

## THE *HISTORIA AVGVSTA* BEFORE MS PAL. LAT. 899: LOST MANUSCRIPTS AND SCRIBAL MEDIATION

### ABSTRACT

This article re-evaluates the role of the manuscript tradition of the *Historia Augusta* in debates over the original contents and authorship of the text. Evidence for physical disruptions to the text before our oldest surviving manuscripts points to an earlier manuscript distributed across multiple codices. A multi-volume archetype eliminates critical arguments against the author's claims about lives missing before the Life of Hadrian as well as in the lacuna for the years A.D. 244–260. Other multi-volume codices of the eighth and ninth centuries show that loss of an initial volume would have disrupted the textual tradition for the index, titles and authorial attributions. Comparison of our most complete early witness, Pal. lat. 899, to the independent branches of the textual tradition shows discrepancies between these paratextual elements as expected in a disrupted tradition. Ultimately, this article concludes that the current debates on authorship and the original scope of the *Historia Augusta* rest on paratextual elements from a single branch of the manuscript tradition, raising doubts about the centrality of these controversies to understanding the work.

**Keywords:** authorship; codex; *Historia Augusta*; lacuna; manuscript; paratext

The text of the *Historia Augusta* (*HA*) is fraught with questions of authenticity. The earliest surviving codex, MS Pal. lat. 899 (**P**), preserves a series of thirty-odd imperial biographies in non-chronological order, with two alleged lacunae, under the names of six different authors. These authors' names appear scattered incoherently throughout the *Lives*, presenting contradictions not only between the index page and individual headings but even between *Lives* where cross-references imply shared authorship.<sup>1</sup> General consensus among *HA* scholars now identifies the six names as an imposture and the 'missing' *Lives* as a charade counterfeiting material that never existed.<sup>2</sup> Between the writing of the *HA* and its earliest codex, however, lie over four hundred years of manuscript users, scribes and potential exposure to damaging acts of god and man that rarely feature in discussions of the work's earliest history.<sup>3</sup> Nor has

<sup>1</sup> These contradictions and their implications were first expressed in H. Dessau, 'Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 24 (1889), 378–92.

<sup>2</sup> Most recent monographs and studies on the *HA* take these two positions: D.W.P. Burgersdijk, *Style and Structure of the Historia Augusta* (Amsterdam, 2010), 73–4 and 79–81; Alan Cameron, 'The *Historia Augusta*', in id., *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford, 2011), 743–82, at 745; M. Thomson, *Studies in the Historia Augusta (Collection Latomus 337)* (Brussels, 2012), 20–36 and 101; S. Ratti, *Polémiques entre païens et chrétiens* (Paris, 2012), 12 and *L'Histoire Auguste: les Païens et les Chrétiens dans l'antiquité tardive* (Paris, 2016), 229; and D. Rohrbacher, *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta* (Madison, 2016), 3–10. See also the introductions to the *Collection Budé* editions cited individually throughout this article. E. Savino, *Ricerche sull'Historia Augusta* (Naples, 2017), 69–76 defends the authenticity of the lacuna, but accepts the fabrication of the authorial names.

<sup>3</sup> Key studies on the textual transmission of the *HA* have focussed on its use by later writers: C. Bertrand, O. Desbordes and J.P. Callu, 'L'Histoire Auguste et l'historiographie médiévale', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 14–15 (1984–5), 97–130; J.P. Callu, 'L'"Histoire Auguste" de

there been extended consideration of the diverse physical formats employed for manuscripts in the period preceding our surviving witnesses. Reconsideration of manuscript transmission practices provides an alternative explanation for both the lacunae and the inconsistency of the six pseudonyms grounded in the physical realities of manuscript usage. Relying on these alleged devices to characterize the author and explain his compositional aims may thus lead to false conclusions both about the author's goals for the work and about the literary community in which he wrote.

The complexity of the *HA*'s compositional structure necessitates specifying which figure is signified as 'the author' when discussing compositional motivations. Even scholars who view the six authorial names as a single writer's imposture acknowledge the diversity of style and informational quality throughout the *Lives*. In particular, nine biographies, often designated *Primary Lives*, stand out for their historical accuracy and appear to present the composition of a different writer than the other twenty-one.<sup>4</sup> Although analysis of vocabulary and mannerisms has revealed that biographies attributed to all six pseudonyms contain similarities, the shared features cluster outside of the *Primary Lives*.<sup>5</sup> Various hypotheses postulating the source of the *Primary Lives* agree that large portions have been copied nearly verbatim into the *HA* from an earlier biographical series.<sup>6</sup> It seems probable, therefore, that the *HA*'s text incorporates the writings of at least two figures who could be designated as 'authors'.

Outside of the *Primary Lives*, cross-references and verbal idiosyncrasies suggest that a single writer continued the series, incorporating the *Primary Lives* with varying degrees of emendation.<sup>7</sup> Anachronisms and a *post euentum* prophecy date this writer

Petrarque', *Antiquitas* 4 (1987), 81–115; and J.P. Callu and O. Desbordes, 'Le "Quattrocento" de l'*Histoire Auguste*', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 19 (1989), 253–75. O. Pecere, 'Il codice Palatino dell'*Historia Augusta* come "edizione" continua', in O. Pecere and M.D. Reeve (edd.) *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1995), 323–69 examines the early textual and scholarly tradition of MS Pal. lat. 899.

<sup>4</sup> These are the *Lives of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Verus, Commodus, Pertinax, Didius Julianus, Severus and Caracalla*. The classifications were proposed by T. Mommsen, 'Die Scriptorum Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 25 (1890), 228–92, at 246, and refined by R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1974), 56–8 and T.D. Barnes, 'Hadrian and Lucius Verus', *JRS* 57 (1978), 65–79. Burgersdijk (n. 2), 30–4 treats in detail the scholarship on the categorization principles.

<sup>5</sup> D. den Hengst, *Emperors and Historiography* (Leiden, 2010), 178–9. D. den Hengst, 'The discussion of authorship', in G. Bonamente (ed.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Perusinum* (Bari, 2002), 187–95 questions whether the discussion of homogeneity and heterogeneity should be restricted to the options of six authors or one. The most recent computer study—J.A. Stover and M. Kestemont, 'The authorship of the *Historia Augusta*: two new computational studies', *BICS* 59 (2016), 140–57—indicates that the *Primary Lives* have an authorial style distinct from the later *Lives*.

<sup>6</sup> This proposition was advanced by R. Syme, 'Ignotus, the good biographer', in A. Alföldi and J. Straub (edd.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1966/67* (Bonn, 1968), 131–53; id., 'Not Marius Maximus', *Hermes* 96 (1968), 494–502; and T.D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978), 99–107, who identify the source as an unknown biographer ('Ignotus') from the third century. J. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus* (Munich, 1974) and more recently A.R. Birley, 'Marius Maximus, the consular biographer', *ANRW* 2.34 (Berlin and New York, 1977), 2679–757 suggest that Marius Maximus was the primary source, which remains the dominant theory—see Burgersdijk (n. 2), 40–1. M. Kulikowski, 'Marius Maximus in Ammianus and the "Historia Augusta"', *CQ* 57 (2007), 244–56 identifies at least two prior sources, including Maximus.

<sup>7</sup> In addition to the traits identified by Dessau (n. 1), both P. White, 'The authorship of the *Historia Augusta*', *JRS* 57 (1967), 115–33 and J.N. Adams, 'On the authorship of the *Historia Augusta*', *CQ* 22 (1972), 186–94 identify unifying linguistic features shared by all six pseudonyms. The presentation of their data does not differentiate between the categories of *Lives*.

to the late fourth or early fifth centuries A.D.<sup>8</sup> Recent scholarship awards the title ‘the author’ to this later writer, differentiated from the writer of the *Primary Lives* as well as from later scribes and copyists.

The significance of the authorial attributions in Pal. lat. 899 changes depending on which hand added them and with what motivation. Most recent discussion presumes that the names were distributed across the *Lives* by the fourth- or fifth-century author. This fraud has been explained as an attempt to deflect repercussions for publishing a pro-pagan work in a Christian empire,<sup>9</sup> to provide a literary game for the reader,<sup>10</sup> to disguise the work as an anthology<sup>11</sup> and to satisfy a frivolous author’s love of deception.<sup>12</sup> For such interpretations, the motivation behind the names provides a key to understanding the work’s compositional aims. If, however, the attributions originated with a later scribe, attempts to analyse the author’s goals through the lens of these attributions are destined for confusion.

Arguments in favour of an author who falsified the scope of his work and invented an ensemble of false identities presume that the ninth-century manuscript Pal. lat. 899 (**P**) preserves not only the original text of the *HA* but also its original paratext—the collection of cues surrounding a work from page numbers and indices to titles and incipits that are not integral to the narrative text, but mediate how the reader approaches it.<sup>13</sup> **P**, originating over four hundred years after the author wrote, was itself probably a copy of a copy, with an unknown number of stages in unknown formats between it and the earliest versions of the text. These stages between the composition of the text and the creation of **P** are difficult to assess owing to the work’s narrow transmission history. However, both the manuscripts and the author’s claims indicate that failures did occur in the centuries between the work’s initial composition and the production of **P**. Comparing the evidence of the surviving witnesses provides clues about the condition of their exemplar. The discernible patterns of loss and scribal correction suggest that the alleged impostures may be the result of events that transpired during transmission—accidental or intentional.

