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INTRODUCTION

Velleius Paterculus published his history of Rome in A.D. 30, the seventeenth year of the principate of Tiberius, fourteen years after the death of Livy, and one year before the publication by Valerius Maximus of his Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, a collection of anecdotes for the use of orators. Velleius is not, and does not deserve to be, ranked among the great Roman historians. Not primarily a literary man, he took up writing only after a long career as a soldier, most of which was spent under the command of Tiberius. His history, nonetheless, indicates that he must have received the customary education in the schools of rhetoric. Further, it is the only surviving representative of the genre from the time of Tiberius and as such has some interest for us.

The purpose of this dissertation, therefore, is to study the history of Velleius Paterculus with a view to illuminating the influence on him of rhetoric, in particular of the rhetorical exemplum, and with a view to suggesting that he was also influenced by biographical materials as
determined by the overall composition of the history, the point of view behind it, and the attitude taken toward the personalities which appear in the history.

In pursuing this goal, I shall discuss first, and as a preface to the body of the paper, the attitude of the early principate toward freedom of expression and its effect on the historicity of Velleius, as well as the effect of Velleius' life, career, and family background. In the body of the paper, I shall be concerned with the extent to which Velleius made use of the rhetorical exemplum and with similarities between his version and others, e.g. those of Valerius and Livy. In the following section, I shall discuss the biographical aspects of the history, giving as an introduction a brief survey of Roman biography, and discuss in some detail the moral judgments which Velleius makes on the individuals which appear in his work.

In the conclusion, I shall attempt to draw together the various elements treated in the body of the text by briefly discussing the possible sources in terms of the material under discussion, and the relative importance of the rhetorical and biographical elements to the overall character of the work.
CHAPTER I

THE ATTITUDE OF THE EARLY PRINCIPATE

TOWARD FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

One of the striking aspects of the history of Velleius is the highly favorable attitude which he takes toward Tiberius Caesar. This stance may be explained to some extent by the fact that Velleius served for many years as a soldier under the command of Tiberius and evidently conceived a genuine admiration for him. Nonetheless, a partial explanation must be sought in the attitude toward freedom of expression which prevailed in the early years of the principate and especially in the government of Tiberius. This attitude is most evident in criminal prosecutions brought against individuals, in the majority of which the treason laws seem to have been the procedural vehicle. Tacitus, in his treatment of the principate of Tiberius, discusses the use of the treason laws and mentions several cases in which accusations were brought under those laws for violations involving the written or spoken word. A brief survey of these cases, together with pertinent cases
from the principate of Augustus, will be useful in tracing
the development of the attitude of the early principate
toward freedom of expression and in determining the attitude
which prevailed when Velleius wrote his history.

F. B. Marsh furnishes us with a suitable starting point:

Under the republic the technical term for treason
was 'diminishing the majesty of the Roman people.'
Many attempts had been made to define the meaning
of this somewhat vague phrase, with the general
result that to incite mutiny in the army or to
bring the constituted authorities into contempt was
treason equally with the overt bearing of arms
against the state. Thus slander of the magistrates
might come within the law if the purpose was se­
ditious. With the establishment of the empire no
outward change was made, but, since the emperor was
now the highest magistrate, the law could easily be
invoked to protect him from vilification and abuse.
Augustus, feeling secure in his position, refrained
from so employing it, and treated those who ridiculed
or defamed him with contemptuous indulgence.¹

The fates of two orator-historians who lived in the
time of Augustus are indicative of the attitude which the
princeps took toward offensive expression. Titus Labienus
and Cassius Severus were both active in public life and
both spoke their opinions openly. Both incurred the anger
of Augustus, and, as a result, one died a premature death
while the other suffered exile.

Seneca Rhetor is our principal source for Labienus:
Libertas tanta, ut libertatis nomen excederet et, quia passim ordines hominesque laniabat, Rabies vocaretur. Animus inter vitia ingens et ad similitudinem ingeni sui violentus, qui Pompeianos spiritus nondum in tanta pace posuisset. In hoc primum excogitata est nova poena: effectum est enim per inimicos ut omnes eius libri comburerentur: res nova et inusitata supplicium de studiosis sumi.  

_Libertas_, frankness and outspokenness, was the cause of Labienus' misfortune; he must have possessed this quality to a high degree, for elsewhere Seneca says:

Memini aliquando cum recitaret historiam, magnam partem illum libri convoluisse et dixisse: haec quae transeo post mortem meam legentur. Quanta in illis libertas fuit quam etiam Labienus extimuit?

The bookburning, which could not have taken place without the knowledge and approval of Augustus, was a disgrace which Labienus could not bear. He had himself shut up in a family tomb and thus committed suicide. "Non finivit tantum se ipse, sed etiam se pelivit."

Seneca makes clear that Labienus was a Pompeian, but the reason for his misfortune lay more in his outspoken frankness. No evidence is given of slanderous statements made against the princeps, but he earned the nickname _Rabies_ for his attacks against his fellow citizens. His contemporary, Cassius Severus, was guilty of the same offense, as Tacitus indicates:

... primus Augustus cognitionem de famosis libellis, specie legis ejus, tractavit, commotus
Again, it was a case of an outspoken man making attacks, not on the princeps, but upon distinguished men and women of his time. By a decree of the Senate, and doubtless with the consent of Augustus, he was banished to the island of Crete. Ten years later, in the principate of Tiberius, he was still provoking hostility and as a result was formally stripped of his property and citizenship and exiled to the island of Seriphus.

In these two cases Augustus demonstrated his desire to protect not so much himself as the leading members of the Senate from slander and thus to uphold their dignity. He was not worried by Labienus' Pompeian tendencies, for he respected the Pompeian historian Livy. Nor was he disturbed by harmless attacks against himself. But in order to maintain a good relationship with the Senate, he had to protect its members from ill-conceived attacks. Such was the reason for the measures taken against Labienus and Severus.

Not long after the exile of Severus, Augustus was succeeded by Tiberius, but no substantive change seems to have been made in the official attitude toward slander and libel. It is clear from the cases of which we have
knowledge that Tiberius went to great lengths to prevent prosecution on the grounds of libel of himself or his family.\textsuperscript{10} Except for the case of Titius Sabinus in A.D. 28, all cases were ones in which Tiberius either immediately dismissed unrealistic charges or treated moderately the more serious offenses.

In A.D. 15, two Roman knights, Falanius and Rubrius, were accused of treason for offenses against the divinity of Augustus, but Tiberius promptly dismissed the charges against both men.\textsuperscript{11} In the same year, Granius Marcellus, a former governor of Bithynia, when accused of extortion, was also charged with slandering Tiberius and with substituting the head of Tiberius on a statue of Augustus. At first, Tiberius, angry at the silly accusations, declared that he would vote openly and on oath. When reminded that this would interfere with the freedom of the Senate, however, he regained self-control and allowed Marcellus to be acquitted of treason. On the extortion charge, though, Marcellus was referred to the courts.\textsuperscript{12}

In A.D. 16, Libo Drusus was accused of revolutionary designs. A noble, he was related to the Scribonia who had been Augustus' first wife and the mother of Julia. Marsh believes that this family background stirred in him
ambitions which he could not hope to realize except by ex-
traordinary action. Whether or not this was true, the
Senate was convened for an investigation when Fulcinius
Trio, an informer, reported to the consuls that Libo had
been engaging in magical practices. During the course of
the trial, the prosecution produced a list of senators
which contained mysterious marks beside certain names. At
this point, Libo gave up hope and committed suicide.
Tiberius, however, showed a moderate attitude when he de-
clared that he would have spared Libo's life, no matter
what his guilt.\textsuperscript{13}

In A.D. 17, Appuleia Varilla, a grand-niece of
Augustus, was accused of adultery and treason. Tiberius
refused to admit as evidence any words spoken against him-
self or his mother. As a result, she was acquitted of
treason, but punishment for adultery was left to her family,
who banished her.\textsuperscript{14}

Lepida, who was a great-granddaughter of L. Sulla and
Cn. Pompeius and had been betrothed to L. Caesar, the
grandson of Augustus, was, in A.D. 20, accused on a variety
of charges, including treason, adultery, poisoning, and the
making of inquiries through astrologers concerning the
imperial house. Tiberius asked the Senate not to consider
the charges of treason and refused to allow her slaves to be examined by torture on any matters referring to his own family. Permitted to testify on other matters, however, the slaves gave evidence which resulted in a conviction and decree of banishment. Not until after the decision had been made did Tiberius state that he had evidence that she had attempted to poison her husband, Quirinius.¹⁵

Tiberius was absent from Rome in A.D. 21 when C. Clutorius Priscus was condemned to death. He had won fame for some verses he had written on the occasion of the death of Germanicus; so, when Drusus, the son of Tiberius, lay ill, he composed another to be used in the event of his death. After Drusus recovered, a charge of treason was brought against the poet, who had foolishly let his poem become known. He was condemned and executed before the princeps could review the sentence. Though not censuring the majority who voted for the penalty, Tiberius did speak favorably of those who wanted a lighter sentence. Further, when he returned to the city, he took precautions against any such hasty executions in the future.¹⁶

In the following year, when L. Ennius, a Roman knight, was accused of treason for converting a statue of the princeps to silver plate for everyday use, Tiberius refused
to allow him to stand trial.\textsuperscript{17}

Up to this point it is clear that Tiberius made a genuine effort to protect individuals from unwarranted accusations. As Marsh points out, he "prevented any extension of the law of treason and restrained delation, refusing to allow trivial acts or slanders against himself to be treated as criminal."\textsuperscript{18} Heretofore, he was secure in his position as princeps of the Roman empire. He had dealt firmly with the seditious plans of Libo Drusus and of Calpurnius Piso. Further, Augustus had made known his wishes for the succession after Tiberius, and Tiberius, though with disappointment, had agreed to allow the direct heirs of Augustus rather than his own son to succeed him. In A.D. 19, when the death of Germanicus removed the possibility of succession by the direct heirs of Augustus, there was still his son Drusus to take his place. But in A.D. 23, Drusus fell victim to the ambition of Sejanus, leaving Tiberius without an heir. The loss of his son embittered the princeps and left him suspicious, for the absence of a designated successor would stir the hopes of those who could see themselves at the head of the government.\textsuperscript{19}

After A.D. 23, as a result, the attitude toward criminal trials, especially those for treason, changed, though
gradually. In A.D. 24, Gaius Cominius, a Roman knight, was accused of writing libelous verses against the emperor. A conviction was obtained, indicating a change of attitude, but Tiberius nonetheless showed moderation by pardoning the accused. In the same year, Firmius Catus was convicted of falsely accusing his sister of treason. The Senate fixed the penalty as banishment, but Tiberius would only allow him to be removed from the Senate. If Tacitus is correct, the reason for the lesser penalty was the service Catus had rendered earlier in exposing Libo Drusus. Whatever Tiberius' motive, the decision indicates a hardening of his heretofore moderate attitude.

In A.D. 25, there occurred the trial of an historian. As such it is of more importance here than those trials involving mere libel for an insight into the prevailing attitude toward freedom of expression in the writing of history. A writer of some repute at that time, Aulus Cremutius Cordus is best known to us for his annalistic history of the Civil Wars which he wrote during the principate of Augustus and which Augustus himself is reported to have read. On the surface, at least, it was this history which brought about his downfall under Tiberius. Tacitus, Suetonius and Cassius Dio are unanimous in stating that
Cordus was brought to trial because he called Brutus and Cassius the last of the Romans. In the words of Tacitus, "Cremutius Cordus postulatur . . . quod editis annalibus laudatoque M. Bruto C. Cassium Romanorum ultimum dixisset." Suetonius echoes Tacitus: "... objectum et historico, quod Brutum Cassiumque ultimos Romanorum dixisset." Likewise Dio: "... κρυθηκε, οτι τον τε Κέσσιον και τον Βροθτον ἐπηνεσε ..." Although there is some doubt, the official charge was probably treason. This term is indicated by the phrase "quos lex maiestatis amplexcitur" which appears in the speech of Cordus reported by Tacitus. Even if this speech is a Tacitean original and not genuine Cordus, Tacitus certainly had access to the senatorial records of the proceedings and would have been influenced by those records in composing the speech. He is not likely to have mentioned maiestas here if he had not found it in the original record. Such a statement as Cordus made in his history, however, seems a trivial excuse for an accusation of treason. It is true that Brutus and Cassius were the murderers of Caesar and that Caesar was the predecessor of Tiberius. From this point of view, Tiberius might understandably feel affronted; but the event had taken place sixty-nine years earlier, and Cordus had written his
statement before Tiberius came to power. In view also of Tiberius' earlier attitude to such charges, this accusation alone does not explain his reaction. The situation is more complicated, as is generally agreed by both ancient and modern authorities.

Tacitus continues his account as follows: "Accusabant Satrius Secundus et Pinarius Natta, Seiani clientes. Id perniciabile reo, et Caesar truci vultu defensionem accipiens." The statement that the accusers were agents of Sejanus and that it was this fact which was fatal to Cordus is important. Sejanus must have had a grudge against Cordus. Seneca, in his Consolatio written to Marcia, the daughter of Cordus, tells us why: "Irascebatur illi ob unum aut alterum liberius dictum, quod tacitus ferre non potuerat, Sejanum in cervices nostras nec imponi quidem, sed escendere." Cordus, in short, had insulted Sejanus who, as he was already working on his plan to gain control of the government, would be rather sensitive to criticism. Since we know of no ground for a serious charge against Cordus, it would seem that Sejanus was faced with the necessity of fabricating one; thus the official charge resulted. And Tiberius, "truci vultu defensionem accipiens," supported his favorite.
Like the ancient authorities, the majority of modern critics discern more behind the misfortune of Cordus than a few indiscreet words of praise for Brutus and Cassius. Teuffel assigns the real cause of the prosecution to the offensive expressions reported by Seneca. Marsh, also emphasizing the evidence of Seneca, notes that he "does not allude to Tiberius as being in any way to blame, nor to the history of Cordus as the cause of his fate." Marsh also is concerned with the anxiety of the accusers to keep the trial going when they had learned that Cordus was starving himself:

Whatever the explanation, it is clear that they [informers] were anxious for some reason that the trial should be resumed, from which circumstance we are justified in concluding that they had brought forward only the matter of his history. Cordus did not care to face further proceedings and took his own life before the informers had got beyond their opening charge, which was intended simply to create a prejudice against him and pave the way for more important matters. Seneca evidently took it for granted that Marcia did not attach much importance to this charge, but he did not think it discreet to mention, even if he knew, the real nature of the case.

Nor does Marsh himself attempt to isolate the real reason for Cordus' trial. He concludes that, "in the archives of the Senate there was no proof of anything against Cordus, except the expressions in his history, and hence the view
of Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio as to the cause of his fate."\(^{35}\)

Two other modern scholars adopt Marsh's view, either directly or indirectly. R. S. Rogers follows closely Marsh's opinion that the charge based on the history was only preliminary.\(^{36}\) Nor does Sir Ronald Syme, who refers to Rogers in his discussion, accept Cordus' writings as the sole charge against him.\(^{37}\)

Not Cordus' history, then, but rather the offense he had given to Sejanus, the trusted minister of the princeps, was the cause of his downfall. Tiberius, less and less secure without an acknowledged heir, did not refuse to admit the charge of treason based on the history, as he had earlier done in cases of libel or slander against himself or members of his family.\(^{38}\) Nor did he express regret for the suicide of Cordus, as he did in the case of Libo Drusus.\(^{39}\) His support of Sejanus, moreover, is reminiscent of the support given by Augustus to members of the Senate when he banished Cassius Severus. Tiberius needed Sejanus' support just as Augustus needed that of the senatorial party. An attack on Sejanus could not go unheeded. Thus Tiberius' attitude toward freedom of expression was not the same as it had been during the earlier part of his reign.
Two other cases which occurred in A.D. 25 are further proof. Votienus Montanus, an orator from Gaul, when charged with insulting the princeps, was convicted and banished. It was the first such punishment for this offense. And Apidius Merula was expelled from the Senate for not having sworn obedience to the legislation of Augustus.

Three years later in A.D. 28, there occurred the conviction and execution for treason of Titius Sabinus, a member and leader of the Julian party and a friend of Germanicus. Accused of plotting to murder Tiberius, he was convicted on the basis of testimony given by three senators who hid themselves between the roof and ceiling of a room into which a fourth senator had lured him for the purpose of inducing him to make treasonous statements. When, soon after, an indictment came to the Senate from Tiberius, Sabinus was convicted and executed immediately in violation of the measures taken by Tiberius himself after the execution of Clutorius Priscus in A.D. 21 to prevent just such hasty executions. This time no reprimand from the princeps was forthcoming.

In the following year, Sejanus achieved his goal of removing Agrippina from his path to the principate when Tiberius at last decided that he had no alternative to the
banishment of both Agrippina and her son Drusus. But the success of Sejanus was short-lived, for in A.D. 31 Antonia, the widow of Tiberius' brother Drusus, informed the princeps of the real designs of his chief of police. Tiberius waited until the very end of a long message to the Senate to condemn for treason the man upon whom he had depended so long for his own security. Now there was no one in whom Tiberius could place his trust.

Velleius wrote in A.D. 30, during years of apparent crisis. Of the downfall of Agrippina in 29 he was no doubt aware, but there is no evidence to indicate that he suspected what was to come in 31. Nonetheless, the events of the years from the death of Drusus to the publication of his history in 30 would be sufficient warning to him that care was to be taken in putting pen to paper. Tiberius did not spare Cordus five years earlier; after so much intrigue, he would be no kinder now.

Valerius Maximus will be of some help in establishing the degree to which Tiberius' attitude had changed. He published his collection of historical anecdotes sometime after A.D. 31. At least the first six books of his collection were written before 29 because in Book Six he speaks of Livia, who died in 29, as still alive. The ninth and
last book is known to have been written after the death of Sejanus, as it contains an attack on him.\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, Sejanus occurs nowhere in any of the earlier books, indicating that those books had not yet been published at the time of his downfall,\textsuperscript{15} or that they had been revised after that occasion. This evidence suggests both the date of publication and that Valerius exercised considerable prudence in his writing. Confirmation of this view comes from his reference to Brutus and Cassius as parricides.\textsuperscript{46} Valerius must certainly have had in mind here the fate of Cremutius Cordus who dared to praise the assassins of Caesar.

The evidence here presented suggests, then, that in A.D. 30 there were political forces which were sufficiently strong to prevent an unbiased, impartial attitude in the writing of history. Though such an ideal atmosphere would have been difficult to achieve at any time in the early principate, it would have been possible to come closer to that goal in the period before A.D. 23. Livy, the Pompeian historian, is indicative of the situation. Though solidly in favor of the old republican form of government, he received the respect of Augustus in the early years of the principate. It has been shown that Tiberius exercised great
discretion in the first years of his tenure, and it took the death of his son and successor to change his attitude. The less secure environment after A.D. 23 is demonstrated principally by the case of Cremutius Cordus who had previously been highly respected. Though the accusations against him based on his history were undoubtedly unwarranted and were brought only to create prejudice, they were allowed to stand by an insecure princeps who needed the protection of Sejanus, the man who had been offended by Cordus. The downfall of Agrippina and the revelations concerning Sejanus did not help the old man's attitude, and the effect on literature is seen in the evidence from Valerius Maximus. Velleius was also undoubtedly affected by the uncertain political conditions, but there were other factors present which must be considered before an evaluation can be made of Velleius' attitude toward Tiberius. These will become evident from a review of his life and career.
For an adequate understanding of Velleius' history and the notions he conveys therein, we must examine his background, both his own life and the history of his family. We are admittedly at a disadvantage in looking for information because to the Roman literary establishment Velleius was an unknown. Nor did his ancestors play a significant part in Roman affairs and so they pass unnoticed in the pages of other historians. To Velleius himself must we turn therefore for information on the earlier history of his family.

At 2.16.2 Velleius gives what he considers to be deserved recognition to two maternal ancestors, Decius Magius, Campanorum princeps, who remained faithful to Rome when Capua joined Hannibal, and Minatius Magius, grandson of Decius, who received Roman citizenship for raising a legion which fought for Rome in the Social Wars. These men were leading members of their communities; at Rome they would have been considered equestrians. While many other
Latin writers of non-Roman origin took on a new identity at Rome, Velleius seems never to have forgotten the fact that his origins were in Campania. Indeed, he boasts of it.  

Later in his work, Velleius singles out his paternal grandfather, Gaius Velleius, who was chosen a *iudex* by Pompey and served as *praefectus fabrum* under Pompey, Marcus Brutus and Tiberius Nero, father of the princeps (2.76). This relationship of his ancestors with Pompey and Tiberius Nero may help to explain the attitude which Velleius takes to Pompey and Tiberius Caesar.

At 2.104.3 Velleius mentions his own father who immediately preceded Velleius himself as *praefectus equitum* in Germany. An uncle, Capito, a man of senatorial rank (Velleius seems to imply that he was the exception in the family), is mentioned earlier as having helped Agrippa to secure the condemnation of C. Cassius (2.69.5). Finally, Magius Celer Velleianus, a brother, is recorded as having been an aide and lieutenant of Tiberius in the war in Dalmatia (2.115.1).

Velleius' origins were, then, Campanian, not Roman. Those ancestors whom he mentions were known to him for their military exploits. Only his uncle, Capito, is mentioned as having senatorial rank. As for Velleius, we
have to depend exclusively on what he himself tells us. Using this information we might reconstruct his life as follows. He must have been born no later than 19 B.C., since he was quaestor-elect in A.D. 6, the minimum age for the quaestorship being 25. He served as military tribune in Thrace and Macedonia under P. Silius and P. Vinicius (the father of M. Vinicius to whom he dedicated his history), about 1 B.C. (2.101.3). In A.D. 1, he accompanied Gaius Caesar to the East where, again as military tribune, he considered it his good fortune to witness a meeting between Gaius and the king of the Parthians on an island in the Euphrates (2.101.3). From A.D. 4 to 13, Velleius served under Tiberius in Germany, acting either as praefectus equitum, in which position he succeeded his own father, or as legatus (2.104.3). During this period, he was elected quaestor, and as quaestor-elect (A.D. 6) he led reinforcements from Rome to Tiberius. During and after his term as quaestor, he served as legatus under Tiberius (2.111.3-4). Then in A.D. 13, at Rome, Velleius and his brother not only attended Tiberius' triumph but also participated as men who were decorated with distinguished honors (2.121.3). The occasion seems to mark the end of his military career, as he says no more of such activities.
This supposition is strengthened by the fact that he held the office of praetor, together with his brother, presumably for the year A.D. 15. This date would accord with the statement of Velleius that he and his brother were among those who had the distinction of being the last to be recommended by Augustus and the first to be named by Tiberius (2.124.3-4).

