

Lucan — dem von Persius so sehr bewunderten! — großer Stil, überhöhter Gebärde ist, groß in der Tat, aber dahinter steht das Leere und der Schrei. Das gerät bei Persius ins Intime, Zarte, Leidensfähige und Menschliche. An der Zeit der neronischen Zeit ist beides, unklassisch ist beides — wie wäre Klartext zu dieser Zeit möglich gewesen! — aber gerade darum ist beides in sich gefügt.

Damit wollte gesagt sein: es war kein Mißverständnis, wenn gerade dieses kleine Büchlein dieses Dichters so fürsorglich umhertrotzt wurde. Mißverständnis war vielmehr die Geringschätzung, mit der Persius in den vergangenen hundert Jahren abgetan und zu den kleinen, unbeträchtlichen Epigonen verwirrt wurde. Alle noch so subtile *docta curiositas*, die man an ihn gewendet hat, wird wohl auch weiterhin wenden wird — und der auch hier ein kleiner Tribut geleistet werden wollte —, bleibt antiquarisch und letztthin unnütz, ja sinnlos, wenn sie sich für das Eigentliche nehmen wollte, statt nur für ein Zusätzliches zum Eigentlichen, das im erlebenden Lesen besteht. Der Text selbst ist, und noch einmal zu sagen, im ganzen so zuverlässig überliefert, daß von dem solchem Erleben kein erst noch durch weitere Forschung zu behobendes Hindernis im Wege steht.

Erlangen

OTTO SEE

### THE SOURCES OF THE GREEK IN SUETONIUS

Throughout all branches of formal Roman literature there appears to have been a convention which prohibited the quotation of anything more than single words of Greek. The normal procedure is seen most clearly in the philosophical works of Cicero (who in his letters, of course, uses Greek freely and at length). In the *Tusculans*, for example, he gives the Greek equivalent of various technical terms (e.g. 1, 14, 22, 28); but when he wishes to quote a Greek writer extensively, he gives his own Latin version, as in the translation of Aristophanes in 1, 41, and the other passages, in prose and verse, which fill nine pages of appendix in the Loeb edition<sup>1</sup>. In the speeches there is virtually no Greek at all, nor does the bulk of Latin literature provide many more passages of Greek, except in the Menippean satires of Varro and in such polymaths as Aulus Gellius and Macrobius, who are prepared to quote whole pages from Greek authors. Valerius Maximus quotes brief passages of Greek hexameters in his stories from the Greek (2, 7, ext.; 3, 4, 7) and one Homeric verse in a story about

<sup>1</sup> See especially *Tusc.* 1, 15: *dicam, si poterò, Latine: scis enim me Graeco loqui. Latino sermone non plus solere quam in Graeco Latine.*

Hermes 31 (1966) 97-123

*Brutus* (1, 5, 7); but otherwise *History*, is obliged to use a great part as Vitruvius does (e.g. 10, 10, 10) minutely in Greek and Roman *ages* (e.g. 2, 13; 16, 6; 21, 28). Copies to be found but the inscription (7, 57) and a spell in a single he translated into Latin, whether by Mucianus, and 8, 42, from *Arrian's History*, this slight neglect of literature

In history and biography the strictness, whether in Sallust or Livy of Nepos; although the last address (Con. 3, 3, where there was no Latin) of the lost historians exhibit any

In such a context, the Caesar is normal practice. Apart from his own correspondence as occur in forty passages ranging from single lost works were apparently written to 272); and he plainly did not pretentious Latin with verbatim from Augustus' letters were observed as particularly valuable of Greek must have been barred passages of Greek in different material employed by the author

In *Julius* there is no Greek introduced as if from a diverse *quidam*. This corresponds exactly words occur with a similar introduction given in the common source (i. App. B. C. 2, 16, 117). What was from the original Greek by some *alea est* (o) in 32, which both A. give as ἀνεργήθη νόμος, the *Ἑλληνιστί* (Dio, apparently from although it appears in Zonaras' citation from Balbus (81) of a *tabula hac sententia . . .*, with seven found these words already in words over the dead at Phae-

sehr bewunderten! — großer Stil, überhöht  
aber dahinter steht das Leere und der Schreck  
me, Zarte, Leidensfähige und Menschliche. A  
beides, unklassisch ist beides — wie wäre Klas  
! — aber gerade darum ist beides in sich gere  
: es war kein Mißverständnis, wenn gerade  
ers so fürsorglich umhegt wurde. Mißverständnis  
zung, mit der Persius in den vergangenen hund  
kleinen, unbeträchtlichen Epigonen verwie  
'*octa curiositas*, die man an ihn gewendet hat  
wird — und der auch hier ein kleiner Tri  
leibt antiquarisch und letzthin unnütz, ja sinn  
iche nehmen wollte, statt nur für ein Zusätzlic  
benden Lesen besteht. Der Text selbst ist, um  
anzen so zuverlässig überliefert, daß von da  
noch durch weitere Forschung zu beheben

OTTO SEE

## OF THE GREEK IN SÜETONIUS

of formal Roman literature there appears to be  
hibited the quotation of anything more than sim  
procedure is seen most clearly in the philosophic  
letters, of course, uses Greek freely and at leng  
e, he gives the Greek equivalent of various tech  
: but when he wishes to quote a Greek writ  
Latin version, as in the translation of Aristophan  
ges, in prose and verse, which fill nine pages  
In the speeches there is virtually no Greek at  
literature provide many more passages of Gree  
ires of Varro and in such polymaths as And  
are prepared to quote whole pages from Gree  
quotes brief passages of Greek hexameters  
t.; 3, 4, 7) and one Homeric verse in a story ab  
icam, si potero, Latine: scis enim me Graece loqui  
nam in Graeco Latine.

Brutus (I, 5, 7); but otherwise he has only odd words. Pliny, in the Natural History, is obliged to use a great number of Greek names for technical purposes just as Vitruvius does (e. g. 10, 10), which our manuscripts present indiscriminately in Greek and Roman letters. Even for these he sometimes apologizes (e.g. 2, 13; 16, 6; 21, 28). Continuous passages are very rare indeed: little to be found but the inscription on an ancient Delphic bronze on the Palatine (7, 57) and a spell in a single hexameter (27, 100). Elsewhere Greek has been translated into Latin, whether by Pliny himself or by his source, as in 8, 6, from Lucianus, and 8, 42, from Aristotle. In such a miscellany as the Natural History, this slight neglect of literary rules is not remarkable.

In history and biography the rule seems to have been observed with great strictness, whether in Sallust or Livy, Curtius Rufus or Tacitus, or in the Lives of Nepos; although the last admits two isolated words of Greek, in Cim. 3, 1, Con. 3, 3, where there was no Latin word available. Nor do the extant fragments of the lost historians exhibit any greater license.

In such a context, the Caesars of Suetonius are a striking exception to normal practice. Apart from extensive quotations of Greek from Augustus' own correspondence as occur in Tib. 21, 4—6, Cl. 4, 2 and 5—6, there are over forty passages ranging from single words to pairs of verses. Some of Suetonius' lost works were apparently written in Greek (MACÉ, *Essai sur Suétone*, pp. 269 to 272); and he plainly did not feel any reluctance to interrupt his own unpretentious Latin with verbatim quotations of all sorts. Indeed the passages from Augustus' letters were obviously a feature of his biographies which he regarded as particularly valuable. But for some at least of his sources the use of Greek must have been barred by the rules of style; and the distribution of passages of Greek in different parts of the Caesars throws some light on the material employed by the author.

In *Julius* there is no Greek at all, except the words *καὶ σὺ, τέκνον* in 82, 3, introduced as if from a divergent source with the words *etsi tradiderunt quidam*. This corresponds exactly to Dio's account (44, 19, 5), where the same words occur with a similar introduction, indicating that the variant was already given in the common source (it is lacking in Nic. Dam. 24, Plut. Caes. 66 and App. B. C. 2, 16, 117). What we do have in this Life are two passages translated from the original Greek by some intermediate Latin writer: the famous '*iacta alea est*' in 32, which both App. B. C. 2, 5, 35 and Plut. Caes. 32, 8, Pomp. 60, 4 give as *ἠεροσίφθω κόβος*, the last passage stating that the words were uttered '*Ἐλλήματι*' (Dio, apparently following Livy, does not give the remark at all although it appears in Zonaras 10, 7, 11 as *ἠεροσίφθω κόβος*); and a long quotation from Balbus (81) of a *tabula aenea . . . conscripta litteris verbisque Graecis . . . contentia . . .*, with seventeen words of Latin. It is clear that Suetonius found these words already in Latin. The same seems to be true of Caesar's words over the dead at Pharsalus, given in 30, 4 as taken 'ad verbum' from

Asinius Pollio and quoted in Latin. The same remark is given, also on the authority of Pollio, in the Greek of Plut. Caes. 46, 1, with the incomprehensible remark that Pollio claimed that Caesar uttered the words in Latin but wrote them in Greek. GARZETTI, ad loc., strongly supports PETER's view that the words *Ἑλληνιστί* and *Ῥωμαϊστί* have been transposed, and that Pollio must have stated that Caesar uttered the words in Greek (like the other famous dicta), but that he (Pollio) gave them in Latin, as we have them in Suetonius. This interpretation will mean that Pollio is to be added to the list of Roman historians who turned Greek into Latin.

Dio Cassius, however, has preserved in his Greek history covering the period a very few phrases of original Greek transmitted to him by Latin sources. Apart from *καὶ σὺ, τέκνον*, already mentioned, these are Pompey's last words, taken from Sophocles and also given in Plut. Pomp. 77, 4 (42, 4, 2) and Brutus' last words, also from tragedy (47, 49, 2). Plutarch undoubtedly had access to further sources of Greek for this period: he quotes passages in Brut. 23, 2 from Bibulus, 24, 4 (also in Val. Max. 1, 5, 7). 34, 3. 40, 2, on the authority of Messala, and 51, 1, on the authority of Volumnius (also in App. B. C. 4, 17, 13), which VOLLGRAFF, Greek Writers of Roman History, p. 64, argues come to both later writers from a secondary source in Greek, probably Juba). But Dio apparently had nothing but these three famous last words—the only examples of original Greek from the whole of his books 41 to 56, apart from the verse in 48, 44, 1: *τοῖς εὐτυχοῦσι καὶ τρίμηνα παιδιά*, which occurs also in Suet. Cl. 1, 1, in a context referring back to the same occasion as Dio's, the birth of Drusus in 38 B. C.—a coincidence which indicates the extreme rarity of such Greek material for this period.

The main historical sources for the reign of Augustus seem to have been written with even stricter adherence to the rule of pure Latin; for there is no trace in Dio of the transmission of original Greek, and most of Suetonius' Greek consists of extracts from the emperor's letters. Most of these are found in the following Lives; but Aug. 92, 2: *δυσφημίαν nominis, ut ad Tiberium scribitur* comes from the same source, and probably also 99, 2: *εὐθανασίαν similem—his enim et verbo uti solebat*. Besides these are the Homeric verse *αἶθ' ὄφελον ἄγαμος τ' ἔμεναι ἄγονός τ' ἀπολέσθαι* in 65, 4 (found also in Exc. Salm. fr. 78, 4 and attributed by BOISSEvain to Dio, but more probably derived from this passage of Suetonius); and the two favourite sayings in 25, 4, *σπεῦδε βραδέως* and a line from Euripides' *Phoenissae*. The former of these is quoted also by Gellius 10, 11, 5, with *et dicere in sermonibus et scribere in epistulis solitum esse aiunt*, which suggests not that both writers derived it independently from the letters of Augustus, but that there was some collection of favourite expressions and bons mots, used also by Macrobius for the anecdotes in Sat. 2, 4, 31, 1, which contain some Greek. The single word in 70, 1: *quae vulgo δωδεκάθεος vocatur* is the sort of exception to rule regularly admitted. There remain the two trimeters

from comedy in 99, 1, which may be words already suggested, or else are meters in 98, 4 concerning Masgabastion.