## 1. TEXTUAL DISPLACEMENT IN THE EARLY MANUSCRIPTS

Two textual displacements in **P** reveal disturbances in its exemplar attributable to displacement of its folios. In the *Life of Carus, Carinus and Numerian*, **P** leaps from section 2.2 to section 13.3, inserting the displaced material after section 15.5 (Pal. lat.

<sup>8</sup> Thomson (n. 2), 37–53 contains a synopsis of the anachronisms. Most scholars see *Prob.* 24.2–3 as an allusion to the consuls of A.D. 395, although Cameron (n. 2), 772–8 argues for a date in the 370s.

<sup>9</sup> Ratti (n. 2), *passim*. Ratti follows a tradition that sees the *HA* as pagan countercultural literature, a proposition championed by J. Straub, *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik* (Bonn, 1963). See also F. Paschoud, ‘L’auteur de l’*Histoire Auguste* est-il un apostat?’, in J.P. Callu, F. Chausson and É. Wolff (edd.), *Consuetudinis amor: fragments d’histoire romaine (II–VI siècles) offerts à Jean-Pierre Callu* (Rome, 2003), 357–69 and F. Paschoud, *Histoire Auguste: Vies d’Aurélien et de Tacite* (Paris, 1996), xv.

<sup>10</sup> Rohrbacher (n. 2), 21–9.

<sup>11</sup> Savino (n. 2), 89.

<sup>12</sup> Cameron (n. 2), 780–2.

<sup>13</sup> The foundational theoretical study treating paratext as an element of a literary work is G. Genette (transl. J.E. Lewin), *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1997).

899, 212r and v). More complex is a jumbled series of events from the *Lives of Severus Alexander* through *Maximus and Balbinus*. Here, five sections of material that C. Bertrand, O. Desbordes and J.P. Callu designate as  $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$  appear in the order  $\alpha\gamma\beta\epsilon\delta$ , displacing sections of the *Severus Alexander* and the *Two Maximini* into the subsequent *Lives*.<sup>14</sup> Both disturbances resulted from physical disruptions to the exemplar, the first caused by a single folio's escape and inaccurate replacement, the second by a loose quaternion, the folios of which were reassembled incorrectly.<sup>15</sup> Comparison with the other branches of the manuscript tradition proves that the failures originated with **P**'s exemplar.

Although most early manuscripts derive from **P**, two other traditions furnish evidence about the manuscript from which **P** itself derived.<sup>16</sup> E. Hohl noticed that the scribes for both **P** and an independent class of manuscripts designated  $\Sigma$  were confused by the exemplar's letter forms, displaying patterns of errors which suggest that both copied a Frankish source.<sup>17</sup> S. Ballou, in an unsuccessful attempt to prove a dependency between the branches, uncovered the close relationship between the  $\Sigma$ -branch and the readings left in **P** by its first corrector, a contemporary to the original scribe who probably employed the same exemplar for the corrections.<sup>18</sup> Together, these observations suggest that the source of **P** and  $\Sigma$  was the same exemplar. The evidence of the  $\Sigma$ -class manuscripts must be used with caution, as the earliest, fourteenth-century witnesses show evidence of emendations using the **P** tradition.<sup>19</sup> The substantive differences between  $\Sigma$  and **P**, however, provide clues about the transmission history. Pal. lat. 886 (**II**), a set of excerpts from the first nineteen *Lives* compiled around the same time as **P**, likewise derives from the same exemplar and can corroborate evidence about its readings.<sup>20</sup>

The relationship between these three branches allows aspects of the exemplar's history to be reconstructed as it relates to the textual displacements. Both failures from **P** are absent in the  $\Sigma$ -class manuscripts. This fact has perplexed many scholars, owing to the frequent, futile efforts of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century intellectuals to emend these failures in **P**, unaware of the extant solution.<sup>21</sup> Yet, writers who preceded the best attempts to correct the disorganization of **P** possessed a text in which the *Life of Alexander Severus* followed the proper order, establishing the independence of  $\Sigma$ .<sup>22</sup> Given the otherwise close relationship between  $\Sigma$  and **P**, the absence of disorganization in  $\Sigma$  suggests that damage to the exemplar occurred after the  $\Sigma$  archetype had been copied.

<sup>14</sup> Bertrand et al. (n. 3), 126.

<sup>15</sup> S. Ballou, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914), 41–2.

<sup>16</sup> The main witnesses for reconstructing **P**'s original readings are Codex Bambergensis (**B**), copied before major emendation to **P**, and Vat. 5301, the manuscript used for the first print edition. For an updated stemma, see Callu and Desbordes (n. 3), 274–5.

<sup>17</sup> E. Hohl, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1927; rev. 1997), viii–x.

<sup>18</sup> Ballou (n. 15), 62–74. On the identity of the first corrector, see Ballou (n. 15), 5–6 and Hohl (n. 17), viii.

<sup>19</sup> On the complex interrelationship between **P** and the other surviving manuscripts, see especially Pecere (n. 3) and Callu (n. 3).

<sup>20</sup> B. Boyer, 'Insular contributions to medieval literary tradition on the Continent', *CPh* 43 (1948), 31–9 demonstrates the independence of **II**, following W.M. Lindsay, *Palaeographia Latina*, Part 3 (Oxford, 1924), 25. Manuscripts **P** and **II** are viewable at the Digital Vatican Library: <https://digi.vatlib.it/>

<sup>21</sup> Pecere (n. 3), Callu et al. (n. 3) and Callu (n. 3).

<sup>22</sup> Callu et al. (n. 3), refuting Ballou (n. 15), who maintained that  $\Sigma$  depended on Petrarch's emendations of **P**.

The excerpts found in **II**, meanwhile, echo **P**'s displacements in the *Alexander Severus* and the *Two Maximini*. Since **II** is independent from **P**, the replicated displacement confirms that the confusion was not a lapse made by **P**'s copyist but rather a result of the shared exemplar's condition. The abridged **II**, ending at the disrupted *Lives of Alexander and Maximinus*, cannot confirm the second displacement. None the less, the undamaged text of the  $\Sigma$ -class manuscripts combined with the evidence of displacement from **II** confirms that certain errors in **P** resulted from accidents of transmission unrelated to the author's composition.

The physical defects of the exemplar reflected in the later manuscripts demonstrate the fallibility of the surviving text. Further discrepancies between the independent branches of the text suggest that these displacements were not the only damage the text had suffered by the time the shared exemplar was being copied. Arguments concerning the two great impostures of the *HA* will thus be weighed against explanations rooted in the physicality of textual transmission and the practices of its scribes.

## 2. THE LACUNA IN A MULTI-VOLUME EDITION

A major lacuna appears in the *HA* for the years A.D. 244–260, although the author refers to the *Lives* of the missing emperors as if relevant biographies had been included. The *Life of Gallienus*, the first nearly complete life after the lacuna, claims that the emperor's early years had already been covered in a biography of his father, Valerian, on whom only a few paragraphs survive (*Gall.* 19.7).<sup>23</sup> Moreover, the programme laid out in the *Life of Elagabalus* includes all the rulers between Alexander and Aurelian, without stating exceptions (*Heliogab.* 35.2).

The common position in recent scholarship explains this lacuna as a fiction devised by an author who never wrote the missing *Lives*.<sup>24</sup> The major arguments in favour of the fiction are:

1. The author's interest in the physical properties of books near the lacuna.
2. Two passages, *Alex. Sev.* 64.1–2 and *Carus* 3.3–8, that skip from Alexander to Gallienus in the lists of emperors.
3. The inclusion of one usurper from the period of the lacuna in the *Thirty Tyrants*, despite his chronological irrelevance and the absence of other coeval usurpers.
4. The description of major events from the period of the lacuna in the surrounding books.
5. The cleanness of the break, which follows the end of a complete biography.

<sup>23</sup> See also the opening (*Gall.* 1.1): *Capto Valeriano, enimvero unde incipienda est Gallieni uita, nisi ab eo praecipue malo, quo eius uita depressa est ...* This *Life* suffers from several short lacunae and textual deficiencies, although the  $\Sigma$ -branch preserves a better text than **P**.

<sup>24</sup> See above, n. 2, as well as J.P. Callu, O. Desbordes and A. Gaden, *Histoire Auguste: vies d'Hadrien, Aelius, Antonin* (Paris, 1992), xlvii–xlix. S. Ratti, *Histoire Auguste: vies des deux Valériens et des deux Galliens* (Paris, 2000), vii–xxviii repeats the case for religious motivations behind the lacuna, against which see Rohrbacher (n. 2), 10. Recent scholarship on the lacuna largely follows the work of A.R. Birley, 'The lacuna in the *Historia Augusta*', in G. Alföldi and J. Straub (edd.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1972/74* (Bonn, 1976), 55–62 and D. den Hengst, *The Prefaces in the Historia Augusta* (Amsterdam, 1981), 71–2. J. Fündling, *Kommentar zur Vita Hadriani der Historia Augusta* (Bonn, 2006), 10–13 reviews the history of the debate and takes an agnostic position.

