

S. J. V. MALLOCH

The tradition about the *mons Caelius*

ABSTRACT: This essay offers three arguments concerning the ancient tradition about the *mons Caelius*. (1) Tacitus' digression on the name of the *mons Caelius* at *Annals* 4.65 provides a useful framework for interpreting the complexity of the tradition: Caeles Vibenna should be regarded as a constant feature, his chronological context as an unstable feature that was recognised as such. (2) Claudius' report of Etruscan *auctores* on the naming of the *mons Caelius* in his speech of A. D. 48 about the Gauls, correctly emended, offers a unique etymology that cannot be reconciled with Roman accounts. (3) The presence of *appellitare* in Tacitus' digression and Claudius' speech is normally assumed to prove Tacitus' debt to Claudius, but this assumption cannot be sustained in the face of their fundamentally irreconcilable treatments of Caeles Vibenna. Tacitus used *appellitare* independently of Claudius, who was not a source of *Ann.* 4.65.

The *mons Caelius* was the subject of multiple foundation stories spanning the Roman monarchy. Livy (1.30.1) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (3.1.5) attribute its incorporation within the *pomerium* to Tullus Hostilius, Cicero (*Rep.* 2.33) and Strabo (5.3.7) to Ancus Marcius. Writers commenting on its nomenclature, my interest in this essay, place its settlement under Romulus or Tarquinius Priscus. More than chronology is at issue too. Was the Caeles who gave his name to the *mons* otherwise unknown, or was he the Etruscan adventurer Caeles Vibenna, who settled in Rome? A further twist is contributed by the Etruscans in an etymology reported by the emperor Claudius in his speech of A. D. 48 supporting the admission of the *primores Galliae* to the Roman senate. Etruscan *auctores* recorded that Servius Tullius occupied the *mons Caelius* under Tarquinius Priscus and named it in honour of his deceased *dux*, Caeles Vibenna. For the Etruscans, Caeles Vibenna never even made it to Rome.

The complexity of the tradition prompts the three questions that this essay seeks to answer. Firstly, how to respond to the complexity? One constructive approach can be elaborated from Tacitus' method in his digression on the nomenclature of the *mons Caelius* at *Annals* 4.65. Secondly, can the Etruscan and Roman etymologies be reconciled? As I shall demonstrate, the more persuasive interpretation, involving the resolution of a textual crux in Claudius' speech, makes it clear that the Etruscan account is incompatible with the Roman versions in a crucial aspect that has importance consequences for the final question I ask: did Tacitus use Claudius' speech as a source for his digression? The language that he shares with Claudius underpins the common assumption that he did. This essay challenges that assumption.

The tradition

Surveying the subject of the nomenclature of the *mons Caelius* in the early second century, Tacitus is in no doubt that Caeles Vibenna gave his name to the Caelian:

Ann. 4.65 *haud fuerit absurdum tradere montem eum antiquitus Querquetulanum cognomento fuisse, quod talis silvae frequens fecundusque erat, mox Caelium appellatum a Caele Vibenna, qui dux gentis Etruscae cum auxilium [appellatum] tulisset sedem eam acceperat a Tarquinio Prisco, seu quis alius regum dedit: nam scriptores in eo dissentiunt. Cetera non ambigua sunt, magnas eas copias per plana etiam ac foro propinqua habitauisse, unde Tuscum uicum e uocabulo aduenarum dictum.*

Caeles Vibenna is associated with the naming of the *mons Caelius* also in Varro, the earliest extant treatment:

Ling. 5.46 *in Suburanae regionis parte princeps est Caelius Mons a Caele Vibenna, Tusco duce nobili, qui cum sua manu dicitur Romulo uenisse auxilio contra Tatium regem. Hinc post Caelis obitum, quod nimis munita loca tenerent neque sine suspicione essent, deducti dicuntur in planum. Ab eis dictus Vicus Tuscus, et ideo ibi Vortumnus stare, quod is deus Etruriae princeps; de Caelianis qui a suspicione liberi essent, tractos in eum locum qui uocatur Caeliolus.*

Two later authors, however, associate a Caeles or Caelius with the nomenclature of the *mons Caelius*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his *Antiquitates Romanae* and Paul the Deacon in his eighth-century epitome of Festus' second-century digest of Verrius Flaccus' Augustan *de uerborum significatione*³:

Dion. Hal. 2.36.2 διαγελλούσης δὲ τῆς φήμης [ie. Romulus'] πολλαῖς πόλεσι τὴν τε κατὰ πολέμου γενναϊότητα τοῦ ἡγεμόνος καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς κρατηθέντας ἐπιείκειαν ἄνδρες τε αὐτῷ προσετίθεντο πολλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ δυνάμεις ἀξιοχρέους πανοικίᾳ μετανισταμένως ἐπαγόμενοι, ὧν ἐφ' ἑνὸς ἡγεμόνος ἐκ Τυρρηνίας ἐλθόντος, ᾧ Καίλιος ὄνομα ἦν, τῶν λόφων τις, ἐν ᾧ καθιδρύθη, Καίλιος εἰς τόδε χρόνον καλεῖται.

Paul. Fest. p. 38 L *Caelius mons dictus est a Caele quodam ex Etruria, qui Romulo auxilium aduersum Sabinos praebuit, eo quod in eo domicilium habuit.*

- 1 So LIPSIUS (1574: notae) for M's *auxilium appellatum tauisset* (*pace* GOELZER [1959] 'tauisset M'). *appellatum*, 'to appeal to for support', 'beseech' (*OLD appello*² 2), is superfluous with *auxilium*, and *appellatum* (CHIFLETIUS *apud* ERNESTI [1752]; FAERNUS *apud* J. G. GRONOVIVS [1721]) renders *auxilium* redundant (and is at odds with the representation of Caeles Vibenna's voluntary support at Dion. Hal. 2.36.2). *Appellare* in this sense does not reflect Tacitean usage (normally 'name'; 'appeal' only in legal contexts: *Ann.* 14.28.1, 16.8.3) and here effects an unTacitean repetition after *appellatum* in the line above (of which, *pace* RUPERTI [1834], Claudius' clumsy repetition *appellita* ^{ruit} ... *appellatus est* offers no defence). LIPSIUS (1574: notae) rightly deleted it as a mistaken repetition ('ego illud, Appellatum, redundare ex priore versu opinor'), which was probably influenced by the similarity of the preceding words: *Caelium appellatum ... cum auxilium appellatum*. Lipsius' *tulisset* is to the point, and the [*appellatum*] <por>*tauisset* of DOEDERLEIN (1841: app. crit.) is also attractive (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 6.5).
- 2 Servius (*Aen.* 5.560) explicitly follows Varro in recording the Romulean tradition. As he is interested only in the *uicus Tuscus* he does not name Caeles Vibenna (*unde quidam uenit cum exercitu*) and does not mention the *mons Caelius*.
- 3 See GLINISTER-WOODS (2007).

Is this individual distinct from Caeles Vibenna? A fragment of Festus on the settlement of the *uicus Tuscus* might suggest so:

Fest. p. 486 L
Tuscum uicum con<plures scrip->
tores dictum aiunt ab <iis, qui Porsenna rege>
de[s]ce[n]dente ab obsi<dione a Tuscis remanserint>
Romae, locoque his dato <habitaerint aut quod Volci->
entes fratres Caeles et <Aulus> Vibenn<a, quos dicunt regem>
Tarquinium Romam secum max ...
rint. M. Varro, quod ex Cael<io in eum locum deducti>
sint⁴.

