

TWO OVIDIAN MISCELLANIES

Ovid's Contribution to the History of Literature and the Historicity of his Exile*

Abstract: This paper deals with two minor Ovidian issues. Ovid's reference to Antony and Brutus' literary writings is argued not to have necessarily pointed to all of them, but only those could have been in Ovid's mind in which invectives against Octavian were contained. At least two late antique accounts of Ovid's exile certainly come from Suetonius' *De poetis*. This is not a mere supposition: it can be convincingly argued for. Hence the thesis that Ovid's exile was a fiction must eventually be defended allowing that even Suetonius could have been mistaken about its historicity, or the facts called to attention here must be explained away. In the *Epitome de Caesaribus* perhaps even the content of the edict imposing on Ovid his banishment may be mirrored, but this cannot be proved likewise sufficiently.

Keywords: *Epistulae ex Ponto*; Antony's writings; Brutus' writings; Octavian Augustus; Jerome's chronicle; *Epitome de Caesaribus*; Suetonius; *De viris illustribus*; *De poetis*

An enquiry leading to this paper has been instigated by the recent Ovidian anniversary which certainly attracted the interest of many of those who so far did not participate in the debates among Ovidian specialists. Being one of them, in the former part of this paper the author exploits the advantage of a fresh approach of a tyro. The latter part builds upon an interest in the historiography of late antiquity and highlights important details which seem to have as yet escaped the debate about the historicity of Ovid's exile.

*) This paper has been supported by Charles University Research Centre program No. 204053. It further benefits from suggestions and other assistance kindly provided by my dear colleagues Michal Ctibor, Barbora Krylová, Martin Bažil, and Rheinisches Museum's anonymous readers and editors.

I. *The Literary Writings of Antony and Brutus*

In the first of the *Letters from the Black Sea* Ovid points to the fact that some writings of Antony and Brutus are still available to the readers in Rome:

*quod metuas non est: Antoni scripta leguntur,
doctus et in promptu scrinia Brutus habet.
nec me nominibus furiosus confero tantis:
saeua deos contra non tamen arma tuli.*

(1.1.23–26)

These verses are printed the same way in all the principal modern editions, only the punctuation differs. The variant reading *carmina* instead of *scrinia* is always registered only in apparatus critici. In some of these editions, however, blank space between the former and the latter elegiac couplet marks a division of this part of the poem into two sections: the former couplet closes the first section, the latter opens the second one.¹ Precisely this division, though, may have obscured a possible liaison between the two couplets, at least so far that the standard Ovidian commentaries do not explicitly draw the consequence of such a liaison which is applicable to the identification of Antony and Brutus' writings in question.

To be fair, nevertheless, right at the outset, there is also a point that makes the reading suggested below disputable. The commentators unanimously agree that *arma* are real weapons, and *dei* in plural thus represent both Caesar and Octavian, against whom the weapons were raised, by Brutus against the former, by Antony against the latter.² This seems justified by Ovid's earlier verses in which he

1) The only exceptions seem to be Richmond 1990 (whose reading is followed throughout in this paper) and Tissol 2014. In both these editions the poems are divided into sections, but no division occurs here. In André 1993 no divisions occur at all.

2) Plus an allusion to the Gigantomachy is being seen herein, see André 1993, 159 n. 5; Helzle 2003, 58; Gaertner 2005, 108 f. (with reference to Ovid. Pont. 2.2.11–12); Tissol 2014, 61.

expressed himself very similarly, and real “weapons” or a “war” is clearly the meaning of *arma* there.³

If, however, these two elegiac couplets are treated as separate, then the writings invoked by Ovid may have been all that Antony and Brutus had ever published,⁴ as modern commentators too consider them to be. In Antony’s case, his letters to Octavian, really full of fierce attacks against his rival as is apparent from the excerpts cited by Suetonius,⁵ and eventually his apology *De sua ebrietate*, in which Octavian certainly could have been mentioned in a negative light,⁶ are maintained to have been in Ovid’s

3) Ovid. *Trist.* 1.5.41–42 and 2.51–52 as referred to by André 1993, 159 n.5 and Helzle 2003, 58 (who refers, by mistake, to the latter passage as 2.53–56, but in these verses Ovid assures Octavian of his allegiance). Further note an observation by Gaertner 2005, 108 and Tissol 2014, 61 that Cic. *Phil.* 2.72 put the very similar words in the mouth of Antony himself: *ego arma contra consules imperatoresque populi Romani, contra senatum populumque Romanum, contra deos patrios arasque et focos, contra patriam tuli.*

4) Our knowledge of these writings is limited only to some titles, general features, fortuitous testimonies, or a few excerpts by other authors which have been gathered already by Teuffel 1916, 500 f., § 209.3 and 504–506, § 210.1–4, and further discussed by Bardon 1952, 209–211; 212; 216; 217; 228 f.; 250; 269 f.; 277 f.; 286–288; 289; 331 f. In the case of Antony this material is even enriched by Huzar 1982, yet still another writing can perhaps be thought of: in Plut. *Ant.* 2.2 the words φησὶ γούν Ἀντώνιος are followed by an incident reported of a corpse of Cornelius Lentulus, Catilina’s fellow conjurate and Antony’s stepfather, which was withheld from the family until Antony’s mother’s appeal to the wife of Cicero. Notwithstanding the verdict of Plutarch himself, according to whom it was proved to be a lie, such an incident perhaps could have been included in Antony’s *De sua ebrietate* for which see below in n. 6, yet some memoirs, or even an autobiography, as well as a speech published as a literary piece could have described it too.

5) See Suet. *Aug.* 7.1; 69.2; 70.1 and perhaps also 16.2; 63.2; 68.1; 69.1; 86.2 where, however, Antony’s words are not explicitly identified as a quotation from his letters to Octavian, and thus other writings can eventually be cited there. Another letter to both Octavian and Hirtius is cited by Cic. *Phil.* 13.10.22–11.26. According to Plut. *Ant.* 78.3 Octavian read to his friends from Antony’s letters after the death of the latter, so that they see whose proposals had been fair-minded and whose answers arrogant.

6) The writing is actually mentioned only by Plin. *NH.* 14.28.148 in the context of his own criticism of insobriety and in negative terms. Concerning details of the content, there is no clue, but Pliny gives the impression as if rather he read it himself. Teuffel’s conjecture (1916, 500, § 209.3) that it was a philosophical treatise titled περὶ μέθης and *sua* is only a malicious addition thus lacks foundation and was, as well as some other early conjectures, rejected already by Bardon 1952, 289. For a

mind.⁷ In the case of Brutus, nonetheless, his philosophical treatises and the epitome of Polybius⁸ are put forward, so, on the contrary, the writings in which censure of Octavian can hardly be supposed.⁹ As, however, the correct identification of the writings by whose fortune Ovid measured that of his own poems may be of some importance, at least for the debate over Augustus' motivation for his intervention against the poet, I would like to call attention to a possibility not yet considered to my knowledge, of how Ovid can also be understood.

In my opinion, *arma* should rather be referred back to Antony and Brutus' writings and understood so that Ovid pointed only to such of them in which attacks against Octavian were contained. This may seem hindered by *dei* in plural, but Augustus and all the other immortals who protected him certainly could have been

detailed discussion of this writing in the context of these days' propaganda battles see Huzar 1982, 654–657 (with further references in n. 108) who, nonetheless, allows for the possibility that Pliny in fact only heard of the writing but never read it.

7) These letters and the apology are thought of already by Teuffel 1916, 500 f., § 209.3 and often brought forward by recent commentators, see André 1993, 3 n. 3 and Gaertner 2005, 107. Helzle 2003, 57 adds an epigram cited by Suet. Aug. 70.1, but Suetonius explicitly labels it as anonymous, not Antony's. Tissol 2014, 61 mentions only the letters, but refers to Huzar 1982 for Antony's other writings.

8) This epitome seems unlikely in any case, since from Plut. Brut. 4.4 it appears to have rather been designed only for Brutus' private use. Likewise the epitomes of Fannius and Coelius Antipater mentioned by Cic. Att. 12.5B.1 and 13.8.1 seem to have been known only to some small circle including Cicero and Atticus.