What Velleius did after his retirement as a soldier and his year as praetor is open to conjecture. He says no more of himself and so disappears from the records of his time. Shall we presume, on the basis of his history, that he devoted the remainder of his life to literature and writing? If so, why did he wait until the last minute to compose a history that has value but is, by his own admission, hastily written and full of defects? Did he then spend the years of his military retirement in active political life, serving in such posts as a worthy veteran might expect to hold under his former commander? He did hold the praetorship, which admitted him to membership in the Senate, but did he serve the government in another capacity? There is no record, and Velleius himself says nothing. Did he perhaps revert to the milieu in which his family was most at home, the life of an equestrian? Did he
in short enter the business world at Rome? Such a second career would be open to a veteran and might help to explain his absence from any official records or historical writings on the period. A businessman's life is an active one but does not of itself justify admittance to the pages of history.

The last alternative is the least likely. Though Velleius does express sympathy with the interests of the equestrian class, due probably to his own equestrian background, there is no evidence to suggest that he himself or his close relations were ever involved in a business world. Since by his election to the praetorship he gained a seat in the Senate, and since what is apparently his first literary undertaking came fifteen years later, he probably gave full-time to public affairs, leaving his literary interests to his leisure time. For this interest in literature there must have been a basis in his earlier education, but again we have no hard facts. J. W. Duff comments:

Concerning his formal education we have scant knowledge; yet considerable rhetorical training may be argued from his artifices of style; and he must have imbibed an interest in books and authors, to judge from his pronouncements on Homer, Hesiod and Cicero, and from excursuses on literary men of the Gracchan, Ciceronian and Augustan periods.

Though there are amateurish elements in the history,
Velleius was adequately trained for the task which he undertook either by early formal training or by the later pursuit of rhetoric and literature as an avocation or quite possibly by both.

At any rate, Velleius certainly wanted to make himself known in the field of literature. As M. L. Paladini points out, he never misses a chance to mention himself or his family in the history. Such notices were partly motivated by a desire to have his family and himself remembered for their military services to Rome. His history was in this sense the capstone of his career. And, as Anderson notes, "the limitations of this career are reflected in the limitations of the composition: he is hardly a sophisticated author."
CHAPTER III

RHETORICAL HISTORY: EXEMPLA IN VELLEIUS PATERCULUS

a) Introduction

Velleius dedicated his compendium of Roman history to another man of whom history records little. Marcus Vinicius' only claim to fame is that he held the consulship in the year A.D. 30, in honor of which accomplishment Velleius addressed his history to him. Several reasons have been advanced for Velleius' choice. Paladini excludes as a reason the fact that Vinicius was a novus homo while stating that Velleius chose him simply because he was the son of the ex-commander of Velleius. In addition, both men had their origins in the same part of Italy, in Campania. Both circumstances accord well with the character and personality of Velleius as we see it through his history. It was only natural for Velleius, a military man above all else, to honor someone connected with a former commander. The common origin gave added impetus to the choice. But another reason, and Paladini seems to give special importance to it, is that
Vinicius' consulship gave Velleius an excuse to write the history.¹ It was the vehicle which happened to be at hand when Velleius decided to write. The military connection, the common origin and the political success of Vinicius, who must have been a close friend, all joined together to make Vinicius the proper candidate for the dedication. The frequent references to Vinicius in the body of the history, however, are merely a rhetorical device.²

How much time did Velleius devote to the task? If he decided to go ahead with the project only after the election of Vinicius, he must have written in a very brief period of time. By his own admission, he was writing in haste, and the summary fashion of the last chapters suggests that he must have been brought up short at the end (2.129ff.).

In so short a time, Velleius could not hope to do justice to his topic. Indeed, at several places he mentions his intention to produce later a iustum opus, a proper history.³ But for the moment he had to be satisfied with a compendium. In writing he shows that he was under the influence of the general trend of his time to let the principles of rhetoric influence every type of literary activity, even to excess. He was not a rhetorician who considered the facts of history merely as material to be
handled eloquently, as Paladini maintains, but rather an historian who expressed himself in the manner in which he was taught in his early education, i.e. in the style of the schools of rhetoric. The environment being filled with rhetoric, Velleius simply adapted himself to it. One of the traits of this rhetorical type of historical writing, certainly not unique to Velleius, is a tendency toward generality of expression. E. Bolaffi thinks that in order to have an adequate understanding of Velleius' history, it is necessary to remember that he avoids narration of particulars and prefers rather to compress his thought after the example of Sallust. Bolaffi cites as an example his concise summary of the struggle between Rome and Carthage from 263 to 146 B.C. (1.12.7).

While keeping in mind that Velleius was heavily indebted to the rhetorical training which he must have had as a youth, it is possible to look at his history from other viewpoints. Thus, M. Michaels believes that in some parts of the history Velleius almost abandons the genus historicum, especially in those parts of Book Two where he discusses his own affairs, and becomes a writer of commentarii. He further thinks that the absence of the genus historicum, i.e. the absence of rhetoric, here and there in the work is
adequately compensated by the fact that Velleius gives a fuller account of events which he experienced personally.\textsuperscript{7}

In similar fashion, M. Cavallero looks upon the book as more of a memorial than a history—a memorial "with an historical cornerstone and a hero, Tiberius, symbol of the epoch seen by the author." The only truly historical part of the book, she maintains, is Book Two, Chapters 105 to 115, the section treating Tiberius' campaigns in Germany, in particular those in Pannonia and Dalmatia.\textsuperscript{8}

Both views have something to recommend them, and both are linked together. Michaels and Cavallero correctly discern the relationship between Velleius, his career and his historical work. The account of the German campaigns between Chapters 104.3 and 124.4 of Book Two is essentially a \textit{commentarius}, a personal record made by Velleius of his activities during that period. The making of such a \textit{commentarius} was standard procedure for a man in Velleius' position, the intention being to produce a brief account of one's activities which could be used later as source material for a full-dress history. Velleius has stated his intention to produce just such a \textit{iustum opus}. But Tiberius, not Velleius, is the central figure of the \textit{commentarius}. Velleius appears only in a subordinate part.
It could be no other way, of course, in A.D. 30. In this way, as Cavallero points out, the personal record serves as a memorial of the part which Velleius played in his hero's campaigns, a memorial extended to members of his family when he introduces them into his narrative to commemorate the part played by them in Roman history. But the memorialization of Velleius and his family is subordinate to the commemoration of the hero Tiberius to whom are devoted the final 37 chapters of the history.

Still, the history is more than a *commentarius* and more than a memorial. Velleius was writing in an age of rhetoric, and rhetoric is thereby one of the more striking elements of the work. J. Hellegouarc'h points out several aspects "which recall those of other rhetorical historians of the era and which correspond to this rhetorical tendency which itself conforms to the tendencies and technique of Hellenistic history." Such characteristics are the use of exaggerated and declamatory *elogia* (V.P. 2.35 and 2.66 on Cicero, 2.127 on Sejanus and 2.129 on Tiberius), his willingness to relate certain exceptional facts, although of little importance in the course of history (in the manner of Valerius Maximus), a taste for certain details of erudition, for moral conclusions (2.7.5; 2.8.2; 2.7.1; 2.50.3; 2.91.4),
and the search for point, turn of phrase, for the striking *sententia* (2.64.2; 2.73.3; 2.124.2; 2.129.3). "All these traits," says Hellegouarc'h, "are so numerous, so indicative of the same tendency that it does not seem to me possible to admit, after Lana, that rhetoric is only the clothing and that it is neither the soul nor the body of the work."12

It is certain, then, that Velleius is heavily indebted to his rhetorical training, many aspects of which appear in his history. Style, language, diction—all are evidently derived from the influence of rhetoric upon him. Another aspect of rhetoric which manifests itself is the *exemplum*, the anecdote taken from events in Roman history and used by the orators to illustrate a particular trait of the Roman character. Anderson, in discussing the various themes which run through the history, recognizes this dependency of Velleius on the *exemplum*:

Neither indiscriminately borrowed nor accidentally expressed, the basic themes in support of the Principate are woven into the History from the beginning. The climax of his work is panegyric, but it is based consistently on *exempla* from Rome's past.13

The *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* of Valerius Maximus, Velleius' contemporary, is a collection of *exempla* arranged
under various headings as a reference work for the orator looking for some historical illustration of the point at hand. It is not a history, though it contains much historical information. The work of Velleius, though cast in historical form, contains many of the *exempla* which are to be found in similar form in Valerius. These *exempla*, as L. Castiglioni recognizes, are the usual material of rhetorical exercises. The difference between Velleius and Valerius is that the former incorporates them into an historical framework while the latter has taken them out of context and arranged them by category.

Various scholars have studied the *exempla* of Valerius Maximus and compared them with corresponding passages in other authors in an attempt to discover the primary source of his information. Clemens Bosch maintains that Valerius composed his collection from two *exemplasammlungen* and occasionally from the fruits of his own readings. This view is regarded by R. Helm as an exaggeration of the view of A. Klotz, who concluded that Valerius drew his material from an *exemplasammlung* which was produced in the short period of time between Livy and Valerius Maximus and that this *exemplasammlung* was the work of C. Julius Hyginus. Helm rejects both Klotz' solution and its exaggeration by
Bosch. He sees the existence of an intervening exemplasammlung as improbable because of the short period of time which would then have passed between the production of the earlier collection and that of Valerius. Unless the intervening collection were an abridgement, Valerius could have justified his own efforts only by the fact that he offered material different from that of his predecessor. But this interpretation is contradicted by Valerius' statement at the beginning of his book: "Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna, quae apud alios latius diffusa sunt quam ut breviter cognosci possint, ab inlustribus electa auctoribus digerere constitui, ut documenta sumere volentibus longae inquisitionis labor absit." Further, Helm maintains, "one must consider him not only a cunning cheat but also a certain fool if one thinks that he dared to dedicate to the emperor Tiberius a work which basically represented only a huge plagiarism." 16

In summary, Helm's argument is twofold: (1) If there was an intervening exemplasammlung between Livy and Valerius Maximus, why is it completely lost while Valerius' collection remains? (2) There is no basis for doubting the assertion made by Valerius himself that he culled his exempla from the works of various eminent writers. 17
Since much of what was written immediately before Valerius has been lost, it is impossible to say with certainty that Valerius did (or did not, for that matter) use a collection of exempla drawn up a few years before his work. Such collections did exist: Hyginus is known to have made one, as is also Verrius Flaccus. But whether they were used in turn by Valerius is a matter for conjecture only. Though comparisons of Valerius with Seneca, Pliny, the Auctor De Viris Illustribus and other authors may yield fruitful results, the absence of an extant collection known to have been written just prior to Valerius and after Livy makes impossible the assignment of a definite source to Valerius other than Livy.

Valerius published his book in A.D. 31 shortly after the downfall of Sejanus, whom he denounces in strong terms (9.11.4 Ext.), and one year after the publication by Velleius of his compendium of Roman history. As has been noted, there appear in Velleius many of the exempla which are contained in Valerius' collection. Similarities between Velleius and Valerius are not few, and yet there are enough differences to indicate that the two authors worked independently of one another. Neither was a primary source for the other, but both were in the same historical
tradition. It will be demonstrated by the following study that Velleius made ample use of the rhetorical exemplum as evidenced by similarities with Valerius. In addition, an attempt will be made to evaluate the type of source he might have used, precise determination of an exact source or sources being impossible.

Exempla in Velleius fall into three categories:
(1) those which he has in common with Valerius, by far the majority; (2) those which he has in common with some other author, though not with Valerius; (3) those which exist only in Velleius. In the treatment of these exempla in the following pages, the version of Velleius will be placed first, followed by that of Valerius and of any other author in which it might occur; there will follow this listing of the various accounts of an exemplum a discussion of the differences involved and any conclusions to be drawn therefrom.

b) Exempla common to Velleius and Valerius

1) On Codrus, the last king of the Athenians:

V.P.1.2.1-2: quippe cum Lacedaemonii gravi bello Atticos premerent respondissetque Pythius, quorum dux ab hoste esset occisus, eos futuros superiores, deposita veste regia pastoralem cultum induit, immixtusque castris hostium, de industria rixam ciens, imprudenter interemptus
The version of Seneca, while preserving the essentials of the story, is quite different from the versions of Velleius and Valerius which are similar in both wording and detail in several places. Valerius' account is longer and is included in the category De pietate erga patriam, while Velleius' version is not given as an exemplum of a particular virtue. The following points of similarity may be noted: (1) "quorum dux ab hoste esset occisus" (V.P.) and "si ipse hostili manu occidisset" (V.M.); (2) "deposita veste regia pastoralem cultum induit" (V.P.) and "depositis
insignibus imperii famularem cultum induit" (V.M.); (3) "immixtusque . . . est" (V.P.) and "ac pabulantium . . . compulit" (V.M.). Of these three similarities, the first two exhibit close agreement in wording as well as in substance, the last shows agreement in substance only.

M. L. Paladini points out these similarities as well as the following differences: (1) In Velleius, the answer of the oracle is ambiguous. In Valerius, it points directly to Codrus. (2) Velleius does not mention knowledge of the oracle on the part of the enemy while Valerius does note this detail. (3) In general, the account of Valerius is fuller than that of Velleius, both in detail and in expression.19

2) On Popilius Laenas as legate to Antiochus Epiphanes:

V.P.1.10.1-2: . . . missus est ad eum legatus M. Popilius Laenas, qui iuberet incepto desistere. Mandataque exposuit et regem deliberaturum se dicentem circumscripsit virgula iussitque prius responsum reddere, quam egrederetur finito harenæ circulo. Sic cogitationem regiam Romana disiecit constantia oboeditumque imperio.

V.M.6.4.3: C. vero Popilius a senatu legatus ad Antiochum missus, ut bello se, quo Ptolemaeum lacessebat, abstineret, cum ad eum venisset atque is prompto animo et amicissimo vultu dexteram ei porrexisset, invicem illi suam porrigere noluit, sed tabellas senatus consultum continentis tradidit. Quas ut legit Antiochus, dixit se cum amicis locuturum. Indignatus
The passage from Livy shows the similarity of the accounts of Velleius and Valerius to the Livian version and thus demonstrates that here both authors are closely influenced by Livy. Points of similarity between Velleius and Valerius are: (1) "qui iuberet incepto desistere" (V.P.) and "missus ut bello . . . abstineret" (V.M.); "mandataque exposuit" (V.P.) and "tabellas senatus consultum continentis tradidit" (V.M.); (3) "regem deliberaturum se dicentem" (V.P.) and "dixit se cum amicis locuturum" (V.M.); (4) "circumscripsit virgula" (V.P.) and "virga solum, quo insistebat, denotavit" (V.M.); (5) "iussitque prius
responsum reddere, quam egredetur finito harenae circulo" (V.P.) and "prius inquit 'quam hoc circulo excedas da responsum, quod senatu referam.'" (V.M.) Here, as in the anecdote about Codrus, is to be observed the close similarity of detail between the accounts of Velleius and Valerius. Exact wording is not identical in the two authors but the substance is very close, e.g., "regem deliberatum se dicentem" (V.P.) and "dixit se cum amicis locuturum" (V.M.). In the case of this particular episode, it is conceivable that Velleius and Valerius were using the same source, i.e. Livy. While the same is true of other episodes, there are a number which do not fall into this category. In both authors the incident is definitely used as an exemplum exalting Roman virtus. As Paladini points out, Velleius has used the anecdote to exalt constantia Romana, while Valerius emphasizes abscissa gravitas of speech and action by inserting it in the category, Graviter dicta aut facta.

3) On L. Aemilius Paulus and the loss of his four sons:

V.P.1.10.3-5: Lucio autem Paulo magnae victoriae compti quattuor filii fuere; ex iis duos natu maiores, unum P. Scipioni P. Africani filio, nihil ex paterna maiestate praeter speciem nominis vigoremque eloquentiae retinti, in adoptionem dederat, alterum Fabio Maximo. Duos minores natu prætextatos, quo tempore victoriam adeptus est, habuit. Is cum in contione extra urbem more maiorum ante triumphi diem ordinem
actorum suorum commemoraret, deos immortalis
precatus est, ut, si quis eorum invideret
operibus ac fortunae suae, in ipsum potius
saevirent quam in rem publicam. Quae vox
veluti oraculo emissa magna parte eum spoliavit
sanguinis sui: nam alterum ex suis, quos in
familia retinuerat, liberis ante paucos
triumpfi, alterum post pauciores amisit dies.

V.M.5.10.2: Aemilius Paulus, nunc felicissimi, nunc
miserrimi patris clarissima representatio, ex
quattuor filiis formae insignis, egregiae
indolis duos iure adoptionis in Corneliam
Fabianque gentis translatos sibi ipse denegavit:
duos ei fortuna abstulit. Quorum alter
triumpum patris funere suo quartum ante diem
praecessit, alter in triumphali currus conspectus
post diem tertium expiravit.

Valerius goes on to narrate the speech made by Paulus after
the deaths of his sons:

'cum in maximo proventu felicitatis nostrae,
Quirites, timerem ne quid mali fortuna moliretur,
Iovem optimum maximum Iunonemque reginam et
Minervam precatus sum ut, si quid adversi populo
Romano imminet, totum in meam domum con-
verteretur. Quapropter bene habet: annuendo
enim votis meis id egerunt, ut vos potius meo
casu doleatis quam ego vestro ingemescerem.'

Livy, 45.40.7-8: Nam duobus e filiis, quos duobus
datis in adoptionem solos nominis, sacrorum
familiaeque heredes retinuerat domi, minor,
- duodecim ferme annos natus, quinque diebus ante
triumpum, maior, quattuordecim annorum, trido
post triumpum decessit; quos praetextatos currus
vehi cum patre, sibi ipsos similis destinantis
triumpbos, oportuerat.

In substance, the three accounts are identical: Paulus
gave two sons in adoption, his older sons, to two famous
Roman families; his two younger sons he kept at home, but they died at an early age, one just before, the other just after his triumph. In detail, however, they are quite different. First, Velleius, who has the longest of the three accounts, cites the names of the adoptive fathers and compares Scipio to his father, while Valerius mentions only the gens Cornelia and gens Fabia. Livy omits mention of the adoptive family or father altogether at this point, delaying it to 45.41.12 where the adoptive family is mentioned in the course of Paulus' speech. Secondly, both Velleius and Valerius narrate the prayer of Paulus, but Velleius places it before the death of the two younger sons while Valerius has Paulus say during a speech which he made after the death of the sons that he had expressed the prayer before their death. In addition, as Paladine points out, both Velleius and Valerius, as well as the epitome of Livy, Book 44, use the term "prayer," while Livy himself speaks of a "desire" on the part of Paulus that no harm come to the state. The third difference between Velleius and Valerius is the reckoning of the time of death of the two younger sons. Velleius says only that the youngest son died a "few" (paucos) days before the triumph and the next youngest even "fewer" (pauciores) days after. Valerius, however, is
precise, fixing on five days before the triumph for the death of the first son and three days after the triumph for the death of the second. Livy himself has four days before and three days after. These discrepancies are not great enough to dispute the idea that Velleius and Valerius are both in the Livian tradition, but they do tend to prove that Velleius and Valerius did not use the same source. The timing of the prayer, the number of days before and after the triumph, the difference of detail in the matter of the adoptive fathers of the two older sons all argue for different Livian sources for the two authors. And further, as Paladini notes, the Valerian account is probably the correct one insofar as it is in agreement with Livy himself on the matter of the timing of the speech and prayer by Paulus. The difference between Livy's "desire" and the "prayer" of the other authors she ascribes to an early epitomator of Livy.23

4) On Lysippus as sculptor for Alexander the Great:

V.P.1.11.4: Cuius turmae hanc causam referunt, Magnum Alexandrum impetrasse a Lysippo, singularem talium auctore operum, ut eorum equitum, qui ex ipsius turma apud Granicum flumen ceciderant, expressa similitudine figurarum faceret statuas et ipsius quoque iis interponeret.

V.M.8.11.2Ext.: Quantum porro dignitatis a rege Alexandre tributa arti existimamus, qui se et
pingi ab uno Apelle et fingi a Lysippo tantum modo voluit?

These remarks of Velleius and Valerius are included here to show that while the two authors may mention the same people or events at various times, they are not necessarily referring to the same situation. Velleius here is discussing an event in the life of Metellus Macedonicus, his bringing back to Rome of statues sculpted by Lysippus on a commission from Alexander. Valerius, under the heading "Quam magni effectus artium sint," is referring primarily to Alexander's influence on the arts. Yet, the two authors have in common the fact that Lysippus worked for Alexander. Valerius has made of this an exemplum of the effect of the arts. Velleius, however, does not intend his anecdote as an exemplum but simply relates an event in the life of Macedonicus.

5) On the four sons of Metellus Macedonicus:

V.P.1.11.7: ... Mortui eius [Macedonic] lectum pro rostris sustulerunt quattuor filii, unus consularis et censorius, alter consularis, tertius consul, quartus candidatus consulatus, quem honorem adeptus est. Hoc est nimirum magis feliciter de vita migrare quam mori.

V.M.7.1.1: [Fortuna] fecit ut eodem tempore tres filios consulares, unum etiam censorium et triumphalem, quartum praetorium videret, ... Hunc vitae actum eius consentaneus finis exceptit: namque Metellum ultimae senectutis spatio
defunctum lenique genere mortis inter oscula conplexusque carissimorum pignorum extinctum filii et generi humeris suis per urbem latum rogo inposuerunt.

Both Velleius and Valerius include this particular detail in a longer account of the blessings of the life of Metellus. Further, both look on it as an exemplum of felicitas; Valerius includes it in his chapter De felicitate; Velleius uses the adverb feliciter in his last sentence. The positioning of this word in Velleius seems to refer particularly to the fact that Metellus' sons carried his body on their shoulders while Valerius' account concerns the felicitas of Metellus' whole life. In addition, there is some difference of detail in the two versions in the matter of the respective positions of the four sons in the cursus honorum, but this discrepancy seems to result more from a variance in the exact point in time referred to. Thus Velleius indicates that, at the time of the death of Metellus, one son was an ex-consul and ex-censor, the second was an ex-consul, the third was currently holding the office of consul, and the fourth was a candidate for the consulship, in which candidacy he was successful.

Valerius, on the other hand, does not refer to a specific time, but says only that "eodem tempore" Metellus saw three
sons as ex-consuls, one of them also an ex-censor who had celebrated a triumph, and the fourth son as praetor. The status of the fourth son as praetor and not as a candidate for the consulship indicates that Valerius' version refers to a slightly earlier point of time, but the reference to the third son as consularis rather than as consul, as V.P. indicates, points to just the opposite conclusion. Again, this exemplum indicates that both authors were working in the same tradition but that neither was using the other for a source nor were they together using the same source.

6) On Servilius Caepio and the death of Viriathus:

V.P.2.1.3: . . . sed interempto Viriatho fraude magis quam virtute Servilli Caepionis Numantinum [bellum] gravius exarsit.

V.M.9.6.4: Viriathi etiam caedes duplicem perfidia accusationem recipit, in amicis, quod eorum manibus interemptus est, in Q. Servilio Caepione consule, quia is sceleris huius actor inpunitate promissa fuit victoriamque non meruit, sed emit.