These passages at first sight give the impression that Verrius Flaccus placed the settlement and naming of the *mons Caelius* by ‘a certain Caeles’ under Romulus, and associated Caeles Vibenna with the settlement of the *uicus Tuscus* in the period of the Tarquini. Verrius evidently knew the Romulean chronology for Caeles Vibenna but preferred to diverge from it. To explain this evidence, CORNELL supposed that Verrius avoided contradicting Varro by ‘postulating’ two distinct men by the name of Caeles, a Caeles who came to Rome under Romulus and the Caeles Vibenna who came to Rome under Tarquinius Priscus. CORNELL wonders why Verrius did not accept Varro’s account completely if he was ‘prepared to go to such lengths to uphold it’. He speculates that Verrius was persuaded to offer a different chronology for Caeles Vibenna by the ‘new information’ that he derived from the Etruscan sources of his *Res Etruscae*⁵. But then the question becomes why Verrius accepted Varro’s account, if his ‘new information’, which contradicted Varro’s chronology, was so compelling, and if he was the best informed scholar on the subject⁶. In fact Varro did not dictate the construction of Verrius’ account at all.

- 4 MUELLER (1839: p. 355) supplemented the first four lines to *habitaerint*, and for *secum max ... rint* offered *secum max<ime adduxisse, eum colue>rint*. GARRUCCI (1866: 62) proposed *fratres Caeles et <Aulus> Vibenn<a, quos dicunt ad regem> Tarquinium se cum Max<tarna contulisse, eum incolue>rint*. (The omission of *Romam* before *se* is presumably a slip. GARRUCCI’S <Aulus> was printed as <A.> by KÖRTE [1897] 74, and the inaccuracy has often been repeated: e.g. THOMSEN [1980] 82; LETTA [2013] 94.) GARDTHAUSEN (1882: 40 n. 2), evidently unaware of Garrucci’s conjecture, offered *fratres Caeles et <A.> Vibenn<ae, qui patria expulsi ad regem> Tarquinium Romam se cum Max<tarna contulerunt, eum colue>rint*. But *max-* is unlikely to be *Maxtarna* (ie. Mastarna, the Latinised Etruscan name of Servius Tullius): the naming of the *uicus Tuscus* after the troops of the *fratres* Vibenna requires mention of them rather than the additional information that Mastarna accompanied the *fratres* to Rome (rightly BRIQUEL [1990] 100–101). Working with the *se cum* and *contulisse / contulerunt* of GARRUCCI and GARDTHAUSEN, MÜNZER ([1898] 607 = [2012] 215) proposed: *cum max<imo exercitu>*, on the analogy of Varro *Ling.* 5.46 *cum sua manu* (cf. Serv. *Aen.* 5.560 *cum exercitu*); Dion. Hal. 2.36.2; Tac. *Ann.* 4.65 *magnas eas copias*; FABIA (1931: 230 n.3) *cum max<imis copiis>*; LETTA (2013: 95) *cum max<ima manu>*. But there is no reason why *secum* is not correct. If *secum max-* is part of a statement about soldiers, a different formulation is required: e.g. (after MUELLER/GARRUCCI) ... *fratres Caeles et <Aulus> Vibenn<a, quos dicunt ad regem> Tarquinium Romam secum max<inum exercitum adduxisse, eum incolue>rint*.
- 5 CORNELL (1976) 414–17 = (2011) 178–80; quotations from 416 = 180. Cf. also MÜNZER (1898) 606 = (2012) 214.
- 6 Cf. MÜNZER (1898) 605 = (2012) 213; CORNELL (1995) 135.

The most economical solution is to assume, as Tacitus demonstrates, that the tradition uniformly associated *Caeles Vibenna* with the nomenclature of the *mons Caelius*. Dionysius simply did not include the cognomen⁷. Nor did Paulus, but he went further. BRIQUEL reasonably suggests that Paulus' selection of material from Festus' entry on the *mons Caelius* involved the omission of a variant that would have identified the *Caeles* as *Caeles Vibenna* and placed him under the *Tarquinius*, the chronology attested by Festus under the lemma *uicus Tuscus*⁸. Paulus' severe handling of Festus' entry on the *uicus Tuscus* offers an analogy for the sort of omission posited for the lemma *mons Caelius*. Paulus offers a single explanation for Festus' three, and omits any mention of *Caeles Vibenna*:

Paul. Fest. p. 487 L *Tuscus uicus Romae est dictus quod ibi habitauerunt Tusci, qui recedente ab obsidione Porsenna remanserunt.*

If Verrius' explanation of the naming of the *mons Caelius* originally contained a chronological variant that placed *Caeles Vibenna* under the *Tarquinius*, his account becomes internally consistent. Verrius did not need to 'postulate' the Romulean *Caeles* who survives in Paulus' epitome: that man was *Caeles Vibenna*.

The association of *Caeles Vibenna* with the nomenclature of the *mons Caelius* was most likely a constant of the tradition. The point of uncertainty, as Tacitus demonstrates, was the Roman monarch with whom he was associated. The chronological range attested for the name of the *mons Caelius* suggests that the etymology arose outside a specific chronological context⁹. Clarification spawned variety, as writers adopted different contexts according to their sources and literary judgements. It is impossible to determine which chronology appeared earliest in Roman historical or antiquarian writing. The Romulean chronology of Varro may be 'ancient'¹⁰, but it is not obvious that the *Tarquinius* chronology was not ancient as well. CORNELL offers an Augustan context and a non-Roman source for its appearance in the tradition: Verrius Flaccus discovered 'new information' about *Caeles Vibenna* in Etruscan sources. *Caeles Vibenna* and *Aulus Vibenna* are indeed securely attested in the native Etruscan tradition¹¹. The earliest evidence dates to the middle of the sixth century. An Etruscan inscription on a bucchero vase discovered in the temple at Portonaccio near Veii states that the offering was made by one 'Avile Vipiennas'. He is normally identified with *Aulus Vibenna*, and the dedication implies that he was an historical figure¹². The date of the bucchero vase in turn raises the possibility that the *fratres Vibenna* and the 'Cneue Tarχunies Rumaχ' (Gnaeus *Tarquinius* of Rome; *CIE* 5275) in the frescoes of the François Tomb at Vulci were re-

7 Dionysius has long been thought to be working here in the tradition of Varro: see e.g. NIEBUHR (1843) 38, cf. (1827) 394; SCHWEGLER (1853) 1.1 507 n.5.

8 BRIQUEL (1990) 96.

9 Cf. SCHWEGLER (1853) 1.2 720-1; LEWIS (1855) 1,508-09; THOMSEN (1980) 83. OGILVIE (1965: on Liv. 1.30.1), commenting on the variety of chronological contexts for the incorporation of the *mons Caelius* within the *pomerium*, remarked that 'the memory that the *Caelian* was once separate and was integrated with the other communities at an historical date survived as part of the Roman national memory'.

