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In the opening words of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, Valerius Maximus juxtaposes both internal and external material in his collection of exempla. The first four words of the preface position the Romans and foreign worlds by side and this structure is echoed throughout the text. Within individually named chapters (De Fortitudo 3.2, De Cruelditate 9.2) or De Gratis (5.2, for instance) Valerius divides the exempla into Roman and external categories. While the majority (697 of 1041 exempla), the foreign exempla still constitute a third of the total number of stories (344 of 1041). The broad division in the structure of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, as well as the comments that Valerius him-

In the opening words of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* Valerius Maximus indicates his determination to include both internal and external material in his collection of *exempla*. The first four words of the preface position the Romans and foreigners side by side and this structure is echoed throughout the text. Within individually themed chapters (*De Fortitudine* (3.2), *De Crudelitate* (9.2) or *De Gratia* (5.2) for instance) Valerius divides the *exempla* into Roman and external categories. While internal material is in the majority (697 of 1041 *exempla*), the foreign *exempla* still constitute a third of the total number of stories (344 of 1041)\(^1\). The broad division in the structure of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, as well as the comments that Valerius makes as he moves from Roman to foreign material, constantly draw attention to the relationship between internal and external\(^2\). The question of how Valerius conceives of this relationship, despite the passing assessments of various scholars, is by no means straightforward\(^3\). This thesis will explore Valerius Maximus’ perception of externals through an examination of his structure, selection of material and use of language.

The collection of *exempla* that Valerius has selected and shaped seems to have been designed for a fairly straightforward purpose. Valerius tells us that the *Facta et Dicta* is a selection of excerpts from other authors collected by him for the convenience of the reader. Nevertheless, the work operates on at least two levels. On casual inspection – particularly when read in pieces – it contains largely inoffensive *exempla* reworked around central themes. When the chapters are carefully read

---

\(^2\) These transition lines are present in 45% of the chapters in the *Facta et Dicta* in which external material is present – there are 29 transition lines in total.  
\(^3\) Chapter One: ‘Vindicating Valerius: A Review of Current Literature’.
through, however, the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* reveals itself as a text that challenges ideas of internality and externality with neatly constructed juxtapositions and pervasive irony. The *Facta et Dicta* is certainly a source-book for argumentation by others, but it is also an argument woven together from the individual *exempla* by the author himself.

Initially, I have examined the text for traces of the ancient ideas of ethnicity that are represented in other sources such as categorisation by physical features or on the grounds of the impact of the climate in different regions. Valerius Maximus demonstrates no interest in the somatic characteristics or skin colour associated with different ethnic groups in the ancient world – he similarly rejects the importance of the environmental theory of race; in the *Facta et Dicta* human beings from diverse environments and backgrounds are interchangeable. Ethnicity is not depicted in terms of physical characteristics or constraints\(^4\). The one feature in the work that appears to contradict this finding is Valerius’ unusual, and rhetorically weighted, use of the term *sanguis* as an ethnic distinguisher. However, when the role of *sanguis* in the work is examined it becomes clear that blood – in stark contrast to its place in modern race theory – is used as a means of demonstrating the essential unity of human beings, rather than their separation into different groups\(^5\).

Valerius’ decision not to discuss ethnicity in physical terms focuses attention on the language that he uses to indicate the differences between internal and external. *Exter, externus, alienus* and *alienigenus* – both within the transition lines between internal and external sections of chapters and elsewhere in the text – consistently draw attention to the division between peoples only to undermine that division by demonstrating the commonality of experience and values\(^6\). Valerius’ use of these words also highlights his deliberate decision to include external material so definitely that no case can be made that this material is present only when there is a lack of Roman material, or only in order to provide variety. The same is true of Valerius’ use of *gens* and *natio*. These terms, generally associated with external peoples, prove to carry no sense of condemnation or inferiority in Valerius’ text. Indeed, their presence

---

\(^4\) Chapter Two: ‘Not Our Brother: Looks and Locations’.


\(^6\) Chapter Four: ‘The Language of Difference’. 
often alerts the reader to material that confounds the easy separation of internal and external categories. Valerius’ deliberate subversion of these relatively neutral indicators of externality leads us into his use of the far from neutral adjective barbarus. Even here we find that Valerius uses barbarus to alert the reader to exempla that subvert the distinction between internal and external. In a selection of exempla where Romans are pitted against foreign enemies Valerius refers to enemy forces with barbarus; this might initially seem to indicate a patriotic superiority on Valerius’ part but his intention is exactly opposite. In each of these cases the faults of Romans are underlined: within the exempla they ignore prodigies, allow themselves to be captured or desert their comrades. In two of the cases, the behaviour of the enemy is carefully constructed to recall Roman faults that Valerius has highlighted within the internal material of the same chapter. Furthermore, all of these uses of barbarus for a foreign enemy are positioned beside exempla that describe Roman civil violence and war. Internality is no more valid a concept, it seems, than externality.

Elsewhere Valerius uses barbarian exempla of virtue and vice to demonstrate the universality of these qualities. Chapters in the Facta et Dicta are constructed to evoke the ancient idea that levels of humanity decreased as distance from the Mediterranean increased. Valerius uses anonymous barbarians to demonstrate the irrelevance of geographic extremity. This is reinforced with the positive presence of certain qualities. In rhetorical set-pieces pietas, crudelitas, virtus and humanitas are envisaged as extending their influence and availability throughout the world; they demonstrate the innate understanding that natura gives to human beings. Valerius’ philosophy gives primacy to behaviour above all; accidents of birth and geography are discounted in the face of demonstrably universal ideas. He pushes his readers to understand how meaningless categories like internal and external really are by employing the language of division to demonstrate a fundamental unity.

Valerius Maximus is an author who needs to be read more seriously than has sometimes been the case; close examination of the text overturns previous claims that he is a narrow-minded, pedestrian and unoriginal author. Valerius rather seems to collude with his reader’s prejudices only to betray these prejudices. The resulting

---

7 Chapter Four: ‘Gens and Natio: What’s in a Name?’
8 Chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’.
9 Chapter Six: ‘Bringing the Outside In’.
10 Chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’.
document is designed to both educate and elevate the reader. We see an intriguing mind reflected in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* – an author who divides the world into two parts in order to demonstrate that it is essentially one; who creates externality in order to stress universality and who demonstrates that both Romans and externals are primarily citizens of the world.

Valerius is simply unworthy of attention or serious consideration. Representative of this attitude are comments describing Valerius in general treatments of Latin literature; in the words of Moses Hadas "Valerius himself has nothing to say worth bearing". Wight Duff does not consider Valerius worthy of even this much attention, noting him as an author who uses Livy as a source and no more. D. Vessey accords him more importance but still sees him as only a "sidelight on first century rhetoric", dismissing his ideas as "threadbare and hackneyed" and his style as "often pedantically sententious". Q. Comis allows that he provides an interesting adjunct to Velleius Paterculus under the heading of "The Histoirography of Consensus" but finishes by commenting "nowadays almost no one reads him."

The demise of Valerius as a serious literary source reaches its fullest, and most vitriolic, expression in the chapter on Valerius Maximus that C.J. Carter contributes to *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*. Carter writes of Valerius Maximus with such distaste that the reader wonders why he should have elected to write a dissertation on Valerius at all. Carter's attitude is clear from his opening paragraph: "In many ways Valerius never deserved to survive, and he still obstinately refuses to die. Paradoxes like this surround an author whom modern taste rightly finds one of the most tedious and affected products of the ancient world." Not content with this, he goes on to discuss Valerius' style further: "to tackle the stuff in any quantity becomes an

---

7. Wardle, D. 'John Ericecco (ed.) Valerii Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia. 2 volumes (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1938).'
Chapter One: Vindicating Valerius: A review of current scholarship.

Valerius Maximus, despite recent interest from a number of authors, remains a largely overlooked representative of early Imperial literature. Until W. Bloomer’s book *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, appeared in 1992, Valerius was largely ignored. The primary reason is the widely held belief that Valerius is simply unworthy of attention or serious consideration. Representative of this attitude are comments describing Valerius in general treatments of Latin literature; in the words of Moses Hadas “Valerius himself has nothing to say worth hearing.”

Wight Duff does not consider Valerius worthy of even this much attention, noting him as an author who uses Livy as a source and no more; D. Vessey accords him more importance but still sees him as only a “sideshow on first century rhetoric”, dismissing his ideas as “threadbare and hackneyed” and his style as “often pedantically sententious.” G. Conte allows that he provides an interesting adjunct to Velleius Paterculus under the heading of “The Historiography of Consensus” but finishes by commenting “nowadays almost no one reads him.”

The demise of Valerius as a serious literary source reaches its fullest, and most vitriolic, expression in the chapter on Valerius Maximus that C.J. Carter contributes to *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*. Carter writes of Valerius Maximus with such distaste that the reader wonders why he should have elected to write a dissertation on Valerius at all. Carter’s attitude is clear from his opening paragraph: “In many ways Valerius never deserved to survive, and he still obstinately refuses to die. Paradoxes like this surround an author whom modern taste rightly finds one of the most tedious and affected products of the ancient world.” Not content with this, he goes on to discuss Valerius’ style further: “to tackle the stuff in any quantity becomes an

1 Bloomer, W. Martin *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill, 1992).
increasingly gloomy and indigestible experience” and to state that Valerius is distinguished chiefly by his “supreme mediocrity of talent”.

Recently, however, several books have treated Valerius Maximus as worthy of serious scholarly attention. There has been a new Teubner edition of his work, the first Loeb of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia in a translation by Shackleton Bailey and – very recently – the publication of a new English translation of the text for a general audience. D. Wardle has also provided a valuable addition with his study of book One which is the first commentary on any section of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia. These works were preceded by two articles focusing on the meaning and significance of Valerius’ text, rather than the textual problems occupying the majority of previous works, which must be credited with partial responsibility for the revival of interest in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia: Carney’s discussion of Valerius’ depiction of Marius and Maslakov’s study of Valerius within the tradition of Roman exemplarity. These works have shown Valerius Maximus apparently can be viewed as important; the question then is why and how he is important.

9 Ibid. 30.
There has been a tendency, even among authors who have regarded Valerius Maximus as worthy of independent study, to use the *Facta et Dicta* as a neutral conduit of information about other wider areas. Valerius has thus become a source book mined for nuggets of information but effectively invisible to those who work it. The past twenty years have seen attempts to raise awareness of the importance of the genre of the *Facta et Dicta* and (to a lesser extent) the personal input of Valerius but traces of the ‘conduit’ approach are still preserved in the attempts of authors to justify their study of the work. Thus Valerius provides an insight into the historical image of Marius and is valuable precisely because he has no opinion or personal ideas to offer, because he preserves the language of school rhetoric, because his collection gives us strictly conventional material about religion, because he presents an unadulterated mirror-image of imperial policy and propaganda and because he is “middle-brow” and thus depicts common attitudes. The text is not interesting in its own right, but is valuable because of what it reveals about silver Latin, non-Republican culture and the organisation of Roman knowledge. Alternatively, study of the text is justified by interest in the time period in which it was written.

H. Mueller at the outset of his work on Roman religion in Valerius Maximus proposes that it would be a valuable exercise to accept Valerius’ stated views on religion as a sincere expression of belief. I shall take a similar approach to Valerius Maximus himself – increasing engagement with Valerius reveals a cogent and thoughtful author, worthy of study in his own right. By taking the author’s individual contribution seriously we stand to gain far more insight into his period and the way he

---


17 Attempts to come to grips with Valerius himself and his particular concerns are most notably found in the work of Bloomer (Bloomer, W. Martin *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill, 1992) and Mueller (Mueller, H. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus* (London, 2002)3-5).


feeds from, and into, other authors than, as hitherto, by using him as a means to some other, largely predetermined, end. We find a writer who is much more interesting; who turns out to be much more subtle, and much more linguistically conscious and controlled, than he has previously been given credit for.

In the attempt to discern Valerius' ideas and views there is, however, one persistent methodology that needs to be treated with caution. This is the temptation to collect all of Valerius' references to an individual and create from them a unified picture that then reveals Valerius' attitude or opinions. Carney is a notable example of this tendency. In his article 'The Picture of Marius in Valerius Maximus' he amalgamates the information from each of the exempla that deal with Marius into an attempt to establish an overall depiction of the man consciously constructed by Valerius. The futility of this approach to a work like the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia has already been exposed by both Maslakov and Bloomer: because of the nature of the collection, the consistency of individuals or events is not nearly so important to Valerius as the point of each exemplum. If he wants to demonstrate the primacy of the Latin language he will present Marius as a proud and respected victor (2.2.2), but if he needs to illustrate the destructive force of crudelitas he will use Marius as a topos of terrible behaviour (9.2.2). Valerius is not in the business of biography and each exemplum must be read primarily with attention to its context rather than its participants. The invalidity of the biographical approach has not, however, prevented others from continuing with it. Most recently, H. Mueller in his pursuit of Valerius' attitude towards the individual deities of Roman religion works in his first three chapters by pooling the information from every exemplum that so much as implies the deity in hand. This approach was anticipated in his article 'Vita, Pudicitia, Libertas: Juno, Gender, and Religious Politics in Valerius Maximus' on which the first chapter of the book is based.

30 Ibid. 221-263.
In the case of Mueller’s study it might be expected that attitudes towards Gods would be more consistent than those towards historical Republican figures, but this is not the case. For instance, if Mueller’s method were to be applied to Venus as she appears in the *Facta et Dicta*, Valerius would seem to have a somewhat divided attitude towards the goddess. Venus appears three times: firstly she is present at 2.6.15 where the women of Sicca use her temple as a venue from which to prostitute themselves. Valerius loads the *exemplum* with disapproving language: *dedecus, turpius, iniuria* and *inhonestus*, and as Valerius insists, the shame should be contrasted with the glorious chastity and fidelity of Indian widows that has been previously discussed (2.6.14)\(^{31}\). The second time that Venus appears is at 8.11.ext.4 where the beauty of Praxiteles’ statue of the goddess was such that it inspired lust in the beholder. The final appearance of Venus, however, is at 8.15.12 where an image of Venus Verticordia is commissioned at Rome to promote chaste and decorous behaviour amongst the women of the city. Venus furthermore honours Sulpicia as the *sancitissima femina* at Rome when she is selected to dedicate the statue. Venus appears twice in direct contravention of chastity and the purity of marriage and once as a sure guardian of *pudicitia* and in association with the most chaste of the Roman matrons. This case sufficiently indicates the need for caution.

A number of authors, however, have approached Valerius with methods that have resulted in important findings. Bloomer largely deserves the credit for re-igniting interest in Valerius Maximus. His 1992 work ‘Valerius Maximus and the New Nobility’ presents an overview of Valerius’ techniques of composition and pays particular attention to summarising, clarifying and correcting the many assertions that have been made regarding the sources of the *Facta et Dicta*\(^{32}\). The most important result of his researches into Valerius’ composition – as recognised by Mueller\(^{33}\) – is that one can seriously speak of Valerius’ composition; Bloomer has clearly demonstrated that Valerius re-worked *exempla* in terms of language and emphasis and was not slavishly dependant upon prior sources for the exact details of each story\(^{34}\). His insistence on treating Valerius within the confines of his genre without imposing the expectations attendant upon a historian or a proponent of any other genre is also...
notable; he argues that much criticism of Valerius arises from misguided attempts to impose inappropriate standards\(^{35}\). For Bloomer the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is no more nor less than a declamatory manual that provides *exempla*, as well as demonstrations of how these *exempla* can be shaped and styled to fit a speaker’s needs\(^{36}\). Bloomer identifies Valerius’ use of unusual, and even original, language in the *Facta et Dicta* and sees in this the continual striving after originality and surprise that in the halls of declamation could give a speaker an edge over the competition\(^{37}\). In passing he suggests that Valerius Maximus intended his work to serve as an introduction to aristocratic Roman ideas and culture for those new to society and the imperial service\(^{38}\).

Bloomer’s claim that Valerius is a careful and conscious composer can, and should, be taken further. Because Valerius’ language has been shown by Bloomer to be original and deliberate we must now focus on what that language reveals about Valerius’ ideas and intentions. One consequence of Bloomer’s (justified) decision to underline emphatically the constraints imposed by genre on Valerius’ work and the final purpose of the work in rhetorical schools and performance is that it forces Valerius into a position of passivity. As exclusively a collector of *exempla*, and the stylistic tricks and flourishes used to integrate these *exempla*, Valerius is denied an agenda of his own in the *Facta et Dicta*. This is by no means exclusive to Bloomer, but it jars in his work precisely because he has gone to such lengths to demonstrate Valerius’ independent construction of *exempla* and personal choice of language\(^{39}\). Bloomer has exerted an effort to demonstrate that Valerius is an independent and conscious composer and yet sharply curtailed that independence by ascribing a determinedly pragmatic purpose to the work. Even if the work were simply a declamatory source-book, this does not preclude the presence of consistent ideas and themes.

\(^{35}\) Ibid. 19 and 254-6.
\(^{36}\) Ibid.14-7, 25-6 and 256-7.
\(^{37}\) Ibid. 235-9. Bloomer identifies *debilamentum* and *duramentum* as Valerian creations, to these two examples can also be added *vaframentum* which is unknown before or after Valerius Maximus.
\(^{38}\) Ibid.12-3 and 259. The disappointing speed with which Bloomer raises, and then moves on from, this idea has been noted by George although, contrary to his assertion, the idea does appear in the text prior to the final page (George, E.V. ‘W. Martin Bloomer. Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility. Chapel Hill/London: The University ofNorth Carolina Press, 1992.’ Classical World 89.5 (1996) 420.)
The difficulties of the limitations that Bloomer imposes on Valerius’ text are revealed when the question of material selection is discussed. Bloomer argues that the composition of a work like the Facta et Dicta demonstrates an attempt on Valerius’ part to reshape and integrate material from Republican history in a fashion appropriate to the new political conditions at Rome. He asserts on a number of occasions that Valerius struggles with this material; Marius’ determined rusticity for instance is, he believes, “difficult or almost intractable” to the author. Most consistently, however, Bloomer draws attention to exempla that deal with civil war: “material that could be interpreted as critical of Rome or the Caesars” and requires “apology or reclassification.” He specifically cites the chapters De Amicitia and De Crudelitate and examines them to ascertain Valerius’ methods of keeping dangerous topics quarantined from the present. In both these cases, however, Valerius both deliberately draws attention to Roman faults and failings and underlines the contemporary relevance of the topics. De Crudelitate is discussed at some length in chapter Six, so I will concentrate on De Amicitia here.

Bloomer argues that Valerius subjects the material in Book 4 chapter 7 (De Amicitia) to a process of abstraction: the political ramifications of the content (which is almost entirely based in civil conflict) are thus obscured by the moral and emotional point of the chapter and thus no uncomfortable connections can be made with the present day, or dynasty. The political angle and present impact of amicitia is, however, consciously promoted by Valerius throughout the chapter. In the preface (which is the longest preface at any point in the Facta et Dicta) he makes it clear that he has decided to focus on friendship as it manifests itself in troubled times. He states outright that this is the most sincere and valuable expression of friendship and supports his point with two contrasting foreign exempla: Sardanapillus and Orestes:

\[
\text{nemo de Sardanapalli familiaribus loquitur, Orestes Pylade paene amico quam Agamemnone notior est patre...} \]

Orestes is used to demonstrate the truest form of friendship. Admittedly this is not a demonstration drawn from civil conflict, but it is one drawn from conflict actually within the family. Pylades and Orestes together kill...
Orestes’ mother and her lover in revenge for the murder of his father Agamemnon. Valerius has selected an ominous example of friendship in very internal conflict with which to start the chapter. By unusually placing it in the preface and then including a pointed transition between this story and the rest of the material, he has made it clear that the reader should pay attention\(^{45}\).

The internal material delivers on the promise of the preface; there are only two exempla not directly connected to civil conflict in the seven presented (4.7.3 and 4.7.7)\(^{46}\). The latter of these also provides the only happy internal exemplum: D. Laelius and M. Agrippa are praised for their steadfast friendship with great men and gods. Valerius expresses the hope that their example will encourage a posterior aetas to practice friendship qua libentius qua etiam religiosius. There are two instances of friendship from Valerius’ own time in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia; one is his friendship with Sextus Pompeius and the other is the friendship between Tiberius and Sejanus. At 9.11.ext.4 Valerius accuses Sejanus of attempting to extinguish the fides amicitiae with his plot against Tiberius\(^{47}\). The two chapters are set at some distance from one another but Valerius imbues chapter 4.7 with so much significance that it is patently designed to lodge in the reader’s memory and 9.11.ext.4 is also remarkable for its emotion, relevance and positioning in the external material. Valerius turns amicitia into a religious figure that he profoundly hopes will be cultivated and revered at 4.7.7 and then accuses Sejanus of attempting to destroy this deity at 9.11.ext.4. It is perhaps notable that Valerius expresses his hopes for the cultivation of amicitia for a posterior aetas. Amicitia is a concept with real and difficult political associations in Valerius’ own time – maybe a future age will enjoy great friendship but the experience of the present day offers little cause for optimism.

This is made even clearer in the final exemplum of 4.7 which describes Valerius’ friendship with Sextus Pompeius (4.7.2b). While Valerius begins with the expected touching praise of his patron (*cuius in animo velut in parentum amantissimorum pectore laetior vitae meae status viguit, tristior acquievit...*) this

\(^{45}\) *Sed quid externa attingo, cum domesticis prius liceat uti?* The preface of 4.7 is discussed in chapter Four: ‘The Language of Difference’, 121-122.

\(^{46}\) The way in which the Roman civil war material is emphasised is discussed below in Bloomer’s treatment of external peoples in Valerius Maximus.

\(^{47}\) The figure who is abused in the exemplum is not specifically identified as Sejanus by Valerius Maximus but I accept the general consensus that this is the most likely identification. For discussion see: Wardle, D. *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Deeds and Sayings Book I. Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1998) 3-4.
happiness is not sustained for long. Instead Valerius goes on to attack unspecified individuals who have envied and resented the relationship, accusing them of *malignitas* and a general enjoyment of Valerius' loss of Sextus. The fact that no explicit charges are laid helps to create a sense of general ill-feeling and bitterness, culminating in Valerius' hope that misfortune will rapidly visit the culprits. This is a dark note on which to end the chapter on friendship and it directly undercuts the hopes that Valerius has expressed at 4.7.7. It is all the more striking as Valerius so rarely refers to his personal experience in the *Facta et Dicta*. This, coupled with its unusual position in the external material, ensures that the reader is alerted to continuing, contemporary threats to *amicitia*. 4.7 as a chapter is connected more firmly to contemporary experiences than almost any other chapter in the work.

There is no doubt that Valerius shapes his material deliberately as Bloomer suggests. In this case Valerius chooses to include this material and he chooses to underline its associations with civil conflict and modern Roman life. If he were to be struggling with the material it would be because he has chosen to present it as difficult and relevant, not because he is defusing it. It seems, however, that in this chapter Valerius is fully in control. The task of collating *exempla* is not forcing him into treating material in this way; Valerius is manipulating the collation of *exempla* to reflect his own ideas and attitudes.

C. Skidmore's primary concern is the question of genre; he argues that the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is not merely a hand-book of stories to embellish declamations but is rather designed to advise readers on the proper way to behave in various kinds of situations. Like Bloomer he sees a didactic purpose in the work, but insists that the point is moral, not cultural, instruction. D. Wardle combines the two, agreeing with Skidmore's emphasis upon the moral focus of the text but maintaining that the work also fulfilled a pragmatic purpose for those involved in declamation. Skidmore's reading of the text has, importantly, brought into focus the possibility that Valerius has shaped the *Facta et Dicta* with larger concerns than rhetorical style in

---

48 *Divites sunt aliorum iacturis, locupletes calamitatibus, immortales funeribus. Sed illi quatenus alienis incommodis suorum adhuc expertes insolentiae varietas humanae condicionis viderit* (4.7.2b).
49 The only other undisputed personal material is at 2.6.8.
51 Ibid. xvi, and 53-82 particularly.
52 On Bloomer, see above n. 34.
mind. His analysis of Valerius' commentary effectively conveys a moralistic sensibility extending beyond an orator’s attempts to demonstrate the way in which his exempla could potentially be used. Skidmore also provides a concise overview of exactly what can be established regarding the genre within which Valerius appears to be writing, and the way in which this relates to Valerius’ structure and style.

Like Bloomer however, he does not fully exploit the image of Valerius Maximus’ construction that he develops in the course of his work. Skidmore makes a number of intriguing observations about the Facta et Dicta but tends to use these observations to attempt a reconstruction of the history of the genre, rather than to approach the text itself. Similarly he states that Valerius’ choices of material reflect the availability of sources and not his own conscious and deliberate selection.

Lapses of faith in Valerius’ control of his medium forestall Skidmore from investigating the important questions that arise from his own observations and undermine his interpretation of Valerius’ purpose.

Mueller builds on Bloomer’s conclusions regarding construction and Skidmore’s emphasis on morality in order to analyse Valerius’ personal and individual attitudes in the sphere of Roman religion. Mueller’s approach includes the afore-mentioned technique of collating references to particular gods in order to build a coherent picture. This is combined with the more interesting techniques of comparison of Valerius’ text with those of other authors and analysis of Valerius’ use of language and vocabulary in the exempla. The problems with the first approach have been discussed above. Comparing Valerius with his sources on the other hand can be a very effective method of establishing Valerius’ particular ideas and concerns, but it too needs to be exercised together with a constant awareness of differences in genre. Thus while many differences between Livy’s text and that of Valerius are intriguing and significant others may simply reveal the different priorities of a historian and a writer of exempla.

55 Ibid. 21 and 47 for example.
56 Ibid. 44-5.
57 This comparative work designed to demonstrate Valerius’ particular concerns represents a useful development on Bloomer’s comparison of Valerius and other authors to provide information regarding his sources.
58 Wardle comments on the fact that differences can often be attributed simply to the different demands of the authors’ works: Wardle, D. Valerius Maximus: Memorable Deeds and Sayings Book I. Translated with Introduction and Commentary (Oxford, 1998) 16-8.
In the discussion of 3.7.1g, for instance, Mueller finds it significant that — in contrast to Livy — Valerius fails to tell the reader that the elder P. Scipio Africanus’ technique of avoiding prosecution by recalling the anniversary of his triumph over Carthage was only successful for one day and that he fails to include more thorough detail of the politics and events of the occasion. The impact of genre does need to be recognised on this occasion: Valerius is constructing an *exemplum* for the chapter *De Fiducia Sui* where expressions of self-confidence (especially from the great Scipio) are overwhelmingly justified by subsequent events. His point is the success of the gesture and not its impermanence. Valerius’ tight focus on the topic of the chapter at hand does not allow — or need — detail of the kind that Livy includes. Recognition of the different priorities of the two authors is particularly important because Mueller uses Livy more than any other author as a comparison and control for the text of the *Facta et Dicta*.

Mueller’s discussion of Valerius Maximus’ use of language is however, valuable. By comparing Valerius’ accounts with those of other authors and studying the construction of passages from the *Facta et Dicta* and their context, he argues that Valerius’ choice of words and his rhetorical flourishes consistently invoke elements of religious feeling and ritual in the text. In undertaking this analysis Mueller’s topic headings reveal his organising principle: he takes a subject such as “The Rhetoric of Sacrifice” or issues of purity and then selects *exempla* to study which include these elements. These studies could reveal a particular preoccupation with religiously significant language in the *Facta et Dicta* but the argument would be stronger with the addition of wider analysis of the terms in question throughout the whole body of the work. Such investigation would be able to demonstrate Valerius’ consistent employment of language and rhetoric highlighting his religious feeling. It would also be able to identify whether Valerius treats the sensitive issue of religion as he does that of ethnicity: by making superficially conservative statements that, on closer inspection of language and content are undermined by his own demonstrations of the universality of virtue and the unimportance of national boundaries.

Much has been done by these writers to promote Valerius Maximus as an independent and conscious author. Bloomer built the foundations of a view of

---

60 See 3.7.1a,b,c,d,e,f, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11 for instance.
62 Ibid. 125-7 and 123-4 respectively.
Valerius that has come to fruition in Mueller’s work. We are now in a position confidently to analyse Valerius’ choices regarding the selection, arrangement and wording of *exempla* in order to gain a greater understanding of his attitudes and the ideas that particularly concerned him in the writing of the *Facta et Dicta*. Twice Bloomer refers to the *Facta et Dicta* as patchwork; he means by this description to convey the self contained and quarantined nature of individual chapters and *exempla* within the work. This imagery can be taken further; patchwork is indeed composed of individual pieces but the juxtaposition of these pieces reveals the selected patterns and the wider intentions of the artist. Patchwork can create art and serve a utilitarian objective. Similarly – as shown by Skidmore and Mueller – Valerius stitches into his pragmatic collection of *exempla* embellishments that reveal the underlying ideas and concerns running through his work. The carefully crafted lines linking together *exempla* and chapters are the ultimate proof: Valerius is a thoughtful and conscious author who demands to be taken seriously on his own strengths.

Bloomer is indeed right in seeing Valerius’ language as distinctive and individual. As Mueller has demonstrated this should be taken as an indication of a correspondingly distinctive and individual author whose thought can be most effectively explored through his language. In Valerius’ choices and arrangement we see the clearest indications of his ideas and attitudes. However, in order to establish a consistency in Valerian usage it is necessary to study individual terms throughout the work. Vocabulary is more stable than subject matter and a story-by-story approach risks selecting those phrases telling us exactly what we expect to hear. For this reason, my study is based on individual words selected after an overview of words connected to externality both in general usage and in Valerius’ text. These words are the key to Valerius’ thought. This methodology, by privileging language over agents (for example Valerius’ very mutable Marius) counters the frustrating fluidity of an approach based on personalities. Comparison with the usage of other authors, as well as careful comparison of stories between authors, will also sharpen our sense of Valerius’ particularity.

It is now time to address the idea running through the centre of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, an idea reflected in the work’s structure – the division between ‘internal’ and ‘external’. Scholars working both particularly on the *Facta et Dicta* and also on the presentation of foreigners in other Latin writers have made a number of statements regarding Valerius Maximus’ depiction of external peoples. Until now,
Chapter One

however, there has been no extended examination of the topic. Watts, at the extreme end of the scale, argues that Valerius Maximus presents: “constant and insidious stereotyping of one race or another”\(^{63}\). Krieger more moderately states that Valerius consistently downplays external material in order to increase the glory of Rome\(^{64}\). A more detailed treatment of this idea appears in Bloomer for whom the external material generally provides a foil to the Roman material. He argues that the effect of the foreign exempla is weakened by the emphasis upon scattered individuals from disparate lands and that Valerius has a tendency to slide easily into abuse\(^{65}\). Bloomer maintains that Valerius’ clear preference is for internal material and this is matched by a tendency to excerpt from Latin authors where possible. Bloomer takes his own assessment of Valerius’ interests to heart: only 22 percent of the exempla discussed in ‘The Rhetoric of the New Nobility’ are external, while the external material amounts to a third of the exempla in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia itself\(^{66}\).

When Bloomer discusses external material he sees it as secondary to the purpose of the work. He argues that Valerius’ compilation is intended to detail the “precedents for civic life”, a civic life that is unquestionably Roman, without ever explaining the presence of the external material that is one third of the entire work\(^{67}\). He argues that “a patriotic bias runs throughout Valerius’ work”, citing for example the reservation of external material in book Two until 2.6. Bloomer concedes just prior to this that in books 1.7 and 1.8 external exempla do outnumber those drawn from internal material but argues that in these cases the external material presents a scattered, “disconnected” image in contrast to the unified depiction of Rome\(^{68}\). Two points need to be made in response to these remarks: firstly, Valerius was presumably under no obligation to include the external material at all; he could have presented an entirely unified Roman front had he been committed to the programme envisaged by

64 Krieger, B. Quibus fontibus Valerius Maximus usus sit in eius exemplis enarrandis, quae ad priora rerum Romanorum tempora pertinent. (Berlin, Diss. 1888) 9.
66 This kind of ratio between internal and external material is not unusual; external exempla cited in Weileder’s book constitute roughly 21 percent of the total number of exempla that he discusses: Weileder, A. Valerius Maximus: Spiegel Kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung (Munich, 1998) 354-64.
67 Ibid. 35.
68 Ibid. 21. He also concedes elsewhere that external material outnumbers Roman material in a number of other chapters but offers no explanation for this phenomenon: pgs.24-5.
Bloomer. Secondly, because the Roman material deals with the affairs of one nation and the external material includes all other nations the internal exempla will inevitably present a more cohesive appearance. Valerius has chosen to present internal and external material and makes his decision clear in the opening sentence of the work that we have. Within the work internal and external materials are combined into chapters; their topics provide unifying themes stronger than the dichotomy between Roman and foreign.

On those occasions where Bloomer can see a clear purpose in the external material it serves as a reminder of foreign moral and cultural inferiority designed to distract attention from internal blushes. In his analysis of the chapter De Crudelitate he alleges, in defiance of the evidence, Valerius’ distrust and dislike of external peoples. Thus Bloomer states: “Positive praise of Rome is not possible in this chapter on cruelty; vituperation of Rome’s enemies is. Thus, the ethnic “flaws” of the Carthaginians and the Greeks are paraded forth.” Yet Valerius constructs the first two Carthaginian external exempla (9.2.ext.1 and 9.2.ext.2) to recall his own extensive depiction of Sulla who is termed a ‘Hannibal’ in his treatment of his compatriots at 9.2.1; Carthaginian cruelty becomes a reminder of Roman atrocities.

Conversely, Valerius explicitly states in the one Greek exemplum (9.2.ext.8) that he does not recognize (agnoscere) an Athens that would demonstrate such cruelty. Furthermore Bloomer’s contention that Romans are presented ‘tactfully’ and ‘patriotically’ in the chapter because they only engage in civil conflict is insupportable; external war has its recognised function and glory, civil war is madness. The last exemplum of the chapter (9.2.ext.11) draws attention to the merited limitation of human life on the basis of such appalling evidence of human failings; it does not lecture the proponents of the “Greeks and barbarian material”

---

69 In fact, from what Skidmore is able to establish about the genre of exempla collections, Valerius’ inclusion of the external category is relatively unusual and Plutarch’s later division of the Sayings of Kings and Commanders into national groups was still more unusual. Skidmore, C. Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen (Exeter, 1996) 38.

70 Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna... (Pr.)

71 As previously stated, this is discussed at length in chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 229-238.

72 Bloomer’s discussion of De Crudelitate is at: Bloomer, W. Martin Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility (Chapel Hill, 1992) 48-54. He also remarks on Carthaginian cruelty at pg. 97.

73 Ibid. 50.

74 Bloomer himself draws attention to the extremity of Valerius’ depiction of Sulla. Ibid. 52-53.

75 Ibid. 48. Thus Munatius Flaccus displays a truculentissimum genus vesaniae (9.2.4).
from the safety of the moral high-ground\textsuperscript{76}. \textit{Crudelitas} is as general to human life as mortality – this is a chapter about the universality of cruelty, not the relative virtue of Rome.

Similarly Bloomer cites the example of 4.7.4 where Valerius criticises the story of Theseus' support of his friend Pirithous as he pursues Persephone. Bloomer argues that with this story "A small phase of Roman civil conflict is superseded by the rhetoric of a greater contest, that between Greece and Rome...Greece is the enemy...an enemy who can be invoked to distract and unite the domestic antagonists and who can be defeated by recourse to patriotic morality."\textsuperscript{77} 4.7.4 could be argued to show many things, including a simple preference for non-mythological material\textsuperscript{78}, but let us assume that it does act primarily to draw attention to the difference between Greece and Rome; in this function it is spectacularly unsuccessful as it deliberately directs the reader’s mind back to the preceding stories:

\begin{quote}
\textit{mixtum cruorem amicorum et vulneribus innexa vulnera mortique}
inhaerentem mortem videre, haec sunt vera Romanae amicitiae indicia, illa gentis ad fingendum paratae monstro similia mendacia.
\end{quote}

The ‘true signs of Roman friendship’ to which Valerius insists his reader attend are exactly those stories that are based in Roman civil conflict and that, as Valerius states, involved violence, bloodshed and death. Surely his choice of imagery where friends mix together their \textit{cruor}, \textit{vulnera} and \textit{mors} cannot help but echo the imagery of civil war where the close relationship of the opponents renders the mixing of wounds and weapons so poignant. The use of alliteration throughout the phrase renders it even more striking and the actual structure of the sentence echoes the inter-mixture of related combatants with its repetition of terms. The introduction of criticism of the Greeks certainly draws attention to the division between internal and external but this only serves to show how meaningless these categorisations are when

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid. 49. This separation of the external material into Greek and Barbarian is alien to Valerius’ composition; \textit{barbarus} is used carefully and deliberately in the \textit{Facta et Dicta} and is applied to a fairly narrow selection of peoples. See chapters Five, Six and Seven for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid. 220.

\textsuperscript{78} Hence Valerius’ expressed doubt of the story of Aeneas’ \textit{penates} at 1.8.7 and the fact that his other criticism of Greek material is concerned with the story of Admetus, king of Thessaly (4.6.2). Skidmore believes that most of these are evidence of Valerius’ tendency to reject stories from mythology: Skidmore, C. \textit{Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen} (Exeter, 1996) 95-6.
Romans are at war with Romans: the true sign of Roman friendship is to die for your friend in conflict with other Romans\textsuperscript{79}. Given the subtlety of this exemplum it is inappropriate to read it as an outright condemnation of Greeks when the history of Roman civil conflict is ironically shown to be far worse: Greeks might fantasise about their history and the pursuit of impious adultery but Romans kill one another\textsuperscript{80}. Furthermore, throughout the rest of the chapter Greek exempla are treated with respect: Greeks appear as examples in the preface and Valerius inserts a rhetorical flourish to draw himself back to the internal material. In the external material Damon and Phinthias are treated at some length (4.7.ext.1) and Alexander and Hephaestion are warmly praised (4.7.ext.2b). It is also notable that when Valerius describes his friendship with Sextus Pompeius he chooses to compare the relationship with that of Alexander and Hephaestion rather than any of the Roman exempla (4.7.ext.2b).

Greece is obviously more than just an “enemy” in this chapter, and its function cannot be reduced to that of a decoy diverting attention from Roman shame.

Weileder also maintains that Valerius characterises external peoples negatively in order to underline the Roman virtues so obvious to the entire world\textsuperscript{81}. For Weileder the external material and external peoples (where he chooses to treat them) are all about Rome\textsuperscript{82}. Conte too argues that while Valerius is not deliberately darkening his depiction of foreign peoples in order to promote Rome “In general Valerius gives the impression of looking on the other peoples with an unshakeable certainty that Roman morality is superior”\textsuperscript{83}. Mueller in his recent publication on Valerius Maximus rarely refers to the external material which is reasonable enough given his focus upon Valerius’ attitude to Roman religion. Where he does discuss the external peoples or exempla he sees them as highlighting Roman qualities with the

\textsuperscript{79} Interestingly, monstrum in the sense in which Valerius uses it here occurs nine times in the text (a further five uses refer to straightforward prodigies and one refers to actual monsters slain by Theseus) and three uses refer to Roman civil conflict (the proscription of Cicero at 5.3.4, Tullia driving over her father at 9.11.1 and Equitius at 9.15.1). A further two uses refer to Roman disgraces (L. Scipio Asiaticus (cos. 190) disgracefully captured at 3.5.1 and Carfania the aggressive female advocate at 8.3.2), no uses refer to foreign conflict and only two refer to disgraces in a foreign context (incest at 1.8.ext.3 and the philosophy of Epicurus at 4.3.6).

\textsuperscript{80} Valerius’ use of this technique is discussed in depth in chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’.

\textsuperscript{81} Weileder, A Valerius Maximus: Spiegel Kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung (Munich, 1998) 56.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid. 107-16. See here particularly his treatment of the Parthians and Germans (breathtakingly based on the examination of one exemplum (5.5.3) and reference to another (2.2.3) despite other exempla where Germans are involved at: 2.6.11, 2.6.14, 2.10.6, 3.6.6, 4.7.3, 5.2.8, 5.8.4, 6.1.ext.3, 6.3.1c, 6.8.14 and 8.15.7) in Valerius’ text for this determinedly Roman-centric and philo-Roman viewpoint.

foil of their essential inferiority. This is despite his discovery that, in at least one case, Valerius’ account of events is the most positive treatment of the behaviour of a particular group of Germans in the surviving sources.

Given the thoroughness of Mueller’s work in many other respects, it is worth pausing to examine some of the evidence on which his opinion of the external material is based. In his chapter on Valerius’ depiction of Jupiter Mueller considers some of the images of Jupiter that Valerius’ positions in foreign lands with an eye towards demonstrating that “Their Jupiters...do not reflect Rome’s Jupiter, even less Roman attitudes towards Jupiter” (86). The first exemplum treated is that of 3.7.ext.3: Zeuxis’ confident appraisal of his painting of Helen, a confidence of which Mueller states only: “Valerius does not approve.” Mueller provides Valerius’ rhetorical question at the end of the exemplum for the reader, but leaves out the rest of the text. The more important comment for understanding Valerius’ attitude towards Zeuxis comes before the quotation from Homer: Zeuxis...quid de eo opere homines sensuri essent exspectandum non putavit, sed protinus <ip>se hos versus adiecit... The mention of Zeuxis’ failure to await public approval of his work ties the exemplum directly into those that precede it. In the first three external exempla three artists show confidence in their work which Valerius believes is fully justified (Euripides at 3.7.ext.1a, Alcestis at 3.7.ext.1b and Antigenidas’ confidence in his pupil at 3.7.2) and in the first and third case the validity of the artist’s opinion is maintained in the face of public disapproval (89). Valerius concludes 3.7.ext.2 by saying:

quia videlicet perfecta ars Fortunae lenocrinio defecta iusta fiducia non exuitur, quamque se scit laudem mereri, eam si ab aliis non impetrat, domestico tamen acceptam iudicio refert.

It is after this comment that Zeuxis’ confidence is reported; Valerius might wonder at the certainty of this self-assurance, but he has made it clear that artists are

---

84 Ibid. especially pgs. 94-101. See also 163-4.
86 Ibid. 94.
87 Ibid. 94.
88 Adeone dextrae suae multum pictor arrogavit ut ea tantum forma<e> comprehensum crederet quantum aut Leda caelestii partu edere aut Homerus divino ingenio exprimere potuit?
89 Ibid. 94.
89 Euripides rejects the Athenians’ demand that he remove a sententia from his tragedy (3.7.ext.1a) and Antigenidas advises a pupil who showed great skill but lacked public approval to “mihi cane et Musis”.
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right to demonstrate such confidence in their work without waiting on public opinion. Mueller moves on at once to 3.7.ext.4 which records Phidias’ response to enquiries about his painting of Jupiter: “...Phidias also responds in jest with verses from Homer...Phidias thus betrays, in Valerius’ presentation, a less than serious attitude towards religion in general and to Jupiter in particular.” Such a conclusion is difficult to draw from Valerius’ words: *Phidias quoque Homeri versibus egregio dicto allusit...* Certainly *alludere* can have the sense of a jesting or mocking allusion and it is to this category that the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* assigns this particular usage; unfortunately we cannot compare it to Valerius’ general use of the term as this is the only appearance it makes in the text. We can, however, look to the rest of the phrase and see that Valerius terms Phidias’ statement an *egregium dictum* – an outstanding statement. We can also look to the rest of the *exemplum* and see that Valerius says of Phidias’ painting that *nullum praestantius aut admirabilius humanae fabricae*.<ver>e manus. Thus Valerius explicitly approves both Phidias’ statement and his work. There is no intrinsic levity in the lines from Homer that Phidias quotes; Valerius recognises the story as a powerful comment on artistic inspiration and he constructs the *exemplum* to display it appropriately.

Mueller does not agree. He goes on to say: “In his chapter on neglected religion we learn that Valerius does not in fact approve of Phidias (1.1.ext.7)” The *exemplum* to which Mueller refers does not exist in Valerius’ original version but only in the epitomes of Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus – this initially makes it difficult to discern Valerius’ attitude, particularly as there are differences between the two accounts of the epitomators. Julius Paris records that Phidias was initially approved by the Athenians for observing that the lustre of marble would last longer than ivory in statues of the gods but that they ordered him to be silent when he added that it would also be cheaper. Nepotianus states simply that Phidias, *eboris sculpator*, commented that the images of the gods could be made more cheaply from marble than

---

90 Indeed, although Mueller is here focused on the religious aspects of the *exemplum* it is very much self-confidence against the tide of public opinion that is at issue.


ivory and that the Athenians nevertheless ordered him to make them of ivory. Neither of these accounts is particularly damning and the risks of taking a biographical approach to the text are again evident. The same exemplum describing Phidias’ ‘impiety’ appears to have also included Socrates’ condemnation for atheism. Thus, by extension of Mueller’s logic, Valerius must also disapprove of Socrates – an idea that stands in opposition to demonstrations of the author’s obvious respect for Socrates on other occasions and under other chapter headings.

To conclude this section of his account of Valerius’ attitude towards “Greek art, Greek Philosophy and Roman religion” Mueller comments: “Of course, Valerius does not in general approve of Greek artists (3.7.ext.5)...Valerius turns in that same derogatory anecdote from Greek artists to very brave Greek leaders...Artists are soft, leaders are tough.” He reiterates his view of Greeks and their art in the Facta et Dicta again a few pages later: Valerius is “derisive”. The sentence in the Facta et Dicta on which Mueller is basing this analysis reads in his book, and Kempf’s text, as non patiuntur me tenuioribus exemplis diutius insistere fortissimi duces...(my emphasis). Briscoe’s Teubner and Shackleton Bailey’s Loeb have the sentence as: Non patiuntur me tenerioribus exemplis diutius insistere fortissimi duces...(my emphasis). Shackleton Bailey regards this reading as so uncontroversial that he does not even mark it with a textual note, Briscoe ascribes it to the consensus codicum and, although he places fort. recte after the alternative reading of tenuioribus in his notes, he does not emend the text. The difference is small, but important for Mueller’s argument; if the root word is tener Valerius is moving on from rather delicate or tender material, if it is tenuis (as Mueller maintains) then the material concerning the artists is slight or trivial and this could be read as supporting Mueller’s analysis of the exemplum.

In either reading of the term, however, the contrast that Valerius is drawing seems to have far more to do with the contrast between art and war, than between

---

95 Socrates is non solum hominum consensu verum etiam Apollinis oraculo sapientissimus iudicatus at 3.4.ext.1, a fearless pursuer of justice at Athens at 3.8.ext.3 and provides the first four external exempla in the chapter Sapienter dicta aut facta (7.2.ext.1a-d). Mueller actually recognises Valerius’ respect for Socrates later on the same page of the argument. Mueller, H. Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus (London, 2002) 94.
96 Ibid. 94 and 99.
99 Interestingly, Mueller’s own reading of ‘gentle’ seems to accord more closely with tener than tenuis.
attitudes to Jupiter as represented by Greeks and Romans. A reading of *tener* (especially given its association with the artistic pursuit of poetry) seems to be both more appropriate to the contrast between Phidias and Epaminondas and more in line with Valerius’ generally respectful attitude towards foreigners throughout the text. This is especially true with regard to the Greeks who, when they are construed with superficial negativity, are often presented in terms of their culture and skill. There is also a certain irony in Valerius’ selection of Epaminondas’ road-paving commission as the first of the *fortissimi duci* who follow these artists. Valerius does not turn straight away from artistic confidence to victories in battle, but pauses to depict a task that is really only ennobled by Epaminondas’ positive attitude (3.7.ext.5).

It appears then, that Mueller — like Bloomer — guided perhaps by the sharp division of internal and external material, expects to find a negative and derogatory view of foreigners in Valerius’ text and accordingly finds it, despite the evidence revealed by a closer reading of the text. As we shall see, however, Valerius’ attitude is much more interesting than Mueller’s reading suggests, and conveyed in much more subtle ways.

More positive assessments of Valerius’ external material are available. B. W. Sinclair argues that while Valerius expresses reluctance to leave behind the Roman material, “this nowhere degenerates into blatant condescension.” Skidmore also rejects any deliberate malevolence in Valerius’ writing but rather sees his depiction of foreign peoples as geared towards the provision of variety and entertainment and Wardle follows Skidmore in this assessment. Skidmore at the conclusion of his treatment of *exempla* literature at Rome notes that one in seven of the *exempla* in Cicero’s oratory is external but Valerius Maximus draws one in three of his *exempla* from foreign lands. Skidmore argues that this indicates “the increasing popularity of foreign *exempla* throughout the intervening period”. Given that Skidmore both credits Valerius with a fair degree of independence in the construction of the *Facta et Dicta* and argues that the author conceived of the work not as a prosaic declamatory

100 Even if we were to accept Skidmore’s argument that foreign *exempla* are present merely to provide entertainment and variety they need to effectively fill this role. Skidmore would thus see this as a manifestation of the pleasurable, not trivial, role of Greek art. Skidmore, C. Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen (Exeter, 1996) 91-92.

101 Thus 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 (further discussed in the chapter ‘The Language of Difference’, 130-131 and 137-139).


source-book but as a guide to morality perhaps we should take this piece of information as part of the wider picture: Valerius Maximus may actually have had more interest in the external material than his predecessors and perhaps the inclusion of the external material served a particular, important role. The moral ideas that he discusses are as vividly present in the external exempla as they are in the Roman material.

The role that Skidmore sees the external material filling is that of providing pleasurable variety from the more authoritative Roman exempla - such a limiting view of the external material is refuted in chapter Three: ‘The Language of Difference’. Even within Skidmore’s argument there are traces of awkwardness indicating that some of his material does not fit; he states at one point that the “need for authoritative precedents…can be best satisfied by Roman examples. This accounts for the ratio of Roman to foreign examples.” Yet he has already told us that the number of external exempla in the Facta et Dicta is unusually high - surely then the question is not why are there so few external exempla, but rather why are there so many? This is especially marked in chapters like 7.2 where there are eight internal exempla and 23 external exempla. One could dismiss the higher number of foreign exempla in a chapter like De Miraculis (1.8, 15 internal to 19 external) as representing the strange tendencies of other lands and peoples (although this is not in line with Valerius’ approach elsewhere or even within the chapter) but it is much harder to make such a case for Sapienter Facta et Dicta (7.2). In this case, Skidmore resorts to arguing that Valerius was limited by the subject material available to him in pre-circulated collections – a weak conclusion that ignores much of the ground gained by Bloomer regarding Valerius’ method of composition. Once again then, despite the material that Skidmore cites, he assumes a dismissive attitude on Valerius’ part towards foreign peoples and finds it in rhetorical phrases that are actually far from straightforward (i.e. 1.6.ext.1 and 2.10.ext.1) given the frequent discrepancy in Valerius’ text between the content of his words and phrases and their

106 Ibid. 89-91.
107 Ibid. 89.
108 Ibid. 21. Although it is questionable to what extent the comparison between Cicero’s speeches on matters of Roman law and Valerius’ work (whose exact genre is still questionable) is a valid one.
contextualisation and structure. It is by attending to the latter that the present work is able to move beyond the self-limiting focus on content characterising previous approaches to the text.

There has been a tendency, therefore, to look at the external exempla purely in terms of the internal material and to find in it further ways of belittling Valerius' skills and ideas. In contrast to this approach, I believe that it is worthwhile to assess the handling of the external material not as a matter for praise or blame, but as a key to Valerius Maximus. His treatment of 'Others' helps to put into place and define Romans within the context of his wider ideas. An investigation based in Valerius' use of language and structuring of material stands to increase our understanding of Valerius in his own time. When assumptions are set aside, it becomes clear that Valerius plays with the boundaries between inside and outside throughout the Facta et Dicta. He is engaged in a dialectic. Behaviour, and not nationality, is the organising principle in Valerius' text and, despite arbitrary and gratuitous assessments to the contrary, Valerius' attitude is truly "cosmopolitan"\(^{110}\).

---

Chapter Two: Born Outsiders: Looks and Location.

**Looks**

A central question for the study of ancient authors' conceptions of foreign peoples is how they conceive of the grouping of peoples into nations or races. This is a fundamental issue; if individuals believe that peoples are distinguished into groups by their physical characteristics it means that movement in and out of these group is markedly more difficult – physical appearance creates a separation that cannot be easily overcome. In modern, multi-cultural societies in which physical traits of dress or grooming are used to define a group these traits can be highly significant and even threatening to those outside the group. Grouping on the grounds of physical appearance becomes even stronger when the distinguishing characteristics consist of skin colour or particular combinations of facial features. The importance of somatic appearance for the designation of ‘race’ in the Greek and Roman world has been debated.

To begin with skin colour – one of the most obvious differences of appearance – in his book *Romans and Blacks* Lloyd A. Thompson argues that the available evidence of Roman attitudes towards blacks, most commonly *Aethiopes*, indicates that the Romans tended to put a great deal of importance on the visual categorisation of peoples. He argues in particular that the Romans saw membership of the category as determined purely by the somatic appearance of an individual, without reference to their ancestry. As he sees the essence of racism in the categorisation of peoples in such a way that no movement is possible between groups he argues the “Roman perceptual context was therefore not of the kind designated in sociological theory as...

---

1 The recent case of a Muslim school girl in Sydney, Australia who came into conflict with her school because of her decision to wear a mantoo to school as a symbol of her religious affiliation suggests both the significance that clothing can hold as a symbol of group membership and the potential discomfort that such a symbol can cause. http://smh.com.au/news/National/Muslim-girl-defiant-as-school-denies-dress-ban/2005/05/14116024405892.html?from=moreStories. Viewed 31st May, 2005.

2 Useful works are: Thompson, L. A. *Romans and Blacks* (Norman, 1989), although specifically concerned with one particular somatic appearance, this work contains a wider discussion of the concept; Isaac presents an overview from the physiognomic angle Isaac, W. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton, 2004) 149-62 and further material on physiognomies can be found in Barton, T. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomies, and Medicine under the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor, 1994). Balsdon collates a useful range of references although he provides little interpretation or discussion at Balsdon, J.P.V.D. *Romans and Aliens* (London, 1979) 214-22. On clothing for both Romans and foreigners the volume of essays Sebesta, J. and L. Bonfante *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison, 1994) is extremely useful. Additionally, Evans treats general physical appearance which provides a control when looking at ethnic appearance Evans, E. ‘Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography’ *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 46 (1935) 43-84.
racial or racist” because members whose somatic characteristics were ‘mild’ enough could move between groups\(^3\). Sherwin-White essentially agrees. When discussing Roman attitudes towards the Jews he rejects the term ‘racial’ to describe Roman antipathy, because a) Romans could, and did, move into the group by means of conversion and b) because “the Jews of Judaea would not differ physically from other Aramaic or Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Levant”\(^4\). Under these arguments an African or an Egyptian who could ‘pass’ as a Roman faced no impenetrable barrier of membership to that ethnic group. On the other hand, the argument assumes the Romans placed a large degree of importance on the appearance of individuals as it related to some kind of ethnic ‘type’; furthermore, it suggests that Romans were in the habit of conceiving of group membership as something that could be easily observed by the features, skin colour, hair and other outward appearances of individuals\(^5\).

The tendency to envisage ethnic groups as having a set physical appearance is evident in the assumptions of various Roman authors and their identification of groups by their physical characteristics. In Petronius’ *Satyricon* Giton rejects Encolpius’ suggestion that they could disguise themselves as Ethiopian slaves by colouring their skin with ink, but the way in which he phrases his rejection is revealing:

\[
\]

---

3 Thompson, L. A. *Romans and Blacks* (Norman, 1989) 82.
4 Sherwin-White, A.N. *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (Cambridge, 1967) 99-100
5 Indeed, Isaac takes this theory to its logical conclusion in commenting that the primacy of physiognomics can mean that even those who have no geographical or familial connection to a particular people are thought to possess “the mental and moral characteristics attributed to that nation”, creating an ethnicity purely of appearance. Isaac, W. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton, 2004) 158.
Giton refers to a series of distinctive physical features of different ethnic groups: the circumcision of Jews, the pierced ears of Arabs and the pale skin of Gauls. He accepts that these are distinctive to the groups in question but he argues that a physical deception will require all details of appearance to be correct and authentic if it is to succeed. For this reason Giton goes on to enumerate attributes that are not so easy to fake as skin colour. Lips, hair, legs and beards are all held up as elements that have a distinctive appearance in Ethiopians. This suggests not only that physical symbols were very important to Romans in the categorisation of different peoples, but also that they observed the appearance of foreigners quite carefully. This in turn is evidence that there was a significant level of interest in these characteristics.

Juvenal, while making a point about the relativity of social customs and circumstances uses the following analogy:

Quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus aut quis in Meroe crasso maiorem infante mamillam? caerula quis stupuit Germani lumina, flavam caesariem et madido torquentem cornua cirro?

(13.162-165.)

