



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### New light on the Historia Augusta

**Citation for published version:**

Stover, JA 2020, 'New light on the Historia Augusta', *Journal of Roman Studies*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435820001239>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1017/S0075435820001239](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435820001239)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Journal of Roman Studies

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## New Light on the *Historia Augusta*\*

JUSTIN STOVER

### ABSTRACT

*This paper presents a new manuscript of part of the Historia Augusta from Erlangen, which vindicates a more than century-old hypothesis by E. Patzig: that the 1489 Venice edition of the work is textually valuable. On this basis, and building on the recent work of R. Modonutti, I present five new passages that are not printed in modern editions of the HA, six lacunose passages restored, and propose that the lost Murbach manuscript is the source. Armed with this new evidence, I re-examine the question of the great lacuna between the Lives of Maximus and Balbinus and the the Lives of the Two Valerians, showing that it is a codicological – and not authorial – feature.*

**Keywords:** *Historia Augusta*, manuscripts, textual criticism, editing, Late Antiquity

### I

The *Historia Augusta* has yet to yield its secrets.<sup>1</sup> Despite more than a century of intensive work on the pseudonymous collection of imperial biographies, from Hadrian to Carus and his

---

\* I would like to thank George Woudhuysen and Gavin Kelly for many hours of conversation on the *HA* and insights at many points. In addition, participants in the *Historia Augusta* colloquium at Edinburgh in May 2019 – especially, besides the above, Rino Modonutti, Michael Allen and Michael Kulikowski – provided very helpful discussion and critique, as did the participants in the transmissions panel at the 11<sup>th</sup> Celtic Conference in Classics in St Andrews in 2018. It was a suggestion of Michael Reeve that first put me on the track of Colonna and the *Mare historiarum*. I am also very grateful to Lukas Dorfbauer, who provided insightful critique and generously provided an advance copy of his forthcoming publication. The editor and referees of *JRS* also offered substantial assistance. This is not to imply any of them endorse the views advanced here.

<sup>1</sup> As is customary in *HA* scholarship, I disclaim complete bibliographic coverage. Virtually every topic on the *HA* is covered in some fashion in the many volumes of *Historia Augusta Colloquia*. Only those studies specifically relevant to the manuscript tradition are cited in this paper. The sigla and references used in this paper are:

P = Pal. lat. 899 (P<sup>1</sup> = P *ante correctionem*, P<sub>B</sub> = P as corrected before B was copied, P<sub>L</sub> = P as corrected before L was copied, etc. The manuscript is available online at *DigiVatLib*.)

B = Bamberg Msc. Class. 54 (online at *Kaiser Heinrich Bibliothek*)

L = Paris lat. 5816 (online at *Gallica*)

sons, ostensibly written by six different authors under Diocletian and Constantine, basic facts about the work remain in contention. Since Hermann Dessau's fundamental study in 1889, almost everyone agrees that it was written by a single author in the later fourth century.<sup>2</sup> But when exactly was it written, by whom, and (most importantly) to what end? What is the purpose of its elaborate and fantastical frame, and what is the relationship of truth to fiction in its enterprise? Why does it have a large gap, the 'great lacuna', between Gordian III and Valerian, where there ought to be the lives of such undoubtedly important emperors such as Phillip the Arab and Decius? Is it another authorial conceit? Such questions have attracted voluminous and often stormy debate. In comparison to the effort spent pursuing these puzzles, less attention over the past century has been paid to investigating the text. On this subject, a century-long consensus has been reached, as represented in Hohl's 1927 Teubner edition and the ongoing multi-editor Budé edition: the most authoritative source is a ninth-century manuscript alleged to have been written in Italy, BAV Pal. lat. 899 (P), which generated almost the entire tradition including two important copies, the ninth-century Bamberg Msc. 54 (B), from Fulda, and the early fourteenth-century Paris lat. 5816 (L), later owned and annotated by Petrarch.<sup>3</sup>

The only possible exception to this broad dependence on P is a heavily interpolated and lacunose group of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts dubbed  $\Sigma$ , which some

---

M = Codex Murbacensis

E = Erlangen UB 647 (online at *UB Erlangen-Nürnberg*)

$\Sigma$  = Archetype of a group of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts

*Ven.* = Venice 1489 edition

*Med.* = Milan 1475 *editio princeps*

*Egn.* = Venice 1516 edition, by Egnatius

*Bas.* = Basel 1518 edition

Colonna = Quotations/adaptations in the *Mare historiarum*

Hohl = 1927 Teubner edition.

<sup>2</sup> Dessau 1889.

<sup>3</sup> Baker 2014: 38–42 attempts to revive the old theory of B's independence of P. His discussion disregards the latest datings of P and B (Bischoff 1998–2011: 3.6569 and 1.216, respectively) and completely ignores the definitive proof adduced by Boyer, who showed that B miscopied several lines because of a hole in the parchment of one folio of P (1948: 33–5). Subsequently, G. Kelly and I have shown that the lines added in the margins of B correspond to complete lines of P (see Kelly and Stover 2016: 117 n. 29). Hence there is no reason to think that the half folio bound with the title *Excerpta Spartiani* at the front of B is anything more than a reader's aid. One could compare the half folio with a star-map bound at the beginning of the contemporary Fulda *Aratea* (Basel, UB AN IV 18). Both of these are written on the verso (confirmed from the rulings), which makes it highly unlikely that they were taken from another source.

have claimed is descended from a distinct tradition.<sup>4</sup>  $\Sigma$  poses particularly difficult challenges. It offers countless small corrections to minor corruptions in P as well as significant bits of non-P text, especially in the *Life of Aurelian*. However, it also often provides no help where P is most corrupt and an independent source would offer the greatest assistance. This fact led Susan Ballou, in her seminal study in 1914 on the manuscript tradition of the *HA*, to conclude that  $\Sigma$  is simply derived from P.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, her analysis rested on erroneous dating of the correcting hands in P, and is not credible in the terms in which she proposed it.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, her essential insight (building on a suggestion by Hermann Peter) that  $\Sigma$  does not perform the role that we would expect of a manuscript independent of P, remains valid.<sup>7</sup> Examples of this can be seen in the lacunose passages in the *Lives of the Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni*. Consider just one of them (*Gal.* 1.1). Here P is so lacunose as to offer little in the way of sense:

exercitus mu.....duces erat.....  
 meror.....imperator.....in persida  
 .....ior omnium.....  
 quod gallienus na.....paterfactosic...../ (P, f. 154r)

This kind of lacuna arises from copying a damaged exemplar where the scribe attempted to represent graphically the characters he could pick out with a rough approximation of their place in the line.<sup>8</sup>  $\Sigma$  merely stitches together the loose ends in P to extract some modicum of sense, omitting everything too corrupt to fix:

exercitus murmurabant duces erat omnium meror quod imperator romanus in persida  
 serviliter teneretur

---

<sup>4</sup> Hohl 1913 and Callu 1992: xciv–ciii; see also Pecere 1993; Bertrand, Desbordes and Callu 1984–85; Callu and Desbordes 1989; Boyer 1948. Essentially the same position, with some refinements, is defended in the most recent contributions, such as Savino 2017 and Nobili 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Ballou 1914: 60–76, cited approvingly by Marshall 1983; this theory was recently revived by Mayer 2016.

<sup>6</sup> Ballou 1914: 75–6. On the dating of the hands in P, see particularly Pecere 1993.

<sup>7</sup> Ballou 1914: 76.

<sup>8</sup> On intratextual lacunae, see Stover 2017a.

..armies. The generals murmured. There was general mourning that the Roman emperor was held in slavery in Persia.

We would expect a tradition wholly independent of P to offer text which could explain the fragments in P and generally respect the lengths of the lacunae left by P's scribe.  $\Sigma$  offers no such text. Hence, even if  $\Sigma$  must have some elements independent of P, it seems still closely restrained by P's limitations.

In this study, I will argue that that a different strand of the manuscript tradition can be gleaned from a fifteenth-century edition of the text printed in Venice, reintroducing a theory first proposed in 1904. By comparing its textual innovations against P with a fourteenth-century historian, Giovanni Colonna, I will show that the tradition represented in that edition must go back to more than a century before print. I will then introduce a new manuscript of two lives in the *HA* which offers a text independent of P and  $\Sigma$ , but instead represents the source of Colonna and the Venice edition. This discovery will shed new light not only on particular problems in the text of the *Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni* – and tell us something new about the historian Dexippus – but also on one of the most curious and controverted features of the whole collection, the great lacuna between Gordian III and Valerian, covering the emperors during the momentous decade between 254 and 264.

## II

In 1904, Edwin Patzig proposed a possible new source for the text of the *HA*, the second printed edition, produced in Venice in 1489 at the undistinguished house of Bernardino di Novara.<sup>9</sup> This edition contains five additions of a sentence or more in the *Lives of Alexander Severus, Maximus and Balbinus*, and the *Two Valerians*.

**A. After Alex. 68.1** amplissimus: Pomponius legum peritissimus, Alphenus, Aphricanus, Florentinus, Martianus, Callistratus, Hermogenes, Venuleius, Triphonius, Metianus, Celsus, Proculus, Modestinus: hi omnes iuris professores discipuli fuere splendidissimi Papiniani, et Alexandri imperatoris familiares et socii, ut scribunt Acholius et Marius Maximus

---

<sup>9</sup> Patzig 1904: 44–50. On the edition, see Hirstein 1998: 168–70.

Pomponius, the most expert lawyer, Alphenus, Africanus, Florentinus, Martianus, Callistratus, Hermogenes, Venuleius, Triphonius, Metianus, Celsus, Proculus, Modestinus. All of these jurists were students of the most famous Papinian, close friends and companions of the Emperor Alexander, as Acholius and Marius Maximus record.

- B. After Max. Balb. 15.7:** nec reticendum est quod Maximus cum et sibi et Balbino deferretur iudicio senatus imperium Balbino dixisse fertur ut Herodianus dicit: ‘quid tu Balbine et ego merebimur cum hanc tam immanem belluam exitio dederimus?’ cumque Balbinus dixisset ‘senatus populique Romani feruentissimum amorem et orbis terrarum’ dixisse fertur Maximus: ‘uereor ne militum odium sentiamus et mortem’.

Nor should we be silent about what Maximus reportedly declared to Balbinus when the Empire was passed to him and Balbinus by the judgement of the Senate, as Herodian relates: ‘Balbinus, what will you and I earn by destroying this savage monster?’ And when Balbinus said, ‘The warmest regard of the Senate and the Roman People, and the whole world’, Maximus reportedly declared, ‘I fear that we will experience the hatred of the soldiers – and death.’

- C. After Max. Balb. 18.2:** sed Fortunatiano credamus qui dicit Pupienum dictum nomine suo, cognomine uero paterno Maximum ut omnium stupore legentium aboliti uideantur

But I should give credence to Fortunatian who says that he was called Pupienus as his own name, but Maximus from his father’s cognomen, so that . . . [the last phrase is corrupt].

**D. and E. Two passages in *Val.* discussed below**

Besides these lengthy supplements, there are multiple additions of several words, such as at *Max. Balb.* 3.4 and *Gal.* 16.1. Most significant of all the 1489 edition’s features is its version

of the *Lives of the Two Valerians*. The life in *ed. Ven.* begins with a line nowhere to be found in the P or  $\Sigma$  traditions, which then proceeds directly into the vulgate *Val. 5.1 cuius*:

Valerianus imperator, nobilis genere, patre Valerio, censor antea, et per dignitatum omnes gradus suis temporibus ad maximum in terris culmen ascendens (*Val. 5.1*) cuius per annos...

The Emperor Valerian, of noble birth, his father Valerius, a censor beforehand, who climbed through every rank of office in due course up to the highest pinnacle on earth ...

After this, comes *Val. 5.1* through *7.1 superatus est*, followed by another paragraph not in P:

Victus est enim a Sapore rege Persarum, dum ductu cuiusdam sui ducis, cui summam omnium bellicarum rerum agendarum commiserat, seu fraude seu aduersa fortuna in ea esset loca deductus ubi nec uigor nec disciplina quin caperetur militaris quicquam ualore potuit. Captus igitur in dicionem Saporis peruenit, quem cum gloriosae uictoriae successu minus honorifice quam deceret elatus superbo et elato animo detineret seque rursus Romanorum rege ne uili et abiecto mancipio loqueretur. Litteras ab amicis regibus qui et ei contra Valerianum fauerant plerasque missas accepit, quarum seriem Iulius refert. (For a translation see below).

We then at last arrive at what is now *Val. 1.1* which continues up to *5.1 Valeriano* before proceeding to *7.1 nunc*.

To put it another way, what we see is the long passage from *Val. 1.1* to *5.1 Valeriano* transposed from the beginning of the life to the middle, with the addition of top and tail passages not in P. Patzig argued that there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the missing passages, and that the deviant arrangement of the *Two Valerians* in the *ed. Ven.* offers a better parallel structure to the *Life of Claudius* than the arrangement in P,  $\Sigma$ , and the modern editions.<sup>10</sup> Hence, he concluded, we should see the text of the *ed. Ven.* as offering the testimony of some lost manuscript independent of P. This should not not have been especially controversial: there is a lengthy passage of over five hundred found in all the manuscripts but

---

<sup>10</sup> Patzig 1904: 49.

omitted by mistake in the *editio princeps*, which stretches from the end of the *Quadruga tyrannorum* through the first four sections of the *Life of Carus* (*Quad. tyr.* 15.10 *et Numerianum ... Car.* 4.7 *si ita est*). Since this passage is found in the *ed. Ven.*, and not the *editio princeps*, it must have been using some manuscript source.

