

ANDREA THEMANN-STEINKE, *Valerius Maximus: ein Kommentar zum zweiten Buch der Facta et Dicta memorabilia* (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, Bd. 77). Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2008, pp. 622, ISBN 9783868210767.

This is a revised version of a doctoral dissertation submitted to the Ruhr-Universität Bochum in 2006. It has the laudable and ambitious aim of providing a full commentary on the second book of Valerius Maximus' work, dealing equally with linguistic, textual, historical and antiquarian (I use the term because much of book 2 concerns political and cultural institutions rather than 'deeds and sayings') aspects. Themann-Steinke has assiduously collected a great deal of information and as a dissertation it has a great deal of merit. Mastery of all these aspects of *Altertumswissenschaft*, however, is hard to attain (I certainly had not done so when I published my first volume of commentary on Livy and do not claim, 37 years later, to possess it in full measure now) and is scarcely to be expected at the very beginning of an academic career. The criticisms that follow should be taken in that light: there is every reason to hope that T. will build on what she has achieved and acquire the skills and knowledge which would enable her to produce a high-level commentary, whether on another book of Valerius or on another writer.

The commentary is based on my Teubner edition of 1998 (an appendix lists the passages where she disagrees with what I and/or Combès (Budé 1995) print). What T. says about the manuscripts (12-4) is taken over from my preface, even including my Latinisation of the names of libraries: since she is writing in German, not Latin, she should have used the vernacular (e.g. Burgerbibliothek, not *bibl. ciuium* for the Berne MS. (A)). She says that the readings of the epitomators Iulius Paris and Ianuarius Nepotianus have to be taken into account, but appears not to realise that this indirect tradition for Valerius' text possesses equal authority to that of the primary MSS. in the direct tradition (ALG = α) and often writes as if the latter are inherently superior (indeed she seems in general to regard the fact that they have a particular reading as itself an argument in its favour): the fact that Paris and Nepotianus preserve the *exempla* in book 1 (1.1.ext.4-4.ext.1) missing in the direct tradition shows that they represent an earlier stage of transmission. It is, though, a reasonable procedure to follow the direct tradition when there is nothing to choose between the two. T. mentions that Servatus Lupus of Ferrières (near Orléans; misled by my *Ferrariensem*, T. talks of Ferrara) was one of the correctors of A, but does not make it clear that his second set of corrections were taken from Paris (and he inserted the missing material at the beginning of the MS.).

T. sometimes includes a textual note even though the reading which she is rejecting is manifestly impossible and has never been printed. Pp. 32-7 contain,

with German translation, the chapter headings found in the MSS. (they are almost certainly not authorial), in a number of footnotes drawing attention to discrepancies between her list and what I print on pp. 1-6 of my edition and between the latter and what appears in the main text, implying that these are errors on my part. She appears not to have realised (the existence of an apparatus should have made it clear) that I am reproducing what appears at the beginning of the MSS. and that this does not always cohere with the headings in the text.

T. devotes a lot of attention to matters of language and style, including 56 pages of her introduction. She has made good use of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (though she does not usually give precise references) and for words not covered in the published volumes (N and Q-Z; the final fascicle of P has just appeared) has consulted the archives in Munich. A number of things, however, suggest that she is not a specialist in this field. Thus she cites Kühner-Stegmann and both the original textbook of Menge (11th edn., 1953, revised by Thierfelder) and the new version of Burkard and Schauer (2000), but not Hofmann-Szantyr; in the introduction she lists, under the headings of 'Morphologie', 'Syntax', 'Lexik' and 'Stilmittel' examples of various items of linguistic and stylistic interest to be found in book 2: the pluperfect with *fui* and the future participle to express purpose are not matters of morphology; and there is an old-fashioned ring to her use of 'classical' to refer only to the writers of the late Republic (she has probably been influenced by Kühner-Stegmann) and her talk of 'Golden' and 'Silver' Latin.