In *Tiberius* there is still less Greek, 71, 1, where the Greek is essential to 57, 15, 2 in the same connection, the *Gadara πηλὸν αἵματι πεφροσμένον* probably quoted from Suetonius, and of obscure origin. More significant has been translated into Latin. *T. cursitare ac ne cubiti quidem mensura* (cf. Corp. Paroem. II 305, Cic. ad Att. si non dominaris, inquit, iniuriam te Tac. Ann. 4, 52, 6, in the form: *colaedi quia non regnaret*. Had Tacitus certainly have translated it into his has it in Latin shows that they both translated, and that Tacitus has simply of Tacitus describes how Agrippina for taking part in the prosecution in 59, 19, 2, refers back to the same story how Agrippina had met Domitian *γὰρ σὺ μοι αἴτιος, ἀλλ' ἄγαμέμνων*. Iliad A 335: *οὐ τί μοι ἔμμεζ ἐπαίτιος* will have had to adjust the words from Homeric *ἐπαίτιος* to the common Greek translate back into his own Greek for which latinized Tiberius' words to that Dio relates the story of Domitian in proper place in that of Tiberius' main narrative used for Tiberius' (anus); and Tacitus provides a hint where he says that for one anecdote the younger Agrippina. But the almost all the sources for this period.

Dio, under the same reign, does clearly derived from one of his sources in 58, 23, 4. To these I shall return in 57, 19, 4.

In *Caligula* there is still very unusual words: *ut ipsius verbo uti*

1. The same remark is given, also on the Plut. Caes. 46, 1, with the incomprehensible Caesar uttered the words in Latin but wrote, strongly supports PETER'S view that the have been transposed, and that Pollio must be the words in Greek (like the other famous em in Latin, as we have them in Suetonius.

Pollio is to be added to the list of Roman atin.

served in his Greek history covering this ginal Greek transmitted to him by Latin v, already mentioned, these are Pompey's id also given in Plut. Pomp. 77, 4 (42, 4, 3); agey (47, 49, 2). Plutarch undoubtedly had this period: he quotes passages in Brut. 23, 3, Max. 1, 5, 7). 34, 3. 40, 2, on the authority ty of Volumnius (also in App. B. C. 4, 17, 130,

of Roman History, p. 64, argues comes lary source in Greek, probably Juba). But these three famous last words—the only e whole of his books 41 to 56, apart from the à τριμήνα παιδιά, which occurs also in Suet. to the same occasion as Dio's, the birth of which indicates the extreme rarity of such

the reign of Augustus seem to have been e to the rule of pure Latin; for there is no riginal Greek, and most of Suetonius' Greek or's letters. Most of these are found in the vσφημίαν nominis, ut ad Tiberium scribit, robably also 99, 2: ἐθανασίαν similem—hoc se are the Homeric verse αἴθ' ὄφελον ἀγαμός, 4 (found also in Exc. Salm. fr. 78, 4 and ut more probably derived from this passage ite sayings in 25, 4, σπεῦδε βραδέως and a e former of these is quoted also by Gellius us et scribere in epistulis solitum esse aiunt; rs derived it independently from the letters me collection of favourite expressions and for the anecdotes in Sat. 2, 4, 31, 1, which d in 70, 1: quae vulgo δωδεκάθεος vocatur is y admitted. There remain the two trimeters

from comedy in 99, 1, which may belong to the same collection of famous last words already suggested, or else are derived from the same source as the trimeters in 98, 4 concerning Masgabas, to which I shall return in another connection.

In *Tiberius* there is still less Greek. Apart from the single word ἔμβλημα in 71, 1, where the Greek is essential to the point of the story, as Dio also has it in 57, 15, 2 in the same connection, there is only the remark of Theodorus of Gadara πηλὸν αἵματι πεφυραμένον (57, 1, and also in Const. Man. v. 1971—4, probably quoted from Suetonius), which comes from the previous reign and is of obscure origin. More significant are two passages where the Greek original has been translated into Latin. These are in 38: *Callipides vocaretur, quem persitare ac ne cubiti quidem mensuram progredi proverbio Graeco notatum est* (cf. Corp. Paroem. II 305, Cic. ad Att. 13, 12, 3); and in 53, 1: *Graeco versu, non dominaris, inquit, iniuriam te accipere existimas?* This appears likewise in Tac. Ann. 4, 52, 6, in the form: *correptumque Graeco versu admonuit non ideo laedi quia non regnaret*. Had Tacitus found this in Greek in his source, he would certainly have translated it into his own Latin; but the fact that Suetonius also has it in Latin shows that they both used a source containing it already translated, and that Tacitus has simply paraphrased it. Moreover the same chapter of Tacitus describes how Agrippina expressed indignation at Domitius Afer for taking part in the prosecution of Claudia Pulchra. Dio, under the year 39 in 59, 19, 2, refers back to the same incident thirteen years earlier, with the story how Agrippina had met Domitius and reassured him with the words οὐ τί μοι αἴτιος, ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων. These words are derived ultimately from *Iliad A 335: οὐ τί μοι ὕμμες ἐπαίτιοι, ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων*. Although Agrippina will have had to adjust the words from plural into singular, the change from the Homeric ἐπαίτιος to the commonplace αἴτιος shows that Dio has here had to translate back into his own Greek from an intermediate Latin source—the same which latinized Tiberius' words to Agrippina in the same connection. The fact that Dio relates the story of Domitius during the reign of Caligula and not at its proper place in that of Tiberius suggests that this source was not in fact the main narrative used for Tiberius (whether Aufidius Bassus or Servilius Nonianus); and Tacitus provides a hint at the end of the following chapter (4.53.3), where he says that for one anecdote at least he was indebted to the memoirs of the younger Agrippina. But the avoidance of Greek is probably a feature of almost all the sources for this period.

Dio, under the same reign, does contain two passages of Greek which he clearly derived from one of his sources: the oracle in 57, 18, 15 and the verse in 58, 23, 4. To these I shall return, together with Tiberius' remark to Galba in 77, 10, 4.

In *Caligula* there is still very little Greek. Suetonius apologizes for two unusual words: *ut ipsius verbo utar, ἀδιατρεψίαν, hoc est, inverecundiam* (29, 1)



(47), both of which could have occurred otherwise he has only the two Homeric quotations (22, 1), and ἢ μ' ἀνάειθ' ἢ ἐγώ σε (22, 4) in Dio 59, 28, 6. In Suetonius these two are in the section where the biographer begins to deal with the emperor, like the two odd words previously mentioned, the most hostile tradition that has left

what we know who this historian was, who Caligula, and who also employed Greek. The account of Josephus Ant. 19, 17 sqq., which follows the tradition of divine honours described in the same passage mentioned above, contains (91—2) a reference to the Greek word reading *Κλοῦίτος* is generally emended). It has been inferred not only that this was the source of the passage but that Josephus derived the whole passage from Cluvius Rufus. This view is supported convincingly by H. G. L. Rend. Linc. 8 [1932] pp. 305—7), with the addition of Caligula's madness comes from Cluvius. This view is doubted by STEIDLE (Suetonius and Cluvius, pp. 286—7), it tallies with the account adduced to be dismissed.

In Suetonius, Cluvius himself is made to quote Homer, μὴ τις ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν μῦθον ἀκούσῃ. This is a mixture of Il. 590: σίγα, μὴ τις τ' ἄλλος ἴδῃ. I. 593: σίγα νυν, μὴ τις σεῦ Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἀκούσῃ. Different from the other Homeric misquotation in Suetonius, which shows no knowledge at all of the source, it is possible only for a man who knows his source from memory (cf. the two verses in Cal. 22). It is likely to be Cluvius himself than Josephus, a Latinist nor likely to be capable of producing a correct Homeric hexameter. Thus there is no doubt that Cluvius, with his Homeric quotation and his account of Caligula's religious megalomania, and the source of the account, and especially Homer, in exactly the

same way whether Cluvius Rufus covered the whole account only with, or just before, the assassination of Caligula, or whether he himself played a minor part. Nor does it follow, as H. G. L. Rend. Linc. p. 305—7), that Cluvius was adopted as a source by Tacitus and Dio. It is perfectly possible that, like

Josephus, they recognised his value as an eyewitness of certain events during the period but found him unsuitable as a general guide. His hostility to Caligula appears, to judge from similar evidence from the following reigns, to extend to both Claudius and Nero. SYME (pp. 178—9) suggests that his activities in Nero's retinue render it probable that Cluvius would have tended to support that emperor; but he is far more likely to have sought to clear himself in the eyes of the new dynasty by attacking his former patron, exactly as the younger Pliny attacked Domitian. For this purpose, as a consular with access to the emperor, he was in a good position to elaborate the chronicle of Caligula's reign. His position cannot, as SYME opines (p. 294, etc.), guarantee his veracity.

That Cluvius was used only as a subsidiary source by the extant historians appears from the fact that the passages which appear to come from him are not organically attached to their contexts, or are found in different contexts in the various authors.

In *Claudius*, apart from the verse in 1, 1 already mentioned, and the book-title *Μωροῶν ἐπανάστασις* in 38, 3, there are three passages in particular from the most hostile parts of the Life. In 15, 4 the words καὶ σὸν γέρον ἐὶ καὶ μωρός follow shortly after the phrase *illud quoque a maioribus natu audiebam*, which shows that the preceding anecdote at least was derived by Suetonius from a personal source. But the Greek phrase has its own introductory tag, *ac ne cui haec mira sint . . .*; which, like *satis constat* in the following anecdote, indicates that Suetonius is here bringing together from various unfavourable sources a number of stories to illustrate the contempt in which Claudius was held in the courts, and to round off a selection of less hostile stories from his main source. Of a similar nature are *nam illa eius cotidiana et plane omnium horarum et momentorum erant . . .* λέλει καὶ μὴ θύγγανε (40, 3), and the Homeric ἀνδρ' ἀπαμύνασθαι ὅτε τις πρότερος χαλεπήνη (42, 1), which is found in a similar context of executions in Dio 60, 16, 8; although there it is attached rather awkwardly to the account of Arria's suicide, while in Suetonius it illustrates Claudius' frequent use of Greek. Less hostile, but apparently outside the main tradition represented by Tacitus and Dio, is the story of Claudius' change of heart towards Britannicus, with the words δ τρώσας καὶ ἴσεται (43). Dio also gives two Greek trimeters in 60, 29, 3, in a disjointed context which goes on to an account of the trial of Asiaticus markedly different from that in Tac. Ann. 11, 2—3. There is patently some confusion of sources hereabouts; for Tacitus, in 11, 2, 5, records Claudius' question to the bereaved Scipio *cur sine uxore discubisset*, which is surely the same anecdote as Suetonius gives in Cl. 39, 1, where the question *cur domina non venisset* refers to Messalina, as an illustration of Claudius' *oblivio*. This last word, in the sense of 'forgetfulness' appears unparalleled in classical Latin except in Tacitus' own account of Claudius' reactions after Messalina's death (and so would seem to have been used in a



common source for that incident); but in Suetonius the passage involves a further problem. He says: *oblivionem et inconsiderantiam, vel ut Graece dicantur μετewορίαν et ἀβλεψίαν* (39, 1). This doubling of Greek and Latin words is paralleled by the passage in Cal. 29, 1 already discussed; but whether Cluvius himself or Suetonius copying him felt it desirable to explain odd words in one language by almost equally odd ones in the other, it is impossible to say. What can be deduced from this confusion is that one source at least presented some of its material in a way which invited misapplication by later historians, and that this source probably used Greek.

In *Nero* there are still clearer indications that the Greek passages had a very secure position in the narrative where they originally occurred. In 40, 1 Suetonius concludes a list of portents of Nero's fall, all related in the normal perfect tense, with an item in the pluperfect, suggesting a change of source: *observatum etiam fuerat, novissimam fabulam cantasse eum publice Oedipodeum exulem atque in hoc desisse versu: θανεῖν μ' ἄνωγε σύγγαμος μήτηρ, πατήρ*. Dio inserts the same line, or a more satisfactory version of it, in an entirely different context (63, 28, 5), as running in Nero's head while hiding at Phaon's villa, and in no way connected with portents or the stage. Similarly the *vox eius celeberrima, τὸ τέχγιον ἡμῶς διαθρέψει* in 40, 2 is introduced by a pluperfect *praedictum . . . olim fuerat*, in a passage inserted between 40, 1 and 40, 4, which in themselves present a continuous narrative of the revolt of Vindex. Dio, on the other hand, inserts it in the middle of a context which corresponds to Nero 47, 2—3, describing Nero's reactions when his military plans finally collapsed. It is likely not that one or other writer has transferred these two anecdotes from a definite position in the chronological sequence of events in which he found it, but that the sequence was never distinct, and that each writer has placed them where he considered most appropriate. The same thing has occurred with the Greek pasquinades in 39, 2. This section is inserted awkwardly to illustrate Nero's *patientia*, as an appendage to the long sequence on his *saevitia* and the disasters of the reign (these two being linked by the common item of the Fire), before the more or less chronological narrative of Nero's fall. This revision of the original schematic treatment of the emperor's vices (26—38) suggests that Suetonius came across this valuable material in a minor source and inserted it in this way rather than omit it altogether. Now the first of these pasquinades, *Νέρων Ὀρέστης Ἀλκμέων μητρόκτονος* is found in Dio 61, 16, 2 in the entirely different context of reactions in Rome after Agrippina's death. According to Tac. Ann. 14, 13, 2, there was at that time no popular criticism of Nero at all; and the context in which these verses appear in Suetonius, with references both to the *Domus Aurea* and to Nero's declared hatred of the senate, show that they belong to the very last years of the reign. Dio has simply inserted those on matricide where they seemed to him most appropriate, regardless of historical accuracy.