Patzig's daring and original hypothesis did not go unnoticed. Hermann Peter, at the time the most recent editor of the *HA*, replied with a damning rebuke several years later.<sup>11</sup> He argued that, in fact, the structure of the *Two Valerians* in P more closely mirrored that of the *Claudius* and that the additions in the *ed. Ven.* could be paralleled elsewhere in the extant text. For example, Peter points out *nobilis genere* and *ensor antea* in the first *Val.* passage is paralleled by *Val.* 5.7 *censorem . . . nobilis sanguine*. But the situation is not nearly so clear elsewhere: *patre Valerio*, for example, would seem to offer unique information about Valerian's father, but there is *Probus* 5.2: *Valerium Flaccinum, adolescentem nobilem, parentem Valeriani*. In the *HA*, *parens* means 'kinsman' and not 'parent', including in a passage just a few lines later (*Probus* 6.2) where *parens* is contrasted with *pater*. Hence, *patre Valerio* could be giving us 'authentic' information, true or not, or it could simply be a misunderstanding of the line from *Probus*. More difficult would be *dignitatis omnes gradus...ad maximum in terris culmen* which uses the authentic late antique terminology of ascent through *dignitates* to the *maximum culmen*, and necessarily implies that Valerian had already held a consulship which is true, and not widely a disseminated fact.<sup>12</sup> Peter's rebuttal was unfair and ultimately unconvincing: leaving aside the exegetical question of the structure of the *Claudius*, the fact that the additions parallel material elsewhere in the *HA* could just as well be considered a testament to their authenticity, since the work as a whole is nothing if not repetitive. He failed to even mention the fact that the *ed. Ven.* must have had a manuscript source, as we can see from its printing of the missing passage in the *Life of Carus*, rendering his conclusion particularly flawed.

---

<sup>11</sup> Peter 1908: 23–9.

<sup>12</sup> For *maximum culmen*, cf. *CTh* 6.6.1, and Barrett and Woudhuysen 2016b: 486); they also show that the phrase *bellicarum rerum agendarum*, which we find in the second added passage, is also authentically late-antique (2016b: 484). Valerian's prior consulship is known only from Zosimus 1.14.1 and from the fact that his first consulship as emperor in 254 is recorded as his second; see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 258 and Peachin 1990: 30.



Jedenfalls ist die Hoffnung hier eine von P unabhängige Quelle der Überlieferung entdeckt zu haben fehlgeschlagen, und das Suchen nach einer solchen wird fortgesetzt werden müssen.<sup>13</sup>

Peter's prestige carried the day, despite the weakness of his rebuttal. His successor as editor of the *HA*, Ernst Hohl, in 1913 made up for these weaknesses with a detailed examination of the *ed. Ven.*, concluding that its readings, where it varied from the manuscripts, were the result purely of conjecture. As a consequence, Patzig's theory would have to wait more than a century for vindication.

In 2016, Rino Modonutti published a sensational discovery, that the lengthy list of jurists transmitted after *Alex. 68.1* only in *ed. Ven.* can be found almost entire and in the same context, in the *Mare historiarum*, a universal history written by a Dominican scholar Giovanni Colonna around the middle of fourteenth century.<sup>14</sup>

Quorum primus et principalis fuit famosus ille Ulpianus, famosissimus iuris consultus, Fabius Sabinus, Cato sui temporis, Helius Gordianus, Iulius Paulus iuris consultus, Clodius Venacius qui fuit e aetate orator amplissimus, *Pomponius iuris consultus, Africanus, Calistrathes, Hermogenes, Venuleius, Triphonius, Metianus, Celsus, Proculus, Modestinus*, hii tres omnes iures consulti, Cathilius Severus. (ed. Modonutti 242)

Those listed above in italics are found only in the *ed. Ven.*, and as Modonutti concludes, demonstrate that the tradition of the *Historia Augusta* in the fourteenth century is considerably more complex than has been supposed. Indeed, Modonutti goes on to show, some of the jurists only found in that list are also mentioned in *Historia imperialis* of Giovanni de Matoci (†1337), the *mansionarius* of Verona who made substantial corrections to P, and *De viris illustribus* of Guiglielmo da Pastrengo (†1362).<sup>15</sup>

Modonutti did not, however, extend his inquiry to the others added passages in the *ed. Ven.* In the *Life of Valerian*, Colonna clearly had a text which began like the *ed. Ven.* with the

---

<sup>13</sup> Peter 1908: 29.

<sup>14</sup> Modonutti 2016. Modonutti (2013) has also edited part of the imperial portion of the *Mare*, from Hadrian to Alexander Severus. Colonna's autograph, which I have consulted, is Florence BML, MS Edili 173.

<sup>15</sup> Modonutti 2016: 304–405. On Matoci, see Stover and Woudhuysen 2017.

same sentence. Since, Modonutti's edition only extends to Alexander Severus, I quote from the autograph manuscript (Florence, BML MS Edili 173).<sup>16</sup>

Edili 173, f. 194r: Fuit autem hic Valerianus genere nobilis patre Valerio, et qui per omnes dignitatum gradus ad imperium venit.

Venice 1489, beginning of *Val.* Valerianus imperator, nobilis genere, patre Valerio, censor antea et per dignitatum omnes gradus suis.

Edili 173, f. 194v: ubi nec uigor nec disciplina militaris nihil sibi ualuit

Venice 1489, after *Val.* 7.1: ubi nec uigor nec disciplina quin caperetur militaris quicquam ualore potuit.

We can also confirm this on the basis of individual readings, if we look particularly at the passage in the *Life of Carus* where the *ed. Ven.* is the *editio princeps*.<sup>17</sup>

1.2 senatus et populi *post* sententia *Ven.* Colonna : senatus ac populo *post* gubernacula

P Σ

1.3 e *om.* P *hab.* Σ *Ven.* Colonna

2.3 regione P<sup>1</sup> religione P<sub>L</sub> *Ven.* Colonna

2.5 quadam P quodam *Ven.* Σ Colonna

2.5 tumebat boni P timebat boni Σ tunc boni habuerat *Ven.* tunc boni habuerit Colonna

3.3 ni his P (in his L) nihil *Ven.* Σ Colonna

3.4 ad *om.* P<sup>1</sup> *hab.* P<sub>L</sub> Σ *Ven.* Colonna

Patzig's intuition was entirely correct. The *ed. Ven.* of 1489 must be based on a manuscript source which goes back more than a century to a time in which the *HA* was barely known, and very few manuscripts existed. There is no other explanation which can account for its agreement with Colonna. It could not have been interpolated from the *Mare historiarum* because Colonna shows awareness of the additional passages, but does not always reproduce them in full. Indeed, in the case of the second addition in the *Val.*, he uses less than one sentence of the text.

---

<sup>16</sup> I examined this on microfilm.

<sup>17</sup> As the collation shows, Hohl's theory (1913: 420) that the *ed. Ven.* used P itself in this passage is entirely untenable.

One must, however, introduce a complication. The *ed. Ven.* was based on the *editio princeps*, printed at Milan in 1475. The Milan edition was based (directly or through an intermediary) on two sources: a mid-fourteenth-century copy of P, Paris lat. 5816 (L), which was subsequently owned and annotated by Petrarch and an unidentified  $\Sigma$  manuscript.<sup>18</sup> The proofs of its primary derivation from L are legion. One noteworthy case is in *Maximus and Balbinus* 16.2-3.

Maximus, quem Pupienum plerique putant, summae[t] tenuitatis sed uirtutis amplissim<a>e fuit. sub his pugnatum est a Carpis contra Moesos. fuit et Scyt<h>ici belli princip<i>um, fuit et Histriae excidium eo tempore, ut autem Dexippus dicit, Histricae ciuitatis. (Hohl 2.70; P, f. 151r)

The scribe of L made a *saut du même au même* error, confounded by the repetition of *fuit*.

Maximus quem puppienum plerique putant summe extenuitatis sed virtutis amplissime fuit. et scitici belli principium fuit. et hystrie excidium eo tempore. Vt autem dexippus dicit hystrice civitatis. (L, f. 71r)

This omission is reproduced in the Milan edition.

Maximus quem Pupienum plerique putant: summe extenuitatis sed virtutis amplissimae fuit: & scithici belli principium fuit & histriae excidium eo tempore. Vt autem Desippus dicit Histricae civitatis. (unpaginated)

Such an error is very unlikely to arise independently, and Ballou has amassed considerable other evidence that L is the ultimate origin of the *editio princeps* of 1475.<sup>19</sup> This same omission is found in the *ed. Ven.* Yet another example can be seen in the lacunose passage in *Gal.* 1.1 discussed above. The *editio princeps* presents the  $\Sigma$  text unaltered, and the *ed. Ven.* prints the same with the addition of a single word.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Marshall 1983: 356 n. 15.

<sup>19</sup> Ballou 1914: 82–9.

exercitus murmurabant duces erat (*add. ingens Ven.*) omnium meror quod imperator romanus in persida serviliter teneretur

Beyond dramatic instances like these, the same conclusion can be reached by just a cursory glance of the hundreds of readings in which the *ed. Ven.* agrees with *editio princeps* against both P and Σ.<sup>20</sup> Hence, the text of the *ed. Ven.* is an amalgamation of the *editio princeps* with the unknown manuscript source, and cannot be considered by itself an uncontaminated witness to that source.

In a similar way, Colonna's *Mare historiarum* is not a text of the *HA*, but an original historical work. Even though it is very likely that Colonna only had one manuscript of the *HA*, we cannot suppose that Colonna did not alter, supplement, and paraphrase as he saw fit. So neither the *ed. Ven.* nor Colonna on their own can be considered a sure guide to the lost tradition of the *HA*, but the *ed. Ven.* only where it disagrees with the *editio princeps* in a significant fashion (that is, excluding the typographic solecisms to which the printer was especially prone), and Colonna only where he agrees with another source for the text of the *HA*. To make full and efficacious use of this tradition, we would want a manuscript of the *HA* itself of the sort that Colonna and the Venice editor had recourse to.<sup>21</sup> Such an uncontaminated witness to this tradition does indeed survive, at least for two of the lives, in a previously unexamined fifteenth-century manuscript now in Erlangen.

### III

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek MS 647 (E) is a manuscript on paper, consisting of fifty-nine folios, written in the later fifteenth century. It contains:

f.1br: Lorenzo Valla, *de libero arbitrio, inc. Maxime vellem, Garsia Episcoporum doctissime . . .* Ends imperfectly (106, p. 49 Chomarat), f. 15v: *multum ad*

---

<sup>20</sup> These can be seen in the apparatus criticus in some of the Budé volumes with readings cited as *edd. vett.* See also Hohl 1913: 417–18.

<sup>21</sup> We can dispense with one red herring here. London, British Library, Add. MS 19904 is a late-fifteenth/early-sixteenth-century manuscript of the *HA* with a text extraordinarily close to that of the *ed. Ven.* Too close, in fact. It reproduces most of its typographic errors, besides adopting its punctuation wholesale. Hence, Hohl (1913: 421) is absolutely correct to regard it as a copy of the *ed. Ven.*

*corroborationem fidei fidei* [sic]. Ed. J. Chomarat, *Lorenzo Valla. Dialogue sur le libre-arbitre*, Paris, 1983.

f. 16r–22v: Blank.

f. 23r: Letter of Bishop Johan von Eich to Bernhard von Waring, prior of Tegernsee, *inc. Iohannes dei gratia Sancte Aureatensis alias Eystetensis episcopus religioso et docto monacho fratri Bernardo priori Sancti Quirini in Tegernsee...* f. 36r: *per infinita secula seculorum. Amen*, with *FINIS* added in a later hand.

ff. 36v–38v: Blank.

f. 39r: *Historia Augusta, Lives of the Two Valerians and the Two Gallieni, inc. (rubr.) Trebellii pollionis ~~liber~~ Valerianus pater et Valerianus filius incipit feliciter.*

*Valerianus imperator patre Valerio censor antea et per dignitatum omnes gradus suis temporibus ad maximum in terris ascendens cuius per annos . . .* f. 52r: *mimis scurrisque uixisse*. The beginning of the main text begins with a crude four-line initial V in red, with the main text following in the customary brown ink.

ff. 52v–57v: Blank.

f. 58r. Giovanni Antonio Campano, letter to Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini, without heading, greeting or attribution, *inc. Centum xxxvi Quintiliani declamationes ad te nuper e germania missas...* f. 59r *ignorem futurum*. See the Rome (not Venice) 1495 *Opera omnia* of Campano, printed by Eucharius Silber, f. 63v–64v.

f. 59v. Blank.

Besides these existing texts, the first folio (f. 1r) contains a list of contents indicating that a number of texts has been lost, including *Cornelius Tacitus de situ Germanorum* and *Daretes* [sic] *Frigius* before the *HA* lives and *Quaedam super tragedias Senece* after. Beneath this list of contents comes the name *Iohannis Mendel*. The list of contents is in Johan Mendel's hand, as Mariarosa Cortesi has shown.<sup>22</sup> Mendel was a canon of Regensburg, and provost in Eichstätt under the same Bishop Johann von Eych who wrote the second item. He died in 1484, which gives us an absolute terminus ante quem for the volume.<sup>23</sup> None of the

---

<sup>22</sup> See the description in Fischer 1936: 378–80. An identical ownership inscription by Mendel is visible on the flyleaf in St Petersburg, MS Lat F I 312, which also contains Valla's dialogue; cf. Wagendorfer 2015: 61.

<sup>23</sup> See Cortesi 1986: 374–6; 1984.

items, however, postdate 1471, and there is very good reason to fix its writing around that date.

