixth shows that both writers use similar words to describe

XII (2).6.3.

¹⁸ *Epitome*, 48.5: Fuit autem Theodosius propagator reipublicae atque defensor eximius = Orosius, VII.34.2-3 : (...)propagator

the state of the Roman empire after the death of Theodosius.¹⁹ Both literary parallels offer promising results, but the strongest factor contributing to the plausibility of this hypothesis is that the word *propagator* associated with Theodosius appears only thrice in Late Latin literature during the emperor's lifetime: these two passages and in only one inscription from Africa.²⁰ These parallels do not necessarily prove that Orosius had read the *Epitome*, but they may indicate a certain degree of influence, albeit indirect.

Jordanes (c. 550) is the next author from whom scholars using *Quellenforschung* can gather evidence about the dissemination of the *Epitome*. An enigmatic writer living in Constantinople during the reign of Justinian, Jordanes provides us with a useful selection of material derived from the *Epitome* during late antiquity in his *Romana* – a text written in the manner of Eutropius, which outlined Roman history from the creation of the world to AD 550.²¹ It is worth noting that there are six parallel passages between the *Epitome* and the *Romana*.

Ecclesiae.

¹⁹ *Epitome*, 48.19: sicque in pace rebus humanis, annum agens quiquagesimum, apud Mediolanum excessit utramque rem publicam utrisque filiis, id est Arcadio et Honorio, quietam reliquens = Orosius, VII.35.23: Theodosius autem composita tranquillataque re republica apud Mediolanium diem obiit)

²⁰ *AE* 1968, 602; see *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1970), & *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol. X. Fasc. XIII (Munich/Leipzig, 2002), pp. 1940–1941.

²¹ Jordanes (c. 552), *H.R.* (*De Summa Temporum vel Origine Actibusque Gentis Romanorum*. ed. Theodore Mommsen, *M.G.H.*, A.A., 5 (Berlin, 1882), J. *Romana*, 314 = *Epit.* 46.2; J. 315 =

While scholars including Salvatore D'Elia have defended the view that Jordanes had direct knowledge of the *Epitome*, there have been few systematic studies specifically addressing Jordanes' knowledge of fourth-century authors.²² Jean-Pierre Callu is an exception. In one of his essays Callu includes a long passage on the relationship between Jordanes and the *Epitome*, and discusses the earliest dissemination of the *Historia Augusta* (c. 399).²³ Basing his argument on the earlier work of Wilhelm Ensslin concerning Jordanes' sources, Callu concluded, perhaps incorrectly, that Jordanes is based on intermediary sources such as the *Histories* of Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus (c. 500).²⁴ More recently, Festy has commented that much of the support for the theory that the *Epitome* was known directly in sixth-century Constantinople relies on the strength of Lydus' (c. 550) acquaintance with this text.²⁵ While Festy and Callu see the weakness of this earlier interpretation, I am open to a greater literary knowledge by Latin writers in sixth-century Constantinople.

After briefly examining and dismissing D'Elia's view, Festy and Callu concluded that there was an intermediary between

Epit. 48.1; J. 315 = *Epit.* 48.5; J. 316 = *Epit.* 48.6; J. 317-318 = *Epit.* 48.6-7; J. 318 : = *Epit.* 48.19; Jordanes, *Getica* 138 = *Epit.* 46.2.

²² D'Elia, *Studi*, p. 22

²³ J.-P. Callu, "La première diffusion de l'*Histoire Auguste*," *B.H.A.C.* 1982/1983 (Bonn, 1985), pp. 89-129.

²⁴ Callu, pp. 104-106.

²⁵ Festy, pp. lxxi-lxxii.

Jordanes and the epitomator, naming Symmachus. Symmachus was an important Roman aristocrat living in Italy during the reign of the Ostrogothic king, Theodoric, and had served the latter until he was executed for his pro-Byzantine leanings. According to Ensslin, Symmachus wrote a historical work called the *Histories*, which is known only through lengthy quotations in Jordanes' *Getica*.²⁶ Since this is not the place for a detailed discussion of *Quellenforschung*, I will summarize my own views on this particular point.²⁷ I believe that Jordanes used Symmachus' *Histories*, but that it was not his major source, probably a few facts here and there such as the parents of Maximinus Thrax. This is the view held by Theodore Mommsen, James O'Donnell, and Brian Croke who credit Jordanes with more literary creativity in the process of combining his sources during the composition of his *Romana*.²⁸

The passages which Jordanes took from the *Epitome* are quoted verbatim with only occasional additions taken from other sources. These are mostly short excerpts, with the exception of two rather lengthy passages dealing with the battle of Adrianople and with Theodosius' foreign policy:

²⁶W. Ensslin, *Des Symmachus Historia Romana als Quelle für Jordanes*, Sitz. Ber. D. Bayer. Ak. des Wiss., Phil., Hist., Kl. (Munich, 1948).

²⁷ See Chapter 5.

²⁸ Jordanes, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 6, ed. Theodore Mommsen (Berlin, 1882), iii-iv; J.J. O'Donnell, "The Aims of Jordanes," *Historia* 31 (1982): 233-240; Brian Croke, "A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning

J. *Romana*, 314: ... ibique lacrimabili bello commisso
imperator sagitta saucius in casa deportatur vilissima,
ubi supervenientibus Gothis igneque supposito incendio
concrematus est = *Epit.* 46.2 : Hic Valens cum Gothis
lacrimabili bello commisso sagittis saucius in casa
deportatur vilissima ubi, supervenientibus Gothis
ignique supposito, incendio concrematus est.

J. 315-316: ... nam Hunnos et Gothos qui eam sub Valente
defetigassent, diversis proeliis vicit (...), cum Persis
quoque petitus pacem pepigit = *Epit.* 48.5 : Nam Hunnos
et Gothos, qui eam sub Valente defetigassent, diversis
proeliis vicit; cum Persis quoque petitus pacem
pepigit.

The parallels are exact, and the text shows little modification.

In the first passage, Jordanes combines Jerome's text (249c) by
using *sagitta saucius* with that found in the *Epitome* by using
villissima casa. It is interesting to note, as Mommsen did in
his edition, that Jordanes typically used one source with
additions from other sources for each section of the *Romana*.²⁹

The *Romana* has six sections: biblical history; non-Roman history;
Roman republican history; imperial history; early Byzantine
history; and the history of the early barbarian kingdoms. For
example in his narrative of the emperors from Augustus to Valens,
Jordanes used Jerome with additions from other authors. His
accounts of Theodosius and Honorius are basically Orosius' text
with additions from the *Epitome* and other authors.

Point," *Chiron* 13 (1983): 90-103.

²⁹ Jordanes, *Monumenta Germaniarum historiarum, Auctores
Antiquissimi*, vol. 6, ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin, 1882), pp. iii-iv.

While, from a *Quellenforschung* perspective, all of the six parallels between Jordanes' *Romana* and the *Epitome* merit a look, here I have only examined two in detail because influence is unmistakable. Towards the end of this passage, Jordanes uses a combination of sources when writing about Theodosius' role as defender of the Empire:

Fuit autem Theodosius propagator reipublicae atque defensor eximius. [Theodosius was a promoter and very great defender of the Roman state]. *Epitome*, 48.5

Admodum religiosus et catholicae ecclesiae propagator omnibusque Orientalibus principibus praeponendus, nisi quod Marcianum tertium post se principem imitatore habuerit. [He was also by far the most pious promoter of the Catholic Church of all the emperors of the East if one does not include Marcian, the third emperor to have reigned after him]. Marcellinus, *Chronicle*, year 379 (*Chronica Minora*, vol. 2, p. 60).

(...) admodumque religiosus ecclesiae enituit propagator reipublicaeque defensor eximius, (...). [He exerted himself by far as a pious promoter of the Church and as a very great defender of the Roman state]. Jordanes, *Romana*, 315

The epitomator sees the emperor Theodosius as *propagator reipublicae* (defender of the empire), while Jordanes and Marcellinus present Theodosius as *propagator ecclesiae* (defender of the Church) following Orosius' *Historia Adversus Paganos* (VII.34.2-3). Clearly, Jordanes is using Marcellinus' *Chronicle* as his main source, but he departs from it, adding the words *defensor reipublicae*, perhaps reminiscent of the epitomator. I would offer the view that such fusion occurs because Jordanes

wanted to show two sides of the emperor Theodosius' character - his piety and his patriotism. Thus, by modifying Marcellinus' text in this manner, Jordanes is quite possibly using another source, which may be the *Epitome*.

An anonymous treatise called the *De terminatione provinciarum Italiae* from the early seventh century, contains three parallels with the *Epitome*.³⁰ The text of the *De Terminatione* is very short, about six pages of Latin text. Amadeo Crivelluci postulated a date for the work as being around AD 680. I think it is earlier - probably the 620's.³¹ The date of composition is reconstructed in the following manner. The latest possible date is given by the fact Paul the Deacon used the *De Terminatione* as a source. Theodore Mommsen wrote an article on the sources of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*.³² Although he writes before the discovery of the *De Terminatione*, he points out that Paul's catalogue of the provinces of Italy contained parallels with a short geographical work located at Bamberg (*Bambergensis* III.14 - a eleventh-

³⁰*De terminatione provinciarum Italiae*, in *Iteneraria et Geographica*, C.C. 175, ed. F. Glorie (Turnhout, 1965), pp. 352-3.

³¹ See Amadeo Crivelluci, „Un opera *De Terminatione Provinciarum Italiae* del secolo VII?" *Studi Storici*, XV (1906): 115-122.

³² Theodore Mommsen, «Die Quellen der Langobardorumgeschichte des Paulus Diaconus,» in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 6, ed. Otto

century copy of mid-tenth-century Napolitan manuscript), whose main sources had been Jordanes' *Getica*, Festus' *Breviarium*, and Isidore's *Etymologiae*. Two-thirds of this anonymous Bamberg Chronographer's description of Italy parallels the text of the *De Terminatione* nearly word for word.

De Terminatione, 2 (...) = Paul, *H.L.*, 2.14-15: Venetie Histrie connectitur et utresque pro una prouincia habentur Enecii grece 'laudabiles', sed latini moris et V litteram addere; Huius Venetie caput Aquilea est, pro qua, nunc Foroiulium dictum eo quod Cesar illic negociationis forum statuerit;

Bambergensis III.14 fol. 2.21: *Eneti licet apud Latinos una littera addatur, Graece laudabiles dicuntur.* (...) Forum Iulii dictum, quod Iulius Caesar negotionis forum ibi statuerat.

The wording is the same, and if one compares their description of Sicily, Corsica, and the etymology of the name Italy, one gets about twelve verbatim parallels. In places the Chronographer has more information, and in other less. It is a strong indication that both Paul and the anonymous Chronographer's work located at Bamberg are using a common source, probably the *De Terminatione*. The *De Terminatione* has also parallels with two other works, the *Descriptio orbis triparti ex Orosii Historiarum adv. Pag. lib. 1.2* (c. 700) and the *Descriptio provincie Italie* (c. 1200).³³ The *De terminatione*, itself, has basically seven sources: Donatus' *Expositio in Aeneidos*, catalogues of the provinces of Italy,

Seeck (Berlin/Dublin/Zurick, 1965), pp. 485-539.

³³ See Grolier, p. 348.

Festus' Breviarium, Jordanes' *Getica*, St. Paul's letters to Galatians, Isidore's *Etymologiae*, and the *Epitome de Caesaribus*. Knowledge of Isidore points to a date for the *De Terminatione* after 615, the time of composition of the *Etymologiae*. There are many elements taken from *Quellenforschung* and philology which points to a date prior to the beginning of the eight century and after 615 - giving the latest possible and earliest possible dates of composition.

There are, however, historical indications in the text which have been little exploited, and these may indicate a more probable date. Jonas, the biographer of Bertulf, third abbot of Bobbio, and of Columbanus, the founder, writes that Columbanus received the land for his monastery in 615 from the Lombard king, but that the last stage of the building construction and the Papal decree occurred in AD 628.³⁴ The anonymous author of the *De Terminatione* mentions no cities or monasteries for the Cottian Alps. Since the anonymous author, who was a Christian, ignored the founding of the monastery, it is probable that he was writing prior to AD 628 when the monastery was merely a series of unfinished buildings with no

³⁴ Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, 61; *Vita Bertulfi*, in *M.G.H., Scr. Rerum Meroving.*, vol. III, ed. B. Kusch (Hannover, 1896), 505-515, p. 512

reputation.³⁵ Most importantly, the anonymous author refuses to discuss the Lombards, and holds Ravenna (*nobilissima*) and Rome (*caput mundi*) in great respect.³⁶ These are indications of a time when some Romans still thought that the Lombards could be defeated. Most importantly the anonymous author mentions Ticenum instead of Pavia, the modern name, which appears in Paul's Catalogue.³⁷ These impressions put the earliest possible date of composition at the early 620's.

This short text is very important, since it is the first work to give to Aurelius Victor the paternity of the *Epitome*. In one of the parallel, the anonymous author of the *De Terminatione Provinciarum Italiae* names Aurelius Victor as the source of a passage dealing with Cottian Alps:

Sunt qui Alpes Cottias et Appenninas unam dicunt esse provinciam; sed hos Victoris revincit hystoria, quae Alpes Cottias per se provinciam appellat/ There are some who say that Cottian Alps and the Appennines mountains are one province, but Aurelius Victor's *History* rebut this saying that the Cottian Alps are a province by themselves.³⁸

This *Historia* was probably the *Epitome* because it contains the same false etymology about the name of Adriatic sea:

Hec usque ad flumen Piscariam protenditur; in qua sunt civitates Firmus, Asculus et Pinnius et iam vetustate corrupta Adria, quae Adriatico pelago nomen dedit. / These continue until the

³⁵ A. Crivelluci, *De Terminatione* (1906): 117.

³⁶ A. Crevelluci, *Studi Storici* (1906): 118

³⁷ A. Crivelluci, *Studi Storici* (1906): 117

³⁸ *De Terminatione Proviciarum Italiae*, IX

Piscaria river, in which there are the cities: Firmus, Asculus, Pinnius, and an already ancient, but destroyed Adria, that gave its name to the Adriatic sea. *De Terminatione provinciarum Italiae*, XII

Adriae orto genitus, quod oppidum agri Piceni etiam mari Adriatico nomen dedit./ Hadrian's cognomen arises through his gens being born in Adria, a city in the country of Picenum, which gave its name also to the Adriatic sea. *Epitome*, 14.1

The error probably proves that this anonymus writer is reading the *Epitome* and not Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* since the *Caesares* does not contain this etymology. The third quotation deals with the etymology about the name of the Cottian Alps: *Quinta vero provincia Alpes Cottiae dicuntur, quae sic a Cottio rege, qui Neronis tempore fuit, appellatae sunt. / Terminatione, V = itemque Cottias Alpes Cottio rege mortuo.* *Epitome*, 5.4. These mountains derive their name from the Roman cognomen of a Gallic family who ruled a part of the Alps peopled by Ligurian tribes from the late fifties B.C. to AD 60.³⁹ This reference may indicate that the *Epitome* was known in Italy during the 620's.

Most of the parallels taken from those authors of late antiquity are probably direct references to the *Epitome*, and offer hints about the dissemination of the *Epitome*'s manuscripts. There is, thus, evidence indicating that, in late antiquity, the *Epitome* may have been known in Italy and in Africa, and known for certain in Constantinople.

³⁹Caesar, Cassius Dio, 60.24.4, 63.1.2-5.4; Strabo, V.1.11

The *Epitome* during the Carolingian Period

During the Carolingian period, the *Epitome* became more widely known. Scholars such as Salvatore D'Elia have found evidence of it in the works of Paul the Deacon (c. 782), Freculph (c. 820), Christian of Stavelot (c. 850), and Sedulius Scottus (c. 850).⁴⁰ Dissemination of the text throughout the Carolingian Empire over a relatively short period of time indicates that there was extensive copying and that the work had a large readership among the educated elites. Close examination of the *Epitome* tradition also reveals interesting aspects of its history with respect to authorship and to Carolingian appreciation of the text.

Paul the Deacon (c. 782) was a prolific poet and historian working in Milan and Monte Cassino who used the *Epitome* for his *Historia Romana*, which comprised fifteen books, and the *Historia Langobardorum*, which is contained in six.⁴¹ He inserted material from the *Epitome* beginning with the reign of Augustus in the middle of Book 7 until the reign of Honorius in Book 11 of the *Historia Romana*. Paul's method of composition seems to be an

⁴⁰Hincmar (c. 850) and Lupus of Ferriere (c. 850) have not been included in this discussion because of a lack of tenable parallels, but see D'Elia for another view, pp. 42-43.

⁴¹Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, in *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, vol. 51.1, ed. A. Crevelluci (Rome, 1908); *Historia Langobardorum*, in *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, vol. 51.2, ed. A. Crevelluci (Rome, 1900).

enlarged version of Eutropius' *Breviarium* with small additions from other authors, which is reminiscent of Jordanes. The following example will suffice:

Missi ad eum persequendum duo consules Pansa et Hirtius et Octavius annos X et VII natus, patre Octavio senatore genitus, maternum genus ab Aenea per Iuliam, Caesaris nepos, quem ille testamento heredem reliquera et nomen suum ferre iusserat. Paullus, *Historia Romana*, VII.I.1 = Missi ad eum persequendum duo consules, Pansa et Hirtius, et Octavianus, adulescens annos X et VIII natus Eutropius, VII.; Octavianus igitur, patre Octavio senatore genitus, maternum genus ab Aenea per Iuliam familiam sortitus, adoptione vero Gai Caesaris maioris avunculi Gaius Caesar dictus, deinde ob victoriam Augustus cognommatus est. *Epitome*, 1.2

The language is fairly close from the point where Paul the Deacon inserts into his collation of Eutropius' *Breviarium* a passage underlined above from the *Epitome* describing the parents of Octavian. The same is true of the following three passages; they attach themselves to Paul's narrative based on the

Breviarium ab Urbe Condita:

Multi autem reges ex regnis suis venerunt, ut ei obsequerentur, et habitu Romano togati scilicet ad vehiculum vel equum ipsius concurrerunt. Adeo denique turbas bella simultates execratus est, ut nisi iusti de causis numquam genti cuicumque bellum iudixerit iactantisque esse ingenii et levissimi dicebat ardore triumphandi et ob lauream coronam id est folia infructuos in discrimen per incerto eventus certaminum securitatem civium praecipitare neque imperatori bono quicquam minus quam temeritatem congruere, satis celeriter fieri, quicquid commode gereretur, armaque nisi maioris emolumenti spe nequamquam movenda esse, ne compendio tenui iactura gravi petita victoria similis sit hamo aureo piscantibus, cuius abrupti amissique detrimentum nullo capturae lucro pensari potest. Paullus, *Historia Romana*, VII.X.5-8 = Adeo denique turbas, bella, simultates execratus est ut nisi iustis de causis numquam genti cuicumque bellum indixerit. Iactantisque esse ingenii et levissimi dicebat ardore triumphandi et ob lauream coronam, id est folia

infructuosa, in discrimen per incertos eventus certaminum securitatem civium praecipitare; neque imperatori bono quicquam minus quam temeritatem congruere: satis celeriter fieri, quicquid commode gereretur, armaque, nisi maioris emolumenti spe, nequaquam movenda esse, ne compendio tenui, iactura gravi petita victoria similis sit hamo aureo piscantibus, cuius abrupti amissique detrimentum nullo capturae lucro pensari potest. Epitome, I.10-12

Paul repeats the three sayings of Augustus about the use of his army - only fight necessary wars, preferring steady generals over aggressive ones, and comparing an aggressive foreign policy to the use of a golden hook in fishing. From book seven to eleven, this is the manner in which Paul uses the *Epitome*. In book eleven and twelve, Orosius' *Historia Adversus Paganos* is Paul's main source, along with additions from the *Epitome*, Jerome's *Chronicle*, Prosper's *Chronicle*, and Jordanes' *Romana*.⁴²

Paul himself says very little about the use of his sources. For example, he mentions Eutropius by name in the preface to the *Historia Romana*. With respect to the *Epitome*, there is no direct mention of the epitomator, although numerous parallels strongly indicate that Paul had indeed read the *Epitome*.⁴³ This conjecture

⁴²*Eutropii breviarium ab urbe condita cum versionibus graecis et Pauli landolfique, recensuit et adnotavit, M.G., A.A. 2* (Berlin, 1879), xxxv-xlvi; A. Crevelluci, pp. 4-6; Ernesto Sestan, «Qualche aspetti della personalita di Paolo Diacono nella sua *Historia Romana*, in *Italia medievale* (Napoli, 1966), 50-75; Walter Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History: Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Paul the Deacon, and Bede* (Princeton, 1988), pp. 347-370.

⁴³Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, in *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, vol. 51.1, ed. A. Crevelluci (Rome, 1908), IX.30 = E.

is reinforced by an examination of the sources of Paul's *Historia Langobardorum*, which has two quotations from the *Epitome*. The first discusses the Cottian Alps, and the other deals with a false etymology about the Adriatic sea, which occurs only in the *Epitome*. The first quotation is significant because Paul mentions Aurelius Victor by name: *Sunt qui Alpes Cottias et Appenninas unam dicant esse provinciam; sed hos Victoris revincit historia, quae Alpes Cottias per se provinciam appellat.*⁴⁴ This *historia* is probably the *Epitome* since the *Historia Langobardorum* has an etymology for the Adriatic Sea that appears only in the *Epitome*:

Haec usque ad fluvium Piscariam pertendit. In qua sunt civitates Firmus, Asculus et Pinnis et iam vetustate consumpta Adria, quae Adriatico pelago nomen dedit. Paul the Deacon, *H.L.*, 2.19

Adriae orto genitus, quod oppidum agri Piceni etiam mari Adriatico nomen dedit. *Epitome*, 14.1

39.6; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana* (H. Droysen (1879), *MGH.*, A.A., 1): Paul, VII.1 = *Epit.* 1.2; P. VII.10 (p. 103) = *Epit.*, 1.16, 1.20-4; P. VII.11 (p. 104) = *Epit.* 2.2-6; P. IX.3 (p. 126) = *Epit.* 28.1-3; P. IX.4 (p. 126) = *Epit.* 29.3; P. IX.6 (p. 127) = *Epit.* 31.3; P. IX.7 (p. 127) = *Epit.* 32.6; P. IX.11 (p. 128) = *Epit.* 33.3; P. IX.12 (p. 129) = *Epit.* 34.2; P. IX.13 (p. 130) = *Epit.* 35.3-5; P. IX.17 (p. 133) = *Epit.* 37.1; P. IX.28 (p. 164) = *Epit.* 39.6-7; P. X.4 (p. 142) = *Epit.* 40.13; P. X.6 (p. 143) = *Epit.* 41.8-10; P. X.17 (p. 148) = *Epit.* 44.1-3; P. XI.1 = *Epit.* 45.2-3; P. XI.1 = *Epit.* 45.4; P. XI.5 = *Epit.* 45.8, 45.8-9; P. XI.6 = *Epit.* 45.5-6; P. XI.11 = *Epit.* 46.2; P. XI.14 = *Epit.* 47.3; P. XI.16 = *Epit.* 47.6-7; P. XI.17 = *Epit.* 47.4-5; P. XII.1 = *Epit.* 48.1; P. XII.5 = *Epit.* 48.2-5, 48.8-19; P. XII.8 = *Epit.* 48.19

⁴⁴Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 2.18 = *itemque Cottias Alpes Cottio rege mortuo. Epitome*, 5.4.

The etymology was that the city of Adria gave its name to the sea, which is false, but repeated by both authors. Michel Festy was unsure if Paul the Deacon did not repeat the information found in the *Epitome* or simply found it in the *De Terminatione Provinciarum Italiae* because their versions are an exact match.⁴⁵

Another author to have read the *Epitome* was Freculph of Lisieux (c. 830) who composed the *Chronicorum Tomi Duo*, a two-volume history of the world from the time of Creation to AD 829.⁴⁶ He made sporadic use of the *Epitome* in the second tome to supplement his narrative about the Roman emperors from Augustus to Theodosius.⁴⁷ He even added these passages in places for stylistic reasons:

⁴⁵Michel Festy, p. lvi.

⁴⁶Freculph of Lisieux, *Chronicorum Tomi Duo*, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne, vol. 106 (Paris, 1848), foll. 915-1258; *Frechulfi Lexoviensis Episcopi Opera Omnia, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievalis*, CLXIX A, ed. Michael I. Allen (Turnhout, 2002), 17-724.

⁴⁷Freculph of Lisieux (c. 825) (*P.L.* 106, 917-1258): II.1.4 (1119d-1120c) = *Epit.* 1.1, 1.4-13, 1.16-21, 1.23-23, 1.30-31; F. II.1.10 (1125a-b) = *Epit.* 2.3-5; F. II.1.13 (1128 c) = *Epit.* 4.2; F. II.1.21 (1138a) = *Epit.* 6.4; F. II.2.6 (1150d) = *Epit.* 11.2-6; F. II.2.8 (1152c) = *Epit.* 12.4, 12.9-12; F. II.2.8 (1152d) = *Epit.* 13.3-5; F. II.2.12 (1159d-1160a) = *Epit.* 14.1-2; 14.7; F. II.2.13 (1162b) = *Epit.* 15.2-4; F. II.2.23 (1168d) = *Epit.* 18.4-6; F. II.2.24 (1169d) = *Epit.* 20.5-8; F. II.2.25 (1170a) = *Epit.* 21.3-4; F. II.3.1 (1175c-d) = *Epit.* 23.3-7; F. II.3.3 (1177d) = *Epit.* 26.2; F. II.3.11 (1186c-d) = *Epit.* 25.2, 35.4-5, 35.7, 35.8; F. II.3.12 (1187a-b) = *Epit.* 36.1-2, 37.1-2, 37.1, 37.3-4; F. II.3.14 (1188d; 1190a-b) = *Epit.* 39.1, 39.5-7; F. II.3.15 (1191b-d) = *Epit.* 40.1-10; F. II.3.21 (1202c-d) = *Epit.* 41.13-15; F. II.4.1 (1203b-c) = *Epit.* 41.19-22; F. II.4.6 (1207a) = *Epit.* 42.4; F. II.4.28 (1227d) = *Epit.* 48.19-20.

Is tamen tantae eruditionis imperator nec caruit uitiis, qui in amore puerorum continens minime fuit. Freculph, C.T.D, II.2.13 (1160b)

Nec tamen vir tantus vitiis caruit. Fuit enim paululum impatiens, leniter iracundus, occulte invidus, palam factiosus; *Epitome*, 1.21

Freculph borrowed one short phrase - *nec tamen vitiis caruit*- about the biography of Augustus from the *Epitome* to add it to his own on Hadrian. For his biographies, he used a combination of many sources in covering the imperial period: an unknown work, Hegesippus' *Joseph Bellum Iudeorum*, the *Epitome*, Eutropius' *Breviarium*, Jerome's *Chronici Canones*, Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus*, Rufinus' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and Orosius' *Historia Adversus Paganos*.⁴⁸

There are approximately twenty identifiable parallels which can be drawn between the *Epitome* and the *Chronicorum Tomi Duo*. Unlike Paul the Deacon, Freculph used the *Epitome* in all his biographies from Augustus to Theodosius. For example, Freculph combines elements from Orosius and the epitomator to end his biography of Galba:

Cumque auaritia, saeuitia, segnitiaque offenderet, Pisonem sibi nobilem idustriumque adolsecntem in filium atque in regnum adoptauit. Hic ante sumptam dominationem multas prouincias egregie administrauit, militem seuerissime tractans, ita ut ingresso eo castra uulgaretur statime: 'Disce militare, miles: Galba adest.' Freculph, C.T.D. II.1.21, 1138a = Hic ante sumptam dominationem multas prouincias egregie administrauit, militem seuerissime tractans, ita ut ingresso eo castra uulgaretur

⁴⁸ Max Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe Ad 500-900* (London, 1957), 265-267; Chester F. Natunczwiez, "Freculphus of Lisieux, his Chronicle and a Mont St.-Michel manuscript," *Sacris Eruditi* 17.1 (1966): 90-134.

statim: 'Disce militare, miles: Galba est, non Gaetulicus.
Epitome, 6.1-4.

The similarities are exact, and show only occasional abridgment. Elsewhere, Freculph's *History* contains striking similarities with continental manuscripts of the *Epitome* (e.g. the transliteration of numerous Greek words found in the *Epitome* into Latin).⁴⁹ Common errors (e.g. Mons Bebius instead of Mons Uesubius) found in some manuscripts of the *Epitome* (Bern. 120 & Leid. Voss. Lat. F 96) also appear in Freculph's *Chronicorum Tomi Duo*.⁵⁰

Freculph was, moreover, a "professional" historian who did not merely echo the information he obtained from the *Epitome*, but reshaped it to fit a Christian framework.⁵¹ An examination of the

⁴⁹E.g. *Epitome*, 11.7 in Guelf. 4388, Paris Lat. 6232, Guelf. 4435, & Vat. Lat. 3342; see Festy, p. lxxv & 17.

⁵⁰Huius tempore mons Bebius in Campania ardere coepit, ex cuius uertice tantum erupit incendium ut regions uicinas et urbes cum hominibus exuret. Freculph, *Chronicorum Tomi Duo*, II.2.3 [= P.L. 106, 1146b] = Huius tempore mons Vesubius in Campania ardere coepit, incendiumque Romae sine nocturna requie per triduum fuit. *Epitome*, 10.12; see Allen, p. 499.

⁵¹Freculph preferred to focus on Nerva's positive traits, emphasising his goodness and generosity, thereby portraying a good emperor who put an end to the second wave of persecution against the Christians. In contrast, the epitomator used the following sequence: a narrative discussing the length of Nerva's reign, the manner of his ascension to the throne, his social and fiscal reforms, his trouble with the praetorians, Nerva's adoption of Trajan, and finally the manner of his death and burial. The epitomator plays down Nerva's virtues in order to stress the weakness of his reign. In so doing, the author shows that he does not equate human goodness with competence to rule. These examples of the *Epitome*'s material used by Freculph will suffice to illustrate his use of the *Epitome*. Whereas the epitomator's aim was to emphasize Nerva's role in imperial history, Freculph reinterpreted the same material, and altered it in keeping with his objective, namely, of writing a history of the world from a Christian perspective.

chapter summarizing Nerva's reign (96-98) provides insight into his method of composition and his use of the *Epitome*. This short chapter contains eleven sentences of Latin text combining material from a lost sixth-century Christian work, Jerome's *Chronici Canones*, and the *Epitome*. Freculph's use of the *Epitome* begins with details about the ascension of Nerva and the *damnatio memoriae* of Domitian taken from an unknown source - *Post Domitianum uero Nerva suscepit principatum: sub quo omnes honorum tituli qui in Domitianum collati fuerant detrahuntur* (cf. Suetonius, Domitian, 17.7, 23.2, Aurelius Victor, 11.8). The second line continues with information taken from Jerome, who discusses the recall of those sent into exile by Domitian - *Revocari autem quicumque ab eo in exsilium trusi sunt ac recipere facultates ex senatusconsulto iubentur* (Jerome, 193b). The third sentence is an editorial comment made by Freculph - *De quibus singulis testimonium perhibens qui gesta illorum temporum conscripserunt*. The fourth line, taken from Jerome, mentions the return from exile of the evangelist John - *Tum igitur apostolorum Joannem de insula Ephesum quasi ad scholam propriam redissem, nostrorum scriptores declarent* (Jerome 193b). The remainder of the text appears to be a reproduction of several passages from the *Epitome* with only a change in narrative focus. The sample of extracts below, each from the respective texts, serves to illustrate the point:

Epitome, 12.1-12: Cocceius Nerva, oppido Narniensi genitus, imperavit menses sedecim dies decem. (...)4 Iste quicquid antea poenae nomine tributis accesserat

indulsit; afflictas civitates relevavit; puellas puerosque natos parentibus egestosis sumptu publico per Italiae oppida ali iussit. (...) 9 Hic Traianum in liberi locum inque partem imperii cooptavit; cum quo tribus vixit mensibus. 10 Qui suggerente ira voce quam maxima contra quendam Regulum nomine inclamaret, sudore correptus est. 11 Quo refrigescente horror corporis nimius initia feбри praebuit, nec multo post vitam finivit anno aetatis sexagesimo tertio. 12 Cuius corpus a senatu, ut quondam Augusti, honore delatum in sepulcro Augusti sepultum est. Eo die, quo interiit, solis defectio facta est.

Namque Nerva Trajanum in liberi locum, inque partem imperii cooptavit (Epitome, 12.9). qui dum, suggerente ira, contra quendam Regulum in clamaret, sudore correptus est (E., 12.10). Quo refrigescente, horror corporis nimium iniquum feбри praebuit, nec multo post vitam finivit, anno aetatis sexagesimo tertio (E. 12.11). Cuius corpus a senatu ut quondam Augusti honore delato, in sepulcro Augusti sepultum est. Eo diee quo interiit die solis defectio facta est (E. 12.12). Imperavit annum unum et menses quattuor (E. 12.1). Iste tributa relaxavit multa (abbreviated E. 12.4), adflictas civitates releuavit (E. 12.4). Puellas puerosque natos parentibus egestosis sumptu publico per Italiae oppida ali iussit (E. 12.4). Freculph, *Chronicorum Tomi Duo*, P.L., 106, 1152 b-d.

Freculph mentions the following in passing these elements from the *Epitome*: Nerva's adoption of Trajan, the manner of Nerva's death and burial, the length of his reign, his efforts in bringing about tax relief, and the creation of an *alimenta* for the poor children of Italy.

Christian of Stavelot (c. 850), a monk from the monastery of Corbie (near Liège), composed a commentary on Matthew's gospel in which he used as *exempla* two passages found in the *Epitome*.⁵² The first relates to a comment made by Titus:

⁵² See M.L. Laistner, *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early*

perdidimus hodie diem, qui non magni profecto alicui prestitimus [Today we, who have not given something of worth to anyone, have lost a day] Christian of Stavelot, *Expositio in Mattheum*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 106, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1848), 1323d = *Quadam etiam die, recordans vesperi nihil se illo die cuiquam praestitisse, venerando caelestique dicto: "Amici", ait, "perdidimus diem"; quod erat magnificae liberalitatis. Epitome*, 10.9

Here again, Christian uses the *perdidimus*, found in the *Epitome*, instead of the more usual *perdidi*, which appears in all the accounts from Suetonius to Jerome. This does not indicate with certainty that Christian had read the *Epitome*, but it does lead one to question whether in fact he had read Jerome.

The second example deals with a passage concerning Diocletian's retirement years, which appears only in the *Epitome* and Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana*. This last *exemplum* is far longer, and contains much more information than the *Epitome*'s passage:

After Diocletian had brought peace to the whole world, he voluntarily relinquished his power and gave it neither to a son nor a daughter, nor any relative. He even made Maximianus, his imperial co-regent, whom he himself had associated with himself on account that they had earlier been friends to each other, resign his powers. When acquaintances and friends asked Diocletian why he was doing this when the whole world was at peace, he responded: "when all of our actions are without censure, it is time we must cede our place to another. Nevertheless, if you see our gardens and orchards planted with our own hand, you will never recommend that powers be retained."⁵³

Middle Ages (Harvard, 1957), pp. 216-236.

⁵³ "Diocletianus cum haberet totum Mundum in pace, nullo cogente imperium reliquit, et nec filio aut filiae, sive alicui affini dedit, etiam Maximinianum consortem imperii, quem ipse secum

The first part when describing the abdication of Diocletian, Christian adds that Diocletian has forced his colleague Maximian to resign his imperium. The second part is a more elaborate description of the gardening activities found in the *Epitome* adding the words *pomaria* (orchards) and *hortos* (gardens). For Festy, these additions indicate that Christian of Stavelot knew the *Epitome* only through a secondary source.⁵⁴ This is possible, but these findings are uncertain since we do know that there was a copy of the *Epitome* in Christian's own monastery at Corbie in the twelfth century.⁵⁵ Even if the *Epitome* had not come into the possession of this particular monastic community during Christian's lifetime (c. 850), the text was indeed known in the area of Liège as the readings of Sedulius Scottus (c. 850) will show. Could it be that Christian had read the *Epitome*? I am intrigued, but the only thing that can be said with certainty is that at least Christian indirectly knew the *Epitome*.

Among the readers of the *Epitome* was also Sedulius Scottus (820-874), who is unique in that he examined the work from a

asciverat, eo quo ante amici ad invicem fuerint, dimittere fecit. Et cum rogaretur a cognatis et amicis idem Diocletianus non hoc facere cum omnia in pace esset, respondit: Cum omnia nostra acta sine reprehensione sunt, debemus alteri locum cedere. Attamen si videretis hortos nostros et pomaria nostris manibus conserta, numquam suaderitis ista retinere." Christian of Stavelot, *P.L.* 106, pp. 1323d-1324a = (...) utinam Salonae possetis uisere holera nostris manibus instituta, profecto numquam istud temptandum iudicaretis. *Epitome*, 39.6

⁵⁴ Festy, p. lxiv n. 109.

⁵⁵ D'Elia, *Studi*, 41.

philosophical perspective, using it as a source of *exempla* for his two treatises, the *Collectanea* and the *Liber de rectoribus christianis*.⁵⁶ This last work is a prime example of the literary genre called the 'Mirror of Princes,' which was popular during the Carolingian period.⁵⁷ In it, Sedulius briefly quotes part of Arrius Antoninus' speech to Nerva, which is contained in the *Epitome*:

(...) amici, qui, cum se mereri omnia praesumant, si quicquam non extorserint, atrociores sunt ipsis quoque hostibus. / Friends presume that they merit all things, and if they have not extorted something for themselves, they become more filled with hate. Sedulius Scottus, *De Rectoribus Christianis*, IX = (...) sed famae etiam inimicorum pariter et amicorum, qui, cum se mereri omnia praesumant, si quicquam non extorserint, atrociores sunt ipsis quoque hostibus / but, the infamies of private enemies and friends alike, who would presume to be entitled to everything with him, are also more atrocious than one's worst enemies, if they can extort anything from him. *Epitome*, 12.3"⁵⁸

The wording with little difference is the same. Sedulius used this as an *exemplum* since it was relevant to his discussion on the positive and negative effects of royal beneficence. This

⁵⁶ Sedulius Scottus, *Expositio in Donatum*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 103, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1844-1855); *Liber de rectoribus christianis*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 103, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1846), coll. 291-332.

⁵⁷ Monette Dalley, "Le *Liber de rectoribus christianis* de Sedulius Scottus et les vertus du roi comme moyen d'action politique," in *Les philosophies morales et politiques au moyen-âge, Actes du IXe congrès internationale de philosophie médiéval, Ottawa, du 1 au 22 août 1992*, eds. B. Carlos-Bazàn, Eduardo Andùja et Léonard G. Sbrocchi (New York, Ottawa, Toronto, 1995), pp. 1486-1487; Hérold Pettiau, *Recherches sur Sedulius Scottus et la colonie irlandaise de Liège (840-901)* (Mémoire, Université libre de Bruxelles, 1992-1993).

⁵⁸ See Sedulius Scottus, *On Christian Rulers and Poems*, trans. with intro by Edward G. Doyle, *Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies*, 17 (Binghamton, 1983), p. 67.

quotation introduces the third section of the work, where the relation between the people and a pious king's government is presented. While Sedulius's inclusion of this one passage cannot be said to offer definite proof of his having read the *Epitome*, he did, as will be discussed, make extensive use of the *Epitome* in composing the *Collectanae*.⁵⁹

The *Collectanae* is a compilation of *exempla* divided into moral and practical categories. Sedulius found uses for the *Epitome*'s material on morals in nine of the thirty subjects in Chapter 80 - the *De uerbo* (On Eloquence), *De adolatione* (On False Flattery), *De beneficio* (On Favour), *De amicis et inimicis* (On Friends and Enemies), *De ebrietate* (On Drunkenness), *De temperantia* (On Self-Control), *De postestatibus* (On Powers), *De superbis* (On the proud), and *De fama* (On Fame). The chapter on *De temperantia* present itself as follow:

1. Quod habes, ita utere, ut alieno non egeas.
2. ciborum conupiscentiae animae sunt detrimenta. Quanto enim corporis uenter impletur, tanto magis anima minoratur.
3. omnis salubritas uiscerum temperantia et continentia est ciborum. Nullam enim patitur infirmitatem qui diligit parcitatem.
4. Parcitas ciborum repulsio est peccatorum. Nunquam enim primi homines de paradyso cecidisset, si parcitatem seruare potuisset.

⁵⁹ *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum Miscellaneum*, ed. Dean Simpson, *Corpus Cristianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 67 (Turnholt, 1988): 80.7.14 = Epit. 14.2; 80.7.15 = Epit. 18.4; 80.8.4 = Epit. 41.10; 80.10.3 = Epit. 10.9; 80.12.21 = Epit. 12.3; 80.16.3 = Epit. 16.7; 80.20.4 = Epit. 2.2; 80.21.7 = Epit. 15.5; 80.22.6 = Epit. 1.10-12; 80.22.6 = Epit. 1.14; 80.22.8 = 39.5-6; 80.24.3 = Epit. 21.4; 80.27.8 = Epit. 1.28.

5. optimus est in omnibus modus laudabilisque mensura.
6. In bonis quoque rebus quicquid modum excesserit uitium est.
7. Ex Vita Caesarum : Antoninus Pius, priusquam salutandus prodiret, degustabat panis aliquantum, ne, frigescere circum precordia per ieiunium sanguine, uiribus exessis interciperetur, eoque actui publicorum minime sufficeret. (= *Epitome*, 15.5)
8. Porphyrio in Oratium : Plerumque sterilitas arboribus euenit per nimias aquas, interdum per siccitas. Sic allegorice intemperate bibentibus.

This rather extensive use of the *Epitome* suggests that Sedulius recognized the value of the text's philosophical material, especially since he placed it on equal terms with the works of Horace, Augustine, Seneca, and Publius Syrus.

Unlike many writers of encyclopaedic material, Sedulius quoted his sources by name and recognized the value of writers from various periods, and thereby raised the profile of a minor ancient Latin work in the medieval philosophical curriculum: *Ex Vita Caesarum*: Claudius Tyberius Nero eleganter a iocularibus Claudius Biberius Mero ob uiolentiam nominatus est. Sedulius Scottus, *Collectanae*, 80.20.4 = Iste, quia Claudius Tiberius Nero dicebatur, eleganter a iocularibus Caldius Biberius Mero ob uinolentiam nominatus est. *Epitome*, 2.2. The wording is the same, and there is no mention of Aurelius Victor. Instead the words *Vita Caesarum* appears, it is probably a generic name for biography even if it is used as a title here. It is used in four instances along with a quotation from the *Epitome*⁶⁰.

⁶⁰ Sedulius Scottus, *Collectanae*, 80.10.3, 80.20.4, 80..21.7, & 80.22.6

According to Festy, Sedulius Scottus - one of the few Carolingian writers to know Greek - is important because his version of the *Epitome* supports the reading in four manuscripts of the *Epitome* that the archetype of the text contained Greek words instead of Latin transliterations.⁶¹ In it, Sedulius spells the word *χρηστολογος* (golden voice) in Greek characters, something found only in some of the manuscripts of the *Epitome* and Landolphus Sagax.⁶²

In the ninth century, the librarian of the monastery of St-Riquier (near Amiens) listed the *Epitome* as part of its collection of books, but did not name Aurelius Victor as the author.⁶³ It has been recently noted that Freculph was once a monk at St-Riquier prior to taking up the bishopric of Lisieux, and had dedicated the first tome of *Chronicorum Tomi Duo* to the prior of St-Riquier.⁶⁴ During the same period in Liège, Sedulius Scottus referred to the *Epitome* by the title of *Vita Caesarum*. Taking this information into account, one can surmise that this error, making Aurelius Victor the author of the *Epitome*, probably

⁶¹ For the word *χρηστολογος* in *Medic. Plut.* 66,39, *Paris. Lat.* 6810, *Augustodun. B.M.* 39 (S 42), and *Bern* 120; Landolphus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, 889d; Festy, p. 28.

⁶² "*Helvius Pertinax magis blandus fuit quam beneficus; verbis affabilis, sed re erat illiberalis; unde aetiam Greco nomine χρηστόλογος appellatus est.*" Sedulius Scottus, *Collectanea*, 80.7.15 = "*Blandus magis quam beneficus, unde eum Graeco nomine χρηστόλογον appellauere.*" *Epitome*, 18.4; Festy, p. lxxv.

⁶³ *Ecclesia Centulensis sive S. Richarii [S. Riquier, c. 831]*: "*Plinius Secundus de moribus et vita imperatorum*" = G. Becker, *Catalogui Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), p. 28.

⁶⁴ Allen, vol. 1, p. xi.

began earlier since both the author of the *Terminatione* and Paul testified that it had spread far and wide by the eleventh century.

These most important early attestations concerning the *Epitome* date from Carolingian times. The work, of which several copies were in circulation, was listed in two library catalogues, and thus illustrates that its influence was not insignificant among the elites.⁶⁵ This is evidenced from the fact that references to the *Epitome* and quotations from the *Epitome* are to be found in the writings of the above mentioned clergymen, bishops, and monks, among whom were historians, theologians, and philosophers.

Conclusion

During late antiquity, the history of the *Epitome* is difficult to trace, but the text was not unknown in the Roman Empire, both in the East and in the West. The *Epitome* also enjoyed great popularity during the ninth century and was read by numerous influential historians and scholars, including Paul the Deacon (c. 782), Freculph (c. 820), and Sedulius Scottus (c. 850).

⁶⁵Festy, p.lviiii; D'Elia, p. 44.

During this period, Sedulius Scottus and Christian of Stavelot reveal another aspect of the epitomator. Like the panegyrists of the fourth century, the anonymous author echoed the views of the elites regarding the emperors and what would constitute the ideal government. Interestingly, Sedulius, for the most part focuses on the passages of the *Epitome* that pertain to these issues. His emphasis was very different from that of Freculph or Paul the Deacon, for whom the *Epitome* served as a source of facts, dates, interesting literary constructions, and occasional ideas. Sedulius' attitude is not surprising since he himself was a philosopher and a theologian of note.

With respect to the two questions raised in the introduction - on the misattribution of the *Epitome* to Aurelius Victor and on the social profile of its readers, the following may be asserted. Firstly, during late antiquity and the Carolingian period, the *Epitome* was thought to be the work of Aurelius Victor, only by the anonymous author of the *De Termiantione* and Paul the Deacon. It is a surprising finding since this belief will become prevalent in later time among numerous readers of the said work, but also of those who compiled monastic library catalogues up until the sixteenth century, a topic which will be discussed in the following chapter. Secondly, evidence regarding the readership of the *Epitome* suggests that those who first read the work were not students, but established scholars.

Chapter II: The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Its Early Readers
From the Post-Carolingian Period to the
Renaissance

After the demise of the Carolingian Empire, between the tenth and the twelfth centuries librarians in *scriptoria* and readers continued to show interest in the work. During this period, the *Epitome* was known directly by the anonymous recensionist of the *Historia de imperio et gestis Romanorum* (c. 950), Landolphus Sagax (1025), and Helgaud (1025). Although many of the anecdotes found in the *Epitome* occur in the work of numerous important historians and writers of the later Middle Ages, very little is known of the *Epitome's* dissemination outside the manuscript tradition and monastic library catalogues prior to the fifteenth century.

Manuscripts of the *Epitome* from
AD 880 to the twelfth century

The period between the late ninth and twelfth centuries opens the era, in which the largest group of surviving manuscripts were copied:

Guelferbytan. 4388 or *Gudianus Lat.* 84 (IXth century)
Vatican. Lat. 3343 (IXth/Xth century)
Paris. Lat. 6121 (Xth century)
Paris. Lat. 6810 (Xth century)
Guelferbytan. 4435 or *Gudianus Lat.* 131 (XIth century)
Leid. Voss. Lat. F. 96 (XIth century)
Augustodun. BM. 39 (S. 42) (XIth century)
Bern. 120 (XIth century)
Leid. Voss. Q 56 (XIIth century)
Medic. plut. 66,39 (XIIth century)

This list makes a total of ten manuscripts. The *Guelferbytanus* 4388, the oldest, is of unknown origin, but no precise location is

known until the sale of the library, where it was housed, by the heirs of the French jurist, Claude Sarravin, at Paris in 1650.¹ The *Vaticanus Latinus* 3343 is probably of French origin.² Through *ex-libris*, it is known that the *Paris. Lat.* 6810 (St-Laumer in the city of Blois during the XIIIth century) and *Leid. Voss. Lat. F* 96 (Fleury) were owned by French monastic communities.³ *Bern.* 120 was the property of the monastery of St. Mesmin, near Orléans.⁴ The others also were probably of French origin.⁵ Only the *Medic. plut.* 66,39 has an Italian origin. Thus, most of these manuscripts appear to have been made in France.

By itself, the manuscript tradition would suggest that much of the interest in the *Epitome* occurred during this period in France. Almost a century ago, Manitius examining nine monastic library catalogues showed this to be only part of the *Epitome* history.⁶ These catalogues were located over a wider area of Europe - Bamberg, Cluny, Corbie, Glastonbury, Marseille, Naunburg, Constanza, Bobbio, Rome, and Urbino, and date in range from 1100

¹ Through autopsy, you find that Sarravin had a ninth-century manuscript of the *Epitome*, which included Vegetius as well. Anne Dacier writes that she wanted to acquire it from the heirs, but could not! The marquis of Guido was the next owner, and he owned many books of Sarravin's library. See Claude Sarravin, Letter, 81, in *Marquandi Gudii ... Epistolae. Quibus accedunt ex bibliotheca gudiana, clarissimorum virorum, qui superiore & nostro saeculo floruerunt et Claudii Saravi ... epistolae ex eadem bibliotheca auctores, curante Petro Burmanno, (Hagae- Comitum, Apud Henricum Scheurleer, 1714), p. 81.*

² Festy, p. lxix.

³ Festy, p. lxix; D'Elia, p. 44

⁴ Festy, p. lxix

⁵ Festy, p. lxix.

⁶ D'Elia, p. 44.

to 1481.⁷ Thus, the *Epitome* was known in France, Germany, Belgium, England, Austria, and Italy. These catalogues show a much a wider distribution of the *Epitome* than what is known through the manuscript tradition. Except for the Italian locations, which probably housed fifteenth-century manuscripts of the *Epitome*, nothing is known of these listings of the *Epitome* in medieval catalogues.

Post-Carolingian readers of the *Epitome*

The first post-Carolingian reader of the *Epitome* is the anonymous recensionist of the *Historia de imperio et gestis Romanorum secundum Eutropium*.⁸ This document, written in medieval Latin, survives in two manuscripts - Bambergensis H.E. III.14 or Hist. 3 (XIth century) and Oxoniensis Magd. Lat. 14 (XIVth century). The original text was written near Naples in c. 951-969, and was bestowed on monk from Corvey after the emperor Henry III (1046-1056) brought it back from Italy as part of his spoils.⁹ In turn this original was copied at Bamberg. The work has recently been edited in an appendix to Michel Festy's edition of the *Epitome*.¹⁰ This *Historia* is one of three works used by Michel Festy in addition to the manuscripts to reconstruct the original,

⁷ D'Elia, p. 44, Catalogue of the Vatican library, which made in honor of Pope Paul III.

⁸ *Chronica Minora*, ed. Theodore Mommsen, M.G.H., A.A., 9.1 (Berlin, 1882), p. 525.

⁹ Elia, pp. 36-37.

¹⁰ Festy (1999), pp. 241-278

and offers a straight forward rendition of the *Epitome* incorporating all the imperial lives until that of the emperor Gratian.

The next known reader is Landolfus Sagax (976/1023), a monk from Monte Cassino in Italy, who bequeathed to us anonymous borrowings of the *Epitome* in the so-called *Historia Miscella*. This name of *Historia Miscella* was first given to the work in 1569 by the French humanist Pierre Pithou.¹¹ Very little is known about the author beyond the *incipit* of the work. Landolfus dedicated his work to a young Lombard lord living in Benevento, a younger child of the duke.¹² The original was taken by Henry III in 1045/1046 during his campaigns in Rome and Southern Italy, and given to a monk from Corbey upon his return. Copies were made of this copy in Bamberg and in Italy, which are the two oldest surviving manuscripts of the *Historia Miscella*.¹³

Landolfus' *Historia Miscella* is essentially an amplification of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana* extended to 976 with elements from various sources added including the *Epitome*. There are roughly twenty direct parallels between the *Epitome* and the *Historia Miscella* taken from the lives of the emperor Caligula to Carinus.¹⁴ There are about ten other parallels between the two

¹¹ *Historia Miscella curante Pithoei Petro* (Pictaviis, 1569).

