

meriterebbe forse uno sviluppo più ampio – specie considerando che in molti casi si tratta di un argomento decisivo per la discussione di possibili integrazioni. Queste osservazioni sono da intendersi come meri suggerimenti per i futuri sviluppi del lavoro editoriale su Festo, e non inficiano in alcun modo il giudizio – ampiamente positivo – sul presente volume. Come appare evidente da queste poche pagine, lo studio di Di Marco rappresenta in tutte le sue parti un indubbio progresso negli studi festini, nonché un imprescindibile punto di partenza per la futura edizione critica del *De uerborum significatione*. Sappiamo ora con precisione quali notevoli progressi sia lecito attendersi, e soprattutto su quali fondamentali, di metodo e operativi, l'edizione dovrà essere condotta.

Sapienza – Università di Roma.

Ilaria MORRESI.

Pauline DUCHÊNE, *Comment écrire sur les empereurs ? Les procédés historiographiques de Tacite et Suétone*, Bordeaux, Ausonius, 2020 (Scripta Antiqua, 137), 24 × 17 cm, 332 p., 25 €, ISBN 978-2-35613-349-6.

When the historian Tacitus and imperial biographer Suetonius, writing in the same social and intellectual milieu, differ in their accounts of parallel events, the types of information they privilege and how it is presented in their narratives will illuminate distinctive methodological aspects. Unvarnished “facticity” is not an issue, for Roman historiography is a literary genre and a branch of rhetoric, in which plausibility and verisimilitude trump strict veracity; authorial choices are treated here not as an exercise in reality-testing or *Quellenforschung* but as part of a historiographical and literary project. In a comprehensive and detailed evaluation of a broad range of evidence, Duchêne offers many sharp insights and interpretations of the scaffolding that sustains the narrative superstructures. Like the orator, the historian is concerned to construct and project a credible persona in his text to enhance his *auctoritas* and give orientation to the reader. Direct first-person interventions, analysed in chapter 1 (p. 19-49), profile the authorial persona and occur typically to demonstrate critical engagement with his sources, written or oral, accepted or rejected, to underline the importance of his work (Tac., *Ann.*, 4.33-34) and its moralising purpose (as famously at *Ann.*, 3.65.1), to justify narrative choices, highlight his own prior researches (e.g. Tac., *Ann.* 2.88.1, *Hist.* 3.51.1; Suet., *Cl.* 15.11), autopsy, direct witness testimony (Suet., *Otho* 10.1-3) or “second-degree” autopsy of documentary evidence (Tac., *Ann.* 4.53.2), and judgements on episodes and his own work. The result is a lively dialogue between the author and his readership, but especially with his predecessors. When extra-narrative sources are cited, authorial interventions are introduced by a range of terms that may give relative weight to the reported version, although there is no absolute correlation and the practices of Tacitus and Suetonius are not identical (chapter 2, p. 51-88). Duchêne presents the data statistically, with finely tuned remarks on the temporal context of the referent (past or present), the type of information being reported (written or oral), its reliability (the “evidential context”), and the effect of semantic qualifiers (such as *plures certioresque, celeberrimi auctores, plerique, fama crebrior, uarie*): *tradere* (often of written sources, *scriptores / auctores*, and erudite information); *credere* (of political interpretations emerging close to the events reported); *ferre* (esp. with anecdotal evidence in Suetonius); *incertum* (of central political issues); *constare; fama* (widely held, but not necessarily weightier); *memorare* (often of the author's own work, or written sources). Many additional terms are reviewed, categorized according to references to writing (e.g. *auctores, componere, scribere*), agreement or disagreement (e.g. *consentire, discrepare,*