Juvenal presumably chooses the analogy of physical characteristics particular to different peoples because it produces clarity; this works on the assumption that the idea of peoples being identified by distinctive attributes was a common one. Thus goitres seemed to have been associated with the Alps, large breasts with the peoples of upper Egypt and blue eyes and blonde hair with the Germans. The familiarity of these characteristics, unusual at Rome, in the context of certain external peoples is emphasised by the two rhetorical questions that divide the lines into sections, firstly quis...miratur... (162) and then ..quis stupuit...(164). These distinctive physical markers are depicted as common in the territory of the peoples with whom Juvenal associates them. Seneca the Younger treats the same theme but in this case feels it necessary to advise his readers to refrain from feelings of disgust when observing the physical characteristics of foreigners as, within their own societies, these features are entirely normal: Non est Aethiopis inter suos insignitus color, nec rufus crinis et coactus in nodum apud Germanos virum dedeceat (De Ira. 3.26.3.). These excerpts from Juvenal and Seneca are founded on two basic assumptions: firstly, the idea that...
certain peoples are characterised by distinctive physical features and secondly, the
idea that these characteristics are so specific to these peoples that they are remarkable
when seen in other societies. The two assumptions are encapsulated by Seneca
directly after the excerpt printed above: Nihil in uno iudicabis notabile aut foedum,
quod genti suae publicum est (3.26.3).

The much later anonymous author of De Physiognomia (apparently a fourth
century text) presents this idea of distinctive ethnic appearances enshrined in a
scientific system. He explicates a type of physiognomy that depends on drawing
comparisons between the features of an individual and the physical features of
different peoples in order to assess the individual’s character (de Phys. 9). As the
anonymous author demonstrates:

Hic Aegyptio est similis, Aegyptii autem sunt callidi, dociles, leves, temerarii,
in verièrem proni; hic Celto, id est Germano, est similis, Celti autem sunt indociles,
fortes, feri; hic Thraci est similis, Thraces autem sunt iniqui, pigri, temulenti.

There is very little discussion of the physical characteristics involved but the
assumption that the reader would be able to visualise an Egyptian, Celtic or Thracian
‘type’ is clear. Polemo makes the same assumption about the connection between

---

6 Barton, T. Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomies, and Medicine under the Roman Empire (Ann Arbor, 1994) 102.
8 De Physiognomonia 14: Capilli crispi nimium subdolum, avarum, timidum, luceri cupidum hominem ostendunt. Referuntur autem tales ad gentem Aegyptiorum, qui sunt timidi, et ad Syrorum, qui sunt avari.
section on color; here the author states: Colorum species in corporibus gentibus attributae sunt. Prout sunt igitur gentium ingenia, ita colorum similitudo noscenda est. This is again followed by a discussion of the traits associated with different skin colours that are associated with different peoples (de Phys. 79). All of this indicates a mental landscape where visual assessment is assumed to be able to determine an individual’s ethnicity, and where, in turn, ethnic groups are recognised and discussed in terms of their physical appearance.

These attitudes are on display when ancient authors begin discussing a particular people: one of the first questions they address is the group’s appearance. Thus in the fourth section of the Germania Tacitus describes the distinctive savage, blue eyes, red hair and large bodies of Germans, although he does add a caveat against generalising about such a big group of people (Tac. Germ. 4). Similarly, when Strabo introduces the Britons he comments on their height, their colouring (which is darker than that of the Celts), and their bowed legs (4.5.2); while he draws attention to the Gauls’ long hair and height (4.4.2-3). Strabo also comments on the similarity between the colour of Southern Indians and Ethiopians (15.1.13). Pliny the Elder describes the colouring of those peoples South of the Ganges and the appearance of the Ethiopians (Nat. 6.70 and 2.189) and both Livy and Caesar comment on the size and appearance of the Gauls (Liv. 5.44.4 and 38.17.3; Caes. Gal. 2.30.3). It is clear that foreign peoples were commonly defined by Roman writers according to certain distinctive physical characteristics.

It is worth extending this idea to the evidence present in Valerius’ text. Valerius does not often describe individuals in terms of their physical appearance. Evans in her analysis of the description of physical appearance in Roman history and biography (categories to which it is doubtful that Valerius actually belongs) cites only one exemplum from the Facta et Dicta that she believes includes characterisation “of

9 Strabo observes that while the colouring of the Southern Indians and Ethiopians is similar, Southern Indians still share their somatic features and hair with other Indians. He explains that the hair of Indians does not curl because of the humidity of their environment. This again argues for a general observation of ethnic features other than colour.

10 Perhaps the most striking exception to this general pattern of physical description is to be found in Sallust who, despite devoting an ethnographic digression to the peoples of Africa, does not describe their appearance at all. (Sal. Jug. 17-9). The remaining epitome of Pompeius Trogus by Justin also contains no physical descriptions of ethnic groups suggesting either that they were originally absent or that they were trimmed by the epitomator.
the permanent appearance of an individual\textsuperscript{11}. Where Valerius does describe the physical appearance of individuals it is external to their behaviour and not an explanation of that behaviour. For example he describes the verecundia of the adulescens excellentis pulchritudinis at 4.5.ext.1 who mutilates his own face in order to deter the lust of strangers; the young man’s physical beauty is not an explanation for his behaviour, in fact he alters his physical appearance to better suit his character and moral imperatives. This is also not a case of physiognomic correspondence between beauty of face and beauty of soul – the youth involved views the two as essentially incompatible\textsuperscript{12}. As this exemplum seems to suggest Valerius is interested in the capabilities of the mind rather than the appearance of the body; the body generally facilitates the action of an exemplum and no more.

An exception to Valerius’ usual lack of interest in bodily form occurs when he specifically underlines his attention to humana corpora in part of the external material of chapter 1.8 De Miraculis: Quid? Illa nonne ludibria Naturae in corporibus humanis fuisse credenda sunt... (1.8.ext.12). He then provides three exempla discussing aspects of the body: Drypetine with her double row of teeth (1.8.ext.13), an anonymous individual with amazing eye-sight (1.8.ext.14) and Aristomenes of Messene who at death was discovered to have a hairy heart (1.8.ext.15). One thing should be obvious – these bodily oddities would not be particularly visible. The eyesight of the individual at 1.8.ext.14 is not a matter of appearance and Aristomenes must actually be cut open in order to reveal the hairy heart indicative of his cunning. Of the three, Drypetine’s teeth are the only external bodily characteristic. Valerius draws attention to their visibility by commenting that they were deformis and this authorial comment on the physical appeal of an individual – which could also be read as simply a neutral description of deformity – is more or less unique in the Facta et Dicta\textsuperscript{13}. Even in this case Drypetine’s teeth are likely to have been generally

\textsuperscript{11} Evans, E. ‘Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography’ Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 46 (1935) 75.

\textsuperscript{12} One of the few physical traits that Valerius refers to in the course of the work is attractiveness – 4.3.1, 4.3.3, 4.3.ext.3a, 4.3.ext.3b, 4.6.ext.2 and 4.7.ext.2a. Again the beauty of individuals is mentioned only in as much as it impacts on the point of the exemplum. For instance in all the exempla from chapter 4.3 beauty is introduced to demonstrate the self-control and restraint of the parties involved – for instance Xenocrates is able to resist the attentions of even the very beautiful Phryne at 4.3.ext.3a and b and even controls any involuntary response.

\textsuperscript{13} Mithridatis vero regis filia Drypetine, laodice regina nata, duplici ordine dentium deformis admodum comes fugae patris a Pompeio devicti fuit. Both Walker and Shackleton Bailey translate deformis as a reference to Drypetine’s ugliness (Walker translates “…looked very ugly because of her double row of teeth”: Walker, H.T. Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings, One Thousand
concealed. More importantly for my purposes, in all these cases the point is not that
the individuals involved are part of a wider grouping, but rather that their physical
traits are unusual and distinctive. Valerius does not present strange peoples
characterized by their unusual physical features as does Pliny the Elder in his
catalogue (Nat. 7.21-35) or Juvenal when he describes the pygmies (13.167-73);
Valerius draws attention to isolated individuals and he is more interested in the body’s
unusual capabilities than its strange appearance. Here, as elsewhere, Valerius does not
generally speak of a people – Roman or foreign, strange or commonplace – in terms
of their somatic appearance.

The one description of physical appearance in the text that could be interpreted
as ‘racial’ actually belongs to a non-human entity. At 1.7.7 Valerius relates Cassius’
dream of his imminent death as prophesied by an apparition: *existimavit ad se venire
hominem ingentis magnitudinis, coloris nigri, squalidum barba et capillo immisso...*14
As Wardle points out, the mention of blackness does not necessarily indicate that the
apparition is meant to be a Negro15. In fact, the description of the hair as *immissus*
rather tells against such an interpretation as the hair-type associated with Negros in
Roman writings is tightly curled, rather than long and hanging down as Valerius
description suggests here16. The long hair, ragged beard, large size and dark colouring
of the apparition combine to create an image that would have been frightening to see
in the middle of the night, but the non-human origin of the figure removes the
physical description from any actual people or person. Even if this *exemplum* were to
be read as containing the traces of colour prejudice, it is unique in a text that
otherwise has very little to say regarding ethnic appearance17.

Valerius does, however, spend a chapter detailing physical similarities
between unrelated individuals – *De Similitudine Formae* 9.14. He opens this chapter

---

14 In the version of this story associated with Brutus that Plutarch records at Brut. 36 and Caes. 69 the
figure is described as strange and terrible in appearance but no actual features are specified. This
effectively tells us, however, what impression the description Valerius provides was intended to create.
17 Snowden discusses the difficult issue of colour symbolism (Ibid. 82-5) as does Thompson:
Thompson, L. A. *Romans and Blacks* (Norman, 1989) 41-5.
with a discussion of two opposed points of view on the inheritance of physical characteristics;

De similitudine autem oris et totius corporis altiore doctrina praediti subtillus disputant, eorumque alii in ea sunt opinione ut existimem illam origini et contextui sanguinis respondere, nec parvum argumentum ex ceteris animalibus trahunt, quae fere gignentibus similia nascentur. Alii negant hanc esse certam Naturae legem, sed species mortalium prout fortuita sors conceptionis obtulit attribui, atque ideo plerumque ex speciosis deformes et ex robustis invalidos partus edi. <igi> tur, quoniam ista quaestio in ambiguo versatur, pauca inter alienos conspectae similitudinis exempla referemus.

One argument states that this similarity corresponds to origini et contextui sanguinis and the other that the distribution of physical characteristics is a matter of chance¹⁸. Valerius does not commit to either view and his discussion includes material to support both points¹⁹.

When the chapter does suggest that physical similarity is meaningful, the underlying assumption is that similarity in appearance indicates a familial relationship. The final exemplum in the chapter (9.14.ext.3) is the most striking example of this principle. In Sicily a native inhabitant is seen to look very much like the proconsul of the province. The proconsul immediately looks for a familial connection – he marvels at the similarity because his father never visited that province. This leads the Sicilian to comment that it was not so strange because while the father of the proconsul had never been to Sicily, his father had certainly been to Rome. The individuals in this story see somatic similarity and seek to explain it through a close familial relationship. Similarly, Valerius comments that Artemo who is able to pass for the murdered king Antiochus actually is unus ex aequalibus et ipse regiae stirpis (9.14.ext.1); the

¹⁸ Cicero in contrast, is in no doubt that children follow the physical appearance of their parents: *Quid enim non videt et formas et mores et plerosque status ac motus effingere a parentibus liberos?* Div. 2.94.

¹⁹ See 1.8.7 and 8.14.pr. for other exempla that have Valerius introduce a question regarding his material and then decline to enter into any argument on the topic. In the former case Valerius elects not to question the decisions made by his sources (incilia litterarum monumenta) regarding the material’s credibility, while in the latter case he states (as at 9.14.pr.) that he will leave discussion to other authorities and confine himself to providing exempla. Pliny the Elder demonstrates a similar attitude to that displayed by Valerius at 1.8.7 at 11.273 when he states that he does not believe Aristotle’s argument that length of life can be predicted from physical signs but will nevertheless include it out of respect for the author.
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similarity is placed against a background of familial relationship\textsuperscript{20}. This tendency to see physical similarity as the product of family links is also indicated by the connection Valerius draws between the material of chapter 9.14 and that of 9.15. In the preface to the latter chapter he indicates the movement from smaller, personal insults allowed by physical resemblance to the attempts of individuals to insert themselves into families with deliberate falsehood: \textit{Sed tolerabilis haec et uni tantummodo anceps temeritas. Quod sequitur impudentiae genus nec ferendum ullo modo periculique cum privatim tum etiam publice late patentis} (9.15.pr). Nevertheless, there are only two instances within chapter 9.14 where Valerius sees physical resemblance as indicative of any kind of connection.

The chapter presents plenty of evidence, on the other hand, for the alternative view cited by Valerius: that shared somatic characteristics may not indicate any connection at all, but are purely the result of chance. For example at 9.14.3 P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica ‘Serapio’ (cos. 138) is profoundly embarrassed by his resemblance to a sacrificial attendant with the \textit{servilis appellatio} of Serapio. Valerius contrasts the glory of Scipio’s family with this \textit{contumelia}. As Serapio is referred to as a servile name we can assume that Serapio the sacrificial attendant was a slave and this in turn means that he was not of Roman, Italian or Latin descent – and yet the similarity between the two men is seen as striking. The physical similarities here span class and ethnic groupings yet indicate no shared identity. In Valerius’ text similarity of appearance underlines the expected distance and division between men’s appearance because it is remarkable, inappropriate but still present. Valerius constructs an even more marked contrast in the external material; at 9.14.ext.2 Hybreas of Mylasa bears a striking resemblance to a \textit{servus Cymaeorum} with somatic similarity again leaping across class and ethnic divisions. Similar material is presented at 9.14.1, 9.14.2, 9.14.4 and 9.14.5. The entirety of Chapter 9.14 seems to indicate to the reader that if they are relying on physical appearance to tell different peoples apart they must be prepared to be misled. In the \textit{Facta et Dicta} shared somatic characteristics are largely meaningless but if they indicate any connection it is a close familial relationship. Distinctive physical appearance in this chapter – indeed throughout the work – is never associated with ethnic groupings.

\textsuperscript{20} In contrast Pliny tells the same story at \textit{Naturalis Historia} 7.53 and calls Artemo a man \textit{e plebe}. 
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Pliny the Elder includes the majority of the material Valerius discusses in chapter 9.14 in book Seven of the *Naturalis Historia* for which he cites Valerius as a source. He opens with a meditation similar to that in Valerius' preface on the resemblance or lack of resemblance between parents and children\(^{21}\) but Pliny — unlike Valerius — introduces the idea in his selection that appearance is related to ethnic group membership as well as familial connection. Thus Pliny includes the potentially scandalous story of Nicaeus the boxer of Byzantium whose appearance is described as that of an *Aethiops*, a trait attributed to the existence of an African grandfather despite Nicaeus' mother having been *nihil a ceteris colore differente* (Plin. *Nat.* 7.51). Pliny chooses to describe Nicaeus' appearance in terms of an ethnic grouping; using this grouping to invoke a particular set of physical characteristics. The assumption is that the presence of particular physical features indicates a connection to the ethnic group who bear these characteristics, thus Pliny states that Nicaeus *ipse avum regeneravit Aethiopem*.

The idea that different *gentes* possess different appearances is also implicit in the story with which Pliny finishes the section. Here Antony is convinced to buy a pair of identical ‘twins’ who are actually unrelated: one is from Asia and one from North of the Alps (7.56). On discovery of the boys’ lack of relationship Antony is furious and approaches the slave-dealer who maintains the value of his product precisely because of this lack of relationship: *quoniam non esset mira similitudo in ullis eodem utero editis, diversarum quidem gentium natales tam concordi figura reperiri super omnem esse taxationem...* It is assumed that individuals from *diversae gentes* will look different and it is a wonder if they do not. Pliny includes the idea of ethnic groupings in his chapter as an ordinary factor in discussions of physical similarity and appearance; Valerius Maximus does not so much as mention it. His groupings of physical appearance are based on units no larger than the family and include not a single comment regarding the characteristic physical appearance of a people, or appearance as it relates to ethnicity.

In fact, the aspect of appearance that Valerius pays most attention to in the text is the easiest aspect of appearance to alter — clothing. This seems to be in line with some of the archaeological evidence. Gergel has observed that peoples on *cuirassed statues* in the article that barbarians and barbarians are identified by the absence of togas (Stat. *Aug.* 46) and argues that throughout Italy most people first wore a toga at their own burial (3.170-79).

\(^{21}\) Plin. *Nat.* 7.50: *Iam illa vulgata sunt: varie ex integris truncos gigni, ex trunciis integros; eademque parte truncos signa quaedam naevesque et cicatrices etiam regenerari, quarto partu Dacorum originis nota in brachio reddit.*
statue breastplates are identified almost purely by their dress
deal the Gallic custom of making loans to be repaid in the afterlife. Valerius finishes the exemplum by stating: *dicerem stultos, nisi idem bracati sensissent quod palliatus Pythagoras creditit* (2.6.10). The Gauls are grouped via their distinctive clothing, *bracae* (a term that Valerius uses nowhere else in the text) and the Greeks, with Pythagoras as their representative, by the *pallium*. The *pallium* is once again characteristically Greek at 2.2.2 when Valerius is discussing the Roman policy of forcing Greeks to speak Latin to Roman officials even in Greece. Here he interprets the policy not as an indication of Roman linguistic deficiency but rather as an attempt to ensure that *nulla non in re pallium togae subici debere arbitrabantur...* The *pallium* is depicted being worn by Greeks at other points in the text: Alcibiades’ mistress at 1.7.ext.3 and Polemo of Athens at 6.9.ext.1. At 1.1.ext.3 it is associated with Dionysius of Syracuse but the reference is actually to mainland Greece – he replaces the golden cloak of Olympian Jupiter with a *lanæum pallium* quipping that it will be better suited to cold or hot weather than the original golden garment. It must be noted, however, that at 2.6.10, while Valerius refers to two distinctive types of dress belonging to two different peoples, his point is one of unity: the Gauls believe the same thing in their trousers as Pythagoras did in his cloak. Once again what looks like an indicator of difference is in reality a denial of difference.

The *pallium* is actually worn by at least one Roman in the text, but in this case Valerius makes it clear that this is an exceptional occurrence. Chapter 3.6 deals with prominent men who *in veste aut cetero cultu licentius sibi quam mos patrius permittebat indulserunt.* In these exempla dress is certainly connected to national affiliation and carries some weight in this connection. Thus the decision of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (cos. II 194) to spend time in the gymnasium in Sicily dressed in a *pallium* and *crepidae* can be interpreted by Valerius as an attempt to win the favour of the allies by sharing in their customs (3.6.1). Valerius is very quick to point out that Scipio only resorted to such occupations when he had exhausted himself.

---

22 Gergel, R. ‘Costume as Geographic Indicator: Barbarians and Prisoners on Cuirassed Statue Breastplates’ in Sebesta, J. and L. Bonfante *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison, 1994) 206. Gergel, while he asserts two or three times in the article that barbarians and prisoners are identified by their clothing often refers to their hairstyles and does not discuss their somatic features at all.

23 Valerius does not appear to be necessarily reflecting the reality of Roman dress; Suetonius depicts Augustus reacting angrily to the absence of togas (Suet. *Aug.* 40) and Juvenal argues that throughout Italy most people first wore a toga at their own burial (3.170-79).
with *militares agitationes* but he does not demonstrate the same level of sensitivity to this behaviour present in Livy’s account. Livy records complaints in the Senate that Scipio’s behaviour was *non Romanus modo sed ne militaris quidem cultus* (29.19.11). Valerius’ attitude is more indulgent and understanding – he does not appear to see a real threat to Scipio’s Roman identity in the adoption of foreign dress.

The same absence of judgementalism is visible in the next two *exempla*; L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus (cos. 190) has a statue of himself set up in *chlamys* and *crepidae* on the Capitol *quia aliquando usus erat* (3.6.2) and Sulla did not consider it *deformis* to wear the same attire in Naples while commanding an army (3.6.3). Valerius shares Cicero’s nonchalance when it comes to these un-Roman outfits but unlike Cicero, he has no point to prove – no defendant to protect by failing to react (Cic. *Rab. Post.* 27) – and, unlike Cicero, he is consistently nonchalant. Heskel maintains that the attack on non-Roman dress is a rhetorical element like any other that Cicero employs or discounts depending on his needs. So despite the particular indulgence shown in the *Pro Rabirio Postumo*, Heskel argues that Cicero is very willing to use the non-Roman clothing of Romans as a means of attack at other points in his work. Verres, in particular, is consistently criticised for his adoption of Greek clothing. The wearing of foreign clothes by Romans on the other hand, does not seem to bother Valerius a great deal; the men who have chosen to wear foreign dress are elevated by their military prowess and standing and the symbolism inherent in non-Roman dress is not strong enough to be problematic for these men. On one occasion Valerius does react severely to a Roman in foreign garb but this is in the context of a very loaded *exemplum*. At 7.3.8 M. Volusius (aed. pl. 43) having been proscribed by the triumvirs, dresses as a priest of Isis and escapes from Rome by begging through the streets. Valerius calls M. Volusius *nimis suae vitae cupidus* for escaping in the dress of an *alienigena religio* and he equally criticises those *nimis alienae mortis cupidi* who have forced a Roman into this position. The clothes are far from the only issue in this case however; Volusius is also entering into the image of a foreign, and often disreputable, religion and begging in the streets. Valerius has constructed a layered *exemplum* designed to highlight the intersection of foreign elements and Roman civil conflict; it is the issue of group membership in itself rather than the issue of the wearing of foreign clothes in particular.

---

25 Ibid. 133-5.
26 For the disrepute of the temple of Isis in Tiberius’ reign see Josephus, *Antiqu.* 18.3.4.
than that of clothing that is really important in this case. Consistently Valerius treats the question of foreign clothing with a light touch, perhaps appropriately, given that the Emperor under whom he writes apparently discarded Roman dress altogether while in self-imposed exile on the island of Rhodes (Suet. Tib. 13.1).

This does not however, as in the case of somatic appearance, indicate a general lack of interest on Valerius’ part. Throughout the text items of Roman clothing appear as powerful symbols of status and identity. Thus one of the punishments described in the chapter De Disciplina Militari (2.7) focuses upon not only social exclusion but also distinctions of dress. At 2.7.9. C.Titius is forced to stand on duty at the headquarters in a toga lacinii abscessis with his tunic discincta. Edwards notes the associations that the latter form of clothing had with mollitia and sexual ambiguity and thus Titius is pushed into the border territory of gender perception. Valerius Maximus seems to draw the reader’s attention to this symbolism when he states the aim of the punishment as encouraging the soldiers’ mortemque, quam effeminate timuerant, viriliter optarent. The soldier is seen as having crossed over into non-masculine territory, and is thus humiliated with the intention that by this treatment he will begin to act like a man again, even if this is achievable only by death. Dress in this case is extremely significant. At the other end of the scale but demonstrating equal significance, Valerius points out that the wearing of the stola traditionally protects Roman matrons from being touched by any court officials: ut inviolata manus alienae tactu stola relinqueretur (2.1.5a). Crassus’ adoption of the wrong cloak – a dark paludamentum – signifies his imminent personal disaster (1.6.11) and the toga is seen to represent both Rome (2.2.2) and also Roman oratory and politics (3.2.19, 3.7.5 and 4.1.12).

Distinctions of dress are obviously significant in Valerius’ view and he uses the symbolism inherent in various kinds of Roman clothing to convey ideas throughout the text. Valerius does on a few occasions refer to foreigners via their distinctive items of clothing but the physical manifestations of external group membership in terms of clothing are, in Valerius’ text, not dangerous or difficult when applied to Roman citizens. In chapter 3.6 foreign dress does not seem to be as

27 For further discussion of this exemplum see chapter Four: ‘The Language of Difference’, 140-141.
28 Bender argues similarly that clothing in the Aeneid is nearly always laden with great symbolic significance. Bender, H. ‘De Habitu Vestis: Clothing in the Aeneid’ in Sebesta, J. and L. Bonfante (eds.) The World of Roman Costume (Wisconsin, 1994) 146-152.
important as the character of the men who wear it. In Valerius’ text Romans can with impunity adopt Greek dress. Valerius underscores not only the ease with which clothing as an indicator of national affiliation can be put on and taken off, but also emphasises that this mutability and confusion of the boundaries between internal and external is not inherently disturbing or dangerous. This strongly implies that for Valerius, physical appearance is not a highly-weighted determiner of group membership; or, that the distinctions between Romans and foreigners are not particularly important in themselves. In view of his wider strategies and preoccupations it seems that the latter may well be the case.

**Location**

Behind the idea of physical appearance as an indicator and determiner of group membership lies, as Isaac asserts, the environmental theory of race. This theory maintains that ethnic differences of appearance, behaviour and custom can be clearly attributed to the area of the earth in which peoples are located, and specifically to such factors as the imagined proximity of the sun to these regions, and the degree of moisture present. It is not my intention here to present a detailed discussion of environmental race theory both because this has been discussed extensively by other authors (particularly in terms of the Greek evidence) and because it is – as we shall see – of little importance to Valerius Maximus. Specific discussion of the theory such as is present in the *Airs, Waters, Places* (esp. 12, 23 and 24) or in Aristotle’s *Politics* (1327b), is not as strongly represented in the Roman sources but the impact of the environment on different peoples does appear as an underlying idea in a variety of genres. Thus Cicero accepts as a given that different environments produce different types of men, both in terms of body and mind (*Div. 2.96*) and even argues that the influence of environment is more powerful than genetic inheritance (*Agr. 2.95*). Livy sees the environment as so powerful that the Gauls change when they are moved out of their natural homelands (38.17.10) and Tacitus suggest that the similarity between

---


Britons and Gauls may be attributable to the close proximity of, and especially the similarity between, their native lands (Ag. 11)\textsuperscript{32}. More detailed references to the impact of the environment on individual peoples come in Seneca the Younger, Pliny the Elder, Vitruvius and Vegetius. Seneca comments in *De Ira* that environmental conditions in the North tend to produce ferocious peoples and that temperate regions produce peoples whose greater self-control make them suitable rulers (2.15)\textsuperscript{33}. A direct link is drawn between Northern peoples' behaviour and their environment although there is no mention of the physical effects of that climate. Pliny the Elder in his *Naturalis Historia* brooks no argument on the impact of the environment: he proclaims *non est dubium* that there is a connection between the celestial conditions above a land and its peoples (2.189). Pliny prefaced the characters of various peoples with the physical effects of climate throughout the passage at 2.189-90. He carefully links each quality that he describes with its environmental causation: the curly hair of the *Aethiopes* is burnt by the proximity of the sun and Pliny refers his reader to the appearance of those who have suffered burns as a point of comparison. The skin of those from the cold North is described as *glacialis* and those inside it are savage because their climate is so inhospitable. The same manifestations of environment in appearance and behaviour are also observable, according to Pliny, in animals from the various regions of the world. Like Seneca the Younger, Pliny links the impact of environment to capacity for rule; he argues that those from the moderate, middle climates are well-suited by nature for rule and have demonstrated this by the founding of *imperia*\textsuperscript{34}.

Vitruvius in *De Architectura* discusses the effects of climate on various peoples in some detail and once again both appearance and behaviour are largely dictated by the region of the earth in which a people are situated\textsuperscript{35}. The moisture and

\textsuperscript{32} Sassi points to the clear system of "ethnic classification" Tacitus employs at this point, allowing him to link particular appearances amongst the Britons with the proximity of those tribes to other regions and peoples. In Sassi, M. M. *The Science of Man in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, 2001) 135.

\textsuperscript{33} This recalls Aristotle's assertions that the people of Greece were intrinsically suited to be rulers while those of the cold regions in the North were unsuited to rule and those of Asia were naturally designed for subjection. Arist. *Pol.* 1327b.

\textsuperscript{34} Pliny goes on to say however that these environmentally-balanced peoples (their identity is not specified although Rome can be assumed to be one of them) have never conquered the remote peoples of North and South. His thought-system therefore encompasses an ethnic group suited for rule but avoids explicitly confronting the idea a particular group or groups as suited to be ruled.

\textsuperscript{35} Sassi sees this passage as marking a new synthesis of material from Greek and Roman origins and suggests that Posidonius may have been very influential in the development of Roman ideas on connection between environment and ethnicity. Sassi, M. M. *The Science of Man in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, 2001) 127-8.
cool climate of the North breeds tall, fair, blue-eyed people with straight red hair. They are also possessed of a large quantity of blood rendering them courageous in battle but susceptible to disease (6.3-4). The strength of the sun on the other hand renders the peoples of the South small, dark and curly-haired. They have black eyes, strong legs and little blood, a trait that, in a neat reversal of Northern characteristics, makes them cowardly in battle but resistant to fever and disease (6.4). Vitruvius goes on to discuss at some length the impact of the environment on voice, accent and intelligence (6.5-11).

For these Roman authors all aspects of the individual are formed under the influence of their climate and environmental conditions although Vitruvius is less scrupulous than Pliny about linking characteristics to particular causes. Vegetius has a very specific interest in the characteristics of various peoples as they are determined by environment; he aims to demonstrate which regions of the world provide the best soldiers in terms of their physical and mental endurance: *Sed tamen et gens gentem praecedit in bello et plaga caeli ad robur non tantum corporum sed etiam animorum plurimum valet*. Vegetius’ interest however, is largely focused on behaviour. He argues that those from the South and close to the sun are intelligent but (as in Vitruvius’ estimation) possess less blood and are accordingly less steady and brave in battle. Those from the North and distant from the sun however are relatively stupid, full of blood and brave (*Epit. 1.2*). Environmental race theory is visible through a variety of Roman authors in a variety of periods, as an assumption underlying the way in which these writers construct their view of the world.  

Cicero’s usage of environmental theory provides an interesting difference in emphasis from that of Pliny, Seneca, Vitruvius and Vegetius. For all four, the aspects of the environment that have such a strong impact on the inhabitants are aspects of the natural environment untouched by human influence: the closeness of the sun to the earth, the amount of moisture in the environment and the temperature of the air. The case is somewhat different in Cicero’s second speech *De Lege Agraria*. Here Cicero is interested in the effect that environment has on behaviour rather than with appearance; he argues that the Carthaginians were liars and fraudulent due to the location of the city, that Ligurians in the mountains are tough and rough and that Campanians in a fertile, bountiful landscape are soft and corrupt (2.95). The way in which Cicero

---

36 The depiction of North and South in both Vitruvius and Vegetius contains obvious echoes of Aristotle’s schema in the *Politics* (Arist.Pol.1327b).
discusses how the environment fosters these characteristics however, reveals that he is speaking of an environment that has already been developed by human beings; the essential factors are not the closeness of the sun, but the proximity to traders; not the moisture in the winds, but the beauty of the cities. This at once strengthens and weakens the environment’s impact. Cicero, although acknowledging that the basic force of the environment remains the same, steps away from the natural elements of the landscape to discuss the impact of landscapes that have been developed by human beings.

Isaac comments on the persistence of the idea in the ancient world that life in a luxurious country as opposed to a hard and unforgiving land ‘softened’ a people, reducing their capability for rule and war37. This idea provides the closest thing to a climatic theory of race in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, although Valerius is even less interested in the environment and landscape of the Roman Empire than he is in the physical appearance of individuals. Even allowing for the fact that it is not his literary purpose to provide descriptive passages of countries and landmarks, references to physical environment in the text are remarkably rare. There are four references in the text to the corrupting influences of rich environments on their inhabitants (2.6.1, 9.1.5, 9.1.ext.1 and 9.1.ext.2). Two of these refer to Asia, a locus classicus of luxury and wealth (2.6.1 and 9.1.5). 2.6.1 also mentions Greece and the remaining two refer to Campania and Volsinii. What is of particular interest in these exempla is the nature of richness in the environments that is seen to have such a damaging effect. Like Cicero, Valerius describes a developed landscape rather than the intrinsic impact of climate on physical constitution but Valerius takes Cicero’s removal from these elements a step further. Valerius does not describe the ease with which the land can be farmed or the proximity of ports as does Cicero when he describes Campania or Carthage (Agr. 2.95); he discusses aspects of sophistication that have even less to do with the physical environment. Asia is no longer depicted as a luxurious land in terms of its natural advantages; Valerius instead describes the end results of these advantages – excessive sophistication and artistry. These things can perhaps be assumed to be the result of the luxurious landscape but that landscape is never explicitly invoked. We are a long way from the effect of the sun on skin, or moisture on the fluids of the body; although the starting points are probably the same,

Valerius takes up the threads much further along their length. The *exemplum* dealing with Sparta at 2.6.1 is a good example.

Sparta is portrayed as using Lycurgus’ laws and their associated austerity to keep citizens away from Asia’s attractions. Asia is so seductive that Sparta even wants to prevent citizens from looking at it, fearing an irresistible attraction through the eye – *civium suorum oculos a contemplanda Asia retraxit* – to the *illecebrae* of Asia. Valerius goes on to describe the temptations that the Spartans associated with Asia and he begins by citing general luxury: *lauiitia, immodicus sumptus* and unnecessary *vulpitas*. He then goes on to provide a few examples of these concepts: the provision of perfumes and garlands at feasts and the serving of dessert. Far from being features of the natural environment, these customs are excesses of sophistication and refinement. *Unguenta* are always associated with corruption in the *Facta et Dicta*, corruption marked by too great an attention to the pleasures of banqueting and society. Plancus, while hiding from soldiers, is given away by his showy lifestyle and the scent of his perfumes (6.8.5); Polemo demonstrates his own corruption by stumbling into a lecture delivered by Xenocrates straight from a banquet and smelling of perfume (6.9.ext.1) and perfumes are amongst the enticements with which Campania corrupts the virility of Hannibal (9.1.ext.1).

*Immodicus sumptus* is the marker of an excessively developed and peaceful country and is by no means essentially related to the landscape in which it occurs. Rome, which Cicero describes as offering physical attractions inferior to surrounding territories and foreign lands, is the site of excessive spending on the two other occasions that Valerius uses *sumptus* to convey this idea (2.9.5 and 9.1.3). The corrupting elements of the landscape in Asia, then, are only secondarily connected to the landscape itself; its charms are the manifestation of human society and custom rather than earth and sky. Similarly, where *illecebra* is used to refer to specific things, as opposed to enticements in a general and non-specific sense, the things that it describes are markers of civilised, human interaction rather than the charms of the natural environment.

38 Cicero’s view of the superior charms of other lands can be seen at Cic. *Agr.* 2.42 and 96. The same idea is suggested by Valerius at 2.2.5-6.

39 Non-specific uses can be found at 9.2.pr and 9.7.mil.rom.2.
consistently opposes to *natura* and uncivilized, undeveloped societies\(^{40}\) and to the highly cultivated (and professional) charms of Phryne at 4.3.ext.3. The same is true at 9.1.ext.1 where Valerius describes the debilitating effect of *luxuria* on Hannibal and his troops in Campania. The seductive forces that Valerius mentions are the manifestations of the sophisticated Campanian society rather than aspects of the landscape as Hannibal is softened with *dapibus largis, abundanti vino, unguentorum fragrantia, veneris usu lasciviore*.

A comparison between this account of the corruption of Hannibal and remarks made by Cicero in the second speech on the Agrarian law is revealing. Cicero begins by describing the features of the Campanian region that have contributed to the character of the people: *Campani semper superbi bonitate agrorum et fructuum magnitudine, urbis salubritate, descriptione, pulchritudine*. The region is described in terms of its soil and fertility and the city in terms of its location and appearance. He then goes on to comment: *deinde ea luxuries quae ipsum Hannibalem armis etiam tum invictum voluptate vicit* (2.95). With *deinde* he acknowledges the distance between the actual landscape and those customs and attractions that develop from it but his description is still fundamentally concerned with the context provided by the natural environment: fertility and beauty. Valerius skips the intervening steps. He is interested in the end result of the features of the Camapanian landscape and not the features themselves. He is using the preconceptions arising from the environmental theory of race without using the theory itself; it has been discarded in the process of creating an exemplum and while certain countries are prone to *luxuria* in the *Facta et Dicta* and are liable to corrupt visitors Valerius never ties this explicitly back to their climate and landscape.

Furthermore, on at least one occasion in the *Facta et Dicta* Valerius denies the power of these luxurious countries to influence individuals at all and as he does so, renders the physical context meaningless in his analysis of the behaviour of individuals and nations. At 9.1.5 Valerius writes an indictment of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius' (cos. 80) conduct in Spain; conduct characterised by banquets, games, extravagant surroundings, ornate clothing and self-indulgence. He indicates his amazement at such a performance with the comment that it took place *non in Graecia neque in Asia, quarum luxuria Severitas ipsa corrumpi poterat, sed in horrida et*

\(^{40}\) See the section 'Behaving like a Human Being' for further discussion of *doctrinae* in the *Facta et Dicta*. 

bellicosa provincia. The physical context has already been high-lighted with a
question immediately preceding this statement: *et ubi ista?* This question and the
statement that follows it reveal the underlying assumption and its insufficiency. It is
accepted that Greece and Asia, countries associated with *luxuria*, can and will corrupt
those who visit them but a visitor should be safe in such a place as Spain, *horrida et
bellicosa* as it is – it offers no attractions and cannot even provide peace. *Horridus* is
used throughout the text for things that are unappealing physically and in terms of
manners; in most cases Valerius goes on to reveal the innate value in the things that
he describes as *horridus* but the word itself indicates something like the opposite of
being seductive 41. In this *exemplum* however, Metellus Pius is not safe; he resists the
force of environmental theory and the rhetorical echo of it that Valerius employs, and
is corrupted in Spain, not Asia or Greece. The impact of different environments is
registered by Valerius and then reversed by the example of Metellus, further
weakening its presence in the text 42.

In these three *exempla* it must be observed that the environment is depicted as
impacting on outsiders who enter the country, not the inhabitants of the country itself.
Isaacs does comment that environmental theory sees only the possibility of decline
when one people moves into the territory of another; we are given only the image of
tough peoples being corrupted by their exposure to softening, tempting lands 43. This
comment from Isaac comes, however, only briefly and at the end of a discussion of
ancient writers and their views of the impact of the environment on the indigenous
inhabitants of various lands. In Valerius on the other hand, this motif of corrupted
foreigners is the clearest trace of environmental theory. There is only one instance
where he describes the attributes of a city and then goes on to the customs of its
inhabitants and this too occurs in the chapter *De Luxuria et Libidine* (9.1) Here
Volsinii is described as *opulenta* and the reputed *Etruriae caput* with well organised

41 Juvenal indeed credits the chastity of the women of early Rome to the fact they were often *horridior*
than their husbands (6.9-10). In Valerius' text Spain is *horrida* and thus should not tempt men to luxury;
the use of *horridus* as an adjective at this point underlines Valerius' tendency to think of dangerously
luxurious countries as highly developed. At 2.1.5 *horrida pudicitia* signifies chastity that is influenced
by no art or artifice, plain and untouched by cosmetics or other attentions. *Horridus* is elsewhere used
of things that are innately good but unadorned at 2.9.5, 4.4.pr, 4.7.7, 6.3.pr, 6.3.10 and 7.2.1. At 2.2.5 it
is used of Rome in contrast to the prosperous Tarentum. It is used with less certainty regarding the
ultimate good of the individual concerned at 5.4.3 and with outright condemnation at 9.2.pr.

42 Valerius also notes the discrepancy between Metellus' behaviour and that of his father, thus
effectively making him stand in opposition to the influence of genetic inheritance as well as
environmental conditions.

laws and customs before it falls into luxury and is overrun by its slave population (9.1.ext.2). The only word here hinting at the impact of the environment is opulenta and the advantages of the city are actually opposed to its fate: rather than being presented as an environment ripe for corruption and luxury, Valerius introduces its decline with sed postquam luxuria prolapsa est.

The only trace of the environmental theory of race in Valerius Maximus, then, is the ability of luxurious countries to corrupt those who encounter them. Even in these instances the features of the seductive countries are the symbols of sophistication which Valerius never explicitly connects with the fertility or richness of the landscape. Just as I argued in the section on physical appearance it is notable that Valerius does not use environmental race theory to render the divisions between different peoples innate and fixed by their background and physical experience. Because Valerius elects to show the effects of environment only on visitors from other countries the emphasis is not upon firm ethnic divisions created by climate but on the mutability and fluidity of character and experience. The impact of the environment is only visible as a subtext to be read into the sophisticated attractions of cities that have the power to seduce visitors. Even then – as the example of Metellus Pius indicates – seduction into luxury and extravagance might just as easily take place in a country that offers no physical attractions of its own.

Valerius' decision not to employ somatic indications of ethnicity and not to integrate environmental theories of ethnicity effectively renders the human beings in his text interchangeable on a physical and behavioural level. They are not marked out by distinctive features or trapped by the characteristics imparted to them by the land of their birth. For an author whose work suggests such an emphasis on division with its structural enshrinement of internal and external, Valerius Maximus displays very little interest in two of the main methods that were used in the Roman world to distinguish ethnic groups. While the broad structure of his work may divide the world into internal and external, these groups are then united in chapters describing common behaviours and experiences. Valerius Maximus does not allow the idea of intrinsic ethnic physical or behavioural characteristics to undermine this basic unity, and thus

44 Isaac sees the fixedness of qualities under the environmental theory of race to be such that it qualifies as "proto-racism": "The implication is that the essential figures of the body and mind come from the outside and are not the result of either genetic evolution or conscious choice. Individuality and individual change are thereby ignored....Entire nations are believed to have common characteristics determined wholly by factors outside themselves, which are, by implication, unchangeable." Isaac, W. The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity (Princeton, 2004) 163-4.
in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* the traditional distinguishing brands of ethnicity are left aside. Conduct alone is king.

Black and white in post-slavery North America stands as one of the most prominent examples of 'race relations' in the modern world. As a result, we are familiar with the construct of race as absolutely dependent upon descent, with racial affiliation an inherited quality. In turn we are familiar with conceiving this inheritance in terms of blood. A good example of this is the movie ‘Showboat’, where marriage between Stephen Baker and Julie Laverne (a woman with some Negro heritage able to "pass" as white) is threatened by local laws prohibiting ‘mixed’ marriages. Stephen Baker’s response is to cut his wife’s hand, suck blood from the wound and claim that he now has as much Negro blood in his body as his bride. Such thinking is now unacceptable and is actually inaccurate as blood has very little to do with descent — a mother carrying a child shares no blood with that child; much less is blood literally shared in an extended ethnic or national group. Such thinking about race appears to have been relatively alien to the ancient Romans. As we have already seen, Valerius Maximus rejects the importance of somatic appearance and environmental theories of race, so we could reasonably expect to find no traces of this biological, blood-determined representation of ethnicity. The repeated function of *sanguis* as racial distinguisher in Valerius Maximus, however, is so striking it necessitates a comprehensive analysis of...

---

Chapter Three: i) Blood Will Out.

There is one feature in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* that appears to be in stark contrast to the physical interchangeability of human beings. This is Valerius' use of blood (*sanguis*) as a determiner of group membership. Freeman wrote of 'race' in 1879:

"the relation of community of blood is at the root of the whole matter...the nomenclature of natural kindred exactly fits the case; it fits it so exactly that no other nomenclature could enable us to set forth the case with any clearness."\(^{11}\)

Black and white in *ante-bellum* North America stands as one of the most prominent examples of 'race relations' in the modern world. As a result, we are familiar with the construct of race as absolutely dependent upon descent, with racial affiliation an inherited quality. In turn we are familiar with conceiving this inheritance in terms of blood. A good example of this is the movie 'Showboat', where a marriage between Stephen Baker and Julie Laverne (a woman with some Negro heritage able to 'pass' as white) is threatened by local laws prohibiting ‘mixed’ marriages. Stephen Baker’s response is to cut his wife’s hand, suck blood from the wound and claim that he now has as much Negro blood in his body as his bride. Such thinking is now unfashionable and is actually inaccurate as blood has very little to do with descent – a mother carrying a child shares no blood with that child; much less is blood literally shared in an extended ethnic or national group.\(^2\) Such thinking about race appears to have been relatively alien to the ancient Romans.\(^3\) As we have already seen, Valerius rejects the importance of somatic appearance and environmental theories of race, so we could reasonably expect to find no traces of this biological, blood-determined representation of ethnicity. The repeated function of *sanguis* as racial distinguisher in Valerius Maximus, however, is so striking it necessitates a comprehensive analysis of

---

how the term is used by his predecessors and contemporaries, as well as a discussion of modern authors' reaction to the concept.

The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* records that *sanguis* can be used to refer to "Blood regarded as running through a family, race, etc." and Valerius Maximus' usage (in a minor triumph for such a despised Latinist) is employed to demonstrate both ideas: in the former case 1.1.ext.2 and in the latter 1.7.ext.1. Of the other examples noted by the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, only Tacitus *Annales* 2.3 could possibly be read to refer to blood as a racial distinguisher. Here Tacitus describes Artabanus as *Arsacidarum e sanguine*, which translates as 'from the blood of the descendants of Arsaces', the first king of the Parthians. There is attestation for a poetic use of *Arsacidae* in the plural to mean simply Parthians, but as Tacitus is here describing Artabanus, a king of the Parthians, this usage seems to refer to lineal descent. This is supported by only one other similar usage in the works of Tacitus, at *Annales* 11.23 where Romans and Italians are described as *consanguinei populi* in contrast to the potential Gallic senators of Claudius. *Consanguineus* refers to familial relations, particularly for brother and sister relationships and close kinship. Tacitus' use of *consanguineus* seems to be a method of underlining the closeness of Italians and Romans via the metaphor of familial relations. This is similar to how *sanguis* is used in Valerius' works and fits the general paradigm, although the term used in this case is *consanguineus*, not *sanguis*.

Tacitus occasionally refers to Roman blood, as at *Annales* 3.39, *Agricola* 35 and *Historiae* 3.75. He also refers to non-Roman blood specifically at *Annales* 14.23 and *Historiae* 4.17. In all these cases however, blood is referred to in the context of warfare, death and bloodshed — for instance at *Annales* 3.39 the benefits of a military tactic preventing the shedding of Roman blood are discussed. Roman blood is literally blood. Excepting the two references mentioned above, there appears to be no appeal here to blood as a determiner of group membership or behaviour without the presence of this literal element. Horace refers to *Latinus sanguis* and *Poenus sanguis* but once again these terms are used to denote spilt, or about to be spilt, blood as he describes battle-fields and oceans stained with the blood of the combatants (*Carm.* 2.1.29-31, 2.12.1-4 and *Ep.* 7.4). Likewise Petronius in the *Satyricon* refers on two occasions to *Germanus sanguis* where this blood is being shed in war (122 (249) and 123 (327)),

and the *Periochae* of Livy on one occasion refers to *noster sanguis* in a literal context (89). The other examples in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* are largely concerned with familial relations and the broader social classes suggested by these relationships. For example Livy refers to *patricius sanguis* at 6.40.6 and Quintilian to *liber sanguis* at *Inst.* 12.9.10. Both categories are, from our knowledge of Roman social practice, largely based on lineal descent. Blood is used to describe particular groups whose membership is determined by descent, but generally not ethnic or national grouping. The emphasis then, appears to be very much on the familial and not the racial sense of *sanguis* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* examples.

To gain a more complete sense of the word *sanguis* and its meanings I have analyzed the data provided by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in all authors prior to, and contemporary with, Valerius Maximus. Within this data, I have focused on three different uses of *sanguis*: familial blood, blood associated with physical or behavioural characteristics, and finally blood used to indicate ethnic and national groupings. These three uses of *sanguis* provide a way of understanding how *sanguis* was used by the Romans of the Republic and early Empire to define and describe various groups and relationships.

**Familial Blood**

The Greek Hematic theory argues that in human beings both the male and female contributions to the foetus are derived from blood. Therefore, the blood of the parents combines to produce a child who then carries blood that links it permanently to its parents and wider family. The role of blood in signifying familial connections is far from being a purely Greco-Roman idea. The strong conceptual connection between blood and familial relation in the Roman mind can be seen to a fantastic extent in Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*. He describes the tribe of the Psylli in Africa whose blood was naturally poisonous to snakes; the babies of this tribe were exposed at birth to snakes and if their blood did not repel snakes it was established that they were products of adultery (7.14). The underlying assumption is that the blood of the child embodies and demonstrates a strong connection between family

---

6 Research has been conducted on similar ideas in other societies. Uli Linke demonstrates the link between kinship and 'inside blood' (in Latin *sanguis* as opposed to *cruor*) across a variety of peoples in an Indo-European context in his article 'Blood as Metaphor in Proto-Indo-European' Linke, Uli 'Blood as a Metaphor in Proto Indo-European' *Journal of Indo European Studies* 13 (1985) 353-264.
members—thus a difference in blood implies a difference in the constitution of the family. *Sanguis* as a marker of familial descent or grouping is a construction that appears consistently, if not frequently, in Roman authors (particularly Virgil and Ovid) up to the time of Valerius Maximus.

In the remaining texts, *sanguis* as a familial marker first appears in fragments from an unknown author, as well as Pacuvius and Ennious’ *Annales*. In the anonymous fragment an individual asks a father whether anyone could see the death of *tuus sanguis*—his son on this occasion—as undeserved (Scaen. Fr. ex incertis incertorum *fab.* 65.120). Similarly in the fragment from Pacuvius, the relationship described is one between parent and child: Antiope addresses her sons as *mea propages sanguinis* (Scan. Fr. Pacuvius. *Antiope*. 13.20). Ennious uses the word when he addresses Romulus and, with what we shall find is a common technique, uses it to describe Romulus’ elevated descent: *O pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum...* (Enn. *Ann.* I.fr 81, II.1-3). To go on to prose authors from this point, *sanguis* as a familial marker next appears in Cicero. In *De Inventione* he initially defines *pietas* as concerned with the family: *patria aut parentes aut alii sanguine coniuncti* (Inv. 2.66) and reiterates the connection at 2.161-2. Elsewhere in Cicero, Quintus Metellus is reminded of the positive qualities of the relatives who constitute *communis sanguis* between himself and Publius Servilius at *Sen.* 25, and Cicero describes his own ancestry in terms of *sanguis* at *Agr.* 2.1.

What is true for Cicero himself is also true for the families of Roman heroes. Lucius Manlius Torquatus (Pr. 49 BCE), in debate on the topic of self interest, claims that his ancestors must have had their own ends in mind when they acted *in liberos atque in sanguinem suum* (Fin. 1.34). Cicero also uses *sanguis* to describe the familial connections of those from the distant mythological past. He quotes Ennious’ description of Romulus as *sanguen dis oriendum* (Rep. 1.64) and elsewhere in Cicero’s works Prometheus is depicted as appealing to the children of the Titans for assistance on the basis of their shared blood (*Tusc.* 2.23). The term is evidently also in use amongst Cicero’s contemporaries: preserved in Cicero’s correspondence is a claim by P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (*Qu.* 44 BCE) to his own status as

---

7 This fragment also represents a use of the unusual *sanguen* form. There are only 25 uses of *sanguen* on the Teubner Database: Saur, K. G. (ed.) *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* CD-ROM (Munich, 2002).

8 Valerius Maximus picks up this connection when he summarises the chapters 5.4 and 5.5 which describe familial *pietas* at the opening of the preface to 5.6: *Artissimis sanguinis vinculis pietas satis fecit.*
coniunctissimus sanguine Antonis (Fam. 12.14.7). Sallust however, uses the term on only one occasion in a speech written for Micipsa and addressed to Iugurtha, despite the potential for word play in Catiline’s private and public plots.

Livy’s use of sanguis can be difficult to pin down; it is clear he is using it to establish boundaries between different groups, but these groups’ exact nature is often unclear. On a few occasions, it is obviously connections between family members that are at issue. At the very foundation of Rome, Romulus attempts to persuade neighbouring tribes to sanguinem miscere with the men of Rome — that is to marry their women to Roman men and thus produce children carrying the combined blood (1.9.4). Later in Rome’s history inter-marriage is again at issue when tension has built to crisis-point between Plebs and Patricians. The Plebs accuse the Patricians of not wanting to mix blood with them (4.4.6), the Patricians in turn react with horror to the idea of a future where the confusion of social groups means that individuals will be ignorant of their sanguis (4.2.6). The Plebs respond by questioning the very blood descent of the present Patricians from the original group of families (4.4.7).

On a smaller scale, the connection between father and son is also explicitly mentioned at 8.7.13 where T. Manlius shows the spoils he has won in battle to his father as proof that they share sanguis. Again, at 8.7.19, Manlius the elder (T. Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus (cos. III 340)) states that the true proof of shared blood will be his son’s willingness to accept capital punishment for his unauthorised foray against the enemy. Other men are similarly depicted as harming their own sanguis: at 40.5.1 Perseus is seen to come to a climax of evil by directing his cruelty against his brother. In non-violent incidences from foreign families, Mazaetullus at 29.29.8 is connected to the Numidian royal family by blood, and also the blood relations of both Hamilcar and Perseus (for a second time) are depicted in terms of sanguis (21.10.3 and 45.7.3 respectively).

As we come to prose authors contemporary to Valerius Maximus, sanguis is still functioning as a familial relationship marker. At Seneca the Elder’s 9 In Micipsa’s speech the king implores his adoptive son not to seek outside allies instead of those who are sanguine coniuncti (Jug. 10.3). 10 While it could be argued that this is a national or ethnic usage of sanguis, Livy’s deliberate reduction of the relationship to one between fellow homines rather than national groups at this point tends to put the emphasis squarely upon individual relationships; thus Romulus phrases the conclusion of his argument with...proinde ne gravarentur homines cum hominibus sanguinem ac genes miscere. 11 Sanguis is used again to describe the Patricians as a group defined by familial descent at 6.40.6. 12 Manlius’ surname Imperiosus is attributed at 7.4.3 to his harsh behaviour towards strangers as well as his own sanguis.
Controversiae 2.1.10, sanguis seems to refer to the relationship between father and son; the speaker (Papirius Fabianus at this point) questions what would make human beings turn against each other *cum una stirps idemque sanguis sitis* and the case in question deals with a father’s unreasonable disinheritance of his son. The *sanguis* grouping here then, seemingly alludes to the common circumstances of human beings as well as a smaller familial grouping that has been disrupted by greed. Once again the meaning of *sanguis* is shaded at 7.5.15, where one of the orators accuses a woman of not sparing *sanguis suus* in pursuit of love; *sanguis* in this case refers both to the woman’s own blood (the implication being that she has deliberately wounded herself to disguise a crime) and her very young son whose damaging testimony she is attempting to refute. The usage of *sanguis* for familial connections then, is familiar enough to be the subject of puns, although, given that Seneca dismisses this construction as *fatuus*, such puns may be in poor taste.

In Velleius Paterculus’ text on the other hand there are none of the nuances that characterise Seneca’s use of *sanguis*, but rather a straightforward acceptance of the term as denoting familial connections. Velleius describes Lucius Aemilius Paulus’ (cos. II 216) prayer that if the gods envied any of his achievements they should take out their anger on his family rather than the Roman state. Velleius describes Lucius Paulus as fulfilling his vow with the loss of a great part of *sanguis suus*; here *sanguis* describes the family as a whole and the author goes on to specify the actual loss of two sons (1.10.5). Velleius Paterculus also includes examples of the *gloria* of his own *domesticus sanguis*—specifically his great-grandfather Minatius Magius of Aeculanum (Vell. 2.16.2). Elsewhere he demonstrates the degrees of closeness possible in a familial relationship by describing Julius Caesar as *C. Mario sanguine coniunctissimus* (2.41.2). These examples drawn from the fragments of early authors, Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Seneca the Elder and Velleius Paterculus are all of the uses of *sanguis* as a familial connection for the prose writers up to, and including, Valerius’ time. While the term is not unusual, it is not densely represented among these authors. Pliny the Elder, who is particularly interesting because he specifically lists Valerius Maximus amongst his sources, does not use *sanguis* in this sense at all.

13 The link is presumably created by the birth of Marius’ son who carried both Marius’ blood and that of the Julii. It is notable that the connection of blood can extend backwards to include the ancestors of a child.
Sanguis as a familial marker appears more commonly in poetic language and especially in Virgil and Ovid. Sanguis takes on an epic grandeur in Virgil’s Aeneid. The blurring between ethnic and familial categories in the ancient world is clearly evident when an attempt is made to distinguish between the two categories, but I will begin by discussing instances in which sanguis seems intended to reveal and explicate familial relationships. This is employed most frequently in the Aeneid to describe lines of descent for individuals and families on a close familial and historical level. The Sibyl for instance describes Aeneas’ descent from his mother when she addresses him as sate sanguine divum (Aen. 6.125-6) and similarly in the underworld Anchises calls his son sanguis meus (6.835). Latinus too describes the relationship between himself and Turnus as one of cognatus sanguis (12.29)\(^\text{14}\).

Elsewhere in the Aeneid sanguis embraces a more comprehensive view of the family line as individuals reveal their connections and background. When Trojan shepherds capture an unknown Greek and bring him into the city for interrogation immediately prior to the fall of Troy, the Trojans, as their first enquiry, ask quo sanguine cretus (2.74). As it has already been assumed that he is a Greek at this point this seems to be more in the nature of a request for his lineage and ancestry. Sinon replies by affirming he is Greek and giving details of his familial and personal connection to Palamedes, as well as his own background (2.77-92)\(^\text{15}\). In book seven Latinus is introduced with an account of his pedigree which ends with an address to Saturn: tu sanguinis ultimus auctor (7.47-9). The practical function of such lineages becomes clear via Aeneas’ handling of his approach to Evander. He describes their respective familial lines and on demonstrating that both families have Atlas in them at some point triumphantly declares: sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno (8.142) before asking for help\(^\text{16}\). Fittingly, when the oracle of Faunus commands Latinus to keep his daughter for an externus gener it also projects forward a vision of

\(^{14}\) This particular combination of words also appears in the Ciris from the Appendix Vergiliana when Scylla cries: Illa ego sum cognato sanguine vobis... (Ciris. 5.410). In this case however Scylla simply refers to the connection between birds that were at one stage human beings rather than members of her actual family.