9) Both the philosophical treatises and the epitome are mentioned by André 1993, 159 n. 4 who further labels Brutus an "orateur renommé", thus, in my opinion, setting a course to perhaps a superior identification. Brutus' philosophical treatises alone are proposed by Helzle 2003, 57 and Tissol 2014, 61, with the former further relating Ovid's label *doctus* to Brutus' reputation as a philosopher, while the latter in the same connection mentions also his "learning in rhetoric". Gaertner 2005, 107 does not identify specific writings, only draws attention to Brutus' reputation as an orator and a philosopher, to his pamphlets to be discussed below, and his letters and poems. These poems, offered to identification directly by some branches of the manuscript tradition of the *Letters from the Black Sea* (see above p. 368), were to my knowledge explicitly favoured by no one in the scholarly debate. Following Tac. Dial. 21.6 they seem once to have been accessible in libraries, although we do not know for how long after they had been stored there, but were not so well known. If, however, the content of these poems is taken into account, they do not seem to be a better option indeed. According to Teuffel 1916, 506, § 210.4 and Bardon 1952, 331 f. these were amatory poems as follows from Plin. Epist. 5.3.5, but if Ovid really wished to refer to a leading case of this kind, there were surely more exemplifying cases at hand.

meant thereby. The effect of such an interpretation would be that Brutus as well would have to be supposed to have produced some writings attacking Octavian. Actually, we are even explicitly informed that he did. According to Tacitus, the historian Cremutius Cordus, when being tried in CE 25 for favourable treatment of Brutus and Cassius, defended himself by appealing to the fact that, among others, Augustus in no way intervened against the writings of precisely the same Antony and Brutus: *Antonii epistulae Bruti contiones falsa quidem in Augustum probra set multa cum acerbitate habent* (Ann. 4.34.5).¹⁰

With this account being called to attention, two questions must intrude immediately. The former is in fact not relevant to the point here, but still it should not be omitted completely: can the information about the accessibility of Antony and Brutus' harmful writings be dated to CE 25 as well, or rather with the majority of modern scholars to Tacitus' own times, or is the case here even a pure invention? Since, however, Cordus' speech contains other possibly correct details concerning actual accessibility or treatment of other authors and their likewise harmful writings slightly more likely to have been known or have come to one's mind in Cordus' than in Tacitus' times,¹¹ I am inclined at least not to exclude the earlier date.¹²

The latter of these questions is of importance, since the answer can eventuate in doubting the credibility of the account preserved

10) Relationship between Ovid's and Tacitus' claim has in fact been observed by many modern scholars, yet none but one of them seems to have drawn consequences for the identification of the writings Ovid had in mind, see Bardon 1952, 287; Koestermann 1965, 122; Huzar 1982, 640 with n. 4; André 1993, 3 n. 3; Tissol 2014, 60f. The only exception seems to be Gaertner 2005, 105 and 107 who speaks of "Brutus' and Mark Antony's anti-Augustan pamphlets" and "their propaganda" and supports it by reference to Tacitus.

11) According to Tac. Ann. 4.34.3–5 Augustus continued his friendly relations with Livy, although due to the latter's laudatory treatment of Pompey he called him "a Pompeian", the same Livy never vituperated several of Caesar's enemies whom Asinius Pollio and Messala Corvinus even praised, yet even so they both kept their fortunes and ranks until their deaths, Cicero's panegyric of Cato was answered only with a written polemic by Caesar and the poems of Bibaculus and Catullus full of calumnies against Caesar were still read by then.

12) For a similar treatment of the speech based on what is known about Cordus, and in the context of the Tiberian part of the *Annals* as a whole and Tacitus' authorial strategies see Wisse 2013, esp. 347–350. Huzar 1982, 640 dated the information in question to Cordus' times explicitly.

in Tacitus, and thus also the ground for understanding Ovid by means of it would lose its capacity: can Brutus be supposed to have ever published any *contiones* directed against Octavian? In fact, there seem to be no doubts on the part of modern scholarship, but neither awareness that doubts could be raised and eventually dissipated.¹³ Nevertheless, the reason for such doubts might perhaps be at hand, although from Cicero's letter to Atticus written on 18th May 44 BCE it is clear that Brutus indeed did publish his *contiones* held in Rome: *Brutus noster misit ad me orationem suam habitam in contione Capitolina petiuitque a me ut eam ne ambitiose corrigerem ante quam ederet* (Att. 15.1A.2).¹⁴ At the latest by the middle of April, however, Brutus left Rome, while Octavian's political activity certainly did not begin by then,¹⁵ and so Brutus had no reason to direct against him any of his *contiones* held in Rome. Yet the term *contio* could mean not only the speech held before the people but before the soldiers as well,¹⁶ and hence Brutus certainly may have attacked Octavian on many later occasions. His publication activity after his leaving of Rome is attested as well, namely by the above cited letter of Cicero, and likewise his writing activity even in the Philippan camp, following Pliny the Elder's affirmation that *M. Bruti e Philippicis campis epistulae reperiuntur* (NH 33.12.39). Doubts therefore may be raised, yet the credibility of the account preserved in Tacitus can be easily defended.

Nevertheless, the question still remains whether Brutus can be supposed to have attacked in some *contiones* solely Octavian as Tacitus' wording seems to suggest, and not both Octavian and

13) Teuffel 1916, 505, § 210.2 in no way doubted Brutus had published such *contiones*, Bardon 1952, 217 even dated his "Contre Antoine et Octavien (plusieurs discours)" in the years 43 and 42 BCE, and Gaertner 2005, 107 while referring to Tacitus states explicitly: "Brutus is known to have produced fierce pamphlets against Octavian".

14) Quint. Inst. 9.3.95 cites from Brutus' speech *De dictatura Cn. Pompei*, which thus must have been published as well.

15) That Brutus fled from Rome due to the incidents that had occurred in the course of Caesar's funeral, then returned for some short time, but in the middle of April was again absent from Rome, follows from detailed explanation by Gelzer 1917, 993 f. On the contrary, the earliest occasion for attacking Octavian on the part of Brutus seems to have been the official acceptance of Caesar's bequest by Octavian, dated to 8th May 44 BCE by Kienast 1990, 61.

16) See ThLL, s. v., I, init.

Antony.¹⁷ Yet in fact there is no reason to doubt it either, since another, even if rather oblique, hint is at hand: according to Vel-leius Paternulus in the time after Mutina in the letters to Octavian *Antonius id subinde Caesarem admoneret, quam inimicae ipsi Pompeianae partes forent* (2.65.1). Other facts are well compatible with it too, for example it seems to have been generally known that Octavian and not Antony was Brutus' archenemy.¹⁸ One can also contrast Octavian and Antony's treatment of Brutus' corpse.¹⁹

The Tacitean account is thus credible in a very satisfactory manner and its content can be precisely what Ovid also could have had in mind when appealing to the writings of Antony and Brutus which, unlike his own, were still available in Rome. Unfortunately, there is nothing to prove it decisively, only an observation can be added that Ovid himself continues with another reference to his own poems: *denique Caesareo, quod non desiderat ipse, / non caret e nostris ullus honore liber* (Pont. 1.1.27–28), thus perhaps indicating that precisely literary writings are what the whole passage is concerned with, not excluding what even *arma* refer to.

At any rate, however, the interpretation suggested here, even if not decisively provable to be superior to that contained in the standard Ovidian commentaries, certainly is possible and perhaps – and it seems only its natural consequence, regardless of my actual opinion on this vexed question – opens the door to strengthening somewhat the case for *carmen* to have been the genuine reason for Ovid's banishment from Rome.²⁰ As such it seems at least worth being included in the Ovidian commentaries to come.

17) As indeed preferred by Bardon, for which see above n. 13.

18) According to Appian. BC 4.129.542 one Lucilius when posing himself to be Brutus brought about a confidence in it precisely by demanding that he be taken to Antony and not to Octavian.

19) See Suet. Aug. 13.1 against Plut. Brut. 53.4; Appian. BC 4.135.568; Cass. Dio 47.49.2.

20) I am very well aware of the delicacy of such an approach, even if one can now refer to Hutchinson 2017 for support. But, illustratively enough, not even this scholar denies *error* to have played some role, only recommends agnosticism about whatever specification of it. At the same time, however, he shows quite convincingly how also *carmen* could have been the reason which at least concurred in imposing the punishment on Ovid. For the issue, after all, see further below at pp. 382 ff.

II. *The Exile: No Silence in Suetonius*

The notion of Ovid's exile having in fact been a fiction has recently been fuelled even by a book of some 250 pages.²¹ Here, however, it is not in my scope to deal with the whole argument as developed therein.²² I would like to call attention only to the fact, to my knowledge not yet properly pointed out, that there is more, or I would even dare to say much more, than a mere supposition that Suetonius informed about Ovid's exile in his *Illustrious Men*, or, more precisely, in its section titled *De poetis*.²³

The first proponents of this fiction thesis managed with reasoning based either solely or largely on Ovid's own poems and pondering the credibility of what he himself conveys to us.²⁴ The silence in Suetonius, or rather in what remains today of his writings, seems first to have been exploited by Fitton Brown, among his arguments gathered in favour of a persuasion, premised to his paper, that the possibility that "Ovid never went to Tomis ...

21) Bérchez Castaño 2015.

22) In my opinion, anyway, the many absurdities we would have to believe in, in the case that the exile should be acknowledged as a fiction, as they are pointed out by Little 1990, seem to me conclusive enough and still a valid counterargument, although Little's own conclusion was not stated so decisively. In what follows, nonetheless, another argument is brought out, not taken into account by Little, but certainly strengthening his point.

23) In what is actually preserved of this writing, unfortunately, not even a trace occurs of the *vita Ovidi*. Solely in Suet. Gram. 20.2 we read that Hyginus *fuitque familiarissimus Ouidio poetae*, so Ovid's own biography can be supposed to have been included, but this evidence is by no means cogent. The index to the *De poetis* containing Ovid's name which precedes the text in some modern editions is only restored from Jerome's chronicle, as it is clearly admitted at least by Rolfe 1914, 390. The value of this source is to be dealt with below, here, however, this index is to be acknowledged as an item coming from outside of the textual tradition of the *Illustrious Men*. What must, nevertheless, be emphasized, is that here below not only an inclusion of the *vita Ovidi* in the *De poetis* is advocated, but even the precise detail that Ovid's exile was at least mentioned therein.