10 CORNELL (1976) 414-5 = (2011) 178.

11 CORNELL (1976) 418-19 = (2011) 182-3.

12 THOMSEN (1980) 85-87. For the vase see e.g. BURANELLI (1987) no. 93 (F. BOITANI).

garded as contemporaries¹³. The *fratres* Vibenna were celebrated figures in Etruria from at least the sixth century, and they were firmly located in the world of the Tarquinius, not of Romulus. It is unlikely that the Romans were unaware of the strong Tarquinian associations of Caeles Vibenna before the principate of Augustus. The only grounds for accepting such a late date is the requirements of CORNELL's argument: the Tarquinian chronology has to be 'new' to give Verrius Flaccus good reason to deviate from the Romulean chronology of Varro. But since Varro did not dictate Verrius' approach, the Tarquinian chronology need not be 'new' to Verrius. It was probably already in the Roman tradition. If Varro knew it, he rejected it in favour of a Romulean chronology¹⁴. Verrius by contrast took up the Tarquinian chronology as a variant alongside the Romulean chronology. If he drew directly on Etruscan sources – and it is not certain that he did – they provided further incentive to record the Tarquinian chronology rather than (to his mind) decisive evidence in its favour. Allowing for the antiquity of both chronologies avoids arbitrarily privileging one over the other, as BRIQUEL does when he claims that the Romulean chronology is a 'secondary variant' of 'minor importance' that arose from a process known as 'Romulisation', the attraction of origin stories to the first king of Rome, and as LETTA does when he describes it as a 'later correction' in reaction to the Tarquinian tradition¹⁵. As Tacitus perceived, the chronological context of Caeles Vibenna was in flux. His observation, far from simply being an admission of uncertainty, was an assertion that chronological ambiguity went with the territory¹⁶.

Claudius and the Etruscans on Caeles Vibenna

Claudius' report of Etruscan *auctores* on the rise of Servius Tullius contains observations on the settlement and naming of the *mons Caelius* during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, one point of contact with some Roman sources on Caeles Vibenna. The Etrus-

- 13 The evidence of the frescoes themselves is suggestive but indecisive (for reproductions see BURANELLI [1987]; ANDREAE et al. [2004]). The frescoes depicting the *fratres* Vibenna and Tarquinius are probably not part of the same 'scene', and the temporal eclecticism of the decorations in the Tomb renders it distinctly possible that Tarquinius belonged to a different chronological context altogether. The frescoes depicting the *fratres* Vibenna and Tarquinius are often read as one scene: see e.g. KÖRTE (1897) 69, 72–3; ALFÖLDI (1965) 230; GANTZ (1975) 551 n. 37; THOMSEN (1980) 71–4, 87; COARELLI (1983) = (1996) 138–78; VERNOLE (2002) 188. For salutary scepticism see e.g. GARDTHAUSEN (1882) 32; MÜNZER (1898) 614 = (2012) 222; *RE* 2 Reihe, VII 818 (w. HOFFMANN); MESSERSCHMIDT (1930) 138, 144–5; MAGGIANI (1990) 19; WISEMAN (2004) 43; RICHARDSON (2015) 118–19.
- 14 Earlier in his essay CORNELL ([1976] 415 = [2011] 179) had speculated that Varro knew the Tarquinian chronology but chose to reject it.
- 15 BRIQUEL (1990) 97–98, 100; LETTA (2013) 100, 109. For 'Romulisation' see THOMSEN (1980) 83–4; POU CET (1985) 200–01; VERNOLE (2002) 179. For the connection of aetiologies with a city founder see CORNELL (1978) 132, 134. As CORNELL (135) points out, 'the Romans ... did *not* trace all their characteristic institutions back to Romulus in a wholesale manner'. A more prevalent tradition saw Rome developing slowly over time.
- 16 Tacitus commences his digression on the *pomerium* with an analogous remark: 12.24.1 *regum in eo ambitio uel gloria uarie uulgata*. See too, on the hills of Rome, Serv. *Aen.* 6.783 *bene urbem Romam dicit septem inclusisse montes. Et medium tenuit: nam grandis est inde dubitatio*.

can narrative otherwise raises questions that throw into sharp relief its fundamental disagreement with the Roman etymologies. Did Servius Tullius himself name the *mons*? Did Caeles Vibenna come to Rome? The uncertainty arises from the decidedly awkward text of the *tabula Lugdunensis* in the crucial passage:

Huic quoque (sc. Tarquinio Prisco) et filio nepotiae eius (nam et hoc inter auctores discrepat) insertus Servius Tullius, si nostros sequimur, captiva natus Oeresia, si Tuscos, Caeli quondam Viuennae sodalis fidelissimus omnisque eius casus comes, postquam uaria fortuna exactus cum omnibus reliquis Caeliani exercitus Etruria excessit, montem Caelium occupauit et a duce suo Caelio ita appellatus, mutatoque nomine (nam Tusce Mastarna ei nomen erat) ita appellatus est, ut dixi, et regnum summa cum rei p(ublicae) utilitate optinuit. ILS 212 I.16–24

Prepared to accept an anacoluthon, QUESTA took *appellatus* in l. 22 as equivalent to *appellita*¹⁷ or {*et*} ... *appellatu*¹⁸ in a gloss on *montem Caelium occupauit*, while PERL, assuming a change of subject from Servius Tullius to *mons*, interpreted *et a duce suo Caelio ita appellatus* to mean ‘und zwar wurde er (d.h. der Berg Caelius) ausdrücklich nach seinem Heerführer Caelius so genannt’¹⁷. But *appellatus* must refer to Servius Tullius, the subject of the main verb, *appellatus est*¹⁸: ‘and, having been frequently called in this way by his leader Caelius, and after a change of name (for his Etruscan name was Mastarna) he was thus called ...’¹⁹.

An error on the part of the engraver best explains the torturous Latin of the inscription²⁰. The ending of *appellatus* seems to have been assimilated to *appellatus est* below, and the *ita* preceding both verbs facilitated the confusion²¹. The basic sense of the phrase *et a duce suo Caelio ita appellat-* is clear: the *mons Caelius* was named after Servius’ leader, Caeles (Vibenna). The question is: does Claudius offer a mere gloss on the name of the *mons Caelius* or does he state that Servius Tullius himself gave the *mons Caelius* its enduring name? Supporters of a gloss have offered various textual remedies:

*et a duce suo Caelio appellatu*¹⁷²²
*e*¹⁸²³ *t a duce suo Caelio appellatus*²³
 {*et*} *a duce suo Caelio appellatu*¹⁸²⁴

17 QUESTA (1998) ad loc.; PERL (1996) 122–3.

18 AS GÖTTLING (1840: 232) for one also realised in his unhappy defence of the text.

19 I keep the form *Caelius* in translations from the *tabula Lugdunensis*, but otherwise use the earliest and more common form, *Caeles*.

20 SAGE (1980: 276–7) argued unconvincingly for retaining the text of the inscription and blaming Claudius (rather than the engraver) for the muddle.

21 *ita appellatus est* is close enough on the line below for assimilation of endings to have occurred – but there is no way of knowing how the text was arranged for the engraver to copy out. Compare the likely error at Tacitus *Ann.* 4.65 above.

