

SUMMO GENERE GNATUS
Aristocratic Bias in Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius*

“Auch Clio dichtet.”
German title of Hayden White’s *Tropics of Discourse*

Hayden White’s notion that even the muse of historiography does not inspire eruptions of truth “wie es eigentlich gewesen”¹ has long since become a truism among literary critics. Clio restricts her devotees to mere interpretations of the data they have available, and even the most conscientious historians have to rely on their own understanding of the world as they try to arrange disjointed events into what they consider sensible narratives. In the process, they downplay or emphasize; at times, they openly state their biases; elsewhere, they communicate them less consciously through word placement, characterizations, or stylistic choices.² The 96 fragments of Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius’ *Annales* have occasionally attracted the attention of classical scholars interested in the historian’s politics, but while it is all but undisputed that his outlook was conservative,³ there has not yet been a focused dis-

*) My warm thanks go to Antonios Augoustakis and Danuta Shanzer for inspiring this project, reading numerous drafts, and encouraging me along the way. I am also indebted to my anonymous referees for comments that I have found extremely helpful.

1) Leopold von Ranke’s famous dictum, often quoted to (mis-)represent his belief in the possibility to reconstruct past realities, can be found in L. v. Ranke, *Geschichte der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (Leipzig 1885) vii. For brief introductions to the thought of Ranke and White cf. M. Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (London / New York 2008) 293–300 and 388–395 respectively.

2) Cf., for example, H. White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore / London 1975) 1–42; id., *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore / London 1985) 51–100, 121–135.

3) D. Timpe, *Erwägungen zur jüngeren Annalistik*, *A&A* 25.2 (1979) 113: “Das bisher Gesagte legt vielmehr nahe, [die Annalisten] für Personen aus der italienischen Munizipalaristokratie oder dem Ritterstand zu halten, die als Klienten von Angehörigen der sullanischen Nobilität schrieben.” See also Timpe 108, 113–114; F. Klingner, *Römische Geisteswelt* (München 1956) 84–85. One exception is M. I. Henderson, *Potestas Regia*, *JRS* 47 (1957) 82–87. The seminal treatment of the

cussion of the subject. In what follows, I will fill this gap by closely examining the extant fragments for their author's prejudices. While the assumption of traditionalist partiality is warranted, I will be able to define his position more precisely. Rather than adopting a specifically pro-Sullan stance, Quadrigarius more generally embraces the contested world view of Rome's beleaguered nobility.

A discussion of Quadrigarius' politics necessarily has to touch upon the competing ideologies of his day. Velleius Paterculus (2.9) locates the annalist roughly at the turn of the second century BCE, and it seems that Quadrigarius' *Annales* dealt with Roman history from the Gallic sack of 390/387 down to his own present. Marius' seventh consulship of the year 87 still finds mention, and the latest datable reference comes from book nineteen out of (at least) twenty-three and deals with Lucius Cornelius Sulla's defeat of the younger Gaius Marius at Sacriportus in 82 (frg. 84 HRR).⁴ It is the civic strife of the post-Gracchan late Republic, then, that shaped Quadrigarius' political views.

In the late decades of the second century, the Roman nobility found its time-honored supremacy facing a multi-angular attack. *Equites* from a lower social and economic rung demanded greater rights for participation, and the expanding Republic's allies simultaneously pushed for increased influence. Much-needed property reforms alleviated some of the immediate pressure to provide pensions for the wars' many veterans, but at the same time threatened

annalist by M. Zimmerer (Der Annalist Qu. Claudius Quadrigarius [München 1937]), touches upon Quadrigarius' political views on p. 77: "[Claudius' eigener politischer Standpunkt] ist der Standpunkt des Senats als der höchsten Verkörperung des Staates, die über den Interessengruppen steht und deren Autorität immer und rückhaltlos anerkannt und verteidigt wird." Cf. also Zimmerer 79, 87, 168–175. However, this statement is not based on a close reading of the extant fragments but on an interpretation of a corpus Zimmerer vastly expands. The most recent discussions are S. L. Bastian, *Osservazioni sui frammenti* 83 P. e 88 O. di Claudio Quadrigario, *AFMC* 3 (1978–1979) 5–13; S. L. Bastian, *Significato del frg. 64 a P. di Claudio Quadrigario nel quadro della sua propaganda politica*, *AFMC* 4 (1980) 283–306; and S. L. Bastian, *Q. Claudii Quadrigarii Annalium Reliquiae: Introduzione, testo critico e commento filologico* (Rome 2005) 9–45.

4) It is strictly for easier reference that all fragments are quoted from H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1883). M. Chassignet (ed.), *L'annalistique romaine, Tome III: L'annalistique récente / L'autobiographie politique* (fragments) (Paris 2004) as well as H. Beck and U. Walter (eds.), *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker II: Von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus* (Darmstadt 2004) include concordances to HRR, as does Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n. 3).

to reduce the aristocracy's land holdings. As the noblemen's power waned, their class also encountered a serious challenge to the propagandistic legitimizations of their dominance. The nobility traditionally projected an image of unflinching martial prowess, unselfish leadership, and unquestioning patriotism to justify their social prominence. However, as the legions incurred repeated defeats against Spanish and German tribes, the upper class's reputation for excellence came under serious scrutiny. The various interest groups eventually coalesced into two more or less cohesive parties – the progressive *populares* and the conservative *optimates* bent on preserving the aristocracy's prerogatives – and it was *popularis* leader Gaius Marius in particular who launched a concerted attack on the nobility's basis of power. Moreover, various aristocrats broke ranks with their peers and sought personal successes at the expense of joint rule and class cohesion.⁵

There is circumstantial evidence that Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius would have sided with the *optimates*. Extant ancient historiography is mostly conservative,⁶ and even the annalist's name makes him a likely sympathizer of the traditionalists. The *gens Claudia*, after all, was among the Roman nobility's most noteworthy. His odd *cognomen*, loosely translated as “the jockey,”⁷ seems to have been a nickname invented by a reverential successor. It only occurs in later writers like Velleius and Seneca and is not attested in Livy, who used Quadrigarius as an important source for his *Ab Urbe Condita* and provides us with a number of fragments.⁸

5) K. Christ, Sulla: Eine römische Karriere (München³2005) 11–53; K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Exempla* und *mos maiorum*: Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität, in: H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (eds.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (Tübingen 1996) 301–338, reprinted and updated as K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Senatus Populusque Romanus: Die politische Kultur der Republik – Dimensionen und Deutungen* (Stuttgart 2004) 169–198; M. McDonnell, Roman Manliness: *Virtus* and the Roman Republic (Cambridge 2006) 181–205, 241–292. For (earlier, greater) aristocratic class cohesion in the institution of the senate in spite of the *nobiles'* competition for honors and positions cf. K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the Nobilitas*, *Historia* 42 (1993) 12–39, translated and updated as Hölkeskamp, *Senatus Populusque Romanus*, 11–48.

6) E. Badian, *Waiting for Sulla*, *JRS* 52 (1962) 47–61; McDonnell (above, n. 5) 267; Zimmerer (above, n. 3) 19–20.

7) Zimmerer (above, n. 3) 3.

8) W.S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur I* (Leipzig⁶1916) 290–291. Gary Forsythe recently suggested that the *cognomen* ‘Quadrigarius’ may not

While there are two references to him as “Clodius,” the plebeian variant of his *nomen gentile*,⁹ it is dubious whether these citations even actually refer to Quadrigarius. The overwhelming majority of *loci* employ the patrician spelling.¹⁰ A desertion to the plebeian side is unlikely, since Suetonius mentions that Publius Claudius Pulcher’s actions to the same effect were unprecedented (Tib. 2.4).