24) Hartman 1905, 69–80; Janssen 1951. For a passing summary of the argument of the latter and for briefly disputing his approach see Claassen 2013, 229–230. Actually, Janssen 1951, 77–79 paid some little attention also to external evidence, yet just pointing out the silence in Tacitus' *Annals*, which at least may be misleading, as emerges below in n. 52, and the alleged absence of any reference to Ovid's exile in the sources until the 4th and 5th century, which is even mistaken, as recalled below at p. 391 with n. 79.

should be very seriously considered". He pointed to the silence in Suetonius' biographies of Augustus and Tiberius, and although he himself considered this item of his argument inconclusive, he also stated that Suetonius "could readily have accorded him [sc. Ovid] a place among all the *relegati* he mentions".²⁵ More emphatically Ezquerro, when, according to his own statement, pondering the arguments and pleading for leaving the question open, emphasized that "[t]he silence is deafening in the case of the historians Tacitus and Suetonius, both of whom have no qualms about describing the punishments meted out to other writers during the reign of Augustus, Tiberius or any other first-century AD emperor". And below even: "despite being an argument *ex silentio*, considerable probatory force attaches to the puzzling absence of an reference to the poet's exile in the writings of Tacitus and Suetonius".²⁶

The counter suggestion to be discussed and supported here is in itself not new indeed. Even before Fitton Brown's paper was published Thibault had been persuaded that "[t]he *De poetis* of Suetonius ... almost certainly included a biographical sketch of Ovid, even if the two lines in Jerome, which are generally accepted as coming from that sketch, have another provenance", and further that the reason for omitting Ovid's exile in the biography of Augustus rests in that the *De poetis* had been written earlier than the *Twelve Caesars*,²⁷ and Suetonius thus only did not want to repeat

25) Fitton Brown 1985, 18 and 21 respectively.

26) Ezquerro 2010, 121 and 126 respectively.

27) The priority of the *Illustrious Men* before the *Twelve Caesars* was only assumed in the scholarship until recently, even if not for entirely tenuous reasons, as they are resumed by Power 2010, 140f. The specific objections to these reasons presented as possible *ibid.* 141 are perhaps a bit artificial, but still it is true that Power's own attempt, *ibid.* 141–156, at supporting this assumption justly results in the statement: "To Syme, the fact that in *Letters* 5.10 Pliny refers to the *Illustrious Men* is 'the general and painless belief.' However, the relatively solid evidence of allusions discussed in this part of the paper gives us something more substantial on which to hang that belief". With such a conclusion I would agree, but Power himself elsewhere in his paper treats this "evidence of allusions" as even more decisive than this. In my opinion, though, a possible involvement of Suetonius' *Vita Vergili* into the very ingenious net of allusions can eventually bear witness to the existence of this piece already at the moment when Pliny's letter was being written, but less to that the whole collection of biographies was the actual subject of the letter. For a dating of the collection similar to that of Power I would therefore prefer other clues: as the

himself.²⁸ Reacting to Fitton Brown, even if only implicitly alluding to his main thesis, Baldwin mentioned both the sources to be dealt with here below and linked them to Suetonius' *De poetis*, although with very cautious circumscriptions "being possibly derived" and "where ... might also have got it".²⁹ On the contrary, Green, even if himself not at all a partisan of the fiction thesis, declared attributing Jerome's Ovidian entries to the *De poetis* as based on "no compelling grounds".³⁰ My ambition is to show that the grounds for it are compelling, and that not even Baldwin's cautiousness is necessary.

As just mentioned, there are two entries concerning Ovid in Jerome's chronicle published between 378 and 381.³¹ In the former dated to 43 BCE³² the poet's birth is recorded: *Ovidius Naso nasci-*

terminus post quem, albeit only an uncertain one, the death of the rhetorician Julius Tiro in CE 107 who was included in the collection, and, since he was not included, the death of Pliny the Younger perhaps in CE 113 as the terminus ante quem, even if both may seem problematic following Power's discussion. For the former see Power 2010, 158 n. 78, and the validity of the latter is, *ibid.* 157, even denied by him since he prefers the Flavian period to have been the latest of interest on the part of Suetonius and his illustrious men having been selected on this criterion. Nevertheless, how can the application of such a criterion be verifiable from our perspective, in the collection commenced only a few years after the Flavian period and preserved to us in so mutilated a state?

28) Thibault 1964, 21f. and 23 respectively. This alleged reason for omitting Ovid's affair from the *Twelve Caesars*, especially the *Life of Augustus*, may not seem too convincing at first glance, yet this omission is puzzling anyway, since the only meaningful explanation would be that Suetonius never heard anything about Ovid, which is absurd at the same time. The notion, however, that the omission is due to Suetonius' awareness of the exile's having in fact been a fiction brings at least its own questions. Had Augustus really been treated by Ovid in this manner, who else than Suetonius should be expected to have been interested in such a curiosity and have expounded on it?

29) Baldwin 1993, 87 with n. 23.

30) Green 1982, 204 n. 14 and see also 207 n. 34 for his doubts on Suetonius' informedness, yet only as the real causes of Ovid's exile were concerned.

31) The last recorded event is the battle of Adrianople, while the council of Constantinople and its outputs seem to have left no trace in Jerome's text, for which see Burgess 2005, 168 with n. 10 who is disputing an attempt to put the publication back to the end of 382 which, notwithstanding, were of little importance here even if vindicated.

32) The dates to which the entries dealing with births and deaths of the literary men are ascribed differ in various manuscripts of the chronicle as is, if Ovid is concerned, discussed by Helm 1929, 56. Nevertheless, for the argument to be developed here below this issue is of no importance.

tur in Paelignis (Hieron. Chron. 158d Helm). Both these particulars, the date and the place of his birth, could have been learnt from Ovid's poems, although the date, or rather the year, is not stated explicitly there, but is obliquely circumscribed: *editus hic ego sum, nec non, ut tempora noris, / cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari* (Trist. 4.10.5–6).³³ As the place of his birth, the region of *Paeligni* is mentioned several times explicitly,³⁴ for once more it can be inferred from the famous passage where the town of Sulmo is labelled as Ovid's fatherland,³⁵ and another passage draws attention to *Paeligni* as a place actually lost by the poet.³⁶ Illustratively enough, Martial shows that Ovid's reader was familiar with this piece of information: «*Ride, si sapis, o puella, ride*» / *Paelignus, puto, dixerat poeta* (2.41.1–2). Without knowledge of Jerome's method, this entry thus could be regarded as based on his own familiarity with Ovid's poetry.

With the latter entry, dated to CE 17, the situation is different: *Ovidius poeta in exilio diem obiit et iuxta oppidum Tomos sepelitur* (Hieron. Chron. 171g Helm). If we are not to posit, as an emergency measure, a theory that the fact and the date of Ovid's death was only inferred from his poetry by Jerome himself and the place

33) It was also possible to calculate it by using Ovid's own age which he explicitly stated as being 50 at the moment when his life changed with the banishment, for which see Ovid. Trist. 4.8.33–36 and 4.10.95–98, but then also the exact dates were necessary. This, if his birth is concerned, can be learnt from the combination of what is told by Ovid. Trist. 4.10.9–14 and Fast. 3.809–814, or the details given in the latter passage could eventually have been substituted by one's own knowledge of the course of Minerva's feast in question. The date of the change in Ovid's life is only conjectured by modern scholars, but, theoretically, it could have been likewise conjectured by an ancient one, even if Hutchinson 2017, 80–82 shows that in fact there are at least two options at hand for such conjecture. Still, the one to reach 43 BCE obviously could have been chosen.

34) Ovid. Amor. 2.1.1 *Hoc quoque composui Paelignis natus aquosis*; 2.16.37–38 *non ego Paelignos uideor celebrare salubres, / non ego natalem, rura paterna, locum*; 3.15.3 *Paeligni rurus alumnus*; 3.15.7–8 *Mantua Vergilio, gaudet Verona Cattullo; / Paelignae dicar gloria gentis ego*; Pont. 4.14.49 *gens mea, Paeligni regioque domestica, Sulmo*.

35) Ovid. Trist. 4.10.3 *Sulmo mihi patria est*.

36) Ovid. Pont. 1.8.41–44 *non meus amissos animus desiderat agros / ruvaeque Paeligno conspicienda solo, / nec quos piniferis positos in collibus hortos / spectat Flaminiae Clodia iuncta uiae*.

of his burial was a piece of common knowledge,³⁷ some written source drawn upon by Jerome must be assumed. On the account coming from such a source, then, the former entry concerning Ovid's birth could have been based as well, and probably indeed was, given the vagueness of his date of birth as it was to be found in his poetry. Moreover, this assumption is perfectly compatible with what is known of Jerome's method.