To pass over the famous *ἐμοῦ θανόντο* finally contains the four last words in Greek Dio's version (63, 29, 2), although this has last hours, including the equivalent of *ha qualis artifex pereo* (29, 2) in the earlier passage appears to have borrowed the remarks in Greek Dio borrowed the tragic verse *θανεῖν μ' ἄνωγε* in his narrative at 28, 5.

Of the remaining Lives, although *Vitellius* at 13, 2 and the three Flavians come too close to literary activity to allow us any idea of his sources, *Otho* both provide relevant passages of Greek: *ante paucos dies exierat in vulgus, laudatam floridam et vegetam respondisse eum*, in 13, 2, an anecdote, introduced by a pluperfect tense, of events, in which Galba's death has already been mentioned. The trace of it in the other sources, particularly *Otho* 7, 2 two incidents are introduced by a change of authority): *Otho's falling out of the sky and postridie quoque in augurando temporibus obmurmurasse, τί γάρ μοι μακροῖς αἰλοῖς* the accompanying sacrifice precede the story of who in *Otho* 1, 1 mentions the sacrifice of Galba's death, says nothing of these two incidents; nor is there any trace of it in the only other passage in Greek in these Lives, the succession in Gal. 4, 1, introduces such a passage discussed later.

Now it has generally been agreed that the authorities for the reigns of Claudius and Nero, for Galba and Otho, is the elder Pliny. This argument can now be confirmed in various ways that Pliny is the basic source who composed the Greek. As a writer in the year-by-year tradition by the evidence of Cassiodorus, Chron. 1, 1, 1, Aufidius Bassus down to the point where he is more strict in this respect than in his earlier work, as we have seen, his use of Greek is very extensive; therefore, that a considerable part of the Greek narrative from Pliny, supplemented with other quotations in Greek (and others, less exact)

but in Suetonius the passage involves a doubling of Greek and Latin words is already discussed; but whether Cluvius it is desirable to explain odd words in the one or the other, it is impossible to say. The confusion is that one source at least presented an invited misapplication by later historians; Greek.

indications that the Greek passages had no where they originally occurred. In 46, 3 of Nero's fall, all related in the normal pluperfect, suggesting a change of source: *fabulam cantasse eum publice Oedipodem* *νεῖν μ' ἄνωγε σύγγαμος μήτηρ, πατήρ*. Dio's factory version of it, in an entirely different Nero's head while hiding at Phaon's villa, tents or the stage. Similarly the *vox eius* *veit* in 40, 2 is introduced by a pluperfect, age inserted between 40, 1 and 40, 4, which narrative of the revolt of Vindex. Dio, on dle of a context which corresponds to Nero when his military plans finally collapsed. riter has transferred these two anecdotes onological sequence of events in which he s never distinct, and that each writer has most appropriate. The same thing has in 39, 2. This section is inserted awkward-an appendage to the long sequence on his n (these two being linked by the common less chronological narrative of Nero's fall. e treatment of the emperor's vices (26—38), his valuable material in a minor source and omit it altogether. Now the first of these *έων μητροόκτονος* is found in Dio 61, 16, 2 eactions in Rome after Agrippina's death. ere was at that time no popular criticism which these verses appear in Suetonius, urea and to Nero's declared hatred of the very last years of the reign. Dio has simply ey seemed to him most appropriate, re-

To pass over the famous *έμοῦ θανόντος* (38, 1) for further discussion, Nero finally contains the four last words in Greek in 49, 3. These do not appear in Dio's version (63, 29, 2), although this has the same basic account of Nero's last hours, including the equivalent of *haec est Neronis decocta* (28, 5) and of *qualis artifex pereo* (29, 2) in the earlier part of the same narrative. Suetonius appears to have borrowed the remarks in Greek from another source, just as Dio borrowed the tragic verse *θανεῖν μ' ἄνωγε* . . . and inserted it in this same narrative at 28, 5.

Of the remaining Lives, although *Vitellius* contains only a single Greek word at 13, 2 and the three Flavians come too close to the period of Suetonius' own literary activity to allow us any idea of his sources for their lives, *Galba* and *Otho* both provide relevant passages of Greek. In *Gal.* 20, 2 Suetonius says: *ante paucos dies exierat in vulgus, laudanti cuidam formam suam ut adhuc floridam et vegetam respondisse eum, ἔτι μοι μένος ἔμπεδόν ἐστιν*. This anecdote, introduced by a pluperfect tense, comes entirely outside the sequence of events, in which Galba's death has already been described; nor is there any trace of it in the other sources, particularly Plutarch, who is generally held most closely to reproduce the basic source for all these events. Similarly in *Otho* 7, 2 two incidents are introduced by *dicitur* (apparently the sign of some change of authority): Otho's falling out of bed on the night after his accession, and *postridie quoque in augurando tempestate orta graviter prolapsus identidem abmurmurasse, τί γάρ μοι μακροῖς ἀλλοῖς*; In Dio 64, 7, 1 the same words and the accompanying sacrifice precede the story of the nightmare. Again Plutarch, who in *Otho* 1, 1 mentions the sacrifice as taking place on the morning after Galba's death, says nothing of these two signs of weakness on the part of the new emperor; nor is there any trace of this tendency in Tacitus' account. The only other passage in Greek in these two Lives, the prophecy of Galba's accession in *Gal.* 4, 1, introduces such complicated issues that it will be discussed later.

Now it has generally been agreed that the common source of our three main authorities for the reigns of Claudius and Nero, and of these three plus Plutarch for Galba and Otho, is the elder Pliny (e.g. MOMIGLIANO, pp. 237—8). This argument can now be confirmed in various respects. In particular, it appears that Pliny is the basic source who completely eschews the use of quotations in Greek. As a writer in the year-by-year tradition of Livy, whose account is shown by the evidence of Cassiodorus, *Chron.* pp. 630, 659, to have been continued by Antidius Bassus down to the point where Pliny took over, he would naturally be stricter in this respect than in his extant *Natural History*; and even there, as we have seen, his use of Greek is very limited. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that a considerable part of our extant accounts consists of a basic narrative from Pliny, supplemented with, among other things, a number of quotations in Greek (and others, less easily recognisable, in Latin) from a work



by Cluvius Rufus, which was not arranged as a clear chronological framework, and was characterized by a tendency to sensational charges against the predecessors of the Flavian emperors (though see SYME, pp. 178, 294, for a more respectful view).

One objection to this theory must be met at once. MOMIGLIANO (pp. 328, 331) argues that the citations in our extant historians from Cluvius, and also from Fabius Rusticus, were taken not directly from these writers, but from quotations from them in Pliny. This view is based primarily on the comparison of Suet. Otho 7, 1 and Plut. Otho 3, 2, where the same detail about imperial diplomas is attributed by the latter to Cluvius Rufus, by the former (with his usual avoidance of proper names) to *quidam*. On this evidence it seems impossible to deny that the reference to Cluvius already occurred in Pliny's version of these events. But the assumption that the same thing is true of all citations of both Cluvius Rufus and Fabius Rusticus in Tacitus as well, and for the whole reign of Nero, raises too many difficulties of its own. Tacitus, in Agric. 10, 3, refers to Fabius as »the most eloquent of modern writers« and quotes his view on the shape of Britain; and there can be little doubt that he knew him personally (cf. C. I. L. VI 10229). Cluvius, a considerably older man, he may not have known, and he refers to him only as *facundus* and *eloquentia clarus* (Hist. 1, 8, 1; 4, 43, 1). But it is inconceivable that, at a time when Fabius was possibly still alive and certainly not long dead, Tacitus should have attempted to give a false impression of having used his works as a source for his own, when, on MOMIGLIANO's hypothesis, it must in fact have been patent that his acquaintance with them was only at second hand.

If the argument breaks down over Fabius, it will not hold for Cluvius either. MOMIGLIANO attaches great importance to the passage where Tacitus refers explicitly to Fabius, Cluvius, and *ceteri auctores* (Ann. 14, 2, 1—3), as indicating, when compared with the corresponding passages in Suetonius and Dio, that the different views were already given by Pliny. What may legitimately be inferred from these passages is that Pliny contained some reference to both versions of the incest-story, including the account of the concubine who resembled Agrippina (which he evidently accepted as a fact); but that, as Tacitus hints, he preferred to blame the empress for the attempted incest. This is all that lies behind the confident *nemo dubitavit* of Suet. Nero 28, 2 and the doubt-expressed by Dio 61, 11, 2, as well as the phrase *quamquam scriptoribus diversa firmantibus* of Victor, Caes. 5, 8, which seems to be derived directly or indirectly from Pliny. Suetonius' treatment of his authorities is dishonest on any account, whether or not he referred to Cluvius in this connection; and the suture is uncomfortable where he joins on a scabrous anecdote from Fabius' version (*olim enim quotiens . . .*). Tacitus, finding some expression of doubt in Pliny, took care to refer to the two better-informed historians to ascertain their views, and we should hardly need his specific statement to know that the inside information

he gives about Agrippina's attempt on was by no means »at Pliny's mercy«, as perfectly well aware of Pliny's shortcomings equally well aware of the existence of the

Pliny, on the other hand, probably writers if he had wished. Far the most satisfactory relationship between the three historians: sulla storia e sul diritto Romano [1918] mainly in the provinces during the early with his work more or less completed, to with the prevalent attitude towards Cluvius Rufus, and perhaps also by Fabius just appeared. He surely refers to them *haveo* — words which need not be sincere holding publication *ne quid ambitioni* p. 392). Another matter over which Pliny's unfashionable attitude is the conduct of SYME (pp. 181, 675) holds that the unfavourable 2, 20, 1, Plut. Otho 6, 3 must come from a and Pliny both died; but himself admit Pliny's work may have some relevance lication fits in not only with this point but the views of Pliny and of Cluvius which

The one anomalous passage, where Pliny be explained much more simply. Cluvius made no secret of his inside information or other the detail reached Pliny, together conference between Vitellius and Sabinus Hist. 3, 65, introduced by *ut fama fuit*, as own work; so SYME, p. 675). Whether as advised by Pliny as an excellent authority and Suetonius, although the latter omit evidence that either Plutarch or Tacitus Emperors: they lack the anecdotes on Cluvius from that source, and they follow the account to Poppaea which is found also in Suetonius' variant in Ann. 13, 45, written when Tacitus (SYME, p. 290).

Now if we may accept the hypothesis that the extant historians was Pliny, and that Cluvius the Caesars and Dio's Histories to provide characterized by the use of Greek, some

anged as a clear chronological framework  
y to sensational charges against the pre-  
ough see SYME, pp. 178, 294, for a more

t be met at once. MOMIGLIANO (pp. 328 to  
extant historians from Cluvius, and also  
ot directly from these writers, but from  
view is based primarily on the comparison  
2, where the same detail about imperial  
o Cluvius Rufus, by the former (with his  
*quidam*. On this evidence it seems impos-  
uvius already occurred in Pliny's version  
at the same thing is true of all citations of  
icus in Tacitus as well, and for the whole  
ulties of its own. Tacitus, in Agric. 10, 3,  
uent of modern writers« and quotes his  
ere can be little doubt that he knew him  
uvius, a considerably older man, he may  
m only as *facundus* and *eloquentia clarus*  
ceivable that, at a time when Fabius was  
ong dead, Tacitus should have attempted  
used his works as a source for his own;  
t must in fact have been patent that his  
second hand.