Yet a patrician name alone does not provide sufficient evidence for optimate leanings, as is amply demonstrated by such distinguished *populares* as the Gracchi and Julius Caesar. Furthermore, Quadrigarius’ unusual *praenomen* has led to the speculation that he was not himself a *nobilis*, but an *eques* or a member of the Italian aristocracy.¹¹ Quadrigarius’ statements about Gaius Marius, however, can be more indicative. At NA 20.6.11, Aulus Gellius, who contributes the largest number of fragments to the Quadrigarian corpus, quotes from the *Annales*:

C. Mari, equando te nostrum et rei publicae miserebitur?

Gaius Marius, will you ever take pity on us and the Republic?¹² (frg. 83 HRR)

This indignant apostrophe certainly accuses the *homo novus* of a noted lack of clemency and a potentially treasonous indifference to the common good. Yet Gellius was not concerned with Quadrigarius’ political views, but with his usage of *nos* in the genitive. It is hardly certain, therefore, that fragment 83 reflects the views of

make the historian out to be fond of the race track but rather constitute a reference to his detailed descriptions of the capitol with its statue of Jupiter in a four-horse chariot. This theory is in keeping with the observation that the name must have derived from later readers. Cf. G. Forsythe, Claudius Quadrigarius and Livy’s Second Pentad, in: John Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford 2008) II 391–396.

9) Cic. leg. 1.6.

10) E. Badian, *The Early Historians*, in: T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Historians* (London 1966) 20; Teuffel (above, n. 8) 290–291; Zimmerer (above, n. 3) 3–4, 14–16.

11) Cf. Chassignet, AR III, XXV; Timpe (above, n. 3) 107–108, who do not, however, question his association with the senate party. For the annalist’s likely social provenance and the resulting need for authentication evident in his writings see also U. Walter, *Opfer ihrer Ungleichzeitigkeit: Die Gesamtgeschichten im ersten Jahrhundert v. Chr. und die fortdauernde Attraktivität des ‘annalistischen Schemas’*, in: U. Eigler / U. Gotter / N. Luraghi / U. Walter (eds), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen – Autoren – Kontexte* (Darmstadt 2003) 135–156.

12) All translations from the Latin are my own.

the historian as opposed to the opinion of one of his protagonists. After all, we know from other quotations that Quadrigarius employed fictional speeches and letters in his *Annales*, and a rhetorical question like the one in frg. 83 HRR is more likely to have been an oratorical feature (i. e.: part of a speech) than an outburst by the annalist.¹³ Gellius would not have made this distinction, as is evident from a quotation from Sallust's *Coniuratio Catilinae*, a mere two paragraphs later. Here, the miscellanist labels a speech Sallust attributes to Gaius Manlius with the generic reference "*in Catilina [Sallusti]*".¹⁴ Furthermore, we should not forget that Marius was already dead at the time Quadrigarius completed his *œuvre*. While the question could be addressed to the politician's homonymous son, the latter died in the same year of 82 which is mentioned in fragment 84. It is highly unlikely that the *Annales* saw publication in the brief time span between the battle of Sacriportus and the younger *popularis*' death. Quadrigarius could, of course, have been apostrophizing the *manes* of either Marius and decrying the detrimental impact their politics continued to have on the *res publica*. Yet the solution I consider most likely is that one of the *Annales*' protagonists is ventriloquizing the historian's own opinion from a time when Marius was still alive. In absence of the lines surrounding the fragment, this suspicion can only stand up to scrutiny as we find more explicit testimony to Quadrigarius' conservative leanings.

Fragments 10b and 12 HRR offer themselves to a deeper analysis of Quadrigarius' politics. Not only are they the longest passages to survive and thus to be considered more representative than the remaining corpus, but Gellius, for once, was not solely interested in linguistic oddities. Rather, he picks frg. 12 from a variety of reports by distinguished competitors ("there is not one of the illustrious historians who spoke otherwise" – *haut quisquam est nobilium scriptorum, qui secus dixerit*, NA 9.11.1) and praises Quadrigarius for having rendered 10b in a manner "exceptionally frank and clear, and with the straightforward and unpolished pleas-

13) Beck/Walter, FRH II 162 are certain that "[d]as mariuskritische Fragment stammt aus einer Rede." Bastian, *Osservazioni* (above, n.3) 6 disagrees: "E' inutile fare delle ipotesi per definire la realtà storica del personaggio che pronuncia il discorso, anche perché, come mi sembra più probabile, potrebbe trattarsi di un'apostrofe dello stesso storico." Cf. also Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n.3), 219.

14) Gell. NA 20.6.14 = Sall. Cat. 33.2.

antness of his traditional style” (*purissime atque inlustrissime simplicique et incompta orationis antiquae suavitate descripsit*, NA 9.13.4). As such, they are likely to have been particularly illustrative of an author whose style was frequently revered.¹⁵ Furthermore, these episodes’ self-contained nature makes it possible to dismiss much of the skepticism that is often rightly brought forth against any interpretation of fragmentary writings. After all, their beginning, middle, and end are preserved (including a morale), and we do not have to worry if a better understanding of the fragments’ contexts would profoundly change our interpretation.¹⁶ The biases we thus identify are likely to have been reflected in the work as a whole and will help put our more conjectural reading of the shorter *reliquiae* on solid footing.

The content of the fragments in question is politically charged. 10b and 12 HRR cover the exploits of noted noblemen Titus Manlius Torquatus and Maximus Valerius Corvinus respectively. Both earned their *cognomina* by defeating Gallic warriors in single combat. Myles McDonnell has adduced numismatic evidence to illustrate how prominently Torquatus, Corvinus, and other monomachists featured in the late second century’s campaign to restore the *optimates*’ martial credibility.¹⁷ It was an institutionalized tradition within the Roman army to provide individuals with the op-

15) Cf. testimonia in frgs. 2, 3 and 4 HRR.

16) Cf. Beck/Walter, FRH II 28–29: “Wörtliche Zitate aus Werken antiker Philologen, die sich für sprachliche Besonderheiten interessierten, sind meist sehr kurz und ohne Kontext. [...] Unproblematisch und zugleich besonders wertvoll sind längere, inhaltlich abgeschlossene wörtliche Zitate, wie sie besonders durch Gellius erhalten sind.”

17) McDonnell (above, n. 5) 248–258. Note also Sallust’s rendering of Marius’ attack on this very reliance on ancestors’ deeds in lieu of a presentation of one’s own qualifications at Iug. 85.21: *atque etiam, quod apud vos aut in senatu verba faciunt, pleraque oratione maiores suos extollunt: eorum fortia facta memorando clariores sese putant* – “and furthermore, what they do either when they talk to you in private or when they address the senate is to praise their ancestors with many a speech. They think that they themselves become more distinguished if they bring up their forebears’ forceful feats.” Sallust, of course, lived one generation after Marius and therefore did not cite the general’s actual words. Yet the social struggles were still very much alive in his day, and he is likely to have preserved some genuine thought of the *populares*. Cf. also Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n. 3), 35 (“la classe dirigente romana, e Claudio Quadrigario, non lo dimentichiamo, fa sua la posizione ottimale, aveva tutto da guadagnare nel rivolgere l’attenzione al tempo passato”); Klingner (above, n. 3) 84–85 (“Die neue Legende dient zum guten Teil der Verherrlichung einer Familie.”); McDonnell (above, n. 5) 272–273 and note 25 below.

portunity of proving their superiority by answering the challenge to duel an intimidating opponent.¹⁸ Optimate moneyers therefore hoped that past generations' glory in this area would make contemporary noblemen appear in a more favorable light. It is in such contested tales of the aristocracy's abilities that Quadrigarius' biases are most likely to appear.