\(^{15}\) The familial sense of sanguis in this case is confirmed by the parallel usage in book Three when another Greek casts himself on the mercy of the Trojans, here genuinely. Achemenides who has been left behind in the territory of the Cyclops by Odysseus’ party explains his identity in response to the enquiry quid sit fari, quo sanguine cretus... (3.259-60).

\(^{16}\) Aeneas states explicitly that because of this link between the two men he has not chosen to use formal procedures, but rather to come in person: his fretus non legatos neque prima per artem / temptamenta tui pepigi; me, me ipse meumque / obieci caput et supplex ad limina ueni.
the glorious descendants that such a marriage will provide in terms of their *sanguis*; the heroic lineage can be seen extending forward as well as backwards (7.98-101)\(^\text{17}\).

Horace defines the connection between parents and children in terms of *sanguis* at *Carm.* 2.20.5-8 when he states that he is not the *sanguis* of impoverished parents. He also uses the term to describe the lineage of Augustus in the *Carmen Saeculare*; the *princeps* is described as the *clerus Anphisae Venerisque sanguis*\(^\text{18}\). A similarly epic sense of *sanguis* is present when Horace describes the subject matter of Pindar as gods and kings with the *sanguis deorum* (*Carm.* 4.2.13-14) and then predicts the celebration of Augustus’ great deeds (4.2.33-60). Tibullus on the other hand uses *sanguis* only once for close familial relationships when he describes his lover as the *sanguis* of her mother (Tib. 1.6.66). In Propertius, as in Virgil and (as we shall see) Ovid, the role of *sanguis* can be divided into those uses referring to the close family and those describing a more grandiose descent. The poet uses blood to indicate a sibling relationship when Aphesiboea makes a decision to put the claims of *amor* above those of *sanguis* by killing her brothers for her husband (1.15.15-6). In his own family Propertius uses *sanguis* as a means of describing the relationship between parents and children: he states he will provide no children to the army of Rome – *nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit* (2.7.13-4)\(^\text{19}\). Where glorious descent is concerned, Propertius addresses Maecenas as a being descended from the *sanguis* of Etruscan kings and has the aristocratic Cornelia claim that the *sanguis* of her elevated ancestors taught her to behave in a praiseworthy fashion (3.9.1-3 and 4.11.47-8)\(^\text{20}\).

As in the Virgil’s epic, Aeneas’ divine heritage is described with *sanguis* in the *Metamorphoses*; Ovid depicts Venus entreating Jupiter to allow Aeneas *qui te de sanguine nostro / fecit avum* to enter heaven (14.588-9)\(^\text{21}\). This kind of epic descent is

\(^{17}\) I am accepting Anthon’s interpretation of *sanguine* as meaning ‘by his descendants’ despite the uncertainty of meaning here because Virgil’s usage of the word *sanguis* seems to be so intrinsically linked to lineage throughout the *Aeneid*. Anthon, C. ‘The *Aeneid* of Virgil’ (London, 1889) 361 n.98. To take the meaning as ‘whose blood shall bear our name star ward’ as does Theodore Williams in his translation seems to me to invest *sanguis* with an idea of quality rather than family carried in blood that is nowhere else found in the *Aeneid*: Vergil, (trans. Williams, T.) *P. Vergilius Maro: The Aeneid* (Boston, 1910).

\(^{18}\) This description of Augustus is used to back Horace’s request that he be granted whatever he might request with sacrifice (*Saec.* 49-52).

\(^{19}\) In the same poem Propertius concludes by referring to his own inheritance of *patrius sanguis*, a substance that pales in comparison next to his love for Cynthia (2.7.20).

\(^{20}\) In contrast, Propertius has Cynthia describe his own lack of nobility specifically via his *sanguis avitus*. He uses blood to convey the idea that nobility as a quality is transmitted in the family line (2.24b.37-8).

\(^{21}\) Aeneas’ familial line of blood is also projected forward at the fall of Troy to speak of his descendants’ future glory 15.446-8.
also envisaged when Ovid wants to contrast the lowly Iphis and Anaxarete a veteris...sanguine Teucri (14.698-9). In a strong echo of Virgil, Ovid again refers to Teucran blood in the course of Aeneas’ journey: *Inde recordati Teucros a sanguine Teucri*...the repetition of Teucer here suggests that the idea of family dominates on this occasion, especially as this thought propsels the Trojans towards Crete, whence Teucer originally came (13.705-6)\(^{22}\). The construct is also visible outside the *Metamorphoses*: Ovid describes Evander as ennobled by the *sanguis* inherited from his mother (*Fast.*1.471-2)\(^{23}\). In the *Fasti* Ovid is largely concerned with the familial line of Romulus and so depicts Romulus assigning a day of worship to Mars — *sanguinis auctor* (*Fast.* 3.97-8) — and addressing Mars as the source of his *sanguis* (*Fast.* 3.73). Mars is equally happy to acknowledge the relationship when he complains that Romulus found no willing wife as others were unwilling to believe he was the *sanguis* of the god, and when he argues that Romulus should be gathered up to heaven (*Fast.* 3.189-91 and 2.484). Ovid applies the same model to his own line of descent in the *Amores* and thus — in a neat reversal of the general use of *sanguis* — highlights his lack of ancestors in public office...*nostri sanguinis auctor eques* (*Am.* 1.3.8).

Elsewhere in Ovid’s works *sanguis* tends to stand for a more immediate familial relationship; he brings the mechanics of the connection into focus by twice referring to children as the shared blood of their parents (*Am.* 2.14.31-2 and *Rem.* 60). *Sanguis* also occurs three times in close proximity in book nine in reference to sibling relationships. At 9.326-7 Iole reminds her mother that the fate of her sister Ochealia is more to be mourned than that of a woman *aliena sanguine nostro*; then *sanguis* appears twice in connection with the story of Byblis who falls in love with her brother\(^{24}\). In book 13 *sanguis* is again contrasted with *alienus* as those involved in the contest over Achilles’ arms attempt to establish who had the closest familial

---

\(^{22}\) Bömer certainly takes this usage as familial; he initially states that *sanguis* here stands for *gens* — a word that can also move between familial or national meanings — and then provides a series of parallel uses that are heavily familial. Bömer, F. P. Ovidius Naso: *Metamorphosen Buch: XII-XIII* (Heidelberg, 1982) 390.

\(^{23}\) *Sanguis* is also used to describe the descent of Polydaemon from Semiramis in the *Metamorphosis* 5.85-8, the descent of Neleus from Neptune at *Met.* 12.557-8 line of Ajax at 13.141-3 and the descent of deities at *Ib.* 473-4.

\(^{24}\) Ovid states that in her passion she *nomina sanguinis odit* and thus blood is seen to actually signify the sibling relationship (9.466 and also 9.498-9).
relationship to the hero (13.31-3). In the Tristia Ovid uses the term to describe the relationship between members of the family circle and in the Fasti sanguis is used to describe relations within the immediate family; those who are made dearer to you by the death of other family members (Fast. 2.621). It is also used in the same work to define the relationship between those individuals (Fast. 6.487-8). In the Heroides, Briseis points out the blood relationship between Achilles and the sons of Telamon (Ep. 3.27-30) and in the Ibis sanguis describes the relationship between father and son (Ib. 511-12). Ovid appears particularly at ease with using sanguis to indicate familial lines and relationships in this way.

Phaedrus, the poet closest in time to Valerius Maximus, uses sanguis just once at the level of the immediate family as a fox outwits an eagle in an attempt to preserve her cubs – her sanguis – by placing the children of the eagle under threat (Phaed. 1.28.8-10). There is also, finally, one funerary inscription that uses sanguis to convey a familial relationship, that of Ti. Claudius Corinthus. In this epitaph, a man identifies himself as cognato sanguine iunctus to the deceased and also refers to him as frater. It appears the usage of sanguis for familial relationships enjoyed fairly wide acceptance.

The familial use of sanguis is more common in the poets of the Republic and early Empire: by my count it appears with greatest frequency in Ovid who deploys the word in this sense twenty-nine times. The difficulty of establishing an iron-clad sense of the frequency with which sanguis is used in a familial sense reflects the fluidity of the boundary between ethnic and familial groups in the ancient world. We will witness this fluidity again when uses of sanguis that appear close to our modern ‘racial’ sense are discussed.

Valerius Maximus uses sanguis to convey a familial connection or grouping on twenty-three occasions. This is a smaller raw number than Ovid, but given Ovid’s combined works are nearly three times the size than those of Valerius, Valerius’ usage character and behaviour. In these cases blood connections are honoured in spite of temptations to reject them.

---

26 Here compared to the relationship between Castor and Pollux (Tr. 4.5.29-30).
27 At 8.475-77 there also appears to be a play on the usage of blood as a term for familial connection despite the literal meaning of sanguis in this context as Gilchrist argues. Gilchrist, K.E. ‘Ovid, Metamorphoses 8.476’ Classical Quarterly 39 (1989) 562. Other familial uses can be found in the Metamorphoses at 2.90-1, 2.367-9 and 5.514-5 and in the Fasti at 2.788.
28 CIL 6.34866: Abrepti fratri cognato sanguine iunctus / reliquias Fuscus condidit in tumulum.
is remarkable. In his text we witness an explosion of references to this blood-based conception of familial connections and there is none of the confusion between familial and racial uses seen in other authors. In the Preface to 9.14 Valerius refers to the relationship between parents and children when he cites the school of thought that sees physical similarity as the result of the origo et contextus sanguinis. Throughout his work he uses *sanguis* for familial relations particularly where he is emphasising the closeness, or significance of the connection; it is, for instance, largely used to describe the relationship between fathers and sons. In the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* however, blood does not provide a map of aristocratic relationships, it is not a tool to describe pedigrees and personal importance. It is used almost exclusively to question the strength and importance of blood ties in the face of other demands and particularly in their relationship to the behaviour of individuals bound by them.

Chapter 5.9, concerned with the moderation of parents towards children suspected of crimes, features three instances of *sanguis*. Here, particularly at 5.9.4, blood conveys the depth and strength that should be inherent between father and son. In this *exemplum* an anonymous father on learning of his son’s parricidal plot begs his wife to confirm that the son is actually his and not a product of adultery because he cannot believe that his *verus sanguis* could plan to murder him. Later in the same *exemplum* Valerius comments on the irony that the isolated setting in which the father offers his son a sword with which to kill him is safer than the connection created by blood: *solitudinem sanguine meliorem*; emptiness and loneliness is to be preferred to the intimacy created by shared *sanguis*. Q. Hortensius Hortalus (cos. 69) at 5.9.2, in no doubt about his son’s identity, similarly acknowledges the power of the bond when he decides that the claims of *sanguis* must be honoured no matter the behaviour of the one who possesses the blood. Thus he keeps his wayward son as his heir despite the possibility of leaving his estate to a more worthy nephew: *mortuus sanguini honorem debitum reddidit*. The son’s possession of *sanguis* is more significant than his character and behaviour. In these cases blood connections are honoured in spite of temptations to reject them.

---

29 The word count for Ovid, based on the Teubner texts of his works, is 227 290. That of Valerius is 80 531.

30 This tendency to use *sanguis* for relationships between males provides an interesting contrast to Linke’s observation that in Proto-Indo-European the term for ‘inside-blood’ is used primarily to describe the connection of women to the tribe. Linke, Uli ‘Blood as a Metaphor in Proto-Indo-European’ *Journal of Indo European Studies* 13 (1985) 356.
In contrast the *sanguis* connection between close family members often takes a violent context in the *Facta et Dicta* when individuals are seen to pursue certain (honourable) paths in spite of the ties of blood. In the chapter 2.7 *De Disciplina Militari* Valerius tests the connection signified by *sanguis* by including individuals who are willing to punish their own blood-relations rather than see standards of discipline fall. Thus at 2.7.4 a blood relation (*sanguine sibi iunctum*) of C. Cotta (cos. II 248) is flogged and demoted for his failure to protect the camp from fire. At 2.7.6 Valerius goes on to speak with awe of the executions carried out by A. Postumius Tubertus (dict. 431) and T. Manlius Torquatus Imperiosus (cos. III 340) on their own sons in order to preserve military discipline; he pictures the axes returning to camp coated with blood that is characterised as belonging to the commanders themselves: *imperatorum proprio sanguine manantes secures*. Here the literal and figurative senses of *sanguis* flow together as the sons’ blood is envisaged as belonging to their fathers.

Another father does not spare his *proprius sanguis* at 6.1.2 in the chapter *De Pudicitia*; L. Verginius kills his daughter in the Forum, preserving her chastity from Decemvir Ap. Claudius. Violence is also occasionally resisted in the interests of proper behaviour because of, or in spite of, the ties of *sanguis*. At 5.1.5 Rhoetogenes of Centobriga is prepared to let his son (*sanguis suus*) be destroyed for the benefit of the Roman siege, but Q. Metellus Macedonicus (cos. 143) in the Celtiberian War will not allow the siege engines to destroy the boy in front of his father\(^\text{31}\). M. Bibulus too rejects the opportunity for advantageous violence when Cleopatra offers him the men who killed two of his sons (*sanguis suus*) in Egypt to punish as he will\(^\text{32}\).

Valerius tests the claims of different relationships against *sanguis* in a number of largely non-violent incidents. The *sanguis* and *clientela* of the elder Africanus are seen in conflict when his son and his scribe stand against one another in the praetorian elections at 4.5.3, a situation resolved by the withdrawal of the client to allow the

\(^{31}\) In this *exemplum* Rome effectively gets to have its cake and eat it too: Rhoetogenes is so intent upon the success of Rome and has such confidence in the rightness of their victory that he is willing to suffer the death of his own *sanguis* before his eyes. Q. Metellus, on the other hand, has such respect for the connection of blood and the relationship between father and son that he will not allow a father to suffer such a loss. The two men present different opinions of what behaviour is called for by the situation and while their opinions differ, both courses of action emphasise the advantage of Rome.

\(^{32}\) Bibulus returns the men to Cleopatra because the right of punishment should properly rest with the senate (4.1.15).
higher claims of the son. Similarly, when Valerius discusses inheritances in the chapter *Quae Rata Manserunt cum Causas Haberent cur Rescindi Possent* (7.8), the claims of blood are often the factor that has been ignored in the construction of the doubtful wills. At 7.8.1 Ti. Sempronius Longus, *sanguine proximus* to Sempronius Tuditanus, attempts unsuccessfully to have that man’s will overturned because the inheritance had been left elsewhere. Pompeius Reginus is deeply insulted by his brother’s decision to leave his estate to *alieni et humiles* rather than the sibling with whom he shares a blood connection (7.8.4). Valerius expresses general disapproval in these cases where the claims of blood are ignored for friends or others. The exception is Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos (cos. 109) who leaves his money to C. Carrinas (cos. suff. 43) instead of (amongst others) the Claudian family to whom he is connected by an *artissimum sanguinis vinculum* (7.8.3) – in this case Valerius explicitly states: *ne hoc re testamentum eius quisquam attemptavit.*

There are also unchallenged and more straightforward uses of *sanguis* in the text. Roman fathers and their adult sons or sons in law (termed later in the *exemplum sanguis et adfinitas*), for instance, would originally not bathe in each other’s presence as this was seen to show a lack of respect for these *sancta vincula* (2.1.7). Roman *humanitas* is also demonstrated in chapter 5.1 when the younger Africanus, on learning that a captured soldier was in fact Masinissa’s young nephew, sends the boy home safely with presents and marks of honour. Valerius praises the general for his belief that the best rewards of victory were to restore temple ornaments to their rightful places and *hominibus sanguinem suum restituere* (5.1.7). 35

Valerius only uses *sanguis* to indicate lines of descent for key figures from relatively recent Roman history on four occasions. At 4.4.6 the pedigree described is that of M. Atilius Regulus (cos. II 256), but the other three instances relate to Augustus’ family. At 9.15.2 Valerius tells with outrage the story of an unnamed 33

33 The exception is the Preface to the chapter *De Amicitia* (4.7) where Valerius states that the ties of friendship are just as strong as the claims of blood. This is just one of the many unusual things about the chapter which finally elevates *amicitia* to the level of the immortal gods (4.7.ext.1).

34 Interestingly, the money has actually been left to Tuditanus’ daughter and while Valerius as we have seen does refer to the blood connection between fathers and their daughters on one occasion (6.1.2) here the blood connection is effectively ignored. The *exemplum* that deals with Tuditanus is inverted at 7.7.2 where a natural (although adopted out) son successfully contests a will that benefits other men who are *sanguine coniuncti* to his father because the bond between father and son is the *artissimum vinculum* possible.

35 The pity and mercy due to the connection of blood is also the underlying assumption in the story of Ser. Galba, who successfully escapes punishment for the massacre of the Lusitanians by commending his children, and also the son of Galus who is *sanguine sibi coniunctus*, to the people of Rome (8.1.abs.2).
individual who dared to suggest that he himself was actually the son of Octavia and
had been exposed at birth and swapped with the son of another household. Valerius
records approvingly Augustus’ punishment of the man who tried to substitute his
‘false’ blood for the verus sanguis of Octavia’s son. In the other two exempla of this
kind a child with descent from two prominent enemies is seen as providing a
reconciling bond. Thus the presence of shared blood is shown as promoting a certain
kind of behaviour and relationship between individuals. At 4.6.4 Valerius looks back
to Augustus’ predecessors and comments on the potential to stop civil war that a child
born of Pompeius Magnus and Julia might have had: concordia communis sanguinis
vinculo constricta. Similarly, 2.9.6 is concerned with the feud between Claudius Nero
and Livius Salinator and concludes with the emperor Tiberius who is a descendant of
both. Valerius fantasises that the two men would have thrown aside their conflict for
close friendship had they known ut eorum sanguis illustrium imaginum serie deductus
in ortum salutaris principis nostri confluere. The issue of Tiberius’ adoption by
Augustus is not mentioned at this point; lines of sanguis presumably persisted despite
legal re-definitions of family relations.

The use of sanguis to describe familial relationships is certainly in evidence in
authors from Cicero onwards. It occurs more often in poetry and refers to both
connections between members of the immediate family and to those between
individuals and their distant ancestors. The exact meaning of sanguis is often difficult
to establish in these ancient authors, where issues of familial connection (particularly
between noble families) blur into possible ethnic connections, but in Valerius
Maximus the sense is clear. Valerius Maximus uses sanguis to describe familial
relations at an unprecedented rate in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia and his use of
the term nearly always involves weighing the importance of this relationship and
other demands. We appear to have an author particularly interested in sanguis itself as
a means of defining familial groups and who is also intrigued by the exact meaning of
such a relationship. It is not a large conceptual step between applying such an idea to
the family and applying it to the tribe, the city or the state and this, as we shall see, is
exactly what Valerius goes on to do.

Before the racial usage of sanguis is discussed however, it is worth examining
exactly what shared possession of blood between any kind of group members might
entail. Is this simply the equivalent of a name, shared between members of a group
and largely symbolic because it is shared between members, or does sanguis between
individuals also entail certain shared characteristics? This is particularly relevant for the conception of race because, as has been discussed in chapter Two: 'Born Outsiders: Looks and Locations', much of the research into ancient ideas of race has been connected to the physical manifestations of group membership.

**Characteristics in the Blood**

Greek and Roman authors frequently draw connections between blood and particular visible or invisible characteristics. The blood of animals for instance, is described in medical writings as having applications closely connected to the perceived qualities of the animal in question. Celsus’ use of blood as a remedy posits a close connection between blood and characteristics. At 6.6.39, Celsus recommends pigeon, dove and swallow blood to treat injuries to the eye that have resulted in the eye-ball being suffused with blood. The logic behind the application is that these birds have very sharp eyesight, and the quality is assumed to be present in, and even transferable via, the medium of their blood. Pliny the Elder records similar applications of various birds’ blood as a treatment for bloodshot eyes and specifies that the blood of male pigeons cures night-blindness in human beings (Nat. 29.126 and 127). Even where there is no obvious connection between the characteristics of an animal and the applications of their blood in a medical sense, the care with which the blood of particular animals is specified for particular problems indicates that the blood of different creatures is thought to possess distinct and peculiar qualities. Books 29 and 30 of Pliny’s *Naturalis Historia* are replete with instructions for the use of animals’ blood for conditions as diverse as smelly armpits (treated with blood from lambs’ testicles at 30.41), gout (weasels’ blood at 30.76), bleeding from the brain (the blood of geese at 29.114 and alternatively the blood of cocks at 30.112), epilepsy (tortoise blood at 32.35) and bald patches (the blood of flies at 29.106 and ravens at 29.110).

*Sanguis* not only has medical properties, but is also linked to various magical and semi-magical procedures. Perhaps unsurprisingly it is advised that if you rub a woman’s thighs with the blood of ticks fed on black bulls she will become disgusted with the idea of sex (28.256); similarly, leaving the blood of a cock under the bed will prove a turn-off for both genders (30.142). In more public applications, the blood of a
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36 The blood of pigeons is also said to have a positive effect, specifically a cleansing effect, at Cels. 5.5.
wolf spread around the fields will deter other wolves (28.266), hyena blood painted on the door-posts will avert magic (28.104), the blood of stags, when burnt, will deter snakes and the blood of basilisks has any number of wonderful qualities (29.66). In some of these instances the mental connection is more obvious, it is for instance rather appropriate that the blood of weasels should be used to call down a curse of universal hatred (28.105), but there appears to be no immediately apparent reason why horse blood should be corrosive to human skin (28.242). Whatever the exact reason behind the properties of each animal’s blood, it is evident that the animals are selected because their blood is believed to have particular qualities.

The same logic is applied to the blood of human beings in particular situations and occupations. At 3.23.7 Celsus details the use of gladiators’ blood as a treatment or cure for epilepsy. The fact that gladiatorial blood should be specified – based upon occupation – suggests that the blood is somehow altered by or impregnated with, the gladiators’ experiences and actions. Pliny records the same treatment even more vividly and describes the blood of gladiators as providing "viventia pocula," suggesting a connection to the hyper-masculinity and virility of these figures (Nat. 28.4)\textsuperscript{37}. Both writers treat this idea with some reluctance or distaste, but neither expresses any doubt about the treatment’s efficacy, or the reasoning underpinning it. Thus the blood’s qualities are linked to the occupations and behaviours of the individuals from which it comes.

In line with these ‘scientific’ usages of blood as a carrier of qualities, Valerius Maximus refers to the power of sanguis to transfer physical characteristics between parents and their children. He does not commit himself to the idea, but mentions it as one theory on the cause of similarity between parents and children:

\textit{eorumque alii in ea sunt opinione ut existiment illam origini et contextui sanguinis respondere, nec parvum argumentum ex ceteris animalibus trahunt, quae fere gignentibus similia nascentur} (9.14.pr).

\textsuperscript{37} Celsus’ description implies that the blood should be collected from a newly dead gladiator - \textit{Quidam iugulati gladiatoris calido sanguine epoto tali morbo se liberarunt} (3.23.7). Pliny’s description makes the process vivid; he describes the blood as \textit{calidus} and \textit{spirans} and even depicts patients kneeling down to suck blood directly from the gladiator’s wounds (Nat. 28.4). Possibly this suggests that the nearer the fighter is to life, the more potently are his experiences and qualities present in his blood. This could be the difference between the applications of the blood of an animal, which is valued for its actual nature (Pliny records methods for storing tortoise blood at Nat. 32.33), and that of a human whose activities and occupation impart value to the blood.
Thus the possibility is raised that sanguis functions as a ‘carrier’ for bodily traits but the exempla Valerius presents do not support such an idea. As seen in the Facta et Dicta, Valerius Maximus does not conceive of ethnic groupings in terms of physical characteristics. On every level in the text, behaviour is more significant than birth: this is also reflected in his usage of blood.

The scientific connection between qualities and sanguis is echoed in the rhetorical usage of blood as the element of the body intimately connected to an individual’s status and behaviour. In Petronius’ Satyricon the idea of ‘servile’ blood arises. In a fragment at 113 one character proclaims on the behaviour of another: “Si quid ingenui sanguinis habes, non pluris illam facies, quam scortum. Si vir fueris, non ibis ad spintriam.” Livy describes an army of freed slaves who, through the leadership and training of Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, forgot their genus et sanguis and fought bravely against the Carthaginians (26.2). Servile blood is seen as incompatible with certain behaviour, which is, by implication, suitable only for those of free blood. This is especially interesting because there is no guarantee that servilis sanguis indicates anything about the familial line of a slave.

Blood can also be used rhetorically to underline their qualities and this is particularly true when that blood is being spilt. Ovid has Polyxena declare that her liber sanguis will make a sacrifice more pleasing to the gods (Met. 13.467-9). On both occasions when Ovid refers to generosus sanguis the blood in question is also literal blood; Polyxena encourages Achilles’ son to shed her generosus sanguis in sacrifice in the same scene where her blood is described as liber (Met. 13.457) and Lucretia’s generosus sanguis is pictured dripping from the blade with which she has killed herself in the Fasti (2.839-90). Ovid wants to underline the positive characteristics of the women and he does so by attributing these characteristics to their blood; at the moment of death Polyxena’s and Lucretia’s blood is imbued with their free birth and nobility – the very factors that led to their deaths.

Blood can also be used to reflect individuals’ behaviour, even when this is unrelated to qualities such as freedom or nobility technically associated with the familial line. Lucretia once again provides an example of this usage: Brutus swears an oath to avenge his dead wife on her castissimus sanguis; the blood takes on the

38 For further discussion of this passage, see the chapter Two: ‘Looks and Locations’ on somatic similarity as a method of determining group membership, 33-36.
characteristic of *castitas* because Lucretia has chosen to kill herself as a punishment for the violation of her chastity (Liv. 1.59.1). In a similar vein, Ovid notes that the goddess Artemis can only be appeased with *virgineus sanguis* (Met. 12.28). Blood can also rhetorically register negative tendencies. In one of Phaedrus’ fables a boar states that he will not avenge an insult from an ass because he is unwilling to stain himself with *ignavus sanguis* – a status arising from the ass’ basic identity (Phaed. 1.29.9-11)\(^39\). Similarly, Ovid uses *sanguis* to underline the criminality of Pyreneus when he depicts the man jumping from the tower in which he has attempted to imprison the Muses and splattering the rocks below with his *sceleratus sanguis* (Met. 5.293). There may be no actual scientific link between blood and behaviour in these cases, but the rhetoric suggests that writers are familiar with the idea of using *sanguis* as a means of embodying individuals’ qualities and actions. In these writers the behaviour of individuals – good or bad – accords completely with their blood’s character.

Valerius Maximus uses *sanguis* in this sense on a few occasions in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* and always to contrast the positive qualities of individuals with their circumstances. He twice refers to free blood and once describes blood as noble or exalted. At 5.4.7, Valerius tells the story of a woman *sanguinis ingenui* who is condemned to death but saved by the *pietas* of her daughter; here her free birth adds to the horror of her situation as she is led into prison to await strangulation – it suggests the seriousness of her crime and the humiliation of her punishment. This is important for the progress of the *exemplum*, as her situation is pitiable enough to prevent the executioner from carrying out the sentence. It also leads him to allow her daughter to visit and keep her mother alive via breast-feeding. Valerius underlines his point – that *pietas* increases in glory as its context becomes harsher and more squalid – by contrasting the woman’s birth and her fate: *ingenuus sanguis* should not find itself in such a desperate situation\(^40\).

The *ingenuus sanguis* of Gemellus is also contrasted with a sordid and disgraceful environment but in this case it is an environment of his own making. Gemellus is accused of taking on a role *intra servilem habitum* by opening a brothel in his own house staffed by Mucia, Fulvia and a noble boy called Saturninus (9.1.8).

\(^39\) In Petronius’ *Satyricon* too, Giton and Encolpius are to appease the sea gods with their *vilissimus sanguis* for the unlucky act of cutting their hair on board during the night. Here the *vilissimus* seemingly encompasses the slave status indicated by their disguises but refers more pointedly to the bad behaviour Eumolpus attributes to them (105).

\(^40\) 5.4.7: *nulla enim acerbitate Fortunae, nullis sordibus pretium carae pietatis evilescit; quin etiam eo certius quo miserius experimentum habet.*
Here Valerius once again uses Gemellus’ free blood as a contrast with his behaviour. The free blood of Gemellus is essentially meaningless because he chooses to behave like a slave. Gemellus’ behaviour is far more revealing than the circumstances of his birth. Once again at 4.6.ext.3 *illustris sanguis* finds itself in a prison. The wives of the Minyae visit their husbands in jail on the eve of their execution and then let the men escape disguised in female clothing. Valerius comments the women were of *illustris sanguis* at Sparta, explaining how they were able to gain access to the prison to see their husbands and emphasising the nobility of the conjugal loyalty that led them to willingly remain in prison in place of their fugitive husbands.

Both the ‘scientific’ and rhetorical instances discussed above use *sanguis* as a means of showing the qualities of the individual – it becomes an index that demonstrates and carries their nature, status and characteristics. The role of *sanguis* in the transmission and formation of these qualities is also discussed more explicitly. Sassi describes the impact of the quality of blood as perceived by ancient thinkers on the qualities of both animals and human beings.\(^1\) Aristotle in the *Partes de Animalibus* states $\pi \lambda \alpha \lambda \nu \delta \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \alpha \Rightarrow \tau \Leftrightarrow \alpha$. "το $\alpha \mu \alpha \tau \omega \phi \sigma \omega \kappa \alpha \Leftrightarrow \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \psi \omega \\tau \alpha \omega \zeta \omega \omega \kappa \alpha \Leftrightarrow \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \\tau \alpha \\alpha \circ \psi \eta \pi \nu \nu \end{array} \right\} (651a10-15)$. In the previous sections he has specified some of the different kinds of blood possessed by various animals and the effect this blood has upon their behaviour and character. The first division he makes is between thick, warm blood that creates strength and thin, cold blood that creates sensitivity and intelligence (648a1-5); the ideal combination is hot, thin blood that renders the animal in which it flows both brave and intelligent (648a10-15).

Aristotle returns to the quality of blood after an excursus on heat and cold; the next division is between blood that is watery and that which is fibrous. The former kind of blood gives animals a tendency to fearfulness and the latter a tendency towards passion (650b25-651a10). This passion appears to be specially connected to anger and aggression, as Aristotle offers bulls and boars as examples of animals with large quantities of fibres in their blood.\(^2\)

In the above model, blood’s intrinsic quality is clearly connected to differences between the behaviour and constitution of various animals. In discussions of the differences between human beings however Greek writers generally appear to


\(^2\) Aristotle’s use of these and similar factors to construct theories of race are further elaborated in chapter Two ‘Looks and Locations’, 40-42.
be interested in the effect of different environments on the physiology of different peoples. Thus Greek authors discuss the moisture content of human bodies in different environments, and the effect of heat or cold in burning or freezing the skin and hair but blood is not specifically addressed in terms of its interaction with the environment and its manifestation of environmental effects. Interestingly, in the remaining texts and fragments, blood seems to appear in detailed discussion of environmental theory and its impact on the human body only in Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* (written between 27 and 23 BCE) and the much later Roman author Vegetius’ work *Epitoma Rei Militaris* (*4th*-5th Century CE). There is also one reference to the action of blood, albeit with a mythological explanation, in an environmental context in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

In these authors the *sanguis* of individuals leads to various ethnic behavioural tendencies and there is even an attempt to explain how the quality of blood creates these characteristics. When Vitruvius describes the impact of different geographical conditions upon the human body he separates out the general heat or coolness of the body, and the influence of these temperatures on resistance to disease, from the role of blood. It is particularly the quantity of this substance that is specifically linked to the degree of courage an individual will display in a military situation. Vitruvius argues that the peoples of the South, who are close to the sun, possess *sanguis exigua* as a result of the heat. This *exiguitas* of blood is directly responsible for their timidity in battle. Conversely, those from the North are said to be full of blood and for this reason very brave in battle: *sanguinis autem abundantia ferro resistunt sine timore* (6.1.4).

Vegetius too, unsurprisingly given the theme of his work, is concerned with the effect of different climates on men’s military capabilities. Vegetius treats the connection between blood and courage more explicitly than Vitruvius. He argues that those in hot climates are parched by the heat and have little blood; the reason for their cowardice then is that they are naturally afraid of losing any of their small supply of blood in war. Those far from the sun on the other hand have plenty of blood and
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44 I have elected to include the latter author simply because his ideas, although closely connected to those of Vitruvius, otherwise stand out as extremely unusual in the Roman world.

45 Vitr. 6.1.4: *...itaque etiam propter sanguinis exiguitatem timidiores sunt ferro resistere...*
proportionally little fear of losing it. Thus the effects of environment are manifested in the blood of various peoples and this blood in turn has a definite impact on their behaviour and demeanour. Ovid’s use of sanguis in the context of environmental theory does not relate to behaviour or military potential but somatic appearance. Ovid in the Metamorphoses is recounting the ill-fated attempt of Phaethon to drive the Sun’s chariot when he comments Sanguine tum credunt in corpora summa vocato / Aethiopum populos nigrum traxisse colorem (2.235-6). Phaethon, by driving his father’s chariot too near the earth, at one stroke creates the arid deserts of Africa and marks the people of that region – inhabitants and environment are both shaped by the proximity of the sun. The sun’s nearness has the effect of drawing the Ethiopians’ blood to the surface of the skin and thus staining that skin black. The blood, under the influence of the environment, creates a visual symbol of group membership. This image is by no means the central point of Ovid’s story but it reveals a tendency to see physical characteristics of various peoples as a result of the combined effects of sanguis and climate that matches the ideas present in both Vitruvius and Vegetius.

Racial Blood

The use made of sanguis by Vitruvius, Vegetius and Ovid brings us to the idea of attributing a particular type of blood to ethnic, national or racial groups. This subject is difficult because of the use that has been made of this conception of blood over the last two hundred years. North American categorisation of individuals by the proportion of ‘negro blood’ they possessed and the slavery that was so closely aligned to these ideas, together with the Nazi concept of ‘Reinblutigkeit’, means that the connection between blood and race is firmly fixed in the modern mind and frequently accompanied by intense discomfort. This leads to two different and opposed tendencies in those speaking about the subject. The first is a tendency to apply this concept without analysis to the ancient world because it is a customary figure of

46 Veget. 1.2: Omnes nationes, quae vicinae sunt soli, nimio calore siccatas, amplius quidem sapere, sed minus habere sanguinis dicunt ac propiterea constantiam ac fiduciam comminus non habere pugnandi, quia metuunt vulnera qui exiguum sanguinem se habere noverunt. Contra septentrionales populi, remoti a solis ardoribus, inconsultiore quidem, sed tamen largo sanguine redundantes, sunt ad bella promptissimi. Tirones igitur de temperatioribus legendi sunt plagis, quibus et copia sanguinis suppetat ad vulnerum morisque contemptum et non possit deesse prudentia, quae et modestiam servat in castris et non parum prodest in dimicatione consiliis.

speech. Montagu’s article ‘The Myth of Blood’ discusses the enduring prevalence in the modern world of the concept that ‘racial’ groupings are intrinsically created and defined by the presence of certain kinds of blood.

This can be illustrated in a recent work by referring to the index of Edith Hall’s *Inventing the Barbarian*. There is an entry under ‘B’ in the Index that reads “Blood, shared in ethnicity” which directs the reader to a section entitled ‘Proofs of Ethnicity’. In this section, Hall uses the term blood several times, and the initial reference to Herodotus 8.114 and his use of the concept ίματο is entirely justified.

So too is the reference to Euripides, *Phoenissae* 247 where the author refers to κοινόν αΣια. However, these seem to be the only occasions where the sources she references explicitly use the concept of blood. In addition, in the line from Euripides the point is a familial relationship via Cadmus, rather than ethnicity. The first footnote of the section gives a source for the assumption that shared blood is a major idea in ethnicity outside of Herodotus: “On the importance to subjective ethnicity of the idea of a common descent, see Keyes 1981B, pp.5-7”. Keyes does indeed argue some idea of descent is central to ethnic self-perception, but he also argues that this descent is by no means literal or connected to actual familial groupings – the context in which blood relationships are most widely described. The language of Hall’s index therefore has a fundamental problem: even if we accept that descent is central to ethnic identity, this should not tempt us to adopt the language of blood, with all its modern associations, as a general term for ethnicity in the ancient world. In fact, Keyes’ argument that this descent is often metaphorical actively distances it from the idea of ‘literal’ blood-familial relationships. The entry in Hall’s index appears then misleading as regards the connection between ethnicity and blood while the power of a modern figure of speech to put in shadow the evidence of the texts themselves is clear.

In contrast, Lloyd Thompson has in past publications reacted vehemently against the idea blood had any racial sense in the Roman world. In the abstract of his
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50 Ibid, For instance, 174 and 177.
51 Ibid. 172.
52 Ibid. 174.
53 Ibid.172 n.39.
article ‘Roman Perceptions of Blacks’ he concludes by stating “Categorisation was determined by the physical appearance of the individual person, not by parentage or ‘blood’.”

The rejection of blood, and specifically ‘black blood’ as a determiner of race is reiterated throughout the article and picks up on Thompson’s concerns in an earlier article ‘The Concept of Purity of Blood in Suetonius’ Life of Augustus’. This article is concerned with the following passage at Aug. 40.3:

> Magni praeterea existimans sincerum atque ab omni colluvione peregrini ac servilis sanguinis incorruptum servare populum, et civitates Romanas parcissime dedit et manumittendi modum terminavit.

The passage is also mentioned in ‘Roman Perception of Blacks’ and in both cases Thompson takes issue with other historians’ readings of this passage as dealing with ‘purity of blood’. Thompson instead argues that this passage refers to Augustus’ desire for Roman citizens to be proficient in Latin and culturally adapted to Roman society. He flatly rejects the idea that this is an instance of ‘Reinblutigkeit’: “The dominant considerations are social and cultural.”

Certainly the application of such notorious concepts to the ancient world should be treated with a great deal of caution, but it is possible to take this caution too far. Thompson is so eager to avoid modern implications of blood as a racial concept that he fails to treat Suetonius’ choice of construction.

Even if we accept (as Thompson seems to be doing) that Suetonius at Aug. 40.3 is simply employing a metaphor that has nothing to do with blood descent and ideas of blood ‘pollution’ but instead refers to the cultural makeup of Roman society, from where does Suetonius draw his metaphor? Especially given Thompson’s assertion in Romans and Blacks that the Roman concept of blood was not connected to ‘race’ descent. Suetonius uses a metaphor (at least) of blood pollution, so the conceptual framework of blood pollution must have been available from some source.

---

59 Thompson, L.A. Romans and Blacks (Norman, 1989) 33-34 and 82-4.
Thompson flirts with this problem in his reference to Livy's passages at 4.1-2 and 1.7 but sidesteps it, proclaiming "The underlying concept of purity of blood, of course, includes the belief that blood is the part of the organism that determines a person's quality...But it is not a concept of 'Reinblutigkeit' in any racialist sense."60. With this he moves on to dismiss the relevance of "purity of blood" in any legislation prohibiting marriage between various parties.

If this is so, it must be asked why Suetonius did not speak of the infestation of foreign religion customs or language as he does elsewhere (Tib. 36 and 71)61. Surely there must be some kind of accepted idea present as a reference point for the metaphor. In this sense, Thompson seems to be doing his best to ignore the reason he was presumably drawn to the Suetonius passage in the first place: because it is an unusual use of *sanguis* for author and era. As such, it certainly deserves more recognition of deliberation and consideration on the part of Suetonius than Thompson is prepared to give it. As we have seen, *sanguis* is used by Roman authors as a means of conveying the connections between familial members. *Sanguis* is also – as its usage in both prose and poetry conveys – capable of carrying the physical and moral qualities of an individual. Thus it is not unrealistic to assume that wider groups in an ethnic or national sense could be referred to in the terminology of family relation, and that their physical characteristics could be linked to the possession of this blood. Thompson's violent rejection of *sanguis* as having any kind of racial sense seems unwarranted.

That said, *sanguis* is not commonly used in authors previous to, and contemporary with, Valerius Maximus to signify ethnic group membership. Even where it seems to be used this way there is rarely certainty that ethnicity is at issue because the ancients did not draw our clear distinctions in this area. The reader is frequently left with a sense that *sanguis* is being used as a tool to distinguish group membership but without an exact sense of which group is at issue – until we come to the uses of *sanguis* in Valerius that definitely relate to ethnic or national groupings. The slippery nature of *sanguis* up to this point is best elaborated by examining the

61 Likewise, why - given that Livy uses the term *sanguis* very sparingly in anything other than a literal sense - does he choose to use it when he is speaking about the admixture of different societal groups in the passages mentioned above?
Chapter Three

ethnic and national uses of *sanguis* in Roman writers before the time of Valerius Maximus.

Virgil’s usage of *sanguis* to define national or ethnic groups has much in common with his use of *sanguis* as a familial marker. The emphasis on descent and lineage in both cases often obscures the boundaries imposed in the modern world between ethnic and familial uses of blood, particularly as Virgil is portraying a world composed largely of aristocrats and their families. Thus, when Venus reproaches Jupiter for the hardships visited on Aeneas by referring to his promise that *certe hinc Romanos olim volventibus annis, / hinc fore ductores, revocato a sanguine Teucri...* (1.234-235), she certainly refers to Teucrians (Trojans) as a whole, but she also refers to Aeneas’ direct line of personal descent from Teucer. This sense is strengthened because the adjective formed from *Teucer* is used very rarely, and thus, while Virgil can (and does) qualify *sanguis* with *Troianus*, on this occasion he uses the construction *sanguis Teucri* – the blood of Teucer – a construction that consolidates the idea of Teucer as an historic individual and with it the idea of familial lineage. When the same construction is applied to Aeneas individually, the sense must be read as familial because not to do so would ignore Aeneas’ own lineage. In other cases throughout the *Aeneid* the blood in question is characterised with terms that were originally personal names but have also become firmly connected to peoples and places. Thus Tros is the figure behind Troy, but the usage as a city name might be assumed to have overwhelmed any familial references as with Dardanus and the eponymous territory of Dardania.

The sense of descent that dominates even these examples is unavoidably connected to Virgil’s use of *sanguis* as an indicator of personal lineage. Virgil does not refer to ethnic or national groups with *sanguis* unless he is doing so to indicate that people’s lineage. Thus the Roman people are said to be fated to arise *Troiano a sanguine* (1.19). On an individual level, Acestes is identified with the same construction (1.550) and Clausus is *Sabinorum prisco de sanguine* (7.706). Similarly, Aeneas is described by the gossips of Carthage as *Troiano sanguine cretus* and the
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62 The line of descent from Teucer is as follows: Teucer – Batia – Erechthonius – Tros – Assaracus – Capys – Anchises – Aeneas.

63 A. 1.19, 1.550 and 4.191.

64 See A. 1.235, 4.230 and in a literal usage at 2.366.

65 4.230-231: *... genus alto a sanguine Teucri / proderet...* So too when Aeneas speaks to Deiphobus, a direct descendant of Teucer, in the underworld *Deiphobe armipotens, genus alto a sanguine Teucri...* (6.500-501).
Trojan leader addresses his men as *Dardanidae magni, genus alto a sanguine divom* (5.45). This last usage again shows the close relationship between ethnic and familial lines in Virgil's epic. The Trojan band are Dardanians in so much as they come from the region of that name, but Aeneas goes on to identify his men as a *genus alto a sanguine divom*. The next obvious question is the exact identity of these gods, and gods can be found most simply in the family line of Dardanus who is the son of Atlas. The reader is then tempted to establish the exact identity of the Trojan band and their family trees' constitution. While I would not want to suggest that all of Aeneas' comrades were descended from Dardanus (nor undertake an investigation to support this assertion), this line demonstrates the way familial and racial uses of *sanguis* irresistibly lean towards one another in the *Aeneid*.

The importance of descent in Virgil's use of *sanguis* is not limited to the Trojans. As Virgil lists the men who have come to contest the foot-race at the commemorative games for Anchises in book five, he identifies Patron as *alter ab Arcadio Tegeaeae sanguine gentis* (5.298-299). Here the ethnicity of Patron's descent is described in terms of two connected elements: he possesses Arcadian blood and comes from a Tegeate family. This does not provide a clear division into ethnic and geographical categories however, as both blood and family are qualified by ethnic adjectives: the wider region of Arcadia defines Patron's blood and the town of Tegea defines his family. The important point is that when blood is qualified with ethnic terms in the *Aeneid* it is used in the same way as familial blood - to indicate an individual's lineage and social status. Thus just as the marriage of Lavinia and Aeneas is depicted in terms of the combination of familial lines identified with *sanguis* at 7.98-101, so their marriage can be depicted in terms of the mixture of two different ethnic 'types' of blood

In the Underworld, Anchises points out Silvius (Aeneas' first son with Lavinia) to Aeneas and describes the shade as *Italo commixtus sanguine surget* (6.762). The question of status and its connection to *sanguis* is emphasised in book Ten where Virgil describes the make-up of Mantua from three gentes of which Mantua is the capital and has strength *Tusco de sanguine* (10.202-203)
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66 Also at 12.838-40.
67 The exact reasoning behind this assertion is somewhat difficult to ascertain. The *sanguis* part of the line is fairly clearly racial but why Mantua should have predominance is uncertain apart from Virgil's personal connection to the city. Sidgwick suggests that Mantua is the head of a league of twelve states "belonging to three original races, of which the Tuscans were chief" Sidgwick, A. *Aeneidos Liber X* (Cambridge, 1884) 35 n.202. Anthon similarly argues that the Tuscans were predominant amongst the Mantuans Anthon, C. *The Aeneid of Virgil* (London, 1859) 505 n.203. Harrison makes the interesting
sanguis in Virgil is deployed in almost exactly the same fashion as familial sanguis; in order to provide the pedigrees of heroes and to establish the history of heroic lands. It is a tool for identifying and legitimising individuals and peoples within their social context and positioning them within the epic parade of history leading to Augustan Rome.

In contrast to his enthusiastic use of sanguis as a familial indicator, Ovid uses blood as an ethnic or national term on only a couple of occasions. In these cases the sense is somewhat different from that conveyed by Virgil. In Paris’ epistle to Helen he compares the wealth and beauty of Phrygia with that of Sparta and on these grounds goes on to plead with her not to despise a Phrygius maritus. He supports this plea with evidence of famous and desirable Phrygians, opening the argument with the (perhaps dubious) example of Ganymedes: Phryx erat et nostro genitus de sanguine, qui nunc / Cum dis potando nectare miscet aquas (Ep. 16.197-8). While Paris is distantly related to Ganymedes, the prior comparison of countries makes it clear that in this instance sanguis is a means of distinguishing the Phrygian (Trojan) group from all other groups and promoting its own particular appeal. \(^{68}\)

The second example of an ethnic or national use of sanguis is much more interesting in terms of Valerius’ use of sanguis. The reference comes from the Tristia and in this poem Ovid pleads with Augustus to allow him to serve out his exile in another region of the empire, one more civilised and safer than Tomis where the Princeps had sent the poet. Ovid argues he is in danger from the native inhabitants and asserts fas prohibet Latio quemquam de sanguine natum / Caesaribus salvis barbara vincla pati (Tr. 2.205-206). Ovid defines himself as possessing Latius sanguis (he was from Sulmo in the territory of the Paelignians) and no matter what Ovid’s personal faults or mistakes, his sanguis is unchanged and gives him a certain status. This Latin status – Ovid doesn’t claim Roman blood here or elsewhere – ought to protect Ovid from particular kinds of treatment. He argues fas will not allow one of blood such as his to be bound with barbarian chains. The possession of Latin blood demands better and the Princeps is duty-bound to protect it. Augustus, however, evidently did not find the argument convincing.

suggesting that the passage means that “Mantua’s fighting strength comes from its Etruscan stock” and thus the vis mentioned is a fairly literal kind of force. Harrison, S.J. Vergil: Aeneid 10 (Oxford, 1991) 125 n.203.

\(^{68}\) Ganymedes is the son of either Tros or Assaracus, depending on the version of the story which is accepted and both men are great-great-uncles of Paris.
Cicero, however, eighty years earlier expresses an even wider idea that the claim to a common blood deserving of preferential treatment and protection is justified. The fifth book of Cicero’s Second *Actio In Verrem* contains a clarion call based on the assumption that Romans share a certain kind of blood as a result of their very Romanness:

Paulo ante, iudices, lacrimas in morte misera atque indigna nauarchorum non tenebamus, et recte ac merito sociorum innocentium miseria commovebamur: quid nunc in nostro sanguine tandem facere debemus? Nam civium Romanorum omnium sanguis coniunctus existimandus est, quoniam et salutis omnium ratio et veritas postulat (5.172).

Not only is the protection of Roman *sanguis* necessary for general safety, but it is demanded by *veritas*, just as Ovid demands protection for his blood in the name of *fas*. Cicero asserts that the connections of blood between Roman citizens should be regarded as indisputably valid. This remarkable statement, made in defence of Publius Gavius, a Roman citizen from a *municipium* in Italy, is not paralleled anywhere else in the work of Cicero. The only other usage of *sanguis* in any kind of national or ethnic sense uses the blood as a method of sly abuse, not protection. On this occasion in 57 BCE, Cicero separates Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus out from the rest of the Pisones, explaining his debased character and behaviour as a result of the *Transalpinus sanguis* inherited through his mother’s line (*Sen*.15). Ethnic blood is again underlined as a key factor in the evaluation of an individual; if the ethnicity of that blood is Roman it is deserving of protection and constitutes a bond between all citizens of the *Res Publica*. If the ethnicity of the blood is not Roman it may help to explain sub-standard, un-Roman behaviour in individuals who have it in their tainted veins.

These ideas encapsulated so strikingly, and so briefly, by an orator are not taken up with nearly such vigour by the historians following him. Livy’s three uses of *sanguis* in an ethnic or national sense are all focused on Etruria and the alliances between different cities in Etruria and the family of the Tarquins. Once again the emphasis on the Tarquin family means that familial, as well as national ties, are at issue. Tarquinius Superbus, on his expulsion from Rome, appeals to the people of Veii and Tarquinienses for aid; he justifies this appeal by referring to his own descent.
he claims that he is *ex se ortus* and possesses the *idem sanguis* as his audience (2.6.2). This certainly refers to Tarquinius’ line of descent: according to Livy his grandfather was actually a Corinthian called Demaratus who married a woman of Tarquinii, their son Lucumo also married a Tarquinian woman (1.34). Thus Tarquinius Superbus had three Tarquinian grandparents and his father’s adoption of Tarquinius as a name meant that his name as well as his familial line came from Tarquinii.

If we assume Tarquinius is consulting the nobility, and comes from the nobility then this use of *sanguis* could be interpreted as familial and here the position of Tanaquil (his mother) is relevant. Livy tells us Tanaquil was a woman *summo loco nata* (1.34.4) and this certainly confirms an aristocratic connection despite Lucumo’s less elevated position (1.34.5). The suspicion that a familial connection is at issue seems at first to be strengthened by the comment that follows where the Tarquinienses were influenced by their *cognatio* with Tarquinius Superbus (2.6.4). However, as the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* defines *cognatio* as “1 Blood-relationship, consanguinity, kinship. b a group of people related by blood, kinsfolk, relations” and it is the exact nature of a blood-relationship that we are trying to establish this is by no means conclusive. Both ethnic and familial senses of *sanguis* apply in this case, but given that Tarquinius is depicted as consulting with the Tarquinienses as a whole, rather than one group of the community, it is perhaps safest to assume that, at this point, Livy uses *sanguis* to refer to an ethnic or national connection. This ethnic connection is closely related to the idea of familial descent rather than culture or residence, given Tarquinius Superbus seems to have been born in Rome and to have spent his whole life as a member of Roman society.

The next use of *sanguis* that is of interest to us is quite similar to the first but more clearly ethnic or national, which may help to consolidate the ethnic sense of the previous usage. Livy writes that the family of the Tarquinii in 508 BCE had sought refuge with Lars Porsinna, king of Clusium and once again appealed to him for support: *nunc orabant ne se, oriundos ex Etruscis, eiusdem sanguinis nominisque, egentes exsulare pateretur* (2.9.1). As there is no obvious familial or nominal link in this case, we must interpret this as a reference to a wider relationship between fellow Etruscans, indicated by the preceding reference to the Tarquinii’s Etruscan origins.

---

This is confirmed in the following material. At 2.9.4, Livy reveals Porsinna's reasoning for his decision to support the Tarquini: *Porsinna cum regem esse Romae tutum, tum Etruscae gentis regem amplum Tuscis ratus, Romam infesto exercitu venit.*

The emphasis is again on the wider Etruscan *gens* and the Tarquini are considered as members of this group. In both this case and the example at 2.6.2 it is notable that Etruscan *sanguis* is depicted in terms of descent – keeping close to the use made of the word by Virgil in the *Aeneid*. It is also quite simply necessary if Livy is going to refer to Tarquinius Superbus and his Roman born sons as possessing Etruscan blood. This renders *sanguis* in an ethnic sense a powerful quality; it survives all of the Roman acculturation that Lucius Tarquinius Priscus proudly claimed to have received from King Ancus (1.35.4-5) and, in the case of Tarquinius Superbus' children, a Roman mother 70.

The last ethnic use of *sanguis* in the remaining works of Livy occurs when the peoples of Etruria meet to discuss whether they will send aid to Veii during their siege. Livy notes that the proposal was not widely supported because the Veientines had not consulted with the other towns of Etruria originally. Concessions are, however, due to *sanguinii...nominique* (5.17.9). The bond between Etruscans is phrased as a blood relationship, and this is again teamed with *nomen* as an alternative conceptualisation. This last example is the most straightforward use of blood as an ethnic grouping in Livy because it lacks the overtly familial dimensions of the Etruscan/Roman Tarquini and their ancestors.

Velleius Paterculus, a contemporary of Valerius Maximus, uses *sanguis* in an ethnic sense just once in his history of Rome. The issue of blood arises when Velleius describes conflict between the Italians and Romans. Velleius makes it clear that he agrees with the Italians' discontent at the lesser status they possessed in spite of their military contributions to Rome, contributions that had elevated the Romans to such an extent that *homines eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis ut externos alienosque fastidire posset* (2.15.2). There are a number of points to be made regarding this comment and the assumptions underpinning it. Firstly, it is assumed that *externi* and *alieni* will be set apart by their *gens* and *sanguis*, secondly that animosity or scorn can be assumed to be a natural reaction towards externals and thirdly, given the Italians' aim is to be

70 This does represent a significant departure from certain modern ideas of race on the basis of blood, which categorise individuals on the exact fraction of blood inherited from their parents and grandparents.
admitted to the Roman citizenship, Velleius accepts that the bestowal of citizenship is a recognition of the presence of common *sanguis* and *gens*. Finally, it is clear Velleius does not believe there is a difference in *sanguis* or *gens* between Romans and Italians. He opens the section by stating that *quorum (the Italians) ut fortuna atrox, ita causa fuit iustissima*... Thus while Velleius appears to accept *sanguis* as a marker of ethnic membership, on the one occasion where he draws attention to a *sanguis* connection between peoples he presents it as a fact Romans are too arrogant and ignorant to acknowledge.

*Sanguis* in authors preceding Valerius and writing contemporaneously infrequently represents an ethnic or national connection. Virgil uses it most heavily in this way – albeit exclusively within the *Aeneid*. The exact meaning of *sanguis*, however, is frequently difficult to establish; ethnic and national connections run closely beside familial connections in most of these instances and indicate how closely the two ideas were allied in ancient thought. Both uses of *sanguis* manifest a similar concentration upon describing the lineage of individuals and groups – *sanguis* is used to introduce and identify peoples with solid information about their place in the world. Predominantly ethnic uses of *sanguis* dissociated from aristocrats’ pedigrees appear only in Cicero, Ovid and Velleius Paterculus.

---

20 1.7 ext.1, 2.7.12, 2.8.8, 3.2.20, 3.1.13, 6.1.9 and 6.4 ext.1.
21 In the order given above these instances are 1.1 ext.2, 1.7 ext.7 and 6.3 ext.2, 6.2.1 and finally 6.2 ext.1.
Valerius Maximus uses *sanguis* – where there is no literal element present – to describe ethnic or national membership on twelve occasions in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*. Seven of these uses describe Roman blood, and five describe variously Punic, Greek, Italian and the simply non-Roman blood of an anonymous woman who appeals to Philip II. This selection of peoples is quite close to those of other authors who use *sanguis* as an ethnic determiner, with some distinctions. Virgil speaks of Trojan, Sabine, Arcadian, Italian and Tuscan blood, Ovid speaks of Phrygian (Trojan) and Latin blood, Cicero speaks of Roman and Transalpine blood, Livy of Etruscan, and Velleius of Italian/Roman, blood. Valerius’ inclusion of Punic blood is unusual as are his two references to general Greek blood, as opposed to any particular group within the Greeks. Unprecedented too is Valerius’ description of blood that is *alienigenus* – simply foreign with no further details. Valerius’ selection is also remarkable for the number of times that he refers to Roman blood; only Cicero has defined *sanguis* with the adjective *Romanus* prior to the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* and then on only one occasion (*Ver. 5.172*).