Concerning this method of his, in the preface to his chronicle Jerome shares with us two important details of how this work came to be. For the most part it was a translation of Eusebius' chronicle, but for the period which we are concerned with some material had been added, coming from Suetonius and other historians: *itaque a Nino et Abraham usque ad Troiae captiuitatem pura Graeca translatio est. a Troia usque ad uicesimum Constantini annum nunc addita, nunc admixta sunt plurima, quae de Tranquillo et ceteris illustribus historicis curiosissime excerpsi* (Hieron. Chron. 6, vers. 15–20 Helm). The fashion in which the work came into being is described by Jerome too, as well as his evaluation of the final product, both of which does not at all support any notion of Jerome's gathering pieces of information about Ovid from his poetry: *itaque, mi Vincenti carissime et tu Galliene, pars animae meae, obsecro, ut, quidquid hoc tumultuarii operis est, amicorum, non iudicum animo relegatis, praesertim cum et notario, ut scitis, uelocissime dictauerim*

37) The famous epitaph in Ovid. Trist. 3.3.73–76 is still an anticipation, accompanied, in addition, with an instruction that his body be buried in a suburban district, thus not in Tomis, so that Ovid would have ceased to be an exile at least after his death, for which see *ibid.* 65–70, further with pleading the immortal gods whether he could at least be buried in his fatherland, see *ibid.* 31–32, and with an expression of anxiety that his body would cover a barbarian soil, but without proper burial, see *ibid.* 45–46. Fascinating – even if also enigmatic – insight into what might have belonged to that eventual common knowledge perhaps provides the Pompeian graffito CIL 4.10595. It reads as follows: [...]*cio s(alutem) morieris Tomi / feliciter* [...], but according to its editor Matteo Della Corte the first readable letter may also be *d*, so the word could be supplemented as follows: [*Oui*]d*io*. In such case, however, what would the verb in the future tense go for? This would make good sense, only if the graffito could be dated to Ovid's lifetime or shortly after his death before the news about it reached Pompeii. But if Ovid's name is not to be restored there, could a 'death in Tomis' not have become that proverbial due to the sufficiently well-known fact that Ovid had passed away there? I am inclined towards this solution, but yet more important is that the graffito mentions only Ovid's death and not his burial.

etc. (Hieron. Chron. 2, vers. 16–20 Helm). Although this statement could eventually be argued away as a mere *captatio benevolentiae*, at least some self-sustaining reason would be needed, thus not one required by a hypothesis which is to be thereby supported, or which even stands only if it is argued away. Nevertheless, since there is indeed no such reason,³⁸ we must start from the presumption that Jerome really worked under time pressure and the number of sources he drew upon was virtually small.³⁹

38) For various aspects of Jerome's work in general see the references given by Burgess 1995, 355 n. 31, for Burgess' own illustrative description of the limits that affected composing the chronicle see *ibid.* 355 f. and further Burgess 2002, 29 and Burgess 2005, 182–184. For many aspects of dictating as employed both by Jerome and in general see Schlumberger 1976, esp. 224 and 227 for this procedure's need for haste and 234 f. for why a contamination of information from various sources was difficult to be thereby achieved. For the vices of Jerome's hasty work see Mommsen 1909, 621 and the references given by Burgess 1995, 355 n. 31 *fin.*

39) There are two basic notions of the body of sources used by Jerome for his additions to Eusebius' chronicle, that of Mommsen 1909 (which is an updated version of the paper originally published in 1850) and that of Helm 1927 (and partially discussed also in Helm 1929). Helm's conception is now defended by Burgess and is definitely preferable, among other reasons as it respects to a greater extent Jerome's above quoted statements which even Mommsen 1909, 607, after all, considered trustworthy, although *ibid.* 620 f. he counted six other sources than Eusebius' chronicle and was prone to accept five more for some single entries. On the contrary, Helm 1927, 303–306, esp. 305, seems to have been willing to reduce this number even down to three and e. g. *ibid.* 156–159; 273 f.; 275–277; 280 f. he disputed some of those suggested by Mommsen. For Burgess' notion, inspired by Helm, of four or five major sources and some minor ones see Burgess 2002, 27 f., but also below in this note for subsequent reduction of this number. The most controversial point in which these two notions differ need not be addressed for the sake of the issue dealt with here, yet for the sake of clarity of my discussion a brief outline can be useful. According to Mommsen Jerome's principal source for his additions was Eutropius, while according to Helm both Jerome and Eutropius drew upon a common source (for a summary of the following debate see Burgess 1995, 351 with n. 14). This latter opinion has been recently reformulated in a way which Helm 1927 himself probably preferred as well (see *ibid.* 303–306), yet since he was limited by the acknowledged hypotheses of his days, he remained rather halfway. For this reformulation see Burgess 2005, 166 n. 4 and 190: this common source is what Jerome himself referred to as the *Latina historia* (Hieron. Chron. 77c Helm), it covered the history of Italy from the mythical beginnings up to the 4th century (in this vague formulation the problem of its precise terminus ad quem is deliberately concealed for here and now), and the so called 'Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte' (see below n. 74) made only a part of it. This latter term thus becomes a bit misleading, but since it is widely used and in what follows I am going to use it only for the treatment of the imperial period on

Concerning the additions dealing with the history of Roman literature, there are very good reasons to consider them as coming mainly from Suetonius' *Illustrious Men*.⁴⁰ The name of this author is (as the only one) explicitly listed as his source by Jerome himself, but there is not a single trace within his additions of the *Twelve Caesars*' having been directly drawn upon.⁴¹ The entries in question drop with Quintilian and the elder Pliny,⁴² while for those dealing with Salvius Julianus, Fronto, and Ulpian another source

the part of this source, I keep using it, even if I approve of Burgess' hypothesis, since it really better conforms to the evidence we have while the only problem it brings, as it seems, is that it urges for reassessment of some other modern hypotheses.

40) Claassen 2013, 230 is of the same opinion regarding this original source, at least as far as the information on Ovid's death and burial is concerned, but supposes that Eusebius himself drew upon Suetonius, and was thus an intermediary source between Suetonius and Jerome. Janssen 1951, 78–79 also allowed for the latter Ovidian entry's having been in Eusebius, but unlike Claassen he failed to realize that either Eusebius or Jerome had to have some earlier source of information for this entry. Actually, all the entries in question really are Jerome's own additions as Hieron. Chron. 6, vers. 10–15 Helm suggests by exculpating Eusebius from omitting *Romana ... historia*, and their absence from the Armenian translation of the chronicle confirms it, for which see Mommsen 1909, 606. That is why, indeed, Jerome's and not Eusebius' source of information is to be established.

41) This argument must really be construed so, since Jerome himself not only has not specified which of the writings of Suetonius he drew upon (see his statement cited above p. 378), but even linked Suetonius' name together with *ceteri inlustres historici*, thus at least at first glance giving the impression as if rather the *Twelve Caesars* had been used by him. Helm's assertion (1927, 138) “[f]ür die literarhistorischen Notizen hat H[ieronimus] selber ... Sueton als seinen Gewährsmann bezeichnet” is thus slightly misleading.

42) As observed already by Mommsen 1909, 611. For Quintilian see Hieron. Chron. 190l Helm, for Pliny the Elder *ibid.* 195c, although Jerome confused him with his nephew, but the mistake is really his own as Hieron. Comm. in Isai. 15.54.11–14, vers. 113–116 [CCSL LXXIII A 611] shows sufficiently: *Plinium secundum, eundem apud Latinos oratorem et philosophum, qui in opere pulcherrimo Naturalis historiae tricesimum septimum librum, qui et extremus est, lapidum atque gemmarum disputatione compleuit*, and see also Mommsen 1909, 615. For the inclusion of Quintilian in the *Illustrious Men* see the index preserved in this writing's manuscript tradition as printed in Brugnoli 1972, 1–3: Quintilian features among the *rhetores* *ibid.* 3, vers. 6. See, however, also Brugnoli's apparatus criticus ad p. 1, vers. 2 where this editor agrees with those secluding this index as a later addition, but still there need be no doubts as to its credibility in regard to the content of the writing. The short *vita Plini* directly attributed to Suetonius, and therefore considered a former part of the *De historicis*, is even preserved in the manuscript tradition of the *Natural History*, see Reifferscheid 1860, 92 f., frag. 80 and comm. ad frag. 80 init.

was manifestly used.⁴³ When the content of all the relevant entries is compared against what is preserved of the *Illustrious Men*, only some trivial additions or mistakes are recognized which cannot be regarded as significant in any way.⁴⁴ Many mistakes in ascribing these entries to the specific years are not an obstacle since they are due to the Eusebian pattern of the chronicle that often sentenced Jerome to guesswork, as precise dates need not have been given by Suetonius, or sometimes Jerome was even limited by where a gap had been left by his predecessor.⁴⁵ If, therefore, Jerome's entries falling within the scope of Suetonius' interest should be considered as having come from anywhere else than the latter's *Illustrious Men*, rather some strong reasons for it must be at hand⁴⁶ and not

43) As also understood by Mommsen 1909, 611 n. 1. For Salvius Julianus see Hieron. Chron. 200e Helm, for Fronto *ibid.* 204e, for Ulpian *ibid.* 215c. All three are treated in the same manner by Eutr. 8.17; 8.12.1 and 8.23, which implies that either Eutropius, or (much rather) the so called 'Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte' was Jerome's actual source.

44) See Mommsen 1909, 611 with n. 2 and 612.

45) See Helm 1929, *passim* and more generally to this aspect of Jerome's work Burgess 2002, 29–32.