E. Savino has refuted the first point, noting that the author's interest in physical books is not only internally motivated in the biographies near the lacuna but also extends to most of the non-*Primary Lives*.<sup>25</sup> The second argument does not account for the presence of the *Lives of the Two Maximini, Maximus and Balbinus* and the *Three Gordians*, the true loss of which would paradoxically strengthen this argument for fictitious loss. In similar fashion, the absence in the *Thirty Tyrants* of the usurpers Jotapianus and Julius Priscus, easily known to the author through Aurelius Victor, would look the same whether *Lives* for the usurpers under Decius had been written and then lost or excluded intentionally.<sup>26</sup> The inclusion of their contemporary, the elder Valens, in the *Thirty Tyrants* provides no concrete proof regarding the existence of the missing biographies, as his inclusion appears motivated both by the author's struggle to reach the promised number of thirty and by the presence of another, related Valens in the ensemble. The author does not employ even the minimal information he would have found in Aurelius Victor. As in the case of Zenobia, whose story appears across three different biographies, each with a different purpose, Valens may well have appeared multiple times.

Both the third and the fourth arguments in favour of a fictitious lacuna presume that the author neither repeats materials nor incorporates other emperors' deeds in a given biography. This presumption can be disproven by looking more broadly at the deployment of historical data throughout the *HA*. The *Lives* covering the emperors in the year A.D. 238 repeat many of the same core facts as necessary for each individual's narrative.<sup>27</sup> Similar repetitions occur across the *Life of Gallienus* and the *Thirty Tyrants*, where the former relates the actions of individual usurpers whose miniature biographies in the latter often contain the same information.<sup>28</sup> The incorporation in the biographies near the lacuna of several events that occurred under Philip does not stand out as unusual deployment of historical data when considering the author's habits. The Scythian War mentioned at the end of the *Life of Gordian III*, for instance, not only serves as a suitable transition point from the account of Gordian but also follows the presentation of materials in Zosimus (1.20.1), whose narrative the *HA* often parallels.<sup>29</sup>

The cleanness of the break where the lacuna begins provides the most compelling evidence for scholars who argue for a falsified lacuna. D. den Hengst has argued that a true lacuna caused by loss of folios would not correspond neatly to the work's internal section breaks, resulting in 'frayed edges' around the lacuna.<sup>30</sup> The undamaged ending of the *Life of Maximus and Balbinus* is thereby suspicious. An unstated assumption for the 'frayed edges' argument requires that any manuscript damage happened to a single-volume copy of the text. With such a codex envisioned, the likelihood that a given

<sup>25</sup> Savino (n. 2), 70–1.

<sup>26</sup> Dessau (n. 1), 363–7 identified two borrowings from Aurelius Victor accepted by subsequent scholarship. Information from the *Caesares* appears throughout the *HA*: Burgersdijk (n. 2), 16.

<sup>27</sup> E.g. notice that Maximinus was declared a public enemy appears at *Maximin.* 15.2, *Gord.* 11.1 and *Max. Balb.* 1.4.

<sup>28</sup> *Gall.* 1.2–3.5 describes the usurpations of Macrianus, Ballista, Quietus, Domitianus, Aureolus, Odenathus and Piso, each of whom receives individual treatment in the *Thirty Tyrants*.

<sup>29</sup> These parallels have been used to speculate about lost historical works available to Zosimus and the *HA* author. See J. Schwartz, 'À propos des données chronographiques de *L'Histoire Auguste*', in G. Alföldi (ed.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1964/65* (Bonn, 1966), 197–210; F. Paschoud, *Zosime: Histoire nouvelle* (Paris, 1971), xxxvii–xl; Barnes (n. 6), 111.

<sup>30</sup> den Hengst (n. 24), 71, restated in Rohrbacher (n. 2), 10.



quaternion would begin or end perfectly with the beginning or ending of a subsection—such as the *Life of Maximus and Balbinus*—significantly diminishes.<sup>31</sup>

If we remove the assumption of a single-volume exemplar, both the lacuna and the displacements that start with the *Life of Alexander* reflect common damage patterns in manuscripts. Several examples of multi-volume manuscript sets survive from the eighth and ninth centuries with more attested in surviving library catalogues.<sup>32</sup> A multi-volume exemplar for the *HA*, the earliest copies of which date to the ninth century, would thus fit with habits of manuscript production in the preceding years. In examples located at the library of St. Gallen, the scribes separated their volumes at internal divisions, without concern for the regularity of volume length or quantity of sections contained in each volume.<sup>33</sup> In a similar vein, the manuscript tradition of the grammarian Nonius Marcellus acquired much of its complexity from an early separation into three volumes containing Books 1–3, 4 and 5–16.<sup>34</sup> A volume division occurring after the *Life of Maximus and Balbinus* in the exemplar would help to explain three of the curious features of the surviving tradition. First, it resolves the issue of cleanness at the beginning of the lacuna, since multi-volume sets usually follow major section breaks. Second, it positions the lacuna at the beginning of a volume, where incidental damage is more likely. Third, it positions the *Lives of Alexander* through *Maximus and Balbinus* near the outer edge of a volume, where they, too, would be prone to damage. The displacements that occurred between the copying of the archetype for the  $\Sigma$ -class and the production of **P** and **II** would thus follow common patterns of handling damage.

A two-volume exemplar may also help to explain the state of materials in **II**. Damage to the *Lives* following *Severus Alexander* would have rendered the following pages more vulnerable. As **II** contains no excerpts beyond the section of the displacement labelled  $\beta$  (*Alex. Sev.* 43.7–58.1) by O. Desbordes et al., this could reflect the use of a single, damaged codex that contained no further material.

The possibility of a multi-volume exemplar has been raised by E. Savino, who likewise concludes that the case for a falsified lacuna has been overstated.<sup>35</sup> Savino's own proposed seven- and three-volume reconstructions, however, leave the cleanness of the lacuna's beginning unaddressed and present inconsistencies in the spatial limitations that he posits caused the collection's chronological disorganization.<sup>36</sup> The hypothesis of a two-volume exemplar, on the other hand, addresses the strongest argument for a fictitious lacuna. The remaining criteria that support falsification by the author do not adequately prove that the surviving material differs substantially from what we might

<sup>31</sup> den Hengst (n. 24), 71 notes that internal lacunae in Tacitus display such fraying but neglects the issue of Tacitus' lost books.

<sup>32</sup> All codices from the St. Gallen collection referred to in this article can be viewed at: <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/csg>. Multi-volume sets can be identified throughout the lists in G. Bekker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885).

<sup>33</sup> A six-volume set of Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob* has volumes that range from 139 to 236 folios containing five to eight chapters each (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 206–9). A ninth-century copy of Augustine's *Commentary on the Psalms* creates groupings of twenty-four to thirty-five psalms on 187 to 250 folios per volume (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 162–6).

<sup>34</sup> L.D. Reynolds, 'Nonius Marcellus', in *ibid.*, *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), 248–52.

<sup>35</sup> Savino (n. 2), 69–76.

<sup>36</sup> For example, Savino (n. 2), 101 notes that the Didius Julianus was switched with Avidius Cassius owing to spatial constraints in his first proposed volume, yet elsewhere proposes volumes longer than the chronological order would have created. The seven-thousand-word variance in proposed volumes undermines the proposition of strict spatial constraints without specifications for the manuscripts' dimensions.

expect of a work that had suffered true loss. Without stronger evidence to support the claim to fiction, a physical explanation that accounts for the condition of the surviving witnesses offers a simpler solution.

### 3. A POSSIBLE MISSING VOLUME

The possibility of a multi-volume set raises an alternative explanation for another absent series of *Lives* mentioned by the author. The *Life of Aelius* states that the reader should possess *Lives* for all rulers from Julius Caesar to Hadrian, although only *Hadrian* appears in the manuscripts (*Ael.* 1.1). This claim has been dismissed by scholars, often with minimal justification.<sup>37</sup> Hesitancy to accept the existence of a more complete series results in part from the position of Suetonius in the modern canon of Roman texts. Arguments against a longer *HA* often take for granted that the author would not have written new *Lives* for emperors already covered in Suetonius, focussing the debate instead on whether the *Lives of Nerva and Trajan* ever filled the gap between Suetonius and the *HA*.<sup>38</sup> However, no current *HA* scholar denies that the author incorporated pre-existing work for the *Primary Lives*.<sup>39</sup> Although the source for the *Primary Lives* has been identified variously as Marius Maximus or another unknown writer, both positions admit that the *HA*'s author revised and reproduced pre-existing work.<sup>40</sup> Instead of questioning whether the author composed new *Lives* for the emperors covered by Suetonius, we should consider instead the possibility that the author borrowed, condensed and modified the Suetonian series.