Punic, Greek, Italian, Latin and Campanian blood are distinguished explicitly from Roman blood in Valerius Maximus’ text, just as Etruscan blood is carefully delineated by Livy (2.6.2, 2.8.1 and 5.17.9). The distinction between Romans and Italians or Latins at this stage is particularly interesting. Writing at a similar time, Velleius Paterculus, as previously mentioned, rejects the distinction between Italians and Romans at 2.15.2 with the argument of shared blood. Presumably, given the closeness of some of the groups distinguished here by Valerius, the degree of somatic difference would have been negligible. We are, after all, dealing with Romans, Italians, Latins and Greeks in most of the cases. This does not seem to be a case of *sanguis* carrying and determining particular distinctive physical characteristics – the behaviour of blood does not explain distinctive dark skin as it does in Ovid’s account of Phaethon’s impact on the Aethiopes (*Met. 2.235-6*). Nor does a wider application of the familial role of blood explain the resemblance between members of particular ethnic groups as could be extrapolated from one theory of physical resemblance cited

---

72 1.7.ext.1, 2.7.12, 2.9.8, 3.2.20, 5.1.3, 6.1.9 and 6.4.ext.1.
73 In the order given above these instances are 1.1.ext.2, 1.7.ext.7 and 6.5.ext.2, 6.2.1 and finally 6.2.ext.1.
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in Valerius' own work (9.14.pr.) Just as these peoples would have been somatically similar, so too they come from the same basic geographical context. Thus any climatic theory of the differences between peoples being created and carried by their sanguis such as those mentioned by Vitruvius (6.1.4) and Vegetius (1.2) are inapplicable. Sanguis never accounts for strength or bravery in the Facta et Dicta and the only characteristics that Valerius links to sanguis seem to be firmly attached to familial relationships. Valerius Maximus seems to be using blood, irrespective of physical similarity or dissimilarity and irrespective of geographic origin, as a means of distinguishing between groups in a ethnic sense in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia both to a greater extent, and also in a very different way, from the authors from his period or before.

This is reflected in one striking distinction between the ethnic use of sanguis in other authors and the usage found in Valerius Maximus. When Virgil speaks of sanguis it is (as previously stated) very much a tool with which descent and lineage can be identified — whether on a familial or a national level. This is reflected in the grammatical form of the word: when sanguis is being used in an ethnic sense by Virgil it is always in the ablative case. This, in the majority of cases, is because sanguis is governed by a or ab75 and on one occasion by de (A. 7.706-9) — forms that are used to indicate the origin of an individual and his people. Twice the ethnically qualified ablative form of sanguis is teamed with the perfect passive participle of crescere meaning ‘arisen from’ or ‘born from’ (2.74-5 and 4.191-2). Twice sanguis is used with the perfect passive participle of commiscere and miscere and the verb surgere in order to demonstrate the creation of a new ethnic line from two different kinds of blood (6.760-66 and 12.838-40). Ovid uses sanguis in the same way at Ep.16.197-8 where Paris makes sanguis dependent on de in order to indicate the descent of Ganymede, and also in the Tristia when he describes himself as natus de Latio sanguine (2.205-6). Livy tends to use the genitive rather than the ablative but it conveys the same idea of origin, descent and connection; peoples are described as being eiusdem sanguinis (2.6.2 and 2.9.1).

In all of those texts included in the Teubner database there are just 33 uses of sanguis in the dative case (compare with the 569 instances in the genitive and 1592 of sanguis in the Facta et Dicta can be found at 21.7, 3.9.2 and 4.3.2).

74 Similarity of appearance between parents and their children is linked to sanguis at 9.14.pr. Aside from this, Valerius twice refers to ingemus sanguis (5.4.7 and 9.1.8) and once refers to illustriis sanguis (4.6.ext.3) all of which uses reference the status of the parent at the child's birth.

the ablative) only nine of which precede Valerius’ work or are contemporary with him. Integration of the material from the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* reveals no further instances of *sanguini* before Valerius or in his period. Nine of the 33 dative uses of *sanguis* in the Teubner catalogue (over a quarter of the total) come from Valerius Maximus. Furthermore, six of these uses of *sanguis* in the dative case are occasions on which Valerius uses *sanguis* in an ethnic or national sense. On two occasions the dative is required by the term *conveniens* (1.1.ext.2 and 2.9.8), on one occasion by the verb *insultare* and in three instances a dative of reference is employed. The difference between ablative and dative is significant. When *sanguis* in the ablative (or genitive) case is connected to familial or ethnic descent the usage is actually literal according to the understanding of ancient medicine. Blood as previously stated, was believed to pass from parent to child and thus the same model is simply applied on a larger scale when Romans are referred to as the blood descendants of the Trojans or of Numa Pompilius. Valerius’ use of *sanguis*, however, is removed from this model and more metaphorical. He uses the dative case of *sanguis* in order to demonstrate the behaviour or treatment appropriate for different ethnic and national groups. This reflects a fundamental difference between his usage of the term and that of other Roman writers; Valerius uses *sanguis* as a means of delineating the present group, and the ideas and actions appropriate to that group. It is a construction utterly disconnected from descent or lineage, concerned only with the present status of individuals and the way in which they behave.

Watts, in his article ‘Race Prejudice in the Satires of Juvenal’, takes Valerius Maximus as an example of “constant and insidious stereotyping of one race or another.” A comparison of Valerius’ use of *sanguis* with the same passages in his probable sources (where these sources have been identified) does reveal an interesting tendency on Valerius’ part. In every instance the explicit reference to group membership described as blood in Valerius Maximus’ text appears to be his own addition and does not feature in those authors who follow him. If we were to accept

76 Liv. 3.57.2, 4.60.1 and 5.17.9; Cic.*Phil.* 14.27 and *Div.* 2.58; Sen. *Con.* 7.5.15 and *Suas.* 6.5 and Cels.2.8 and 7.30.  
77 These ethnic or national dative uses of *sanguis* occur at 1.1.ext.2, 1.7.ext.1, 2.7.12, 2.9.8, 5.1.3 and 6.1.9. The remaining three dative uses of *sanguis* in the Facta et Dicta can be found at 21.7, 5.9.2 and 6.1.2. Interestingly in two of these cases *sanguis* is used to describe a familial relationship.  
78 See the first section of this chapter: ‘Blood Will Out’, 51-52.  
79Virg. *A.* 1.19 and Hor. *Ars.* 291-293 respectively.  
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Thompson’s argument that the idea of blood in ethnic or racial discourse is to be inextricably connected to racism and ideas of ‘blood purity’, then Watts’ assessment of Valerius might be said to deserve credence. As, however, Valerius determinedly removes the sense of descent or lineage from *sanguis* when he uses it to describe an ethnic group, it appears that there is something different altogether going on in his usage of the term. I will now discuss each of the ethnic uses of *sanguis* in the *Facta et Dicta* in comparison with different authors’ versions of the same material and taking into account the context of the word in Valerius’ work. As will become clear, in Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* blood is about behaviour, not birth.

Initially it is valuable to discuss two *exempla* in which the use of *sanguis*—because it can be compared with very similar constructions elsewhere—serve to demonstrate Valerius’ deliberate choice of blood as an ethnic determiner. These *exempla* also provide a hint of the way in which Valerius will deploy *sanguis* throughout the text. At 1.7.ext.7 the mother of Dionysius of Syracuse dreams she is bearing an infant satyr and is told of her child’s future pre-eminence amongst the Greeks: he will be the most outstanding and powerful of *Graius sanguis*:

*Tutioris somni mater eiusdem Dionysii. Quae cum eum conceptum utero haberet, parere visa est Satyriscum, consultoque prodigiorum interprete clarissimum ac potentissimum Graii sanguinis futurum certo cum eventu cognovit.*

When Cicero records the dream of Dionysius’ mother at *de Divinatione* 1.39 the idea of Grecian blood is absent. Instead Cicero describes Dionysius as *clarissimus Graeciae*. This phrasing puts Dionysius in the context of the nation of Greece but not in the blood-context presented by Valerius Maximus. The difference could be seen, as in Wardle’s commentary, as simply a re-phrasing of Cicero’s text by Valerius, but because Valerius’ usage of *sanguis* is unusual, the change of terms is significant. This impression is further enhanced by the adjective that is used to describe the blood of Dionysius; this is the first time in the remaining Latin sources that we have a reference to Greek blood as a whole. The closest that we come before this point is Virgil’s reference to Patron as having come from Arcadian blood in the *Aenéid* (5.299). Here Valerius refers to Dionysius of Syracuse as being a member of a much

---

larger blood-community with a term that is more usually found in the poets.\textsuperscript{82} Graius is only used on one other occasion in the \textit{Facta et Dicta} – in the next \textit{exemplum} that I will discuss where it is once again wedded to sanguis and refers to Themistocles (6.9.ext.2). The use of Graius suggests a poeticism on Valerius’ part; perhaps the kind of semi-Romantic image appropriate to a mother’s prophetic dream of success and the heroic status of Themistocles. While no other author prior to Valerius' period or during it qualifies sanguis with Graius, a very similar concept is visible in other authors who use different substantives with Graius. Lucretius addresses Epicurus with \textit{O Graiae gentis decus...}(3.3) at one point and there is also an intriguing parallel in Velleius Paterculus. In this case Velleius introduces Lycurgus as a man of pre-eminent importance and influence in Greek history in terms that are extremely close to Valerius' own: \textit{Ea aetate clarissimus Grai nominis Lycurgus Lacedaemonius...}(1.6.3). The construction that Valerius is using is not unusual, but he has made the very unusual decision of using sanguis instead of nomen or gens.

The reason behind Valerius’ decision in favour of blood is not immediately clear. It could perhaps be seen as providing a strictly defined context in which Dionysius of Syracuse can excel; while Cicero’s choice of clarissimus Graeciae strongly associates Dionysius with Greece, it does not do so in such an exclusive fashion as Valerius’ imagery. Similarly at 6.9.ext.2 Valerius Maximus’ version seems to introduce the limitation of the group over which an individual is pre-eminent. Here Themistocles is described as Graii sanguinis virorum clarissimus, despite his shaky youth:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Piget Themistoclis adolescentiam attingere, sive patrem aspiciam abdicationis iniungentem notam, sive matrem suspendio finire vitam propter filii turpitudinem coactam, cum omnium postea Graii sanguinis virorum clarissimus exstiterit, mediumque Europae et Asiae vel spei vel desperationis pignus fuerit: haec enim eum salutis suae patronum habuit, illa vadem victoriae adsumpsit.}
\end{quote}

In Nepos’ biography of Themistocles, no such limitation is present (\textit{Them.} 1.1f). He states that \textit{anteferatur huic nemo, pauci pares putentur}. The praise is not limited in sample or in time. By implication Themistocles stands in comparison with

\textsuperscript{82} Glare, P. G. W. \textit{Oxford Latin Dictionary} (Oxford, 1996) 770. The particular genitive form that Valerius uses with the double ‘i’ ending is especially rare.
pre-eminent Romans as well as Greeks. This doesn’t seem to be the case in Valerius’ account; the attributes of both men are set in, and limited to, the context of those of their own blood. Valerius’ choice of terms with which to praise Themistocles and Dionysius of Syracuse however, are suggestive of striking liberality rather than the limitation of foreign glory. In Valerius’ text *clarissimus* is overwhelmingly applied to Romans and Roman achievements[^83]; this is not surprising given its technical application in the empire as an honorific designation for those of senatorial rank[^84]. Nevertheless Valerius does choose *clarissimus* to describe Dionysius of Syracuse, Themistocles, Socrates (twice), Xenocrates and Aeschines[^85]. The limitation that Valerius creates by describing Dionysius and Themistocles as the most outstanding men of Greek blood is undercut with an adjective that puts their achievements into the same context as those of prominent Romans. *Sanguis* in these two cases, in part because it represents an unusual preference on Valerius’ part, draws attention to the limits of an ethnic group and then confounds these limits. Themistocles and Dionysius of Syracuse are presented as excelling only within the context of Greek blood, but they are praised with the terminology of Roman excellence.

Valerius’ use of *sanguis* in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is on occasion more overtly subversive. 1.1.2. relates the story of Masinissa’s pious restoration of tusks taken from the shrine of Juno and presented to him by his over-eager subordinates:

> At non similiter Masinissa rex. Cuius cum praefectus classis Melitam appulisset et aequae ex fano Iunonis dentes eburneos eximiae magnitudinis sublatos ad eum pro dono attulisset, ut comperit unde essent adventi, quinqueremi reportandos Melitam inque templo Iunonis collocandos curavit, insculptos gentis suae litteris significantibus regem ignorantem eos accepsisse, libenter deae reddidisse. Factum Masinissae animo quam Punico sanguini conveniens!

[^83]: *Clarissimus* is used of externals and external achievements on eight occasions in the text; it is used of Romans and their achievements a total of 32 times.


[^85]: Of Dionysius at 1.7.7, of Themistocles at 6.9.2, of Socrates at 3.4.1 and 6.4.2, of Xenocrates’ eloquence at 6.9.1 and of the voice of Aeschines while orating at 8.10.1.

Additionally *clarissimus* is used to describe the provinces of Achaea and Macedonia at 7.5.4 and an external general (presumably Aristomenes of Messene) at 1.8.18.
Valerius as he praises Masinissa explicitly contrasts the king’s piety with his Punic blood, attributing the action rather to Masinissa’s personal animus. The only other occasion on which an author prior to, or contemporary with, Valerius refers to sanguis in an abstract sense in relation to the Carthaginians comes from Livy and there it is used to suggest the familial line of the Barca dynasty (Liv. 21.10.3).

This exemplum seems to be closely based upon Cicero Ver. 2.4.103 although Valerius has shifted the focus more closely onto Masinissa himself.

Cicero’s text creates a contrast between behaviour and birth because the story appears in the context of a list of C. Verres’ (pr. 74) impious and outrageous acts. Cicero specifies that the temple had been safe non modo illis Punicis bellis but etiam from contemporary pirate gangs. Cicero repeats etiam when he introduces the story of Masinissa’s piety. Warfare leaves the temple untouched, it is safe from pirates and even Masinissa respects Juno’s temple, Verres however acts with contempt for the sanctity of the place. Cicero’s specification of the temple’s safety in the Punic wars and his statement that etiam Masinissa honoured the temple implies that Masinissa made his pious gesture while he was still an enemy of Rome, prior to switching his alliances from Carthage to Rome in 206. The connection between Masinissa and the Punic wars is reinforced by having the Numidian write in Punicae letters on the tusk.

Melita (Malta) had been under Roman control since it was wrested from the Carthaginians during the Punic wars in 218 BCE (Liv.21.51) so Masinissa’s piety is exhibited even towards a temple in enemy territory. Not so in the case of Verres who was unable to protect the Roman possession from his own desires.

In the Facta et Dicta Valerius clearly invokes the same political and historical context although Verres is absent. The final internal exemplum of the chapter (1.1.21) describes the Senate’s punishment of Q. Pleminius (legate of the elder Africanus) and the restoration of the money he stole from the temple of Proserpina at Locri. Valerius describes the Roman’s scelerata avaritia and the savage punishment that Proserpina enacts upon him for his crimes. Pleminius is again mentioned at the opening of the first external exemplum which describes Pyrrhus’ sack of the same temple (1.1.ext.1). This recalls Livy’s comment in the course of relating Pleminius’ sacrilege, that the temple had been violated only once before – by Pyrrhus when it was not a Roman possession (29.8). After relating the same story of Pyrrhus’ crime, Valerius Maximus links Masinissa at 1.1.ext.2 to this great enemy of Rome: his praefectus classis, aeque to Pyrrhus, steals from the temple of Juno on Melita. We are led from Pleminius’
internal impiety towards a Roman possession through Pyrrhus’ impiety towards a Carthaginian possession to Masinissa’s *pietas* towards an enemy, Roman-held island. The model of behaviour when it comes to sanctuaries is an enemy external. It is in the shadows of Roman wars, and specifically the Punic wars, that Masinissa’s actions are set. Like Cicero, Valerius deliberately underlines the reference by associating Masinissa with the adjective *punicus* but by attaching it to *sanguis* and not *litterae* he draws even closer attention to Masinissa’s ethnicity and behaviour.

Masinissa’s behaviour is contrasted with a blood-dependent ethnic grouping by which he is defined: *Factum Masinissae animo quam Punico sanguini conveniens!* The statement is loaded. It assumes that ethnic *sanguis* influences the behaviour of peoples: the possession of *Punicus sanguis* creates an expectation of a certain kind of behaviour. This certainly fits into the framework (described above) that sees characteristics of behaviour and appearance as being carried in the blood. Masinissa was educated at Carthage and closely aligned with the state but Valerius elsewhere chooses to describe the king in terms of his Numidian identity. At 8.13.ext.1 Valerius refers to Masinissa as *Numidiae rex* and he is attached to Numidia at a number of points in the work (5.1.7 and 7.2.6c). He is never described as Carthaginian or Punic on any other occasion and is, in fact, shown fighting in opposition to the Carthaginians (2.10.4 and 5.2.ext.4). In this *exemplum* Valerius appears to have deliberately chosen to highlight Masinissa’s Punic connections in order to invoke the background of the Punic wars and show an external enemy acting with piety and respect towards a Roman possession – in contrast to the Roman Pleminius at 1.1.21.

Wardle comments that Valerius is “contrasting Roman piety with natural Carthaginian impiety” but the construction contains far more artifice than Wardle suggests. Valerius is not enforcing a “traditional attitude” by paying lip-service to it, but deliberately undermining the expected connection between ethnicity and behaviour. The one time in the *Facta et Dicta* that Masinissa is identified as a Carthaginian is when Valerius is specifically stating that Masinissa is not acting like a Carthaginian; for despite the influence of his enemy blood Masinissa is able to defy expectations by the action of his *animus*. Valerius Maximus contrasts Masinissa’s

---

87 Even the idea of ‘traditional’ Carthaginian impiety is open to question. The story of Masinissa recalls Hannibal’s behaviour at the temple of Juno at Lacinium where the Carthaginian takes note of the warning Juno delivers against plundering her temple and instead shapes the gold he had intended to steal into an offering for the goddess (Cic. *Div.* 1.48).
Chapter Three

behaviour with that both of Romans, and cultured outsiders. Thus Masinissa’s actions are put in contrast with Dionysius of Syracuse at 1.1.ext.3: Valerius comments on the irony that Masinissa raised in *media barbaria* should act with a more sophisticated piety than one born in Syracuse. Masinissa shows concerned respect for the temples of his enemies; Dionysius plunders indiscriminately.

Blood and behaviour are again contrasted at 6.2.ext.1. Immediately before the *exemplum* Valerius Maximus has discussed the freedom of speech and action demonstrated by M. Castricius (magistrate of Placentia), Ser. Sulpicius Galba (pr. 54) and A. Cassellius (6.2.10-12); he then introduces the first foreign *exemplum*:

_Inserit se tantis viris mulier alienigeni sanguinis, quae a Philippo rege temulentō immerens damnata, <provocare se iudicium vociferata est, eoque interrogante ad quem> provocaret, ‘ad Philippum’ inquit, ‘sed sobrium.’ Excussitcrapulam oscitanti, ac praesentia animi ebriam resipiscere causaque diligentius inspecta iustiorem sententiam ferre coegit. Igitur aequitatem, quam impetrare non potuerat, extorsit, potius praesidium a libertate quam ab innocentia mutuata._

Once again this appears to be a Valerian original and it is also markedly different from other ethnic uses of *sanguis*. The emphasis on lineage in authors like Virgil and on connections between peoples in authors like Livy means, as previously stated, that the ethnic usage of *sanguis* (very much like the familial usage of the term) generally acts to create connections and identify the origins and affiliations of individuals. In this case the woman’s community is not specified; she is essentially isolated in the text by the description of her blood as *alienigenus*, connected to neither country, people or family. *Sanguis* acts initially as a divisive force here, despite the use of the genitive case, because the woman is described only as a foreigner to Rome. Valerius chooses to position the incident in close proximity to the deeds of various eminent Roman men and there he draws attention to the unnamed woman of alien blood, depicting her as elbowing her way in between the *tanti viri* of Roman history.

Plutarch on the other hand does record a name for the individual – Machaetas – and in his version of the story the subject is male. It is tempting to see Valerius’ depiction of the character, and the way that he isolates her with blood, as deliberately weakening subject’s position in the *exemplum*. This weakening doesn’t end with the depiction of the woman; Valerius’ story also shows Philip as definitely drunk rather
than only falling asleep as he is in Plutarch’s version (Moralia. 178F-179A); neither of the individuals in Valerius’ *exemplum* have the authority or strength that they possess in Plutarch’s account. The weakening of the figure of the woman draws another contrast between blood and behaviour and acts to enforce that freedom of speech is by no means a solely Roman – or even masculine – prerogative. By underlining the woman’s *alienigenus sanguis* in direct comparison with the *tanti viri* at Rome, Valerius implies the *Romanus sanguis* of those great men just as surely as a reference to black blood suggests implicitly the existence of white blood. Unlike the image of vigorous separation that references to colour might suggest to a modern audience however, Valerius is here making a point about unity. Just as Magistrates, Praetors and Jurists of Roman blood are capable of standing before Consuls, Dictators, and all powerful Triumvirs and refusing to compromise themselves by silent obedience (6.2.10, 6.2.11 and 6.2.12 respectively), so too is the unnamed woman of foreign but indeterminate blood, able to confront a king – even a drunken king – and demand fair trial. The confidence with which she approaches Philip is foreshadowed by the manner in which she inserts herself amongst records of the men of Rome to demonstrate behaviour that is perhaps unexpected for, but nevertheless available to, her alien blood, sex and status.

*Sanguis* – as I stated at the opening of this section – is not only used to describe external peoples, but is also applied to the Roman group. Once again the use of blood in this sense appears to be a particularly Valerian preoccupation. The story detailing Hannibal’s dream of bloody conquest is recorded both in Cicero’s *de Divinatione* 1.49. and in Livy at 21.22.6-9. Valerius’ version is at 1.7.ext.1:

Hannibalis quoque ut detestandum Romano sanguini ita certae praedictionis somnium, cuius non vigiliae tantum sed etiam ipsa quies hostilis imperio nostro fuit: hausit enim proposito et votis suis convenientem imaginem, existimavitque missum sibi ab love mortali specie excelsiore iuvenem invadendae Italiae ducem. Cuius monitu primo vestiglia nullam in partem *<deflexis>* secutus oculis, max humani ingenii prona voluntate vetita scrutandi pone respicientis, animadvertit immensae magnitudinis serpentem concitato impetu omne quidquid obvium fuerat proterentem, postque eam magnu cum caeli fragore erumpentes nimbos lucemque caliginosis involutam tenebris. Attonitus deinde quidnam *<id>* esset monstri et quid portenderet.
interrogavit. Hic dux 'Italiae vides' inquit 'vastatatem: proinde sile et cetera tacitis permitte fatis.'

In Livy's case the historical flow is uninterrupted, as might be expected, by any commentary on the reader's possible reaction to Hannibal's dream. Cicero's text may seem a more promising source, as it too is effectively a collection of exempla, but once again such commentary is absent. Neither Cicero nor Livy draw attention to Hannibal as a focus of Roman hatred, nor do they mirror Valerius' assertion of the collective feeling of the Roman ethnic group — as defined by its shared blood — towards the memory of Hannibal's campaigns. Only Valerius Maximus feels the need to remind his reader of the shudder appropriate for those who have Roman blood in their veins. It is perhaps necessary to reinforce the proper reaction to an external enemy at this point in the chapter as so many of the enemies presented in the internal material thus far are Roman.

In the Facta et Dicta as a whole approximately seventeen percent of the internal material deals with civil conflict; in chapter 1.7, 62.5 percent of the internal material is drawn from Roman internal struggles. 1.7.1 describes Augustus' dream before the battle of Philippi, at 1.7.2 Calpurnia dreams of Julius Caesar's assassination, 1.7.5 sees Cicero forced out of Rome by his inimici and comforted by the spirit of Marius, at 1.7.6 T. Gracchus advises his brother in a dream that they will suffer the same fate and at 1.7.7 Cassius foresees his imminent execution after Actium. There is only one internal exemplum in De Somnis that takes place in external war (1.7.3), the other two exempla in the section describe the dreams of an anonymous man regarding religious procedure at games held at Rome, and the otherwise unknown Haterius Rufus who foresees his own death (1.7.4 and 1.7.8). Internal conflict dominates the chapter before Valerius reminds the reader at the opening of the external material of the 'real' enemy of Roman blood.

In this instance we again see Romanus sanguis in the dative case, not the genitive or ablative as is more usual in familial or ethnic uses of the term in other authors. Romanus sanguis functions not as an indication of lineage, but as a label for the particular collection of qualities that defines a Roman. At 1.7.ext.1 Valerius uses

89 The inclusion of the latter exemplum strains Bloomer's statement that this chapter contains: "only those (dreams) whose contents were of public importance." Bloomer, W. M. Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility (Chapel Hill, 1992) 20.
blood to indicate the manner in which Romans will react to one of the great foreign enemies and confirms the appropriate, expected response of Romanus sanguis to what—as we may assume from the Masinissa exemplum—is the more expected activity of Punicus sanguis. This exemplum is one of four in which Romanus sanguis is constructed in opposition to the Carthaginians. In each of them Valerius explores the expectations of quintessentially Roman behaviour and characteristics; at 1.7.ext.1, 2.9.8 and 6.6.ext.1 he uses the blood of the Romans as a touchstone that determines their attitude towards an enemy. 1.7.ext.1 is the most straightforward of these exempla—it might be expected that Rome would hate the leader of one of their greatest historical rival nations—and yet it is still constructed to juxtapose Roman internal and external war. Romans should reserve their hatred for external enemies like Hannibal; and yet they expend so much of it on fellow Romans; they do not necessarily behave as their blood dictates they should.

At 2.9.8 Valerius reports on the unspecified but harsh punishment of Roman envoys who fail to fulfil their oaths to the Carthaginians; a punishment designed to demonstrate that fides—even towards enemies—is the only suitable attribute for one of Roman blood:

Turpis etiam metus censores summa cum severitate poenam exegerunt: M. enim Atilius Regulus et L. Furius Philus M. Metellum quaestorem compluresque equites Romanos, qui post infeliciter commissam Cannensem pugnam cum eo abituros se Italia iuraverant, dereptis equis publicis inter aerarios referendos curaverunt. Eos qu<oqu>e gravi nota adfecerunt qui cum in potestatem Hannibalis venissent, legati ab eo missi ad senatum de permutandis captivis neque impetrato quod petebant, in urbe mancerunt, quia et Romano sanguini fidem praestare conveniens erat et M. Atilius Regulus censor perfidiām notabat, cuius pater per summos cruciatus exspirare quam fallere Carthaginenses satius esse dixerat. Iam haec censura ex foro in castra transcendit, quae neque timeri neque decipi voluit hostem.

In Livy’s account at 24.18.1-6 the incident is one amongst many reported censorial decisions and it lacks the explicit statement of actions inappropriate to Roman blood. Livy’s account actually seems to focus more upon actions inappropriate to particular levels of status within Rome, as those punished have any
state supplied horses confiscated, are removed from their tribes and degraded to membership of the aerarii: his superioribusque illis equi adempti qui publicum equum habebant, tribuque moti aerarii omnes facti. The punishment of both those men who deserted from Rome, and those who distorted their oath to Carthaginians, are conveyed together after the description of their crimes. The two incidents are joined with secundum, which simply conveys a sequential sense.

Valerius’ account on the other hand, is separated into two parts; it maintains the sequence of Livy’s material but the distribution of punishment and censorship is treated differently. Firstly Valerius treats the deserters and describes their punishment: dereptis equis publicis inter aerarios referendos curaverunt. Then he indicates a clear separation between this story and the next: eos qu<oqu>e gravi nota adfecerunt qui cum in potestatem Hannibalivs venissent... and goes on to tell the story of the deliberately misinterpreted vow. This statement gives the impression that the punishments indicated for the second group of men are different from those carried out against the first group of deserters, and the reader’s attention is focused onto the trespasses of the Romans who chose to escape from Carthaginian captivity. Valerius first states the offence and then explains why the (unspecified) punishments were so harsh:

quia et Romano sanguini fidem praestare conveniens erat et M. Atilius Regulus censor perfidiam notabat, cuius pater per summos cruciatus exspirare quam fallere Carthaginenses satius esse duxerat.

Valerius’ first point is that fides is generally appropriate to all those of Romanus sanguis; this is followed by an exemplum of honourable behaviour that is constructed in such a way as to give it the most emphasis possible. Firstly, Valerius states that the censor who decided the punishment for such perfidia was M. Atilius Regulus (cos. 217) – immediately suggesting the man’s ancestor – M. Atilius Regulus (cos. 256). Valerius goes on to build on the suggestion by confirming the relationship between the two men and reminding the reader of the punishment that Regulus pater suffered for his determination to keep faith with the Carthaginians90. The particular

---

90 Paradoxically, the punishment that Regulus receives for behaving as Romanus sanguis should, and which confirms his honourable status, is described here in such a way that it inevitably recalls a
point of behaviour at issue is reinforced three times in this section of the exemplum with the terms fides, perfidia and fallere and this is a value that Valerius elsewhere associates strongly with Rome in the preface to chapter 6.6 De Fide Publica\textsuperscript{91}. With plain didactic statement and an appropriate exemplum Valerius constructs a text-book lesson in the behaviour that is appropriate for the Roman group as a whole, irrespective of status or rank. He then goes on to draw a moral from the story, stating that the punishment was designed to enforce that the enemy should neither be feared nor deceived. Once again sanguis is used in the dative case and dictates the values that Romans should properly exhibit. No matter whether an agreement is made with an enemy or a friend, fides is the appropriate Roman reaction. In this instance sanguis acts not to show the descent or origin of Rome but to describe the Roman ethnic and political group by stating the values that must be exhibited by that group. The fundamental point of the exemplum is, however, that these values have been wilfully neglected by the Roman soldiers involved. The way that Roman blood should behave is described specifically because Romans do not behave like that. The ethnic group can be identified by rhetorical assertion, not visible action.

A similar statement reinforcing the existence of the Roman ethnic group can be found within the chapter De Fide Publica at 6.6.ext.1. Here the focus is actually upon the refusal of the Saguntines to break their faith with Rome by surrendering to Hannibal’s forces, but Valerius briefly sets the scene as he introduces the exemplum:

\textit{Post duorum in Hispania Scipionum totidemque Romani sanguinis exercituum miserabilem stragem, Saguntini victricibus Hannibalis armis intra moenia urbis suae compulsi, cum vim Punicam ulterior nequirent arcere, collatis in forum quae unicuique erant carissima atque undique circumdatis accensisque ignis nutrimentis ne a societate nostra desisterent, publico et communi rogo semet ipsi superiecerunt. Crediderim tunc ipsam Fidem, humana negotia speculantem, maestum gessisse vultum, perseverantissimum sui cultum iniquae Fortunae iudicio tam acerbo exitu damnatum cernentem.}

punishment that Valerius specifically rejects as inappropriate and dishonourable for Romanus sanguis at 2.7.12: \ldots per summos cruciatus exspirare...\textsuperscript{91} 6.6.pr: quam (fides) semper in nostra civitate viguisse et omnes gentes senserunt et nos paucis exemplis recognoscamus.
The version preserved in Valerius is inaccurate\textsuperscript{92}. Rome is excused by Valerius for her failure to aid the Saguntines by the massive losses sustained by the Scipios in Spain, but these losses actually occurred seven years later. In other accounts of the Saguntine siege where the destruction of the Roman armies is absent there is, of course, no necessity to underline the ethnic unity of the Roman armies that fell and thus no mention of Roman blood\textsuperscript{93}. Valerius chooses an account that creates a less contentious situation in which the Saguntines can express their \textit{fides}: they have not been callously abandoned by Rome but rather Rome has no resources left with which to protect them.

In Valerius’ account the use of \textit{Romanus sanguis} at this point seems almost to be a deliberate reference back to the use of the same term at 2.9.8 where the connection is so pointedly made between Roman blood and \textit{fides}. This connection frames the internal material: the preface to 6.6 states: \textit{quam (fides) semper in nostra civitate viguisse et omnes gentes senserunt et nos paucis exemplis recognoscamus}. Then even as we enter into external proofs of \textit{fides} Valerius provides a transition line at the end of the final internal \textit{exemplum} 6.6.5 in which Rome’s particular associations with \textit{fides} is enforced again: \textit{quam ut civitas nostra semper benignam praestitit, ita in sociorum quoque animis constantem recognovit}. While this might seem to indicate a patriotic statement of Roman monopoly on \textit{fides}, it is unwise to take Valerius at face value. This insistence on the prominence of Roman \textit{fides}, especially in the transition line, places the actions of the Romans into direct comparison with those of the external \textit{socii}. The only two external \textit{exempla} in the chapter are both cases where Rome does not come to the aid of her allies (Saguntum at 6.6.ext.1 and Petelia at 6.6.ext.2). Yet the allies, rather than surrendering to Hannibal, destroy themselves in maintenance of their loyalty to Rome. In both \textit{exempla} Valerius forces the reader to recognise why the allies put themselves in such danger by emphasising their \textit{fides} towards Rome: \textit{ne a societate nostra desisterent} (6.6.ext.1) and \textit{quia deficere a nostra amicitia noluerant} (6.6.ext.2). Between the two \textit{exempla} he further underlines the tragedy of the situation:


\textsuperscript{93} Livy’s account of the incident is at 21.14, that of Appian is at \textit{ib.}12 and Florus is at 1.22.
Crediderim tunc ipsam Fidem, humana negotia speculantem, maestum
gessisse vultum, perseverantissimum sui cultum iniquae Fortunae iudicio tam acerbo
exitu damnatum cernentem (6.6.ext.1).

The condemnation of the Saguntines to such a bitter end is the result of Fortuna in that it is the result of Rome’s failure to come to the aid of her ally. Valerius provides reasons for this: the massive losses of Romanus sanguis and the obvious weakness of the Roman state at this time are displayed in the opening lines of the first exemplum and in the second Rome’s reasons for failing to aid Petelia are also supported in other sources. Nevertheless, external publica fides is outstanding in this chapter as allies keep faith with Rome to the death and Valerius draws the reader’s attention to this remarkable loyalty. Because Valerius Maximus associates blood with behaviour and particularly with the essential characteristics of Romans so consistently, and because this exemplum takes place in a chapter concerned with fides, the construction of the exemplum tends to imply a decision made by the Saguntines between the qualities of Romanus sanguis, the Romans in their essence, and those of the Carthaginians. The Saguntines choose Rome even if – as at 2.9.8 and, ironically, 6.6.ext.1 in truth – Roman fides is not always entirely reliable.

In the last of the four exempla in which Romanus sanguis is displayed in relation to the Carthaginians, the issue is not what is fitting for Romans to do, but what can be fittingly done to Romans. Valerius steps in at 2.7.12 to draw a veil across the crucifixion of those inhabitants of Rome who deserted to fight with the Carthaginians in 201 BCE, stating that he can see no reason to dwell on such injuries, however deserved, to Roman blood:

Nihil mitius superiore Africano. Is tamen ad firmandam disciplinam militarem aliquid ab alienissima sibi crudelitate amaritudinis mutuandum existimavit: si quidem devicta Carthagine, cum omnes qui ex nostris exercitibus ad Poenos transierant, in suam potestatem redegisset, gravius in Romanos quam in Latinos transfugas animadvertit: hos enim tamquam patriae fugitivos crucibus adfixit, illos tamquam perfidos socios securi percussit. Non prosequar hoc factum ulterior, et quia Scipionis est et quia Romano sanguini, quamvis merito, perpesso servile supplicium insultare

94 Liv. 23.20
Valerius chooses instead to pass on to *exempla* which entail no such disgrace for Rome. Livy on the other hand, records these punishments at 30.43.13 without any of Valerius' rhetorical flinches. He recounts the bare details and although he does close the chapter immediately afterwards, the following chapter continues from this natural conclusion with further details of the cessation of hostilities. This pause between chapters is the closest thing to a trace of Valerius' self-conscious concern with Roman *sanguis* that is present in Livy's text. There is certainly no expression at this (or any other) point in Livy's text of the Roman ethnic blood group – as previously stated the only group that Livy defines in this way is the Etruscans. Valerius' choice of language is by no means accidental when he defines the group of deserters via their *sanguis*. The *transfugae* have abandoned Rome; they have chosen instead to desert to the archenemy of Rome – the enemy whom Valerius has told us at 1.7. ext.7 it is an essentially Roman quality to hate. More than this, the deserters seem actually to have been captured as enemies by their own compatriots. They appear to have deliberately rejected their own country in the strongest terms, and yet they are – despite the provisions of Roman law in which Scipio's actions are grounded – inescapably, and unalterably, Roman.

Under the model that we can see operating in other authors where blood reflects the behaviour of the individual at their death – Lucretia's *castissimus sanguis* in Livy (1.59.1) or Pyreneus' *sceleratus sanguis* in Ovid (Met. 5.293) – we should expect the blood of these Romans to be characterised with negative or at least ambiguous qualities. Under Roman law they have forsaken their citizenship and attendant rights at the same time as they have forsaken their compatriots. However, according to Valerius, despite their crimes the deserters retain their Roman blood and this, with simple, unquestionable logic, makes their distinctively non-Roman death into painful material. Valerius' language both makes us aware of the confusion of categories inherent in these events and asserts that the presence of *Romanus sanguis* provides a means by which a correct course of action can be plotted through the confusion – Romans should not be punished like slaves. And yet here a Roman

---

95 Brand, C.E. *Roman Military Law* (Austin, 1968) 100-1 and 105. The *Digest* of Justinian states that deserters to the enemy are no longer to be considered as *milites*, but rather as *hostes*: Dig. 49.16.7.
general has allotted crucifixion, the most servile of all punishments, to former Roman soldiers. Valerius draws attention to the seriousness of his own material: *Non prosequer hoc factum ulterius*... Although Metellus' innate kindness is reinforced, and the deserters have deserved their punishment, crucifixion is still a terrible and unexpected punishment for Romans to experience; such a death precludes the need for further critical words.96

This concern with the appropriate treatment of those possessing *Romanus sanguis* recurs at 6.1.9 where once again the status of the Roman involved is compromised – albeit through no fault of his own. Unusually here the discussion of *Romanus sanguis* is motivated by an individual, rather than a group. Nevertheless, a more general lesson is drawn from the experience of T. Veturius regarding the unchangeable status of Roman blood:

```
Contio haec, illa curiae gravitas. T. Veturius, filius eius Veturii qui in consulatu suo Samnitibus ob turpiter icatum foedus deditus fuerat, cum propter domesticam ruinam et grave aes alienum P. Plotio nexum se dare adulescentul admodum coactus esset, servilibus ab eo verberibus, quia stuprum pati noluerat, adfectus, querellam ad consules detulit. A quibus hac de re certior factus senatus Plotium in carcerem duci iussit: in qualicumque enim statu positam Romano sanguini pudicitiam tutam esse voluit.
```

There is plenty of variation between different versions of the incident that Valerius Maximus records at 6.1.9. In fact, even the names of the debt-bonded youth and his persecutor vary between the accounts of Valerius Maximus, Livy (8.28) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (16.5); a quirk that isn’t straightened out by comparison with Cicero’s version as it includes no names (*Rep*. 2.59). The point of Valerius’ story however, is clear: a freeborn youth in straitened circumstances is forced into debt-bondage. His master makes sexual advances toward him and when these are refused,

96 Interestingly, while two of the four other appearances of Roman crucifixion are treated by Valerius as being entirely justified (Julius Caesar’s crucifixion of the pirates at 6.9.15 and 2.7.9 where runaway slaves are described as being most fit for crucifixion) the other two instances cast doubt on the legitimacy of proceedings. At 8.4.2 Valerius relates the story of a slave who was tortured six times and then crucified for a crime he refused to admit to, and then tells a similar story at 8.4.3 in which he makes the point that the evidence of such repeated tortures should have been compelling. Similarly, at 6.3.5 he describes L. Domitius’ crucifixion of a provincial as being *in fine severitatis et saevitiae*... It seems that Valerius views Roman legal crucifixion as such a severe punishment that - even in the case slaves and non-Romans - its application is open to interrogation.
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beats him. In this account the youth complains to the Consuls, the Consuls inform the Senate, and the Senate jails the master as a statement that the chastity of Roman blood should be safe no matter its position. In the accounts of Livy, Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus the process and result of the youth’s complaint is quite different.

In the version of the story present in both Livy and Dionysius the youth arouses popular fury by running out into the crowds and it is his bloodied back and the injustice of his case that motivate the abolition of debt-bondage. Livy opens his account at 8.28 by stating that it was this incident that led to the end of *nexum* and concludes his account with the same idea, contextualising it firmly within the conflict between the Plebs and Patricians. He records that the volume of people gathered into the forum by the youth’s story forced the senate to convene and that the agitation of the crowd further forced a change of the law. Dionysius at 16.5 records that the people, furious at the youth’s treatment, took the matter to the tribunes who indicted the master on a capital charge and once again overthrew the law of debt-bondage.

Cicero’s reference (*Rep.* 2.59) also emphasises the abolition of debt bondage and, as in the two other accounts, *Romanus sanguis* is not mentioned. In Cicero’s account a conscious delineation of Roman status isn’t present even though he compares the Roman treatment of debt bondage with the reforms of Solon at Athens. The popular agitation and outrage visible in all these accounts stands in stark contrast to Valerius Maximus, whose narrative appears to have shifted the emphasis of this incident to empower the Senate and Consuls, and who has removed the element of conflict between plebs and patricians most notably present in Livy’s account. In the *Facta et Dicta* it is the Consuls and Senate, not the crowd, who protects those under the obligation of *nexum*; they do not, however, change the condition of that individual or abolish *nexum*. Valerius emphasises that the special quality of Roman blood is protected *despite* the position of the youth, a position that in this *exemplum* does not change.

Technically speaking, there is no tension here between the presence of *Romanus sanguis* and the absence – or suspension – of citizenship, as an individual under *nexum* is still a Roman citizen throughout the experience but Valerius is careful to emphasise the indignity of the youth’s position. Valerius begins by presenting the family background; T. Veturius is the son of a T. Veturius Calvinus

---

(cos. II 321) who was handed over to the Samnites during his consulship because he had made a treaty turpiter. By identifying this particular family (not mentioned in the accounts of Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus or Cicero) Valerius has as a background to the story a father who has behaved dishonourably in the eyes of Rome, and has been rejected by his own country to the extent of being surrendered to the enemy. In terms of both behaviour and status, the elder Veturius’ Romanness is under pressure, and yet it recalls the judgement Valerius has made upon the deserters at 2.7.12 and the unchangeable, vital quality of their blood.

The plight of the son follows on from the sins of the father; the younger Veturius, adulescentulus, is burdened by domestica ruina and debt and for this reason undertakes the nexum agreement with P. Plotius. Valerius manipulates the order of the sentence to follow the statement of Veturius’ unavoidable decision (coactus est) with servilibus ab eo verberibus, quia stuprum pati noluerat, adfectus...Having been forced by circumstances into debt-bondage, Veturius is beaten like a slave and Plotius attempts to compromise him sexually. The succession of images pushes Veturius into a increasingly desperate position; he approaches the consuls whereupon Plotius is jailed and the pudicitia of Romanus sanguis is made safe in qualicumque statu positam. The point is that Veturius’ chastity should be safe no matter how lowly or desperate a position he, as a Roman, should occupy. The removal of the political struggle between plebs and patricians focuses the attention of the reader more clearly on the bare bones of the matter: the pudicitia of Romanus sanguis is not at threat from some outside force, some ultra-virile barbarian or degenerate representative of the east, it is at threat from another Roman – a Roman of the same blood as Veturius without even separation imposed by the labels of internal status groups. Here, as at 2.7.12, Valerius underlines the sanctity of Roman blood and the particular conditions and privileges which, like the responsibilities of 2.9.8 or 3.2.20, should be attendant upon it – irrespective of behaviour or status. And, as at 2.7.12 the particular conditions and privileges of Roman blood are compromised – if not actually violated here – by another of the same blood.

The next three exempla show sanguis as a key element in interactions between Romans and their close neighbours, the Latins and Italians – once enemies but by Valerius’ time thoroughly incorporated into Roman structures and citizenship. In the incident described at 3.2.20 we return to the behaviour appropriate to Romanus sanguis as the Roman general Valerius Flaccus expresses his unwillingness that he
and his men should be *spectatores...alienae virtutis*. Once again Carthage is the enemy but here the blood distinction is between Rome and her allies. The ‘alien courage’ in question is displayed by the Paelignian cohort assisting Rome at the siege of Capua. More particularly it is displayed by the Paelignian cohort’s Prefect Vibia Accaus:

*Ceterum ut humanae virtutis actum exsequamur, cum Hannibal Capuam, in qua Romanus exercitus erat, obsideret, Vibia Accaus, Paelignae cohortis praefectus, vexillum trans Punicum vallum proiecit, se ipsum suosque commilitones, si signo hostes potiti essent, exsecratus, et ad id petendum subsequente cohorte primus impetum fecit. Quod ut Valerius Flaccus, tribunus tertiae legionis, aspexit, conversus ad suos ‘spectatores’ inquit, ‘ut video, alienae virtutis huc venimus: sed absit istud dedecus a sanguine nostro, ut Romani gloria cedere Latinis velimus. Ego certe, aut speciosam optans mortem aut felicem audaciae exitum, vel solus praecurrere paratus sum.’ His auditis Pedanius centuria, convulsum signum dextra retinens, ‘iam hoc’ inquit ‘intra hostile vallum mecum erit: proinde sequantur qui id capl niolunt,’ et cum eo in castra Poenorum irrupit totamque secum traxit legionem. Ita trium hominum fortis temeritas Hannibalem, paulo ante spe sua Capuae possessorum, ne castrorum quidem suorum potentem esse passa est.*

The Roman group is reinforced twice in close proximity, first with its distinguishing blood and secondly with its title. The group is then put in contrast with the *Latini* who are implicitly of different blood, as well as different title. There is no sense of co-ordinated action between Romans and Latins to counter Flaccus’ emphasis upon division and competition. In Livy’s account (25.14.4-7) while competition is still present between the groups, the troops under the command of Vibia Accaus are at least referred to as allies, a technical and political division rather than one based around the qualities of blood. For Livy the political division becomes the point – allies are acting to achieve greater glory that the Romans they are assisting: 

*exprobrante Romanis ignaviam qui sociis captorum castrorum concederent decus.*

---


99 This is in line with Valerius’ references elsewhere to a strong desire to maintain the separation between Romans and Latini: 3.1.2 and 6.4.1. The Latin war also looms large as a dangerous and threatening event: 1.7.3, 2.7.6, 5.6.5, 6.9.1 and 9.3.4.
Valerius Maximus shears off the previous paragraphs present in Livy’s version that describe the indecision and cowardice of the Roman consul who should have been leading the attack. In fact, according to Livy, the consul is only recalled from his shameful conduct by the action of Vibius Accaus and the speech it inspires in Valerius Flaccus. This speech in turn motivates the brave action of the centurion Pedanius. In Livy’s account it is Pedanius and Vibius Accaus who are particularly marked with honour in the distribution of rewards and indeed Vibius Accaus is already inside the besieged camp when the Roman centurion follows him. In Valerius Maximus’ account Vibius Accaus is still in the process of following his standard forward when the centurion breaks through the siege together with his troops. The version presented by Valerius casts the actions of the Romans in a more prominent and pure light by simplifying the course of events; the Consul’s cowardice is not allowed to intrude into the exemplum. Valerius is not afraid to criticise Romans as 6.4.ext.1 (discussed below) demonstrates; the omission of the Consul’s bad behaviour could be seen as simply a trimming of extraneous material to better suit the exemplum format. It does however simplify the story and this has the effect of focusing the reader’s attention on the competition for glory between the Romans and the Paeligni: those allies who might assist Rome in battle, but are not of her blood.

One troublesome detail of this exemplum is that, as Mr. Martin Stone pointed out, the Paeligni are not actually Latins and don’t appear to be in possession of Latin rights at this point— they are central Italians and speak an Oscan dialect. Yet Valerius describes them as Latins, drawing a fine definition between Rome and the people from whom they are historically seen to be descended. This is the sole reference to the Paelignians in the Facta et Dicta and the majority of their neighbours are also absent, so there is no real comparison for their treatment available within the text. In the account of this incident given by Livy the author certainly doesn’t call the Paeligni Latins. We must either accept that Valerius Maximus is incompetent enough to confuse Latins with Italians or look for an alternative explanation¹⁰⁰. And indeed, if we are to apply the model which sees such instances as Valerius’ reference to Masinissa as Punicus (1.1.ext.2) as deliberate and not simply evidence of carelessness or ignorance, then this is perhaps a trace of a wider attitude at work.

¹⁰⁰ Evidence that this is a viable alternative term for the Paelignians rather than gross incompetence on Valerius’ part may be found in Ovid’s reference to his own Latius sanguis despite his Paelignian heritage at Tr. 2.205-6.
Valerius refers to the Paeligni as *Latini*, and not Italians in an *exemplum* where Romans are eager to ensure that their *gloria* does not appear to disadvantage in comparison to that of the Paeligni. *Italia*, and the adjective *Italicus* created from it, are generally deployed in a fairly neutral fashion throughout the *Facta et Dicta*. There are three explicit references to the Italian war (5.4.ext.7, 6.2.1 and 6.3.3) and two other references to Italian conflict with Rome over the issue of citizen rights (2.8.pr and 6.4.1) but aside from these references, *Italia* is used as an extension of Rome. Thus, for instance, two different generals save *urbs et Italia* (3.8.5 and 4.2.2)\(^{101}\) and many of the references to Italy record Hannibal’s invasion of the territory and the conduct of the war in this territory\(^{102}\). More than this, *Italia* can function as a marker of internality; thus Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (cos. II 134) when abused by the assembly for his failure to show sympathy for Tiberius Gracchus states “taceant... quibus Italia noverca est.” (6.2.3). The charge of not being originally from Italy is used here as a weapon against the crowd and thus Italy is closely aligned to Rome itself in the sense that they are both privileged homelands. Even where the Italian war is discussed, Italy is not painted darkly; at 5.4.ext.7 Pulto of Pinna performs an act of equal *pietas* and bravery by rescuing his father from the Romans and at 6.2.1 the pride of the Italians of Privernum secures for them the Roman citizenship (discussed further below). Meanwhile, the reference at 6.3.3 actually blackens the character of a Roman not an Italian, as C. Vettienus is punished for attempting to escape service in the Italian war by mutilating his hand.

The usage made of *Latinus* and *Latium* however, tends to be somewhat darker, especially in the depiction of the Latin war. There are five explicit references to this conflict and Valerius consistently underlines its danger and gravity. At 1.7.3 the war is described as *grave et periculosum*, at 5.6.5 the Roman battle line against the Latins is *inclinata et paene iam prostrata* and victory is *insperata*, at 6.9.1 Rome is *Latino tumultu fessa* and at 9.3.4 Manlius Torquatus is celebrated for bringing back *amplissima et gloriosissima ex Latinis et Campanis victoria* – a reference that does also encompass an Italian enemy. At 2.7.6 Valerius makes it clear that the Latin war is serious enough for a father to kill his son in order to preserve military discipline. Nor

\(^{101}\) Other references where *Italia* is paired with Rome in action, custom or honour appear at 2.5.1, 8.14.1, 9.2.1 and 9.5.1.

\(^{102}\) See 2.9.8, 3.7.ext.6, 3.8.1, 5.6.7, 7.2.3, 7.3.ext.8, 7.4.4 and 7.6.1a.
do the Latins receive altogether positive press in material outside of that dealing specifically with the Latin war, as examination of 3.1.2a will demonstrate.

The adjective \textit{Latini} occurs three times in the \textit{exemplum} at 3.1.2a and there is also a use of the substantive \textit{Latium}. This \textit{exemplum} tells the story of Cato the Younger’s resistance to the suggestion of Latins who were visiting his uncle M. Drusus that he should attempt to win his uncle over to their demands for citizenship. Valerius first refers to a group of \textit{Latini} who had approached M. Drusus in his capacity as tribune of the Plebs, then introduces Q. Poppaedius \textit{Latii princeps} who finally holds the child Cato over a considerable drop and threatens to let him go if he will not aid the cause of the Latins. When Cato still resists Poppaedius, Valerius has the Latin proclaim \textit{"gratulemur nobis, Latini et socii, hunc esse tam parvum, quo senatore ne sperare quidem nobis civitatem licisset."} Thus the Latin identity of Poppaedius is reinforced for the third time in the \textit{exemplum}. The conclusion of the story speaks approvingly of Cato’s actions: \textit{tenero ergo animo Cato totius curiae gravitatem praecepit, perseverantiaque sua Latinos iura nostrae civitatis apprehendere cupientes repulit}. The overbearing, threatening ally challenges a small, defiant Roman to the ultimate glory of the child. Valerius seems to go out of his way to remind the reader as often as possible that it is the Latins who are under discussion and there is a sense in this \textit{exemplum} that he is not convinced that the Latins should have been granted citizenship. This is particularly significant because – as both Plutarch and even Pseudo-Aurelius Victor recognise in their versions of the story – Poppaedius was an Italian and not a Latin\textsuperscript{103}. The combined evidence of these \textit{exempla} seems to indicate a consistent tendency on Valerius’ part to cast the Latins in threatening roles – even to the extent of manipulating the sources – and to project a more generally positive view of the Italians. Taking this darker depiction of the Latins into account, the use of \textit{Latini} to describe the Paeligni at 3.2.20 could possibly represent a deliberate decision on Valerius’ part designed to create a stronger sense of rivalry and contrast between the Roman Valerius Flaccus and the Paelignian Vibius Accaus.

\textsuperscript{103} Pseudo Aurelius Victor \textit{De Viris Illustribus urbis Romae} 80.1: \textit{...a Q. Popedio Silone Marsorum principe...} and Plut. \textit{Cat.Min.} 2.1-5.
at this point in Valerius' text at least, it might be the success of rival Latins that would really hurt. Whatever else is going on in this exemplum, Valerius perceives and underlines a blood distinction between Romans and Latins, and once again sanguis stands to represent the behaviours essentially appropriate to the Roman group as a whole. Valerius Maximus has Valerius Flaccus comment "...sed absit istud dedecus a sanguine nostro, ut Romani gloria cedere Latinis velimus." Ideas of descent or lineage – so often linked to aristocratic families and ‘blood lines’ – are absent. This is a bare statement of what is appropriate for all Romanus sanguis and it is, in fact, a centurion – member of a group whose humilitas Valerius elsewhere describes – who responds to the speech and propels the Roman troops into the camp. The Romans attempt to prove that fortitudo is a quality especially linked to their blood, but the very fact that there is a competition in bravery in this exemplum demonstrates the essential universality of the virtue. This has already been suggested in the opening line of the exemplum which specifies its subject matter as actus humanae virtutis – the subject is human, not Roman, virtus although this is an internal exemplum. Valerius adopts the stance that for another people to outdo the Romans in acts of bravery is humiliating, but the fundamental point in this story is that humiliation is altogether possible. It is – after all – only the admirable fortitudo demonstrated by the Paelignians that recalls the Romans to their task.

A close, complex relationship between Italians and Romans is the focus of a sanguis distinction at 6.2.1, in the chapter Libere Dicta aut Facta and once again the Italians are portrayed in a highly positive light. In this case the inhabitants of Privernum after their attempt at rebellion in 329 BC are in great danger before the Roman senate who have convened to judge the population. Yet the leaders of Privernum refuse to beg or plead, rather reiterating that they are both desirous and...
deserving of freedom and assuring the senate that a bad peace will give Rome little quiet but a good peace will be perpetual.

Priverno capto interfectisque qui id oppidum ad rebellandum incitaverant, senatus indignatione accensus consilium agitabat quidnam sibi de reliquis quoque Privernatibus esset faciendum. Ancipiti igitur casu salus eorum fluctuabatur, eodem tempore et victoribus et iratis subjicta. Ceterum cum auxilium unicum in precibus restare animadverterent, ingenui et Italici sanguinis oblivisci non potuerunt: princeps enim eorum in curia interrogatus quam poenam mererentur, respondit 'quam merentur qui se dignos libertate iudicant.' Verbis arma sumpserat exasperatosque patrum conscriptorum animas inflammaverat.

Sed Plautius consul, favens Privernatium causae, regressum animoso eius dicta obtulit, quaesivit qualem cum iis Romani pacem habituri essent impunitate donata. At is constantissimo vultu 'si bonam dederitis' inquit, 'perpetuam, si malam, non diuturnam.' Qua voce perfectum est ut victis non solum venia sed etiam ius et beneficium nostrae civitatis daretur.