22 HAASE (1855) 331; CARCOPINO (1930) 118, (1961) 195; CHARLESWORTH (1939) no. 5.

23 MOMMSEN (1853) 63; and at RITSCHL-MOMMSEN (1864) 448; BARROW (1934) no. 24.

24 PARETI (1931) 156; LETTA (2013) 96.

These emendations involve difficulties: *et* is superfluous in HAASE's *et a duce suo Caelio appellitatu* Γm^1 ('also', 'even?'), and MOMMSEN's $e^{\Gamma s^1} t$ produces strange word order and an abrupt parenthesis from a speaker liberal with his words. None of them solves the fundamental flaws in this reconstruction: positing a gloss creates a problem in *suo* (which in the above conjectures should be *eius*) and an uncharacteristic ambiguity that is also illogical. Dating the naming of the *mons* before Servius' occupation of the *mons Caelius* (perfect passive participle *appellitatum* ~ perfect *occupavit*) renders it unclear whether Servius or someone else was responsible for the name. Since the Etruscan tradition reported by Claudius clearly implies that Caeles Vibenna did not go to Rome, it must have recorded that the *mons* was named *after* Caeles *by* someone else. The focus of this tradition on Servius (not least *a duce suo*) strongly suggests that it held him responsible for the name. The *appellita* Γuit^1 of NIEBUHR offers a neat solution that accounts for *suo* and is chronologically appropriate²⁵.

What is the nuance of the frequentative? *appellitare* is a very rare verb that occurs first in Verrius Flaccus (Paul. Fest. p. 24 L *appellitauisse* : *appellasse*), next in Claudius, and otherwise in authors with a taste for archaic vocabulary: Tacitus, Aulus Gellius, Apuleius, and Macrobius²⁶. Although Verrius Flaccus evidently defined *appellitare* as equivalent to *appellare*, usage indicates a frequentative nuance²⁷ that is appropriate here²⁸. *appellitauit* has Claudius say that 'Servius was in the habit of calling it thus after his leader Caelius'. The frequentative implies that the *mons* had another name and that Servius' name stuck (hence a looser translation might be: 'Servius gave it this customary name after his leader Caelius'). Tacitus records that other name and uses *appellitare* in the same sense: 4.65 *haud fuerit absurdum tradere montem eum antiquitus Querquetulanum cognomento fuisse ... mox Caelium appellitatum a Caele Vibenna*. Later authors also use *appellitare* when it is stated or implied that more than one name is at issue: see especially Apul. *Apol.* 10.2 *hic illud etiam reprehendi animaduertisti quod, cum aliis nominibus pueri uocentur, ego eos Charinum et Critian appellitarim*; also Gell. 17.20.4 *sic enim me in principio recens in diatribam acceptum appellitabat*; 18.9.11 *eadem ergo ratione antiqui nostri narrationes sermonesque 'insectiones' appellitauerunt*; Apul. *Apol.* 63.6, 9 (6) *hiccine est sceletus, haecine est larua, hoccine est quod appellitabatis daemonium? ... (9) hunc qui sceletum audet dicere, profecto ille simulacra deorum nulla uidet aut omnia negligit; hunc denique qui laruam putat, ipse est laruans*. Macr. *Sat.* 5.20.2, 6–7 (2) *quae sint ista Gargara quae Vergilius esse uoluit fertilitatis exemplar ... (6) Ex his liquido claret Gargara cacumen Idae montis appellitari. (7) Pro oppido autem Gargara qui dixerint enumerabo*.

25 NIEBUHR (1827) 393 n.59. PARETI (1931: 156 n. 2) and PERL (1996: 123–4) urge against the *appellitauit* of NIEBUHR that Tacitus used the participle *appellitatum*. This argument is premised on the assumption that Tacitus used Claudius as a source: the result is a circular argument that also binds Tacitus into using even the syntax of his alleged source. NIEBUHR's emendation has often been taken up: e.g. FABIA (1929) ad loc.

26 TLL II.1 272.76–82.

27 Hence, presumably, THEWREWK (1889: p. 20) *appellitauisse*: <*saepe*> *appellasse*. *saepe* might have dropped out between the two verbs, but *frequenter* vel sim. would give more appropriate sense. For frequentatives see WÖLFFLIN (1887); HOFMANN-SZANTYR (1972) 297–8; in Tacitus, MALLOCH (2013) on *Ann.* 11.18.1.

28 Pace e.g. BRIQUEL (1990) 89 n.15; LETTA (2013) 96.

Servius Tullius' occupation and naming of the *mons Caelius* presupposes that Caeles Vibenna did not migrate to Rome but had died in the meantime²⁹. LETTA disputes this inference by arguing that Claudius' words do not exclude the possibility that Caeles Vibenna came to Rome with Servius Tullius and that the *mons Caelius* acquired its name later, after his death³⁰. To remove Servius' agency in the naming of the *mons Caelius* LETTA emends Claudius in a way that does not support his argument: reading *montem Caelium occupavit, {et} a duce suo Caelio ita appellitatu* ^rm¹ does not have the *mons Caelius* acquire its name some time after Servius Tullius occupied it. Claudius' language otherwise suggests that Caeles Vibenna had died before he came to Rome. In the phrase *omnis eius casus comes*, *omnis* implies that the adventures of Caeles have come to an end; *cum omnibus reliquis Caeliani exercitus* implies that Caeles was not longer its *dux*. In stark contrast to his role in the Roman sources, Caeles Vibenna was simply not an agent in the Etruscan account of the *mons Caelius* reported by Claudius. Either he never was, or he was removed from the story, perhaps when the independent and incompatible Etruscan and Roman traditions on Mastarna and Servius Tullius were 'conflated' to give priority to the future king of Rome³¹. Servius could easily be inserted into the tradition on the *mons Caelius*. In this version he was a close confidant of Caeles Vibenna, and he later had a reputation for giving Rome her formal definition as a city, not least by extending the urban territory and dividing it into quarters³².

Tacitus and Claudius

Since the discovery of the *tabula Lugdunensis* in the sixteenth century, Tacitus' use of *appellitare* is normally assumed to prove that he used Claudius' speech of 48 as a source for his digression on the *mons Caelius*³³. Syme believed that the 'material' (ie. 'the Etruscan adventurer Caeles Vibenna') and the verb *appellitare* 'certify' that Tacitus drew on Claudius' speech, which he read in the *acta senatus* while researching the early books of the *Annals*³⁴. This assertion was part of Syme's wider argument that the *acta senatus* was Tacitus' main source for the Tiberian *Annals* and his source of Claudius' speeches,

29 So e.g. GRENIER (1926) 35; SCOTT-RYBERG (1929) 76; FABIA (1931) 228–29; RIDLEY (1975) 162 = (2014) 106 (revised); CORNELL (1976) 413 n.6 = (2011) 177 n.6; THOMSEN (1980) 92; RICHARDSON (2015) 121.

30 LETTA (2013) 96.

31 Incompatibility of the traditions: see e.g. ALFÖLDI (1965) 213; MOMIGLIANO (1984b) 417–8 = *CAH*² VII.2 96; RIDLEY (1975) 166 = (2014) 111; THOMSEN (1980) 67, 103–04; CORNELL (1976) 413–14 = (2011) 177–8, (1995) 140; BRIQUEL (1990) 102; VERNOLE (2002) 185–6, 197. Conflation: MOMIGLIANO (1961a) 14–16; CORNELL (1976) 413–4 = (2011) 177–8.