46) Helm's occasional generalizing statements even have an effect, as if there were none of this sort, see e. g. Helm 1927, 155 where "ja alle Notizen aus der Literaturgeschichte" are noted to have come from Suetonius. According to Mommsen 1909, 615–617, however, such were the Senecan entries (Hieron. Chron. 183k; 184e; 185b Helm and the mention of Seneca *ibid.* 171b), since Seneca's brother Gallio is confused with his adoptive father who in fact, and not Gallio, was a declaimer and since there was no section suitable for Seneca in the *Illustrious Men*. Further, the entries on Nigidius Figulus, Anaxilas of Larissa, and Musonius Rufus (Hieron. Chron. 156j; 163k; 189c Helm), since the former two are treated as magicians and are not labelled suitably to Suetonian sections, and the latter two were Greeks in fact. Finally, also the remarks about the younger Cato in Hieron. Chron. 153b Helm, since he never authored any writing, the jurists Sergius Sulpicius and P. Servilius Isauricus *ibid.* 157e, the latter for the same reason and both since there was no suitable section for them, and the physician Artorius *ibid.* 163b and the pantomimist Pylades *ibid.* 165c for reasons not specified. Nevertheless, according to Reifferscheid 1860, 94–97 there was also a section titled *De philosophis* in the *Illustrious Men* containing much of this problematic material, although not necessarily in the biographies devoted specifically to all the individuals in question. *Ibid.* 22, frag. 4 the entry on Pylades is placed as a part of the proem to the *De poetis*. On the contrary, however, *ibid.* 358, frag. 217 the entry on Sergius Sulpicius and P. Servilius Isauricus as well as *ibid.* 360, frag. 227 that on Artorius are ascribed to Suetonius' other writing whose one-time existence was only suggested by Reifferscheid himself, but see Prchlík 2015, 11–13 for a brief summary of subsequent objections on the part of the

only the problem that one's own hypothesis is being called into question by the actual content of a relevant entry in Jerome. So far as Ovid is concerned, the authorities of the times when there was no fiction thesis, and so their perspective was not yet biased by the arguments of either side of the ensuing controversy, had not a shadow of suspicion about the origin of both Jerome's Ovidian entries: both Reifferscheid and Roth included them in their editions of the fragments of the *De poetis*⁴⁷ as well as Mommsen in his conspectus.⁴⁸ Were the fiction thesis well-argued and accepted, then perhaps it could serve as a starting point for reconsidering the origin of Jerome's Ovidian entries, but not the other way round.

Another late antique source in which Ovid's exile is mentioned is of importance as well. In the so called *Epitome de Caesaribus*, the collection of short imperial biographies from the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century,⁴⁹ we read as follows:

scholarly world. Helm 1927, 144f. also ascribed the entries on Artorius and Anaxilas to Suetonius, the former on the basis of Reifferscheid's authority, but not subscribing to his hypothesis concerning that unattested writing and, while recognizing the objection that the proper section seems as yet to have been missing there, clearly favouring the *Illustrious Men*. As for the latter entry, he proposed that the Neopythagorean affiliation of Anaxilas had been compatible with an interest in medicine, or it could together with those on Nigidius Figulus and Musonius Rufus have been a part of some summary of expulsions of philosophers from Rome, as even Mommsen had opined, yet such a summary, according to Helm, certainly fitted precisely in the *Illustrious Men*. Further, Helm 1927, 154 ascribed to Suetonius also the entry on Sergius Sulpicius and P. Servilius Isauricus once more following Reifferscheid's authority, yet this once making no provision for his problematic ascription of this entry to the specific writing suggested by himself. No one after Mommsen seems to have taken into account the confusion of Gallio with his adoptive father, but the mistake can very well be once more Jerome's own similar to that he committed about the two Plinii referred to above in n. 42.

47) Reifferscheid 1860, 49, frag. 42–43; Roth 1907, 298 f.

48) Mommsen 1909, 614.

49) Since Theodosius, who died in 395, is included (*Epit. de Caes.* 48), while Arcadius, who died in 408, is mentioned without indication that he was not alive at the moment (*ibid.* 48.19), the publication is very likely to have fallen within the time span between their deaths. As for the attempts at a more precise dating, that of Cameron 2001 who argued for the year 395, before Theodosius' funeral which took place in November, has been effectively disproved by Festy 2003. According to Schlumberger 1974, 245 an encomiastic character of the last chapter on Theodosius suggests that the writing was being composed already during his lifetime, and since the author claimed the state to be quiet at the moment (*Epit. de Caes.* 48.19), he was

poetam Ouidium, qui et Naso, pro eo quod tres libellos artis amatoriae conscripsit, inreuocabili damnauit exilio (1.24).⁵⁰ Two important features of this account are to be discussed here. Unlike Ovid himself who always insisted that he was guilty of two faults, *carmen et error*, and only avoided the slightest specification of the latter,⁵¹ the late antique epitomizer noted only *carmen*. This can be a result of a superficial reading of Ovid's poetry,⁵² but much rather it had been stated in a source drawn upon by the epitomizer whose source in turn went back to some official document of the Augustan period, such as the edict imposing on him the punishment as mentioned directly by Ovid himself.⁵³

not yet aware of the Germanic inroads to the West after 400. Festy 1999, LIII–LVI and 237 n. 28 proposed as a terminus post quem the year 402 as that of the death of Symmachus whose panegyric on Theodosius could have been drawn upon in the last chapter, or even August of 406 when Radagaisus had been defeated by Stilicho, which is perhaps alluded to by the anonymous author.

50) As printed in the recent CUF edition: Festy 1999, 5. The Ovidian specialists, probably still more familiar with the Teubner one, thus Pichlmayr 1961, 135: *poetam Ouidium, qui et Naso, pro eo, quod tres libellos amatoriae artis conscripsit, exilio damnauit*, certainly notice one important improvement of Festy's reading, which is to be commented below at pp. 386 ff.

51) See esp. Ovid. Trist. 2.207–212, other clear hints to or direct mentions of *error* are e. g. in Ovid. Trist. 2.109; 3.5.45–52; 4.1.23–26; 4.4.37–39; 4.10.89–90; Pont. 1.6.25–26; 1.7.39–42; 2.2.15–16; 2.3.46; 2.9.67–76; 3.3.71–76. Some circumstances are even hinted at: Ovid saw by accident some misdeed of another person, see Ovid. Trist. 2.103–104; 3.5.49–50; 3.6.27–28, by which Augustus himself was offended, see *ibid.* 2.134; 2.209–210; 4.10.97–98.

52) For example following Ovid. Trist. 5.12.45–46 where the Muses are qualified as *maxima causa* of his exile, even if it is not blankly stated so, only the Muses are asked for its being allowed to be stated so, or *ibid.* 2.3 where Ovid identifies *damnatas Musas* as his *criminal*. Further, of course, many places where the *Art of Love* is identified as *carmen* might have been understood so, e. g. Ovid. Trist. 2.239–240; 2.251–252; 2.345–346; 3.14.5–6; 5.12.67–68; Pont. 2.9.73; 2.9.76; Ibis 5–6. For an argument that Tacitus, probably thanks to a non-superficial reading of Ovid's poetry, although it is not stated explicitly, considered the main cause for his exile *error*, as it emerges from Tac. Dial. 12–13, see Little 1990, 29–30. Only in passing should be noted that Tacitus thus seems to have been aware of the circumstances of Ovid's exile – whether real or fictitious – when composing his *Dialogue* prior to his *Annals* (the debates over the exact dates of their publication need not to be entered here since this very succession of these writings is by no means disputed), and so his silence in the *Annals* at least embarrasses the fiction thesis too.

53) Ovid. Trist. 2.135 and 5.2.58. That there had been no mention of *error* in the edict was an opinion of Thibault 1964, 7f., and Hutchinson 2017, 76 counts on

From the same Ovid's poetry it seems that *error* was so delicate that it was kept in secret. It was not made public through hearing either in the senate or before a tribunal,⁵⁴ although perhaps precisely this was threatening to him if he told too much in his poems.⁵⁵ He himself further pointed out that his punishment was utterly unique in the whole period of antiquity up to his times⁵⁶ and came long after the *carmen* had been published.⁵⁷ Thus *carmen* may easily seem to have been a mere front for some other fault which could not have been publicized, yet since Augustus did not banish the writings of his personal enemies Antony and Brutus from public libraries,⁵⁸ while in Ovid's case precisely this seems to have happened,⁵⁹ he at least can be thought of as having

it as well. The character of the account in the *Epitome* has been noticed in modern scholarship too, see Thibault 1964, 21: "[i]t may be worthy of note that our earliest extant source of information ... repeats the official story", and Festy 1999, 65 according to whom the *Epitome* "donne de l'exil du poète à Tomes le motif officiel". Baldwin 1993, 87 even considered it "worth a word", but did not further comment upon it.

54) See Ovid. *Trist.* 2.131–132.

55) See Ovid. *Trist.* 1.1.21–24.

56) Ovid. *Trist.* 2.361–466; 2.495–496; 2.567–568; *Ibis* 5–6. Fitton Brown 1985, 22 refers to Isocr. *Bus.* 39 as to a possible source of inspiration to Ovid for this item of alleged fiction, yet it could perhaps be acknowledged only if there were a certainty that Ovid's exile really was a fiction, since in Isocr. *Bus.* 38 the offences of the gods contained in *carmina* of not named but easily identifiable poets are listed, but no kind of *error* is ascribed to any of them. In the following chapter, referred to by Fitton Brown, the punishments of these poets are presented as examples, and one of them is introduced as follows: φεύγων τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τοῖς οἰκειοτάτοις πολεμῶν ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον διετέλεσεν. According to a conjecture in Van Hook 1945, 125 n. b perhaps Archilochus is meant.

57) Ovid. *Trist.* 2.545–546.

58) See Ovid. *Pont.* 1.1.23–24. Perhaps specifically those attacking Octavian were concerned as argued for above in this paper.