Valerius thus refers to the Italians as being in possession of a specific kind of blood — *ingenuus sanguis*. Once again the possession of this blood demands that the Italians behave in the way that they do, no matter how dangerous it might be; they are not able simply to yield to Rome and come quietly under its control. In Livy’s account at 8.21 the facts of the story remain largely the same and Livy too makes a comment on the behaviour of those of Privernum. He describes the responses of the ambassador (unus ex Privernatibus legatis) from the town as evidence of his being: *magis condicionis in qua natus esset quam praesentis necessitatis memor*.

The difference between Livy and Valerius Maximus is subtle but definite. Valerius’ main verb is in the plural and he refers to the feeling of the whole populace of Privernum although one individual actually speaks for the town, Livy’s main verb is singular and he describes the feeling of the legate, whose singularity he emphasises. Valerius identifies the element which cannot be forgotten and therefore influences behaviour, as the possession of *ingenuus et Italicus sanguis* and it is free and *Italian* blood not just free blood — a quality once again unconnected to lineage but acting to represent the Italians as a whole. Livy on the other hand, focuses on the condition of the legate’s birth, a condition not specified but presumably one of freedom. This phrasing isolates individual nobility rather than communal unity in pride. The
freedom of the Italians is a central concept in both accounts but in Valerius the importance of this quality is dependent upon the blood of the community, in Livy’s account it is dependent upon the status of the individual. We see in Valerius Maximus’ version evidence that blood distinctions are by no means a way of making Romans positive and everyone else negative: blood other than Roman is capable of demanding – and displaying – positive behaviour.

Indeed, on this occasion *sanguis* is obviously not simply a means of creating division between internals and externals because this story is positioned as the first internal exemplum. There can be no question that the vagaries of transmission, rather than authorial intention, have placed this exemplum in the internal material. Valerius links it to the second internal exemplum with the comment *Sic in senatu loqui Privernas ausus est: L. vero Philippus consul adversus eundem ordinem libertatem exercere non dubitavit ...* at the opening of 6.2.2. Valerius is clearly counting the leader of Privernum as an internal exemplum of free speech or action, presumably because the town is on the point of being given citizenship at the opening of the exemplum, have received it by the end and are not conceived of as being very foreign at all

Although the residents of Privernum are positioned in the internal material, however, they possess – and are distinguished by – *Italicus sanguis*. It is, indeed, their refusal to forget this Italian blood that secures them Roman citizenship. *Sanguis* in Valerius’ text cannot then be dependent upon legal status; it seems that internal status and Roman citizenship do not necessitate exclusively Roman blood. It would be very interesting indeed to know whether, and when, *Romanus sanguis* and its expectations would apply to the citizens of Privernum and whether these would replace, or rest alongside of, the demands of Italian blood.

The values of *Romanus sanguis* are put in opposition with another Italian group during the encounter between Quinctius Crispinus and his Campanian guest friend Badius, recorded by Valerius Maximus’ at 5.1.3.

*Quid de Quinctio Crispino loquer, cuius mansuetudinem potentissimi adfectus, ira atque gloria, quatere non potuerunt? Badium Campanum et hospitio benignissime domi suae exceperat et adversa valitudine correptum attentissima cura recreaverat. A*

107 This assumes that Valerius’ explanation of his reasoning at 4.5.ext.1 can be reversed and applied to the internal material. At 4.5.ext.1 Valerius opens by stating *Quod sequitur externis adnectam, quia ante gestum est quam Etruriae civitas daretur.*
quo post illam nefariam Campanorum defectionem in acie ad pugnam provocatus, cum et viribus corporis et animi virtute aliquanto esset superior, monere ingratum quam vincere maluit: nam 'quid agis' inquit, 'demens, aut quo te prava cupiditas transversum rapit? Parum habes publica impietate furere, nisi etiam privata lapsus fueris? Unus videlicet tibi Romanorum Quinctius placet in quo scelestaque exerceras arma, cuius penatibus et honoris vicissitudinem et salutem tuam debes! At me foedus amicitiae dique hospitales, sancta nostro sanguini, vestris pectoribus vilia pignora, hostili certamine congredi tecum vetant. Quin etiam, si in concursu exercitu fortuito umbonis mei impulso prostratum agnovissem, applicatum iam cervicibus tuis mucronem revocasse. Tuum ergo crimen sit hospitem occidere voluisse, meum non eris hospes occissus. Proinde aliam qua occidas dexteram quaere, quoniam mea te servare didicit. 'Dedit utrique caeleste numen debitum exitum, si quidem in eo proelio Badius obtruncatus est, Quinctius insigni pugna clarus evasit.

The story of the encounter between Quinctius and Badius is initially similar in Livy’s version at 25.18.4-15; there Quinctius Crispinus resists the challenge that Badius delivers in the course of the battle with a slightly puzzled reference to their guest-friend relationship (neé sibi nec illi ait hostes deesse in quibus virtutem ostendant...) and the promise that even if he were to meet Badius in battle he would actively avoid injuring him. The real differences begin when Livy allows Badius to respond to Quinctius’ comments. At this point, Badius insults Quinctius by commenting at length on the hypocrisy and nastiness of the Romans and yet Quinctius holds his peace until persuaded by his friends to fight the Campanian. This Quinctius does straight away, only pausing long enough to secure permission from his generals in line with military procedure. Badius is badly wounded in the conflict, narrowly escaping death by retreating, and Quinctius proudly displays his spoils from the fight. Livy records the incident – a triumph of both morals and arms – in terms of the positive effect it had upon the morale of the Roman troops.

In the Facta et Dicta Valerius Maximus introduces the exemplum as a demonstration of the scrupulous character of Quinctius: his steadfast resistance to anger and the desire for glory in the face of the demands of clementia. Quinctius during his encounter with Badius is described as unquestionably superior to the Campanian in body and spirit – Valerius effectively informs the reader that there is no risk involved for Quinctius in choosing to fight Badius thus pre-empting the
accusations of cowardice made Badius in Livy’s account (tum Campanus increpare mollitiam ignauiamque et se digna probra in insontem iacere, hospitalem hostem appellantis simulamtemque parere cui sciat parem se non esse. Liv. 25.18). In Valerius’ account Badius is given no direct speech and Quinctius’ speech (one of the longest examples of direct speech in the work) is expanded into a bitter lecture on morality.

In the course of this speech Quinctius draws a contrast between the attitudes of Romans and Campanians to the pledges of friendship and the gods of hospitality, they are: sancta nostro sanguini, vestris pectoribus vilia pignora. Quinctius rejects utterly the idea of killing Badius and apportions the potential guilt of a battle between the two of them solely to Badius. At the end of the lecture Valerius Maximus concludes the story by stating that both men received their due deserts from the gods: he records that Badius was killed in the battle and Quinctius earned glory by his distinguished fighting. Valerius’ Quinctius is more purely a moral hero than Livy’s more militant hero; he demonstrates restraint rather than establishing his prowess. Undeniably the better man he does not prove it in contest. He distinguishes himself from his opponent by his superior moral conduct and his greater demonstration of humanitas, a value that the Campanian neither demonstrates nor values. These qualities are directly linked to Quinctius’ possession of Romanus sanguis, a substance that is put into opposition to the pectora of the Campanian despite, ironically, the Roman citizenship held by the Campanians by this stage. Valerius does not actually describe the Campanians as being of different blood, but the inference can be clearly drawn from Quinctius’ words. Quinctius’ still feels that he can distance himself from the conduct of the technically Roman Campanians with the symbol of Roman blood. The blood distinction does not appear in Livy’s account of the conflict, although he does repeatedly refer to Badius with Campanus. An explicit comparison between Roman and Campanian is present, but it is made by Badius and is designed to seize the moral high ground for the Campanian by presenting the Romans as oath-breakers: si parum publicis foederibus ruptis dirempta simul et priuata iura esse putet, Badium Campanum T. Quinctio Crispino Romano palam duobus exercitibus audientibus renuntiare hospitium (25.18).

Valerius Maximus’ introduction of the issue of blood as a distinction between the Romans and Campanians is again tightly focused in this exemplum upon an issue of conduct. The particular issue in question is widely humanitas and more precisely
the respect due to bonds of guest-friendship. Valerius depicts Quinctius as maintaining the fiction that Romans like himself (as opposed to — in reality — Romans like Badius) demonstrate these qualities to a greater extent, but there is no sense that they are unavailable to the Campanians. Quinctius’ righteous indignation is not based on the fact that the Campanians have no access to — or understanding of — humanitas, Quinctius reviles Badius on the basis that the Campanians demonstrate no respect for the well-understood bonds of amicitia and hospitium; they regard the oaths sworn under that banner as vilis. At the end of the chapter, 5.1.ext.5 clearly demonstrates that the Campanians are capable of demonstrating admirable hospitality and friendship as they receive the defeated and vulnerable Roman troops after their encounter with the Samnites at the Caudine Forks in 321 BCE. The values linked to Romanus sanguis are not characteristically Roman — these are qualities drawn from a universal pool. Quinctius’ attempts to separate himself from Badius on the grounds of blood rather serve to underline their shared Roman citizenship. Valerius demonstrates with one exemplum the disunity possible within the Roman community with Quinctius’ fiction of blood, and the failure of Romans to behave as they say they should.

It is not always the case, unfortunately, that the Romans are capable of giving instruction on matters of conduct. There are no other attestations for the story recorded by Valerius Maximus at 6.4.ext.1 and therefore no version with which to compare it, but here Valerius depicts the Roman general D. Iunius Brutus Calaicus (cos. 138) being reprimanded by the frank response of the Spanish inhabitants of Cinginnia to his offer that they might pay a ransom to Rome to end their conflict. The people of Cinginnia state that their ancestors left them steel with which to defend their freedom, not gold to buy it from an avarus commander:

Cuius mentio mihi subicit quod adversus D. Brutum in Hispania graviter dixit referre: nam cum ei se tota paene Lusitania dedidisset ac sola gentis eius urbs Cinginnia pertinaciter arma retineret, temptata redemptione propemodum uno ore legatis Bruti respondit ferrum sibi a maioribus quo urbem tuerentur, non aurum quo libertatem ab imperatore avaro emerent, relictum. Melius sine dubio istud nostri sanguinis homines dixissent quam audissent.
Valerius could hardly be said to be glorifying the actions of the Romans here or concealing their vices. Rather he once again uses *sanguis* to project a distinct, unified image of the Roman people and the requirements of behaviour attendant upon those people. As a group of conquerors Rome should fight, not blackmail the enemy. The endurance of the people of Cinginnia is underlined here; nearly all of Lusitania has yielded to Rome but this one *urbs* will not give up the fight.\(^{108}\) The community as a whole is unified in its resistance; the inhabitants deliver their rejection with *unum os* to the *legati* dispatched by Brutus. Valerius concludes the *exemplum* with his own commentary, informing the reader that Brutus was not only wrong to offer to accept money to end the siege, but that the behaviour of the community was far more appropriate for Romans: the Cinginnians have out-Romaned the Romans. This *exemplum* stands out as the one occasion on which someone outside of the story censures the behaviour of Roman blood. At 3.2.20 Valerius Flaccus rallies the Roman troops when he notes the bravery of the Paeligni and at 2.9.8 the censors act to reprimand the Roman legates who desert Hannibal. Here the externals draw attention to the failure of conduct on the part of Brutus but Valerius personally steps in to deliver his judgement, just as he does at 2.7.12 when the crucifixion of Roman citizens is at issue. There is no doubt that Brutus has fallen short of the behaviour expected of *Romanus sanguis* and equally little doubt that the statement of the Cinginnians would have brought credit to a Roman; Valerius Maximus’ use of *sanguis* neatly draws the attention of the reader to this very point. The contrast between the behaviour of the two peoples seems particularly sharp when it is considered that the Lusitanians attract the most uses of the word *barbarus* of any people in the text (twice at 7.3.6 and once at 9.6.2). It seems that in a moral contest *barbarus sanguis* can convincingly beat *Romanus sanguis*.

Given the manner in which the variants that Valerius Maximus records have been adapted from the original, and the manner in which his distinctive use of *sanguis* is employed, Watts’ comment on Valerius’ propensity to stereotype externals is coming from the wrong angle. The interesting information here is not how Valerius Maximus ‘stereotypes’ other peoples, but what the blood distinctions reveal about ethnic identity and the importance of behaviour in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*.

\(^{108}\) The use of *urbs* here is significant as it suggests a developed city; the term is consistently used for Rome in the *Facta et Dicta*. This is especially true when it is used in comparison with *gens* for the rest of Lusitania – a word used more commonly for external communities.
Krieger states that Valerius Maximus consistently downplays the virtues of externals and obscures Roman vices, in order to magnify Roman glory. This cannot be supported from the text of the *Facta et Dicta*. In the ‘Vice’ books (books 9.1-9.11 which are all concerned with demonstrations of negative qualities) the Roman *exempla* still out-number the external *exempla* 104 to 37 and if Krieger were to be right we should expect a figure much more heavily weighted in favour of the external material. Likewise, although the internal *exempla* generally heavily outewight the external, in occasional chapters like 8.7 *De Studio et Industria* (attributes of which Valerius strongly approves) there are more than twice as many external as internal *exempla*. Likewise in chapter 7.2 *Sapienter Dicta aut Facta* there are 8 internal *exempla* and 23 external.

In two instances (1.7.ext.7 and 6.5.ext.2) we see *sanguis* being used as a fairly neutral term for ethnicity in conjunction with surprisingly liberal praise of externals. Sometimes Valerius does accentuate Roman prowess with blood distinctions, as at 5.1.3, and sometimes he shows characters inspiring Roman pride and patriotism by using blood distinctions, as at 3.2.20. His attitude in these cases, however, seems to be essentially something other than a simple desire to glorify Rome at the expense of the externals. On both these occasions the virtues displayed by Rome (*humanitas* and *fortitudo*) are available to the externals and in the latter case, Roman pride must be invoked because the externals are displaying *fortitudo* more vigorously than the Romans. Similarly, when Quinctius reviles Badius for his lack of *humanitas* at 5.1.3 his use of *sanguis* underlines that his opponent is technically a Roman too. At 1.7.ext.1 *Romanus sanguis* does dictate hatred of a foreigner, but this is because he is Hannibal, a great military opponent of Rome shown in the anticipation of his campaigns in Italy and this external enemy is contrasted with the plentiful internal conflict at Rome. Elsewhere *Romanus sanguis* is employed as a corrective; a reminder that certain kinds of behaviour are not acceptable for a Roman as at 2.9.8 (possibly echoed at 6.6.ext.1) and at 6.4.ext.1, and that certain treatment of Romans are unsuitable (2.7.12 and 6.1.9). In external cases the emphasis upon behaviour remains;

---

109 Krieger, B. *Quibus fontibus Valerius Maximus usus sit in eis exemplis enarrandis, quae ad priora rerum Romanorum tempora pertinent.* (Berlin, diss. 1888) pg.9.

110 The overall percentage of external material in the work is 33 percent. In the ‘vice’ books the percentage of external material is only very slightly higher at 35 percent.

111 This *exemplum* is situated amongst a series of *exempla* that show Romans disappointing the expectations dependent upon their blood and being punished by the censor in the chapter *De Censoria Nota.*
Chapter Three

at 1.1.ext.2 the expectations of behaviour based on Masinissa’s ‘Punic’ blood are confounded, at 6.2.ext.1 a woman of alien blood demonstrates out-spokeness equal to the Romans and at 6.2.1 Italian blood refuses to humble itself before its Roman conquerors.

What then can we conclude from Valerius’ use of *sanguis*? Firstly Valerius is using *sanguis* in a new way to deal with ideas of ethnicity; the ethnicity of blood in the *Facta et Dicta* is one separated from ideas of descent or origin; it stands as a name for the Roman group, not a description of its pedigree or the familial constitutions of its members. Despite the alarm bells that sound in the modern mind when blood is linked to ‘race’ the separation that Valerius constructs between the traditional association of the term with familial lines and connections and his own usage makes blood into something altogether different; his is not a mindset where a ‘scientific’ categorisation of percentages of inherited blood forever defined one’s unchangeable social position. The unimportance of somatic appearance and the environmental theory of race for Valerius, and the importance rather of behaviour and custom is not undermined by his use of blood, because where ethnic blood is mentioned, it is overwhelmingly used to make a point about behaviour.

*Sanguis*, when it appears in an ethnic sense in the *Facta et Dicta*, generally refers to the distinctive behavioural characteristics of a people — for instance Carthaginian wickedness and Roman *fides* — but it very often stands to demonstrate the exception and not the rule. *Sanguis* suggests a model of ‘national characteristics’ and destroys it at the same time, and because the majority of references are to Roman blood, it is the national character of Rome that undergoes the most thorough deconstruction. *Fides* may be particularly linked to Roman blood, but Romans sometimes ignore it while Saguntines demonstrate it admirably. *Fortitudo*, and the *gloria* that accompanies its demonstration, may be the particular concern of Romans but the Paelignians will beat them to it if they don’t take care. Freedom from greed and corruption is the duty of a Roman, but sometimes it takes a Spaniard to make that point. Hatred of external enemies is justified, but there are plenty of enemies at home as well. Unmolested *pudicitia* is the right of a Roman, but another Roman may well try to take away that right, and a Roman should not die like a slave, although a famous Roman general may order that he should. The *tanti viri* of Rome can protect their own positions with freedom of speech and so can a woman of *alienigenus sanguis*; *humanitas* is a particularly Roman attribute but it is available to all if they
choose to value it, and *impietas* is particularly to be expected of a enemy Carthaginian but a man of ‘Punic’ blood can act with admirable piety. Even those virtues in which the Romans excel are essentially universal; even those punishments and acts most alien to Romans can be applied to their compatriots by Romans, and conversely members of the enemy who ought to demonstrate the characteristic vices of the enemy will not always oblige.

Valerius’ unusual usage of *sanguis* is striking amongst the texts that he would have read and that were written during his life. For a modern reader schooled in the recent history of race relations it is even more confronting because Valerius chooses a term that we associate with absolute ethnic division and uses it – once again – to demonstrate that the divisions between internal and external are anything but absolute. In an ancient context, by detaching the term from the rhetoric of familial relation and lineage he removes its limitations – there is no attempt to define blood groups in the text, in some ways it is merely a name for the group and yet a name that Valerius chooses to take from a substance running through every human’s veins. Thus Valerius’ *sanguis* is infinitely more flexible than the idea of *natio* or *gens*, and the choice of a word associated with these units, but not inextricably linked to them, allows him both to refer to the structures of ethnic inter-relationship and to undermine them. *Sanguis* is thus well suited to an author who seems to be making the point again and again throughout the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* that where behaviour is accepted as the frame of reference, there is no essential difference between Out, and In.

---

1. Saddington lists the “main significant terms” used for “racial” difference in early imperial Rome as *barbarus, gens, natio, and externus*. He does not mention *sanguis* or *alienigenus* but in Valerius they are used consistently both in the transitions between internal and external material and in other sentences. Saddington, D.B. ‘Roman Attitudes to the External Genres of the North’ *Acta Classica*, 4, (1961) 91-92.

2. By a transition line I mean the comments, ranging from a word to sentence, that Valerius uses to highlight his motion from internal to external material. They generally appear in the final internal examples but are also found in the first external exception.


4. These lines are equally significant in terms of his attitudes towards his own people. The connection between transition lines and Valerius’ attitude to the Roman group will be discussed in chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’, 176-177.
Chapter Four: The Language of Difference.

The fact Valerius Maximus does not discuss different external groups' physical appearance and does not employ the environmental theory of race in any systematic or significant way, turns us back to the language he uses to convey externality. In contemporary Australia, people often indicate foreignness (if they do not specify an actual ethnic national group) by reference to colour (particularly darkness of skin — "he's black") or, increasingly, by reference to religion ("those Muslims"). They might also use terms indicating legal or political status ("refugees", "asylum seekers" or, derisively, "queue-jumpers") or simply call someone a foreigner. Patterns of opinion can be detected by analysing where and how the terms are deployed. The same is true of the terms that indicate foreignness in Valerius' text. Given the broad structuring of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia into internal and external material I will begin by addressing Valerius' use of four different adjectives indicating externality: externus, exter, alienus and alienigenus. The function of these terms in the transition lines between internal and external material and within individual exempla may initially appear divisive, sometimes even scornful, but consistently the role of the adjectives is to confuse boundaries, not to enforce them.

Moving On Out: Transitional Adjectives.

One of the major uses of adjectives denoting foreignness in the Facta et Dicta is to mark the point in chapters where Valerius turns from Roman to external exempla. On twenty nine occasions these transition lines represent moments at which Valerius comments self-consciously on the distinction between Romans and externals. He addresses the nature of both groups by clearly delineating the point at which material from one ends and the Other begins. This section will discuss the way in which the transitions reveal Valerius' attitude towards foreigners.

---

1 Saddington lists the "main significant terms" used for 'racial' difference in early imperial Rome as barbarus, gentes, nationes and externus. He does not mention exter, alienus or alienigenus but in Valerius they are used consistently both in the transitions between internal and external material and in other contexts: Saddington, D.B. 'Roman Attitudes to the Externae Gentes of the North' Acta Classica, 4. (1961) 91-92.

2 By a transition line I mean the comments, ranging from a word to sentences, that Valerius uses to highlight his motion from internal to external material. They generally appear in the final internal exemplum but are also found in the first external exemplum.

3 M. People Testify (1999).

4 These lines are equally significant in terms of his attitudes towards his own people. The connection between transition lines and Valerius' attitude to the Roman group will be discussed in chapter Five: 'Barbarism Begins at Home', 176-177.
The clustering of external adjectives around transition lines in the *Facta et Dicta* is clear on inspection of the distribution of the words. In Valerius' text *externus* most often signifies a transition between internal and external material. Only five of the 21 instances are not positioned in the last internal *exemplum* or the first external *exemplum*, and even in one of these five cases *externus* is still part of a transition line, albeit a transition line that has been delayed into the second internal *exemplum*.

*Alienigenus* is also overwhelmingly transitional in the *Facta et Dicta*; eight of eleven instances occur in transition lines between the internal and external material, all in the first external *exemplum* of the relevant chapter. The correlation between transition and *alienus* is not nearly so strong: only five of the fourteen uses of *alienus* meaning foreign are used to signify a structural move away from Roman material. All of these except 5.10.3 are positioned in the first external *exemplum*. *Exter* (used eight times in the work) is used only twice in a transition line but both of these lines are particularly interesting examples of the device.

The four adjectives are frequently associated with transition but to establish exactly how Valerius conceives of the transition from internal and external a closer examination must be undertaken. It will become clear that in roughly one third of all transition lines Valerius makes a statement indicating the conclusion of the internal *exempla* and introducing the external material as a natural component of the collection he has undertaken. *Externus* for example, when it signifies movement in Valerius’ text from Rome to foreign lands, is generally fairly neutral; characteristic examples are 3.4.ext.1, 6.1.ext.1 and 4.1.15. Of the sixteen transitional uses of *externus* nine (66%) are transitions implying no judgement or sense of evaluation on the part of Valerius towards external peoples. The percentage of neutral transitions is much lower for *alienus* where two of five uses are straight (40%) and falls again for *alienigenus* to two of eight (25%). *Exter*, finally, has no neutral value in transitions: both uses involve self-conscious evaluative comparison of internal and external.

---

5 The transitional uses of *externus* are 1.6.ext.pr., 1.8.ext.2, 3.3.2, 3.4.ext.1, 3.7.11, 3.8.ext.1, 4.1.15, 4.3.ext.1, 4.5.ext.1, 4.7.pr., 5.6.ext.1, 6.1.ext.1, 6.3.ext.1, 7.3.10, 9.11.ext.1 and 9.12.ext.1.
6 1.8.ext.2: *Et quoniam ad externa transgressi sumus...* *Externus* appears in 10 of 29 transition lines in the *Facta et Dicta* as a whole.
7 1.5.ext.1, 2.10.ext.1, 4.6.ext.1, 5.3.ext.1, 6.2.ext.1, 6.5.ext.1, 7.2.ext.1a and 8.11.ext.1.
8 4.7.ext.1, 5.10.3, 6.9.ext.1, 8.14.ext.1 and 9.5.ext.1.
9 5.2.10 and 8.15.ext.
10 3.4.ext.1: *Sed ut Romanis externa iungamus...*; 6.1.ext.1: *Atque ut domesticis externa subnectam...* and 4.1.15: *Ad externa iam mihi exempla transire conantih...*
11 5.10.3 and 8.14.ext.1.
12 6.2.ext.1 and 8.11.ext.1.
material. The neutral transitions should not be ignored—the lack of embroidery itself is telling. Valerius chooses to include the external material and does not feel further comment is necessary in these cases where externus or alienus or alienigenus are simply a means of differentiating between Romans and non-Romans. Where this takes place Valerius clearly conveys that the presence of the external material is an accepted and necessary element of the work as a whole.

This is entirely in line with the construction of the work. Valerius opens the first sentence of the preface to the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia with this statement of purpose: Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta...ac dicta memoratu digna...digerere constitu. As Valerius states in the first words of his work, it is his intention to include material not only from Rome but from the whole known world. The exempla may be widely divided into internal and external, but in the fifty-nine chapters for which Valerius includes external exempla, domestica and externa are grouped together—unified around behaviours, characteristics and scenarios presented as common to both. Valerius goes out of his way to enforce repeatedly that all individuals who demonstrate virtues—be they external barbarians or Romans of low status—deserve inclusion and recognition. Valerius’ interest in the universality of certain qualities does not mean his selection and presentation of material is entirely even-handed, but it does mean that the external material has an important role to play.

Indeed, there are thirty chapters in the work in which Valerius feels no need to comment at all on the transition between internal and external material. In these cases the presence of foreign exempla stands without explanation or excuses, unself-consciously contributed as part of the undertaking at hand. There is certainly no sense that Valerius is driven to foreign exempla only when no Roman material is available as suggested by Bloomer and Skidmore. Given the extensive, deliberate inclusion of so much external material, it is unwise to base an interpretation of Valerius’ attitude towards the external material on just a few transition lines, as does Skidmore.

13 See chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’.
15 Skidmore demonstrates the role of the external material in the provision of variety with 2.10.ext.1 and 3.8.ext.1. Skidmore, C. Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen (Exeter, 1996) 89 This will be discussed later in the chapter. Wardle agrees with Skidmore, adding 5.7.ext.1 and 9.5.ext.1. I would however argue that the material at 5.7.ext.1 is iucundiora not because it is external and thus provides variety, but because it describes a son’s life preserved by his father’s willingness to give up the wife that the boy was in love with (5.7.ext.1), and then a father’s desire to cede his kingdom to his son (5.7.ext.2), as opposed to a father being slaughtered in the proscriptions while trying to preserve his son.
In seven uses of *externus*, three uses of *alienus*, six uses of *alienigenus* and two of *exter*, however, Valerius does seem to depict the movement from internal to external as a move downwards and not sideways. More of these weighted uses of *externus* appear in transition lines that are positioned in the final internal *exemplum* of chapters 16. In these cases Valerius seems to suggest that the internal material is more worthy of space and carries more authority than the external material. At the external preface to chapter 1.6 he actually states that the *externa... latinis litteris inserta... auctoritatis minus habent* and yet, he says, he chooses to include them for the sake of variety. We see Valerius make this careful distinction between the internal and external *exempla* again at 3.7.11 and 7.3.10 where he explicitly states that he is concluding the internal material with a lighter – or more humble – *exemplum* in order to ease the progress away from Roman topics. Once more the conclusion could be drawn that the external material is of lower quality or authority than the internal material. Thus in the former case (3.7.11) Valerius places Accius’ self-confident refusal to defer to Julius Caesar in the literary sphere between Rome’s defence of Porta Capena in 211 BCE (3.7.10b) and Euripides’ defence of his own artistic judgement against the taste of the Athenian people (3.7.ext.1) and explains the selection as follows:

*magna spatia divisus est a senatu ad poetam Accium transitus. Ceterum ut ab eo decentius ad externa transeamus, producatur in medium.*

The generally un-geographical Valerius depicts this progress between *exempla* as a physical situation. Accius and the Senate are *divisus* by a *magnum spatium*, he needs to effect a movement from one to the other – *transire*, repeated in the *exemplum* – and so positions a stepping stone for the leap *in medium*. The language of the *exemplum* mimics the geographical distance between Porta Capena and Athens via the

---


16 Three of six internal instances, as opposed to 4 of 11 external instances.

17 This statement is slippery – Valerius specifies that the external *exempla* have less authority *Latinis litteris inserta*, implying that in their original language or context the *exempla* have a greater degree of authority. The reader is left to wonder whether the presence of Rome simply raises the standard and belittles the external material (which is not in line with Valerius’ general stance) or whether there is a partial acknowledgement of the difficulties of removing the foreign material to an unfamiliar context in an excerpted form. Is Valerius recognising cultural relativity to some extent if the value of these *exempla* changes depending on context?
city of Rome — not a logical path in the physical sense — but one that allows Valerius to move from the Punic wars to Greek drama in a decentius fashion, perhaps delaying long enough for the smell of the battle-field to lift. This transition line cannot be read as dismissive of the external material vis-à-vis its externality. Valerius makes a transition not only from internal to external, but more importantly from desperate military conflicts to dramatic performance; the semi-political example of Accius’ self-confidence is a neat stopping-point between political and artistic concerns.

At 7.3.10 the traces of a physical journey are again present. Valerius states that he will provide one last internal story before his path is turned (devertere) towards the external material: *His uno adiecto levioris notae exemplo ad externa devertar*.

Valerius is more explicit in this case about the difference between the kinds of *exempla* — the story of the father’s cunning approach to undermining sexual desire is material of *levior nota*. Given that the stories at 7.3.8 and 7.3.9 both depict escapes from Triumviral proscription (respectively the escapees are M. Volusius (aed. pl. 43) and Sentius Saturninus Vetulo), and that 7.3.10 tells of a father subverting his son’s *inconcessa ac periculosae* passion, there does indeed seem to be a lessening of tension around the point of the transition. The Donkey Man’s clever movement of a fatal oracle onto his donkey rather than himself at 7.3.ext.1, follows more naturally on the *levius exemplum* of sexual misadventures not because it is external, but because it does not involve Romans proscribing their compatriots.

Nevertheless, a reader on seeing these *exempla* might be tempted to assume Valerius has less respect for the external material that he chooses to include; that — as Skidmore and Wardle argue — the role of the external material is to provide light variety. The sense of tension being released or a lightening of approach as Valerius moves from internal to external is a recurring theme in transitions. It is not, however, generally indicative of a negative or dismissive judgment on the content of the external material. At 6.9.ext.1 in the chapter *De Mutatione Morum aut Fortunae* Valerius moves from Julius Caesar’s spell in captivity with the pirates (6.9.15) to

---


Chapter Four

Polemo's conversion to sobriety as a result of a speech made by Xenocrates (6.9.ext.1) with the following transition line: *Attento studio nostra commemoravimus: remissiore nunc animo aliena narrentur.* The relaxation of attention is not the result of a fundamental difference in the validity of the content, but a result of the origin of that material. The distinction is depicted as being purely between *exempla* that are *nostra* and thus personally painful and significant, and those that are *aliena*\(^\text{20}\). At 9.2.ext.1 Valerius even states explicitly that the internal and external material is *par dolor*. Any relaxation he signals as he enters the foreign *exempla* is simply because the material is not Roman and in this case that means there is *nullus nostrae civitatis rubor inest*. Internal and external manifestations of *crudelitas* are equally painful; the only distinction indicated is that the internal material is also a source of Roman shame\(^\text{21}\).

The reasoning is clarified at 9.11.ext.1 by the gruesome material involved in the chapter *Dicta Improba aut Facta Scelerata: Illud autem facinus, quia externum est, tranquilliore affectu narrabitur*. There is necessarily a lower level of emotion in relating the external material because it is not Roman. The *exempla* do not cast mournful or shameful shadows through Roman history because *nos* bear no responsibility for the actions of externals – by making *externum* dependant on *facinus* Valerius is able to suggest that no Roman has committed the crime and that the crime itself is essentially alien – *facinus* is not used in the internal material of this chapter. Once again however the only distinction drawn here is between internal and external status not the nature of the material – Sejanus is after all, placed as the ultimate and most extreme *exemplum* in the external material of chapter 9.11\(^\text{22}\). In these cases a Roman will have no personal involvement with the foreign material simply because it is not Roman, not because it has been selected for variety or pleasure. Valerius is throwing the same punches in internal and external material; the difference for the reader is that between actually being hit and watching someone else take a beating.

Valerius' respect for his external material is suggested when the device of deploying an *exemplum* to bridge a perceived gap between internal and external material is echoed in an extended transition in the chapter *De Gratia* (5.2). Valerius ends the Roman material with the story of a group of undertakers who offer to carry

---

20 The contrast between *noster* and *alienus* recurs in the transition line at 9.5.ext.1. *Noster* is also paralleled with *alienigenus* at 1.5.ext.1, 5.3.ext.1 and 7.2.ext.1a.

21 Chapter 9.2 is discussed in depth in chapter Seven: 'Behaving Like a Human Being', 229-238.

22 9.11.ext.4. The placement of Sejanus in the external material of this chapter (9.11.ext.4) is an extremely interesting decision on Valerius' part and one discussed in chapter Six 'Barbarism Begins at Home', 184-188.
out the funerals of A. Hirtius (cos. 43) and C. Pansa (cos. 43) at the cost of one sesterce in recognition of their services to the state. Valerius opens 5.2.10 by commenting that this exemplum concerns the sordes gratae and closes the story with a back-handed compliment on the significance of those who lived only for gain choosing to forgo it; he then turns his attention to the transition between the two sections of exempla:

Pace cinerum suorum reges gentium exterarum secundum hunc tam contemptum gregem referri se patientur, qui aut non attigendus aut [non] in ultima parte domesticorum exemplorum collocandus fuit. Sed dum honesti etiam ab infimis [estis] editi memoria non intercidat, licet separatum locum obtineant, ut nec his adiecti nec illis praelati videantur (5.2.10).

In this case Valerius suggests that he may be considered to have gone too far with his final internal exemplum. As at 3.7.11 and 7.3.10 he ends internal material with an anecdote of a different kind from that which goes before, but in those cases the individuals involved are still drawn from the upper classes of society. At 5.2.10 however, the proponents are not poets or an anonymous family whose status must be assumed to be at least respectable, but a group of undertakers — men Valerius depicts as infimi and a contemptus grex. This placement has consequences: the status of the undertakers is so lowly that Valerius fears that it is insulting for the foreign grati to have to follow them. However, he goes on to protest that the undertakers have not been placed before (praeferrer) the reges gentium exterarum in the sense of having been given a more honourable position, but that the placement of such men is difficult: they must be at the end of the internal material if they are to be mentioned at all.

Finally he argues that the undertakers deserve to be included but that their position must be read as placing them in neither the internal nor external category. This explanation and the quick succession of excuses display Valerius’ respect towards the proponents of the external exempla. On this transition line’s evidence, the figures described in the external material have a status that needs to be recognised and protected; there is no sense that the distance between internal and external is such that it allows the situation to pass without comment. The external kings are, in fact,
justified in being offended by their situation next to lowly members of Roman society; they are not like the undertakers who must feel honoured by their very inclusion, quarantined in a no-man’s land between prominent Romans and external monarchs. The importance of gratitude is the same in the internal and external exempla, it is only as a result of the structure of the work – as Valerius protests – that the undertakers must rub shoulders with foreign kings. The general universality of the work is once again enforced by Valerius’ insistence that the undertakers have a right to be included in his collection. The same respect for worthy exempla that he displays when dealing with external peoples is also evident when he looks to the lowest rungs of his own society.

In one case where Valerius seems to focus on the lesser importance of external exempla, the authority and gravity of the internal material is conveyed with few words and an unusual placement. The preface to chapter 4.7 – De Amicitia – is exceptional for a number of reasons. It is the longest preface in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, including the preface to the work as a whole; it is one of the few occasions where individuals are mentioned in a preface and one of only two occasions where externals are mentioned and it is the only case in the work where a transition line actually appears in the preface to the internal material. Valerius, after discussing the importance of friendship and its particular power in times of hardship, provides the contrasting examples of the prominence of Sardanapallus’ friends and the obscurity of Orestes’ before he suddenly seems to ‘come to’: sed quid externa attingo, cum domesticis prius liceat uti? From here he proceeds to seven internal exempla and then opens the external material with a transition line that seems to imply that the two external exempla that follow are included simply via the magnanimity of Rome: Haeret animus in domesticis, sed aliena quoque bene facta referre Romanae urbis candor hortatur (4.7.ext.1).

---

24 Valerius specifies that the exemplum of the undertakers should be separated from all other material: licet separatum locum obtineant, ut nec his adiecti nec illis praelati videantur.
25 Exempla detailing the achievements of those of low status at Rome are discussed in chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 242-245.
26 4.7.pr. stands at 204 words in the Latin, the preface to the work as a whole at 180 words.
27 Generally only the very elevated appear in prefaces, Romulus is mentioned at 3.2.pr., a disputed Julia at 6.1.pr., Tiberius at 8.13.pr. and the house of Augustus at 8.15.pr. The exception is 5.5.pr where Valerius seems to be discussing his relationship with his own brother. The only other preface where externals are mentioned is 1.7.pr. where Valerius refers back to the concluding external exempla of chapter 1.6.
28 Interestingly domesticus appears in only two other of the 16 externus transitions (1.6.ext.pr and 6.1.ext.1) but occurs in three of the four general uses of externus.
All this at first sight suggests the vastly superior value of the internal material, but this is not the case. Valerius has consciously chosen the unusual technique of giving external examples in the Preface. Thus despite his rhetorical rejection of Greek myths of friendship at 4.7.4, it is with the foreign figures of Orestes and Sardanapallus that he chooses to show that adversity gives the greatest proofs of friendship (4.7.pr.). Likewise, when Valerius wants to compare his own friendship with Sextus Pompeius to a famous friendship of the past, he chooses Alexander and Hephaestion for the comparison. The deliberation behind this comparison is revealed by its very explicit terms: *nece metuo ne parum conveniat mihi Pompeium meum instar esse Alexandri, cum illi Hephaestio suus alter fuerit Alexander* (4.7.ext.2b). Furthermore, in order to facilitate this comparison, Valerius positions his own experience at the end of the external material which is an extremely unusual technique in the *Facta et Dicta*.

Valerius’ selection of material indicates that he takes the external material and the demonstrations it offers extremely seriously, and warns us not to take his rhetorical flourishes at face value. In this case Valerius values external manifestations of amicitia so much that he willingly confuses the structural division into internal and external in chapter 4.7 in order to deploy foreign exempla in a powerful fashion.

Despite the evidence of Valerius’ conscious decision to use external exempla in this case, he does ask in the preface to chapter 4.7 why external material should be included if appropriate internal material exists. Here and elsewhere Valerius creates a tension between his evident desire to include foreign peoples and a tendency to rhetorically draw away from the external material. A number of times, for instance, Valerius uses a device whereby he comments on the quantity of Roman exempla that demonstrate a given quality, and then goes on to state that, nevertheless, external material will, and ought to be, included. The most ironic of these transitions occurs in 7.2 *Sapienter Dicta aut Facta*, where Valerius boldly claims *tempus deficiet domestica narrantem...*, goes on to stress the integral part that *robor animorum* has had in the fortunes of the Roman Empire and grandly concludes:

---

29 The other example where internal material occurs in the external section is 9.11.ext.4 - the passage denouncing Sejanus.

30 Velleius Paterculus uses a reverse of this technique in a transition line on one occasion in his text, although it is expressed in this case as delay rather than preference. After discussing Homer he announces: *Dum in externis moror, incidi in rem domesticam...* (1.7.2). The delay and lingering here occurs in the external material and Velleius forces a move into the internal material.
Valerius obeys his own command to such an extent that the eight Roman examples of wisdom are followed by 23 external *exempla*. Bloomer rightly identifies that in this chapter “the foreign majority is due to Greece’s wealth of philosophers, poets and statesmen”\(^\text{31}\). Rome cannot easily compete and Valerius’ ostentatious transition line carefully draws attention to the imbalance of the chapter while superficially explaining it. On other occasions the same construct is modified to fit within the external material. At 4.6.ext.1 Valerius acknowledges the existence of conjugal love in *alienigenus* lands but states that *e quibus paucos attigisse satis erit*. Exactly the same sentiment appears at 2.7.ext.2 although it is delayed until the conclusion of the external material and used to cut this material short\(^\text{32}\). In these cases once again the quantity and quality of the Roman *exempla* are underlined and limitations are placed upon the inclusion of external material. In each case this directs attention onto the external material and – ironically – justifies its inclusion. Thus Valerius argues that despite the wealth of available Roman material he must grant space to the external *exempla*; they are valuable and important in their own right. At 3.8.ext.1 and 6.3.ext.1 Valerius again emphasizes that he could provide many more Roman *exempla* of the qualities in question (*Constantia* and *Severitas* respectively) but has instead decided to include external material. In the chapter *De Constantia* Valerius states that despite the many Roman *exempla* available *satietas modo vitanda est. itaque stilo meo ad externa iam delabi permittam* (3.8.ext.1). At 6.3.ext.1 he goes further to assert that examples of *Romana severitas* could fill the *totus terrarum orbis* but then says *tamen externa summatim cognosse fastidio non sit*.

In these two cases there is a trace of condescension in Valerius’ handling of the transition. In the first case it is relatively subtle: *itaque stilo meo ad externa iam delabi permittam*. Here there is a sense of physical relaxation in the phrase *delabi permittam*; *delabi* signifies downwards motion and also has a strong sense of loss of control in both a physical and moral sense\(^\text{33}\). When coupled with *permittere* the reader


\(^{32}\) 2.7.ext.2: *Sed aliena prospexisse tantummodo satis est, cum propriis mulloque uberioribus et felicioribus exemplis gloriaris liceat.*

\(^{33}\) The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* gives each meaning both a sense of downwards movement and a loss of control except for the second. Here the maintenance of control must be specified: “I To fall freely or
is left with a sense that the inclusion of external material is a favour on the part of a Roman who allows this indulgence. The use of *fastidio* implies condescension more overtly in the second case with its suggestion that one could despise the external material but Valerius chooses not to do so. The same impression is given when Valerius explains his inclusion of external material at 4.7.ext.1 as the result of Roman *candor*—fair-mindedness on Rome’s part allowing foreigners to have their moment in the sun. Because the transition lines are fundamentally inclusive it is tempting to read a gentle irony into Valerius’ tone. These lines are constructed with a superficial condescension that must have rendered them acceptable to a patriotic Roman, while still allowing Valerius to promote the importance of the external material.

A similar sense of magnanimity is evident at 8.15.ext.1 where Valerius says that he will include external *exempla* of distinctions awarded to foreign leaders *quia sine ulla deminutione Romanae maiestatis extera quoque insignia respici possunt*. The fact that internal and external are not in competition and that external distinctions do not present a threat to internal glory is itself suggestive of a fairly liberal outlook on Valerius’ part. There is no sense that Roman glory must come at the expense of external degradation—all are able to excel without conflict. Valerius’ technique of reference to the inclusion of the external material in transition lines emphasises their rightful presence in the work; even phrases that initially appear patronising reinforce this central point. If there are so many excellent *exempla* from Rome it is especially significant that so much external material is included in the work. The quantity of external material and the central point of the transition lines should be kept in mind when assessing the interpretation that Valerius’ generosity towards externals is motivated only by the side-benefits for Roman readers: namely the provision of pleasurable *varietas* in the midst of serious Roman material.

There are powerful reasons for believing that in Valerius the external material fulfills a weightier role than simply novelty items scattered across Roman history, some of which have already been discussed. Valerius is not working in a vacuum and...
Quintilian for example comments on the persuasive power of external *exempla*; he argues they have their own *auctoritas*\(^{36}\). External *exempla*, according to Quintilian, encapsulate the opinions of *gentes* and *populi* in widespread – even universal – beliefs and the universality of behaviour and experience is important to Valerius. Throughout Valerius’ work there is a sense that he fundamentally needs the external material to complete the picture of various qualities the readers receive. Skidmore argues that the external material helps Valerius to be “more persuasive” and while he does not develop this idea it is clearly a part of his argument that the *Facta et Dicta* is designed to be a persuasive handbook of moral conduct\(^ {37}\). There are however, large sections of text that seem to emphasise not instruction but the influence of certain behaviours or qualities throughout all peoples.

Chapters that centre on negative qualities make this very clear: in chapter 9.5 *De Superbia et Impotentia* Valerius includes four internal *exempla* and then turns to the external material for relief: *Satis multa de nostris: aliena nunc adiciantur* (9.5.ext.1). This transition shifts some of the weight of accusation from Rome to the rest of the world – the sentence overbalances in the second half with two words of more than three syllables and the repetition of *a*- sounds around the central *munc*. The reader is guided into proofs of external arrogance and outrage which exactly numerically balance those *exempla* drawn from Rome\(^ {38}\). The same dynamic underpins the chapter *De Ingratis* (5.3) where, after providing eleven Roman *exempla*, he opens the external material with *Ac ne nostra confessis alieni genae urbes insultent*... (5.3.ext.1) Valerius demonstrates to his readers (and he almost implies some external readers with this transition line) that ingratitude is not essentially Roman – eight external *exempla* follow and then an outright attack on the ingratitude demonstrated at various points by the city of Athens (5.3.ext.3f).

Despite the superficial condescension colouring some of the transition lines already discussed, this same sense of universality can also be observed in chapters

\(^{36}\) Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.36. *Adhibebitur extrinsecus in causam et auctoritas. Haec seuti Graecos, a quibus κριτηρίων dicuntur, iudicia aut iudicationes vacant, non de quibus ex causa dicta sententia est... sed si guid ita visum gentibus, populis, sapientibus viris, claris civibus, illustribus poetis referri potest.*


\(^{38}\) It could be argued however, that the internal material is rather more damning for Rome than the external material is for its constituent nations. Valerius presents four internal *exempla* two of which involve murder (9.5.2 and 9.5.4) and all of which involve active (usually vocal) insults delivered to the senate or individuals. In contrast, the external material includes only one active insult (9.5.ext.2) while the other three *exempla* refer to behaviour that enforces the exclusiveness of one group towards another – i.e. the refusal of the Campanian senators to use the same forum as the rest of the population – and include no violence.
dealing with positive characteristics. At 6.5.ext.1 in the chapter De Iustitia, despite his own characterization of Iustitia as a quality in which Rome particularly excels (6.5.pr.), Valerius makes it clear that he wants to include external evidence of that quality: *Verum ne alienigenae iustitiae oblitii videamur*... Even Romana iustitia should be depicted as demonstrated by externals in their own exempla. The same attitude is evident in sentences that lead up to Valerius’ comment at 4.7.ext.1 that Roman candor necessitates the commemoration of conjugal love in other countries: he opens the external material by acknowledging that *sunt et alienigeni amores iusti obscuritate ignorantiae non obruta*39. The structure of the Facta et Dicta puts emphasis squarely on behaviours like Justice or Ingratitude first, and only then on the distinction between internal and external. An assumption of the universality of these qualities is a foundation of the Facta et Dicta as a whole and the presence of the external material both demonstrates, and confirms the importance of the idea. Thus the terms externus, exter, alienigenus and alienus in transition lines may be superficially divisive but hint at a deeper unity.

The external material, then, not only fulfils a definite role in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia but is worthy of respect and attention. This is demonstrated by the inclusion of external material in fifty-nine chapters and the presence of neutral transition lines. It is also supported by close reading of transition lines that may initially seem negative. The essential difference in treatment between internal and external is often only in the strength of the emotional reaction expected from a Roman audience towards Roman material. Valerius never treats the externals with the scorn demonstrated by Celsus when that author groups the medical knowledge of *exterae gentes* together with the information that can be gained by treating animals40. After all, every time Valerius employs a transition line to move to material that is externa or aliena or alienigena or exter, he not only draws attention to the distinction between internal and external; he also underlines the presence of the external material in a manner impossible to ignore. The Roman readers of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia are being clearly shown a complete picture of external peoples with reference to both virtue and vice; a picture that is in every important way comparable to that of the

---

39 Similarly at 5.6.ext.1: *Sunt et externa eiusdem propositi exempla...*, 9.12.ext.1: *Sunt et externae mortes dignae adnotatu* and 4.3.ext.1: *Ac ne eiusdem laudis commemorationem externis invideamus...*

40 Pr.65. Nam et ii, qui pecoribus ac iumentis medentur, cum propria cuiusque ex multis animalibus nosse non possint, communibus tantummodo insistunt; et exterae gentes, cum subtilem medicinae rationem non noverint, communia tantum vident...
Chapter Four

Roman people. Valerius presents a persuasive universalism couched in terms designed not to frighten even the most jingoistic resident of Rome.

Us and Them.

Both inside and outside of the transition lines one of the most striking aspects of the foreign adjectives in Valerius' text discussed above is their generality. These terms are rarely used to describe a particular people – instead they convey the idea of externality, the fundamental distinction between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’. When they are used in association with individual nations or peoples the point is to underline the fact that these peoples are outsiders to the subject of the exemplum – in many ways they act as leveling tools. Despite the gradations of externality that are elsewhere registered in Valerius’ text, these terms simply indicate Them and not Us. While the adjectives are primarily used to distinguish between Rome and other nations, outside of transition lines they do sometimes indicate the peoples outside the walls of other communities.

Externus and Exter.

Valerius Maximus uses the terms externus and exter throughout the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia to describe material not drawn from Roman history and tradition. This use of the two adjectives, while not unusual, is not representative of his contemporaries. Valerius does not use either term for gradations of group membership within the Roman community as does, for instance, Seneca the Elder who identifies those outside the family or outside of a marriage with exter or to distinguish between individuals as does Manilius who frequently uses externus to distinguish ownership on an inter-personal level. Celsus, despite his relatively heavy usage of externus and exter, uses only exter – and even then only once – to denote foreignness. Every other usage refers to the physical outer-side of bodies and objects.

41 See chapter Six: ‘Bringing the Outside In’.
42 Con. 1.1.12: Scio quam acerbum sit supplicare exteris... In line with this usage domesticus in the next line refers to the immediate family. Similarly 2.7.8: At hercules adversus externorum quondam opiniones speciosissimum patrocinium erat: ego viro placeo. Even when Seneca uses the term in reference to a Peregrinus, the emphasis is upon the contrast between this man’s opinion of a woman and her husband’s opinion – it is very much on a familial level (2.7.exc.).
43 Man. 4.376 and 5.407 for example.
44 Pr.65: et exterae gentes, cum subtilem medicinae rationem non noverint, communia tantum vident...
In Valerius on the other hand, *externus* and *exter* are terms for outsiders in the national/ethnic sense. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* attributes very similar meanings to both of these adjectives — a primary meaning of situated (*externus*) or originating (*exter*) on the outside and a secondary meaning of foreign in terms of peoples and nations\(^45\). There is, however, a difference in the way Valerius deploys the two terms throughout the text. *Externus* is much more commonly used than *exter* (21 occurrences of *externus* to 8 of *exter*).

As *externus* is frequently fairly neutral in transition lines it is also a neutral term in the remainder of the text. One of the sixteen uses of *externus* in the final *exemplum* of the internal material is not in fact transitional but rather acts as a general term for foreign — as opposed to internal — conflicts. In this case it is positioned as a rhetorical counter-point for *domesticus*: *ita lugubres semper existimatae sunt victoriae, utpote non externo sed domes* *tic* *o* *partae cruore* (2.8.7). This general usage accounts for the other three uses of *externus* that appear other than at the beginning or the end of a section. At 5.7.2 Valerius depicts Caesar triumphant over *et externorum et domesticorum hostium* and once again the contrast is drawn between *externus et domesticus*. The same contrast is employed at 6.1.10; here Valerius reports the decision of the Tribunes of the Plebs that prominent men should not be able to *externis periculis domesticas delicias emerent*. *Externus* also implicitly stands as a contrast for internal Roman affairs at 6.6.1 where M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. II 175) is appointed as guardian to Ptolemy V. Valerius emphasises Lepidus’ experience and mastery in internal affairs (*...viri sanctitatem rei publicae usibus et sacris operatam*) as he is appointed to an *externa procuratio*. This *exemplum* demonstrates the time and effort Rome is willing to devote to a foreign country’s internal affairs in order to preserve *publica fides*. The guardianship of Ptolemy’s son, although to some extent an external affair, is gladly and thoroughly undertaken by Rome.

This use of *externus*, as indicated by its frequent partnership with *domesticus*, acts as a clear delineation between In and Out. In three of four cases *externus* is linked to external conflict\(^46\) but the general sense is a creation of rhetorical balance not invective. At 2.8.7 the tears suitable for internal conflict are balanced with the joy.

\(^{45}\) Glare, P. G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996) 559-560. In the case of *externus* there is another meaning listed, that of not belonging to an individual/ object and in a metaphorical sense not intrinsic.

\(^{46}\) At 6.1.10 the sexual crime of C. Cornelius is contrasted with his magnificent track record as a soldier, Valerius tells us that he was known to have served with *fortissima virtus* and received the *primum pilum* four times; these feats in war constitute the *externa pericula* mentioned.
legitimately felt at external victory and at 6.1.10 the external victory is put into contrast with internal misbehaviour. At 5.7.2 however Valerius creates a sense of Caesar’s total power by depicting his victory over both internal and external enemies, the two groups balanced and unified with a repetition of *et* before each word. Velleius Paterculus uses a similar construction to describe Augustus’ achievements, although in his case *bella civilia* and *bella externa* are described\(^47\). The four *exempla* so far discussed employ *externus* as a contrast for Roman internal politics and affairs, as do all of the transitional uses of the term. There is one exception to this general pattern at 2.6.1 where *externus* draws a distinction between Sparta’s customs and those foreign customs that might corrupt and weaken the state\(^48\). This is the only time that Valerius links *externus* to corruption or negative influences on a state. While this demonstrates that *externus* in the text does not exclusively distinguish between Rome and foreign nations, it is worth noting that Valerius opens the *exemplum* by describing Sparta as *proxima maiorum nostrorum gravitati*.

*Exter* is not so heavily transitional in its usage as *externus* — six of eight uses occur outside the context of transition lines\(^49\). Like *externus* however, *exter* is used to broadly refer to those peoples outside of, and as opposed to, Rome. Nevertheless, in Valerius’ use of *exter* the blurring of any clear lines between the two begins to be evident. The six non-transitional uses can be separated into those that are pointedly used to divide and those that are employed to create a sense of universality\(^50\). The divisive use of *exter* is quite close to the use of *externus* just discussed but perhaps slightly stronger. *Exter* is the opposite of Roman and focuses on the legal

\(^47\) Vell. 2.89.3: *Finita vicesimo anno bella civilia, sepulta externa, revocata pax, sopitus ubique armorum furor*... Perhaps an even closer parallel in Velleius describes Sulla’s determination to deal with his external enemies before completing his power with victory over his internal enemies. Here *externus* is partnered with *domesticus*. Vell. 2.24.4: *existimavitque ante frangendum hostem quam ulciscendum civem, repulsoque externo metu, ubi quod alienum esset vicisset, superaret quod erat domesticum.*

\(^48\) *Ac minime mirum est quod homines labore ac patientia gaudentes tenacissimos patriae nervos externum deliciarum contagione solvi et hebetari noluerunt...* Similarly in Seneca the Elder’s *Controversiae* 2.2.6 where the use of *externum ungumentum* (amongst other things) signifies not only corruption but madness.

\(^49\) Although the manuscripts of 2.pr (preserved in Shackleton Bailey’s 2000 text and Briscoe’s 1998 Teubner) read: *Dives et praepotens naturae regnum scrutatus inician stirium qua nostrae urbis quae ceterarum gentium priscis ac memorabilibus institutis...* I find the alternative reading of Kempf’s 1888 Teubner, in which *externum* replaces *ceterarum*, more convincing. Kempf’s reading which makes *exter* dependent on *gens* and puts it in contrast with *nostra urbs* is in line with Valerius’ construction in the Preface of the work and at 7.6.pr as his notes assert. *Cetera* only qualifies *gens* at one other point in the text (7.2.6c) whereas *exter* is dependent on *gens* in seven of eight uses. Furthermore, where *cetera* is used with *gens* it is used not to draw a distinction between Rome and other nations (as is *exter* but rather to group together the various African states.

\(^50\) Divisive uses are at 2.7.13, 4.3.13 and 2.2.3, uniting uses are Pr, 2.pr and 7.6.pr.
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ramifications of a lack of citizenship in particular instances. Thus at 2.7.13 Valerius describes punishments of deserters to Carthage in the Third Punic War as being specifically tailored to their status by the Younger Africanus. At 2.7.13 non-Roman deserters - *exerarum gentium transfugae* - are executed in a deliberately shameful fashion and one inappropriate for Roman citizens\(^\text{51}\). The distinction between Romans and foreigners is necessarily enforced. This *exemplum* is, however, a reversal of 2.7.12 in which Roman deserters are treated more harshly than Latins by the Elder Africanus and even crucified. The combination of 2.7.12 and 2.7.13 is not designed to leave the reader with a comfortable sense of certainty regarding the differences between internals and externals. In both cases we are dealing with men who have chosen to desert to the enemy despite their Roman citizenship. This citizenship sentences deserters to a servile punishment in the first *exemplum* and protects them from it in the second. Internal status is neither so desirable as to prevent anyone from deserting it, nor so inviolate as to ensure the absence of servile punishments – the boundaries are flexible and, potentially, treacherous.