32 Cf. MOMIGLIANO (1984b) 414 = *CAH*² VII.2 92–3; CORNELL (1995) 202–04.

33 See e.g. VERTRANIUS (1569) on *Ann.* 4.65; LEO (1896) 204 n.7 = (1960) 312; MOMIGLIANO (1932) 319 = (1975) 822, (1961a) 12 n. 29, (1961b) 56 = (1966) 741, (1990) 111, who argued that Tacitus had Claudius' speech in mind when writing his digression on the *mons Caelius*, but that his acquaintance with Claudius' speeches was neither wide nor based on direct consultation of the *acta senatus*; GRIFFIN (1982) 417 (but more cautiously at [1990] 482); CALBOLI (1990) 25, 26; PERL (1996) 123–4; MIGLIORATI (2003) 50–1.

34 SYME (1958) 286, 709–10, (1977) 247 = (1984) 1027. Cf. too CARCOPINO (1930) 117–9; SAGE (1991) 3416–7.

which he exploited for their antiquarian content³⁵. Syme exaggerated Tacitus' reliance on documentary materials for systematic original research³⁶, but he was surely right that Tacitus would have sought out the original text of Claudius' speech, as his later omissions in other orations by Claudius implies³⁷. Tacitus might have specially consulted Claudius' speech in the *acta senatus*, or, most probably, read it in a more accessible form, perhaps in a collection of the emperor's speeches³⁸. But was Tacitus reading Claudius' speeches when writing the Tiberian *Annals*? It seems unlikely that he was, particularly if (on Syme's view) reading them involved systematic perusal of the *acta senatus* so far in advance³⁹.

TOWNEND, reacting against SYME's view of Tacitus' research methods, proposed that Tacitus read Claudius' speech in the history of one of his Tiberian sources, Aufidius Bassus⁴⁰. Writing in c. 48,⁴¹ Aufidius apparently gave a long quotation of Claudius' speech in a digression on the *mons Caelius* that he apparently inserted into his account of the fire on the Caelian in 27. He quoted the speech at length, rather than supplying a précis, to offer a 'sensible compliment' to Claudius and because the material on the Caelian was interesting. It is not certain however that Aufidius was writing in 48⁴² and that he would wish to 'compliment' Claudius, particularly if it involved potentially compromising his own narrative by inserting a speech that was generally irrelevant to the context. Nor is interest a gauge of authenticity. Tacitus was interested in Claudius' speech but did not reproduce it exactly. There is no reason to think that Aufidius would have approached the task differently. TOWNEND's assumption that Tacitus in turn slavishly 'took over' his digression from the same hypothetical digression in Aufidius is refuted by Tacitus' disagreement with Claudius over *Caeles Vibenna*. There is a broader methodological point too. TOWNEND's refusal to credit Tacitus with using Claudius' speech directly creates

35 Use of the *acta senatus*: see SYME (1958) 278, 705, 708; (1977) = (1984) 1014–42; (1982) 73–81 = (1988) 207–21.

36 Although Tacitus refers to several types of *acta* as source material, he cites the *acta senatus* as a source only once and in a manner that suggests that the information it provided was supplementary (*Ann.* 15.74.3 *in commentariis senatus*). Some regard Tacitus' use of the *acta senatus* as exceptional: e. g. MOMMSEN (1904) 1150 = (1909) 257; MOMIGLIANO (1932) 320 = (1975) 823; WOODMAN (2009) 7–10. MARTIN (1994: 200–1, 206–7) offers a more generous estimation of Tacitus' use of the *acta senatus*, but is sceptical of SYME's extreme position. For the rarity of ancient historians' systematic use of archives see MOMIGLIANO (1990) 66, 110–12; MARTIN and WOODMAN (1989) p. 26; MARINCOLA (1997) 103–5.

37 Cf. *Ann.* 12.11.1, 12.22.2, 12.61.2; GRIFFIN (1990) 482–3.

38 If there was such a collection. Cf. MARTIN (1994) 207; GRIFFIN (1982) 405.

39 For scepticism that Tacitus researched extensively in advance see e. g. FABIA (1931) 225–6, 235–7; BRIQUEL (1990) 93; SAGE (1991) 3417.

40 TOWNEND (1962). Tacitus does not mention Aufidius in the extant text of his historical works, but he is generally regarded as a source for the early *Annals* at least. See *FRHist.* I 521 (LEVICK).

41 TOWNEND (1962: 365) proposed that Aufidius 'must have been composing' the early portions of his history 'about' the year of Claudius' speech of 48 (cf. [1961] 230: Aufidius finished writing his history 'hardly later than 47'). This precise chronology is pure speculation: it is necessary to TOWNEND's assumption that Aufidius provided Claudius' speech for Tacitus' use at *Ann.* 4.65.

42 What is certain is that the elder Seneca used Aufidius' history for his *Suasoriae* (two fragments survive concerning Cicero: *FRHist.* 78 F 1–2). As Seneca died in 41 at the latest, Aufidius' work was in circulation by the start of Claudius' principate in whole or in part (as far as the late Republic); if only in part, it is unknown when the later portion appeared (*FRHist.* I 520–1 [LEVICK]).

an inconsistency, since there is (again) no reason to think that Aufidius took a different approach to primary materials⁴³.

SYME's interest in elaborating his theory that Tacitus exploited the *acta senatus* led him to avoid investigating the relationship between the statements of Tacitus and Claudius about Caeles Vibenna, perhaps precisely because of their incompatibility. Attempts to sidestep their disagreement have been unsuccessful. FURNEAUX and PARETI proposed that Tacitus only 'partly' followed Claudius⁴⁴. But if Tacitus did not report the unique version of Claudius' *auctores Tusci* and explicitly referred to more than one *scriptor*, it is impossible to determine what he could have taken from Claudius that was not available to him in the writers he consulted. BRIQUEL offers a more radical solution: Tacitus' source was not Claudius' speech of 48 but his *Historiae*.

BRIQUEL argues that Tacitus did not use Claudius' speech of 48 directly because he would not have conducted preliminary research of the sort imagined by SYME and because he offers a different account of Caeles Vibenna⁴⁵. He proposes instead that Tacitus used Claudius' *Historiae*, which supposedly digressed on the *mons Caelius* in its narrative of 27. When Claudius came to write his speech, he revised the earlier views of his *Historiae* and thereby created the disagreement with Tacitus' digression⁴⁶. BRIQUEL's reconstruction is untenable. If Claudius' speech of 48 is excluded as a source of Tacitus, it is scarcely credible to maintain that *appellitare* nonetheless proves that Tacitus used another text of Claudius. BRIQUEL must then effect the awkward manoeuvre of identifying Tacitus' source as Claudius' *Historiae*, when the most obvious candidate for *res Etruscae* was his *Tyrrhenika*. But the *Tyrrhenika* has to be excluded from consideration because it was written in Greek (cf. Suet. *Claud.* 42.2). The *Historiae* is an uncertain candidate in itself. It is unlikely that it proceeded beyond the death of Augustus⁴⁷, but if it did Tacitus would not have copied its narrative of 27 so closely as to use the same event as a pretext for exactly the same digression: such an approach flies in the face of ancient historiographical method generally and his handling of Claudius' speech in particular. BRIQUEL's theory of revision is equally problematic. Claudius started writing his *Historiae* as a young man and worked on it during his adult life⁴⁸. In BRIQUEL's view, Claudius' speech revised the account of Caeles Vibenna in his *Historiae*. What prompted the

43 On this methodological point cf. OAKLEY (2000): 'If T. did not himself exploit the *acta senatus*, then we must conclude that he used an otherwise unknown writer who did consult these records; and that merely pushes back the problem one stage further, since there is no reason to think that the views of T.'s sources on archival research differed much from his own'; MALLOCH (2013) on Tac. *Ann.* 11.23–25.1.