For Velleius this incident is an exemplum of fraus, for Valerius of perfidia, two similar notions. As is to be expected, the Valerian account is somewhat more detailed, but both assign the blame to Servilius Caepio. Valerius does, however, go one step further to place part of the perfidia on the friends of Viriathus for having killed him.
7) On the surrender of C. Hostilius Mancinus:

V.P.2.1.3-5: Haec urbs [Numantia] . . . tum Pompeium magni nominis virum ad turpissima deduxit foedera . . . nec minus turpia ac detestabilia Mancinum Hostilium consulem. Sed Pompeium gratia impunitum habuit. Mancinum verecundia (quippe non recusando) perduxit huc, ut per feticias nudus ac post tergum religatis manibus dederetur hostibus. Quem illi recipere se negaverunt, sicut quondam Caudini fecerunt, dicentes publicam violationem fidei non debe re unius lui sanguine.

V.M.1.6.7: . . . ergo prodigiorum numerum numero calamitatium aequavit [Mancinum], infelici pugna, turpi foedere, deditione funesta.

V.M.2.7.1: . . . Itaque neglectae disciplinae militaris indicium Mancini miserabilis deditio, servatae merces speciosissimus Scipionis triumphus extitit.

Livy, Per. 55-56: . . . Et victus enim a Numantinis et castris exutus, cum spe s nulla servandi exercitus esset, pacem cum his fecit ignominiosam, quam ratam esse senatus vetuit . . . Ad ex solvendum foederis Numantini religione populum Mancinus, cum huius rei auctor fuisse, deditus Numantinis non est receptus.

Both Velleius and Valerius have substantially the same account of this incident. Valerius, however, considers it an exemplum of the lack of military discipline, while Velleius ascribes it to "vel ferocia ingenii vel inscitia nostrorum ducum vel fortunae indulgentia." Further, both accounts are in substantial agreement with the Livian tradition as seen in the Periochae though Valerius, under
De prodigii, has an account of the prodigious warnings which Mancinus received before he set out for Spain, a detail Velleius does not recount. The accounts of Velleius and Valerius are no doubt in the same tradition, (both refer to the turpia foedera), as Paladini recognizes, but the absence of the prodigies in Velleius indicates at least that he was using as source material neither Livy nor a source directly derived from him. Even in his haste, he could not have passed up such a pointed warning.

8) On the slaying of Tib. Gracchus by Scipio Nasica:

V.P.2.3.1-2: Tum P. Scipio Nasica . . ., circumdata laevo brachio togae lacinia ex superiore parte Capitolii summis gradibus insistens hortatus est, qui salvam vellent rem publicam, se sequerentur. Tum optimates, senatus atque equestris ordinis pars melior et maior, et intacta perniciosis consiliis plebis inruere in Gracchum stantem in area cum catervis suis et conscientem paene totius Italiae frequentiam. Is fugiens decurrensque clivo Capitolino, fragmine subsellii ictus vitam, quam gloriosissime degere potuerat, immatura morte finivit.

V.M.1.4.2: . . . Male igitur tribunatu gesto occisus est a Scipione Nasica. Primo ictus fragmento subsellii, postea clava expiravit. Corpus eius cum his, qui pariter occisi erant, Lucretius aedilis plebi inhumatum in Tiberim abici iussit.

V.M.7.2.6: Ti. Gracchum tribunum pl. agrariam legem promulgare ausum morte multavit.
V.M.3.2.17: Cum Ti. Gracchus in tribunatu pro-
fulissimis largitionibus favore populi occupato
rem publicam oppressam teneret palamque
dictitaret interempto senatu omnia per plebem
agi debere, . . . Tum Scipio Nasica, 'Quoniam'
inquit 'consul, dum iuris ordinem sequitur, id
agit, ut cum omnibus legibus Romanum imperium
corrut, egomet me privatus voluntati vestrae
ducem offero', ac deinde laevam manum ima parte
togae circumdedit sublataque dextra proclamavit:
'qui rem publicam salvam esse volunt me
sequentur', eaque voce cunctatione bonorum
civium discussa Gracchum cum scelerata factione
quas merebatur poenas persolvere coegit.

Livy, Per. 58: Cum iterum tribunus plebis creari
vellet Gracchus, auctore P. Cornelio Nasica in
Capitolo ab optimatibus occisus est. Ictus
primum fragmentis subsellii, et inter alios,
qui in eodem seditione occisi erant, insepultus
in flumen proiectus . . .

The accounts of Velleius, Valerius and of Livy, as
seen in the Epitome, are similar in content and phrasing.
Velleius says that Scipio covered his left arm with the
eage of his toga and rushed down from the Capitol, urging
on those who wished that the Republic should be safe.
According to Velleius, a crowd composed of senators,
knights and plebeians followed him to the place where Gracchus
stood stirring up the people. As Gracchus fled, he was
hit on the head by a piece of wood from a stool and died.
Valerius has much the same detail, but does speak of reasons for the action taken against Gracchus. In 3.2.17, his principal account of the incident, he says that Gracchus held the republic in oppression and was preaching revolution; in 1.4.2, preserved in the abridgement made by Januarius Nepotianus, the reason given is that he performed badly the office of tribune; in 7.2.6, he is accused of daring to promulgate agrarian reform laws. Velleius mentions none of these reasons in his account, though the fact that he was advocating agrarian laws is mentioned in 2.2.3 in the general narration of Gracchus' deeds. Valerius also mentions that Gracchus' body was thrown unburied into the Tiber River. This detail is in the summary of Livy, but not in Velleius.

9) On Scipio's answer to Carbo concerning Tib. Gracchus:

V.P.2.4.1: Aristonicus ... is victus a M. Perpenna ductusque in triumpho, set a M' Aquilio, capite poenas dedit, cum initio belli Crassum Mucianum, virum iuris scientissimum, decedentem ex Asia proconsulem interemisset.

V.M.3.4.5: [M. Perpenna] regem enim Aristonicum cepit Crassianaecque stragis punitor extitit ... 

Livy, Per. 106: M. Crassus bellum Parthis inlaturus Euphraten flumen transit, victusque proelio, in quo et filius eius cecidit, cum reliquias exercitus in collem recepisset, evocatus in conloquium ab hostibus velut de pace acturis, quorum dux erat Surenas, comprehensusque et
ne quid vivus pateretur repugnans, interfectus est.

In this instance, Velleius has simply made a passing reference to an affair to which Valerius devotes space in two chapters. Velleius says only that Aristonicus, captured by Perpenna, was put to death because he killed Crassus. Valerius says this also at 3.4.5, but at 3.2.12 he relates Crassus' attempt to escape by thrusting his whip into the eye of one of his captors who then killed him. Frontinus (Strat. 4.5.16) has this account also. Livy's account is somewhat different.

Neither Velleius nor Valerius speak of Crassus' son. Nor do they mention that he was summoned to a peace conference by the enemy who had just defeated him. Velleius, instead, says that Crassus was departing from Asia when he was killed. In this incident, then, there is considerable difference between Velleius on the one hand and Valerius and the summary of Livy on the other. Valerius also is at variance with the Livian tradition as seen in the summary of this incident.

10) On Scipio's answer to Carbo concerning Tib. Gracchus:

V.P.2.4.4.: Hic [Scipio], eum interrogante tribuno Carbone, quid de Ti. Gracchi caede sentiret, respondit, si is occupandae rei publicae animum habuisset, iure caesum. Et cum omnis
contio adclamasset, hostium, inquit, arma-
torun totiens clamore non territus, qui
possum vestro moveri, quorum noverca est
Italia?

V.M.6.2.3: Cn. Carbo ... P. Africanum ...
quid de Ti. Gracchi morte, cuius sororem
in matrimonio habebat, sentiret inter-
rogavit, ut auctoritate clarissimi viri
inchoato iam incendio multum incrementi
adiceret, quia non dubitabat quin propter
tam artam adfinitatem aliquid pro memoria
interfecti necessarii miserabiler esset
locuturus. At is iure eum caesium videri
respondit. Cui dicto cum contio tribunicio
furore instincta violenter suclamasset,
'taceant' inquit 'quibus Italia noverca
est'. Orto deinde murmurare 'non efficetis'
ait 'ut solutos verear quos alligatos
adduxi'.

Livy, Per. 59: Cum Carbo tribunus plebis rogationem
tulisset, ut eundem tribunum pleb., quotiens
vellet, creare liceret, rogationem eius
P. Africanus gravissima oratione dissuasit,
in qua dixit Ti. Gracchum iure caesum videri.

Polyaeumus, Strat. 8.16.5: ἐκπίπτων ὕπο τοῦ δῆµου
θορυβούµενος ἔµε ἐφη ὦνδὲ στρατιωτῶν ἐνόπλων
ἐλεγµὸς ἐξεπλήξεν, οὕτως ἐν συγκλίδων ἐνθρησκευόµεν
θόρυβος, ὥν οὔδὲ ἐν τῇ Ιταλίᾳ μητρών, οὐ
μητέρα. τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ συνεστάλησαν καὶ τοῦ
θορυβεῖν ἐπαύσαντο.

All the authors have substantially the same account
of the incident; yet there are differences. Velleius says
nothing of the motive of Carbo in putting the question to
Scipio as Valerius does. The Summary of Livy also does not
touch this point. Scipio's answer, however, as recorded by
Velleius, is more concise. Velleius has a qualifying
si-clause where Valerius and Livy do not; Velleius says
jure caesum where Valerius and Livy say iure caesum videri.
Scipio's noverca remark is present in Velleius and Valerius,
absent in Livy, but present in Polyaenus who lacks the
initial question and answer. Livy, finally, has the iure
caesum comment in a direct speech, not in answer to a
question.

These differences are great enough in this instance
to be evidence that Velleius and Valerius did not work from
the same source. Valerius has the motive of Carbo recorded,
but it is Vellius who gives us the qualifying si-clause with
which Scipio must have avoided the dilemma into which the
question had thrust him: He was caught between his politi­
cal associates on the one hand and his family connections
on the other. Further, the two authors are not following
the Livian tradition as recorded in the summary of Book
Fifty-Nine.

11) On the death of Scipio Aemilianus:

V.P.2.4.5-6: ... mane in lectulo repertus est
mortuus, ita ut quaedam elisarum faucium in
cervice reperiarentur notae. De tanti viri
morte nulla habita est quaestio eiusque corpus
velato capite elatum est, cuius opera super
totum terrarum orbem Roma extulerat caput.

V.M.5.3.2d: ... raptorem spiritus domi inventit,
mortis punitorem in foro non repperit.
V.M.8.15.4: ... mors clandestinis inlata insidiis ... 

Livy, Per. 59: Cum P. Scipio Africanus adversaretur fortisique ac validus pridie domum se recepisset, mortuus in cubiculo inventus est. Suspecta fuit, tamquam ei venenum dedisset, Sempronia uxor hinc maxime, quod soror es.et Graccharum, cum quibus simultas Africano fuerat. De morte tamen eius nulla quaestio acta. Defuncto eo acrius seditiones triumvirales exarserunt.

This exemplum again illustrates the differences which can occur between Velleius and Valerius. Velleius says that Scipio was found dead in bed; Valerius at best only implies this; Livy, however, states it specifically. Velleius states that he had marks of strangulation on his throat; Valerius only implies that there was foul play; Livy says that his wife Sempronia was suspected of poisoning him. Velleius and Livy state that there was no inquest; Valerius does not mention it. Neither Valerius nor Livy mention anything about the burial as does Velleius, but Livy mentions the resultant disturbances not recorded by Velleius and Valerius.

The results again are mixed, with Velleius having some elements in common with Livy, and Valerius others. It appears that Velleius and Valerius arrived at their conclusions in different ways.
12) On Q. Metellus Macedonicus before Contrebia:

V.P.2.5.2-3: Et ante eum paucis annis tam severum illius Q. Macedonici in his gentibus imperium fuit, ut, cum urbem Contrebiam nomine in Hispania oppugnaret, pulsas praecipiti loco quinque cohortes legionarias eodem protinus subire iuberet: facientibus omnibus in procinctu testamenta, velut ad certam mortem eundem foret, non deterritus proposito [perseverantia ducis], quem moriturum miserat militem victorem recepit: tantum effecit mixtus timori pudor spesque desperatione quaesita. Hic virtute ac severitate facti in Hispania fuit clarissimus.

V.M.2.7.10: [Metellus], cum apud Contrebiam res gereretur, conlocatas a se in quadam statione quinque cohortes atque ex ea viribus hostium depulsas repetere eandem stationem e vestigio iussit, non quod speraret ab his amissum locum recuperari posse, sed ut praeferet culpam pugnae insequentis certaminis manifesto periculo puniret. Edixit etiam ut, si quis ex his fugiens castra petisset, pro hoste interficeretur. Qua severitate compressi milites et corporibus fatigatis et animis desperatione vitae implicatis loci tamen iniquitatem multitudinemque hostium superarunt.

Front., Strat. 4.1.23: Q. Metellus Macedonicus, in Hispania, quinque cohortes, quae hostibus cesserant, testamentum facere iussas, ad locum recuperandum remisit; minatus non nisi post victoriam receptum iri.

Both Vellelius and Valerius agree that there were five cohorts who were beaten back by the enemy and then ordered by Metellus to return; Valerius alone describes the place from which they were beaten back as praeceps. Frontinus
says only that they withdrew. Velleius and Frontinus have
the detail about the wills made by the soldiers before they
returned, a detail Valerius has omitted. Omitted by
Velleius but included by Valerius are the reason for
Metellus' action and the threat to put to death as an
enemy any soldier who retreated to the camp. Both authors
close the account with a reference to the *severitas* of
Metellus' decision, thus agreeing on the quality of the
Roman character which this incident exemplified.

Though there are differences of detail, the accounts
of Velleius and Valerius are substantially the same. This
is indicated by the number of cohorts and the common use
of the anecdote as an *exemplum* of *severitas*. Since Livy's
account of the episode may have been omitted by his
epitomator, no conclusions can be drawn from its absence,
as we consider Velleius' and Valerius' sources.

13) On C. Gracchus protected by Pomponius:

V.P.2.6.6: *Quo die singularis Pomponii
equitis Romani in Gracchum fides fuit, qui
more Coclitis sustentatis in ponte hostibus
eius, gladio se transfixit.*

V.M.4.7.2: *Laetorius autem in ponte sublicio (sic)
constitit et eum, donec Gracchus transiret,
ardore spiritus sui saepsit ac vi iam
multitudinis obrutus converso in se gladio
celeri saltu profundum Tiberis petiit, quamque
in eo ponte caritatem toti patriae Horatius*
Cocles exhibuerat, unius amicitiae adiecta voluntaria morte praestitit.

The substance of this anecdote is virtually identical in both authors, though Valerius' account is the longer and the more detailed. Both authors represent a man standing at the bridge and holding off the enemy, thus protecting Gracchus. Both authors compare this man to the legendary Horatius Cocles. In detail, however, there are differences: Velleius identifies the man as Pomponius; Valerius calls him Laetorius. (In Valerius' account, there is a Pomponius who withstands the opposition at the Porta Trigemina.) Further, Valerius describes in greater detail the affairs at the bridge: the defender was "overwhelmed by the power of the mob," "turned his sword on himself," and "with a swift leap hurled himself into the Tiber." In addition, whereas Velleius says only "more Coelitis," Valerius has "quamque in eo ponte caritatem toti patriae Horatius Cocles exhibuerat." Finally, for Velleius the incident is an exemplum of fides, for Valerius of amicitia.

14) On the death of C. Gracchus at the hands of his slave:

V.P.2.6.4-6: Hunc [C. Gracchum] L. Opimius consul, ... morte adfectit. Id unum nefarie ab Opimio proditum, quod capitis non dicam Gracchi, sed civis Romani pretium se daturum idque auro repensurum proposuit ... Gracchus profugiens, cum iam comprehenderetur
ab ils, quos Opimius miserat, cervicem Euporo servo praebuit, qui non seipsum se ipse interemit, quam domino succurrerat.

V.M.6.8.3: C. Gracchus, ne in potestatem inimicorum perveniret, Philocrati servo suo servicia incidendas praebuit. Quas cum celeri ictu abscidisset, gladium crūre domini manantem per sua egit praecordia. Euporum alii hunc vocitatum existimant; ego de nomine nihil disputo, famularis tantum modo fidei robur admiror.

V.M.9.4.3: Ceterum avaritia ante omnes L. Septimulei praecordia possedit, qui, cum C. Gracchi familiaris fuisset, caput eius abscidere et per urbem pilo fixum ferre sustinuit, quia Opimius consul auro id se repensurum edixerat. Sunt qui tradant liquato plumbō eum cavatam partem capitis, quo ponderosius esset, expelles.

Livy, Per. 67: C. Gracchus seditioso tribunatu acto cum Aventinum quoque armata multitudine occupasset, a L. Opimio consule ex senatus consulto vocato ad arma populo pulsus et occisus est, et cum eo Fulvius Flaccus consularis, socius eiusdem furoris.

There are three essential facts to deal with here: the death of Gracchus, the identity and death of his slave, and the weighing of the head of Gracchus. On the death of Gracchus, Velleius first (2.6.4) says that Opimius killed him, then (2.6.6) states that Gracchus submitted his neck to his slave. Valerius says only that the slave killed him; Livy has Opimius killing him. On the identity and death of the slave, Velleius says that his name was Euporus and that he slew himself immediately after killing Gracchus.
Valerius has the name of the slave as Philocrates, though he does mention that others thought the name was Euporus. Valerius also has the slave committing suicide immediately. On the reward for the head, Velleius has Opimius promising to pay a reward in gold for the head; Valerius has the same detail, including the name of the man, Septimuleius, who cut off the head and carried it through the city. Livy mentions neither the slave nor the reward offered by Opimius.

Except for the Summary of Livy, on which no proof can be based because the summarizer could have omitted almost anything, the accounts are very similar in substance and in detail. The greatest difference is one of emphasis, as Paladini points out, in the weighing of the head.

15) On the censure of M. Lepidus Porcina:

V.P.2.10.1: Prosequamur nota severitatem censorum Cassii Longini Caepionisque, qui abhinc annos CLVII Lepidum Aemilium augurem, quod sex milibus HS. aedes conduxisset, adesse iusserunt.

V.M.8.1.7Damn.: Admodum severae notae et illud populi iudicum, cum M. Aemilium Porcinam a L. Cassio accusatum crimine nimirum sublimis exstructae villae in Alsiensi agro gravi multa aestecit.

This episode does not occur in the summaries of Livy. The accounts of Velleius and Valerius are similar, though Velleius specifies the date and the value of the house and notes the name of the second censor, while Valerius says
only that the house was 'nimis sublime exstructae" but does
mention its location. The incident may be considered as
an exemplum of severitas.

16) On Marius suppressing Saturninus and Glaucia:

V.P.2.12.6: Sextus consulatus veluti praemium ei
meritorum datus. Non tamen huius con­
sulatus fraudetur gloria, quo Servilii
Glauciae Saturninique Apulei furorem
continuatis honoribus rem publicam laceran­
tium et gladiis quoque et caede comitia
discutientium, consul armis compescuit
homenique exitiabiles in Hostilia curia
morte multavit.

V.M.3.2.18: Item, cum tr. pl. Saturninus et
praetor Glaucia et Equitius designatus tr.
pl. maximos in civitate nostra seditionum
motus excitassent, nec quisquam se populo
concitato opponeret, primum M. Aemilius
Scaurus C. Marium consulatum sextum gerentem
hortatus est ut libertatem leges que manu
defenderet protinusque arma sibi adferri
iussit. Quibus allatis ultima senectute
confectum et paene dilapsum corpus induit
spiculique innexus ante fores curiae
constitit ac parvulis et extremis spiritus
reliquis ne res publica expiraret effecit:
praesentia enim animi sui senatum et equestrem
ordinem ad vindictam exigendam impulit.

Velleius does not have so full an account of this
incident as does Valerius, but he does have the essentials:
during his sixth consulship, Marius engaged the dissenters
at the Senate house and put them to death. Valerius adds
one name, Equitius, to the list of trouble-makers and
represents Marius as urged to action by Scaurus and as so
feeble that he could scarcely wear the armor necessary, an
anachronism applicable to Marius' seventh consulship. The
difference in treatment is characteristic of Valerius'
generally longer, more ornate accounts, while Velleius'
carefully composed description of the incident is indicative
of the compendious nature of the early part of the history.

17) On Metellus Pius as winning his father's return from
exile:

V.P.2.15.3-4: ... Q. Metellus, Numidici filius, qui meritum cognomen Pii consecutus erat; quippe expulsam civitatem a L. Saturnino
tribuno pl., quod solus in leges eius iurare noluerat, pietate sua, auctoritate senatus, consensu populi Romani restituit patrem.

V.M.5.2.7: Metellus vero Pius pertinaci erga exulem patrem amore tam clarum lacrimis quam alii victoriis cognomen adsecutus ... 

As sometimes happens, Velleius has outdone Valerius
in detail on this matter. Both authors are explaining
the way in which Metellus earned the cognomen Pius, but
Velleius gives the reason for Numidicus' exile. It is,
however, a minor matter for both authors as it is introduced
into a more important context: for Velleius, the Social
Wars; for Valerius, another feat of supplication on the
part of Pius.

18) On Sulpicius' flight from Sulla and his death:

V.P.2.19.1: Sulpicium etiam adsecuti equites in Laurentinis paludibus iugulavere, caputque
eiul erectum et ostentatum pro rostris velut omen imminetis proscriptionis fuit.

V.M.6.5.7: Iam L. Sulla non se tam incolumem quam Sulpiciium Rufum perditum voluit, tribunicio furore eius sine ullo fine vexatus. Ceterum cum eum proscriptum et in villa latentem a servo proditum conperisset, manu missum parricidam, ut fides edicti sui constaret, praecipitari protinus saxo Tarpeio cum illo scelere parto pillo iussit, victor alloquim insolens, hoc imperio iustissimus.

Livy, Per. 77: P. Sulpicius cum in quadam villa lateret, indicio servi sui retractus et occisus est. Servus, ut praemium promissum indici haberet, manumissus et ob scelus proditi domini de saxo delectus est.

Valerius has used this incident as an exemplum of iustitia and his account closely follows that of the summary of Livy. Velleius' account, however, is completely different, placing Sulpicius in the Laurentine marshes when discovered instead of in a villa, as in the accounts of Valerius and Livy. Also, in Valerius and Livy he is found with the help of the information given by a slave, whereas Velleius says only that he was found by a group of equites. The two accounts are quite different, bespeaking a different source for Velleius.

19) On Marius released by the "servus publicus":

V.P.2.19.2-4: Marius post sextum consulatum annumque LXX nudus ac limo obrutus, oculus tantummodo ac naribus eminentibus, extractus arundineto circa paludem Maricae, in quam
se fugiens consectantis Sullae equites abdiderat, iniecto in collum loro in carcerem Minturnensium iussu duumviri perductus est. Ad quem interficidendum missus cum gladio servus publicus natione Germanus, qui forte ab imperatore eo bello Cimbrico captus erat, ut agnovit Marium, magno eiulatu expromens indignationem casus tanti viri abierunt gladio profugit et carcerere. Tum cives, ab hoste misereri paulo ante principis viri docti, in instructum eum viatico conlataque veste in navem imposuerunt. At ille adsecutus circa insulam Aenaram filium currsum in Africam direxit inopemque vitam in tugurio ruinarum Carthaginiensium toleravit, cum Marius aspiciens Carthaginem, illa intuens Marium, alter alteri possent esse solacio.