Let us look at fragment 10b:

cum interim Gallus quidam nudus praeter scutum et gladios duos torque atque armillis decoratus processit, qui et uiribus et magnitudine et adulescentia simulque uirtute ceteris antistabat. is maxime proelio commoto atque utrisque summo studio pugnantibus manu significare coepit utrisque, quiescerent. pugnae facta pausa est. extemplo silentio facto cum uoce maxima conclamat, si quis secum depugnare uellet, uti prodiret. nemo audebat propter magnitudinem atque inmanitatem facies. deinde Gallus inridere coepit atque linguam exertare. id subito perdoliturum est cuidam Tito Manlio, summo genere gnato, tantum flagitium ciuitati accidere, e tanto exercitu neminem prodire. is, ut dico, processit neque passus est uirtutem Romanam ab Gallo turpiter spoliari. [...] ita [...] constiterunt: Gallus sua disciplina scuto proiecto cantabundus, Manlius animo magis quam arte confisus scuto scutum percussit atque statum Galli conturbauit. dum se Gallus iterum eodem pacto constitutere studet, Manlius iterum scuto scutum percutit atque de loco hominem iterum deiecit: eo pacto ei sub Gallicum gladium successit atque Hispanico pectus hausit [...]. ubi eum euertit, caput praecidit, torquem detraxit eamque sanguinolentam sibi in collum inponit. quo ex facto ipse posterique eius Torquati sunt cognominati.

In the meantime, a certain Gaul – naked, except for his shield and two swords, and adorned with a torque and bracelets – stepped forward, a Gaul who outshined the others in terms of strength and height and youth and, at the same time, valor. At the peak of the battle, as both sides were fighting with relentless vigor, he began to make signs with his hand at both sides to cease hostilities. A pause was made in the combat. As soon as silence was made, he yelled at the top of his lungs that whoever wanted to duel with him should step forward. Because of the Gaul's height and the savageness of his features, nobody dared to answer the challenge. Then the Gaul started laughing at them and sticking out his tongue. This fact immediately pained one Titus Manlius, a man of the most prominent provenance, namely that such a disgrace was befalling the citizenry, that from such an enormous army no one stepped forth. He, like I am saying, stepped forward and did not accept that Roman valor was despoiled by the Gaul in such a ghastly fashion. [...] Thus they were facing each other: The Gaul was singing and – according to his learned method – had his shield thrust out; Manlius

18) S. P. Oakley, *Single Combat in the Roman Republic*, CQ 35.2 (1985) 392–410.

relying on his inborn courage more than on any training struck shield on shield and weakened the Gaul's stance. While the Gaul was once more trying to place himself in the same position, Manlius once more struck shield on shield and chased the man from his place once more. In this manner, Manlius managed to get below the Gaul's sword and gouged his opponent's chest with his own Spanish weapon [...]. When he had felled his enemy, he sliced his head off, pulled the blood-spattered torque from the Gaul's neck and placed it around his own. On account of this deed, Manlius and his offspring received the nickname "the Torquati." (Gell. NA 9.13.7)

As historians turn 'facts' into tales, they have to rely – for lack of alternative models – on strategies employed by writers of fiction. In his seminal analysis of this phenomenon, Hayden White stated that one frequent pattern of arranging information into a seemingly sensible sequence of cause and effect was the so-called 'Romance': "It is a drama of the triumph of good over evil, of virtue over vice, of light over darkness [...]."¹⁹ That fragment 10b is the tale of Manlius' triumph is clear, since Quadrigarius' stated concern is with the *gens Manlia's* acquisition of its famous *cognomen*. The tale, after all, culminates in *posterique eius Torquati sunt cognominati*. By identifying those qualities that Quadrigarius describes as bringing about this triumph – his hero's 'virtue' according to White – we can bring the annalist's prejudices into focus.

The remedy Titus Manlius provides for the Gallic menace is his noble heritage. As Wolfgang Schibel observes,²⁰ fragment 10b must constitute the first occurrence of Manlius in the general narrative – he is referred to as *cuidam* – and what Quadrigarius says to characterize him here thus becomes tantamount to what the author considered important about the protagonist. As Manlius makes his entrance, the annalist describes him concisely as *summo genere gnatus*. As both an alliteration and a *figura etymologica*,²¹ this participial phrase with its epic resonance and archaizing rendering of the perfect passive participle attracts added attention to the grandeur of Manlius' ancient family line. Quadrigarius thus highlights aristocratic origins as the main constitutive characteristic of the hero.

19) White, *Metahistory* (above, n.2), 9.

20) W. Schibel, *Sprachbehandlung und Darstellungsweise in römischer Prosa: Claudius Quadrigarius, Livius, Aulus Gellius* (Amsterdam 1971) 21–22.

21) Schibel (above, n.20) 21.

Schibel disagrees with the statement that Manlius' tale is one of an aristocrat whose qualities save the day. He argues that it is the honor of the entire Roman *populus* that the protagonist defends, and that despite Quadrigarius' interest in the Roman *gentes*, Torquatus ultimately acts not as a nobleman but as a representative Roman.²² And yet the wording of the passage indicates otherwise. The Gaul's offense may indeed be described as pertaining to the entire citizen body (*tantum flagitium civitati accidere*), and Manlius feels pain not for himself (or his *gens*) but for the entire *virtus Romana* (*neque passus est virtutem Romanam ab Gallo turpiter spoliari*). However, these statements actually strengthen rather than weaken the assumption that the protagonist is acting as an exemplary nobleman. One of the aristocracy's traditional approaches toward preserving its joined rule was to stigmatize too great an accumulation of power in one person. While aristocratic displays of greatness did serve to justify the class's societal prominence (and thus featured so prominently in the day's optimate propaganda), the traditional nobleman had to subordinate his aspirations to the interests of the state, both to please his peers and to ensure elections by the people.²³ It is Quadrigarius' intention to praise just such a combination of personal and class-based distinction with an eagerness to serve the *res publica*, as is demonstrated by the passage's word order. Quadrigarius closely entwines references to Manlius' aristocratic excellence with statements that point out his acting in the interest of the entire army: the first allusion to his heritage (*summo genere gnato*) is followed immediately by a reference to the disgrace felt by the entire *civitas* (*tantum flagitium civitati accidere*). Then, in strictly parallel structure, another allusion to Manlius' exceptional qualities (*e tanto exercitu neminem prodire*) is interlocked with a repeated testimony to his patriotism

22) Schibel (above, n.20) 65: "Seine Geschlechtszugehörigkeit ist gleichgültig. [... Sie] bildet nur die Brücke zu seinem Bürgertum; sie ist nicht selbst der Ausgangs- oder der Zielpunkt seines Handelns."

23) Schibel (above, n.20) 22 himself notes: "So unterstützt das adelige Selbstbewußtsein das Verantwortungsgefühl für das Ganze." Cf. also McDonnell (above, n. 5) 181–205 and (for the provenance of the aristocrats' self-image, including service to the *populus* as a constitutive element) K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Die Entstehung der Nobilität: Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jhdt. v. Chr.* (Stuttgart 1987) 204–240; Hölkeskamp, *Conquest, Competition and Consensus* (above, n. 5), 12–39 = Hölkeskamp, *Senatus Populusque Romanus* (above, n. 5), 11–48.