A hypothetical reconstruction that includes the Suetonian materials adds at least thirteen more *Lives* before Hadrian's, depending on how one interprets the apparent conflict between *Ael.* 1.1 and *Ael.* 7.5 over the inclusion of Julius Caesar.<sup>41</sup> The length of this portion of text would more easily fill a full volume than a missing pair for Nerva and Trajan alone. The closest proxy for such a volume—the Suetonian *Lives* themselves—show that this series is approximately the same length as the proposed volume containing the *Lives of Hadrian through Maximus and Balbinus*. A character count of two online editions of both texts provides the following data:<sup>42</sup>

<sup>37</sup> A. Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste: les empereurs romains des IIe et IIIe siècles* (Paris, 1994), xxxv simply calls the existence of these lives 'proprement invraisemblable'. Rohrbacher (n. 2), 5 echoes this sentiment. den Hengst (n. 24), 14–16 leaves room for a Suetonian series, ruling impossible only minor figures before Aelius.

<sup>38</sup> Callu et al. (n. 24), xvi and xlvi–xlix proposes that the *Lives of Nerva and Trajan* were intentionally omitted. Paschoud (n. 9), xxvii suggests that the work once contained these *Lives*, now lost.

<sup>39</sup> See the introduction, as well as Callu et al. (n. 24), xvii–xix; Birley (n. 6), *passim*; Cameron (n. 2), 778; Thomson (n. 2), 93.

<sup>40</sup> In addition to the sources in n. 6, see A. Molinier, 'Marius Maximus source latine de la Vie de Commode?', in G. Bonamente, F. Heim and J.P. Callu (edd.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Argentoratense* (Bari, 1998), 223–48.

<sup>41</sup> These passages only conflict if in the phrase *omnes qui post Caesarem dictatorem ... uel Caesares uel Augusti uel principes appellati sunt* the word *post* is interpreted as excluding its object from the series. Usage suggests that inclusivity is possible, especially in a sequence of related figures; *TLL* 10.2.169.80–170.7 and 174.59–175.26.

<sup>42</sup> The character counts for each are presented without counting spaces as characters. Both texts were checked against one another and against the Teubner edition for major omissions of text and edited to remove extraneous numbering and footnotes.



	Latin Library <sup>43</sup>	Lacus Curtius <sup>44</sup>
Suetonius (ALL)	448,854	448,515
<i>Historia Augusta</i> (1–21)	449,840	449,792

Although the addition of the *Lives of Nerva and Trajan* might make this first volume longer than the second, even if the author emended and condensed the source material, variations in length up to several dozen folios are not unusual in surviving multi-volume sets.<sup>45</sup>

Loss of an entire volume would once more help to explain the unusually clean start to the *Life of Hadrian*. An entire volume containing not only Nerva and Trajan but also the works of Suetonius or something close to them could easily have been lost, destroyed by accident or simply loaned out, never to return. Letters from Lupus of Ferrières, whose activity immediately preceded the production of **P** and **II**, show that Suetonius was both rare and in demand at that time.<sup>46</sup> He himself requested to borrow a two-volume copy from the monastery at Fulda.<sup>47</sup> No other trace survives of this dual-volume arrangement. Like the *HA*, Suetonius suffers from a narrow manuscript tradition, all extant copies deriving from an eighth- or ninth-century Frankish manuscript.<sup>48</sup> Thus, even if the loss of the proposed first *HA* volume were due to lending rather than damage, its absence in the manuscript tradition of both Suetonius and the *HA* would be unsurprising given the slender transmission for each.

The author's claims about the original extent of his work require considering the possibility of a series opening with Caesar rather than with Nerva or Trajan. Both M. Meckler and E. Savino argue on thematic principles that the *Life of Hadrian* suitably introduces the author's narrative goals, rebutting the hypothesis that the author would have wanted to include either Nerva or Trajan.<sup>49</sup> Meckler notes that Hadrian's biography initiates several dominant themes for the surviving series: the author's ambivalence toward imperial power centred around an emperor neither adored nor reviled universally, the novelty of adopted princes in the figure of Aelius, and the role of adoption in legitimating imperial succession. Savino, accepting these thematic links, argues that a series opening with Trajan would make the connection between this anti-Christian emperor and the Theodosian dynasty too apparent and uncomfortable.<sup>50</sup> A series beginning with Julius Caesar, however, avoids the issue Savino raises and provides a suitable embodiment of Meckler's major themes in the glorified and hated arch-usurper himself, followed by the nephew who legitimated his power on the basis of adoption.

<sup>43</sup> *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, The Latin Library, accessed 8 August 2020, <http://thelatinlibrary.com/sha.html>

<sup>44</sup> B. Thayer, 'The *Historia Augusta*', Lacus Curtius: Into the Roman World, accessed 25 July 2019, [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Historia\\_Augusta/home.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Historia_Augusta/home.html) Text from D. Magie (transl.), *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Cambridge, MA, 1921, 1924, 1932).

<sup>45</sup> See n. 33.

<sup>46</sup> S.J. Tibbetts, 'Suetonius', in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), 399–404.

<sup>47</sup> G. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières* (The Hague, 1966), 52.

<sup>48</sup> R.A. Kaster, 'The transmission of Suetonius's *Caesares* in the Middle Ages', *TAPhA* 144 (2014), 133–6.

<sup>49</sup> M. Meckler, 'The beginning of the *Historia Augusta*', *Historia* 45 (1996), 364–75 and Savino (n. 2).

<sup>50</sup> Savino (n. 2), 65–7.

Savino rejects a pre-Hadrianic series by noting that no surviving manuscript preserves this material and that reinserting it requires hypothesizing medial stages in transmission, which is indeed the supposition under consideration.<sup>51</sup> Meckler doubts that the author would have reproduced the works of Suetonius and asks why Aelius should be the first presumptive heir to be treated.<sup>52</sup> Although in the introduction to the *Life of Aelius* the author appends the idea of biographies for those who ‘in some way came into prominence or the hopes of imperial power’, his primary interest is in figures who reached the official position of Caesar, a designated successor to an Augustus (*Ael.* 1.1). The author contrasts these heirs apparent to those who had previously been legitimated either through familial relation alone or through traditional adoption (*Ael.* 2.2). As Burgersdijk has noted, the author envisions the specific Tetrarchic system of adoption into a defined sequence of imperial offices, in which Aelius would reasonably appear as the first unsuccessfully named Caesar for a dynasty defined by adoption.<sup>53</sup>

A three-volume set of imperial biographies corresponds with manuscript production practices in the period preceding the earliest *HA* manuscripts and provides an explanation for the clean breaks surrounding the missing *Lives*. Substantial material preceding the *Life of Hadrian* would also help to explain the curious lack of introduction in a work well known for its colourful prefaces and frequent exposition of the author’s motives and accomplishments.<sup>54</sup> Loss of the first volume and damage to the third would lead a copyist producing a single-volume copy of the remaining *Lives* to create manuscripts in the surviving format. With a manuscript tradition as slender as the *HA*’s, such a process of loss and damage need only have happened once during the roughly four-hundred-year period between composition and the earliest surviving manuscripts to produce the text preserved in the closely related traditions of **P**, **Π** and **Σ**.

A similar calamity befell the works of Tacitus, for which a damaged multi-volume edition preceded the lacunose surviving manuscripts, causing a mix of clean and rough breaks in the surviving texts.<sup>55</sup> Where other witnesses such as Jerome help to confirm the original extent of Tacitus’ works, the *HA* suffers from obscurity, requiring greater reliance on the author’s claims. One further feature of the early manuscripts, however, supports the hypothesis of a lost first volume. Discrepancies in the paratexts across the three surviving branches cast doubt on the originality of the paratext in **P** and its value in interpreting the author’s compositional aims.

#### 4. A FRAGILE PARATEXT

A written volume’s accompanying paratext usually conveys information about the source and purpose of a text, including authorial ascriptions and tables of contents. Although in the modern world of printing and editions, the author more easily controls the paratextual information surrounding their work, in the case of Medieval manuscripts,

<sup>51</sup> Savino (n. 2), 65 n. 23.

<sup>52</sup> Meckler (n. 49), 372.

<sup>53</sup> Burgersdijk (n. 2), 54–8.

<sup>54</sup> On the author’s prefatory habits, see den Hengst (n. 24). The question of a lost introduction was raised by H. Dessau, ‘Über die Scriptorum Historiae Augustae’, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 561–605, at 578–9 and R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968), 206–7.

<sup>55</sup> C.E. Murgia, ‘The textual transmission’, in V.E. Pagán (ed.), *A Companion to Tacitus* (Chichester, 2012), 13–22.

the paratext of each volume was often determined not by an author but by the needs and interests of scribes.<sup>56</sup> Whereas consistency across several branches of a manuscript tradition may imply origination with the author, as in several examples discussed in the recent volume *The Roman Paratext*, the paratext surrounding the *HA* is troublesomely inconsistent.<sup>57</sup>

Loss of an initial volume would have disrupted paratextual transmission, particularly if the earlier *HA* manuscripts followed the customary practice of concentrating these materials in the first volume. In a two-volume copy of Isidore's *Etymologies*, for instance, only the initial volume offers a title and an index for the entire set (Cod. Sang. 231–2). The second volume contains only an index for the chapter headings, without even the work's title. Scribes also created descriptive paratext for volumes independent of the exemplar, as occurs in a multi-volume copy of Augustine's *Commentary on the Psalms* (Cod. Sang. 162–6). The branches of the *HA* manuscript tradition each transmit different paratexts, suggesting that the exemplar lacked authoritative standing, or that copyists invented headings and titles independently.