V.M.2.10.6: . . . missus enim ad eum occidendum in privata domo Minturnis clausum servus publicus natione Cimber et senem et inermem et squalore obsitum strictum gladium tenens adgredi non sustinuit et claritate viri obcaecatus abierit ferro attonitus inde ac tremens fugit. Cimbrica nimirum calamitas oculos hominis praestrinxit, devictaeque gentis suae interitus animum comminuit, etiam dis immortalibus indignum ratus ab uno eius nationis interfici Marium, quam totam deleverat. Minturnenses autem maiestate illius capti comprehensum iam et constrictum dira fati necessitate incolumem praestiterunt. Nec fuit eis timori asperrima Sullae victoria, cum praesertim ipse Marius eos a conservando Mario absterrere posset.

Livy, Per. 77: C. Marius pater cum in paludibus Minturnensium lateret, extractus est ab oppidaniis, et cum missus ad eum occidendum servus natione Gallus maiestate tanti viri perterritus recessisset, impositus publice navi delatus est in Africam.

This story is basically the same in all three authors.

Velleius, however, seems closer to Livy than Valerius because
Valerius says nothing of the discovery of Marius in the swamp as do both Velleius and Livy. Velleius goes into great detail about the actual arrest, while Livy's summarizer merely notes that he was taken out of the swamp. All three are in agreement in stating that the slave fled, overwhelmed by the sight of so great a man brought so low. Only slight variations on the nationality of the slave are in evidence, and Velleius and Valerius refer to his capture in the Cimbric wars. But Valerius omits the fact that Marius, having been put aboard ship, set sail for Africa, a detail mentioned by both Velleius and Livy. Velleius ends his account by pointedly making the comparison of Marius and Carthage, both humbled, both comforting one another. Valerius ends by commending the courage of the Minturnae in facing up to Sulla by releasing Marius. Livy's summary is silent, drawing no moral.

There are other accounts of this exemplum in Lucan, B.C. 2.70.ff., Seneca Rhetor, Cont. 7.2.6, and Plutarch, Marius 37-40. Lucan is very close to Velleius, mentioning the arrest of Marius in the swamp and making the comparison between Marius and Carthage at the end. Seneca, in abbreviated fashion, refers to the swamp ("Minturnensis palus exulem Marium non hausit") and to the flight of the
would-be executioner ("iter a conspectu exulis flexit"). Plutarch, in an extended account covering four chapters, 37-40, follows Marius all the way from the swamp to Africa, the only notable difference being that the slave-executioner in the other accounts is in Plutarch a horseman-executioner and there is no mention of him as being "sent" to do the task (39.1).

20) On Q. Catulus against Pompey's extraordinary command:

V.P.2.32.1-2: Digna est memoria Q. Catuli cum auctoritas tum verecundia. Qui cum dissuadens legem in contione dixisset esse quidem praecelarum virum Cn. Pompeium, sed nimirum iam liberae rei publicae neque omnia in uno reponenda adiecissetque: 'si quid huic acciderit, quem in eius locum substituitis?', subclamavit universa contio, te Q. Catule. Tum ille victus consensu omnium et tam honorifico civitatis testimonio e contione discessit.

V.M.8.15.9: Q. etiam Catulum populus Romanus voce sua tantum non ad sidera usque evexit: nam cum ab eo pro rostris interrogaretur, si in uno Pompeio Magno omnia reponere perseverasset, absumpsit illo subiti casus incursu in quo spem esset habiturus, summo consensu adclamavit 'in te'. Vim honorati iudicii admirabilem! si quidem magnum Pompeium cum omnibus ornamentis, quae retuli, duarum syllabarum spatio inclusum Catulo aequavit.

This exemplum, of auctoritas and verecundia for Velleius and of "quae cuique magnifica contigerunt" for Valerius, is not in the Periochae of Livy but does exist in
Plutarch, *Pompey*, 25.5, where it takes much the same form as in Velleius and Valerius. The close similarity between the accounts indicates that the tradition on this event was very firm and united, and that Valerius and Velleius may have used the same source.

21) On Pompey's clemency toward Tigranes:

V.P.2.37.2-5: prior filius Tigranis, sed discors patri, pervenit ad Pompeium: mox ipse supplex et prae sens se regnumque dicioni eius permisit, praefatus neminem alium neque Romanum neque ulius gentis virum futurum fuisse, cuius se potestati commissurus foret, quam Cn. Pompeium; proinde omnem sibi vel adversam vel secundam, cuius auctor ille esset, fortunam tolerabilem futuram: non esse turpe ab eo vinc, quem vincere esset nefas, neque inhoneste aliquem summitti huic, quem fortuna super omnis extulisset. Servatus regi honos imperii, sed multato ingenti pecunia, quae omnis, sicuti Pompeio moris erat, redacta in quaestoris potestatem ac publicis descripta litteris. Syria aliaeque, quas occupaverat, provinciae ereptae, et aliae restitutae populo Romano, aliae tum primum in eius potestatem redactae, ut Syria, quae tum primum facta est stipendiaria. Finis imperii regii terminatus Armenia.

V.M.5.1.9: Regem Armeniae Tigranem, qui et per se magna cum populo Romano bella gesserat et infestissimum urbi nostrae Mitridatem Ponto pulsum viribus suis protecerat, in conspectu suo diutius iacere supplicem passus non est, sed benignis verbis recreatum diadema, quod abicerat, capiti reponere iussit certisque rebus imperatis in pristinum fortunae habitum restituit, aeque pulchrum esse iudicans et vincere reges et facere.
Livy, Per. 101: Tigranem in deditionem accepit
Pompeius eique ademptus Syria Phoenice
Cilicia regnum Armeniae restituit.

The Livian summary is here sketchy, saying only that Pompey, in accepting Tigranes' surrender, restored him to Armenia but took away Syria, Phoenicia and Cilicia. Valerius' treatment, fuller but with scarcely more detailed information, points in a general way to the extent of Tigranes' fall from power and his attitude of supplication before Pompey but gives special emphasis to Pompey's reasons by means of the neat closing epigram. Velleius in placing emphasis on the clemency and honesty of Pompey, goes into greater detail about the encounter between the two men. We learn that Tigranes' son preceded him in surrender, while the details of the settlement are set forth in greater detail than in Valerius. We learn, in fact, that some provinces taken from Tigranes were "restitutae populo Romano" while others were only "in eius potestatem redactae." Thus in this exemplum also, there are differences between Velleius and Valerius, which indicate that they were not using the same source.

22) On Pompey's triumph:

V.P.2.40.3-4: ... in urbem reiit magnificentissimumque de tot regibus per biduum egit triumphum longeque maiorem omni ante
se inlata pecunia in aerarium, praeterquam a Paulo, ex manubis intuil. . . . Huius viri fastigium tantis auctibus fortuna extulit, ut primum ex Africa, iterum ex Europa, tertio ex Asia triumpharet et, quot partes terrarum orbis sunt, totidem Faceret monumenta victoriae suae.

V.M.8.15.8: . . . Eques Romanus pro consule in Hispaniam adversus Sertorium pari imperio cum Pio Metello principe civitatis missus est. Nondum ullum honorem curulem auspicatus bis triumphavit . . . De Mitridate et Tigrane, de multis praeterea regibus plurimisque civitatibus et gentibus et praedonibus unum duxit triumphum.

Livy, Per. 103: Pompeius de liberis Mithridatis et Tigrane Tigranis filio triumphavit Magnusque a tota contione consalutatus est.

Lucan, B.C. 7.279-80: Sitque palam, quae tot duxit Pompeius in urbem Curribus, unius gentes non esse triumphi.

These notices of the triumphs of Pompey are included here to show that, even on a matter so widely recognized, the authors under consideration are not working from the same source, nor are the sources from which they worked even close to agreement with one another. The accounts of these four authors are not cast in the form of an exemplum; there is no engaging anecdote pointing a moral or illustrating a trait of Roman character. Yet the incident must have been included in all the history books and rhetorical manuals as being the crowning achievement in the
career of one of Rome's greatest citizens.

23) On Caesar's capture by the pirates:

V.P.2.41.3-42.3: Idem postea admodum iuvenis, cum a piratis captus esset, ita se per omne spatium, quo ab his retentus est, apud eos gessit, ut pariter his terrori veneratione esset, neque umquam aut noxet aut die . . . aut excalcearetur aut discingeretur, in hoc scilicet, ne si quando aliquid ex solito variaret, suspectus his, qui oculis tantummodo eum custodiebant, foret . . . Quae nox eam diem secuta est, qua publica civitatium pecunia redemptus est, ita tamen, ut cogeret ante observis a piratis civitatis dari, contracta classe tumultuaria privatus invectus in eum locum, in quos ipsi praedones erant, partem classis fugavit, partem meruit, aliquot navis multosque mortales cepit; laetusque nocturnae expeditionis triumpho ad suos reversus est, mandatisque custodias quos ceperat, in Bithyniam perexit ad proconsulem Iuncum . . . petens, ut auctor fieret sumendi de captivis supplicii: Quod cum ille se facturum negasset venditurumque captivos dixisset . . ., incredibili celeritate revectus ad mare, priusquam de ea re ulli proconsulis redderetur epistulæ, omnis, quos ceperat, suffixit cruci.

V.M.6.9.15: . . . inter primae iuventae initia privatus Asiam petens, a maritimis praedonibus circa insulam Pharmacam exceptus L se talentis redemit. Parva igitur summa clarissimum mundi sidus in piratico myoparone repetendi fortuna voluit. Quid est ergo quod amplius de ea queramur, si ne consortibus quidem divinitatis suae parcit? Sed caeleste numen se ab iniuria vindicavit: continuo enim captos praedones crucibus affixit.

Velleius has by far the more detailed account of this incident. He speaks of the conduct of Caesar while in
captivity, of his determined action after being freed to punish the pirates, and of the actual punishment. The anecdote in Velleius is, implicitly at least, an exemplum of the firmness of purpose with which Caesar could act and explicitly of the swiftness of his actions. Valerius has placed the anecdote in his category De mutatione morum aut fortunae, but has emphasized only the detail of the ransom worth 50 talents, thus drawing the conclusion that it was a small sum to be used for ransoming so great a man. The incident does not appear in Livy's summaries, but Suetonius, Divus Julius 4, has an account similar in detail to that of Valerius.

24) On Cato bringing the Cyprian treasures to Rome:

V.P.2.45.5: Unde pecuniam longe sperata maiorem Cato Romam retulit: cuius integritatem laudari nefas est, insolentia paene argui potest, quod una cum consulibus ac senatu effusa civitate obviam, cum per Tiberim subiret navibus, non ante iis egressus est, quam ad eum locum pervenit, ubi erat exponenda pecunia.

V.M.4.1.14: Cypriacum pecuniam maxima cum diligentia et sanctitate in urbem deportaverat.

V.M.4.3.2: Unde cum pecuniae deportandae ministerium sustineret, tam aversum animum ab omni venere quam a lucro habuit in maxima utriusque intertemporantiae materia versatus: nam et regiae divitiae potestate ipsius continebatur et fertilissimae deliciarum tot Graeciae urbes necessaria totius navigationis deverticula
erant. Atque id Munatius Rufus Cypriacae expeditionis fides comes scriptis suis significat. Cuius testimonium non amplerctor: proprio enim argumento laus ista nititur, quoniam ex eodem naturae utero et continentia nata est et Cato.

V.M.8.15.10: Potest et M. Catonis ex Cypro cum regia pecunia revertentis ad pulsus ad ripam urbis memorabilis videri, cuin nave egrediendi consules et ceteri magistratus et universus senatus populusque Romanus officii gratia praesto fuit, non quod magnum pondus auri et argenti, sed quod M. Catonem classis illa incolumem advexerat laetatus.

Livy, Per. 104: Leges latae de redigenda in provinciae formam Cypro et publicanda pecunia regia M. Catoni administratio eius rei mandata est.

Lucan, B.C. 3.164: (census populi R) Quod Cato longinquam vexit super aequora Cypro.

The incident which Velleius narrates here is not included in Valerius' handbook in precisely the same form. Valerius 4.1.14 and 4.3.2 both refer to the task undertaken by Cato, the bringing back of the Egyptian king's treasure, but not to his conduct when he returned to Rome. Valerius 8.15.10 does refer to his actions at the time of his return but mentions him as disembarking to meet the welcoming party, not as refusing to disembark until he had reached the point at which the treasure was to be unloaded. Livy's summary and Lucan both refer to the incident in passing. It is clear here also that, although the sources used by
Velleius and Valerius are in the Livian tradition, the
details are sufficiently different to demand the conclusion
that the two authors did not use the same source.

25) On the death of Julia and her son:

V.P.2.47.2: Quarto ferme anno Caesar morabatur
in Gallis, cum medium iam ex invidia
potentiae male cohaerentis inter Cn. Pompeium
et C. Caesarem concordiae pignus Iulia, uxor
Magni, decessit: atque omnia inter destinatos
tanto discriminii duces dirimente fortuna
filius quoque parvus Pompei, Iulia natus, intra
breve spatium obiit.

V.M.4.6.4: Consimilis affectus Iuliae C. Caesaris
filiae adnotatus est. Quae, cum aediliciis
Pompei Magni coniugis sui vestem crure
respersam e campo domum relatam, vidisset,
terrata metu ne qua ei vis esset adlata,
exanimis concidit partumque, quem utero
conceptum habebat, subita animi consternatione
et gravi dolore corporis eicere coacta est
magni quidem cum totius terrarum orbis
detimento, cuius tranquillitas tot civilium
bellorum truculentissimo furore perturbata
non esset, si Caesaris et Pompei concordia
communis sanguinis vinculo constricta
mansisset.

Both authors cite the death as the cause of the break
between Pompey and Caesar, although Velleius simply mentions
it while Valerius relates the circumstances which brought
it about. Lucan (B.C. 1.111-120) also cites it as the cause
of the break between the two leaders. In addition, Seneca
the philosopher refers to it (Cons. ad Marc. 14.3). The
difference between Velleius and Valerius again demonstrates
that the two authors, while in the same tradition, were working from different material.

26) On the death of Pompey:

V.P.2.53.1-2: . . . Aegyptum petere proposuit [Pompeius] memor beneficiorum, quae in patrem eius Ptolomaei, qui tum puero quam iuveni propior regnabat Alexandriam, consulat ... missi itaque ab rege, qui venientem Cn. Pompeium (is iam a Mytilenis Corneliam uxorem receptam in navem fugae comitem habere coeparet) consilio Theodoti et Achillae exciperent hortarenturque ut ex oneraria in eam navem, quae obviam processerat, transcenderet: quod cum fecisset, princeps Romani nominis imperio arbitrioque Aegyptii mancipii C. Caesare P. Servilio consulibus iugulatus est. Hic post tres consulatus et totidem triumphos domitumque terrarum orbem sanctissimi atque praestantissimi viri in id evecti, super quod ascendi non potest, duodevicensimum annum agentis pridie natalem ipsius vitae fuit exitus, in tantum in illo viro a se discordante fortuna, ut cui modo ad victoriam terra defuerat, deesset ad sepulturam.

V.M.5.1.10: Quam praecellarum tributae humanitatis specimen Cn. Pompeius, quam miserabile desideratae idem evasit exemplum! Nam qui Tigranis tempora insigni regio texerat, eius caput tribus coronis triumphalibus spoliatum in suo modo terrarum orbe nusquam sepulta locum habuit, sed abscessum a corpore inops rogi nefarium Aegyptiae perfidiae munus portatum est etiam ipsi victori miserabile: ut enim id Caesar aspexit ... .

Livy, Per. 112: Cn. Pompeius cum Aegyptum petisset, iussu Ptolemaei regis, pupilli sui, auctore Theodoto praeceptore, cuius magna apud regem auctoritas erat, et Pothino occisus est ab

According to Velleius, Pompey sought out Egypt because he remembered previous kindnesses to his father on the part of Ptolemy; he took his wife on board on the way there, and, on the advice of Theodotus and Achillas, the king sent men to kill him. They did so by luring him into a smaller craft for the ostensible purpose of going ashore. Once in the boat, he was killed. Velleius goes on to say that the man who could find no more earth to conquer could not, at death, find some earth in which to be buried. Valerius makes this last point without describing the manner of Pompey's death and the people responsible, then goes on to describe Caesar's reaction to the sight of Pompey's head. Livy's summary says, without explaining why, that Pompey made for Egypt, that Theodotus and Pothinus advised the king to dispose of Pompey, and that Achillas carried out the task in a naviculum before Pompey reached land. Further, Livy says that his wife and son fled.

Velleius mentions Theodotus and Achillas as the authors of the plot; Livy has Theodotus and Pothinus. Velleius does not name the killer; Livy names Achillas. Velleius has Pompey picking up his wife at Mytilene while
en route, Livy implies as much by saying that she fled, but he also includes Pompey's son Sextus whom Velleius does not mention. Other than these details, the accounts of Velleius and Livy are much the same. Valerius, however, while he has the substance of the incident, treats it more briefly, leading up to the humane reaction of Caesar which is the main point of his treatment.  

27) On Calpurnia's dream:

V.P.2.57.2: ... et uxor Calpurnia territa nocturno visu, ut ea die domi substiteret, orabat, ... .

V.M.1.7.2: ... audiverat [Augustus] enim divi Iuli patris sui uxorem Calpurniam nocte, quam is ultimam in terris egit, in quie abit vidisse multis eum confectum vulneribus in suo sinu iacentem, somnique atrocitate vehementer exterritam rogare non destitisse ut proximo die curia se abstineret.


Suetonius, Divus Julius, 81.3: ... ; et Calpurnia uxor imaginata est conlabi fastigium domus maritumque in gremio suo confodi, ac subito cubiculi fores sponte patuerunt.

Neither Velleius nor Valerius give this incident much attention. Velleius merely mentions it in recounting several warnings made to Caesar before his assassination.
Valerius mentions it immediately after the warning of Artorius the physician to the young Caesar just before the battle of Philippi as a "recens et domesticum exemplum" also giving warning to Augustus. He includes it in the category De somniis. Neither author mentions the falling pediment and the opening of the doors which awakened Calpurnia, as do Julius Obsequens and Suetonius. But Valerius does have in common with Suetonius Calpurnia's dream of holding the wounded Caesar in her arms. Further, Valerius relates the content of the dream, while Velleius merely mentions that she was warned by a dream.32

28) On Spurinna's warning to Caesar:

V.P.2.57.2: Nam et haruspices praemonuerunt, ut diligentissime iduum Martiarum caveret diem, . . .

V.M.8.11.2: Praedixerat [Spurinna] C. Caesari ut proximos XXX dies quasi fatales caveret, quorum ultimus erat idus Martiae. Eo cum forte mane uterque in domum Calvini Domiti ad officium convenisset, Caesar Spurinnae 'ecquid scis idus iam Martias venisse? At is 'ecquid scis illas nondum praeterisse?' Abierat alter timorem tamquam exacto tempore suspecto, alter ne extremam quidem eius partem periculo vacuum esse arbitratus est. Utinam haruspicem potius augurium quam patriae parentem securitas fefellerisset.

Suet., Julius 81.2: Et immolantem haruspex Spurinna monuit, caveret periculum, quod non ultra Martias Idus proferretur.
This incident does not occur in the summaries of Livy. Velleius, as in the preceding exemplum, merely mentions the fact that there was a warning from a seer. Suetonius does the same but names Spurinna. Valerius, however, tells the story in some detail.

29) On the death of D. Brutus:

V.P.2.64.1-2: D. Brutus desertus primo a Planco, postea etiam insidiis eiusdem petitus, paulatim relinquente eum exercitu fugiens in hospitis cuiusdam nobilis viri, nomine Camelii, domo ab his, quos miserat Antonius, iugulatus est iustissimasque optime de semerito viro C. Caesari poenas dedit, cuius cum primus omnium amicorum fuisse, inter-fector fuit et fortunae, ex qua fructum tulerat, invidiam in auctorem relegat censebatque aequum, quae acceperat a Caesare, retinere, Caesarem, qui illa dederat, perire.

V.M.9.13.3: Quid, D. Brutus exiguom et infelix momentum vitae quanto dedecore emit! Qui a Furio, quem ad eum occidendum Antonius miserat, comprehensus, non solum cervicem gladio subtraxit, sed etiam constantius eam praebere admonitus ipsis his verbis iuravit: 'ita vivam, dabo'. O cuestionem fati aerumnosam! O iurandi stolidam fidem! Sed hos tu furores inmoderata retinendi spiritus dulcedo subicis sanae rationis modum expugnando, quae vitam diligere, mortem non timere praecipit.

In addition to the selection quoted here, Valerius also has an anecdote concerning the attempt of a friend, Sergius Terentius, to save the life of Brutus by pretending to be him (V.M. 4.7.6). This anecdote is nowhere referred
to by Velleius. V.M. 9.13.3 is much closer to Velleius' version, but there are differences of detail. Velleius points out that Brutus was first deserted and then sought out by Plancus, then deserted by his army, that he then took refuge with a certain noble, Camelus, at whose home those sent by Antonius caught up with and killed him. He goes on to cite the ingratitude of Brutus toward Caesar. Valerius has none of this detail but does name Brutus' killer, Furius. He is more concerned with the rhetorical effect to be gained from citing the last words of Brutus, "ita vivam, dabo." Valerius emphasizes Brutus' desire to live (the heading of the chapter is De cupiditate vitae), while Velleius brings out the justice of his fate.

30) On Ventidius serving as praetor and later consul in the same year:

V.P.2.65.3: Vidit hic annus Ventidium, per quam urbem inter captivos Picentium in triumpho ductus erat, in ea consularem praetextam iungentem praetoria. Idem hic postea triumphavit.

V.M.6.9.9: ... Hic est Ventidius, qui postea Romae ex Parthis et per Parthos de Crassi manibus in hostili solo miserabiliter iacentibus triumphum duxit. Ita qui captivus carcerem exhorruerat, victor Capitolium felicitate celebravit. In eodem etiam illud eximum, quod eodem anno praetor et consul est factus.
It is clear that these two anecdotes are quite close. The only real difference is that Valerius gives more detail concerning the triumph which Ventidius celebrated, while Velleius is more specific on his captivity.

31) On Caesitius Flavus and C. Julius Caesar:

V.P.2.68.4-5: Quatenus autem aliquid ex omissis peto, notetur immodica et intempestiva libertate usos adversus C. Caesarum Marullum Epidium Flavumque Caesitium tribunos pl., dum arguunt in eo regni voluntatem, paene vim dominationis expertos. In hoc tamen saepe lacessiti principis ira excessit, ut censorship potius contentus nota quam animadversione dictatoria summoveret eos a re publica testareturque esse sibi miserrimum, quod aut natura sua ei excedendum foret aut minuenda dignitas.

V.M.5.7.2: Non tam speciosa Caesiti equitis Romani sors patria, sed par indulgentia. Quia ab Caesare omnium iam et externorum et domesticorum hostium victore cum abdicare filium suum iuberetur, quod is tribunus pl. cum Marullo collega invidiam ei tamquam regnum adfectanti fecerat, in hunc modum respondere sustinuit . . .