At 2.2.3 Valerius is also intent on examining non-Romanness in a very dense *exemplum*. It opens with a justification of Marius’ refusal to learn Greek: Valerius states that a *victor* of Marius’ calibre is entirely within his rights to refuse to learn the language of a *devicta gens*. The language of desertion enters into this *exemplum* too; the risk of learning Greek, according to Valerius, is that of becoming a *transfuga* from the *ritus patrius* under the influence of an *alienigena ingenii exercitatio*. The *exemplum* draws attention to itself with a cluster of terms stressing the foreignness of Greek language – *gens, transfuga, alienigenus* – as well an address to Marius presenting the unnatural dynamic of the victor submitting to a conquered people. Valerius goes on to speak disparagingly of the current practice of allowing those of *exterarum gentium* (specifically Greeks) to speak Greek in the Senate house. Then finally he identifies the first Greek to do this as Molo, tutor of Cicero, admits that he was worthy of the honour and concludes with praises of Cicero and Marius.

The language of the *exemplum* is designed to be noticed; it features a number of words and forms rare to the text as a whole: *transfuga* appears four times\(^\text{52}\), *opinari* appears only once and the superlatives of *gloriosus* and *abundans* are both

\(^{51}\) The Non-Roman deserters were used in public wild-beast shows.

\(^{52}\) The instances are 2.2.3, 2.7.12, 2.7.13 and 7.4.ext.2.
infrquent. Exter and alienigenus are also two of the less prominent adjectives used to denote foreignness in the work and they together with transfuga and the basic subject matter of the exemplum, hammer in the distinction between victorious Rome and the conquered Greeks whose tongue is permissible in the city only on sufferance. Us and Them do not meet on equal terms.

On a closer reading however, this exemplum is undercut with typically Valerian ambiguity. The two particular Romans mentioned are the key – the exemplum certainly focuses around Marius initially but Valerius makes the decision to introduce Cicero into the story as well. The iconic Roman military victor and highest force of Roman oratory are, as Valerius points out in the last sentence of the exemplum (a sentence with two unusual superlatives), both from Arpinum. In fact, the glory of the two men is depicted as being that of Arpinum: Conspicuaefelicitatis Arpinas <m>unic<ipi>um, sive litterarum gloriosissimum contemptorem sive abundantissimum fontem intueri velis. This comment cannot help but remind the reader that both men were novi homines who struggled for inclusion in Rome. The success of the first of these men justifies his violent opposition to the introduction of foreign language and learning, the success of the latter effectively licenses that introduction. Greek is thoroughly accepted and integrated, just as were Marius and Cicero in time, and may have similar benefits to the state. Thus the initial clear distinction between internal and external is blurred as the two Roman heroes and the exterae gentes prove to be more closely related than they might initially appear.

The closeness of external and internal experience becomes explicit in the remaining uses of exter. Exter is positioned in such a way that it underlines the essential unity between the experience of Rome and other peoples in three prefaces in the Facta et Dicta. The first of these occurs in the Preface to the entire work when Valerius identifies his purpose as the collection of facta...ac dicta memoratu digna of the urbis Romae exterarumque gentium. The same aim is restated in the preface to book Two where he specifies that he will record the prisca ac memorabilia instituta of both nostra urbs and exterae gentes. In both cases Valerius is stressing that his work will demonstrate deeds, words and institutions from the whole world – that he will provide a universal picture. Similarly in the preface to the chapter De Necessitate

53 Gloriosissimus is used twice (2.2.3 and 9.3.4) and Abundantissimus is used four times (2.2.3, 4.7.7, 6.9.ext.5 and 7.1.2).

54 Exter appears eight times and alienigenus appears eleven times. This is in contrast to alienus (fourteen uses) and externus (21 uses).
Valerius uses *exter* to demonstrate the universal impact of *Necessitas* (7.6.pr.). He comments that the impact of the harsh laws of *abominanda Necessitas* have acted upon *cum urbem nostram tum etiam exteras gentes*. The balanced phrase here – as in the other two prefaces discussed – depicts the world as two sections united by the material they share. This is quite different from the way in which *externus* appears outside of the transitional material where at every point (bar 5.7.2) internal is opposed to external as exclusive categories. Instead, when *exter* is used the reader is reminded that both sections of the world have memorable deeds and sayings; both have ancient institutions, and both are susceptible to the demands of necessity. This is the same pointed universality that Valerius’ use of *natura* often reveals and that anchors his assumption that qualities like *pietas, virtus, crudelitas* or *humanitas* are common to all peoples.\(^{55}\)

*Alienus* and *Alienigenus*

As the patterns in the material above suggest, both *exter* and *externus* have regular substantives upon which they are dependent in the majority of cases. In all but one case *exter* is dependent on *gens*\(^{56}\) and *externus* in 13 of 21 cases depends on the explicit or implied noun *exemplum* – usually in the plural.\(^{57}\) *Alienus* and *alienigenus* are not nearly so consistent in their usage. In the case of *alienus* this reflects a milder sense of externality than that conveyed by any of the other adjectives discussed here. On a number of occasions it is debatable whether *alienus* indicates foreignness in the text or simply the sense of small ‘o’ other, not this one but the other one, not my possession but someone else’s. In Phaedrus *alienus* consistently conveys a sense of possession: other bird’s feathers, other people’s taste and other people’s faults – never foreignness in an ethnic sense.\(^{58}\) Manilius similarly uses the term to mean other in terms of stars that are not the actual birth stars of individuals and different birth stars. The closest he comes to using the term to convey a sense of foreignness is when he speaks of the planets moving through different sections of the sky.\(^{59}\) Celsus on the other hand uses *alienus* purely to indicate unsuitability. Various treatments,

\(^{55}\) See chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’.

\(^{56}\) I have included Kemp’s reading of *exter* at 2.Pr. in this figure. The exception is 8.15.ext.1 where it is dependent on *insigne*.

\(^{57}\) 1.6.pr, 1.8.ext.2, 3.3.2, 3.4.ext.1, 3.7.11, 3.8.ext.1, 4.1.15, 4.5.ext.1, 5.6.ext.1, 6.1.ext.1, 7.3.10, 9.11.ext.1 and 9.12.ext.1.

\(^{58}\) Phaed.1.3.1, 3.5.39 and 4.10.3 respectively.

\(^{59}\) Man. 4.376, 2.472 and 2.963 respectively.
substances or activities are described as *alienus* to the patient; the only variation occurs when Celsus negates the *alienus* with *nec* to suggest that something is in fact suitable or harmless\(^{60}\).

Some of Valerius’ uses included in this section could be read to simply mean other. Due to the material under discussion and the language of the particular *exempla* in which they are embedded, however, a capital letter at the beginning of *Other* seems to be implied. Despite its ambiguity, both senses of ‘otherness’ inherent in *alienus* ensure that where it occurs its primary function is divisive. This is certainly in line with the usage of Valerius’ contemporary Velleius — he uses *alienus* to describe animals’ tendencies to separate into their own species\(^{61}\) — but as I shall argue, these divisive uses more often than not indicate underlying unity.

In two of the *exempla* that employ *alienus* the story is focused upon one nation’s recognition of admirable behaviour in members of another *natio*. In both these cases the virtue recognised is also deemed suitable for the spectator nation and questions of group behaviour and self-definition are raised. At 4.5/ext.2 the Athenians are spectators of Spartan virtue: an old man in an Athenian theatre waits in vain for the offer of a seat from one of his compatriots and is finally given a place not by an Athenian but by one of a group of Spartan envoys. This gesture is met with approval by the Athenians: *quod ubi fieri populus aspexit, maximus plausu alienae urbis verecundiam comprobavit*. *Alienae urbis* could be translated as ‘another city’ but as both Shackleton Bailey and Walker recognise in their translations, the sense is a little stronger\(^{62}\). The Athenians have failed to show due respect for one of their elders — a man instantly recognisable as worthy of respect as Valerius’ unusually physical description makes clear\(^{63}\). Instead, representatives of a foreign city have fulfilled the demands of the Athenian society by showing respect to the man. The applause this generates from the Athenian audience serves to condemn them: *ferunt tunc unum e Lacedaemoniis dixisse ‘ergo Athenienses quid sit rectum sciant, sed id facere neglegunt.’*

---

\(^{60}\) Characteristic uses at Cels. 5.26.23g, 5.26.26b, 8.7.4, 7.26.5, 6.7.3 and 6.6.1k.

\(^{61}\) Vell. 1.16.2: *et quemadmodum clausa capso aliove saepto diversi generis animalia nihil minus separata alienis in unum quodque corpus congregantur...*


\(^{63}\) *...qui hominis aetate moti canos eius et annos...*
Valerius draws attention to the conclusion of the *exemplum* with the addition of *ferunt*. This focuses the reader on the words attributed to the Spartan not only by stressing the last sentence, but also by echoing the idea of speech, repeated shortly afterwards at *dixisse*. Within the conclusion the tension between internal and external is underlined with the close proximity of *Lacedaemonii* and *Athenienses*. The comment of the Spartan serves to confirm that respect for their elders is a fundamental part of Athenian and Spartan society. The bald statement *quid sit rectum* indicates an assumption of the commonality of values between the two peoples; certain things are indisputably right whether you are an Athenian or a Spartan. In this case the Spartans fulfil the demands of respect towards the Athenian aged (a demand that should have been fulfilled by Athenians) leaving the image of a group of foreign ambassadors acting to preserve the values of the Athenian society. *Alienus* serves to underline the externality of the Spartans but once again it is evident that the values under discussion are shared by both peoples. The Spartans recognise respect for the elderly as not only appropriate to the Athenians, but also appropriate to themselves – it is abstractly *rectum* and thus universally applicable irrespective of other distinctions between states.

In a second *exemplum* that demonstrates this kind of dynamic the stakes are much higher; the incident takes place in the midst of battle and a battle being fought to free Romans trapped by a Carthaginian siege (3.2.20). The spectators in this case are (initially at any rate) also Roman. Vibius Accaus (a Paelignian) throws his standard into the besieged camp and, having cursed himself should he fail to retrieve it, charges forward. Valerius Flaccus (a Roman) observes this and then delivers a pep-talk to his men:

> 'Spectatores' inquit, 'ut video, alienae virtutis hic venimus; sed absit istud dedecus a sanguine nostro, ut Romani gloria cedere Latinis velimus. Ego, certe, aut speciosam optans mortem aut felicem audaciae exitum, vel solus praecurrere paratus sum.'

It is evident that this use of *alienus* is pointed. The *virtus* under discussion not only belongs to another but also – more importantly – belongs to one who is non-
The speech as a whole makes this emphasis clear; in the very next line Valerius refers to *sanguis noster* (a term replete with ethnic significance) and then directly opposes the *Romani* and *Latini* around the acquisition of *gloria*. The centurion Pedanius is inspired to mirror the action of Accaus, and the two peoples race each other to the walls of the city in a competition to display pre-eminent *virtus*. This *virtus* is certainly available to both peoples but the Romans are possessive of the quality – they will not stand for it to pass into alien hands – and they are inspired to live up to the expectations attendant on Roman behaviour and success in battle. *Alienus* demonstrations of *fortitudo* and *verecundia* in both this *exemplum* and the one discussed above stand as criticisms of those who do not live up to the standards of their own societies, but need to be reminded of appropriate conduct by foreigners. The Romans adapt their behaviour to seize glory from their external prompts, the Athenians do not. *Alienus* also indicates milder opposition in military contexts and foreign policy.

The camp of the Bruttians and Lucanians at 1.8.6 is characterised as *aliena* by Valerius in a fairly straightforward *exemplum*. A young man later identified as Mars is depicted leading *nostros* (the Roman soldiers) to capture the *aliena castra*; Valerius reflects the two opposed forces in his sentence structure: *et nostros ad aliena castra capienda et Lucanos Bruttiosque ad sua defendenda*... The exact repetition of the pattern of *et*, possessive adjective, *ad*, object and gerundive balances the forces against one another. The contrast between *alienus* and *suus* is repeated at 7.4.ext.1 as Agathocles of Syracuse chooses to attack Carthage rather than defend his own city. At 4.6.ext.3, on the other hand, the Minyae are driven to appeal for foreign aid (*aliena ops*) after they have been expelled from their lands and are effectively refugees. Here the appeal to Sparta signifies the desperation of their plight; Valerius terms them *supplices* and *indigentes*. They have nothing that can be described as *suus* and must depend on alien kindness.

At 6.7.2 Valerius depicts the lengths to which Romans were driven by the triumviral proscriptions of 43/2 BCE. In this case the fate of Q. Lucretius who is...
hidden by his wife in the roof of their bedroom is contrasted with that of other proscribed men who have hidden in alienis et hostilibus regionibus. A contrast is created between Lucretius’ own home (his personal suus) and Rome as a whole and lands overseas which fundamentally do not belong to a Roman and to which Romans also fundamentally do not belong, as indicated by the lands’ hostility. This particular sense of alienus takes on a loaded character at 3.4.5, the only occasion alienus, or any other of the adjectives discussed here is applied to Rome.

The permeability of the boundaries between inside and outside is also visible in Valerius’ chapter De Humili Loco Natis Qui C/ari Evaserunt. There has been very little to do with war. The ambiguity present in 2.2.3 has already been examined in terms of the construction that includes both alienus and hostilis indicates that hostility is not essentially an expected component of alienus but must be added with a separate term.

Non parvus consulatus rubor M. Perpema, utpote [quam] consul ante quam cives, sed in bello gerendo utilior aliquanto rei publicae Varrone imperator: regem enim Aristonicum cepit Crassianaeque stragis punitor exstitit, cum interim, cuius vita triumphavit, mors Papa lege damnata est: namque patrem illius, nihil ad se pertinentia civis Romani iura complexum Sabelli iudicio petitur redire in pristinas sedes coegerunt. Ita M. Perpemae nomen adumbratum, falsus consulatus, caliginis simile imperium, caducus triumphus aliena in urbe improbe peregrinatus est.

Valerius presents his readers with the paradox of Perpema – consul and imperator but not a citizen. Valerius constructs the conclusion of the exemplum to underline the contrast between Perpema’s very Roman qualities and career and his actual non-Roman status. His presence in Rome is described as peregrinari and, for him, Rome is an aliena urbs. Valerius’ choice of language forces the reader to see this from Perpema’s perspective and underlines the issues of identity involved. The confusion is further emphasised because Valerius makes peregrinatus agree grammatically not with Perpema himself, but with his Roman triumphus and it also

---

66 It is worth noting that the construction that includes both alienus and hostilis indicates that hostility is not essentially an expected component of alienus but must be added with a separate term. 67 It is doubtful whether he really fits into the chapter De Humili Loco Natis Qui Clari Evaserunt, he rises from circumstances which so successfully conceal their lowliness that he dies before it is discovered. The discovery of his false citizenship then has the effect of undercutting his clarus ending and thus effectively punctures the achievements that are the moral of each of the other exempla. This exemplum is discussed in chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 241-242.

68 The chapter De Iure Triumphi (2.8) has no external exempla. Throughout the Facta et Dicta triumph is an exclusively Roman achievement – as might be expected given its technical and formal aspects. The only possible exception is Dionysus - here represented as Liber pater - triumphing over India (3.6.6) and in this case Valerius chooses to identify Dionysus with a very Roman epithet. More than this however, in instances like 6.9.9 triumph can act as a marker not only of status but also of inclusion. Thus Valerius comments on the change of fortune that sees P. Ventidius go from being displayed as a child in Cn. Pompeius Strabo’s triumph after the capture of Asculum to celebrating his own triumph over the external enemies of Rome. This achievement is placed alongside his consulship and praetorship in the one year.
seems to encompass both his *consulatus* and *imperium*. These qualities suddenly become alien in Rome because they are attached to a figure who, despite his successful career at Rome, has been judged an alien. Qualities we would view as essentially Roman are not so easily categorised: those who demonstrate these qualities at the highest level are not necessarily Roman – the relationship between behaviour and ethnicity is teased out and the reader is warned to beware of simplistic separations into Us and Them.

The permeability of the boundaries between inside and outside is also visible in Valerius’ use of the uncommon adjective *alienigenus*. According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* Valerius provides the majority of uses of the term to mean *diversae nationis* and *exterus*; only a handful of other uses are mentioned and none of them contemporary to Valerius. Valerius has used an unusual term and, in line with the rhetorical emphasis of such a choice, *alienigenus* carries a much stronger sense of externality than *alienus* in the text. In the three non-transitional uses of the adjective *alienigenus* the reader is left with a sense of external influence and power that has very little to do with war. The ambiguity present in 2.2.3 has already been examined in terms of Valerius’ use of Cicero and Marius as icons of Roman achievement. There is another ambiguity present in the *exemplum* however, and that is the exact role of the Greek language and Greek learning more generally.

Marius sees something threatening to the *patrius ritus* in the learning of Greek; a sense – as the term *transfuga* indicates – that the possession of Greek will draw him away from Rome, corrupt him with the *devictae gentis facundia*. Initially in the *exemplum* Greek maintains this alien and threatening position – Valerius refers to the past custom that foreigners were not permitted to speak Greek in the Senate and identifies the first instance where this rule was relaxed. For Greek to present a threat, however, it must have some degree of power, either as a source of pleasure or as an effective tool. In this case it is the latter and we see Greek’s power through the power that a Greek teacher gives to Cicero. Valerius introduces Molo as follows: *Molo rhetor, qui studia M. Ciceronis acuit.* The connection with Cicero is reiterated as Valerius justifies Molo being permitted to speak in Greek: *quoniam summam vim Romanae eloquentiae adiuverat.* The *exemplum* concludes with further praise of

---

69 In 126 of 152 occurrences of *imperium* in the *Facta et Dicta* that *imperium* is Roman. Additionally, sixty of sixty-three uses of *imperator* refer to Romans.

70 *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* Vol. 1 (Munich, 1900) 1563. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* provides only 15 instances of the other sense of *alienigenus* meaning *diversi generis, diversae naturae*. 
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Cicero as the abundantissimus fons of letters. Greek learning, it appears, has played a fundamental role in creating the paragon of Roman eloquence and Valerius uncompromisingly underlines Molo’s Greekness; he uses the Greek-based word rhetor which appears nowhere else in the text and refers to Molo as a member of an extera gens. There is no escaping the fact that Molo is an expert in the language that Marius viewed as a real threat but it appears that the foreign language and culture in question is, via Cicero and then others, actually a part of Roman discourse and public life.

In this sense Valerius has answered the rhetorical question he posed at 2.1.10 where he asks what Greek knowledge could add to the Roman system of learning via exempla: Quid hoc splendidius, quid etiam utilius certamine?...quas Athenas, quam scholam, quae alienigena studia huic domesticae disciplinae praetulerim? Valerius—despite his own comments at 2.2.3 and 8.7.ext.1—seems here to reject the idea in the strongest possible terms. The stance of sensitivity towards the status of Greek learning that Valerius adopts spreads into a sneer at 4.3.6b when he disparages the precepts of Epicurus:

licet Athenae doctrina sua glorientur, vir tamen prudens Fabricii
destationem quam Epicuri malu<er>it praecpta. Quod eventus quoque indicavit:
nam quae urbs voluptati plurimum tribuit, imperium maximum amisset, quae labore
delectata est, occupavit, et illa libertatem tueri non valuit, haec etiam donare potuit.

These exempla work on at least two levels: firstly the issue of the benefits of education generally and secondly the impact of Greek learning upon the history of Rome. The wider issue of education means that, in spite of the language Valerius employs, this is not a rejection of specifically Greek methods of education, but rather part of a general emphasis in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia upon innate knowledge and understanding. Valerius rejects higher education and the subtleties of philosophical discourse (concepts strongly associated with Greece) at a number of points throughout the work. As we shall see Scythians, Thracians and Lusitanians

---

71 Valerius recognizes the debt to Greek again at 8.7.ext.1: Graeca quoque industria, quoniam nostrae multum profuit, quem meretur fructum Latina lingua recipiat.
72 Scholae in four of six uses are Greek in the Facta et Dicta. Additionally, on the only two occasions where schola is used in connection with Romans the Romans involved are difficult figures, Sulla’s son boasts of his father’s proscriptions in a schola (3.1.3) and the Gracchi attend a schola at 4.4.pr.
(5.4.ext.5, 2.6.12 and 6.4.ext.1) are all praised for the wisdom and understanding they demonstrate without education. The point Valerius consistently enforces is that virtue is universally available and displayed. Thus while he certainly demonstrates elsewhere a respect for scholarly and artistic endeavour (particularly that concerned specifically with human life), innate knowledge, and the educative principle of imitation around which the Facta et Dicta is based are of primary importance.

At 4.3.6b Fabricius Luscinus rejects the Epicureans' teachings, as they are relayed by Cineas of Thessaly, as false sapientia. He is guided by his instinctive revulsion for the ideas—he regards them as so contrary to nature that they are monstra. At 2.1.10 Valerius relates nostalgically the ancient Roman form of education by personal exemplum. The simplicity and practicality of this system is contrasted with the trappings of higher education: Athens (as a symbol of this kind of learning), scholae and studia. Valerius is making a point about education, not the Greek 'race'; they are present simply as an iconic symbol of the advanced learning that can be so easily trumped by an individual's instinctive virtus.

Valerius' broad point about virtue having been made in rhetorically charged asides, he is happy to acknowledge within individual exempla that Greek education has had a key role to play in Roman politics and culture. This demonstrates again that he is not involved here in a division into internal and external—Roman greatness vs. Greek volubility. Rather, he sets up this very idea in the figure of Marius and then confounds it by introducing Molo (tutor to Roman achievement) and Cicero—fellow novus homo to Marius. Alienigeni education and customs can help Romans excel within their society, propelling them above other Romans in the on-going competition of public life just as Molo guided Cicero towards fame. Greek may be alienigenus, Rome may be a victor and Greece defeated but, as Horace would advise, the relationship is not nearly as simple as these facts might suggest. Valerius' construction of individual exempla reveals that this is something he understands.

It is one thing for Greek language to give an individual an edge over his rivals; it is another thing altogether when foreign trappings become necessary in order to survive the hostility of other Romans. In the chapter Vafre Dicta aut Facta (7.3) M.
Volusius (aed. pl. 43) adopts the appearance of a priest of Isis in order to escape the proscriptions. Appian relates the same set of events with little comment, adding the detail that Volusius borrowed the outfit from a friend who was a devotee of Isis (B.C. 4.46). Valerius’ account is not nearly so neutral – he has Volusius adopting the clothing and then petens stipem through the city of Rome and beyond – indignity is added to indignity and there is no question in the exemplum that the adoption of such a pose is undignified:

*quid illa necessitate miserius, quae magistratum populi Romani abieci honoris praetexto alienigenae religionis obscuratum insignibus per urbes indigendi? O nimis aut hi suae vitae aut illi alienae mortis cupidi, qui talia vel ipsi sustinuerunt vel alios perperi coegerunt! (7.3.8)*

Valerius highlights the removal of Volusius’ Roman insignia for those of an alienigena religio with a full explanation of the significance of the former clothing; Volusius is a magistratus Romani populi and his toga praetexta is an indicator of his honor. Instead he goes through the city obscuratus as a follower of Isis and for Valerius this is utterly wretched: it is better to die than to have adopted such measures or – importantly – to have forced others to adopt them. This is a very strong rejection of Volusius’ actions but their context is at least as much the point as the act itself.76

Volusius — an aedile — is forced to remove those symbols indicating his status and honour and instead hide in a foreign religion, begging in the streets of Rome. This exemplum is an indictment of the civil conflict that has created this unnatural situation: it is safer for Volusius to appear in Rome as a priest of an alien and undignified religion than as a respectable magistrate of the city of Rome. Blame is not attached to one side of the conflict; although Volusius is escaping to Brutus’ camp he does so because, as Valerius has told us at the moment of introducing the character, he has been proscribed by the triumvirs.77 It is notable that in this exemplum Brutus is not condemned as he is on other occasions (1.5.7 and 6.4.5), nor is he put into explicit

---

76 A similar – perhaps more fundamental – confusion of categories elicits praise from Valerius at 4.6.ext.2 when Hypsicratea disguises herself as a man in order to accompany Mithridates in flight: *cuius tanta fides asperarum atque difficilium rerum Mithridati maximum solacium et iucundissimum lenimentum fuit...*

77 *M. Volusius, aedilis plebis proscriptus, adsumpto Isiaci habitu...*
opposition with Augustus or Julius Caesar as elsewhere (1.7.1 and 3.2.15)\textsuperscript{78}. Both sides are responsible for the mess at Rome, and at least in this \textit{exemplum} Brutus’ camp offers a safety that is unavailable in the city governed by the Triumvirs. In the next \textit{exemplum} (7.3.9) Valerius goes on to comment that Sentius Saturninus Vetulo’s usurpation of the symbols and rights of a Praetor in order to protect himself from the proscriptions was \textit{speciosius} than Volusius’ escape. Ventulo’s escape at least demonstrates that the structures of society still have power; Volusius’ escape shows those structures completely overturned as an apparently foreign priest and beggar is safer in Rome than a Roman of high standing. ‘Internal’ and ‘external’ are virtually meaningless labels in this context.

Valerius’ use of the adjectives \textit{externus}, \textit{exter}, \textit{alienus} and \textit{alienigenus} to convey externality is indicative of the ambivalence throughout the \textit{Facta et Dicta Memorabilia} when it comes to the distinction between internal and external. On the one hand Valerius is very clear about drawing lines between Romans and the rest of the world; his use of \textit{externus} for instance is focused on foreigners to a unique extent in terms of contemporary usage. Nevertheless, while \textit{externus}, \textit{exter}, \textit{alienus} and \textit{alienigenus} point initially to difference they consistently reveal similarity. Furthermore they demonstrate that the boundaries between internal and external are so permeable and fragile that their very existence is in doubt. Apparently solid walls become gates into a labyrinth as we follow the threads.

**Gens and Natio: What’s in a Name?**

Aside from adjectives like \textit{externus}, \textit{exter}, \textit{alienus}, \textit{alienigenus} and (we shall see) \textit{barbarus}, Valerius uses two other particular terms to label external groups: \textit{gens} and \textit{natio}\textsuperscript{79}. Saddington highlights these terms as being used particularly with reference to foreign communities and groups in the early empire\textsuperscript{80}. In Valerius’ text \textit{gens} is overwhelmingly – though not exclusively – used of foreign groups and \textit{natio} is entirely external\textsuperscript{81}. Sometimes the externalising adjectives mentioned above are used

\textsuperscript{78} At 7.3.8 Brutus is certainly not described with the vivid terminology of parricide that Briscoe identifies elsewhere: Briscoe, J., ‘Some Notes on Valerius Maximus’ Sileno 19 (1993) 405.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Civitas}, \textit{populus} and \textit{urbs} are also used throughout the text but there usage is not relevant to the topic under discussion here. \textit{Stirps}, as indicated at pg. 201, is only used in an ethnic sense on one occasion.

\textsuperscript{80} Saddington, D.B. ‘Roman Attitudes to the \textit{Externae Gentes} of the North’ Acta Classica, 4. (1961) 91-2.

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Gens} is used in an ethnic sense 54 times in the work and three of these uses (1.1.15, 2.4.2 and 5.1.1) are internal. \textit{Natio} is used four times (1.1.ext.3, 2.6.12, 2.10.6 and 3.7.1a) and all uses refer to foreign groups, although 1.1.ext.3 also has a general sense.
in combination with one of these substantives: *gens* is qualified on a number of occasions with *extera* in the text\(^{82}\) and it is twice qualified by *barbara* (5.4.ext.5 and 7.3.6). This indicates that when Valerius uses *gens* he does not assume that it intrinsically carries the sense of externality but rather, that it is a label to which the idea of externality can be attached. Saddington further notes that *gens* and *natio* were generally used by Roman authors to describe “less civilized peoples” and that both terms tend to be used to define a people in terms of their relationship with Rome – often with overtones of savagery in military situations\(^{83}\). This, as we shall see, is not the case in Valerius’ text.

Valerius does use the term *gens*, particularly in the plural and in a non-specific sense, to comment on the power of Rome\(^{84}\). Thus Valerius comments that the policy of making Greeks and Asians even while in their own lands speak Latin when interacting with Romans was no doubt intended to spread the high-standing of Latin *per omnes gentes* (2.2.2). The countries of the world imbibe not Latin itself but the power of a country that can demand that its language be international. Masinissa’s gratitude and loyalty towards Rome is recognised by *non solum Africa sed etiam cunctae gentes* (5.2.ext.4) and Roman *iustitia* is an *exemplum inter omnes gentes* (6.5.pr)\(^{85}\). Roman might is routinely calculated in terms of the *gentes* under its control – the trick perpetrated upon a Sabine farmer by a Roman priest ensures for Rome the control of *tot gentes* for instance (7.3.1) – and the control of these nations is in turn a demonstration of Roman virtue. Thus Roman military discipline ensures she will rule the *validissimae gentes* (2.8.pr) and her triumphs over many *gentes* are consolidated by the exercise of the censorship at home (2.9.pr). This good behaviour extends outwards as Rome demonstrates a spirit of *liberalitas* to *reges*, *urbes* and *gentes*\(^{86}\).

Thus the plural of *gens* is utilised to describe the world outside of Rome, and

---

\(^{82}\) As in the Preface, at 2.7.13, 5.2.10, 2.2.3, 7.6.3 and – I would argue – the preface to book Two.


\(^{84}\) *Gens* in an ethnic or national sense constitutes the biggest percentage of Valerius’ total use of the term. He uses *gens* 72 times in the work and 54 of these uses are ethnic or racial (76%). In terms of the usage of the word itself, Cicero uses it 228 times, Livy uses it 476 times and Virgil uses it 96 times. Velleius Paterculus, Valerius’ contemporary, uses it 41 times. Additionally, Celsus uses *gens* on five occasions and Seneca the Elder uses it thirteen times.

\(^{85}\) On an individual level too Scipio Aemilianus’ frugality is demonstrated before an audience of *socios et exteras gentes* at 4.3.14.

\(^{86}\) Once again the same construction is used on an individual level; Pompey’s career is depicted as triumphs over *civitates* and *gentes* (8.15.8).

---
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particularly those areas of the world under Roman control. There is no sense of contempt or condemnation in this usage.

On an individual level however, *gens* stops functioning in relation to the power of Rome and simply functions as a means of identifying particular peoples; it appears particularly when Valerius wants to convey the characteristics of a group and thus needs to define the unit in question. Valerius, for instance, sometimes connects a word indicating writing or language to *gens* with a possessive pronoun. Masinissa inscribes the tusks that he returns to the shrine of Juno at Melita with the *gentis suae litterae* (1.1.ext.2), and Pythagoras pursues his quest for knowledge to the extent of learning from Egyptian priests the *litterae gentis eius* (8.7.ext.2). A Galatian queen is able to exact revenge safely on a Roman centurion who has raped her by alerting her countrymen in the *lingua gentis suae* (6.1.ext.2). Language is also a characteristic of the *gens* when Mithridates is depicted as capable in the languages of the *duo et viginti gentes* that make up his empire (8.7.ext.16). This characteristic use also extends to customs on occasion: the Numidian kings for instance, refuse to kiss other people in accordance with the *mos gentis suae* (2.6.17).

Other, more subjective characteristics of foreign *gentes* are also depicted in the *Facta et Dicta* but Valerius uses them to demonstrate the ambiguity of ethnic categorisations rather than to force peoples into a strait-jacket of consistent national characteristics. Thus in the chapter *De Amicitia* as a contrast to the bloody manifestations of Roman friendship on display Valerius labels the Greeks as a *gens ad fingendum parata* on the evidence of the stories of Theseus and Pirithous’ journey to the underworld (4.7.4). Valerius has just previously stated of such stories that: *vani est istud narrare, stulti credere*. The Greeks who adhere to the stories must be either stupid or liars. As was argued earlier Valerius adopts this stance as an ironic contrast to the historical, but utterly savage, *exempla* that he draws from various civil conflicts at Rome. The Greeks are not presented as liars at any other point in the work. Valerius attributes such a characteristic to the *gens* at this point because it allows him to construct a contrast between Rome’s bloody civil history and the fictional, but largely harmless, mythology of Greece. This is not part of a co-ordinated and contemptuous portrait of the Greek people. Valerius uses *gens* on this occasion to

---

describe a thoroughly civilised people; a people whom he frequently describes with *civitas* – a term that has been seen as indicating higher levels of sophistication.\(^{88}\)

In the context of the chapter *Dicta Improba aut Facta Scelerata* (9.11), Valerius depicts a more general criminality as characteristic of a *gens*; at 9.11.ext.3 he asks *quamquam quid hoc quasi imusitatum illis gentibus miremur* in reaction to Mithridates’ (actually Pharnaces’) war with his father over the throne in the previous *exemplum* (9.11.ext.2), and then continues on to relate the story of Sariaster’s blood-bound conspiracy against his father. Similarly, Valerius in the chapter *De Crudelitate* (9.2) states that the savagery of Zisemis, King of Thrace – he was given to forcing parents to eat their own children and conducting vivisections – should not be particularly surprising because of the *gentis ipsius feritas* (9.2.ext.4)\(^{89}\). The element of wonder or amazement that is defined in these two *exempla* (*mirari* at 9.11.ext.3 and *admirabilis* at 9.2.ext.4) again shows characteristics being attributed to the *gens* in order to explain events. Violence and savagery ought not to be wondered at because they are associated with the *gentes* in question. This should not, however, be taken as an indication of a consistent stereo-typing of different *gentes* in terms of these characteristics; Thracians are elsewhere credited with *sapientia* (2.6.2) and Mithridates (as one representative of his *gens*) demonstrates praise-worthy gratitude and scholarship at different points in the *Facta et Dicta* (5.2.ext.2 and 8.7.ext.16 respectively). It is notable that in these cases where negative characteristics are attributed to *gentes* they are not being depicted in terms of their relationship with Rome but rather purely in terms of internal politics. Most important however, is the finale that these *exempla* build up to at the end of both the chapter *Dicta Improba aut Facta Scelerata* (9.11) and the ‘Vice’ books as a whole\(^{90}\). Valerius’ horror at the brutality of the *gens* exhibited at 9.11.ext.3 is immediately followed by the climactic excoriation of the Roman Sejanus (9.11.ext.4). The ‘Vice’ books conclude with a

\(^{88}\) Saddington, D.B. ‘Roman Attitudes to the *Externae Gentes* of the North’ *Acta Classica*, 4. (1961)92. Valerius refers to various Greek states with *civitas* on a number of occasions, for instance: 2.6.1, 2.10.xt.2, 3.1.ext.1, 3.2.ext.5, 3.8.ext.3 and 4.6.ext.3.

\(^{89}\) Diodorus Siculus (34/35.12) provides a record of the figure that Valerius Maximus names Zisemis, here called Zibelimus. The details are fairly similar to those of Valerius’ account: Zibelimus, son of Dieglyis, enacts his revenge for the treatment of his father by the Thracian people via acts of great cruelty. Diodorus refers to “such lengths of cruelty and lawlessness” on the slightest grounds and includes the image of children being force-fed to their parents. Diodorus doesn’t explicitly state that Zibelimus’ conduct varied from the norm in Thrace – in fact he is said to be continuing his father’s standard of blood lust - but he does record that the Thracians eventually find horrible ways to kill him when they can no longer support his conduct. Zisemis’ cruelty is then unacceptable to the Thracians, not just record-breaking as it is in Valerius’ account.

\(^{90}\) Chapters 9.1-9.11 which uniformly deal with vices and bad behaviour.
Chapter Four

Roman whose unparalleled wickedness subverts entirely the idea of any particular and consistent connection between certain foreign gentes and bad behaviour\(^91\). Roman readers are lulled into a false sense of security by demonstrations of external wickedness and then presented with stark evidence that their compatriots are capable of far worse.

The way in which Valerius undermines any sense of negative national stereotyping when he attributes characteristics to different gentes is further demonstrated with reference to ferox and ferocitas in three different exempla\(^92\). At 2.7.11 the characteristics of a Spanish gens explain the need for unusually harsh military discipline on the part of Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (cos. 142). Valerius argues that the Roman had to force his mansuetissimum ingenium to saevior severitas in order to conquer the ferocissimae gentis animi — in this case, the Lusitanians. The intrinsic ferocity of the Lusitanians is depicted as being such that the general resorted to mutilation of Roman deserters and prisoners of war in an effort to seize victory. Once again the exemplum is heavy with irony. Only two people mutilate Roman soldiers en masse in the Facta et Dicta; the mansuetissimus Fabius Maximus and Hannibal. Mutilation, a behaviour that features heavily in the chapter de Crudelitate (9.2)\(^93\), is enlisted in a struggle for military discipline which aligns the ‘very kind’ commander with the some of the worst brutality carried out by enemies against Romans in war. Q. Fabius Maximus cuts off the hands of Roman deserters, just as Hannibal cuts off the front part of Roman prisoners’ feet (9.2.ext.2). Valerius Maximus graphically describes the hands severed on Fabius Maximus’ order lying scattered on the blood soaked ground. They are a symbol of Roman saevior severitas justified by the (here unsubstantiated) savagery of an enemy gens.

The implications of ferocitas in a gens are again explored at 3.2.ext.7 in the chapter De Fortitudine. Here Rhoetogenes leads a mass suicide of the defeated Numantines in their city and Valerius comments specifically on his source of inspiration:

\(^{91}\) See discussion of 9.11.ext.4 in chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’, 184-188.

\(^{92}\) 2.7.11, 3.2.ext.7 and 9.13.ext.4

\(^{93}\) Mutilation of the living appears in four of the fifteen exempla in the chapter (9.2.ext.1, 2, 4 and 8) and mutilation of the dead appears in a further four instances (9.2.1, 2, 3 and 9.2.ext.5).
Sed Theramenes (the central figure of the previous exemplum) a litteris et doctrina virilitatem traxit, Numantino vero Rhoetogeni ad consimilem virtutem capessendam quasi magistra gentis suae ferocitas exstittit.

The virilitas of Theramenes has exactly the same result as the ferocitas of the Numantines. Valerius' attitude to this event is unambiguous; he acknowledges it as a demonstration of virtus and a fortis act, comparable with Theramenes' resistance to the cruellest of the thirty tyrants at Athens. This is despite the fact (not stated but understood in the course of the exemplum) that the city to which Numantia was so implacably opposed was Rome. The first hint of this arises at the opening of the next exemplum where he refers to Numantia as an inimica urbs and aligns it to Carthage (3.2.ext.7). This is, however, in no way used to detract from the bravery that is inspired by Rhoetogenes' ferocitas or, in fact, the courage of Hasdrubal's wife that is described at 3.2.ext.7. Possession of the same ferocitas by the anonymous bodyguards of Dionysius of Syracuse presumably explains their selection by the paranoid tyrant; Valerius identifies them as ferocissimarum gentium homines (9.13.ext.4). Here there are no names or hints to geographical origin; the men are simply from an extremely fierce gentes and the description serves to prove that they are suited to the task of protecting the tyrant. Their extreme status would usually render them fundamentally out of place within a Syracusan family but in Dionysius' case Valerius points out that it effectively preserves the tyrant for 38 years of rule.94

The last three exempla demonstrate a connection between gens and ferox or ferocitas in the Facta et Dicta; the noun and adjective forms are not common in the text, ferox appears seven times and ferocitas only once.95 There are two uses of the superlative form of ferox (half of the uses of the adjective in relation to external peoples) and both of these qualify gens (2.7.11 and 9.13.ext.4).96 This should not, however, be taken as evidence of a condemnatory view of the savagery of foreign peoples on the part of Valerius Maximus; ferocitas inspires fortitudo in Rhoetogenes and when it is used in the superlative of the Lusitanians and the anonymous bodyguards it indicates only the extreme martial prowess and spirit of those so described. Nor is the term exclusively used of externals; ferox describes Romans on
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94 Qui (Dionysius) duodequadraginta annorum dominationem in hunc modum peregit.
95 Ferox appears at 2.7.11, 3.2.19, 5.3.1, 6.3.6, 9.2.ext.10, 9.13.ext.4 and 9.14.2 Ferocitas appears only at 3.2.ext.7.
96 The other two external uses are 3.2.19 and 9.2.ext.10.
three occasions and it appears in reference to both Horatius Cocles and the father of Pompeius Magnus. The link between *ferocitas* and *gens* is not indicative of a deliberate ‘Othering’ of the peoples involved. Rather, *gens* once again appears as Valerius attributes certain behaviours or attitudes to a different group. These characteristics are not present as a means of stereo-typing the group but rather in order to create certain juxtapositions within individual *exempla*. Roman *saevitia* is weighed against Lusitanian *ferocitas*; Numatine innate *virtus* is compared to Athenian higher-education and the dangers found within the family are contrasted with the safety to be found in ferocious, foreign *gentes*. Consistently in Valerius Maximus, *gens* in combination with *ferox* questions the distinction between civilised and uncivilised peoples.

Unlike *natio*, *gens* is also used by Valerius – albeit infrequently – to refer to Rome. On the three occasions when *gens* is used in reference to Rome it describes the characteristics of the Roman people: Rome’s devotion to *religio*, *virilitas* and *humanitas* are on display. Valerius declares that the assiduous attention paid by Romans to the rites of Ceres despite the recent disaster at Cannae made a significant impact on the gods. He states that the gods were ashamed to further abuse a *gentem quae ne iniuriarum guidem acerbitate ab eorum cultu absterreri potuerit* (1.1.15).

The enemy against which the Romans needed some form of divine protection at 1.1.15 is the recipient of Roman *humanitas* at 5.1.1a. This quality – as will be argued – although praised as an attribute of the *gens Romana* by the Carthaginians (‘*O munificentiam gentis Romanae deorum benignitati aequandam!*’) is depicted in terms of its universality throughout chapter 5.1. In fact, the final image of chapter 5.1 is Hannibal’s *humanitas*.

The characteristics of the *gens Romana* are not only the qualities of grand gesture – piety and mercy – *virilitas* is important too and it needs to be protected at all times. At 2.4.2 Valerius records the origins of theatres in the city of Rome and the stallng point that occurred when P. Scipio Nasica ordered that no facilities should be provided to allow spectators to view a show sitting down: *ut scilicet remissioni animorum standi virilitas propria Romanae gentis iuncta esset*. It is characteristic of
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97 The Roman occurrences are at 5.3.1, 6.3.6 and 9.14.2; the last two refer to Horatius Cocles’ action towards his sister and Cn. Pompeius Strabo’s ability to inspire fear, though not to such an extent that he avoids mockery.

98 Roman uses of *gens* are at 1.1.15, 2.4.2 and 5.1.1.

99 Chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 244-254.
the Roman people to worship the gods, to extend mercy to enemies and to remain alert and disciplined even when engaged in entertainment. In all these cases Valerius constructs an outsider’s observation of the Roman people; the gods view Roman piety at 1.1.15, the Carthaginians are overwhelmed by Roman *mansuetudo* at 5.1.1a and Valerius looks back on a distant era of Roman morality at 2.4.2. Valerius’ distance from this epoch is emphasised when he chooses to continue this chapter by describing various elaborate refinements of theatres at Rome, suggesting a people appreciative of luxury and not averse to relaxing their *virilitas* on occasion.\(^{100}\) *Gens* then, when used of individual ethnic groups, is not imbued by Valerius with a lack of civilisation, nor is it exclusively external. It simply a means of attributing characteristics to that people, but never in the sense of out-right stereotyping. Valerius’ perception of externality is too flexible to allow for rigid national ‘types’. 

*Natio* is not a term that Valerius uses extensively – it appears only four times in the *Facta et Dicta*. The infrequent usage of *natio* is in line with Livy and Velleius Paterculus who use the term eight and eleven times respectively, but it is in stark contrast to Cicero who employs *natio* on 153 occasions throughout his work.\(^{101}\) Valerius uses *natio* once in a general sense (1.1.ext.3) and three times in relation to three different nations: Thrace (2.6.12), the Cimbrians (2.10.6) and the *nationes* of Spain (3.7.1a). Valerius’ usage of the term does not carry a condemnatory sense: at 2.10.6 a public slave, *natione Cimber*, cannot bring himself to kill Marius, presumably having been overawed by the man’s victories over his own people. This should not be read as a comment on the character of the slave; the focus of chapter 2.10 is the manifestation of personal *maiestas*. Here we see a demonstration of Marius’ individual authority, not the weakness of the Cimbrians. At 3.7.1a, *omnes nationes* of Spain defect to the Carthaginians after the destruction of P. Scipio and Cn. Scipio Calvus together with most of their armies. *Natio* in these cases identifies the units of people involved with no sense of denigration.

Similarly, while one could be tempted to read *natio* as deliberately connected to a lack of civilisation at 2.6.12 where Valerius comments on the wisdom *sine ullis doctorum praeceptis* of the *natio Thraciae*, the use of *natio* at 1.1.ext.3 forestalls such thinking. At 1.1.ext.3 Valerius concludes an *exemplum* about Masinissa’s *pietas* and
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\(^{100}\) See especially the refinements described at 2.4.6.

\(^{101}\) This count is based on the Teubner text data-base: Saur, K. G. (ed.) *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* CD-ROM (Munich, 2002).
opens his account of Dionysius of Syracuse’s many impieties with the question: *Quamquam quid attinet mores natione perpendi?* Valerius implicitly encompasses in this statement both Syracuse and the tracts of *barbaria* wherein he envisages Masinissa with the term *natio*. As his very point is the different levels of civilisation found in the two places, *natio* cannot be firmly connected to a lack of culture and sophistication. This rhetorical question confirms in the first chapter of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* that Valerius fundamentally disavows the strong effects upon behaviour of affiliation to different *nationes*. His neutrality in the use of this term echoes his perception of the neutrality of the effects of the *nationes* themselves. After all, the *natio* *Thraciae* might have no formal education but Valerius insists that it still possesses an intrinsic understanding of the *verus condicionis nostrae habitus* (2.6.12).

Although Valerius uses the terms *gens* and *natio* overwhelmingly of foreign peoples, it seems that he also uses the words without strong overtones of emotion or significance. Neither term could be said to consistently indicate a lack of civilisation where it appears in the *Facta et Dicta*. Rather, both words provide labels with which groups of peoples can be delineated, and in the case of *gens* this includes the Roman social unit as well as foreign peoples. *Gens* is used when Valerius wants to attribute a behaviour to an ethnic group but it is by no means a tool of stereo-typing on an ethnic basis and the plural of the term stands in a consistently neutral fashion for those groups of peoples who constitute the nations of the world. The term *natio* seems to carry no particular overtones in the few instances where it is used, and the impact of *nationes* on human beings is explicitly dismissed by the author himself at 1.1. ext.3.

Valerius’ use of *gens* and *natio*, like his use of adjectives denoting externality, seems to confirm that the stark division between internal and external created on one level by the structure of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is not to be taken at face value. Even nouns that Saddington identifies as prominent markers of uncivilised externality in the early imperial period are deployed in an understated or ironic fashion throughout the text as Valerius consistently uses his language to undermine the division between Rome and external communities that he himself has made.
Chapter Five: Barbarism Begins at Home.

Any examination of a Latin author's attitude towards foreigners must encompass their use of the term *barbarus* and its derivatives. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* describes the primary usage of the term in Latin literature in the following way: "*a Romanis omnes nationes dicuntur barbarae praeter Graecos Romanosque*". In Valerius Maximus' text the uses of *barbarus* and *barbaria* are not nearly so indiscriminate as such a definition might suggest but are conscious and quite particular. *Barbarus* in Valerius' text is deployed in the author's ongoing negotiation of the relationship between internal and external. Ironically, given its broad implications of inferiority and dismissive tone, *barbarus* is a marker that will alert the reader to the subtleties of certain passages. Within these carefully constructed *exempla* a variety of rhetorical techniques are utilised to demonstrate the artificiality of the distinction between Romans and foreigners. Three main themes emerge. Valerius draws the reader's attention to the falsity of the connection between external and enemy since the internal group itself is so frequently divided; he registers and then undermines the widespread idea that external peoples can be categorised as progressively less civilised and even less human; and he argues strongly for the universality of certain fundamental qualities amongst humankind. Some *exempla* must be treated under more than one heading; this is an indication of the range of the images that Valerius signposts with one of the sharpest designations of Us and Them.

*Barbarus* occurs thirteen times in the work, in books 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9. *Barbaria* is used a further three times, bringing us to a total of 16 uses of the two terms. Valerius' rate of usage is comparable to Livy's and Cicero's use of the term and even slightly higher. This is particularly interesting given that – as will be
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1 The Smiths, *Meat is Murder* (1985) With thanks to J.M.
2 *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* Vol. 2 (Munich, 1900-1906) 1735.
3 This will be discussed in the current chapter.
4 Chapter Six: 'Bringing the Outside In'.
5 Chapter Seven: 'Behaving Like a Human Being'.
6 For purposes of comparison I have looked at Tiberian authors and Cicero and Livy who are seen to be two of Valerius' major sources. The fourth book of Ovid's *Ex Ponto* has also been included as the poems were written between 13 and 16 CE (Melville, A.D. (trans) and Kenney, E.J. *Ovid: Sorrows of an Exile: Tristia* (Oxford, 1992) xi). The method of comparison I have used in the following table is the division of the number of times that *barbarus* and *barbaria* are used by a range of Valerius' contemporaries and major sources, by the number of words in their collected works as they appear on the Teubner data-base: Saur, K. G. (ed.) *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* CD-ROM (Munich, 2002). This establishes a rate of usage that represents the percentage of the terms *barbarus* and *barbaria* in the texts as a whole:
discussed later—Valerius’ language does not reflect areas of usage in other authors. Valerius, despite his reputation for bigotry, only identifies certain peoples as barbari. For every external people that are barbari there are far more peoples who are not so described. Valerius provides 344 external exempla dealing with 90 different foreign communities and, in thirteen of these, barbarus is used in relation to the Parthians, the Thracians, the Britons, the Cappadocians, the Scythians, the Lusitanians and the Persians. The word appears twice in close proximity to Carthage but never as an adjective describing the Carthaginians as a people or individuals (5.1.ext.6 and 9.2.ext.1). In three additional cases anonymous individuals are described as barbarus (3.3.ext.7, 9.2.ext.11 and 9.13.ext.3). The term barbaria is used to describe regions three times: at 1.1.ext.3 it describes Numidia, and possibly the wider area of Africa, at 5.5.3 it describes Germany and at 4.6.ext.3 barbaria is used in a general sense to describe Asia Minor and the Pontic Gulf. Barbarus and barbaria are not blanket terms for everyone outside the privileged space of Greece and Rome in Valerius Maximus’ text.

The terms barbarus and barbaria in other writers of the Tiberian period appear less frequently than in Valerius Maximus’ work. Celsus in De Medicina uses the term only as a neuter substantive, as the name for a kind of plaster designed to be applied to bloody wounds. Manilius in the Astronomica uses barbarus once to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of Uses</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Rate of Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velleius Paterculus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26 705</td>
<td>0.01872 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104 014</td>
<td>0.00096 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 866</td>
<td>0.00346 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaedrus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8786</td>
<td>0.01138 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Elder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69 321</td>
<td>0.01298 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>514 366</td>
<td>0.0136 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1 080 552</td>
<td>0.01138 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Maximus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80 531</td>
<td>0.01986 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Livy, for instance, uses barbarus with particular frequency when discussing the Gallic invasion of Rome.
10 1.6.11, 3.2.12, 3.2.23b, 9.15.ext.2, 5.4.ext.5, 7.3.6 and 9.6.2, 6.3.ext.3.
11 Cel. De Med. 5.19.1: Optimum ex his est quod barbarum vocatur and 5.26.23e: maximeque, si caro est barbarum.
describe the speech of human beings in the period before agriculture, sea-travel and organised society: *tunc et lingua suas accepit barbara leges* (Man. 1.85). It thus operates very much in the sense of a lack of civilisation, but not a lack of any particular civilisation – Goold suggests that the men who are cited as making the first discoveries that began the process of illumination are Zoroaster, Belus, Necepeso and Petosiris. The only description of these figures’ location is the comment that the *reges* at lines 41-45 are *oriente sub ipso* and rule *nigras...urbes*. This gives the civilisers an eastern context, probably Egyptian or Babylonian. The use of *barbarus* here is not connected to a particular people; it seems to simply mean a lack of civilisation in speech closely linked to the original meaning of the Greek term βάρβαρος.

Seneca the Elder does use *barbarus* on a number of occasions in the *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae*. All of the uses in the *Suasoriae* occur in the context of an exploration of the options present for the 300 Spartan soldiers at Thermopylae and they all refer to Xerxes or his troops. Thus one speaker instructs the men: *O Lacedaemonii, ite adversus barbaros* (Sen. *Sua.* 2.1) and Xerxes is twice described as an *insolens barbarus* (ibid. 2.7 and 2.22). In a similar argument, in *Controversia* 6.5. *pars altera* the Athenian Iphicrates describe his Thracian bodyguard as barbarians.

The other uses of *barbarus* in the *Controversiae* appear in discussions of piracy. The term appears three times in *Controversia* 1.2 which details the attempts of a girl to be reinstated to a priesthood after her capture by pirates, incarceration in a brothel and murder of a soldier (Sen. *Cont.* 1.2.1, 1.2.11 and 1.2.20). The speakers express disbelief that she could make any claim to the purity required of a priestess after her experiences, commenting on what she might have suffered amongst *barbari* although one speaker actually uses her experiences amongst her captors as a demonstration of her chastity. It is often not clear whether *barbari* is intended to apply only to the pirates, or extends to those amongst whom she dwelled in the brothel, but a particular reference to the pirates would certainly complement ancient
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13 ibid. xvii-xviii.
14 This is in line with traditional Greek attitudes towards the Persians: Herod. 1.pr.
16 ibid.1.2.1: *Inter barbaros quid passa sit nescio: quid pati potuerit scio*. Also 1.2.11: *Viderimus quid in te audere potuerit feras hostium, libido barbarorum, licentia domitorum.*
17 ibid.1.2.20: *Potest aliquam servitus cogere: servit et barbaris et piratis, inviolata apud illos mansit.*
prejudices against nomadism and general Roman views of pirates\textsuperscript{18}. The two are connected in another tale of piracy where a youth has been sold to a pirate gang and in this case it is certainly the pirates who are described as \textit{barbati}\textsuperscript{19}. Seneca, then, only terms specific people \textit{barbati} through the filter of a Greek narrator and in these cases it is applied to Thrace and Persia. In all other instances \textit{barbati} are outside the law and organised society, hostile to civilised settlements and members of no discernable nation.

The main usage of \textit{barbarus} in authors of the Tiberian period and in Valerius’ most likely sources is in the context of war. Velleius Paterculus, a soldier and thus likely to have been in contact with various foreign peoples, uses \textit{barbarus} to refer to contemporary enemies and his usage reflects O’Gorman’s theory that, when it comes to the identification of \textit{barbati}, the basis of the categorisation is “essentially military”\textsuperscript{20}. When Velleius Paterculus chooses to use \textit{barbarus} to describe a people or individual their personal circumstances are not necessarily the same; the term is used for massed Pannonians, for individual aristocratic Germans and even for one Roman. The unifying factor is that on each occasion the people described as \textit{barbati} are fighting Rome; furthermore these conflicts are contemporary to Velleius’ own experience.

The people of Illyricum and the Germans are \textit{barbati} in Velleius Paterculus’ text\textsuperscript{21}. This reflects two regions of conflict in which Tiberius operated before his accession and that would later prove troublesome in his relatively peaceful reign (Tac. \textit{Ann.} 4.32.2-4). Velleius refers to the inhabitants of Illyricum as \textit{barbati} in the course of describing the rebellion that took place in 12-11 BCE amongst the Pannonians, the Dalmatians and the other peoples of the region (Vell. Pat. 2.110.2-3). The use of \textit{barbati} here cannot be connected strictly to one of the tribes but rather refers to the assembled forces that faced Tiberius in Illyricum: with this term the enemy as a whole are indisputably made Other. Nevertheless, Velleius comments that the threat from

\textsuperscript{18} Hartog, F. (trans. Lloyd, J.) \textit{The Mirror of Herodotus} (Berkeley, 1988) 197.
\textsuperscript{19} Sen. Cont.7.1.18: \textit{et adiecit hodie <quoque> illum poenas dare inter barbaros inclusum, per quos necesse est illi patria, populo, lare carere}. Interestingly, Sextus Pompeius who is described as \textit{barbarus} in terms of his language by Velleius (2.73) was also conceptualised as a pirate by other ancient authors. Powell, A. and Welch, K. \textit{Sextus Pompeius} (London, 2002) vii. For the association of piracy and those at the edges of the world see Clarke, K. ‘An Island Nation: Re-Reading Tacitus’ \textit{Agricola’} JRS 91 (2001) 104.
\textsuperscript{20} O’Gorman, E. ‘No Place Like Rome: Identity and Difference in the \textit{Germania} of Tactitus’ \textit{Ramus} 22.2 (1993) 139.
\textsuperscript{21} 2.107-8 and 2.118 for Germans and 2.112 for Pannonia.
this rebellion was so great because the Pannonians were versed in both Roman discipline and Roman language: *Omnibus autem Pannoniis non disciplinae tantummodo, sed linguae quoque notitia Romanae* (2.110.5). In addition to these accomplishments, the Pannonians were literate and rational: *plerisque etiam litterarum usus et familiaris animorum erat exercitatio* (ibid). This is notable in view of Saddington’s discussion of the primary uses of *barbarus* amongst the Romans; he states that, in line with the original Greek meaning of the term, a *barbarus* “was some one who could not be understood”22. Here Velleius Paterculus uses *barbarus* to describe a people who are easily understandable – they speak Latin! Nor are they apparently irresponsible, stupid or uncouth, other indicators of barbarism according to Saddington23. Velleius does not appear to be using *barbarus* here to refer to the level of civilisation, rather this use seems intended to separate and denigrate an accomplished foreign enemy24. The drama of the occasion is increased because the *barbari* are not just in conflict with Rome at this point but actually with Tiberius himself (2.111.2).