(*is, ut dico, processit neque passus est uirtutem Romanam ab Gallo turpiter spoliari*). The close proximity of the two negatives *neminem* and *neque* further underlines the connection between the last two phrases. Within this entangled sentence, the centrality of Manlius' nobility, in spite of his dedication to the common good, is made particularly obvious by the anaphoric antithesis of *tantum flagitium* and *e tanto exercitu neminem prodire*. The cowardice of so great an army amplifies the disgrace of the common people and, in turn, makes Manlius appear as an even more shining example of Roman virtue.²⁴

The importance of the term *virtus Romana* itself should not be underrated. J. Hellegouarc'h and Myles McDonnell (inter alios) have traced the term's shifting usages through the first century and pointed out that, in the days when the aristocracy's dominance had remained uncontested, *virtus* had been associated specifically with the highest class's behavior. Yet when the social climbers of the first century established a claim to equal prominence, they started to express their own perceived superiority by redefining the meaning of this most Roman of terms. Quite necessarily, they had to belittle the importance of heritage in the process. Instead, they stressed that their own advancement through hard labor should outrank the privileges of high birth. *Virtus* had thus become a charged and contested term, and while their definitions differed, both camps claimed it as indicative of their own distinction.²⁵ In Quadrigarius' rendition of the Torquatus episode, it is significant that a nobleman saves the *virtus Romana*, as the commoners cannot help but stand

24) Cf. Schibel (above, n. 20) 22: "Die anaphorische Stellung von *e tanto (exercitu)* nach *tantum (flagitium)* erzeugt den Gedanken, daß die Schmach um so viel größer ist, als das Heer so groß ist."

25) J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République* (Paris 1972) 476–478; McDonnell (above, n. 5) 241–292. An example of such attitudes can be found in Sallust's rendering of a speech of Gaius Marius at Iug. 85 (cf. note 17). Employing the new definition of virtue, the leader of the *populares*, a *homo novus* himself, states that he received his nobility from his virtuous behavior (*ex virtute nobilitas coepit*). His own *virtus* is based on his military accomplishments rather than upper-class genes. He continues: *Hae sunt meae imagines, haec nobilitas, non hereditate relicta, ut illa illis, sed quae ego meis plurimis laboribus et periculis quaesivi* – "These are my ancestral masks, this is my nobility, which has not been bequeathed to me through an inheritance (like theirs to them), but which I earned through my many toils and trials." Cf. in particular McDonnell (above, n. 5) 272–275.

idly by. Quadrigarius has traditional qualities of the *nobiles* symbolically defeat the *homines novi* and their own claim to 'valor'.

Furthermore, Quadrigarius also grants *virtus* in the aristocratic sense to the Gallic warrior (*qui et uiribus et magnitudine et adulescentia simulque uirtute ceteris antistabat*). *Virtus* occurs here in a climactic listing of physical qualities and, as such, should not be considered an acquired value but a mark of class. Ironically, what distinguishes the Roman monomachist from the rest of the *exercitus* connects him to his foreign adversary. However, Quadrigarius renders even the latter's ultimate defeat in terms of first-century class conflict. This interpretation is supported by the observation that the annalist provides another explanation for Torquatus' triumph that supplements the earlier *summo genere gnato*. Manlius fights *animo magis quam arte confisus*, while the Gaul ultimately fails because of his sole dependence on rigid, learned techniques that make him inflexible. He cannot help but apply the same failed tactics repeatedly (note *eodem pacto* and the repetition of *iterum*). The term used by Quadrigarius to sum up these uninspired fighting techniques is *disciplina*.²⁶ Therefore, the juxtaposition in the actual fighting scene is not between the Roman and the Gaul but between inborn *animus* on the one hand and learned *disciplina* and *ars* on the other. *Disciplina*, however, is often applied to the methods of the Roman army as well.²⁷ Since it is their greater experience in such fields as the military that the social climbers use to contest the old aristocracy's sole claim to *virtus*, the fact that Manlius' aristocratic *animus* trumps the Gaul's learned *disciplina* deals yet another propagandistic blow to the *popularis* party. The assumption that this is in fact how Quadrigarius wanted the scene to be read gains further credibility if we consider that *magnitudo animi* was another necessary condition for *virtus* according to the old aristocratic definition.²⁸ *Animus*, then, is another loaded term and a core value of the *optimates*, and it triumphs over terminology associated with the *populares*.

26) Schibel (above, n. 20) 25 notes: "In der Stereotypie seiner *disciplina* gefangen, versucht [der Gallier], die erste, bereits mißlungene Aktion erneut auszuführen." Cf. also M. v. Albrecht, *Meister römischer Prosa von Cato bis Apuleius: Interpretationen* (Heidelberg 1971) 115, 118; Schibel (above, n. 20) 66.

27) E. g., Cic. *Tusc.* 1.2; *Caes. Gal.* 6.14; *Liv.* 8.6.14; *Tac. Ann.* 15.67.

28) Hellegouarc'h (above, n. 25) 290.

A comparison between fragment 10b and Livy's version of the scene at 7.9.6–7.10.14 has been undertaken perhaps too many times.²⁹ Yet the changes Livy makes to Quadrigarius' narrative are still indicative of both authors' differing perspectives and thus bear importance for our understanding of Quadrigarius' value system.³⁰ After all, Livy stresses the importance of this source himself,³¹ and the changes he introduces into the account therefore betray what elements of the *Annales* the Augustan historian considered too idiosyncratic to be included in his own work. A brief juxtaposition will provide further evidence that Quadrigarius actually considered Manlius a nobleman first and foremost.

It should, in this context, perhaps not be overstated that Livy (unlike Quadrigarius) has 'his' Manlius ask the express permission of his commander before he engages in the duel. Asking permission is a topos in the long tradition of such scenes of single combat (toward the creation of which Livy may have significantly contributed),³² and it helps commit the aristocrat's actions to the interests of the people at large in a way Quadrigarius would also have favored. Furthermore, this detail is a necessary precondition for a scene, later in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, when Torquatus puts his son to death for having failed to show this kind of deference before a similar contest (8.7.1–8.8.1). Still, while Livy's insertion of Torquatus' appeal to the dictator retains the double loyalty to father and fatherland found in his source ("Then the dictator said, 'May you be honored for your valor and your piety toward your father and your fatherland, Titus Manlius' – *tum dictator 'macte virtute,' inquit, 'ac pietate in patrem patriamque, T. Manli, esto'*, Liv. 7.10.4), his version is more elaborate and dramatic ("Without your explicit permission, Sir,' Manlius said, 'I would never fight outside the ranks, not even if I should see certain victory'" – *'iniussu tuo,' inquit, 'imperator, extra ordinem nunquam pugnaverim, non si certam victoriam videam'*, Liv. 7.10.2). Although he thus significantly strengthens the importance of Torquatus' 'noble' submission, Livy, in fact, reduces the admiration of his protagonist's lofty origins.

29) Cf. running notes.

30) Cf. v. Albrecht (above, n. 26) 114: "Da Livius im Ganzen ausführlicher berichtet, sind die Auslassungen desto bezeichnender."

31) Fragment 10a HRR = Liv. 6.42.3.

32) A. Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley / Los Angeles 1998) 96 n. 4; Oakley (above, n. 18) *passim*.

The monomachist himself points out that he is an offspring “of that family which flung the Gallic horde from the Tarpeian rock” (*me ex ea familia ortum quae Gallorum agmen ex rupe Tarpeia deiecit*, Liv. 7.10.3), but the praise is implicit and no longer uttered by the tale’s narrator. The stress of the *Ab Urbe Condita* scene thus becomes a quite different one. Livy’s Torquatus acts explicitly as an integrated member of a great society (“Go ahead and – with the gods on your side – honor Rome’s invincible name!” – *perge et nomen Romanum invictum iuvantibus dis praesta*, Liv. 7.10.4). The group he belongs to is that of young Romans, not so much of noble Romans (“Then the youth was outfitted by his equals in age” – *armant inde iuvenem aequales*, Liv. 7.10.5), and it is at the most dramatic moments of the tale that Livy refers to him not by his name but simply as a *Romanus*.³³ Quadrigarius, due to his different focus, had referred to him by his *nomen gentile* (*Manlius*) in these passages. Livy’s changed times have effected different concerns, namely one with the ‘Roman’ versus the ‘Foreigner’, not with the upperclassman’s superiority over the masses.