The key to understanding the second part of this miscellany perhaps lies in the last item, the letter of Giannantonio Campano. I know of no other manuscript copies of Campano's letter (and the copy here is textually superior to that which eventually appeared in print).<sup>24</sup> It is almost certainly written in his hand – compare the letter in ASV Armarium t. 10, f. 209r<sup>25</sup> and the fragmentary biography of Federico da Montefeltro in Urb. Lat. 1022 which has been claimed to be part autograph. The fact that it contains no salutation, valediction or attribution may well mark it out as a work in progress. While the section from the *HA* which precedes the letter is in a different hand, we have other reasons to connect earlier items in the volume with Campano. First, he is well known as a reader of Tacitus' *Germania*, which he used extensively in an oration he composed for the Diet of Regensburg (but never delivered), in which he appealed to the pristine nobility and virtue of the Germans.<sup>26</sup> Second, the volume is wrapped in a parchment sheet containing curial documents, including one issued at Siena in 1460 (when it is known that Campano was in Siena) dealing with affairs in Münster and Bratislava. Hence, it seems as if the second half of the original volume, from Tacitus to the end, belonged originally to Campano, and Mendel added the text at the beginning when the volume came into his possession. What is interesting is that the manuscript seems to be a German production and to have remained in Germany since being written: it is not merely associated with Campano, but it is a relic of his German adventure, whose destination was none other than Regensburg. As a canon of Regensburg, Mendel may well have attended the synod, which could explain how the volume ended up in his possession. To find a connection between Campano and Mendel is not wholly surprising: Mendel's friend Johann Tröster was an intimate of Enea Silvio Piccolomini (the future Pope Pius II), patron of Campano and the dignitary in whose retinue he travelled to Regensburg, as was Mendel's bishop Johann von Eyck.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> See Cortesi 1994: 83. She notes the superiority of the text, but does not identify the hand.

<sup>25</sup> A plate can be seen De Beer 2007: 136.

<sup>26</sup> See the lively account in Krebs 2011.

<sup>27</sup> Tröster's relationship with Mendel is confirmed by the St Petersburg manuscript mentioned above, which was copied by Tröster and belonged to Mendel. Mendel also witnessed Tröster's elevation to a doctorate in canon law at Regensburg in 1468 (see Sheffler 2008: 340). Tröster, who had probably become acquainted with Piccolomini some years earlier in Vienna and who had extensive humanistic interests, was later put in charge of the education

As a working hypothesis then, the text of *HA* in the Erlangen manuscript was discovered somewhere in Germany by Campano. After all, as a good fifteenth-century humanist, he filled his free hours with manuscript hunting.<sup>28</sup> Somewhere in Germany he found the old manuscript of the *Minor Declamations* documented in the final item in the Erlangen volume. He found another containing a relatively rare patristic text, Victorinus' *De generatione diuini uerbi* (more commonly known as *Ad Candidum Arrianum*), written *litteris peruetustis*, which he sent to Pope Sixtus IV, with a letter:

Cum nonnullas Germaniae bibliothecas nuper euoluerem, libellum inueni litteris quidem scriptum peruetustis, uerum situ atque puluere ita consumptum, ut iam legi uix, nisi magna cum diligentia, posset.<sup>29</sup>

Recently when I was browsing several German libraries, I found a little book written in very old script, but so worn away by mould and dust, that it could scarcely be read, save with great concentration.

Another old manuscript, whose contents he does not identify, was sent to Alfonso of Aragon, with a letter containing a lively description of these libraries and their (unappreciated) contents: *magna copia librorum vetustissimorum in tota Germania est*.<sup>30</sup> Hence, even if we do not know what monasteries Campano visited, it is entirely plausible that he visited one with an old *HA* manuscript.

This could also explain why the manuscript only contains two lives. Following this reconstruction, Campano would not have had much time for copying or having copies made, as his party was either travelling on to Regensburg on a fairly tight schedule, or he was still in the cardinal's service at the Diet, or they were rushing home after the death of Pope Paul II.<sup>31</sup> The first thing any sensible person looks for in an unreported manuscript of Juvenal is the 'Oxford lines', thirty-four lines interposed in the *Sixth Satire*, preserved 'only in a single

---

of his nephew; cf. Sheffler 2008: 340–1, with bibliography. On von Eyck and Piccolomini, see Märtil 2015.

<sup>28</sup> See Di Bernardo 1975: 285.

<sup>29</sup> *Ep.* 6.52 (ed. 1707, p. 399).

<sup>30</sup> *Ep.* 9.45 (ed. 1707, pp. 532–4).

<sup>31</sup> See Di Bernardo 1975: 245–92. We can trace the journey in great detail thanks to the travelogue by Campano's companion in the legate's party, Agostino Patrizi, *De legatione germanica*, extant in Vat. Lat. 3842, ff. 22r–85v.

manuscript of average quality'.<sup>32</sup> In the same way, anyone who knew anything about the *HA* would have immediately searched to see if the great lacuna was filled. Failing that, the next thing to check would be the state of the lacunose passages in the *Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni*. Campano was not just a poet and diplomat, but a keen student of Roman history, who oversaw the *editio princeps* of Suetonius (Rome 1970). He certainly would have been familiar with the *HA*, known exactly where to look and which sections he would want copied if necessity forced him to be selective. That would explain why we have only those two lives.

Campano would have found much to excite his interest. To start, the title in the very first line. One exceptional feature the *Life of the Two Valerians* in the *ed. Ven.* (which Patzig did not remark upon) is the title and attribution. Unlike P, Σ and the *editio princeps*, it attributes the *Lives of the Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni* explicitly (and 'correctly') to Trebellius Pollio. These lives had previously been attributed to a different one of the six *HA* authors, Capitolinus, due to a codicological problem in P's archetype. The *Two Valerians* is the first life after the great lacuna and is imperfect at the beginning. On f. 152r of P, what we find is the end of the *Lives of Maximus and Balbinus* and the imperfect beginning of the *Lives of the Two Valerians*, with the following *explicit – incipit*:

MAXIMUS SIVE PUPIENUS ET BALBINUS IULI CAPITOLINI EXPLICIT

INCIPIT EIUSDEM VALERIANI DUO

What must have happened is the loss of the previous lives explicitly attributed to Trebellius, and hence *eiusdem* was misinterpreted to mean Capitolinus and not Trebellius Pollio. This directly inspired the simple title *Eiusdem Valeriani duo* in the *editio princeps*. In the *ed. Ven.* we find quite a different title, with the 'correct' attribution to Trebellius Pollio: *Trevelii Pollionis Valerianus pater & filius*. Given that the beginning of the *Two Valerians* is different in the *ed. Ven.* and derived from its lost manuscript source, we should presume that this strand alone preserved the name of the 'genuine' – if that term has any meaning in discussing the attribution of *HA* lives – author of the life.

---

<sup>32</sup>Luck 1972: 217. On these lines, with full bibliography, see Sosin 2000.



This is almost precisely the title found in the Erlangen manuscript (f. 39r): *Trebellii pollionis ~~liber~~ Valerianus pater et Valerianus filius incipit feliciter*.<sup>33</sup> Since the Erlangen manuscript (which I will call E) predates the *ed. Ven.* by some two decades, this must be our earliest witness of the attribution of the *Two Valerians* to Trebellius.

The text that follows is the same as found in the *ed. Ven.*:

Valerianus imperator, nobilis genere, patre Valerio, censor antea, et per dignitatum omnes gradus suis temporibus ad maximum in terris culmen ascendens (*Val.* 5.1) cuius ...

After 7.1 *superatus est*, we find the same passage as in the *ed. Ven.* albeit in a less corrupt form:

Victus est enim a Sapore rege persarum, dum ductu cuiusdam sui ducis cui summam omnium bellicarum rerum agendarum commiserat, seu fraude seu aduersa fortuna in ea esset loca deductus ubi nec uigor nec disciplina quin caperetur militaris quicquam ualere potuit Captus igitur in dicionem Saporis peruenit, quem, cum gloriosae uictoriae successu nimis honorifice quam deceret elatus, superbo inflatoque animo detineret seque usurum Romanorum rege ut uili et abiecto mancipio loqueretur. Litteras ab amicis regibus qui et ei contra Valerianum fauerant plerasque missas accepit. Quarundam seriem Iulius refert.

ualere : ualore *Ven.* nimis : minus *Ven.* elatus . . . animo : elatus superbo et elato animo *Ven.* usurum : rursus *Ven.* ut : ne *Ven.* fauerant : faerant E (*a.c.*) quarundam : quarum *Ven.* [INSTRUCTIONS TO COPY-EDITOR: SMALL TYPE]

For he was conquered by Shapur, the king of the Persians, when he was led by the guidance of one of his generals, to whom he had granted the authority for running the whole campaign, either by trickery or bad luck into a position where neither strength nor military discipline could do anything to prevent his being captured. He was captured therefore, and fell into the power of Shapur, who was puffed up with pride at the success of this victory, rather less honourably than was appropriate and with proud

---

<sup>33</sup> Most of the titles in the *ed. Ven.* are the same as in the *editio princeps*; hence, where they differ, as in here and in the *Max. Balb.*, given as *Maximus et Balbinus* in *Ven.* and just *Maximus* in *Med.*, we should assume the use of the manuscript source.

and haughty intention held him, and declared that he would use the king of the Romans as base and vile slave. He received quite a few letters from kings allied to him who, who were even on his side against Valerian. Julius records a whole series of these.

In one of these cases, one can already glean that the text of E is closer to Colonna than the Venice edition: a form of the verb *valere* is in both E and Colonna where the *ed. Ven.* has the noun *valore*. This holds true throughout the text. For example, E and Colonna give the names of the first two kings who wrote to Shapur on Valerian's behalf as *Vesonius* and *Vellenius*, where the *ed. Ven.* gives *Belsolus* and *Valerius*. (P and the *editio princeps* have *vel solus* and *Velenus*.)

Like any other manuscript, E has idiosyncrasies in its text, but we can use the other two sources for this tradition to help control for them. Agreements between E and either the *ed. Ven.* (against the *editio princeps*) or Colonna should represent the reading of the alternate tradition. A selected list:

*The Lives of the Two Valerians*

- 6.2 post senatus *add.* consulti E Colonna
- 6.3 aestimabis : extimabis E Colonna
- 6.3 manere in curia PΣ *Ven.* : in curia manere E Colonna
- 6.7 de militibus de senatu P Σ *Ven.* : de senatu de militibus E Colonna
- 1.2 posterisque E posteris P<sup>1</sup> *Med.* et posteris P *corr.* posterisve Σ posteriusque *Ven.*
- 1.3 saepe E Σ *Ven.* mepe P<sup>1</sup> nempe P *corr.* *Med.*
- 2.2 quid ad P Σ *Med.* quid habet et E *Ven.*
- 4.3 reges E *Ven.* regis P Σ *Med.*

*The Lives of the Two Gallieni*

- 1.1 post imperium *add.* et E *Ven. om.* P
- 2.1 occupavitque : atque E *Ven.*
- 2.5 post uenit *add.* deinde E *Ven. om.* P Σ *Med.*
- 3.9 uotiumque E Σ *Ven.* uotium P *Med.*
- 4.6 gessit E Colonna gerit P
- 5.5 una E Colonna uno P
- 5.6 Illyricum E *Ven. om.* P Σ *Med.*
- 9.3 stupefacto E Colonna obstupefacto P

11.7 epithalamion : epistola miono P *Med.* epistola mioni Σ epithalamium E *Ven.*

12.6 *post Persico add. et E Ven. om.* P Σ *Med.*

13.2 tum E Σ *Ven.* cum P *Med.*

16.1 tyrannos esse passus est Romanum dehonstantes imperium E *Ven.* tyrannos uastari fecit P Σ *Med.* (*suppl. per ante tyrannos Baehrens*) cf. *Alex.* 2.2.

17.1 dixit ille sciebam patrem meum esse mortalem E *Ven.* nec defuit an ille se dixit sciebam patrem meum esse mortalem P *Med.* nec defuit cum ille sic dixit sciebam patrem meum esse mortalem Σ *del. ut gloss. Hohl*

21.5 annis E *Ven.* anno P Σ *Med.*

20.3 constillatosque E *Ven.* costilatosque P *Med.* costulatosque Σ.

All of these readings will deserve careful attention from the next editor of the *HA*. Let us focus on just one example: P's *costilatosque* in *Gal.* 20.3, an adjective used to describe what are some obviously rather splendid belts (*baltei*). The lexica consider *costilatus* as an adjective probably meaning 'ribbed', despite the fact that this is the only attestation of the word.<sup>34</sup> While the reading *constillatosque* in E and the *ed. Ven.* is not flawless, it points us to what must be the intended word, *constellatosque* or 'jewelled', which appears in several early editions, such as Boxhorn's Leiden edition (printed in 1631), and provides an easy palaeographic explanation for P's reading.

Nonetheless, our direct evidence for the tradition represented by E, the *ed. Ven.*, and Colonna does not extend further back than the fourteenth century. To demonstrate that its text represents an even earlier tradition, we need to find occasional agreements with P in its earliest state. P's exemplar undoubtedly had its flaws, and it is inevitable that some of them would eventually be corrected conjecturally. A manuscript descending from the same source as P would show some of these errors. And this is indeed what we find. Proper names are particularly useful for this sort of analysis. At *Val.* 4.1, P and E share the reading *Albini* for *Albani*, which is found in Σ and was added into P by a corrector before L was copied. Likewise, E consistently calls the general Macrianus Macrinus; so too, in a number of instances, does the main hand in P. However, in some of these cases P (for example, *Gal.* 1.2 and 3.2) was corrected very early on, before B was copied from P in the later ninth century. The same can be said for the reading *Carrenis* in E and P's first hand, which was soon

---

<sup>34</sup> *TLL* 4.1085.44–5 (Wulff).

corrected to *Charrenis* (*Gal.* 10.3). Outside of names, E shares with the first hand of P the reading *gubernaret* at *Gal.* 2.2, which was soon corrected in P to *gubernabat*; and *eterni* for *externi* at *Gal.* 9.2, which was corrected in P before L was copied.

This takes the origin of the tradition of E, the *ed. Ven.* and Colonna back to well before the fourteenth century, back to the time of P and its archetype. Strictly speaking, however, this may demonstrate the antiquity of E's text, but does not prove its independence of P. The standard of proof for independence is undoubtedly high. At *Gal.* 19.5, Salmasius first noted that a word must have dropped out, probably after *anno: multi eum imperii sui anno periisse dixerunt*. The sense demands *nono*, but there is no indication of anything missing in P,  $\Sigma$  or the early editions. But in E, we find a gap the space of several characters immediately following *anno*. If the scribe had recognised that another word was needed, why did he not supply one? Such lacunae, as have seen, were designed to represent how the source manuscript with illegible text appeared to the eye, with the goal of being able to fill in the gaps if another copy should turn up. Hence it looks like E was copied from a manuscript which had a word rendered illegible by physical damage following *anno*.