Four different early titles survive for the *HA*, one from each of the three surviving branches (**P**, **II** and **Σ**) and one attested for a lost manuscript from the Abbey of Murbach. These titles are:

**P:** Vitae diuersorum principum et tyrannorum a diuo hadriano usque ad numerianum diuersis compositi

**Σ:** Gesta romanorum principum seu imperatorum et rei p. inuasorum a diuo adriano usq(ue) ad numerianu(m) ab historiographis scripta diuersis<sup>58</sup>

**II:** ex libro Spartiani de uita caesarum excerptum<sup>59</sup>

**M:** Vita cesaru(m) u(e)l tira(n)oru(m) ab helio adriano us(que) ad Car(u)m carinu(m) libri VII

Discrepancies appear in the terminology used for the genre (*uita/uitae/gesta*), the titlature for legitimate rulers (*caesarum/principum/imperatorum*) and the term for usurpers (*tyrannorum/inuasorum rei p.*). While three name the boundaries of the work, two different titles appear for the final *Life*, and only one tradition divides the *HA* into seven books. Two describe the work as the composite efforts of multiple authors (of which only one uses the noun *historiographis*), while one names Spartianus alone.

Attempts to resolve the differences and uncover the 'original' title have reached differing conclusions. J.P. Callu argues that the Abbey of Murbach catalogue's accuracy on other well-attested titles lends authority to both its wording and the unique seven-book division.<sup>60</sup> Savino, following Pecere, posits that **P** conveys the most likely original

<sup>56</sup> On the creation of titles by booksellers and manuscript users, rather than by authors, see especially N. Horsfall, 'Some problems of titlature in Roman literary history', *BICS* 28 (1981), 103–14 and B.-J. Schröder, *Titel und Text* (New York, 1999).

<sup>57</sup> L. Jansen (ed.), *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers* (Cambridge, 2014). Cases for authorial paratext are discussed in R. Gibson, 'Starting with the index in Pliny', 33–55 and S. Butler, 'Cicero's *capita*', 73–111, which note the consistency across manuscript branches, as well as in R. Rees, 'Intertitles as deliberate misinformation in Ammianus Marcellinus', 129–42, which draws on external confirmation about the paratext preceding the earliest manuscripts.

<sup>58</sup> Example from Vat. lat. 1898, viewable at the Digital Vatican Library (n. 20).

<sup>59</sup> Sedulius Scottus' excerpts similarly give *ex uita Caesarum*: J. Klein, *Über eine Handschrift des Nicolaus von Cues* (Berlin, 1866), 94–9.

<sup>60</sup> J.P. Callu, 'La première diffusion de "l'Histoire Auguste"', in J. Béranger and J. Straub (edd.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1982/83* (Bonn, 1985), 89–129. Against, see Pecere (n. 3), 338 n. 41 on the significance of the term *Caesarum* to later audiences.

title because of its similarity to a line from the biography of Macrinus.<sup>61</sup> The  $\Sigma$ -branch, distinctive for using the term *gesta*, can offer only supplemental information, since its earliest witnesses bear traces of correction against **P**.<sup>62</sup> The disagreement between all four independent witnesses to the title despite the shared exemplar suggests two possibilities: either the scribes at the head of each surviving tradition lacked a title and invented as necessary or certain scribes wilfully modified the title from their exemplar.<sup>63</sup>

The case of **II**, the oldest witness independent of **P**, supports the first possibility, as at several instances neither the original scribe nor the correctors who had access to other manuscripts reproduce the paratext from **P**. The physical formatting of both manuscripts' initial folios displays conscious planning for each paratext. In **II**, the title and the incipit for the *Life of Hadrian* show no signs of cramping or deviation from the lining. It would seem, then, that the title was written concurrently with the main text and could have occupied more space if the scribe had both knowledge of and desire to reproduce the title attested in **P**. Instead, **II** contains a brief title, conveying neither the boundaries of the series nor the notion of multiple authorship. The titles of the individual *Lives* in **II**, where the original scribe has included them, likewise diverge from **P**. The *Life of Aelius* appears as *De Commodo et Helio Vero*, an odd title that implies two subjects, rather than one (Pal. lat. 886, 143v). This misinformation results from a line in the text itself, where the subject is identified as *Ceionius Commodus, qui et Aelius Verus appellatus est* (*Ael.* 2.1). Although misconstrued, this title, like that of the *Life of Hadrian*, occupies space planned concurrently with the body text. It bears little resemblance to **P**'s title: *incipit eiusdem Spartiani Helius*. Although **II** shared an exemplar with **P**, the scribe derived unique titles from internal information.

Although the original scribe for **II** may have chosen not to reproduce an extant paratext, it seems probable that the subsequent manuscript users who wrote additions and corrections would have imported the paratext from their corrective text, had it been possible. No fewer than three other hands appear in **II**, ranging from a close contemporary of the original scribe to an eleventh- or twelfth-century hand. Of these three correctors, at least the first two had access to an independent manuscript. In the excerpt from the *Life of Marcus Aurelius* (*Aur.* 19.4), the first corrector emended the negative conjunction *nec* to *non*, switching to the reading attested in **P**, although *nec* is not an evident error in the abridgement. The second corrector, in a segment of poetry from the *Life of Macrinus*, replaces *nihil* with the equivalent word *nil* attested in **P** (*Opil.* 11.6). This replacement does not correct any metrical issues, and unnecessary doublings remain. As such, the second corrector cannot have discovered the replacement by principles of metrical scansion. Similarly, in the *Life of Septimius Severus* (*Sev.* 14.11), this corrector has replaced the word *paulo* with *populo*, even though *paulo* is not recognizable as an error in the context of the excerpts (148v).<sup>64</sup> Although both correctors must have possessed a witness to the text independent of **II**, neither emends the paratext to match **P**. The first corrector, when he does make additions to the paratext, occasionally

<sup>61</sup> Pecere (n. 3), 329; Savino (n. 2), 68. *Opil.* 1.1 *Vitae illorum principum seu tyrannorum siue Caesarum ...* M. Thomson, 'The original title of the *Historia Augusta*', *Historia* 56 (2007), 121–5 reaches a similar conclusion.

<sup>62</sup> This comparison may help explain the glossing of *principum* as *imperatorum*, the former preserved in **P**, the latter possibly original to the  $\Sigma$  family.

<sup>63</sup> Pecere (n. 3), 337–8 discusses wilful modification in the context of **II** and **M**.

<sup>64</sup> *profectus dehinc ad bellum parthicum edito gladiatorio munere & congiario paulo* ( $\Pi^a$ )/*pplo* ( $\Pi^b$ ) *dato*.

reverses the usual order of names, for example *De Antonino marco* (144v), or adds elements absent from **P**, for example *De Vero Antonino* (145r). The second corrector, for his part, makes no emendations to the paratext. There are thus not one but three independent reader/writers, whose activities do not reproduce **P**'s paratext despite access either to the shared exemplar or to another manuscript with readings from the **P** tradition.

Attempts to determine the original title may well come to differing conclusions because none of the four traditions reproduces an 'original title'. Works from antiquity often gained titles later in their transmission from a readership desirous of easy reference.<sup>65</sup> Additionally, manuscript users were in the habit of adding descriptive information, whether for others or for their own personal benefit. Codex Bambergensis 54 E.III.19 (**B**), a direct copy of **P**, shows the scribe's individual initiative for the paratext. On the first folio of the codex, the title page lists not six but eight authors, as well as a novel title: *Excerpta Spartiani de principibus – de iulio capitolino – de aelio spartiano et de mario maximo – de aelio lampridio – de uulcacio gallicano et auidio cassio – de trebellio pollione – de flauio uopisco*.<sup>66</sup> This scribe, drawing information from within the text, has added Marius Maximus and Avidius Cassius to the list of authors. Marius Maximus must appear, owing to his name appearing within the first lines of the surviving *HA* text, as a biographical forerunner.<sup>67</sup> Why Avidius Cassius should be named as an author of his own biography is more perplexing but must again result from the scribe's misunderstanding of internal information.

Contemporary descriptive titles resemble those found in **P** and **M**. Although O. Pecere has argued that the title formulation *a ... usque ...* belongs to the fourth to sixth centuries, the same formulation appears in the component pieces of ninth-century multi-volume codices to describe the contents of the individual volumes.<sup>68</sup> The second volume of Augustine's *Commentary on the Psalms* at St. Gallen, for instance, gives the title *Incipit tractatus Aurelii Augustini a psalmo XXXVI usque in psalmum quinquagesimum* (Cod. Sang. 165). The title is not a general title for the commentary but a description of the contents in one specific volume. The variation in the *HA* titles that include this formulation supports the hypothesis that the scribes crafted them employing similar contextual information. Although *diuo hadriano* (**P/Σ**) and *helio adriano* (**M**) refer to the same figure, the latter formulation draws from the biography of Hadrian (1.2), while the former follows Suetonian patterns for naming divinized emperors. As for the final life, *Carum carinum* (**M**) names the first and last figures in the biography—perhaps more sensible with the *a ... usque ...* formula—whereas *numerianum* (**P/Σ**) names not the final emperor treated but the emperor usually listed last when Carus, Carinus and Numerian appear together in the work.<sup>69</sup> Neither title is provably original, since both conform to a conventional title pattern employed in the period when the manuscripts were created.