It is in keeping with this reading that Livy also removes Quadrigarius’ references to the Gaul’s iterative behavior. The essential *animo magis quam arte confisus* is also missing.³⁴ Far from acting in an underhanded manner, he calls self-reflexive attention to this intertextual move by describing Torquatus’ superiority in similar words but with a different take. Note Livy’s use of *magis quam* in the following passage:

corpus alteri magnitudine eximium, versicolori veste pictisque et auro caelatis refulgens armis; media in altero militaris statura modicaque in armis habilibus magis quam decoris species.

The first man’s body was of excessive height and gleaming due to a glittering garment and weapons embossed in gold; the other man’s stature was moderate for a military man and he was a modest sight with his weapons that were easy to wield rather than impressive to look at. (Liv. 7.10.7)

Uninterested in the distinguished fighting skills of a Roman nobleman, Livy has Torquatus, not his opponent, appear as a profes-

33) Cf. v. Albrecht (above, n. 26) 116; Schibel (above, n. 20) 49.

34) v. Albrecht (above, n. 26) 116: “Wenn Livius den Gallier zuerst angreifen läßt, so unterstreicht er dadurch die Korrektheit des Römers, während die Bemerkung des Claudius *animo magis quam arte confisus* ihm wohl die Schulfremdheit des Manlius zu stark zu betonen schien.”

sional soldier (*in armis habilibus magis quam decoris*), which in the newer tale has become a positive attribute. The Gaul, on the other hand, has been reduced to a ‘barbarian’, a gross³⁵ beast (*belua*) of excessive luxuriousness in his garb.³⁶ Accordingly, Livy’s modification of the most characteristically ‘Quadrigarian’ lines proves their distinctive quality and incompatibility with the prejudices of the Augustan’s own day.

In addition, we should note that there is further proof in Quadrigarius’ extant fragments that *summo genere gnato* is more than a mere descriptive, and that the annalist’s interest – unlike Livy’s – was more in class than it was in nationality. The phrase recurs in fragment 15 HRR:

Persuadent cuidam adulescenti Lucano, qui adprime summo genere gnatus erat, sed luxuria et nequitia pecuniam magnam consumpserat.

They recruit[ed] a certain young Lucanian, who had been of particularly prominent provenance, but had in his lavishness and opulence squandered a great sum of money.

Here, as in 10b, *cuidam* indicates that the Lucanian has not previously occurred in the narrative and requires an introduction and a characterization. Once more, Quadrigarius employs *summo genere gnatus* for the purpose. It is the annalist’s interest in class qualities that enables him to apply the same impressive phrase to an enemy of Rome³⁷ and one of the city’s most distinguished heroes, as long as they are both of lofty birth. Here, however, he is passing an even more direct moral judgment, as is underlined by the conjunction separating the two halves of the relative clause. The antithetical *sed* in combination with the pluperfect tense underlines

35) Livy apologizes for mentioning details of the Gallic warrior’s inappropriate behavior: *quoniam id quoque memoria dignum antiquis visum est* – “For to the ancients, even this seemed worthy of memory” (Liv. 7.10.5).

36) It is in keeping with Livy’s take on the Roman-Barbarian dichotomy that ‘his’ Manlius does not decapitate his foe. Cf. also v. Albrecht (above, n. 26) 116; Feldherr (above, n. 32) 97–98. For Livy’s reducing the Gaul to a prototypical barbarian cf. also B. Kremer, *Das Bild der Kelten bis in die augusteische Zeit* (Stuttgart 1994) 70–75 and very briefly R. Heinze and K. Büchner, *Livius und Claudius Quadrigarius*, in: E. Burck (ed.), *Wege zu Livius* (Darmstadt 1967) 376–382 as well as J. Lipovsky, *A Historiographical Study of Livy: Books VI–X* (Salem, New Hampshire 1984) 95. Klingner (above, n. 3) 84 imprecisely considers Quadrigarius’ (not Livy’s) Torquatus tale one of Romanness overcoming “Barbarentum.”

37) For a more detailed rendition of this enemy’s story, cf. Liv. 8.27.

the incompatibility of high origins and degenerate wastefulness. The aristocracy's deterrents often brought forth the charge of reckless extravagance,³⁸ but to Quadrigarius nobility self-evidently meant excellent behavior on top of excellent genes, which is consistent with that class's traditional self-perception.³⁹ When the Lucanian left the realm of acceptable behavior, he could no longer lay claim to his lofty origins.⁴⁰ This condemnation of excess luxuries helps sharpen our focus on Quadrigarius' place within the optimate movement. Such noblemen as sought to exceed their peers at the expense of the groups' shared interests often went through massive amounts of money in little time.⁴¹ Quadrigarius may then have been on the side of those who would condemn not just all *populares*, but even the occasional optimate if he too obviously put his personal interests ahead of those of the nobility.⁴² This is clearly in keeping with the idealized images of Roman noblemen that he presents in fragments 10b and 12 HRR.⁴³

38) Cf., e. g., Sall. Iug. 85.41.

39) For this aspect of the nobility's self-image cf., again, Hölkeskamp, Entstehung der Nobilität (above, n. 23), 204–240 (for the importance of wealth and frugality particularly 228); Hölkeskamp, Conquest, Competition and Consensus (above, n. 5), 12–39 = Hölkeskamp, Senatus Populusque Romanus (above, n. 5), 11–48.

40) Livy is equally consistent, in that his rendition of the story mentions corrupt Lucanian youths as *clari magis [...] quam honesti* – “prominent, yes, but not honorable” (Liv. 8.27.6). He is far more dismissive of class matters than Quadrigarius could allow himself to be.

41) Cf. McDonnell (above, n. 5) 241–292.

42) This interpretation is not in complete contradiction with Bastian, Significato (above, n. 3), who finds Quadrigarius' incontestable interest in great military commanders to be indicative of his pro-Sullan leanings. As a product of his Hellenizing time, the annalist was concerned with great individuals, but the ideal he presented in the process was the one outlined in my present paper. Badian, Early Historians (above, n. 10), 19 disagrees both with my reading of political bias and with Bastian's observation of Quadrigarius' noted interest in great individuals: “Nor can we see any social or factional bias or even serious moral purpose. [...] Claudius' lack of interest in politics and personalities is phenomenal [...]” Cf. also Timpe (above, n. 3) 114–115; Zimmerer (above, n. 3) 74–75.