Even more revealing then is E's text of the lacunose passages in P. Leaving intratextual lacunae of the sort we find in the *Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni* is an important scribal practice, particularly in the early Middle Ages.<sup>35</sup> This indeed happened with Cicero's *De oratore*, which is extant with a lacunose text in two ninth-century northern manuscripts, Harley 2376 and Avranches 238. From these spring the whole medieval tradition. Unknown for centuries, however, there remained a manuscript of a completely separate tradition housed at the cathedral of Lodi. Discovered by Landriani in 1421, this manuscript was used to make the text of Cicero whole.<sup>36</sup>

These lacunae could be transmitted through generations of copies, as indeed can be seen in the manuscripts descended from P. But in the case of P itself, we have good reason to believe that it was copied directly from the damaged archetype. On f. 154v (reproduced as passage C below), the writing is extremely compressed in the two lines before the lacunose passage, and at least the last half line before is certainly written in a different hand, given it uses an *ri* ligature seen nowhere else in the codex. Multiple hands active around lacunae are a feature that can be observed in the manuscripts of Ammianus as well.<sup>37</sup> As discussed above,

---

<sup>35</sup> On the scribal practice of leaving lacunae, see Stover 2017a.

<sup>36</sup> See Stover 2017a: 315–16 and Winterbottom, Rouse, and Reeve 1983: 107–8.

<sup>37</sup> See Stover and Kelly 2016: 122 and Barrett and Woudhuysen 2016a: 22.

one of the prime pieces of evidence against  $\Sigma$ 's independence from P is its treatment of the lacunose passages. Hence examining these passages in E will shed light on its relationship to P and/or its archetype.

In two instances, E transmits less text than P. First, *Gal.* 5.6:

occupasset gothori.....a quo P	occupasset
	.....
	quo E

This would be difficult to explain if E were ultimately derived from P. Likewise, at *Gal.* 1.1 P begins the lacunose passage after *exercitus* with the truncated *mur* wholly absent in E. But in all other cases, E presents more text than P, with its supplements mostly corresponding to the shape of P's lacunae. I present the text here as it appears in the manuscripts, with the actual line divisions and original readings, erroneous or not (I use / for line breaks, // for page breaks, and ignore all later corrections in P).

[INSTRUCTIONS FOR COPY EDITOR: SET IN EITHER PORTRAIT OR LANDSCAPE, ALBEIT WITH LINE DIVISIONS STRICTLY OBSERVED, AND PREFERABLY A VERTICAL LINE IN BETWEEN THE TWO COLUMNS]

<p>A. <i>Val.</i> 8.5</p>	<p>P, f. 154r:</p> <p>Sigallienum valeriani filium de quo iam multa /  nobilis fuit se saloninum filius /  gallienus quietus /  libro adiuncto ad aliud volumen transeam /  semper enim me vobis dedidi et famae cui negare nihil possum:</p>	<p>E, f. 41v</p> <p>Gallienum Valeriani filium de quo multa dicenda /  Iam nobis sunt et Gallienum Saloninum qui eiusdem /  Gallieni filius fuisse perhibetur qui et ipse Gallienus /  est dictus; huic volumini adiunxero. /  Idcirco ad aliud volumen transeam. Semper enim /  me vobis dedidi et famae cui negare nihil /  debeo neque possem.</p> <p>(if) I add to this volume Gallienus, the son of Valerian, about whom there has already been much for us to say, and Gallienus Saloninus, who is said to have been the son of Gallienus, and is himself called Gallienus. Therefore, I will move on to another volume. For always I have dedicated myself to you, and to your reputation, to which I neither should nor can deny anything.</p>
<p>B. <i>Gal.</i> 1.1</p>	<p>P, f. 154r–154v</p> <p>exercitus meo imperator duces erant in Persida /  quod Gallienus noster pater factus //  moribus reperi perdidit. Gallieno igitur et Volusiano consularibus /</p>	<p>E, f. 41v–42r</p> <p>-deret vocabantur exercitus /  duces erant ingens omnium meorum quia /  Valerianus imperator orbis Romani servitute /  Persidam teneretur et quia Gallienus natura /  lascivior capto patre ob suorum insolentiam morum //  rem p. pene perdidit. Gallieno igitur et Volusiano /</p> <p>... the armies were summoned...the generals. Everyone had a vast sorrow, that Valerian, the emperor of the Roman world, was held in Persian captivity, and that Gallienus, by nature more given to lust, had almost ruined the state due to the recklessness of his habits, after the capture of his father. Therefore, in the consulship of Gallienus and Volusianus...</p>

C. Gal.1.3-4	P, f. 154v	E, f. 42r
	<p>ac remp de capesserent sic igitur /  imperium macrino /  causae macri imperandi cum filiis haecfuerunt/</p>	<p>cum filiis suis imperatores ac remp. demum/  ipse cum filiis suis capesserunt. Sic igitur ro. imperium ma/  crino nisi filiis est delatum. causae autem macrino/  cum filiis imperandi hec fuerunt: ...</p> <p>...with his sons, emperors, and at last he, with his sons,  seized the state. So therefore the Roman empire was  bestowed on Macrinus as well as (?) his sons. The causes of  Macrinus and his sons' accession were these...</p>
D. Gal. 2.1	P. 154v	E. f. 42r:
E. Gal. 4.2	P, f. 155r–155v	E, f. 43r
	<p>ad omnia riaergoma undique/  petit occupa partibus quas /  posuerat ita imperium bellum/  instuxit esset omni quaecontra/</p>	<p>ad omnia gesta militaria. Macrinus ergo undique/  collectis exercitibus orientis partes petit atque/  ut posset late sibi delatum diffundere et tueri/  imperium, bellum sic instruxit atque copias sic/  paravit ut esset omnium circumspectus quae ꝑ contra/</p> <p>...to all military accomplishments. Therefore Macrinus, his  armies gathered from every quarter, sought the eastern parts  and so set in motion a war to extend and protect the empire  bestowed on him, and prepared his troops to be on guard for  everything which against...</p>
	<p>... atque imperatori//  uuuium transmisitaegypt dataest /  a strangy /  milites uitumest /  ribus cum gallienus in luxuria et in probitate perstiteret. cumque/</p>	<p>...atque imperatori/  Galieno vivum Romam transmisit . Egiptus /  que tota tunc Theodoto data est /  strangi milites/  sevitum est /  ribus cum Galienus in luxuria et /</p>

		in gravitate improbitatis persistet, cum que ...
F. <i>Gal.</i> 4.4	P, f. 155v	E, f. 43v
	contra hunc que urbem recoepisset	exercitum / postumus / dentibus gallis gallienus muros/
		... contra hunc/ Galienus cum cognovisset paravit exercitum./ que urbem / Postumus recepisset/ defendentibus Gallis Gallienus/ muros circumiens sagitta ictus est. septemque annis/



Unlike  $\Sigma$ 's supplements, E's text corresponds with roughly the amount of text missing in P and provides new and substantive information. The *ed. Ven.* provides little assistance, mostly reproducing the  $\Sigma$  supplements from the *editio princeps*, albeit with occasional divergences which agree with E (the addition of *ingens* in Passage B, quoted above, and *saevitum* for *victum* in Passage E). Colonna, however, provides a strong parallel for E's version of Passage B, despite his paraphrasing:

Edili 173, f. 194v: sed Galienus Valeriani filius homo natura lascivior comperta  
patris captivitate gaudebat, iocabatur cum esset omnium ingens meror quod  
Romanorum princeps captivitate persicha teneretur.

Hence the treatment of the lacunose passages is not due to the fifteenth-century scribe of E, but rather goes back to the earlier tradition.

On the surface, then, it very much looks like a parallel case to Cicero's *De oratore*, where gaps in one tradition can be filled by recourse to another. Indeed, what is particularly interesting is that E's text appears not so much to supplement P, but to represent a different visual interpretation of a single hard-to-read archetype. Different eyes will be able to make out different elements of damaged texts. Despite all this, a determined sceptic could dismiss this filling as mere supplementation, early, perhaps, but supplementation all the same.<sup>38</sup> To prove with certainty the independence of E from P, what we need is to find a unique reading in E which must contain *inherited* rather than *innovated* truth – that is, a correct reading which is beyond conjecture.

*Gal.* 13.8 contains a rather compressed and confused account of a barbarian invasion into Greece and its subsequent repulsion by an Athenian force. In P it reads as follows:

atque inde Cyzicum et Asiam, deinceps Achaiam omnem vastarunt et ab  
Atheniensibus duce Dexippo, scriptore horum temporum, victi sunt.

And then they laid waste to Cyzicus and Asia, then all of Achaea, and were defeated by the Athenians, under the general Dexippus, the historian of those times.

---

<sup>38</sup> See Stover 2017b for a case of ninth-century supplementation of an archetypal lacuna.

There are no apparent problems with this passages – the manuscript tradition of P and Σ and the early printed editions display no variants, beyond some difficulty with the orthography of *Cyzicum* and the form of the verb *vastarunt* – and the sense is immediately clear and obvious. And yet this passage has hung under a cloud of suspicion for more than a hundred years. The event described is the Herulian invasion of Greece in 268. While our surviving historical accounts do not shed much light on this event, the archaeological record demonstrates the traumatic impact of the incursion.<sup>39</sup>

The general and historian mentioned, Dexippus, happens to be a reasonably well known person.<sup>40</sup> His writings may mostly be lost – although the spectacular discovery of the Vienna palimpsest has provided substantial sections – but his career left a mark on the physical fabric of Athens.<sup>41</sup> A number of surviving inscriptions detail his career in great detail, including *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2931, 3198, 3667, 3671 and especially 3669. We know the succession of offices Dexippus held: *basileus*, eponymous *archon*, *kratistos*, a priesthood at Eleusis, agonothete and panegyriarch of the Panathenaic games. The final inscription (which includes the most detailed sequence of offices) was erected by Dexippus' sons and postdates the Herulian invasion, yet it makes no mention of Dexippus' starring role. As Fergus Millar put it, 'we could hardly guess from this inscription that Dexippus had ever seen military action'.<sup>42</sup> Instead, its real focus is on Dexippus' achievement as a writer of history, as a chronicler of the barbarian invasion, rather than as the general who led the glorious resistance. The only evidence we have for Dexippus' military career is this passage in the *HA*.

It is not entirely implausible for the *HA* to transmit valuable information about Dexippus, since it relied more or less extensively on Dexippus' historical work. T. D. Barnes argued some forty years ago that the major source for the *Two Gallieni* is Dexippus, and the new Vienna fragments have offered additional corroboration for this view.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> See Fowden 1998: 48–59.

<sup>40</sup> The seminal study is Millar 1969.

<sup>41</sup> On the Vienna fragments (the underscript in Vienna hist. gr. 73), see Martin and Grusková 2014a; 2014b; 2014c. C. P. Jones has posted three excellent discussions of the new fragments online at academia.edu (<https://harvard.academia.edu/ChristopherJones/Papers>).

<sup>42</sup> Millar 1969: 21.

<sup>43</sup> See Barnes 1978: 109–11; Mallan and Davenport 2015; Martin 2017; Zecchini 2017.

Nonetheless, it remains rather remarkable that no one saw fit to commemorate his military achievements in Athens.<sup>44</sup>

In 1897, J. Bergman recognised the fundamental implausibility of the *HA*'s claim, and proposed a simple solution: instead of *duce Dexippo*, what if the original read *indice Dexippo* or *docente Dexippo*?<sup>45</sup> Nine decades later, powerful arguments against the *HA*'s account were assembled by De Ste. Croix.<sup>46</sup> In general, modern scholars have remained sceptical (and perhaps, at times, overly sceptical) of 'facts' found in the *HA* alone.<sup>47</sup> In this anomalous case, however, they have generally accepted the testimony of the *HA* without corroboration. For many of them, the decisive factor has been simply the lack of any manuscript support for Bergman's emendation.<sup>48</sup>

The Erlangen manuscript offers a dramatic confirmation of Bergman's instinct (f. 48r):

atque inde Cyzicum et Asiam, deinceps Achaïam omnem vastarunt et ab Atheniensium duce ut scribit Thesipus horum temporum scriptor.

And thereupon they laid waste to Cyzicus and Asia, and then all of Achaea, and were beaten by the general of the Athenians, as Dexippus, the historian of these times, writes.

There is simply no way that a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century scholar would have had any difficulty with the line as transmitted in P. There is nothing fundamentally implausible about the idea of a single figure being both a general and an historian: witness Thucydides and Caesar. Instead, the doubt arises because of the particularities of Dexippus' life and career, which only came to be known with the publication of the inscriptions from Athens, centuries after E was written. No evidence available in the Renaissance would motivate tampering, so E's text ought roughly to represent the archetypal reading.

---

<sup>44</sup> Attempts to glean hints of his military activity from the (conventional) language in the inscription, as in Mecella 2006: 255–7, are unconvincing.

<sup>45</sup> Bergman 1898: 18–22.

<sup>46</sup> de Ste Croix, 1981: 653–5, n. 42.

<sup>47</sup> The classic formulation of this principle is by Chastagnol 1963: 70.

<sup>48</sup> Migliorati 2013: 20 n. 10: 'la tradizione manoscritta non presenta infatti alcuna corrutela o alternanza di *lectiones*'.

Thus, even under the most stringent conditions, I have shown the independence of the tradition represented by Colonna, E, and the Venice edition. This allows the text to be restored in four out of the six lacunose passages, adding in total some twenty lines. For the *Life of the Two Valerians*, we also have the two new added passages, *Valerianus imperator...* and *Victus est enim....* Of course, just because they are derived from a source independent of P does not make them authentic, and I do have some doubts about the authenticity of the first one in its current form.<sup>49</sup> Throughout the two lives where E is extant, there are some hundred new readings which will require close examination by the *HA*'s next editor, and across the rest of the text there are hundreds more readings from Colonna and the *ed. Ven.* which need to be recorded and considered, in addition to the three new passages from *Maximus and Balbinus* and *Alexander*.