¹² Festy, p. lxxv

¹³ Vaticanus Pal. 909, Bamberg. H.E. III 13; see Festy, p. lxvi.

¹⁴ Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, in *Fonti Per la Storia Italia*, 51-52 (Rome, 1908), -861b = *Epit.* 1.10-12, 1.14, 1.3,

works due to Landolfus' use of Paul's *Historia Romana* for the lives of Augustus, Tiberius, and the emperors from Diocletian to Theodosius.¹⁵ Landolfus is important for the textual history of

1.15-25, 1.29-30; 862b-c = *Epit.* 1.26-28; 863c = *Epit.* 2.8; 864b = *Epit.* 2.9, 2.1; 862d = *Epit.* 1.31865a-b = *Epit.* 3.2-3; 865b-866a = 3.4-5, 3.6-7, 3.8-9; 865c = *Epit.* 4.1; 865d-866a = *Epit.* 4.2-4; 867b-c = *Epit.* 4.5-8; 867d = 4.9; 868a = *Epit.* 4.10-12; 868a-b = *Epit.* 5.1-2; 868c = *Epit.* 5.5; 868d = *Epit.* 5.5; 869a = *Epit.* 5.6; 869a = *Epit.* 5.7; 869b = *Epit.* 5.7; 870a = *Epit.* 6.2; 870a = *Epit.* 6.3; 870b = *Epit.* 7.1; 870c = *Epit.* 7.2; 870c = *Epit.* 8.2; 872a = *Epit.* 8.3-4; 874a-b = *Epit.* 9.2-4; 874b-c = *Epit.* 9.5-12; 874c = *Epit.* 9.13; 874d-875a = *Epit.* 9.14-16; 875a = *Epit.* 9.18, 9.19; 875b-d = *Epit.* 10.2-8; 876a-b = *Epit.* 10.10-11, 876c = 10.12-13, 10.14; 876d = 10.16; 877a-c = *Epit.* 11.6-8; 877c, 878a = *Epit.* 11.9-10, 11.3; 878a = *Epit.* 11.4; 878b-c = *Epit.* 11.11-15; 878d = *Epit.* 12.1; 879a-b = *Epit.* 12.2-4; 879b-d = *Epit.* 12.5-8; 879d-880a = *Epit.* 12.9-11; 880a = *Epit.* 12.12; 880a = *Epit.* 13.1; 880b = 13.3; 880b = *Epit.* 13.3-4; 881a-b = *Epit.* 13.6-10; 882b = *Epit.* 13.11-14; 882c = *Epit.* 14.1; 883c-884b = *Epit.* 14.2-12; 884c = *Epit.* 15.2; 884d-885a = *Epit.* 12.3-6; 886a = *Epit.* 15.7; 886b = *Epit.* 15.8-9; 887a = *Epit.* 16.6; 887b-c = *Epit.* 16.2-5, 16.8; 888c = *Epit.* 16.11; 888d = *Epit.* 16.13-14; 889a = *Epit.*, 17.1; 889a = *Epit.* 17.2; 889b-c = *Epit.* 17.5-6; 889c = *Epit.* 18.1; 889c-890a = *Epit.* 18.3-6; 890a = *Epit.* 19.1; 890a = *Epit.* 19.2; 890c = *Epit.* 20.2; 890c-891a = *Epit.* 20.5-7; 891a = *Epit.* 20.8; 891b = *Epit.* 20.9; 891b-c = *Epit.* 21.1-4; 891d = *Epit.* 21.6; 892a = *Epit.* 21.7; 892a = *Epit.* 22.1; 892a-b = *Epit.* 23.1; 892b = *Epit.* 23.2-3; 892c = *Epit.* 23.4; 893 a = *Epit.* 24.2-5; 893b = *Epit.* 25.2; 893b-c = *Epit.* 25.2, 26.1-2; 883c = *Epit.* 27.1; 894c = *Epit.* 28.3-4; 894c = *Epit.* 29.1; 895a-b = *Epit.* 30.1, 31.1; 895b-c = *Epit.* 31.2; 895c = *Epit.* 32.1; 885c-896a = *Epit.* 32.1-4; 886a = *Epit.* 32.5; 886b = *Epit.* 33.1; 897a-b = *Epit.* 33.2; 897b = *Epit.* 34.2; 897b-c = *Epit.* 34.2-3; 897c = *Epit.* 34.4; 898a = *Epit.* 35.1; 898b-c = *Epit.* 35.2-8; 898c = *Epit.* 35.9; 899a = *Epit.* 35.8; 899b = *Epit.* 36.1; 899b = *Epit.* 36.2; 899c = *epit.* 37.2-3; 899d = *Epit.* 37.4; 899d = *Epit.* 38.1; 900b-c = *Epit.* 38.6-8; 900c-d = *Epit.* 39.1; 901b = *Epit.* 39.4; 901b = *Epit.* 39.2; 903c = *Epit.* 40.1; 904c = *Epit.* 41.2-4; 905a = *Epit.* 40.3; 905b-c = *Epit.* 40.10-11; 908b = *Epit.* 40.18-19; 908c = *Epit.* 40.20; 909b = *Epit.* 41.8; 909c = *Epit.* 41.11-12; 909d-910a = *Epit.* 41.13-14; 911c = *Epit.* 41.15-16; 912a = *Epit.* 41.20; 912b = *Epit.* 41.21; 912c-d = *Epit.* 41.22-23; 918b = *Epit.* 42.17; 918c-919a = *Epit.* 42.19-21; 924d-925d = *Epit.* 43.7-8; 931a = *Epit.* 45.10; 934d-935a = *Epit.* 46.2-3.

¹⁵ Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, 860bc = Paulus, VII.5-8 (cf. *Epit.* 1.10-12); 863a-b = P. VII.11 (cf. *Epit.* 2.1-7); 894c = P. IX.3 (cf. *Epit.* 28.1-3); 899c = P. IX.17 (cf. *Epit.* 37.1); 904a = P. IX.28 (cf. *Epit.* 39.6-7); 907d-908a = P. X.4 (cf. *Epit.* 40.13-14);

the *Epitome* because his work used ancient, now lost, Italian manuscripts showing the use of Greek in the *Epitome*, already present in some of the manuscripts. Landolfus' text of the *Epitome* also may show contamination from a Medieval Latin version of the *Epitome* similar to that found in the *Historia*, which survives in the Bambergensis H.E. III.14 (XIth century) and Oxensis Magd. 14 (XIVth century).¹⁶

The third reader of the *Epitome* is Helgaud, a monk from the monastery of St. Denis near Paris. In 1025, he composed a biography of the second Capetian ruler, Robert the Pious (996-1031), celebrating his piety and generosity. There is only one quotation from the *Epitome* within his *Vita Robertis Pii*, which is as follow: "Ut verbis Aurelii Victorini loquar, ad humanae conversationis exemplum, per laboris genera universa, vir provectus ad summa." Helgaud, *Vita Robertis Pii*, P.L. 212, 910d-911a = "Hoc exitu obiit uir ad humanae conuersationis exemplum, per laboris genera uniuerſa ad summos prouectus usque eo ut fortunae uocaretur pila." *Epitome*, 18.3. Normally, it would not be considered proof of Helgaud's knowing the *Epitome*, but naming Aurelius Victor leads us to think he does. It is a common mistake by readers of the manuscripts based on a misunderstanding of the

926b= P. X.17(cf. *Epit.* 44.1-3); 927b = P. XI.6(cf. *Epit.* 45.2); 930c-d = P. X.6(*Epit.* 45.5-6); 935d-936a = P. XI.14(cf. *Epit.* 47.3); 937a = P. XI.14(cf. *Epit.* 47.3); 938c = P. XI.16-17(cf. *Epit.* 47.1, 47.4-6); 938d = P. XII.1(cf. *Epit.* 48.1); 946b-d = P. XII.4-8(cf. *Epit.* 48.2, 48.8-20).

¹⁶ Festy, p. lxvi

incipit, Libellus De Vita Imperatorum a Augusto usque Theodosium breviatus ex libris Aurelii Victoris. This attribution of the work to Aurelius Victor is older than all the surviving manuscripts containing the *incipit*, and its meaning was never entirely clear to the readers, since already in the seventh and eight centuries readers such as the anonymous author of the *De Terminatione* misunderstood the meaning of the *incipit* that made Aurelius Victor the author of the *Epitome*. If Helgaud had not misunderstood the *incipit*, it is probable that he would have quoted the *Epitome* without naming Victor leaving us few clues to make a clear identification of the passage. His reference to Aurelius Victor also betrays a common misspelling of the Victor turning it into a Victorinus, as found in two manuscripts of the *Epitome*.¹⁷ These two elements show without a doubt that Helgaud knew the *Epitome*.

The *Epitome* from the twelfth century to the Renaissance

After Landolfus, there are no known readers of the *Epitome* until the end of the fourteenth century. Historians such as Frudolf of Michelberg (c. 1103) knew elements of the *Epitome* through the *Historia de Imperio et gestis Romanorum*, Landolfus Sagax's *Historia Miscella* or Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana*.¹⁸

¹⁷ Augustodun. B.M. 39 (S 42) and Leid. Voss. Lat. F. 96; see Festy, p. 2.

¹⁸ Frudolf (a.k.a Ekkehard of Aura), ed. G. Waitz, *M.G.H., Scriptorum*, VI (Berlin, 1844), p. 93 lines (l.) 18-39 = *H.M.*, p. 860b-d (cf. *Epit.* 11.12, 1.4, 1.15-23); p. 95 1.56-65 = *H.M.*,

The same is true of Henry of Huntingdon (c. 1137), and Riccobaldus of Ferrare (c. 1318).¹⁹ Among the non-historians, Petrarch (1361)

863a-b (cf. *Epit.* 2.1-7); p. 97 l. 44-45 = *H.M.* 866b; p. 97 l. 45-46 = *H.M.* 865a (cf. *Epit.* 3.2); p. 97 l. 58-59 = *H.M.* 865b (cf. *Epit.* 3.3); p. 97 l. 63 = *H.M.* 865b-866a (cf. *Epit.* 3.7, 3.4); p. 98 l. 29-30 = *H.M.* 865d (cf. *Epit.* 4.2); p. 98 l. 37-43 = *H.M.* 867b-c (cf. *Epit.* 4.5, 4.8); p. 101 l. 5-6 = *H.M.* 868b (cf. *Epit.* 5.2); p. 104 l. 17-24 = *H.M.* 869b-c (cf. *Epit.* 5.6-70; p. 101 l. 69-70 = *H.M.* 870a (cf. *Epit.* 6.3); p. 102 l. 10-11 = *H.M.* 870c (cf. *Epit.* 7.2); p. 102 l. 33-35 = *H.M.* 874d (cf. *Epit.* 9.14); p. 103 l. 5-7 = *H.M.* 877a-b (cf. *Epit.* 11.6, 11.8); p. 103 l. 10-11 = *H.M.* 878a (cf. *Epit.* 11.5); p. 103 l. 36 = *H.M.* 878d (cf. *Epit.* 12.1); p. 103 l. 44 = *H.M.* 880a (cf. *Epit.* 13.1); p. 103 l. 47-52 = *H.M.* 880b (cf. *Epit.* 13.4); p. 103 l. 53-54 = *H.M.* 881b (cf. *Epit.* 13.10); p. 103 l. 61-63 = *H.M.* 882b (cf. *Epit.* 13.11); p. 104 l. 21 = *H.M.* 882c (cf. *Epit.* 14.1); p. 104 l. 25-32 = *H.M.* 883c-884a (cf. *Epit.* 14.7, 14.2-6); p. 104 l. 38 = *H.M.* 884b (cf. *Epit.* 14.9); p. 105 l. 22-23 = *Bambergensis H.E.* 16.4 (cf. *H.M.* 887c, *Epit.* 16.4); p. 105 l. 54-56 = *H.M.* 889b-c (cf. *Epit.* 17.5-6); p. 106 l. 51-58 = *H.M.* 891b-d (cf. *Epit.* 21.1-6); p. 107 l. 13-21 = *H.M.* 892b-c (cf. *Epit.* 23.3-7); p. 107 l. 31-32 = *H.M.* 893a (cf. *Epit.* 24.5); p. 107 l. 62 = *H.M.* 893c (cf. *Epit.* 27.1); p. 108 l. 13-15 = *H.M.* 894c (cf. *Epit.* 28.3); p. 109 l. 2 = *H.M.* 895c (cf. *Epit.* 32.1); p. 109 l. 35-39 = *H.M.* 897b, 897c (cf. *Epit.* 34.2-4); p. 109 l. 50-54 = *H.M.* 898a-c (cf. *Epit.* 35.2, 35.5-6); p. 110 l. 24-26 = *H.M.* 900b-c (cf. *Epit.* 38.6-8); p. 110 l. 3-32 = *H.M.* 900c (cf. *Epit.* 39.1); p. 110 l. 37-39 = *H.M.* 905b-c (cf. *Epit.* 40.12); p. 110 l. 42-43 = *Bambergensis H.E.* III 40.12 (cf. *Epit.* 40.12); p. 111 l. 38-39 = *H.M.* 905b (cf. *Epit.* 40.5); p. 111 l. 41-43 = *H.M.* 904c (*Epit.* 41.2-3); pp. 111 l. 70 - 112 l. 1 = *H.M.* 908b (cf. *Epit.* 40.6); p. 112 l. 8-9 = *H.M.* 909c (*Epit.* 41.12); p. 112 l. 14-15 = *H.M.* 910a (cf. *Epit.* 41.14-15); p. 113 l. 2-19 = *H.M.* 911a, 911b, 911c-d, *Bambergensis H.E.* 42.6 (cf. *Epit.* 41.20-24, 42.1, 42.6); p. 113 l. 23-24 = *H.M.* 918d-919a (cf. *Epit.* 42.20-21); p. 115 l. 6-8 = *H.M.* 926d (cf. *Epit.* 44.1-2); p. 115 l. 16-20 = *H.M.* 926d, 927b (cf. *Epit.* 45.1-2); p. 115 l. 28 = *Bambergensis H.E.* III 45.4 (cf. *Epit.* 45.4); p. 119 l. 24-30 = *H.M.* 929a, Jerome, 248c, *Gallic Chronicle* 442 year 377 (cf. *Epit.* 48.2); p. 119 l. 45-47 = *H.M.* 934d-935a (cf. *Epit.* 46.2); p. 131 l. 13-20 = *H.M.* 935c-336a (cf. *Epit.* 47.2).

¹⁹ Henry of Huntingdon (c. 1136), *Historia Anglorum* 1.17 = Landolfus Sagax, *H.M.*, 863c; 1.28 = *H.M.*, 888c; 1.31 = *H.M.* 890d; 1.33 = *H.M.* 894c; 1.35 = *H.M.* 898b; 1.41 = *H.M.* 930c-d; 1.42 = *H.M.* 938c; 1.43 = *H.M.* 946b-d; Riccobaldus, *Compendium Historiae Romanae*, 9.69 = Paul, XI.19-25; R. 9.70 = Paul, IX.26-28; R. 9.72 = Paul, X.1; R. 9.73 = Paul, X.2; R. 10.1 = Paul, X.3-7; R. 10.2 = Paul, X.8; R. 10.3 = Paul, X.9-12; R. 10.5 = Paul, X.16; R. 10.6 = Paul, X.17-18; R. 10.9 = Paul, X.16; R. 10.11 = Paul, 11.7-8; 11.10; R. 10.12 = Paul, XI.4-7; R. 10.13 = Paul, XI.16-17; R.

quotes passages containing material from *Epitome*.²⁰ Phrases of the *Epitome* also appear in an anonymous French translation of Freculph's *Chronicorum tomus duo* (XVth century), an anonymous rendition of Paul's *Historia Romana* in the *Cronaca B detta Volgarmemente Varignana* (Bibl. Univ. Di Bologna, m.n. 432 (c. 1390), and Ragnulf Higden's middle English version of the Henry of Huntingdon in his *Polychronicon*.²¹ One can also add that the *Epitome*'s rendition of Diocletian's retirement planting cabbages was a well known finding, being mentioned in Boccacio (c.1380), Beneventus (1388), Poggio (1430), and Vergerio (1430).²² It looks, it feels like the *Epitome*, but these, however lengthy, are all renditions of Paul's *Historia Romana*, Landolfus Sagax's *Historia Miscella*, or the anonymous author of the *Historia*.

10.15 = Paul, XII.1-3; R. 10.16 = Paul, XII.4-5; R. 10.17 = Paul, XII.5; R. 10.18 = Paul, XII.6.

²⁰ Petrarch (c. 1350), *De Remediis Utriusque Fortune* (Remedies for fortune, fair and foul, transl. into modern English with commentary by Conrad H. Rawski, 5 volumes, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1991), I.43 = H.N. 808b(cf. Epit. 41.8); I.52 = H.M.(cf. Epit. 41.11-12); I.64 = H.M. 67d(cf. Epit. 4.9); I.118 = H.M. 860d-861a(cf. Epit. 1.19); II.21 = H.M. 878b(cf. Epit. 11.11-12); II.75 = H.M. 88d(cf. Epit. 16.7); II.131 = H.M. 878c, 878d, 879d, 882b(cf. Epit. 11.15, 12.1, 12.8, 13.12)

²¹ Ragnulf Higden (c. 1320), *Polychronicon*, IV.3, IV.21, IV.26 (*Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, monachi Cetrensis*, ed. rev. Joseph Rawson Lumby, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* 41 (London, 1888) = note 18 [Henry of Huntingdon]; Anonymus (c. 1390), *Cronaca B detta Volgarmemente Varignana* (Bibl. Univ. Di Bologna, m.n. 432), in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 18.1, edd. L.A. Muratori, et alii (Bologna, 1914), pp. 163-209; the French version of Freculph, *Chronicorum Tomi Duo* in Arsenal 3515, 5078 et 5079 - see Chester F. Natunczwiez, "Freculphus of Lisieux, his Chronicle and a Mont St.-Michel manuscript," *Sacris Eruditi* 17.1 (1966): 90-134.

²² Boccacio, *De Casibus Illustrium Virorum*, ed. Louis Bruewer-Hall, p. 191; Beneventus, *Romuleo*, X.42.3; Poggio, *Epistula*, 304; Vergerio, *De Ingeniis moribus et liberalibus adolescentiae studiis liber*, 31.

From the thirteenth century to the fifteenth century, very little is known of the *Epitome* outside the manuscript tradition and the monastic library catalogues mentioned earlier. The manuscripts are the following:

Paris. Reg. 4955 (XIIIth century)
 Paris. 16026 (XVth century)
 Bern. 104 (XIVth century)
 Medic. plut. 64,36 (XVth century)
 Vatican. Ottobon. Lat. 1507 (XVth century)
 Vatican. Urbinas Lat. 411 (XVth century)
 Vatican. Ottob. Lat. 1223 (XVth century)
 Vatican. Lat. 6800 (XVth century)
 Neapolitan. IV C 36 (XVth century).

This list gives a total of nine manuscripts made between 1250 and 1482. Except for the first two, all these manuscripts are of Italian origin because the manuscripts contained information indicating the name of the copier and his place of work (e.g. Nicola Lens in Venice). The following analysis of three of these six manuscripts will suffice to give an accurate rendering of the type of men who owned manuscripts containing the *Epitome* during the fifteenth century.

The Vaticanus Ottobonensis Latinus 1223 was copied in 1453 at Venice by a Florentine named Nicolo Len[...] for the benefit of Sechondo Magistro Gerolmo.²³ Besides the *Epitome*, the manuscript contains a large part of the Latin Anthology, excerpts of various Latin authors, Tibullus' poems, extracts from Greek authors, and

²³ *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la bibliothèque vaticane, catalogue établi par Élisabeth Pellegrin et alii* (Paris, 1982), tome I, pp. 487-493.

Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*. A prince of the Ottoboni house bought the manuscript in the 1480s, which later became part of the Vatican collection upon the ascension to the papal throne of a member of this house in the seventeenth century. Vaticanus Ottobonensis Latinus 1507, made around 1485, in Northern Italy contains: Dictys Cretensis' epic poem, the *Epitome*, Ioanne de Sacrobosco's mathematical treatise, a commentary of Donatus, and Nicola's Perotti's Latin translation of Plutarch's work.²⁴ The manuscript was copied for Bartholomeo Ghislardi, a law professor at the University of Bologna. Finally, Frederico de Montefeltro produce the third, the Vaticanus Urbinas Latinus 411, between 1474 and 1482 for Frederic, duke of Urbino, who mentions it among the holdings of his library in 1482.²⁵ The manuscript includes a mathematical work by the Duke, an anonymous verse oration of Augustus' family, the *Epitome*, Pompeius Trogus' *Prologues*, Festus' *Breviarium*, a work by Leonardus Datus, extracts from Sallust's *Histories*, and the *Ps. Sallust Letters to Caesar*.

After Landolfus Sagax, I found only two readers of the *Epitome*. The first is Simon de Hesdin (c. 1380), known through his French translation of Valerius Maximus' *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, who mentions a Victor as one of the great historians of antiquity in the preface following Herodotus and Polybius.²⁶

²⁴ Pellegrin, tome I, pp. 594-595.

²⁵ Pellegrin, tome II.2, pp. 588-589; D'Elia, p. 44.

²⁶ Simon de Hesdin et Nicolas de Genoesse, *Faits et Dits Memorables de Valère Maxime*, B.N.F. Richelieu manuscrit occidentaux français 42; see Marcel Lecourt, 'Antoine de Sale et

Hesdin believed that Victor had written a history of wars fought by Rome in Africa. Comparing this entry about Victor with those about Herodotus and Polybius explains this title. Hesdin writes that Herodotus wrote a history of Egypt, while Polybius composed a history of the Ptolemies. This is untrue, but both informations contain a grain of truth since both authors wrote on those topics in their larger histories. The same can be said of the epitomator who included elements of the wars fought by the emperors in Africa against internal and foreign foes. Hesdin who knew both Latin and Greek must have heard of these three authors through *florilegia*, which may explain his partial understanding of these three authors' works. Since Hesdin produced his work for the Angevine dynasty in Naples, his Latin *florilegium*, probably, contained elements of the *Epitome*, and not Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, whose manuscripts were to be rediscovered in the 1450s.

The last known reader prior to the revolution of printing is Sicco Polento, in 1437, who mentions in his History of the Latin Literature (c. 1426-1437) the following information about the *Epitome*: "Sextus Aurelius, qui etiam Victor nomine appellatus est. Orditur ab Octavio iste atque singulos ex ordine memorans ad Theodosium venit illum, qui Archadio et Honorio filiis rem publicam quietam salvamque reliquit."²⁷ Polento quotes the last

Simon de Hesdin,' in *Mélanges en l'honneur d'Émile Chastelain* (Paris, 1910), p. 343.

²⁷ *Sicconis Polentonis Scriptorum Illustrum Latinae Linguae ll. XVIII*, ed. B.L. Ulman (Rome, 1928), VII, p. 219.

line of the *Epitome*, and gives the right information about the number of lives found in the *Epitome*. His quote is interesting because Polento writes prior to the copying period of most of the extant Italian manuscripts at a time when the epitomator was little known. It is conceivable that this entry in his widely read work encouraged the urban elites to sponsor the copying of new manuscripts of the *Epitome*.

It is also in Italy that interest among the urban elites of Italy lead to the first printed edition of the *Epitome*. The librarian of Frederic of Urbino, Laurentius Abstemius published the *editio princeps* of the *Epitome* at Fano in February, 1504.²⁸ It was soon followed by editions in France at Paris (November, 1504) and in the Holy German Empire at Strasbourg (13 February, 1505).²⁹ The Strasbourg edition is a reedition of Abstemius' version of the *Epitome* based on a fifteenth-century manuscript, while that Fra Jocondo is based on an unknown older French manuscript. It also known through Beatus' correspondence and an *ex-libris* from one of the surviving specimens of Schurer's edition, now located at the Bibliothèque Nationale, that Beatus Rhenanus owned a copy, through his friendship with Matthius

²⁸ *Vita M. Catonis, Sextus Aurelius [epitomator] de vitis caesarum, benevenutus de eadem re, (...) curante Laurentio Abstemio* (Fano, 1504).

²⁹ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris [epitomator] libellus de vita et moribus imperatorum Romanorum (...) curante Ioanne Iucundo* (Parisiis, 1504); *Vita M. Catonis, Sextus Aurelius [epitomator] de vitis caesarum, benevenutus de eadem re, Philippi Beroaldi & Thomae Vuolphius Iunioris, Epithoma Rerum Germanicarum, Thomas Aucuparij* (Argentorum, apud Matthium Shurer, 1505).

Schurer. About Abstemius and Jocondo's editions, there is no contemporary discussions. Nothing is known pertaining to the number of copies made. All these editors did not question the authorship of the *Epitome* (attributing it erroneously to Aurelius Victor) or attempt to annotate it.

Conclusion

The first part showed the wide dispersal of the *Epitome*, mainly in France, but also in England, the Holy Roman Empire (Austria and Belgium), and Italy. The second discussed three readers (anonymous recensionist of the *Historia*, Landolfus Sagax, and Helgaud). The first two are important because their works contained a version, found in now lost Italian manuscripts of the *Epitome*, probably older than the surviving French manuscripts. For example, Landolfus gave the Greek phrases found in the *Epitome*, which rarely survives in the French manuscripts. Helgaud was mentioned because of his attribution of the *Epitome* to the hand of Aurelius Victor from a misreading of the *incipit*, a common error already known from earlier readers of the *Epitome* such as Paul the Deacon.

The third part looks at the survival of the *Epitome* through its readers and manuscripts from the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries giving attention to the difficulty surrounding this research. It is only at the end of the fourteenth century that

readers are rediscovering directly the *Epitome*, and not mentioning elements of it through Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana* as the example of Riccobaldus of Ferrare's *Compendium historiae romanae* shows for the period prior to the early fourteenth century. Probably through Sicco Polento's 1437 *History of Latin Literature*, the Italian urban elites became aware of the *Epitome*, and sponsored the copying of manuscripts between the 1450 and 1485 and the first printed edition of the *Epitome* in February 1504. Consequently, this interest spread to the rest of Europe through other printed editions in November 1504 at Paris and February 1505 at Strasbourg.

Chapter III: The Development of Modern Scholarship on the *Epitome*

This chapter examines how knowledge and understanding of the *Epitome* developed during the modern era through the works of editors, historians, translators, recent scholars, and authors of novels. Unlike the previous chapters, this chapter does not proceed chronologically, but thematically examining the evidence, which relates to these developments during the early modern and modern eras.

Schott and the *Epitome*

Andreas Schott's edition of the *Epitome* is important in the sixteenth century for being the first commentary on the text. Laurentius Abstemius, the librarian of the Duke of Urbino, published the *editio princeps* in 1504.¹ This edition is a straightforward rendition of the *Vaticanus Latinus* 6800 and an otherwise unknown fifteenth-century manuscript. There is no annotation or *apparatus criticus*, something typical of early editions. The work has a dedication to the duke of Urbino, Guido Ubaldo. During the same year, a Veronese architect and printer, Giovanni Giocondo (*Ioannes Jucundus*) printed an edition using older French manuscripts of the *Epitome*.² The work is dedicated to the French king, Louis XII (1499-1512). Matthias Schurer at

¹*C. Nepotis de Vita Catonis Senioris. Sextus Aurelius de Vitis Caesarum. Benevenutus Imolensis de eadem re [= Libellus qui dicitur Augustalis] rec. Laurento Abstemio* (Fani, 1504).

²*Sexti Aurelii Victoris A Caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium*

Strasbourg republished Abstemius' editions adding the text of Jacob Wimpfeling.³ The next edition was produced by Giovanni Baptista Cipelli (i.e. Ioannes Baptista Egnatius Venetus) in 1516, and is marked by a long essay on biographies and useful palaeographical notes.⁴ The work is dedicated to the French humanist, Jean Grolier (1479-1565). At the same time another Italian printer produced an edition of a translation of Herodian's Histories by Angelo Poliziano along with a new version of the *Epitome*, Eutropius' *Breviarium*, and the last eight books of Paul's *Historia Romana*.⁵ A few months later, Erasmus printed Egnazio Cipelli's edition of the *Epitome*, but he replaced the philological annotations with his own. The new edition is dedicated to Frederick and George, the dukes of Saxony.⁶ In 1564, Elie Vinet

excerpta rec. Joanne Jucundo (Parisiis, 1504).

³ *Hic subnota continentur vita M. Catonis. Sextus Aurelius de Vitis Caesarum. Benevenetus de eadem re. Philippi Beroaldi & Thomae Vuolphii disertatio de nomine imperatorio. Epithoma rerum Germanicarum usque ad nostra tempora. Thoamae Aucuparii Distichon (Argentori, 1505).*

⁴ *In Hoc volumine haec continentur, C. Suetonii Tranquilli XII Caesares, Sexti Aurelii Victoris a D. Caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium excerpta, Eutropii De Gestis Romanorum lib. X., Pauli Diaconi libri ad Eutropii historiam additi, annotationibus et prefationibus ab Ioanne Baptista Egnatio Veneto (Venetiis: In aedibus Aldi, et Andreae Soceri, mense Maio, 1516).*

⁵ *Herodian Libri VII. - Aurelius Victor, Sextus, Ab caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium. - Eutropius. Historiae Libri X. - & Paulus Diaconus, Libri VIII ad Eutropii historiam additi, rec. Ph. Iunta (Florentiae, 1517).*

⁶ *Ex recognitione D. Erasmi C. Suetonius Tranquillus Dion Cassius Nicaeus (G. Merula interprete). Aelius Spartianus, J. Capitolinus, Ael. Lampridius, Vulcatius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio, F. Vopiscus Syracusius. Quibus adjuncti sunt S. Aurelius Victor,*

produced an edition printed at Poitiers with detailed annotations, which Andreas Schott used for his own edition.⁷ These early editions are generally without numbering of pages. The edition of Egnazio Cipelli was used again in subsequent printings of Justin's *Historia Philippica*, the *Historia Augusta*, or in so called the *Historiae Romanae Epitomae*, which includes all the epitomators from Velleius Paterculus to Jordanes.⁸

The *Epitome* during the Early Modern Era

With the publication in 1579 of Andreas Schott's edition of the *Epitome* along with Aurelius Victor's corpus, scholars and editors had in hand a text and commentary which created interest in the work and, the prompted early modern discussions of the *Epitome*. Over the next 150 years, Frederick Syllaburg, Janus Gruter, Anne Dacier, Samuel Pitiscus, Johann Arntzen, Johann

Eutropius, Paulus Diaconus, A. Marcellinus, P. Laetus, Annotationes ab Ioanne Baptista Egnatio Veneto (Basel, 1518).

⁷*De Vita et moribus imperatorum romanorum excerpta ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris, a Caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium imperatorem. Elias Vinetus emendavit...* (Pictavis, apud E. Marnefium, 1564).

⁸i.e. *Ex Trogi Pompeii Historiis externis libri xliiii. His accessit ex. Sext. Aurelio Victore De Vita & Moribus Romanorum Imperatorum Epitome curat ab Simone Colinaeo* (Paris, 1530); *Ex Trogi Pompeii Historiis externis libri xliiii. His accessit ex. Sext. Aurelio Victore De Vita & Moribus Romanorum Imperatorum Epitome, curante Ioanne Sichardo* (Lugduni, apud Seb. Gryphium, 1538); *Historiae Romane Epitomae Lucii Iulii Flori, C. Vell. Paterculi, Sext. Aur. Victoris, Sext Rufi Festi, Messalae Corvini, Eutropii, Pauli Diaconi, M. Aur. Cassiodori, Iornandis & Iulii Exuperanti, emendavit J. Gruter* (Amsterdamo, apud G.I. Caesium, 1625);.

Friedrich Gruner, and A.J. Valpy reproduced Schott's pioneering work in their own editions of the *Epitome*, offering a few ideas about the sources and textual corrections.⁹ In Teubner's collection, Fr. Pichlmayr and R. Grundel give us two excellent editions of the text in 1911 and 1970.¹⁰

The *Epitome* also attracted the interest of French and Dutch humanists such as Gérard-Jean Vossius (1579-1649), Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630-1721), and G. Bechmann (c. 1685).¹¹ For the most part,

⁹ *Aurelius Victoris opera omnia*, ed. Frederic Syllaburg (Frankfurt, 1588); *Aurelii Victoris opera omnia*, ed. Janus Gruter (Hannover, 1610); *Historiae Romanae Epitomae Lucii Iulii Flori, Sex. Aur. Victoris, Rufi Festi, Messalae Corvini, Eutropii, Paulli Diaconi, M. Aur. Cassidiori, Iordanis, et Iulii Exuperantii, emendaverunt ab Ionne Iambonio* (Amsterdam, 1630), pp. 249-279; *Aurelii Victoris Opera*, ed. Anne Dacier (Paris, 1681); *Aurelii Victoris opera omnia*, ed. Samuel Pitisci (Paris, 1699); *Aurelii Victoris opera omnia*, ed. Johannes Artzenius (Amsterdam, 1733), pp. 447-600; see W. Engelmann and E. Preuss, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum*, vol 2: *scriptores Latini* (Leipzig, 1882), 731-732 [for later editions].

¹⁰ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris De Caesaribus Praecedunt De viris illustribus urbis Romae et liber Origo gentis Romanae; subsequitur Epitome de Caesaribus / recens. F. Pichlmayer et R. Grundel* (Teubner, Leipzig, 1970), pp. 133-176.

¹¹ See Hippolyte de Laporte, "Huet, Pierre-Daniel," in *Biographie Universelle, Ancienne et Moderne*, ed. Michaud, J.-F., tome 20 (Paris, 1854 (1967)), pp. 101-105; Sextus Aurélius Victor, *Origines du Peuple Romain, Hommes Illustres de la Ville de Rome, Histoire des Césars, Vies des Empereurs Romains*, tr. par M.N.A. Dubois, collection C.L.F. Panckoucke (Paris, 1846), p. 15.; Gérard-Jean Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, Amsterdam, 1658, book II, chapter 15; Arthur Cohn, *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et Libri de Caesaribus et Epitomes undecim capita priora fluexerint*, (Berlin, 1884), p. 7; *Disputationem circularem de S. Aurel. Vict. ... su praesidio Dan. Guil Molleri ... submiti G. Bechmannus [1685]*, in *D.G. Molleri ... Dissertationes academice de vitis quiquaginta historicorum...*, ed. F. Roth-Schotzil (Noribergae

discussions exploring the epitomator's ideas and identity during this period offer only interesting speculations and obvious observations such as those of Huet. In one of his long letters to Mme Anne Le Fèvre [Mme Dacier ou Anna Tanaquil], a seventeenth-century editor of the *Epitome*, Bishop Huet remarked that a major confusion about the *Epitome* arose out of a misunderstanding in the manuscript tradition, discussed at length in the previous chapters.¹² He also believed that the epitomator may have had a name similar to that of Aurelius Victor, which the French humanist thought to be either Victorius or Victorinus. Pierre-Daniel Huet stressed that the work calls itself a summary of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* (*Libellus de Vita et Moribus Imperatorum breviatus ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris a Augusto Caesare usque ad Theodosium*). Only Bechmann offers anything more substantial, but his essay deals mostly with Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* looking in detail at the biographical elements of his life. He is important only for being the first to believe without hesitation that the epitomator was not Aurelius Victor. This interest allowed publishers to popularize the text through vernacular translations.

Translations

et Aldorfi, 1726), pp. 2-14.

¹² Sextus Aurélius Victor, *Origines du Peuple Romain, Hommes Illustres de la Ville de Rome, Histoire des Césars, Vies des Empereurs Romains*, tr. par M.N.A. Dubois, collection C.L.F. Panckoucke, (Paris, 1846), p. 15.

The *Epitome* had some impact on the reading public. As mentioned earlier, the reading public benefited from the many editions produced either independently or as appendixes to editions of Justin's *Epitoma Philippica*. These editions improved knowledge of the Latin text.¹³ Because of the numerous Latin editions, interest in vernacular translations of the *Epitome* grew among a non-specialist audience. First in the sixteenth century, Agostino Arrivabene translated the *Epitome De Caesaribus* and the *De Viris Illustribus* into Italian.¹⁴ Later in the seventeenth century, English translations began appearing in annexes to Justin's works.¹⁵ The first translation by George Wilkins, a

¹³ The *British Library General Catalogue of Printed Books to 1975*, vol. 14 & vol. 329 (London and alii, 1979-1989), pp.: 95-99, pp. 432-439; *The National Union Catalogue. Pre-1956 Imprints*, vol. 636 (Mansell, 1979), pp. 63-65; *Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale, auteurs, tome V* (Aubry-Azzoni) (Paris, 1924), pp. 560-566.

¹⁴ *La vite, I costumi et fatti de gl' Imperatori Romani, parte tratee da Sesto Aurelio Vittore, parte scritte da Eutropio, et da Paolo Diacono, Novellament dalla latine alla italian lingua*, ed. A. Arrivabene (C. de Trino, Vinegia, 1544).

¹⁵ *The Historie of Justine. Containing a narration of kingdomes, from the beginning of the Assyrian monarchy unto the raigne of the emperours Augustus. Whereunto is newly added a brief collection of the lives and manners of all the emperours succeeding (...)* newly translated into English by G.W. (London, W. Jaggard, 1606); *The History of Justine, taken out of the four and forty books of Trogius Pompeius (...)* [no pagination] *Together with the Epitomie of the Lives and Manners of the Roman Emperors (of Aurelius Victor) (...)* tr. into English by Robert Codrington (London, W. Gilbertson, 5 editions [1654]), pp. 526-606; See *Early English 1475-1640, Selected from Pollard and Redgrave's Short-Title Catalogue, Cross Index to Reels* (Ann Arbor, University Microfilms International, 1985).

largely forgotten rival of William Shakespeare (c. 1605), was included in a series of biographies of Roman emperors from Augustus to the Holy Roman emperor of his own day (Rudolf II, 1576-1612). Wilkins' work was dedicated to one of James I's favorites, the Earl of Carlisle - James Shay (d. 1636), a man whom contemporaries mocked for his lack of interests outside diplomacy and entertainment. Historically noteworthy, this dedication shows another side to the mind of Shay, who like his master James I may have had scholarly interests and an admiration for antiquity, but it also shows that Wilkins knew how to flatter members of the court. The work went through numerous reprints.

Robert Codrington (d. 1665) offered another translation of the text in 1654, with reprints appearing in 1664, 1666, 1672, and 1682.¹⁶ In Codrington's editions, the biographies from Augustus to Theodosius are translated verbatim from the *Epitome*. Historically, this translation, under its various guises, also shows the intricacies of the period during and after the English civil war. Codrington was a survivor of the period. He dedicated the first edition to Oliver Cromwell, in hope of advancement in England's bureaucracy. Cromwell's reaction to this dedication is not known, but the following facts may help to illuminate this largely forgotten episode in Cromwell's life as a patron of the arts. In

¹⁶ "Robert Codrington," in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Sir Leslie Stephen and alii, vol. IV. (Oxford, 1921-1922), pp.

the 1640s Codrington had written a verse elegy in honour of the Earl of Strafford, a minister of Charles I, who had been executed by order of Parliament. Despite his royalist beginnings and Cromwell's apparent silence in response to the translation, Codrington later composed parliamentary pamphlets. The reasons for Cromwell's indifference to Codrington are obscure. Cromwell and his secretariat make no mention of Codrington's translation of the *Epitome* in his extant correspondence and writing. Such an omission is peculiar because Cromwell was a generous patron of literature, supporting Milton and other famous writers of the period, as well as the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.¹⁷ Fortunately, Codrington found employment with other patrons who shared his own strong protestant views and supported his efforts in translating French and Swiss theologians into English. After the fall of the Commonwealth, Codrington found other avenues for his talents. In 1664, he reissued his translation of the *Epitome*, this time dedicating it to James Shane (Shaen), one of Charles II's ministers.¹⁸ He found employment at Charles' court writing a jingoist pamphlet for the King's Dutch war.¹⁹ The numerous

665-666.

¹⁷ Graham Parry, *The Seventeenth Century. The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700* (London and New York, 1989), pp. 91-106.

¹⁸ See George E. Cokayne, *The Complete Baronetage*, vol. III: English, Irish, and Scottish, 1649-1664 (Exeter, 1900-1906), p. 323 - on John Shane, baron and governor of Ireland in the late 1670's.

¹⁹ See Robert Codrington, *His Majesty's Propriety and Dominion on*

reeditions of his English translation testify to the interest in his works among England's reading public.

More recently in the nineteenth century, two German translations were made of the *Epitome*.²⁰ An interest in the *Epitome* also arose among the French reading public in the nineteenth century, and again at the beginning of the new millennium. In 1846, M.A. Dubois translated the *Epitome* into French for the editor, C.L.F. Panckoucke.²¹ Michel Festy, in 1999, produced a new edition and French translation of the *Epitome*.²² In 2003, André Dubois et Yves Germain produced a French translation of the *Epitome* and the whole of the so-called Victor's Corpus.²³ During the twenty-first century, H.W. Bird and Thomas Banchich have produced as yet unpublished English translations.²⁴

the British Seas asserted, together with a true account of the Netherlanders' insupportable Insolences (London, 1665).

²⁰ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Historia Romanae ex recensione Joannis Gruneri*, cura et interpretatione germanicae linguae a Franc. Xav. Schonberger, (Viennae, 1806); Sextus Aurelius Victor, uebers. Von August Closs (Stuttgart, 1837-1838) 3 vol. In *Römische Prosaiker in neuen Uebersetzungen*, 130, 132-133

²¹ M. N.A. Dubois, pp. 302-504.

²² *L'Épitomé des Césars*, texte établi et traduit par Michel Festy, (Paris, les Belles Lettres, 1999); reviewed by Stéphane Ratti, *Antiquité tardive* 7 (1999): 444-452; by Jorg Schlumberger, *Antiquité Tardive* 8 (2000): 395-399; T.D. Barnes, *Classical Review* 52.1 (2002): 25-27.

²³ Aurélius Victor, *Œuvres complètes*, trad. Du latin par André Dubois et Yves Germain (Clermond-Ferrand, 2003).

²⁴ H.W. Bird has announced an essay about the *Epitome* for an upcoming translation for Liverpool Classics due in 2003 (letter to the author, May, 11th 2001); Thomas Banchich, *Epitome de*

The Great Kaisergeschichte debate:
Scholarship from 1872 until 1974

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, scholars began systematically studying the minor texts of ancient literature, such as the *Epitome*, in order to get a more complete picture of antiquity. This process was particularly prevalent at the universities of the Rhine Confederation and later the German Empire due to their own political debates. German university scholars produced mainly works of *Quellenforschung* (the reconstruction and study of a given work's sources) and *Quellenkritik* (an analysis of the uses of the sources in a historiographical study of a particular author).²⁵ These modern methods of research increased knowledge about the *Epitome*'s text and the epitomator.

Caesaribus, (Buffalo, 2000) [or [Http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm](http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm)].

²⁵ R. Armstedt, (1885); A. Cohn, *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et epitomes undecim capita priora fluexerint* (Diss. Berlin, Leipzig, 1884); W. Enman, "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*," *Philologus supp.* IV, (1884), Heft 3: 335-501; Lud Jeep, "Aurelii Victoris *De Caesaribus* e l'*Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Revista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* I (1873): 505-518; F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig, 1901, ND Hildesheim 1965); Th. Opitz, "Quaestionum de Sex. Aurelio Victore capita tria," *Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis* 2, (1872): 197-278; E. von Woelfflin, "Die Latinität der *Epitome*," *Archiv. F. Lat. Lex.* XII (1902): 445-452.

Scholars like Alexander Enmann hypothesized that the *Historia Augusta's* author (c. 395), Eutropius (369/370), Festus (369/370), Aurelius Victor (361), and the epitomator (c. 395) all depended on a lost earlier text of abbreviated biographies. According to Enmann, this source would explain the close similarity in language and content found in the works of those writers. He also analyzed stylistic and intellectual interrelations between the epitomator and Aurelius Victor looking at how both authors used their first-century material. While he showed a greater affinity for material from Tacitus's *Annales* and *Historiae*, Aurelius Victor and the epitomator both favoured the material found in Suetonius' *Vita Caesarum*, which was anecdotal in nature. However, he stresses that neither used Tacitus or Suetonius directly, but through an intermediary, the so-called *Kaisergeschichte*. Enmann believed that the epitomator, who was writing approximately thirty-five years after Aurelius Victor, also used parts of Victor's work to colour his narrative.

Other scholars such as Arthur Cohn, Rudolf Armstedt, Theodore Opitz, and Ludwig Jeep studied Aurelius Victor's influence on the epitomator. In the *Epitome's* first eleven biographies and in biography 34.4, the epitomator used almost verbatim the language and content of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* with additions of material found in Suetonius's *Vita Caesarum* and Eutropius'

Breviarium.²⁶ Comparing the *Epitome* preface with that of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* reveals stylistic and contextual similarities:

Anno urbis conditae
septingentesimo vicessimo
secundo, ab exactis vero
regibus quadringentesimo
octogesimoque, mos Romae
repetitus uni prorsus parendi
pro rege imperatori vel
sanctiori nomine Augusto
appellato. *Epitome*, 1.1

Anno urbis septingentesimo
fere vicesimoque duobus etiam,
mos Romae incessit uni prorsus
parendi. Aurelius Victor,
Caesares, 1.1

The comparison clearly adds weight to the epitomator's own words when he writes that his work will be mainly a summary of Aurelius Victor continued to the reign of Theodosius. As with all epitomes, the epitomator did more than just summarize. The language and content of Victor's *Caesares* take a different shape in the hand of the epitomator. Some of the changes might seem insignificant such as changing verbs and adding more spoken language, but others indicate the use of other materials. For example, his ablative absolute toward the end of the sentence in the Latin text shows an awareness of the debate which occurred over the name of Octavian's new honorific in 27 B.C., a detail absent from Victor's narrative. Such changes indicate a breadth of reading beyond Victor's text. Later authors continued Enmann's work on the sources and the understanding of these fourth-century authors.

²⁶ See Chapter 5, pp. 126-134 & J. Schlumberger (1974), pp. 17-62.

Comparing Aurelius Victor and the epitomator, Th. Opitz and L. Jeep found that the epitomator's biographies tended to be more anecdotal than historical. Opitz also briefly studied all the biographies after chapter eleven, at which point the epitomator came to rely more on material found in Eutropius with additions from an anonymous source common to him and the *Historia Augusta*. Opitz proposed two unproven and highly debatable views about the epitomator and Aurelius Victor. He believed that Victor's *Caesares* and the *Epitome* were two independent summaries of a lost full-length imperial history of Aurelius Victor. Opitz also dated the *Epitome* to the 430's, something which ran against the internal dates of the *Epitome*, which point to a period between AD 395 and 408, because of his own study on the date of Servius' *Commentary on the Aeneid*.

Another major area of discussion was the epitomator's language. In 1902, E. von Wofflin studied the *Epitome*'s language and style, and found the epitomator's style less traditional than that of Aurelius Victor.²⁷ In the *Epitome*, von Woelflin observed improper uses of possessive and demonstrative pronouns and prepositions. Compared with the more classical Latin of Aurelius Victor, the epitomator used words characteristic of late Latin.²⁸

²⁷Edouard von Woefflin, "Die Latinität der *Epitome*," *Archiv. F. Lat. Lex.* XII (1902): 445-452.

²⁸E.g. *consaguineus* or *germanus* rather than *frater* [It is one of

The epitomator's less elevated style recalls that of Augustine's *Confessions* (c. 397) in certain respects which add to the interest of this text whose style was markedly different from his contemporaries' more refined style. Eutropius tends to write a clear and fluid bureaucratic Latin, while Aurelius Victor attempts to imitate Sallust's language and style. Except for Woelflin, nineteenth-century scholars made little attempt to understand the *Epitome* in itself or its author's identity.

Although the work has been studied in passing by major twentieth-century scholars such as Max Laistner, André Chastagnol, Ronald Syme, T.D. Barnes, W. Den Boer, and François Paschoud, little was done on the *Epitome* specifically until Jorg Schlumbergher's doctoral dissertation, which he published in 1974.²⁹ His research offers a colourful mix of discussions concerning the sources and interesting historical material found in the *Epitome*. His book deals with the identification and

the earliest extant uses of the word *consobrinus* as *patrueilis*].

²⁹Max Laistner, "Some reflections on latin historical writing in the fifth century," *Classical Philology* 35 (1940): 241-256; André Chastagnol, "Emprunts de l'*Histoire Auguste* aux *Caesares* d'Aurélius Victor," *Revue de Philologie et d'Histoire Ancienne* 41 (1967): 85-97; R. Syme, "Fiction in the Epitomators," *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1977/1978* (Bonn, 1980), 267-278; R. Syme, "Illyricum in the Epitomators," in *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 221-236; T.D. Barnes, "The Lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin Historical Tradition," in *B.H.A.C. 1968/1969* (Bonn, 1970), pp. 13-43; Zosime, *Histoire Nouvelle*, texte établi et traduit par François Paschoud (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1971); W. Den Boer (1972), pp. 1-209; J. Schlumberger (1974).

reconstruction of the epitomator's sources, which he found to be Sextus Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, Eutropius' *Breviarium*, the *Enmann Kaisergeschichte*, and Nichomachus Flavianus's lost *Annales* (c. 389). The *Annales* was the source of both the Suetonian elements of the first twelve chapters and the borrowings from Marius Maximus's *Caesares*, a third-century continuator of Suetonius (also used by the *Historia Augusta*). Schlumberger refused to enter into the debate over the Ignotus (another continuator of Suetonius) as a source for the *Epitome* as proposed by R. Syme.³⁰ The matter will be discussed here only in so far as it is useful to show the complexity of the debate among *Quellenforschung* scholars.

The reconstruction of the sources of the *Historia Augusta* is a complex problem to which Ronald Syme offered a major contribution.³¹ Earlier scholars had argued that the biographies from Hadrian to Macrinus had one basic source which was Marius Maximus's *Caesares* (c. 217 C.E.), a lost series of biographies. Syme challenged this view by proposing that the author of the *Historia Augusta* used many sources. Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 390) wrote that it was very popular in its own time and it was read by

³⁰ Ronald Syme, "Ignotus, the Good Biographer," in *Emperor and Biography. Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 30-53.

³¹ Ronald Syme, *Ammianus and The Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 264 ff; Ronald Syme, "Ignotus, the Good Biographer," in *Emperor and Biography. Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford,

uncultured.³² The *Historia Augusta* authors believe these biographies were a stitched together assemblage of gossip and official documents.³³ Such poor opinions of the work led Syme to propose another source for the good historical material found in the biographies from Hadrian (117-138) to Heliogabalus (218-222) in the *Historia Augusta*. He proposed another lost imitator of Suetonius who wrote biographies from Hadrian to Heliogabalus. Although his arguments have convinced many scholars such as T.D. Barnes and others, the debate still rages; similar debates continue about the *Epitome's* sources.

Scholarship from 1974 to 2001

T.D. Barnes and others have critiqued Schlumberger's views about the *Epitome* and Nicomachus Flavianus' lost work.³⁴

1971), pp. 30-53.

³² Ammianus Marcellinus, 28.4.14.

³³ *Historia Augusta*, Aelius, III.1; Geta, II.1.