43) Quadrigarius also mentions *genus* as an indicator of a person's quality in fragment 7 HRR: *Nam Marcus [...] Manlius, quem Capitolium servasse a Gallis supra ostendi, cuiusque operam cum M. Furio dictatore apud Gallos cumprime fortem atque exuperabilem res publica sensit, is et genere et vi et virtute bellica nemini concedebat.* – “For Marcus Manlius (who – as I have shown above – saved the Capitol from the Gauls and whose efforts – when in Gaul with Dictator Marcus Furius – the country perceived to be particularly robust and irresistible) was second to none in terms of provenance, strength, and martial valor.” While *genere* as it is

Fragment 12 HRR⁴⁴ does not lend itself to as fruitful a comparison to Livy's corresponding account as fragment 10b,⁴⁵ but even on its own it strongly underlines the impressions we gained from our previous inquiries:

Adulescens tali genere editus, L. Furio Claudio Appio consulibus fit tribunus militaris. atque in eo tempore copiae Gallorum ingentes agrum Pomptinum insederant [...]. dux interea Gallorum, vasta et ardua proceritate armisque auro praefulgentibus, grandia ingrediens et manu telum reciprocans incedebat perque contemptum et superbiam circumspiciens despiciensque omnia venire iubet et congregari, si quis pugnare secum ex omni Romano exercitu auderet. tum Valerius tribunus, ceteris inter metum pudoremque ambiguis, impetrato prius a consulibus, ut in Gallum, tam inaniter adrogantem, pugnare sese permitterent, progreditur intrepide modesteque obviam; et congregiuntur et consistunt et conserebantur iam manus. atque ibi vis quaedam divina fit: corvus repente improvisus advolat et super galeam tribuni insistit atque inde in adversarii os atque oculos pugnare incipit [...]. Sic tribunus spectante

employed in a polysyndetic (and alliterative) tricolon with *vi* and *virtute* clearly understands provenance as a mark of distinction, the overall sense of the passage is hard to grasp. Quadrigarius may merely be praising a nobleman as he did in 10b and 12. However, Torquatus' ancestor Marcus Manlius Capitolinus has, unlike the protagonists of 10b and 12, been mentioned before (*supra ostendi*). Therefore, Quadrigarius may possibly be reminding his readership of Capitolinus' qualities as a lead-in to a narrative that deals with his fall (similar to the one described in fragment 15). He was, after all, said to have harbored tyrannical aspirations. Quadrigarius' Capitolinus may, then, have served as another deterrent example of a nobleman gone rogue that was intended to strengthen aristocratic solidarity. Without additional context, this question is impossible to answer, although fragment 8 HRR, which speaks of somebody's (= Capitolinus?) suitability to overthrow the Republic (*ad rem publicam evertendam*) makes the latter assumption likely.

44) Hermann Peter's inclusion of this fragment into the Quadrigarius corpus has occasionally been questioned. For an older survey of the debate cf. Schibel (above, n. 20) 9–12, 93–98. For Bastian's argument to accept the fragment into her edition of Quadrigarius, cf. Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n. 3), 140–141. Gellius does not mention the annalist from whose oeuvre he is quoting by name, and Schibel and others have considered the tale to be Gellius' own creation. Feldherr (above, n. 32) 94 recently noted in this context that Quadrigarius was one of the grammarian's favorite sources, which would make the passage's inclusion in the corpus reasonable, but that the fragment may have seen an additional step of transmission via a collection of *exempla* of how noble families received their *cognomina*. Perhaps my own focus on the similarities between 10b and 12 HRR can provide more arguments for the inclusion of the Corvinus tale in the Quadrigarian collection.

45) I have nothing to add to L. Finette, Marcus Valérius Corvinus ou l'histoire d'un surnom: A propos du *Fragment 12* (Peter) de Claudius Quadrigarius, *CEA* 29 (1995) 103–108.

utroque exercitu et sua virtute nixus et opera alitis propugnatus ducem hostium ferocissimum vicit interfecitque atque ob hanc causam cognomen habuit Corvinus. [...]

A young man of such great provenance was a military tribune during the consulship of Lucius Furius and Claudius Appius, and at that time, enormous forces of the Gauls had occupied the Pomptine district. [...] In the meantime, the Gauls' commander, a man of enormous, towering height and armed with weapons of shining gold, pranced about taking gigantic steps and shaking a spear in his hand. Looking around with arrogant contempt and towering over everything, he orders that if anybody from the Roman army dared to duel with him, he should come forth and meet with him. Then tribune Valerius, though fear and shame overwhelmed his wavering companions, stepped forth to face him, unafraid, yet modestly, and only after he first sought permission from the consuls to fight against the Gaul, who was so groundlessly arrogant. And they approach each other and they stand firm and they are already starting to fight. And then there was a sort of divine intervention! Suddenly and unexpectedly, a raven came flying and lingered over the tribune's helmet and he started pecking the opponent's face and eyes. [...] Thus the tribune defeated the terribly savage leader of the enemies in plain sight of both hosts relying on his own valor and aided by the bird's assistance. He killed the Gaul and received the nickname 'Corvinus' for this feat. [...]

Again, the threat is formidable, and Quadrigarius describes the monomachist who comes to the rescue as, first and foremost, a man of noble birth. His *genus* is mentioned so prominently that it should be considered the whole episode's theme, and the story itself may well have tied into a longer discussion of the nobility's qualities, which would have been the missing point of reference for the demonstrative *tali* ("such"). Provenance, once more, is the 'light' prevailing over the 'darkness'. Here as in 10b, Quadrigarius goes on to stress the contrast between the courageous *nobilis* and the scared multitude (*ceteris inter metum pudoremque ambiguis*). While Quadrigarius' Corvinus, unlike his Torquatus, asks permission from his commanding officers before he engages in single combat, this detail is more in unison with the optimate tint of 10b than with Livy's later renderings. Where Livy went out of his way to depict Torquatus as a Roman first and a nobleman second, Quadrigarius refers to Corvinus by his *nomen gentile* at the precise moment when he submits himself to the will of the consuls (*Valerius tribunus*).⁴⁶ The idealized monomachist remains, explicitly, a nobleman, whose first priority is to serve his country (as a 'tribune', which he is suc-

46) The consuls, one might add, are themselves members of the aristocracy.

cessively called), but who still easily outshines men of lesser origins. An alliterative tricolon (*et congregiuntur et consistunt et conserebantur iam manus*) brings out Corvinus' exemplary determination even more clearly, and two adverbs sum up Quadrigarius' ideal of the forceful (*intrepide*) nobleman lacking personal aspirations (*modeste*) most succinctly. One of the 'remedies' this second Quadrigarian monomachist provides for the Gallic threat of his own time is, again, his inborn valor (*sua virtute nixus*). Significantly, the historian in such central position assigns the same contested term (*virtute*) that we saw treated in 10b HRR to a man he explicitly marks as noble. Once more, the implication is that *virtus*, by definition, belongs to the *optimates*. Another element to underline this justification of optimate rule via allusions to illustrious ancestors is the explanation Quadrigarius provides for the raven's unexpected assistance. He calls it a moment of divine intervention (*vis quaedam divina fit*). In the annalist's day, it became more customary to claim a divinity's endorsement of one's own political stance, and that Quadrigarius did not shy away from recruiting the gods for his own particular brand of conservatism is evident also from fragment 53a HRR. At 25.39.11, Livy lists Quadrigarius among those who ascribe unrealistic portents to one of their heroes:

et verae gloriae [L. Marci] etiam miracula addunt, flammam ei contionanti fusam e capite sine ipsius sensu cum magno pavore circumstantium militum.

And to Marcius' true glory, they [= the historians] even add miracles, namely a flame that poured out of his head as he was addressing an assembly to the great terror of the attending soldiers (Marcius himself was unaware).

Much like fragment 64a, which Sonia Laconi Bastian has presented as evidence for Quadrigarius' admiration for great aristocratic *imperatores* like Scipio (and, by association, for Sulla),⁴⁷ 53a HRR does not preserve the annalist's actual words. Rather, we are presented with a paraphrase. These fragments, therefore, do not lend themselves as easily to the kind of close reading I have been undertaking in this paper. Yet Livy's *gloriae addunt* in 53a HRR does our interpreting for us, in that the Augustan historian tells us himself that the likes of Quadrigarius deliberately added to the fame of

47) Bastian, *Significato* (above, n. 3); cf. also Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n. 3), 38–43.

such distinguished *nobiles* as Lucius Marcius. Here as in the Corvinus tale, the annalist apparently did not hesitate to involve supernatural forces in his celebration of lofty origins.