*dissentire*), circulation of information (e.g. *percrebescere*, *rumor*, *uulgare*), the spoken word (e.g. *affirmare*, *aiunt*, *dicere*, *persuadere*, *referre*), thought (e.g. *arbitrari*, *credibile*, *existimare*, *opinio*, *putare*, *suspicere*), and anonymised formulae (*traditur*, *fama est*). Differentiation is especially clear when several terms occur within a single passage – as Suet., *Tib.* 3, where *traditur* against *fama* point respectively to aristocratic texts and a more diffuse version (p. 69-70); or Tac., *Ann.* 1.1, where the decline in Roman historiography is marked successively by the verbs *memorare* (the Republican tradition), *dicere* (the reign of Augustus), *componere* (the Julio-Claudians), and *tradere* (more elevated, of Tacitus' own project) (p. 75). So also (e.g.) p. 164-165, on Suet., *Cl.* 44; p. 211-222, on *Vesp.* 16. Such elements contribute to constructing the author's credibility as meticulous researcher, indicating his relative responsibility for the version offered, solidifying or interrogating available information, and encouraging critical reader engagement. Individual narrative strategies of the two writers emerge through detailed comparison of larger episodes appearing in both and characterized by multiple mentions of sources and authorial interventions (chapter 3, p. 89-123). The fullest representative example here is Tiberius' retirement to Capri (Tac., *Ann.* 4.57, 67; Suet., *Tib.* 40-45), where Duchêne evaluates the motives circulating for the withdrawal. The paradox of an emperor quitting Rome for an island, like an exile, will have generated confusion and multiple explanations. Tacitus first emphasizes the political intrigues of Sejanus over physical and psychological factors, *secutus plurimos auctorum*, but then backtracks (*Ann.* 4.57) to consider, like Suetonius, private vices as the reason for the emperor's protracted absence; additionally there is the temper and political interference of Tiberius' mother (*traditur etiam...*). From island-exile to *dissimulatio* to sexual perversion is a logical progression. Tiberius' sexual extravaganzas, fully itemized by the biographer (*Tib.* 43-45), receive more muted treatment at *Ann.* 6.1 and are integrated in the political design (pointed violation of social categories), with Tiberius further "de-romanised" through assimilation to the stereotype tyrant figure (*Ann.* 6.6.2). Connecting the Capri episode with Tiberius' earlier retreat to Rhodes in 6 BC, Duchêne makes a compelling case that in Tacitus details from the second withdrawal are projected back on the first, and that the first was in fact modelled on the second (p. 110-114). What emerges is a coherent profiling and historiographical strategy that incorporates public bewilderment at Tiberius' withdrawal into isolation (hence the multiple explanations), the association between island-retreat and his sense of guilt, and the political connection with the tyrant figure. Chapter 4 (p. 125-172) demonstrates how various common motifs are integrated and assimilated by the two writers to emphasize their different perspectives. Political attacks on his family serve typically to undermine an emperor's legitimacy. Tacitus' Vitellius owes his career entirely to the prestige of his more distinguished father (*Hist.* 1.9); Suetonius insists on Vitellius' gluttony (*Vit.* 7.1-2) and his youthful depravity with Tiberius on Capri (*Vit.* 3.5), which in turn smears both son and father. The literary stereotypes appearing in both writers – the good general, tyrant and victim – offer excellent material for extended comparative study. A system of dynamic and suggestive contrasts informs both writers: "le stéréotype du bon général peut donc aussi bien être utilisé 'en plein' pour favoriser une figure que 'en creux', pour la dévaloriser" (p. 135). Duchêne offers exemplary analyses of Vitellius' impiety at Bedriacum (playing on the reader's knowledge of Germanicus, p. 132-135), and of the victims of imperial hatred (execution of Octavia, rumours around the death of Agricola, the demise of Junius Blaesus, p. 135-140). Here again, the recurrent tropes (e.g. the emperor's feigned concern for an opponent he was allegedly poisoning) characterize the tyrant as much as his victims. These elements may be coordinated to dramatize the narrative through "un effet d'accumulation : la répétition d'un même schéma donne ainsi l'impression d'une multiplication de

morts semblables” (p. 140); artful disposition may enhance this effect, as at Suet., *Vit.* 14, where the arrangement of victims, from most likely to least likely rivals, suggests a “spirale meurtrière” that reflects equally on the character of the tyrant. In passages like this, individual details are subsumed in the historiographical design. Analogously with other common motifs and type-scenes that structure the narrative and evaluate the ruler: suggestive portents, the emperor’s career before assuming power as reference point, his accession to power (with fine analysis of the categories activity / passivity), the death scenes as summation of his reign – all this pre-existing material integrated to produce differently weighted accounts (p. 150-172). The substantial fifth chapter (p. 173-235), the high point of the book, studies with great acumen the appropriation, reinterpretation and transformation of different historiographical currents by historian and biographer in their portraits of the individual emperors, again with emphasis on narrative effects and thematic disposition, not on “facticity”. A few remarks on this illuminating section must suffice for a sense of the main drift. Duchêne pays meticulous attention to periodization, inflection points, and the progressive degradation in the various reigns; details in the biographies keyed to the character of individual emperors rather than to external influences; the historian’s diachronic gaze in defining *boni* and *mali principes*; suggestive schemata as value judgments, as with Tiberius / Germanicus ~ Nero / Britannicus (p. 206-207); Galba as anti-Nero, Otho as Nero *rediuuius* (at least until his quasi-philosophical suicide, p. 215-217) and again Vitellius replaying the degenerative Neronian schema (p. 224-234); the bad emperor styled as imperial counter-model; conflation (notably Tiberius, Nero and Vitellius) of the tragic-Platonic tyrant with Roman political realities. Among the chapter’s many virtues, I highlight just Duchêne’s remarks on Suetonius’ recalibration of Tacitus’ hostile take on Otho for the respective procedures of the two writers (p. 220-224), and the literary and ideological functions of the gluttony motif in the presentation of Vitellius (p. 227-230). Multiple typological affinities and intersections between the imperial portraits leads to the conclusion that “ces personnages ne sont pas tant conçus comme des individus avec des caractéristiques particulières, mais comme autant de supports à une réflexion sur l’exercice du pouvoir suprême. D’une certaine façon, ces hommes ne sont pas des hommes, ce sont des idées” (p. 235). Generic constraints are addressed in chapter 6 (p. 237-266), where Duchêne nuances the distinction between annalistic historiography and thematic biography (organization *per tempora* as against exhaustive enumerations *per species*); the two approaches, already acknowledged by Plutarch and Nepos (p. 252-254), are shown to be frequently interpenetrating, with representation and interpretation reinforcing each other. On the other hand, perceptive analyses of common episodes in Tacitus and Suetonius (the staged *naumachia* at Suet., *Cl.* 21 and Tac., *Ann.* 12.56-57, or the education of the emperor at Suet., *Nero* 52 and Tac., *Ann.* 12.8; p. 256-259) bring out the writers’ tendency to emphasize political and personal perspectives (or “filters”) respectively. Finally, Duchêne’s magisterial conclusion (p. 267-299) integrates and theorizes all the strands analysed so far within a broad literary, cultural, and ideological context. Notable issues discussed include narrative vs. historical choices, historical veracity and the “laws” of history, with Cicero’s letter to Lucceius (*Ad Fam.* 5.12) and Seneca, *Apoc.* used as reference points for reader expectations or the tacit “pacte historiographique,” the “processus d’élaboration” and the “tactique d’inclusion narrative, sans véritable attachement à la vérité historique” (p. 278-281); historical texts as political and moralising instruments; the literary mechanisms of memorialization for political ends (“le souvenir crée la narration et, à son tour, la narration perpétue le souvenir,” p. 285); Suetonius’ protreptic highlighting of the extraordinary, both positive and negative; the past not as “une matière fixe et impossible à modifier” (p. 296), but adapted to the