³⁴ T.D. Barnes, T.D. Barnes, "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its sources," *Classical Philology* 71 (1976): 258-268, pp. 262-264 (against); François Paschoud, "Deux ouvrages récents sur l'*Epitome de Caesaribus* et Aurélius Victor," *Revue des Etudes Latines* 53 (1975): 86-98 (for); D. Nellen, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Gymnasium* 83 (1976): 111-113 (against); L. Bessone, "Recensione di Jorg Schlumberger' *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Rivista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* 105 (1977): 78-80 (favorable); R.Ph. Green, "A review of Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1979): 225-229 (critical); Guilermo Ballaira, "Recensione di Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1976), *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* (1977): 229 (favorable); Anonymous, "Compte-rendu du livre de Jorg Schlumberger," *Byzantiom* 45 (1975): 177; D. Nellen, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger,

Schlumberger responded to Barnes' criticisms and those of others in an article published in 1981.³⁵ In his book, he had maintained the view that the *Epitome's* major source was Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* which used Marius Maximus' lost *Caesares* (c. 220 AD) among other sources. Other avenues of Schlumberger's research offer promising results. Schlumberger devoted three chapters to the manner in which these sources were assembled by the epitomator. He observes that the anonymous author used few sources, and that the process of composition used by the epitomator explains this utilization of few sources: he recited his work to stenographers instead of writing it himself.³⁶ Such a method, according to Schlumberger, forces the writer to rely more on his memory and additions from the few works in front of him. In the 1981 article, Schlumberger observed that the epitomator added many philosophical elements to his biographies.

One author who is virtually ignored by recent scholarship, Peter Lebrecht-Schmidt, offered useful suggestions in his 1978

Epitome de Caesaribus, (Munich, 1974), "Byzantinische Zeitschrift 70 (1977): 123-127 (against); B. Mouchovà, "Recensione di Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974)," *Eirene* 16 (1978): 143-144; Wilhelm den Boer, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, (Munich, 1974), *Gnomon* 51 (1979): 165-167 (against & a recapitulation of his views stressing mnemotechnical activity over the use of sources).

³⁵Jorg Schlumberger, "Die verlorene *Annalen* des Nicomachus Flavianus. Ein Werk über Geschichte des römischen Republic oder Kaiserheit?" *B.H.A.C.* 1982/1983 (Bonn, 1985), 302-325.

³⁶J. Schlumberger, "'Non scribo sed dicto' (H.A. T. 33.8): hat der autor der *Historia Augusta*," *B.H.A.C.* 1972/1974 (Bonn, 1976), 221-

article in the *Realencyklopaedie*.³⁷ First, he rightly critiqued Schlumberger's reconstruction of the sources, in its general picture, arguing that the epitomator had little to do with Symmachus and Nicomachus Flavianus' literary circle. He envisions the epitomator as offering a moderate pagan view of fourth-century Rome, independent of Nicomachus Flavianus' rabidly strident paganism.

In the controversy over the parallels between the *Epitome* and the *Historia Augusta*, K.P. Johne's contributions are less useful. In a short article, he briefly discussed three parallels between the *Historia Augusta* and the *Epitome* concerning the emperor Pertinax, proposing that the *Historia Augusta*'s author had read the *Epitome*.³⁸ This view is very different from that held by Schlumberger who believes, perhaps rightly, that both works contained independent renditions of Marius Maximus' lost *Caesares*. Nonetheless, Schlumberger's conjecture concerning the use of Marius Maximus does not eliminate the possibility that these contemporary writers could draw from one another.

After Jorg Schlumberger, there have been major contributions

238; J. Schlumberger, (1974), pp. 63-77.

³⁷Peter Lebrecht-Schmidt, "*Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. Wissowa, G., Kroll, W., Mittelhaus, K., & Ziegler, K. (München, 1978), supplement vol. 15, 1671-1675.

³⁸K.P. Johne, "Die *Epitome de Caesaribus* und die *Historia Augusta*," *Klio* LIX 1977: 497-501.

on the *Epitome* from scholars in various parts of the world.³⁹ For example Barry Baldwin, Isabel Moreno-Ferrero, and Eugène Cizek were concerned with the style and ideas of the *Epitome*.

Baldwin offers a different approach. In his 1993 article, he makes a critical study of the *Epitome's* first twelve short

³⁹Valerio Neri, "Le fonti della vita di Costantino nell' *Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Rivista storica Antica* XVII-XVIII (1987-1988) : 249-280; Barry Baldwin, "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* from Augustus to Domitian," *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 43 <72> (1993) : 81-101; Eugène Cizek, "La poétique de l'histoire dans les abrégés du IV^e siècle ap. J.-C.," *Revue de Philologie et d'Histoire Ancienne* 68.1-2 (1994): 107-129; R.W. Burgess, *Hydatius: A Late Roman Chronicler in Post Roman Spain* (PhD., Oxford, 1988), pp. 39-45; *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire*, ed. with English translation by R.W. Burgess (Oxford, 1993); R.W. Burgess, "Principes cum tyrannis: two studies on the Kaisergeschichte and its tradition," *Classical Quarterly* 43.2 (1993): 491-500; R.W. Burgess, "On the date of the Kaisergeschichte," *Classical Philology* 90 (1995): 111-128; R.W. Burgess, "Jerome and the Kaisergeschichte," *Historia* 44.3 (1995): 349-369; R.W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronology*, *Historia*, 135 (Stuttgart, 1999); Stéphane Ratti, *Les empereurs romains d'Auguste à Dioclétien dans le Bréviaire d'Eutrope. Les livres 7 à 9 du Bréviaire d'Eutrope: introduction, traduction et commentaire*, *Annales de l'université de Franche-Comté*, 604 (Paris, 1996); Stéphane Ratti, "Les *Romana* de Jordanès et le *Bréviaire d'Eutrope*," *Antiquité Classique* 65 (1996): 175-187; Stéphane Ratti, "Compte-rendu du livre *l'Epitomé des Césars*, texte établi et traduit par Michel Festy, (Paris, 1999); Review of Festy' editions: Stéphane Ratti, *Antiquité Tardive* 7 (1999): 444-452; J. Schlumberger, *Antiquité Tardive* 8 (2000): 395-399; T.D. Barnes, *Classical Review* 52.1(2002): 25-27; M. Festy, "Le début et la fin des *Annales de Nicomache Flavien*," *Historia* 45.4 (1997): 464-478; Bruno Bleckmann, "Bemerkungen zu den *Annales* *Nicomachus Flavianus*," *Historia* 44 (1995): 83-99; Bruno Bleckmann, "*Epitome de Caesaribus*, Landolfus Sagax und 300 000 Alamannen zwei Bemerkungen anlässlich der neuen *Epitome*-Ausgabe von M. Festy," *Gottinger für Altertumswissenschaft* 2 (1999): 139-149; *Lexikon der Lateinischen Epitomatoren des 4. Jahrhundert* (*Aurelius Victor: Liber de Caesaribus; Eutropius: Breviarium; Epitome de Caesaribus*), ed. Isabel Moreno-Ferrero (Hidelsheim,

biographies. These biographies bring very little that is new or not found in the earlier sources such as Suetonius and Tacitus. Baldwin believes that these authors' works were used directly for stylistic reasons, and the epitomator made his own errors in transcribing elements from Suetonius' biographies of the early Caesars. In shorter articles, Barry Baldwin has discussed the reception of the *Epitome* in John Lydus's Constantinople and in Samuel Johnson's England.⁴⁰

Valerio Neri, Stéphane Ratti, Bruno Bleckmann, and Michel Festy have discussed the sources, and have defended Schlumberger's major proposed source, the Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*. Stéphane Ratti limits the use of *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus to the *Epitome* material for the period prior to 78 while accepting the possible use of Jerome and a lost model for the *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (c. 380).⁴¹ Michel Festy ascribed to the

2001).

⁴⁰Barry Baldwin, "A classical source for Johnson on Augustus and Lord Bute," *Notes and Queries* 42 (1995): 467-468; Barry Baldwin, "John Lydus in Latin on Augustus," *Byzantion* 65 (1995): 526-527.

⁴¹The *Consularia constantinopolitana* or the *Descriptio consulatum* (manuscript title) being a consular chronicle from 509 BC to 468 AD is added to the many manuscripts of Hydatius Chronicle. Otto Seeck studied and demonstrated that this consular chronicle was brought to Spain from Constantinople in 388 by the widow of the Egypt prefect, Cynegius (*R.E.*, 3.2 (1899), 2454-2459. The *Descriptio Consulatum* takes its origin from a long line of consular chronicles, a sub-genre of history born in the republican era. The *Descriptio Consulatum* owes much of its material to earlier models made in Constantinople from 343 to 388 by many anonymous hands. The version of 380 may have been used by Jerome, the epitomator, and Ammianus Marcellinus because of the numerous

epitomator a possible knowledge of Quintus Symmachus Eusebius' speeches, and discusses the *Epitome's* date (c. 408). He also believes that Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* discussed events as far as 389. Like many, he thinks that Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* was the intermediary between Latin and Byzantine historical tradition.

The most interesting recent work on *Quelleforschung* is that by Richard Burgess. His ideas are close to that of Barnes, and like him, Burgess has no patience with hypotheses involving Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*.

Conclusion

The major scholarly effort in the modern era has been making a late antique work such as the *Epitome* available to our understanding and reading pleasure. The text has occasionally earned a certain degree of popularity among modern readers. There are four copies of the Latin text on the Internet, and Thomas Banchich's English translation also appears on the same medium. Its influence upon the modern world has been negligible except perhaps as a source of exempla or as an example of the continued influence of Latin on modern education, but its continued existence is a tribute to human endeavours and innovation.

stylistical parallels between these authors and the *Descriptio*

Consulum.

Chapter IV: The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and the
 Historical Genre in Antiquity

Jorg Schlumberger devoted only a few lines to the historical sub-genre of abbreviated history (*epitomes* or *Breviaria*) in his book about the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, although a consideration of genre is essential to comprehend the work fully.¹ Other modern scholars like Pierre Dufraigne, in his book on Aurelius Victor's *Historiae Abbreviatae* or *Caesares*, another summary of imperial biographies, devoted a whole sub-section of his introduction to the topic of this historical sub-genre.² Defining abbreviated histories or *breviaria* is thus not easy. In 1922, Marco Galdi discussed in detail the sub-genre of *breviaria* breaking down the chapters of his book according to these various names, *epitome*, *periochae*, *breviaria*, or *Historiae Abbreviatae* (titles of popular ancient short historical works written in both Greek and Latin at various time during antiquity), so as to examine a sub-genre containing works with different aims whose only similarity lay in the abbreviated form of their composition.³ This chapter endeavours to clarify the definition and to place the *Epitome de Caesaribus* within the historical genre with respect to three basic topics. The first part defines the historical sub-genre of abbreviated history. The second part integrates the *Epitome de Caesaribus* within the various historical sub-genres found in

¹ Jorg Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 1-2.

² Aurélius Victor, *Les Césars*, texte établi et traduit par P. Dufraigne (Paris, 1975), pp. xxxix-xlv.

³ See Marco Galdi, *L'Epitome nella letteratura latina* (Naples, 1922), pp. 18-22.

ancient Latin historiography - *historiae*, *Annales*, *vitae*, *chronicae*, and *breviaria*. The first are full-length historical compositions, while the next three are shorter compositions.

Defining Abbreviated Histories or *Breviaria*

The best way to describe epitomes is through a comparison with chronicles. Chronicles are often associated with or compared to these short lives of emperors found in *breviaria* and *historiae abbreviatae*, and there are similarities between the two genres.

A.J. Woodman stated the problem clearly:

"Most of the works mentioned in this and the following paragraphs are usually known as *breviaria* or *chronica* (there is little difference between the two terms): these differ fundamentally from epitomes in as much as they draw their material from more than one source, and they generally make use of their authors' personal experience: i.e they are 'original'."⁴

A.J. Woodman, simplifying a great deal, sees little differences between *breviaria* and *chronica*. True, abbreviated biographies found in *breviarium* and *historiae abbreviatae* connect events within imperial lives using either a chronological sequence as in the case of Eutropius or a thematic sequence in the case of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*. Chronicles, for the most part, do the same in terms of years following a fixed point: the first Olympic Games

⁴ A.J. Woodman, "Date, genre, and style in Velleius: some literary answers," *Classical Quarterly* n.s 25.2 (1975): 284 n. 4.

(776 before the common era [BC]) for the Greeks; the founding of Rome (753 BC) for the Romans; the universe's creation (4053 BC) for the Jews or *anno mundi*; the time of Abraham (2016 B.C.) for the imitators of Jerome; and the birth of Christ for medieval chroniclers after Prosper Tiro (390-463).⁵ Chronicles and *breviaria* both often have patrons or dedicatees. For example, Aurelius Victor dedicated his *Historiae Abbreviatae* to Constantius II (321-361)- . Jerome had two dedicatees, Vincentius and Gallienus, for his chronicle. The *epitomator* mentioned no patrons. These two historical sub-genres both have a central subject, a proper geographic centre, and a proper social centre.⁶ For example, the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, a text representative of views of Italian urban elites, deals mostly with the Roman Empire through the emperors' wars and travels in Italy and Illyricum with respect to *breviaria*, while, for example, Marcellinus Comes' *Chronicle* discusses mostly the eastern Empire and the creation of a state around Constantinople from the view of Illyrian military class.⁷ Both types of composition contain strong moralistic

⁵ See C.F. St. Clair, *Ancient Chronography and the Latin Chronographical Tradition from Cornelius Nepos to Sulpicius Severus* (Diss., University of Ithaca, 1972), pp. 13-40; Indukis Stern, *The Greater Medieval Historians: an Interpretation and Bibliography* (Lanham, 1980); e.g. Richer, *Histoire de France*, 888-995, ed. and tr. Robert Latouche, 2 vols., (Paris, 1930-1937).

⁶ For Chronicles, see Hayden White, *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representations* (Baltimore and London), p. 17.

⁷ For Marcellinus, see Brian Croke, *Count Marcellinus and His Chronicle* (Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 145-215.

statements classifying rulers as good or bad.

Having considered these many similarities, I have to draw attention to the differences which deserve to be studied. First, the fourth-century historical abbreviators' works are governed by a particular format. They often ended their works with certain political reflections (i.e. Aurelius Victor's summing up the good and the bad the emperor Constantius' stewardship of the Empire), while a chronicle simply ends on a major event (i.e Justinian's African triumph for Marcellinus Comes' *Chronicle*). Second, these texts develop within certain imperial lives a real historical narrative. Their authors attempt to bring an explanation to an event or a series of events. For example, the *Epitome* provides explanations to interpret the fall of Gratian (367-383), the death of Julian (361-363) and a few other major historical incidents. Third, the *Breviarium* tradition grew out of the biographical sub-genre and Suetonius' *Vita Caesarum* and other earlier biographers. This means that the short biographies found in the *Epitome* contain much anecdotal information: emperors' physical traits, their behaviour (good or bad), their friendships, and everyday habits. Last, the literary style of a text like Sextus Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* (AD 361) offers a more refined style than a consular chronicle, using direct and indirect discourse, punctuating relatively long periodic sentences, and presents a mix of archaic

and fourth-century Latin not found, in general, in consular chronicles such as the *Chronica Urbis Romae* and the first-century fragments of the *Chronicle of Praenestum*.⁸

After comparing *breviaria* and chronicles, one can simply define a *breviarium* as being a summary of Roman history or period of it. Defining further *breviarium* is not easy, and causes difficulties. Some modern scholars, such as Eugen Cizek, see all so-called Latin *breviaria* in this manner: "Nous n'envisageons aucunement une opposition entre le *breviarium*, résumé ou raccourci d'histoire romaine, genre littéraire très latin, et l'épitomé, résumé historique d'origine grecque, qui serait centré sur une tranche limitée de l'histoire."⁹ He sees all Latin *breviaria* as one. Other scholars, such as John Marincola, divide, perhaps correctly, Latin historical summaries or *breviaria* into two different types, historical epitome and *breviarium*, which are defined in the following manner: "Despite the sometimes inexact terminology, one should distinguish between an epitome and a *breviarium*; the former is a résumé or précis of single work, whereas the latter is (usually) a short work of history that is

⁸ Pierre Dufraigne, pp. xlv-llii; *Chronica Urbis Romae*, in Theodore Mommsen's *Chronica Minora, Monumenta Historica Germanicarum, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 9.1 (Berlin, 1882), pp. 145-149 & *Chronica Praenesti*, in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum*, vol. 13.2, ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin, 1863), p. 113.

⁹ Eugen Cizek, "La poétique de l'histoire dans les abrégés du I^{er} siècle," *Revue de Philologie* 68.1 (1994) : 108.

composed from more than one source."¹⁰ Thus, there are two sorts of Latin *breviaria*: *epitome* and *breviarium*. Epitomes are considered to be summaries of a particular work such as Justin's *Epitome of Pompeius Trogus' Philippics* (III/IV century AD) or the *Periochae Livianae*.¹¹ *Breviaria* such as Eutropius' *Breviarium ad Urbe Condita* are perceived to be summaries of a people's history from their incorporation to the author's present. More recent efforts have attempted to combine the two schools of opinions into a coherent definition and a history of Latin *breviaria*.¹² A third group of scholars, such as Pierre Dufraigne, ties in the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and the *Caesares* of Aurelius Victor with biographies or *vitae*, such as Suetonius' *Vitae Caesarum*.¹³ Much of Dufraigne's view arises from his seeing profound differences between Eutropius' *Breviarium* and Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*.

His first difference, perhaps minor, lies in the interest of

¹⁰ John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 28-29, n. 138; Enrica Malcovati, "I breviari storici del IV secolo," *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere, Filosofia E Magistero dell R. Università di Cagliari* 12 (1942): 38.

¹¹ Justin, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, tr. by J.C. Yardley, intro. and annotation by M.C. Develin (Atlanta, 1994).

¹² *The Breviarium of Festus. A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary*, ed. J.W. Eadie (London, 1967), pp. 10-13; Pierre Dufraigne, pp. xxxix-xli; Paul Jal, "But et technique d'abréviateurs latins: Justin et les abréviateurs de Valère Maxime," *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France* (1983): 39-44; Liviu Franga, "A propos de l'épitomé de Justin," *Latomus* 47 (1988): 868-874.

¹³ Pierre Dufraigne, pp. xxxix-xlv.

Festus and Eutropius in chronology (i.e. the use of consular years and other means of chronology). A second difference can be seen in the level of language used in abbreviated biographies as compared to *breviaria* (at least this is my hunch).¹⁴ Abbreviated biographies employed more complex language than *breviaria*. Eutropius (like his medieval imitators Paul the Deacon, Jordanes, Freculph, and Landolfus Sagax) writes in simple and clear style, while Aurelius Victor favours obscure words and complex sentence construction reminiscent of Tacitus and Sallust. To a lesser degree, the *epitomator* has the same ambition mixing the language of the poets and that of Aurelius Victor. A third difference deals with the work's structure. *Breviaria* are more often divided into books as can be seen in the works of Eutropius while abbreviated histories are just list of biographies. Because of these differences, Dufraigne sees works as the *Epitome* as both biographies and *breviaria*.

The *Epitome de Caesaribus* within Fourth-century Historiography

Understanding the *Epitome de Caesaribus* begins by placing it within both the history of *breviaria* and the historical context of the fourth-century. Latin *breviaria* began in the first century

¹⁴ This hunch is based on readings of Giovanni Matocii's *Historiale Imperiale* and Beneventus of Imola's *Liber Augustalis*, two fourteenth-century writers who wrote abbreviated histories of the emperors.

B.C.¹⁵ Fragments of three epitomes of Sallust survived: by L. Ateius Praetextus Philologus (c. 15), Vibius Maximus (c. 60) and Granius Licinianus (c. 130).¹⁶ Livy was summarized on many occasions. Under Tiberius (14-37) or at least prior to the time of Martial (c. 41-100), an *Epitoma Liviana* was made.¹⁷ Vellius Paterculus (c. 30) composed a summary of Roman history.¹⁸ Florus (c. 120) later wrote another summary of Roman history.¹⁹ L. Ampelius followed suit in the third century writing a short historical summary in his *Liber Memorialis*.²⁰ Finally, the last known summaries of Livy were composed by anonymous writers in the third century and fourth century: the *Oxyrhynchus Epitome* and the *Periochae*.²¹ Justin wrote a *summary of Pompeius Trogus'*

¹⁵ I. Opelt, "Epitome," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 5: *Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*, ed. Theodor Klauser (Stuttgart, 1962), p. 946.

¹⁶ *The Breviarium of Festus*, ed. J.W. Eadie, (London, 1967), p. 12; I. Opelt, *Reallexikon*, p. 948.

¹⁷ J.W. Eadie, p.11.

¹⁸ Velleius Paterculus, *Compendium of Roman History, Res Gestae of Augustus*, tr. Shipley, Frederick, Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge and London, 1924 [1967]), pp. viii-xx, 2-239 [Later editors like A.J. Woodman called it a summary, while R.J. Starr describes it as universal history. Eugen Cizek sees Velleius' work as an epitome. Cf. A.J. Woodman, "Questions of date, genre, and style: some literary answers," *Classical Quarterly* 25.2 (1975): 282-288; R.J. Starr, "The scope and genre of Velleius' History," *Classical Quarterly* 31.1 (1981): 162-174; Eugen Cizek, *Histoire et Historiens à Rome dans l'antiquité* (Lyon, 1995), pp. 200-202].

¹⁹ Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*, tr. E.S. Forster & Cornelius Nepos, *Lives*, tr. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge and London, 1929).

²⁰ Lucius Ampelius, *Aide-Mémoires (Liber Memorialis)*, texte établi et traduit par Arnault-Lindet, Marie-Pierre (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1993).

²¹ Tite-Live, *Abrégés de livres de l'Histoire Romaine de Tite-Live*. Tome 34, 2 volumes (*Periochae* 1-144), texte établi et tr.

Philippics in forty books. According to modern authors such as I. Opelt and E. Cizek, it is within this historical tradition of *breviaria* that the works of Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and the epitomator belong and have the closest affinities.

As I discussed earlier, although they share many similarities, these three authors, Victor, Eutropius, and the epitomator are not easily defined within an historical sub-genre of *breviaria*. Then, how does the *Epitome* really fit into the tradition of *breviaria*? The *Epitome* contains many individual characteristics: biographical form, complex style, and other previously mentioned traits. The work calls itself, in part, a summary of Aurelius Victor's books (*breviatus ex Aurelii Victoris libris*). The author says little about historiography within the text: two comments on morality, one about the idea of writing more about good emperors, and two more on his sources. About genre, he uses one word which is of interest - *breviatus* "having been summarized." This verb or its cognates are found in many epitomators of the fourth and early fifth century.²² Such words describe the work and its methodology. Beyond the term *breviatus* the epitomator says the most about the sub-genre among the epitomators writing that he places greater emphasis on the lives

Jal, Paul (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1984).

²² See A.J Woodman, "Date, genre, and Style in Velleius," 282-288.

of the good emperors rather than on those of lesser emperors.²³ He also says a few words about his interest in the *exitus* (death) and the *mores* (manners) of the Roman emperors examined.²⁴ These small historiographical parentheses imply that the *epitomator* saw himself more as a biographer than an historian. Unlike Victor or Eutropius, he likes to allude to his sources - *ex libris in istum videatur transferri* (48.9).

Conclusion

While the *epitomator* assimilates his work to a summary, his composition shows the influence of Aurelius Victor since the *Epitome* is a list of emperors with short discussions of their reign, office, and private lives written in an elevated style and in the form of short biographies. I think all these views of *breviaria* proposed by modern scholars in the first pages of this chapter are useful in understanding the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, but obscure an essential fact. The historical genre was never defined in antiquity as it is today, and the best that can be done is observing traits. I remember Gervais of Canterbury's (c. 1174)

²³ I began to say much about a good emperor, by whom fifty-six year after Augustus' death the Roman state afflicted by the cruelty of tyrants was restored as if by some fate so as not to be completely destroyed. *Plura dicere studium coegit imperatoris boni, quem ab Augusti morte post annos sex et quinquaginta Romana respublica exsanguis saevita tyrannorum quasi fato quodam, ne penitus rueret, assecuta est.*" *Epitome*, 9.16

²⁴ *Epitome*, 40.2, 40.10

comments about contemporary chroniclers that are fitting with respect to the *Epitome*:

There are many writers who, when writing Chronicles or Annals, exceed their limitations, since they take pleasure in expending and exaggerating their additions and pieces of information. They proceed in the manner of an historian in compiling their chronicle, and what they ought to write briefly and in simple style, they endeavour to elevate with pretentious words.²⁵

Gervais believed that recent chroniclers such as Richer of Tours were more ambitious in writing their work, which in many ways made no longer chroniclers, but historians. I believe that this process was also at work with fourth-century epitomators. Simply put, ancient writers of *breviaria* were free to improvise within their historical composition borrowing elements from biographies, and this may explain why it so hard to define the *Epitome* in the manner of a grammarian or a historian of literature.

²⁵ "(...) Sunt autem plurimi qui, cronicas vel annales scribentes, limites suos excedunt, nam philacteria sua dilatare et fimbrias magnificare delectant. Dum enim cronicam compilare, historici more incedunt, et quod breviter sermonesque humili de modo scribendi dicere debuerant, verbis ampullosis aggravare conantur (...)." Gervais of Canterbury, *Chronica*, praefatio, ed. Stubbs, in R.S., 79.1 (1879), pp. 87-88; see Benoît Lacroix, *L'historien au moyen-âge*, (Montréal et Paris, 1971), p. 41.

Chapter V: The *Epitome* and its Sources

For over a century, discussions about fourth-century Latin historians, such as the epitomator, have been in the form of works using the techniques of *Quellenforschung* or source reconstruction. This chapter will examine the *Epitome's* sources and discuss the difficulties surrounding their recovery.

As far as the *Epitome* is concerned, the recovery of the sources has come down in two basic schemae. Prior to the 1870s, most scholarly analyses of the sources consisted mainly of drawing parallels between information found in the *Epitome* and that of extant sources based on linguistic and contextual similarities. For example, Andreas Schott (1579) believed the sources of the *Epitome* to be Suetonius, the *Historia Augusta* (H.A.), Aurelius Victor, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Eutropius.¹ Anne Dacier (1681) and Theodore Opitz (1872) added Zosimus to that list, an author who had

¹ '(...). Mihi certe studio fuit, indicare quam feliciter Lavernae litasset, & unde potissimum uvas decerpisset; a Tranquillo nimirum, Victore, Ammiano, Eutropius, ceteris. *De Vita et Moribus Imperatorum Romanorum, excerpta ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris, a Caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium Imperatorem. Andreas Schott (...) emendabat; scholiis (...) illustrabat* (Lugd. Batav., apud Gaasebequios, 1669), p. 8 n. 1

become known in the West in 1585.² From 1884 onward, modern scholars such as Charles Cohn, Alexander Enmann, and Jorg Schlumberger began to propose lost intermediaries between the *Epitome* and the ancient authors previously discussed by early scholars (indirect derivation).³ This change in source reconstruction was due to more systematic approaches in *Quellenforschung*.

Defining *Quellenforschung* and the Particular Problems of the *Epitome*

Quellenforschung is a useful tool.⁴ Like all the techniques of philology, it is a method comparing texts in order to determine their relationship to one another (e.g.

² See *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Historiae Romanae Compendium. Interpretatione et notis illustravit Anna Tanaquil (...)* (Parisiis, apud Dionysius Thierry, 1681); Theodore Opitz, "Quaestionum de Sexto Aurelio Victore capita tria," *Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis* 2 (1872): 197-278.

³ Arthur Cohn, *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et libri de caesaribus et epitomes undecim capita priora fluxerint* (Diss., Berlin/Leipzig, 1884); Alexander Enmann, "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch de Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae. Quellenstudien," *Philologus Suppl.* 4 (1884): 397-501; Jorg Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Munich, 1974), pp. 233-248.

⁴ See R.W. Burgess, "Jerome's *Chronici Canones*, *Quellenforschung*, and Fourth-Century Historiography," in Giorgio Bonamente, François Heim, and Jean-Pierre Callu, *Historia Augusta Colloquium Argentoratense, H.A.C. nova Series, VI* (Bari, 1998), pp. 84-87; David S. Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian* (London and New York, 1999), pp. 90-95.

Suetonius' *Vita Caesarum* and the *Epitome*).

Quellenforschung does not simply consist of comparing texts in order to find particular linguistic and factual parallels, but rather employs a complex set of principles with a view to reaching a high degree of verifiability with respect to textual derivation. Similar language and facts in more than one text are useful, but they only present corresponding narrative styles and historical outlook. Scholars need to look also for common errors and idiosyncrasies repeated throughout the texts being compared. When these similarities are numerous enough, one can argue a case for derivation. Derivation occurs through roughly these possible schemas: a) direct derivation; b) indirect derivation through an existing or lost intermediary; c) or an indirect derivation through a lost common source which predates both surviving texts.⁵ Proof of direct derivation without using *Quellenforschung* is rare in antiquity (e.g. Orosius, in his *Historia Adversus Paganos*, 7.11.1 & 7.19.4, specifically naming Eutropius' *Breviarium*). Numerous parallels, disjunctive or conjunctive,

⁵ I have mentioned three possible schemas of *Quellenforschung*, but one could also mentioned derivation of either all of them or two in combination. For late fourth-century epitomators, this would have been unusual because of the scarcity of books and highly ritualised means of book exchanges in antiquity.

between texts are usually an indication that some type of derivation occurred. Each path of derivation leaves different traces in subsequent works. If the later text contains more information than the earlier one, one can then look for a more ancient source from which both authors have selected historical material. If the later work contains elements from an intermediary source, there will be traces of this intermediary's perceptions through the use of factual information (e.g. Roman titles, institutions, or a geographical location fitting an intermediary period) which would be anachronistic in either the earlier or the later texts studied). There are cases where this lost source can be identified. The *Epitome's* sources fall into all three types of derivation, which would explain the numerous controversies among scholars.

The Debate over a Main Source

In modern times, there have been four important reconstructions of the *Epitome's* sources. Jorg Schlumberger proposed that the *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, a lost work (AD 389/391), which combines elements from Suetonius, Marius Maximus, the *KG*, Aurelius Victor, and Eutropius for

the imperial period were the epitomator's basic sources.⁶

In his review of Jorg Schlumberger's book, T.D. Barnes suggests that the sources of the *Epitome* were the *KG*, Marius Maximus, Aurelius Victor, and possibly Eutropius, Ammianus, and Eunapius.⁷ Wilhelm Den Boer believed that authors such as the epitomator had used their own reminiscences for the material relating to their own time combined with materials found in rhetorical compilations of ancient authors which were used in school in rhetorical exercises.⁸ All of these views contain valid elements that cannot be dismissed. Rhetorical schools did shape the moral outlook of students and fostered the use of *exempla* (moral anecdotes) among fourth-century authors, a good point for Wilhelm den Boer's views. The *KG* and the *Annales* were important contributions to fourth-century historiography, and were probably not unknown to their fellow contemporary historians. The epitomator probably knew Marius Maximus, and perhaps elements from Suetonius as well. In addition, combining elements taken from the three points of views from the 1970s offers a

⁶ Jorg Schlumberger (1974), pp. 233-248.

⁷ T.D. Barnes, "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its Sources," *Classical Philology* 71 (1976): 258-268.

⁸ W. Den Boer, (1972), p. 21; W. den Boer, "Rezension der Jorg Schlumberger *Epitome de Caesaribus*," *Gnomon* 51 (1979): 169; "Rome à travers trois auteurs du quatrième siècle," *Mnemosyne* 21 (1968): 254-282.

reasonably valid reconstruction of the *Epitome's* sources.

In the 1990s, Jean-Pierre Callu and Michel Festy attempted such reconstructions by combining elements from the three schools of thought in the manner first introduced by Harry Bird in his work on Aurelius Victor and Eutropius.⁹ The results are interesting and worthy of admiration, but these authors did not address certain difficulties with respect to the use of the *KG*, Suetonius, Ammianus Marcellinus, Nicomachus Flavianus, Marius Maximus, and the *Consularia* tradition.

Nature and Content of Nicomachus Flavianus *Annales*

In 1974, Jorg Schlumberger published his dissertation on the *Epitome's* sources. In this study he argued that most of the *Epitome* depended upon one source alone, which he believed to be Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* (389/391). Jorg Schlumberger's hypothesis with respect to Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* is difficult to prove because two inscriptions (AD 431) are the only witnesses for this

⁹ J.-P. Callu, "La première diffusion de l'*Histoire Auguste* (VIe-IXe s.)," *B.H.A.C. 1982/1983* (Bonn, 1985), pp. 89-129; Pseudo-Aurélius Victor, *L'Épitome de Césars*, texte établi et traduit par Michel Festy (Paris, les Belles Lettres, 1999), pp. xx-xxxviii.

author.¹⁰ Beyond the name of the author and that of the work, these inscriptions tell nothing about the content of the work. This work was commissioned by Theodosius probably during the period, in which Nicomachus Flavianus was both Praetorian Prefect and *Quaestor Palatii* (c. 389/391). Some such as Barnes (until recently) and R.W. Burgess have argued that the *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavius Senior was a Republican history on the basis of Nicomachus' surviving historical interests.¹¹ Nicomachus' son and Quintus Aurelius Symmachus Eusebius commissioned a group to make a copy of Livy's *Histories*, and the epitomator and Claudian tell us that Theodosius was an avid reader of Republican history.¹² According to Guy Sabbah, the title of *Annales* was often used to describe non-contemporary history.¹³ On the basis of

¹⁰ C.I.L. VI.1782-3

¹¹ Symmachus, *Epistulae*, IX.13; cf. John Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425* (Oxford, 1975), p. 231, n. 3; Barnes, pp. 267-8; T.D. Barnes, "The Historia Augusta, Nicomachus Flavianus, and Peter the Patrician," *Classical Review* 54.1 (2004): 120-124; R.W. Burgess, *Classical Philology* (2005) (forthcoming).

¹² Symmachus, *Epistula*, IX.13; E.G. Zetzel, "The Subscriptions in the Manuscripts of Livy and Fronto and the Meaning of Emendation," *Classical Philology* (1980): 39-42; Claudian, In *Honor of the Fourth Consulship of Honorius*, verses 394-398 & *Epitome*, 48.12.

¹³ Aulus Gellius, *Noctes atticae*, 5.18.1-6; cf. Guy Sabbah, *Ammianus Marcellinus, in Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century AD.*, ed. G. Marasco (Leiden/Boston, 2003), 46-47.

those circumstantial facts, it is highly possible that the *Annales* was a Republican history.

Despite the certainty of scholars such as T.D. Barnes, their position can be disposed of by a rebuttal. In late antiquity, the meaning of *Annales* had become associated with Consular Chronicles such as the *Fasti Romani* or the *Descriptio Consulium*, and in the first century Tacitus himself had titled his last work the *Annales*, which describes the history of the emperors from Tiberius to Galba.¹⁴ The other only certain thing about Nicomachus Flavianus Senior's literary interest is that he composed a Latin translation of Themistius' *Paraphrase of the Analytics of Aristotle* and that he perhaps commissioned one for Philostratus' *Greek life of Apollonius of Tyana*.¹⁵ It is dangerous to base his historical interests on those of Symmachus and Theodosius. These two men were very eclectic in their historical

¹⁴ "In late antiquity the term (*annales*) is quite rare, and it is used in the general sense of of historical records or representation (e.g. Prud., c. *Symm.*, 1.596, Rut. Nam. *de red. suo*, 1.311, Orosius, *Hist. Prol.* 10)." Brian Croke, "Chronicles, Annals, and 'Consular Annals' in Late Antiquity," *Chiron* 31 (2001): 298-299; cf. J. Schlumberger, "Verlorene Annalen," pp. 306-307.

¹⁵ Pierre Courcelle, *Lettres grecques dans l'occident latin* (Paris, 1948), p. 57; Sidonius Apollinarius, *Epistula*, VIII.3

interest. In his past time, Symmachus supervised editions of Sallust's *Jugurtha* and Livy's *Histories*.¹⁶ He possessed a huge library at his house on the Caelian, which included a copy of Pliny's *Natural History*.¹⁷ His extant speeches and letters show an average interest in Roman imperial history.¹⁸ He seemed to have read or possessed a copy of Eutropius' *Breviarium*.¹⁹ He knew that for example that "Look, Augustus claims Baiae for himself from an unbroken sea, and the imperial expenditure labors under the Lucrine dikes. Tiberius is worshipped while swimming and sailing at his island-retreats. Pius searches for rest at Caieta. Marcus, more relaxed, is heard in the Lyceum and the Academy."²⁰ With respect to Theodosius' literary interests, from the little we know of it can be said that he liked geography commissioning an itinerary of his Empire, which survived in

¹⁶ Symmachus, *Epistula*, IV.24

¹⁷ Symmachus, *Epistulae*, I.24; IV.18.5

¹⁸ Symmachus, *Epistula*, I.1.13.3; cf. Stuart Cristo, "Appendix B: Symmachus and the Classics," in *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus. A Political and Social Biography* (Diss., Fordham University, 1974), pp. 217-218

¹⁹ Symmachus, *Epistula*, III.50

²⁰ "Ecce Baias sibi Augustus a continuo mari vindicat et molibus Lucrinis sumptus laborat imperii; Tiberius in devorsoriis insularum nantans et navigans adoratur; Pius otia Caietana persquitur: in Lycio et Academia remissior Marcus auditur." Symmachus, *Oration*, I.16; See Ralph G. Hall Jr., *Two Panegyric in Honor of Valentinian I by Q. Aurelius Symmachus: A Translation and Commentary* (Diss Univ. of South Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1977), p. 12.

part in the Geography of Dicuil (c 825) (e.g. the dedication).²¹ If one bases his views on the works of panegyrists such as Claudian, Theodosius also picked his *exempla* from the lives of the emperors (e.g. Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, and Domitian, Trajan, and Marcus Aurelius).²² Circumstantial evidence such as that mentioned above can be argued both ways. Schlumberger and Barnes have done it quite eloquently. In the end the only thing you can say is that Nicomachus wrote an historical work in honour of Theodosius. One needs to look at other evidence to make up his or her mind.

The first is the *Anecdoton Holderi* (a small biographical note written about AD 550).²³ This short work mentions that Quintus Aurelius Symmachus Memmius, Nicomachus' great-grand-nephew, wrote a history on the model on his ancestors - dixit sententiam pro allectiis in senatu parentesque suos imitatus historiam quoque Romanam septem libris edidit. Clearly among his ancestors, we know that Nicomachus Flavianus wrote a

²¹ Dicuil, *Liber de Mensura Orbis Terrae* (Berloni, 1870).

²² Claudian, *In Honour of Honorius' Fourth Consulship*, verses 312-320.

²³ See Alain Galonnier, "Anecdoton Holderi ou Ordo Generis Cassiodorum, introduction, édition, traduction et commentaire," *Antiquité Tardive* 4 (1996): 299-312.

history. About the content of Symmachus' *Historiae*, we known that he wrote a history, which dealt with imperial discussing the rise of the emperor Maximinus (235-238).²⁴ While, it can easily be said that the phrasing of the *Anecdoton* is vague, and its author could be writing a hyperbole complimentary to Symmachus by associating authors, who wrote different types of history. Symmachus' *Historiae* were probably written during his stay in Constantinople awaiting the reception of his embassy by the emperor between 519/521.²⁵ From this little phrase - *imitatus suos parentes*, it is impossible to argue either way on the content of Nicomachus' *Annales*.

In recent times, scholars have speculated about its content:

"Tout aussi délicate est la question du point de départ des Annales. Pour W. Hartke, l'œuvre de Nicomache, traitant de l'histoire de la seconde dynastie flavienne, part de la mort de Claude II, son fondateur mythique. Selon J. Schlumberger, les Annales retracent l'histoire impériale depuis

²⁴ "nam ut dicit Symmachus in quinto suae historiae libro: quod nos idcirco huic nostro opusculo de Symmachi historia mutuauimus." Jordanes, *Getica*, 86

²⁵ See Priscian, *De Figura Numerorum*, Praefatio; M. Festy, "L'*Historia Romana* de Symmaque le Jeune," *Historia* 52.2 (2003): 254; Callu, (1985), p. 109; Giuseppe Zecchini, *Ricerche di storiografia latina tardoantica* (Roma, 1993), p. 86

Auguste. Pour G. Zecchini, elles embrasseraient l'ensemble de l'histoire, mais très succinctement des origines aux Haut Empire.'²⁶

Schlumberger and Hartke see Nicomachus' *Annales*, as full-pledged histories of the scope of Ammianus' *Rerum Gestarum Libri*, while Zecchini believes that it was a *breviarium* of Roman history similar to that of Eutropius. These interpretations are all possible, but Zecchini may prove to be the most interesting. Although the exact form of Symmachus' *Historiae* is unknown, it is quite possible that his work was a *breviarium* in seven books like that Orosius.²⁷ There are strong factors for this interpretation because the story of Maximinus is located in book five of a work, which contained seven books.²⁸ Orosius discusses Maximinus in book seven of his *Historia Adversus Paganos*, hence I believe that discussing Maximinus in book five for Symmachus would make sense if one intended to write until the beginning of the reign of Justin.²⁹ If Nicomachus' *Annales* and Symmachus' *Historiae* were similar in scope and content, one should have least fragments of Nicomachus' *Annales*. However, unlike Symmachus' fragments, nothing survives that can be

²⁶ Festy, p. 14.

²⁷ G. Zecchini, p. 61

²⁸ See note 31

²⁹ Orosius, VII.19.1-2.

identified with certainty.³⁰

The Nature and Content of the *Kaisergeschichte*

In 1884, Alexander Enmann found strong validation for the existence of the *Kaisergeschichte*, a lost series of imperial biographies written around 357, in the verbal parallels among the various late antique epitomators referring to the emperors from Augustus to Julian.³¹ For Augustus's reign, he mentioned these parallels between the epitomator and Eutropius: his military campaigns, his treatment of Parthia, and his reception of embassies from far-away nations. For Aurelius Victor, the author of the *H.A.*, and Eutropius, Enmann finds parallels similar in language for the reigns of Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Diocletian, Constantine, and Constantius: abandonment of Dacia, Hadrian's nickname of *Graeculus*, the death of Lucius

³⁰ Freculph of Lisieux (AD 825) mentions some *scriptores annalium* in his *Tomi Chronici duo* (1169c) - *ferunt de eo annalium scriptores, quod esset omnium qui ante eum fuerunt acerrimus ingenio, ac omnia qua intendisset, in finem pergens (...) Punica eloquentia promptior* (= *Epit.* 20.8). By *scriptores Annalium*, Freculph just means various historians' works. It is not a fragment of Nicomachus' *Annales*.

³¹ Alexander Enmann, "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch *de viris illustribus urbis Romae*," *Philologus suppl.*, 4 (1884): 335-501.

Verus under Marcus Aurelius, Decius' birthplace at Budalia, near Sirmium, the wars of Aurelian and Diocletian, Constantine's bridge over the Danube, and the wars between Magnentius and Constantius. Such striking parallels in language led him to believe in the existence of a common source. Enmann noted the interest of the *KG* author in usurpers. More recently, Richard Burgess has discovered a few more parallels, and he found that Polemius Silvius (c. 440), who compiled a list of emperors, exhibited a keen interest in usurpers.³² Polemius Silvius named two first-century usurpers, Scribonianus (AD 42) and Antonius (AD 89). They are named only by Suetonius (Claud., 13.2), in the *H.A.* (c. 395), and the *Epitome* (c. 395). Burgess thinks that this list owes much to the *Kaisergeschichte*, which was to a large degree concerned with Gallic affairs.

The *Epitome's* Sources for the Emperors
from Augustus to Domitian (Chapters 1-11)

The sources of the epitomator for the chapters one to eleven present difficulties, but can be reconstructed as follows: the *Kaisergeschichte*, echoes of Suetonius' *Caesares*,

³² R.W. Burgess, "*Principes cum Tyrannis*: Two Studies on the *Kaisergeschichte* and its Tradition," *Classical Quarterly* 43.2 (1993): 495-499.

and Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*.

The epitomator incorporates into his biographies of Augustus, Galba, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, a series of Suetonian anecdotes. Over fifty parallels are to be found between Suetonius' work and the *Epitome*.³³ Yet because of the possible use of intermediaries, modern scholars such as

³³ *Epit.*, 1.4 = Suetonius, Aug., 18.2; 1.7 = Suetonius, Aug., 21; 1.10 = Suetonius, Aug., 21.1; 1.11 = Suetonius, Aug., 25.3; 1.12 = Suetonius, Aug., 25.4; 1.13 = Suetonius, Aug., 23.1; 1.14 = Suetonius, Aug., 25.1; 1.16 = Suetonius, Aug., 66.2; 1.16 = Suetonius, Aug., 66.1; 1.17 = Suetonius, Aug., 84.1; 1.18 = Suetonius, Aug., 34; 1.19 = Suetonius, Aug., 28.3; 1.20 = Suetonius, Aug., 80.1; 1.21 = Suetonius, Aug., 71; 1.23 = Suetonius, Aug., 69; 1.25 = Suetonius, Aug., 25; 2.2 = Suetonius, Ti.b. 42.1; 2.4 = Suetonius, Tib., 69.1; 2.9 = Suetonius, Tib., 41 (border wars); 3.7 = Suetonius, Calig., 36.2; 3.9 = Suetonius, Calig., 19.1 (the Puteoli's bridge); 4.4 = Suetonius, Claudius, 13.2; 4.4 = Suetonius, Claudius, 20.1; 5.1 = Suetonius, Nero, 6.2; 5.3 = Suetonius, Nero, 12; 5.5 = Suetonius, Nero, 35.1; 5.7 = Suetonius, Nero, 49.2; 5.7 = Suetonius, Nero, 49.2-3; 5.8 = Suetonius, Nero, 57.1; 5.9 = Suetonius, Nero, 57.1; 6.2 = Suetonius, Galba, 14.2; 6.3 = Suetonius, Galba, 6.2; 7.1 = Suetonius, Otho, 1; 8.2 = Suetonius, Vitellius, 7.1, 13.1; 8.3 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 6.2, Suetonius, Vitellius, 15.1; 9.3 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 13; 9.9-13 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 8.4; 9.14 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 14; 9.18 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 23.4 & 24; 10.1 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 3.1, 4.1; 10.3 = Suetonius, Titus, 7.1; 10.4 = Suetonius, Titus, 6.1; 10.4 = Suetonius, Titus, 6.2; 10.7 = Suetonius, Titus, 7.1-2; 10.11 = Suetonius, Titus, 9.2; 10.12 = Suetonius, Titus, 8.3; 10.13 = Suetonius, Titus, 8.3; 10.14 = Suetonius, Titus, 8.3; 10.15 = Suetonius, Titus, 11.1; 11.1 = Suetonius, Vespasian, 3.1; 11.4 = Suetonius, Domitian, 20; 11.5 = Suetonius, Domitian, 19.1; 11.14 = Suetonius, Domitian, 4.3; 13.10 = Suetonius, Domitian, 22.2 (the oracle read in the *cras, cras*, made by a crow on the Capitoline announcing the providential nature of Trajan).

Schlumberger have been reticent to credit an epitomator with any direct knowledge of Suetonius.

As discussed earlier, both the epitomator and Victor collected other passages from Suetonius, such as Caligula's passion for dressing like the gods or an anecdote about Titus' mercy.³⁴ This last parallel illustrates the point:

Clementiam vero usque eo
perdultit, ut amplissimi
ordinis duo cum adversus eum
coniuravissent neque abnuere
cogitatum scelus quirent,
monuerit primo, post deductos
in spectaculum se utrimque
assidere iusserit petitoque ex
industria mirmillonum, quorum
pugnae visebantur, gladio
quasi ad explorandam aciem uni
atque alteri commiserit;
quibus perculsi et constantiam
mirantibus diceret: 'Videtisne
potestates fato dari
frustraue temptari facinus
potiundi spe vel amittendi
metu? Epitome, 10.10

Neque minus sancte facilis in
tuendis qui forte in se
coniuravissent, adeo ut, cum
amplissimi ordinis duo abnuere
cogitatum scelus nequirent,
patresque cenuissent de
confessis supplicium sumendum,
deductos in spectaculumse
utrumque assidere iusserit,
petitoque ex industria
gladiatoris, quorum pugnae
visebantur, gladio, quasi ad
explorandam aciem uni atque
alteri committeret. Quis
perculsis et constantiam
mirantibus: 'Videtisne,
inquit, potestates fato dari,
frustraue tentari facinus
potiundi sped vel amittendi
metu ?' Aurelius Victor, 10.3-
4

The language is very similar, which strongly indicates that the epitomator had read Victor's *Caesares*. In addition, there are close parallels between both these passages and Suetonius

³⁴ Aurelius Victor, 3.10; *Epitome*, 3.5; Suetonius, *Cal.*, 52.5; *Epitome*, 10.10, Aurelius Victor, 10.3-4, Suet., *Tit.*, 9.1

with respect to the material.³⁵ There are major differences between the *Epitome*'s account and Victor's narrative. While Victor, for example, mentions the role of the senate in the trial of the two senators, the epitomator is silent on the matter. In contrast, the epitomator has more to say about the types of gladiators than either Suetonius or Victor. Such differences may indicate a common source used by Suetonius, Victor, and the epitomator. Another imperial bon mot found in Suetonius about Titus' clemency is repeated in the *Epitome* (10.9) and Eutropus' *Breviarium* (7.21.4) (= Suetonius, *Titus*, 8.1). In this passage, the wording is again very similar. With reference to these three parallels, Alexander Enmann and Richard Burgess are proved right, again in believing that an intermediary source between Suetonius and the epitomator must be postulated and that it may be the *Kaisergeschichte*.

The idea of such an intermediary is difficult to dismiss even in the independent parallels between the *Epitome* and

³⁵ Duos patricii generis convictos in adfectione imperii nihil amplius quam ut desisterent monuit, docens principatum fato dari, si quid praeterea desiderarent promittens se tributurum. (...) ceterum ipsos non solum familiari cenae adhibuit, sed et insequenti die gladiatorum spectaculo circa se ex industria conlocatis oblata sibi ferramenta pugnantium inspicienda porrexit. Suetonius, *Titus*, 9.1

Suetonius' work. In his biography of Tiberius, the epitomator mentions the military situation on the various borders in AD 37, a point also discussed by Suetonius.³⁶ The two authors differ considerably on the question of the location of the Rome's enemies. While Suetonius describes the geographical disposition of the tribes along the border of the Danube in the first century AD, the epitomator describes the situation of the mid-fourth century. The Sarmatians lived across from Moesia in Suetonius' time, while in the fourth century they lived across from Pannonia.³⁷ The description would better match the time in which the *Kaisergeschichte* was written than that of the *Epitome*. In the epitomator's own time, the Sarmatians no longer resided on the borders of Pannonia, and had been broken into three groups: the Limigantes, the free Sarmatians, and those living in the Roman Empire.³⁸ This discrepancy clearly shows that in this case the epitomator used a source which was not Suetonius himself. The passage reveals a mid-fourth century

³⁶ *Epit.*, 2.9 = *Suet.*, *Tib.*, 41 [alluded in Aurelius Victor, *Caesares*, 2.3 thus probably the KG]; cf. Barnes, p. 262.

³⁷ Tacitus, *Histories*, 1.79 (c. 120); *Expositio mundi et gentium*, 57 (c. 360); Ammianus, 17.12 (c. 390).

³⁸ Ammianus Marcellinus, 17.12-13; cf. K. Kretschmer, "Sarmatae," in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, eds. Wilhelm Kroll und Kurt Wilte (Stuttgart, 1920), vol. 1a, pp. 2542-2550, p. 2547; Tadeuz Sulimirski, *The Sarmatians* (Southampton, 1970), p. 181.

reworking of Suetonius' text.³⁹ The epitomator may not have brought to date Suetonius' account with respect to geography, since the change of location of the Samartians had become meaningless by the end of the fourth century.