Livy, Per. 116: . . . invidiae adversus eum causam praestiterunt . . . quod Epidio Marullo et Caesitio Flavo tribunis plebis invidiam ei tamquam regnum adfectanti concitantibus potestas abrogata est.

Velleius agrees with the summary of Livy here in focusing attention on the two tribunes, Epidius and Caesitius. Both authors cite the same reason for the actions of the tribunes: "dum arguunt in eo regni voluntatem" (V.P.),
and "invidiam ei tamquam regnum affectanti concitantibus" (Livy). For Velleius, it is an exemplum of immodica et intempestiva libertas. Valerius, however, concentrates on the father of Caesitius and his refusal to disown his son, which element in the episode Velleius nowhere mentions. Valerius does, however, cite the reason why Caesar asked this action on the part of the father toward the son: "quod is tribunus pl. cum Marullo collega invidiam ei tamquam regnum affectanti fecerat." The three accounts, in other words, are in complete harmony on the question of the conduct of the tribunes. The part played by Caesitius, the father, may well have been in Livy despite its absence from the summary, while its absence from Velleius' account shows that Velleius was using a source different from that of Valerius. He could hardly have failed to include such a pointed exemplum of old Roman constantia and, in Valerius' words, "amor parentum et indulgentia in liberos" had it been available to him.

32) On Artorius' warning to Octavian before Philippi:

V.P.2.70.1: . . . (nam ipse Caesar, etiam si infirmissimus valetudine erat, obibat munia ducis, oratus etiam ab Artorio medico, ne in castris remaneret, manifesta denuntiatione quietis territo), . . .

V.M.1.7.1: Eius medico Artorio somnum capienti nocte, quam dies insecutus est, quo in campis
Philippiis Romani inter se exercitus concurrerunt, Minervae species oborta praecipit ut illum gravi morbo implicitum moneret ne propter adversam valitudinem proximo proelio non interesset. Quod cum Caesar audisset, lectica se in aciem deferri iussit. Ubi dum supra vires corporis pro adipiscenda victoria excubat, castra eius a Bruto capta sunt.

This incident is not recorded in Livy's summaries. The accounts of Velleius and Valerius are in harmony, but Valerius alone spells out the content of the dream which both give as the reason for Octavian's departure from the camp on the day of the battle. Paladini points out that Velleius introduces the incident only by way of a parenthesis, whereas Valerius gives it its own importance in the category De somniis.33

33) On the death of Cassius:

V.P.2.70.2-3: Tum Cassius ex sua fortuna eventum collegae aestimans, cum dimisisset evocatum iussissetque nuntiare sibi, quae esset multitudo ac vis hominum, quae ad se tenderet, tardius eo nuntiante, cum in vicino esset agmen cursu ad eum tendentium neque pulvere facies aut signa denotari possent, existimans hostes esse, qui irruerent, lacerna caput circumdedit extentamque cervicem interritus liberto praebuit. Deciderat Cassii caput, cum evocatus advenit nuntians Brutum esse victorem. Qui cum imperatorem prostratum videret, sequar, inquit, eum, quem mea occidit tarditas, et ita in gladium incubuit.

V.M.9.9.2: Nam C. Cassium error a semet ipso poenas exigere coegit: inter illum enim pugnae
quattuor exercituum apud Philippum varium ipsumque ducibus ignotum eventum missus ab eo Titinius centurio nocturno tempore, ut specularetur quonam in statu res M. Bruti essent, dum crebros excessus viae petit, quia tenebrarum obscuritas hostesne an conmilitones occurrerent dominus non sinebat, tardius ad Cassium reedit. Quem is exceptum ab hostibus omniaque in eorum potestatem recidisse existimans finire vitam properavit, cum et castra hostium invicem capta et Bruti copiae magna ex parte incolumes essent. Titini vero non obliteranda silentio virtus, qui oculis paulisper haesit inopinato iacentis ducis spectaculo attonitus, deinde profusus in lacrimas 'etsi inprudens' inquit, 'imperator, causa tibi mortis fui, tamen, ne id ipsum inpunitum sit, accipe me fati tui comitem', superque exanime corpus eius iugulo suo gladium capulo tenus demisit ac permixto utriusque sanguine duplex victim a iacuit, pietatis haec, erroris illa.

Livy, Per. 124: Sed inaequalem fortunam partium mors Cassii fecit, qui in eo cornu fuisset, quod pulsum erat, totum exercitu fusum ratus mortem conscivit. Altera dein die victus M. Brutus et ipse vitam finivit, exorato Stratone fugae comite, ut sibi gladium adigeret. Annorum erat circiter XL.

Substantially, again, the accounts of Velleius and Valerius are identical and are in agreement with the Livian version as seen in the Periochae. Differences in emphasis and in detail are, however, to be noted. Paladini notes that Velleius prefers to dwell on the essential points of the incident, emphasizing a description of Cassius' death while relegating to the background the activities of the scout sent out by Cassius. Valerius, on the other hand,
dwells in more detail on the scout at the expense of a
description of the death of Cassius. (He says merely
"finire vitam properavit.") This is done, despite the fact
that the anecdote is included in the chapter De errore and
that the paragraph both begins ("Nam Cassium error") and
ends ("erroris illa") with a reference to the error in
judgment on the part of Cassius. For it is Cassius' error,
not that of the scout.

The error, the main theme of the anecdote, is referred
to by Velleius ("existimans hostes esse"), by Valerius (see
above) and by Livy ("totum exercitum fusum ratus"). The
difference in treatment, however, is manifested by various
nuances of detail. Velleius does not mention the name of
the scout, referring to him only as "evocatum." Nor does
he refer to the reason for his tardiness. He goes on to
explain Cassius' decision for suicide, i.e. that he had
determined that an approaching band of men was hostile
("existimans hostes esse, qui irruerent"), and then
describes the suicide itself. Finally, he states briefly
the reaction of the scout on seeing his commander's body.

Valerius, on the contrary, gives the name of the
scout, Titinius a centurion, and also the reason for the
delay ("quia tenebrarum obscuritas hostesne an conmilitones
occurrent dinoscere non sinebat"). He goes on to give the reason why Cassius decided on suicide ("Quem is exceptum ab hostibus omniaque in eorum potestatem recidisse existimans"), simply mentions the suicide itself, and then relates the reaction of Titinus.

The Livian account refers only to the error of judgment made by Cassius ("totum exercitum fusum ratus"). He makes no mention of the part played by the scout in the episode.

The accounts of these three authors are, then, substantially the same, but the differences in detail would indicate that they did not use the same source. 35

Of the thirty-three exempla surveyed in this section, seventeen are to be found in similar form in Livy. Though the degree of similarity varies in detail and emphasis, in substance the accounts are much the same. The remaining sixteen exempla cannot be found in Livy or the epitomes of Livy. Two of these, the Codrus and Lysippus anecdotes, are not to be expected there. The other fourteen fall into the historical period covered by the lost books and may have been excluded by his epitomator. Three of the fourteen, the censure of Lepidus Porcina, the successful campaign of Metellus Pius to bring his father back from exile, and the
dual magistracy of Ventidius, are not of great significance and may well have been omitted by Livy himself. The remaining eleven exempla are, however, of such significance as to be expected in Livy. These may be divided into two groups: a) those which are found in a Livian author other than Valerius; and b) those which are not found in another author. To the first group belong the following: No. 12, Metellus Nacedonicus at Contrebia (Frontinus); No. 20, Catulus against Pompey's command (Plutarch); No. 23, Caesar and the pirates (Suetonius); No. 25, the death of Julia (Lucan and Seneca philosophus); and No. 28, Spurinna's warning to Caesar (Suetonius). To the second group belong: No. 5, the four sons of Macedonicus; No. 6, the death of Viriathus; No. 13, the protection of C. Gracchus by Pomponius; No. 16, Marius against Saturninus and Glaucia; No. 29, the death of Brutus; and No. 32, the warning of Artorius to Octavian. All the exempla in this last group may have been omitted by Livy's epitomator. That they occur in Valerius is suggestive of a Livian origin.

In sum, all but two of the exempla surveyed here are either found in Livy or can be safely traced to him. This conclusion indicates that Livy held a dominant position in the historiographical tradition of the first century A.D.
Though a supporter of the old republican form of government, he was held in high regard by Augustus, nor is it likely that Tiberius would have downgraded him. For both principes had to work within the framework of the form of government which Livy represented. Indeed, it was part of their political propaganda. Velleius, the admirer of Tiberius and participant in his government, would also look favorably upon the Republican historian.

c) Exempla common to Velleius and to authors other than Valerius

1) Mummius and the loss of the art treasures:

V.P.1.13.4: Mummius tam rudis fuit, ut capta Corintho cum maximorum artificum perfectas manibus tabulas ac statuas in Italiam portandas locaret, iuberet praedici conducentibus, si eas perdidissent, novas eos reddituros.

Frontinus, Strat. 4.3.15: L. Mummius, qui Corintho capta, non Italiam solum, sed etiam provinciam tabulis statuisque exornavit, adeo nihil ex tantis manubiiis in suum convertit, ut filiam eius inopem Senatus ex publico dotaverit.

Livy, Per. 53 (Oxy): Sigla statu(a)s tabulas Corinth(ias L. M)ummius distribuit circa oppida et Romam ornavit.

All three authors refer to the fact that Mummius brought back art treasures from Corinth, Frontinus and the Periochae of Livy from Oxyryynchus also stating that he distributed them both in Rome and in the outlying towns and
provinces. While this is as far as Livy's summary goes, Frontinus adds that Mummius kept nothing for himself, that he was so poor that the Senate had to provide a dowry for his daughter from public funds. Velleius, however, states that Mummius informed those who had contracted to transport the treasures back to Italy that they would have to replace whatever they lost. Velleius did not intend it to be an exemplum of a certain type of Roman general, for he is merely comparing Mummius to the urbane and sophisticated Scipio. The anecdote is used only to explain the character of Mummius. It is however the type of anecdote that is likely to be used by a rhetorician looking for a good exemplum, so that it falls within our purview. Velleius' account is not to be found in another author, such as in Valerius, leading to the possibility that he was using sources out of the mainstream of the historical tradition.

2) Caesar's brave example at Munda:

V.P.2.55.3-4: Sua Caesarem in Hispaniam comitata fortuna est, sed nullum umquam atrocius periculosiusque ab eo initum proelium, adeo ut plus quam dubio Marte descenderet equo consistensque ante recedentem suorum aciem, increpita prius fortuna, quod se in eum servasset exitum, denuntiaret militibus vestigio se non recessurum: proinde viderent, quem et quo loco imperatorem deserturi forent. Verecundia magis quam virtute acies restituta, et a duce quam a milite fortius. Cn. Pompeius
gravis vulnere inventus inter solitudines avias interemptus est; Labienum Varumque acies abstulit.


Though Velleius does not mention Munda by name, it is certain that he is referring to the same battle as that in Livy's summary, because both authors say that Cn. Pompeius was killed at the battle. Livy's summary merely states that Caesar was victorious at Munda and that Pompey was killed. Velleius gives the reader the anecdote about Caesar's courageous and successful effort to shame his troops into fighting to the end rather than retreating. No account of the incident is to be found in Valerius, but Plutarch has it in *Caesar*, 56.2, and Suetonius refers to Caesar's ability to rally his troops (*Divus Julius* 62). Valerius does refer to Caesar's battle at Munda, referring to the effort on the part of his troops to use enemy bodies for protection, but nowhere does he recount the incident which Velleius narrates.

3) Notes proclaiming a conspiracy against Caesar:

V.P.2.57.2: . . . et libelli coniurationem nuntiantes dati neque protinus ab eo lecti erant.
Suet., *Divus Julius* 81.4: ... quinta fere hora progressus est libellumque insidiarum indicem ab obvio quodam porrectum libellis ceteris, quos sinistra manu tenebat, quasi mox lecturus commiscuit.

Here Velleius makes passing reference, in connection with other warnings to Caesar, to admonitions which the dictator would have received from some written notes had he read them. Suetonius reports the same incident, saying that Caesar put the note in with others he intended to read. The incident is apparently referred to by Plutarch (Caesar 65.1), who states that one Artemidorus passed to Caesar a roll containing a written warning, but that Caesar could not read it because of the crowd pressing round him. Neither Valerius nor Livy's summary record the event. Velleius evidently had access to information which Valerius did not use or chose to omit from his exempla.

4) Antony grants amnesty to the conspirators:

V.P.2.58.2-4: Tum consul Antonius ... convocato senatu cum iam Dolabella, quem substituturus sibi Caesar designaverat consulem, fasces atque insignia corripuisset consulis, velut pacis auctor liberos suos obsides in Capitolium misit fidemque descendendi tuto interfectoribus Caesaris dedit. Et illud decreti Atheniensium celeberrimi exemplum, relatum a Cicerone, oblivionis praeteritarum rerum decreto patrum comprobatum est.

Livy, *Per.* 116: Oblivione deinde caedis eius a senatu decreta, obsidibus Antonii et Lepidi
de liberis acceptis coniurati a Capitolio descenderunt.

By citing the famous decree of the Athenians as an example of amnesty, Velleius here makes the point that the amnesty of Antony is also an exemplum of such a course of action. The incident is also recorded in Plutarch (Antony 13ff.).

Of the four non-Valerian exempla cited here, two—No. 1, Mummius and the art treasures and No. 2, Caesar at Munda—occur in Livy. The other two occur in Plutarch; No. 3, the warning notes to Caesar also exist in Suetonius. That these last two are not in Livy may be due to omission by the epitomator, while the absence of all four in Valerius may be the result of selection on his part. All are evidently in the Livian tradition.

d) Exempla in Velleius alone

1) The death of Q. Catulus in the proscriptions:

V.P.2.22.4: Q. Catulus, et aliarum virtutum et belli Cimbrici gloria, quae illi cum Mario communis fuerat, celeberrimus, cum ad mortem conqueretur, conclusit se loco nuper calce harenaque perpolito inlatoque igni, qui vim odoris excitaret, simul exitiali hausto spiritu, simul incluso suo mortem magis voto quam arbitrio inimicorum obiit.

This little anecdote stands out clearly in a chapter in which Velleius brings together three men who died in the
proscriptions of Marius. Though Velleius does not say so explicitly, it might be considered as an **exemplum** of courage and resignation in the face of overwhelming odds. The same might be said of the death of Merula, recounted just two sections earlier, in 2.22.2, but in that case the anecdotal character, the quality which causes the event to catch the reader's eye, is not so clear.

2) Caesar flees from Sulla in disguise:

V.P.2.41.2: ... habuissetque [Caesar] fere XVIII annos eo tempore, quo Sulla rerum potitus est. magis ministris Sullae adiutoribusque partium quam ipso conquirentibus eum ad necem mutata veste dissimilemque fortunae suae indutus habitum nocte urbe elapsus est.

Though Valerius (5.3.3) has recorded an incident which took place during Caesar's flight from Sulla, he does not mention the fact that Caesar changed clothes in order to go unnoticed and that he slipped out of the city during the night. Valerius' incident also focuses not on Caesar, but on one Sextilius, to whom Caesar went for help. This incident is to be found neither in Livy's summaries nor in Plutarch's biography of Caesar. Suetonius (Divus Julius 1.2) says that Caesar went into hiding, moving from one place to another frequently, but he does not mention any change of clothing.
3) Caesar mistakes trees for pirate ships:

V.P.2.43.1-2: Idem [Caesar] mox ad sacerdotium ineundum . . . festinans in Italiam, ne conspiceretur a praedonibus omnia tunc obtinentibus maria et merito iam infestis sibi, quattuor scalmorum navem una cum duobus amicis decemque servis ingressus effusissimum Adriatici maris traiecit sinum. Quo quidem in cursu conspectis, ut putabat, piratarum navibus cum exuisset vestem alligassetque pugionem ad femur alterutri se fortunae parans, mox intellexit frustratum esse visum suum arborumque ex longinquum ordinem antemnarum praebuisse imaginem.

This anecdote does not appear in Valerius, the Periochae of Livy, or Plutarch, though it is clearly the type of incident which would lend itself to inclusion in all three. It is the last of the three exempla which Velleius relates concerning Caesar's early life, only one of which, the capture of Caesar by the pirates, apparently achieved wide circulation in ancient literature. This early story, however, seems to have been supplanted by later stories of Caesar's crossing of the Adriatic during the Civil War. Suetonius (Divus Julius 58.2) relates a similar incident in which he crossed from Dyrrachium to Brundisium in order to lead across his hesitant troops. The crossing was made in a small boat during a severe storm and Caesar would not permit his helmsman to give way to the
storm. (Cf. Lucan, B.C. 5.476-678.)

4) Messalla Corvinus and Octavian:

V.P.2.71.1: Corvinus Messalla, fulgentissimus iuvenis, proximus in illis castris Bruti Cassilique auctoritatii, cum essent qui eum ducem poscerent, servari beneficio Caesaris maluit quam dubiam spem armorum temptare amplius; nec aut Caesari quidquam ex victoriis suis fuit laetius quam servasse Corvinum aut maius exemplum hominis grati ac pii, quam Corvinus in Caesarem fuit.

Though this is not an anecdote in the strict sense, the refusal of the command by Corvinus stands out for Velleius as an "exemplum hominis grati ac pii" and so is included here.

5) Gaius Velleius, grandfather of Paterculus, kills himself:

V.P.2.76.1: Quod alieno testimonium redderem, eo non fraudabo avum meum. Quippe C. Velleius, honoratissimo inter illos CCCLX iudices loco a Cn. Pompeio lectus, eiusdem Marcique Bruti ac Ti. Neronis praefectus fabrum, vir nulli secundus, in Campania digressu Neronis a Neapoli, cuius ob singularem cum eo amicitiam partium adiutor fuerat, gravis iam aetate et corpore cum comes esse non posset, gladio se transfixit.

Here Velleius pays tribute to his grandfather by recounting his death and turning the incident into an exemplum of "singularem . . . amicitiam."

6) Domitius Calvinus cudgels Vibillius:

V.P.2.78.3: Eadem tempestate Calvinus Domitius, cum ex consulatu obtineret Hispaniam,
Velleius himself refers to this event as an exemplum of austerity to be compared with that of ancient Rome ("gravissimi comparandique antiquis exempli").

7) Servilia, wife of Lepidus (son of the triumvir), commits suicide:

V.P.2.88.3: Aequetur praedictae iam Antistii Servilia Lepidi uxor, quae vivo igni devorato praematura morte immortalem nominis sui pensavit memoriam.

When the younger Lepidus, caught in a conspiracy to assassinate Augustus, was put to death, his wife Servilia committed suicide and thus, by her premature death, earned eternal memory for her name. Livy's summaries narrate the death of Lepidus, but they do not mention Servilia.

8) C. Sentius Saturninus blocks Egnatius from the consulship:

V.P.2.92.4-5: . . . et [Saturninus] Egnatium florentem favore publico sperantemque ut praeturam aedilitati, ita consulatum praeturae se iuncturum, profiteri vetuit, et cum id non obtinuisset, iuravit, etiam si factus esset consul suffragiis populi, tamen se eum non renuntiaturum. Quod ego factum cullibet veterum consulum gloriae comparandum reor, nisi quod naturaliter audita visis laudamus libentius et praesentia invidia, praeterita veneratione prosequimur et his nos obrui, illis instrui credimus.
Velleius clearly looks on Saturninus as an exemplum of old Roman constantia, as he says that he thinks that his action is worthy to be compared to the gloria of the old consuls.

9) An enemy soldier crosses a river to see Tiberius:

V.P.2.107.1-3: . . . unus e barbaris . . . ex materia conscendit alveum solusque id navigii genus temperans ad medium processit fluminis et petiiit, liceret sibi sine periculo in eam, quam armis tenebamus, egredi ripam ac videre Caesarem. Data petenti facultas. Tum adpulso lintre et diu taeitus contemplatus Caesarem, nostra quidem, inquit, furit iuventus, quae cum vestrum numen absentium colat, praesentium potius arma metuit quam sequitur fidem. Sed ego beneficio et permissu tuo, Caesar, quos ante audiebam, hodie vidi deos, nec feliciorem ullae vitae meae aut optavi aut sensi diem. Impetratoque ut manum contingeret, reversus in naviculam, sine fine respectans Caesarem ripae suorum adpulsus est.

Velleius intends here to convey the impression that his hero, Tiberius, was so admired that even the enemy considered him a god and desired to touch his hand. The exemplum has been modified to the extent that the author is neither making a point concerning the old Roman virtues or the Roman character in general nor simply telling a charming little story with no moral point attached. Rather, he is definitely asserting that his hero was all things to all men. In this matter, Velleius has shown some measure of
originality, just as he has with his literary excursuses and his summary of the establishment of Roman colonies.

10) Caelius Caldus kills himself with a chain:

V.P.2.120.6: Cum in captivos saeviretur a Germanis, praeclaris facinis auctor fuit Caelius Caelius, adulescens vetustate familiae suae dignissimus, qui complexus catenarum, quibus vincitus erat, seriem, ita illas inlision capiti suo, ut protinus pariter sanguinis cerebrique effluvio expiraret.

This anecdote is in the tradition of the exemplum as we have seen it throughout this study: a brief account of an event which illustrates the Roman character. Though Velleius refers to it only as a praeciarum facinum, the implication is clear that he is referring to an act of bravery and pride.

e) The exempla in the composition of the History

The preceding list of exempla which appear in the history of Velleius may lead the reader to believe that Velleius composed his history by sorting through some such collection of exempla as that of Valerius Maximus, putting those selected in chronological order and then fastening them together in a continuous narrative. Some scholars accept this view, but it is doubtful that Velleius used only this type of source. Admittedly, there are many
exempla in Velleius, most of which are substantially the same as corresponding accounts in Valerius Maximus. Yet the overall tenor of Velleius' writing, his preference for personalities, his great haste, his digressions on matters decidedly not conducive to the exemplum format (such as colonization, the great intellects of Cicero's time and of the earlier period of Greek and Roman history)--all this argues against the conclusion that Velleius relied completely on a collection of exempla for his material.

In his eagerness to finish his task in the shortest possible time, Velleius would have turned away from the collections, where he would have found the material arranged according to categories and not in chronological order. The need for haste would have forced him to use sources which were already arranged in the same order as he would be using.

Further, Velleius, having a taste for personalities, approached the writing of history with its personalities in the forefront of his mind. His main purpose, after all, was to praise the man whom he most admired, Tiberius. While concentrating on one person, he took the same attitude toward the many other people whose names were carved in the glory of Rome's past. Tiberius, for him, dominated the
events of his time; in the same way, the famous men of earlier Roman history overshadowed the events which they controlled. Velleius' history is a personal history, a history of the great personalities in Roman life.