I turn to matters of substance. T. has clearly read widely in the secondary literature and with such a mass of diverse material it would be absurd to complain that she has missed this or that item or does not cite all she could have done in individual notes (and I would lay myself open to the reply of *tu quoque*). She lists commentaries before the main bibliography and for Livy cites only that of Weissenborn and H. J. Müller: she appears to have made no use of the commentaries of Ogilvie, Oakley and myself, which contain much that is relevant (also, especially Oakley, on linguistic matters); this is particularly regrettable in the case of the origin of the *ludi scaenici* (2.4.4), a matter to which Oakley devotes over 40 pages, together with an appendix dealing with Valerius' account (*Commentary*, ii. 40-72, 776-8). Another omission is the *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, relevant for such matters as the *senaculum* (2.2.6) and the temple of Concordia (see below).

In the introduction T. agrees with Carter and Bellemore that Valerius composed his work between AD 14 and 16, not, as has generally been held, between 27 and 31 (though she does not accept their view that 6.1.praef. refers to Julia, not Livia). I argued for the traditional view in *Sileno* 19 (1993), 398-404 (fully taken account of by T.) and do not wish to respond in detail here, merely mentioning two matters. T. thinks that Sex. Pompeius, consul in AD 14, could have been proconsul of Asia in 15/16, when the identity of the governor is unknown: she is unaware that Augustus prescribed a minimum of five years between consulship and proconsulship (Dio 53.14.2; under Tiberius there is no attested interval of less than ten years). Secondly, she implies that Tiberius went into self-imposed exile in Rhodes because Augustus had forced him to marry Julia: the marriage was in

11 BC, the withdrawal to Rhodes in 6; Suetonius (*Tib.* 7.3), moreover, says that though Tiberius was unhappy about having to divorce Vipsania Agrippina, the marriage was initially successful.

2.7.5 produces a major historical problem, concerning the identity of the brother of Q. Fulvius Flaccus, the censor of 174, whom the latter expelled from the senate. I discussed it in my note on Livy 40.41.7-11, agreeing with Broughton that he was identical with the military tribune of Livy 40.41.7, M. Fulvius Nobilior, who had been adopted from the Fulvii Flacci into the Nobiliores. T., who devotes seven pages to the issue, has a novel and ingenious solution, but one, I fear, which is mistaken. She thinks that he is L. Manlius Acidinus, who was indeed a brother of the censor, adopted into the Manlii, and who held the consulship with Flaccus in 179; Valerius, she thinks, has conflated Livy 40.41.7 and 41.27.2, which also mentions the expulsion. The expulsion of a consular was a rare and very serious matter and if Flaccus had done so, it is inconceivable that it would not have been mentioned by Livy's source and Livy himself; cf. 39.42.5 (L. Quinctius Flaminius).

I conclude by mentioning a number of points of detail, for convenience all taken from the first chapter, many of which serve to illustrate what precedes.

p. 120: T. rightly prefers *lectulum* (α) to *lectum* in Paris (saying the agreement of the α MSS. is an argument for retaining it; see above), and describes the omission of *-lu-* as 'eine Art von Haplographie': it is, rather, a case of '*saut de même à même*' p. 122: it is not the case that Livy is the first prose writer to use *uirginitas*: it occurs at Cic. *nat. deor.* 3.59. p. 124: on p. 132 T. repeats what she says here about Plin. *nat.* 14.89, from Fabius Pictor (fr. 27P; she does not give the reference). p. 131: T. wrongly says that Valerius is the first prose author to use *Venus* to refer to (sc. sexual) love: it is found at Varro *rust.* 2.10.6 and Livy 30.12.18, 39.43.5. pp. 132-3: *ut ... efficerent* is a final, not a consecutive clause; Valerius writes *ut non* because it negatives just *non tristis ... et horrida*, not the whole clause (cf. Kühner-Stegmann, ii.209-10); by the same token T.'s retention of the transmitted *sed et* is impossible: what follows is clearly adversative. p. 136: T. has the idea that the shrine of Viriplaca is identical with the temple of Concordia: the former is on the Palatine, the latter at the northern end of the forum; she describes the erection of a temple to Concordia by L. Opimius (cos. 121), after he had been responsible for the murder of Gaius Gracchus and his supporters, as 'thanks for the restoration of peace'. p. 139: T. retains, as I do, *non magis quam in aliquo sacrato loco nudare se nefas esse credebatur* but thinks it means 'they did not believe it was more sinful (sc. for a father and son or father-in-law and son-in-law) to strip naked in front of each other than in some holy place', which is not a reason for not doing so. The reason for retaining the paradosis is that the negatives intensify, not cancel, each other; see B. Löfstedt, *A Class* 34 (1991), 158 n. 8. p. 141: At 2.1.9, 3.8.1 and 3.8.ext.6 forms of *circuminspicere* are transmitted, with forms of *circumspicere* as a correction in A at 2.1.9, in later MSS. at 3.8.1 and in A itself at 3.8.ext.6. T. accuses me of inconsistency in reading *circumspectum* in the first passage, but retaining *circum-* in the other two, without any compelling reason for so doing. My reason was that at 2.1.9