While Enmann's interpretation of the sources is useful and explains nearly all of the verbal and contextual similarities among the epitomators, it does not do so with regard to Suetonius. Other parallels require more complex explanations. A complex passage illustrates the difficulties surrounding *Quellenforschung*. Aurelius Victor (4.3) and the *Epitome* (3.9) both describe the bridge over the Bay of Puteoli which was erected by Caligula:

In spatio trium milium, quod in sinu Puteolano inter moles iacet, duplici ordine naues contexens, arenae aggestu ad terrae speciem uiam solidatam, phalerato equo insignisque quercea corona, quasi triumphans indutus aureo paludamento, curru biugo decucurrit." *Epitome*, 3.9

Adhuc annonae egestas composita, quam Caligula inexerat, dum, adactis toto orbe navigiis, pervium mare theatri curribusque damno publicum efficere contendit. Aurelius Victor, 4.3

Nam Baiarum medium intervallum ad Puteolanas moles, trium milium et sescentorum fere passuum spatium ponte coniunxit

³⁹ A Sarmatis Pannoniam, non Moesiam, vexatam esse, *Epitome* cum tradat, recedit a Suetonio, et id suo iure, id quod cuiusvis sedium populorum illorum situm animo complectenti apparebit. Arthur Cohn, *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et epitomes. Undecim capita priora fluxerint* (Berlin, 1884), p. 33.

contractis undique onerariis navibus et ordine duplici ad
 ancoras conlocatis superiectoque terreno ac directo in Appiae
 viae formam. Per hunc pontem ultro citro commeavit biduo
 continenti primo die falerato equo insignisque quercea corona
 et caestra et gladio aureaque chlamyde, postridie quadrigario
 habitu curriculoque biiugi famosorum equorum (...). Suet.,
Cal., 19.1-2

Here, the epitomator has clearly not copied Victor's *Caesares* since the *Epitome* contains all the details about the chariot and the bridge found in Suetonius. Victor mentions the bridge of boats, but he places greater emphasis upon the after-effects of Caligula's actions. Victor and Cassius Dio argue that it was Caligula's extravagance which caused a major famine in Rome under his successor.⁴⁰ Neither the epitomator nor Suetonius discussed the information about the famine in that context. The epitomator and Suetonius mainly list Caligula's extravagances in their respective accounts. A difference of this sort with Victor shows that the epitomator had obviously not used Victor's narrative in writing this passage, but I do not think this echo of Suetonius comes from the *Kaisergeschichte* either as we will see in the following paragraphs.⁴¹

⁴⁰ See Cassius Dio, 59.17.1-3; cf. Seneca, *De Brevitate Vitae*, 18.5-6; Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 19.5-6.

⁴¹ Pierre Dufraigne, p. 77 n. 14; M. Festy (1999), p. 74, n. 10.

Knowledge of Suetonius need not be disputed here, since Caligula's excesses were so well known that the imperial panegyrist of AD 310 still remembers Caligula's feat of bridging the gulf of Baiae in a panegyric in honor of Constantine:

"Iunxerit licet quondam Hellesponti angustias
 classe connexa Persarum rex potentissimus:
 temporaries ille transitus fuit. Simili nauium
 continuatione Baianum sinum strauerit ab Augusto
 tertius Caesar : dedicata fuit illa nectatio
 principis otiosi. / Perhaps the all-powerful king
 of Persia did once link the straits of the
 Hellespont by stringing his fleet across; but that
 crossing was temporary. With a similar chain of
 ships the second Caesar after Augustus traversed
 the bay of Baiae; but that crossing was a mere whim
 of a decadent emperor." *Panegici Latini*,
 VII(6).13.4 (tr. Mark Vermes)

Contrasting the undertaking of Constantine's bridge over the Rhine with those of Xerxes and Caligula across the Hellespont and Baiae, the panegyrist of AD 310 follows the tone of Suetonius in dismissing Caligula's feat as a mere extravagance. The panegyrist in question was clearly familiar with the account of Suetonius, albeit indirectly.

Elsewhere, the epitomator copies Augustus' boast about turning Rome from a city of bricks to one of marble, which bears a close similarity with Suetonius' version of it:

Auxit ornauitque Romam aedificiis multis, isto

glorians dicto: 'Urbem latericiam repperi, relinquo marmoream.' *Epit.* 1.19

Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo ut sit iure gloriatus 'marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset.' *Suet., Aug., 28.3*

The epitomator, here, presents the same facts that Suetonius does about Augustus' boast, but there are, however, some stylistic differences worth noting.⁴² The epitomator uses the indirect speech, while Suetonius uses the direct speech.⁴³ This difference is important because this is how in medieval florilegia on Suetonius his bon mots are reported - "The adaptation of selections to serve moral and diactic purposes left the excerptor free to change word order, to leave out unnecessary words and phrases, and to alter mood and tense as he saw fit, as well as the actual wording, particularly if the original happened to be just too candid for the reader."⁴⁴ It is possible that such procedure also occurred in rhetorical handbook of exempla.

⁴² The boast is also mentioned in Orosius, VII.7.7, and it may indicate that bon mot was well known.

⁴³ Schlumberger, p. 25; Festy, p. 63 n. 17.

⁴⁴ See Hubert Hill Harper Jr., *Suetonius in certain Mediaeval Florilegia*, (Diss., University of South Carolina, 1952), p. 157; *Flores Suetonii* - n, e, p, a (Paris. 17903, Paris 7647, Escorial Q.I.14e, Aras 64(65a) Urbem pro maiestate imperii ornatam (...) excoluit adeo ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere quam latericiam accepisset.

The epitomator does so elsewhere with jokes from Suetonius: Caldius Biberus Mero, disce militare, and nosti me uirum esse.⁴⁵ There are the type of episode rhetorical handbooks would contain.⁴⁶ Most of these appear in the *flores Suetonii* of the later Middle Ages. This may explain why there are so many echoes from Suetonius in the *Epitome*. Oral tradition or an anthology similar to those of Macrobius and of Arusianus Messius could easily explain those interesting bon mots found in the *Epitome*.⁴⁷

It was, however, Aurelius Victor who appears to have had the most notable influence upon the epitomator's style for the chapters from one to eleven. Almost a century ago, Fr. Pichlmayr listed over forty instances in his edition of the *Epitome*.⁴⁸ In the 1970s Jorg Schlumberger made significant

⁴⁵ *Epit.*, 2.2, 6.3, 9.4

⁴⁶ Harper, pp. 18-19

⁴⁷ Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 2.19; Arusianus Messius, *Exempla Elocutionum*, ed. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. VII (Leipzig, 1878), pp. 447-514.

⁴⁸ Aurelius Victor (A.V.), 1.1 = *Epitome* (E.), 1.1; A.V., 1.1 = E., .2; A.V. 1.6 = E., 1.28; A.V. 2.1 = E., 2.4; A.V. 2.1 = E., 2.6; A.V. 2.3-4 = E., 2.8; A.V. 3.3-4 = E., 3.2; A.V. 3.6-7 = E., 3.3; A.V. 3.10 = E., 3.4-5; A.V. 3.13 = E., 3.8; A.V. 3.16-17 = E., 4.2; A.V. 4.1 = E., 4.3; A.V. 4.2 = E., 4.4; A.V. 4.6-7 et 4.11 = E., 4.5; A.V., 4.12 = E., 4.6; A.V. 4.14 = E., 4.9; A.V. 4.13 = E., 4.10; A.V. 4.15 = E., 4.11-12; A.V. 5.2 = E., 5.2-4; A.V. 5.4-5 = E., 5.5; A.V. 5.5 = E., 5.5; A.V. 5.16 = E., 5.7; A.V. 6.1 = E., 6.1; A.V. 6.3 =

additions to this list.⁴⁹ The following example

illustrates both the method and its results:

Anno Urbis conditae
septingentesimo uicesimo
secundo, ab exactis uero
regibus quadringentesimo
octogesimoque, mos Romae
repetitus uni prorsus parendi,
pro rege imperatori uel
sanctiori nomine Augusto
appellato. Octavianus igitur,
patre Octavio senatore
genitus, maternum genus ab
Aenaea per Iuliam familiam
sortitus, maternum genus ab
Aenea per Iuliam familiam
sortitus, adoptione uero Gai
Caesaris maioris auunculi
Gaius Caesar dictus, deinde ob
uictoriam Augustus
cognominatus est. *Epitome*,
1.1-2 (c. 395)

Anno urbis septingentesimo
fere uicesimoque duobus etiam,
mos Romae incessit uni prorsus
parendi. Namque Octavianus,
patre Octavio atque adoptione
magni auunculi, Caesaris, ac
mox procerum consulto, ob
uictoriam partium placide
exercitam, Augusti cognomento
dictus, illectis per dona
militibus atque annonae
curandae specie uulgo, ceteros
haud difficulter subegit.
Aurelius Victor, 1.1 (c. 361)

Similarities in terms of language and ideas are obvious in
these passages; these are shown underlined. The epitomator

E., 6.4; A.V. 8.6 = E., 8.3; A.V. 8.6 = E., 8.4-5; A.V. 8.7 =
E., 8.6; A.V. 9.1-2 = E., 9.5; A.V. 9.5 = E., 9.6; A.V. 9.6 =
E., 9.7; A.V. 9.8 = E., 9.9-10; A.V. 9.9 = E., 9.11; A.V.
9.9-10 = E., 9.12-13; A.V. 10.1 = E., 10.3; A.V. 10.6 = E.,
10.6; A.V. 10.2 = E., 10.8; A.V. 10.4 = E., 10.10; A.V. 10.6
= E., 10.16; A.V. 11.3-4 = E., 11.2; A.V. 11.5-6 = E., 11.3;
A.V. 11.8 = E., 11.13; A.V. 11.12-13 et 12.1 = E., 11.15;
A.V. 34.4 = E., 34.3; A.V. 40.2-3 = Ep., 41.2; A.V. 40.4 =
E., 41.3

⁴⁹ *Epit.*, 13.11 = A.V. 13.12; *Epit.* 16.12 = A.V. 16.14;
Epit., 16.15 = A.V. 16.15; *Epit.*, 21.2 = A.V. 21.1; *Epit.*,
25.2 = A.V. 2.1 (*insontes et noxios*); *Epit.*, 29.5 = A.V.
29.3; *Epit.*, 30.2 = A.V. 30.2; *Epit.*, 33.1 = A.V. 33.6;
Epit., 34.2 = A.V., 33.28; *Epit.*, 34.3 = A.V. 33.12; see.
Jorg Schlumberger, pp. 47-56, 80-81, 118, 137 n. 21; 143-166.

copied faithfully the main ideas – the return of one man's rule, Octavian's adoption by Gaius Julius Caeaar, and gaining the title of Augustus and the *tribunicia postestas*. There are small additions by the epitomator of elements from the *Kaisergeschichte*. Victor had simply named Augustus' two fathers and had ascribed the title of Augustus to his victory in the civil war; the epitomator adds the name of his mother and the efforts of Octavian to gain the favour of the senate, the army, and the people by avoiding the name of king being rewarded with the title of Augustus, both facts ultimately derived from Suetonius' biography of Augustus via the *Kaisergeschichte*.⁵⁰

In the chapters on Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, and Domitian, the epitomator copied facts found only in Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* following closely the style of the phrases: the removals of kings Archelaos and Marobodus by Tiberius, Caligula's dressing up like a god, Messalina's brothel, the death of Claudius, the annexation of the Cottian Alps and the kingdom of Pontus under Nero, and Domitian's passion for torturing flies.⁵¹ As in the previous passages, there are in those chapters, additions from the KG in the

⁵⁰ Suetonius, *Augustus*, 7.4; cf. Festy, pp. 59-60, note 2.

⁵¹ See note 43 for chapters 2,3,4 and 11.

chapters, but the chain of thought of Victor is there with occasional departures. Both the epitomator and Victor seemed to have a fondness of the sexual eccentricities of the first-century emperors. These passages will suffice for our purpose:

1) Eo progressus est ut, neque suae neque aliorum pudicitiae parcens, ad extremum amictus nubentium uirginum specie, palam conuocato senatu, dote dicta, cunctis festa more frequentantibus nuberet. Pelle tectus feræ, utrique sexui genitalia uultu contrectabat. Epit. 5.5 = (...) eo progressus est uti, neque suae neque aliorum pudicitiae parcens, ad extremum amictus nubentium uirginum specie, palam senatu, dote data, cunctis festa more celebrantibus, (...) pele tectus feræ utrique sexui genitalia uultu contrectabat (...). A.V., 5.5

2) (...) Cuius foedum exercitium Graecorum lingua klinoplanen vocabat. Epit. 11.7 = (...) cuius foedum exercitium Graecorum lingua clinopalen uocabat. A.V., 11.5

These passages are copied word for word by the epitomator from Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*.⁵² There are more *alinea* - (...) - in Victor's text than in that of the epitomator since in those places, like in the description of a marriage in which Nero was the bride, where Victor has more to say, the epitomator abbreviates the text cutting off non-essential elements - such as Nero's leaving the wedding scene being

⁵² While the epitomator and Aurelius Victor's narratives for *clinoplanen* both ultimately derived from Suetonius' lives Domitian (*Domitianus*, 22.1), it was from Victor that the epitomator copied this passage. See Schlumberger, p. 40 & Festy, pp. 79 n. 7 & 95 n. 9.

carried in a litter in Victor's passage.

While the material from Suetonius's narrative appearing in the *Epitome* is both numerous and verbally close, *Quellenforschung* especially in the passage about Caligula's whim is of no help. I have made the conjecture that the epitomator may be using a rhetorical handbook as a source, which may explain the abridgement and reworking of Suetonius' phrases and the pleasant nature of the selection of passages. Thus, it can be argued that most of the material in chapters one to eleven in the *Epitome* are the result of a combination of information taken in the *KG*, Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, and some form of oral tradition found in anthologies.

The *Epitome's* Sources for the Emperors from Nerva to Heliogabalus (Chapters 12-23)

While the *Epitome's* second-century sources have been much discussed, there have been basically two major viewpoints that deserve attention.⁵³ Jorg Schlumberger

⁵³ I mention in passing that Jacques Schwartz in 1979 proposed that the H.A. author had read the *Epitome* through an analysis of various passages. See Jacques Schwartz, "L'Histoire Auguste et l'*Epitome*," *B.H.A.C.* 1977/1978 (Bonn, 1979), pp. 220-221.

believes that the *Epitome* contains information derived indirectly from Marius Maximus' *Caesares* through Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*. T.D. Barnes proposes a simpler answer: "In contrast to Schlumberger, I believe that the evidence available allows us to identify Maximus and the KG as the main sources of the *Epitome* for the second and early third centuries, and I am not willing to postulate additional sources until the necessity becomes evident."⁵⁴ Very little is known about the work of this biographer of the later Caesars.⁵⁵ Most of the information about this work comes from a fourth-century imitator, the *H.A.*⁵⁶ Independent of the

⁵⁴ T.D. Barnes, *Classical Philology* (1976), p. 263.

⁵⁵ L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus (1), *PIR.* (1), eds. Herman Dessau, (Berlin, 1889), vol. 2, p. 346, n. 233; A.R. Birley, *Septimius Severus*, (London, 1971), pp. 124-133.

⁵⁶ "Homo omnium verbosissimus, qui et mythistoricis se voluminibus implicavit." *H.A.*, *Quad. Tyr (Firmus)*, 1.1-2 (cf. J. Muller, "Der Geschichtsschreiber L. Marius Maximus," in *Untersuchungen zur römischen Kaisergeschichte* (Berlin, 1870), 23 ff.; J. Plew, *Marius Maximus als direkt und indirekte Quelle der SHA* (Strasbourg, 1878); J.M. Heer, "Der historische Wert der Vita Commodis," *Philologus Supplement IX* (1904): 3-302; E. Hohl, "Kaiser Commodus und Herodian," *Sitzungsbericht der Deutschen Akademi der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1956), pp. 1-46; G. Barbieri, "Mario Massimo," *Rivista di filologia e Istruzione Classica* 32 (1954): 36-79 & 262-275; T.D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Bruxelles, 1978), pp. 98-117; R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), 30-53; F. Kolb, *Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der Historia Augusta* (Bonn, 1972); *Histoire Auguste*, tr. par André Chastagnol (Paris, 1994), pp. liv-lix; F. Kolb, "Cassius Dio, Herodian und die Quellen der Historia Augusta," *Historiae*

H.A., Ammianus Marcellinus' *Rerum Gestarum Libri* and the *Scholia Iuvenalem* contain references to Marius Maximus' *Caesars*.⁵⁷ Apart from this, little information is known about these biographies by Marius Maximus. The most preferred view, that of A.R. Birley, is that Marius Maximus is to be identified with a consul of Alexander Severus' time, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus (AD 223).⁵⁸ He wrote a series of biographies on the period extending from Nerva (AD 96-98) to that of Alexander Severus (221-235), now lost. In different biographies, the *H.A.*'s single author writes that Marius Maximus was fond of imperial correspondence, senatorial decrees, and moralistic statements. Modern authors do not hold these biographies of Marius Maximus in very high esteem as these comments from from Agnès Molinier, author of a recent study on his biographies, suggests:

En outre, nous appuyant sur ce que nous savons des habitudes et des travers de cet écrivain (sympathies pro-sénatoriales, goût pour les spéculations astrologiques, les *iocularia*, etc), nous serions très tentés de lui imputer la paternité de tel ou tel passage témoignant d'une partialité outrancière en faveur du Sénat, ou de la relation de tel oracle ou prodige (...).⁵⁹

Augustae Collquium Macerantense III (Bari, 1995), pp. 179-191.

⁵⁷ Anonymus, *Scholia in Iuvenalem*, IV.53, ed. P. Wessner, (Berlin, 1941), p. 57; Ammianus, 28.4.14

⁵⁸ A.R. Birley (1971), pp. 311-312

⁵⁹ Agnès Molinier, "Marius Maximus source latine de la vie de

He was too pro-senatorial and too given to anecdotes.

Ammianus Marcellinus had a similar view, but has a few words about his popularity: "Some of them [late fourth-century Roman senators] hate learning like poison, but read Juvenal and Marius Maximus with avidity. These are the only volumes that they turn over in their idle moments, but why this should be so is not for a man like me to say."⁶⁰

Since 1872, scholars such as Theodore Opitz and T.D. Barnes have argued that Marius Maximus' *Caesares* were the main source for chapters 13 to 23 of the *Epitome* owing to the numerous parallels between the *HA* and the *Epitome*.⁶¹

Commode?," *Historiae Augustae. Colloquium Argentoratense MCMXCVI*, Giorgio Bonamente, François Heim et Jean-Pierre Callu (eds), *H.A.C. n.s. 6* (Bari, 1998), p. 244.

⁶⁰ "Quidam detestantes ut venena doctrinas, Iuvenalem et Marium Maximum curatiore studio legunt, nulla volumina praeter haec in profundo otio contrectantes, quam ob causam non iudicioli est nostri." Ammianus Marcellinus, 28.4.14 (tr. Walter Hamilton (Harmondsworth, 1987), p. 360).

⁶¹ *Epitome*, 12.2 = *H.A.*, *A.P.*, 1.4; lib., 13.4 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 3.3; lib., 13.11 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 6.3; lib., 14.1 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 1.1-2; lib., 14.12 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 1.5; lib., 14.2 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 14.8-9; lib., 14.11 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 20.7-10; lib., 14.6 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 14.11; lib., 14.11 = *H.A.*, *H.*, 15.11; lib., 14.12 = *H.A.*, *A.P.*, 2.6; lib., 15.2-4 = *A.P.* 2.2 & 13.4; lib., 15.7 = *H.A.*, *A.P.*, 12.4-6; lib., 16.5 = *H.A.*, Verus, 11.9 & *M.A.*, 14.7; Lib., 16.6 = *H.A.*, Verus, 2.7-9; Lib., 16.7 = *H.A.*, *M.A.*, 2.6, 3.1, 16.5; Lib., 16.9 = *H.A.*, *M.A.*, 21.9; Lib., 18.1 = *H.A.*, *M.A.*, 18.1; Lib., 18.2 = *H.A.*, *P.*, 4.2-3; Lib., 18.4-5 = *H.A.*, Pert., 12.1 & 13.5; Lib., 21.4 = *H.A.*, *Cc.*, 2.1;

Although the *H.A.*'s author often names Marius Maximus, he does not quote the passages discussed earlier. The use of Maximus' work by the *H.A.*'s author is difficult to gauge if one is to judge only from his quotations. This is not the only problem facing scholars. Alexander Enmann and Michel Festy have shown that the *Kaisergeschichte* is the intermediary between Suetonius and the epitomator. It is highly probable that the *Kaisergeschichte* has the same function with regard to Marius Maximus.⁶² Some of the textual parallels support the opinion of Alexander Enmann and Michel Festy, namely Trajan's liking for wine and Marcus Aurelius' efforts to alleviate the treasury's difficulties:

<u>principio uitae</u>	<u>A principio vitae</u>	Erat enim ipse
<u>tranquillissimus,</u>	<u>tranquillissimus,</u>	tantae
<u>adeo ut ab</u>	<u>adeo ut ex</u>	<u>tranquillitatis,</u>
<u>infantia uultum</u>	<u>infantia quoque</u>	<u>ut vultum numquam</u>
<u>nec ex gaudio nec</u>	<u>vultum nec ex</u>	<u>mutauerit maerore</u>
<u>ex maerore</u>	<u>gaudio nec ex</u>	<u>uel gaudio,</u>
<u>mutauerit,</u>	<u>maerore mutaverit.</u>	<u>philosophiae</u>
<u>philosophiae</u>	<u>Philosophiae</u>	<u>deditus Stoicae,</u>

Lib., 23.6-8 = *H.A.*, Heliog., 17.1-3 & 17.5; Lib., 45.6 = *H.A.*, A.S., 65.4-5; cf. Theodore Opitz, "Quaestionum de Sex. Aurelio Victore capita tria," *Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis* 2 (1872): 229-230; Werner Hartke, *De Saeculi Quarti Exeuntis Historiarum Scriptores Quaestiones* (Diss. Inaug., Leipzig, 1932), pp. 17-20; Ernst Hohl, "Das Ende Caracallas. Eine quellenkritische Studie," *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia*, II.1 (Berlin, 1950): 276-293; J. Schlumberger, pp. 78-133; T.D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Bruxelles, 1978), pp. 107-108.

⁶² Enmann, pp. 356-374; Festy, pp. xxiv-xxvii.

studens
litterarumque
Graecarum.
Epitome, 16.7

deditus Stoicae,
(...). Eutropius,
8.11.1

(...) H.A., Marcus
Aurelius, 16.5A

"Hic, cum aerario
exhausto largi-
tionibus, quas
militibus
impenderet, non
haberet, neque
indicere
provincialibus aut
senatui aliquid
vellet,
instrumentum regii
cultus facta in
foro Traiani
sectione
distraxit, vasa
aurea, pocula
crystallina et
murrina, uxori
ac suam sericam et
auream vestem,
multa ornamenta
gemmarum, ac per
duos continuos
menses venditio
habita est
multumque auri
redactum. Post
victoriam tamen
emptoribus pretia
restituit, qui
reddere comparata
voluerunt;
molestus nulli
fuit, qui maluit
semel emptam
retinere."
Epitome, 16.9-10

"Ad huius belli
sumptum cum
aerario exhausto
largitiones nullas
haberet neque
indicere
provincialibus aut
senatui aliquid
vellet,
instrumentum regii
cultus; facta in
foro divi Traiani
sectione,
distraxit, vasa
aurea, pocula
crystallina et
murrina, uxori
ac suam sericam et
auream vestem,
multa ornamenta
gemmarum. Ac per
duos continuos
menses ea venditio
habita est
multumque auri
redactum. Post
victoriam tamen
emptoribus pretia
restituit, qui
reddere comparata
voluerunt;
molestus nulli
fuit, qui maluit
semel emptam
retinere."
Eutropius, 8.13.2

"Cum autem ad hoc
bellum omne
aerarium
exhausisset suum
neque in animum
induceret, ut
extra ordinem
provincialibus
aliquid imperaret
in foro divi
Traiani auctionem
ornamentorum
imperialium fecit
vendiditque aurea
pocula et
crystallina et
murrina, vasa
etiam regia et
vestem uxori
sericam et
auratam, gemmas
quin etiam, quas
multas in
repostorio
sanctiore Hadriani
reppererat. Et
per duos quidem
menses haec
venditio celebrata
est, tantumque
auri redactum, ut
reliquias belli
Marcomannici ex
sententia
persecutus postea
dederit potestatem
emptoribus, ut, si
qui vellet emptam
reddere atque
aurum recipere,

sciret licere. Nec
molestus ulli fuit
 qui vel non
 reddidit empta vel
 reddidit." H.A.,
 M.A., 17.4-5

A close examination of these six passages reveals many contextual and linguistic parallels. The epitomator and Eutropius have virtually the same language for the six parallels except for two small departures by the epitomator, while the H.A. author offers only occasional verbal echoes - *vultum nec gaudio ex maeore, aerarium exhaustissimum, in foro divi Traiani, aurea pocula (...), et per duo menses (...), and molestus fuit.*⁶³ While some have argued that the epitomator simply copied Eutropius, it is more probable that they are both simply following the KG because of the two earlier mentioned departures. In contrast, the H.A. author may have been copying Marius Maximus' *Caesares* directly, which may explain why there are additions within his text - the location of Marcus' treasury, the depository of Hadrian, the cause of the sale, and the wars against the Marcomanni. Over a century ago in an article published in 1884, Alexander Enmann

⁶³ H.A., M.A., 16.5 = Eutropius, 8.11.1 = *Epitome*, 16.7; H.A., M.A., 17.6 = Eutropius, 8.14.1; *Epitome*, 16.8; H.A., *Verus*, 9.11 = Eutropius, 8.10.3 = *Epitome*, 16.5; etc. (A. Enmann, pp. 357-361 & 364-366).

was the first to suggest the possibility of an intermediary.⁶⁴ In the same year, Arthur Cohn put forth the view that the *H.A.* and the *Epitome* appear to have copied Eutropius.⁶⁵ Theodore Opitz believed that the *H.A.* and the epitomator had a common source which was not Eutropius but Marius Maximus.⁶⁶ Werner Hartke argued from stylistic evidence that this common source was biographical and may have been Marius Maximus.⁶⁷ However, the *Epitome* has elsewhere interesting parallels with Eutropius' *Breviarium*, the numerous buildings of Hadrian in the provinces, the death at Loricus of Antoninus Pius, the death of Lucius Verus near Concordia, Severus' wall in Britain (erroneous), the nickname of Caracalla, and an erroneous length to Heliogabalus' reign, which may indicate that he used directly the *Kaisergeschichte*.⁶⁸

Did the epitomator read Marius Maximus' *Caesares*, Eutropius' *Breviarium*, or simply the *Kaisergeschichte*? On

⁶⁴ A. Enmann, pp. 356-373.

⁶⁵ A. Cohn, p. 69.

⁶⁶ Th. Opitz, p. 230

⁶⁷ W. Hartke (1951), pp. 19-20.

⁶⁸ *Epit.* 14.4 = *Eutr.*, 8.7.2; *Epit.*, 15.3 = *Eutr.* 8.8.1; *Epit.* 15.7 = *Eutr.*, 8.8.4; *Epit.* 16.5 = *Eutr.* 8.10-3-4; *Epit.* 20.4 = *Eutr.* 8.18.1; *Epit.* 20.2 = A.V. 21.1; Jer. 213d; *Epit.*, 23.1 = *Eutr.* 8.22, A.V. 23.3, *H.A.*, *Hel.*, 34.1.

the basis of the first parallel quoted earlier, Jorg Schlumberger believes that it is possible to see that the Eutropius provided more information than did the epitomator about the type of philosophy followed by Marcus Aurelius, which may indicate that Eutropius copied more faithfully the *Kaisergeschichte*, but also in other place the use of Marius Maximus' *Caesares* through the *Annales* of Nicomachus.⁶⁹ I believe that he used both directly, the *Caesares* and the *Kaisergeschichte*.⁷⁰ Since I have given ample evidence of the use of the *Kaisergeschichte* for the chapters 12-23, I must concentrate on how the use of Marius Maximus can easily be explained by examining first this parallel from the chapter on Nerva and then others:

Qui cum in curiam a senatu gratanter excerptus esset, solus ex omnibus Arrius Antoninus, vir acer eique amicissimus, condicionem imperantium prudenter exprimens, amplexus eum, gratulari se ait senatui et populo provinciisque, ipsi autem nequaquam, cui satius fuerat malos semper principes eludere quam tanti oneris vim sustinentem haud molestiis modo et periculis subici, se famae etiam inimicorum pariter et amicorum, qui, cum se mereri omnia praesumant, si quicquam non extorserint, atrociores sunt ipsis quoque hostibus./ When he had been joyfully welcomed by the senate in the curia, alone without others, Arrius Antoninus, a sagacious man very dear to him, described wisely the imperial condition, embraced him; and said that he congratulated the senate, the people, and the province, but could not do the same for him because it would have been preferable by far to avoid evil

⁶⁹ Schlumberger, pp. 101-103; cf. Enmann, pp. 358-361.

⁷⁰ It is possible that the epitomator may have known Eutropius directly. See Barnes, p. 262.

emperors than to endure the weight of such a burden for he was not only supporting the worries and dangers, but also the public calamities of enemies and friends alike, who would presume to be entitled to everything with him, are also more atrocious than one's worst enemies, if they have not exhorted something from him. *Epitome*, 12.3

(...) Avus maternus Arrius Antoninus, bis consul, homo sanctus et qui Nervam miseratus esset, quod imperare coepisset (...)./(...) his grand-father Arrius Antoninus, twice consul, a virtuous man who was sad for Nerva because he become to reign (...). *H.A., Antoninus Pius*, 1.4

Both passages discuss Arrius Antoninus' speech in which he laments for his friend Nerva that has become emperor. In the *H.A.* we find only an allusion to this speech, while the epitomator provides a summary of it while highlighting certain points. In another instance, the *H.A.* gives a more complete account Heliogabalus' death than does the epitomator:

Ipse tumultu militari interfectus est. Huius corpus per Urbis vias more canini cadaueris a militibus tractum est, militari cauillo appellantium indomitae rabidaeque libininis catulam. Nouissime, cum angustum foramen cloacae corpus minime reciperet, usque ad Tiberim deductum adiecto pondere ne umquam emergeret, in fluuium proiectum est. *Epit.* 23.5-6

Sed milites et maxime praetorianus, vel scientes quod mala in Alexandrum Heliogabalus pararat (...). Post hoc in eum impetus factus est atque in latrina, ad quam confugerat, occisus. Tractus deinde per publicum. Addita iniuria cadaveri est, ut id in cloacam milites mitterent. Sed cum non cepisset cloaca fortuito, per pontem Aemilium adnexo pondere, ne fluitaret in Tiberim abiectum est, ne umquam sepeliri posset. Tractum est cadaver eius etiam per circi spatia, priusquam in Tiberim praecipitaretur. *H.A., Ant. Heliog.*, 16.5-17,3

The *H.A.* author mentions the reason of the military revolt in which Heliogabalus died and where he died, the epitomator does not discuss them stopping on the details of his death adding a cruel joke upon the emperor. Both accounts contain some verbal echoes, which may indicate a common source.⁷¹ The use of the *Kaisergeschichte* by the epitomator for this period may be possible, but it is unlikely that it was his only source, probably Marius Maximus' *Caesares*. T.D. Barnes also argued independently that it was Marius Maximus: " ... in the *Vita Heliogabali* whose main source for 1-18.3 I have already argued to be Marius Maximus."⁷² Elsewhere, both the *H.A.* and the *Epitome* have that Caracalla liked to take poses and manner of dressing to imitate Alexander the Great in posture.⁷³ In truth such an opinion that the epitomator use the *Caesares* is sound because the epitomator has precise information not found in Eutropius, the *H.A.* author, and Aurelius Victor: the cognomen of Trajan's wife (Pompeia Plotina), embassies to Antoninus, Antoninus being stoned during food riots, and Severus' four friends.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Schlumberger, pp. 122-123; Festy, p. 177 n. 11.

⁷² Barnes, p. 263.

⁷³ *Epit.* 21.4 = *H.A.*, *Caracalla*, 2.1.

⁷⁴ *Epit.*, 42.; 15.4, 15.9, 20.6; cf. Barnes, p. 263 & Festy, pp. 280-282.

The final clue in defence of the epitomator's direct knowledge of Marius Maximus comes from another parallel text. Both the *H.A.* and the *Epitome* contain the same theme concerning government:

(...) si ei foedis hominibus, quis sese quasi fidissimis prudentissimisque dederat, carere aut probatis eruditisque monitoribus uti licuisset, perfectus haud dubie princeps enituisset." *Epitome*, 45.6.

Notum est illud pietati tuae, quod in Mario Maximo legisti, meliorem esse rem p. et prope tutiorem, in qua princeps malus est, ea, in qua sunt amici principi mali, si quidem unus malus potest a plurimis bonis corrigi, multi autem mali non possunt ab uno quamvis bono ulla ratione superari. Et id quidem ab Homullo ipsi Traiano dictum est, cum ille diceret Domitianum pessimum fuisse, amicos autem bonos habuisse, atque ideo illu magis odio fuisse, quam rem p. temporis sui, et ille: 'Qui melius est unum malum pati quam multos.'" *H.A.*, *Alex. Sev.*, 65.4-5

The idea discussed is that a bad emperor surrounded by good advisers can provide good government, while a good emperor who is surrounded by bad advisers governs badly. The parallel may be accidental since both discuss a *topos*, but it seems amusing that the *H.A.*'s author attributed the passage to Marius Maximus' *Vita Traiani*. It is intriguing that the *Epitome* also contains the same *topos*, but for a different emperor entirely. But the idea that the earlier moral vignette - namely that a bad emperor is better for the Empire than bad advisers - may have also been copied from Marius Maximus is intriguing. Because of the use of much

material from Marius Maximus which is derived directly for the emperors from Nerva to Heliogabalus, it is quite possible that here too the epitomator is using him here and in the passage in the Chapter on Constantius II on Pompeia Plotina.⁷⁵

As I earlier mentioned, the evidence collected from *Quellenforschung* allows us to make the case that the epitomator used the *Kaisergeschichte* and Marius Maximus for the Chapters 12-23 of his work. He may have had other sources such as Eutropius, but this cannot be discovered with the information available.

The Epitome's Sources for the Emperors from Alexander Severus to Carinus (24-38)

Finding the *Epitome's* sources for the third and fourth centuries has presented scholars with many difficulties for over a hundred years. Modern research, for the most part, has been sound on the basics, and its emphasis upon intermediary sources such as the *Kaisergeschichte* has been useful in helping to understand the *Epitome's* account for the

⁷⁵ *Epit.*, 45.6 & 42.21

third century. The debate has, however, centred upon whether the epitomator used the *Kaisergeschichte* directly or indirectly. While Jorg Schlumberger does not believe, Michel Festy does, in their respective books, that the *Kaisergeschichte* was used directly in Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* and the *Epitome*. Others such as T.D. Barnes believe that the *Epitome's* source was probably Eunapius' *Historia*, on the basis of the parallels between Zosimus' *Historia Nova* and the *Epitome*.⁷⁶

The epitomator's third-century narrative is not drawn solely from the *Kaisergeschichte*. Some passages in the works of Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, the epitomator, and Jerome contain information that had a tone only applicable to the last quarter of the fourth century when describing such details as the site of Gordian III's monument, and may be personal in nature:

"Corpus eius,
prope fines Romani
Persicique imperii
positum, nomen
loco dedit
Sepulcrum

"Miles ei tumulum
vicesimo milario a
Circesio, quod
castrum nunc
Romanorum est
Euphratae ac

"Gordiano
sepulchrum milites
apud Circesium
castrum fecerunt
in finibus
Persidis, *titulum*

⁷⁶ T.D. Barnes, "The *Epitome* and its sources," *Classical Philology* 71 (1976): 265-268; *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Bruxelles, 1978); T.D. Barnes, "The Sources of the *Historia Augusta* (1967-1992)," in *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Macerantense*, eds. Giorgio Bonamente & Gianfranco Paci (Bari, 1995), pp. 1-31.

Gordiani."
Epitome, 27.3

imminens,
 aedificavit."
 Eutropius, 9.2.3
 (cf. Festus, 22.5
 Jerome, 217b)

huius (...)."
H.A., Gd., 34.2

All three passages repeat the same information, but with slight modifications - a monument for Gordian marking the border between the two great empires.⁷⁷ Both, however, the epitomator and the *H.A.* author write erroneously of his tomb or *sepulchrum*, while Eutropius, Jerome, and Festus mention the right type of monument - cenotaph or *tumulus*.⁷⁸ Ammianus discusses a tomb like the *H.A.* author and the epitomator. While it is important to note that Eutropius had taken part in Julian's expedition and had seen the monument, the similarities - *vicisimo miliario* and *castrum Romanorum* - among the accounts of Jerome, Festus, the *H.A.* author, and Eutropius are hard to ignore.⁷⁹ Some have, perhaps rightly, argued that this may be due to a common source, probably a continuation of the *Kaisergeschichte* to 366. Ammianus discusses the monument twice in his account of Julian's stay

⁷⁷ See J.-F. Gilliam, "Three passages in the *Historia Augusta*," *B.H.A.C.* 1968/1969 (Bonn, 1970), pp. 103-107; Zosime, *Histoire Nouvelle: Livre III*, texte établi et traduit par François Pascoud, tome, 2(1) (Paris, 1979), pp. 121-122, n. 38.

⁷⁸ Festy, p. 145 n. 6

⁷⁹ "(...) cui expeditioni ego quoque interfui." Eutropius, 10.16.1; [Dr. Burgess believes that a continuation to the *Kaisergeschichte* covering the events from Julian to the ascension of Valentinian and Valens is to be postulated because of the stylistic similarities between Festus and Eutropius for various events of this period].

at Circesium. Eunapius mentions it with respect to Julian's stay at Doura-Europos.⁸⁰ The epitomator is copying an unknown source, which contained the error about the nature of the monument.⁸¹ It was not the *Kaisergeschichte* because the *Epitome* account has no verbal similarities with Eutropius' *Breviarium* for this story. While the *H.A.* author combines the *KG* account with another, which contains many elements - the border between the two empires and a tomb - similar to that of the epitomator, their compositions owe something of that of Ammianus, who also says the same thing. In 1968, Ronald Syme credited the author of the *H.A.* with knowledge of Ammianus' *Rerum Gestarum libri*, and this credible opinion many well explain the similarities between the *H.A.* and the *Rerum Gestarum libri*. The *H.A.* author may have added to his account of Gordian elements from both the *KG* and Ammianus. With respect to the epitomator, I am uncertain of the connection, and this is a problem that I examine further in this chapter.

The *Epitome*, an important historical document about the third century, contains valuable information. One such point examined long ago by Theodore Opitz and Ernst Hohl is the verbal and contextual parallel between Zosimus and the

⁸⁰ Ratti, p. 306, n. 10-11.

⁸¹ *Epitome*, 27.3; *H.A.*, *Gd.*, 34.2; Eunapius, frag. = Zos., 3.14.2; Ammianus, 23.5.7 & 23.5.17.

epitomator, both of whom discuss Gordian III's ancestry.⁸² Unlike the prevalent Byzantine and fourth-century Latin accounts for the third century, Herodian, the epitomator (AD 395) and Zosimus (AD 500) knew three Gordians.⁸³ This was also true of the *Chronographer of 354* who describe three Gordians: two who died in Africa and another who gave a congiarium to the Roman people.⁸⁴ Like Herodian's *History* (AD c. 260) and three third-century Latin inscriptions, the anonymous author of the *Chronica Urbis Romae* knew three Gordians.⁸⁵ Zosimus' knowledge and that of the above-mentioned Byzantine authors about Gordian is at odds with the usual Byzantine and Latin accounts, which occur in two different versions. The first found in Aurelius Victor (AD 361), Eutropius (AD 370), and Ammianus Marcellinus (AD c. 390), George Synkellos (AD 811), Georgius Monachos (AD c. 900), and *Chronicon Paschale* (AD c. 600) is that there were

⁸² E. Hohl, "Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaisers Tacitus." *Klio* 11 (1911): 195; Th. Opitz, o.c., p. 243.

⁸³ Herodian, 7.10.7; *Epitome*, 27.1; Zosimus, 1.16.1; cf Schlumberger (1974), p. 139; B. Bleckmann, *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spatantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras*, Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, 11 (Munich, 1992), p. 71; F., Graebner, "Eine Zosimusquelle," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 14 (1905): 188; R. Syme, *Emperors* (1971), p. 232; F. Paschoud (1971), p. 141.

⁸⁴ the *Chronographer of 354*, ed. Th. Mommsen (1892), *Chronica Minora*, 9.1, p. 147; cf, E. Hohl, p. 195.

⁸⁵ Herodian, 7.10.7; *C.I.L.*, VIII. 848 = ILS 498, 4218 = ILS 500, 10079; cf. *Histoire Auguste*, ed. André Chastagnol (Paris, 1994), p. 726, n. 6.

only two Gordians.⁸⁶ The second found in Eusebius of Caesarea (AD 325), which is repeated in Jerome (AD 381), Orosius (AD 417), Jordanes (c. AD 550), and Leo the Grammarian (c. AD 900), is that there was only one Gordian.⁸⁷ How to place the *Epitome's* account within these three versions?

The *H.A.'s* author who knew three Gordians probably was familiar with Herodian's *History* (mentioned by name in *H.A.*, *Clodius Albinus*, 1.2), while the epitomator had a different source since he knew none of the material found in Herodian's *History* except for three Gordians.⁸⁸ For example, the epitomator does not know of Clodius Albinus' governorship of

⁸⁶Aurelius Victor, 27.1; Eutropius, 9.2.1-2; Ammianus Marcellinus, 26.6.19, 23.5.17; George Synkellos, ed. G. Dindorf (1829), p. 681; Georgius Monachos, *Chronicon*, ed. C. De Boor (1904), p. 461, lines 5-17, and *Chronicon Paschale* ed. Th. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* (1892), p. 501, line 6; cf. Bruno Bleckmann (1992), p. 68; J. Schlumberger, p. 138, n. 27; Bruno Bleckmann (1992), pp. 403-404, n. 33.

⁸⁷Eusebius of Caesarea, *H.E.*, VI.29 & VI.33; Jerome, *Chronici Canones*, 216h-217b; Orosius, 7.19.2; Jordanes, *Romana*, ed. Th. Mommsen (1882), *Chronica Minora*, 5.1, p. 36; Leo the Grammarian, ed. I. Bekker, (1838), p. 75;

⁸⁸"Wo es möglich ist, scheint sich die *Epitome* bzm. ihre Quelle aber doch in erster Linie der lateinischen Tradition anzuschliessen: Wie die beiden anderen Breviaren nennt sie die Senatszwischenkaiser Pupienus et Balbinus (26.2), während sich die *HA* nach umständlichen Erörterungen der Alternativen für Maximus et Balbinus und damit für die Version der griechischen Quellen entscheidet." J. Schlumberger, p. 138; cf. Bruno Bleckmann (1992), pp. 71-72; Zosime, F. Paschoud (1971), p. 141.

Britain or the correct relationship between Caracalla and Julia.⁸⁹ Here, one can very well argue that the epitomator is using a source whose author used the KG along with an unknown source. Jorg Schlumberger, Bruno Bleckmann, and François Paschoud believe that this source was Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*. Barnes and others think that this source was Eunapius.⁹⁰ E. Hohl only notes that the epitomator refers to the emperor Clodius Maximus Pupienus as Pupienus, the name found in the Latin tradition.⁹¹ Had he been following Herodian, he would have certainly called him Maximus.⁹² The *H.A.*'s author calls this emperor Pupienus Maximus, according to the Greek tradition.⁹³ Barnes mentions that the epitomator knew of Taurinus, as proof that the epitomator knew the tradition of Herodian, but I am less certain since in his list of emperors and usurpers, Polemius Silvius knew of him.⁹⁴ Clearly from this comparison, it is possible that the epitomator used two Latin sources. Could

⁸⁹ *Epitome*, 20.2; 21.5.

⁹⁰ Barnes, p. 264.

⁹¹ "Dass die Epitome einer lateinischen Quelle folgt, geht zur Genüge daraus hervor, dass sie cap. 26 den Namen Pupienus und nicht mit den Griechen den Namen Maximus wahlte. Der Bericht des Victor ist ziemlich ausführlich, wir erfahren den volleren Namen Antonius Gordianus und lernen den Ort der Erhebung (apud Thysdri oppidum) kennen (26.1). Freilich ist der zum Mitregenten erhobene Sohn ausgefallen und an seiner Stelle der dritte Gordian (27.1) zum Sohn statt zum Enkel gemacht worden." E. Hohl, p. 195.

⁹² Herodian, 7.10.5-8.7

⁹³ *H.A., Maximus et Balbinus*, 16.6-7

⁹⁴ Barnes, p. 264; Polemius Silvius, *Laterculus*, 31.

this source be *KG* and a catalogue of emperors like that of Polemius Silvius?

With respect to consular Chronicles and catalogues of emperors, it is noteworthy that these were an important, but forgotten source of Roman history. Comparison of the *Chronographer of 354* with the epitomator's narrative for the third century is instructive for purpose of finding this lost unknown Latin source of both writers. There are similarities - the three Gordians and the sites of the death of the usurpers Aemilianus and Aureolus - between the passages found in the *Epitome* and the *Chronica Urbis Romae*, a catalogue of emperors within the *Chronographer of 354*. Such a similarity may not be fortuitous, and it is possible to argue that the epitomator made use of such a catalogue in addition to the material found in the *Kaisergeschichte*.

There are other theories which attempt to explain the parallels between the epitomator's and Zosimus' accounts for the third century. T.D. Barnes believes that the epitomator obtained his information from Eunapius' *Historia* (c. AD 378/404). Such an assertion rests on some solid ground. Zosimus' first four books contain many parallels with numerous passages of Eunapius, found in his extent *Vitae Sophistarum* and Constantine Porphyrogenetus' *Excerpta* from

Eunapius' *Historia* and Photius' *Bibliotheca*. For this reason, scholars such as Theodore Opitz and T.D. Barnes have argued that there is a connexion between the epitomator and Eunapius.⁹⁵ About twenty parallels are to be found between the epitomator and Zosimus for the period from 282 to 363.

Ernst Hohl and Jorg Schlumberger, I believe, clearly demonstrated that the epitomator did not directly use Greek sources.⁹⁶ Most of the parallels between Zosimus' *Historia Nova* and the *Epitome* can be found in the works of Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and Ammianus Marcellinus with the exception of the passages dealing with the deaths of Crispus and Fausta.⁹⁷ T.D. Barnes mentions three other exceptions - the African ancestry of Aemilianus (AD 253), valerian's opprobrious nickname Colobius, and Aurelian's two victories over the Alemanni.⁹⁸ First and the last are only mentioned in Byzantine sources.⁹⁹ I would add a third - the usurper Septiminus under Aurelian in Damaltia.¹⁰⁰ The word Colobius found in the *Epitome* is another problem that needs an explanation. The appearance of Colobius in Rufinus'

⁹⁵ See Opitz, pp. 240-270; Barnes (1976), pp. 266-270.

⁹⁶ E. Hohl, *Klio* 11 (1911): 195-196; J. Schlumberger, p. 138; cf. Bruno Bleckmann (1992), pp. 71-72; Zosime, F. Paschoud (1971), p. 141.

⁹⁷ See Festy, pp. 190-191.

⁹⁸ Barnes, p. 264.

⁹⁹ See Festy, pp. 150-1 & 162-3.

¹⁰⁰ Festy, p. 163.

Ecclesiastical History (AD 401) may be an indication that a Latin tradition existed about this nickname independent from the tradition of the Byzantine writers.¹⁰¹ The absence of the victories of Aurelian against the *Alemanni* from Victor and Eutropius' accounts may be simply an oversight on their parts, and the *KG* may have mentioned them. Epitomators pick and choose information in their sources. The author of the *Epitome* and Aurelius Victor alone of fourth-century writers do not mention Aurelian's war against Zenobia and Palmyra.¹⁰² About the third century wars against the *Alemanni*, Jerome alone of fourth-century authors mentions the siege of Aquileia by *Alemanni* and their defeat at the hand of Gallienus in Venitia.¹⁰³ The epitomator's mentions of the victories of Claudius and Aurelian against the *Alemanni* may just be his narrative choice. The same may be true of the usurper Septimius. Enmann had more than proven the dependence of fourth-century writers upon the *Kaisergeschichte*, and this is more than likely that the epitomator is using the *Kaisergeschichte* as a source with possible additions from a lost catalogue of emperors similar to the *Chronica Urbis Romae*.

¹⁰¹ P.G. Michelotto, "A proposito di *Epis. De Caesaribus* 32.1, *cognomento Colobius*," in *Rendicotti di Istituto di Lombardi*. 114 (1980): 197-205.

¹⁰² Ratti, p. 335 n. 8.

¹⁰³ Jerome, 220 i-k.

The Epitome and the Sources for the emperors
from Diocletian to Theodosius (chapters 39-48)

There is however one episode that cannot be disposed of by the arguments used previously. The epitomator and Zosimus offer similar details about Fausta, Constantine's wife:¹⁰⁴

At Constantinus obtento totius
Romani imperii mira bellorum
felicitate regimine, Fausta
coniuge ut putant suggerente,
Crispum filium necari iubet.
Dehinc uxorem suam Faustam in
balneas arduas coniectam
interemit, cum eum mater
Helena dolore nimio nepotis
increparet. *Epitome*, 41.11-12

Without any consideration for natural law he killed his son, Crispus, on suspicion of having had intercourse with his step-mother, Fausta. And when Constantine's mother, Helena, was saddened by this atrocity and was inconsolable at the young man's death, Constantine as if to comfort her, applied a remedy worse

¹⁰⁴ On the death of Crispus and Fausta (cf. Jerome, 231d, 232a; Eutropius, 10.6.3; Orosius, 7.28.26; Ammianus Marcellinus, 14.11.20; Prosper Tiro, *Chronica Minora*, 1.232; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* 5.8.6; Julian, *Caesares*, 336a-b; Libanius, *Or.* 30.37; Sozomen, *H.E.*, 1.5; Zonaras, XIII.2, ed. Dindorf (1870), p. 179, ll. 17-23; Philostorgius, II.4a; *Except. de sentenciis*, p. 270, ed. U.P. Boissevain (1895), p. 270, n. 188); Evagrius, *H.E.*, 3.41; Otto Seeck, "Crispus," in *Paulys Realencyklopaedie des Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa (Stuttgart, 1901), vol. 4.2, pp. 1722-1724; P. Guthrie, "The execution of Crispus," *Phoenix* 20 (1966): 325-331; T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, 1981), p. 220; Jan Willem Drijvers, "Flavia Augusta Fausta: some remarks," *Historia* 41.4 (1992): 500-506; H.A. Pohlsander, "Crispus: brilliant career, tragic end," *Historia* 33 (1984): 79-106; J.-L. Desnier, "Zosime II, 29 et la mort de Fausta," *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (1987): 297-305; N.J.E. Austin, "Constantine and Crispus," *Acta Classica* 23 (1980): 133-138; G. Marasco, "Costantino et le uccisione di Crispo e Fausta (a. 326 D.C.)," *Rivista di Filologia* 121 (1993): 297-317); David Woods, "On the death of the empress Fausta," *Greece & Rome* 45.1 (1998): 70-86.

than the disease: he ordered a bath to be overheated, and shut Fausta up in it until she was dead. Zosimus, 2.29.2 (tr. From the Greek by R.T Ridley).

There are close similarities in these parallel accounts of the fall of Crispus and Fausta: the tears of her mother-in-law and her death through suffocation. While these similarities are enough for some to write about a common source, there are several differences in these two accounts, the origin of Crispus, and the reasons for Crispus' death, which lead one to wonder if Zosimus and the epitomator did rely on the same source.

The common source's identity creates a still-raging dispute among modern scholars. Close analysis shows the version to be hostile to Constantine. This source, according to F. Paschoud, J. Schlumberger, and Bruno Bleckmann, explained Constantine's conversion to Christianity because this religion alone gave atonement for such crimes.¹⁰⁵ This lost source contained other elements which were unfavourable to Constantine - Fausta's affair with a guard and her death a result of a failed abortion.¹⁰⁶ All three scholars mentioned above believed that the source was Nicomachus Flavianus's

¹⁰⁵ F. Paschoud(1995): p. 23; J. Schlumberger, p. 198; Bruno Bleckmann, *Historia* 40.3 (1991): 352-353.

¹⁰⁶ Philostorgius, *Historia Eclessiatica*, 2.4a; David Wood, *Greece and Rome* (1998): 98.