Given this attitude on the part of the author, it is logical to assert that Velleius used as sources biographical materials on the men whom he treated in his narrative, in which some at least of the *exempla* previously catalogued could have been found. Münzer holds the view that biographies formed the foundation of his work and that he used historical narrative only to bind together the different biographical sections. Especially representative of this method of composition is the era of the Civil Wars when Caesar, Augustus and Tiberius dominate the history, but it is also true to a lesser extent of the earlier part of the work. Further, Münzer asserts, this attempt to join together two different types of treatment, annalistic and biographical, is responsible for the unsettled presentation which often characterizes the history.

The literary treatment of one individual's life was not the most developed form of literature in Rome at the time of Velleius Paterculus, nor did it ever become so. Still, the interest which the Roman citizen took in the
individuals who made up his family was always strong, so that there developed early a form of biographical record-keeping which led eventually to the writing of formal biography. D. R. Stuart emphasizes that this was a natural development, springing from the native instincts of the Roman people. The development started with the primitive dirges, neniae, which were chanted in impromptu fashion at the funeral of the deceased. The result of a native impulse, they were biography in embryo. Also arising at an early stage were primitive narrative ballads, which were sung at banquets to extol the deeds and virtues of famous men. These are known to have been obsolete at the time of the Elder Cato. Standing alongside the neniae and the ballads as rudimentary biography but of a somewhat different nature were the titulus imaginis and the elogium or tomb inscription. The former was the description attached to the busts of ancestors in the family portrait gallery. It identified the subject of the bust, gave his father's name and offered a summary of the civil and priestly offices held by the deceased. The tomb inscription, parallel to the titulus imaginis, was in its earliest form a bare enumeration of the res gestae of the subject. This form, prevalent in the fourth and third centuries B.C., left amplification to
literary history and documentary record. A later form, which began about the middle of the third century B.C., consisted of a poetic epitaph in native Saturnian verse. According to Stuart, it "made general appraisal or ethical appreciation of the dead as conventional a part of the subject-matter as parentage and honors had been." These epitaphs, or *elogia*, had "more the nature of the eulogistic tribute, less that of the biographical memorandum." In this respect they achieved a more literary character than was present in the earlier forms of commemorative expression.

But the biographical instinct was not completely fulfilled in these brief commemorative sketches. Opportunity for depth of treatment was provided by the prose funeral eulogy, the *laudatio funebris*, which came nearer to the ancient norm of formal biography. Much more elaborate than *titulus* and *elogium*, the practice existed for centuries, the earliest known instance being the funeral speech on the first consul, Brutus, delivered by his colleague Valerius Publicola. This information is given to us by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who confesses that he does not know whether it was an innovation or an inheritance from the age of the kings. He is certain, however, that it was of Roman origin. This full-fledged funeral speech
originally had a place in Roman private life, but when the deceased had held public office it became a public event. Women came to be so honored in the first century B.C., e.g. Caesar's speech in honor of his aunt Julia.  

In content, the laudatio funebris approached the nature of a biography. The first part of the speech was devoted to praise of the deceased man's ancestors. Due in part to the great reverence which the Romans always showed their predecessors, it was also used to show the position of the deceased in the family line. There followed an account of the official career of the deceased, i.e. a record of the public offices he had held in his lifetime. This record was as necessary here as it had been in the titulus and elogium, but expansion was possible in the laudatio which could not be achieved in those shorter forms of commemoration.

Following upon the record of the deceased's official career there was a narrative of the more important events which occurred in his life. This might be used by the speaker to counter more hostile versions which did or could arise. Finally, there would be some mention of the deceased's private life, especially of his property, since this determined his social rank.
Such was the nature of the *laudatio funebris*, the formal funeral speech which developed out of more primitive, instinctual desires to commemorate a person recently deceased. Delivered orally, it was nonetheless written down and published for the benefit of the man's family and of posterity. Such published *laudationes*, dating to the Second Punic War, were in circulation at the time of Cicero.\(^5^1\)

Stuart comments:

Certain it is that when these speeches were consigned to writing and thus took permanent form as literary units, each separate specimen must have contained as an integral feature a rehearsal of ancestral descent and glory sufficient to locate the man in the family series and to lead up to discussion of his own life and personality. One of the incentives that led Roman households to preserve funeral speeches in documentary form was the utilitarian aim of resorting to older specimens as models and sources of information whenever a death in the family necessitated a similar panegyric. This very fact is evidence, if any be needed, that pedigree and ancestral achievement were inevitable topics.\(^5^2\)

With the development of the *laudatio funebris*, however, the Roman commemorative instinct was still not completely fulfilled. Written though it was, the funeral eulogy was not a highly literary form. To achieve this goal, the Roman instinct needed the inspiration of the Greeks. The increase in concern for the individual in fourth century B.C. Greece brought with it an interest in leaving a literary
record of an individual's life. The development began with the Sophists, who adapted the poetic *encomium* to prose. What had been a triumphal song for a victor in the lyric poems became for the Sophists an exercise in epideictic oratory.\(^{53}\) The first biography proper was the *Evagoras* of Isocrates, published in 365 B.C., which claimed to be the first *encomium* on a living person. Xenophon's biography of Agesilaus followed soon after and in the same tradition.\(^{54}\)

The Peripatetic school of philosophy took the development further when the new interest in ethics led them to a deeper study of the human personality. Biography as developed by this school attempted to reveal a man's character through his actions. The *Bioi andrôn* of Aristoxenus was the first of this type. Not confined to true Peripatetics, it had as its most famous practitioner the Academic philosopher Antigonus of Carystus. Others were Satyrus, who worked at Alexandria and extended the genre to men of action as well as of letters, and Hermippus of Smyrna, who produced a large work on philosophers, poets and lawgivers and who had great influence over Plutarch.\(^{55}\)

Besides the encomiastic type of biography typified by Isocrates and Xenophon and the ethical approach of those who practiced the Peripatetic method, there existed also a third
type which developed at Alexandria, the center of Greek scholarship. Used as introductory material for Greek texts and giving more attention to chronology and less to character, it was a rudimentary attempt to weigh evidence in a search for the truth. As a result, it was often dry and uninspiring.56

At Rome, all three types won acceptance because of the already strong native instinct for commemoration. The earliest Roman biographical literature extant is that of Cornelius Nepos, but St. Jerome quotes the authority of Suetonius in naming Varro as the founder of the genre.57 His Imagines were a collection of seven hundred character-sketches in fifteen books, each accompanied by a portrait and an epigram. Including both Greeks and Romans, Varro was the first to put them side by side.

We know from Jerome that Santra, a scholar of the Ciceronian age, and Hyginus, a freedman of Augustus, also wrote in the biographical format, but their works have been lost. Cornelius Nepos is the only pre-Velleian biographer of whom we have any substantial literature remaining. A friend of Cicero and Atticus, he followed the Peripatetic tradition, thinking of himself as a populariser writing to entertain and give moral encouragement, not to provide
factual information suited to history. As did Varro, Nepos compared the lives of famous Greeks and Romans. In his work, De viris illustribus, consisting of sixteen books, the categories of generals, poets, kings, and historians are certain to have been included. Three of the surviving biographies stand out. "The Epaminondas and Agesilaus are eulogies, the first somewhat like the conventional form taught in the schools of rhetoric, the second an imitation, in the event not close, of Xenophon's work of the same name. Both, like Nepos' other Lives, seem to owe something to the native commemorative oration, . . ." His life of Atticus is the only extant biography of a contemporary whom he knew and as such it is more interesting. Like the first two, it is a eulogy, but it benefits from the immediate contact which Nepos had with his subject.

Such was the development of biography at Rome before Velleius wrote his history. The native instinct to commemorate had always been strong; in its less formal aspect it culminated in the laudatio funebris, which was itself committed to writing for the benefit of the subject's family and ultimately published for the benefit of posterity. It is significant for this discussion that collections of such speeches were available to the public. When the native
urge, in a further development, was subjected to the influence of Greece, formal, literary biography resulted. Though not developed to perfection, the literary genre, as we see it through the works of Nepos, did exist in some quantity. We have no way of gauging how extensive it was, because most has been lost. But it is possible to conjecture that a great many of the personalities who are represented in Velleius were at some time the subject of such literary treatment. If not deserving of such formal treatment, there surely would have existed for them records such as tituli, elogia or laudationes funebres.

A brief study of Velleius' history with this biographical background in mind will bear out the validity of Münzer's argument that the foundation of the work was biographical and that historical narration was used as a binding. Münzer himself calls attention to the section on L. Aemilius Paulus and Perses in 1.9.3. -1.10.5. Here, he maintains that Velleius has woven together threads from a biography of Perses with those from a life of Paulus. Velleius opens with the traditional summary of Paulus' name, honors, characteristics, and parentage. He also mentions that Paulus was created consul, the central fact with which he connects the biographical material on Paulus to the events
at hand in the annalistic narrative, i.e. the Macedonian war against Perses. Velleius then proceeds to the narrative of the defeat of Perses by Paulus at Pydna (1.9.4). This event Münzer sees as common to the biographies of both Paulus and Perses and thus as the transition from the use of Paulus' biography as a source to that of Perses. Then, in sections five and six, Velleius returns to Paulus' life for his triumphal procession. The narrative is interrupted in 1.10.1-2 by the confrontation between Laenas and Antiochus, but resumes in 1.10.3-5 with the account of how Paulus lost his four sons.

It is possible, and perhaps preferable, to assert that the section on Perses came from a life of Paulus and not from a separate life of Perses. Anything said in this section of Velleius' history would certainly have been in a biography of Paulus. The important point, though, is that this section is definitely biographical in tone and treatment, suggesting that Velleius was drawing on biographical materials. What is more, after an interruption of one chapter (1.11), in which he treats the Macedonian war against Pseudophilippus, Velleius turns to a discussion of P. Scipio Aemilianus, the natural son of Paulus adopted into the family of the Scipios, one of the sons Paulus lost, as
reported in 1.10.3-5.

The intervening chapter points up the fact that Velleius was using an annalistic source to maintain an accurate chronology and to fill in the gaps between biographical material; the section on Scipio beginning in Chapter Twelve indicates that, as soon as Velleius reached the affairs of a great man in the annalistic narrative, he turned to biographical material for his information. As evidence for this method we may cite the opening of Chapter Twelve in the traditional biographical style: name, ancestry, characteristics and, in the case of Scipio, the facts about his adoption and his election as consul. The historical fact of his consulship has served Velleius as a transition from annalistic to biographical source. When he reached this point in his annalistic material, he switched to biographical materials on Scipio. Then, because he has as yet said nothing about Scipio's earlier achievements, he goes back briefly to his activities in Spain and Africa. Having brought his reader, and himself, up to date, he goes on to narrate the destruction of Carthage. In 1.13.2, he relates Scipio's reception of the cognomen "Africanus," and in 3-5 he compares him with Mummius who has at the same time destroyed Corinth (1.13.1).
At this point, Velleius digresses in order to discuss colonization (1.14-15), great Greek and Roman intellects (1.16-17), and the great cities which were centers of intellectual life (1.18). So ends Book One. Book Two opens with a prologue asserting the historian's traditional regret for Rome's lost virtus; Chapters Two and Three deal with Tib. Gracchus; then in Chapter Four the narrative of Scipio's career resumes with his second consulship, his destruction of Numantia, his reply to Carbo's question concerning Gracchus and his death. The occurrence here of the exemplum on Scipio's answer to Carbo lends support to the assertion that, at least in some instances, Velleius got his exempla from sources of a biographical nature and not directly from a collection of exempla.

Turning back to Chapters Two and Three, we find the treatment of Tiberius Gracchus in much the same form. Velleius opens with the traditional account of his name, ancestry, and earlier history and then goes into the reasons for his present course of action and his characteristics. In section two, Gracchus deserts the Optimate faction, and in section three, his program is presented. In Chapter Three, section one, Velleius introduces P. Scipio Nasica, giving his ancestry and also his relationship to and actions
against Gracchus. In section two, Gracchus is killed, and Velleius finishes the chapter with his own commentary.

Chapter Four, after brief mention of affairs in Asia, is devoted as previously mentioned to Scipio Aemilianus. Chapter Five relates two events in Spain which occurred before Numantia but which escaped his notice. There was no time to go back and insert them in their proper order, so Velleius introduced them here.

Gaius Gracchus is introduced in Chapter Six, again with the customary summary of his characteristics and his relationship to Tiberius. Then his program is recorded and the events leading to his death at the hands of Opimius and Flaccus. The following chapter is devoted to a comparison of the Gracchi brothers.

After using Chapters Eight to Ten to introduce various matters unrelated to one another, including a digression in Chapter Nine on the intellectual leaders of the second and first centuries B.C., Velleius introduces Marius in Chapter Eleven. Once more, the introduction consists of the name, ancestry and characteristics of the man before an account is given of his activities. Marius then dominates Chapters Eleven and Twelve before attention turns from him, returning in Chapter Seventeen where he is seen in flight from Sulla.
Finally he appears in Chapter Twenty-two, where his proscriptions are described and in Twenty-three briefly where his death is mentioned.

The intervening chapters, meanwhile, have been devoted to other personages. Drusus is introduced in Chapter Thirteen with the customary biographical remarks. There follows an account of his attempt to restore the Senate to prominence, his death and the Social War to which it set the spark. The War is discussed in Chapters Fifteen and part of Sixteen, and the remainder of Sixteen is devoted to the deeds of Minatius Magius, an ancestor of Velleius.

With Chapter Seventeen, enter Sulla, who with some exceptions, dominates the narrative until Chapter Twenty-nine and the entrance of Pompey. Münzer has found Velleius' treatment of Sulla and Mithridates as instructive for his method in the composition of his history.

In his narrative sources, used, as earlier mentioned, to keep him on a proper course, Velleius has reached the point at which Sulla was elected consul. He now goes back to discuss briefly his birth, descent and earlier history. Thus the fact of Sulla's consulship forms a link between the annalistic and biographical sources, as has been noted in regard to Paulus and Scipio. With the beginning of
Chapter Eighteen, however, there is a seemingly complete break from Sulla to Mithridates, whose characteristics and earlier actions are related. Then, at 18.3, Velleius, with the comment "sorte obvenit Asia provincia," ties together the information on Sulla and Mithridates which he has culled from separate biographical materials on the two men. The comment connects the most recent event in Sulla's life, his election to the consulship, with the most recent affairs of Mithridates, his hostile actions in Asia.

As mentioned above, the section from Chapter Seventeen until Pompey is introduced in Twenty-nine is devoted to Sulla. It is evident, however, that Velleius has used material other than Sulla's biography as his source for this section. Mithridates has already been mentioned. It remains to point out briefly the other instances: P. Sulpicius, 2.18.5 - 2.19.1; Marius, 2.19.1-4; Cinna, Cn. Pompeius, the proscriptions and death of Marius, 2.20.1 - 2.23.3; the comment by Velleius on Attica fides, 2.23.4-5; Fimbria and Laenas, 2.24.1-2; the death of Cinna, 2.24.5; and the account of Pontius Telesinus, 2.27.1-3. 64 Despite these diversions, it is clear that they are only that, and that Sulla remains the dominant personality of this section of the history.
The remainder of the history is put together in much the same way. Pompey dominates Chapters Twenty-nine to Forty, again with diversions, e.g. the assassination of Sertorius by Perpenna, 2.30.1; the Slave War of Spartacus, 2.30.6; the Catilinarian conspiracy, 2.34.3 - 2.35.5; the digression on the races and nations reduced to provinces, 2.38-39. In Chapter Forty-one, Pompey gives way to Julius Caesar, who is the central figure until Chapter Forty-four, from which point biographies of both men are much in evidence. Pompey's death occurs in Chapter Fifty-three, leaving Caesar to command the narrative alone.

With the death of Caesar, Octavius enters (Chapter Fifty-nine). Again, we have a biographical approach, an account of his origin, earlier history and his return to Rome at the time of Caesar's death. From this point until Chapter Ninety-four, Octavius is at the center of the narrative in much the same way as Sulla has dominated the account of his time. Other events and personalities might temporarily intervene, but the key personality is definitely Octavius. Enter Tiberius in Chapter Ninety-four, from which point to the end the book may be safety considered a biography.
In summary, personalities are a key element in the history, and our brief survey would indicate that Velleius derived most of his material from biographies of famous men who influenced events, relying on annalistic sources to fill in the gaps and to keep his chronology straight. The degree of balance between the two types varies. In the earlier part of the work, the annalistic treatment forms the foundation while the biographical information is secondary. Later, however, the biographical element becomes paramount with the annalistic taking a lesser role. As for the exempla, Velleius drew the greater part of them not from a collection such as the one that Valerius Maximus compiled but rather from the biographical materials which were his principal sources. These anecdotes were generally well known and would have been incorporated into biographies of the men included in them. Such, for example, were those concerning Aemilius Paulus, Scipio Aemilianus, Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, men for whom we may presume that biographies existed. The remainder, such as the Laenas episode, the misfortune of Mancinus, Q. Catulus, the death of Cassius, Calvinus Domitius and Vibillius, Velleius would have found in his annalistic source or, recollecting them from his earlier rhetorical training, would have checked in a collection of
exempla such as those put together by Valerius Maximus and others. It must be remembered that such anecdotes were common knowledge among educated Romans of Velleius' day. The basic outlines of many of the exempla would then have been familiar to Velleius, thus requiring only a minimum of research on his part to clarify the details.
CHAPTER IV

BIOGRAPHY: INDIVIDUALS IN VELLEIUS

The outstanding feature of the character portraits of Velleius and of the ideas which he embodies in them is that they are essentially non-political and moral in tone. As Cavallero points out, the judgments which Velleius makes about the personages of Roman history are aimed, not at the political role which those people might have played, but rather at the *virtus* of which they have given proof.\(^1\) J. Hellegouarc'h concurs in this opinion, saying that a man's political position, his social class or even his nationality were of no importance to Velleius in the formation of his judgments on them. Only their propensity to vice or virtue was important. In this context, he maintains, it is not necessary to separate Velleius' judgment on *novi homines* from that on all the people whom he discusses.\(^2\) Cavallero and Hellegouarc'h are basically correct, though it would be imprecise to state that politics and social class are completely excluded from Velleius' thinking. We have seen the influence of Velleius' municipal background
on his attitude, and his obvious attachment to Tiberius implies a political point of view. Yet morality, not politics, was the primary criterion in his representation of the more important figures of Roman history.

In Book One, two of the most famous aristocrats are brought to the fore, Q. Metellus Macedonicus and P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus. In 1.11.2, Velleius notes the reason for Metellus' cognomen Macedonicus, ascribing it rightly to his campaigns in Macedonia. He uses the word *virtus* in this context, referring to Macedonicus' military bravery rather than to his general moral excellence. The same use of the word appears in 1.12.1, again in reference to Macedonicus. But in 1.11.6-7, Velleius discusses Macedonicus' *virtus* in the general sense, referring to his service to the state, to his attention to his family. Here, however, he does not use the word *virtus* specifically.

Of Scipio Africanus, Velleius says: "vir avitis P. Africani paternisque L. Pauli virtutibus simillimus, omnibus belli ac togae dotibus ingeniique ac studiorum eminentissimus saeculi sui" (1.12.3). As in the case of Macedonicus, Scipio is recommended for his military ability and for his moral qualities rather than for his political opinions. No
doubt, this favorable opinion of two stalwarts of the Roman aristocracy is due in part to the traditions of Roman historical writing, but it is at least significant that Velleius, writing at a time when it was essential to show a preference for the empire felt that these two men deserved praise. His praise did not reject the principate as the legitimate form of government (Augustus had consolidated his powers before Velleius was even born, nor did Velleius have strong ties to the old republican aristocracy.) but was simply a tribute to traditional concepts of morality which still prevailed at Rome in Tiberius' day.

Perhaps more indicative of Velleius' attitude is his account of the careers of the Gracchi. Of Tiberius Gracchus, Velleius says, "vir alioqui vita innocentissimus, ingenio florentissimus, proposito sanctissimus, tantis denique adornatus virtutibus, quantas perfecta et natura et industria mortalis condicio recipit" (2.2.2). Tiberius Gracchus, in other words, was endowed with all the qualities of greatness which a Roman could hope to possess, but in Velleius' eyes he used the wrong methods to achieve his end: "... summam imis miscuit et in praeruptum atque anceps periculum adduxit rem publicam" (2.2.3). The periculum was immediately caused by Gracchus' proposal of the agrarian
laws. At first glance, Velleius' condemnation of Gracchus on this point might seem to be politically motivated, and indeed the question is not only one of morality and conduct but one of policy. Rather than political principle, however, class loyalty seems to be behind Velleius' thought on this matter. He was after all a member of the equestrian class which would be hurt by any economic reforms at Rome in Gracchus' time. But the program of Gracchus is not nearly so important to Velleius as the methods which he used to attain his ends. For Gracchus removed his colleague Octavius from the tribunate, an illegal act, in order to further his ends, and Velleius condemns this action by implication (2.2.3). In addition his language when describing the murder of Gracchus is indicative of the attitude which he takes:

Tum optimates, senatus atque equestris ordinis pars melior et maior, et intacta perniciosis consiliis plebs inruere in Gracchum stantem in area cum catervis suis et concientem paene totius Italiae frequentiam. (2.3.2)

It is notable that, in this passage, Velleius speaks of the better part of the equestrian order as being opposed to Gracchus. And he comes directly to the point when he refers to the destructive policy of Gracchus. Noteworthy also are the derogatory words catervis and concientem used of
Gracchus and his followers. One last indication of Velleius' attitude is his reference to Gracchus ending the life "quam gloriosissime degere potuerat" (2.3.2), a clear indication of attention to conduct rather than to policy.

The commentary which Velleius inserts on the occasion of Tiberius Gracchus' death reinforces this view. Essentially he sees the violent death of Gracchus as the beginning of the end for the Roman Republic, when law was superceded by force as the final arbiter of human affairs. "Inde ius vi obrutum potentiorque habitus prior, discordiaeque civium antea condicionibus sanari solitae ferro diiudicatae bellaque non causis inita, sed prout eorum merces fuit" (2.3.3). Continuing, Velleius says "... et ubi semel recto deerratum est, in praeceps pervenitur, nec quisquam sibi putat turpe, quod alii fuit fructuosum" (2.3.4).

One curious aspect of Velleius' treatment of Tiberius Gracchus is the seeming indifference which he displays toward Scipio Nasica's part in the murder of his cousin, Gracchus. Velleius opens 2.3 with the expected comments on this member of the family of the Scipios and takes note of the fact that, in opposing Gracchus, Nasica was putting his country before his family ties. He fails, however, to
condemn Nasica for the manner in which he brought about Gracchus' death. Velleius clearly disapproves of the methods of the opposition yet he surprisingly fails to condemn Nasica. The omission could, of course, be due to haste, but more plausibly it is an indication of the degree to which Velleius disapproved of Gracchus' methods.