architecture of the respective texts, to be evaluated on their own terms. In sum, Duchêne has produced a rich, ambitious and engrossing study, based on profound knowledge of the sources and issues, with some brilliant insights and interpretations, and meticulous attention throughout to philological, literary, historical and cultural analysis. Her work is fully on target and repays close reading by students of the historiographical methods and practices of Tacitus and Suetonius.

*Birkbeck, University of London.*

Gottfried MADER.

Karin Margareta FREDBORG, "*Lucca*" *Summa on Rhetoric: The Earliest Italian Ciceronian Treatise in the Middle Ages*, Firenze, SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2021 (Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini d'Italia, 58. Serie I, 29), 25 × 18 cm, XIV-129 p., 42 €, ISBN 978-88-9290-068-4.

The 'Lucca *Summa*' is the earliest European exposition of Ciceronian rhetoric, merging the *De Inuentione* with the pseudonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* by removing the overlapping passages. Dr Fredborg has for many years edited and studied the early medieval texts of Latin rhetoric, notably Thierry of Chartres' commentary on the two works just mentioned. But one wonders what the point is of publishing this rather small item (just over 100 pages of text), which has been carefully and recently studied by the author herself, and by Gian Carlo Alessio and John O. Ward. The treatise has at least two outstanding features: first of all it updates Cicero's examples, providing interesting contemporary topographical references that reveal its place of composition: the German invasion of northern Italy with special pressure on Vicenza; and the places Vicenza, Verona, Treviso, Pavia, Brendola (16 km. south-west of Vicenza), Bassano del Grappa (34 km. north-east), and Lonigo (23 km. south-west). The last three are small and the least important, so their relationship to Vicenza is especially significant, and that is doubtless where this treatise was written. It remains steadfastly anonymous, and Vicenza is not otherwise known as a centre of scholarly activity at the time. And it reveals a concern for the art of live, judicial oratory, not just classroom, written dictamen as was the rule north of the Alps. It was undoubtedly written for colleagues and fellow school-masters teaching rhetoric, in an urban, not monastery school. It survives in two copies only, of which the stately Lucca MS (Lucca, Bibl. capitolare Feliniana 614), written in central Italy, donated to the church of St Martin by William, bishop of Lucca 1175-1194, measures no less than 535 × 365 mm. This is the size of the Great Bibles (Winchester, Lambeth and Bury) of twelfth-century England. It shows the different priorities of the societies north and south of the Alps: theology as against the Liberal Arts. And it demonstrates the lively, litigious culture of the Italian cities, the heritage of ancient Rome. The sources used in the work, though, illustrate consciousness of the relevant writings from northern Europe: the commentaries of Grillius, Victorinus and Thierry of Chartres, and brief quotations from Aristotle (*Categoriae*), Sallust, Virgil and Horace. On p. 78 [186] *nunc aliud tempus, alii pro tempore mores* looks like a commonplace of the schoolroom: apparently first found in Hildebert of Le Mans, *Carm. min.* 17. 7, it seems to have spread to Gerald of Wales in several of his works. A close reading of the text reveals a number of unfortunate typographical errors: p. 38 penultimate line, p. 39 [10] line 7, p. 51 bottom line: Delete the question-mark; p. 41 [21] line 1 *quo de agitur] de quo agitur*; p. 47 [47] penultimate line *perrexise] perrexisse*; p. 48 last line *Agamenmonis] Agamemmonis*; p. 51 [64] penultimate line *nune] nunc*; p. 53 line 7 *inde-] inde*; p. 76 [177] line 5: Add question-mark after *ciuitatem*; p. 84 line 2 *commnuni] communi*; p. 87 line 4 *adiscipendi] adipiscendi*, [233] *acusator]*