Annales.¹⁰⁷ However, all that can be ascertained is that it derived from the time of Julian. When Eutropius discusses Fausta's fall in 370, he was the first of the surviving Latin authors to discuss the dynastic crisis. Eusebius' account (c. 337) obviously ignores these events of 326 in his *Eulogy of Constantine*. According to F. Paschoud, the version connecting the trials of Crispus and Fausta was probably a story found in the *Kaisergeschichte* repeated in Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*.¹⁰⁸ One must be cautious in reaching such a conclusion. Aurelius Victor, the author of the *Descriptio Consulium*, and Ammianus Marcellinus only mention the fall and death of Crispus.¹⁰⁹ This presentation of the year 326 also occurs in the *Descriptio Consulium*.¹¹⁰ Reading these two works brings to light that neither Victor nor the *Decriptio*'s

¹⁰⁷ Garth Fowden proposes that Zosimus and the Byzantine tradition derived their story relating to Fausta and Crispus from the ecclesiastic tradition of Philostorgios and Sozomen, not Eunapius. He says little of Latin tradition in this regard. See "The last days of Constantine: oppositional version and their influence," *Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994): 163.

¹⁰⁸ "(...) Ce sont avant tout les sources issues de la '*Kaisergeschichte*' d'Enmann qui lient la mort de Crispus et celle de Fausta." F. Paschoud (1995): 20, n. 32.

¹⁰⁹ "Quorum cum catu grandior, incertum qua causa, [Crispus] patris indicio occidisset (...)." Aurelius Victor, 41.11; cf. Ammianus, 14.11.20

¹¹⁰ "Constantino VII et Constantino Caes (326). His Conss. occissus est Crispus et edidit vicennalia Constantinus Aug. Romae." *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, Richard Burgess (ed.), *The Chronicle of Hydatius and The Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1993), p. 236.

anonymous compilers established links between the falls of two members of Constantine's family. After the publication of Eutropius' *Breviarium*, Jerome's *Chronici Canones* mentioned the events concerning Fausta and Crispus separately.¹¹¹ Clearly, the linking of the two events in the *Epitome* and Zosimus' *Historia* did not come from the *Kaisergeschichte*. Eutropius who wrote after the composition of the *Kaisergeschichte* was the first of the Latin authors to mention both events. Eutropius' tone is reminiscent of Julian's *Caesares*. The first historical allusion connecting the events of 326 was probably found in Julian's *Caesares* written in AD 363:

There too he found Jesus, who had taken up his abode with her and cried aloud to all comers: 'He that is a seducer, he that is a murderer, he that is sacrilegious and infamous, let him approach without fear! (...) To him Constantine came gladly, when he had conducted his sons forth from the assembly of the gods. But the avenging deities nonetheless punished both him and them for their impiety, and exacted the penalty for the shedding of the blood of their kindred, until Zeus granted them a respite for the sake of Claudius and Constantius.'¹¹²

Julian mentions both the dynastic crisis of 326 and 337, in which most of the Constantinian family were killed. The religious connotation reappears in Zosimus' account of the

¹¹¹ Jerome, 231d & 232a; cf. Orosius, 7.28.26.

¹¹² Julian, *Caesars*, 336a-b (transl. by Wilmer Cave Wright); F. Pascoud, *Historia* 20 (1971): 338-339.

dynastic crisis of 326, but it does in the account of the epitomator. Zosimus' source was probably Eunapius' *Historia*, which probably detailed the accusations against Constantine first presented in Julian's *Caesares*. The absence of the pagan bias in the epitomator is an indication that epitomator's source was different.

Although the account of Fausta's fall can be used to argue in favour of the influence of Nicomachus Flavianus *Annales*'s upon the epitomator if one believes that this parallel is a fragment of the *Annales*, the absence of any pagan bias found in Zosimus may be an indication that the epitomator had another source. The same is true if the epitomator was using, as Barnes writes, Eunapius' *Historia* as a source.¹¹³ Was he using an oral source? At parties in ancient Rome, people would routinely talk against the emperors at their own risk. It is interesting to note that the biographies of Constantine and of Theodosius are the only lives by the epitomator which contain elements taken from the oral tradition (e.g. the song about Trachala).¹¹⁴ Reasonably, one could thus argue that the epitomator's account of the fall of Fausta may be a reminiscence from this oral tradition.

¹¹³ See Barnes, p. 265.

¹¹⁴ *Epitome*, 41.16.

The epitomator, as he himself wrote, was aware of the divergent views surrounding these events - *ut putant*/ as some think.¹¹⁵ For his material on Constantine, it can be argued that in composing his narrative, the epitomator used Victor and Eutropius' accounts as found in the *Kaisergeschichte*, but that he also resorted to other sources which at present cannot be identified with certainty.

There are still a number of parallels involved in the imperial portraits of Constantius II, Julian, Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, which became seriously problematic without resorting to Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales*. There are strong similarities between some passages and some taken from Ammianus Marcellinus' and Jerome's works. While it can be argued, as does Richard Burgess, that there is evidence suggesting that material on the lives of Constantius II and Julian is derived from the *KG* and Aurelius Victor, the same cannot be said of the portraits of Valentinian and his relatives.¹¹⁶ Of these four parallels, the description of Valentinian's father's strength provides definite proof that the epitomator had not read the work of Ammianus Marcellinus:

¹¹⁵ *Epitome*, 41.11.

¹¹⁶ R.W. Burgess, *Historia* (1995): pp. 365-368.

Huius pater Gratianus,
mediocri stirpe ortus apud
Cibalas, Funarius appellatus
est eo quod uenalicium funem
portanti quinque milites
nequirent extorquere. Eo
merito ascitus in militiam,
usque ad praefecturae
praetorianae potentiam
conscendit; ob cuius apud
milites commendationem
Valentianiano imperium
resistenti oggeritur. Epitome,
 45.2-3

Natus apud Cibalas, Pannoniae
oppidum, Gratianus maior
ignobili stirpe cognominatus
est a pueritia prima Funarius
ea re, quod nondum adultus
uenalem circumferens funem
quinque militibus eum rapere
studio magno conatis nequaquam
cessit aemulatus Crotoniaten
Milonem, cui mala saepe
cohaerenter laeua manu
retinenti uel dextra nulla
umquam uirium fortitudo
abstraxit. ob ergo validi
corporis robur (...) cuius
meritis Valentinianus ab
ineunte adolescentia
commendabilis contextu suarum
quoque suffragente uirtutum
indutibus imperatoriae
maiestatis apud Nicaeam
ornatus (...)." Ammianus,
 30.7.2-4

These two passages offer contextual and linguistic similarities as well as important differences. Here we will focus on the differences. The epitomator writes that Gratian the Elder reached the praetorian prefecture, while Ammianus mentions that this man was a *protector* (a soldier having the honorary rank of imperial guardsman), a tribune, a count of Africa (commander of the units stationed in this vicariate), and a duke of Britain (similar to the previous rank). On this point, the epitomator mentions the Praetorian prefecture, a civilian post which, in the fourth century, was

rarely obtained by a former soldier (e.g. Salutius Secundus achieved this distinction).¹¹⁷ With respect to Gratian it is unlikely that he held the praetorian prefecture because he had neither legal nor accounting skills, in contrast to Salutius Secundus; it would have been an embarrassment for the emperor to give such a position to a soldier known mainly for his bravery. Thus for this reason, it appears that epitomator is mistaken in his account of Gratian the Elder's career.¹¹⁸ In analysing this parallel, François Paschoud and Bruno Bleckmann make a good case for a common source.¹¹⁹ All that can be said for certain regarding the lost source is that it was concerned with Valentinian's ancestry. This fact was unusual because Eunapius did not show the same interest, but Jerome did know of Valentinian's *origo* in Cibala.¹²⁰ To my knowledge, only Symmachus demonstrated any comparable interest in Gratian the Elder,

¹¹⁷ *PLRE* (1971), p. 40.

¹¹⁸ Michel Festy (1999), p. 216.

¹¹⁹ Bruno Bleckmann, "Bemerkungen zu den *Annales* des Nicomachus Flavianus," *Historia* 44 (1995): 87-93, François Paschoud, "Valentinien traversé, ou: De la malignité d'Ammien," in *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, ed. by J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, and H.C. Teitler (Amsterdam, 1992) pp. 67-84; Burgess, *Classical Philology* (upcoming).

¹²⁰ Jerome, 243-4 g.

whom he discussed in his *Panegyric on Valentinian*.¹²¹ It is certain that Symmachus knew of it since Symmachus mentions that Valentinian travelled with his father during his various commands: "Should I say that Africa is by right your true fatherland, for it was the first to teach you in your father's tent what kind of emperor you should be? (...) There you first learned to endure the sun and the dust; a short time before your cradle had been covered by the snows of Illyricum. A little earlier you had drunk melted ice, and then as if transferred to different elements you tempered by your endurance to the dryness of parched Libya."¹²²

This parallel is important because it shows another tradition upon which the epitomator could have drawn upon. Symmachus, Zosimus, the epitomator, and Ammianus described Gratian the Younger, Valentinian's son, as a teenager.¹²³ This is rhetorical hyperbole which first appeared in a speech honouring Gratian and Valentinian. Symmachus calls him in

¹²¹ Symmachus, *Oration*, 1.3; the passage is fragmentary, but this would be a perfect place to give a summary of Gratian the Elder's military career from its legendary beginning.

¹²² An non ipsam quoque Africam iure patriam tua dixerim quae te prima in contubernio parantis edocuit, quoalis princeps esse deberes? (...). Symmachus, *Oration*, 1.1 & 1.3; cf. Hall Jr., p. 2.

¹²³ Symmachus, *Oration*, 2.3, 3.5, & 4.1; Ammianus, 27.6.4 = E., 45.4.

his Panegyrics both *puer* and *adulescantus*. This usage by Symmachus may explain why there are two traditions about the age of Gratian, born either in 354 or 359.¹²⁴ Gratian was probably born in 359, but the epitomator using evidence found in a panegyric similar to those of Symmachus aged Gratian by a few years. *Adulescentus* in Roman culture is someone between the ages of fourteen and twenty-eight.¹²⁵ The epitomator may have computed backward from the earlier possible age.

There are similarities alluded to previously with Symmachus' orations: "Le panégyrique de 391 n'a pas été conservé. O. Seeck, *ibid*, p.vi n. 11, lui rapporte de préférence deux citations préservées par le rhéteur Arusianus Messius dans le recueil grammatical d'*Exempla elocutionum* (...) l'une d'elles est la suivante (p. 340 Seeck) : *solere principe bona uerba largiri*. Faut-il en tirer un rapprochement avec *Épit.*, 48.9 : *largiri magno animo magna*, (...) Cela reste bien sûr du domaine de l'hypothèse."¹²⁶ In addition, it can be argued that the *Epitome* contains elements

¹²⁴ Jerome, 241f & *Descriptio* (see Burgess, *Hydatius*, p. 238); *Epitome*, 47.7.

¹²⁵ Censorinus, *Dies Natalis*, 14.2.

¹²⁶ Festy, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii n. 67.

in its moral portrait of Gratian the Younger, which owe much to Ausonius' *Actio Gratiarum*, which were written in honour of Gratian.¹²⁷ Panegyrics were produced in numerous important cities of the Roman Empire for festive occasions such as victories, consulates, and imperial birthdays. Many people collected the best speeches which served as reading material, as Ausonius and Symmachus suggest in their correspondence.¹²⁸ Thus, it would not be surprising that the epitomator had used elements of some of them in his narrative.

Dr. Barnes makes another parallel between Ammianus, the epitomator, and Zosimus in his review of Schlumberger's book about the proclamation of Valentinian II in 375.¹²⁹ All three accounts mention that Valentinian II (375-392) was living with his mother, whose name both Ammianus and Zosimus knew. This may due to a common source. Eunapius was probably the most ancient, and may account for the tradition. I do not

¹²⁷ Aus., Grat. Act. 14.64 = Epit., 47.5 on Gratian attitude to wine, food, and sex; cf. Festy, p. 225.

¹²⁸ Symmachus, letters, 1.12, 1.14; G.W. Bowersock, "Symmachus and Ausonius," in F. Paschoud, *Colloque genevois sur Symmaque: à l'occasion du mille-six-centième anniversaire du conflit de l'autel de la Victoire* (Paris, 1986), pp. 1-15.

¹²⁹ Zos. 4.19.1; Ammianus, 30.10; *Epitome*, 45.10; cf. Barnes, p. 265.

think so because Ammianus had an informant for the events of 374/375, from which he could have learned of what transcribed between Justina and Merobandes.¹³⁰ Ammianus knew the governor of Valeria, Messalla, and since Valentinian died at Bregetio, he must have attended him there, which is the province of Valeria.¹³¹ Ammianus' account is far more detailed than that of Zosimus, naming the estate where Justina was lodging with her son.¹³² Zosimus and the epitomator only mention the meeting, but the later also mentions the role of Equitius just like Zosimus.¹³³ Ammianus only discusses the role of Merobaudes in the proclamation, and does not name Equitius. This is an indication of a different source, probably his informant. The epitomator is a different case, and would have been dependant on his source. Was it Eunapius? This is very likely because in the last parallel, not mentioned by Barnes, between Zosimus and the *Epitome* about the oracle given to the notary Theodorus is a perfect match.¹³⁴ It is the most conclusive proof of the use of Eunapius' *Historia* by the epitomator in his work.

¹³⁰ Ammianus, 29.6.6

¹³¹ Ammianus, 30.5.13-14

¹³² Ammianus, 30.10.5-6

¹³³ Epit. 45.10; Zos., 4.19.1

¹³⁴ Zosimus, 4.13.4; *Epitome*, 48.3; cf. Festy, pp. 228-9.

Conclusion

The conclusion reached here is that the *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, Jorg Schlumberger's *verlorene Hauptquelle*, was not the main source of the *Epitome*. His sources were varied as the epitomator says on occasion in his work (e.g. 41.10).

For the emperors from Augustus to Domitian (chapter 1-11), I have shown that Aurelius Victor was his main source. He may have also used an anthology, which included passages from Suetonius' *Caesares*. He without a doubt used the KG to add elements to his narratives for various chapter such as 10.10.

With respect to other sources of the *Epitome* for Chapters 12-23, I argued these to be the *Kaisergeschichte*, Marius Maximus' *Caesares*, and some type of oral traditions. The *Kaisergeschichte* was an important work which later epitomators could not ignore. It was the first fourth-century work to combine in the Latin language the information found in a lost imperial catalogue similar to that of the *Chronica Urbis Romae* and in the works of writers such as Suetonius, and Marius Maximus. Alexander Enmann and numerous scholars including Richard Burgess have shown this text's importance with respect to the historical tradition which dealt with the events of the early and mid-fourth century.

While there remain many problems relating to the *Epitome's* sources, I have attempted to show that there are ways of explaining the *Epitome's* connection with the Greek tradition found in Eunapius using the catalogues of the author of the *Chronica Urbis Romae* and Polemius Silvius and the KG for Chapters 24 to 38. With respect to Ammianus Marcellinus' *History*, the similarities discussed may well indicate the use by the epitomator of various panegyrics and Eunapius for Chapters 39-48.

Like Jerome, the epitomator intelligently made use of one major source to which small additions are made using other sources. Thus, the epitomator used Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* for Chapters 1-11 with additions from the KG and another lost source, the KG And Marius Maximus for chapters 12-23, the KG and a lost catalogue of emperors for Chapters 24-38, and the KG again with additions from Eunapius and other sources.

Chapter VI: Ethics and Emperors in the *Epitome*¹

A critical reading of historical *breviaria*, or summaries, of the late Roman Empire such as the *Epitome de Caesaribus* brings attention to the political message that is found within these works. In their historical accounts Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and the epitomator appear to draw a portrait of the ideal emperor. The present discussion examines how, among the writers of *breviaria*, the epitomator focuses on and glorifies self-control among the caesars, presenting an ascetic vision of the ideal emperor than found among pagan contemporaries. This ascetic zeal can be seen in the manner in which the anonymous author sees the control of pleasures of the table, of the body, and of sleep. He also places great emphasis upon the control of emotions (anger, joy, sadness, etc.). It is worth noting that the text also contains numerous conventional political statements and adds some late-fourth-century opinions to these views. When put together, these statements form a set of interesting political principles. These facts lead me to believe that these biographies could be perceived as a Mirror of Princes in disguise. If one removes the names of the emperors from these statements, they become universal principles.

¹ This chapter has been recently published in French in a slightly altered fashion in the *Cahiers des Études Anciennes du Québec*. see Jean-Luc Gauville, "La conception du contrôle de soi dans le récit de l'*Epitomé des Césars*," *Cahiers des Études Anciennes du Québec* 38 (2000): 83-89.

From late antiquity onward at least in Latin, *Mirror of Princes* is the general title for treatises on kingship.² These works were derived from three traditions: the *Epinicia* (a poem composed in honour of an athlete, winner at one of the major athletic events), Isocrates and Xenophon's panegyrics, and Plato and Aristotle's works on politics.³ Among Greek authors, the earliest fragments of this sort date from the third century B.C (Diotogenes and Pseudo-Ecphantius).⁴ Another work survives in fragments from Cicero's time: an epicurean philosopher from Naples, Philodemos (c. 110 - c. 40 B.C.), who wrote a *περί βασιλείας*.⁵ The first extant treatises are *The Duties of a King*, a work of Dio Chrysostom (AD 40-115) dedicated to Trajan, Plutarch's *Discourse to an Unlearned King*, and Aelius Aristides' (AD 117-187) *Oration on Rome*.⁶ The emperor Julian (331-363) wrote

² Patricia J. Eberle, "Mirror of Princes," in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 8 (New York, 1987), pp. 434-436; E. M. Jeffreys and A. Kusen, "Mirror of Princes," *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan, volume 2 (New York and Oxford, 1991), pp. 1379-1380.

³ Xenophon wrote a panegyric of Agesilas, of which two-thirds deal with the king's qualities (3-11) and the *Cyropaedia* (the education of Cyrus, king of the Persians); Pindare, *Oeuvres complètes*, tr. A. Puech (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1922-1923); Xénophon, *Cyropédie*, in *Oeuvres Complètes*, 3 volumes, tr. P. Chambry (Paris, 1933-1935)); Isocrates, *Opera Omnia*, 3 volumes, tr. Norbin, G., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge and London, 1928-1932); Plato, *The Republic, Laws*; Aristotle, the *Politics* and *Nicomedian Ethics*.

⁴ See E.R. Goodenough, "The political philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928): 55-102.

⁵ Philodemos, *Werken*, 8 buchs, ed. K. Wilkes et alii, (Leipzig, Teubner, 1884-1914).

⁶ Dio Chrysostom, *Works*, ed. and tr. J.W. Cohoon & H.L. Crosby, 3 volumes (Cambridge, Loeb's Classics, 1932-1951); Plutarch, *Moralia*, 14 volumes, tr. F.C. Babbitt, Loeb Classical Library

a short dialogue on kingship and similar ideas in his two panegyrics of Constantius II (317-361).⁷ After the triumph of Christianity, Christian authors such as Synesius of Cyrene (370-415) and John Chrysostom wrote such treatises.⁸ Synesius wrote an address to the emperor Arcadius in 399 as part of the embassy delivering the *aurum coronarium*, and in this work he used the language found in treatises on royalty according to most editors and critics. John Chrysostom composed a dialogue comparing kingship with the monastic vocation (c. 380). The first real Latin Mirror of Princes is the *Institutio Traiani* (c. 330).⁹ Some seventy-five later, Claudian (AD c.370-410) added within his verse panegyric in Latin composed for Honorius' fourth consulate, a small treatise on kingship in the form of advice given by the

(Cambridge and London, 1927-1954); Aelius Aristides, *On Rome*, ed. and tr. S. Levin (Glencoe, 1950).

⁷ Julien, *Oeuvres complètes*, 3 volumes, tr. Bidez, J. (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1932-1936).

⁸ Synesius, *De Regno*, tr. C. Lacombrade (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1950), pp. x-xx; Wolfgang Hagl, *Arcadius Apis Imperator : Synesios vom Kyrnene und sein Beitrag zum Herrscherideal der Spätantike* (Stuttgart, 1997), pp. 66-82; see contra Alan Cameron and J. Long, *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (Berkeley, 1993), pp. 93-102; Jean Chrysostome, *Comparaison entre le moine et le roi*, in *Opera omnia*, tr. Ed. Jeannin, vol. 2 (Bar-Le-Duc, 1865), pp. 112-145.

⁹ Ps. Plutarch, "Institution Traiani. Epistula ad Traianum," in *Moralia*, vol. 7, cura e G. Bernardakis (Stuttgart, 1896), pp. 183-193; see for date Max. Kerner, "Fictio auctoris, Eine theorigeschichtliche Miniatur am Rande Der Institutio Traiani," in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter* (Hannover, 1988), pp. 739-780; Tilman Struve, "The importance of the organism in the political theory of John of Salisbury," in *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. Michale Wilk, *Studies in Church History Subsidiaria*, 3 (Oxford, 1984), pp. 306.

emperor Theodosius to his son, Honorius.¹⁰ Corippus does the same in his *In laudem Iustini* (565-578).¹¹ All these writers show that among Latin elites, among which we may include the epitomator, such treatises on royalty did have some influence.

Mirror of Princes and the *Epitome*

The *Epitome* is not to be regarded as a Mirror of Princes, although there are several similar features between these texts. Such a view should not be surprising since imperial panegyrics - which are not Mirror of Princes - such as the one written for Trajan by Pliny the Younger uses the language found in Greek *Περὶ Βασιλείας*. Chronologically alone, it is interesting that the first known Latin "Mirror of Princes", the *Institutio Traiani*, dates from Constantine's time (306-337). In fact, one finds in the *Life of Constantius II* (337-361) by the epitomator the elaborate political language comparing the state to the body at least in Latin which appears in Mirrors of Princes such as the *Institutio Traiani* and more rarely in political oratory such as the *Panegyric of Justin II* by Corippus:¹²

¹⁰ Claudian, *Panegyric on the fourth consulate of Honorius*, tr. William Barr, Liverpool Latin text Classical and Medieval, 2 (Liverpool, 1981).

¹¹ Flavius Cresconius Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minori*, ed. With transl. And Comm. By Averil Cameron (London, 1976).

¹² In my statement, I deliberately ignore the use of the organic metaphor by Livy which is less elaborate and which uses the language of Alcmeon of Crotona (c. 500 B.C) eulogising the interdependency of the parts of the body. See Livy, *Histories*,

Although I have omitted many things <earlier>, Pompeia Plotina, <Trajan's wife>, is said in an incredible speech to have so much increased her husband's glory; while Trajan's procurators were agitating the provinces with accusations so much that one among them is said that he interviewed a certain wealthy man and asked, 'How did you come by it?' Another procurator asked, 'From where do you have it?' And a third says 'Bring us what you have?' This procurator greatly agitated the wife of Trajan, who started to reproach him, because he was indifferent to his glory. Trajan responded that from now on, detesting dishonest collections of money he would call the "Fiscus" the spleen, for while <this department of state> grew, the other parts of the body diminished.¹³

Toward the end of this imperial biography, the epitomator compares the *fiscus* to the spleen, an organic metaphor. He uses this bodily terminology to discuss the health of the state damaged by the evils of financial administrator, the procurators. The organic metaphor used by the epitomator is similar to the language of Ps. Plutarch - he refers to the stomach and the intestines as the metaphor for the *quaestores* and the *Commentarienses*, which, if they grow because of an immense avidity and hold up in heaps with tenacity, they cause innumerable and incurable diseases so that the ruin of the whole body is imminent because of the vices of these people.¹⁴ This

II.32; Hippocrates, *Nature of Man*, 4

¹³ *Namque ut ceteras omittam, Pompeia Plotina incredibile dictu est quanto auxerit gloriam Traiani. Cuius procuratores cum provincias calumniis agitent, adeo ut unus ex his diceretur locupletium quemque ita convenire: 'Quare habes?' alter: 'Unde habes?' tertius: 'Pone, quod habes', ille coniugem corripuit atque increpans, quod laudis suae esset incuriosus, talem reddidit ut postea exactiones improbas detestans, fiscum lienem vocaret, quod eo crescente artus reliqui tabescunt.*" Epitome, 42.21.

¹⁴ *Quaestores et commentarienses (non illos dico qui carceribus*

idea is also present in Corippus' *In Laudem Iustini*, and described in similar language. In Roman imperial political discourse, the body is used to describe various aspects of the State. For example, the emperor is the head, while the peasants, the soldiers, the senate, and the bureaucracy are respectively the feet, the arms, the heart, and the digestive organs.¹⁵ The epitomator sees all these body parts as the state working in combination. If one fails, the rest fails.

Such similar traditions allow for more discussion of the epitomator's political ideas. All the rhetorical references to good and bad imperial qualities within the *Epitome* have a late fourth-century flavour (for example, the use of *trux* in prose instead of the more classical *saevus*). These political statements found in the *Epitome* can easily be compared with those expressed through the pen of Claudian in his *Panegyric of the Fourth Consulship of Honorius*, c. A.D. 398. These two works offer many similarities with respect to political ideas. Claudian, in the fabricated speech given by Theodosius to his son, Honorius, placed in the *Panegyric in Honour of Honorius' Fourth Consulship*, offers those qualities of the good emperor: avoid lust, control one's

praesunt, sed comites rerum privatarum) ad ventris et intestinorum refert imaginem : quae si immensa aviditate congesserint et congesta tenacius reservaverint, innumerabiles et incurabiles generant morbos, ut vitiis eorum totius corporis ruina immineat. *Institutio Traiani, II.*

¹⁵ Corippus, *In laudem Iustini*, verses 220-280; *Institutio Traiani, II*; see p. 245.

anger, use your good sense, be indifferent to food, be fit, know the exercises of war, and know history.¹⁶

The epitomator's political views are presented in a less elaborate way. For example in the life of the emperor Pertinax, he points out that the emperor became an *exemplum* for the dangers of human upheavals.¹⁷ This moral statement had recognizable political connotation for the ancient reader, and many elements of the lives of the emperors were seen in the same way.¹⁸ The use of *exempla* is always a sign of a didactic message underlying a literary composition, and in this the epitomator stresses throughout his work self-control, *temperantia* (13.4) et *continentia* (48.19). With some nuances, it bears some similarity with Aurelius Victor and Eutropius, who stressed throughout their works respectively *moderatio* (moderation), *clementia* (clemency) and *civilitas* (love of the state and one's fellow citizens).¹⁹

¹⁶ Claudian, *Panegyric in Honour of the Fourth Consulship of Honorius*, verses 235-418.

¹⁷ *Hoc exitu obiit vir ad humanae conversationis exemplum, per laboris genera universa ad summos provectus, usque eo ut fortunae vocaretur pila. Epitome*, 18.3.

¹⁸ An *exemplum* is a short story relating to the past used to illustrate a speech in ancient rhetoric. Because of their rhetorical training, poets and historians employed these *exempla* as moralizing images in their works from the first century A.D. onward.

¹⁹ Aurelius Victor, 1.6; 13.9; Eutropius, 8.2.1; 8.4, X.; cf. Stephane Ratti, *Les empereurs d'Auguste a Domitien dans le Breviaire d'Eutrope: les livres 7 a 9 du Breviaire d'Eutrope; introduction, traduction et commentaire*, Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, 13 (Paris, les Belles Lettres, 1996), pp. 69-88.

Self-Control and the *Epitome*

The epitomator places great importance on the following qualities: clemency (1.15; 9.2; 10.10; 12.6; 13.9; 15.3; 35.7; 48.16), loyalty in friendship (1.16; 9.3; 10.3; 10.9; 12.1; 13.5-6; 43.4; 46.3; 48.9; 48.18), education or support of the arts (1.17; 2.4; 11.4; 12.5; 13.8; 14.2, 14.6; 16.6; 16.7; 18.4; 20.8; 41.14; 42.7; 42.18; 43.5; 44.3; 45.6; 47.4; 48.11); knowledge of war (1.10-12; 2.3; 6.3; 10.2; 11.5; 13.4; 14.4; 16.3; 20.5; 29.2; 31.2; 36.2; 40.15; 41.11), affability (1.20; 9.4; 16.8; 41.15; 48.9), and respect for the people (10.8; 12.3; 13.4, 41.14, 48.9).

Differences between the epitomator and Claudian or the epitomators bring out the complex nature of the epitomator's political views. The epitomator admires other qualities: control of one's passions (lust, anger, and laughter). The same is true about being frugal in regard to food, drink, and oddly enough about sleep.²⁰ During the epitomator's own time, such a theme

²⁰ This insistence on controlling one's sleep is a quality of good emperors not mentioned before the composition of book 25 of the *Rerum Gestarum Libri* of Ammianus Marcellinus in which he describes this quality in Julian. This topos is taken from Greek literature (e.g. Homer, *Iliad*, 5.590; Libanios, *Royal Discourse upon Constantius and Constans*, 9.144). Inspired probably by Sallust's *De Coniuratione Catilinae*, this insistence on controlling sleep is credited by the epitomator to other emperors (Augustus, Vespasian, Constantius II, and Gratian). Afterward, it is an accepted quality

appears elsewhere only in Ammianus Marcellinus' *Rerum Gestarum libri* and the *Historia Augusta* influenced by philosophical discussions.

The epitomator, the author of the lost *Kaisergeschichte*, and Eutropius allude to stoic *apatheia* - the absence of facial emotions - when discussing Marcus Aurelius.²¹ The epitomator's interest in the lack of facial emotions goes further than his two contemporaries when one adds his various statements about controlling laughter.²² Such an attitude needs to be seen in its context. For ancient philosophers such as Marcus Aurelius this road leads to happiness. This belief is discussed in the works of Plato (430-347 B.C.) and Aristo (third century B.C.) and it was the custom among Athenian and Roman magistrates to maintain a facial decorum in order to enhance their position in society (*gravitas*). Plato believed that sadness or laughter were distractions for the soul. According to Hippocrates and other medical practitioners laughter is a physical and mental phenomenon. In turn, this act is within our control. Philosophers throughout antiquity realized that although one could not prevent laughter, one could nonetheless control its intensity and circumstances.²³ Regarding this discussion, one needs only to

of emperors or great leaders, Charlemagne, Alexis I, Napoleon, and Winston Churchill.)

²¹ *Epitome*, 16.7 & Eutropius, 8.11.1.

²² *Epitome*, 28.3; 48.18.

²³ *Ludo autem et ioco uti illo quidem licet, sed sicut somno et*

recall Plato.²⁴ The latter accepted moderate laughter as means of relaxation, a method of instruction to attack vice and folly, and means to understand complex ideas.²⁵ Plato disapproved also of guffaws.²⁶ In his ideal state he granted the right to laugh only to children, slaves, and manual workers. Wise men, who had successfully battle against pleasure and pain, had accomplished a victory over themselves. Wise men never laugh nor cry. This is the state that Marcus Aurelius had reached through exercises and conversion to philosophy. The amusing and the serious are thus one within him, a feat which was naturally admired by posterity and men such as the epitomator.

The epitomator believed that an emperor should be frugal about food, drink, and oddly enough about sleep. The control of sleep was a popular idea found in ancient rhetorical lore. This theme appears for the first time in Homer's *Iliad*. Sarpedon, the leader of the Lydians, in verse 590 of fifth song (ε), summarizes for Hector a king's labour during war: "Here is our duty: night and day press every captain of your foreign troops to keep his

quietibus ceteris tum, cum gravibus seriisque rebus satis fecerimus. Cicero, *De Officiis*, 103; cf. Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.235.

²⁴ See Stephen Halliwell, "The uses of laughter in Greek culture," *Classical Philology* 41 (1991), 279-296; C.J. de Vries, "Laughter in Plato's writings," *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 378-381; Lawrence Giangrande, *The use of spoudaiogeloion in Greek and Roman Literature*, (Paris and the Hague, 1972), pp. 8-12.

²⁵ Plato, *Republic*, 452d; *Laws*, 816d-e.

²⁶ Plato, *Republic*, 388e.

place in battle, and fight off the blame and bitterness of your defeat!"¹ Homer sees a captain's duty as to be almost always awake to protect his soldiers. Thus, Sarpedon, by extension, must control his periods of sleep. Around AD 344 Libanios, *Royal Panegyric in honour of Constantius and of Constans* (59.144) gave a good rendering of this topos:

"His day is spent in action, and his night is the same as his days. There is no room for strong drink, and sober conduct is his usual practice. All who are slothful are most hateful to him, but anyone wide awake is his close friend. He does not himself have bodyguards to protect his person, but he provides the protection from his person for his guards. For whenever he seems overtaken by deep sleep, he allows them their rest as entirely pardonable, and he himself as though struggling against nature takes a spear and does sentry duty for the imperial quarters. His incessant labour stretches through every season of the year and all occasions.²

This Greek topos is not popular in Latin literature. It is

¹ σοὶ δὲ χρή τάδε πάντα μέλιν νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέρας, ἀρχοῦς λισσομένῳ τηλεκλείτῳ ἐπικούρων νωλεμέως ἐχέμεν κρατερὴν δ' ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπὴν." Homère, *Iliade*, 5,490 (tr. Robert Fitzgerald).

² «Ἐκείνῳ τοίνυν ἡμέρα μὲν ἔργοις, νύξ δὲ ἐν ἴσῳ ταῖς ἡμέραις. μέθη δ' ἀοεκλήλαται καὶ τὸ νήφειν ἐν συνηθείᾳ ἀγρόος δὲ ἅπας ἔχθιστος ὁ δ' ἐγρήγορος ἐπιτήδειος. φρουρὰν δὲ σώματος οὐκ αὐτὸς ἔχει τὴν παρὰ τῶν δορυφόρων τὴν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῖς δορυφόροις παρέχει. ἐπει-δὲν γὰρ αἰσθηται κατειλημμένους ὕπνῳ πολλῶ τοῖς μὲν οὐκ ἀσύγνωστον τὴν ἀνάπαυλαν ἀφήσιν αὐτὸς δὲ ὥσπερ ἀνταγωνιζόμενος τῇ φύσει τὸ δόρυ λαμβάνων περίπολον αὐτὸν τῶν βασιλείων καθίστησιν. ὁ δὲ πόνος συνεχῆς τέταται διὰ πάσης ὥρας ἔτους καὶ καιρῶν ἀπάντων.» Libanios, *Oratio LIX (Royal Discourse Upon Constantius and Constans)*, 59,144 (trans. M.H. Dodgeon revised by Mark Vermes and Sam Lieu, in *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views. A Source History*, ed. by Samuel Lieu and Dominic Montserrat, (London and New York, 1996), p. 198; A similar virtue (controlling sleep) is attributed also to Constantine - Or. 59.27 - and Constantius - Or. 59.121.

alluded to in another context in Cicero's *De Officiis*. The orator exhorts his son to imitate the wise man in order to be a good magistrate. He must control his physical appetites and his manner of laughter. In chapter 103, he compares laughter to sleep. Both must be controlled through reason. One sleeps or laughs when all serious activities are accomplished.

At the end of the fourth century, Ammianus Marcellinus, in his *Rerum Gestarum Libri*, numbers among Julian's virtues the fact that Julian slept little in order to do all his work:

This kind of self-control was strengthened in him by his sparing use of food and sleep, a habit to which he adhered obstinantly both at home and in the field. (...) His frame was inured to fatigue, and he had refreshed himself with a short allowance of sleep, on waking, personally superintend the relief of sentries and pickets, and after this important task betake himself to his studies. And if the lamps by which he worked at night could have spoken they would without doubt have testified to the difference between him and some other emperors, since they knew that he refrained from indulging even in such pleasures a human nature requires.²⁹

A contemporary of Ammianus Marcellinus, the epitomator likes the *topos* and mentions some emperors such as Augustus, Vespasian,

²⁹ Hoc autem temperantiae genus crescebat in maius, iuuantes parsimonia ciborum et somni, quibus domi forisque tenacius utebatur. (...) 5. Ubi uero exigua dormiendi quiete, recreasset corpus laboribus induratum, expergefactus, explorabat per semet ipsum uigiliarum uices et stationum, post haec seria ad artes confugiens doctrinarum. 6. Et si nocturna lumina, inter quae lucubrabat, potuissent uoce ulla testari, profecto ostenderant, inter hunc et quosdam principes multum interesse, quem quidem norant uoluptatibus ne ad necessitatem quidem indulsisse naturae. Ammianus Marcellinus, 25.4.4-6 (Translated by Walter Hamilton, *Penguin Classics*, Harmondsworth, 1987).

Constantius II, and Gratian who slept little.³⁰ Prior to 395 without counting these two authors, only Sallust and a few other Latin authors show any interest to this Greek *topos*.³¹ Curiously, the anonymous author does not include Julian, which may hint that the epitomator did not owe his fascination to Ammianus. This *topos* takes root in the middle ages and the modern era. There were numerous famous leaders who were known to have had little sleep.

The epitomator like all his contemporaries disapproved of vices such as avarice and incontinence, but he abhors the lack of control of one's emotions (anger, in particular).³² While he writes of these vices, interestingly, the epitomator mentions some of the remedies that emperors of "old" used. For anger, he quotes two sure remedies. In the life of Theodosius, the author mentions the fact that the emperor Augustus learned to control his anger from a philosopher. In the same passage, the emperor Theodosius, well known for his rage, or men like him are offered ways to control their anger. The epitomator recalls Theodosius' difficulty with anger in this manner:

³⁰ Cumque esset cibi ac uini multum, aliquatenus uero somni abstinens. *Epitome*, 1.22 (Augustus); Vigilare de nocte, *Epitome*, 9.15 (Vespasian); a cibo uinoque et somno multum temperans, *Epitome*, 42.18 (Constantius II); parcus cibi somnique et uini ac libidinis victor, *Epitome*, 47.5 (Gratian).

³¹ e.g. Sallust, *De Coniuratione Catilinae*, II.8, V.3, XII.3, XV.4; Livy, *Histories*, 21.4; Velleius Paterculus, II.88, II.127.4; Pliny the Younger, *Panegyric of Trajan*, 49.9, 12, 13, 14.3, 15.4; Suetonius, *Augustus*, 78.2.

³² There are rhetorical common place, and one can already find them in Cicero's works, (e.g. *De Republica*, 1.38).

<Theodosius> angered easily for petty things, but he appeased quickly. From which severe orders were somewhat softened by some delay. He also had by nature what Augustus had from a teacher of philosophy. When he would easily be agitated, he would order something harsh when he angered, he would recall from memory the twenty-four Greek letters in order that this delay would calm him after the wandering of his mind had been elsewhere.³³

Despite criticizing this poor self-control, the epitomator using Augustus as an exemplum gives the principal means for self-control- delay through education -, which some such as Theodosius had by nature.

In antiquity, few philosophers showed an interest in controlling anger. Two treatises against anger have reached us, namely, those of Seneca and Plutarch.³⁴ The most interesting for our purpose is Seneca's *De Ira*, where in book II Seneca studied the means to control anger. There are three ways: education, philosophy, and giving oneself delays in difficult emotional situations. The epitomator, in his biography of Theodosius, alluded to two of those means: philosophy and giving oneself delays. The epitomator's bon mot about Augustus is also found in

³³ *Epitome*, 48.13-15; cf. Sozomenes, VII.25, Theodoret, V.17-18, Rufinus, *H.E.*, II.18, Ambrosius, *Epistula*, I.51; cf. Stephen Williams and Gerard Friel, *Theodosius: The Empire At Bay*, (New Haven and London, 1994), pp. 45, 64-65, 68 - for Theodosius' bouts with anger.

³⁴ Sénèque, *Dialogues*, tome premier: *De Ira*, texte établi et traduit par A. Bourguery, (Paris, 1961); Plutarch, *On the Avoidance of Anger*, in *Essays*, tr. Robin Waterfield, intr. and notes by Ian Kidd, (Harmonsworth, 1992), 168-201.

Plutarch's *Moralia* and the Greek tradition derived probably from his lost biography of Augustus.³⁵ Interestingly, the epitomator chose to repeat it when discussing Theodosius, who was easily prompted to anger, no doubt wanting to influence contemporaries. Without saying that the epitomator knew Seneca's *De Ira*, such observation shows nonetheless that he, like Seneca, had thought perhaps a great deal about this emotional problem.

Elsewhere, in his *Life of Hadrian*, the epitomator reprimands the emperor Hadrian for not restraining his anger and simulating self-control.³⁶ Summarizing Marius Maximus, he writes that "Hadrian was equally harsh in provoking and responding; he responded to a poem with a poem, a bon mot with a bon mot, and again to the extent that one could think that he was ready for anything." The author of the *Historia Augusta* also gives numerous examples of the manner, in which Hadrian responded to insults in various forms, and these examples are all taken as positive examples of Hadrian's character. The epitomator has chosen to summarize all these passages from Marius Maximus to disgrace

³⁵ Plutarch, *Moralia*, 207c; cf. Georgius Cedrenus, ed. Immanuel Bekker, tomus prior, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. 34, (Bonn, 1838), p. 303; John of Antioch, frag. 78.7 (*Exc. Salmas*, p. 392, in *F. H. G.*, ed. Charles Mueller, (Paris, 1867), p.: 569); Leonis Grammatici, *Chronographie*, ed. Immanuel Bekker, Bonn, 1842, CSHB v. 47, p. 59; Constantini Manassis *Breviaricum Historiae Metricum*, CSHB 29, verses 1897-1909.

³⁶ Continentiam (...) similans (...). Acer nimis ad lascessendum pariter et respondendum seriis, ioco, male dictis; referre carmen carmini, citum dictui, prorsus ut meditatum crederes aduersus omnia. *Epitome*, 14.6-7; cf. Festy, pp. 109-110.

Hadrian. By this action, the epitomator shows an interest for self-control (*continentia*), an important issue to late-fourth-century elites.³⁷

The epitomator, the author of the *H.A.*, and Ammianus also dwell in detail on other things to be avoided by an emperor: lack of education, seeking glory in battle, and excessive consumption of wine (Trajan, Galerius, Maximinus, and Licinius).³⁸ He also adds a remedy used by the emperor Maximinus: "When Maximinus was intoxicated and his mind was clouded, he would order many cruel things; but since those acts had made him regretful, he decided to differ what he had ordered until morning when he was sober."³⁹ The only corresponding references to this manner of controlling excess while drunk occur in *Origo Constantini Imperatori*, Aurelius Victor, and Herodotus.⁴⁰ In Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, this manner of controlling one's behaviour while drunk is mentioned with respect to Trajan. The same is true of Herodotus, who ascribed this practice to Persian nobles, and of the author of the *Origo*, who said it about Galerius. While the *topos* in the

³⁷ Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion. Toward a Christian Empire* (Madison, 1992), pp. 66-68.

³⁸ Repeating the folly of the diatribe of the uncultured emperor Licinius (307-324) against rhetoric (*Epitome*, 41.8); hostility to glory seeking (43.8 & 46.2-3); hostility to drinking (40.19 & 48.10).

³⁹ quo ebrius quaedam corrupta mente aspera iubebat, quod cum pigeret factum, differri quae praecepisset in tempus sobrium ac matutinum statuit. *Epitome*, 40.19.

⁴⁰ *Origo Constantini imperatori*, 4.11; Aurelius Victor, *Caesares*, 13.10; Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.33

Epitome is neither original, he chose to appropriate it for Maximinus Daza, who was known for very little, thus raising the stature of a much-maligned emperor. As well, this remedy fits the beliefs of the period against intoxication. The epitomator differs from Aurelius Victor and Eutropius, by discussing an abhorrence of alcoholism throughout his work, idealizing those who practise temperance with respect to wine.⁴¹ Only the author of the *H.A.* showed such an interest for the topic with respect to the number of passages.⁴² These mentions of self-control (*continentia*) by the epitomator is truly a reflection of his own time, which the author of the *H.A.* mocks in his life of Saturninus (c. 280).⁴³

His catalogue of *topoi* bears similarity with that of the author of *H.A.* and other imperial biographer, but occasionally the *Epitome* bears witness to the tradition of Mirrors Princes, which used a taste for organic metaphors.

⁴¹ Passion for drinking subtly mocked: *Epitome*, 2.2, 4.3, 13.4, 40.19, 42.18; temperance about wine: *Epitome*, 1.22; 47.5, 48.10

⁴² *H.A.*, *Verus*, 4.5-6; *Commodus*, 3.7; *Avidius*, 3.4; *Niger*, 6.6; *Albinus*, 13.1; *Caracalla*, 9.3; *Macrinus*, 13.4 ; *Alexander Severus*, 39.1; *Maximinus Duo*, 28.2; *Gordianus*, 6.6, 19.1.-3; *Maximinus et Balbinus*, 6.1, 7.6; *Gallieni Duo*, 17.6-7; *Claudius Gothicus*, 13.5; *Aurelianus*, 6.1; *Bonusus*, 14.3-4, 15.2; *Carinus*, 17.3.

⁴³ *H.A. Saturninus*, 11.4.

Conclusion

In many ways the *Epitome* is first a catalogue of biographies, but this work, at times, resembles a Mirror of Princes. The virtues and vices of princes mentioned in the *Epitome* recall those discussed by Claudian in his panegyric of Honorius' fourth consulate. In this work, Claudian, as said earlier, inserted a short Mirror of Princes under the guise of a brief dialogue between Theodosius and Honorius. Theodosius, in Claudian's verses, gives important advice to Honorius. With the help of his heart and mind, man perceives the good and the bad in life (235-242). Theodosius advised his son to avoid anger, avarice, lust, and many other things. He emphasized learning to appreciate friends, respecting the laws and the people, and having a good knowledge of the art of war. In ending his dialogue, Claudian exhorts the ten-year-old Honorius to study and to show particular interest in history, who teaches kings to survive difficult moments and crises. One finds the same emphases in the *Epitome*.

The epitomator's remedies for vices show a sensible attitude toward human nature. His call for self-control is similar to that found in contemporary panegyrists' works. Modern scholars such as C.E.V. Nixon believe that their rhetorically worded pleas attracted little imperial attention. Unsurprisingly, Augustine, in his *Confessions*, mocked his own attempt at imperial

panegyrics during his stay in Milan, but were the panegyrists' attempts without merit? While it would not be cynical to say that autocratic emperors ignored such arguments, Claudian believed that if emperors ignored the elites' pleas as expressed in imperial panegyrics or historical texts, they ran the risk of being mocked because of their vices and behaviour in the theatres and religious festivals throughout the empire.⁴⁴ Claudian's numerous panegyrics eulogized the first years of Honorius' reign, while the later years sparked much mockery as Zosimus' and other men's writings bear out. Zosimus' attitude is important because it shows that the educated elite watched the behaviour of the emperors, and that much of their expectation was based on the characterisation of an ideal emperor. With respect to this attitude, the epitomator is a prime example of it devoting much space to observing the emperors according to this ideal.

⁴⁴ Claudian, *Panegyricus De Consulatu quarto Honorii Augusti*, 241-246

Chapter VII: Religious Identity and the Epitomator

The epitomator challenges scholars to discern signs of his personality since he probably made his compilation generally bland and devoid of personal feelings for rhetorical reasons. Scholars such as Andreas Schott and, more recently, Michel Festy have written that this anonymous author composed his work with a pagan point of view, but few modern historians have attempted to define his pagan beliefs. To better understand the epitomator's religious identity, his work should be compared with those of contemporaries, such as Aurelius Victor or Eutropius, to discover similarities and differences among their attitudes. Despite great difficulties, such a comparison allows the suggestions of religious viewpoints found in the *Epitome* and in the contemporary authors' works to emerge and point up elements of the epitomator's spiritual world. The *Epitome* was among the few pagan literary productions to have survived from the Italy of the emperor Honorius (395-423).¹ Although many pagan elements are evident in the *Epitome*, the epitomator left few real clues about his actual religious views. The present chapter examines the *Epitome*'s religious elements with respect to the way in which the epitomator saw dreams and suicides because they are important clues to religious persuasion.

I looked at two themes because Christians and pagans differed greatly from each other in these two aspects - dreams and suicide

¹ Michel Festy (1999), pp. 2-57.

in the *Epitome*. There were two reasons for it. The first is that two recent books discussed those topics for the imperial Roman world at large: Gregor Weber's *Die Traume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike* (Stuttgart, 2000) and Anton Van Hoof's *From Autonosia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity* (Chicago and other places, 2001). The second reason lies in my interest in Cassius Dio; dreams are the most potent form of religious observance in his history. He mentions an oracle given in a dream to his friend Sextus Quintilius Condianus at the sanctuary of Mallus (73.7) and his own dreams which lead him to write three historical works.² This is typical of late antiquity from the time of Marcus Aurelius onward. Except for Suetonius, and Macrobius, and the author of the *Historia Augusta*, few Roman Latin-speaking authors showed such an interest in dreams; thus, the telling of two dreams is the most unusual feature of a minor work such as the *Epitome*.

The religious atmosphere of the period

During most of the fourth century, while the emperors supported literature without concerning themselves with the religious background of authors (i.e. Aurelius Victor and Pacatus), the social and cultural dialogues between Christianity

² Marie-Laure Freybuiger-Galland, « les rêves chez Dion Cassius, » *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 101.3-4 (1999) : 553-545.
179

and paganism produced much conflict.³ Constantine's conversion changed the religious orientation of the Roman Empire. Christianity, despite its divisions, rapidly imposed restrictions against paganism, such as the outlawing of sacrifices and the destruction of certain famous pagan temples.⁴ After thirty years, Christianity's supremacy was arrested briefly during the reign of Julian (361-363). He opposed Christianity through his writings, a law forbidding the profession of teaching to Christians, and the establishment of a centralized pagan clergy for the whole empire. After Julian's death, Christianity came back stronger than before. The Christian emperors and the bishops reimposed the laws against

³ See Gaston Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, vol. II (Paris, 1891); S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (London, 1933); P. Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, (Paris, 1949); *Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. Arnaldo Momigliano (Oxford, 1963); Stuart Christo, pp. 43-56; James J. O'Donnell, "The Demise of Paganism," *Traditio* 35 (1979): 45-88; Brian Croke and J. Harries, *Religious Conflict in Fourth Century Rome* (Sydney, 1982); P. Chuvin, *Chronique des derniers païens* (Paris, 1991), pp. 43-61; T.D. Barnes & R.W. Westhall, "The Conversion of the Roman Pagan Aristocracy in Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum*," *Phoenix* 45 (1991): 50-61; Frank R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529*, 2 vols (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993-94); Bertrand Lancon, *Rome*, pp. 119-132; H. A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore, 2000); A.D. Lee, *Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity* (London/New York, 2000), pp. 115-137; M. R. Salzman, *The Conversion of the Roman Aristocracy* (Berkeley, 2004).

⁴ Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, II. 46 & IV.16 & IV.23 - Constantine's laws for Asia Minor and Syria, *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI.10.2-3, XVI.6, XVI.10.10, XVI.10.12 - the laws of Constantius II, Valentinian, and Theodosius against sacrifices; Constantine ordered, according to Eusebius, the destruction the temple at Aphaca (c. 330), that of Asclepius at Aegea (c. 330), and the temple of Venus at Balbeck (c. 330), and Theodosius either ordered or condoned those of the temple of Magna Mater in Rome (c. 390), and the Serapeum in Egypt.

sacrifices, ended payments of salaries and the replacement of pagan priests, favoured Christians over pagans in the administration, and closed famous pagan temples such as the temple of Apollo at Antioch by Constantius II, the oracle of Besa at Abydos, and the temple in honor of Trajan at Antioch.⁵

These religious conflicts encouraged on the local level a complex literary barrage of tracts and public debates. In Italy, I will only mention the debate between Ambrose, bishop of Milan (373-397), and Symmachus (c.335-402), a famous pagan senator, over the restoration of Augustus' altar of victory in the *curia* in AD 384. The emperors Valentinian II and Theodosius judged in favour of Ambrose, preventing the altar from being returned to the *curia*.

Later, Theodosius turned a civil war against Eugenius, who had been tolerant of Rome's pagans, into a crusade against pagan cults at Rome. Briefly, Symmachus' son was allowed by Stilicho to return the altar to the *curia*. By the 410s, the altar was removed again this time forever.