A paratext that post-dates composition may also help explain other anomalies. C. Bertrand-Dagenbach notes that the *HA* is the only known source to designate the

<sup>65</sup> See n. 56.

<sup>66</sup> F. Eyssenhardt and H. Jordan, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae ab Hadriano ad Numerianum* (Berlin, 1864), iv. The scribe also seems to believe that Spartianus was the master compiler.

<sup>67</sup> *Hadr.* 2.10, a *Life* attributed to Spartianus, with whom Maximus is paired in the index. Marius Maximus reappears at *Hadr.* 12.4, 20.3, 25.4; *Heliogab.* 3.9, 5.5; *Ant. Pius* 9.3; *Aurel.* 1.5, 25.10; *Avid. Cass.* 6.6–7, 9.5; *Comm.* 13.2, 15.4, 18.2; *Pert.* 2.8, 15.8; *Sept. Sev.* 15.6; *Alb.* 3.4, 9.2, 9.5, 12.14; *Geta* 2.1; and *Heliogab.* 9.6.

<sup>68</sup> Pecere (n. 3), 329–30.

<sup>69</sup> *Quatt. Tyr.* 1.4, 15.10; *Carus* 4.3, 19.1. Carus is listed after Numerianus only at *Carus* 18.3.

Emperor Alexander as Alexander Severus, and does so only in the paratext.<sup>70</sup> Sources from the third to the fifth centuries usually refer to him as Aurelius Alexander, Severus Alexander or simply Alexander.<sup>71</sup> The *HA* itself follows its contemporaries in the body text, which led the third corrector of **Π** to supply the title *De Aurelio Alexandro* from internal information (156r).<sup>72</sup> A switch in the paratext to Alexander Severus would be unidiomatic for the writer of the body text but not remarkable enough to suggest any intentional fraud. Rather, it appears to derive from internal information that Alexander was given the name Severus, which had been borne by his great-uncle, without the knowledge that his official inscriptions placed Severus before Alexander.<sup>73</sup> Although such an error is possible in the late fourth or early fifth centuries, the likelihood increases in later periods when the work was being copied. The author never commits the error in the body text.

Numerous errors and emendations in the titles of **P** itself suggest that its scribe also produced a paratext independently of the author's design. At *Gall.* 14.1–2, the scribe mistakenly rubricated the words *Et Claudius* as though a separate life of Claudius were beginning (Pal. lat. 899, 159v). This rubrication error immediately follows a lacuna that occurs during the description of a conspiracy against Gallienus. A quick reading of the first sentence in this pseudo-*Life* would make it seem as though Claudius were being elevated to imperial office owing to the verb *electus est*, but the true *Life of Claudius* begins much later. Shortly after that error, the scribe rubricates *Saloninus Gallienus* as a separate section, but there is no matching indication of a separate *Life of Saloninus* in the index, as there are for the similarly rubricated individual *Lives* of the tyrants (160v). In the midst of the *Thirty Tyrants* (15.4), the name Ballista was mistakenly rubricated mid-sentence, then erased and rewritten by either the original scribe or the corrector (167v). Once again, the context reveals the reason for the rubrication, since the sentence describes Ballista's usurpation. The real miniature biography of Ballista, however, appears three sections later (*Tyr. Trig.* 18). The reverse issue occurs at the beginning of the biography of Trebellianus (*Tyr. Trig.* 26), where the scribe wrote the name in black ink, which was then erased, and a rubricated title crowded into the available space (171r).

Perhaps most telling is the bifurcated life of Tacitus. The paratext presents Tacitus and his brother Florianus in separate *Lives* with individual incipits and index entries.<sup>74</sup> However, the resulting *Life of Florianus* concludes by returning to the Senate's elation at the election of Tacitus as emperor (*Tac.* 18–19). Structurally, this suggests that Tacitus and Florianus should be considered one book, as are the *Lives of the Two Maximini*, *Two Valerians* and *Gallienus and Saloninus*, which all conclude with a summary review of the principal figures. Indeed, modern editions ignore **P**'s paratextual evidence and set Florianus' biography inside the *Life of Tacitus*.<sup>75</sup> These errors of rubrication and the uncertainty in the titles point to a scribe whose exemplar lacked

<sup>70</sup> C. Bertrand-Dagenbach, *Histoire Auguste: Vie d'Alexandre Sévère* (Paris, 2014), xvii.

<sup>71</sup> Aurelius Alexander: Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 24.1, Eutr. 8.23; Alexander: Cass. Dio 80.17.3, Hdn. 5.7.4, Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 6.28, Jer. *Chron.*, Amm. Marc. 26.6.19, Julian. *Caes.* 313a; Severus Alexander: *Epit. de Caes.* 24.1.

<sup>72</sup> Neither the initial scribe nor the first two correctors provided a title for this *Life*.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *CIL* 7.965, *Imp Caes M Aurelio Severo Alexandro Pio Fel aug pont maximo trb pot cos p p coh i ael hispanorum eq devota numin*

<sup>74</sup> Index and 199r.

<sup>75</sup> Hohl (n. 17), vol. 2; Paschoud (n. 9 [1996]). It is only by considering these sections as a single *Life* that scholars who see the number of thirty *Lives* as a significant structuring principle can reach that number: e.g. Thomson (n. 2), 97–100.



key paratextual elements, a hypothesis further supported by the activity of the corrector who identified some errors but allowed others to remain.

Allowing space for scribal invention, O. Pecere's observation that the title *De uita caesarum* (II) would be a natural emendation for an audience familiar with Suetonius does not necessarily conflict with J.P. Callu's observation that the Abbey of Murbach catalogue tends to transmit accurate titles for other works.<sup>76</sup> In the absence of an authoritative title, the solutions offered by P, Σ, II and M each represent reasonably conjectured descriptive titles for a series of imperial biographies influenced by Suetonius, yet distinguished by a focus on minor figures and usurpers. The conflicting evidence in the four surviving titles and the paratextual discrepancies between the two oldest independent manuscripts (P and II) show that, despite the close relationship between all surviving branches of the manuscript tradition, the paratext itself was malleable. Although incipits and explicits are notoriously fragile, this degree of fragility in the title as well suggests that the paratextual tradition as a whole had become disrupted, which the loss of an initial volume would cause.<sup>77</sup>

## 5. THE AUTHORIAL NAMES

Paratextual inconsistencies between the most closely related branches ought to make the modern reader wary of placing too much authoritative weight on data supplied by these reader-aids. Nevertheless, the century-old debate over single or multiple authorship for the *HA* depends substantially on uncorroborated paratextual evidence from P. As part of his proof of single authorship, H. Dessau noted that P's distribution of the *Lives* among the six spurious authors created contradictions.<sup>78</sup> Cross-references between the *Life of Pescennius Niger* and the *Life of Clodius Albinus*, for instance, directly claim shared authorship, yet the manuscript attributes these lives to different authors.<sup>79</sup> While Dessau was correct to question the truth of multiple authorship, it does not necessarily follow that the contradictions originated with the author. When examining the body text of the *HA* separately from the headings and from the table of contents, the fiction of multiple authorship all but disappears, leaving instead a host of falsified sources and ample material for a perplexed scribe to cause modern confusion.

P names six authors on the index page and in the incipits and explicits to individual *Lives*: Aelius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Vulcacius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio and Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius. Of these, four appear within the body text. Capitolinus and Lampridius appear together in a list of inspirations for the *HA*'s writing style. Rather than imitating the traditional historiography of Sallust, Livy, Tacitus or Trogus, the author says he will imitate 'Marius Maximus, Suetonius Tranquillus, Fabius Marcellinus, Gargilius Martialis, Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius and others' (*Prob.* 2.6). Suetonius and Marius Maximus we know as

<sup>76</sup> See n. 60.

<sup>77</sup> R.W. Burgess, 'Eutropius v.c. *magister memoriae*?', *CPh* 96 (2001), 76–81, at 80: 'It must be noted that incipits, explicits, dedications, colophons, headings, and subscriptions, in fact any short texts that stand separate from the beginning or end of an ancient author's work, are the most fragile parts of the text, often failing to be treated with the same consideration as the works themselves.'

<sup>78</sup> Dessau (n. 1), 378–92.