Fabius, it will not hold for Cluvius either.  
nce to the passage where Tacitus refers  
*i auctores* (Ann. 14, 2, 1—3), as indicating,  
g passages in Suetonius and Dio, that the  
Pliny. What may legitimately be inferred  
tained some reference to both versions of  
t of the concubine who resembled Agrip-  
s a fact); but that, as Tacitus hints, he  
he attempted incest. This is all that lies  
t of Suet. Nero 28, 2 and the doubts  
he phrase *quamquam scriptoribus diversa*  
seems to be derived directly or indirectly  
authorities is dishonest on any account,  
s in this connection; and the suture is  
orous anecdote from Fabius' version (*olim*  
ome expression of doubt in Pliny, took  
d historians to ascertain their views, and  
ment to know that the inside information

he gives about Agrippina's attempt on Nero is derived from Cluvius. Tacitus  
was by no means »at Pliny's mercy«, as MOMIGLIANO suggests (p. 331). He was  
perfectly well aware of Pliny's shortcomings (Ann. 13, 31, 1; 15, 53, 4), and  
equally well aware of the existence of the works of Cluvius and Fabius.

Pliny, on the other hand, probably could not have made use of these two  
writers if he had wished. Far the most satisfactory account of the chronological  
relationship between the three historians is that forward by CIACERI (Ricerche  
sulla storia e sul diritto Romano [1918], pp. 391—3), whereby Pliny, writing  
mainly in the provinces during the early years of Vespasian, returned to Rome  
with his work more or less completed, to find that it was quite out of keeping  
with the prevalent attitude towards the Julio-Claudians exemplified by  
Cluvius Rufus, and perhaps also by Fabius Rusticus, whose works had probably  
just appeared. He surely refers to them in n. h., *praef.* 20: *occupantibus locum  
taceo* — words which need not be sincere any more than his pretext for with-  
holding publication *ne quid ambitioni dedisse vita iudicaretur* (cf. CIACERI,  
p. 392). Another matter over which Pliny may have felt that he had taken an  
unfashionable attitude is the conduct of Caecina in his advance through Gaul.  
SYME (pp. 181, 675) holds that the unfavourable picture as given in Tac. Hist.  
2, 20, 1, Plut. Otho 6, 3 must come from a source written after 79, when Caecina  
and Pliny both died; but himself admits that the posthumous publication of  
Pliny's work may have some relevance. In fact, CIACERI'S view of this pub-  
lication fits in not only with this point but with certain other differences between  
the views of Pliny and of Cluvius which will appear from what follows.

The one anomalous passage, where Pliny evidently did quote Cluvius, must  
be explained much more simply. Cluvius, back in Rome from Spain, can have  
made no secret of his inside information about Otho's diplomas; and somehow  
or other the detail reached Pliny, together perhaps with the details of the  
conference between Vitellius and Sabinus which Cluvius had attended (Tac.  
Hist. 3, 65, introduced by *ut fama fuit*, as if Tacitus had not found it in Cluvius'  
own work; so SYME, p. 675). Whether as a historian or not, Cluvius was recog-  
nised by Pliny as an excellent authority on these matters, as later by Plutarch  
and Suetonius, although the latter omits his actual name. There is indeed no  
evidence that either Plutarch or Tacitus used Cluvius for the year of the Four  
Emperors: they lack the anecdotes on Galba and Otho which appear to come  
from that source, and they follow the common account of Otho's relationship  
to Poppaea which is found also in Suetonius and Dio, but was replaced by a  
variant in Ann. 13, 45, written when Tacitus was undoubtedly using Cluvius  
(SYME, p. 290).

Now if we may accept the hypothesis that the basic source followed by the  
extant historians was Pliny, and that Cluvius was drawn upon for the Annals,  
the Caesars and Dio's Histories to provide certain passages, particularly those  
characterized by the use of Greek, some assistance may be drawn from the

stylistic arguments propounded by D'ANNA, *Le Idee Letterarie di Suetonio* (1954), cap. 7. The writer here distinguishes certain chapters of Nero's catalogues of items inartistically strung together (e.g. 9 and 35) from others which exhibit an elaborate periodic structure and give a continuous narrative (e.g. 47, 48, 49); and argues that the two types reproduce the characteristics of two different sources with clearly distinguishable attitudes towards Nero. Some of his conclusions are vitiated by the failure to recognise Suetonius' basic principles of biographical composition: on the one hand, his economical use of material, however important historically, which did not bear directly upon the central figure; on the other, his method of compiling his main chapters of virtues and vices by amassing exempla and arranging them in a way which seldom reveals anything of the nature of his sources. Thus many of the disconnected items in Nero 9 may have been taken from a full narrative of the reign such as we suppose Pliny to have provided (e.g. the building-regulations in 16, 1); and in Pliny they need not have been anything like so brief and formulaic as they appear in their new setting. But in describing Nero's accession (8), reception of Tiridates (13), artistic career (20—25), and downfall (40—49), Suetonius has clearly followed a narrative source, sometimes more or less verbatim (as is shown by the close parallels in Dio and Victor), sometimes with interpolations from another source or sources. Examples of the latter are the passages already referred to as containing Greek (40, 2; 46, 3), clearly divorced from the main context by the use of a pluperfect tense (*praedictum ... erat observatum fuerat*).

That this main narrative eschewed the direct quotation of Greek is made clear by three passages where the original Greek has been turned into Latin in Suetonius' source (the fourth such passage, the Greek proverb in 33, 1, does not appear in a narrative context, but will be referred to in the discussion of Claudius' death). The first of these is in 20, 1: *Graecum proverbium iactans, occultae musicae nullum esse respectum*, which is closely connected with the details of Nero's voice-training also found in Pliny n. h., 94, 166; the second in 20, 2: *si paulum subbibisset, aliquid se sufferti tinniturum Graeco sermone promisit*. Both these passages occur in the continuous narrative of the emperor's artistic career (20—25), though it must be supposed that Pliny gave this at much greater length. Throughout these chapters, no Greek is found; although Nero's address to the judges at the Games (23, 3), his praise of the Greeks (22, 3), and his prayer at the Isthmus from the same account (37, 3), must all have been in Greek originally. Moreover in 20, 2 the Latin is extremely odd: *subbibito*, *tinnio* and *suffertus* are either ἀπαξ λεγόμενα or virtually unparal- leled in classical Latin, though the first two at least have good Greek parallels in ἐπιπίνω and λαλαγέω. Such peculiar Latin must be due to a historian who was determined at all costs to avoid Greek, as Suetonius certainly was not. The same is probably true of the apparently unparal- leled phrase in 23, 1: *consilium*

*et votum celeriter reverti me*, from a Greek, coming as it did to a Greek engaged in his Greek tour.

The third of the passages translated in 45, 2: *inscriptione Graeca, nunc deus* in the middle of the long narrative context by the references to Vinde attacks on Nero is to be contrasted with 'Ορέστης which we have already seen in pieces of Greek, the whole section being in Greek. The two passages thus fall neatly

Now the latter of these, which is a joke in Greek which we have passed over, throws on the treatment of Claudius

Suetonius, in Cl. 44, 2 gives two versions: (a) that the poison was administered on the Capitol, and that Claudius was given in a mushroom by Agrippina up the poison, and was given a second dose; (b) that he was given the poison to be suffering from drunkenness, a version which plainly combines the two versions, and adding the name of Xenophon to administer the poison on a feast of drunkenness in Suet. Cl. 33, 1). Of the two versions, (a) is evidently the more successful in Pliny. Juv. 5, 147. 6, 620—and in Pliny the most part by Tacitus and entirely for one or the other in Cl. 44, 2. In Nero's case he is inconsistent. In 33, 1 he says that he murdered, *ut qui boletos, in quo cibi cibum posthac proverbio Graeco conlatum*, taking for granted version (b)—and then translates it into Latin. On the other hand, in Cl. 44, 2 he says *histrio in cantico quodam ὑγίανε: bibentem natantemque faceret, exitium*. This clearly has no reference to the mushroom which was never regarded, in any case, but to a potion; and this must be the version of the *praegustator*. This version, therefore, and so to Cluvius. Version (b) we also

D'ANNA, *Le Idee Letterarie di Suetonio* distinguishes certain chapters of Nero as strung together (e.g. 9 and 35) from others in structure and give a continuous narrative of two types reproduce the characteristics of distinguishable attitudes towards Nero. Some of the failure to recognise Suetonius' basic method of compiling his main chapters on Nero and arranging them in a way which reflects the nature of his sources. Thus many of the details have been taken from a full narrative of the events provided (e.g. the building-regulations in Nero's reign have been anything like so brief and formless as those in the reign of Augustus). But in describing Nero's accession (8), his early career (20—25), and downfall (40—49), Suetonius has a narrative source, sometimes more or less parallel in Dio and Victor), sometimes with other sources. Examples of the latter are the opening Greek (40, 2; 46, 3), clearly divorced from the rest of a pluperfect tense (*praedictum ... erat*,

where the direct quotation of Greek is made original Greek has been turned into Latin in the passage, the Greek proverb in 33, 1, does not seem to be referred to in the discussion of Nero's fall in 20, 1 : *Graecum proverbium iactans, ut dicitur, quod si quis in tinnitibus mori fuerit, non suffert tinnitum Graeco sermone profertur*, which is closely connected with the first found in Pliny n. h., 94, 166; the second in Suetonius *de sufferti tinnitum Graeco sermone profertur* in the continuous narrative of the emperor's fall. It must be supposed that Pliny gave this at the beginning of these chapters, no Greek is found; although in the Games (23, 3), his praise of the Greeks in the Games from the same account (37, 3), must all be derived from 20, 2 the Latin is extremely odd: *ἅπαντα λεγόμενα* or virtually unparallelled in Latin must at least have good Greek parallels in Latin must be due to a historian who was not a Greek, as Suetonius certainly was not. The only unparallelled phrase in 23, 1 : *consilium*

*quod celeriter reverti me*, from a letter to Helius, which was certainly written in Greek, coming as it did to a Greek freedman from the philhellene emperor who was engaged in his Greek tour.

The third of the passages translated from the Greek is the pasquinade in 35, 2 : *inscriptione Graeca, nunc demum agona esse et traderet tandem*. This comes in the middle of the long narrative of Nero's fall, and is firmly attached to the context by the references to Vindex in the other pasquinades. This collection of attacks on Nero is to be contrasted with that in 39, 2, containing the *Νέρονος ὀρέστης* which we have already observed as displaced in Dio, and two other pieces of Greek, the whole section being very awkwardly inserted in its place. The two passages thus fall neatly to Pliny and Cluvius respectively.

Now the latter of these, which seems to come from Cluvius, includes (39, 3) a joke in Greek which we have passed over, and must now consider for the light it throws on the treatment of Claudius' death in the different sources.

Suetonius, in Cl. 44, 2 gives two contradictory accounts of this murder: a) that the poison was administered by the *praegustator* Halotus at a banquet on the Capitol, and that Claudius lingered on in agony all night; b) that it was given in a mushroom by Agrippina, that Claudius fell into a coma and threw up the poison, and was given a second dose, either in gruel or in an enema. Dio 61, 34, 2 gives the latter version alone, adding that Claudius was at first thought to be suffering from drunkenness, and specifying Lucusta, *φαρμακίδα περιβόητον* *ἐκ τούτου τούτω ἐλωκύναν*, as the source of the poison. Tac. Ann. 12, 66—67 plainly combines the two versions, naming both Halotus and Lucusta together, and adding the name of Xenophon as the doctor concerned, though he is made to administer the poison on a feather (a detail used in a different context of drunkenness in Suet. Cl. 33, 1). Of the two stories, b) involving mushrooms, was evidently the more successful in popular fancy. It appears in Mart. 1, 20, 4, *Jun. 5, 147. 6, 620*—and in Pliny n. h., 23, 92, besides being followed for the most part by Tacitus and entirely by Dio. Suetonius expresses no preference for one or the other in Cl. 44, 2. In *Nero*, however, he makes use of both versions, inconsistently. In 33, 1 he says that Nero, made no secret of his complicity in the murder, *ut qui boletos, in quo cibi genere venenum is acceperat, quasi deorum cibum posthac proverbio Graeco conlaudare sit solitus*. In other words, he is here taking for granted version (b)—and using a source which has Greek translated into Latin. On the other hand, in 39, 3 he describes how *Datus Atellanarum* *in cantico quodam ὕγίαιε πάτερ, ὕγίαιε μήτηρ ita demonstraverat, ut ebriam natantemque faceret, exitum scilicet Claudi Agrippinaeque significans*. This clearly has no reference to the poisoned mushroom (nor to the enema, which was never regarded, in any case, as the characteristic mark of the murder) but to a potion; and this must be the poison of version (a), administered by the *praegustator*. This version, therefore, belongs to a tradition where Greek is used, and so to Cluvius. Version (b) we already knew to have followed by Pliny, and

can now infer to have been derived by our historians from that writer. Although from the fact that it seems to have been more popular, Pliny may have chosen this version because Halotus, the villain of (a), had survived Nero and is later heard of as appointed to a handsome *procuratio* by Galba (Suet. Gal. 15, 2, 1; not in Plut. Gal. 17), in which post he will have been a colleague of Pliny himself. Cluvius is not likely to have been affected by such considerations.