When Velleius calls Germans *barbari* they are always in conflict with Roman troops. In two of these instances those Roman troops are under the direct command of Tiberius. Thus the barbarous Germans are encountered by Tiberius in his actions in Germany and against Maroboduus (2.107-8). Velleius recounts a speech of praise and support made to Tiberius by a member of one of the tribes on the river Elbe in the summer of 5 CE; the speaker is described as: *unus e barbaris aetate senior* (2.107.1). Although this incident represents a moment of truce, the context is certainly one of conflict with a variety of savage peoples. Thus Velleius describes the conquest of peoples even unknown by name, including a tribe *etiam Germana feritate ferocior*, together with marches into territories untouched by Rome (2.106.2). The tribe of the elder who speaks to Tiberius are shown reacting to the sight of a Roman craft on the water with terror. Velleius draws further attention to the strangeness of the tribe with his patronising description of the wooden canoe of the tribesman as: *navigii genus* (2.107.1). The spokesman elder meanwhile emphasises his tribe’s inferiority as he
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23 ibid.

24 ibid.2.110.5-6: *Itaque hercules nulla umquam natio tam mature consilio belli bellum iunxit ac decreta patravit.* Also see the reaction of the Romans to the rebellion cited at 2.110.6: *Quin etiam tantus huius belli metus fuit, ut stabilem illum et firmatum tantorum bellorum experientia Caesaris Augusti animum quateret atque terreret.*
calls Tiberius a god and disparages the young men of his tribe for fighting against the general (2.107.2). The *barbari* fighting Rome are as uncultured and inferior as Saddlington suggests they should be in this case\(^\text{25}\).

In Velleius’ depiction of aristocratic individuals the emphasis of the term *barbarus* shifts specifically to education although the context is still hostile. Like the Pannonians, Maroboduus is educated and civilised: *Maroboduus, genere nobilis, corpore praevalens, animo ferox, natione magis quam ratione barbarus* (2.108.2). A very similar construction is used later in book Two to describe another troublesome German – Arminius. Arminius is called a barbarian when he is introduced as the instigator of the plan to trap Varus in the Teutoberg forest (2.118.3-4). Velleius uses the following terms: *Tum iuvenis genere nobilis, manu fortis, sensu celer, ultra barbarum promptus ingenio, nomine Arminius* (2.118.2). As the description continues it is clear Arminius’ display of Roman qualities is beyond the expectations engendered by the use of *barbarus*. Arminius was, according to Velleius Paterculus, involved over a long period with the Roman military, a Roman citizen and, furthermore, a Roman *eques*\(^\text{26}\). The barbarity of both Maroboduus and Arminius demonstrates the unusual extent of their education, and the ultimate failure of this education to secure their loyalty towards Rome. Velleius is able to denigrate both men with the term *barbarus* although, as he points out, their personal accomplishments are impressive. Maroboduus is a *barbarus*, although it may be due more to birth than intellectual ability, and Arminius is still judged within the limits of the term. The reverse is true when Velleius uses *barbarus* to describe another ‘Enemy of Rome’, Sextus Pompeius, whose lack of rhetorical training is barbaric\(^\text{27}\).

Velleius’ use of *barbarus* highlights a similarity between these figures: in all three cases the men are enemies of Rome in conflicts contemporary to the author’s experience. *Barbarus* has different nuances within the different applications of the term but consistently Velleius employs the term only where there is opposition between a foreign people and Rome: in one extreme case it is even applied to an

\(^{25}\) Ovid similarly uses *barbarus* to indicate the cultural insufficiency of his home in exile. At *Ex Ponto* 4.2.38 he claims that *barbarus Hister* is responsible for the deterioration of his poetry as he lacks any audience for his work there. At *Ex Ponto* 4.13.20 he expresses his shame at having composed in Getic using *barbara verba*.

\(^{26}\) 2.118.2: *adidus militiae nostrae prioris comes, iure etiam civitatis Romanae decus equestris consecutus gradus*...

\(^{27}\) 2.73.1: *Hie adulescens erat studiis rudis, sermone barbarus, impetu strenuus, manu promptus, cogitatu celer, fide patri dissimillimus, libertorum suorum libertus servorumque servus, speciosis invidens, ut pareret humillimis.*
internal Roman enemy\textsuperscript{28}. Similarly in the Appendix to Phaedrus, on the one occasion \textit{barbarus} is used in the Fables, the poem describes a soldier of Pompey goaded into combat with a \textit{barbarus} and there is no indication as to which people the latter comes from (Phaed. \textit{Appendix.} 10.16). Here too there seems to be a connection between opposition to Rome and the indication of external status in a derogatory or dismissive fashion\textsuperscript{29}.

Livy’s use of \textit{barbarus} is also heavily geared towards a hostile context. Sixty-two of the seventy uses of the term in the surviving sections of the text describe the interactions of various peoples with Rome during, or after, war. Forty-one of these instances simply depict peoples with whom Rome is at war (often in actual battle scenes)\textsuperscript{30}: thirteen refer to Rome’s allies in war – always with an element of scepticism surrounding that ally’s loyalty\textsuperscript{31} – and eight refer to Roman foreign policy at the conclusion of hostilities\textsuperscript{32}. The peoples represented by \textit{barbarus} in the work reflect prominent opponents of Rome. The people most frequently termed barbarians are the Spanish, followed by a section of usage relating to Africa, particularly Carthage and Numidia, and then a smaller number describing the Gauls\textsuperscript{33}.

Furthermore there is a sense that the \textit{barbari} are acceptable, even natural, opponents for those who are imbued with the culture of the Mediterranean. Livy depicts the Romans upbraiding the people of Arpi in 213 BCE for instance for choosing to fight on behalf of \textit{alienigeni} and \textit{barbari} and not on the side of Rome (Liv. 24.47). Livy conveys the sense that such behaviour is inexplicable in the construction he uses to introduce the indirect question: \textit{percontantibus Romanis quid sibi vellent Arpini...} The Romans cannot understand what would motivate the Arpini to make such a choice.

\textsuperscript{28} Tronson identifies a similar technique of ‘othering’ the enemy (and the origins of such a technique in terms of the word \textit{barbarus}) in operation in Caesar’s Gallic and Civil Wars: Tronson, A. ‘Pompey the Barbarian: Caesar’s Presentation of “The Other” in \textit{Bellum Civile} 3’in Joyal, M. (ed.) \textit{In Altum: Seventy-Five Years of Classical Studies in Newfoundland}. (Newfoundland, 2001) 78-85.

\textsuperscript{29} This is a familiar concept to the modern mind. Barbarity is still attributed to enemies when emotional intensity is high, as in the reactions of international leaders to recent terrorist attacks in Madrid and London. E.g. \texttt{http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3504046.stm} where King Juan Carlos is quoted as referring to the attacks as “terrorist barbarity”. Similarly, in 2005, Pope Benedict has described the London bombings as “barbaric acts against humanity”: \texttt{http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4659093.stm} (Viewed 12/7/2005).

\textsuperscript{30} For instance 5.38, 29.2, 30.11 or 38.49.

\textsuperscript{31} Eight of these thirteen uses of the term describe the wavering loyalty of Syphax in the course of Rome’s conflict with Carthage e.g. 24.48, 28.17 and 29.23. Other nations at 40.35 and 40.36.

\textsuperscript{32} For instance, the redistribution of the cities of Emathia by Marcius to Thracians and other peoples (40.3) or the permission granted to sections of Macedonia to have armed guards against their barbarous neighbours (45.29).

\textsuperscript{33} 26 uses of \textit{barbarus} relate to the Spanish, 15 to Africans and 10 to the Gauls.
In a hostile context, enemies can also use *barbarus* to describe Romans. Livy indicates his authorial distance from the association between Rome and *barbarus* by putting the accusation in the mouth of an enemy of Rome. On three occasions Livy has Philip V describe the Romans as *barbari*, and even has him express surprise on viewing a Roman camp that such a thing could be built by *barbari*. Romans are also termed *barbari* on occasion in Cicero’s work, when the adjective is applied to Roman citizens who are political opponents. Tronson sees in Cicero’s use of *barbarus* to describe individuals an accusation of a lack of cultivation that creates a “cultural and social barbarian”. This is certainly present when he mocks Verres as a *barbarus* for his failure to understand terminology in his own documentation. The word is similarly used to describe Antony in his edicts beside the other adjectives *contumeliosus* and *rudis* (Phil. 3.15) but it can also carry the sense of savagery and cruelty as it does when Cicero uses it to describe the “twins” Dolabella and Antony in the eleventh Philippic (Phil. 11.2). Both senses are present when he abuses Vatinius for attempting to present a learned and philosophical front despite his *immanes* and *barbari mores*.

In Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* seven of thirteen uses of *barbarus* occur in relation to peoples who, in the context of the *exemplum*, are engaged in conflict with Rome. The particular range of opponents on display is quite different from the contemporary threats identified as *barbari* by Valerius’ closest contemporary Velleius Paterculus. The seven *exempla* describe conflict with Carthage (5.1.ext.6 and 9.2.ext.1), Parthia (1.6.11), Pergamum (3.2.12) Britain (3.2.23b), Lusitania (7.3.6) and Cappadocia (9.15.ext.2). In two of these cases the conflict is potential rather than actual – at 7.3.6 Sertorius suggests the adoption of guerrilla tactics against Rome to his Lusitanian troops, and at 9.15.ext.2 Augustus averts
trouble in the east by executing a pretender to the Cappadocian throne who claimed to be Ariarathes X – actually killed by Antony in 36 BCE.

Valerius does not apply *barbarus* directly to Rome or Romans, whatever their level of education or social polish. He is more circumspect in his selection of language; *barbarus* needs to be kept external in its application in order to create the contrast and tension between designated barbarians and the barbarous behaviour of which Romans are capable. It is noticeable that when Valerius does describe Sejanus as *efferaetae barbariae immannitatem truculentior* the *exemplum* is actually positioned in the external material (9.11.ext.4).

The *exempla* in which Valerius chooses to refer to opponents of Rome as *barbari* are all relatively remote from the author’s own day. The first Carthaginian instance describes Hannibal’s burial of prominent Roman generals between 216 and 208 BCE during his conflict with Rome. The second describes the purported torture of Regulus after his refusal to lobby at Rome for the Carthaginians in 255 BCE and the crushing of captured Roman soldiers under the keels of Carthaginian ships (5.1.ext.6 and 9.2.ext.1). The only other source for the crushing of the Roman soldiers appears to be a fragment of Varro’s *De Vita Populi Roman*37. While it is tempting to assume that the executions occurred after one of the major naval battles during the first Punic War, Valerius Maximus puts it together with the capture of Regulus in 255 BCE and several major naval battles were fought close to this time. Along with the introduction of the following *exemplum* with: *Eorum dux Hannibal...* and Varro’s substantive use of *Poenus* in his account, this suggests that the incident occurred during the Second Punic War38. Another two *exempla* describe the deaths of Crassi: one via defeat by the Parthian forces in 53 BCE and the other at the hands of a Thracian soldier in 130 BCE (1.6.11 and 3.2.12). Another describes the heroic valour of a single Roman soldier against the Britons during Julius Caesar’s attempts to invade the island in 55-4 BCE (3.2.23b). The closest of these *exempla* in time to Valerius is that of the pseudo-Ariarathes in 36 BCE and then the death of Crassus in 53 BCE. Progressing backwards through the chronology the order is: Caesar’s soldier in Britain (55-4 BCE), Sertorius and the Lusitanians (c. 76 BCE), the demonstrations of Hannibal’s


38 V.Max.9.2.ext.2. Riposati connects Varro’s use of Poenus to comments made by Livy regarding Hannibal’s cruelty. Varro (Riposati, Benedetto ed.), *De Vita Populi Romani* (Milan, 1972) 308.
humanitas (216-08 BCE), the keel crushing of Roman soldiers (at some point in the Second Punic War (218-201 BCE) and finally the Regulus story (255 BCE).

It is fruitless to attempt to correlate Valerius Maximus’ use of barbarus to serious threats to Rome or specifically to military activity against external peoples under Augustus and Tiberius even in the most recent exempla. Valerius states that the exemplum of the Cappadocian usurper describes a major threat to the Roman Empire but he does not convey that there is a serious threat to Rome in the material concerning Britain. After all, a single Roman is able to assert himself against massed barbarian forces via incredible fortitudo at 2.2.23b and the incident is so removed from Rome that it reads as a set piece of exploration 39. Similarly, at 7.3.6 a Roman is in charge of the Lusitanians and has to convince the simple and uncouth Spaniards that they do not have the strength to present a serious threat to the Roman armies in what is essentially a civil war. Even the threat implicit in the recognition of the pseudo-Ariarathes X (safely averted by Augustus at 9.15.ext.2) as Valerius puts it: caput imperio dementer imminens iusto impendere supplicio coegit seems to be somewhat of an exaggeration. Cappadocia is barely mentioned in many histories of Augustus’ reign, and Jones uses it as a model of a peaceful territory 40. The incident is not mentioned in Cassius Dio or Suetonius 41 and Augustus himself saw no cause to include the incident (or Cappadocia) in his Res Gestae. In Valerius’ text the two major threats to Rome that are associated with barbarus are in the past; one distantly so and the other in the case of Parthia fairly comfortably so, for the course of Tiberius’ reign sees no conflict with Parthia. It would even be difficult to argue that Valerius particularly connects his use of barbarus to historic threats to Rome, as the Gauls – appearing on eight occasions in the work – are never described with the term 43.

39 The writer of the Octavia could state that before the reign of Claudius the Britains were ducibus nostris ante ignoti. Oct.28-9. Clarke also discusses the extent to which Tacitus portrays Britain as an isolated and unknown land (albeit one opened up by Agricola’s campaigns) when he writes the Agricola. Clarke, K. ‘An Island Nation: Re-Reading Tacitus’ Agricola’ JRS 91 (2001) 99-101.
41 Suetonius does record the annexation of Cappadocia in the reign of Tiberius but even this event appears to have been predominantly peaceful (Tib. 37.4). Mattern records that the Cappadocians revolted in Tiberius’ reign as a result of the census (Mattern, S.P. Rome and the Enemy: Imperial Strategies in the Principate (Berkeley, 1999) 157) but the passage that she refers to in Tacitus’ Annales identifies the rebels as the Citae - natio Cappadoci Archelao subiecta- rather than the Cappadocians as a whole.
43 The Gauls appear once at 1.1.ext.9 and aside from this appear only in chapter 2.6 at 2.6.7a-e, 2.6.9 and 2.6.10.
The problematic external peoples during and immediately prior to the reign of Tiberius are not described as *barbari* in Valerius’ account. While Illyricum is mentioned in three *exempla* in the *Facta et Dicta*, none of these *exempla* are near to contemporary, and only one deals with relations between Rome and Illyricum. Pannonia and Dalmatia are never specifically mentioned. Similarly *barbarus* is not used on any of the 14 occasions Valerius refers to German peoples and the *exempla* are notably non-contemporary. Of the fourteen *exempla* dealing with German peoples, eight refer to Marius’ conquests between 104 and 101 BCE, two refer to Roman defeats at the hands of the Cimbri in 104 BCE, one refers to Cimbrian trophies at Rome in 121 BCE and two are not specific in time but describe the Cimbrians’ outlook on death.

While no German is described as *barbarus*, there is one reference to Tiberius racing through the recently conquered German territories to reach Drusus and here the land is described as a *barbaria*:

*iter quoque quam rapidum et praeceps velut uno spiritu corripuerit, eo patet quod Alpes Rhenumque transgressus die ac nocte, mutato subinde equo, ducenta milia passuum per modo devictam barbariam Antabagio duce solo comite contentus evasit* (5.5.3).

This *exemplum* is the only reference to the relationship between Germany and Rome in a contemporary sense. *Barbaria* here signifies not a territory hostile to Rome but a territory recently pacified and uncultivated. *Devictus* is present in the sentence to add the idea of potential hostility; it would be redundant if this was already signified by *barbaria*. Even though the danger invested in Germany in this story is implicit, not demonstrated, it should be noted that Weileder’s theory that this *exemplum* demonstrates Rome’s successful, and total, conquest of Germany because Tiberius can ride through it safely, cannot be supported. To follow this argument is to entirely ignore the point of this *exemplum*. Valerius is concerned in chapter 5.5 to demonstrate fraternal *pietas* and he uses the *exemplum* of Tiberius’ race to his

---

45 1.1.20 (Roman and Illyrian conflict as a secondary issue in 174 BCE), 1.5.ext.2 and 8.13.ext.7.
46 Respectively: 2.2.3, 6.1.ext.3, 3.6.6, 4.7.3, 5.2.8, 6.9.14, 8.15.7, 2.10.6 (Marian *exempla*), 4.7.3, 5.8.4 (104 BCE defeat), 6.3.1c (121 BCE spoils), 2.6.11, 2.6.14 (Cimbrian bravery).
brother’s death-bed as an example of striking pietas precisely because of the hardship and danger of the undertaking; hence the tantus... ut construction employed at the opening of the exemplum⁴⁸. At 5.5.3 then, Germany is implicitly dangerous due to its newly conquered status, but it is not actively hostile to Rome⁴⁹.

Only one other use of barbaria could possibly be connected to foreign policy and the hostility of foreign peoples in the era of Tiberius, namely the use of barbaria to describe the birthplace of King Masinissa in Africa⁵⁰. This could possibly be linked to on-going attempts to counter the threat presented by Tacfarinas in Africa.

Tacfarinas was one of the Musalimii and had the Mauri in alliance⁵¹ – geographically this appears to place the base of the revolt close to Masinissa’s kingdom of Numidia⁵². However, the difficulty with such a connection is that in the preceding exemplum Valerius has described Masinissa as a Punicus – probably in reference to his familial connections with the Carthaginian nobility⁵³. While Masinissa is generally identified as Numidian in the text, it is the Carthaginian connection that is associated with barbaria here. At any rate, the events under discussion are distant to Valerius’ time and the relationship of Rome and Africa is not under discussion at 1.1.ext.2 or 1.1.ext.3, so to draw such a connection would appear far fetched. Syme also suggests that Tacitus may have significantly exaggerated the impact of the Tacfarinas rebellion which, if true, would further weaken any association between Valerius’ use of barbarus and barbaria and contemporary threats to Rome⁵⁴.

Valerius’ use of barbaria follows the pattern set out in the exempla of Tiberius’ pietas (5.5.3). In three cases Valerius depicts the generally admirable behaviour of individuals in contrast with difficult, primitive environments⁵⁵.

⁴⁸... tantum enim amorem princeps parensque noster insitum animo fratris Drusi habuit ut cum Ticini... gravi illum et periculosa valitudine in Germania fluctuare cognosset, protinus inde metu attonitus erumperet.

⁴⁹ Barbaria takes on an explicit sense of active hostility at Ex Ponto 4.5.34-5. Ovid credits Sextus Pompeius with having made the viae barbariae safe for the poet to travel through. Ovid further’s the sense of threat on a personal level – he is unable to travel because the territory around the Pontus is one ubi barbarus hostis / ut fera plus valeant legibus arma facit (Pont. 4.9.93-4).

⁵⁰ 1.1.ext.3: <is> in media barbaria ortus sacrilegium alienum rescidit. See pages 85-88 for further discussion of Masinissa.


⁵² Syme points out that as well as Tacfarinas being one of the Musulamii in Tacitus’ account “most of his activities take their rise in the Musulamian country.” Syme, R. ‘Tacfarinas, The Musulamii and Thubursici’ in Colemann-Norton, P.R. Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honour of Allan Chester Johnson (Princeton, 1951 ) 117.

⁵³ 1.1.ext.2: factum Masinissae animo quam Punico sanguini conveniens!

⁵⁴ Syme, R. ‘Tacfarinas, The Musulamii and Thubursici’ in Colemann-Norton, P.R. Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honour of Allan Chester Johnson (Princeton, 1951 ) 120.

⁵⁵ 1.1.ext.3, 4.6.ext.3 and 5.5.3.
Masinissa’s *pietas* at 1.1.ext.3 is remarkable because he has been raised in media *barbaria*, and yet acts in a more civilised fashion than Dionysius of the more sophisticated Syracuse⁵⁶. Similarly the displays of conjugal devotion performed by Artemisia of Caria and Hypsicratea in the Pontus (4.6.ext.1 and 4.6.ext.2) take place in the (typically vague) *barbariae immensas solitudines* but are as worthy of notice and praise as those from Greece. From a slightly different angle the behaviour of Tiberius is set against a potentially unwelcoming environment which, like the other cases just mentioned, draws attention to his deeds. Tiberius’ fraternal *pietas* holds firm even against the physical dangers inherent in his journey *per modo devictam barbariam*. These cases stand collectively in contrast to the traitor at 9.11.ext.4 who is categorised as displaying behaviour not only appropriate to the savagery associated with *barbaria*, but even going far beyond it⁵⁷.

Thus the connection between threatening contemporary enemies, both external and internal, and the use of *barbarus* that is so evident in Velleius Paterculus is apparently absent from Valerius Maximus’ text. Valerius’ use of *barbarus* and *barbaria* does not convey the passion of recent threat and combat, or reflect the force of a jingoistic Roman patriotism. Nor, as shall become clear, does *barbarus* identify or denigrate historical enemies as it does in Livy’s text. Rather, *barbarus* is one of a variety of rhetorical techniques that Valerius uses to undermine the opposition between internal and external – even, as shall become clear, when it appears in a hostile context.

**Barbarism**

Of the six hundred and ninety seven internal *exempla* in the *Facta et Dicta* more than half mention a foreign community⁵⁸. This is not to argue that Valerius conceptualises Rome as a pillar of international understanding: of the three hundred and seventy eight internal *exempla* that mention external communities, two hundred and seven depict Rome engaged in conflict with these peoples. This might lead a

---

⁵⁶ This prompts Valerius’ question: *Quamquam quid attinet mores natione perpendi?* 1.1.ext.2 is discussed in depth in chapter Three, ii): “Who’s Got the Blood?”, 85-89.

⁵⁷ The positioning of the accusation that Sejanus is *efferatae barbariae inmanitate truculentior* - in a rhetorical question asking whether Sejanus seriously considered himself equal to the task of holding the *habetas Romani imperii* - suggests that the use of *barbaria* here indicates not only brutality but also a level of unsophistication unequal to the subtleties and complexities of such an important political role.

⁵⁸ Calculated by excluding prefaces and counting each sub-section (i.e. a,b,c) in the Loeb edition as a separate *exemplum*. Three hundred and nineteen of six hundred and ninety seven *exempla* do not mention external peoples.
reader to assume that Valerius sees a strong connection between the categories of
foreigner and enemy, complemented by a corresponding pairing of Roman and friend.
Valerius’ use of the term barbarus on seven occasions to describe peoples in conflict
with Rome initially seems to confirm this assumption. There is, however, a marked
lack of heat when Valerius does choose to describe an opponent of Rome as barbarus.
As argued in the first section of this chapter, there is no evidence that he reaches for
the term when discussing contemporary opponents of Rome, unlike Velleius
Paterculus. Neither does he encompass the great past foes of Rome with the adjective
as does Livy. He fails to apply the term to two traditional scourges of the Romans —
the Gauls and Germans — while using barbarus to describe peoples who had little or
no conflict with Rome, such as the Scyths (5.4.ext.5). The one exception is Carthage,
the great traditional enemy of Rome (5.1.ext.6 and 9.2.ext.1) but jingoism is again
entirely absent. As we shall see, Carthage is associated with barbarus only when
Valerius is making a statement about the essential unity of human experience.

That even barbarity associated with Carthage facilitates Valerius’ universalism
should warn the reader against any expectation of finding in the Facta et Dicta
Memorabilia a blindly patriotic view of Romans fighting gamely against barbarian
hordes, even if that is what Valerius initially appears to offer us. Closer examination
of the passages in which opponents of Rome are not only hostes but also barbari will
reveal once again that Valerius only constructs borders between Rome and foreigners
in order to undermine them. Valerius sets up images of Romans in conflict with
barbari in which the Romans struggle against overwhelming odds and often
demonstrate virtus in the process, but these situations are rarely straightforward.
Romans are not necessarily good and foreigners bad: Romans all too frequently
behave unwisely, are influenced by greed or impiety and abandon their companions.
Similarly, the vices attributed to externals serve as reminders of Roman disgraces.
Nor are Romans friends and barbarians enemies: in every case these snap-shots of
external war are set amidst the horrors of Roman civil conflict where enemy and
compatriot are virtually indistinguishable. Valerius gives the lie to any idea of a
straightforward moral barrier between Romans and foreigners and demonstrates the
essential meaninglessness of such categories. Enemies can be determined by their
behaviour, not their language or lack of civilised accessories.

59 1.6.11, 3.2.12, 3.2.23b, 5.1.ext.6, 9.2.ext.1 and 9.15.ext.2.
60 See below, chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 229-238 and 245-254.
Chapter Five

At the death of M. Crassus (1.6.11) the reader is shown Roman standards in *hostilibus manibus* and then Roman soldiers laid low by *equitatu barbarorum*:

> Non sinit nos M. Crassus, inter gravissimas Romani imperii iacturas numerandus, hoc loco de se silentium agere, plurimis et evidentissimis ante tantam ruinam monstrorum pulsatus ictibus. ducturus erat a Carrhis adversus Parthos exercitum: pullum ei traditum est paludamentum, cum in proelium exeuntibus album aut purpureum dari soleat; maesti et taciti milites ad principia convenerunt, qui vetere instituto cum clamore alacri accurrere debebant; aquilarum altera vix convelli a primo pilo potuit, altera aegerrime extracta in contrariam ac ferebatur partem se ipsa convertit. magna haec prodigia, sed et illae clades aliquanto maiores, tot pulcherrimarum legionum interitus, tam multa signa hostilibus intercepta manibus, tantum Romanae militiae decus barbarorum obtritum equitatu, optimae indolis filii cruore paterni respersi oculi, corpus imperatoris inter promiscuas cadaverum strues avium ferarumque laniatibus obiectum. vellem quidem placidum, sed quod<br>

Within the general Roman destruction M. Crassus is singled out by his failure to recognise the succession of ill-omens that should have warned him against engagement with the Parthians. In the catastrophe that follows Valerius takes care to specify the fate of the general amongst his men in a very cinematic *exemplum*. The disaster is first described in a series of general images after initial confirmation of its scale; the sheer size of the catastrophe is underlined in the series of demonstrative pronouns beginning with *t-* that introduce each clause. This also renders the individual soldiers killed invisible among the massed symbols of Roman destruction — it is a camera shot that scans the battlefield from a great distance and shows the troops scattered and destroyed by the movement of the battle.

The focus of the shot narrows sharply and the perspective changes from a universal view to that of Crassus himself. The picture is underlined with an explicit reference to the scope of his vision: *optimae indolis filii cruore paterni respersi oculi*... Having looked through the eyes of the commander, the reader is left with a final image of Crassus’ body still recognisable among the Roman dead: *corpus imperatoris inter promiscuas cadaverum strues avium ferarumque laniatibus*
objectum. By putting the past perfect participle of obicere in agreement with corpus Valerius also reserves the indignities inherent in a lack of burial for Crassus alone. This echoes the focus of the exemplum: general Parthian barbarity does not create such a memorable disaster, the blame lies with Crassus’ personal impiety and obstinacy.

The central issue of Crassus’ fatal error of judgement is framed by Valerius’ depictions of the Parthians and Romans. A tension is created between the barbarous force of the Parthians and the behaviour of a Roman as the Parthians carry out the will of the gods, and Crassus ignores it. Weileder has argued that the barbarity of the Parthians detracts from, and mitigates, Crassus’ behaviour but there is nothing in the exemplum to support this. The Romanae militiae decus are obtritum at 1.6.11 — crushed and trampled by the enemy horse. This is not only normal behaviour for cavalry but also ties the exemplum to ideas of righteous punishment. The one other time obterere is used in the Facta et Dicta it is also used as a past perfect participle. In this case it refers to the punishment meted out by the Roman people against Sejanus: omni cum stirpe sua populi Romani viribus obtritus etiam apud inferos...quae meretur supplicia pendit (9.11.ext.4). The verb expresses the Romans’ justified response to Sejanus – a figure who has threatened pax, leges and the fides amicitiae. The barbari become the tool of the gods who repay Crassus’ arrogance with a similar destruction. External enemies punish the crime of an internal: sic deorum spreti monitus excandescunt, sic humana consilia castigantur, ubi se caelestibus praefertunt.

61 Weileder, A., Valerius Maximus: Spiegel Kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung (Munich, 1998) 110: “So wird die Niederlage des Crassus, die Valerius auf die Mißachtung göttlicher Mahnungen und Vorzeichen vor Carrhae, also auf die Schuld eines Römers, zurückführt, durch die negative Zeichnung der Parther als kampfstarke, unmenschliche und brutale Gegner ein wenig gemildert.” At the level of practical detail Weileder’s insistence (Weileder, A., Valerius Maximus: Spiegel Kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung (Munich, 1998) 109-10) that the image of the unburied Romans should be read as an outright condemnation of the barbarous Parthians should be discounted. Valerius recounts this detail simply as an element of the disaster along with the number of casualties and the capture of the standards — it condemns Crassus’ stubbornness, not the Parthians’ inhumanity, they are not even mentioned when the image is presented. Furthermore Justin’s Epitome of Pompeius Trogus (who, Bloomer has argued (Bloomer, W.M. Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility (Chapel Hill, 1992) 99-108.), is a major source for Valerius’ external material) records that the Parthians left their own dead to be consumed by predators in exactly this fashion and only later arranged burial of the remaining bones (41.3.5).

62 This is a term that evidently conveys great violence and power and is also in line with the kind of emotional upheaval that Valerius depicts himself undergoing as he relates both the story at 1.6.11: vellem guidem placidius, sed quod relatus< seats> verum est, and that of Sejanus (9.11.ext.4): pio magis quam valido affectu rapior.
Valerius describes the enormity of the Roman defeat by juxtaposing the symbols of Rome with their frailty. He first refers to the destruction of *pulcherrimarum legionum*; *legio* is (unsurprisingly) a term used exclusively to describe Roman forces in the *Facta et Dicta*. He next refers to the captured *signa* of the Romans, an image which refers back to the soldiers’ inability to remove the distinctively Roman *aquilae* several lines before, and then Valerius explicitly describes the destruction of *Romani milites*. Even the description of the body of the *imperator* uses a term that is overwhelmingly Roman in Valerius’ text. Each time the Roman forms and symbols appear they are set up to be knocked down. The prodigies consist of breaches of ancestral tradition and Crassus – failing in his duty as *imperator* – refuses to recognise how significant they are. The superlative Roman legions he commands – the *decus Romanae militiae* – are unable to defend themselves. They are trampled down in a battle which sees their all-important standards lost to an enemy described with the dismissive term *barbari*.

Another Crassus is defeated in another foreign land in the chapter *De Fortitudine*:

When P. Crassus refuses to allow Aristonicus to have power over him, his only alternative is death. He is already in the enemy’s power – Thracians in the army

---

63 Sixty three *exempla* include the term *imperator*, and in sixty of these cases the *imperator* in question is Roman.

64 The brief summary at Obsequens 64 is similarly condemnatory towards Crassus’ disregard for portents and prodigies; he is seen as having neglected (*neglegere*) the signs and as having behaved *pertinaciter*. Plutarch also records the neglect of *prodigia* (his *prodigia* are basically identical to those presented by Valerius) but he is not as explicitly condemnatory (Plut. *Crassus*. 23).
of the claimant to the throne of Pergamum: he is inter Elaeam et Myrinam exceptus
and we see him alone, with no weapons and in a position of great dishonour. This
exemplum is all about the importance of preserving dignitas. Far from presenting an
irreconcilable conflict between Roman and foreigner, this Crassus is able to restore
his own honour only with a Thracian barbarian’s aid. Once again the barbarian is a
tool in the rhetoric of more exalted ideas than Roman ethnic prejudice. The ‘suicide’
of Crassus puts him firmly within the tradition of Roman (and especially Stoic)
ideas of the retrieval of honour as Crassus – like Lucretia (Liv. 1.58-9), or the anonymous
gladiators cited by Seneca the Younger (Ep. 70.20, 22-3) – secures his own death
when a ‘good’ life is no longer possible. The use of the adjective Romanus here at the
point where Crassus has performed the deed freeing him from captivity and
demonstrating his fortitudo underlines that such behaviour is entirely appropriate for a
Roman general. It is, though, perhaps more notable that it is at this point in the
exemplum that Valerius deploys the much less common term barbarus. Crassus at the
moment of redemption is Romanus but it is a barbarus who is vital to this process: an
enemy, barbarian captor becomes the agent of Roman freedom. The Thracian is by no
means deliberately involved – Crassus sticks a virga into his eye in order to ensure an
appropriately fatal response – but the paradoxical relationship between the two men
and the categories that they represent is at the heart of the passage.

There is only one other author who describes Crassus’ valiant stage­
management of his own death, although there are a number of accounts of his defeat. Florus,
gen erally accepted as writing during the second half of the second century
CE, presents a version of events closely following Valerius’ own:

Aristonicus, regii sanguinis ferox iuvenis, urbis regibus parere consuetas
partim facile sollicitat, paucas resistentis, Myndon, Samon, Colophona vi recepit;
Crassi quoque praetoris cecidit exercitum ipsumque cepit. Sed ille memor et familiae
et Romani nominis custodem barbarum virgula excaecat et in exitium sui, quod
volebat, ita concitat (Flor. 1.35.4-5).

Crassus’ death while fighting against Aristonicus is noted at: Liv. Per.59a, Strab.14.1.38, Vell.2.4.1,
Flor. 1.35.4-5, Just. 36.4.28, Eutrop. 4.20.1 and Obseq. 28.

Florus even replicates the use of Romanus and barbarus at the moment Crassus achieves his own death—underlining the two categories that clash and complement in this event. In most other accounts it is simply stated that Crassus died during conflict with Aristonicus, although we suffer from the loss of the full text of Livy and must depend on the summaries at this point\(^\text{67}\). Eutropius, a later author, and Justin in his epitome of Pompeius Trogus, also provide accounts of the death\(^\text{68}\). In these accounts the death of Crassus moves from the positive account of Valerius and Florus, through the fairly neutral accounts of Livy, Strabo, Velleius Paterculus and Obsequens, and into the negative. In Eutropius’ account the body of the Roman general is mutilated and his head is presented to Aristonicus—a gesture that indicated great dishonour\(^\text{69}\). The account of Justin is darker; Crassus is accused of overwhelming avarice and mismanagement; it is his fault his troops are in disarray when both he and they are destroyed in a fitting punishment for his greed\(^\text{70}\). In the mixed authorial traditions and motivations concerning the death of Crassus, Valerius Maximus has chosen to focus on a version which allows the embattled Roman general to redeem his dishonourable capture in the tradition of noble Roman suicides. He does this with the unwitting, but vital, assistance of a barbarian soldier. For M. Crassus barbarians are used to bestow punishment, for P. Crassus, redemption.

Caesar’s attempted invasion of Britain once again presents us with a lone Roman demonstrating extreme fortitudo:

\begin{quote}
Tuum vero, Scaevi, inexsuperabilem spiritum in utra parte rerum naturae admiratione prosequar nescio, quoniam excellenti virtute dubium reliquisti inter undasne pugnam fortioarem edideris an in terra vocem miseris. bello namque quo C. Caesar, non contentus opera sua litoribus Oceani claudere, Britannicae insulae caelestes iniecit manus, cum quattuor commilitonibus rate transvectus in scopulum vicinum insulae quam hostium ingentes copiae obtinebant, postquam aestus regressu
\end{quote}

\(^{67}\) Liv. Per. 59a, Strab. 14.1.38, Vell. 2.4.1 and Obseq. 28.

\(^{68}\) Eutropius wrote in the second half of the fourth century CE (Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. (Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford, 1970) 424-5) and Justin seems to have written his epitome of Livy’s contemporary Trogus in the second half of the second century CE (Justin, (trans. Yardley, J C.) Epitome of the Philippic, History of Pompeius Trogus (Atlanta, 1984) 4.

\(^{69}\) Eutrop. 4.20.1: Victus est tamen Crassus et in proelio interfectus est. Caput ipsius Aristonico oblatum est, corpus Smyrnæae sepultum. For the dishonouring properties of dismemberment see: Segal, C. The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad, (Leiden, 1971) 16-7.

\(^{70}\) Just. 36.4.7-8: Asia Liciño Crasso consuli decernitur, qui intentor Attalicae praedae quam bello, cum extreמו anni tempore inordinata acie proelium conservisset, victus poenas inconsultae avaritiae sanguine dedit.
suo spatium quo scopulus et insula dividebantur in vadum transitu facile redegit, ingenti multitudine barbarorum adfluent, ceteris rate ad litus regressis solus immobilem stationis gradum retinens, undique ruentibus telis et hostibus ab omni parte acri studio ad te invadendum nitentibus, quinque militum diurno proelio suffectura pila una dextera hostium corporibus adegisti. ad ultimum destricto gladio, audacissimum quemque modo umbonis impulsi, modo mucronis ictu depellens, hinc Romanis, illinc Britannicis oculis incredibili, nisi cernereris, spectaculo fuisti. postquam deinde ira ac pudor cuncta conari fessos coegit, tragula femur traiectus saxique pondere ora contusus, galea iam ictibus discussa et scuto crebris foraminibus absumpto, profundo te credidisti ac duabus loricis onustus inter undas, quas hostili cruore infeceris, enasti, visoque imperatore armis non amissis sed bene impensis, cum laudem merereris, veniam petisti, magnus proelio, sed maior disciplinae militaris memoria. itaque ab optimo virtutis aestimatore cum facto tum etiam verba tua centurionatus honore donata sunt (3.2.23b).

Scaevius stands on an isolated rock, a scopulus, opposite a hostium ingentes copiae. Even the country is hostile to the Roman: Scaevius, already in the middle of danger, is further exposed by the landscape which changes its very nature from sea to land to facilitate the Britons’ crossing 71. The participle Valerius uses to describe the movement of the barbari – adfluentes – mirrors the movement of the water that streams out to allow easy access to Scaevius. The Britons and their environment are united in their hostility to the Roman. Scaevius is a point of stillness amongst frantic movement; Valerius describes him as immobilis on his rock, surrounded by the barbarians who are adfluentes, nitens and their weapons are ruentes. The reader is not shown any emotion from Scaevius while the enemy, although their contest with Scaevius is enough to leave them fessi, are still driven onwards by ira and pudor to attack him. As Scaevius departs to the ships Valerius points out that he has triumphed over the hostile landscape – the waves are now coloured with the blood of Britons: inter undas, quas hostili cruore infeceras.

71 The fluidity of the landscape echoes ancient geographical beliefs that Britain and Ireland rested at the very edge of the world where land and sea could not be trusted to retain their proper forms or adhere to the accepted rules of nature: Clarke, K. ‘An Island Nation: Re-Reading Tacitus’ Agricola’ JRS 91 (2001) 97-9.
Scaevius is almost ridiculously Roman in this *exemplum*; he is not so much an individual as a cipher for the ideal Roman soldier. He is a moral paragon—one man who cannot be taken by a huge number of enemy soldiers. Valerius’ phrasing: *ad te invadendum* turns Scaevius into a fortress or a state rather than a man, and refers back to the ideal of the physical impenetrability of Roman citizens. Scaevius is not only impenetrable but he also throws enough javelins to equip five soldiers in a day long battle. Scaevius’ superhuman perfection culminates in his reaction when he regains the safety of the ship—he immediately asks the pardon of his commander for losing his shield in the conflict.

The barbarians Britons in this case are, however, not only present to provide a theatre for Scaevius’ valour; their presence is also a sharp reminder of the insufficiency of Scaevius’ comrades. Valerius uses a subtle touch to convey Scaevius’ abandonment by his fellow soldiers. The other Romans are not actually identified as Romans as Shackleton Bailey’s translation suggests: “The other Romans returned by their ship to shore…” but rather discreetly termed *ceteris* at their moment of retreat. This moment is, however the exact one at which the *ingens multitudo barbarorum* rushes across the altered landscape to lay siege to Scaevius’ rock. The Britons are not described as barbarians at any other point in the *exemplum*; Valerius uses the term only in the juxtaposition of the attacking Britons and the retreating Romans that leaves Scaevius to demonstrate his *fortitudo*. The fact that Valerius notes that Scaevius throws enough javelins to last (specifically) five men in a day long battle cannot fail to remind the reader that he would have been sharing these weapons with (specifically) four other soldiers, had they not deserted him. The inadequacy of the Romans’ behaviour is reinforced when they are united with the Britons to form an audience for their comrade’s valour with Valerius’ balanced...
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Britannicus... construction 78. The Romans are amazed, but apparently not inspired to come to Scaevius’ aid.

Valerius’ deliberate construction of the Scaevius incident is confirmed by comparison with alternate versions that present similar figures. Identifying the Scaevius of Valerius’ exemplum presents some difficulties but there are two close equivalents in Plutarch’s Life of Caesar (Plut. Caes. 16) and Cassius Dio (37.53.23). In the first case, Plutarch and Valerius Maximus seem to share a common source. The actual details of the Scaevius story differ between the two authors but the wider context is remarkably similar. At this point in the biography of Caesar, Plutarch describes the remarkable loyalty of Caesar’s soldiers to their commander and the bravery inspired by this loyalty (Caes. 16). He then illustrates this loyalty with exempla. The initial three are Acilius who gains possession of an enemy ship despite losing his hand in the process, Cassius Scaeva—the hero of the siege of Dyrrachium—and then the unnamed soldier who echoes Valerius’ Scaevius. The order of exempla here is exactly that of exempla 3.2.22, 23a and 23b in Valerius’ chapter De Fortitudine and Valerius also accompanies his choice of men with commentary on the loyalty and discipline of Caesar’s soldiers.

The balance of the scene described by Plutarch is, however, very different. Roman soldiers are caught in a marsh and a private soldier runs in to help, forcing the barbarians to flee, rescuing the Romans and losing his shield in the process. In a show of emotion—utterly lacking from Valerius’ account—the soldier hangs his head and weeps before Caesar when he begs pardon for the lost shield (Plut. Caes. 16). The soldier is a figure in motion, forcing his way into the action and defeating his foes, rather than Valerius’ still figure at the centre of the action who, unable to overwhelm his opponents, nonetheless retreats with honour. Plutarch’s soldier routs the Britons and rescues the trapped Roman centurions. None of the Roman soldiers retreats as they do in Valerius’ account (ceteris rate ad litus regressis), and Plutarch’s phrasing, which places the rescue of the centurions after the rout of the barbarians, ensures that this rescue cannot be read as a retreat. The Britons are barbarians triumphed over by a Roman hero; they are a background to the achievements of Roman soldiers, not their failings.

78 Valerius uses the hinc...illinc construction on seven occasions in the Facta et Dicta (3.2.23b, 3.8.3, 4.7.7, 6.9.ext.7, 7.2.ext.1c, 7.4.4 and 8.15.8) but in only one other of these instances at 6.9.ext.7 does he use it to oppose two different powers. In this case the two nations depicted are also united in intent as both seek the alliance of King Syphax.
The figure of Publius Scaevius in Cassius Dio’s account of Julius Caesar’s pursuit of the inhabitants of the Herminian Mountains is again different (37.53.2-3). The details however are similar enough to that of the exemplum at 3.2.23b in Valerius Maximus to justify Kempf’s emendation from Scév or Scëvola to Scae in this case. Once again the expedition to an island is undertaken without strict military necessity to do so. In each story the disembarkation of the soldiers is a mistake and they are trapped on a section of land offshore. In Cassius Dio, however, the trapped Romans’ behaviour differs substantially. The commander misjudges the tides and terrain and abandons his own men but unlike the troops in Valerius’ account – who retreat and leave Scaevius to his lone demonstration of valour – the troops in Dio die in battle after demonstrating their own bravery. Furthermore, Dio emphasises the bravery of these troops in such a way that Scaevius’ escape looks less glamorous than in Valerius’ account. Cassius Dio states that all but one soldier died bravely defending themselves: γενναῖος διμίνικος εἶπεν (37.53.3) and then details Publius Scaevius’ retreat. The adverb γενναῖο separated from the description of Scaevius, and both the present middle participle of ἀλλ᾽ and the aorist finite form of πᾶσα τὰς are clearly plural, attaching the brave defence to those Roman soldiers who have died in the attack. Publius Scaevius escapes with many wounds and without his shield by entering the water and swimming to safety.

The key difference between the two other accounts of the Scaevius figure and that in Valerius is the retreat of his fellow soldiers. The Roman soldiers do not retreat in Plutarch’s version of the story as they are trapped and unable to do so (Caes. 16). Similarly in Cassius Dio’s account Scaevius’ fellow soldiers make no attempt to retreat, but rather die fighting (37.53.2-3). Matthew Roller identifies Valerius’ exemplum of Roman fortitudo presented at 3.2.23b with the famous story of Horatius Cocles. Roller sees this particular parallel as part of the wider similarities (visible in a variety of authors) between the Caesarean soldier Scaeva and Horatius Cocles.

While Valerius does not state that Scaevius at 3.2.23b is actually the same individual as Scaeva at 3.2.23a, the parallel between these exempla and Horatius Cocles is still revealing. In Livy’s account the Romans desert as a result of outright fear and panic.

79 Kempf, C. Valerii Maximi: Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium (Stuttgart, Teubner, 1866) 123.
80 In Valerius’ account the motivation for the attack is Caesar’s overwhelming ambition for his empire, in Dio’s account he is acting out of a desire to provoke the peoples of the Herminian Mountains into open warfare and thus forestall any future attempts at rebellion or revolt.
but Horatius is able to inspire at least some of them to come to his aid\textsuperscript{82}. Valerius’ account is subtle and more disturbing; it offers no explanation for the retreat of Scaevius’ comrades – their motivation remains a mystery: \textit{ceteris rate ad litus regressis solus immobilem stationis gradum retinens}. In Livy’s account Horatius’ performance strikes shame into some of the audience and Sp. Larcius and T. Herminius resolve to stand by him while other Romans work to demolish the supports of the bridge at his instruction (2.10.3-6)\textsuperscript{83}. Horatius’ performance eventually inspires the Etruscan enemy with \textit{pudor} too, but not until it has already shamed his fellow countrymen into action. Valerius also presents Scaevius’ performance as prompting \textit{pudor} in the observers but it is only the Britons who are affected. The barbarian Britons feel \textit{pudor} at their inability to kill Scaevius, the Romans feel no \textit{pudor} at their failure to help him. The description of the Britons as \textit{barbari} in Valerius’ \textit{exemplum} acts to underline the dubious behaviour of Scaevius’ companions. The Britons are only ever \textit{barbari} when the Romans have abandoned their comrade to face the enemy troops alone.

Valerius’ Scaevius is a superhuman model of valour but he is no more victorious than M. Crassus or P. Crassus in their \textit{exempla}, although like P. Crassus he successfully salvages his dignity. Glorious victory is not on offer. M. Crassus and P. Crassus are killed and Scaevius retreats badly injured from an unbeatable foe. When Valerius uses \textit{barbarus} to describe an opponent of Rome in the \textit{exempla} discussed in this chapter, the Romans are always in serious trouble. This is certainly true of both Regulus (who is an exemplar of Roman virtues at their best in Valerius’ text\textsuperscript{84}) and the Roman prisoners of war who are victims of the Carthaginians at 9.2.ext.1 in the chapter \textit{De Crudelitate}:

\textit{Transgrediemur nunc ad illa quibus, ut par dolor, ita nullus nostrae civitatis rubor inest. Carthaginienses Attilium Regulum palpebris resectis machinae, in qua undique praecauti stimuli eminebant, inclusum vigilantia pariter et continuo tractu undique praecauti stimuli eminebant, inclusum vigilantia pariter et continuo tractu factisque (2.10.3-6).}

\textsuperscript{82} Qui positus forte in statione pontis cum captum repentino impetu Janiculum atque inde citatos decurrere hostis vidisset trepidamque turbam suorum arma ordinesque relinguere, reprehensans singulos, obstens obtestansque deum et hominum fidem testabatur nequiquam desertio praesidio eos fugere... Duos tamen cum eo pudor tenuit, Sp. Larcium ac T. Herminium, ambos claros genere factisque (2.10.3-6).

\textsuperscript{83} Valerius’ own account of Horatius’ defence of the bridge at 3.2.1 makes no mention of Horatius’ abandonment or the activity of the other Roman soldiers at this time. Within the \textit{exemplo}, Horatius’ valour is uncomplicated by any cowardice on the part of other Roman.

\textsuperscript{84} He is depicted as such at: 1.1.14, 2.9.8 and 4.4.6.
doloris necaverunt, tormenti genus indignum passo, auctoribus dignissimum. eadem usi crudelitate milites nostros [quos] maritimo certamine in suam potestatem redactos navibus substraverunt, ut earum carinis ac pondere elisi inusitata ratione mortis barbaram feritatem satiarent, taetra facinore pollutis classibus ipsum mare violaturi.

In this exemplum Valerius twice distinguishes between Carthaginians and Romans. He begins by stating that the material relating to Carthage contains nothing to shame nostra civitas and when he moves from the story of Regulus to that of the captured soldiers he refers to the latter men as milites nostri (9.2.ext.1). This technique acts to create a Roman community including the reader together with Valerius and the captured men while excluding the Carthaginians and other external groups. The superficial separation between Rome and externals in this particular chapter, however, draws attention to a much stronger unity between the two groups which will be fully discussed in chapter Seven85. For now the specific connection to note is the one that Valerius constructs between the first internal exemplum and the first two stories in the external material. 9.2.1 describes Sulla’s crudelitas and Valerius introduces him by stating that while he presented a Scipio to Rome in his pursuit of victory, he presented a Hannibal to his people in using that victory. The mention of Hannibal is brought to mind sharply when Carthaginian troops, and then the general himself, are found paralleling Sulla’s opening position in the external material (9.2.ext.1-2). Valerius provides an explicit marker with the mention of Hannibal at 9.2.1 and then proceeds to link this exemplum to the opening external exempla with both content and language.

Both Sulla and the Carthaginian troops defile natural water with their slaughter; Valerius describes Sulla filling the Tiber with the bodies of the dead and makes special mention of the bloodied waters – cruentatae aquae (9.2.1). The Carthaginian troops crush Roman soldiers under their keels and thus pollute their fleet and violate the sea – pollutis classibus ipsum mare violaturi (9.2.ext.1). This deed is recalled at 9.2.ext.2 as Hannibal’s effect on the land mirrors his troops’ activities on water. In this case, bodies are again heaped into a river (here the Vergellus) but with the practical purpose of creating a bridge from the Roman dead. Valerius’ use of three

85 See pg. 233-242 below.
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words reinforces the connection made with content: he states that Sulla slaughtered women as if too little satiated (satiare) by the blood of men and then describes another sign of his inexplibilis feritas. Each of these three words recurs in some form in the description of Carthaginian cruelty: the Carthaginians crush Romans under their keels in order to barbaram feritatem satiarent (9.2.ext.1) and Hannibal is unable to sanguine explebatur until he has seen all of his Roman prisoners kill each other (9.2.ext.2). These are the only uses of the verb satiare, or of words formed from the verb explere, in chapter 9.2 and there is only one other use of feritas in the chapter (at 9.2.ext.4).

The heightened rhetorical intensity at which Valerius is working is clearly visible as he creates the parallel between Roman and Carthaginian cruelty; he employs words in unusual ways in these exempla. This is also the only occasion on which feritas is connected to a Roman in the Facta et Dicta and the only occasion on which barbarus is applied to something other than a person or people. It is also a unique use of the term in connection with the Carthaginians in the text86. Both Romans and Carthaginians manifest the same capacity for cruelty and the same blood-lust. Both are identified as working outside of their usual cultural environments as Sulla manifests feritas and the Carthaginian troops barbara feritas. Both behaviours are intended to be shocking and both signal the universal presence of crudelitas. The superficial division between Romans and Carthaginians that Valerius sets up in the opening images of the external material is thoroughly undermined by those things the two groups share. This includes their victims – both Hannibal and Sulla enact their cruelty particularly against Rome.

Home

In each of the exempla discussed Valerius shows Rome in hostile interactions with foreign peoples associated with the term barbarus. On closer inspection however, the comfortable certainties of such a division are systematically undermined: M. Crassus and his troops are killed by barbarians but the real culprit is the general’s stubborn refusal to pay attention to prodigies and P. Crassus finds libertas and dignitas at the hands of a barbarian soldier after he disgracefully allows himself to be captured. Scaevius stands against an enemy who are only ever called barbari at the

---

86 The association of the Carthaginians with barbarus is discussed more fully later in this chapter, 180-183.
moment his comrades desert him, and the *barbara feritas* of the Carthaginians is structured to recall the extraordinary cruelty of Sulla. This deconstruction of the divisions between friend/enemy, good/bad and Roman/foreigner is part of a wider program that Valerius pursues throughout the work and which can be seen expanding outwards from these *exempla*. The key lies in the placement of the *exempla* within the wider structure of their chapters. In every case the *exemplum* that establishes, and then undermines, this contrast between internal and external is immediately followed or preceded by *exempla* dealing with Roman civil war.

There are ninety one chapters in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* as it survives in manuscript (including the epitomes of chapters 1.1-1.4 provided by Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus) and fifty-nine of these ninety one chapters – i.e. sixty-five percent – include external material87. Thirty one chapters have a final internal *exemplum* that explicitly or implicitly deals with internal dissension at Rome; twenty-eight of these are followed by external material – that is ninety percent. In the *Facta et Dicta* Valerius employs a device which I term a transition line: a phrase – ranging from a few words to several sentences – that self-consciously underlines the fact that Valerius is moving from internal to external material88. These appear in twenty-nine of the fifty-nine chapters that include external material – forty-nine percent. In twenty-one of the twenty-eight chapters where external material follows a final *exemplum* dealing with civil conflict, a transition line is positioned between the two categories to draw attention explicitly to the move from internal to external material. That is to say that a transition line appears in seventy five percent of these cases:

Percentage of chapters with external material: 65% (59 of 91).

Percentage of chapters in which the final internal *exemplum* deals with internal conflict that include external material: 90% (28 of 31).

Percentage of eligible89 chapters with a transition line: 49% (29 of 59).

Percentage of eligible chapters where the final internal *exemplum* deals with internal conflict that have a transition line: 75% (21 of 28).


88 Valerius’ use of transition lines is discussed in chapter Four: ‘The Language of Difference’, 114-127.

89 By an eligible chapter I mean a chapter that has external material and thus could logically employ a transition line.
A comparison of these percentages strongly suggests Valerius tends to include external material in chapters which conclude their depiction of internal material with an image of internal conflict and that he also tends to mark the transition between the two categories in these cases. The categories of internal and external are deliberately juxtaposed to underline their dubious integrity.

The information given by these percentage comparisons is supported by one instance where in a transition from internal to external Valerius explicitly draws attention to civil conflict and his own unwillingness to continue with such material. Valerius provides only two internal exempla in the chapter De Patientia before he breaks away from an exemplum detailing an unidentified Pompeius’ defiance of king Gentius into an extended transition line (3.3.2):

Ac ne plura huiusce generis exempla domi scrutando saepius ad civilium bellorum detestandam memoriam progredi coger, duobus Romanis exemplis contentus, quae ut clarissimarum familiarum commendationem ita nullum publicum maerorem continent, externa subnectam.

Valerius states that he does not want to treat material dealing with internal conflict and will instead introduce external material. This does not, of course, mean that Valerius has failed to include material dealing with Roman civil conflict: exempla including this material make up roughly seventeen percent of internal anecdotes. Rather, rhetorical flourishes like the one above are designed not to distract the reader but to engage them; the sharp division between internal and external is put into contrast with the manifold divisions that have historically run through the internal category. These cracks undermine the foundations of any idea that human beings can be separated into clearly defined groups of ‘Us’ and ‘Them’.