<sup>79</sup> *Pesc.* 9.3, attributed to Aelius Spartianus, and *Clod.* 1.4, attributed to Julius Capitolinus.

biographers from the works of the latter and the reputation of the former.<sup>80</sup> The other four are spurious. Fabius Marcellinus appears earlier in the *HA*, as the purported author of a *Life of Trajan* (*Alex. Sev.* 48.6).<sup>81</sup> Gargilius Martialis appears shortly before Marcellinus and allegedly wrote a *Life of Alexander* containing excessive detail about the emperor's dining habits (*Alex. Sev.* 37.9). Both works can be included safely in the author's lengthy catalogue of invented sources.<sup>82</sup> Capitolinus and Lampridius, who round out the list, appear nowhere else and are associated with no specific biographies. If it were not for the paratext, these two would be considered further fictionalized sources for an author attempting to validate his material.<sup>83</sup>

Trebellius Pollio seems the strongest candidate for internal mention of multiple authorship, but likewise fills a literary function employed elsewhere and receives attention as a co-author on the evidence of the paratext. The author cites Pollio twice within the body text of the later *Lives*: for a series of *Lives* from Philip the Arab through Claudius (*Aurel.* 2.1) and for condensing the *Lives* of thirty pretenders into a single volume (*Quatt. Tyr.* 1.3). Modern editions give the impression that such a series has survived under the name Trebellius Pollio, assigning to him the fragmentary *Life of Valerian* through the *Life of Claudius*, including the *Thirty Pretenders*. In both the table of contents and the incipits of **P**, all of these *Lives* are assigned rather to Julius Capitolinus with the word *eiusdem*, up until the *Life of Claudius*.<sup>84</sup> The index and the explicit to the *Life of Claudius* are the only places at which the manuscript attests Pollio's authorship. The corrected attributions stem from scholarly activity, not from the witness of the earliest manuscripts.

As a literary character, Pollio acts like the author's other false authorities, to justify his organizational principles. Prior to Pollio's introduction, when the author compressed the *Lives* of Maximinus and his son into a single book, he claimed that this was the practice of one Tattius Cyrillus (*Maximin.* 1.2).<sup>85</sup> Cyrillus, like so many of the other authorities cited for their biographical habits, is otherwise unknown. Pollio's inclusion as the originator of a thirty-tyrant compendium follows this same pattern. He also acts as a foil for the author's writing habits from the *Life of Aurelianus* onward. In a notorious conversation between the author and an urban prefect, Junius Tiberianus, Pollio's name arises at the pivotal moment when the two discuss how the author should write (*Aurel.* 2.1).<sup>86</sup>

<sup>80</sup> Amm. Marc. 28.4.14 cites Marius Maximus as one of two authors who receive attention from the aristocracy of his day. On the identity and works of Marius Maximus, see especially R.P.H. Green, 'Marius Maximus and Ausonius' *Caesares*, *CQ* 31 (1981), 226–36; A.R. Birley, 'Indirect means of tracing Marius Maximus', in G. Bonamente and G. Paci (edd.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Maceratense* (Bari, 1995), 55–74; and Birley (n. 6). See also the relevant passages in J. den Boeft, J.W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst and H.C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVIII* (Leiden, 2011).

<sup>81</sup> In the same passage, the author attributes the *Life of Trajan* to Marius Maximus and the fictionalized authors Aurelius Verus and Statius Valens.

<sup>82</sup> G.B. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* (Baltimore, 1994), 617 trusts the *HA* and includes a *Life of Alexander* in his entry on the historical Gargilius Martialis. Against this, see Syme (n. 54), 100.

<sup>83</sup> Thomson (n. 2), 21 n. 11 agrees that this is a list of spurious authors but maintains that their appearance in the paratext was intended by the author.

<sup>84</sup> Thomson (n. 2), 100–2 accuses the index of making a mistake here because of the ambiguity of the colophons. Ratti (n. 24), xiv–xv n. 15 traces the history of this emendation, which relies on conjecture rather than on manuscript-based evidence for the originality of an attribution to Pollio.

<sup>85</sup> Burgersdijk (n. 2), 107–9 identifies Nepos as the inspiration for the combined biography.

<sup>86</sup> The *Life of Aurelianus* features prominently in discussions of the *HA* for its description of the author's agenda and the chronological inconsistency created by the character of Tiberianus. For analysis of the introduction, see den Hengst (n. 24), 94–110, D. Pausch, '*libellus non tam diserte quam*

Although Tiberianus protests that Pollio wrote too ‘carelessly’ (*incuriose*) and ‘cursorily’ (*breuiter*), the author convinces him that the biographer is more reputable than mendacious historians like Tacitus. As in the case of Cyrillus, the author deploys Pollio as a fictitious inspiration for his literary decisions.

Pollio thereby becomes the opposing figure to Junius Cordus, the infamous ‘whipping boy’ of the *HA*.<sup>87</sup> Cordus appears as a foil for the author’s writing habits, especially when they could be subject to criticism.<sup>88</sup> But whereas Cordus represents everything scurrilous, petty and pointless about the biographical genre, Pollio represents restraint, ingenuity and truthfulness. Pollio and Cordus also share the distinction of being two of the few spurious authors whose names derive securely from identifiable literary references. Another ‘whipping boy’ named Cordus appears in the *Satires* of Juvenal, which the author knew.<sup>89</sup> Trebellius Pollio, as A. Birley has argued, derives from the combination of Asinius Pollio and his ally Trebellius Fides in Cicero’s *Sixth Philippic*.<sup>90</sup> Similarities between the critiques of Trebellius’ biographies and the criticisms of Julius Caesar attributed to Asinius strengthen the plausibility of the allusion.<sup>91</sup> As Birley suggests, the author may even be punning by referring to Trebellius’ *Fides* in passages where he purports to champion the truthfulness of biographies, before embarking on wild inventions.<sup>92</sup>

The name Trebellius Pollio thus conveys a particular meaning within the body of the text. He acts as a foil, invented for the author’s convenience. His presence in the headings, on the other hand, results from scholarly emendations. In fact, of the six alleged authors, only Aelius Spartianus appears in the body text, in a dedicatory inscription to the *Life of Aelius* (*Ael.* 1.1). Spartianus is also the only author named in a paratext independent of the **P** family, credited by **II** with the entire collection. For Capitolinus, Lampridius and Pollio, the paratext of **P** alone implies their authorship. If the multi-author fiction is original, neither **II** nor the title from **M** shows any awareness thereof. Either the scribes, correctors and indexers for both other manuscripts elected to ignore the exemplar’s paratext or the paratext found in **P** stands independent from the shared textual tradition.

The body text presents an image of authorship distinct from that of the headings attested in **P**. The text has a dominant narrative voice that never directly claims collaboration; the headings give six names that break up the author’s own claims about his work’s continuity. Despite attempts to identify a unifying feature among the *Lives* assigned to the various authorial names, no obvious solution has emerged. T. Honoré proposed a typology based on puns—Spartianus for the ‘Spartan’ rulers, Capitolinus for the Senate-friendly, Lampridius for the wastrels carousing by lamplight—yet this

*fideliter scriptus?*, *AncNarr* 8 (2010), 115–35, and the relevant passages in Paschoud (n. 9 [1996]). On the chronology, A. Chastagnol, *Les Fastes de la prefecture du Rome au Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1962), s.v. ‘Junius Tiberianus’ and Rohrbacher (n. 2), 7.

<sup>87</sup> R. Syme, ‘Bogus authors’, in id., *Historia Augusta Papers* (Oxford, 1983), 103–5.

<sup>88</sup> E.g. *Maximin.* 29.10 *reliqua qui uolet nosse de rebus Veneriis et amatoris, quibus eum Cordus aspergit, eundem legat.* Cordus appears at *Alb.* 5.10, 7.3, 11.4; *Opil.* 1.3; *Maximin.* 4.1, 6.8, 27.7, 28.10, 29.10, 31; *Gord.* 4.6, 5.6, 12.1, 14.7, 17.3, 19.9, 21.3–4, 22.2, 26.2, 31.6, 33.4; *Max. Balb.* 4.2, 12.4.

<sup>89</sup> Alan Cameron, ‘Literary allusions in the *Historia Augusta*’, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 363–77.

<sup>90</sup> A.R. Birley, ‘“Trebellius Pollio” and “Flavius Vopiscus”’, in G. Bonamente and F. Paschoud (edd.), *Historia Augusta Colloquium Perusinum* (Bari, 2002), 33–47. This interpretation has found favour also in Rohrbacher (n. 2), 21–2.

<sup>91</sup> Birley (n. 90), 36; Asinius appears as a critic of Caesar’s writings in Suet. *Iul.* 56.4.

<sup>92</sup> Birley (n. 90), 37.

theory has evident flaws.<sup>93</sup> Why should the militaristic Pertinax be Capitoline, while Didius Julianus, mocked for his lack of military courage (*Did. Iul.* 6.6–7), belongs to Spartianus? Savino's conjecture that less important rulers were drawn into the orbit of the more notable counterparts despite differing typologies explains such pairs as Elagabalus and Alexander, but not the separation of Macrinus and Diadumenianus.<sup>94</sup> M. Thomson's proposal that the name Lampridius derives not from the word for lamp (*lampas*) but from a type of voracious eel (*lampreda*) and is deployed for emperors of insatiable appetites causes chronological issues if true.<sup>95</sup> Although he hypothesizes that *lampreda* could have been current in the fourth and fifth centuries, the earliest records of the word appear in the eighth century A.D. Without earlier testimony, associations between Lampridius and appetite would more reasonably originate with the scribes of the eighth and ninth centuries. Furthermore, the absence of the grandest eater of all the emperors, Maximinus, from the list of Lampridian *Lives* makes that proposed typology suspect.