Accordingly, if Cluvius gave the version involving Halotus and the poisoned drink, while Pliny preferred that with Lucusta and the mushrooms (Seneca, Apocol. 2 suggests that it did not take long for different stories to begin to circulate), it becomes possible to explain some very odd features of the murder of Britannicus, as described by Tac. Ann. 13, 15, Suet. Nero. 33, 2, and Dio 61, 7, 2. The story contains continual reminiscences of version (b) of the murder of Claudius: in particular, the choice of the first dose as slow-working, its failure to take effect, the choice of a second as more rapid, and the employment of Lucusta. The most suspicious feature among these parallels is the twofold introduction of Lucusta by Tacitus. In Ann. 12, 66, 4 she appears as *artifex talium nomine L. . . nuper veneficii damnata et diu inter instrumenta regni habitata* in 13, 15, 4 as *damnata veneficii nomine L., multa scelerum fama*. Dio introduces her for Claudius' murder in almost the same terms as Tacitus; his account of that of Britannicus is so sadly abbreviated by the epitomators that we cannot tell whether Lucusta was ever mentioned there. Suetonius omits all mention of her in Cl. 44, 2—3, while introducing her in Nero 33, 2, for the murder of Britannicus, as *quadam L. venenariorum indice (artifice THOMAS)*.

These variants can be explained only on the assumption that one of the original sources introduced her for the first murder only, another only for the second. Thus Pliny, following the current mushroom-story for Claudius, with Lucusta as the prime agent, evidently provided few circumstantial details for Britannicus; whereas Cluvius, using the story of Halotus and the poisoned draught for Claudius, was able to employ the material from the other version for the death of Britannicus, making it appear as Lucusta's first major crime and so introducing her a fresh character. His version seems to be followed by the Scholiast on Juv. 1, 71, who regards her entirely as a creature of Nero's and mentions only the murder of Britannicus. Then Tacitus, who combined Pliny and Cluvius to provide the fullest possible account of Claudius' death, inadvertently introduced Lucusta a second time for the second murder as if she was a fresh character. His carelessness is hardly palliated by the fact that book 13 is the first of a new hexad and may have been completed after a certain interval, but the second introduction could not have echoed the first so closely unless he had found it phrased in this way in one of his sources. Suetonius, more circumspectly, avoided the doublet by cutting Lucusta out of the earlier incident, which was already rich enough in details, and kept the whole story for Britannicus. Dio, who seems never to have corrected such discrepancies in advance

(see below), used Lucusta for the first murder, probably omitted her from the second, as he neglected to refer to Cluvius at all for this Pliny. Each of our extant historians reveals his sources for these two murders, his characteristic evidence also shows that Cluvius was prepared to use one context to enrich another. This suspicion of the various accounts in our authorities of

We have Tacitus' word that authorities of the break was caused *forte an dolo principis* (An account is clearly a mixture of the two versions, hostile in 38, 8. 39, 3, and of the more favourable account appears most distinctly in Dio 62, 16). The latter begins with the anecdote: *dicente quibusdam βαρόνος γαῖα μεχθήτω πυρί, Immo, inquit, ἐπιπύρομαι*, continues with the reference to *plerique co* spreading the fire (a detail which is found in Dio). There can be no point in this mention of Dio to establish their authority; and it is quite a common method of indirect and anonymous phrasing should conceal the authority of Cluvius standing, who was in Rome during that summer. If the inference is valid or not, there is evidence that Nero responsible for the Fire.

Pliny's attitude to the question is hard to judge. Despite his constant interest in the buildings which appear to blame Nero for the Fire. *solac . . . duraverunt . . . ad Neronis principis annis postea cultu virides iuvenesque, ni principis mortem*. Here the actual accusation, *quibusdam* found in the MS D, and is properly rejected. The final part of the sentence is at least suspect, and the word *princeps* and an unexplained reference of persons unspecified anywhere in the context. The words are a later addition, whether by a later writer to adapt his passing reference to the Fire to a version probably after Josephus made his list of Nero's crimes, written about 75. For such later revisions of the text, mainly one cannot argue on the basis of this text. It is certain the charge of deliberate incendiaryism.

But we possess evidence concerning the Fire in Nero 43, 1 (and similarly in Dio 63, 27, 2) we



y our historians from that writer. Apart  
 en more popular, Pliny may have chosen  
 ain of (a), had survived Nero and is last  
*procuratio* by Galba (Suet. Gal. 15, 2, but  
 will have been a colleague of Pliny himself,  
 cted by such considerations.

rsion involving Halotus and the poisoned  
 h Lucusta and the mushrooms (Seneca  
 ke long for different stories to begin to  
 in some very odd features of the murder  
 n. 13, 15, Suet. Nero. 33, 2, and Dio 61, 7, 4.  
 scences of version (b) of the murder of  
 ne first dose as slow-working, its failure to  
 more rapid, and the employment of Lu-  
 long these parallels is the twofold intro-  
 n. 12, 66, 4 she appears as *artifex talium*  
*ta et diu inter instrumenta regni habita;*  
*e L., multa scelerum fama.* Dio introduces  
 e same terms as Tacitus; his account of  
 iated by the epitomators that we cannot  
 oned there. Suetonius omits all mention  
 ng her in Nero 33, 2, for the murder of  
*um indice (artifice THOMAS).*

only on the assumption that one of the  
 e first murder only, another only for the  
 erent mushroom-story for Claudius, with  
 y provided few circumstantial details for  
 the story of Halotus and the poisoned  
 oloy the material from the other version  
 it appear as Lucusta's first major crime  
 r. His version seems to be followed by the  
 her entirely as a creature of Nero's and  
 icus. Then Tacitus, who combined Pliny  
 ssible account of Claudius' death, inad-  
 time for the second murder as if she was  
 ardly palliated by the fact that book 13  
 e been completed after a certain interval;  
 have echoed the first so closely unless he  
 one of his sources. Suetonius, more cir-  
 utting Lucusta out of the earlier incident,  
 ils, and kept the whole story for Britan-  
 corrected such discrepancies in advance

see below), used Lucusta for the first murder, as he found her in Pliny, and  
 probably omitted her from the second, as he found it in Cluvius — unless he  
 neglected to refer to Cluvius at all for this incident and continued to follow  
 Pliny. Each of our extant historians reveals, in his handling of the conflicting  
 sources for these two murders, his characteristic method of going to work. Their  
 evidence also shows that Cluvius was prepared to misappropriate material from  
 one context to enrich another. This suspicion is confirmed by a consideration  
 of the various accounts in our authorities of the Fire of 64.

We have Tacitus' word that authorities disagreed as to whether this out-  
 break was caused *forte an dolo principis* (Ann. 15, 38, 1). His own subsequent  
 account is clearly a mixture of the two versions, with a reflection of the more  
 hostile in 38, 8, 39, 3, and of the more favourable in 39, 1—2. The hostile  
 account appears most distinctly in Dio 62, 16—17, and in Suet. Nero 38, 1. The  
 latter begins with the anecdote: *dicente quodam in sermone communi, 'Εμοῦ*  
*παρόντος γαῖα μειχθήτω πυρὶ, Immo, inquit, ἐμοῦ ζῶντος, planeque ita fecit;* and  
 continues with the reference to *plerique consulares* catching imperial slaves  
 spreading the fire (a detail which is found in much the same form in Tacitus and  
 Dio). There can be no point in this mention of the rank of these witnesses unless  
 to establish their authority; and it is quite in accordance with Suetonius'  
 common method of indirect and anonymous reference to his sources that the  
 phrase should conceal the authority of Cluvius Rufus, a consular of many years'  
 standing, who was in Rome during that summer (Nero 21, 2). Whether this last  
 inference is valid or not, there is evidence that a writer who used Greek held  
 Nero responsible for the Fire.

Pliny's attitude to the question is hardly revealed by his extant work.  
 Despite his constant interest in the buildings of Rome, there is only one passage  
 which appears to blame Nero for the Fire. This runs, in our texts of 17, 5:  
*... duraverunt . . . ad Neronis principis incendia, quibus cremavit urbem*  
*annis postea cultu virides iuvenesque, ni princeps ille adcelerasset etiam arborum*  
*mortem.* Here the actual accusation, *quibus cremavit urbem annis postea* is not  
 found in the MS D, and is properly rejected by DETLEFSEN as a gloss; and the  
 final part of the sentence is at least suspect, as involving an awkward repetition  
 of the word *princeps* and an unexplained reference, as it appears, to the death  
 of persons unspecified anywhere in the context. It is at least likely that these  
 words are a later addition, whether by a later hand or by Pliny himself, desiring  
 to adapt his passing reference to the Fire to a view which had become widespread  
 probably after Josephus made his list of Nero's major crimes in B. J. 2, 13, 1,  
 written about 75. For such later revisions of Pliny, see CIACERI, p. 405. Cert-  
 ainly one cannot argue on the basis of this passage that Pliny's history con-  
 tained the charge of deliberate incendiaryism.

But we possess evidence concerning the alternative view of the Fire. In  
 Dio 43, 1 (and similarly in Dio 63, 27, 2) we learn that in his final panic Nero



*creditur destinasse urbem incendere feris in populum immissis*. This story contains no apparent relationship to the earlier Fire of 64; and that it was not intended merely to portray Nero as going one better than his supposed earlier arson. The same city is shown by Victor, *Caes.* 5, 13 (a passage containing matter which cannot be derived from Suetonius himself, but must be from a common source, which asserts this same intention to set fire to Rome in 68, while now mentioning the actual fire of 64. However incompetent a historian Victor was, it is inconceivable that he should have omitted the really serious charge and retained this vague statement of an unfulfilled intention if both were found in his source. It is thus clear that Suetonius used two different sources: one which explicitly blamed Nero for the great Fire, while the other regarded this as accidental, but accused the emperor of a plan to burn the city in 68. Further, the account of the latter is found firmly imbedded in the continuous narrative of the fall of Nero (40, 4—45), in which no Greek occurs but there is a Greek pasquinade translated into Latin. Everything combines to show that the former source was Cluvius, the latter Pliny.

Now to return to the Greek verse with which Suetonius' account of the Fire begins: there is some evidence that Cluvius, in relating this story about Nero, has appropriated the main idea from another context. The verse *ἔμοῦ θανόντος* is attributed by Dio 68, 23, 4 to Tiberius, with the further statement that he often counted Priam blessed because he was utterly destroyed together with his country and his kingship. Exactly the same sentiment, with the appropriate change to «he saw his country destroyed . . .» is attributed by Dio 62, 16, 1 to Nero, with the words *καὶ αὐτός*, as if Dio was aware of the repetition; but he does not this time give the verse. In Suetonius' version of the former context in *Tib.* 62, 3 we have *namque identidem Priamum felicem vocabat, quod superstitum omnium suorum exstitisset*, with no verse; while in *Nero* 38, 1, where the verse is given, there is no reference to Priam. It is clear that the sources used by both Suetonius and Dio made use of the same item, with both verse and reference to Priam, for both emperors similarly. Apart from the use of Greek, it is most unlikely that Pliny, who was consciously writing a continuation of the history of the earlier Julio-Claudians, would have been guilty of this transference. Cluvius, on the other hand, was writing without regard to predecessors; and it is easy to see how, recognising the extreme appropriateness to Nero of the story earlier told of Tiberius, he transferred it to his own account of the Fire of 64 where it fitted in excellently with Nero's known interest in Troy and composition of a *Halosis Ilii*. Thus Dio, reading the sources for Tiberius, copied the story down complete; but later, finding it in Cluvius' account of Nero, he dropped the verse, retaining the Priam-anecdote as an integral part of the circumstantial detail and apologizing for the repetition with the words *καὶ αὐτός*, which have caused such perplexity to editors of the text. Suetonius, on the other hand, who is known to have started making notes for his later Lives while

still working on the earlier (cf. his use of *down to Caligula*), noticed the duplication of the two contexts.