## IV

So far, we have found a new tradition for the text of the *HA*. The immediate question that arises, then, is what impact this new tradition has on our understanding of P, its correctors, and its relationship to  $\Sigma$ ? To give one example, Matoci supplied a line in the gutter of f. 71v of P (*Caracalla* 8.2): *eumque cum Severo professum sub Scaevola et Severo in advocacione fisci successisse*. There has been debate about the authenticity of this supplement, since Mommsen rejected it as a spurious interpolation.<sup>50</sup> Even so, it could hardly be Matoci's invention, given the detailed knowledge of the Roman political system this line implies. It is also found in Colonna.

hic fuit ille Papinianus famosissimus iuris consultus qui fuerat Severo amicissimus  
atque cum eo sub Scevola iuris consulto professus fuerat, cui postea in advocacionem  
fisci successit (ed. Modonutti 220).

---

<sup>49</sup> As mentioned above, the first line of *Val.* in E and the *ed. Ven.* is certainly impeccable from the words *per dignitatum*, since the language closely reflects late antique usage. It is possible that we have the whole life of Valerian, albeit a very scrappy one by the standards of the *HA*, but it is not impossible that the words *Valerianus imperator...antea* were added to a mutilated beginning in an attempt to make it whole.

<sup>50</sup> Mommsen 1890: 288. See, for example, Syme 1970: 322.

This was that most famous of jurists, Papinian, who had been a dear friend of Severus and had served with him under the jurist Scaevola, and whom he succeeded as *advocatus fisci*.

As a result, this line must derive from the non-P tradition, and Matoci must have had access to it. So too there are multiple phrases and sentences transmitted in  $\Sigma$  alone, such as:

At *Aelius* 5.9: *atque ad verbum memor iterasse fertur.*

After *Alex. Sev.* 56.10 *victoriam*: *de Germanis speramus per te victoriam*

After *Tacitus* 16.8 *studio*: *satisfeci claudam istud volumen*

After *Aur.* 19.4 *beneficiis*: *inserviendum deorum immortalium praeceptis*

After *Aur.* 19.5 *opem dei*: *deorum quae numquam cuiquam turpis est*

After *Aur.* 19.6 *perquirite*: *patrimis matrimisque pueris carmen indicite. Nos sumptum sacris, nos apparatus sacrificiis. Nos aras tumultuarias indicemus.*

After *Aur.* 29.3 *nos est sed hoc falsum fuit*

The authenticity of these supplements has been debated. Thomson has strongly defended the authenticity of the addition in 19.6 on basically irrefutable historical grounds.<sup>51</sup> I would add to that demonstration, that two of these (*Alex. Sev.* 56.10 and *Tac.* 16.8) look like *saut du même au même* omissions, which makes it very unlikely that they were faked. One of these passages, at least (*Aur.* 19.5), must have been in Colonna's text:

Edili 173 151r: *rogabat inperator <deorum> opem que numquam cuique turpis est*<sup>52</sup>

In addition, Modonutti has already shown that in a large number of individual cases, Colonna has what we otherwise know as  $\Sigma$  readings.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Thomson 2012: 109.

<sup>52</sup> The word *deorum* is illegible in Edili 173, but we can confirm that as the reading from later manuscripts of the *Mare*. I thank Rino Modonutti for this information.

<sup>53</sup> Here let it suffice to reject out of hand the absurd idea that the omission of these passages in P has anything to do with Christianity (Baker 2014: 84, going back to Hohl 1913: 390-1). Everyone involved – the scribe of P, the scribe of  $\Sigma$ , Colonna himself, even the scribe of the archetype – was almost certainly a Christian, and there are literally dozens of passages serenely transmitted by all of our sources which are vastly more offensive to pious ears than these banal omissions. Indeed, there are sixteen other appearances of *deorum* in P beyond

And yet, when we turn to the the treatment of the lacunose passages in *Val.* and *Gal.* discussed above,  $\Sigma$ , as we have seen, presents stitched up versions of P, with nary a trace of the text in E and Colonna. There are other indications as well: besides additional passages,  $\Sigma$  contains a large number of omissions. Some of these omissions seem to correspond ever so closely to physical features in P. The eye of the scribe of  $\Sigma$ 's archetype had a habit of wandering down to the next line before he had finished the previous one. So at *Claudius* 14.5  $\Sigma$  (with the partial exception of one manuscript) omits *balteum ... uncialem*, where P has (f. 179r; I have put in bold the text in  $\Sigma$ ):

**auream cumacum cypream unam** . Balteum argentum auratum  
unum . anulum bigem me unum . uncialem; **brachialem unam**

[INSTRUCTIONS FOR COPY EDITOR: PLEASE LEAVE SPACING HERE AS IS]

At *Tacitus* 14.4,  $\Sigma$  omits *haec....ostendit*, where P appears as follows (f. 199r):

**usque quaenam effusionem in eo fratres frugi reprehendite** . haec ipsa imperan  
di cupiditas aliis eummoribus ostendit . fuisse quam fratrem **duo igitur principes**

At *Tyr. Trig.* 18.3,  $\Sigma$  omits *ut...imperaret*, where P has (f. 168v):

**multa et sumpsisse illum purpuram** . ut moreromano imperaret  
**exercitum duxisse**

Finally, at *Quadrige* 3.6,  $\Sigma$  omits *per...pretium*; compare P (f. 208v):

**taceoita domumelicum iovioptimo maximo consecratum** perdeterimum princi  
pem et ministerium libidinis factum vi detur pretium . **Fuit tamen firmus**

In other cases,  $\Sigma$  omits phrases which begin a line in P, such as at *Probus* 15.1, where it omits the *ago dis immortalibus* at line beginning in P (205r); *Probus* 23.3, where it

---

the one omitted passage at *Aur.* 19.5. These are *scribal* features, and the fact that three of them are tightly clustered is a strong indication that the P's poor scribe was just having a bad day. Equally it could mean that the scribe of the archetype of  $\Sigma$  was being particularly attentive to his non-P source as he was copying the *Aurelian*.

skips *nusquam lituus audiendus*, a phrase at line beginning in P (f. 207v); and *Carus* 17.7, where it jumps over *longum....dicere* where in P (f. 215v) the line begins with *-gum*. In another case, it looks like  $\Sigma$  has omitted a whole line in P, and excised the surrounding nonsense. At *Macrin.* 4.1  $\Sigma$  omits *varium...dixisset*; compare P (f. 92r):

**crino quidem insenatu multi quando nuntiatumest** variumhelio  
 gabalum imperatorem cum iam caesarem alexandrum senatus di  
 xisset **ea dicta sunt appareat nobilem sordidum spurcum fuisse**

Once the line was skipped, the nonsense word *variumhelioxisset* would be all that remained, and would be a prime candidate for deletion.

It is not just deletions. On f. 151r at *Maximus and Balbinus* 16.6, P reads *duorum/gordianorum/inafrica*, with the two */* signs indicating transpositions. The scribe of B was probably correct to interpret these as meaning that *in Africa* should be placed before *Gordianorum*, i.e. that *Gordianorum* should have its place swapped with *in Africa* to make *duorum in Africa Gordianorum* (f. 150r). This is a subtle change, so it is not especially surprising that L's scribe missed the transposition and just wrote P's original *duorum Gordianorum in Africa* (f. 75r), which ensured that this was the reading in all the editions up to Peter's. The scribe of  $\Sigma$ 's archetype instead understood the two marks to be attached to *duorum* and *in Africa*, and so placed *in Africa* before *duorum Gordianorum*. This is obviously incorrect, but it is a mistake that only could have arisen from reading P itself: it cannot be a coincidence that  $\Sigma$  has a transposition just where P marks one, and that its reading could only arise from a misunderstanding of P's correction.

One final indication of  $\Sigma$ 's derivation from P can be found at the beginning of the *Two Valerians*. Here,  $\Sigma$  follows P's arrangement with the letters to Shapur first, but with an additional passage at the beginning.<sup>54</sup> It is a combination of Eutropius 9.7 and Orosius

---

<sup>54</sup> I quote here from the earliest  $\Sigma$  manuscript, Florence, BML plut 20 sin. 6, f. 72v: 'Inter hec Valerianus in Retia existens ab exercitu Augustus est appellatus uolente populo ac Senatu gaudente. Fuit enim uir nobilis sciencia ac eloquencia clarus qui per multas dignitates ac officia rem publicam nobilissime administravit. Fuit enim pretor insignis censor equissimus. Post adeptum principatum in dispositione ducum et magistratum nemo iustior nemo melior. Quo tempore Rome Gallienus filius eius a populo Cesar est appellatus. Valerianus igitur cum ingenti exercitu profectionem parauit in persas relicto ut plerique asserunt Rome filio Gallieno. Denique Valerianus regnum Persarum potenter inuadens incauto suorum ductu a Sapore persarum rege captus est et ignominiosa apud persas



7.22.4, with what appears to be a deal of tenuous extrapolation from the life of Valerian. Even so, a few words show the influence of the extra passages in E and the *ed. Ven.: nobilis, per multas dignitates ac officia, incauto suorum ducto*.<sup>55</sup> This suggests that the scribe of  $\Sigma$ 's archetype must have been copying from a manuscript with P's arrangement of the lives, but did not want to let the additional material in his other source to go to waste, and so combined it with his other historical sources to make a bridge passage.<sup>56</sup>

The nature of  $\Sigma$  can thus be best explained as being descended from P but *contaminated* from the source of Colonna's text of the *HA*. P, after all, is not the only known early manuscript of the text. There is also the B, but that is a copy of P, and so hardly useful for finding an independent source. In addition, we know from the Murbach library catalogue that there was a manuscript of the text present there before the middle of the ninth century, and we have a single folio from this manuscript preserved in Nuremberg (fr. lat. 7).<sup>57</sup> One folio is not enough to say much about the Murbach text, but we have an underexploited resource for recovering many of its readings: the Basel edition of 1518, printed by the famous house of Froben.

Froben had heard of the old manuscript of the *Historia Augusta*, and as he was preparing the edition with Erasmus, the ostensible editor, he wrote to the Abbot of Murbach, Georg von Masmünster (George de Masevaux), to try and obtain the codex. No answer came, and in the winter of 1518, they began printing the text. After, however, all the lives up to Diadumenus (in the order of the first edition) had been printed, eight quires in total, Froben at last got his hands on the manuscript.<sup>58</sup> At the same time, Froben finally managed

---

seruitute consenuit ac infamis offidi donec uixit damnationem sortitus est ut ipse acclinis humi regem semper ascensurum in equum non manu sed dorso attolleret.'

<sup>55</sup> The last of these was noted already by Patzig 1904: 50.

<sup>56</sup> It is important to note that  $\Sigma$  does not reproduce the late-ancient technical vocabulary of the E passage (*summum culmen, rerum bellicarum agendarum*) and that there is no trace of Orosius in the passage; hence, the relationship cannot go the other way. Baker 2014: 83-4 hints at the possibility of the antiquity of  $\Sigma$ 's passage, although this requires the dubious proposition that the account of Valerian's captivity did not come from Orosius, but rather his source.

<sup>57</sup> The Nuremberg fragment has until now received a scandalous lack of attention, with generally nothing more than an oblique reference to a letter of Bischoff mentioned in passing in Zahn 1973: 121. It is listed in Bischoff's catalogue (2004: no. 3652). The neglect is being remedied: Dorfbauer 2020 contains an extended treatment, and the arguments I present here are fleshed out much more fully in Stover (forthcoming).

<sup>58</sup> One can count these quires from quire signatures, which turn out to be terniones (twelve pages each). Hence the printed portion extends from 193–288 inclusive in the Basel edition. Bertrand, Desbordes and Callu (1984-85: 100) misread the evidence and assume that the



to obtain a copy of Egnatius' 1516 edition from Venice at the Frankfurt book fair held the week before Easter, the first week of April 1518. Reprinting would have been disastrous, financially speaking. So instead Froben decided to print a collation of the Egnatius and the *Murbacensis* against the text which had already been printed. These collations shed further light on  $\Sigma$ . At *Ael.* 2.5, Froben reports the *Murbacensis* read *durativum* for P's *duraturum* – certainly an error, since *durativum* has very little claim to being a Latin word in use before the Middle Ages.<sup>59</sup>  $\Sigma$  has the same reading. The same can be said for *Ael.* 6.3 *incubuimus* where P reads *incuibimus* (later banalised by the corrector to *incumbimus*), *Ael.* 7.5 *adoptionem* where P reads *adoptionem*, and other passages as well:

*Marc. Aur.* 12.4 egerat M  $\Sigma$ ] gerit gerat P

*Comm.* 8.6 8.6 qui M  $\Sigma$ ] cui P

*Comm.* 2.9 lenonum M  $\Sigma$ ] lelomihi P<sup>1</sup>

*Comm.* 18.16 imperante M  $\Sigma$ ] imperatore Bas. imperantem P

We can also confirm this from the Nuremberg fragment, which reads *piscinam* correctly with  $\Sigma$  against P's *pircinam* at *Comm.* 11.3. Of course, these readings and the bulk of the other examples not adduced here are correct readings against errors in P, and so provide no sure evidence of influence. *Durativum*, however, as an extremely idiosyncratic error, is sufficient to secure the connection between M and  $\Sigma$ .

There are connections between M and Colonna as well. Take the following three reasons:

*Marc. Ant.* 22.4 tot et talium . . . tot et tales M] tot talium . . . tot tales Bas. P

Colonna, ed. Modonutti 165: tot et talium . . . tot et tales

*Comm.* 2.9 lenonum minister ut probris M] lebrorum ministeriis probris Bas.

lelomihi minister ut probris P<sup>1</sup> lenonum minister ut probris P *corr.*  $\Sigma$  lebrorum minister improbis L

---

printed portion stretched only to *Marc. Aur.* 9.7 (p. 217), and so failed to account for two-thirds of Froben's collations.

<sup>59</sup> It is not in the *TLL*; for some medieval instances, see *DMLBS* s.v. 'durativus'.