In the Rome of early 380s, a Vestal Virgin, named Claudia Primigenia, escaped punishment for marrying her lover, Maximus, and breaking her vows to the extent that the college of Pontiffs and Symmachus could not force the city prefect Bassus and an

⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus, 19.12.3-10; John of Antioch, frag. 181, Müller *FHG* IV, pp. 606-607.

unnamed official, probably the vicarius urbis Romae, Valerius Anthedius, to bring them back to Rome to face punishment.⁶ The judge in the hearing, probably Valerius Anthedius, was a Christian, and felt more sympathy for the couple, who were both recent noble Christian converts, than for the College's predicament despite his friendship for Symmachus. In the early 400s, another senatorial couple, Melania and Pinianus, who decided to become a nun and a monk respectively, forced the Senate to buy their lands so they could donate thirty years of revenue to the Church despite the opposition of the Urban prefect, Pompeianus, who died in a riot on the day of the vote.⁷ Despite the collapse of the urban publicly funded cults in Italy after Theodosius' victory, paganism survived in the countryside into the sixth century.⁸

In this period of religious strife in Italy, Theodosius and his immediate successors continued to honour writers, Christians and pagans alike because of the power of the literature among the elites. Theodosius' reign produced many Latin writers, but most were Christians.⁹ In rhetoric, philosophy, history, as well as the

⁶ Symmachus, *Epistula*, 9.147-148; Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum*, II.38; cf. Stuart Christo, pp. 48-49.

⁷ Gerontius, *Vita Melania*, 53-54; cf. B. Lancon, *Rome*, pp. 102-103.

⁸ Gelasius, *Letter to Andromachus*, 31; Gregory, *Dialogues*, II.8; cf. Bertrand Lancon, *Rome*, pp. 129-132.

⁹ R.A. Markus, "Paganism, Christianity and the Latin Classics," in *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century*, ed. J.W. Binn (London and 182

fields of jurisprudence, theology, and medicine, literary compositions proliferated and survived to a lesser extent, but there were, however, few works by pagans: the consular Symmachus, the proconsul Pacatus, and Ammianus Marcellinus. This Spanish emperor supported education by laws and honoured writers.¹⁰ He gave prefectures to the pagan historians, Aurelius Victor and Eutropius. This emperor accepted the dedication of the *Annales* of the pagan Nicomachus Flavianus whom he named first proconsul of Asia, then quaestor.¹¹ He named the pagan rhetor, Pacatus, to the proconsulship of Africa following a panegyric given at Rome in 389.¹² Theodosius had his sons briefly educated by the famous pagan rhetor, Themistius.¹³

His immediate successors continued to follow a generous policy toward the arts. At the court of Honorius, Theodosius' youngest son, the encouragement of literature causes no surprise. Under his guardian, Stilicho, patronage of the arts and literature was beneficial, particularly to Prudentius, Claudian, and Manlius

Boston, 1974), 1-21; Alan Cameron, "Paganism and Literature," in *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en Occident*, ed. Olivier Reverdin, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* (Fondation Hardt), tome 23 (Genève, 1977), 1-40.

¹⁰ *Codex Theodosianus*, 11.16.15 (AD 382), 11.16.18 (AD 390).

¹¹ "Nicomachus Flavianus," *PLRE*, vol. 1, "Flavianus (15).

¹² *Codex Theodosianus*, 9.2.4; "Pacatus," *PLRE*, vol. 1, Pacatus (1), p. 372.

¹³ Themistius, *Orationes*, 16.204c; 16.213a; 18.224b; cf. Glanville Downey, "Education in the Christian Roman Empire," *Speculum* 32 (1957): 48-61.

Theodorus. Later, Honorius maintained, during the disputed papal election of AD 416/417, an official correspondence by his own hand with certain high officials like Aurelius Anicius Symmachus, the prefect of Rome in 417, and with the representatives from cities of Spain.¹⁴ Honorius protected rhetors, doctors, and grammarians in their fiscal immunities relating to the liturgies and work details of cities of Italy and Africa through a law of 414 while his empire suffered from invasions and usurpations.¹⁵ His nephew, Theodosius II (408-450) honoured the historian, Socrates, and accepted the dedication of his *Church History* - a Melecite Christian with contacts with the pagan underground of the East. This emperor's enthusiasm for copying manuscripts earned him the nickname of the calligrapher from the people of Constantinople.¹⁶

By the end of the fourth century in the West, patrons of literary culture favourably turned to distinguished writers who could portray the complex nature of the age - a Christian empire proud of the Rome's past glories. The manner in which the epitomator did this juggling act presents elements useful to a

¹⁴ *Collectio Avelana, Epistulae Imperatorum, Pontificum, Aliorum, A.D. 367-553*, ed. O Gunther, C.S.E.L. 35, (Vienne, 1895-1898), pp. 4, 14-24, 29, 31-36; André Chastagnol, *La préfecture urbaine au bas Empire*, (Paris, 1960), pp. 172-178; Hagith Sivan, "An unedited letter of the emperor Honorius to the Spanish soldiers," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie* 61 (1985): 273-287.

¹⁵ *Codex Theodosianus*, 13.3.16-17

¹⁶ Georgius Codinus, *Opera*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1839-1843), p. 151; Kenneth Hollum, "Theodosius II," *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 12, ed. J. Strayer (New York, 1989), p. 19.

scholar trying to understand the religious atmosphere of Italy during the *Epitome's* time of composition.

The Epitomator's religious identity

Modern scholars, especially Jorg Schlumberger, consider the epitomator a pagan. The religious ideas of fourth-century epitomators have found little room in modern studies except for the studies of Eutropius.¹⁷ Ammianus Marcellinus has benefited from the greatest attention. For example, Pierre Camus in 1967, Valerio Neri in 1985, and R.L. Rike in 1987, left us monographs on the religion of Ammianus, commenting briefly on the epitomators' religious views.¹⁸ Johann Straub did the same in 1963 for the *Historia Augusta*.¹⁹ Schlumberger accepted the general view about the epitomator's religion when he subtitled his book on the

¹⁷ Giorgio Bonamente, "Il paganismismo di Eutropio. Le testimonianze di Niceforo Gregoras e di Peter Lambeck," *Annali della facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia* 16 (1985): 257-272.

¹⁸ P. Camus, *Ammien Marcellin, témoin des courants littéraires et religieux du IVE siècle* (Paris, 1967); Valerio Neri, *Ammiano e il Cristianesimo, Religioni e Politicia nelle Res Gestae di Ammiano Marcellino*, *Studia di Storia Antica* 11 (Rome, 1985); R.L. Rikes, *Apex Omnium: The Religion in the Res Gestae of Ammianus* (Berkeley and London, 1987); T.D. Barnes, *Ammianus and the Representation of Reality* (Cornell, 1998), chapters seven and eight; Thomas Harrison, "Templum Mundi Totius: Ammianus Marcellinus and a Religious Ideal of Rome," Ch. 15 of Jan Willem Drijvers and David Hunt, eds., *The Late Roman World and its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus* (Routledge 1999), pp. 178-90.

¹⁹ *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetic in der christlichen Spätantike: Untersuchungen über Zeit und Tendenz der H.A.* (Bonn, 1963).

Epitome: a study of pagan historiography in the fourth century.²⁰

Despite Schlumberger's assurance, the epitomator's religious position demands more discussion because the majority of writers in Honorius' Italy were Christians. Religious identity is not easy to discern in late antiquity, and pagan beliefs cannot be assumed from allusions to the gods and pagan practices in the works of Latin authors writing after 395.²¹ Great care must be exercised in reading late antique writings for signs of religious convictions. This is the reason why I have felt it necessary to study seriously those passages dealing with religion in the *Epitome* - the most important being dreams and his attitudes toward suicide, comparing the findings with those discovered in the works of Aurelius Victor and others.

The religious practices of sacrifice and magic which appear in the works of Ammianus Marcellinus, Aurelius Victor, and Eutropius, do not appear in the *Epitome*. Aurelius Victor approved of Hadrian and Diocletian who had rebuilt temples and participated themselves in religious festivals taking part in sacrifices, and he defended the creation of a cult to Constantine's family in Circa. Eutropius' religion appears barely perceptible in his work

²⁰ J. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Münich, 1974).

²¹ Averil and Alan Cameron, "Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the Late Empire," *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 14 (1964): 316-328.

except for the deification of emperors from Augustus to Jovian, which contain elements of polemic in some cases.²² In his description of the myth relating to the conception of Romulus, Eutropius, like Livy, interprets Mars in the manner of natural philosophy as a shepherd who seduced Rhea Sylvia.²³ He mentions the construction of some temples.²⁴ The colourless tone of his remarks concerning religion presents a misleading view of his beliefs. To understand Eutropius' subtle language, one needs only to see how he takes liberties with the list of deified emperors. He writes that Constantine and Constantius II should have been deified - *meruit inter divus referri*.²⁵ To a contemporary reader, the words deserving of deification would have been understood to be a criticism of the measures of Constantius II to have his father Constantine deified: deification by his own senate in Constantinople, the building of the so-called *Caesareum*, a temple complex including a Christian chapel honouring Constantius Chlorus and his son Constantine, and the reference to his father as *divus* in his laws.²⁶ Eutropius was, thus, making

²² Augustus (7.5); Claudius (7.8); Vespasian (7.13); Titus (7.14); Nerva (8.1); Trajan (8.2); Hadrian (8.6); Antoninus Pius (8.4), Lucius Verus (8.5); Marcus Aurelius (8.6); Septimus Severus (8.10), Pertinax (8.13), Gordian III (9.3); the Philippes (9.3), Decius (9.4), Claudius II (9.8), Aurelian (9.9); Diocletian (9.16); Constantine (10.1); Constantius (10.4); Julian (10.7); and Jovian (10.8)

²³ Eutropius, 1.1

²⁴ Eutropius, 7.23

²⁵ Eutropius, 10.8; 10.15

²⁶ Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, 3; Wilhem den Boer, *Some Minor Historians*, (Leiden, 1972), p. 152; Salvatore Calderone, 187

both a religious and political statement against Constantius II, since from a pagan point of view, the Roman senate could not make Constantine a *divus* because his body had not been cremated following pagan ritual, a must for a *consecratio*.²⁷ Also as an admirer of the Roman senate, Eutropius could not have ignored this usurpation of authority by that of Constantinople in carrying out a *consecratio*.²⁸ Obliquely however, he was acknowledging both Constantine's greatness and his impiety from a pagan point of view by using the *meruit* instead of *relatus est*. With respect to Jovian, Eutropius faces the same difficulty and side-steps the issue in the same way. Most importantly, Eutropius considers Julian a deified emperor, a brave stand since Julian only became a *divus* after the *Breviarium*'s publication, at least as it appears in the *Theodosian Code*. Upon his death, Julian had suffered at least in practice a *damnatio memoriae* throughout parts of the East.²⁹ Also in his speech *In Honour of Jovian's Consulship*, Themistius said that laws of Julian and Constantius were almost abolished.³⁰ This inclusion of Julian among the *divi* by Eutropius was a subtle political stand which contemporaries would have

"Teologia politica, successione dinastica e consecratio," in *et`costantina*," in (ed.) W. Den Boer, *Le Culte des Souverains dans l'Empire Romain*, entretiens sur l'antiquité classique (fondation Hardt), 19 (Genève, 1973), pp. 213-269 .

²⁷ Den Boer, p. 152.

²⁸ See H.W. Bird, "Eutropius on Numa Pompilius and the Senate," *Classical Journal* 81 (1986) 243-244.

²⁹ Gregory of Nazianus, *Second Invective against Julian*, 5.16; C.I.L. III 7088 at Pergamon.

³⁰ Themistius, *In honour of Jovian's Consulship*, 67d-68c

easily seen as Wilhelm Den Boer and Giorgio Bonamente have argued very well.³¹ It is only because of the marriage of Gratian and Constantia and the revolt of Procopius that Julian's posthumous reputation improved. Dynastic politics easily explain this reversal in policy. Even if his text was brief, Eutropius did take a religious stand. It is we moderns that are fooled by Eutropius' colourless language, but Christian readers of Eutropius such as Paul the Deacon in the ninth century thought necessary to write a Christianized version of Eutropius' *Breviarium* because of many subversive comments.

The epitomator had less freedom than Aurelius Victor and Eutropius to express himself with reference to religion. One finds that the epitomator did not speak of sacrifice and magic or could not, probably like Claudian, because of restrictive laws.³²

In contrast, Eutropius and Aurelius Victor suggest a more active paganism. The epitomator, like his predecessors Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, mentions the deification of emperors. In contrast to Eutropius who ignores none of the imperial apotheoses, the epitomator refers only to the deifications of Augustus, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius.³³ The anonymous author

³¹ See W. Den Boer, , 152-158; Giorgio Bonamente, *Giuliano L'Apostata e Il 'Breviario' di Eutropio* (Rome, 1986), 150-170

³² For these laws see H. Levy, "Claudian's neglect of magic as a motif," *Transaction of the American Philological Association* 79 (1948): 87-91.

³³ See *Epitome*, 1.30; 15.8; 16.14

describes a few temples, myths, religious rites, and statues linked with the imperial cult.³⁴ The author speaks highly of the power of the oracles dealing with Trajan and Theodosius.³⁵

These allusions appear vague and only indicate that the epitomator was willing to copy expressions of ancient worship and to repeat some facts about pagan practices given in his sources in a language that recalls the panegyrics and poems of Christian poets, such as Ausonius and Sidonius Apollinaris. For example, W. Den Boer points out that the epitomator mentions the *Dirae*, a Virgilian expression for the Furies.³⁶ These goddesses make no appearance in the works of Eutropius or Aurelius Victor, although they held similar beliefs about divine retribution attributing this duty to Jupiter.³⁷ This notion of divine retribution is typical of ancient historiography, occurring among both Christian and pagan historians in late antiquity, but its use in the *Epitome* shows the presence of conventional pagan beliefs. In order to

³⁴ See *Epitome*, 1.28 (temples in honor of Augustus); 4.9 (the myth of the Phoenix); 9.8 (the temple of the divine Claudius called monumenta); 12.14 (the Saecular games); 13.10 (the Capitolium); 16.14 (temple in honor of Marcus Aurelius); 23.2 (the priesthood of Heliogabalus); 34.3 (statues of Jupiter and Claudius); 34.3 (the reading of the *Libri Fatales*) 40.17 (the myth surrounding the birth of Alexander).

³⁵ *Epitome*, 13.10; 48.2-3.

³⁶ *Hic fratrem suum Getam peremit; ob quam causam furore poenas dedit Dirarum insectatione, que non immerito ultrices vocantur; a quo post furore convaluit.* *Epitome*, 21.6; W. den Boer, *Historians*, p. 106.

³⁷ H.W. Bird, *Aurelius Victor* (1984), pp. 82-83.

understand the author's religion, one needs to analyse those passages which seem unique to his work.³⁸ In this analysis, one passage is crucial. The author writes: "I believe it is by divine intention that, although the law of the universe, nature, or some other <force> causes things that are unknown to men, these effects are mitigated by the councils of rulers, just as by the remedies of medicine."³⁹ This stoic description of divine *providentia* is left vague and in the singular, *attributum divinitus*, a topos also found in the *Enneads* of Plotinus.⁴⁰ with respect to the epitomator's composition, the word, *divinitus*, is used only once earlier in respect to Trajan as the divine solution to the problem of an earlier period (13.10).⁴¹ The audience would have understood this passage, as referring either to the *numen* - a unspecified divine consciousness, if his listeners or readers were pagan, or to God, if they were Christian.⁴²

His utter silence relating to Christianity helps us to define further the sense of his religious beliefs, typical of late Latin

³⁸ Bird, p. 83.

³⁹ Credo diuinitus attributum ut, dum mundi lex seu natura aliudue quid hominibus incognitum gignit, rectorum consiliis tamquam medicinae remediis leniantur." *Epitome*, 16.4.

⁴⁰ See Plotinus, III.5

⁴¹ Quae omnia eo maiora visebantur, quo per multos atque atroces tyrannos perduto atque prostrato statu Romano in remedium tantorum malorum divinitus credebatur opportune datus, usque eo ut adveniēns imperium eius pleraque mirifica denuntiaverint. *Epitome*, 13.10.

⁴² P. Camus, pp. 134-135.

historiography.⁴³ There are few exceptions to this literary censorship of all references to Christianity found in pagan historiography. Ammianus Marcellinus and Eutropius mentioned Christianity in their works.⁴⁴ The epitomator totally ignores Christianity, as does Aurelius Victor. Even when he discusses Gratian's perfect self-control with respect to sex and wine - *vini ac libidinis victor*, he treats it as a part of the control of self, a *topos* dear to philosophers.⁴⁵ He avoids words associated with the concept dear to Christians of *Virginitas*. In the same manner, he does not say that the Lateran palace was the residence of the bishops of Rome by the end of fourth century.⁴⁶ In addition, the epitomator shows, even if only for a moment, hostility toward Constantine. He used as a metaphor for Constantine the word, "ward" (*pupillus*), since the epitomator thought the emperor was in need of guardianship because of his

⁴³ See note 16.

⁴⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus, 15.5.26; 15.7; 21.16.16; 22.10; 22.11; 25.5; 29.3; 30.9; cf. E.D. Hunt, "Christians and Christianity in the Ammianus," *Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985): 186-200; John Matthews, *The World of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Baltimore, 1989), chapter 16; T.D. Barnes, *Ammianus and the Representation of Reality* (Ithaca and London, 1999). Eutropius, *Breviarium*, 10.9; about Julian's hostility toward Christianity; see G. Bonamente, "Il paganesimo di Eutropio. Le testimonianze di Neceforo Gregora e di Peter Lambeck," in *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia* 16 (1985): 257-272; Stéphane Ratti, *Les empereurs romains d'Auguste à Dioclétien dans le Bréviaire d'Eutrope: Les livres 7 à 9 du Bréviaire d'Eutrope: introduction, traduction, et commentaires* (Paris, 1996), pp. 15-17.

⁴⁵ *Epitome*, 47.3

⁴⁶ *Epitome*, 20.6

excessive spending at the end of his reign.⁴⁷ , He may have meant that Constantine had spent too much on his churches and their fiscal immunities to the Christian clergy. He also called Constantine the brigand because he remembered the emperors pillaging of temples and public buildings for his new city. Yet, he called him also the best - *praestantissimus*. Was he criticizing Christianity or only Constantine?

It is hard to say without any doubt, since, in other passages, the author shows indifference toward polytheism. For example, in his life of Caligula, the epitomator narrates in a quite different manner from Aurelius Victor how this emperor liked dressing up in the guise of various gods. Comparing the two passages, one finds a striking difference:

"Denique tres sorores suas stupro maculavit. Incedebat habitu deorum suorum; Iovem ob incestum, e choro autem Bacchanali liberum se asserebat." *Epitome*, 3.4-5.

"Quin etiam sororum stupro ac matrimoniis illudens nobilibus, deorum habitu incedebat, cum Iovem se ob incestum, ex choro autem Bacchanali Liberum asseret." Aurelius Victor, 3.10

The anonymous author added 'suorum (his own)' to the 'deorum' of the source passage, which is interesting because the author seems to distance himself from Caligula's gods. Is he doing it for

⁴⁷ *Epitome*, 41.16
193

himself or to please Christian readers? The question cannot be answered considering this passage alone, but his general silence toward Christianity does not allow us to think that this addition is done for the benefit of his audience alone.

The epitomator shows little interest in imperial deification. In his life of Marcus Aurelius, he writes that everyone (*omnes*) presumed that the deification of Marcus Aurelius occurred in the same manner as Romulus.⁴⁸ This brief comment can take on apologetic connotations for different readers. For a pagan, it is simply a philosophical note, which recalls that of Cicero in the *De Republica*, or Livy in his *Histories*, on this same Romulus. For certain fourth-century Christians, the text could have meant that epitomator doubted Marcus Aurelius's divinity.⁴⁹ This attitude recalls that of Tertullian, who writes that none of your gods is earlier than Saturn: (...) So far, then, as books give us information, neither the Greek Diodorus or Thallus, neither Cassius Severus or Cornelius Nepos, nor any writer upon sacred antiquities, have ventured to say that Saturn was anything but a man: (...)."⁵⁰ Did the epitomator like Tertullian, believes in

⁴⁸ *Epitome*, 16.14

⁴⁹ Some will tell us rightly that the imperial cult of the fourth century has been purified of its elements like sacrifices. In this manner, the cult loses many of its impious aspects for Christians like Eusebius of Caesarea or Constantine. The cult had been Christianized. See.

⁵⁰ Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 10; cf. Justin, *First Apology*, 18.1; 21.3, etc.; Tatian, *Discourse to the Greeks*, 4; Tertullian, *Ad*
194

euhemerism? An analysis of these passages can only confirm the vagueness and ambiguity of the epitomator's polytheism.

Nothing in the *Epitome* appears at first controversial, just like Eutropius. Even when describing the reign of Julian, the epitomator chooses only non-controversial details. He writes about Julian's courage, his battle hardiness, his interest relating to philosophy, and his insatiable desire for glory.⁵¹ A little further, he, however, scolds Julian for ignoring oracles and signs and disapproves of Julian honouring the gods to the point of superstition, both being important for a pagan. These points appear in most of the ancient writers who dealt with Julian, both Christians and pagans. For example, Prudentius (c. 400), a Spanish writer working in Rome, when discussing Julian, describes him in this manner at the beginning of his portrait: "Of all the princes [of his time] however, <Julian> alone made exception [he was a pagan instead of being a Christian]. I was a child, and I recall that he was a very brave general, a law-giver, famous for his speaking ability and for action, his country's fervent defender, but not a defender of our religion. Julian loved three hundred thousand gods; he was derelict against God, but not

Nationes, 28-36; Jean Beaujeu, "Les apologètes et le culte du souverain," in (ed.) W. Den Boer, *Le Culte des souverains dans l'empire romain*, entretiens sur l'antiquité classique (fondation Hardt), 19 (Genève, 1973), pp. 103-142.

⁵¹ *Epitome*, 43.1-8.

against Rome."⁵² If Prudentius held such views, similar ideas found in the *Epitome* would have offended neither the emperor Honorius nor Stilicho, the *magister militum* if they had read the text.

At the beginning of this chapter, I stated that the perception of suicide in the *Epitome* was a clue to the religious beliefs of the author. It is important because perceptions of the after-life differed fundamentally in late antiquity because of religion. For example Christians such as Augustine (354-430) thought it both unreasonable and sinful to commit suicide - it follows that suicide is monstrous.⁵³ In a short text such as the *Epitome*, the evidence about suicide needs to be explored with care. There are ten mentions of suicide in the *Epitome*. Among late antique historians, this is certainly a point on which the epitomator dwelled upon a great deal. As he writes himself, this is an important *species* (aspect) that allows the understanding of an individual, whether a simple Roman or an emperor.⁵⁴ Among his pagan contemporaries, this interest is unusual, as we will see, and few contemporaries showed such an interest in suicides, and among Christians only Jerome displayed a comparable interest among historical or important writers:

⁵² Prudentius, *Apotheosis*, V.449-453.

⁵³ Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 1.1.27; Exodus, 20.13; cf. Anton Van Hoof, *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-Killing in Classical Antiquity* (London and New York, 1990)), pp. 181-197.

<i>Epitome</i>	Aurelius Victor's <i>Caesares</i>	Eutropius' <i>Breviarium</i>	Jerome's <i>Chronici Canones</i>	Ammianus Marcellinus' <i>Res Gestae</i>	Symmachus' <i>Epistulae</i>
Nero 5.7	Nero 5.6	Nero 7.15.1	Anthony's and Cleopatra's 162h	Martinus' 15.4	29 saxons I.2
Otho 7.2	Otho 7.2	Otho 7.17.2	Cornelius Gallus' 164e	Remegius' 28.20	Nicomachus Flavianus 4.16
Otho's soldiers 7.2			Messalla Corvinus 170l	Remegius' 30.2	Nicomachus Flavianus 4.51
Septimius Severus 20.9			Saccuius Plautus 172h		
Diocletian 39.5			Lucan 183f		
Maximianus 40.5			Iunius Gallio 183g		
Magnentius 42.6	Magnentius 42.10	Magnentius 10.12.2	Seneca 184e		
Decentius 42.8	Decentius 42.10	Decentius 10.12.2	Nero 185h		
An attempt by Augustus 1.29			Otho 186e		
An attempt by Hadrian 14.12			Magnentius 238h		
			Decentius 238h		
			Martyrs 242c		

Jerome's *Chronici Canones* contains twelve mentions of suicide, while Aurelius Victor, and Eutropius present only four.

⁵⁴ quorum exitus iste fuit. *Epitome*, 40.5
197

Ammianus Marcellinus and Symmachus have only three. The *H.A.*, not in this table, mentions those of Gordian I (d. 238) and Servianus (c. 136).⁵⁵ As I wrote earlier, the epitomator mentions ten. While Jerome discusses these suicides briefly for the most part without explanation, paying little attention to the reasons or the manner in which it was done. On the contrary, the epitomator takes a morbid pleasure at examining both. While Jerome, Eutropius, and Aurelius Victor used mostly *interfecio semet* or *propria man*, the epitomator liked gore in his descriptions of suicide.⁵⁶

With respect to his religion, this is an important topic because suicide is only tolerated among Christians when invoking martyrdom. In his *Chronici Canones*, this is the only instance in which a comment is offered for martyrs under Julian - *voluntate propria corruerunt*. Jerome mentions the means of suicide for three individuals for the imperial period: Messalla Corvinus in AD 8 by starvation, Lucan in AD 65 by bleeding, and Seneca in AD 65 by bleeding and poisoning. The epitomator does in almost every case: Nero with a sword, Otho with a sword,

⁵⁵ *H.A.*, *Gordianus Tres*, 16.3 & *Hadrianus*, 25.8.

⁵⁶ Cleopatra et Antonius semet interfecunt (...). Jerome, *Chronici Canones*, 162h; Cornelius Gallus (...) XLIII aetatis suae anno propria se manu interfecit. 164h; L. Anneus Seneca (...) incisione uenanum et ueneni haustu perit. 183f; (...) uario ambos supplicio semet adegit. Aurelius Victor, 42.10; Nero se interfecit. Eutropius, 7.15.1; coangustatus gladio occulte proviso ictum pulsu parietis iuvans transfosso latere, ut erat vasi corporis,

Septimius through stuffing himself with meats, Diocletian with poison, Maximian through hanging, Magnentius with a sword, and Decentius through hanging. He also alludes to two attempts at suicide by Augustus through poisoning and Hadrian through poisoning. He analyses the reasons for the suicides of both Septimius Severus and Diocletian. In most suicides, he does not have to because the context is clear.

The epitomator writes that Severus: "While he was unable to suffer the pain of all his limbs, particularly his feet, instead of poison which was denied to him, he absorbed with avidity a dish of meat, from which, since he could not chew, he expired exhausted from indigestion."⁵⁷ According to the epitomator, Severus committed suicide because of his old age and health problems due to gout in both legs. This story occurs in none of the others sources: Cassius Dio, the author of the *Historia Augusta*, Aurelius Victor, and Eutropius.⁵⁸ Only Aurelius Victor mentions that Severus suffered from gout at the end of his life. In the manner of his suicide, the context infers that this action was an individual choice, and this was accepted without prejudice. This would be odd for a Christian, and may indicate that the

vulnere naribusque et ore cruorem effundens(...). *Epit.* 42.6.

⁵⁷ Is dum membrorum omnium, maxime pedum, dolorem pati nequiret, ueneni vice, quod ei negabatur, cibum grauis ac plurimae carnis avidius inuasit, quem cum conficere non posset, cruditate pressus exspiravit. *Epitome*, 20.9.

⁵⁸ Cassius Dio, 77.17.4; *Historia Augusta*, *Septimius Severus*,

epitomator was influenced by various philosophical opinions appearing in Cicero's and Seneca writing.

In late antiquity, Christians were hostile to suicide. Augustine, in his *De Civitate Dei* written between 410 and 420 writes " (...) then certainly anyone who kills himself is a murderer, and is the more guilty in killing himself the more innocent he is of the charge on which he was condemned himself to death. We rightly abominate the act of Judas, and the judgement of truth is that when hanged himself he did not atone for the guilt of his detestable betrayal but rather in increased it, since he despaired of God's mercy and in a fit of self-destructive remorse left himself no chance of a saving repentance."⁵⁹ Augustine makes it abundantly clear that suicide is wrong, and elsewhere mocks both Lucretia and Cato, two much admired actions by ancient Romans and contemporary pagans.⁶⁰ He does not connect his views to any biblical texts, although there are two injunctions against suicide in the Bible in the book of Tobias and the Acts of the apostles.⁶¹ On the other hand, the Book of Judges extols the suicide of Samson as an act of

23.2; Aurelius, 20.9; Eutropius, 8.19.

⁵⁹ Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 1.1.17 - see translation by J.F. Shaw of Augustine's *City of God*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series I, Vol. II, ed. Philip Shaff (New York, 1886).

⁶⁰ Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 1.1.21 & 1.1.23.

⁶¹ *Tobit*, 3.10; *Acts*. 16.27-28.

martyrdom.⁶² Augustine, however, is adamant in seeing suicide negatively, while John Chrysostom and Ambrose also are vehement against suicide, but allow it in cases of martyrdom citing the case of Eligia.⁶³ Jerome links suicide to abortion in his letters, and condemns it except in cases of martyrdom.⁶⁴ Only Lactantius is as vehement as Augustine against suicide writing: "thus it was Cleanthes, with Zeno, and Empedocles, (...); and thus also the Roman Cato's deed, (...); and nothing can be wicked. For if a homicide is guilty because he is a destroyer of man, he who put himself to death is under the same guilt, because he puts to death a man."⁶⁵ In this context, the epitomator's morbid interest with suicide is suspect if he is a Christian.

With this respect, one needs only to read what Cicero and others wrote on the topic of suicide. Torquatus, a speaker in Cicero's dialogue called the *De Finibus*, says like a good Epicurean that the wise man does not fear death.⁶⁶ However, as Epicurus writes, "He is utterly small-minded for whom there are

⁶² Judges, 16:21-31.

⁶³ See Jacques Bels, "La mort volontaire dans l'oeuvre de Saint-Augustin," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 187 (1975) : 147-150; John Chrysostom, *Homily on the Acts*, XXXVI; Ambrose, *De Virginitate*, III.1.

⁶⁴ Jerome, *Epistula*, 22.15.

⁶⁵ Lactantius, *Divinae Institutes*, 3.18; See for translation Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, tr. By William Fletcher, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo, 1886).

⁶⁶ Cicero, *De Finibus*, 1.62.

many plausible reasons for committing suicide."⁶⁷ For Epicureans, there is only one valid reason:

For Epicurus thus presents his wise man who is always happy: his desires are kept within bounds; death he disregards; he has a true conception, untainted by fear, of the divine nature; he does not hesitate to depart from life, if that would better his condition.⁶⁸

This passage tells us that the wise man fears neither life nor death. That is why, if the wise man decides to terminate his own life, it is only to escape suffering.

For Stoics like Cato the Younger, suicide is an alternative to a situation which is contrary to their principles to the extent that they believe:

But since these neutral things form the basis of all appropriate acts, there is good ground for the dictum that it is with these things that all our practical deliberations deal, including the will to live and the will to quit this life. When a man's circumstances contain a preponderance of things in accordance with nature, it is appropriate for him to remain alive; when he possesses or sees in prospect a majority of the contrary things, it is appropriate for him to depart life. Cicero, *De Finibus*, III.60 (Loeb translation)

And they say that the wise man will commit suicide reasonably <i.e., for a good reason>, both on behalf of his fatherland and on behalf of his friends, and if he should be in very severe pain or is mutilated or has an

⁶⁷ *Collection vaticane des sentences d'Epicure*, 38.

⁶⁸ Sic enim ab Epicuro sapiens semper beatus inducitur : finitas habet cupiditates; neglegit mortem; de dis immortalibus sine ullo metu vera sentit; non dubitabat, si ita melius sit, migrare de vita. Cicero, *De Finibus*, 1.62 (translation is from Loeb's classical library); cf. Epicure, *Letter to Menoeceus*, in Diogenes Laërtius, 10.125-128.

incurable disease. Diogenes Laërtius, 7.130 (Loeb translation)

This is an act of reflection. If the wise man judges that events which surround him are contrary or about to be, it is appropriate to leave life. The reasons are varied, including sickness, defeat, and other examples of great distress.⁶⁹ These statements by both Cicero and Diogenes Laertius fit far more the thinking of the epitomator than that of Christian thinkers.

These next passages will convincingly show that the epitomator's thought lies far more in a pagan context than it does a Christian one. The next story deals with Diocletian's death.⁷⁰ In this passage, the epitomator sees Diocletian's suicide as wrong because it was due to *formido* (fear). Looking at imperial ages opens up many avenues of investigation. One can look at imperial calendars, chronicles, panegyrics, and other historical accounts for birthdays, ages, and other personal information about emperors, but it can also contribute to an understanding of attitudes toward old age. The biography of Diocletian is very interesting in this respect. Romans discuss old age both as a good time and a bad time. Cicero and Pliny

⁶⁹ Seneca, *Letters to Lucillius*, 70.23-27.

⁷⁰ Vixit annos sexaginta octo, ex quis communi habitu prope nouem egit. Morte consumptus est, ut satis patuit, per formidinem voluntaria. Quippe cum a Constantino atque Licinio vocatus ad festa nuptiarum, per senectam, quo minus interesse valeret, excusauisset, rescriptis minacibus acceptis quibus increpabatur Maxentio fuisse ac Maximino favere, suspectans necem dedecorosam

left us elements reconstructing this picture of old age in their letters and a dialogue (*De Senectute*). Cato the Elder and Spurinna are good examples of how old age can be a good time, in which these men serve as advisor to younger men and fellow politicians, write books, or practice agriculture.⁷¹ Old age was also a time feared by Romans because of infirmities and crippling diseases. Reading toward the end of the *epitomator's* biography of Diocletian, one can also see another aspect of old age, which Romans liked less - being powerless. Diocletian committed suicide to avoid facing Licinius and Constantine, who were angry because he had refused to come to Licinius' wedding to Constantia in Milan. Earlier, Diocletian's letters to their opponent, Maximinus, had been ignored when he had tried to obtain from this emperor the recall from exile his wife and daughter.⁷² Diocletian's choice of committing suicide is looked down upon by the *epitomator*. This is unusual because suicide in face of overwhelming odds or in the face of a debilitating disease was considered noble and accepted. The example of Cato the Younger, Otho, and other men was, in a political context, revered among the elites of the Roman empire.⁷³ Cornelius Nepos, Pliny, and Tacitus admired the actions of Pomponius Atticus, of Nerva the

venenum dicitur hausisse. *Epitome*, 39.7

⁷¹ Cicero, *De Senectute*, 11-60 ; Pliny, *epistula*, 1.1-12.

⁷² Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 32.1-2.

⁷³ Suetonius, *Otho*, 9-11; Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, 12.21;

Elder, and Domitius Tullus in the face of deliberating disease.⁷⁴²⁰⁵
The *epitomator's* prejudice may be due to this belief because of his use of *formido* in the earlier sentence and *suspectans* that Diocletian's situation could have easily been restored through a personal visit to either Constantine or Licinius. The *epitomator* associates this particular act of suicide with the word *formido* - fear. Although Diocletian was avoiding the possibility of an unjust death through suicide, he did this out of fear rather than out a deliberate choice by a man of sense. This failure to use judgement is the reason why the *epitomator* saw Diocletian's suicide in a negative light. Thus, this anonymous writer saw good and bad reasons for suicide, which only made sense in a pagan context.

Elsewhere, he offers a comment on the death of Maximianus.⁷⁵ His suicide ends a guilty life, and this is justice. The *epitomator's* attitude is similar to that of Ammianus when he discusses the death of Remigius, the master of office of Valentinian, in AD 376.⁷⁶ According to Ammianus, this was

⁷⁴ Cornelius Nepos, *Vita Attici*, 22, Pliny, *epistula*, VIII.18.1-12, and Tacitus, *Annales*, 6.26.

⁷⁵ Maximianus Herculius a Constantino apud Massiliam obsessus, deinde captus, poenas dedit mortis genere postremo, fractis laqueo cervicibus. *Epitome*, 40.5.

⁷⁶ raptum, quae Remigius egerit vel quantum acceperit, ut Romani iuvaret actus infandos, per quaestionem cruentam interrogabat. quibus ille cognitis, cum esset, ut dictum est, in secessu, conscientia malorum urgente, vel rationem formidine superante calumniarum, innodato gutture laquei nexibus interiit. Ammianus
205

justice because he had caused the death of numerous men from the cities of Africa proconsularis on the coast of Libya, who had the courage to complain on the exactions of Romanus, the count of Africa.⁷⁷ This Romanus had asked the cities to defray the cost of moving his army when the emperor had just contributed to the expenses and moved supplies for the fighting. To these cities, this meant a disguised bribe. In this context, the cities had sent embassies to Valentinian (364-375), in 366 and 368; these had failed because the board of inquiry was bribed by Romanus. Remigius, in turn, had arranged the trials of the legates for false testimony, a capital crime. Later after another war, Valentinian and Gratian learned of the whole affair from a different board of inquiry in 373/374. Romanus only went into retirement, but Remigius committed suicide because he feared the anger of Valentinian. Ammianus rejoices over on the fall of Remigius in two passages, in a way that is not unlike the language of the epitomator about Maximian.

These passages from the *Epitome* indicate that the epitomator clearly placed himself in the tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus rather than that of a Christian, such as Augustine. These are

Marcellinus, 30.2.12 & 28.6.30.

⁷⁷ Ammianus, 27.9, 28.6, 30.2.10; cf. Brian Warmington, "The Career of Romanus," *Byzantinisch Zeitschrift* 49 (1962): 55-56; John Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989, pp. 482-483; D.J. Mattingly, *Tripolitania* (Ann Arbor, 1994), chapter nine.

also useful hints on the epitomator's attitude toward death and his religious beliefs. He may have been a pagan, but we need more clues, and this is why I shall examine his perception of dreams because some of his attitudes are important inferences toward understanding his religious convictions. In other words, the epitomator can be seen as moderate in his faith.⁷⁸ His world vision allows for divination, an indifference to statues, and a particular devotion toward divine providence.⁷⁹

Dreams in the *Epitome*

For ancient people, both Christians and pagans, dreams had religious meaning. The epitomator discusses three important dreams, which add to the complexity of his religious identity. The first dream is found in the story about Galerius' mother, and its importance lies with the epitomator's reaction to this story.⁸⁰ In it, Galerius' propaganda had announced that he had a divine father probably using the method employed by Alexander the Great and Augustus, in which a god in the form of a dragon or a snake visits in a dream their respective mother to impregnate them. The epitomator thought this was very presumptuous.

⁷⁸ Pierre Chuvin, pp. 43-61; O'Donnell, pp. 76-84.

⁷⁹ *Epitome*, 16.4.

⁸⁰ Ortus Dacia Ripensi ibique sepultus est, quem locum Romulianum ex vocabulo Romulae matris appellarat. Is insolenter affirmare ausus est matrem more Olympiadis, Alexandri Magni creatricis, compressam dracone semet concepisse. *Epitome*, 40.16-17.

Similarly in his *Panegyric of the Sons of Constantine*, Libanios mocks this type of propaganda, and probably Roman emperors, such as Galerius, who in this way had used a *visum* (a dream with an apparition).⁸¹

The second dream discussed in the *Epitome* deals with the fourth-century emperor Jovian's father, Varronian. Like many of his contemporaries, Varronian took dreams very seriously, but it is a world in which the dreams and their interpretation become fundamentally Christian. Varronian's own son was a Christian. For Varronian himself, history has left no indication of his religious views. At the most, one finds information about his dreams in Ammianus Marcellinus' *Rerum Gestarum Libri* and the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, two contemporary works. Ammianus Marcellinus relates a dream of Varronian at the end of his account of Jovian's reign:

It was said that his father had previous intimation of what would happen from a dream, which he confided to two close friends, adding that he himself would also wear the consular robe. Part of the prophecy came true, but he was disappointed of the rest. He heard of his son's elevation, but death carried him off before saw him again. As for what the old man told in his dream about the highest magistracy falling to one of his name, it was Varronian, his grandson, still a small child, who was proclaimed consul with father Jovian, as I have related (tr. Walter Hamilton).⁸²

⁸¹ See Libanios, *Oration*, 59.23-25.

⁸² Dicebatur autem Varronianus pater eius monitu cuiusdam somnii dudum praescisse, quod evenit, idque duobus amicis commisisse fidissimis illo adiuncto, quod ipsi quoque deferetur trabea

208

Ammianus uses the word prophecy to qualify Varronian's dream, and thus classifies the dream as oracular. Ammianus, for his own reasons, is giving a pagan manner of interpreting a dream notwithstanding Varronian's religion, whatever it was. In this context, the epitomator mentions another dream of Varronian: "Since he had frequently lost children, his father had in a dream the order to call Jovian the child that would be born from the imminent delivery of his wife."⁸³ It is an oracular dream, according to Macrobius' scheme of understanding dreams in his *Commentary on Cicero's Dream of Scipio* in book VI of the *De Republica*, with a personal twist, in which the divinity gives an order. This god is not named! The choice of the name Jovian speaks of the god Jupiter, but it could also be due to the fact that Varronian had for a long time commanded the Jovians, a elite cavalry guard unit created by the emperor Diocletian.⁸⁴ What is of interest here is that unlike the earlier dream account of Galerius' mother, the epitomator showed none of his earlier doubts and scepticism about the genuiness of Romuliana's presumptuous

consularis. sed impetrato uno adipisci non potuit aliud. audita enim filii celsiore fortuna, antequam eum videret, fatali praeventus est morte. et quia huic nomini amplissimum magistratum portendi per quietem praedictum est seni, Varronianus nepos eius infans etiamtum, cum Ioviano patre declaratus est, ut supra rettulimus, consul. Ammien Marcellin, 25.10.16.

⁸³ Eius patri, cum liberos crebros ammitteret, praeceptum somnio est eum qui iam instante uxoris partu edendus foret diceret Iovianum. *Epitome*, 44.2.

⁸⁴ Ammianus, 25.5.8.

dream. Here the epitomator marks Varronian's dream as a act of piety despite the mundane nature of the dream's context. In the fourth century as in the twenty-first century, the choice of a name is an action full of conventions rich in family and religious sense. The greater an anxiety, the more a dream takes on a deep religious sense. It is interesting to note that the epitomator places great emphasis on the circumstances surrounding Varronian's dream to add to the impact. Gregor Weber adds that this type of dream also occurs in Christian tradition.⁸⁵ In the Gospel of Matthew, Joseph must call the son about to be born of Mary, Jesus because of a dream.⁸⁶ Varronianus' dream may have been inspired by readings of Matthew's Gospel, and may be a story reported after the fact, something which Romans call *vaticinatio post eventum*.

The third dream is associated with the origin of Theodosius' name. According to the epitomator, "one is told that his parents having been warned in a dream gave a sacred meaning to his name, as it translated in Latin 'a deo datum' (by God given)."⁸⁷ Here again, the epitomator notes that it is divinely ordered. The *épitomator* does not discuss the religion of the parents, when they were probably Christians.

⁸⁵ Gregor Weber, *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000), *Historia-Einzelschrift* 143, p. 165.

⁸⁶ *Mathew's Gospel*, 1.21.

⁸⁷ *Huic ferunt nomen somnio parentes monitos sacrauisse, ut Latine intellegimus a deo datum.* *Epitome*, 48.2.

These prenatal dreams had special meaning, and I see key clues through the analysis of these two dreams. First, the epitomator takes the oracular value of these two dreams very seriously. Prior to the fourth century, I found only two examples of naming dreams in history: Joseph and the mother of Buddha.⁸⁸ These two dreams may not have been unique since such dreams are common among Amerindian and African cultures of today.⁸⁹ For example, the Ese Eja community in the Peruvian Amazon, people dream the names of their children. While these dreams occur in modern primitive culture, you find similar practices in Mediaeval Island and Norway:

Guðný Böðvarsdóttir dreamt that a man came to her from Hjarðarholt. It seemed to her that she asked him how Halldóra, her daughter-in-law, was doing. The man told her that Halldóra had given birth to a boy. Guðný asked him about the boy's name. "He is called Vígstærkr (1)", was the answer. The other morning [in waking life] a man visited Guðný. He told her that Halldóra had given birth to a child. Guðný asked if it was a girl or a boy. He answered her that it was a boy and that his name was Sturla.⁹⁰

Sturla Þórðarson (c. 1250) wrote this story in his Saga to

⁸⁸ Ashvashosha (50 B.C.), *Buddha Charitra (Deeds of Buddha)*, 1-2 & Matthew, 1.23.

⁸⁹ Daniela M. Peluso, "That Which I Dream Is True": Dream Narratives in an Amazonian Community," *Dreaming: Journal of the Association for the Study of Dreams*. Vol 14(2-3), 107-119; JoAnn D'Alisera, "Born in the USA: Naming Ceremonies of Infants among Sierra Leoneans in the American Capital." *Anthropology Today* 14:16-18, 1998. Sister M. Inez Hilger, "Naming a Chippewa Indian Child," *Wisconsin Archaeologist*, 39 (1958), 120-126.

⁹⁰ *Sturlunga Saga*, ed. Jon Johannesson, Magnus Finnbogagson & Kristjan Gídjarn, vol. 1 (Reykjavík, 1948), pp. 382-384.

explain his name. The child, the author, earned his name through a dream of his grandmother. A similar story occurs in the *Acta et Vita Sancti Olavi* which mentions a naming dream for the king of Norway. An ancestor of the family visited a friend of Olaf's parents, Hrani, in a dream, and he was told of the pregnancy of queen Asta and the emplacement of a treasure. Hrani told the parents to name the child, Olaf.⁹¹ Naming dreams occur in all the areas settled by the Indo-Europeans. Naming dreams are present in Norse legends, the Bible, and early lives of Buddha.

In this context, it is possible that the epitomator or court panegyrists misunderstood an Illyrian naming ceremony. Thus, we may have here the naming dream of Varronian, a part of an Illyrian naming ceremony, with only an accidental connection with *Matthew's Gospel*. Nonetheless, it is also possible that the naming dream was created by a Court panegyrist on the basis of *Gospel of Matthew*, which the epitomator repeated giving it a pagan context.

Those two naming dreams are very interesting because the way they are presented by the epitomator bear similarities to both modern and ancient naming ceremonies. If so, this may indicate that epitomator knew of similar stories, and he heard of them in a pagan context. If, however, the epitomator took *vaticinatio* (a

⁹¹ Wilhelm Gronbeck, *The culture of the Teutons*, tr. By W. Worseter (Copenhagen, 1931), vol. II, pp. 27-33.

fabricated story with an etymological meaning) of court panegyrists, it is interesting that he reshaped the story into pagan naming ceremonies for both Jovian and Theodosius. To me, if it is the case, it would be an undeniable proof that the epitomator is a pagan with knowledge of ancient Balkanic culture. In the fourth century, such syncretism is seen in the decorative motifs of Galerius' city of Romulianum, in which Roman deities are shown with Thracian Dragons, an element of Thracian mythology.⁹²

Conclusion

Like Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 390) and Eutropius (c. 370), the epitomator lives in a time when he must veiled his pagan religious belief or make them discreet. Aurelius Victor, who wrote under Julian (361-363) and spoke openly of pagan rituals such as haruspices and sacrifices in his account of Gordian the elder, is a different story and presents the resurgent paganism of that period. Ammianus Marcellinus, who wrote under Theodosius, has to compose parodies to write about sacrifices mocking the drunkenness of Julian's Gallic soldiers or when he talks about the magical arts describing them only when they are being suppressed or in the past tense.

⁹² Michel Festy (1999), p. 183.
213

The epitomator's view of the divinity is expressed in ways presenting the divinity only through its providential aspects. Such an attitude may explain why oracles and oracular dreams play such distinctive part in his account. He believes like Eutropius and Aurelius Victor in divine retribution, and sees it in pagan terms mentioning the *Dirae* or Furies. In most occasions, Gods are in the plural, but they may show the influence of ancient Thracian and Illyrian cults in his use of their naming ceremonies. On rare occasions, he also presents the divine undefined when he speaks in his own voice - *diuinitus attributum, ut, dum mundi lex seu natura aliudue quid hominibus incognitum gignit.*⁹³ These phrases leave the divine undefined. He is a religious man because he scorns both Julian and Galerius' for ignoring oracles and attributing to themselves what is the attribute of the gods. Like Ammianus Marcellinus, he is fond of asceticism, which may explain why he devotes much space to the temperance of Julian, Gratian and Constantius, and scorns other emperors, such as Augustus, Domitian, and Maximian, who lack self-control. Thus, the epitomator presents himself as a pagan with strong beliefs, but also as an author who must be guarded in his beliefs.

⁹³ *Epitome*, 16.4
214

Conclusion

Retracing all the major ideas in this thesis offers interesting insights into the understanding of the *Epitome*. At the beginning of this vast essay, I organized the text into four areas of analysis, with short conclusions for each chapter. The first three chapters dealt with the history of the text. Chapter four was devoted to placing the *Epitome* within the genres of historical writing. Chapter five analyzed the sources of the *Epitome*. The last two chapters offered elements clarifying the *epitomator's* ideas about the social and political values of the Roman empire and religion. My aim throughout has been to understand the *Epitome* as a literary artefact of the fourth-century Roman empire.

This goal first proposed by H. Temporini to Jorg Schlumberger and enlarged to include numerous sub-questions created by Schlumberger, Barnes, Callu, and Festy remains the *raison-d'être* of all subsequent research. In the end, we find some answers and further questions, refining our understanding of this short and challenging work.

About the history of the text, two chapters were devoted to *Epitome's* reception during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Modern Period. While much is known about the *Epitome* during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, little work has been done about its reception during the modern era. The examination of the

Epitome's medieval readers has offered some new insights but the textual history and perceptions of the text during the Middle Ages. First, it is clear that the *Epitome's* history during late antiquity is uncertain despite many indications that the text enjoyed some popularity in Gaul, Italy, Africa, and Constantinople. The *Epitome's* readers in Constantinople offer the greatest insights about the epitomator. Clearly in Constantine's city the *Epitome* was regarded as anonymous, a fact lost during most of the Middle Ages. Except for Jordanes, there was no extensive use of the *Epitome*. Late antique authors used the *Epitome* as a source of bon mots and interesting facts. The wide dispersion of the *Epitome* offers indications that the text enjoyed some popularity and was copied in the most urbanized Latin regions of the post-Roman world. Despite these interesting facts, much remains to be understood about the text's reception during this period.

Salvatore D'Elia and Michel Festy have examined the reception of the *Epitome* during the Carolingian period and the eleventh century, but they showed no interest in why there were so many known readers for this period. This situation may have been due to the intense copying and cataloguing of the *Epitome*. Beyond the examination of this process, two questions were always on my mind.

First, why did some regions of Latin Christendom see the text as anonymous while others areas saw the *Epitome* as a work of Aurelius Victor? Second, one also wonders why this intense activity ended

by the thirteenth century and picked up again in the fifteenth century? To the first question, the answer lies in the areas of copying. This association with Aurelius Victor appears in Italy with the anonymous *De Terminatione Provinciarum Italiae* (c. 620) and spread to the rest of Europe by the tenth century. In Liège in the ninth and tenth centuries, readers saw the *Epitome* as anonymous. Such a situation owes its origin to the fact that Liège *scriptoria* are probably copying an early lost version of the *Epitome*. Such behaviour can be explained by the pattern of dispersion of manuscripts. Italian manuscripts were always a useful place of origin for kings, emperors, and lesser nobles who wanted to endow the libraries of their religious foundations. By the fifteenth century, the tradition ascribing the *Epitome* to Aurelius Victor is so entrenched among medieval writers that Sicco Polento repeats it in the first important Renaissance treatise on historiography. Beyond this association with Aurelius Victor, the *Epitome* was catalogued as a work of Pliny (probably the Elder) in some monastic library catalogues. In terms of textual history, these facts indicate that most manuscripts owed their *tituli* to an archetype from a time prior to the eighth century since the title mentions no author. In terms of intellectual history, it also shows that medieval authors, such as Sedulius Scottus, show a deep interest in and knowledge of Latin literature even in respect of minor authors.

Chapter Two was more a comparison of the manuscript

tradition with the surviving library catalogues of medieval monasteries. While the manuscript tradition shows mainly a dispersal of the *Epitome* manuscripts in France and in Italy, the library catalogues show that the manuscripts were known almost everywhere among Latin speaking lands during the Middle Ages between 900 and 1437. During this period, there are few readers because of the vast dispersal of the works of Paul the Deacon, Freculph, and Landophus Sagax, which contain large segments of the *Epitome*. I named as readers only the compiler of the version in medieval Latin of the *Epitome* (c. 950), Helgaud (c. 1025), Landophus Sagax (c. 1025), and Sicco Polento (c. 1437). Both Helgaud and the Linguist, Sicco Polento, are mentioned here because they had named Aurelius Victor as the author. Landolfus appears in this list because his selection of thirty passages of the *Epitome* pertains to the emperors from Caligula to Diocletian, whose lives were of less interest to Paul the Deacon.