The same thing evidently occurred in the case of the Greek phrase *περιτελλομένων ἐναντῶν Ῥωμαίων* ἐπιπέσειν, which, with some additional words, is found in Dio 57, 18, 1. Suetonius himself observes, there was nothing part of the same lines again in 62, 18, 3, in a context which is for the Fire, together with another (Cicero) *μητρόκοτος ἡγεμονεύσει*, which is probably actually saw the extinction of the Julio-Claudians, much to the point, and the oracle is certainly a good one for a historian to quote it twice; but for a hostile account of the Fire, it was worth quoting.

In the same way it is likely that Cluvius' account of the strange detail in *Suet. Cal.* 37, 1, which is found in the later chroniclers, is linked with the equally odd item *piscat Junibus nexis*, as in *Nero* 30, 3. So they appear in *an.* 61, while Eutropius 7, 14 attempts to refer to it by *exemplo C. Caesaris*; though Victor, still in the reign of Nero, has no trace of the item. In these passages we have a detail which is perhaps odd that Cluvius, who was writing during the reign at least, should have used a detail from a source which was an emperor for his own account of Nero; but it is similar to the examples we have already seen. The same process of borrowing might be seen in the night cabinet-meeting ending in a music-hall scene in *an.* 5, 5 and in *Nero* 41, 2, Dio 63, 26, 4; although the latter is to be in continuous narrative derived from a source.

There is one anecdote in our authorities which is not in our issues. In *Gal.* 4, 1 Suetonius gives two versions of the story: *constat Augustum puero adhuc salutanti dixisse, Καὶ σύ, τέκνον, τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡμῶν παύσειν, si non fueris imperatorum eum, verum in senecta, si fueris imperatorum eum, pertinet. Tac. Ann.* 6, 20, 3, under the year 31, says: *Tiberii de Servio Galba tum consule; quem postremo Graecis verbis in hanc sententiam temptatum postremo Graecis verbis in hanc sententiam quandoque degustabis imperium, seram ac in senecta, si fueris imperatorum eum, pertinet. Tac. Ann.* 19, 4 gives a similar account under the year 31, the occasion was Galba's betrothal, the Greek

in *populum immissis*. This story contains the Fire of 64; and that it was not intended earlier than his supposed earlier arson of 5, 13 (a passage containing matter which is self, but must be from a common source), set fire to Rome in 68, while nowhere ever incompetent a historian Victor was, he omitted the really serious charge and fulfilled intention if both were found in Suetonius used two different sources: one of the Fire of 64, while the other regarded this as a plan to burn the city in 68. Further, the story is imbedded in the continuous narrative which no Greek occurs but there is a Greek which anything combines to show that the former

with which Suetonius' account of the Fire of 64, Cluvius, in relating this story about Nero, in another context. The verse *ἔμοῦ θανόντος...* is attributed by Dio 62, 16, 1 to Cluvius, with the further statement that the city was utterly destroyed together with his house. The same sentiment, with the appropriate reference to the Fire of 64, is attributed by Dio 62, 16, 1 to Cluvius, who was aware of the repetition; but he does not mention Suetonius' version of the former context in *Priamum felicem vocabat, quod superstes* was; while in Nero 38, 1, where the verse

It is clear that the sources used by both Suetonius and Cluvius, with both verse and reference to the Fire of 64, part from the use of Greek, it is most likely that Suetonius was writing a continuation of the history which he had been guilty of this transference without regard to predecessors; and it is the inappropriateness to Nero of the story which he copied into his own account of the Fire of 64, and Suetonius' known interest in Troy and composing the sources for Tiberius, copied the story into Cluvius' account of Nero, he included the anecdote as an integral part of the circle of the repetition with the words *καὶ αὐτός*. The editors of the text. Suetonius, on the other hand, was making notes for his later Lives while

still working on the earlier (cf. his use of Augustus' correspondence for the Lives down to Caligula), noticed the duplication in time to divide the material between the two contexts.

The same thing evidently occurred over the oracle *τρὶς δὲ τριηκοσίων περὶ τελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν Ῥωμαίους ἔμφυλος ὀλεῖ στάσις*. This, with a few additional words, is found in Dio 57, 18, 5 in the year 19 A. D., when, as Dio himself observes, there was nothing particularly appropriate about it. He gives the same lines again in 62, 18, 3, in a context where Nero is being openly blamed for the Fire, together with another Greek hexameter, *ἔσχατος Αἰνεαδῶν ἀπρόοπτος ἡγεμονεύσει*, which is presumably the work of someone who actually saw the extinction of the Julio-Claudians. The 900 years are still not much to the point, and the oracle is certainly not good enough for any single historian to quote it twice; but for Cluvius, still requiring details for his hostile account of the Fire, it was worth borrowing from an earlier source on Tiberius.

In the same way it is likely that Cluvius was responsible for the duplication of the strange detail in Suet. Cal. 37, 1 *ut calidis frigidisque unguentis lavaretur*, which is found in the later chroniclers among the excesses of Nero, always linked with the equally odd item *piscatus est rete aurato et purpura coccoque fimbriis nexis*, as in Nero 30, 3. So they appear in Orosius 7, 7, 3, Jerome Chron. an. 61, while Eutropius 7, 14 attempts to reconcile the confusion with the words *exemplo C. Caesaris*; though Victor, still apparently following Pliny, has no trace of the item. In these passages we have not the clue of Greek to help us, and it is perhaps odd that Cluvius, who certainly dealt with part of Caligula's reign at least, should have used a detail from one of the other historians on that emperor for his own account of Nero; but the displacement of material is so similar to the examples we have already considered that he is the most likely culprit. The same process of borrowing may account for the duplication of the night cabinet-meeting ending in a music-hall performance in Cal. 54, 2, Dio 59, 5, 5 and in Nero 41, 2, Dio 63, 26, 4; although the latter pair of passages appears to be in continuous narrative derived from Pliny.

There is one anecdote in our authorities which involves more complicated issues. In Gal. 4, 1 Suetonius gives two versions of a single story about Galba: *constat Augustum puero adhuc salutanti se inter aequales apprehensa buccula dixisse, Καὶ σὺ, τέκνον, τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡμῶν παρατρέψῃ; sed et Tiberius, cum comperisset imperaturum eum, verum in senecta, Vivat sane, ait, quando id ad nos nihil fertinet. Tac. Ann. 6, 20, 3, under the year 33 A.D., has: non omiserim praesagium Tiberii de Servio Galba tum consule; quem accitum et diversis sermonibus percontatum postremo Graecis verbis in hanc sententiam adlocutus est: Et tu, Galba, quandoque degustabis imperium, seram ac brevem potentiam significans. Dio 57, 16, 4 gives a similar account under the year 20, with the added detail that the occasion was Galba's betrothal, the Greek words being given less vividly as*

καὶ σὺ ποτε τῆς ἡγεμονίας γεύσῃ, and the explanation for Tiberius' lack of concern, »because he was going to rule in old age and after his own death. Finally Josephus Ant. 18, 217, in illustration of Tiberius' interest in horoscopes, relates the same story of Tiberius, with no circumstantial details or quotation of actual words.

There are clearly serious inconsistencies between the versions of the story. One, however, can be removed at once. Tacitus, wishing to insert the story early in the Annals in order to prepare for the accession of Galba at the end of the work, has simply chosen to place it in the year in which Galba has first been mentioned, because he was then consul. He does not state specifically, and must not be held to imply, that the incident took place in 33; while his phrase *omiserim* is a clear indication that he had inserted the story from an extraneous source (one which there is reason to suspect, as will be seen, he did not begin to use until he had written the first few books of the Annals). In fact such a story could not have occurred in the main sources for Tiberius' reign, Aufidius Bassus, Servilius Nonianus and the elder Seneca, none of whom lived to see Galba emperor.

With this confusion cleared away, it is possible to distinguish two different versions of the story. The first of these concerns Augustus, during Galba's boyhood (he was about seventeen when Augustus died), and gives the words in the idiomatic Greek recorded by Suetonius; the second concerns Tiberius, on the occasion of Galba's betrothal, with the words in Latin (from which Dio's commonplace Greek appears to be a translation), and sets the story on the context of Tiberius' interest in horoscopes, as it occurs in Josephus, Tacitus and Dio. Neither of these versions can well have come into existence before 68; yet both were incorporated in sources used by Suetonius. Neither occurs in Plutarch, who has no section on portents in either *Galba* or *Otho*.

Given two such sources, Suetonius' treatment presents no difficulties. Finding them both, he has preferred the former for its lively Greek, which bears all the marks of *ipsissima verba*; but also quotes the latter, as fitting much more credibly into the chronological scheme and Tiberius' known interest in astrology, and as containing Tiberius' further comment. Similarly Tacitus, either having noted down the story while working on Galba for the Histories or finding it in a source for Tiberius, introduces it in the year of Galba's consulate, though whether the very close translation into Latin of what were evidently the same Greek words as Suetonius attributes to Augustus is Tacitus' own work or someone else's, is not at first sight apparent. Dio's account is much more puzzling. With the two key words of Suetonius' Greek changed into more ordinary language, he is surely working from a version with the remark already in Latin; but, if we suppose this version to be Pliny's, as is the most obvious explanation, there is the problem of how Dio came to insert the anecdote as early as the year 20. Even if he knew that Galba's betrothal fell in that year.

is likely enough if his bride Lepida M. Lepidus who in 21 A.D. was conceived (Ann. 3, 35, 2), he is not likely to have been had completed Tiberius' reign and read indeed preserve a brief reference to the Dio seems to have dealt with his matter resulted in serious duplications.

An examination of the contexts of the anecdotes reveals a clue which may suggest and the other passages containing Greek in literary form, and how the displacement

In Aug. 98, 4 Suetonius reports the e *Thrasyllum Tiberi comitem contra accul felicem Priamum vocabat*, his plan to murder by the cunning of Thrasyllus *ut aiunt*; and Thrasyllus, including the story related: a prophecy of Tiberius' principate, follows: This passage in Tacitus leads on, by way of reference to the prophecy of Thrasyllus' so that it contains in fact the prophecies cribed under the year 33, when none of the three contexts show signs of Greek in the verses given by Suetonius; the second is the parallel passage in Dio (58, 25, 3); the Galba in Greek, as stated by Tacitus and

From this it can be inferred that there in Tiberius' reign, in all of which Thrasyllus of which Greek was quoted in the original shows that this source must have been written at the death of Nero.

These clues all point directly to a 1 ex-prefect of Egypt Tiberius Claudius B son of Thrasyllus, carried on his father's to be patronised by Vespasian, was described *lectus in omni literarum genere rarissimus* while his descendents attained sufficient Hadrian at least to ensure that his work perish before most of our authorities have generally CICHORIUS, Röm. Stud. (1922) d'Hist. (1928—9) p. 33, KROLL in P-W stemma, SHERWIN WHITE in Pap. Brit. in Bull. dell'Inst. d'Arch. Or. 49, (1950)

and the explanation for Tiberius' lack of rule in old age and after his own death. Illustration of Tiberius' interest in horoscopes, with no circumstantial details or quotation of

sistencies between the versions of the story. Once. Tacitus, wishing to insert the story before the accession of Galba at the end of the year in which Galba has first been consul. He does not state specifically, and must have meant that the event took place in 33; while his phrase *non* he had inserted the story from an extraneous source to suspect, as will be seen, he did not begin with the few books of the Annals). In fact such a story is a main source for Tiberius' reign, Aufidius and the elder Seneca, none of whom lived to see

it, it is possible to distinguish two different versions of these concerns Augustus, during Galba's reign (when Augustus died), and gives the words in Suetonius; the second concerns Tiberius, on which the words in Latin (from which Dio's translation), and sets the story on the confines, as it occurs in Josephus, Tacitus and Dio. All have come into existence before 68; yet the story used by Suetonius. Neither occurs in Pliny's *Galba* or *Otho*.

Suetonius' treatment presents no difficulties. The former for its lively Greek, which bears Dio also quotes the latter, as fitting much more the reign and Tiberius' known interest in astrology rather comment. Similarly Tacitus, either working on Galba for the *Histories* or introduces it in the year of Galba's consulate; translation into Latin of what were evidently the sources to Augustus is Tacitus' own work or is apparent. Dio's account is much more of Suetonius' Greek changed into more Greek from a version with the remark already mentioned to be Pliny's, as is the most obvious reason now Dio came to insert the anecdote as that Galba's betrothal fell in that year.

is likely enough if his bride Lepida (Gal. 5, 1) was the daughter of the M. Lepidus who in 21 A.D. was concerned about his *nubilem filiam* (Tac. Ann. 3, 35, 2), he is not likely to have been aware of the prophecy at all until he had completed Tiberius' reign and reached 64, 1, 1, where the epitome does indeed preserve a brief reference to the same story. As we have observed, Dio seems to have dealt with his material as he came to it, even when this resulted in serious duplications.

