

According to Pagán, in Tacitus' texts 'wondrous is the behaviour of men, even decent men, for whom moral cowardice is no longer exceptional but necessary' (p. 249). By looking at *miracula* as contextually situated phenomena, Pagán highlights the importance of the ordinary/extraordinary dialectic in Tacitus' works to detect the 'political forces that may otherwise pass unnoticed' (p. 248).

The book offers meaningful reflections on the assumptions underlying Tacitus' status as a sceptical author. Scholars of historiography and literary scholars working on ancient paradoxography will find useful discussions on the methods and techniques employed by Tacitus when processing unverified reports. Likewise, Tacitean scholars will benefit from fresh close readings of passages on which much has been written. Overall, this book goes beyond the apparent artistic/anecdotal function of wonders in innovative ways and sheds light on how knowledge of the world is constructed in Tacitus' works through *miracula*.

University of St Andrews

PABLO AEDO ROJAS  
[pgr3@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:pgr3@st-andrews.ac.uk)

### SUETONIUS' *LIVES OF POETS*

STACHON (M.) (ed., trans.) *Sueton, De poetis. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den erhaltenen Viten nebst begründeten Mutmaßungen zu den verlorenen Kapiteln*. Pp. 580. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2021. Cased, €98. ISBN: 978-3-8253-4852-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X22001901

Suetonius has had few champions of his own. Often he is studied by Classicists whose proper background and expertise are rather in annalistic historiography or Roman history, such as R. Syme and F.R.D. Goodyear, with understandably misguided results (see my introduction to T. Power and R.K. Gibson [edd.], *Suetonius the Biographer: Studies in Roman Lives* [2014], p. 2; cf. K.R. Bradley, *Latomus* 61 [2002], 486, 696–702 on C. Edwards; also T. Power, *Collected Papers on Suetonius* [2021], pp. 1–7 and *passim*, esp. pp. 207–12, 229–37 for D. Woods, whose ideas have been annulled *in toto*; see e.g. D. Wardle, *Arctos* 40 [2006], 175–88; M.B. Charles, *Latomus* 73 [2014], 667–85). Unless one is familiar with the conventions of ancient biography from the earliest Greek fragments to the *Augustan History*, one is inevitably doomed to produce a precarious reading of Suetonius' work, especially his *Illustrious Men*. Fortunately, S. makes a break from such misinterpretations with this major edition of Suetonius' *De poetis*.

This is the first complete text in over 75 years, following landmark efforts to rescue Suetonius' other extant writings besides the *Lives of the Caesars* by J. Taillardat (*Insults and Games* [1967]) and R.A. Kaster (*Grammarians and Rhetoricians* [text and commentary 1995; OCT 2016]). The present edition of these fascinating ancient *Lives* of Terence, Virgil, Horace, Lucan and Persius contains a new Latin text of all five biographies as well as a German introduction, translation and commentary. In its selection of readings S.'s text is an original contribution to the previous editions of C.L. Roth (1858), A. Reifferscheid (1860, with a commentary on the *Vita Terenti* by F.W. Ritschl), A. Rostagni (1944) and J.C. Rolfe (1914; 1997<sup>2</sup>, revised by G.P. Goold), although not all of his editorial decisions will be accepted, and it does not improve very

substantively upon Rolfe's Loeb. The translation is generally accurate and serviceable, but an index would have been helpful, and also line numbers for S.'s fulsome apparatus criticus.

The inclusion of the fragments is an added benefit for specialists. S. edits fragments from Suetonius' lost *Lives* of Ennius, Bibaculus, Lucretius, Cornificius, Varro, Macer, Gallus, Cinna, Varius (without Tucca), Varus, Bavius, Ovid, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Livius Andronicus, Pacuvius, Accius, Naevius, Plautus, Caecilius, Turpilius, Afranius, Atta, Pomponius, Laberius, Publilius (but not Philistio [fr. 44 Reiff.]) and Lucilius. So much is mostly to be expected. S. adds new fragments from biographies of Laevius and Ticide as well as less assuredly Marsus, Titinius and Novius. The orator Memmius, who was known for his erotic poems, is omitted in agreement with my own position, and also Calvus, which accords with my argument that his biography was similarly placed in Suetonius' *Orators* (*Athenaeum* 102 [2014], 543–5; repr. in *Collected Papers on Suetonius* [2021], pp. 53–6). Most of the relevant scholarship has been carefully consulted. Rare but noteworthy uncited items in the commentary include J.A. Sánchez-Marín's article 'Prodigios, elementos eróticos y retrato físico en las biografías de poetas' (*Emerita* 53 [1985], 291–308) and B. Graziosi's chapter 'Horace, Suetonius, and the *Lives* of the Greek poets' (in: L.B.T. Houghton and M. Wyke [edd.], *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and His Readers* [2009], pp. 140–60).

There is not room here for discussion of all of the *Lives*, but in order to give a useful sense of both the erudition and radicalness of S.'s text, some minor points of detail are offered below on the first *Life* of Terence (I follow S.'s sigla and section numbers, which differ from those of Rolfe).