44 FURNEAUX (1896) on *Ann.* 4.65; PARETI (1931) 156. Cf. MARTIN-WOODMAN (1989) on Tac. *Ann.* 4.65: Tacitus' digression 'owes something' to Claudius' speech; see now WOODMAN (forthcoming) ad loc.

45 BRIQUEL (1990) 92–3, 102–05. BRIQUEL is followed by QUESTA (1998: on *ILS* 212.2.21–2), who revised his earlier belief (1963: 231–2) that Tacitus used Claudius' *Tyrrhenika*, as MUELLER (1877: 111 n.128) had proposed.

46 BRIQUEL (1990) 104.

47 Cf. *FRHist.* I 511 (LEVICK).

48 Cf. Suet. *Claud.* 41: (1) *historiam in adulescentia hortante T. Liuio, Sulpicio uero Flauo etiam adiuuante scribere adgressus est. Et cum primum frequenti auditorio commisisset, aegre perlegit refrigeratus saepe a semet ipso. Nam cum initio recitationis diffractis compluribus subselliis obesitate cuiusdam risus exortus esset, ne sedato quidem tumultu temperare potuit quin ex interuallo subinde facti reminisceretur cachinnosque reuocaret.* (2) *In princi-*

revision? Presumably Claudius' discovery of the *auctores Tusci* that he mentions in his speech. Claudius most probably knew the Etruscan evidence through his work on the *Tyrrhenika*. Since the date of that work is unknown⁴⁹, it is not certain that the version of the *Historiae* was written earlier: Claudius could have known the Etruscan tradition on Caeles Vibenna before he wrote the Tiberian narrative of his *Historiae* (if he wrote it at all). In this scenario Claudius' account of Caeles Vibenna in the *Historiae* would agree with that of his speech of 48 – and BRIQUEL's attempt to accommodate the disagreement between Tacitus and Claudius crumbles.

If BRIQUEL tries to work with the disagreement between Claudius and Tacitus, LETTA argues instead that they offer consistent accounts of the naming of the *mons Caelius*. Tacitus' source, however, was not Claudius' speech of 48 but a speech he gave about the *pomerium* that was reported in the *acta senatus*⁵⁰. Why does LETTA propose a different text of Claudius, when his belief that Claudius and Tacitus agree does not require him to do so? LETTA's answer is that the speech on the *pomerium* supposedly dealt with the history of the *mons Caelius* at greater length than Claudius' speech of 48. In truth LETTA needs to posit an alternative Claudian text for the sake of his next tendentious manoeuvre: if Tacitus drew on a different speech of Claudius, he can be used 'per chiarire il pensiero di Claudio sui punti che nelle *tabula Lugdunensis* sono omessi'⁵¹. Since LETTA uses Tacitus' digression to reinforce his initial interpretation of Claudius' speech⁵², he must suppose that Tacitus used a different Claudian text in order to avoid a circular argument (Claudius' speech agrees with Tacitus' digression ~ Tacitus has used Claudius' speech ~ Tacitus confirms the agreement). That manoeuvre is methodologically dubious and involves a series of unprovable and contested suppositions, that Claudius delivered a speech on the *pomerium*, that it treated the *mons Caelius*, and that Tacitus used it for his digression on the *pomerium* at *Ann.* 12.23.2–24⁵³. To support the notion that Tacitus used Claudius' speeches for his digressions, LETTA posits an analogy between Claudius' alleged speech on the *pomerium* and the one Tacitus gives Claudius on the *haruspices* at

patu quoque et scripsit plurimum et assidue recitavit per lectorem. Initium autem sumpsit historiae post caedem Caesaris dictatoris ... See MOTTERSHEAD ad loc.; *FRHist.* I 511 (LEVICK, CORNELL).

49 *FRHist.* I 512 (LEVICK, CORNELL).

50 LETTA (2013) 96–99.

51 LETTA (2013) 99.

52 LETTA (2013) 99–101: Caeles Vibenna *did* come to Rome; Claudius' *occupavit* = possession, not conquest; Claudius connected Caeles Vibenna to the *mons Caelius* and the *uicus Tuscus*. In support of the second point, LETTA (97) reports the suggestion of s. POLETTI that it would be strange for Claudius to depict Servius Tullius as a conqueror when he is emphasising Rome's acceptance of foreigners. Would it? Claudius' broader point is served more effectively by the idea that Servius seized the *mons Caelius* and became king, since in this scenario Rome embraced even her enemies. Tacitus has Claudius make the same point in relation to Romulus at *Ann.* 11.24.4.

53 Syme (1958: 705) championed the notion that Tacitus' digression on the *pomerium* derived from a speech of Claudius recorded in the *acta senatus*. If Claudius delivered such a speech, and it is not certain that he did, it is pure speculation that Tacitus used it. Tacitus' remark at 12.24.1 (quoted above) implies that he read a number of sources. A variety have been proposed. For bibliography see GRIFFIN (1990) 484.

Annals 11.15, but the analogy is false, since the latter is not an ‘excursus’ but the same kind of speech as Tacitus gives Claudius in 48⁵⁴.

Attempts to qualify Tacitus’ debt to Claudius’ speech of 48 or transfer it to another Claudian text are unconvincing distractions from the need to re-examine the underlying rationale for connecting their incompatible accounts on the *mons Caelius*. The belief that the occurrence of *appellitare* in both texts establishes Tacitus’ debt to Claudius creates an unworkable relationship between the two. *Appellitare* alone simply cannot bear the burden scholars place on it. If Tacitus unconsciously borrowed *appellitare* from Claudius’ speech, he presents an interpretative dead-end, since he could not have intended an allusion. It is inconceivable, on the other hand, that Tacitus would have deliberately deployed unusual vocabulary which might draw attention to Claudius’ fundamentally different account without subjecting it to any implicit commentary. When, by way of contrast, Tacitus seems to allude to the opening of the *Res Gestae diui Augusti* at the start of the *Annals*, he evoked its language and content to challenge its interpretation of the career of Augustus⁵⁵. In his digression on the *mons Caelius*, however, Tacitus offer no indication that he is engaging with the Etruscan tradition on Caeles Vibenna offered by Claudius. In the absence of such engagement, any evocation of Claudius’ speech risked raising questions about Tacitus’ method by gesturing to a tradition that he ignores entirely. It is, ironically, Tacitus’ very use of *appellitare* which hints that he did not draw on Claudius’ speech as a source. Tacitus and Claudius arrived at the *mons Caelius* from very different routes, Claudius through the life of Servius Tullius, Tacitus from events under Tiberius. Both chose the verb because its archaic tone complemented the esoteric subject matter, and in particular because its semantic nuance was appropriate. Tacitus perhaps picked it up from the historical or antiquarian *scriptores* that he mentions in his digression⁵⁶. Claudius was perhaps influenced in his choice of language by the same traditions, but his sources were *auctores Tusci* writing most likely in Etruscan⁵⁷. Rather than sharing a common source, Claudius and Tacitus might have shared a common source of

54 Cf. Malloch (2013) on Tac. *Ann.* 11.15.1.

55 Cf. *R. Gest. diu. Aug.* 1–2 with Tac. *Ann.* 1.9–10.7 – especially 10 for a hostile reading of Augustus’ career. For discussion see Haverfield (1912) 197–99; Goodyear (1972) on Tac. *Ann.* 1.9–10.7; Cooley (2009) 48–50.