An examination of the contexts of this story and of certain other related anecdotes reveals a clue which may suggest how the prophecy concerning Galba and the other passages containing Greek in the reign of Tiberius first came into literary form, and how the displacements and duplications came about.

In Aug. 98, 4 Suetonius reports the exchange of two Greek trimeters with *Thrasyllum Tiberi comitem contra accubantem*; in Tib. 62, 3, where Tiberius *elicem Priamum vocabat*, his plan to murder Caligula and Gemellus is thwarted by the cunning of Thrasyllus *ut aiunt*; and in Tac. Ann. 6, 21 a long section on Thrasyllus, including the story related also in Suet. Tib. 14, 4 of Thrasyllus' prophecy of Tiberius' principate, follows immediately on the story about Galba. This passage in Tacitus leads on, by way of a digression on determinism, to a reference to the prophecy of Thrasyllus' son concerning the principate of Nero; so that it contains in fact the prophecies of three separate principates, all described under the year 33, when none of them were in any way in question. All three contexts show signs of Greek in the source: the first containing the Greek verses given by Suetonius; the second having the Greek *ἐμοῦ θανάτος* . . . in the parallel passage in Dio (58, 25, 3); the third having the emperor's words to Galba in Greek, as stated by Tacitus and quoted by Suetonius.

From this it can be inferred that there was a source covering certain events in Tiberius' reign, in all of which Thrasyllus played a prominent part, and in all of which Greek was quoted in the original. Moreover, the third of the passages shows that this source must have been written, or at least completed, after the death of Nero.

These clues all point directly to a known writer of the Flavian age: the ex-prefect of Egypt Tiberius Claudius Balbillus, who was almost certainly the son of Thrasyllus, carried on his father's profession as court astrologer, lived to be patronised by Vespasian, was described by Seneca (N. Q. 4, 2, 13) as *perfectus in omni literarum genere rarissime* and quoted by Pliny (n. h. 19, 3); while his descendants attained sufficient distinction down to the reign of Hadrian at least to ensure that his works would not have been allowed to perish before most of our authorities had the chance to make use of them (see generally CICHORIUS, *Röm. Stud.* (1922) p. 392, CUMONT in *Mél. d'Arch. et d'Hist.* (1928—9) p. 33, KROLL in *P-W. Suppl. Band v* (1931) 59—60, with *Lemma*, SHERWIN WHITE in *Pap. Brit. Sch. Rome* (1939) p. 21, n. 68, SCHWARZ in *Bull. dell'Inst. d'Arch. Or.* 49, (1950) pp. 45—55, MAGIE, *Roman Rule in*

Asia Minor (1950), pp. 1398—1400). We have no direct knowledge of any of his writings except the purely astrological works addressed to Seneca's friend Hermogenes (Catal. Cod. Astrol. Graec VIII 3, p. 103), in which he explains the method of calculating a man's future and particularly the importance of certain heavenly bodies as threatening death (cf. Suet. Nero 36, 1); but Seneca's words indicate that he wrote on a variety of topics, and the sort of semi-historical work hinted at in our sources, on the influence of astrology and other predictions on the imperial succession, with special reference to the successes of Thrasyllus and of Balbillus himself, would be well within his known field of interests. PETER goes so far as to give him an entry in *Hist. Rom. Frag.* (pp. 304—5), on the strength of Seneca's quotation about dolphins and crocodiles in Egypt; but there is no reason to class him as a historian proper (cf. CHARLES WORTH in *C. A. H. X.* p. 869). Certainly he is not cited by name by any of our historians; but it should be remembered that Dio names no sources whatsoever for this period; Suetonius names none later than the death of Tiberius, although he indicates the use of variants by such phrases as *constat, ut aiunt*, etc., while Tacitus, who apparently follows Pliny throughout all the later books of the *Annals*, names him twice only, with two mentions of Cluvius Rufus and three of Fabius Rusticus. For the reign of Tiberius, no sources are acknowledged at all, apart from one reference to Pliny's German Wars in *Tac. Ann.* 69, 3, one to Agrippina *ib.* 4, 53, 3, and one to Seneca in *Suet. Tib.* 73, 2. Yet it is fairly certain that considerable use must have been made of Aufidius Bassus and Servilius Nonianus, the latter of whom gets no nearer an acknowledgement than the phrase *vir consularis* in *Suet. Tib.* 61, 6. It is noticeable, however, that the historians make a point of referring to their main authorities if they occur in the history of the period in their own right; as Suetonius (*Nero* 21, 2), Dio (63, 14, 3) and Tacitus (seven times in the *Histories*) refer to Cluvius Rufus whose part in events was hardly significant. This may account for the rather unnecessary references to Balbillus in *Tac. Ann.* 13, 22, 1 and *Suet. Nero* 36, 1 (the latter normally introduces prophecies of this sort with vague reference to *multi*, *ib.* 6, 1, *mathematici*, *ib.* 40, 2). In default of any specific testimony, the acceptance of Balbillus as the source in question must remain conjectural; but some such writer there must have been to account for the observed phenomena in our historians, and the name Balbillus may serve to represent him.

Such a work as we have described, whether mainly in Latin or in Greek, appearing soon enough after the death of Galba for the Flavian historians to make use of it, will have attracted attention particularly for the audacious claim it made that Thrasyllus had prophesied Galba's accession something like fifty years before (this attention will have been further increased if the author was a distinguished intimate of the emperor and already well-known as an author). It appears to have become established as a standard minor source for the reign of Tiberius.

Cluvius, accordingly, who was not written by Balbillus first the story about the prophecy, deliberately or not, he seems to have misread 'the emperor' as referring to Augustus; and he has added confirmatory details out of his own head to *puero adhuc* and *apprehensa buccina*. At the same time he seems to have borrowed from a Greek source, *τοῖς δὲ τριηκοσίων . . .* and *ἐμοῦ θρόνου* of Nero's reign; whence the former was copied into its proper context, straight from Balbillus in the manner we have observed above.

Pliny, for his part, while narrating the story of Nero's birth, which appears in *Dio* 64, 1, 1, will have translated the chronological reference clear (for the introduction of Otho in *Plut. Gal.* 19, 2, 1, the rest of the material, as falling outside Nero's birth, which he inserted at the beginning of *Dio* 61, 2, 1, and perhaps *Suet. Nero* 36, 1, a passage on Balbillus, probably by way of indicating the fact that Nero's birth is there dated in the reign of Tiberius, as it must have appeared in Balbillus).

Of our extant writers, Tacitus plainly makes use of Balbillus' material about Tiberius' addiction to horoscopes, though Dio traces it to as early as Thrasyllus). In the same context he evidences the use of Balbillus' material about Nero's principate, which he inserts at the end of the book out of sequence (*ib.* 22, 6), with a promise to mention the authors' name, as no doubt he did in the *Annals*, although he held over one detail from the *Annals* on Agrippina's death in 14, 9, 5. The other portions of his work. Tacitus' treatment of this material is in accordance with SYME (*App.* 37, p. 695) that his references to Balbillus in *Ann.* 1, 4, 4; 4, 57, 3 bear the marks of later interpolation. It was taken from a subsidiary source which he had written a large part of the first hexadecateuch. The appearance of Thrasyllus (*ib.* 6, 20, 3, *Dio* 61, 2, 1).

Suetonius appears to have used Balbillus' material to provide the prophecies in *Tib.* 14, 4 and 62, 1, and the prophecy of Augustus' last days in *Aug.* 98, 4, 1. In the case of Thrasyllus, and perhaps the comic lines of the *Annals*, the prophecy he uses simply the sources for Galba's reign. He laid Balbillus aside after completing *Tiberius*.



We have no direct knowledge of any of his logical works addressed to Seneca's friend (Tac. Hist. VIII 3, p. 103), in which he explains the future and particularly the importance of the coming death (cf. Suet. Nero 36, 1); but Seneca's works cover a variety of topics, and the sort of semi-empirical, on the influence of astrology and other sciences, with special reference to the successes of Nero, would be well within his known field of activity. It is not surprising to give him an entry in Hist. Rom. Frag. 100, 1. Seneca's quotation about dolphins and crocodiles would class him as a historian proper (cf. CHARLES-LEWIS). He is not cited by name by any of our sources. It is interesting that Dio names no sources whatsoever for the portents later than the death of Tiberius, although he uses such phrases as *constat, ut aiunt, etc.*; but he follows Pliny throughout all the later books of the Hist. Rom. with two mentions of Cluvius Rufus and the reign of Tiberius, no sources are acknowledged to Pliny's German Wars in Tac. Ann. 1, 1, and one to Seneca in Suet. Tib. 73, 2. Yet it is interesting that it must have been made of Aufidius Bassus and from whom he gets no nearer an acknowledgement than Tib. 61, 6. It is noticeable, however, that the portents refer to their main authorities if they occur on their own right; as Suetonius (Nero 21, 2), Dio (Hist. 57, 15, 7) and the Histories refer to Cluvius Rufus, whose name is significant. This may account for the rather frequent use of his prophecies in Tac. Ann. 13, 22, 1 and Suet. Nero 36, 1. The prophecies of this sort with vague reference to Cluvius Rufus. In default of any specific testimony, the sources in question must remain conjectural; but it is interesting to account for the observed phenomena in the Hist. Rom. Cluvius Rufus may serve to represent him. It is interesting, whether mainly in Latin or in Greek, that the prophecies of Galba for the Flavian historians to attract attention particularly for the audacious prophecies prophesied Galba's accession something like the prophecies of Augustus have been further increased if the author of the Hist. Rom. emperor and already well-known as an established as a standard minor source for

Cluvius, accordingly, who was not writing the history of Tiberius, found in Balbillus first the story about the prophecy of Galba's succession. Whether he deliberately or not, he seems to have misinterpreted a reference to 'Caesar' or 'the emperor' as referring to Augustus; and he is the most likely person to have added confirmatory details out of his own head to fit this version, so as to give rise to *puero adhuc* and *apprehensa buccula* in Suetonius' first version. At the same time he seems to have borrowed from Balbillus the two prophecies in Greek, *τοὺς δὲ τριηκοσίων . . .* and *ἐμοῦ θανάτου . . .*, for use in his own account of Nero's reign; whence the former was copied by Dio (despite his earlier use of it in its proper context, straight from Balbillus), the latter by Suetonius, in the manner we have observed above.

Pliny, for his part, while narrating the portents of Galba's accession as it appears in Dio 64, 1, 1, will have translated Tiberius' words into Latin and made the chronological reference clear (for the position of these portents, cf. the introduction of Otho in Plut. Gal. 19, 2, Tac. Hist. 1, 13, 3). He made no use of the rest of the material, as falling outside his period, except for the details of Nero's birth, which he inserted at the beginning of Nero's reign, as they are found in Dio 61, 2, 1, and perhaps Suet. Nero 6, 1. The dependence of the latter passage on Balbillus, probably by way of Pliny, accounts for the remarkable fact that Nero's birth is there dated in the first place in relation to the death of Tiberius, as it must have appeared in Balbillus' work.

Of our extant writers, Tacitus plainly turns to Balbillus at Ann. 6, 20, 3 for material about Tiberius' addiction to horoscopes not hinted at in the earlier books, though Dio traces it to as early as 16 A.D. (57, 15, 7, with a reference to Thrasyllus). In the same context he evidently found the prophecies of Galba's and Nero's principates, which he inserts at the same point, the latter entirely out of sequence (ib. 22, 6), with a promise to give it in full, presumably with the authors' name, as no doubt he did in the lost book 7, on the birth of Nero; although he held over one detail from the same context (cf. Dio 61, 2, 1) for Agrippina's death in 14, 9, 5. The other prophecies he omits, as below the dignity of his work. Tacitus' treatment of this material ties up with an observation of SYME (App. 37, p. 695) that his references to Tiberius' exile in Rhodes in Ann. 1, 4, 4; 4, 57, 3 bear the marks of later insertion into the context («Perhaps it was taken from a subsidiary source which he did not light upon until he had written a large part of the first hexad»). The Rhodian exile is of course the first appearance of Thrasyllus (ib. 6, 20, 3, Dio 55, 11, 1).