**Vita Ter. 1.** The editor of the Aldine text of Terence (1517) was no doubt right to notice the grammatically wrong mood of the manuscripts' *natus est*, which he emends to *natus sit*, as was Ritschl to recognise the rhetorical need to connect *natus* and *mortuus* more emphatically with something like *et . . . et*, based on Suetonius' logical aim in this sentence to disprove that Terence was ever a prisoner of war (*inter finem secundi Punici belli et initium tertii natus est et mortuus*). For this reason, Roth printed *natus sit* and Ritschl proposed <et> *natus sit et mortuus*, which has since been followed by T.F. Carney in his edition of the *Hecyra* (1963) and now by S. But *natus sit* is in an incorrect tense sequentially after the perfect-tense verbs *captum esse* and *potuisse*. Once we emend instead to the pluperfect *natus esset* following these two perfects (cf. *transnominavit, quod . . . natus esset, Dom.* 13.3), the missing text in question becomes apparent, where haplography occurred due to the *-et* ending of *esset*. For *natus est et mortuus*, read *natus esset <simul> et mortuus*. The palaeography is easy: following a conflation, a long *s* became *t* by mistake (*ess[et simul] et > esf et > est et*), and the words *simul et* ('and also') suit the biographer's style even better than Ritschl's *et . . . et* (see e.g. *animo simul et corpore hebetato, Claud.* 2.1; *amicorum libertorumque intimorum simul et uxoris, Dom.* 14.1). It is always best to restore *Suetonium cum Suetonio*.

**Vita Ter. 3.** S. prints F. Leo's conjecture *de <Hecyra in> enumeratione* (Rostagni ad loc.) in place of Roth's commonly accepted *dinumeratione*. The latter is consistent with what we know of Volcacius' *De poetis* (see Ritschl ad loc.) and holds sway in Rolfe's edition, while the former seems an unlikely error. The manuscripts *AS* have the nonsensical *denumeratione*, although almost all others have *de enumeratione*, which may have been a logical correction. T. Mommsen's *de remuneratione* does not fit the context (the proximity of *nummorum* notwithstanding) and hardly warrants mention in S.'s apparatus criticus. However, manuscript *M* notably has *de enunciatione*. I thus propose *denuntiatione*, which fits naturally with this section's theme of poetic glory. Unlike *dinumeratio*, it is a part of the author's known vocabulary for censure (*accusatorum denuntiationibus, Aug.*

66.2; cf. Apul. *Apol.* 60). This emendation finally explains the verb in the line of Volcacius that follows, which has long puzzled scholars: ‘The sixth play Hecyra *will be excepted* from these’ (*sumetur Hecyra sexta ex his fabula*). Suetonius supports the preceding point that *et hanc [Andriam] et quinque reliquas aequaliter populo probavit*, since Volcacius criticised Terence’s plays as a whole (*denuntiatione omnium*), yet thought highly of the *Hecyra*; hence, the conjunction *quamvis* (‘despite’) with regard to this mixed assessment.

Another of Ritschl’s emendations is accepted by S. in *bis deinceps* for the manuscripts’ *bis die*, but this is needless, since *bis die* is perfectly good Latin and very much in Suetonius’ style, as opposed to *bis deinceps* or even *bis in die* (cf. *bis anno*, Aug. 31.4).

**Vita Ter. 4.** Reifferscheid printed *se tutari*, but most editors, including Roth and later P. Wessner in his edition of Donatus (1902), have traditionally preferred *refutare*, which is likewise found in the manuscripts. S. now reverts to *se tutari*, which matches Suetonius’ gloss *se . . . defendisse* later in the same section. However, this language is nowhere else used by the biographer and prevents the participial clause from building grammatically on *eamque (infamiam)* in the same way that *auxit* does. More Suetonian would be one accusative at the front of the sentence that is then governed by two actions of a single subject; the rumour was both *increased* and not *refuted* by the poet: *eamque ipse auxit, numquam nisi leuiter refutare conatus* (see e.g. *infamiam impudicitiae facillime refutavit*, Aug. 71.1). Equally gratuitous is S.’s reading *tum* in the next sentence for *tamen*, which provides the concessive force that is necessary after *se leuius defendisse*.

S. has greatly advanced our knowledge of the text of Suetonius’ *Poetae* and its fragments. His scholarly edition and commentary on these biographies is certain to be of considerable use to all those who work seriously on Roman biography, textual criticism or any of the poets. In fact, for these Latinists, it will likely be a must-own.

New York

TRISTAN POWER  
[tristan.power@gmail.com](mailto:tristan.power@gmail.com)

## JEROME AND ROME

SCHAAF (I.) (ed.) *Hieronymus Romanus. Studies on Jerome and Rome on the Occasion of the 1600th Anniversary of his Death.* (Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 87.) Pp. 609, colour pls. Turnhout: Brepols, 2021. Cased, €150. ISBN: 978-2-503-59259-6.  
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X22002220

This collection of essays, edited by Schaaf with the participation of E. Prinzivalli, B. Feichtinger and G. Caruso, is the result of a conference that took place in Rome, 30 September to 3 October 2019, on the occasion of the 1600<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Jerome’s death. The theme of the volume is Jerome’s different kinds of relationships to the city of Rome – a theme well chosen, since it is wide enough to include many important aspects of Jerome’s life and literary production. The volume contains studies dealing with Jerome’s early career as well as his later writings, and even his later reception is included, with the contributions of M. Cilenti and M. Fallica, who examine the reception of Jerome in a