56 MÜNZER ([1898] 608 = [2012] 216) placed Tacitus’ source material between Verrius Flaccus and Claudius, and suggested that he exploited ephemeral literature and even ‘historical reminiscences’ in speeches delivered in the senate. HAHN (1933: 58–60) placed Tacitus’ antiquarian source material between Varro and Verrius Flaccus and claimed that it was unrelated to Claudius’ speech.

57 Cf. CORNELL (1995) 134. This is the simplest explanation arising from Claudius’ words and his interest in Etruscan history (for which cf. e.g. CORNELL [1976] 417–18 = [2011] 181; VERNOLE [2002] 168–9; *FRHist* I 512–3 [LEVICK, CORNELL]). It complicates matters unnecessarily to argue that Claudius was drawing on a Roman intermediary. The claim of MOMIGLIANO (1961a: 16) that Claudius used ‘compilations by Roman writers or romanised Etruscans’ rests on the assumption that he was ignorant of Etruscan; but that assumption is questionable. The argument of MARAS (2010: 190–92) that Claudius’ source (which, following ALFÖLDI [1965] 133–4, 215, MARAS thinks was probably Fabius Pictor) distinguished between the Roman and Etruscan traditions is unlikely in view of the silence of the Roman tradition about Mastarna/Servius Tullius, and merely pushes the problem back one stage to Fabius Pictor (what was the nature of his sources?).

inspiration. Their use of *appellitare* turned out to be an unsurprising coincidence – but a coincidence nonetheless⁵⁸.

List of works cited

- ALFÖLDI, A. (1965) *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor
- ANDREAE, B., HOFFMANN, A., WEVER-LEHMANN, C. (eds) (2004) *Die Etrusker*. Munich
- BARROW, R. H. (1934) *A selection of Latin inscriptions*. Oxford
- BLAKE, H. MCK., POTTER, T. W., WHITEHOUSE, D. B. (eds) (1978) *Papers in Italian archaeology I: the Lancaster seminar. Recent research in prehistoric, classical and medieval archaeology*. Oxford
- BRIQUEL, D. (1990) 'Le témoignage de Claude sur Mastarna/Servius Tullius', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 68: 86–108
- BURANELLI, F. (1987) *La Tomba François di Vulci*. Rome
- CALBOLI, G. (1990) 'Tra corte e scuola: la retorica imperiale a Roma', *Vichiana* 1.2 17–39
- CARCOPINO, J. (1930) Review of FABIA (1929), *Journal des savants* March: 116–28
- CARCOPINO, J. (1961) *Les Étapes de L'Impérialisme Romain*. Paris
- CHARLESWORTH, M. P. (1939) *Documents illustrating the reigns of Claudius and Nero*. Cambridge
- COARELLI, F. (1983) 'Le pitture della tomba François a Vulci: una proposta di lettura', *DArch* 3.3 43–69 = (1996) 138–78
- COARELLI, F. (1996) *Revixit ars: Arte e ideologia a Roma, dai modelli ellentistici alla tradizione repubblicana*. Rome
- COOLEY, A. E. (2009) *Res gestae divi Augusti: text, translation, and commentary*. Cambridge
- CORNELL, T. J. (1976) 'Etruscan historiography', *ASNP* ser. 3, 6: 411–39 = MARINCOLA (2011) 175–204
- CORNELL, T. J. (1978) 'The foundation of Rome in the ancient literary tradition', in Blake et al. (1978) 131–40
- CORNELL, T. J. (1995) *The beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic wars (c. 1000–264 BC)*. London
- CRISTOFANI, M. (ed.) (1990) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini*. Rome
- DOEDERLEIN, L. (1841) *C. Cornelii Taciti opera*. Vol. 1. Halle
- ERNESTI, J. A. (1752) *C. Cornelii Taciti opera*. Leipzig
- FABIA, P. (1929) *La Table Claudienne de Lyon*. Lyon
- FABIA, P. (1931) 'A propos de la Table Claudienne', *REA* 33: 117–38, 225–60
- FURNEAUX, H. (1896) *P. Cornelii Taciti Annalium ab excessu diui Augusti libri, The Annals of Tacitus*. Vol. I: books I–VI. 2nd Edition. Oxford
- GANTZ, T. N. (1975) 'The Tarquin dynasty' *Historia* 4: 539–54
- GARDTHAUSEN, V. E. (1882) *Servius Tullius oder Mastarna*. Leipzig
- GARRUCCI, R. (1866) 'Pitture Vulcenti del Principe D. Alessandro Torlonia', in his *Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento*. Vol. 2 (Rome) 57–72
- GLINISTER, F. and WOODS, C. (eds) (2007) *Verrius, Festus, & Paul: lexicography, scholarship, & society*. London

⁵⁸ HARDY (1912: 149 n. 5) observed that the 'curious' presence of *appellitare* in Tacitus and Claudius 'can hardly be more than accident'. FABIA (1931: 234–7) argued that Tacitus had not seen Claudius' speech when he wrote his digression on the *mons Caelius* and that the use of *appellitare* by both was coincidental.

For comments on a draft I am grateful to S. P. Oakley, M. D. Reeve, J. W. Rich, and A. J. Woodman, who also kindly shared with me some notes from his forthcoming edition, *The Annals of Tacitus, book 4*.

This material is under copyright. Any use outside of the narrow boundaries of copyright law is illegal and may be prosecuted.

This applies in particular to copies, translations, microfilming as well as storage and processing in electronic systems.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2018