59) See Ovid. *Pont.* 1.1.11–12 where Ovid's persuasion that even his friends must have put away the *Art of Love* from their private libraries testifies to its having been removed from the public ones. Further confirmed it seems by Ovid. *Trist.* 1.1.67–68 where some proper sentence it had to serve is mentioned, 3.1.65–66 where Ovid's new book sent by him to Rome did not ask in libraries for those which Ovid himself now wished never to have composed, and 3.14.17 where the *Art of Love* is declared to have been ruined with him. Moreover, from *ibid.* 9–10 it seems that other books than the *Art of Love* remained in libraries, yet from 3.1.67–74 and 79–80 it appears that the new books sent from Tomis were banished too.

intervened also, if not primarily, against the unhealthy content of his poems.⁶⁰ An objection eventually based on Bardon's – otherwise undoubtedly right – opinion that at least in Antony's case due to his propaganda his writings in question had already been well known,⁶¹ still would not work since both Ovid's poems had to be already well known too and Antony's writings surely could have been more efficiently put into oblivion, if removed from libraries. Furthermore, although it is true that Ovid himself claims: *causa meae cunctis nimium quoque nota ruinae / indicio non est testificanda meo* (Trist. 4.10.99–100), here certainly *carmen* is hinted at and not *error*, since at least the Thracian king Cotys was manifestly unaware of the nature of *error* and Ovid could wish it to remain so⁶² as well as he could be persuaded that the secret would die with him.⁶³ This whole vexed issue of *carmen et error*, nev-

60) As already mentioned, Hutchinson 2017 seeks to establish this, here only vaguely touched on, possibility more firmly by referring to the inscription which sheds light on Augustus' actual endeavours whom the success of the *Art of Love* could have indeed seemed to hamper.

61) Bardon 1952, 288. The account in Appian. BC 5.132.548 about the burning of γραμματεῖα, ὅσα τῆς στάσεως σύμβολα dates to 36 BCE, so none of Antony's writings could have been involved. The question, however, is whether at all “quantities of the invective” as rendered by Huzar 1982, 639–640 with n. 3 is what Appian thereby meant. For example his translators in Czech have rendered it as “acts” or “decrees” (Burian / Mouchová 1989, 439) and in my opinion this is more likely to be the accurate meaning. According to Huzar, Antony may also have been included among “authors of little repute” whose writings were burnt after the death of Lepidus, for which see Suet. Aug. 31.1, but the formulation *quidquid fatidicorum librorum Graeci Latiniq[ue] generis nullis uel parum idoneis auctoribus uulgo ferebatur* seems much rather to be understood so that these *fatidici libri* had none or obscure authors. Rightly, nonetheless, she calls attention to Cass. Dio 52.42.8 according to whom Octavian pretended to have burned some compromising documents (τὰ γραμματεῖα) found in Antony's equipment (ἐν τοῖς κιβωτίοις αὐτοῦ) after his death, but in fact only a small part of them had been destroyed, while the rest was later used against Octavian's enemies. Nevertheless, these were surely kept by Octavian himself, and thus are not those later available and pointed to by Ovid (and Tacitus whose account is discussed above at pp. 371 f.).

62) Ovid. Pont. 2.9.75–76.

63) Ovid. Trist. 1.5.51–52. In spite of this, some authorities refer Ovid. Trist. 4.10.99–100 to *error*, see perhaps Little 1990, 23 (the verses in question are not quoted), and certainly Thibault 1964, 20 and 27, and Green 1982, 207 who supports it by pointing out that Ovid. Pont. 1.7.39–40 claims that everyone knows he has committed no crime. Nevertheless, even if they were right, it would only testify to

ertheless, cannot and need not be resolved here, since even if the latter played some role – which at least cannot be denied easily, if at all – it seems to have been suppressed from publicity, and thus in Ovid's edict only *carmen* had to be mentioned, whether in fact being another genuine, the only genuine, or the counterfeit reason for his banishment.

Another point that deserves attention is the qualification of Ovid's exile as *inreuocabilis* on the part of the late antique epitomizer.⁶⁴ By the time of late antiquity, this term had become a juridical terminus technicus,⁶⁵ the possibility, nonetheless, that it stood in some official legal document of the Augustan period thereby cannot be proved. Moreover, Ovid himself describes his exile much rather in terms of the *relegatio*⁶⁶ and at least could have deceived

that *error* had been known in certain circles, as Green even himself specifies immediately, but still it would not follow therefrom that it had to be mentioned in the edict. Moreover, there are passages which suggest that Ovid was obliged to be silent about *error*: Ovid. Trist. 2.208; 3.6.31–33; Pont. 2.2.59; 3.1.147. The last one, however, gives the impression that his wife was informed.

64) Precisely this term is missing in Pichlmayr's edition (see above n. 50), and so the impact of its inclusion in the text has, to my knowledge, not yet been considered in Ovidian scholarship. Despite this, Festy's enterprise seems fully justified. Although the term occurs only in the indirect tradition of the *Epitome*, namely in Landolfus Sagax' *Historia miscella* and two manuscripts of the Vulgar Latin version of the *Epitome*, which in fact means that there are two witnesses to this reading, still they stand against only one manuscript of the *Epitome* itself, since there is a lacuna in all the other ones. Generally to the credibility of this indirect tradition see Festy 1999, LXXIII–LXXXI, and to the passage in question Festy's apparatus criticus ad loc. and also Opitz 1872, 271 and 273 f. Baldwin 1993, 87 n. 23 evidently considered this term Landolfus Sagax' own arbitrary addition – a consequence of hardening over the centuries – but in all probability unjustly.

65) In ThLL, s. v. the earliest recorded occurrence in a juridical text is Dig. 39.5.34.1 *haec donatio inreuocabilis est*. Later even three times the phrase *irreuocabile exilium* appears, see Cod. Iust. 1.2.14.6 from the year 470; Iulian. epit. Lat. novell. Iust. 6.24 from the year 535, and *ibid.* 7.38 from the same year. Other occurrences are Cod. Iust. 5.11.7.3 from the year 531: *liberalitas*; *ibid.* 5.12.31.3 from the year 530 *in suum lucrum hoc maritus conuertat firmumque et inreuocabile habeat*; and *ibid.* 8.33.3.3c from the year 530 *plenissime habeat rem creditor idemque dominus iam inreuocabilem factam*.

66) So it is even explicitly stated in Ovid. Trist. 2.135–138; 5.2.54–61; 5.11.21–22, other hints are *ibid.* 1.3.5–6; 1.3.85; 2.129–130; 4.4.45–46; 4.9.11–12. This kind of penalty is generally discussed by Mommsen 1899, 964–980. To Ovid's case, however, much of what is cited from Marcianus in Dig. 48.22.4 seems applicable, excepting, of

himself that some mitigation could be hoped for: *denique non possum nullam sperare salutem, / cum poenae non sit causa cruenta meae* (Trist. 3.5.43–44).⁶⁷ At the same time, though, he strongly seems to admit that it really was only his own deception of himself: *ipse licet sperare uetes, sperabimus usque: / hoc unum fieri te prohibente potest* (Trist. 2.145–146).⁶⁸ Still, however, this subtle piece

course, an island as a place he was relegated to: *Relegati in insulam in potestate sua liberos retinent, quia et alia omnia iura sua retinent: tantum enim insula eis egredi non licet. et bona quoque sua omnia retinent praeter ea, si qua eis adempta sunt: nam eorum, qui in perpetuum exilium dati sunt uel relegati, potest quis sententia partem bonorum adimere.*

67) Although Ovid. Trist. 3.5.53–54 specifies that he hopes only for a concession to move to another place, it may be suspected as nothing more than a *captatio benevolentiae*, rather than a reflexion of the conditions determined for his exile. Similarly, Ovid. Pont. 1.6.25–28 assures his friend Pomponius Graecinus that the offence he committed was not such that no chance at all would have been left for him, but this chance, he makes clear, was only for an alleviation of his penalty and not the abrogation thereof.

68) I can see no other way how to understand this “interdiction of hope” than as an allusion to the content of the edict, although Mommsen’s approach (1899, 976) of the *relegatio* seems to be an obstacle: “[e]in Endtermin kann festgesetzt werden ... beide [sc. both Ausweisung and Internierung] können aber auch ohne solchen und somit auf Dauer ausgesprochen werden”. Nevertheless, following Ovid’s own words, not taken into account by Mommsen, one would rather suppose an explicit uttering of irrevocability of his exile to have stood in the edict. Likewise embarrassing, however, the contention may seem of an unknown authority probably from the 13th century, discussed and cited by Owen 1889, XXV, which has appended a kind of summary to the text of the *Tristia* in the manuscript held in the Bodleian Library, containing a classification of types of banishments composed both in prose and dactylic hexameters. According to this authority *relegatus ... habet spem reuertendi*, while those who had no hope were *proscriptus* and *exul*. Yet the meaning of Ovid’s words still seems obvious enough, and Green 1982, 205 was probably of the same opinion, since when dealing with the passages close to the elegiac couplet in question, he claims Ovid’s banishment to have been “in perpetuity”. After all, at least one irrevocable banishment is recorded during the times of Augustus as Mommsen 1899, 976 n. 4 pointed out, see Suet. Aug. 65.4 *Agrippam nihilo tractabiliorem, immo in dies amentiosem in insulam transportauit saepsitque insuper custodia militum. cauuit etiam s.c. ut eodem loci in perpetuum contineretur*. Although this Agrippa’s case is completely different from that of Ovid and the uttered irrevocability of the exile seems to have been an innovation, and therefore sanctioned by the senate, in Ovid’s case the discreetness manifestly was mostly required, and that is why it can be easily believed that his relegation was irrevocable too, even if the senate was not involved. Some *in perpetuum relegati* are, moreover, reported to Trajan by Plin. Epist. 10.56.3–4, although here the banishments from the province by the proconsul

of information seems unlikely to have come from his poetry, and thus it either had to be stated somehow in the edict, eventually to be later rephrased into the language of late antiquity, or it comes from some additional comment on the part of the source drawn upon by the late antique epitomizer, pointing out that the exile had in fact never been revoked, which was somehow misread or confused by this epitomizer.