The unsystematic method of assigning the authorial names to *Lives* provides supporting evidence that these attributions developed later in the manuscript tradition. As Thomson notes, sequences of attributions that appear disordered in modern editions, where the *Lives* have been reordered for chronology, appear contiguously in the arrangement of P.<sup>96</sup> The contradiction between the texts and the ascriptions for the *Lives of Pescennius Niger* and *Clodius Albinus*, senseless if they had appeared side-by-side chronologically or were added by the author, fits neatly for a scholar adding attribution to the disorderly sequence of the manuscripts. The *Life of Niger* appears in a sequence of *Lives* attributed to Spartianus, while the *Life of Albinus* appears much later, surrounded by other Capitoline *Lives*.<sup>97</sup> The attributions suit the manuscript, independent from the work's narrative and despite the disorganization and damage affecting other elements of the work.

Evaluating the significance of the paratextual materials to the author's original project requires recognizing that the scribes who produced the manuscripts viewed their role not simply as transcribers but as correctors for deficiencies in the text.<sup>98</sup> Scribes missing authorial information for their manuscripts tended to supply the information based on available evidence, as they did with the titles.<sup>99</sup> The sixth-century *Latin Anthology*, preserved in the Codex Salmasianus, ascribes poems to the best of the classical poets and equally to otherwise unnamed figures. When other sources for this collection exist, the attributions do not always agree.<sup>100</sup> A work known as *De uiris illustribus* circulated under Pliny the Younger's name in several manuscripts, a scribal

<sup>93</sup> T. Honoré, 'Scriptor Historiae Augustae', *JRS* 77 (1987), 156–76, at 170–6.

<sup>94</sup> Savino (n. 2), 91–5.

<sup>95</sup> Thomson (n. 2), 30–1.

<sup>96</sup> Thomson (n. 2), 90–3 considers this as evidence that the author intentionally sequenced the *Lives* out of order.

<sup>97</sup> Savino (n. 2), 76–8 argues that the disorganization of the *Lives* occurred later in the transmission and suggests that we can resolve the Pescennius and Albinus attribution issue by rearranging the index chronologically without altering the titles. This would assign both to Spartianus but requires prioritizing the evidence of the index over the incipit, which attributes the *Life of Albinus* to Capitolinus.

<sup>98</sup> For a detailed treatment on the types of liberties taken by manuscript scribes, see D. Wakelin, *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft* (Cambridge, 2014) and M. Fisher, *Scribal Authorship and the Writing of History in Medieval England* (Columbus, 2012), 16 n. 5.

<sup>99</sup> On the titles, see n. 56.

<sup>100</sup> F. Clover, 'The *Historia Augusta* and the *Latin Anthology*', in E. Birley and K. Rosen (edd.), *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1986/89* (Bonn, 1991), 34–9 and Schröder (n. 56), 293–6.

conjecture for a manuscript lacking attribution later reproduced by copyists.<sup>101</sup> At times, false attributions came from interpretations of difficult information, as when in some codices of the *Panegyrici Latini* the abbreviation *memet* was reinterpreted to match the name of another contributor, Mamertinus.<sup>102</sup> One might suspect that a similar, erroneous expansion of the abbreviation *u.c.* created Vulcacius Gallicanus, found only at the *Life* that includes those initials. Aside from such possibilities, the contextual cues of the *HA* offer sufficient information for earnest scholars to supply three names from biographers not recognized as fictitious inventions and a fourth from the dedication to the *Life of Aelius*. Either an author inventing six pseudonyms has bungled his own device by attributing lives that cross-reference one another to different characters, or a scribe who had limited familiarity with the work has invented attributions loosely following the manuscript order, drawing the names for the authors from the damaged text available to him.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

MS Pal. lat. 899 is not the author's draft of the *HA*; so much is undeniable. What physical forms the copies took from the first draft through over four hundred years of transmission can only be speculated on, aided by faint clues in the earliest surviving manuscripts. It is important nevertheless to remember that the text had a physical history and readership in the span between composition and the creation of its earliest witness, **P**.

The model proposed here challenges two broad assumptions concerning the transmission of the *HA* that have shaped the central debates over the plausibility of the lacunae and the authorial attribution of the work. First, it is usually assumed that the work was always contained in a single codex, leading to suspicion over the clean break that starts the lacuna. Second, most scholars presume that the paratext in **P** originated at the hands of the author, leading to debates over the purpose and function of six fictitious authors.<sup>103</sup> Neither of these is a neutral assumption about the state of the manuscripts prior to the earliest witnesses, and the indirect surviving evidence indicates that these assumptions may be flawed.

Discrepancies in the titles, headings and authorial attributions between the four major manuscript traditions point to a damaged exemplar without an authoritative paratext. The patterns of missing material—from the malleable paratext to the lack of a general introduction to the discrepancies between the surviving material and the stated boundaries of the work—fit loss patterns not for a single codex but for a three-volume set that

Similar issues plague the *Greek Anthology*: see A.S.F. Gow, *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions* (London, 1958).

<sup>101</sup> R.D. Sweeney, 'The ascription of a certain class of MSS. of the "De viris illustribus" of the Pseudo-Aurelius Victor', *RhM* 111 (1968), 191–2 and M. Sage, 'The "De viris illustribus": authorship and date', *Hermes* 108 (1980), 83–100. The most recent critical edition is P.M. Martin, *Les hommes illustres de la ville de Rome* (Paris, 2016).

<sup>102</sup> Shortened from *magistri mem<oriae> et <rhetoris latini>*: see C.E.V. Nixon and B.S. Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini with Latin Text of R.A.B. Mynors* (Berkeley, 1994), 9–10, at the suggestion of O. Seeck, 'Studien zur Geschichte Diocletians und Constantins', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 137 (1888), 713–26.

<sup>103</sup> Rees (n. 57) begins from an assumption of authorial control over the transmission of the paratext to conclude that the author could use these cues to mislead the reader. This proposition requires a reading public that is not an editing public or a public that can interact with the author. The book numbers in Ammianus are, however, attested prior to the earliest manuscripts. The same is not so for the *HA*.

has suffered some combination of lending, loss and damage. This probability is further supported by the evidence of physical damage behind textual displacements in the surviving manuscripts near the ends of two of the proposed volumes. Lacking sufficient information to fill out their paratexts, the scribes and correctors for both Palatine manuscripts would naturally have gathered data from the work itself, filling in the titles and authors on the evidence of faulty context clues.

In response to the question why the author chose to hide behind six, clearly fictitious, pseudonyms and then decided to excise a set of potentially controversial biographies despite the authorship charade, the answer may be that he did not. The accidents likely to have occurred in the four hundred years between composition and our earliest copy, as well as the habits of scribes copying damaged manuscripts, raise the possibility that the author never planned these supposed fictions at all. In the absence of compelling evidence that the paratextual material of Pal. lat. 899 derives from an exemplar that preserved the original headings and ascriptions, further debate on the nature of the *HA* using this evidence risks unnecessary confusion. It creates the contradictory image of an author clever enough to remember that he should omit certain would-be usurpers from his list of thirty tyrants, yet unobservant enough to create inconsistencies in his authorial attributions; careful enough to deploy information he wanted to preserve despite a planned lacuna, but incautious enough to damage text on only one side thereof. In short, it risks proposing an author who is only as clever or forgetful as an argument needs him to be.

Absolving the author of the *HA* from the unprecedented fictions of inventing six pseudonyms and faking a lacuna allows for productive research situating the author into the literary context of his contemporaries. Refining computer analyses to distinguish one author from his substantial copied material may help compare his process of editing and revising to other late antique compilers, where analyses designed to differentiate six authors against one have proven inconclusive.<sup>104</sup> The last remaining major fiction, the time of the work's composition, may fruitfully be compared to faux-historical dialogues or perhaps exercises in persuasive rhetoric, setting aside the fruitless debates over false identities and religious fervour. Recognizing the variability of codex structure and that medieval scribes were not simply copyists but revisionists and scholars who sought to supply full manuscripts where only partial ones survived transforms the *HA* from a monstrous literary enigma back to a curious—if often scurrilous—testament to the literary practices of its day.

*Hendrix College*

MARTIN SHEDD  
shedd@hendrix.edu

<sup>104</sup> I. Marriott, 'The authorship of the *Historia Augusta*: two computer studies', *JRS* 69 (1979), 65–77 claimed to prove single authorship through computer analysis. D. Sansone, 'The computer and the *Historia Augusta*: a note on Marriott', *JRS* 80 (1990), 174–7 outlined the methodological issues with Marriott's study, which was further discredited in B. Frischer, 'How to do things with words per strong stop', in H. Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin* (Innsbruck, 1993), 585–99. Three related articles likewise tested the single authorship hypothesis against the six named authors and found that results slightly favoured multiple authorship. These are P.J. and L.W. Gurney, 'Authorship attribution of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Literacy and Linguistic Computing* 13 (1998), 119–31; P.J. and L.W. Gurney, 'Subsets and homogeneity: authorship attribution in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Literacy and Linguistic Computing* 13 (1998), 133–40; and E.K. Tse, F.J. Tweedie and B. Frischer, 'Unravelling the purple thread: function word variability and the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Literacy and Linguistic Computing* 13 (1998), 141–9. See also Stover and Kestemont (n. 5).