- GOELZER, H. (1959) *Tacite: Annales livres IV–XII*. Paris
- GÖTTLING, K. W. (1840) *Geschichte der Römischen Staatsverfassung von Erbauung der Stadt bis zu C. Cäsar's Tod*. Halle
- GOODYEAR, F. R. D. (1972) *The Annals of Tacitus books 1–6*. Volume I: *Annals 1.1–54*. Cambridge
- GRENIER, A. (1926) *The Roman spirit in religion, thought, and art*. London
- GRIFFIN, M. T. (1982) 'The Lyons tablet and Tacitean hindsight', *CQ* 32: 404–18
- GRIFFIN, M. T. (1990) 'Claudius in Tacitus', [CQ](#) 40: 482–501
- GRONOVIVS, J. G. (1721) *C. Cornelii Taciti opera quae exstant*. Utrecht
- HAASE, F. (1855) *Cornelii Taciti opera*. Leipzig
- HAHN, E. (1933) *Die Exkurse in den Annalen des Tacitus*. Leipzig
- HARDY, E. G. (1912), *Three Spanish charters and other documents*. Oxford
- HAVERFIELD, F. (1912), 'Four notes on Tacitus', *JRS* 2: 195–200
- HOFMANN, J. B., SZANTYR, A. (1972) *Lateinische Grammatik*. Volume 2 *Syntax und Stilistik*. Rev. Edn. Munich
- KÖRTE, G. (1897) 'Ein Wandgemälde von Vulci als Document zur römischen Königsgeschichte', *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 12: 57–80
- LEO, F. (1896) 'Die staatsrechtlichen Excursus in Tacitus' Annalen', *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Philol.-hist. Klasse (1896) 191–208 = (1960) 299–317
- LEO, F. (1960) *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Ed. E. FRAENKEL. Rome
- LETTA, C. (2013) 'Dalla *Tabula Lugdunensis* alla Tomba François: la Tradizione Etrusca su Servio Tullio', *SCO* 59: 91–115
- LEWIS, G. C. (1855) *An inquiry into the credibility of the early Roman history*. London
- LIPSIUS, J. (1574) *C. Cornelii Taciti Historiarum et Annalium libri qui exstant*. Antwerp
- MAGGIANI, A. (1990) '1.1 Tomba François', in Cristofani (1990) 18–19
- MALLOCH, S. J. V. (2013) *The Annals of Tacitus, book 11*. Cambridge
- MARAS, D. F. (2010) 'Ancora su Mastarna, *Sodalis Fidelissimus*', *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'* 17: 187–200
- MARINCOLA, J. (1997) *Authority and tradition in ancient historiography*. Cambridge
- MARINCOLA, J. (ed.) (2011) *Greek and Roman historiography*. Oxford
- MARTIN, R. H. (1994) *Tacitus*. Reprint with corrections. London
- MARTIN, R. H. and WOODMAN, A. J. (1989) *Tacitus: Annals book iv*. Cambridge
- MESSERSCHMIDT, F. (1930) *Nekropolen von Vulci*. Berlin
- MIGLIORATI, G. (2003) 'Forme politiche e tipi di governo nella Roma Etrusca del VI se. A.C.', *Historia* 52: 39–66
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1932) 'Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone', *RAL* 8: 293–336 = (1975) 799–836
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1961a) *Claudius: the emperor and his achievement*. Trans. W. D. HOGARTH. Reprint with a new preface, bibliography, and minor corrections. Cambridge
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1961b) Review of SYME (1958), *Gnomon* 33: 55–8 = (1966) 739–44
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1966) *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Rome
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1975) *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Rome
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1984a) *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Rome
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1984b) 'The origins of Rome', in (1984a) 379–436 = *CAH*² VII.2 52–112
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1990) *The classical foundations of modern historiography*. Berkeley
- MOMMSEN, T. (1853) Review of A. DE BOISSIEU, *Inscriptions antiques de Lyon* (Lyon, 1846), in *Annali dell'istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* 10: 50–83
- MOMMSEN, T. (1904) 'Das Verhältniss des Tacitus zu den Acten des Senats', *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie* 1146–55 = (1909) 253–63
- MOMMSEN, T. (1909) *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 7. Berlin
- MOTTERSHEAD, J. (1986) *Suetonius: Claudius*. Bristol

- MUELLER, C. O. (1839) *Sexti Pompei Festi de verborum significatione quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig
- MUELLER, K. O. (1877) *Die Etrusker*. Neu bearbeitet von W. DEEKE. Erster Band. Stuttgart
- MÜNZER, F. (1898) 'Caelae Vibenna and Mastarna', *RhM* 53: 596–620 = (2012) 204–28
- MÜNZER, F. (2012) *Kleine Schriften*. Ed. M. Haake and A.-C. Harders. Stuttgart
- NIEBUHR, B. G. (1827) *Römische Geschichte*. Erster Theil. Zweite, völlig umgearbeitete, Ausgabe. Berlin
- NIEBUHR, B. G. (1843) *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*. Zweite Sammlung. Bonn
- OAKLEY, S. P. (2000) Review of A. J. WOODMAN and R. H. MARTIN, *The Annals of Tacitus, book 3* (Cambridge, 1996), *BMCR* 2000.01.28
- OGILVIE, R. M. (1965) *A commentary on Livy books 1–5*. Oxford
- PARATI, L. (1931) 'Per la storia degli Etruschi', *Studi Etruschi* 5: 147–61
- PERL, G. (1996) 'Die Rede des Kaisers Claudius für die Aufnahme römischer Bürger aus Gallia Comata in den Senat (CIL XIII 1668)', *Philologus* 140: 114–38
- POUCET, J. (1985) *Les origines de Rome: tradition et histoire*. Brussels
- QUESTA, C. (1963) *Studi sulle fonti degli Annales di Tacito*. 2nd Edn. Rome
- QUESTA, C. (1998) *L'Aquila a due Teste: Immagini di Roma e dei Romani*. Urbino
- RICHARDSON, J. H. (2015) 'Andreas Alföldi and the adventure(s) of the Vibenna brothers', in Richardson and Santangelo (2015) 111–30
- RICHARDSON, J. H. and SANTANGELO, F. (eds) (2014) *The Roman historical tradition: regal and republican Rome*. Oxford
- RICHARDSON, J. H. and SANTANGELO, F. (eds) (2015) *Andreas Alföldi in the twenty-first century*. Stuttgart
- RIDLEY, R. T. (1975) 'The enigma of Servius Tullius', *Klio* 57: 147–77 = RICHARDSON and SANTANGELO (2014) 83–128
- RITSCHL, F. and MOMMSEN, T. (1854) 'Zur Rede des Kaisers Claudius', *RhM* 9: 443–50
- RUPERTI, G. A. (1834) *C. Cornelii Taciti opera*. Vol. 1. Hanover
- SAGE, M. M. (1991) 'The treatment in Tacitus of Roman Republican history and antiquarian matters', *ANRW* II.33.5: 3385–419
- SAGE, P. (1980) 'La Table claudienne et le style de l'empereur Claude: essai de réhabilitation', *REL* 58: 274–312
- SCHWEGLER, A. (1853) *Römische Geschichte*. Vol. 1. Tübingen
- SCOTT-RYBERG, I. (1929) 'Early Roman traditions in the light of archaeology', *MAAR* 7: 7–118
- SYME, R. (1958) *Tacitus*. Oxford
- SYME, R. (1977) 'How Tacitus wrote Annals I–III', *Historiographia Antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae*. Louvain 231–63 = (1984) 1014–42
- SYME, R. (1982) 'Tacitus: some sources of his information', *JRS* 72: 68–82 = (1988) 199–222
- SYME, R. (1984) *Roman Papers*. Vol. III. Ed. A. R. BIRLEY. Oxford
- SYME, R. (1988) *Roman Papers*. Vol. IV. Ed. A. R. BIRLEY. Oxford
- THEWREWK, E. (1889) *Sexti Pompei Festi de verborum significatione quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Budapest
- THOMSEN, R. (1980), *King Servius Tullius: a historical synthesis*. Gyldendal
- TOWNEND, G. (1961) 'Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny', *Hermes* 89: 227–48
- TOWNEND, G. (1962) 'Claudius and the digressions in Tacitus', *RhM* 105: 358–68
- VERNOLE, V. E. (2002) *Servius Tullius*. Rome
- VERTRANIUS, M. (1569) *Ad P. Cornelii Taciti Annalium et Historiarum libros ... notae*. Lyon
- WISEMAN, T. P. (2004) *The myths of Rome*. Cambridge
- WÖLFFLIN, E. (1887) 'Die verba frequentativa und intensiva', *ALLG* 4: 197–222

WOODMAN, A. J. (2009) 'Introduction', in IBID (ed.) *The Cambridge companion to Tacitus*. Cambridge, 1–14

WOODMAN, A. J. (forthcoming) *The Annals of Tacitus, book 4*. Cambridge

S. J. V. MALLOCH

University of Nottingham