The modern era was covered in Chapter III. I have shown in this chapter an interest for early modern English translations of the *Epitome* in the English language of George Wilkins and Robert Codrington. I have sketched also the trends of the great modern debates over the sources and other problems created by the complexities of the *Epitome*. Lastly, I have discussed the influence of the *Epitome* upon modern literature (see annex 5). Despite being a lesser text of Roman literature, the text finds a

place in French and English literature. Such an interest reflects the importance of Latin and its literature upon the modern world. Like medieval authors, we are fond of bon mots and interesting ideas. History is always full of lessons. I feel more archival work at a later time should be done into the circumstances of these translations made in London during the turbulent seventeenth century. The colourful history of Robert Codrington, a translator of the *Epitome* begs an examination. Such investigation would also bring light to the role of the Latin historical works in the great debates of the English civil war. Such a study goes beyond the scope of this thesis, as it is focused upon understanding the *Epitome*. Reading fifteen centuries of literature and scholarly works shows how much ancient literature has furnished ideas to people and countries constructing new ideas and ways of thinking.

Chapter IV dealt with the place of the *Epitome* within the genre of history in its own time, and in terms of the modern definition of history. Much of the twentieth-century literary study on epitomes has been dominated by the debate between Eduard von Wolfflin and Martin Schanz over the existence or nonexistence of the historical sub-genre of epitomes. Eduard von Wolfflin believed that epitomes were summaries of a particular author or topic, and that these works did not belong to a particular genre such as history. Martin Schanz, in contrast, thought that epitome was influenced in the process of composition by genre conventions.

To his mind, there was such a thing as historical epitome or *breviarium*. Among the many views defended during this period, Pierre Dufraigne offers the most promising, seeing Aurelius Victor's *Historiae Abbreviatae* and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* as a new and different sub-genre within history different from earlier epitomes and an important innovation of fourth-century historiography. Thus, there were three types of historical epitomes: *breviarium*, epitome of a single historian, and abbreviated biographies. The *epitomator* himself may have believed that he was writing a *breviarium*. Since only he, Aurelius Victor, and the *Kaisergeschichte*'s author had ever written abbreviated biographies, it was natural that he would place himself within the tradition of the *breviaria*. After a thousand years, the nature of such innovation becomes clear - the creating of new historical sub-genre. You can categorize authors under one heading, those writing an epitome of an author, *breviara*, or abbreviated biographies. Reading Latin historiographical convention shows that while you can find rules defining the genre of history such as Aulus Gellius' short essay in his *Noctae Atticae*, most historians did not "stick" to labels of historical sub-genres. This manner of writing seems to fit the *epitomator* who, while claiming to write an *Epitome* of Aurelius Victor, clearly appears to be writing a *breviarium* (a historical summary of the lives of the emperors from Augustus to Theodosius) which uses numerous sources with a biographer's bias.

Such observations also bring home the point of how fourth-century historians wanted not just to imitate but also to innovate within accepted genre conventions. Ancient rhetoric in treatises such as Menander about panegyrics present set-speeches in which individual orators could show brilliance by adding and subtracting elements to fit the circumstances of composition. The selection of ideas and of themes was the manner in which writers showed originality. Reading the Latin or Greek panegyrics is a good case in point. Within the conventions of these set-pieces, each author shows his brilliance and originality. Imitation is always present, but selection of elements and style make each of these panegyrics original and a witness to the occasion of composition.

I believe this is also true of *breviaria* and abbreviated histories.

About the sources discussed in Chapter 5, the thesis finds little basis for connecting the *Epitome* and the contemporary work, Nicomachus' *Annales*. While in many ways the *epitomator* may be a compiler dependent upon Aurelius Victor's work and the *Kaisergeschichte*, the anonymous author manipulates their information (e.g. transferring Trajan's remedy against the evil of drinking found in Victor's work to another emperor), is capable of correcting errors found in these two authors (e.g. the number of Gordians), and makes his own (e.g. Augustus' avoidance of sleep).

In addition to these authorial marks upon the text of the *Epitome*, there is little interest for foreign affairs, Britain,

and Africa. His sources were Aurelius Victor's *Historiae Abbreviatae*, the *Kaisergeschichte*, Eutropius' *Breviarium*, Marius Maximus' *Caesares*, contemporary panegyrics, a *florilegium* of Suetonius, and consular annals. The narrative of the *Epitome* is constructed around three main sources - Marius Maximus, Victor, and the *Kaisergeschichte* - upon which elements of other sources are added.

Influenced by the work of H.W. Bird and a deep interest in Cassius Dio's piety and writings, I concentrated upon two elements discussed in Chapters VI and VII: the pagan elements within the *Epitome* and those elements which conveyed his political and social views. As a pagan, the *epitomator* was moderate in his views. His view of the divinity owed much to stoic and neoplatonic views as they appeared in the work of Macrobius and Servius, but it is still polytheistic in character. He showed little interest for more formal cult practice associated with sacrifices, but he was fascinated by dreams and divination. His views show little of the activism found in the works of Symmachus, Nicomachus Flavianus' polemical essay against Christianity, Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, Ammianus Marcellinus' *Rerum Gestarum Libri*, the *Historia Augusta*, and Eutropius' *Breviarium*. His works has the moderate tone found in the works of Macrobius and Claudian.

The *epitomator's* political ideas offer a view into the minds of the elites of Honorius' Italy. These views resembled those

found in late fourth-century imperial panegyric. These ideas concentrate upon advertising the best and worst qualities as they appear in the lives of the emperors. The *epitomator* also shows the influence of works such as the contemporary *Institutio Traiani*. Three themes stand out in this respect. The *epitomator* shows a fascination for three aspects of asceticism: restraint in food, sleep, anger, sex, and drink. These views represent ideas found in late fourth-century Rome among Christians, and more rarely among pagans such as Ammianus Marcellinus and the author of the *H.A.* Although his work owes much to earlier sources for his exempla, the ideas are used to discuss modern problems relating the behaviour of more recent emperors. He mentions the tools used by Augustus to control his anger - delay and philosophy - in his biography of Theodosius. The ideas may have originated with the author of the *Kaisergeschichte*, but within the *epitomator's* narrative these ideas are placed within the more modern context of the inability of Theodosius to control his anger. Therefore, the ideas become those of the *epitomator*. Similarly, he borrows ideas from Marius Maximus to illustrate the reign of Valentinian on how good advisors can temper the reign of a weak or bad ruler. Like authors of panegyrics, the *epitomator* wanted to influence the behaviour of present rulers and to teach them moderation (*moderatio*). Vices are mocked throughout the work, and good behavior celebrated. These goals are also found in Victor and Eutropius, but these are modified to fit the moods and usage of the early fifth century. In many ways, the *epitomator's* work was

also a product of his time. The taste for asceticism is absent from the work of these earlier epitomators, but the *epitomator* was awed by ascetic courage (e.g. *victor libidinis*).

True, the *epitomator* was a minor author of late fourth-century Rome, but his work also happens to be a literary artefact representing the evolution of cultural ideas in the fourth century. In this work, the *epitomator's* personality comes out by placing his ideas within the frame of his own time, not just his narrative. Through comparison with contemporary authors such as Eutropius it is possible to bring out his personality from a colourless narrative. More needs to be done in respect to the *epitomator's patria* because of his emphasis upon the areas of Italy and the Balkans at the expense of other regions of Italy in terms of architectural features and towns. I believe also that much could be done on the *epitomator's* precise social rank. His social and political views were those of the educated elites, not very different from those of Victor or Eutropius. The reconstruction of his literary *persona* and perhaps his identity, I hope, will be the direction of new studies. Careful attention to his ideas also throws light upon the evolution of pagan thought during this period - more introspective and more ascetic in nature. More comparison with Servius and Macrobius would increase our knowledge of moderate paganism at the end of the fourth century. Similar comparison also shows the growing isolation of the Italian elites from the imperial government. Moderation was

not the way of autocratic emperors. Nonetheless, projects such as the *Epitome* are a witness to similar attempts made by authors of panegyrics, and thus offers the modern world a window into the minds of late Romans living in the Italy of the 390s.

Appendix 1: The *Epitome* and its Readers¹

In Chapter One, I chose to mention only those texts, which allowed a reasonable *Quellenforschung* demonstration using strict criteria. I also alluded in the notes that other scholars, including Michel Festy, proposed on less strict criteria other possible readers of the *Epitome* promising to discuss them in an appendix. This amplified list of readers and medieval library catalogues is the result of this endeavour. In addition, I also wanted to show the influence of Paul the Deacon, Freculph, and Landolfus Sagax on later authors, such as Riccobaldus of Ferrare, in propagating some of the anecdotes found in the *Epitome*. I, thus, hope that my readers and future scholars will be find it useful in better understanding the *Epitome's* story.

The Readers of the *Epitome*:

Eusebius/Rufinus, *H.E.*, VII.9 (c. 402), = *Epit.* 32.1

Orosius, VII.22.4 (c. 417) = *Epit.* 32.1; VII.34.3 = *Epit.* 48.5; 7.35.23 = *E.* 48.19; VII.8.8 = *Epit.* 8.4.

John Lydus, 2.7 (c. 550) = *Epit.* 1.28.

Jordanes, H.R. (*De Summa Temporum vel Origine Actisbusque Gentis Romanorum*, ed. Mommsen, Th.), (c. 550), J. 314 = *Epit.* 46.2; J. 315 = *Epit.* 48.1; J. 315 = *Epit.* 48.5; J. 317 = *Epit.* 48.7; J. 318 = 48.19

¹This list has been compiled in part from the work of Salvatore D'Elia (*Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di A.V.*, 1: *La tradizione diretta*, Napoli, 1965, 24-45), Barry Balwin's research ("John Lydus in Latin on Augustus," *Byzantion* 55 (1995): 527-528), P. Michelotto, ("A proposito di *Epit. de Caesaribus* 32.1, cognomento *Colobius*," *Rendiconti di Istituto Lombardi* 114 (1980): 197-205), and my own investigations.

Paul the Deacon, *H.L.* 2.87 (c. 780); *Historia Romana* (cf. Droysen, H. (1879)), XI.1 = *Epit.* 45.2-3; P. XI.1 = *Epit.* 45.4; P. XI.5 = *Epit.* 45.8, 45.8-9; P. XI.6 = *Epit.* 45.5-6; P. XI.11 = *Epit.* 46.2; P. XI.14 = *Epit.* 47.3; P. XI.16 = *Epit.* 47.6-7; P. XI.17 = *Epit.* 47.4-5; P. XII.1 = *Epit.* 48.1; P. XII.5 = *Epit.* 48.2-5, 48.8-19; P. XII.8 = *Epit.* 48.19

Freculph of Lisieux (c. 825) (*P.L.* 106, 917-1258): II.1.4 (1119d-1120c) = *Epit.* 1.1, 1.4-13, 1.16-21, 1.23-23, 1.30-31; F. II.1.10 (1125a-b) = *Epit.* 2.3-5; F. II.1.13 (1128 c) = *Epit.* 4.2; F. II.1.21 (1138a) = *Epit.* 6.4; F. II.2.6 (1150d) = *Epit.* 11.2-6; F. II.2.8 (1152c) = *Epit.* 12.4, 12.9-12; F. II.2.8 (1152d) = *Epit.* 13.3-5; F. II.2.12 (1159d-1160a) = *Epit.* 14.1-2; 14.7; F. II.2.13 (1162b) = *Epit.* 15.2-4; F. II.2.23 (1168d) = *Epit.* 18.4-6; F. II.2.24 (1169d) = *Epit.* 20.5-8; F. II.2.25 (1170a) = *Epit.* 21.3-4; F. II.3.1 (1175c-d) = *Epit.* 23.3-7; F. II.3.3 (1177d) = *Epit.* 26.2; F. II.3.11 (1186c-d) = *Epit.* 25.2, 35.4-5, 35.7, 35.8; F. II.3.12 (1187a-b) = *Epit.* 36.1-2, 37.1-2, 37.1, 37.3-4; F. II.3.14 (1188d; 1190a-b) = *Epit.* 39.1, 39.5-7; F. II.3.15 (1191b-d) = *Epit.* 40.1-10; F. II.3.21 (1202c-d) = *Epit.* 41.13-15; F. II.4.1 (1203b-c) = *Epit.* 41.19-22; F. II.4.6 (1207a) = *Epit.* 42.4; F. II.4.28 (1227d) = *Epit.* 48.19-20.

Lupus (c. 840), *Epistula* 37 (Ad dominum regem Karolum) (cf. Loup de Ferrière, *Correspondance: tome 1er, 829-847 ap. J.-C.*, ed. and transl. by Léon Levillain, Paris, 1927), 160-165, pp. 164-165): "Imperatorum gesta brevissime comprehensa vestrae majestati offerenda curavi, ut facile in eis inspeciates, quae vobis vel imitanda sint vel cavenda (Lupus sent the king a copy of the Libellus (cf. Ernst Duemmler, *Neues Archiv des Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 28 (1903), p. 260)).

Christian of Stavelot, *Expositio in Mattheum*, *P.L.* 106, 1323d-e (= *Epit.* 39.6), 1448c (= *Epit.* 32.6); 1323c-d (= *Epit.* 10.9) (c. 875)

Hincmar, *De Divortio Lotharii Regis et Theutbergae Reginae*, (*P.L.* 125), 758c (cf. Hincmar, *De Divortio Lotharii et Theutberae Reginae*, M.G.H., Hannover, 1992, p. 248).

Sedulius Scottus, *De Rectoribus Christianis*, IX = *Epit.* 12.3) (Sedulius Scottus, *On Christian Rulers and Poems*, trans. with intro by Edward G. Doyle, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 17, Binghamton, 1983, p. 67 (Thus the emperor Nerva used to say: "Friends presume to merit all things for themselves, and if they have not extorted something, they become more atrocious).)

Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum Miscellaneum*, in *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 67, ed. Dean Simpson (Turhold, Brepol, 1988) 80.7.14 = *Epit.* 14.2; 80.7.15 = *Epit.* 18.4; 80.8.4 = *Epit.* 41.10; 80.10.3 = *Epit.* 10.9; 80.12.21 = *Epit.* 12.3; 80.16.3 = *Epit.* 16.7; 80.20.4 = *Epit.* 2.2; 80.21.7 = *Epit.* 15.5; 80.22.6 = *Epit.* 1.10-12; 80.22.6 = *Epit.* 1.14; 80.22.8 =

39.5-6; 80.24.3 = *Epit.* 21.4; 80.27.8 = *Epit.* 1.28.

Florilegium Bambergensis H.E. III, 14 (c. 962): (*Epit.* 1.16, 4.5, 4.10, 9.18, 11.10, 12.12, 15.4, 23.7, 40.14, 43.7; 47.6).

Helgald sive Helgaud (c. 1025), *Epitoma Vitae Regis Roberti Pii*, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 212, ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1844-1855), 909-936, p. 910d-911a = *Epit.* 18.3 ("ut verbis Aurelii Victorini loquar, ad humanae conversationis exemplum, per laboris genera universa, vir proventus as summa").

Landolphus Sagax (c. 1025), *Historia Miscella*, in *Patrologie Latine*, vol.95, ed. J.-P. Migne, (Paris, 1844-1855), 739-1138 = Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, in *Fonti Per la Storia Italia*, 51-52 (Rome, 1908), 861b = *Epit.* 1.10-12, 1.14, 1.3, 1.15-25, 1.29-30; 862b-c = *Epit.* 1.26-28; 863c = *Epit.* 2.8; 864b = *Epit.* 2.9, 2.1; 862d = *Epit.* 1.31865a-b = *Epit.* 3.2-3; 865b-866a = 3.4-5, 3.6-7, 3.8-9; 865c = *Epit.* 4.1; 865d-866a = *Epit.* 4.2-4; 867b-c = *Epit.* 4.5-8; 867d = 4.9; 868a = *Epit.* 4.10-12; 868a-b = *Epit.* 5.1-2; 868c = *Epit.* 5.5; 868d = *Epit.* 5.5; 869a = *Epit.* 5.6; 869a = *Epit.* 5.7; 869b = *Epit.* 5.7; 870a = *Epit.* 6.2; 870a = *Epit.* 6.3; 870b = *Epit.* 7.1; 870c = *Epit.* 7.2; 870c = *Epit.* 8.2; 872a = *Epit.* 8.3-4; 874a-b = *Epit.* 9.2-4; 874b-c = *Epit.* 9.5-12; 874c = *Epit.* 9.13; 874d-875a = *Epit.* 9.14-16; 875a = *Epit.* 9.18, 9.19; 875b-d = *Epit.* 10.2-8; 876a-b = *Epit.* 10.10-11, 876c = 10.12-13, 10.14; 876d = 10.16; 877a-c = *Epit.* 11.6-8; 877c, 878a = *Epit.* 11.9-10, 11.3; 878a = *Epit.* 11.4; 878b-c = *Epit.* 11.11-15; 878d = *Epit.* 12.1; 879a-b = *Epit.* 12.2-4; 879b-d = *Epit.* 12.5-8; 879d-880a = *Epit.* 12.9-11; 880a = *Epit.* 12.12; 880a = *Epit.* 13.1; 880b = 13.3; 880b = *Epit.* 13.3-4; 881a-b = *Epit.* 13.6-10; 882b = *Epit.* 13.11-14; 882c = *Epit.* 14.1; 883c-884b = *Epit.* 14.2-12; 884c = *Epit.* 15.2; 884d-885a = *Epit.* 12.3-6; 886a = *Epit.* 15.7; 886b = *Epit.* 15.8-9; 887a = *Epit.* 16.6; 887b-c = *Epit.* 16.2-5, 16.8; 888c = *Epit.* 16.11; 888d = *Epit.* 16.13-14; 889a = *Epit.*, 17.1; 889a = *Epit.* 17.2; 889b-c = *Epit.* 17.5-6; 889c = *Epit.* 18.1; 889c-890a = *Epit.* 18.3-6; 890a = *Epit.* 19.1; 890a = *Epit.* 19.2; 890c = *Epit.* 20.2; 890c-891a = *Epit.* 20.5-7; 891a = *Epit.* 20.8; 891b = *Epit.* 20.9; 891b-c = *Epit.* 21.1-4; 891d = *Epit.* 21.6; 892a = *Epit.* 21.7; 892a = *Epit.* 22.1; 892a-b = *Epit.* 23.1; 892b = *Epit.* 23.2-3; 892c = *Epit.* 23.4; 893 a = *Epit.* 24.2-5; 893b = *Epit.* 25.2; 893b-c = *Epit.* 25.2, 26.1-2; 883c = *Epit.* 27.1; 894c = *Epit.* 28.3-4; 894c = *Epit.* 29.1; 895a-b = *Epit.* 30.1, 31.1; 895b-c = *Epit.* 31.2; 895c = *Epit.* 32.1; 885c-896a = *Epit.* 32.1-4; 886a = *Epit.* 32.5; 886b = *Epit.* 33.1; 897a-b = *Epit.* 33.2; 897b = *Epit.* 34.2; 897b-c = *Epit.* 34.2-3; 897c = *Epit.* 34.4; 898a = *Epit.* 35.1; 898b-c = *Epit.* 35.2-8; 898c = *Epit.* 35.9; 899a = *Epit.* 35.8; 899b = *Epit.* 36.1; 899b = *Epit.* 36.2; 899c = *epit.* 37.2-3; 899d = *Epit.* 37.4; 899d = *Epit.* 38.1; 900b-c = *Epit.* 38.6-8; 900c-d = *Epit.* 39.1; 901b = *Epit.* 39.4; 901b = *Epit.* 39.2; 903c = *Epit.* 40.1; 904c = *Epit.* 41.2-4; 905a = *Epit.* 40.3; 905b-c = *Epit.* 40.10-11; 908b = *Epit.* 40.18-19; 908c = *Epit.* 40.20; 909b = *Epit.* 41.8; 909c = *Epit.* 41.11-12; 909d-910a = *Epit.* 41.13-14; 911c = *Epit.* 41.15-16; 912a

= *Epit.* 41.20; 912b = *Epit.* 41.21; 912c-d = *Epit.* 41.22-23; 918b = *Epit.* 42.17; 918c-919a = *Epit.* 42.19-21; 924d-925d = *Epit.* 43.7-8; 931a = *Epit.* 45.10; 934d-935a = *Epit.* 46.2-3.

Sicco Polenton (c. 1426-1437), *Sicconis Polentonis, Scriptorum Illustrium Latinae Linguae ll.* XVIII, ed. B.L. Ullman (Rome, 1928), VII, p. 219, 29 ff (Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore. Parte 1: La tradizione diretta, Collana di Studi Latini*, 11, Naples, 1965, pp. 44-45: Sextus Aurelius, qui etiam Victor nomine appellatus est. Orditur ab Octaviona iste atque singulos ex ordine memorans ad Theodosium venit illum, qui Archadio et Honorio filiis rem publicam quietam salvamque reliquit.

Mentions in Medieval monastic catalogue

Ecclesia Centulensis sive S. Richarii (S. Riquier) (AD 831): "Plinius Secundus de moribus et vita imperatorum (See G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, Bonn, 1885, p. 28; Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore. Parte 1: La tradizione diretta, Collana di Studi Latini*, 11, Naples, 1965, p. 41; the attribution of the *Libellus* to Pliny can probably be explained, according to S. D'Elia, because it was found in a volumen containing the *Origo*.

The catalogue of the monastery of Michelsberg at Bamberg ((c. 1100) 158): *De Vita Cesarum Romanorum I. Item alius* (le texte utilisé par Frudolf) (cf. G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, Bonn, 1885; Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore. Parte 1: La tradizione diretta, Collana di Studi Latini*, 11, Naples, 1965, pp. 42-43).

The catalogue of the abbey of Cluny (c. 1158-1161), 29 et *Libellus de Vita et moribus imperatorum a Cesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium* (See G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, Bonn, 1885, p. 180; Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore. Parte 1: La tradizione diretta, Collana di Studi Latini*, 11, Naples, 1965, p. 43).

The catalogue of the abbey of Corbie (c. 1150) and (c. 1200): a) 305 and 306 (*Liber Virorum Illustrium* (maybe Jerome) and *Chronica Victoris*) b) 232 (*Chronica Victoris*) (See Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore. Parte 1: La tradizione diretta, Collana di Studi Latini*, 11, Naples, 1965, p. 43).

Catalogues of Clastonbury, Marsiglia, Naunburg (c. 1150) (see M. Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in Mittelalterlichen*

Bibliotheks katalogen, Lipsia, 1935, p. 188; Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore. Parte 1: La tradizione diretta*, Collana di Studi Latini, 11, Naples, 1965, p.44).

The Catalogue of Costanza (c. 1343)

The catalogue of Bobbio (c. 1461),

The catalogue of Urbino (c. 1482),

The catalogue of Fleury (c. 1552),

Indirect Mentions of the *Epitome*

Latin readers:

Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, in *Fonti Per la Storia Italia*, 51-52 (Rome, 1908), 860bc = Paullus, VII.5-8(cf. *Epit.* 1.10-12); 863a-b = P. VII.11(cf. *Epit.* 2.1-7); 894c = P. IX.3(cf. *Epit.* 28.1-3); 899c = P. IX.17(cf. *Epit.* 37.1); 904a = P. IX.28(cf. *Epit.* 39.6-7); 907d-908a = P. X.4 (cf. *Epit.* 40.13-14); 926b = P. X.17(cf. *Epit.* 44.1-3); 927b = P. XI.6(cf. *Epit.* 45.2); 930c-d = P. X.6(*Epit.* 45.5-6); 935d-936a = P. XI.14(cf. *Epit.* 47.3); 937a = P. XI.14(cf. *Epit.* 47.3); 938c = P. XI.16-17(cf. *Epit.* 47.1, 47.4-6); 938d = P. XII.1(cf. *Epit.* 48.1); 946b-d = P. XII.4-8(cf. *Epit.* 48.2, 48.8-20).

Henry of Huntingdon (c. 1136), *Historia Anglorum: H.M.*, 863c; 1.28 = H.M., 888c; 1.31 = H.M. 890d; 1.33 = H.M. 894c ; 1.35 = H.M. 898b; 1.41 = H.M. 930c-d; 1.42 = H.M. 938c; 1.43 = H.M. 946b-d; Riccobaldus, *Compendium Historiae Romanae*, 9.69 = Paul, XI.19-25; R. 9.70 = Paul, IX.26-28; R. 9.72 = Paul, X.1; R. 9.73 = Paul, X.2; R. 10.1 = Paul, X.3-7; R. 10.2 = Paul, X.8; R. 10.3 = Paul, X.9-12; R. 10.5 = Paul, X.16; R. 10.6 = Paul, X.17-18; R. 10.9 = Paul, X.16; R. 10.11 = Paul, 11.7-8; 11.10; R. 10.12 = Paul, XI.4-7; R. 10.13 = Paul, XI.16-17; R. 10.15 = Paul, XII.1-3; R. 10.16 = Paul, XII.4-5; R. 10.17 = Paul, XII.5; R. 10.18 = Paul, XII.6. Nonetheless, Henry of Huntingdon knows the name of various historians: Eutropius and others).

Frudolf (a.k.a. Ekkehard d'Aura), ed. G. Waitz, *Monumenta Germanica Historica, Scriptorum VI*, (Berlin, 1844), p. 93 lines (l.) 18-39 = H.M., p. 860b-d (cf. *Epit.* 11.12, 1.4, 1.15-23); p. 95 1.56-65 = H.M., 863a-b (cf. *Epit.* 2.1-7); p. 97 l. 44-45 = H.M. 866b; p. 97 l. 45-46 = H.M. 865a (cf. *Epit.* 3.2); p. 97 l. 58-59 = H.M. 865b (cf. *Epit.* 3.3); p. 97 l. 63 = H.M. 865b-866a (cf. *Epit.* 3.7, 3.4); p. 98 l. 29-30 = H.M. 865d (cf. *Epit.* 4.2); p. 98 1.37-43 = H.M. 867b-c (cf. *Epit.* 4.5, 4.8); p. 101 l. 5-6 = H.M.

868b (cf. *Epit.* 5.2); p. 104 l. 17-24 = *H.M.* 869b-c (cf. *Epit.* 5.6-70; p. 101 l. 69-70 = *H.M.* 870a (cf. *Epit.* 6.3); p. 102 l. 10-11 = *H.M.* 870c (cf. *Epit.* 7.2); p. 102 l. 33-35 = *H.M.* 874d (cf. *Epit.* 9.14); p. 103 l. 5-7 = *H.M.* 877a-b (cf. *Epit.* 11.6, 11.8); p. 103 l. 10-11 = *H.M.* 878a (cf. *Epit.* 11.5); p. 103 l. 36 = *H.M.* 878d (cf. *Epit.* 12.1); p. 103 l. 44 = *H.M.* 880a (cf. *Epit.* 13.1); p. 103 l. 47-52 = *H.M.* 880b (cf. *Epit.* 13.4); p. 103 l. 53-54 = *H.M.* 881b (cf. *Epit.* 13.10); p. 103 l. 61-63 = *H.M.* 882b (cf. *Epit.* 13.11); p. 104 l. 21 = *H.M.* 882c (cf. *Epit.* 14.1); p. 104 l. 25-32 = *H.M.* 883c-884a (cf. *Epit.* 14.7, 14.2-6); p. 104 l. 38 = *H.M.* 884b (cf. *Epit.* 14.9); p. 105 l. 22-23 = *Bambergensis H.E.* 16.4 (cf. *H.M.* 887c, *Epit.* 16.4); p. 105 l. 54-56 = *H.M.* 889b-c (cf. *Epit.* 17.5-6); p. 106 l. 51-58 = *H.M.* 891b-d (cf. *Epit.* 21.1-6); p. 107 l. 13-21 = *H.M.* 892b-c (cf. *Epit.* 23.3-7); p. 107 l. 31-32 = *H.M.* 893a (cf. *Epit.* 24.5); p. 107 l. 62 = *H.M.* 893c (cf. *Epit.* 27.1); p. 108 l. 13-15 = *H.M.* 894c (cf. *Epit.* 28.3); p. 109 l. 2 = *H.M.* 895c (cf. *Epit.* 32.1); p. 109 l. 35-39 = *H.M.* 897b, 897c (cf. *Epit.* 34.2-4); p. 109 l. 50-54 = *H.M.* 898a-c (cf. *Epit.* 35.2, 35.5-6); p. 110 l. 24-26 = *H.M.* 900b-c (cf. *Epit.* 38.6-8); p. 110 l. 3-32 = *H.M.* 900c (cf. *Epit.* 39.1); p. 110 l. 37-39 = *H.M.* 905b-c (cf. *Epit.* 40.12); p. 110 l. 42-43 = *Bambergensis H.E.* III 40.12 (cf. *Epit.* 40.12); p. 111 l. 38-39 = *H.M.* 905b (cf. *Epit.* 40.5); p. 111 l. 41-43 = *H.M.* 904c (*Epit.* 41.2-3); pp. 111 l. 70 - 112 l. 1 = *H.M.* 908b (cf. *Epit.* 40.6); p. 112 l. 8-9 = *H.M.* 909c (*Epit.* 41.12); p. 112 l. 14-15 = *H.M.* 910a (cf. *Epit.* 41.14-15); p. 113 l. 2-19 = *H.M.* 911a, 911b, 911c-d, *Bambergensis H.E.* 42.6 (cf. *Epit.* 41.20-24, 42.1, 42.6); p. 113 l. 23-24 = *H.M.* 918d-919a (cf. *Epit.* 42.20-21); p. 115 l. 6-8 = *H.M.* 926d (cf. *Epit.* 44.1-2); p. 115 l. 16-20 = *H.M.* 926d, 927b (cf. *Epit.* 45.1-2); p. 115 l. 28 = *Bambergensis H.E.* III 45.4 (cf. *Epit.* 45.4); p. 119 l. 24-30 = *H.M.* 929a, Jerome, 248c, *Gallic Chronicle* 442 year 377 (cf. *Epit.* 48.2); p. 119 l. 45-47 = *H.M.* 934d-935a (cf. *Epit.* 46.2); p. 131 l. 13-20 = *H.M.* 935c-336a (cf. *Epit.* 47.2).

Romuald of Salertani (c. 1215) (*Romualdi Salernitani, Chronicon anno Mundi 130 - Anno Domini 1178*, ed. C.A. Garufi, L.A. Muratori, et alii, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 7.1, Bologna, 1914, 4-297): Aetatus sextus, p.: 44 (65b-66b): *Epit.* 1.10-12, 1.16-17, 1.18-20, 1.21-22, 1.24, 1.26, 1.28, 2.3; p.: 66 (91a) = *Epit.* 28.3; p.: 76 (102a) = *Epit.* 39.6; p.: 78 (105b) = *Epit.* 41.8-9; p.: 85 (change of codice in the edition) = *Epit.* 44.3-4; p.: 87 = *Epit.* 45.4, 45.5; p.: 92 (return in the edition to the original codex 113a-b) = *Epit.* 48.5, 48.8, 48.9-11, 48.13-17, 48.18-19, 48.19-20.

Ragnuph Higden (c. 1320), *Polychronicon*, IV.3, IV.21, IV.26 (*Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, monachi Cetrensis*, ed. rev. Joseph Rawson Lumby, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* 41 (8 volumes)) = English translation of Henry Huntingdon.

Petrarch (c. 1350), *De Remidiis Utriusque Fortune* (*Remedies for fortune, fair and foul*, transl. into modern English with

commentary by Conrad H. Rawski, 5 volumes, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1991), I.43 = H.M. 808b(cf. *Epit.* 41.8); I.52 = H.M. (cf. *Epit.* 41.11-12); I.64 = H.M. 67d(cf. *Epit.* 4.9); I.118 = H.M. 860d-861a(cf. *Epit.* 1.19); II.21 = H.M. 878b(cf. *Epit.* 11.11-12); II.75 = H.M. 88d(cf. *Epit.* 16.7); II.131 = H.M. 878c, 878d, 879d, 882b(cf. *Epit.* 11.15, 12.1, 12.8, 13.12)

Giovanni Boccaccio, *De Casibus Illustrium Virorum*, a Facsimile Reproduction of the 1520 Paris edition by Louis Brewer-Hall, (Gainesville (Fl.), 1962), 193-200

Anonymus (c. 1390), *Cronaca B detta Volgarmente Varignana* (*Bibl. Univ. Di Bologna*, m.n. 432), in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 18.1, edd. L.A. Muratori, et alii, Bologna, 1914, 3-478. pp.: 162-163 : *Epit.* 20.1 ff.; pp. 168-169 = *Epit.* 22.4 (the death of Heliogabalus); pp.: 181-182 = *Epit.* 28.3 (Philip Iunior); pp.: 21 = *Epit.* 37.3-4; p.: 209 = *Epit.* 39.6 (The anonymous author learned of these passages from the *Historia Romana* of Paul the Deacon).

Flavio Biondi (c. 1423), *Epistula*, 238 (*Guarinus Veronensis Flavio Suo Sal. Pl. D. = Cod. Monac. Lat. 5369f.79v*) (cf. Remegio Sabbadini, *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese*, Vol. 1, Venice, 1915, pp.: 372-375; Arnaldo Momigliano, "Per una nuova edizione della *Origo Gentis Romanae*," *Athenaeum* 36 (1958), 248-256); *Roma Triumphans* (Basel, 1559, pp. 149-151 : Some reflections on late Latin historiography: Ammianus, H.A., Eutropius, Orosius, etc.).

Greek Readers:

Zosime (c. 520), *Historia*: 1.23 = *Epit.* 29.6; 1.30 = *Epit.* 32.2; 1.36 = *Epit.* 32.3-4; 1.46 = *Epit.* 34.3; 1.49 = *Epit.* 35.2; 1.64 = *Epit.* 36.1; 2.12 = *Epit.* 40.2; 2.16 = *Epit.* 40.7; 2.11 = *Epit.* 40.6; 2.12 = *Epit.* 40.20; 2.8 = *Epit.* 41.2; 3.29 = *Epit.* 43.4; 4.5 = *Epit.* 46.1-6; 4.35 = *Epit.* 47.6-7; 4.54 et 4.58 = *Epit.* 48.7; 4.46-7 = *Epit.* 48.6; 4.54 = *Epit.* 48.3;

Peter Patricios (c. 540), frg. 191,

Pseudo-Symeon (c. 970), (F. Halkin, "Le règne de Constantin d'après la chronique inédite du pseudo-Syméon," *Byzantion* 29-30 (1959-1960): 7-27, p. 11; cf. *Eklogai istoriôn ou Épitomé de Syméon le logothathète*, ed. J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota graecae codd. mss. bibl. regiae Parisiensis*, t. 2, Oxford, 1939, 243-379) fol. 82r-83r du *Parasiensis* 1712 = *Epit.* 41.16; fol. 87r = *Epit.* 41.1 (his lifespan).

Georgios Kedrenos, *Historiarum Compendium*, I. col. 516 (P.G. 121) (c. 1075)

Anonymus Byzantine life of Constantine, (c. 1000) (*Bibliotheca Hagiographica graeca*, 3e ed., Bruxelles, 1957).

A reader of the Caesars of S. Aurelius Victor

Petrarch, *De Remediis Ultriusque Fortune*, 1.64: Aurelius Victor, *De Caesararibus* 4.14; 2.131 = Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus*, 12.1, 13.10; 2.84 = Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus*, 20.25-26; 2.44= Aurelius Victor, 38.1-4

The most interesting passage is the following: "Worth remembering in this respect is a remark of the Roman emperor Septimius Severus, who, as an old man suffering from the gout, uncovered a conspiracy of his officers to name his son Augustus, although he himself was still alive. The seditious conspirators and his son were apprehended and knelt before his throne terrified and trembling with fear of execution. The emperor touched his head with hand and said: 'now at last you know that the head does the ruling not the feet.'" Petrarch, *De Remediis Ultriusque Fortune*, 1.64.

Medieval readers of the Origo

Geoffrey of Virturbo, *Speculum Regum*, M.G.H. S.S. 22
M.G.H. SS. XX e Puccioni, *La Fortuna Medievale dell' Origo Gentis Romanae*, Firenze, 1958, pp. 105 ff.

Appendix 2: Its Medieval Version and the Establishment of the *Epitome* Text

Although there is little that is original in the medieval version of the *Epitome* or *Victoris Epitoma*, I found only a few passages where the anonymous recensioist contributes information of his own. The first passage appears in an anecdote about imperial *providentia* in the biography of Marcus Aurelius.¹ The passage offers interesting insights about the personality of recensioist and the text of the *Epitome* itself. The Christian recensioist removed the Stoic details about nature and the divine - *lex mundi seu naturae aliudve* - keeping only a description of the numerous and unforeseen blows cured by good government - a possible sign of Christian censorship. His rendition contains some departures to the received text of the *Epitome*. Interestingly this same passage in the *Epitome* contains an *obolus* (an obscure passage) in Pichlmayr's edition, which Festy in his edition removed. An *obolus* can mean many things in palaeography, and plainly put it is a difficult passage:

Credo divinitus attributum ut, dum mundi lex seu natura +aliudue quid hominibus incognitum gignit, rectorum consiliis tamquam medicinae remediis leniantur. *Epitome*, 16.4 (Pichlmayr's edition)

Credo divinitus attributum ut, dum mundi lex seu natura aliudue qui hominibus incognitum gignit, rectorum consiliis tamquam medicinae remediis leniantur. *Epitome*, 16.4

¹ *Epitome*, 16.4

Et Credo divinitus factum ut mundus qui tantis et inauditis gladiis affligebatur, huius imperatoris consiliis et consolationibus tamquam medicine remediis salvaretur. *Victoris epitoma*, 16.4 ²

The modern text is reconstructed on the basis of Landolfus Sagax's *Historia Romana* (*aliudue*) (s in Festy's *apparatus criticus*), the *Guelferbyt.* 4435 (B in Festy's), *Vatic. Ottob. Lat.* 1223 (*aliudue*) (m in Festy's), and the *Vaticanus Latinus* 3343 (*aliunde*) (i in Festy's). This passage shows a minor problem in modern palaeography, and I find odd that Festy would ignore it because this removal, however, fails to take into account the opinions of Pichlmayr, who placed an *obolus* because the previous editors had given contradictory readings of the passage.³ For example, Giovanni Giocondo had the sentence *ea mala* as the antecedent for the *quid*.⁴ Thus, I believe that the *obolus* should remained for clarity sake in the mind of future readers.

The passage in the *Victoris epitoma* becomes also interesting for another reason. The *Victoris epitoma* at 16.4 adds *consolationibus* to *consiliis*. These two ideas fully capture the *epitomator's* version of imperial *providentia* as well as the two sides of Christian *providentia*. Comparable

² Festy (1999), p. 259.

³ Pichlmayr, p. 152.

⁴ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris [= epitomator] libellus de vita & moribus imperatorum Romanorum (...) curante Ioanne Jucundo* (Parisii, 1504), 16.4; T.D. Barnes, *Classical Review* (2002): 26.

ideas appeared earlier in the biography of Titus, in which the *epitomator* writes:

Quibus tamen malis nullo vexato pecunia propria subvenit cunctis remediorum generibus, nunc aegrotantes per semetipsum refeciens, nunc consolans suorum mortibus afflictos./ For these calamities, however, Titus assisted with his own money without prejudice to anyone, at one time curing the sick by his presence with every type of remedy, at another consoling those affected by the death of their loved ones. (E. 10.14)

Consilia and *consolationes* are trademark tools of imperial *providentia* according to the *epitomator*, and logically would be expected to be present in a similar context in the *Epitome*. The passage shows, then, that the recensionist had a good appreciation of the *epitomator's* sense of imperial *providentia*.

There are numerous difficult passages in the *Epitome*, on which *Victoris epitoma* throws light.⁵ Festy used the *Victoris epitoma* in establishing his recent edition of the *Epitome*, and used it to correct some of these difficult passages in the text, but he sometimes fails to do so. In two instances the *Victoris epitoma* could have helped more to clarify our

⁵ "Le texte de l'*Epitome*, tel qu'il est édité depuis près de cinq siècles d'après les manuscrits, contient des lacunes qui sont le plus souvent insoupçonnables et n'apparaissent que par comparaison avec la tradition indirecte italienne." Festy (1999), p. lxxviii.

understanding of the *Epitome*. This medieval version of the *Epitome* needs, however, to be used with extreme care because of these difficulties. The anonymous Campanian author of the *Victoris epitoma* often copied the *Epitome* incorrectly and changed the wording of the text because of his ignorance of history. My interest in the *Victoris epitoma* lies in its role in discussing complex problems raised by Bruno Bleckmann and my own reading of several passages in Festy's edition.

The first passage, found in the manuscripts of the A and D groups (Festy's classification), occurs where the *epitomator* narrates how the emperor Julian died in his camp on the Tigris in AD 363. The *Victoris epitoma* (as it appears in Festy's edition) differs slightly from the text of the *Epitome*:

Relatusque in tabernaculum, rursusque ad hortandos suos egressus, paulatim sanguine uacuatus, circa noctis fere medium defecit, praefatus consulto sese de imperio nihil mandare ne, uti solet in multitudine discrepantibus studiis, + amico ex invidia, rei publicae discoria exercitus periculum pararet./ After he had been carried to his tent, he came out again in order to encourage his men. After losing his blood, he died around midnight. He said beforehand that he had on purpose given no order concerning the imperial power for fear that, as it is customary in a multitude when opinions differ, he might contrive danger for a friend through envy and for the state from a military dissension. *Epitome*, 43.4 [Pichlmay's edition]

"Qui, portatus ad tabernaculum, iterum ad hortandos suos exiuit, sed sanguine paulatim deficiente prope mediam noctem defecit. De imperio enim nullum consilium dare uoluit aut

aliquid demandare ne, sicut solet in multitudine fieri discordantibus inter se militibus, illis qui amici erant aliquod periculum faceret./ After he had been carried to his tent, Julian came out a second time in order to encourage his men; but with his blood gradually failing to flow he died around the middle of the night. About the empire, he did not wish to give any advice or to order anything for fear that, as it is customary to occur among a multitude when soldiers disagreed among themselves, he might cause some danger to those who were his friends. " *Victoris Epitoma* - Festy (1999), p. 276 (43.4).

Relatusque in tabernaculum rursusque ad hortandos suos egressus paulatim sanguine vacuatus circa noctis fere medium defecit. Praefatus consulto sese de imperio nihil mandare, ne, uti solet in multitudine discrepantibus studiis, amicorum ex invidia rei publicae pre discordia exercitus periculum pararet./ Preferring upon self-reflection to order nothing about the empire for fear that, as it is customary in a multitude where the opinions of friends differ, he might contrive a danger because a military squabble arose from the desire to rule. Landolfus Sagax, *H.M.*, 11. (cf. Crevilluci, *R.S.I.* v. 51 (1914), pp. 151-152)

The author of the *Victoris epitoma* perceived the danger only against the emperor's friends. The *epitomator* presented the same instance in a slightly different manner in his narrative. The *epitomator* apprehends the danger from civil war for both the state and Julian's friends. The *Victoris epitoma's* version, however, by design or not, runs close to the account of events found in the text of Ammianus concerning the dying words of Julian.⁶ Because of the anonymous author's inclination to slightly modify the text of

⁶ 'Super imperatore uero creando caute reticeo, ne per imprudentiam dignum praeteream, aut nominatum quem habilem reor, anteposito forsan alio, discrimen in ultimum trudem.' Ammianus, 25.3.20

the *Epitome*, I believe that the anonymous tenth-century recensionist has unconsciously modified the text to give his version a Christian tone, which is absent from the *epitomator's* text. Nonetheless, the anonymous author's modification also shows that the text of the *Epitome* could be misread in the manuscript used to make the recession.

Another small matter in dispute among modern scholars working on the *Epitome* concerns the number of *Alemanni* slaughtered by Claudius Gothicus at the Lac de Garde in AD 268. Bruno Bleckmann, a reviewer of Festy's French translation of the *Epitome*, found helpful Festy's addition to text of the manuscripts for his own research on the sources of Zonaras.⁷ Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana* and the *Historia Miscella* of Landolfus Sagax gave a figure of 300,000 *Alemanni*, which Festy incorporated in the narrative.⁸ Numbers in ancient manuscripts are always a tricky matter, and naturally Bleckmann found the number in Landolfus interesting and suspicious. First Bleckmann finds suspicious that while describing a similar victory of Gallienus (two years earlier), Zonaras numbered the *Alemanni's* losses at

⁷ Bruno Bleckman, "Epitome de Caesaribus, Landelfus Sagax un 300,000 Alamannen zwei Bemerkungen anlaßlich der neuen Epitome-Ausgaben von M. Festy," *Gottinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 2 (1999): 139-149; Michel Festy, p. 159, n. 5.

⁸ "adversus trecenta milia Alemannorum haud procul a lacu Benaco dimicans, tantam multitudinem fudit, ut aegre pars dimitia superfuerit." Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, 11.

300,000. Bleckmann goes on to argue that the number of the Alemanni slain are probably the casualties of the same battle, which the *epitomator* has erroneously misplaced during an event under Claudius. Bleckmann arrived at this conclusion since no other literary sources besides the *Epitome* mentions Claudius fighting the Alemanni. Bleckmann believes that the *epitomator* and Zonaras are using the same source, the lost Nicomachus Flavianus' *Annales* (c. 380), in which this number of casualties was found. Thus for this reason and others, Bleckmann believes that Festy's correction is sound.

While Festy's correction is possibly correct, I am unsure of its validity. I think that here the version in the *Victoris epitoma* is essential for understanding the passage: "(...) exercitum contra Alamannos in pugnam exiuit non longae a lacu Benaco, et tantam ex illis multitudinem occidit ut ad poenam media pars remaneret."⁹ Pichlmayr, the earlier editor, believed that the passage, in the *Epitome*, should be read, in a similar manner, writing: '*adversum gentem Alemanorum haud procul a lacu Benaco dimicans tantam*

⁹ '(Claudius) brought out the army for combat against the Alemanni not far from the Lac de Garde, and he killed such a multitude that only half of them remained for punishment. Festy, p. 267.

multitudinem fudit ut aegre pars dimidia superfuerit.'¹⁰ In this debate, the variant found in the *Victoris epitoma* offers some insights corroborating Pichlmayr's reading of the manuscripts. Perhaps, the *epitomator* was looking for poetic imagery instead of precision in describing the slaughter of *Alemanni*. Ignoring other possibilities, Festy conjectures that Paul the Deacon had read an older manuscript for the correction, but I am less certain.¹¹ One could argue that Paul could also be using a source other than the *Epitome* to supplement the *Epitome* narrative. Such conclusion is not impossible since Paul was more informed about this battle than the *epitomator* giving its location near Verona: '*in silva quae Ligana dicitur.*'¹² Thus because of this possibility and the contradictory evidence found in the *Victoris epitoma*, I would argue that Paul's numbers should also not be added to the Latin text of the *Epitome*.

By comparing these three passages, in both the *Epitome* and the *Victoris epitoma*, I have shown how the anonymous

¹⁰ 'Fighting the Alemannic people Claudius slaughtered such a multitude that less than half of <them> remained.' Pichlmayr, p. 161.

¹¹ Festy, p. 159, n. 6.

¹² Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, IX.12 (cf. Crivelluci, p. 129).

author of the *Victoris epitoma* in those instances probably reworked the text giving in many instances a Christian twist absent from the original. Such a comparison is also useful since it definitely indicates passages within the *Epitome* with a clear pagan bias, which a Christian writer could find issue with.

Appendix 3: Passages about Self-Control

I have added this list because I did not want to overburden my footnotes, but I also felt that this information in one place would help my readers and influence later scholars.

Passages discussing bodily metaphors in antiquity:

Epitome, 42.21: "Namque ut ceteras omittam, Pompeia Plotina incredibile dictu est quanto auxerit gloriam Traiani; cuius procuratores cum provincias calumniis agitarent, adeo ut unus ex his diceretur locupletium quemque ita convenire: 'Quare habes?' alter: 'Unde habes?' tertius: 'Pone, quod habes', ille coniugem corripuit atque increpans, quod laudis suae esset incuriosus, talem reddidit, ut postea exactiones improbas detestans fiscum lienem vocaret, quod eo crescente artus reliqui tabescunt."

Institutio Traiani, II: Princeps uero capitis in re publica obtinet locum, uni subjectus Deo et his qui vices illius agunt in terris: quoinam et in humano corpore ab anima uegebatur caput et regitur. Cordis locum senatus obtinet, a quo bonorum operum et malorum praecedunt initia. Oculorum, aurium et linguae officia sibi vindicant iudices et praesides provinciarum. Officiales et milites manibus coaptantur. Qui semper adsistunt principem, lateribus assimilantur. Quaestores et commentarienses (non illos dico qui carceribus praesunt, sed comites rerum privatarum) ad ventris et intestinorum refert imaginem: quae si immensa aviditate congesserint et congesta tenacius reservaverint, innumerabiles et incurabiles generant morbos, ut vitiis eorum totius corporis ruina immineat. Pedibus vero solo jugiter inhaerentibus agricolae coaptantur: quibus capitis providentia tant magis necessaria est, quo plura inveniunt diverticula, dum in obsequio corporis in terra gradiuntur, eisque iustius tegumentorum debetur suffragium, qui totius corporis erigunt sustinent et promovent molem. Pedum adminicula robustissimo corpori tolle: suis viribus non procedet, sed aut turpiter inutiliter et moleste repet, aut brutorum animalium more movebitur.

Flavius Cresconius Corippus, *Panegyric of Justin II*, 249-257:
"Quod fisci est, nullus rapiat. Cogniscite fiscum ventris habere

locum per quem omnia membra cibantur. Venter alit corpus. Fuerit si venter inanis, omnia deficiunt, tenuantur robore membra et contracta rigent arentibus ossa medullis. Omnibus sufficiunt sacrati commoda fisci, ex quibus est commune bonum, commune levamen. Tutetur fiscus iustorum nemine laeso, quae sua sunt, rapiat, quae sunt privata, relinquat."

Jean de Salibury, *Policraticus*, 540c (5.2.): "Quaestores et commentarienses (non illos dico qui carceribus praesunt, sed comites rerum priuaterum) ad ventris et intestinorum refert imaginem. Quae, si immensa audivitate congesserint et congesta tenacius reseruauerint, innumerabilis et incurabiles generant morbos, ut uitio eorum totius corporis ruina immineat."

Marcus Aurelius' *apatheia*:

Epitome, 16.7 (= Eutrope, *Breviarium*, VIII.6.2): "A principio vitae tranquillissimus, adeo, ut ab infantia vultum nec ex gaudio nec ex maerore mutaverit."

Plato, *Republic*, III.387d: "Moins que tout autre, aussi, il se lamentera, et c'est avec le plus de douceur possible qu'il supportera un malheur, lorsque celui-ci l'atteindra." (tr. Robert Baccou).

Plato, *Republic*, III.388e: "Il ne faut pas non plus que nos gardiens soient amis du rire. Car, presque toujours, quand on se livre à un rire violent, cet état entraîne dans l'âme un changement violent également. Il me le semble, dit-il. Qu'on représente donc des hommes dignes d'estime dominés par le rire, est inadmissible, et ce l'est beaucoup plus s'il s'agit des dieux." (idem)

Plato, *Republic*, III.389d: Or, pour la masse des hommes les principaux points de la tempérance ne sont-ils pas les suivants: obéir aux chefs, et être maître de soi-même en ce qui concerne les plaisirs du vin, de l'amour et de la table ? (idem)

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 1.8: "From Apollonius I learned freedom of will and undeviating steadiness of purpose; an outlook to nothing else, not even for a moment, except to reason, and to be always the same, in sharp pains, on the occasion of the loss of a child, and in long illness (tr. George Long);"

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 1,9: "(...)and he never showed anger or any other passion, but was entirely free of passion, and also most affectionate;" (tr. Georges Long)

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 1,15: "From Maximus I learned self-government, and not be led aside by anything; and cheerfulness in all circumstances, as well as in illness; and a just admixture in the moral character of sweetness and dignity, and to do what was set before me without complaining. (...) and he never showed amazement and surprise, and was never in a hurry, and never put off doing a thing, nor was perplexed nor dejected, nor did he ever laugh to disguise his vexation, nor, on the other hand, was he ever passionate or suspicious." (ibid)

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 1.16: "In my father (...) I observed that he had overcome all passion for joy; (...) and to be satisfied on all occasions and cheerful; (...) And that might be applied to him which is recorded of Socrates, that he was able both to abstain from, and to enjoy, those things which many are too weak to abstain from, and cannot enjoy without excess." (ibid)

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 2.17: "(...)But this consists in keeping the daemon within a man free from violence and unharmed, superior to pains and pleasures, (...)." (ibid)

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, 7.60: "(...) For what the mind shown in the face by maintaining in it the expression of intelligence and propriety, that ought to be required and also in the whole body. But all these things should be observed without affectation." (ibid)

Seneca, *Letters to Lucilius*, 23.4.1: "Mihi crede, verum gaudium res severa est.