Colonna, ed. Modonutti 190: In palatio autem inperiali mulierculas forme pulcrioris instituit ad prostibulorum formam ac pudicitie ludibrium, onnibus undique conuocatis lenonibus, tenebat

*Comm.* 17.1 Q. Aemilius M] Quintus Aelius *Bas.* Quintius Aemilius P

Colonna, ed. Modonutti 195: Quintus Aemilius

The third of these is obviously the weakest. The first is fairly minute, but strongly suggestive of some relationship between M and Colonna. The middle one clinches the case. Colonna has, of course, completely rephrased the passage. There can be no doubt, however, that his text of the *HA* read *lenonum*. P read the absolute nonsense *lelomihi*, not improved by L's *lebronum*, which passed into the early printed editions, and no one managed to record the correct meaning until  $\Sigma$  came along, and P was corrected from a  $\Sigma$  manuscript.

The foregoing might seem a slight evidentiary basis, but this is because Froben's collations, as a guide to M's readings, are frustrating to say the least. Comparing the Basel edition with the extant Nuremberg fragment, we can conclude that Froben caught less than half of the divergences between his codex and his edition. He was also not collating M against P, but rather against his own edition, which was based on the Venice 1489, based in turn on the *editio princeps* which was based on a combination of L and an unknown  $\Sigma$  manuscript. They also only run up through the first third, or so, of the text. For the rest of the text (including, unfortunately, the two lives transmitted in E), all we have is Froben's claim that the Murbach manuscript was used for the rest of the text. In point of fact, almost all of the divergences between the Basel edition and its source in the Venice 1489 edition after Diadumenus are taken from Egnatius' 1516 edition. Even so, there are a couple suggestive readings:

*Gal.* 7.7: principe E *Bas.*] principem P  $\Sigma$  *Med. Ven. Egn.*

*Gal.* 11.4: pace P  $\Sigma$  *Med. Ven. Egn.*] aetate E *Bas.*

While the first of these is hardly conclusive, the second is almost definitive, since the 1518 edition prints in the margin *als. pace*, or 'in the other, *pace*', which is the reading of P,  $\Sigma$  and all the other editions, including that of Egnatius. A glance at the other marginal variants in the edition for the *Lives of the Two Valeriani* and the *Two Gallieni* show how these annotations functioned:

*Val.* 1.5 *remotioribus in marg.* Alius. Interioribus

*remotioribus Egn. interioribus PEΣ Med. Ven.*

*Gal.* 4.8 *Corinthum in marg.* Alius. Astacum

*Astacum Egn. Contum PE conthum Σ (corinthum R) corinthum Med. Ven.*

*Gal.* 13.8 *Macedoniam, Moesiam in marg.* Alius. Achenoniam, Boetiam

*Macedoniam moesiam Egn. achenoniam boetiam PE Med. Ven.*

*anthenoniam moesiam Σ*

In the first and last, Erasmus decided to print Egnatius' emendations in place of the reading of his base text from the Venice edition, while in the second he records Egnatius' (palmary) conjecture in the margin, printing his received text. None of these cases give us any certain information on the readings of the Murbacensis, since they can all be accounted for by means of the two other sources we know were used: the *ed. Ven.* and Egnatius. But we cannot otherwise account for *aetate* at Gal. 11.4. The only place the editor could have taken *aetate* from is the Murbach manuscript. Now *aetate* is certainly an error, referring as it does to Antoninus Pius, who was, after all, over fifty when he became emperor. But the phrase *adulta fecerat pace* could easily have led to *aetate*, even though it does not actually make sense in context. Hence, we have here a shared error between M and E.

Perhaps there is a reason for this. As discussed above, we know a good deal about Campano's journey to the North and back. On the return journey, the party headed straight down the Rhine valley, from Heidelberg to Hagenau to Strasbourg to Breisach, and on to Basel.<sup>60</sup> This itinerary – undertaken at considerable haste, one might add, since they made it the more than 1,250 km to Rome in fewer than forty days – would have taken them within probably less than 20 km of the Abbey of Murbach. Obviously this is simply conjecture, but Campano would have had the means to have seen, or to have sent a factotum to examine, the Murbach manuscript.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Di Bernardo 1975: 289.

<sup>61</sup> Even if this did not happen, we can surmise at least a German origin for E's exemplar, and it would hardly be a stretch to imagine a descendant of the Murbach manuscript found in a German religious house like Tegernsee, with which Mendel and Tröster had connections. A distant possibility is a *liber in quo continentur de vita cesarum* listed in a twelfth-century catalogue of an unidentified German library in a manuscript now in Leipzig (UB, MS 329), first printed by Leyser 1841.

So the outlines of a coherent picture of the non-P source for the text of the *HA* begins to emerge. Filling it out is beyond the scope of the present study. Suffice it to say here that we have cleared up the mystery of  $\Sigma$ . It is not itself a source for the text independent of P, but was contaminated from such a source. Hence, all  $\Sigma$  readings do need to be considered, and when they agree with Colonna, or the Venice 1489 (where it differs from the *editio princeps*), or Froben's Murbach collations or the Basel 1518 (where it differs from the previous editions), they should be regarded as a reflection of the non-P source. As consequential as these conclusions may be, this new tradition of the text of the *HA* has another feature which can provide new insight into the nature of the work itself.

## v

Now that we have shown the independence of the tradition of Colonna, E, the *ed. Ven.*, the Murbach manuscript etc. we can use their evidence to understand something about the transmission of the text before P, which in turn will overturn a widely accepted theory about the nature of the work. Besides new passages, this tradition offers a significant transposition in the *Two Valerians*. I do not intend here to rehash the arguments of Patzig and Peter on which arrangement of material is more consistent with the other lives of the *HA*. Instead, let us look at this transposition as a codicological feature.

We have a very precise notion of the physical characteristics of P's archetype, due to the disorder of gatherings afflicting the *Alexander*, the *Two Maximini* and the *Maximus and Balbinus*, as well as the transposed passage in the *Carus* representing an archetypal folio. Folios first. The latter passage, *Carus* 13.1 *Augustum* to 15.5 *nullam*, which is transposed in P after 2.2 *felicitas*, consists of 1,965 characters without spaces. This is the most direct evidence we have for the length of a folio in P's archetype. There is, however, a less direct piece of evidence. In the *Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni*, the lives which directly follow the great lacuna, there are found the six intratextual lacunae caused by illegible text in the archetype. Successive lacunae like this usually are caused by physical damage, afflicting the tops or bottoms of pages.<sup>62</sup> Indeed, were there any doubt that these lacunae tell us something about the physical characteristics of the archetype, one only needs to calculate the amount of text between the lacunose passages:

---

<sup>62</sup> See Kelly 2015 and Stover 2017: 310–12.

Between the first two lacunae, *Val.* 8.4–*Gal.* 8.1: 256 characters

Between the second and third, *Gall.* 1.1-1.2: 315 characters

Between the third and fourth, *Gall.* 2.4–5: 257 characters

Between fifth and sixth, *Gall.* 4.3–4.4: 351 characters

This regularity indicates that something more than indiscriminate calamity dictated where the damage occurred. Everyone acknowledges that the displaced passage in the *Carus* (of 1,965 characters) represents an archetypal folio. The amount of text between the two sequences, that is between the fourth and fifth, from *Gall.* 2.1 *quae contra* to 4.2 *imperator*, is 2,039 characters. It makes good codicological sense for the amount of space between these two sequences to make a folio, whether or not a single folio actually intervenes, since we would expect physical damage to occur at roughly the same places on the page.

Likewise, Colonna, E and the *ed. Ven.* do not begin with the letters of the eastern kings to Shapur (*Val.* 1.1 *Sapori* to 4.4 *Persici*) pleading for Valerian's release, but rather with the Valerian's appointment to the censorship by Decius (*Val.* 5.1 *cuius* – 7.1 *superatus est*), followed by a bridge passage not in P, and then proceeding to the letters. In other words, the difference between these two is where *Val.* 1.1 *Sapori* to 4.4 *Persici* is placed. That passage consists of 2,059 characters, exactly in the range of a folio in P's archetype. Hence, neither the independent tradition nor the scribe of P should be accused of wilfully rationalising or recasting the text, as alleged by Patzig and Peter. The question instead is where a loose folio should be inserted into the text.

Let us move from folios to quires. We know quite a bit about the gatherings in P's archetype due to the fact that two gatherings were copied in the wrong place. This happens right before the great lacuna. We can count back eight gatherings, although we do not know the length of the final gathering with certainty, since (as I will show) we do not know if text was lost. Two of these gatherings were copied out of order in P, which Ballou dubbed **A**, *Alex.* 43.6 *fecisset* ... 58.1 *de isauria*, and **B**, *Maxim.* 5.3 *comperit*...18.2 *mecum*. We know these are gatherings, since they are almost identical in length (13,869 and 13,400 characters respectively), and consistent with what we know was the length of individual folios (1,700–2,000 characters). The order of text in P up to the lacuna is as follows: *Alex.* 58.1 *optatae*...*Maxim.* 5.3 *primum*, *Alex.* 43.6 *fecisset* ... 58.1 *de isauria* (**B**), *Maxim.* 18.2 *sentiant*...*Max. Balb.* 8.2 *vulgares*, *Maxim.* 5.3 *comperit*...18.2 *mecum* (**A**), and then finally *Max. Balb.* 8.3 *quam et senatui*...to the end of the life. These various chunks of text are all

consistent with gatherings. *Alex.* 58.1 to *Maxim.* 5.3 is 12,969 characters, and the long passage *Maxim.* 18.2 to *Max. Balb.* 8.2 is 54,272 characters, which divides evenly into four gatherings averaging 13,568 characters. Hence, we know almost exactly the codicology of the eight gatherings preceding the lacuna in P's exemplar. The following table gives one model of how the gatherings before the great lacuna are arranged in P with the sequence of numbers giving the correct order, counting backwards from the from the great lacuna, the length of each block of text in characters and what that entails for the length of quires.

	Text	Length	Quire
<b>&lt;LACUNA&gt;</b>			
<b>-1</b>	<i>Max. Balb.</i> 8.3 <i>quam et senatui...</i> to the end		
<b>-6 (B)</b>	<i>Maxim.</i> 5.3 <i>comperit...</i> 18.2 <i>mecum</i>	13,400	13,400
<b>-2, -3, -4, -5</b>	<i>Maxim.</i> 18.2 <i>sentiant...</i> <i>Max. Balb.</i> 8.2 <i>vulgares</i>	54,272	13,568
<b>-8 (A)</b>	<i>Alex.</i> 43.6 <i>fecisset ...</i> 58.1 <i>de isauria</i>	13,869	13,869
<b>-7</b>	<i>Alex.</i> 58.1 <i>optatae...</i> <i>Maxim.</i> 5.3 <i>primum</i>	12,969	12,969

This disarrangement affects only P.  $\Sigma$  has the correct order, whether through inheritance or innovation. Colonna also seems to have had the correct order, since he narrates Alexander Severus' campaigns as follows (ff. 142v–143r, ed. Modonutti 249):

(*Alex.* 58.1) Preterea in Mauritania Tigina per Furium Celsum res prospere geste sunt et in Ilyrico per Macrinum et in Armenia per Iulium Palmatium legatum. (*Alex.* 59.1) Igitur post belli gloriam, cum Rome apud populum et apud senatum civiliter vivendo nimium Alexander amaretur, ad bellum Germanicum proficisci voluit:

Caution is in order, because Colonna constantly rearranges his source texts, but this passage looks like a straightforward summary of a passage from the *Historia Augusta*. And yet if Colonna's manuscript of the *HA* had P's arrangement of gatherings, the second half of the passage (on 115v in P), from *Igitur post* would have occurred some ten folios before the first half (concluding on f. 125r).

Matoci, the industrious corrector of P, laboured mightily to restore the correct order to P. At the beginning of passage **B**, on f. 120r, he writes, 'Vitam maximini et filii eius valde confusam et cum grandi labore reduc[trimmed] ad semitam veritatis sic colige.' What he proposes is that **B**, which he takes (correctly) as beginning with *comperit Alexandrum* and

(incorrectly) as ending with *Max. Balb. 8.3 nomine nuncuparunt* at the top of f. 148v (instead of with *Alex. 18.2 mecum*, which is two lines from the bottom of f. 148r), should be transposed before *Alex. 58.1 vario tempore*, which is very close to where it belongs, two words later, before *optatae*. For passage **A**, on f. 106r, he provides a *signe-de-renvoi* and notes, ‘Require sequentia ubi est signum supra hic notatum in vita Maximini. Et incipit sic *Occiso heliogabalo* etc.’<sup>63</sup> So he mistakes the beginning of **A** as beginning with *Occiso Heligabalo ubi primum*, the four words preceding **A** which begins with *fecisset*. More importantly, however, he restores **A** to a curious position earlier in the text, right before *Alex. 15.6 negotia et*. This is what we find in L, the manuscript copied from P after Matoci’s correction and before the later refinements (f. 52rb).

...(Alex. 15.5) capitali pena adfecit. (Maximin. 5.3) Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum (Alex. 43.7) fecisset et templare reliquia deserenda. (Alex. 44.1) In iocis...

This arrangement was maintained in the Milan *editio princeps*, derived primarily from L, and in the *ed. Ven.*, which simply copied it from the *editio princeps*

The same is true with passage **B**, *Maximin. 5.3 comperit Alexandrum ... 18.2 omnes qui mecum*, which in P was copied into the middle of the *Life of Maximus and Balbinus*, right between 8.2 *homines vulgares* and *quam et senatui*. Matoci’s attempt to fix the problem accidentally scooped up a little bit of *Max. Balb. 8.2–3*:

quam et senatui acceptissimam et sibi aduersissimam esse credebant. quare factum est, ut diximus, ut Gordianum adolescentulum principem peterent, qui statim factus est. nec prius permissi sunt ad Palatium stipatis armatis ire quam nepotem Gordiani Caesaris nomine nuncuparunt.