What is, nonetheless, rather overlooked in the debate so far, is the context of the passage in question within the *Epitome*.⁶⁹ It serves as an *exemplum* of Augustus' sternly punishing the vices he himself suffered from: *cumque esset luxuriae seruiens, erat tamen eiusdem uitii seuerissimus ultor, more hominum qui in ulciscendis uitiiis quibus ipsi uehementer indulgent acres sunt. nam poetam Ouidium etc.* (Epit. de Caes. 1.24). According to Schlumberger, nowhere else in our sources this vice is attributed to Augustus.⁷⁰ If, however, the content of the edict in question is mirrored somehow in the account of the *Epitome*, then *luxuria* in the sense of "amatory" or "sexual excesses" must be what the author of the *Epitome* had in mind. This is, of course, no surprise,⁷¹ yet it still may be of some importance since the unique linking together of punishing the vices which oneself suffers from, a censure of Augustus' *luxuria* and Ovid's case can very easily be imagined to have been inspired by the text in which Augustus himself censured and punished someone else's *luxuria*, such as the edict decreeing Ovid's banishment.

are referred to, and later it must even have become a standard practice, as attested by Paul. Sent. 5.22.3 *bonis ademptis in insulam perpetuo relegantur*, Dig. 48.19.28.1 *relegatio ad tempus, uel in perpetuum*, 48.22.7.2–3. Taking all this into account I am inclined to believe that also Ovid's banishment, despite technically being a relegation, was irrevocable and as such it was specified directly in his edict.

69) Not even Janssen 1951, 83 with n. 5 serves for exception, although he did quote the passage in full context, but only to partially reproduce its content in his own discussion, taking no account of what is built upon here.

70) See Schlumberger 1974, 27 with n. 39 where references to Plin. Epist. 8.22 and Cass. Dio 36.40.5 indeed indicate only the places censuring this vice in general, while Val. Max. 8.6 added by Festy 1999, 65 n. 23 has four particular *exempla* to present, but none of them featuring Augustus.

71) Janssen 1951, 83 too renders this word as "passive" and Festy 1999, 5 as "luxure", while *ibid.* 65 n. 23 he points out Augustus' laws protecting marriage as what could have been referred to by the latter part of the compound sentence before introducing Ovid as a specific example.

From all this the question arises in what source the anonymous epitomizer could have learnt what he tells us about Ovid's exile. With regard to his method of writing history which is going to be outlined below, two can be excluded: Ovid's own poetry and the edict from the Augustan period. This means that he must have drawn upon an intermediary source and the question is whether we are able to establish at least some details about it.

The author of the *Epitome* has left us no self-critical remarks similar to those of Jerome, but indeed, they would fit him as well. In his writing, for example, long stretches are copied nearly verbatim from the *Caesares* by Aurelius Victor and Eutropius' breviary, without any attempt at harmonizing their totally different dictions. It is, then, very reasonable to suppose that he followed, perhaps likewise slavishly, a not very high number of sources in which instant information had been easily at hand.⁷² Concerning their identification, there is no consensus yet among specialists, but here it is not necessary to enter the debate,⁷³ since for the section containing Augustus' biography it is clear that Aurelius Victor and a source drawing heavily on Suetonius while supplying some details from elsewhere were followed.⁷⁴ The former is preserved and can

72) For a detailed discussion see Schlumberger 1974, 63–77, for an approving outline Festy 1999, XLI–XLIII. The approach of the former is criticised by Gauville 2005, 1; 4; 8, an alternative one is pleaded for by Baldwin 1993, 88f., but none of these two seems convincing.

73) The main hypotheses have been formulated by Schlumberger 1974, passim; Barnes 1976; Festy 1999, XII–XXXVIII; and Gauville 2005, 97–158, esp. 157–8, and 221–2. For my approval of the view of Schlumberger see Prchlík 2015, 13 with n. 25.

74) This latter source is commonly identified with the so called 'Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte', unpreserved, yet nowadays a largely recognized common source for many later historical sources, for which see HLL V 196–198, § 536. According to Schlumberger 1974, 17–62 and 235–244, however, another lost source, the so called *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, were as well drawn upon in this section. I agree with him even on this controversial hypothesis, but here this issue may be set aside, even if Flavian still had at his disposal some sources which were hardly accessible at the end of the 4th century, such as the one suggested by Prchlík 2017, 274. Even in the case, though, that the actual intermediary source may have been considered these *Annales* (as indeed is by Schlumberger 1974, 27; 60f. and 239f.), I believe the most likely original source of the account of Ovid's exile would be the one I am going to argue for in what follows. On the contrary, I do not share the opinion of Gauville 2005, 110–123, esp. 115–119, and 157 that also a rhetorical handbook

be excluded since he conveys nothing about Ovid, for the latter, therefore, the question remains where the account of the cause for Ovid's exile came from in it.

It remains an obvious fact that in his *Twelve Caesars* Suetonius introduces the content of a number of imperial edicts, even if recent scholarship doubts his own investigation in the archives to have revealed them and rather their availability in the already extant literary sources or in some collections is envisaged.⁷⁵ Hence, however, even though his *Illustrious Men*, in whose remains various documentary material is cited as well, may well have been published earlier than he ranked highly enough for the archives to be opened to him,⁷⁶ his interest in and knowledge of the content of the edict imposing banishment on Ovid is not only possible, but even likely. This writing, manifestly available during the period of late antiquity, thus becomes the most plausible link of the chain⁷⁷ for this piece of knowledge to reach the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, even if certainly not its direct source.

As a conclusion it is fair to admit that the origin of both late antique accounts of Ovid's exile in Suetonius' *De poetis* was not proved beyond all doubts, but certainly beyond all reasonable

or some anthology was drawn upon in this section of the *Epitome*, but even if this were true, since this opinion is based especially on the use of direct speech in the *Epitome*, it could not apply to the account in question. The persuasion of Baldwin 1993, explicitly stated at 83 f. n. 13 and illustrated passim, about the direct drawing upon Suetonius on the part of the late antique epitomizer, I do not share either. Both these approaches, in my view, do not conform to what can be learnt about this anonymous' above described method of writing history.

75) The issue is discussed in detail by de Coninck 1991 whose doubts about direct consultation of archive documents by Suetonius himself follow his observations that Suetonius scarcely ever claims he did and that often he describes their content in the same way as Tacitus and Cassius Dio. He accepts, however, the notion of Suetonius' special interest in the period of Cicero and Augustus. Both is shared by Birley 1984, 248 f. and 249 respectively, and Power 2010, 159–162.

76) For the date of its publication see above n. 27.

77) Thus also more plausible than eventual sources used by Suetonius, since, for example, his lists of edicts occupying whole chapters of the *Twelve Caesars* seem to me to have hardly been gathered from older narrative sources. Rather they had been taken over from some juridical repertories or sources of a similar kind which are not likely to have been consulted either by the author of the 'Kaisergeschichte' or the so called *annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus.

doubts.⁷⁸ Partisans of the fiction thesis thus cannot manage only with pointing out any slipperiness or uncertainty of Suetonius' testimony. They have to either produce stronger arguments for the case that there could have been no such testimony in the *De poetis*, or count with the strange possibility that even Suetonius, with all his interest in the Augustan period, was similarly mistaken as Pliny the Elder and probably also Statius who accepted at least Ovid's sojourn to Tomis as a historical fact.⁷⁹ The possibility that the account preserved in the *Epitome de Caesaribus* mirrors even the content of the imperial edict is interesting but cannot be proved so convincingly as to invalidate the fiction thesis without any further ado. That notwithstanding, with the very satisfactorily proven inclusion of some account of Ovid's exile in Suetonius' *De poetis* the partisans of this thesis at least face another difficulty.⁸⁰

78) Actually there is even a third late antique source to corroborate – although only in highly speculative manner – the notion of the Suetonian origin of the accounts preserved in Jerome's chronicle and the *Epitome de Caesaribus*. Sid. Apoll. Carm. 23.158–161 mentions as well only *carmina . . . libidinosa* as a reason for Ovid's banishment, thus as Festy 1999, 65 n. 24 noticed, the official one whose inclusion in the *De poetis* unlike the other, *error*, is being tried to be established above in this paper. Afterwards, Sidonius continues with the speculation about Corinna having in fact been a nickname for some *Caesarea puella*, which I guess can be precisely the kind of “nuggets of information” for whose selection from earlier historians Suetonius is complimented by Stadter 2007, 536. This, of course, does not mean that Sidonius did not himself read Ovid (the only other mention of his name by Sid. Apoll. Epist. 2.10.6 seems to suggest rather his own familiarity with Ovid's poetry), but certainly he could have known Suetonius' *De poetis* as well (despite the possibility that his only mention of Suetonius *ibid.* 9.14.7 may be a mistake, for which see Prchlík 2015, 10 n. 6, and by no means it is the *De poetis* that is hinted to there). This Suetonian account thus could have come into Sidonius' mind when composing his own poem.