circumspectum is adjectival, qualifying *honorem* and with the sense of ‘careful’, ‘circumspect’, in the other two verbal. I may have been wrong about the latter (I was indeed inconsistent in giving *circum-* a *fort. recte* at 3.8.1 but not at 3.8.ext.6): there is no certain case of the verb in pagan Latin (at Stat. *Theb.* 2.700, where P has *circuminspice*, ω *circumspice*, editors print it as two words) and Shackleton Bailey read *circumspicere* in all three passages of Valerius. p. 142: T. cannot have been expected to discuss *patres conscripti* in detail, but she might have referred to more than Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. 839 ff.; see, e.g. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome*, 247, 445 nn. 17-19; *ibid.* T. need not have said that there is no doubt that *ualuis* should be preferred to *balbis* (the common phonetic corruption): what could *adfixique balbis* possibly mean? p. 143: at 2.2.6 *statio* means ‘position’, not ‘session’; *ibid.*: T. should have added ‘and similar verbs’ after *procedere*: only one of the examples she gives has *procedere*; T. goes on to say that *processurarum* is a normal classical usage, by which she means that the future participle does not express purpose (cf. p. 51): it could not do so, since the usage is found only with verbs of motion. It is frequent in Livy, but occurs first in Gaius Gracchus, once each in Cicero and Sallust, and twice in the *bellum Africum*; on no definition of ‘classical’, then, is there anything unclassical about it (see Kühner-Stegmann, i. 761, Hofmann-Szantyr, 390-1, Oakley, *Commentary*, i. 585). p. 144: at Livy 38.57.5 *consurrexisse* refers to the senate getting to its feet to urge Scipio to betroth his daughter to Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, not to getting up from a meal; *surgere* is also common in the latter sense. p. 145: T. might have referred to *cantabant* in Paris and *canebant* in Nepotianus, which are clearly replacements of *pangebant* by a normal equivalent; *ibid.*: these ballads have been seen as ‘oral tradition’, preserving stories about early times; cf., e.g., Oakley, *Commentary*, i. 23; *ibid.*: the word-order of *quid hoc splendidius, quid etiam utilius certamine* is not a combination of chiasmus and hyperbaton: the hyperbaton produces the chiasmus. p. 146: T. says that the conjecture which I attribute to Vahlen is not to be found at the place I cite: it is at his *Gesammelte philologische Schriften*, i. 627-8, in the discussion of 5.2.ext.4 (I ought, therefore, to have given the page reference). p. 147: T. claims, citing Menge (357), that in writing *huic domesticae disciplinae* Valerius is departing from the normal word-order in phrases containing demonstrative, adjective and noun: in fact Menge is talking only about cases where *ille* has the sense of ‘famous’ (he does give an example, presumably invented, with *hic*, which is not used in that sense); *domesticae huic disciplinae* would have been very strange here. (I am grateful to David Langslow for discussion of this point.) p. 148: *Camilli Scipiones Fabricii Marcelli Fabii* is an example of the plural being used to mean ‘people like ...’ and refers to the five famous individuals of these names; cf. Kühner-Stegmann, i. 72; Camillus is not the ‘usual *cognomen*’ of Republican Furii; there were many others (see the index in *MRR*); and for ‘Servii’ read ‘Servilii’. *ibid.*: delete ‘Gen.’ in ‘*singulus* kommt as Gen. Sg.’; but what could *singuli imperii nostri lumina* mean?

JOHN BRISCOE
University of Manchester
John.Briscoe@manchester.ac.uk