Fragment 67 falls in a similar category as 53a HRR, in that Livy once more points his readers to the peculiarities of Quadrigarius' narrative. After summing up how the Rhodians, caught on the wrong side of the Third Macedonian War, appealed to the Romans for mercy, Livy says that Quadrigarius in particular stated that the senators did not bother responding but silently pointed to an earlier decree (*Claudius nihil responsum auctor est, tantum senatus consultum recitatum, quo Caras et Lycios liberos esse iuberet populus Romanus*, Liv. 44.15.1). The *consultum* – and thus the dignity of the *nobiles* assembled in the senate – stands unshakable, and again we should note how Quadrigarius' rendition has an empowered and, more importantly, united nobility act in the name of the whole *populus Romanus*.

One last testimony to Quadrigarius' stance as an optimate who enthusiastically sided with the nobility, yet urged the aristocrats to abandon too excessive a focus on personal aggrandizement and to close ranks with their class, is fragment 57 HRR. Gellius at NA 2.2.13 cites from book 6 of the *Annales*:

Deinde facti consules Sempronius Gracchus iterum, Q. Fabius Maximus, filius eius, qui priore anno erat consul. Ei consuli pater proconsul obviam in equo vehens venit neque descendere voluit, quod pater erat, et, quod inter eos sciebant maxima concordia convenire, lictores non ausi sunt descendere iubere. ubi iuxta venit, tum consul ait: 'Quid postea?' lictor ille, qui apparebat, cito intellexit, Maximum proconsulem descendere iussit. Fabius imperio paret et filium conlaudavit, cum imperium, quod populi esset, retineret.

Then Sempronius Gracchus (for the second time) and Quintus Fabius Maximus were elected consuls. The latter was the son of the one who was consul the year before. As proconsul, the father – on horseback – encountered this said consul and did not want to dismount, because he was his father, and the lictors did not dare to order him to dismount because they knew that father and son were on the best terms. At the moment when he came close, the consul said: "What is next?" The lictor who was at hand quickly understood and ordered Maximus the proconsul to dismount. Fabius obeyed the command and praised his son, because he maintained his command, which was issued by the people.

Once more, Quadrigarius is discussing a particularly distinguished *gens* of the Roman *nobilitas*, the *Fabii Maximi*, and his ideal nobleman yields personal interests to those of the *populus*. In this

case, the conflict is between an aristocratic *pater familias*'s entitlement to a son's respect and the position the latter holds in the state,⁴⁸ which is emphasized by the close juxtaposition of familial terms and official titles (chiastic at *filius eius, qui [...] erat consul*, parallel at *ei consuli pater proconsul*, cf. also *quod pater erat* and *proconsulem descendere iussit. [...] paret et filium conlaudavit*). Here as in fragments 10b and 12, the *nomen gentile* (*Fabius*) is used at the decisive moment of the father's submission to the *res publica*, underlining that not just any Roman's, but a nobleman's desired behavior is the focus of this episode. To subordinate the otherwise unimpeachable right of the head of a family to the interest of the state is a noted subcategory of the *nobiles*' general commitment to the *populus*. Furthermore, the emphasis laid on the magistracies accumulated in the persons of the two Fabii (the nouns *consul* and *proconsul* occur six times in the fragment) adds to the glorification of a family that – like the other *gentes* – determined its relative rank within the Roman nobility through such distinctions.⁴⁹ Yet the annalist's praise may here well have gone beyond emphasizing an aristocratic feat and adducing superior lineage as a reason for excellence. As Hans Beck and Uwe Walter suggest, Quadrigarius' unflinchingly positive rendering – followed also by the annalist's successors – seems to have deflected criticism from the Fabii for a succession that looked almost dynastic and therefore 'un-Republican'. If this is true, then Quadrigarius would here have gone beyond merely a biased interpretation of transmitted events and moved closer to an outright falsification.⁵⁰

48) Henderson (above, n. 3) 82–87 presents a different reading of this passage. He asserts that Quadrigarius' focus on the *imperium populi* reflects a *popularis* idea of the superiority of a popular mandate over the proconsulate. However, Badian, *Early Historians* (above, n. 10), 34 refutes this interpretation (in but one brief footnote): "The point of the story [...] is simply that the *imperium*, which goes with public office, ought to be superior even to *pietas* towards a father."

49) For these values cf. again Hölkeskamp, *Conquest, Competition and Consensus* (above, n. 5), 12–39 = Hölkeskamp, *Senatus Populusque Romanus* (above, n. 5), 11–48; Hölkeskamp, *Entstehung der Nobilität* (above, n. 23), 204–240, particularly 225.

50) Beck/Walter, *FRH II* 143. While we have already seen at least one of Quadrigarius' nobleman fall from grace after an initially positive portrayal, such a turn of events seems less likely in the case of the Fabius episode. After all, the Lucanian of frg. 15 HRR lost the annalist's approval in the same sentence that he originally attained it. The narrative of frg. 57 HRR seems too self-contained to allow for such a turn of events.

Another aspect of all of Quadrigarius' portrayals of long-dead nobles is perhaps best illustrated by the Fabius fragment. While there remained some debate over the precise dating of, e.g., the Manlius episode in frg. 10b HRR,⁵¹ Quintus Fabius Maximus and his father, the famous *Cunctator*, are more easily located on the timeline of Republican history. By providing old *exempla* of admirable aristocratic behavior with a precise position in space and time, Quadrigarius authenticated these tales of the nobility's grandeur at the same time that he publicized them to a Roman citizenry that expanded after the Social War. Dating, then, is an important aspect of Quadrigarius' double intention of reminding the aristocrats of their value system, while he simultaneously commended them to the lower strata of Roman society.⁵²

We can now turn our attention back to the annalist's portrayal of his contemporaries. Fragments 76 and 85 HRR contain references to Metellus Numidicus, the "nobility's martyr",⁵³ and Metellus Pius, another optimate partisan, respectively. Sonia Laconi Bastian's reading of 76 HRR ("Having dismissed the assembly, Metellus comes to the Capitol with many mortals, then makes toward home, the entire citizen body led him back." – *Contione dimissa Metellus in Capitolium venit cum mortalibus multis, inde domum proficiscitur, tota civitas eum reduxit*, Gell. NA 13.29.1) is supportive of my previous findings. Pointing to the sentence's climactic arrangement, she states: "Il trionfo di Metello quindi non è altro che una consacrazione carismatica, la *salutatio* che ideologicamente si traduce nel *consensus* e rappresenta l'approvazione della politica di Metello da parte di Claudio e di conseguenza la condanna di Mario e più esplicitamente l'aperta ostilità nei confronti della democrazia."⁵⁴ While 85 HRR describes another of Metellus' successes, Quadrigarius does not discuss his 'virtues' or the 'vices'

51) Beck/Walter, FRH II 119–120.

52) For the original function of *exempla* and the importance of making an aspiring nobleman's feats public (the root meaning of *nobilis* is "well-known"), cf. Hölkeskamp, *Entstehung der Nobilität* (above, n. 23), 204–240; Hölkeskamp, *Exempla und mos maiorum* (above, n. 5), passim. For the *exempla*'s changing nature see Beck/Walter, FRH II 111, and 22–24, 27 for Quadrigarius' widening readership.

53) Timpe (above, n. 3) 108–109: "Für Claudius ergeben die Fragmente höchstens schwache Hinweise auf eine sympathische Behandlung des Metellus Numidicus, des Märtyrers der Nobilität."