79) For the former see Plin. NH 32.54.152–154, the latter's allusion in Stat. Silv. 1.2.254–255 to *tristis in ipsis / Naso Tomis* could be eventually explained away as accepting the literary play of one poet on the part of the other. These two testimonies are, nonetheless, by no means later than those eventually lacked in Tacitus, Suetonius or Cassius Dio as they are quite unhappily presented by Williams 1994, 3 in n. 2. As the third one the author of the Pompeian graffito referred to above in n. 37 probably should be added, although he can perhaps be easier considered than Pliny and Statius an uninformed victim of Ovid's alleged deception. Yet not that easily, since he probably refers to Ovid's death in Tomis as a fact, while Ovid himself obviously could have only anticipated it, for which see above n. 37.

80) Although I have announced that in this paper I would be concerned only with the alleged silence in Suetonius, let me here add one methodological note con-

References:

- André, J. 1993: *Ovide: Pontiques*, Paris.
- Baldwin, B. 1993: The Epitome de Caesaribus, from Augustus to Domitian, *QUCC* 43, 81–101.
- Bardon, H. 1952: *La littérature latine inconnue I*, Paris.
- Barnes, T. D. 1976: The Epitome de Caesaribus and Its Sources, *CPh* 71, 258–268.
- Bérez Castaño, E. 2015: El destierro de Ovidio en Tomis: realidad y ficción, Valencia.
- Birley, A. R. 1984: rev. of B. Baldwin, *Suetonius*; A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius. The Scholar and His Caesars*; L. De Coninck, *Suetonius en de Archivalia*, *JRS* 74, 245–251.
- Brugnoti, G. 1972: *C. Svetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae, pars prior, De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, Leipzig.
- Burgess, R. W. 1995: Jerome and the Kaisergeschichte, *Historia* 44, 349–369.
- Burgess, R. W. 2002: Jerome Explained: An Introduction to his Chronicle and a Guide to its Use, *AHB* 16, 1–32.
- Burgess, R. W. 2005: A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the Epitome de Caesaribus between 358 and 378, Along with Further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the Kaisergeschichte, *CPh* 100, 166–192.
- Burian, J. / Moučková, B. 1989: *Appiános: Krize římské republiky*, Praha.

cerning the debate over historicity of Ovid's exile in general and reacting to the claim by Williams 1994, 4 according to whom "negative historical statements are notoriously hard to prove, and the burden of proof must lie with those who believe the historical exile, not with those who oppose it". This claim seems to me somewhat consternating, to say the least. According to Hollis 1996, 26 Williams therewith "gets into unnecessary tangles over the relationship between literature and history", but I would rather say this claim is completely mistaken. Every historical statement can be converted into some negative one, and if someone, for example, maintained that "Ovid's exile is not a fiction", would only herewith the onus probandi be carried over to the partisans of the fiction thesis? Certainly not. What indeed matters, is our sources, and since some say that Ovid was in exile and none that his exile was a fiction, the burden of proof lies with those whose claim the sources actually do not support. The arguments *e silentio* only rarely need not be treated as only auxiliary, and the present case is not such one, since against the sources eventually silent about Ovid's exile stand those silent about his exile's having been a fiction, in particular Seneca the Elder as Hollis 1996, 26 rightly noticed, and, paradoxically enough, Suetonius' *Life of Augustus* and Tacitus' *Annals* as pointed out above in n. 28 and 52. The possibilities of many of our sources are, of course, limited as Williams' book is trying to show precisely for the case of Ovid's exile poetry, but at the same time we must be aware that when trying to correct our sources we get ourselves on yet swamplier soil. If Ovid distorts reality, and hardly one would doubt he does, we must ask why he does so, and that he in fact did not know this reality is only one of the possible answers. For preferring this answer to other ones, however, there once more must be some self-sustaining reason, but I for one see none.

- Cameron, A. 2001: *The Epitome de Caesaribus and the Chronicle of Marcellinus*, CQ 51, 324–327.
- Claassen, J.-M. 2013: *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile*, London / New Delphi / New York / Sydney.
- de Coninck, L. 1991: Les sources documentaires de Suetone, ‘Les XII Césars’: 1900–1990, ANRW 2.33.5, 3675–3700.
- Ezquerria, A. A. 2010: Ovid in Exile: Fact or Fiction?, *Analele Științifice ale Universității Ovidius Constanța. Seria Filologie* 21, 107–126.
- Festy, M. 1999: *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: Abrégé des Césars*, Paris.
- Festy, M. 2003: De l’*Epitome de Caesaribus* à la *Chronique de Marcellin: l’Historia Romana de Symmaque le Jeune*, *Historia* 52, 251–255.
- Fitton Brown, A. D. 1985: The Unreality of Ovid’s Tomitan Exile, LCM 10, 18–22.
- Gaertner, J. F. 2005: *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto*, Book I, Oxford.
- Gauville, J.-L. 2005: *Abbreviated Histories: The Case of the Epitome de Caesaribus (AD c. 395)*, Diss., McGill University.
- Gelzer, M. 1917: M. Iunius Brutus, der Caesarmörder (Iunius 53), RE X, 973–1020.
- Green, P. 1982: Carmen et Error: πρόφασις and αἰτία in the Matter of Ovid’s Exile, *ClAnt* 1, 202–220.
- Hartman, J. J. 1905: *De Ovidio poeta commentatio*, Lugduni Batavorum.
- Helm, R. 1927: Hieronymus und Eutrop, RhM 76, 138–70 and 254–306.
- Helm, R. 1929: Hieronymus’ Zusätze in Eusebius’ Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte, *Philologus Supplbd.* 21, Heft 2, Leipzig.
- Helzle, M. 2003: *Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto*, Buch I–II, Heidelberg.
- Hollis, A. S. 1996: *Ovidius Exulans*, CR 46, 26–27.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2017: Some New and Old Light on the Reasons for Ovid’s Exile, *ZPE* 203, 76–84.
- Huzar, E. 1982: The Literary Efforts of Mark Antony, ANRW 2.30.1, 639–657.
- Janssen, O. 1951: De verbanning van Ovidius. Waarheid of fictie?, in: O. Janssen / A. Galama, *Uit de Romeinse keizertijd, ’s-Hertogenbosch*, 77–105.
- Kienast, D. 1990: *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt.
- Koestermann, E. 1965: *Cornelius Tacitus: Annalen*, Band II, Buch 4–6, Heidelberg.
- Little, A. D. 1990: Ovid’s Last Poems: Cry of Pain from Exile or Literary Frolic in Rome?, *Prudentia* 22, 23–39.
- Mommsen, Th. 1899: *Römisches Strafrecht*, Leipzig.
- Mommsen, Th. 1909: Ueber die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus, in: Th. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften VII*, Berlin, 606–632.
- Opitz, Th. 1872: *Quaestionum de Sex. Aurelio Victore capita tria, Acta societatis philologiae Lipsiensis* 2, 197–279.
- Owen, S. G. 1889: *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristivm libri V*, Oxford.
- Pichlmayr, F. 1961: *Sexti Avrelīi Victoris Liber de Caesaribvs*, Leipzig.
- Power, T. J. 2010: Pliny, Letters 5.10 and the Literary Career of Suetonius, *JRS* 100, 140–162.
- Prchlíř, I. 2015: The Fiery Eyes of Augustus and the annales of Nicomachus Flavianus, *GLP* 25, 9–20.
- Prchlíř, I. 2017: The Murder of the Innocents in the Saturnalia and the Religion of Macrobius, *Klio* 99, 260–277.

- Reifferscheid, A. 1860: *C. Svetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*, Leipzig.
- Richmond, J. A. 1990: *P. Ovidi Nasonis Ex Ponto libri quattuor*, Leipzig.
- Rolfe, J. C. 1914: *Suetonius with an English Translation II*, London / New York.
- Roth, K. L. 1907: *C. Svetoni Tranquilli quae supersunt omnia, fasc. II: De grammaticis et rhetoribus, deperditorum librorum reliquiae*, Leipzig.
- Schlumberger, J. 1974: *Die Epitome de Caesaribus*. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr., Munich.
- Schlumberger, J. 1976: „Non scribo sed dicto“ (HA, T 33, 8): Hat der Autor der *Historia Augusta* mit Stenographen gearbeitet?, *BHAC* 1972/4, 221–238.
- Stadter, Ph. 2007: *Biography and History*, in: J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford, 528–540.
- Teuffel, W. S. 1916: *Geschichte der römischen Literatur I*, Leipzig / Berlin.
- Thibault, J. C. 1964: *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Tissol, G. 2014: *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto*, book I, Cambridge.
- Van Hook, L. 1945: *Isocrates in three volumes III*, Cambridge, MA / London.
- Williams, G. D. 1994: *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Wisse, J. 2013: *Remembering Cremutius Cordus: Tacitus on History, Tyranny and Memory*, *Histos* 7, 299–361, <<http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/2013A11WisseRememberingCremutiusCordus.pdf>>.