Ten years later, Gaius Gracchus came into prominence advocating much the same proposals as his brother. Of Gaius, Velleius says, "qui Ti. Gracchum, idem Gaium fratrem eius occupavit furor, tam virtutibus eius omnibus quam huic errori similem, ingenio etiam eloquentiaque longe praestantiorem" (2.6.1). Again it is evident that Velleius has moral qualities and personal conduct in the front of his mind rather than political programs. In this passage he speaks of Gaius' virtutes, his ingenium and his eloquentia, contrasting them with furor and error. Gaius was to be condemned because he allowed himself to be caught in the grip of furor, more precisely because he sought to avenge his brother's death or to attain regalis potentia, the latter being the greatest political sin at Rome and thus immoral (2.6.2). Had Gaius been more restrained, Velleius says, he could have been the first citizen of the state, but he reached out even further than Tiberius ("longe maiora et
acriora petens"). Fulvius Flaccus is equally condemned as
socium regalis potentiae and as aeque prava cupientem
(2.6.4). Here Velleius indicates that he disapproves of
Gaius' program, but the disapproval is based on the immo-
rality of the end or goal not on his adherence to one or the
other of the political factions involved. The same con-
cclusion may be drawn concerning Velleius' statement in
2.7.7-8 that the worst part of Gaius' program was the
proposed founding of colonies outside of Italy. The ob-
jection is grounded in the belief that this will eventually
result in colonies more powerful than the mother city.
Again the disapproval is not founded on factional politics.

Velleius' attitude to the Gracchi may be summed up in
his own words: "viri optimis ingeniis male usi, vitae
mortisque habuere exitum; qui si civilem dignitatis
concupissent modum, quidquid tumultuando adipisci gestierunt,
quietis obtulisset res publica" (2.7.1). These words
indicate once more that Velleius disapproves not of their
politics so much as of their methods. Where elsewhere he
does show some disapproval of their programs, it is based
on the lack of moral worth in those programs rather than on
partisan politics.
As he progresses in his narrative, Velleius takes the time to speak briefly of the merits of two eminent Roman families, the Metelli and the Domitii. In mentioning the remarkable fortune of the Domitii—who, though few in number, were all distinguished in public life—he implies that these men exercised their virtus to an outstanding degree (2.10.2). He also takes note of the fame of the Metelli, comparing them to the Domitii. Q. Metellus Numidicus was "nulli secundum saeculi sui" (2.11.1&3).

After the Gracchi, however, the next outstanding figure to appear in the history is Gaius Marius. The historical tradition on the former military hero is a mixture of the Sullan annalists, who despised him, and of those writers who reflected on the virtues exemplified by his career. Of the latter, Cicero was the most favorable, and not unexpectedly because both men had the same local origin and both were successful novi homines. Sallust, Cicero's contemporary, was able to achieve a more detached view, seeing Marius as good up until the time of his election to the consulship when he succumbed to ambitio. Livy sees him as "a military hero and a political disaster." He clearly favors the second part of the dilemma which he poses in Epit. 80: "utrum bello melior an pace perniciosior
The same two-sided opinion, the Republican tradition, is evident in Velleius' treatment. From the beginning, Velleius recognizes the faults of the man while paying tribute to his accomplishments, especially those in war. The same ambivalent attitude expressed in Livy's question is present in the opening remarks of Velleius: "C. Marius, quem praediximus, natus agresti loco, hirtus atque horridus vitaque sanctus, quantum bello optimus, tantum pace pessimus, immodicus gloriae, insatiabilis, impotens semperque inquietus." (2.11.1). Marius' only attractive qualities as Velleius represents them here are his early life and his superior generalship, all else tending to downgrade the man. The superior military ability is mentioned again in 2.12.5 where, in commenting on the battle of the Raudian Plain, Velleius states that Marius, by that victory, seemed to redeem himself from all his evil actions. Again, in 2.12.6, he receives favorable notice when, in his sixth consulship, he put down the furor of Servilius Glaucia and Saturninus Apuleius armis. Velleius also displays a sympathetic attitude when he recounts the story of Marius' flight from Sulla and subsequent exile (2.19.2-4).
But on other matters Marius does not fare so well with Velleius. When in 88 B.C. the tribune Publius Sulpicius, heretofore an excellent man, attached himself to Marius, Velleius regards him as "subito pravus et praeceps" (2.18.6). Further insight is given by the comment that Cinna was no more restrained than Marius and Sulpicius (2.20.2). And when Marius, together with Cinna, seized Rome, his return was pestiferus for the citizens (2.22.1). Among the victims of the proscriptions were some of the most distinguished men of the state: Octavius, "vir lenissimi animi," killed on Cinna's command but certainly with the consent of Marius; Merula, a suicide; M. Antonius, "princeps civitatis atque eloquentiae," slain by the soldiers; and Q. Catulus, also a suicide (2.22.2-4). Of the proscriptions, Velleius says:

Omnia erant praecipitia in re publica, nec tamen adhuc quisquam inveniebatur, qui bona civis Romani aut donare auderet aut petere sustineret. Postea id quoque accessit, ut saevitiae causam avaritiae praebet et modus culpae ex pecuniae modo constitueretur et qui fuisset locuples, fieret is nocens, suileque quique periculi merces foret, nec quidquidvideretur turpe, quod esset quaestuosum (2.22.5).

Velleius focuses here on the definition of property rights, but the tone of the passage indicates that he considered the actions immoral. And this is the essential point. The
relative merits of the claims to power of Sulla and of Cinna and Marius do not concern him. Conduct is the chief criterion, and by this measure Marius does not come off well in Velleius' eyes. Velleius, evidently following Livy, sums up the Republican tradition: Marius was "vir in bello hostibus, in otio civibus infestissimus quietisque impatientissimus." (2.23.1).^7

Cinna, Marius' colleague in his sixth consulship, also merits criticism. As already mentioned in connection with Marius, Cinna was considered by Velleius to be no more restrained than Marius and Sulla. The particular incident in question is his distribution of the newly enfranchised Italians into all the tribes rather than only into the original eight. Velleius sees this action of Cinna as unjust to the older citizens because it would weaken their prestige and give the new citizens more power than their benefactors (2.20.1-2). In addition, Cinna is censured by Velleius for his part in the proscriptions (2.22.1-5). And, finally, in commenting on Cinna's death, Velleius says:

... vir dignior, qui arbitrio victorum moreretur quam iracundia militum. De quo vere dici potest, ausum esse eum quae nemo auderet bonus, perfecisse quae a nullo nisi fortissimo perfici possent, et fuisse eum in consultando temerarium, in exequendo virum (2.24.5).
His undertakings went beyond what a good citizen would dare, but he was resolute to a greater degree than could be expected and, though reckless of design, he was brave in accomplishment. Cinna, therefore, though his methods and programs merited criticism by Velleius because of their lack of fairness, was nonetheless accorded some degree of praise by him.

Marcus Livius Drusus is exceptionally indicative of the attitudes which Velleius had when he was writing his history. A nobleman by birth, Drusus is regarded with approval by Velleius for the programs which he proposed. During his tenure as tribune in 91 B.C., Drusus proposed that the lawcourts be returned to the control of the Senate from the hands of the equites. Velleius approves of the measure though he himself was of the equestrian class. This approval was not given on the basis of party loyalty but rather because he thought it was a good measure. The reasons were moral, not political. The equites had misused their trust by mistreating many innocent men, most notably Publius Rutilius Rufus who was condemned for extortion. (2.13.2).

When Drusus found his proposals defeated by the very group which they were designed to benefit, he became
disillusioned and turned to advocating citizenship for the Italians. This effort cost him his life at the hands of assassins. "Hunc finem clarissimus iuvenis vitae habuit." (2.14.2) Velleius, then, sees Drusus as a martyr for a good cause.

That morality, not political connections or preferences, influenced the views of Velleius is again evident in his treatment of Sulla. At first, Velleius is able to refer to him as "vir qui neque ad finem victoriae satis laudari neque post victoriam abunde vituperari potest" (2.17.1). This sentence sums up his attitude to Sulla, and the judgment again is moral, not political. Sulla is commended for his defense of Rome against the faction of Marius, Marius' son, and Publius Sulpicius (2.19.1). He is given approval for his conduct of the war against the forces of Mithridates at Athens, in Boeotia, and in Macedonia, and for his defeat of Mithridates himself in Asia (2.23.3-6). He is commended for disposing of the external menace before attempting to deal with the internal troubles of Rome (2.24.4). Further approval is given him for his peaceful return to Italy when he was in a position to exercise force, "non belli vindicem, sed pacis auctorem" (2.25.1). Sulla changed, however, when he reached Rome and his victory was complete. On the
occasion of the death of the younger Marius, who attempted to escape from the city before Sulla arrived, Velleius says of Sulla "Felicis nomen adsumpsit, quod quidem usurpasset iustissime, si eundem et vincendi et vivendi finem habuisset" (2.27.5). Velleius means the remark partly as a tribute to the younger Marius' power and influence, indicating that Sulla was not content until the man was gotten rid of. At the same time, nonetheless, the second part of the statement is clearly meant to convey the impression that Velleius disapproved of everything that followed upon Sulla's victory while having considered him as a force for good in his drive toward that victory.

With Sulla, then, Velleius is again concerned, neither with political affiliation nor with the relative merits of the various political factions and programs, but with conduct. Until his victory, Sulla had acted honorably and in the interest of the Roman state; after the victory was won, his amazing lack of restraint was roundly condemned. "... imperio, quo priores ad vindicandam maximis periculis rem publicam olim usi erant, eo in immodicae crudelitatis licentiam usus est" (2.28.2). The key words here are "immodicae crudelitatis licentiam," words indicative of a moral point of view.
Perhaps the most surprising element in Velleius' work is the amount of space which he devotes to the career of Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus. It is surprising because Pompey was the arch-enemy of Julius Caesar, who defeated him in the Civil Wars and founded the dynasty to which Velleius' hero, Tiberius, belonged. Why would Velleius so honor a man who had stood in opposition to Caesar's ambitions and to his concept of government? Before considering this question, it would be better to examine Velleius' treatment of Pompey in terms of the general concern whether Velleius is essentially making political or moral judgments on history. It can be demonstrated that judgments concerning Pompey's career are also based on moral considerations rather than on political preferences. The existence of a rhetorical tradition of the "moral" Pompey is indicated by Lucan, B.C. 9.190-214, who significantly puts his comment into the mouth of Cato. The phraseology of the Lucan passage does not suggest any dependence on Velleius, but some of the same ideas are expressed. 8

Velleius admits at the outset that any adequate discussion of Pompey's career would demand many volumes but that the self-imposed restrictions on his work require that he be brief (2.29.2). He notes that Pompey was noble,
mentioning his mother Lucilla, who was of senatorial stock, but ignoring his consular father. D.C. Earl notes that the family had been noble for three generations, though it was "hated and despised by the good men of the governing oligarchy." Velleius' description of Pompey himself is worth quoting in detail:

innocentia eximius, sanctitate praecipuus, eloquentia medius, potentiae, quae honoris causa ad eum deferretur, non vi ab eo occuparetur, cupidissimus, dux bello peritissimus, civis in toga, nisi ubi vereretur ne quem haberet parem, modestissimus, amicitiarum tenax, in offensis exorabilis, in reconcilianda gratia fidelissimus, in accipienda satisfactione facillimus, potentia sua numquam aut raro ad impotentiam usus, paene omnium vitiorum expers, nisi numeraretur inter maxima in civitate libera dominaque gentium indignari, cum omnes cives iure haberet pares, quemquam aequalem dignitate conspicere. Hic a toga virili adsuetus commilitio prudentissimi ducis, parentis sui, bonum et capax recta discendi ingenium singulari rerum militariarum prudentia excoluerat, ut a Sertorio Metellus laudaretur magis, Pompeius timeretur validus (2.29.2-5).

The emphasis here is on moral goodness, as the first elements of the description demonstrate: Pompey was innocentia eximius, sanctitate praecipuus. He was desirous of power but only of that power which he could earn by his conduct not that which might be seized by force. He was amicitiarum tenax, i.e. he held to and abided by his political associations. There is no mention of what those associations are, no delving into the politics of the time. He was paene omnium vitiorum
expers, almost without fault. And the description ends with that aspect of his character which Velleius saw as most important, his military training and ability. Pompey was first and foremost a soldier, a natural subject for the soldier Velleius, who obviously admires him. This admiration is evident at 2.30.3, where Velleius expresses surprise at Pompey's pique when attention is paid to Julius Caesar but nonetheless does not censure him for his jealousy since he sees it as a common weakness of mankind.

Throughout the discussion of the period when Pompey was a strong force in politics, Velleius' treatment emphasizes his military accomplishments and the power which he consequently had at his disposal. The occasion of the granting of imperium aequum to Pompey so that he might defeat the pirates provokes the following comment:

raro enim invidetur eorum hominibus, quorum vis non timetur: contra in iis homines extraordinaria reformidant, qui ea suo arbitrio aut deposituri aut retenturi videntur et modum in voluntate habent. Dissuadebant optimates, sed consilia impetu victa sunt (2.31.4).

Just before this passage, Velleius admires Pompey's accomplishments as a commander, but here he shows some concern about his conduct once he gains that extraordinary power for which he had been proposed. In addition, Velleius shows that he is able to view events without bias by expressing
approval of the objections of the Optimates to the grant of power. Again Velleius demonstrates interest not in politics and factions but in a right course of action. The Optimates seemed to have the stronger argument, although it did not favor his hero Pompey.

In his discussion of Pompey's solution to the pirate problem, provision of a means of support which would eliminate the need to engage in piracy, Velleius demonstrates the same concern. The success of the plan was due to its inherent worth and not to the fact that Pompey devised it. It would have worked no matter who its author had been (2.32.6).

In 2.33.2-4, Velleius contrasts Pompey with Lucullus, the general whom he superseded in the command against Mithridates. Lucullus is charged by Pompey with infamiam pecuniae, Pompey by Lucullus with interminatam cupiditatem imperii. And Velleius accepts the view that Pompey was interested in nothing but glory: "in adpetendis honoribus immodicus, in gerendis verecundissimus, ut qui eos ut libentissime iniret, ita finiret aequo animo, et quod cupisset, arbitrio suo sumeret, alieno deponeret" (2.33.3). Ambition is the chief defect, but even this can be tolerated in a man who did so much for Rome. Pompey was a soldier,
and it was inherent in the nature of a soldier to seek power. It was to Pompey's credit that, while he would tolerate no one more powerful than himself, he used his own power with moderation. Proof of this lies in the fact that he disbanded his army before his return to Rome. "Omni quippe Brundisii dimisso exercitu nihil praeter nomen imperatoris retinens cum privato comitatu, quem semper illi astare moris fuit, in urbem rediit . . ." (2.40.3).

It must be acknowledged, however, that after 60 B.C., as Caesar gradually became the dominant force in Roman politics, Pompey was forced to adjust his moderate stance, a stance which seems more to have been given him by nature than to have been assumed as a political strategy. Velleius himself admits this when he calls attention to Pompey's unconstitutional methods (his absentee governance of Spain and his refusal to disband his troops) and when he states flatly that had Pompey died two years previously his reputation would have been preserved intact (2.48.1-2).

To return to the original question, why did Velleius place so much emphasis on Pompey, the prime opponent of Caesar the founder of the Empire? Part of the answer lies in Velleius' use of the "Pompeian" historian, Livy, but Velleius' character and disposition and his family history
are also involved. He goes to great lengths to include his ancestors in his record of Roman history. His grandfather had served under Pompey as praefectus fabrum and had been appointed by him as one of the 360 judges (2.76.1). It is reasonable to assume that Velleius' interest in Pompey stems partly from pride in this family connection. Partly, too, it is derived from Velleius' career. Like Pompey, he was first and foremost a military man, and his focus is on Pompey the soldier and his military virtues.

In 63 B.C., the year in which Pompey returned victoriously from abroad, another Roman citizen was at the height of his career in government service. Velleius describes Marcus Tullius Cicero as a man "qui omnia incrementa sua sibi debuit, vir novitatis nobilissimae et ut vita clarus, ita ingenio maximus . . ." (2.34.3). He was a new man who had raised himself to the level of nobility, distinguished in natural talent and in the life to which he applied that talent. Cicero saw himself as the savior of the republic in the action which he took against Catiline, and his grand design was for a concordia ordinum, a coalition of all the factions in Roman politics which would have as its goal not the interests of party but the welfare of the Republic. While Velleius mentions him only a few times in
the course of his narrative, it is obvious that he admires him; at the same time, Cicero appears as only one among many Roman statesmen with whom Velleius dealt. There is nothing of the attachment that Velleius shows for Pompey. Although Cicero is the subject of two of the remaining seven Senecan *suasoriae*, Velleius' treatment does not seem to have been influenced by them.

Another of the Roman statesmen presented by Velleius is Marcus Cato, the leader of the conservative faction in Roman politics, from whom Cicero received support during the crisis of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Of him also Velleius speaks in predominantly moral terms:

\[
\ldots \text{homo Virtuti simillimus et per omnia ingenio diis quam hominibus propior, qui numquam recte fecit, ut facere videretur, sed quia aliter facere non potuerat, cunque id solum visum est rationem habere, quod haberet iustitiae, omnibus humanis vitiiis immunis semper fortuna in sua potestate habuit (2.35.2).}^{13}
\]

For Velleius, as for many others, Cato was an example of virtue at its best in Roman life. It was simply contrary to his nature to act immorally, and justice was the cornerstone of his ethical principles. He was even immune to all human faults. Elsewhere Velleius speaks of Cato's integrity, apparently intending praise although his statement seems to imply censure (2.45.5). Velleius seems also to imply here
that Cato at times traversed the bounds of reason, although quite harmlessly so, in displaying that integrity. Again, in 2.47.5, Velleius approves of Cato's vote of acquittal for Milo, the killer of Publius Clodius. Milo had performed a service to the state although it was a bad precedent to set (2.47.4), and Velleius in approving of Cato's decision is also approving of the murder of Clodius, "quo nemo perniciosior rei publicae neque bonis inimicior vixerat" (2.47.5).

After Tiberius and Pompey, the most important figure in Velleius' narrative is C. Julius Caesar. He is important, however, not because he too exemplifies Velleius' predominantly moral attitude to people and events, but rather because he does not. Velleius in his treatment of Caesar has noticeably relaxed his attention to conduct and turned instead to ability and accomplishments.

The first appearance of Caesar in the narrative is indicative of this altered point of view. The opening description emphasizes Caesar's talents:

Hic nobilissima Juliorum genus familia et, quod inter omnis antiquitatis studiosos constabat, ab Anchise ac Venere deducens genus, forma omnium civium excellentissimus, vigore animi acerrimus, munificentia effusissimus, animo super humanam et naturam et fidel evectus, magnitudine cogitationum, celeritate bellandi, patientia periculorum Magno
Caesar is cited as notable for the antiquity of his lineage, the handsomeness of his appearance, his keen and vigorous mind, his generosity and courage, the greatness of his designs, his ability to move swiftly in military operations and to endure dangers. Nowhere is there any mention of moral qualities. Velleius does not take a moral stand. He is neutral as far as a judgment on Caesar's character is concerned. In this, he follows the policy of the early principate of de-emphasizing Caesar. The dictator was the adoptive father of Augustus, but his political style was ill-suited to Augustus' much-avowed purpose of restoring the Republican form of government. The Augustan policy is conspicuous in the silence of Horace, who seldom mentions the dictator, and also of Vergil, who in the Aeneid proffers a "veiled rebuke."¹⁴

Following the introductory character-sketch is a long list of Caesar's accomplishments, an uncritical account which pays due respect to his talents (2.⁴¹.2-2.⁴³.4). The same attitude is present throughout the remainder of Velleius' treatment of Caesar's career. In 2.⁴⁹.2-3,
Velleius remarks that Caesar left nothing undone in his search for a peaceful solution to the impasse between himself and the senatorial faction. He also notes in the same sentence that Pompey's associates resisted all of Caesar's overtures. "Nihil relictum a Caesare, quod servandae pacis causa temptari posset, nihil receptum a Pompeianis . . ."\textsuperscript{15} Throughout the passage Velleius' attitude is neutral.

In 2.52.4-5, Velleius refers to the famous "parce civibus" order at the battle of Pharsalus. Although there is some doubt about the text here, the subject-matter is indicated by comparison with Suetonius, \textit{Divus Iulius} 75 and Appian, \textit{Bellum Civile} 2.80.\textsuperscript{16} He clearly approves here as he does when he expresses surprise at the treatment accorded Caesar by Brutus, who had enjoyed Caesar's \textit{clementia}. Further, the fact that no Roman citizen lost his life at Pharsalus except in battle made Caesar's victory all the more glorious. Velleius comes closest here to praising Caesar's attitude toward those he has defeated, yet he is still not so enthusiastic about Caesar as he was about Pompey and will be about Tiberius. He realizes that \textit{clementia} was the prerogative of the tyrant, not so much the product of true patriotism as the result of political calculations.\textsuperscript{17}
In his treatment of Caesar's death, Velleius speaks of Brutus and Cassius as ungrateful for the favors which Caesar has shown them but seems to find fault with the dictator for a lack of vigilance, for carelessness, at a time when he had been warned repeatedly that his life was in danger. He further dismisses the event as due to the inevitability of Caesar's destiny. Notable also is the absence of any final encomium (2.57.1-3).

Though Velleius takes a less-than-enthusiastic stand on Caesar, his opinion of Brutus and Cassius, who were responsible for his death, is nevertheless low. Cassius is mentioned as "atrocissimi mox auctor facinoris" when he saves the remnants of the legions at the battle of Carrhae in 53 B.C. (2.46.4). Brutus is stigmatized as ungrateful to Caesar for all the benefits he had received from the dictator. "Pro dii immortales, quod huius voluntatis erga Brutum suae postea vir tam mitis pretium tulit!" (2.52.5). Other than in these two instances, Brutus and Cassius are mentioned together when Velleius is referring to their character although he may name them individually when mentioning their military and political operations. His basic charge against the conspirators is their ingratitude to Caesar. The reason, he says, was that Caesar could not
win over Brutus with a promised consulship and offended Cassius by postponing his candidacy (2.56.3). Velleius also implies that the assassins were guilty of deceit in making a public statement contrary to their true attitudes and intentions (2.62.2-4). The themes of deceit and ingratitude are emphasized again when Velleius speaks of Brutus' death:

. . . iustissimasque optime de se merito viro C. Caesari poenas dedit, cuius cum primus omnium amicorum fuisse, interfector fuit et fortunae, ex qua fructum tulerat, invidiam in auctorem relegabat censebatque aequum, quae acceperat a Caesare, retinere, Caesarem, qui illa dederat, perire (2.64.1-2).

And a final estimate of Brutus and Cassius sums up:

Hunc exitum M. Brutii partium XXXVII annum agentis fortuna esse voluit, incorrupto animo eius in diem, quae illi omnes virtutes unius temoniate facti abstulit. Fuit autem dux Cassius melior, quanto vir Brutus: e quibus Brutum amicum habere malles, inimicum magis timeres Cassium: in altero maior vis, in altero virtus: qui si vicissent, quantum rei publicae interfuit Caesarem potius habere quam Antonium principem, tantum retulisset habere Brutum quam Cassium (2.72.1-2).

In sum, Velleius' attitude to Brutus and Cassius is a moral one.