54) Bastian, *Osservazioni* (above, n. 3), 6–7. Cf. also Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n. 3), 210; Beck/Walter, FRH II 157–158; Zimmerer (above, n. 3) 168–169.

he overcomes. Still, the positive tone (“That is why the soldiers of Metellus were slaughtered to a much smaller extent and – for which there was a dire need – the sling shooters could easily pick the enemies off the parapet” – *quare milites Metelli sauciabantur multo minus et, quod maxime opus erat, a pinnis hostis defendebant facillime funditores*) adds to the generally favorable impression the annalist has created of the old families throughout his work. The earlier fragment 41, in which the consuls warn the enemy invader Pyrrhus about an imminent attempt on his life in order to preserve their own righteousness would have served a similar function. The noblemen act because they do not appreciate employing bribery, pay-offs, or trickery (*nobis non placet pretio aut praemio aut dolis pugnare*) and would much rather face Pyrrhus in open battle (*armis vincere*) than to gain victory through dishonest means.

We should now turn to Quadrigarius’ single surviving mention of Sulla before we ultimately return to Marius. The reference is from book 19 and has Sulla laying siege to the Piraeus:

Cum Sylla conatus esset tempore magno, eduxit copias, ut Archelai turrim unam, quam ille interposuit, ligneam incenderet. venit, accessit, ligna subdidit, submovit Graecos, ignem admovit; satis sunt diu conati, numquam quiverunt incendere: ita Archelaus omnem materiam observat alumine. quod Sylla atque milites mirabantur, et postquam non succendit, reduxit copias.

When Sulla had already struggled for a long time, he led out his forces in order to put fire to the single wooden tower, which Archelaos had placed in his path. He came, approached closer, put down kindling, drove off the Greeks, applied fire. They tried long enough – they could never set the tower on fire, because Archelaos had covered the whole matter in alum. Sulla and his soldiers marveled at this, and after it still did not catch flames, he removed his forces. (frg. 81 HRR)

Like fragment 83 with its apostrophe to Marius, this fragment does not offer itself to a conclusive interpretation of Quadrigarius’ stance on contemporary politics. On the one hand, Sulla is described as resourceful (*conatus esset tempore magno*), and the four main clauses in asyndeton that describe his move toward the city’s defenders create an impression of swift efficiency. Two single verbs (*venit, accessit*) are followed up by two alliterative compound verbs with direct objects in chiasmic structure (*ligna subdidit, submovit Graecos*), and the last unit (*ignem admovit*) varies the prefix attached to the same simplex as in the preceding clause. Yet in spite of this elegance both in the action and the words that describe it,

Sulla's attempts ultimately fail (*numquam quiverunt incendere*). His retreat is also portrayed in chiasmic asyndeton (*non succendit, reduxit copias*), and the effect of this unexpected reversal is almost comical.⁵⁵ It seems impossible, ultimately, to make any secure statements about Quadrigarius' stance on the persons of Marius and Sulla. On the one hand, Sulla and his excesses would hardly have lived up to the ideals Quadrigarius presented in the previous fragments. On the other hand, the politician was trying to reinstitute the rule of a class Quadrigarius cherished. Due to his strong optimate leanings, the annalist may, therefore, have accepted the dictator if not as a hero, then at least as a necessary evil.⁵⁶ A fragment from the beginning of book 18 becomes relevant here:

Si pro tua bonitate et nostra voluntate tibi valitudo subpetit, est quod speremus, deos bonis bene facturum.

If on account of your "goodness" and our support good health comes to you, then that is what we would hope, namely that the gods are about to treat the "good" well. (frg.79 HRR)

Since Gellius at NA 1.7.9 notes that Quadrigarius wrote these words at the beginning of the book (*In duodevicesimo annali eiusdem Quadrigarii principium libri sic scriptum*), it is possible that these words do not have to be attributed to another orator's fictionalized speech. They may well constitute a dedication to a contemporary patron of Quadrigarius.⁵⁷ After all, we know that the following book already deals with Marius and Sulla, and since the *Annales'* coverage becomes successively broader, book 18 may well have included a transition to contemporary events that would make such a dedication appear well-placed. If the addressee was Sulla (a possibility made less likely by Quadrigarius' references to this optimate politician in the third person), then perhaps the historian's renderings of aristocratic valor were meant to present the dictator with an ideal to model himself after. This, of course, is mere speculation. However, even as the addressee remains anonymous, this passage does strengthen the impression of aristocratic tendencies, due to its allusion to key *optimates* terminology. The

55) Bastian, *Reliquiae* (above, n.3), 44 thinks Sulla's defeat in this scene makes his ultimate victory seem even more spectacular.

56) For the senate's sometimes less than positive take on Sulla's actions, cf. Plut. Sulla 10.4; Badian, Sulla (above, n.6), 52.

57) Cf. Timpe (above, n.3) 110.

adjective *bonus* traditionally described the superiority of the well-born and rich, and it came to be about as heavily contested as *virtus*. The senate party continued to refer to itself as “the good”,⁵⁸ and the dedication puns heavily on this term by stating the author’s hope that the *boni* will receive the gods’ appreciation for this very quality (*pro bonitate*).⁵⁹

Whatever his feelings for Sulla, it seems highly unlikely that Quadrigarius would have had any sympathies for Gaius Marius. Much like some other fragments in the surviving corpus that point to a contrasting of political opinions (with clear favorites expressed),⁶⁰ fragment 83 still lacks the context to make its interpretation secure. We can say, however, that it would be very much in keeping with Quadrigarius’ aristocratic biases if Clío had induced him to yell frustrated accusations at the *homo novus* – be it through the mouth of one of his protagonists or via his own narrative voice.

New York, NY

Mathias Hanses

58) Hellegouarc’h (above, n. 25) 484–493: “Il s’ensuit que le *bonus vir* est celui qui manifeste au plus haut point son caractère de *vir*, c’est-à-dire sa *virtus*. [...] Mais le *bonus*, c’est surtout celui qui possède les qualités nécessaires à un membre des classes dirigeantes [...]. A l’origine, l’épithète est réservée [...] aux classes supérieures et spécialement aux membres de l’ordre sénatorial. [...] Avec l’évolution de *bonus* vers sa nuance morale, sa valeur devient plus incertaine [...]. Bien qu’il s’agisse essentiellement d’une appellation partisane, il y a [...] une tendance à assimiler *boni* et membres des grandes familles, ou tout au moins des familles riches. A l’époque des *Verrines*, il semble bien qu’il s’agisse surtout, comme ce fut sans doute le cas sous Sylla, des membres de l’*ordo senatorius*.”

59) Cf. Chassignet, AR III, XXXIII–XXXIV; Tímpe (above, n. 3) 110. Note that the etymologically related *bene* also plays into the pun. Hellegouarc’h (above, n. 25) 488 points to the adverb’s own political connotations: “Il y a en même temps progression de la notion de *bonus* vers un concept exclusivement partisan [...]. On notera l’emploi de l’adverbe *bene* avec des verbes exprimant l’action et surtout l’opinion politique.”

60) Fragment 88 HRR: *crudeliter ille, nos misericorditer; avariter ille, nos largiter* – “He acts most savagely, we take pity; he is avaricious, we act generously”; Zimmerer (above, n. 3) 169 notes: “frg. 88 spricht von Grausamkeit und Geiz des Gegners, zwei Vorwürfe, die häufig gegen Marius erhoben wurden”, cf. also Bastian, Osservazioni (above, n. 3), 9–10; Bastian, Reliquiae (above, n. 3), 226–228; fragment 89 HRR: *Sed idcirco me fecisse, quod utrum neglegentia partim magistratum an avaritia an calamitate populi Romani evenisse dicam, nescio*. – “But for that reason I acted thus, though I do not know whether I should say it turned out this way because of the negligence of a part of the magistrates or because of avarice or because of the misfortune of the Roman people.”