Suetonius appears to have used Balbillus directly for the earlier period, to provide the prophecies in Tib. 14, 4 and 62, 3, as well as the eye-witness details of Augustus' last days in Aug. 98, 4, with the exchange of trimeters with Thrasyllus, and perhaps the comic lines in Greek ib. 99, 1. For the Galba prophecy he uses simply the sources for Galba's principate, presumably having Balbillus and Balbillus aside after completing *Tiberius*. Had he used him directly for the



later anecdote, he would hardly have found difficulty in choosing between the two variants.

Dio probably used Balbillus for the account of Thrasyllus in 55, 11, 1—2, and although he omits the Masgabas-verses of Suet. Aug. 98, 4, perhaps incomprehensible, he refers briefly to the comic lines of ib. 99, 1 in 56, 30, 4. He also probably owes to Balbillus the notice of Galba's *toga virilis* in 56, 21, 1, which is stated to have appeared as a coincidence *τοῖς δὴ ἔπειτα ἀνθρώποις*, and can hardly have been remarked in any work written before 68. He turns to him again for the Greek prophecy in 57, 18, 5; and while consulting him noticed also the prophecy of Galba's accession, which he introduced a little later (57, 19, 4), whether to fit in with the reference to Galba's betrothal which he may have been able to date to the year 20, or as an example of the astrological investigations which he may have found in some other source. What is very odd is that Dio does not use the original Greek of Tiberius' words, as we have it in Suetonius, but a version which can only derive from Pliny's Latin. Since it is inconceivable that Dio would have taken the trouble to look up Pliny (whom he was not to use for several books to come), it can only be supposed that some Byzantine scribe, puzzled by the strange verb *παραιτέω* in Dio's text, glossed in the simpler words *τῆς ἡγεμονίας παραγέσσει* from Dio's second mention of the incident at the beginning of Galba's reign (64, 1, 1) where it is clearly translated from Pliny's Latin version of the same context. This will explain why the perfectly simple word *ἀρχῆς* has also been changed if the whole phrase from the later passage was glossed into the text of the former (for a similar explanatory gloss by Xiphilinus, cf. 69, 18, 1). Finally Dio referred to Balbillus for information on the last part of the reign, with the *ἐμοῦ θανάτου* passage (58, 23, 4), and, shortly after, the passage linking the deaths of Thrasyllus and Tiberius (ib. 27—8) and giving considerable prominence to Thrasyllus' clever handling of the emperor. Some of the same material, though in an abbreviated form, was also obtained from Balbillus by Josephus.

A further point which may be explained by the use of Balbillus is the displacement of the appearance of the phoenix in Tac. Ann. 6, 28, 1. This appears in Dio 58, 27, 1 under the year 36, joined with the fire on the Aventine which Tac. ib. 45, 1 places in the same year, as one of the portents of Tiberius' death which Thrasyllus so shrewdly misinterpreted. This date for the phoenix is confirmed by Pliny N. H. 10, 5, on the authority of Cornelius Valerianus. Tacitus, however, distinctly dates the phoenix to 34, introducing its appearance with the names of the consuls; and, while he evidently welcomed any item to relieve the account of prosecutions which otherwise occupies that year (Ann. 6, 29—30), it is hard to suppose that he would have transferred it blatantly from 36, if he had found it clearly dated in the main annalistic record. Clearly the main historians did not mention this questionable event, which was vouched for only by writers familiar with Egypt; and Tacitus, while

extracting from Balbillus the material in detail in the same source, without any explanation of the displacement).

There may be many other incidents in the use of Greek in our extant writers and signs of incorporation into the main text from a subsidiary source. This discussion aims to characterise a number of passages and attribute their origin to Cluvius Rufus or the writer whom we have identified with Balbillus, the contribution of Fabius Rusticus, of whom except that he favoured Seneca and was present at his histories. It appears, however, that the passages which have been examined fall into a clearly characterised group. One possible exception is the *καὶ λάσεται*; but this exhibits such hostile evidence of Tac. Ann. 14, 2, it is to be attributed to Fabius, who tended to support her.

But what has been inferred concerning the use of Balbillus suffices to indicate the shortcomings which have been pointed out by writers of the next generation. Pliny, nephew says (Ep. 5, 8, 5), appears not to have been scrupulous in his use of material (as we know from the fact that he had been rendered obsolete almost before he was born) to take a savage enough line about Nero and to see in him a public servant embittered by the misdeeds of his master (SYMÉ, pp. 292—3). It is more likely that the use of Balbillus in n. h. were a concession to the atmosphere of the time, or a date after the composition of the *Historiae*. Tacitus was anxious to live down his unfortunate recollections of the emperor, and was obviously misappropriating material from other sources to support his bogus circumstantial evidence to an ancient experience.

Tacitus describes the Julio-Claudian period as *Tiberii Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res quam occiderant recentibus odiis compositas*. Tacitus already accepts as a common literary topos *Neroni falsus adstruit scriptor* (3, 20, 4, with *adstruit* rather than in BUECHELER's, of some date about 93 Josephus might almost be desc

und difficulty in choosing between the account of Thrasyllus in 55, 11, 1-2; verses of Suet. Aug. 98. 4, perhaps as the comic lines of ib. 99, 1 in 56, 30, 4. He notices of Galba's *toga virilis* in 56, 29, 5, coincidence *τοῖς δὴ ἔπειτα ἀνθρώποις*, any work written before 68. He turned 1 57, 18, 5; and while consulting him, accession, which he introduced a little the reference to Galba's betrothal which year 20, or as an example of the astro- re found in some other source. What is original Greek of Tiberius' words, as we ch can only derive from Pliny's Latin. ld have taken the trouble to look up veral books to come), it can only be puzzled by the strange verb *παρὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν παραγέυσεται* from the beginning of Galba's reign (64, 1, 1), y's Latin version of the same context. ole word *ἀρχῆς* has also been changed, sage was glossed into the text of the y Xiphilinus, cf. 69, 18, 1). Finally Dio 1 the last part of the reign, with the shortly after, the passage linking the -8) and giving considerable prominence emperor. Some of the same material, obtained from Balbillus by Josephus. ined by the use of Balbillus is the dis- nix in Tac. Ann. 6, 28, 1. This appears d with the fire on the Aventine which one of the portents of Tiberius' death preted. This date for the phoenix is e authority of Cornelius Valerianus. enix to 34, introducing its appearance hile he evidently welcomed any item which otherwise occupies that year at he would have transferred it bla- y dated in the main annalistic record. ention this questionable event, which iliar with Egypt; and Tacitus, while

extracting from Balbillus the material used in 6, 20, 3-22, 6, noticed the detail in the same source, without any precise indication of the year, and so introduced it at the first convenient point (SYME, pp. 472, 771-4, offers no explanation of the displacement).

There may be many other incidents in our authorities which still reveal the signs of incorporation into the main tradition of historical writing from a subsidiary source. This discussion aims merely to work out the implications of the use of Greek in our extant writers and to recognise certain features which characterise a number of passages and enable us with some confidence to attribute their origin to Cluvius Rufus or Pliny, and with some hesitation to a writer whom we have identified with Balbillus. No light has been thrown upon the contribution of Fabius Rusticus, of whom we still know virtually nothing except that he favoured Seneca and was prepared to falsify history for partisan reasons. In particular, we are not aware whether he would have admitted Greek into his histories. It appears, however, that the passages of Greek which we have examined fall into a clearly characterized group, which is to be attributed to Cluvius. One possible exception is the anecdote in Cl. 43 containing *ὁ τρώσας αὐτὴν ἴσεται*; but this exhibits such hostility to Agrippina that again, on the evidence of Tac. Ann. 14, 2, it is to be attributed rather to Cluvius than to Fabius, who tended to support her.

But what has been inferred concerning two of the main Flavian historians suffices to indicate the shortcomings which led to their complete supersession by writers of the next generation. Pliny, though writing *religiosissime*, as his nephew says (Ep. 5, 8, 5), appears not merely to have been prolix and indiscriminate in his use of material (as we knew already from Tacitus), but to have been rendered obsolete almost before he completed his Histories by his failure to take a savage enough line about Nero and his predecessors. There is no need to see in him a public servant embittered by lack of promotion under Nero (so SYME, pp. 292-3). It is more likely that such hostile expressions as are found in his h. were a concession to the atmosphere in Rome as Pliny found it as a date after the composition of the Histories. Cluvius, on the other hand, perhaps anxious to live down his unfortunate record under Nero, appears as unscrupulously misappropriating material from one emperor to another, in order to add bogus circumstantial evidence to an account ostensibly based on his own experience.

Tacitus describes the Julio-Claudian historians as dishonest in two ways: *liberum Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae postulatione occiderant recentibus odiis compositae sunt* (Ann. 1, 1, 5). About the year 87 Tacitus already accepts as a common literary activity the composition of *quae Neroni falsus adstruit scriptor* (3, 20, 4, which is surely to be taken in this sense, rather than in BUECHELER's, of some poetical Neronian apocrypha); and about 93 Josephus might almost be describing Pliny and Cluvius as, on the one

hand, »those who, as a result of being well-treated by Nero, neglected to tell the truth«, and, on the other, »those who, from sheer hatred, behaved so outrageously with their falsehoods that they deserve severe criticism« (Ant. 20, 154). But when he goes on to complain that they falsified the history even of emperors who lived before their own time, he must be referring to Fabius Rusticus; since both Cluvius and Pliny were grown up during the reigns they are known to have described, and Plutarch evidently followed Pliny. Whether indeed Pliny was really favourable towards Nero or merely appeared so by contrast to Cluvius and Fabius, we cannot tell. But by the beginning of the second century the time was clearly ripe for Tacitus to produce the definitive account of the period, combining the solid factual framework of Pliny with the more generally accepted embellishments of the others; and for Suetonius to make his own more ingenuous and erratic selection from the same sources<sup>1</sup>. After this, the first generation of writers on Claudius and Nero had no appeal except to such professional historians as Cassius Dio.

Liverpool

G. B. TOWNEND

<sup>1</sup> See however S. H. A. Prob. 2.7, where Tacitus, with Sallust, Livy and Trogus, is compared unfavourably with Suetonius and others, for writing *non tam diserte quam vere*.

MISZE

KRITISCHES ZUM H

(Hom. 17, 1; 20, 1;

1. Callim. hymn. 1, 91 ff. ist so überl

Χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίδη παννύχ  
δῶτορ ἀπημονίης. τεὰ δ' ἔργ'  
οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κει

Der Optativ fut. mit der Modalpartikel A. 2) noch nicht ganz ausgeschlossen, wird mehr erwähnt. ἀείσει schreibt der Hypothesis ebenso IANOS LASKARIS in der Editio princeps, DER und HOWALD-STAIGER<sup>1</sup> folgen STEPHAN WILAMOWITZ. PFEIFFER schließlich nimmt wieder auf unter Berufung auf den Index

Die Unsicherheit der Textherstellung durch die Uneinigkeit der Editoren anschaulich spielend ein paläographisches Argument, die bisherige Lesart und Sigma in der Minuskel, zugunsten der Delta-Lesart in meiner Studie über die Hss von IANOS LASKARIS in solchen Verwechslung nachgewiesen: 1. Die Lesart des verlorenen Archetypus<sup>4</sup> ε ( = Vallicell. F 20, etwa 1460), IOANNES LASKARIS verlesen, S. 159, 11 P. die Korruptel δευσιγενῶν zu dem unsinnigen δημάτων (S. 159, 11 P. die Korruptel δευσιγενῶν) zu dem unsinnigen δημάτων (S. 159, 11 P. die Korruptel δευσιγενῶν) lichkeit nach schon im Archetypus ἀβύσσου nahm getreu IOANNES SKUTARIOTES, wie er in der andern direkten Kopie, Marc. gr. 241, verbessert zu ἀβύσσου (S. 94, 169). Die g-Lesart findet sich in den Orphischen Argonauten (2. Hälfte des 15. Jh.) δῆμα statt σῆμα. Die Verlesung der Vorlage vor, d. h. eine so

<sup>1</sup> Die Dichtungen des Kallimachos. Griech.

<sup>2</sup> L. ROUSSEL, Callimaque, Hymne à Zeus.

<sup>3</sup> Die Hss, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen der Orphischen Argonauten (Texte u. Unters. z. Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit.).

<sup>4</sup> Er gehörte der Zeit der jungen Minuskel an.