Matoci’s solution was picked up by L, which on f. 73r goes directly from 8.2 *homines vulgares* to 8.4 *his gestis*, with the missing bit (concluding with the end of passage A, *vario tempore etiam cum de Isauria*) found on f. 63vb in the middle of the *Two Maximini* 18.2 between *mecum* (with Matoci’s *sunt* added) and *et Gordianos*. This arrangement is followed

---

<sup>63</sup> Ballou 1914: 44.



by the *editio princeps* with the wider passage from *Maximus and Balbinus* on f. 96r, but the orphaned middle section (*Max. Balb.* 8.2-3) considerably earlier on f. 84v.

In the *ed. Ven*, this orphaned bit of *Maximus and Balbinus* remained lost, trapped in the *The Lives of the Two Maximini*, producing the following text, a hopeless amalgm of materials from three different lives (f. 115r):

(*Maximin.* 18.2) Sanctissimi autem p. c. illi qui & Romulum & Caesarem occiderunt: me hostem iudicaverunt: cum pro his pugnarem: & ipsis vincerem: nec solum me: sed etiam vos: & omnes qui mecum sunt: (*Max. Balb.* 8.2) quos & senatui acceptissimos: & sibi adversissimos esse credebant. (*Max. Balb.* 8.3) Quare factum est: ut diximus: ut Gordianum adolescentulum principem peterent: qui statim factus est. Nec prius permissi sunt ad Palatium stipatis armatis ire: quam nepotem Gordiani Caesaris nomine nuncuparent. (*Alex. Sev.* 58.1) Vario tempore cum etiam de Isauria (*Maximin.* 18.2) sentiunt & Gordianos, patrem ac filium Augustos vocarent.

Something remarkable, however, has happened to the text of the original passage (*Max. Balb.* 8.2-3, *ed. Ven.* f. 120v), which has no parallel in the *editio princeps* or any of the known manuscripts.

(*Max. Balb.* 3.2) Egressi igitur e senatu: primum capitolium ascenderunt: ac rem divinam fecerunt. (*Max. Balb.* 8.2) Sed dum in capitolio rem divinam faciunt. populus ro. imperio Maximi contradixit: timebant enim severitatem eius homines vulgares. (*Max. Balb.* 8.3) Quare factum est: ut gordianum adolescentulum principem peterent: qui statim factus est: nec prius permissi sunt ad palatium stipatis armis ire: quam nepotem gordiani Caesaris nomine nuncuparent. (*Max. Balb.* 3.3) Deinde ad rostra populum convocarunt.

Two things stand out here. First, the orphan bit which is printed five pages earlier in Venice 1489 is printed again here, albeit lacking *quam et senatui acceptissimam et sibi adversissimam esse credebant*. There is no evidence whatsoever that the Venice editor was even aware of the problem of the transposition – much less had the capacity to fix it. What we see here is typically agglutinative: we know the editor had a manuscript source he used in addition to the *editio princeps*, that manuscript source must have had *Max. Balb.* 8.3 where it belongs after 8.2, and he cheerfully and obliviously printed the same bit twice in



two different places using both of his sources. But equally remarkable is the fact that the whole affected passage, 8.2–3, is itself transposed to between *Max. Balb.* 3.2 and 3.3.<sup>64</sup> It can hardly be coincidence that where one of the destructively rogue gatherings of P's archetype happened to land finds itself on unstable footing.

It helps that the order found in the Venice edition could be original. The *HA* is here following Herodian quite closely, and the reordered narrative fits Herodian's much better than P's order (7.10.5–9). Indeed, in this case we may find a rare tell-tale sign of disturbance in the original text of P, which actually reads at 8.3 *quare factum est ut diximus*, seemingly to smooth over the lack of chronology. Finally, to clinch the matter, the subtraction of 8.2–3 still gives the surrounding passage to good sense:

(*Max. Balb.* 8.1) Decretis ergo omnibus imperatoriis honoribus atque insignibus, percepta tribunicia potestate, iure proconsulari, pontificatu (-tum P) maximo, patris etiam patriae nomine inierunt imperium. (*Max. Balb.* 8.4) His gestis celebratisque sacris, datis ludis scaenicis ludisque circensibus gladiatorio etiam munere, Maximus susceptis votis in Capitolio ad bellum contra Maximinum missus est cum exercitu ingenti, praetorianis Romae manentibus.

The purpose here, however, is not to advocate for one reading or the other, but rather to demonstrate that, first, the other manuscript source did not have the same disorder as that found in P, L, and the *editio princeps*, and second, that this tradition has its own signs of disorder not found in the other tradition. It also frustrates attempts to identify the precise length of the final gathering before the great lacuna, since we do not know where the passage it falls into ought to be placed within *Maximus and Balbinus*.

Indeed, confusion continues up to the last line of that gathering, where the Venice edition closes with text not in P:

(*Max. Balb.* 18.1) Haec epistola probat Pupienum eundem esse, qui a plerisque Maximus dicitur nomine paterno. Si quidem per haec tempora apud Graecos non facile Puppienus, apud Latinos non facile Maximus inveniatur, et ea, quae gesta sunt

---

<sup>64</sup> First noted by Bernhardt 1847: 16, albeit without connecting it to the arrangement of gatherings in P.

contra Maximinum, modo a Puppieno modo a Maximo acta dicantur. **sed Fortunatiano credamus, qui dicit Pupienum dictum nomine suo, cognomine uero paterno Maximum, ut omnium stupore legentium aboliti uideantur.**

It is highly unlikely that the final sentence, not found in P, with its citation of an authority introduced earlier (*Max. Balb.* 4.5), and the flagrant nonsense of its last four words, is an invention of the Venice editor. Only excessive regard for P could produce such an opinion. As we have seen, the Venice edition relies on a manuscript source which could go back to P's archetype, and so there is no reason not to see this as an omission in P itself. This also has a direct bearing on the question of gatherings. A single sentence makes a scant difference in the length of a gathering, but if there was text at the end of *Maximus and Balbinus* that P does not transmit (perhaps due to illegibility arising from physical damage), there may well have been more of it than the single corrupt sentence found in the *ed. Ven.* Hence we should be doubly cautious in extrapolating the length of the last gathering or gatherings before the great lacuna.

As we have seen, the eight or so gatherings preceding the great lacuna exhibit a considerable amount of textual and codicological turmoil, none more so than the final gathering before the great lacuna.<sup>65</sup> Here a gathering from much earlier in the codex which is the source of the whole tradition was inserted, and the text itself is in chaos, to such a degree that we can gain no clear picture of what it was like when it was whole. The same holds true of the gathering after the lacuna. The folia were disarranged – there is no clarity on where the text even begins. Further all the intratextual lacunae in the *Two Valerians* and *Two Gallieni* seem to occur in what would have been the first gathering: from the beginning of the *Two Valerians* through the last of lacunose passages (*Gall.* 4.4 *Gallienus*) there are some 10,400 characters, which leaves more than enough space to make up for the missing text.

Obviously the manuscript had suffered much. It was disbound and had loose folios as well. What sort of disaster afflicted the *Maximus and Balbinus* cannot be guessed, nor can the malady afflicting both the *Two Valerians* and the *Two Gallieni*, although, given the codicological regularity of the damage, fire and water are strong candidates. It is almost as if

---

<sup>65</sup> Many traditions are afflicted by gatherings missing or copied out of order; for example, Ammianus (see Den Boeft et al. 2013: 199-200) and Sallust's *Jugurtha* (see Stover and Woudhuysen 2020).

it was precisely at this point the manuscript was subjected to some extreme trauma, which spilled out over into the neighbouring gatherings, centred around the lives of *Maximus and Balbinus* and the *Two Valerians*. This is significant, because it is between these two lives that we are missing a decades worth of lives, stretching from the years 244–253 (or 260), covering the four emperors Philip the Arab, Decius, Trebonianus Gallus and Aemilianus, the ‘great lacuna’ mentioned above.

Conventional opinion has for many years held that the great lacuna is a deceit cooked up by the crazed author of the *HA*. ‘It is a triumph of modern scholarship on the *Historia Augusta*’, writes Rohrbacher, ‘to have demonstrated that this lacuna is not just the unexceptional result of textual dislocations common in ancient manuscripts, but is actually the purposeful construction of our creative author.’<sup>66</sup>

There are two different theories that posit that the lacuna is a deliberate feature. The first was proposed by Casaubon, who proposed that the *compositor* of the *corpus* was a Christian, and omitted the lives *pietatis Christianae fervore impulsum in Deciorum odium*.<sup>67</sup> This ‘suppression theory’ continues to find adherents.<sup>68</sup> However most scholars do not consider the missing lives to have been suppressed in the course of their transmission, but rather suppose that they were never written at all, a theory which in its most popular form goes back to A. R. Birley. Birley argued that

in order to avoid dealing with the reigns of Decius and Valerian, in which major persecutions of the Church took place, and of Philip, a supposedly philochristian emperor, the author of the *HA* served up his work with a deliberate lacuna.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Rohrbacher 2016: 9. Salutory exceptions to the near general acceptance of the authorial nature of the *lacuna* include Savino 2017: 69–74, albeit argued on shaky grounds; Baker 2014: 74–80, but based on a misinterpretation of the *explicit/incipits* in P (the spacing of the *explicit/incipits* of *Max. Balb.*, *Val.* and *Gall.* are well within the norms elsewhere in the manuscript, e.g. that of *Gord.*, on f. 141v, *Heliog.* on 87v, and especially the *incipit* of *Clod. Alb.* on f. 96r, where there is no *explicit* for *Opil. Macrin.*) and the curiously mistaken idea that the holes due to the relatively poor production value of the vellum in B (see Suckale-Redlefsen 2004: 50) have something to do with the great lacuna; and Cameron 2011.

<sup>67</sup> Casaubon 1603: 445. He did believe, however, that the lives originally existed: ‘scribit Vopiscus in Aureliano Trebellium Pollionem a duobus Philippis usque ad divum Claudium & eius fratrem Quintillum imperatores tam claros quam obscuros memoriae prodidisse. Eius operis pars desideratur hodie, pars adhuc superat’ (at 450).

<sup>68</sup> See, for example, Cornell 2013: 1.74; Baker 2014: 80 (with some hesitance).

<sup>69</sup> Birley 1978, reprising arguments made originally in 1967: 125–6, with notes.

All sorts of other reasons have been introduced in the years since, such as the end of Herodian's history, the lack of source material in general, the author's reverence for the emperor Julian, or imitation of fragmentary texts. Birley and his successors have catalogued how frequently the author of the *HA* discusses physical books before the lacuna, how most of the facts known about these emperors are already included in other lives, indeed how coded messages elsewhere in the text contain the author's confession of the hoax.<sup>70</sup>

Too much ingenuity and toil have been spent for nothing. The state of the text shows without any question that the archetype suffered a considerable trauma, centered almost exactly on the lacuna. The very last line before the lacuna is not transmitted by P, but solely by the other tradition. After the lacuna, we have another line not in P, and an errant folio from a gathering which toward the end suffered heavy physical damage resulting in the intratextual lacunae. How does it happen that the parts of the work affected most severely by codicological problems and physical damage just happen to be the text on both sides of a fake lacuna? Evidence like this cannot be manufactured. Arguments that the lacuna is authorial do not need to be addressed individually: they represent special pleading.

This discovery also casts strong doubt on the suppression theory. It is conceivable that the damage could have been caused by the dismemberment of the archetypal codex to remove the offending lives. It would not explain, however, why the confusion reaches so far back into the work, nor can it explain what looks to be physical damage at the end of the first gathering after the lacuna. More importantly, this theory cannot account for why half of the (very positive) *Life of Valerian* remains.

Instead, the only tenable theory is that our whole tradition of the *Historia Augusta* derives from a single manuscript, a once splendid codex reduced to a pitiful state before generating the surviving tradition. The best comparand is the *De verborum significatu* of Festus, whose extant tradition derives from a ruined manuscript, the Codex Farnesianus, which had been disbound and mutilated, and then afterwards half burnt, obliterating one of the two columns on all the folios. The codex that preserved the *HA*, probably at least partially disbound, was copied at least twice, once to produce P and a second time to

---

<sup>70</sup> Rohrbacher 2016: 9–10; Burgersdijk 2010: 79–81 (with further bibliography); Den Hengst 1981: 70–7; among many others.

produce M, the ultimate source of Colonna, E, and the *ed. Ven.* with some of the elements in a different order.<sup>71</sup>

## VI

By way of conclusion, let us briefly look at the ramifications of this argument on editing the text. This paper has demonstrated the existence of a distinct line of transmission of the text of the *HA* independent of P. Unfortunately, this source is not available directly for the whole text, and we need to obtain its readings indirectly for most of the text. For the small portion of the *Commodus* transmitted in the Nuremberg fragment, we have direct access to that source. For the two lives where E is extant, we can assume it offers direct access to that tradition, particularly if we use the *ed. Ven.* and Colonna to control for its *errores proprii*. Froben's list of M readings, collated against the edition he prints, provides further access to this tradition, along with the weak presumption that the readings of the Basel edition that differ from P and  $\Sigma$ , and are not included in Froben's collation, may represent its text. Colonna's *Mare historiarum* must be collated for the entire text, and any agreement with any other source for the text of the *HA* should be regarded as a reading of the lost source; Matoci's *Historia imperialis* should be collated as well, with an eye toward non-P readings, as well as his corrections in P itself.<sup>72</sup> The *ed. Ven.* needs to be collated entirely against the *editio princeps* for the whole text. Any significant variations ought to be attributed to the lost manuscript source.

Between these four fontes, hundreds of new significant readings can be recovered, beyond the new passages which have been brought forward here. Our evidence has suggested that some of them might be superior to the tradition of P. Further gleanings nod in the same direction. Consider the passage in *Severus* in which the eponymous emperor catches his son Caracalla attempting a coup, and which is well known for its *verbatim* overlap with Aurelius Victor (*Sev.* 18.10 with *Vict., Caes.* 31–26):

---

<sup>71</sup> I leave aside here the question of the ninth-century excerpts known as II, on which see now Dorfbauer 2020.