The nature of laughter and the means to control it:

Cicero, *De Officiis*, 103: "Ludo autem et ioco uti illo quidem licet, sed sicut somno et quietibus ceteris tum, cum gravibus seriisque rebus satis fecerimus."

Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.235: "Atque illud primum - quid sit ipse risus, quo pacto concitetur, ubi sit, quo modo existat atque ita repente erumpat, ut eum cupientes tenere nequeamus, et quo modo simul latera, os, uenas, oculos, uultum occupet -, uiderit Democritus (...)."

Plato, *Republic*, V.452b-d: "Mais, repris-je, puisque nous nous sommes lancés dans la discussion il ne faut pas craindre les railleries des plaisants, tant et de tels propos qu'ils tiennent là-contre, (...) Et cela montra qu'est insensé celui qui croit ridicule autre chose que le mal, qui tente d'exciter le rire en prenant pour objet de ses railleries un autre spectacle que celui de la folie et de la perversité, ou qui se propose et poursuit sérieusement un but de beauté qui diffère du bien." (Garnier-Flammarion)

Epictetus, *The Manual*, : "Ris rarement et pas à tous propos ni à gorge déployée." (Collection classique en Roche)

Martianus Capella, IV.332: "When he had said this and several of the gods had laughed [dialectic dressed as a Marsian sorceress] as much as was seemly, Pallas rather shocked, restrained them as they were starting to make jokes, reminding them that this was a women of perfect sobriety, something which had been wholly denied to some of the gods;" (tr. William Harris Stahl, Richard Johnson, and E.L. Burge)

Martianus Capella, IV.348: (...) "For example, laughter in man. For no one can laugh unless he is a man, and there is no man who cannot laugh when he wants to, so far as it is in his nature. (...) But when we call man an animal capable of laughter, we have thereby distinguished him from the generality of all other living things."
(ibid)

Martianus Capella, IV.398: "For just as it is a property of man to be capable of laughter. (...)." (ibid)

Martianus Capella, V.479: "Property is a thing's unique characteristic; for example, laughter, for laughter is unique to man." (ibid)

Martianus Capella, V. 545: (...) "[after speaking of introduction, both fundamental and insinuatory, Capella discusses when to use

insinuatory introduction] when acclamation or laughter has caused some interruption.

Seneca, *Letters to Lucilius*, 23.3: "Existimas nunc me detrahare tibi multas voluptates, qui fortuita summoveo, qui spes, dulcissima oblectamenta, devitandas existimo? Immo contra nolo tibi umquam deesse laetitiam. Volo illam tibi domi nasci; nascitur, si modo intra te ipsum sit. Ceterae hilaritas non implent pectus, frontem remittunt, leves sunt, nisi forte tu iudicas eum gaudere, qui ridet. Animus esse debet alacer et fidens et super omnia erectus."

Passages dealing with the control of sleep:

Homer, *Iliad*: "Là est ton devoir, nuit et jour presse les capitaines des troupes alliées à garder leurs places dans le combat et repousse le blâme et la tristesse de la défaite." (J.-L.G.)

Plato, *Laws*, VII. 808a-b: "S'éveiller de nuit, c'est, pour chacun, le seul moyen d'expédier de larges parts de sa besogne politique ou domestique, si l'on est, soit magistrat dans la cité, soit maître ou maîtresse en sa propre maison. Beaucoup de sommeil ne convient pas, en effet, par loi de nature, ni à nos corps ni à nos âmes ni à l'exercices des activités qui leur sont propre. Un homme endormi ne vaut rien, non plus qu'un homme sans vie; au contraire, celui de nous qui a le plus grand souci de vivre et de penser, celui-là reste éveillé le plus longtemps possible, réserve faite seulement de ce qu'exige la santé, et c'est peu, si l'on a su s'habituer. Les chefs qui veillent la nuit dans les cités sont redoutables aux méchants quels qu'ils soient, ennemis ou citoyens; respectés et admirés par les hommes justes et tempérés; utiles à eux-mêmes et à la cité tout entière. (Garnier-Flamarion)

Plato, *Laws*, VI.757a:

Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus*, 8.20: "Et cette attention qu'il portait à soi-même, il ne la relâchait jamais si ce n'est dans son sommeil: encore celui-ci était-il refoulé par le peu de nourriture - car souvent il ne touchait même pas au pain - et par sa conversion soutenue vers l'Intellect." (tr. Henry).

Seneca, *Naturales Questiones*, 6.2.3: "Non cibus nobis, non umor, non vigilia, non somnus sine mensura quadam salubria sunt.

Diogenes Laërtius, *Les vies et la doctrine des Philosophes*, VII (quotes Plato's *Laws*):

Libanios, *Panegyrique royal (Basilikos) en l'honneur de Constance et de Constans*, 59.144: "Sa journée est faite d'actions et sa nuit de la même chose. Il n'y a pas de place pour une boisson forte, et une conduite sobre est son état normal. Tous ceux qui sont paresseux lui sont odieux, mais quiconque a les yeux bien ouverts est son intime. Il [Constans] n'a pas besoin de gardes du corps, mais accorde sa protection à ses gardes. Au point que chaque fois qu'il les voit sommeillant, il tolère leur repos comme entièrement pardonnable et lui-même, comme s'il combattait la nature, prend un lance et monte la garde devant son Q.G. Son labeur incessant augmente au complet les saisons de l'année et toutes les occasions." (J.-L.G.)

Libanios, 59.27: "And neither by light of day nor when night came on could anyone say that he [Constantine] ceased either from both or indeed from either one of them." (tr. Sam Lieu and Dominic Montferrat)

Libanios, 59.121: "He does not spend his times of leisure in sleep and ease but has exchanged his repose for the practice of military skills." (tr. Sam Lieu and Dominic Montferrat).

Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, IV.29: "For himself, he sometimes passed sleepless nights in furnishing his mind with Divine knowledge (....)" (tr. E.C. Richardson in *Post Nicene Fathers*)

Cicero, *De Officiis*, 103: "Ludo autem et ioco uti illo quidem licet, sed sicut somno et quietibus ceteris tum, cum gravibus seriisque rebus satis fecerimus."

Sallust, *De Coniuratione Catilinae*, II.8: Sed multi mortales, dediti uentri atque somno, indocti incultique uitam sicut peregrinantes transiere. V.3 : Corpus patiens inediae, algoris, uigiliae, supra quam cuiquam credibile est. XIII.3 : (...) dormire prius quam somni cupido esset (...).

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum Libri*, 25.4.4-6.: "Hoc autem temperantiae genus crescebat in maius, iuuantes parsimonia ciborum et somni, quibus domi forisque tenacius utebatur. (...) 5. Ubi

uero exigua dormiendi quiete, recreasset corpus laboribus induratum, expergefactus, explorabat per semet ipsum uigiliarum uices et stationum, post haec seria ad artes confugiens doctrinarum. 6. Et si nocturna lumina, inter quae lucubrabat, potuissent uoce ulla testari, profecto ostenderant, inter hunc et quosdam principes multum interesse, quem quidem norant uoluptatibus ne ad necessitatem quidem indulsisse natura."

Epitome, 1.22 (Auguste): Cumque esset cibi ac uini multum, aliquatenus uero somni abstinens .

Epitome, 9.15 (Vespasien): Vigilare de nocte.

Epitome, 42.18 (Constance II): a cibo uinoque et somno multum temperans (...)

Epitome, 47.5 (Gratien): parcus cibi somnique et uini ac libidinis victor.

Eginhard, *Life of Charlemagne*, II.26: "Noctibus sic dormiebat ut somnum quater aut quiquies non solum expergescendo, sed etiam desurgendo interruperet."

Suetonius, *Augustus*, 78.2: "non amplius ... quam spetem horas dormiebat, ac ne eas continuas, set ut ... ter au quater expergisceretur."

Procopius, *The Secret History*, 8.19-24: "He had little need of sleep as a rule, and his appetite for food and drink was unusually small: (...) and after sleeping for perhaps one hour he would pass the rest of the night walking round and round the Palace. Yet had he been prepared to spend just that amount of time in good works, the nation could have enjoyed a very high degree of prosperity. Instead he employed all his natural powers for the ruin of the Romans, and succeeded in bringing the whole political edifice crashing to the ground. His prolonged vigils, privations, and painful efforts were undergone with this object alone - always and every day to devise for his subjects bigger calamities for him to crow over." (Penguin version)

Pliny the Younger, *Panegyric of Trajan*, 49.9: "Inde tibi parcus et brevis somnus, nullumque amore nostri angustius tempus quod sine nobis agis."

Pliny the Younger, *Panegyric of Trajan*, 13: Non tibi moris tua inire, nisi commilitonum ante lustrasses; nec requiem corpori, nisi post omnes, dare.

Pliny the Younger, *Panegyric of Trajan*, 15.4: "Veniet erogo tempus, quo posterī visere, uisendum traderre minoribus suis gestient, quis sudores tuos hauserit campus, quae refectiones tuas arbores, quae somnum saxa praetexerint, quo denique tectum magnus hospes impleueris."

Augustine, *De Ordine*, II.8: "Adolescentibus ergo studiosis eius vita itat vivendum est, ut a venereis rebus, (...) a torpore somni atque pigritiae, (...), se abstineant.

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 21.4: "vigiliarum somnique nec die nec nocte discriminata tempora; (...)."

Velleius Paterculus, II.88: "Erat tunc urbis custodiis praepositus C. Maecenas equestri, sed splendido genere natus, vir, ubi res vigiliam exigeret, sane exsomnia, (...).

Velleius Paterculus, II.127.4: "(...) vultu vitae tranquillum, animo exsomnia."

Passages dealing with anger:

Epitome, 48.14-15: "Habuitque a natura quod Augustus a Philosophiae doctore. Qui cum uidisset eum facile commoueri, ne asperum aliquid statueret, monuit, ubi irasci coepisset, quattuor atque uiginti graecas litteras memoria recenseret, ut illa concitatio, quodae momenti est, mente alio traducta parui temporis interiectu languesceret."

Claudian, *Panegyric in Honor of Honorius' Fourth Consulate*, 241-247: "iram sanguinei regio sub pectore cordis protegit imbutam flammis avidamque nocendi praecitemque sui. rabie succensa tumescit, contrahitur tepefacta metu. cumque omnia secum duceret et requiem membris vesana negaret, invenit pulmonis opem madidumque furenti praebuit, ut timidae ruerent in mollia fibrae."

Seneca, *De Ira*, II.29: "Maximum remedium irae mora est. Hoc ab illa pete initio non ut ignoscat sed ut iudicet: graues habet

impetus primos; desinet si exspectat. Nec uniuersam illam temptaueris tollere: tota uincetur dum partibus carpitur."

Georgius Cedrenus, ed. Immanuel Bekker, tomus prior, *Corpus Scriporum Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. 34, (Bonn, 1838), p. 303: "Id adeo gratum Caesari fuit, ut convocato senatu Athenodorum multis verbis laudaverit; addideritque se, cum turpem ageret vitam, ab eo fuisse correctum. Iam gravis aetate Athenodorus in patriam redeundi veniam petiit, quod iam perfectam rerum cognitionem et agendi rationem Caesar esset consecutus. Cum aegre veniam impetrasset, ultimo digressu valedicens Caesari in aurem insusurravit, hortans ut quoties ira commoveretur, non ante agi quicquam mandaret quam apud sese 24 vocabulorum elementa enumerasset: morat enim animum Caesaris subita ira exardescere, et facile mutari

Libanios, 59.121: "He is invulnerable with regard to to the schedule of the body and oes not succumb to ill-timed temper." (tr. Sam Lieu and Dominic Montferrat).

Passages criticizing drunkenness and it remedies:

Epitome, 1.22 (Auguste): "Cumque esset cibi ac uini multum (...)

Epitome, 2.2 (Tibère): "Iste, quia Claudius Tiberius Nero dicebatur, eleganter a iocularibus Caldus Biberius Mero ob uinolentiam nominatus est."

Epitome, 13.4 (Trajan): "ut quasi temperamento quodam uirtutes miscuisse uideretur, nisi quod cibo uinoque paululum deditus erat.

Epitome, 40.18 (Maximinus Dacia): "uini audior. Quo ebrius quaedam corrupta mente aspera iubebat; quod cum pigeret factum, differi, quae praecipisset, in tempus sobrium ac matutinum statuit."

Epitome, 48.10: "Illa tamen, quibus aspersus est, uinolentiam scilicet."

Origo imperatori Constantini, 4.11: Igitur Galerius sic ebriosus fuit, ut, cum iuberet temulentus ea quae facienda non essent, a praefecto admonitus, constituerit ne iussa eius aliquis post prandium faceret."

Herodotus, *Histories*, I.133: (...) It is also their general practice to deliberate upon affairs of weight when they are drunk; and then on the morrow, when they are sober, the decision to which they came the night before is put before them of the house in which it was made, and if it is then approved of, they act on it; if not, they set it aside. Sometimes, however, they are sober at their first deliberation, but in this case they always reconsider the matter under the influence of wine (tr. G. Rawlison).

The *H.A.* and Temperance:

1. (...) popinam domi instituerit (...). (...) ut vagaretur in tabernas (...). (Verus, 4.5-6)
2. auidus uini itme abstinens, cibi adpetens et inediae patiens, Veneris cupidus et castitatis amator (Avid. 3.4)
3. Et cum potaret in lucem helluaretur viribus Romani imperii, vespera etiam per tabernas ad lupanaria volitavit (Com., 3.7)
4. cibi parcissimus, leguminis patrii auidus, uini aliugando cupidus (Sev. 19.8)
uini auidus, cibi parci, rei Veneria nisi ad creando liberos prorsus ignarus (Niger, 6.6)
5. saepe adpetens uini, frequenter abstinens (Alb. 13.1)
6. auidus cibi, uini etiam adpetens (Carac. 9.3)
7. uini cibusque auidissimus (Macr. 13.4)
8. Cum amicos militares habuisset, ut usum Traiani, quem ille post secundam mensam potandi, usque ad quique pocula, instituerat, reservaret, unum tantum poculum amicis exhibebat in honorem Alexandri Magni, id dans brevius, nisi si quis, quod licebat, maius libere postulasset. Uus Veneris in eo moderatus fuit (...) (Alex. Sev., 39.1-2)
9. uini parcissimus, cbi auidus (Max. duo 28.2)
10. uini parcus, cibi parcissimus (Gord. 6.6)
11. uni cupidior ... cibi parcus ... mulierum cupidissimus (Gord. 19.1.-3)
12. cibi auidus, uini parcissimus, ad rem Veneriam nimis rarus (Max. et Balb 6.1)
13. uini cibi rei Veneriae avidus (Max. et Balb. 7.6)
14. Bibit in aureis semper poculis apsernatus vitrum, ita ut diceret nil esse communius. Semper vina variavit neque umquam in uno convivio ex uno vino duo pocula bibit. (Gall. Duo, 17.6-7)

15. unica castimonia, uini parcus, ad cibum promptus
(Claud. 13.5)
16. uini et cibi paulo cupidoior, libidinis rarae (Aur.
6.1)
17. Longum est frivola quaeque conectere, odiosum ciere,
quali statura fuerit, quo corpore, quo decore, quid
biberit, quid comederit, ab aliis ista dicantur,
quae prope ad exemplum nihil prosunt. Nos ad ea,
quae sunt dicenda, redeamus. (Saturninus, 11.4)
18. De hoc Aurelianus saepe dicebat : « non ut vivat,
natus est, sed ut bibat ». Quem quidem diu in
honore habuit causa militiae. Nam si quando legati
barborum udecumque gentium venissent, ipsi
propinantur, ut eos inebriaret atque ab his per
vinum cuncta cognosceret. Ipse quantumlibet
bibisset, semper securus et sobrius et, ut Onesimus
dicit scriptor vitae Probi, adhuc in vino
prudentialior. (...). (Bonosus, 14.3-5)
19. Vini plurimum effudit. (Carinus, 17.3)

Appendix 4: Andreas Schott (1552-1629) and the *Epitome*

I want to examine two aspects of Andreas Schott's contribution to modern understanding of the *Epitome*. First, I wish to show how his edition and commentary still offer useful palaeographical and historical insights for understanding the epitomator's text. Then, I discuss how Schott's edition bridges medieval and modern perceptions of the *Epitome*.

Michel Festy heralds Schott's edition as the first to intelligently use a group of manuscripts to reconstruct the text, but plays down the usefulness of Schott's commentary.¹ In fact, Schott used three manuscripts - *Parisinus Latinus* 6121 [*Pithoei codex*]; *Leidenensis Voss. Lat. F* 96 [*Floriacensis*], the now lost *Cuianeus codex* - and earlier editions of the *Epitome* to make his own.² In his own commentary Festy uses a few of Schott's annotations, high praise indeed. Schott commentary is a benchmark in the evolution of scholarly commentaries of the *Epitome*. In the fifteenth century, commentaries are mainly *scholia* - small notes about palaeography and more rarely

¹ M. Festy, pp. lxxvii-lxxviii.

² In his note 1.1, Schott mentions the manuscripts of Cujas and Pithou in note 42.6. In his note 45.6, he mentions the *Floriacensis* manuscript. In his note 47.3 and 48.14, Schott writes that he uses the editions made by Aldus (Egnazio's printer), Gryphius (printer of an anonymous editor), Jocondo, Froeben (Erasmus' printer), Vinet, and two other editions named through their location (Verona and Guelf.) [cf. Aurelius Victor, *Historia Romana*, Ioanne Arntzenio curante cum notis (Amsterdam, 1733), 540-600, for these notes].

reader's observations. In the early editions of the *Epitome*, Egnazio or Erasmus wrote short scholia. Vinet added a few more detailed notes on stylistic and occasionally historical observations, which were repeated by Schott in his commentary. Prior to Schott, there are few full-scale commentaries for any classical authors outside of the Bible. For example, Only Filippo Beroaldi's commentary of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in 1504 and that of Suetonius' *Vita Caesarum* in 1500 by the same author catches the interest of modern scholars. Although these commentaries are very good, they are written in the manner of an ancient commentary, such as those of Thomas Aquinas of Aristotle's works. Schott's commentary is straightforwardly written in footnote form.

Except for Giocondo's edition made from good manuscripts of the *Epitome* or Elie Vinet's annotations, the earlier editors bring nothing new toward the understanding of the text except for useful paleographical conjectures.³ The introductions of most of these early editions deal with either Justin or Suetonius not the *Epitome*. It is in this atmosphere that Andreas Schott comes on the scene.

With respect to content, Schott writes on style, palaeographical difficulties, and history. There is even a little bit of *Quellenforschung*. In the first note after

³ Michel Festy, pp. lxxxii-lxxxviii & see Chapter III, pp. 65-67.

discussing the manuscripts used in the edition, Schott mentions his views about the *Epitome's* sources naming Suetonius, the fictional authors of *Historia Augusta*, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and Ammianus Marcellinus. He also adds little comments about parallels between the *Epitome* and Greek authors which he knew - Plutarch, Cassius Dio, and Zonaras. The only author forgotten is Zosimus, and this omission can easily be explained by the fact that the *Historia Nova* was unknown in Western Europe until 1585, when the a Latin translation popularized his work, whose Greek version only appeared in the eighteenth century in an edited form. At the end of the chapter about the emperor Augustus in the *Epitome*, Schott printed the *editio princeps* of Augustus' *Res Gestae*. There are, however, small difficulties with some of his opinions about Victor's and the epitomator's religious background - Schott believes they were Christians. Nonetheless his commentary is still useful for many reasons. First, most of Schott's notes deal with style, and these are useful because through this analysis he makes the discovery that theepitomator is not Aurelius Victor whose work he also edited. Secondly, Schott was a careful reader, and gives useful points about paleographical difficulties or social aspects of the *Epitome*. Schott's contribution to the modern understanding of the *Epitome* does not stop with the usefulness of his commentary, but I believe was important in creating the modern perceptions of the text, which sees the *Epitome* as a very minor text. During the Middle Ages, epitomes had a far greater reputation than they do today.

Andreas Schott began his work on the corpus of Aurelius Victor by chance. He was born into a Catholic family in Anvers, Belgium at the beginning of the Dutch religious wars in 1552.⁴ After studies at the University of Louvain, he was driven into exile by religious turmoil in his hometown, first to Douai, then Bourges, and finally Paris. He attached himself to various powerful nobles prior to becoming Bubescq's private secretary in order to finance his own studies. In 1577 Ogier Ghislain de Bubescq, another Belgian, was the prefect of the former queen of France, Elizabeth of Austria, at her court in Bourges (1574-1579). During his long stay at Constantinople for the Hapsburg kings, Bubescq discovered a vast corpus of antique inscriptions and Augustus' famous *Res Gestae* at Ancyra. In Paris, Andreas Schott became a close associate of a group of humanists, Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), Pierre Pithou (1539-1596), Jean Passerat (1534-1602), and Jean Papire-Masson (1541-1611). At the time, he was merely Bubesq's private secretary, and he was doing the equivalent of graduate work at the University of Paris. He made useful contacts at the university and at court, meeting numerous important scholars who generously opened their private libraries to Schott. Jacques Cujas (1522-1590) lent him an excellent manuscript, now lost, of the *Epitome*.⁵ Through Cujas' friendship with Jean Matal, Schott obtained access to the so

⁴E. Regnard, "Andreas Schott," in *Nouvelle Biographie Générale depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours*, tome 43, ed. Firmin Didot (Paris, 1864), pp. 885-887.

⁵M. Festy, p. lxxxvii

called *codex Metelli*, a twelfth-century copy of Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*.⁶ Schott and other scholars offer a useful example of the humanist revolution started under Francois I in France; but more importantly it shows an interest by some scholars in Paris for the texts of late antiquity or medieval texts with a late antique content. For example, Pithou published the *editio princeps* of the *Historia Miscella*, a compendium of Roman history written in 1023.⁷

Beyond these mere facts, little is known of the background to Schott's edition except for a group of letters and the preface of his 1579 edition of the *Epitome* and those of later reeditions.⁸ The work is dedicated to Elizabeth of Austria and indirectly to Bubescq.⁹ These letters are historically

⁶ *Sex. Aurelii Victoris Historiae Romanae breviarium ... ex bibliotheca Andreae Schotti; cuius etiam notae adiectae sunt* (Antwerpiae, ex officina Christophori Plantini, 1579), p. 179; Salvatore D'Elia, *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore* (Napoli, 1965), pp. 74-77; Aurelius Victor, *Césars, texte établi et traduit par Pierre Dufraigne* (Paris, 1975), pp. lv-lvi.

⁷ *Historiae Miscella a Paulo Aquilegiensi Diacono primum collectae, post etiam a Landulpho Sagaci auctae productaeque ; ad imperium Leonis III. Id est, Annum Christi DCCCVI Libri XXIII, ... [ex recognitione P. Pithoei]* (Basileae, Apud Petrum Pernam, 1569).

⁸ I.e *De Vita et moribus imperatorum romanorum excerpta ex libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris, a Caesare Augusto usque ad Theodosium imperatorem. Editio Vulgata Andreas Schott compositis tribus m.ss. cum vett. vulgatis emendabat, schollii & versi iconibus ex antiquitis nismismatis delineatis illustrabat. Quibus accesserunt & Eliae Vineti nota* (Lugduni Bataviae, Apud Graasbequios, 1669).

⁹ *Sex. Aurelii Victoris Historiae Romanae breviarium [i.e the 'Origo' 'De Viris illustribus', 'De Caesaribus', 'Epitome',] ...*

important on two counts. First, they show the powerful role of nobles, princes, and occasionally women for the production of editions of ancient literary works at this time. Second, they give us insights into new attitudes with respect to the *Epitome* during this period. The first theme is being reconstructed by scholars such as Sharon Kettering, who has already contributed several articles and books on the literary patronage of women, nobles and princesses, in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France.¹⁰ I will deal only with the second theme - attitudes toward the text - modern views seeing the *Epitome* as simply an *Epitome* without historical value beyond its useful facts to serious history students. During most of the Middle Ages, it was established writers, not students, who mentioned the *Epitome*. For example, readers of the *Epitome* or material deriving from it were to be found in the works of Sedulius Scottus and Petrarch, and they inserted the didactic elements of the *Epitome* as part of their Mirrors of Princes.¹¹ The idea that the *Epitome* was a school text is a relatively recent one. Eutropius' *Brevarium*, Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, the *Epitome*, and Festus' *Breviarium* became school texts in the second year

Ex bibliotheca Andreae Schotti cuius etiam notae adiectae sunt (De Vita et moribus Imperatorum Romanorum ... accesserunt & Eliae Vineti notae (Antwerp, 1579); see Prefatio = Ioannes Artzenius, pp. 649-650.

¹⁰ Sharon Kettering, *Patronage in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France* (Aldershot [U.K.] et Burlington [U.S.A.], 2002).

¹¹ *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum Misellaneum*, ed. Dean Simpson, *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 67 (Turnholt, 1988); Petrarch, *De Remediis Ultriusque Fortune (Remedies for fortune, fair and foul*, transl. into Modern English by Conrad H. Rawski, 5 volumes (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1991).

of Latin in most of Europe and North America during the modern period.¹²

I believe this new perception - as a mere epitome - of the epitomators was born in the sixteenth century. How does one recognize this change in the literary perception of the *Epitome*? First one examines general attitudes toward history and historians in Renaissance pedagogical treatises.¹³ Baptista Guarino encourages students to read both Livy and Eutropius. Jocondo thought highly of the *Epitome* dedicating his edition to the French, king Louis XII. Then, one also perceives this change in the two letters of Andreas Schott to the court of

¹²[Aurelius Victor] - see R. Armstedt, *Quae ratio intercedat inter undecim capita priora Sex. Aurelii Victoris et libris de Caesaribus et Epitomes*, Programms des Gymnasium, (Buckenberg, 1885); Aurelius Victor, *De Viris Illustribus et de Caesaribus*. Zum Gebrauch fur Schulen, besonders fur den zweiten cursus in der latein. Sprache, mit fortlaufender Erklar... herausgeg. von J.B. Frise (Altona, 1804); [eutropius] - see *Selectae e profanis scriptoribus historiae quibus admista sunt varia honeste vivendi praecepta ex iisdem scriptoribus ...* ed. Jean Heuzet (Parisiis, apud viduam Etienne, 1734); *Eutropii Historiae romanae breviarium ad urbe condita ... Ut et Sexti Aurelii Victoris. De Viris Illustribus* (Londini, apud C. Bathurst, 1765); James Ross, *Selectae e profanis criptoribus historiae* (Philadelphia, 1802) [un abrégé de Heuzet]; *Eutropius, adapted for the Use of Beginners with Notes and Excercises and Vocabularies*, ed. by W. Welch and C.G. Duffield, (London, 1883); *Books of Eutropius with a vocabulary by John T. White* (London and New York, 1887); Joseph Sorn, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Eutropius*, 2 vol., Programms des Gymnasium (Laibach, 1889); *Eutropius, Books I & II*, ed. by Watson Caldecott (London, 1893).

¹³*Humanist Educational Treatises*, ed. And tr. By Craig W. Kallendorf (Cambridge and London, 2002), p. 108 (Leonardo Bruni), p. 225 (On Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini), and p. 285 (on Baptista Guarino).

Elisabeth of Austria at Bourges. In his letter to Bubesq, Schott looks at the role of epitomes and compares them unfavorably to the great historians' works which were becoming better known through printing. In his commentaries, Schott analyses the historical value of the edited works, often correcting them by employing the correct information found in Suetonius' *Vita Caesarum*, the *Historia Augusta* or Ammianus Marcellinus' *Rerum Gestarum Libri*. His words about epitomes are very harsh:

This is the ancient scholarly quarrel, o most noble Bubesq, that causes the fall and the decline of ancient historians and of ancient peoples, which comes as result of the writers of epitomes. These writers, as long as they can promise a short summary of a period or a familiar author to the less educated readers, do not see that they are causing a greater loss. Hence, this comes about! While among the Greek authors these epitomators are wiser than Polybius, Diodorus and Dio, among the Latin authors Titus Livy is lost for the most part. The works of Xiphilinus, Florus, and another of the anonymus epitomators are accepted so that they become authoritative. While there is a work of Justin, the whole of Trogus is lost. I do not know in what unlucky corner of the Earth to await so far in vain those works which are in hidden with the six books of Cicero's *Res Republica*.¹⁴

¹⁴ Vetus ea doctissimum hominum querela est, amplissimi Bubesqui, Historicorum Vett. & quidem maiorum gentium cladem calamitatemque non aliunde invectam, quam ab Epitomarum scriptoribus : qui dum se compendio & temporis & rei familiaris studere lectori credulo pollicentur, ne illi maius se dispendium facere non vident. Hinc enim factum. Ut de Graecis Polybii prudentissimi, mehercle, scriptoris, Diodoris atque Dionis; de Latinis vero T. Livii multo maxima pars interciderit : idque Xiphilinis & Floris aliique anonimois acceptum esse referendum : adeoque Justini opera Trogum integrum amissum, frustra hactenus expectari, cum sex M. Tulli de Repub. Libris, nescio in quo infelici terrarum angulo delitescantibus. *Sexti Aurelii*

First, he mocks the writers of epitomes who present familiar things through summaries written in a simple style to uneducated readers. Writers of epitomes have none of the critical acumen of Polybius or a Livy or even have the language of a Cicero. Schott expresses in a clear manner some of the frustration of modern scholars with epitomes that are either too short or ignore key events found in their sources. Nonetheless, he does not deny the importance of epitomes to the reconstitution of Livy's work or that of Cassius Dio. All these views come close to those presented by Pierre Jal or others modern readers about epitomes.¹⁵

These impressions are not the only ones which appear in Schott's edition. He also shows a more medieval outlook, and uses part of the corpus of Aurelius Victor (*Epitome de Caesaribus*, Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*, the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, and the *De Viris Illustribus Romae*) as a Mirror of Princes. Thus, in celebrating the virtues of Elizabeth, he advised her to study examples of the women found in Aurelius Victor's *Caesares* and those found in the *Epitome*. He suggested avoiding the example of Julia and Agrippina, but advocated following that of Pompeia Plotina, Trajan's wife.¹⁶ In this

Victoris Historiae Romanae Compendium, ed. Johannes Arntzenius (Amsterdam, 1733), p. 666.

¹⁵ See Pierre Jal, "A propos des *Histoires Philippiques*: quelques remarques," *Revue des Etudes Latines* 65 (1987): 194-209

¹⁶ *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Historiae Romanae*, ed. Johannes Arntzenius (Amsterdam, 1733), p. 650 [Schott's preface].

manner, Schott recalls one of the uses made of the *Epitome* during the Middle Ages by some medieval readers, a source for useful phrases to add in a Mirror of Princes. Schott's choice of good and bad examples is very much influenced by his edition. Only in the *Epitome*, does Pompeia Plotina appear as a great model of virtue, and, in his preface, Schott quotes the epitomator's account verbatim about Pompeia Plotina. This is unusual since, in the sixteenth century, Plotina is seen as neither good nor bad, consistent with her portrayal in the *Historia Augusta* and Cassius Dio's *Histories*.¹⁷ In the 1590s, Pierre de Brantôme (1540-1614) in his account of the great women of history shows this ambiguous side of Plotina.¹⁸ Elisabeth of Austria's, the wife of Charles IX (1560-1574), reaction to Schott's Mirror of Princes, is known through the court response in verse and Schott's letter to Bubescq. She says that she read the *Epitome* in her youth at her father's court; it is a work which she knows well and appreciates. The poems also bring out clearly that the court appreciated Schott's work.¹⁹

This use of the *Epitome* is very conventional in the sixteenth century since kings and nobles had received similar words ever since the time of Livy or Suetonius. Schott's language is interesting because the recipient is a woman.

¹⁷ *Historia Augusta, Vita Hadriani*, 2.10; 4.1-5; L. Cassius Dio, *Histoires*, 69.1.1-2; Aurelius Victor, 13.12-13; Eutropius, 8.6.1

¹⁸ Pierre Brantôme, *Les Dames Galantes*, ed. Maurice Rat (Paris, 1965[1614]), pp. 91-92

¹⁹ Ioannes Arntzenius, pp. 652-654.

Since the end of the Middle Ages, women had received such dedications, and sometimes they produced them themselves as Christine de Pisan (c. 1364-1429) and Marguerite de Navarre (1492-1549), sister of François I, show.²⁰ Nonetheless besides paying compliments to his patroness, it was an opportunity for Schott to discuss the didactic aspect of the *Epitome* as well as more scholarly questions.

²⁰ Don Anthony of Guevara, *The Diall of Princes* tr. by Sir Thomas North, ed. K.N. Colville (London, 1919) [A dedication to Mary Tudor (1555-1558)]; Marguerite de Valois, *Le miroir de l'âme pécheresse*, ed. Joseph L. Allaire (Munchen, 1972); Marguerite de Valois, *Hepthaméron*, ed. Michel François (Paris, 1967); Christine de Pizan, *The Book of the Body Politics*, ed. & tr. by Kate Langdon Forhan (Cambridge, 1994).

Appendix 5: The *Epitome* during the Modern Era

Outside of scholarly interest, the epitomator was not ignored in modern fiction or education. With the advent of printing replacing transcription by hand, both authors were able to make an impact upon the modern world. For example, copies of the *Epitome* jumped from nineteen to about 6000 by AD 1700. In 1561, the university of Paris library contained four printed copies of the *Epitome*.¹ At Cambridge prior to 1600, there were twelve printed copies that became part of the school inventories through inheritance.² In Italy, upon his death, Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600), a papal librarian, owned a tenth-century manuscript copy of the *Epitome* and printed copies in his family library.³ The *Epitome* received the most attention in France and in England. Very early in the sixteenth century, John Dee (1527-1608), the Nostradamus of Elizabethan England, owned a copy of Erasmus' edition of the *Epitome*.⁴ This book and others were at

¹ *Catalogue de la réserve XVIe siècle (1501-1540) de la bibliothèque de l'université de Paris*, par Charles Beaulieux (Paris, 1910), p. 34 n. 929, p. 180 n. 1096, p. 263 n. 204 & suppl. pp. 47 & 99.

² *Books in Cambridge Inventories*, vol. 1, ed. E.S. Leedsham-Green (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 229, 233, 251, 260, 283, 312, & 314.

³ Pierre de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris, 1887), pp. 276-7 & 390.

⁴ Royal college of Physicians' Library, D128a/4,18c (see W.H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst, 1995), p. 258).

the heart of a major law-suit among his heirs.⁵ Ultimately, this work became the property of the College of Physicians of England in 1644. In France, H. Cornelius Agrippa (1480-1534), Jean Bodin (1520-1596), and Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592) made use of the *Epitome* in their works.⁶ It is not known if Bodin or Cornelius Agrippa owned a copy of the *Epitome*. In the eighteenth century, Samuel Johnson owned a copy of Arntzen's edition of the *Epitome*.⁷ The *Epitome*'s material also made its way into James Boswell's *Life of Johnson*.⁸ Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, also owned a copy of Erasmus' edition of the *Epitome*.⁹ In chapter 14 of his novel '*1601 And Is Shakespeare Dead?*' written in 1880, Mark Twain mentions Aurelius Victor as part of a discussion on Montaigne by the guests of Twain's fictional supper written in the manner of

⁵ See *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, ed. Julia Roberts and Andrew Watson (London, 1990), pp. 48-52.

⁶ Montaigne, *Essais*, I.42 = E. 39.6; II.12 = E. 41.8; P.F. 6647 Collection Montaigne dans la bibliothèque municipale de Bordeaux = *Caesarum vitae post Suetonius Tranquillum, ex recognitione Erasmi* (Lugduni, apud S. Graprium, 1551); Cornelius Agrippa, *De Intercitudine et vanitate scientiarum et artium* (Lugduni, 1552), chap. 1 = E. 41.8; Jean Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, Transl. from the Latin by Beatrice Reynolds (New York, 1969), pp. 71 & 380.

⁷ Barry Baldwin, "A classical source for Johnson on Augustus and Lord Bute," *Notes and Queries* 42 (1995): 467-468

⁸ See James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, II. 470-471, ed. A.C. Bandy (Philadelphia, 1982) = *Epitome*, 1.28.

⁹ *Catalogue de la bibliothèque de Montesquieu*, ed. Louis Desgraves (Genève et Paris, 1954), p. 200 n. 2819bis.

Boccaccio's *Decameron*.¹⁰ Twain owned a copy of both Montaigne's essays and *the Epitome de Caesaribus*, and he ascribes the *Epitome* to Aurelius Victor.¹¹

In 1748, the Bodleian library had 10 printed copies of the *Epitome*.¹² Thomas Jefferson, third president of the United States, donated in 1823 three copies of the *Epitome* as well his own vast collection of books at Monticello to the Library of Congress to replace the books lost during the destruction of Washington at the hand of the British.¹³ Most great libraries in the world today have similar numbers. McGill has three copies of ancient editions of the *Epitome*.¹⁴ In the twentieth century, the ancient editions of the *Epitome* housed in the Prussian state library, formerly that of the king of Prussia, suffered water damage because of their storage in a mine in the

¹⁰ Mark Twain, *1601 or A Conversation as it was by the social fireside in the time of the Tudors*, embellished with an illuminating introduction, facetious footnotes and a bibliography by Franklin J. Meine (Ney York, 1938).

¹¹ Alan Gribben. *Mark Twain's Library: A Reconstruction* (G.K. Hall: Boston, 1980).

¹² *Catalogus impressorum librorum bibliothecae Bodleiana in Academia Oxoniensis*, eds. Thomas Hyde, Joseph Bowles, & Robert Fysher (Oxford, 1748), p. 42, 481, 534, & 636.

¹³ Jefferson donated the editions of Matthias Schurer (1505), of Erasmus (1517), and Ioannes Arntzenius's (1733) to the Library of Congress. See online catalogue.

¹⁴ The McGill rare book collection possesses an Erasmus (1517), a Gruter (1625), and Arntzenius (1733).

Saare region during World War II.¹⁵ A copy of Giocondo's edition from the same collection is now lost, my suspicion is that it was stolen during shipping probably at the end of the war. A 1579 edition by Andreas Schott of the corpus of Aurelius Victor including the *Epitome* is being auctioned off for 675.00 euros by a book seller online for Rick Vander Voet, an American book collector from Boise, Idaho, whose family brought it to the U.S.A. in 1895 from Belgium.¹⁶ A copy of Fillipo Junta's 1517 edition of the *Epitome* is selling at auction for 4000.00 euros through a French book dealer.¹⁷ Magg Brothers of London is selling a 1696 edition by Samuel Pitiscus for 180 pounds sterling.¹⁸

The *Epitome's* role in education is not so easily discerned. In Wilhemine Germany, the *Epitome* served as a textbook to teach Latin to German *Gymnasium* students in the city of Buckenberg in 1885.¹⁹ The University of Ottawa used elements of the *Epitome*

¹⁵ See online catalogue of the Prussian State Library.

¹⁶ Antiquariaat Wim de Goeij, an Amsterdam book dealer, item 8992 = Voet collection, 606-7; There is no other known copy of the 1579 Andreas Schoot's edition in the U.S.A..

¹⁷ STC Italian, p. 326; Adams H 376; cf. www.forum-hes.nl/forum/main_stocklist.phtml/subject/141/2/Classical_Antiquity.html. There is no other known copy of the 1579 Andreas Schoot's edition in the U.S.A.

¹⁸ *Christies Catalogue of London*, -Schweiger 1136, (London, 2004), p. 343.

¹⁹ R. Armstedt, *Quae ratio intercedat inter undecim capita priora Sex. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et Epitomes*, *Programm des Gymnasiums* (Bückenburg, 1885)

as part of the classics comprehensive exam for students specializing in Late Antiquity in the 1990's until the abolition of its Ph.D. program. Other university programs in North America and Great Britain do the same.²⁰

²⁰ 289A-001L: Topics in Late Antiquity, From Rome to Byzantium - Constantine and Justinian (Berkeley, Spring Catalogue, 2004); Latin 214: History Writing in Latin (2003 Fall Catalogue of the Franklin Institute at Duke University).

Bibliography

Texts and Translations of the *Epitome*

The Historie of Justine. Containing a Narrating of Kingdoms, from the Beginning of the Assyrian Monarchy unto the Reigne of the Emperours Augustus. Whereunto is newly added a Brief Collection of the Lives and Manners of all Emperours Succeeding (...). Tr. by [Georges Wilkins]. London, 1606 [no pagination].

The History of Justine, taken out from four and forty books of Trogus Pompeius (...) together with the Epitomie of the Lives and Manners of the Roman Emperors (of Aurelius Victor), (...). Tr. Robert Codrington. London, 1654, 526-606.

Historiae Romanae Epitomae Lucii Iulii Flori, Sex. Aur. Victoris, Sexti Rufi Festi, Messalae Corvini, Eutropii, Paulli Diaconi, M. Aur. Cassidiori, Iordandis, and Iulii Exuperantii. Amsterdam: Ioannes Ianbonium, 1630, 249-278 [*Epitome*].

[Pseudo-Aurelius Victor]. *Epitome de Caesaribus, in Usus Delphinum.* Ed. Annae Tanaquilli Fabri [Mme Anne Dacier]. Paris, 1681.

Aurelius Victor. *Opera.* Ed. J. Arntzen. Amsterdam, 1733, 447-600.

Sextus Aurelius Victor. *Origine du peuple romain, hommes illustres de la ville de Rome. Histoire des Césars. Vies des empereurs romains.* Tr. par N.A. Dubois. Paris, 1846, 302-504.

Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber De Caesaribus praecedunt Origo Gentis Romanae et Liber de Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae subsequitur Epitome de Caesaribus. Rec. Pichlmayr, Fr. & Grundel, R., Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1911(1970), 133-176.

Pseudo-Aurélius Victor. *Abrégé des Césars.* Texte établi, traduit et commenté par Michel Festy. Paris: les Belles Lettres, 1999.

[Anonymous]. *A Booklet about the Style of Life and Manners of the Imperatores Abbreviated from the Books of Sextus Aurelius Victor.* Tr. Thomas M. Banchich. Buffalo, 2000.

Ancient Sources

Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri Qui Supersunt. Ed. Wolfgang Seyfarth. 2 volumes. Berlin: Teubner, 1978.

Aurélius Victor. *Les Césars.* Texte établi et traduit par Pierre Dufraigne. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975.

Cassius Dio. *Roman History*. Tr. by Ernest Cary. 9 volumes. London and Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1914-1927.

Cedrenus, Georgius. Ioannis Scylitzae. *Opera*. Ed. I. Bekker. *Corpus Scriptorum Historiarum Bonnensis*. Vol. 1. Bonn, 1838.

Chronica Urbis Romae. Ed. Th. Mommsen. *Monumenta Germanicorum Historicorum, Auctores Antiquissimi* IX (*Chronica minora* I). Berlin, 1892, 141-148.

The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire. Ed. R.W. Burgess. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Eunapius. *Fragments*. in *Fragmenta Historiarum Graecarum*. Vol. IV. Ed. C. Mueller. Paris: Éditions Fernand Didot Frères, 1864, 7-56.

Eutrope. *Breviarium ad Urbe Condita*. Texte établi et traduit par Jean Hellogouar'ch. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998.

Festus. *Breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani*. Texte établi et traduit par Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet. Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1994.

Herodian. *History of the Empire*. Tr. by C.R. Whittaker. 2 Volumes. London and Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1969-1970.

Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs des IIe et IIIe siècles. Tr. par André Chastagnol. Paris: Éditions Bouquins, 1994.

John of Antioch. *Fragments*. In *Fragmenta Historiarum Graecarum*. Vol. IV, Ed. Ch. Mueller. Paris: Éditions Fernand Didot, 1851, 535-622.

[Jerome]. *Eusebius Werke, siebenter Band. Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. Ed. Rudolf Helm. Berlin, 1956.

Leo the Grammarian. *Chronographia*. Ed. I., Beeker, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiarum Bonnensis*. Bonn, 1842.

Orose, *Histoires*. Texte établi et traduit par Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet. 3 Volumes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990-1991.

Suetonius. *Opera*. Ed. and tr. by John C. Rolfe. 3 Volumes. London and Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1914(1998).

Zonaras. *Annales*, ed. M. Pinder, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiarum Bonnensis*. Vol. II. Bonn, 1844.

Zosime. *Histoire Nouvelle*. Texte établi et traduit par François Paschoud, 5 Tomes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971-1989.

Modern Bibliography

Armstedt, R., *Quae ratio intercedat inter undecim capita priora Sex. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et Epitomes*. Programm des Gymnasiums. Bückenburg, 1885.

Baldwin, Barry. "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* from Augustus to Domitian." *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 43 <72> (1993): 81-101.

Barnes, T.D. "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its sources." *Classical Philology* 71 (1976): 258-268.

Barnes, T.D. "The lost kaisergeschichte and the Latin tradition" *B.H.A.C.* 1968/1969. Bonn, 1970: 13-43.

Barnes, T.D. *The sources of the Historia Augusta*. Bruxelles, 1978.

Barnes, T.D. "Jerome and the 'Historia Augusta.'" In *Historiae Augusta Colloquia*, N.S. 1: Colloquium Parasinum 1990. Paris, 1992: 19-28.

Bird, H.W. *Aurelius Victor. A Study in Historiography*. ARCA 14 Liverpool, 1984.

Birley, A.R. "Fiction in the *Epitome*." *Historia Augusta Colloquium IV: Colloquium Barcinonense*. Bari, 1996: 67-82.

Bleckmann, Bruno. "Bemerkungen zu den *Annales* Nichomachus Flavianus." *Historia* 44 (1995): 83-99.

Bleckmann, Bruno. *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spatantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras*. Munchen, 1992.

Bleckmann, Bruno. "Überlegungen zur Enmanschen Kaisergeschichte und zur Formung historischer Traditionen in Tetrarchischer und Konstantinischer Zeit." in *Historia Colloquium Bonnense*, eds. Bonoamente, Giorgio and Rosen. Klaus, Bari, 1997: 11-37.

Boer, W. Den. *Some Minor Historians*. Leiden, 1972.

Burgess, R.W. "Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*." *Historia* 44.3 (1995): 349-369.

Burgess, R.W. "Jerome's *Chronici Canones*, Quellenforschung and Fourth-Century Historiography." In *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Argentorense 1996*, N.S. VI. Bari: 1998, 83-104.

Chastagnol, André. "Emprunts de l'*Histoire Auguste* aux *Caesares d'Aurélius Victor*." *Revue de Philologie et d'Histoire Ancienne* 41 (1967): 85-97.

Cohn, A. *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et libri de Caesaribus et epitomes undecim capita priora fluxerint*. Diss. Berlin, Leipzig, 1884.

Christo, Stuart. *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus. A Political and Social Biography*. Diss. Fordham University, 1974.

Croke, Brian "A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point," *Chiron* 13 (1983): 90-103.

Elia, Salvatore d'. *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta di Aurelio Vittore: La tradizione diretta*. Naples, 1965.

Enmann, Alexander. "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch *De viris illustribus urbis Romae* Quellenstudie." *Philologus supp.* IV, (1884), Heft 3: 335-501.

Festy, Michel. "Le début et la fin des *Annales* de Nicomaque Flavien." *Historia* 45.4 (1997): 464-478.

Hartke, W. *Römische Kinderkaiser. Eine Strukturanalyse römischen Denkens und Daseins*. Berlin, 1951.

Hartke, Wilhelm. *Geschichte und Politik im spätantiken Rom. Untersuchungen über die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, *Klio* 45. Leipzig, 1940.

Hohl, E. "Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaisers Tacitus." *Klio* 11(1911): 178-229 & 284-324.

Jarecsni, J., "The *Epitome*: an Original Work or a Copy? An Analysis of the First Eleven Chapters of the *Epitome De Caesaribus*," *Acta Classica Universitatis Debreceniensis* 33 (1997), 203-214.

Jeep, Lud. "Aurelii Victoris De Caesaribus e l'Epitome de Caesaribus." *Revista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* I (1873): 505-518.

Johne, K.P. "Die Epitome de Caesaribus und die Historia Augusta." *Klio* LIX 1977: 497-501.

Laistner, Max. "Some reflections on latin historical writing in the fifth century." *Classical Philology* 35 (1940): 241-256.

Lebrech-Schmidt, Peter. "Epitome de Caesaribus." In *Paulys Realencyclopädie des Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. 15. Ed. K. Ziegler. Munchen, 1978, 1671-1675.

Leo, F. *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*. Leipzig, 1901, ND Hildesheim 1965.

Mommsen, Th. *Ueber di Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus*. In *Gesammelte Schriften*, VII: *Philologische Schriften*. Berlin-Zurich, 1965 (1850): 606-632.

Neri, Valerio. "Le fonti della vita di Constantino nell' Epitome de Caesaribus." *Rivista storica Antica* XVII-XVIII (1987-1988): 249-280.

O'Donnell, J.J. "The Aims of Jordanes," *Historia* 31 (1982): 233-240

Opelt, L. S.v. *Epitome*. In *Reallexicon der Antike Christendum*, volume 5. Berlin, 1962, 944-973.

Opitz, Theodore. "Quaestionum de Sex. Aurelio Victore capita tria." *Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis* 2, (1872): 199-281.

Paschoud, François. "Deux ouvrages récents sur l'Epitome de Caesaribus et Aurélius Victor." *Revue des Etudes Latines* 53 (1975): 86-98.

Ratti, Stéphane. *Les empereurs romains d'Auguste à Dioclétien dans le Bréviaire d'Eutrope. Les livres 7 à 9 du Bréviaire d'Eutrope: introduction, traduction et commentaire*. Annales de l'université de Franche-Comté, 604. Paris, 1996.

Ratti, Stéphane. "Jérôme et Nicomache Flavien: sur les sources de la Chronique pour les années 357-364." *Historia* 46 (1997): 479-508.

Schlumberger, J. "Die verlorinen Annalen des Nicomachus Flavianus. ein Werk über Geschichte des römischen Republic oder Kaiserheit?" *B.H.A.C.* 1982/1983. Bonn, 1985: 302-325.

Schlumberger, J. *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des vierten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Vestigia 18. München, 1974.

Schlumberger, J. "Die *Epitome de Caesaribus* und die *Historia Augusta*." *B.H.A.C.* 1972-1974. Bonn, 1976: 201-219.

Schwartz, Jacques. "L'Histoire Auguste et l'Epitome." *B.H.A.C.* 1977/1978. Bonn, 1980: 219-224.

Syme, Ronald. "Fiction in the Epitomators." *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium* 1977/1978. Bonn, 1980: 267-278.

Syme, Ronald. "Illyricum in the Epitomators." In *Emperors and Biography*. Oxford, 1971: 221-236.

Vossius, Gérard-Jean. *De Historicis Latinis* (II.15). In *Opera Omnia*. Amsterdam, 1658, vol. 4.

Witzmann, Peter, *Zum Herrscherbild in der Spatantike. Aurelius Victor und Orosius*. Berlin, Frei Universität Diss., 1999.

Wood, David. "On the Death of the Empress Fausta," *Greece and Rome* 45.1 (1998): 70-86

Woefflin, Edouard von. "Die Latinität der *Epitome*." *Archiv. Fur Latinische Lexicologie und Grammatik*. XII (1902): 445-452.

Woefflin, Edouard von. "Aurelius Victor." *Rheinische Museum* 29 (1874): 282-308.