With the victory of Caesar over the Pompeian party came the death of Republican Rome; with the death of Caesar came the real beginning of the struggle for empire; with the
defeat of Brutus and Cassius one element in that struggle was eliminated. It remained for the three leading contenders for power to resolve the disputes between themselves. Antony, Octavian and Lepidus went about the task with vigor and determination. The details of the struggle, even the struggle itself, are of no concern here. What is important is the personalities involved and Velleius' attitude to them. It has been shown up to this point that his approach to history was centered on the people in history, not so much on their political programs and affiliations as on their personalities and characters. In short, Velleius was concerned not with politics but with morality, not so much with the rightness or wrongness of a particular political program as with the way in which the advocates of those programs conducted themselves. This is true of his attitude toward the people of Republican Rome and it is also valid for his attitude toward the personalities of the Empire.

Of the three members of the second triumvirate, Velleius devotes most of his attention to Marcus Antonius. Scattered throughout his treatment of the period of the Civil Wars are frequent references to Antony's conduct and character, the first indication of which, as Velleius sees it, appears in the section dealing with Octavian's arrival
in Rome. "Hunc protinus Antonius consul superbe excepit" (2.60.3). Antony received him disdainfully (although out of fear rather than contempt) and soon began to insinuate that Octavian was behind plots against his life (2.60.3). Then there came into public view the mad desire (furor) of Antony and Dolabella, his colleague in the consulship, for dominatio (2.60.4). Even more revealing of Velleius' attitude is his description of Antony's treatment of Cicero, whose attack on Antony in the Philippics is termed a "defense of liberty" (2.64.3-4). The result was death for Cicero, "furente deinde Antonio simulque Lepido" (2.66.1). By his deed, termed a scelus by Velleius, Antony cut off the vox publica (2.66.2). For this act he would be cursed (2.66.5). The conflict between Cicero and Antony was traditional material for the rhetorical exercises practiced in the schools and in private in the early principate. Of the surviving seven Suasoriae collected by Seneca Rhetor, two treat this theme. In the sixth, Cicero deliberates whether to beg Antony for his life, in the seventh whether to burn his books on Antony's promise to save his life. Neither subject, however, is treated by Velleius.

Other indications of Velleius' attitude to Antony come in 2.71.2 where he states that Antony deserved the death
prophesied for him by Varro of Reate (who was outlawed by Antony in 43 but escaped death), and in 2.82.3-4 where he refers to his growing vices nourished by power, licence and flattery. Finally, there is the account of his desertion of his own army (2.85.3), and of his death (2.87.1).

For Lepidus, the least powerful member of the triumvirate, Velleius does not have a high regard. "Hic vir omnium vanissimus neque ulla virtute tam longam fortunae indulgentiam meritus" (2.80.1). To Octavian he refers in respectful and admiring language as is indicated by his comment at 2.36: "Consulatui Ciceronis non mediocre adiecit decus natus eo anno divus Augustus abhinc annos LXXXII, omnibus omnium gentium viris magnitudine sua inducturus caliginem." Velleius refers to Augustus' character as he continues his discussion of the period of transition from Caesar the dictator to the rule of Augustus. He refers to the "singularis indolem iuvenis" (2.59.4). He mentions the "solis orbis caput eius curvatus" (2.59.6), and he speaks of his "caelestis animus" (2.59.2). It is clear that Velleius holds Augustus in very high regard, albeit out of the necessity imposed by the times, and he gives the reason: Augustus has ended the Civil Wars and peace may again prevail (2.89.1-6).
From the foregoing analysis, then, it is arguable that Velleius approaches history from the point of view of the people who made it and that, in his emphasis on people, he is concerned not with their political affiliations but rather with their tendency toward vice or virtue, in short with the morality or immorality of their conduct. The individuals cited to this point all belonged to the republican period or to the period of transition to the empire. After that transition, Velleius shows himself to be almost exclusively concerned with the person of the Princeps, for a brief time Augustus, but principally Tiberius. Though these two men hold a place of prominence, however, Velleius does take the time to mention several people whose conduct deserved attention. It is clear therefrom that Velleius' preoccupation with conduct continues on into the imperial period, rather than stopping with the end of the republic. He describes M. Agrippa as follows:

M. Agrippa, virtutis nobilissimae, labore, vigilia, periculo invictus parenideque, sed uni, scientissimus, aliiis sane imperandi cupidus et per omnia extra dilationes positus consultisque facta conjugens (2.79.1).

Again the emphasis is on personal qualities and conduct, though it must be admitted that Agrippa had no political platform for Velleius to approve or disapprove. And he
notes the paradox of Agrippa's association with Augustus: he was a highly capable second-in-command, a republican virtue, though a monarch's servant, a monarchy's vice ("parendi, sed uni, scientissimus").

Velleius also praises the "praeclearum excellentis viri factum C. Sentii Saturnini" (2.92.1). Saturninus, consul in 19 B.C., conducted the elections of that year while Augustus was absent from the city. The praeclearum factum was that he refused the bid of Rufus Egnatius to stand for the consulship because he considered him unworthy. Velleius speaks of his action thus:

Quod ego factum cullibet veterum consulum gloriae comparandum reor, nisi quod naturaliter audita visis laudamus libentius et praesentia invidia, praeterita veneratione prosequimur et his nos obrui, illis instrul credimus (2.92.5).

The emphasis is on the constantia with which Saturninus performed his duty. Velleius adds the remark that we all too often overlook the present when we need an example of good conduct.

On the other side of the ledger we find M. Lollius, a legatus in charge of troops in Germany. He was, in Velleius' eyes, "... homine in omnia pecuniae quam recte faciendi cupidiore et inter summam vitiorum dissimulationem vitiosissimus ..." (2.97.1). Here too the phrase "recte
faciendi" points to Velleius' preoccupation with conduct. Later, in 2.102.1, he tells of the "perfida et plena subdoli ac versuti animi consilia" of Lollius. Again the emphasis is clear.

When Lollius was badly beaten in Germany, the occasion for Velleius' remarks about his character, the responsibility for that part of the war was turned over to Drusus Claudius Nero, the brother of Tiberius. Velleius speaks highly of him:

... adolescenti tot tantarumque virtutum, quot et quantas natura mortalis recipit vel industria perficit. Cuius ingenium utrum bellicis magis operibus an civilibus suffecerit artibus, in incerto est: morum certe dulcedo ac suavitas et adversus amicos aequa ac par sui aestimatio inimitabilisuisse dicitur; nam pulchritudo corporis proxima fraternae fuit (2.97.2).

And finally Maroboduus, the leader of the Germanic Marcomanni, who leaves such an impression on Velleius that he temporarily abandons his policy of haste to commend the man and his character, thereby emphasizing the superiority of his former opponent Tiberius:

... genere nobilis, corpore praevalens, animo ferox, natione magis quam ratione barbarus, non tumultuarium neque fortuitum neque mobilem et ex voluntate parentium constantem inter suos occupavit principatum, sed certum imperium vimque regiam complexus animo statuit avocata procul a Romanis gente sua eo progresi, ubi cum propter potentiora arma refugisset, sua faceret potentissima.
Occupatis igitur, quos praediximus, locis finitimos omnis aut bello domuit aut condicionibus iuris sui fecit. (2.108.2).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been twofold: to examine the influence on Velleius' history of the rhetorical exemplum and to study the biographical approach which he takes to the writing of history. He published in A.D. 30, late in the principate of Tiberius who, following the policy of his predecessor, Augustus, had early displayed a tolerant attitude toward freedom of expression both written and spoken, and had been intent on restraining the infamous delatores who preyed on the Roman public. After A.D. 23, however, Tiberius, dejected by the loss of his son and heir, Drusus, and increasingly worried by the possibility of an attempt to usurp his power, turned inward on himself. The trial of the historian, Cremutius Cordus, is indicative of what protection the writer could expect for his freedom of expression. Though the charge against him based on his history was prejudicial and preliminary, it was nonetheless advanced, and Cremutius in resignation committed suicide.
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From the death of Cremutius in A.D. 25 to the time when Velleius wrote his compendium, political intrigue increased at Rome. By A.D. 30, Tiberius had done away with Agrippina and her sons. He was in no mood to be considerate.

In this atmosphere, Velleius decided to publish his short history on the occasion of the elevation to the consulship of a good friend, Marcus Vinicius. In addition to a formal dedication, Velleius dated several events from the consulship. But the true hero of the history is Tiberius. To him alone belong the last thirty chapters of the work. It is Velleius' way of showing his admiration for his old commander under whom he served during the last ten-to-fifteen years of his military career. In this attitude taken by the soldier to the general is seen the influence of Velleius' life and career on his writing. An unsophisticated man, with his roots in the Italian countryside, he takes considerable pride in the fact that he served under so remarkable a person. Though his account of Tiberius' activities is certainly one-sided and thus open to much criticism, it is in large part sincere. If its praise is overdone, the reason lies more in the extremely high opinion which Velleius had of Tiberius than in any desire to flatter.
Together with pride in so great a leader there is his pride in the part, admittedly small, which he played in Tiberius' accomplishments. Reflected in Velleius' mention of his own actions are both pride in his own state in life and the traditional Roman desire to have one's name and deeds remembered by posterity. And he wants the exploits of earlier members of his family to be remembered too, as is evident when he makes a place for them in his narrative of the Republic. His work is, in this sense, a family history and a personal memoir.

In addition to the effect of family pride and personal career, there is evident in the history the influence of Velleius' formal education. Though a soldier by profession, Velleius apparently received the customary Roman education in which much emphasis was placed on rhetoric. Since a student commonly began training in rhetoric at about age sixteen, Velleius would have had time for such study before he entered the military. The rhetorical exempla, or anecdotes taken from the Roman past, are particularly evident throughout the work. Some are apparently original, but many are found in substantially the same form in Velleius' contemporary, Valerius Maximus. Most are traceable to the tradition represented by the historian Livy. Velleius did
not make direct use of Valerius' collection, which was published only a year later. That he did use Livy directly is possible, though there are differences of detail which point to other sources.

The implications of the *exempla* for the authenticity of the history, at least the early part of it, are clear. Velleius did little research of his own beyond reading the published accounts of the more important events of the past. His veracity depends on the veracity of his sources, and because of the high degree of selectivity inherent in a compendium, a penetrating examination of people and events is not present, nor would it have been possible. His reliance on commonly accepted anecdotes indicates further that his real interests lay not in the story of Rome before Tiberius but in the period when his hero dominated Roman politics and diplomacy. All else was but the setting for the important events of his own time. The past, as it were, was prologue.

The anecdotal character of the history as seen through the use of *exempla* is complemented by, and in turn complements, the biographical aspect. It has been the second purpose of this study to examine the interest which Velleius shows in the individuals who appear in the historical record
of Rome. This interest is apparent in two ways: a) the structure of the history and b) the moral judgments which Velleius makes on the personages whom he includes in his narrative. Whereas Livy employed an annalistic framework for his history, Velleius chose to move, not from year to year, but from individual to individual. Though he certainly assigns dates to events, he does not allow his narrative to be broken up by the beginning of a year as Livy sometimes does. Rather, he follows events centering on one person until that person passes from the scene; then he moves to the next important individual in the narrative. This does not mean that there are no interruptions. He will digress from one individual, but only to relate briefly events concerning another individual, before returning to the central figure. In this way, the reader sees in succession events surrounding Marius, Sulla, Pompey and Caesar, while minor individuals are inserted into the sequence wherever they touch upon the central figures. Mithridates, for example, appears in connection with Sulla, and Brutus and Cassius in connection first with Caesar and then with Octavian.

Together with the structure of the work, which is centered on individuals, there is the attitude which Velleius displays toward those individuals. He is not so much
concerned with the politics of a person's actions as with their morality. Where he does comment politically, it is done from the point of view of the morality of a political course of action, not with reference to his own political beliefs. Velleius does not provide a strong philosophical basis for his moral judgments, but it is nonetheless present. As does Sallust, he sees the destruction of Carthage as the beginning of the precipitate retreat from virtue ("quippe remoto Carthaginis metu sublataque imperii aemula non gradu, sed praecipiti cursu a virtute descitum, ad vitia transcursum; ..." 2.1.1). The Gracchi, for instance, made bad use of their talents ("viri optimis ingeniiis male usi" 2.7.1). According to Velleius, had they used legitimate means to reach the honors which they sought, they would have been better received.

What philosophical basis does exist in Velleius' work, then, reflects the attitude of earlier writers. These beliefs are most strongly expressed in Sallust but also occur in Livy. In other respects, however, Velleius stands alone in the Roman historiographical and biographical tradition. No one, either before or after him, composed a history with so much emphasis on biography and expressed that biographical interest in the structure. Sallust has character portraits,
but he is principally concerned with two events, the Jugurthine War and the Catilinarian conspiracy. Livy has character portraits and is concerned with conduct, but the framework is annalistic, i.e. historical. Of post-Velleian writers, Tacitus' method and structure are annalistic while Suetonius wrote conventional biography in the Peripatetic tradition. Velleius does not seem to have had an influence on either author.

The biographical approach which led Velleius to look at individuals from the point of view of their actions is complemented in the history by the use of the *exempla*. Such anecdotes were commonly used by orators to draw a moral or to illustrate a particular aspect of the Roman character. Velleius' use of them in such abundance serves to reinforce the judgments which he makes on the personalities in his history. The point of view is aided by the method chosen, namely, to illustrate the story of Rome through the personalities and character of the important people in its history. This union of rhetoric and biography is given further emphasis by the use of summary characterizations to introduce major personages into the narrative. Such characterizations, which held a solid place in historical writings and in the rhetorical tradition before Velleius, combine an
essentially biographical subject-matter with a largely rhetorical treatment.

Velleius calls his compendium a history, and yet the prevailing attitude is biographical. One simply cannot say that it is a history and ignore the biographical element; nor can one say that it is a true biography. It is rather a mixture of the two genera. Velleius himself implies that it is not a full-dress history when he promises that his iustum opus will follow. It is a brief survey of Roman history essentially in two parts: a) Roman history before Tiberius and b) the Tiberian period, covering the time from his first entrance to the date of publication. To reiterate, the first part is a prelude to the great events which took place during the life of the second princeps. It provides Velleius with the proper framework in which to place his account of the life of Tiberius. And in this account the biographical approach is apparent. Velleius focuses on one person. His work was written to honor the man whom he considered to be the one true hero of the age. Yet this biographical approach is evident not only in the last part of the history but also in the early chapters where Velleius briefly relates the story of Rome. Within the historical mold of the whole work, it is the biographical unit which
is the principal component. Velleius moves not from event to event, nor from year to year, but from personality to personality. And the series of brief biographies which comprises the pre-Tiberian section forms a background, or prelude, to the biography of his hero which is the climax. For lack of a better word we call it a history, but it is a history in which the structure is largely biographical and the emphasis certainly so.

If Velleius' work is in some respects a history and in others biography, there remains the question: where did he obtain his information? His reliance on exempla which are substantially the same as corresponding anecdotes in Livy and Valerius Maximus at first suggests that Livy was his source. Yet differences in detail and the biographical emphasis indicate use of other sources besides Livy, especially biographical material. Although biographies had been written at Rome toward the end of the first century B.C., the lack of extant works corresponding to material in Velleius makes certainty impossible in considering them among Velleius' sources. Velleius' incorporation into his narrative of the exploits of some of his ancestors indicates with greater certainty that he used his own family records. Only one of his ancestors is mentioned elsewhere in Roman
historical writing. Though it is not plausible that
Velleius would have consulted the family records of those
individuals whom he treated in his narrative, it is possible
that he examined collections of *laudationes funebres* which
existed in written form. More formal biographies of the
great personalities in Roman history were extant at Velleius' time than are even known about today; for example, Nepos is known to have written many biographies for which we do not even have the titles. The structure and point of view of Velleius' work suggest that he used such source material.

A discussion of sources leads naturally to an attempt at estimating the value of Velleius' work as historical reference-material. The compendious nature of the work militates against any attempt on the part of the author to analyze events in depth. So do the biographical approach and the use of the *exempla*, which served only as a prelude to the part in which the author was really interested. Yet even this part, the life of Tiberius, is not reliable. The author's close attachment to his former commander and his own military career prevents him from seeing events with an unbiased eye. The time of writing did not encourage objectivity.
Still, the history has value. In the strictly historical sense, it serves as a counterweight to the excessively hostile attitude of Tacitus toward Tiberius. In the literary sense, it stands as our only surviving representative of the genre from the early principate other than the monumental work of Livy which is to be more properly classified with Republican literature. It has value too from the point of view of the structure and attitude taken toward the writing of history, the emphasis on the individual and his actions. In view of the Roman emphasis on the individual citizen and his search for gloria in the service of the state, it is not unique. Such an emphasis is to be found in other historians, notably in Sallust and Livy. Yet the way in which Velleius has blended an historical framework with a biographical format is not to be found before him. And there are other less important, yet interesting, elements: the honorary dating of certain events from the consulship of Vinicius, the surveys of the Roman colonies and provinces and of the famous literary figures of Rome. Finally, there is the way in which Velleius injects himself and his family into the record. It is in keeping with the Roman desire for gloria and the custom of writing commentarii, yet the technique is new.
As a source for the serious historian, Velleius' compendium is unsatisfactory; its literary qualities and innovative features give it lasting interest for the historiographer.
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4 It is possible that he met Sejanus at this time. The latter had been selected by Augustus as a comes for C. Caesar. Cf. Tac., Ann. 4.1; Charlesworth, C.A.H. 10.624; "L. Aelius Sejanus," P-W 1.1, cols. 529-531.

5 Cf. Anderson, op. cit., pp. 29ff. In asserting that Velleius was in sympathy with the aims of the Roman middle-class, especially with that segment which had interests in real estate, he cites V.P. 2.23.2 on Valerius Flaccus' debt law; 2.66.2 on Octavian's reluctant participation in the proscriptions of the second triumvirate; 2.68.1-2 on the proposal by M. Caelius of a cancellation of debts; 2.72.5 on the flight of the proscripti to Sex. Pompey after the defeat of Brutus and Cassius; 2.74.2 on the stirring up by L. Antonius, brother of Marcus, of those who had lost their land to veterans; 2.75.1 on Tib. Claudius Nero, father of the princeps, as self-proclaimed protector of those who lost their lands.


7 At 1.16.1-2 Velleius admits, "neque tamen temperare mihi, quin rem saepe agitatem animo meo neque ad liquidam ratione perductam signem stilo." Again, at 2.74.4-5 he mentions the origin of the term "Opimian wine," all the while admitting that it was not the proper place for such a notice.


9 See below, p. 28, on the aspect of the history as commentarius.

10 Anderson, op. cit., p. 10.
CHAPTER III

1Paladini, Studi Su Velleio Patercolo, p. 447.

2Ibid.

3V.P. 2.48.5; 96.2-3; 99.3; 103.4; 114.4; 119.1. The location of the first reference to the proposed iustum opus at 2.48.2 suggests that he intended to begin his fuller treatment with the Civil Wars.

4Paladini, op. cit., p. 452.


7Ibid., p. 11.

8M. Cavallero, Review of Velleio Patercolo o della propaganda, by Italo Lana, Maia 6 (1953), p. 237. She errs in isolating chapters 105-115 as the only truly biographical part of the book for it is not a coherent whole. One would rather expect as a logical choice the section from Tiberius' adoption by Augustus (2.103) to his succession to the principate and the consolidation of his position (2.124-25). At the least, the entire part dealing with the German campaigns (2.104-24) should be so regarded. Cavallero's division ignores such legitimate aspects of historical writing as Velleius' summary of literary developments.

9See above, p. 25.

10A third memorialization is, of course, that for Vinicius.
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13 Anderson, Rise and Fall, p. 52.


15 Ibid.


17 Helm, op. cit., p. 152.


19 Ibid., p. 233.

20 Ibid., p. 237.

21 Ibid., pp. 234-235: "precatus est" (V.P.); "precatus sum" (V.M.); "precatus" (Per. 44); "optavi" (Livy 45.41.8).

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.


26. Ibid., p. 135. Astin thinks that Livy's epitomator is wrong here about the occasion for the remark.


28. Careful composition is evident in alliteration, e.g. "caede comitia," "consul . . . compescuit," and "morte multavit," and in the placing of the word "consul."

29. V.M. 4.1.13, referring to this incident, concerns the reaction of Numidicus when he received word of his recall and so is not pertinent here.

30. Ibid., p. 249.


33. Paladini, "Rapporti," pp. 244-245.

34. Ibid., pp. 245-246.

35. Ibid. Paladini argues that the agreement in substance would lend credence to a common source despite the difference in detail.


40 $^{\text{Ibid.}}$

41 Ibid., pp. 250 and 270.


43 Ibid., p. 195.


46 Ibid., p. 207.


50 Ibid., p. 215.


54 Ibid.

55 Ibid., p. 4.


64 *Ibid.*, p. 272. Münzer believes that Velleius made up his character-sketch of Sulpicius, since the tribune's individual characteristics are not generally to be found in the sources. He thus implies that Velleius got his information from a biography of Sulla. The same may also be true of Pontius Telesinus.


CHAPTER IV


2 *Hellegouarc’h, Les Buts de l'oeuvre historique de V.P.*, pp. 673-674.

3 *Supra*, p. 20.

5Ibid., p. 108.

6Ibid.

7Ibid., Cf. Livy, Periochae 80: "... vir, cuius si examinentur cum virtutibus vitia, haud facile sit dictu, utrum bello melior an pace perniciosior fuerit."

8"Potentiae quae honoris causa ad eum deferretur, non vi occuparetur, cupidissimus" (V.P. 2.29.3) corresponds to "Nil belli iure poposcit,/ Quaerque dari voluit sibi posse negari" (Luc. 9.195-196.). "Dux bello pertissimus, civis in toga, nisi ubi vereretur ne quem haberet parem, modestissimus" (V.P. 2.29.3) is reminiscent of "Invasit ferrum, sed ponere norat./ Praetulit arma togae, sed pacem armatus armavit." (Luc. 9.198-199).


10Sir Charles Oman, Seven Roman Statesmen of the Later Republic (New York: Longmanns, Green, 1903), Chapter 8: "Pompey," passim.

11Supra, p. 129.


13On "homo Virtuti simillimus," cf. the sentiments expressed by Valerius Maximus (2.10.8): "... exiguum viri patrimonium, astricti continentia mores, modicae clientelae, domus ambitioni clausa, paterni generis una ... imago, minime blanda frons, sed omnibus numeris perfecta virtus. Quae quidem effecit ut quisquam sanctum et egregium civem significare velit, sub nomine Catonis definiat."

15Cf. the similar statements of Caesar himself, B.C. 1.9: "Quonam haec omnia nisi ad suam pernicem pertinere? Sed tamen ad omnia se descendere paratum atque omnia pati rei publicae causa;" and B.C. 3.90: "Exercitum cum militari more ad pugnare cohortaretur suaque in eum perpetui temporis officia praedicaret, imprimis commemoravit: testibus se militibus uti posse, quanto studio pacem petisset; . . . ."

16There is, however, no similar statement in Caesar's own account of the battle, B.C. 3.89ff.

17Cf. Velleius' remarks on the clementia of Augustus in the case of Julius Antonius (2.100.4).

CHAPTER V


2Cf. Livy 23.7-10 on Decius Magius.
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