<sup>72</sup> For example, *manu* is found before *Cecropii* in E at *Gall.* 14.9 where P and  $\Sigma$  are clearly missing a word: *Cecropii Dalmatarum ducis Gallienus dicitur esse percussus*. Matoci's *Historia imperialis* has the same word (BAV, MS Chig. I VII 259 f. 21rb): *quem ut quidam ystorici scribunt Cecropius dux dalmatie Gallienum propria manu occidit*.

rogareturque (-quem P) omnibus ante tribunal prostratis, caput manu contingens ait:  
 “Tandem sentitis caput imperare, non pedes.”

When they cast themselves prostrate before the tribunal and asked for pardon, Severus, touching his head with his hand, said, “Now at last you know that the head is what does the ruling, and not the feet”.

Quo metu cum stratus humi . . . exercitus veniam precaretur: "Sentitisne," inquit, pulsans manu, "caput potius quam pedes imperare?"

When the army was prostrate on the ground with fear and begged his forgiveness, “Don’t you know that the head,” he said, tapping it with his hand, “rather than the feet, does the ruling?”

Klein has already noted that the *quem* of P might well conceal an original *-que <venia>m*, on the basis of the parallel text in Victor, which makes a deal more sense than the naked *rogaretur*; indeed Peter went so far as to print it in his second edition.<sup>73</sup> Compare the corresponding passage in Colonna’s *Mare*:

set rogatus ab omnibus et in terram prostratis ut tante severitate veniam daret quievit, set tunc paulisper manu capud contingens dixit: ‘Tandem satis capud inperare, non pedes!’ (ed. Modonutti 207)

One might also note that Colonna’s *in terram* coincides with the *humi* in Victor’s text. It goes without saying that there is no chance that Colonna was acquainted with Victor, a text with virtually no medieval or even early Renaissance circulation.<sup>74</sup> Instead, his text of the *HA* must have contained a version of this passage even closer to Victor, and therefore more correct, than our surviving manuscripts.

Hence, work on the text of the *HA* must begin anew, from the ground up. I have already shown here how such an analysis can clear up two major puzzles in the text, the

---

<sup>73</sup> Klein 1882: 146. The reading is also occasionally found in early modern editions, but it was Klein who devised the ingenious palaeographic solution.

<sup>74</sup> On the circulation of Victor, see Stover and Woudhuysen (forthcoming).

nature of the great lacuna and Dexippus' military career. How many more such puzzles in this most puzzling of texts are capable of such resolution? Only the work of editing, now set on firmer foundations, will answer.

*University of Edinburgh*

justin.stover@ed.ac.uk

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, R. 2014. 'A study of a late antique corpus of biographies (*Historia Augusta*)', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.
- Ballou, S. H. 1914: *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta*, Leipzig.
- Barrett, G. and Woudhuysen, G. 2016a. 'Assembling the Austrasian Letters at Trier and Lorsch', *Early Medieval Europe* 24, 3-57
- Barrett, G. and Woudhuysen, G. 2016b. 'Remigius and the "important news" of Clovis rewritten', *Antiquité tardive* 24, 471–500.
- de Beer, S. T. M. 2007 'Poetry and patronage: literary strategies in the poems of Giannantonio Campano', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Bergman, J. 1898: *De P. Herennio Dexippo et Gothorum illa in Atticam incursione quid scriptores et inscriptiones doceant*, Stockholm.
- Di Bernardo, F. 1975: *Un vescovo umanista alla Corte Pontificia. Giannantonio Campano (1429–1477)*, Rome.
- Bernhardy, G. 1847. *De Scriptoribus Historiae Augustae*. Halle.
- Bertrand, C., Desbordes, O. and Callu, J.-P. 1984–85: 'L'Histoire Auguste et l'historiographie médiévale', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 14–15, 97–130.
- Birley, A. R. 1978. 'The Lacuna in the Historia Augusta,' in J. Straub (ed.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1975/1976*, Bonn, 55–62.
- Birley, A. R. 1967. 'The Augustan History' in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Biography*, London, 113–28.



- Bischoff, B. 2004: *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen). Teil 2: Laon – Paderborn*, Wiesbaden.
- Bleckmann, B. and Brandt, H. (eds) 2017: *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Dusseldorpiense*, Bari.
- Boyer, B. B. 1948: ‘Insular Contribution to Medieval Literary Tradition on the Continent (concluded)’ *Classical Philology* 43, 31–9.
- Burgersdijk, D. 2010: ‘Style and structure of the *Historia Augusta*’, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Callu, J.-P. and Desbordes, O. 1989: ‘Le “Quattrocento” de l’*Histoire Auguste*’, *Revue d’Histoire des Textes* 19, 253–75.
- Cameron, A. 2011. ‘*Antiquus Error / novus error*: the *HA*, Nicomachus Flavianus, and the “pagan resistance”’, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 24, 835–46.
- Casaubon, I. 1603: *Historiae Avgvstae Scriptores Sex. Aelius Spartianus, Iulius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Vulcatius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio, & Flavius Vopiscus. Isaacvs Casavbonvs ex vett. libris recensuit : idemque librum adiecit emendationvm ac notarvm*, Paris.
- Chastagnol, A. 1964: ‘Le problème de l’histoire Auguste. État de la question’, in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1963*, Bonn, 43–71.
- Cornell, T. J. (ed.) 2013. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, 3 vols, Oxford.
- Cortesi, M. 1994: ‘Un nuovo testimone delle *Declamationes minores pseudoquintilianee*’, in S. Bruni (ed.), *Immagini del Medioevo. Saggi di cultura mediolatina*, Spoleto, 81–95.
- Cortesi, M. 1986: ‘Scritti di Lorenzo Valla tra Veneto e Germania’, in O. Besoni and M. Regoliosi (eds.) *Lorenzo Valla e l’Umanesimo italiano. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi umanistici (Parma, 18–19 ottobre, 1984)*, 1986, 365–98.
- Cortesi, M. 1984: ‘Una pagina di umanesimo in Eichstätt’, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 64, 227–60.
- Dendorfer, J. (ed.) 2015. *Reform und früher Humanismus in Eichstätt. Bischof Johann von Eych (1445–1464)*, Regensburg.
- Den Boeft, Jan, W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, and H. Teitler 2013: *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXIX*, Leiden.
- den Hengst, D. 1981: *The Prefaces in the Historia Augusta*, Amsterdam.
- Dessau, H. 1889: ‘Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der Scriptores *Historiae Augustae*’, *Hermes* 24, 337–92.



- Dorfbauer, L. 2020. ‘Das Nürnberger Fragment und die karolingische Überlieferung der „Historia Augusta“’, *Hermes* 148 (forthcoming).
- Fischer, H. 1936: *Die lateinischen Papierhandschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen*, Erlangen, (repr. Wiesbaden, 1971).
- Fowden, G. 1998: ‘City and Mountain in Late Roman Attica’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108, 48–59.
- Hohl, E. 1913: ‘Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der Historia Augusta’, *Klio* 13, 258–88, 387–423.
- Hirstein, J. 1998: ‘L’histoire du texte de l’Histoire auguste. Egnazio et la Vita Marci’, in G. Bonamente, F. Heim and J.-P. Callu (eds.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Argentoratense*, Bari, 167–89.
- Kelly, G. 2015: Review of J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst and H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXIX*, Leiden, 2014, in *Journal of Roman Studies* 105, 457–8.
- Klein, I. 1882. ‘Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Script. Hist. Aug.’, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 37, 274–91.
- Krebs, C. B. 2011. *A Most Dangerous Book: Tacitus’ Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich*, New York.
- Leyser, H. 1841: ‘Ein Handschriftenkatalog aus dem Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts’, *Serapeum* 2, 331-334.
- Luck, G. 1972: ‘The textual history of Juvenal and the Oxford lines’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76, 217–31.
- Migliorati, G. 2013: *Problemi di storia militare del secolo III d.C.*, Milan.
- Mallan, C. and Davenport, C. 2015: ‘Dexippus and the Gothic invasions: interpreting the new Vienna fragment (*Codex Vindobonensis Hist. gr.* 73, ff. 192v–193r)’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 105, 203–26;
- Marshall, P. K. 1983: ‘*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*’ in Reynolds 1983: 354-6.
- Martin, G. 2017: ‘Die Struktur von Dexippus Skythika und die Historia Augusta’, in Bleckmann and Brandt 2017: 97–114.
- Martin G. and Grusková, J. 2014a “‘Scythica Vindobonensia’ by Dexippus (?): new fragments on Decius’ Gothic Wars’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 54, 728–54.

- Martin G. and Grusková, J. 2014b, “Dexippus Vindobonensis (?)”. Ein neues Handschriftenfragment zum sog. Herulereinfall der Jahre 267/268’, *Wiener Studien* 127, 101–20.
- Martin G. and Grusková, J. 2014c ‘Ein neues Textstück aus den “Scythica Vindobonensia” zu den Ereignissen nach der Eroberung von Philippopolis’, *Tyche* 29, 29–43.
- Märtl, C. 2015: ‘Bischof Johann von Eych und Eneas Silvius Piccolomini’, in Dendorfer 2015: 93–113.
- Mayer, M. 2016: ‘Génesis y evolución del texto de la Historia Augusta. Consideraciones a propósito de la *Vita Pescenii Nigri*’, in J. Velaza (ed.), *From the Protohistory to the History of the Text*, Frankfurt am Main, 313–32.
- Mecella, L. 2006: ‘Le città dell’Oriente romano e le invasioni barbariche del III secolo d.C.’, *Mediterraneo antico* 9, 241–66.
- Millar, F. 1969: ‘P. Herennius Dexippus: the Greek world and the third-century invasions’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 59, 12–29 (= F. Millar, *Rome, the Greek World and the East, Vol. 2: Government, Society and Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. H. M. Cotton and G. M. Rogers, Chapel Hill, 265–97).
- Modonutti, R. 2016: ‘I consiliarii di Severo Alessandro e la tradizione dell’*Historia Augusta* nel Trecento’, *Segno e testo* 14, 381–410.
- Modonutti, R. 2013. *Fra Giovanni Colonna e la storia antica da Adriano ai Severi*, Padua.
- Mommsen, Th. 1890. ‘Die Scriptorum Historiae Augustae’, *Hermes* 25, 228–292.
- Nobili, M. 2014: ‘Due note critiche alla *Vita Commodi* nella *Historia Augusta*’, in G. Piras (ed.), *Labor in studiis. Scritti di filologia in onore di Piergiorgio Parroni*, Rome, 193–9.
- Patzig, E. 1904: ‘Die römischen Quellen des salmasischen Johannes Antiochenus I. Eutrop und Ammian. Mit einem Anhang zur Textkritik der Scriptorum Hist. Aug.’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 13, 13–50.
- Peachin, M. 1990: *Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235–284*, Amsterdam.
- Pecere, O. 1995. ‘Il codice palatino dell’*Historia Augusta* come “edizione” continua’, in O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve (eds), *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 11–22 October 1993*, Spoleto, 323–69.
- Peter, H. 1908: ‘Zur Textesgeschichte der Scriptorum historiae Augustae’, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 15, 23–9.
- Reynolds, L. D. (ed.) 1983: *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford.
- Rohrbacher, D. 2016: *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta*, Madison.

- de Ste Croix, G. E. M. 1981: *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*, London.
- Savino, E. 2017: *Richerche sull'Historia Augusta*, Naples.
- Sheffler, D. L. 2008: *Schools and Schooling in Late Medieval Germany: Regensburg, 1250–1500*, Leiden.
- Sosin, J. 2000: 'Ausonius' Juvenal and the Winstedt Fragment,' *Classical Philology* 95, 199–206.
- Stover, J. 2017a: 'Space as paratext: scribal practice in the medieval edition of Ammianus Marcellinus', in M. Teeuwen and I. van Renswoude (eds.), *The Annotated Book in the Early Middle Ages: Practices of Reading and Writing*, Turnhout, 305–22.
- Stover, J. 2017b: 'Epitome de Caesaribus 1.24 and Ovid's exile', *Classical Philology* 112, 267–75.
- Stover, J., forthcoming: 'The Murbach manuscript of the *Historia Augusta*', *Exemplaria classica*.
- Stover, J. and Kelly, G. 2016: 'The Hersfeldensis and the Fuldensis of Ammianus Marcellinus: a reconsideration', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 62: 108–29.
- Stover, J. and Woudhuysen, G. 2017. 'Giovanni de Matociis and the *Codex Oratorianus* of the *De uiris illustribus urbis Romae*', *Exemplaria Classica* 21, 125–48.
- Stover, J. and G. Woudhuysen, 2020. 'Aurelius Victor and the Ending of Sallust's *Jugurtha*', *Hermathena* 199. In press.
- Stover, J. and Woudhuysen, G., forthcoming: 'Aurelius Victor', in J. Stover (ed.), *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics*, Oxford.
- Suckale-Redlefsen, G. 2004. *Die Handschriften des 8. bis 11. Jahrhunderts der Staatsbibliothek Bamberg. T. 1. Texte*, Wiesbaden.
- Syme, R. 1970: 'Three Jurists', in J. Straub (ed.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1968–1968*, Bonn, 309–323 (= R.Syme, *Roman Papers*, Vol. 2, ed. E. Badian, Oxford, 1979, 790–804).
- Thomson, M. 2012: *Studies in the Historia Augusta*, Collection Latomus 337, Brussels.
- Wagendorfer, M. 2015: 'Johann von Eych und sein Umfeld an der Universität Wien nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Biographie des Johannes Mendel aus Amberg', in Dendorfer 2015: 47–6.
- Winterbottom, M., R. H. Rouse, and M. D. Reeve 1983: 'Cicero, rhetorical works' in Reynolds 1983: 98–112.

Zahn, P. 1973: 'Hrabanus Maurus: Super Matthaem. Zu einem neuen Fragmentfund in der Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg', *Bibliotheksforum Bayern* 1, 120–5.

Zecchini, G. 2017: 'Il nuovo Dexippo e l'Historia Augusta', in Bleckmann and Brandt 2017: 189–96.