This juxtaposition of internal disunity and the ideas attendant on barbarus can be demonstrated within the structure of the individual chapters in which the above exempla are located. The exempla that constitute 1.6.1-1.6.9 do not deal with internal conflict; in fact after the opening exemplum describing the flames that indicated the royal destiny of Servius Tullius, exempla 1.6.2 to 1.6.9 all portray prodigies that are received while Rome is in conflict with a foreign power. At 1.6.10 the first indication of internal conflict arises with Cn. Octavius (cos. 87) witnessing a prediction of his fate in the decapitated statue of Apollo. The final three exempla complete the
depiction of the grim fates of all three members of the triumvirate of Crassus (1.6.11), Pompey the Great (1.6.12) and Julius Caesar (1.6.13). At 1.6.12 the prodigies that should have persuaded Pompey of the futility of his conflict with Caesar are described and at 1.6.13 Valerius depicts the prodigies that anticipated the assassination of Caesar himself. In both of these cases the men in question ignore the prodigies and are destroyed by their fellow Romans. M. Crassus’ ill-omened clash with the Parthians is positioned at 1.6.11 in the midst of this internal conflict.

There is a rough chronological drift in the chapter De Prodigis and the last four exempla are set in chronological order but the order is not so strict that this alone explains the position of the Crassus exemplum. It is also significant that Valerius chooses to use barbarus to describe the Parthians – nowhere else so described in the Facta et Dicta – in this particular context. Crassus’ obstinacy and his disastrous defeat at the hands of barbari is set beside exempla that deal with extremely destructive conflicts in a divided Roman state. Crassus ignores omens and loses huge forces in an external war, the Romans around him behave similarly and are killed by their compatriots – the barbarian Parthians who simply fight successfully against a foreign enemy exhibit the most appropriate behaviour of any of those involved. Effectively an enemy to his own men, Crassus creates the same confusion of categories as the images of civil war. Valerius follows his death, appropriately, with the civil war between Julius Caesar and Pompey, and Caesar’s eventual assassination at Rome.

In chapter 3.2 De Fortitudine, exempla 3.2.1 to 3.2.12 – the exemplum describing the death of P. Crassus Mucianus in the war against Aristonicus – all deal with external war. 3.2.13 however describes the defiant last words of Q. Metellus Scipio, Pompey’s father-in-law, at his suicide in front of the triumphant Caesarean troops. Valerius states that Scipio’s last words guaranteed him aeterna laus for his fortitudo. This introduces another two examples of fortitudo in civil war before Valerius returns to external conflict at 3.2.16. 3.2.17 to 3.2.22 alternate between internal and external war until 3.2.23a describes the awe-inspiring performance of the Caesarean soldier whom Valerius identifies as M. Caesius Scaeva in the civil war

---

90 1.6.1 578-534 BCE 1.6.2 211 BCE 1.6.3 396 BCE 1.6.4 89 BCE 1.6.5 461, 217, 192 BCE 1.6.6 217 BCE 1.6.7 137 BCE 1.6.8 212 BCE 1.6.9 214, 208 BCE 1.6.10 87 BCE 1.6.11 53 BCE 1.6.12 48 BCE 1.6.13 44 BCE.

91 “Imperator se bene habet.”

92 3.2.14 describes Cato’s suicide at Utica and 3.2.15 that of his daughter Porcia after the death of her husband Brutus. 3.2.16 describes the cool bravery in battle manifested by Cato the elder.
between Caesar and Pompey. This exemplum and the previous one dealing with the endurance of another Caesarean soldier in external war leads Valerius into an excursus on the great soldiers created by the discipline of the divus Iulius and then into exemplum 3.2.23b and the story of Scaevius’ valiant struggle against barbarians.

At both points where barbarus is used in the chapter De Fortitudine it is neighboured by an outstanding example of fortitudo in a civil war context where that virtue can become extremely problematic. Scaevia’s glory actually consists after all, in the sheer number of fellow Romans he has killed and P. Crassus’ honourable barbarian-aided suicide is followed by three examples of outstanding citizens who can only deal with Caesar’s victory in civil war by committing suicide. In such circumstances it might be expected that two exempla depicting Roman fortitudo against barbarian enemies would provide relief, but, as we have seen, these exempla merely continue the confusion of internal and external categories. Crassus needs the help of a barbarian soldier to demonstrate fortitudo and Scaevius must demonstrate it because he has been deserted by his comrades. Once again the behaviour of the foreigners is less open to question than that of the Romans, and in Crassus’ case, it actually provides salvation for the Roman. Foreign enemies are here compared and contrasted with Roman enemies in closely matched exempla.

The exemplum detailing the cruelty of the Carthaginians towards captured Romans is slightly different in that it is positioned in the external material but it follows a series of internal exempla dealing exclusively with Roman cruelty in civil war. Exemplum 9.2.1 describes Sulla’s atrocities against Romans and 9.2.2 describes those of Marius. These two complementary exempla are followed by L. Damasippus’ (pr. 82) excesses at 9.2.3 and then L. Munatius Flaccus’ behaviour to the citizens of Ategua whom he believed to be Caesarean partisans. Elsewhere Valerius acknowledges instances of unacceptable Roman behaviour towards foreigners (such as Ser. Sulpicius Galba’s (cos. 144) treacherous slaughter of the Lusitanians in the chapter De Perfidia) but in De Crudelitate the emphasis is upon the appalling things
that Romans do to other Romans\textsuperscript{96}. When Valerius introduces the external material he acknowledges the \textit{rubor} that such accounts must instil in citizens of the Roman community and he then goes on to describe the \textit{barbara feritas} directed towards Romans by their most notorious foreign enemy (9.2.ext.1 and 2). As we have seen, however, these external \textit{exempla} are constructed to echo the first internal account of Sulla’s \textit{crudelitas} and by doing so reinforce both the universal presence of cruelty and its universal horror whether it is perpetrated by Romans or foreigners. More than this, the connections between Sulla and the activities of the Carthaginians in this chapter explicitly underline the fact that both have Romans as their victims. For the Carthaginians this is entirely natural — they are, after all, engaged in a protracted war with the Romans. It is far less natural, on the other hand, for the Roman Sulla to be so energetically exercising cruelty against his compatriots.

In this case Valerius also appears to be deliberately using \textit{barbarus} in unexpected places. 9.2.ext.1 is the one occasion in the work where the adjective \textit{barbarus} is used to refer to something other than a person or persons. Here Valerius says of the Carthaginians that they \textit{barbaram feritatem satiarent}. Their savagery is described as \textit{barbarus}, not they themselves. This is an important distinction: it removes the adjective from the people and attaches it to just one act, unlike the description of the unspecified \textit{barbari} and their novel cruelty given at 9.2.ext.11. The two \textit{exempla} from the same chapter can be usefully contrasted: at 9.2.ext.11 the people are not named; their unimportance is made clear by their description as simply \textit{illi barbari}. The only information that Valerius provides about them is a description of their behaviour — here noteworthy for its cruelty. At 9.2.ext.1 on the other hand, he describes a cultured people who are very well known to author and audience, and rather than characterising the people as a whole as \textit{barbari}, he chooses to attach this label to their \textit{feritas}, an attribute also possessed by a Roman in the same chapter of the \textit{Facta et Dicta}\textsuperscript{97}.

The other \textit{exemplum} where the term \textit{barbarus} is associated with Carthage is 5.1.ext.6 in the chapter \textit{De Humanitate}. Once again it is not a straightforward reference to a Carthaginian or to the group as a whole as \textit{barbari}. In this \textit{exemplum},

\textsuperscript{96} The construction of chapter 9.2 is discussed in greater length in chapter Six ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 229-238.

\textsuperscript{97} Of Sulla’s actions at 9.2.1: \textit{id quoque inexplebilis feritatis indicium est}. Here, unlike the \textit{feritas} of the Carthaginians, Sulla’s \textit{feritas} can never be satisfied. Once again see ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’ for further discussion of Valerius’ use of \textit{feritas}. 
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which survives in an incomplete form, Valerius Maximus describes Hannibal’s humanity towards the bodies of Aemilius Paullus (killed at Cannae, 216 BCE), Ti. Gracchus (killed 212 BCE) and M. Marcellus (killed 208 BCE) after their defeat in battle. Prompted by these instances, and writing in summary of the entire chapter Valerius describes the powerful quality of *humanitas* in human affairs. The *exemplum* before this point focuses attention clearly upon Hannibal himself as it is introduced with: *Facta mentione acerrimi hostis...*, a lead in from the previous *exemplum* which finishes with a reference to Hannibal. Similarly the treatment of the Roman corpses is described in three sentences each of which begins by putting the name of Hannibal alongside that of the Roman he is burying: *Hannibal enim Aemilii Paulli...Hannibal Ti. Gracchum...Hannibal M. Marcellum...* The emphasis is most certainly upon the individual character rather than the people as a whole.

Having dealt with the specific material in this way, Valerius pauses to discourse more generally on *humanitas*, opening with the phrase:

*Ergo humanitatis dulcedo etiam in efferata barbarorum ingenia penetrat, torvosque et truces hostium mollit oculos ac victoriae insolentissimos spiritus flectit.*

Certainly this is designed to be a general statement, just as is the discussion of the universal power of *pietas* motivated by the behaviour of the Scythians, but in the case of the Scythians the use of *barbarus* is actually part of the story of the *exemplum*. The Scythians are referred to as an *immanis et barbara gens* in terms of their lack of civilisation – although their loyalty to their parents has rescued them from any harsher charge – before Valerius goes on to discuss the power of *pietas*. In Hannibal’s case however, there is no explicit link between the use of *barbarus* and the general. The statement is general and the only real anchor is context: Valerius has been discussing war between Rome and Carthage and Hannibal as the victor has been moved to offer honours to the Roman dead.

Valerius’ choice of language separates the specific description of Hannibal as an individual from those under the influence of *humanitas*. At 5.1.ext.6 the power of *humanitas* and its specific impact upon *barbari* are separated from Hannibal’s actions

---

98 5.1.ext.5: *quo animo si pro imperio nostro adversus Hannibalem quoque usi fuissent, truculentis securibus materiem saeviendi non praebuissernt.*

99 5.4.ext.5: *Prima igitur et optima Rerum Natura pietae est magistra...*

100 ibid: *quo quidem uno tam pio dicto immanis et barbara gens ab omni se feritatis crimine redemit.*
and placed after the *ergo*. They appear to have a more general application than the behaviour of the Carthaginians. The figures after the *ergo* are put into the plural: they are *barbari* and *hostes*, and the shift from specific singular to general plural creates distance between Valerius’ treatment of Hannibal and his use of *barbarus*. These are subtle distinctions but they also seem to be reflective of the way in which Carthaginians – as opposed to the noble but savage Scythians – are portrayed throughout the text. Certainly on the individual level, Hannibal is nowhere else referred to as a *barbarus* or associated with barbarity in the *Facta et Dicta*. *Barbarus* is obviously a term that Valerius does not easily or automatically associate with the Carthaginians but in this instance at 9.2.ext.1, where Carthage is at war with Rome and the material follows a catalogue of Roman internal violence, he chooses to use the term.

Valerius then, plays with the sharp division between internal and external with these uses of *barbarus*. The *exempla* involved often draw attention to dubious Roman behaviour while their foreign opponents behave exactly as the hostile context demands. Roman impiety, disgraces, betrayals and outright sadism feature in such a way as to bring into question where the real barbarity in these *exempla* lies. Because the main victims of these behaviours are Romans, it also breaks down the connection between foreigner and enemy: a connection that Valerius has highlighted with his use of *barbarus* in these instances of external war. This confusion of the simplistic categories of inside and outside is reflected and enhanced by Valerius’ neighbouring depictions of a community where civil war makes every Roman potentially an enemy of Rome.

The same elements are present within one *exemplum* at 7.3.6:

*Sertorius vero, corporis robore atque animi consilio parem Naturae indulgentiam expertus, proscriptione Sullana dux Lusitanorum fieri coactus, cum eos oratione flectere non posset ne cum Romanis universa acie confregere vellent, vafro consilio ad suam sententiam perduxit: duos enim in conspectu eorum constituit equos, validissimum alterum, <alterum> infirmissimum, ac deinde validi caudam ab imbecillo sene paulatin carpi, infirma a iuvene eximiarum virium universam convelli iussit. obtemperatum imperio est. sed dum adulescentis dextera irrito se labore fatigat,

101 See chapter Six ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’ for further discussion of the Scythians’ role in the text, 222-229.
A *barbara gens* plans to take on the whole of the Roman army and is shown a more effective way of attacking the forces. Their leader prevents them from rushing *in exitium suum* and cleverly convinces a tribe *aspera et regi difficilis* of the benefits of guerrilla warfare. The irony in this *exemplum*, of course, is that the leader of the barbarians is a Roman engaged in what is essentially a Roman civil war. Sertorius is forced by the Sullan proscriptions to become *dux Lusitanorum* and is shown exercising his considerable gifts to lead an effective and efficient campaign against the *Romani*. Valerius emphasises the strangeness of the situation by repeating the adjective *barbarus* twice as he describes Sertorius’ troops\(^{102}\). They are a *barbara gens*, recalling the *gentes* that elsewhere in the *Facta et Dicta* constitute subjects of Rome\(^{103}\) and their resistance to rule is another reminder of the appropriate position of such peoples. The irony of the situation is reinforced as Sertorius makes his demonstration to a *barbara contio*\(^{104}\). What should in linguistic terms be an incident of Rome at war with a foreign people is actually a civil conflict in which Romans employ *barbari* to fight against other Romans\(^{105}\). Inside and outside are turned inside out.

Another example occurs in the chapter *De Severitate* when M. Manlius (cos. 392) is executed because he has threatened Roman *libertas* (6.3.1a). Valerius puts a speech of explanation in the mouth of personified *libertas*:

\(^{102}\) Nowhere else does *barbarus* appear twice in the one *exemplum* in the text.

\(^{103}\) See chapter Four: ‘The Language of Difference’ for discussion of *gens* in this sense, 141-142.

\(^{104}\) *Contio* and the present participle from *contionor* are rarely used of Rome in the text (18 of 28 uses). When they do appear in an external context they are only otherwise used in relation to Athens (3.8.ext.2, 3.8.ext.3, 6.5.ext.2, 6.5.ext.3, 8.7.ext.1, 8.9.ext.1 and 8.9.ext.2) and Thurii in Italy (twice at 6.5.ext.4).

\(^{105}\) No versions of this story in sources prior to Valerius Maximus survive although Pliny’s reference at Ep. 3.9.11 suggested that it was well known. Frontinus’ account is close to Valerius’ and does use *barbarus* once but in this case it is a plural substantive usage for the people. Valerius’ final comment on Sertorius’ protection of the *barbari* from their own impulses is absent and Frontinus’ *exemplum* opens with a clear statement of Sertorius’ self-interest: *Q. Sertorius, quod experimento didicerat imparem se universo Romanorum exercitu...* (Strat. 1.10.1). Another version is at Plut. Sert. 16 and within Frontinus the story recurs under another heading at 4.7.6.
Because Manlius has threatened Rome with civil dissension and unrest he explicitly becomes an external enemy and is punished accordingly. The boundaries between internal and external are pliable and penetrable. It is an individual’s behaviour and not his technical status that is the fundamentally important categorising factor.

Another Roman threatens the security of Rome and is duly punished at 9.11.ext.4. This passage perhaps holds a key to Valerius’ on-going interest in civil conflict throughout the work. Despite Tiberius’ relatively peaceful reign, Valerius records one incident that must have reminded those at Rome far too clearly of the excesses of civil war. These memories are deliberately evoked at 9.11.ext.4 as Sejanus threatens Tiberius – the certissima salus of the Roman empire (Pr.) – and thus threatens to plunge the human race into gory darkness:

*Sed quid ego ista consector aut quid his immoror, cum unius parricidii cogitatione cuncta scelera superata cernam? omni igitur impetu mentis, omnibus indignationis viribus ad id lacerandum pio magis quam valido aeductu rapior: quis enim amicitiae fide extincta genus humanum cruentis in tenebris sepelire conatum profundo debitae exsecrationis satis efficacibus verbis adegerit? tu videlicet efferatae barbariae immanitate truculentor habenas Romani imperii, quas princeps parensque nostrer salutari dextera continet, capere potuisti? aut te compote furoris mundus in suo statu mansisset? urbem a Gallis captam, et trecentorum inclitae gentis virorum strage foedatum <amnem Creme ram et> Alliensem diem, et oppressos in Hispania Scipiones et Trasumennum lacum et Cannas, bellorumque civilium domestico sanguine manantes mucrones amentibus propositis furoris tui repraesentare et vincere voluisti. sed vigilarunt oculi deorum, sidera suum vigorem obtinuerunt, aerae pulvinaria templa praesenti numine vallata sunt, nihilque quod pro capite augusto ac patria excubare debuit torporem sibi permisit, et in primis auctor ac tutela nostrae incolumitatis ne excellentissima merita sua totius orbis ruina collaborentur divino

106 See especially Tacitus’ description of the resulting violence and fear at the downfall of Sejanus: Tac. *Ann.* 5.6-9 and similar material in Cassius Dio 58.10-12.
consilio providit. itaque stat pax, valent leges, sincerus privati ac publici officii tenor servatur. qui autem haec violatis amicitiae foederibus temptavit subvertere, omni cum stirpe sua populi Romani viribus etiam apud inferos, si tamen illuc receptus est, quae meretur supplicia pendit.

The threat presented by Sejanus to order and peace at Rome renders him efferatae barbariae immanitate truculentior. The mingling of internal and external threats continues in the exemplum. Sejanus' conspiracy against Tiberius is compared to the capture of Rome by the Gauls, the massacre of Romans at Cremera, Allia, the defeat of the Scipiones in Spain, Trasimene, Cannae and finally the evil effects of civil war\textsuperscript{107}. Valerius presents a series of successful external victories over Rome and builds these to a climax with the imagery of civil war, where both sides in the conflict effectively take the character of external threats to Rome and the categories of internal and external are thoroughly confused. Sejanus is accused of wanting to replicate and even surpass the tragic events that have formerly shaken the internal stability and integrity of Rome, underlining both the seriousness of the threat and the unnatural (though not unusual) position of a Roman who would choose to attack Rome. The position of the mundus is threatened: Sejanus has tried to bring about the ruina of the totus orbis together with peace, law and society itself. Valerius' highly charged rhetoric here presents one man as an embodiment of the confusion and destruction inherent in civil war: Sejanus is both Roman and dangerous, alien enemy.

The conception of Sejanus as a threatening external/internal in geographical/racial terms does not appear to be a standard topos in the ancient writers. Sejanus appears in a relatively small sample of Roman authors, and even in those where he plays a fairly major role – such as Tacitus' \textit{Annales} – sections crucial to the history have been lost. However, it is notable that the imagery that Valerius uses at 9.11.ext.4 does not appear to anywhere like the same extent in the other sources' descriptions of the prefect of the Praetorian Guard. The closest that Tacitus comes to external imagery in the surviving text is to refer to Sejanus as a \textit{municipalis adulter} (Tac. \textit{Ann.} 4.3). While the \textit{Oxford Latin Dictionary} states that \textit{municipalis} can be used in a disparaging sense, roughly equivalent to the sense of 'small town', Tacitus doesn't

\textsuperscript{107}Professor Braund identified a very similar list of threats to Rome at Juv.2.153-7 where Juvenal also uses the accumulation of historic catastrophes as a stick with which to beat an individual who has fallen short of the expectations of society.
appear to use the term in this way often and this is essentially a put down, not an externalisation. In fact he only uses the term on five occasions elsewhere, and only in one other case does there appear to be a sense of disparagement\(^\text{108}\). This is not really a statement of externality; while it physically locates Sejanus' origins outside Rome, \textit{municipales} are citizens. A sense of condescension for social customs improperly understood is present rather than fear of direct opposition to Roman society.

Other than this reference the only hint in Tacitus' \textit{Annales} is his description of Sejanus' origins. He records that Sejanus originally came from Vulsinii (Tac. \textit{Ann.} 4.1). Tacitus makes no further comment on this, but at a stretch a reference could be seen to Rome's past relationship with this community. Vulsinii was involved in an attempt to rebel against Roman power and invade Roman territory in collusion with Sappinum in the 3rd century BCE; this incident saw the two communities punished and brought into line by Rome. If such a reference is intended by Tacitus he has great faith in the reader's ability to bear a grudge because he gives no hints of this conflict in the text and many other \textit{civitates} had been in conflict with Rome more recently.

Tacitus does indicate that Sejanus is outside the norms of the branch of Roman society he is moving in – for instance the record of his alleged prostitution as a young man and the consistent emphasis upon his equestrian status despite his very public political role (Tac. \textit{Ann.} 3.29, 4.3 and 4.39). Sejanus' equestrian status receives quite a lot of attention in the laudatory account of Velleius Paterculus. Velleius' insistence on the suitability of Sejanus for high office and honour despite his background and status suggests that this was a point of sensitivity or controversy (VeiL 2.127). Velleius' account has no references indicating Sejanus' externality, but this is hardly surprising when the text predates Sejanus' 'barbaric' behaviour. The emphasis on externality in Valerius Maximus appears to be absent from Tacitus' account but the sections describing his downfall are missing from the remaining text. Tacitus makes Sejanus a social upstart for his actions under Tiberius but he is not externalised as a means of vilification. Similarly in Suetonius' account, Sejanus is no barbarian; he is rather a tool in the hands of an emperor more cunning and cruel than the praetorian captain could ever hope to be (Suet. \textit{Tib.} 55.1 and 61.1). Nor does Cassius Dio describe Sejanus' activities in the striking terms of barbarism and externality used by Valerius Maximus, even in book 58 which details his crimes and downfall. Such implications

\(^{108}\) Tac. \textit{Hist.} 2.21 \textit{Municipale vulgus, pronum ad suspiciones...
are also absent from references to Sejanus in Seneca (Sen. *ad Marciam*. 22.4-7 and *de tranqu.* 11.11) and Josephus (Joseph. *Ant.* 18.181). Juvenal seems to provide the only hint in this direction in his tenth satire; here he discusses the impermanence of power and success with Sejanus as an excellent example. In the course of the satire he states:

* idem populus, si Nortia Tusco
  * favisset, si oppressa foret secura senectus
  * principis, hac ipsa Seianum diceret hora
  * Augustum... (Juv. 10.74-7)

Sejanus' origins outside Rome are thus underlined, he is a provincial from Vulsinii and an Etruscan; this distinction serves to increase the distance between Sejanus and Rome considerably. A foreign goddess is invoked for his protection and Nortia is balanced by the use of the term Augustus with its strong connections with some of the oldest aspects of Roman religion. Here then, we could possibly see Sejanus as an external and a foreigner, opposed to Rome, but – given the close links between Rome and Etruria throughout Rome’s history – an association with the Etruscans could hardly be read as ‘barbarizing’ Sejanus. The vitriol and emotion of Valerius Maximus' account are absent. To some extent it is unsurprising that other authors fail to match the extreme imagery of Valerius; no other author we possess writes in such close proximity to the events. Other authors depict Sejanus with the perspective of history; Valerius describes a vivid, contemporary threat to *pax, lex, privatum ac publicum officium*, and the bonds of *amicitia*.

Valerius Maximus' treatment of Sejanus in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* seems to be quite unique amongst the remaining accounts. Juvenal only hints at Valerius’ striking imagery of an internal who behaves like an external, and there to a very limited degree. It is notable that while Valerius Maximus characterises Sejanus in terms of barbarity, he makes no attempt to suggest Sejanus is an external – by birth he is very much a part of the society, it is – as indicated above – his behaviour that places him outside. This case clearly demonstrates Valerius’ interest in the confusion of internal and external within the context of civil conflict. Like Manilius who is...

---

109 Tacitus is likely to be more balanced in his account of the crimes of Sejanus, because they are also seen in the context of the crimes of Tiberius and the weaknesses of the principate structure as a whole. So too Seneca, Suetonius or Cassius Dio. Velleius Paterculus writes before the storm had broken and thus his text constitutes our only positive record of Sejanus' role in Roman history.
aligned to the Senones (6.3.1a) Sejanus is aligned to external threats, but he is also an embodiment of civil war as he threatens the order of Rome and the world. He is a most unnatural amalgam of externalised intent and internal status and this in itself undermines the integrity of internal or external categories.

I include 9.15.ext.2 amongst the exempla that use barbarus to indicate the insufficiency of a neat division between internal and external in hostile situations, although there are differences in the way in which the exemplum is presented:

Idem barbarum quendam ob eximiam similitudinem Cappadociae regnum adfectantem, tamquam Ariarathes esset, quem a M. Antonio interemptum luce clarius erat, quamquam paene totius orientis civitatum et gentium credula suffragatione fultum, caput imperio dementer imminens iusto impendere supplicio coegit.

9.15.ext.2 is not immediately preceded by material dealing with civil conflict but the way Valerius constructs the chapter plays into the same issues of structure discussed above. Chapter 9.15 is graced with the slightly cumbersome title: De Iis Qui Infimo Loco Nati Mendacio Se Clarissimis Familiis Inserere Conati Sunt. In the preface to the chapter Valerius makes it clear that he is dealing with subject matter that constitutes a grave danger to the state as well as to individuals:

Sed tolerabilis haec et uni tantummodo anceps temeritas. Quod sequitur impudentiae genus nec ferendum ullo modo periculique cum privatim tum etiam publice late patentis.

The previous chapter has dealt with confusion of the social structure brought about by the physical similarity of unrelated individuals; each of the internal exempla depicts the similarity of those of low standing to those of high standing, thus the father of Pompey the Great is confused with his cook and P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio (cos. 138) a man of eximiae ...nobilitas is constantly compared to a sacrificial attendant (9.14.2 and 9.14.3). The final external exemplum describes the remarkable similarity of a Sicilian to the Roman proconsul of that province leading to a suggestion from the provincial that they might share descent from his father who had visited Rome (9.14.ext.3). Thus not only questions of status but also the structures of internality and externality are confused although as Valerius points out in the
preface to the next chapter this really affects only the individual in question. Valerius moves from this unintentional confusion of social structures to the deliberate attempts of individuals to manipulate and confuse that order. This is depicted as being dangerous to society as a whole. Valerius links the attempted intrusions of those of low status into families of high status to civil disorder and violence. The first exemplum deals with Equitius of Firmum and Herophilus the Horse Doctor and Valerius suggests that had Herophilus not been stopped, he – like Equitius – might have planned to murder the Senate

Here Valerius refers to the turbulentus error of the vulgus in supporting Equitius; similarly the false Clodius is supported by the violentia plebis (9.15.4). The internal material concludes with the displacement of a rightful son allowed by its context in Sullana violentia (9.15.5).

Valerius, having established the connection between the confusion of social structures and civil violence and dissent, concludes the chapter with an exemplum in which a barbarus attempts to insert himself into the royal line of Cappadocia (9.15.ext.2). As is argued in above Valerius appears to go out of his way deliberately to depict the threat posed by the pseudo-Ariarathes in dangerous terms

His action is portrayed in the negative vocabulary of madness and it threatens the empire as a whole: (Augustus) caput imperio dementer imminens iusto impendere supplicio coegit although the very madness of the attempt threatens to undermine it. The impostor is put into the company of the internal threats to stability like Equitius and Herophilus.

The main reason given for the degree of threat involved is that Pseudo-Ariarathes has support: he is paene totius orientis civitatum et gentium credula suffragatione fultus. Once again however, this external exemplum does not sit in a self-contained vacuum but reaches back to reference the internal material. Valerius’ specific comment on the eastern peoples’ belief in the pseudo-Ariarathes does not section them off as credulous natives, but aligns them with the people of Rome whose credence in various impostors has just been described. At 9.15.1 Equitius is supported by the error of the populace despite his evidens mendacium and Herophilus so successfully falsifies his connection to Marius that he is made patron of veterans’ colonies, municipia and collegia. Trebellius Calcha at 9.14.4 similarly garners so much popular support for his claim to be Clodius that a fair trial is scarcely possible.

---

110 9.15.1: quod nisi divinae Caesaris vires huic erubescendae procellae obstitissent, simile vulnus res publica excepisset atque in Equitio acceperat... postquam ille (Caesar) caelo receptus est, in urbe redditi et consilium interficiendi senatus capere sustinuit.

111 Chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’ 162.
A barbarian in Cappadocia is only attempting what at least six individuals (according to the internal material) have attempted at Rome. Likewise, just as Julius Caesar intervenes to stop Herophilus (9.15.1) as well as the individual pretending to be Cn. Asinius Dio’s son (9.15.5) and Augustus punishes the man claiming to be a child of Octavia, order is again restored in Cappadocia by Augustus who acts to protect the empire with the execution of the false Ariarathes. The internal and external categories are blurred together by similar content and the solution to social disturbance proves to be the same for both: the Caesars will ensure that families and social structures alike are fully protected.

Significantly, in this chapter the Caesars (here Julius Caesar and Augustus) are presented as the restorers of order in five of seven exempla including the final two exempla. This provides a contrast for the frequent involvement of the Caesars in civil conflict throughout the Facta et Dicta, civil conflict that is juxtaposed with external conflict – marked (as I have argued) by the use of the term barbarus for the external people – at 1.6.11, 3.2.12, 3.2.23b and 9.2.ext.1. For in each of these cases the exemplum that portrays Romans struggling against barbarian forces sits beside an exemplum that describes an incident specifically from the civil war between Julius Caesar and Pompeius Magnus. At 1.6.12 Pompey enters conflict with Caesar despite the discouraging omens, at 3.2.13 Metellus Scipio bravely commits suicide rather than be captured by the Caesarian soldiers, at 3.2.23a Scaeva slaughters a multitude of Roman opponents in defense of Caesar’s cause and at 9.2.4 Munatius Flaccus commits atrocities while defending Ategua from Caesar’s siege. Whether or not 9.15.ext.2 was originally intended to be the conclusion of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia it is a strong image of the structure of the society and the empire reinforced, rather than threatened by, the power of the Caesars. Julius Caesar’s adoptive son, Augustus, follows his divine father’s actions and also protects families from false claimants and the people of Rome, and elsewhere, from themselves. As the line between internal and external is shown to have little meaning, the central role of Augustus and his heir is brought even more sharply into focus. They rise up still scattered with the ash of civil war; figures of justice and stability for all of human

---

112 9.15.1, 9.15.2, 9.15.5, 9.15.ext.1 and 9.15.ext.2.
113 Notably, these incidents are not taken from the most recent civil war available but the war between Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great – Valerius does maintain a distance from the war between Octavian and Antony in these cases.
kind. We are shown the order and protection that Sejanus has threatened to destroy along with Tiberius.

Valerius demonstrates in these *exempla* to what extent the internal category lacks integrity. It is undermined by Roman impieties, disgraces and betrayals. M. Crassus ignores the gods and Roman tradition, P. Crassus dishonours himself and is only redeemed by a *barbarus*, and Scaevius is abandoned by his comrades. In contrast, the *barbari* can rarely be held at fault for their actions; the Parthians, the Thracians and the Britons simply fight external enemies. The externals even unwittingly participate in the expression of divine will, and Roman pursuits of redemption and honour. Even at their worst the barbarians are no worse than the Romans: Sulla and Hannibal balance each other with a terrible symmetry. By positioning these multi-layered encounters with ‘barbarians’ next to examples of Roman civil war Valerius reinforces his point. The same idea is strikingly clear in those incidents where Manlius, Sertorius, and – most importantly – Sejanus, behave like the worst kind of external enemies despite their internal status. The terminology of externality and internality is undermined by the actions of human beings; the categories in themselves are fundamentally flawed.

1 As in Sorensen the Elder’s usage of *barbari* in the words of Greeks describing Persians at S assisting 2.1, 2.7 and 2.27.
2 As at 1.6.11, 1.2.12, 2.2.22, 7.3.6 and 9.8.2.
3 For example 9.15.11.2, 9.2.11.1 and 5.1.11.8.
4 This sentence is noteworthy not only for its encapsulation of the gradations possible in externality, but also for the only use of *ater* in the comparative form in the *Facies et Dextra*. Valerius inserts a marked rhetorical flourish. Similarly, there is only one use of *ater* in the superlative form in the work. This takes place in Valerius’ highly charged account of the elder Africanius’ crucifixion of Roman deserters after the defeat of Carthage (2.7.12). *Atenus* in the comparative form is actually extremely rare in Latin as a whole; the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* records only 19 uses. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* Vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1909) 1567. Valerius is not at all afraid to use unusual vocabulary – he is, for instance, the only Latin author who uses the word *selfsame*. In addition he provides two or six uses of *alter*. Such independent language choices work against the idea that Valerius’ composition is entirely derivative.

5 In this section these chapters will be discussed: 3.3, 9.11 and 9.13.
Chapter Six: Bringing the Outside in

Because we are dealing with a Roman author, and working within the Greek tradition of sharp differentiation between Greeks and barbarians, it might be expected that in internal Roman exempla, or when compared to Greeks\(^1\), foreign peoples should be referred to as barbarians\(^2\). Similarly, it makes intuitive sense that on occasions in the external material when the subjects are in conflict with Rome, they should be described as barbari\(^3\). It captures the attention of the reader to a greater extent, however, when anonymous peoples are described with barbarus in external exempla that have nothing to do with Rome or with Greece. In these cases traces of an outlook where peoples are positioned in a scale of increasing externality as they move further away from the Mediterranean are visible.

We know that Valerius is happy to utilise gradations of Otherness, since he uses the concept explicitly at 3.4.2 when he describes Tarquinius as: alienum quod ex Etruria, alieniorem quod ortum Corintho\(^4\). At various points in the Facta et Dicta Valerius points to different peoples and identifies them as the cultural extremities of the known world\(^5\). The point is made not only with language but also with carefully structured chapters that suggest a progression outwards ending in the most external of externals. Although these barbari are anonymous – not important enough even to be identified by name – these peoples confound any simple boundaries between inside and outside. The presence of these shadowy externals in the text reveals the underlying unity of humankind, and demonstrates the topsy-turvy relationship of internal and external categories.

It is most revealing to begin by establishing those ideas that Valerius does not adhere to in characterising degrees of externality in his work. One striking element of the work is the extent to which it is free from monsters and grotesques. In Valerius'...

---

1 As in Seneca the Elder’s usage of barbari in the words of Greeks describing Persians at Suas. 2.1, 2.7 and 2.22.
2 As at 1.6.11, 3.2.12, 3.2.23b, 7.3.6 and 9.6.2.
3 For example 9.15.ext.2, 9.2.ext.1 and 5.1.ext.6.
4 This sentence is noteworthy not only for its encapsulation of the gradations possible in externality, but also for the only use of alienus in the comparative form in the Facta et Dicta as Valerius inserts a marked rhetorical flourish. Similarly there is only one use of alienus in the superlative form in the work. This takes place in Valerius’ highly charged account of the elder Africanus’ crucifixion of Roman deserters after the defeat of Carthage (2.7.12). Alienus in the comparative form is actually extremely rare in Latin as a whole, the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae records only 19 uses: Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Vol. 1 (Munich, 1900) 1567. Valerius is not at all afraid to use unusual vocabulary – he is, for instance, the only Latin author who uses the word vaframentum. In addition he provides two of six uses of vafr. Such independent language choices stand against the idea that Valerius’ composition is entirely derivative.
5 In this section three chapters will be discussed: 3.3, 9.11 and 9.13.
text cultural and geographical extremity do not consign foreign communities to the realms of the fantastic. Africa, for instance, which Evans identifies as a particular source of Roman anxiety and speculation, is almost entirely devoid of interesting freaks in the *Facta et Dicta*. Africa appears in the text as a political entity whose customs might be distinctive (for example, the reluctance of the Kings of Numidia to be kissed at 2.6.17) but are never marked out as negative or particularly unusual. On two occasions Valerius comments on the longevity of Africans - Masinissa at 8.13.ext.1 and the Ethiopian people as a whole at 8.13.ext.5 - but this is in the context of similar Roman *exempla* of long living figures and *exempla* drawn from familiar countries like Greece. Aside from these instances, sections of Africa appear as military opponents and allies in various *exempla* and Africans are represented as philosophers, kings and grateful and respected friends of Rome. The closest Valerius comes to any sense of the marvellous and monstrous in Africa (and indeed almost in the work as a whole) is a massive snake that the troops of M. Atilius Regulus (cos. II 256) encounter in the river Bagrada at 1.8.ext.19. Here the reader is presented with the frightening image of a snake large enough to devour and crush *multi milites* and which, even when destroyed, has the power to pollute the river and its banks with its *pestifer* blood and stench. There is however, nothing topsy-turvy in the *exemplum* - no malformed bodies or reversal of nature – there is simply an exaggeration of the known. Snakes are dangerous and thus a snake of *tanta magnitudo* is extremely dangerous; it is not discussed as characteristic of the African landscape but rather occurs as an ‘historical’ incident at a particular time and geographical location with no suggestion of repetition.
The extreme North of the known world is no stranger than the South in Valerius Maximus' text. Geographically, the most distant points mentioned in this area are the territories of the Teutoni in Germany and Britain. When the Teutoni appear as anything other than a background to Roman victory (3.6.6 and 6.9.14) they are worthy of high praise – or at least their women are worthy. At 6.1.ext.3 Valerius describes the request by the women of the conquered Teutoni to be presented as gifts to the Vestal Virgins. When their request is refused they commit suicide rather than become sexually vulnerable slaves. Valerius praises the *virtus* of the women in the following terms:

\[Di melius, quod hunc animum viris earum in acie non dederunt: nam si mulierum suarum virtutem imitari voluissent, incerta Teutonicae victoriae tropaea reddidissent.\]

Here there is an element of inversion – women are demonstrating *virtus* that should characterise the activity of their men – but such inversions are not the stuff of the grotesque and indeed are far from alien to Roman history. In fact, Quintilian discusses the efficacy of this very technique in selecting powerful *exempla*: the female assassin of Pyrrhus is potentially a more powerful *exemplum* than Horatius by virtue of the extraordinary conjunction of femininity and courage (Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.9-10). There is certainly no sense of condemnation or distortion on a societal level in Valerius' description.

Britain, on the one occasion that it appears in the text, is certainly characterised as hostile and remote (3.2.23b). Valerius positions the island beyond *Oceanus* and hints at the idea of the fluidity of land and sea in the distant North when he describes the tide flowing out and leaving Scaevius vulnerable to attack, but he

---

13 Tacitus declines comment on tales of inhuman tribes in furthest Germany, dismissing them as *fabulosa* and *incomperta* (Ger. 46), Valerius does not mention them at all.

14 The stand-out *exemplum* from the early empire is that of Arria demonstrating to Paetus that honourable suicide *non dolet* Plin. *Ep.* 3.16. This *exemplum* is particularly interesting in view of Mueller's observation that it is the least threatening account of the event to survive: Mueller, H. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus* (Indianapolis, 2004) 45-7.

15 Cf. Tacitus' inversion of society in his introduction to the year 69 CE where the primary demonstrations of virtue come from women and slaves: *Non tamen adeo virtutum sterile saeculum ut non et bona exempla prodiderit. Comitatae profugos liberos matres, secutae maritos in exilia continges...* (Tac. *Hist.* 1.3)

16 This can be usefully contrasted to Tacitus' description of the German Sitones who are actually ruled by women: *in tantum non modo a libertate sed etiam a servitute degenerant* (Ger. 45).
does not exploit these elements\textsuperscript{17}. Britain does not become bizarre as is often the case in ancient writers, and its traditional partner in geographic crime – Ireland – is not mentioned at all\textsuperscript{18}. Working around the compass to the far East, India is a focus of praise and civilised behaviour: the Indians gain gloria and demonstrate sapientia in their practise of patientia (3.3.ext.6) and their women are wonderfully chaste and loyal to their husbands (2.6.14). Cicero acknowledges the bravery of the natives but refers to India as an extreme barbaria, a term that he strengthens with the adjectives vastus and agrestis as he queries whether there is any country more appropriately described in this way: \textit{Quae barbaria India vastior aut agrestior?} (Tusc. 5.77). This is in line with India’s traditional Roman identification as a land at the very boundary of the world\textsuperscript{19}. This kind of characterisation is absent from Valerius despite the similarities between the material that follows Cicero’s comment in the \textit{Tusculan Disputations}, and Valerius’ exempla at 2.6.14 and 3.3.ext.6\textsuperscript{20}. Similarly there are none of Pliny’s Indian monsters in Valerius’ text (Plin. Nat. 7.23), although Pliny cites Valerius as one of the sources for the chapter\textsuperscript{21}. The Scythians too escape any “monsterisation” in the \textit{Facta et Dicta}\textsuperscript{22}. Valerius Maximus has taken the ancient map of the world and firmly crossed out ‘Here Be Dragons’ on every side.

This absence of monsters is particularly interesting in view of Barton’s argument that the early Empire and late Republic saw an unprecedented level of interest in monsters and grotesques\textsuperscript{23}. It also weighs against Skidmore’s assessment of the importance of the “pleasure criterion” in the inclusion of external exempla in the \textit{Facta et Dicta Memorabilia} as a whole\textsuperscript{24}. Valerius does not include crowd-pleasing freaks and foreign tribes situated as close to the edge of humanity as they are to the

\textsuperscript{17} Clarke discusses the changeable nature of the British and Irish landscape in Roman authors. Clarke, K. ‘An Island Nation: Re-Reading Tacitus’ \textit{Agricola’} JRS 91 (2001) 97-99.


\textsuperscript{20} At Tusc.5.78 Cicero goes on to describe the competition between Indian widows to be cremated with their husbands and Indian endurance; these practices are described by Valerius at 2.6.14 and 3.3.ext.6.

\textsuperscript{21} Plin. Nat. 7.23 The presentation of the Indians in Valerius and Pliny is discussed more fully in chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 220.

\textsuperscript{22} See particularly chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’ for Valerius’ treatment of the Scythians, 222-229.


\textsuperscript{24} Skidmore, C. \textit{Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen} (Exeter, 1996) 89-92.
edge of the world; his choice of foreign exempla is much more mundane. Valerius is not entirely without imagination – he does record self-healing and wind-nourished goats; ashes on an altar that are impervious to breezes and intoxicating waters, all crammed into one exemplum in the chapter De Miraculis (1.8.ext.18). There is, however, no correlation between physical extremity and distance from civilisation and these tricks of Natura. The goats live on Crete and Cephallenia, the altar is in Croton and the alcoholic water is in Macedonia and Campania. These are foreign territories, but they are familiar foreigners. The strange is knitted into the fabric of the known and common-place, not used to demonstrate the Otherness of distant lands.

Valerius’ use of cannibalism is a good demonstration of this tendency. Arens groups together accusations of cannibalism and accounts of “Homo monstrosus” (tree-living people, people with feet attached backwards) as reactions to the unknown and distant. Goldman too underlines the idea that cannibalism is, and “has always been, a quintessential symbol of alterity, an entrenched metaphor of cultural xenophobia.” In the Facta et Dicta there are two instances of cannibalism and they both take place in Spain: firstly during Scipio’s siege of Numantia and secondly at Calagurris as the town attempts to maintain its loyalty to Sertorius by resisting Pompey’s siege (7.6.ext.2 and 7.6.ext.3). Valerius shows no tolerance for such a technique of survival; he states at the conclusion of the first exemplum: nulla est in his necessitatis excusatio: nam quibus mori licuit, sic vivere necesse non fuit. He goes on to describe the citizens of Calagurris with cum omne serpentum ac ferarum genus comparatione sui titulo feritas superarit. The fact remains, however, that Valerius only employs the spectre of cannibalism in relation to two cities – not nomadic tribes or distant rumours – but in the case of Calagurris, a Spanish civitas that gave birth to Quintilian only

---

25 This tendency to avoid freakish material perhaps explains Valerius’ frequent recourse to named sources for the external exempla in the chapter De Senectute in which incredible life-spans are reported. Rather than this proving, as Skidmore suggests (Ibid. 97), that Valerius sees no moral purpose in these exempla and thus will not “vouch” for the stories personally, this seems to be a manifestation of his consistently limited use of grotesque or incredible material.

26 Ibid. 42. Skidmore sees this chapter (together with 8.13) as a manifestation of the paradoxographical tradition in Valerius’ text. I do not agree with his analysis that this material is included simply to entertain – as stated above Valerius simply makes too little of the potentially sensational material for his to be the case.


29 Valerius’ account stands in stark contrast to Juvenal’ exoneration of the town’s inhabitants from any blame for the act. Juv. 15.93-106.
or so years after the *Facta et Dicta* seems to have been written. Aberrant behaviours, like strange occurrences in the environment, are situated in the thoroughly known and civilised world.

Valerius Maximus, then, does not adopt a model of externality with monsters at the edges of the map. Neither are extremes of externality determined by physical distance from Rome. Recent approaches to understanding Roman geography often depict ethnographic or geographic material in Roman authors as a series of lines that are fixed at the centre point of Rome. Murphy sees this tendency in the structure of Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*; he argues that the narrative follows rivers through the landscape and that, by doing this, Pliny reflects a tradition of constructing geographies as “the itinerary of a voyage along the coast.” Vassaly too refers to Cicero’s construction of ‘journeys’ through the landscape around Rome in his speeches, following such thoroughfares as the Appian way. Pomeroy stresses that the ancient writers tend to depict the world outside Rome in terms of a journey starting at the nearest point and working ever outwards, running through a succession of less and less familiar places and peoples. An image of this kind occurs on the shield of Aeneas as a list of the peoples paying respect to Rome culminates with the Morini, *extremi hominum* and the *indomiti* Scythians. (A. 8.727-728).

Similarly, Tacitus’ *Germania* concludes with the German peoples who are both most distant and most savage, and the final images are of non-human tribes (*Ger.* 46). This structure also reflects the climatic concept of humanity (Valerius’ rejection of which is discussed earlier), that identifies the Mediterranean as the temperate centre of the

---

30 Contrasting examples of distinctly ‘Other’ cannibals can be found at Plin. *Nat.* 7.9 and Herod. 4.106.
31 It seems that Valerius’ use of cannibalism, given that both instances in the *Facta et Dicta* occur in the context of Spaniards resisting Roman sieges, is closer to colonial justifications of subjugation than outright ‘Othering’ of the people involved. Goldman, L. ‘From Pot to Polemic: Uses and Abuses of Cannibalism’ in Goldman, L (ed.) *The Anthropology of Cannibalism* (Westport, 1999). Arens examines the accusations of cannibalism made by the invading Spanish against the South Americans and finds these accusations escalated as the natives began to resist Spanish theft of their lands. Arens, W. *The Man-Eating Myth* (Oxford, 1979) 43-9. This kind of technique is by no means obsolete, it has been alleged recently that militiamen grilled, boiled and ate children in the course of inter-tribal fighting in the North-east Congo: http://www.smh.com.au/news/world/Congo-militia-grilled-&-boiled-victims-UN/2005/03/17/1110913739872.html# (Viewed 18/03/2005).
33 Ibid. 102.
world with increasingly extreme climates, and thus increasingly extreme human beings, extending out from this centre\(^{36}\).

The journey from Us to Them appears to have come most naturally to the Roman mind in the form of a progression through the peoples and places in-between. In many Roman authors the journey is marked by increasing externality and extremity and ends in monsters. Valerius does not take a consistent geographic approach. As I have just argued, he does not subscribe to the theory that physical distance from Rome necessitates increasingly alien customs and morals. He does, however, utilise the idea that some peoples are more civilised than others in order to construct cultural progressions towards extremity that echo the geographic progressions found in other Roman writers. Rather than leading to monsters and strange customs, however, these journeys ultimately lead the readers back to themselves, as Valerius demonstrates the insignificance of internal and external categories.

There are three instances in the *Facta et Dicta* where unspecified peoples are described as *barbari* within the external material (3.3.ext.7, 9.13.ext.3 and 9.2.ext.11)\(^{40}\). The anonymity of the barbarians and the absence of any Roman political context allow us to read the passages without much of the baggage often expected where *barbarus* is used. It also effectively avoids the sense of geographical procession that Pomeroy and Murphy discern in other Roman authors. The reader doesn’t know exactly where Valerius is going in a physical sense but he makes his point about cultural distance clearly. In all three *exempla*, Valerius creates a sense of extremity that underlines the lowly Otherness of his subjects, not only in Roman but also in external terms; they are not only *alieni* but *alieniores* and even *alienissimi*.

Valerius Maximus has great respect for the assassin of Hasdrubal and yet this man is anonymous: *servus barbarus Hasdrubalem, quod dominum suum occidisset graviter ferens, subito adgressus interemit*... (3.3.ext.7). Anonymity does not mean that the identity of the assassin is unimportant however; Valerius Maximus underlines the assassin with the very plainness of the placement of substantive subject and qualifying adjective at the opening of the sentence. The initial use of *servus* and then the qualifying *barbarus* place a compelling emphasis on the slave’s status. The story is related in a very similar fashion in Appian, Livy and Polybius, but nowhere is the

---


\(^{40}\) Discussion of 9.13.ext.3 follows at 205-209 and of 9.2.ext.11 at 209-213.
slave’s identity underlined with this double description of his status. Appian describes the assassin simply as a slave: ὁ δοῦλος (App. Ib. 2.8). In Livy’s account of the same incident some attention is drawn to the slave – he is described as barbarus...quidam⁴¹ – but there is a duality in such a description. By referring to him as ‘a certain barbarian’, Livy at once draws attention to the particular individual under discussion and neutralises this emphasis. He makes it clear that he is referring to a particular person of whom he has knowledge, but also makes it clear that he will provide no further information. The general effect of this is to divert the reader’s attention from the man’s servile status to his character, revealed by his cheerful reaction to torture at the hands of the Carthaginians⁴².

Neither of these accounts gives any clue to the origins of the slave. In contrast, Polybius’ account, does not specify the status of the individual or give exact details of his motivation but describes the assassin solely in terms of his ethnic background. Polybius states that a Κέλτας killed Hasdrubal on account of a personal injury (Polyb. 2.36.1), so the man is identified on this one occasion as Celtic or Gallic. Valerius does not use the term Celtae in the Facta et Dicta. He does refer to the Celtiberians, especially in relation to the Spanish campaigns conducted by Q. Metellus⁴³, but the Celtiberians are never described as barbari⁴⁴. Without definitive details, the reader is left to read between the lines of Valerius’ account of Hasdrubal’s assassin. The exemplum describes a man whose status is defined in terms of his enslavement to a foreign people; this suggests that the adjective qualifying servus also describes the man’s status in relation to that foreign people. Thus the slave is a barbarian in the context of the external world which he inhabits.

Hasdrubal’s assassin is identified as an external amongst externals, a status that by no means places him closer to Rome and makes the Carthaginians the true externals⁴⁵. Rather Valerius Maximus uses the description to draw a contrast between this story and the previous exemplum which details the incredible endurance of Indians: Haec e pectoribus altis et eruditis orta sunt, illud tamen non minus

---

⁴¹ Liv. 21.2.6: barbarus eum quidam palam ob iram interfecti ab eo domini obtruncavit...
⁴² ibid.
⁴³ V.Max.3.2.21, 4.3.1, 7.4.5 for instance.
⁴⁴ Spaniards in another region however are identified as barbari – the Lusitanians at 7.3.6 (twice) and 9.6.2.
⁴⁵ Contra O’Gorman’s assertion that barbarians must always exist as part of a “discourse of duality” that contrasts barbarian and Roman: “In other words, if two types of barbarism are represented, one will be assimilated to the Roman.” O’Gorman, E. ‘No Place Like Rome: Identity and Difference in the Germania of Tacitus’ Ramus 22.2 (1993) 147.
admirabile servilis animus cepit (3.3.ext.7). This could be read as a statement purely concerned with status, especially in view of the phrase servilis animus. This phrase in itself would be significant as it demonstrates a willingness to engage with and recognise the social structures of different peoples. However, the addition of barbarus to servus indicates that the stratification present is not purely to do with internal social structures but also with degrees of extremity. The selection and sequencing of the previous exempla in the section reveals a progression towards ultra-externality in line with this kind of conceptualisation.

Throughout the external material of chapter 3.3 it is possible to trace stratifications in the externality of the peoples presented. The exempla are sectioned into three distinct groups finally leading to the climactic exemplum of the servus barbarus. The first exemplum describes a Macedonian youth whose religious scruples motivate his resistance to entirely accidental pain during a sacrifice being conducted by Alexander (3.3.ext.1). This is followed by exempla depicting an Italian (3.3.ext.2 and 3.3.ext.3), a Greek (3.3.ext.4) and a Sicilian (3.3.ext.5); representatives of ethnic groups that are all civilised and developed; none of these external peoples are (or would be expected to be) described as barbari by Valerius Maximus. Their civilised – yet – external status is underlined by the statement describing the ability of philosophia to refine and educate the individuals who embrace her that acts as a preface to 3.3.ext.2-5.

Philosophia is overwhelmingly a praiseworthy and valued element in the Facta et Dicta – she is characterised as litteris pollens46 – and she is an exclusively external quality in Valerius Maximus’ text, often functioning as a marker of esteem47. Outside of chapter 3.3 philosophia is connected twice to the Athenian Xenocrates as he successfully resists the lures of the courtesan Phryne and the power of Alexander the Great (4.3.ext.3a and 4.3.ext.3b) then convinces the dissolute youth, Polemo, to adopt a respectable life (6.9.ext.1). Philosophia is also connected to Polyastratus and Hippocles whose connected fates are included in the chapter De Miraculis and dignified by Valerius’ assertion that they resided in the concordiae sinu (1.8.ext.17). The one negative association occurs at 2.6.11, when Valerius uses philosophia to refer to the dubious (avar et feneratoria) beliefs of the Gauls, however the term is then

46 3.3. ext.1: Est et illa vehemens et constans animi militia, litteris pollens, venerabilium doctrinae sacrorum antistes, Philosophia. Quae ubi pectore recepta est, omni inhonesto atque inutili adfectu dispulso, totum [in] solidae virtutis munimento confirmat, potentiusque metu facit ac dolore.
47 As at 2.6.11, 4.3.ext.3, 6.9.ext.11 and 8.9.ext.3.
immediately associated with the more honourable (alacris et fortis) traditions of the Cimbri and Celtiberians.\textsuperscript{48}

The privileged position of the external groups associated with\textit{ philosophia} in chapter 3.3 is emphasised in individual\textit{ exempla} with comments that place these people in comparison with less esteemed structures and societies. Thus, while the opening of 3.3.ext.1 underlines the status of the Macedonian boy who allows himself to burn rather than disturb Alexander’s sacrifice\textsuperscript{49}, Valerius ends the\textit{ exemplum} by commenting that Darius would have understood the unlikeliness of success against the Macedonians had he viewed the scene: \textit{si huic miraculo Dareus inseruisset oculos, scisset eius stirpis milites vinci non posse cuius infirmam aetatem tanto robore praeditam animadvertisset}. In the final assessment this\textit{ exemplum} reveals something about the Macedonian\textit{ stirps} as a whole, rather than a particular group within that society.\textsuperscript{50} The Macedonians are put into comparison with the Persians, traditional barbarians and\textit{ barbari} in Valerius’ text (6.3.ext.3).

Similarly, 3.3.ext.2 – the first\textit{ exemplum} inside the embrace of\textit{ philosophia} – describes a philosopher from Italy, Zeno of Elea who travels to Sicily in order to convince the populace of Agrigentum to overthrow their tyrant. Here, the figure of the philosopher is put in comparison with a society dominated by a Sicilian tyrant. Zeno travels into a politically unenlightened environment and thus emphasises the civilisation and sophistication of his own society: \textit{patriam enim egressus in qua frui secura libertate poterat, Agrigentum miserabili servitute obrutum petiit...} This is underlined by the comparison between the two men: one who will seek freedom for others at his own expense and another who is addicted to his own dominion, to the point of madness; Valerius comments on the\textit{ feritas} of the tyrant’s\textit{ vesana mens}. The Philosopher continues his struggles against tyrants by taking on Nearchus in 3.3.ext.3, once again displaying his power against the dangerous structure of tyranny. In this description, Zeno and his Eleatic homeland, like the Macedonians, are social and philosophical exemplars in contrast to less enlightened lands. These foreign\textit{ exempla} of\textit{ patientia} are marked out by their political and moral sophistication and their

\textsuperscript{48} Chapter 2.6 is dedicated to the institutions of foreign communities that Valerius regards as worthy of serious consideration and his reaction to the material is overwhelmingly positive throughout.

\textsuperscript{49} He is one of the\textit{ nobilissimi pueri} who traditionally supply attendants.

\textsuperscript{50} This is the only use of\textit{ stirps} to indicate ethnicity in the work; familial uses are at 2.9.6, 3.2.ext.9, 8.3.3, 9.11.ext.4, 9.14.1, 9.14.ext.1.
civilisation. This pattern of esteemed external philosopher vs. tyrant is repeated in 3.3.ext.4 and 5 with the Greek Anaxarchus in Cyprus and Theodotus in Syracuse.

When the *patientia* of the Indians is discussed at 3.3.ext.6, a different kind of endurance emerges. Here the Indians do not resist accidental pain or suffer torture with political aims in mind; they seek out the physical hardships of the natural environment in order to harden their bodies and minds. Valerius Maximus credits those Indians who display contempt for physical suffering with the possession of *sapientia* and *gloria*. There is no mention of the social status of these Indians; rather *patientia* is simply located *apud Indos*. Certainly, a group is mentioned within this context who manifest *patientia* in particularly striking ways, but *patientia* is also presented as a general quality of the Indian people and this is emphasised by the use of the passive voice to describe its exercise. The Indians are mentioned on two other occasions in the *Facta et Dicta* and there too they are highly praiseworthy (2.6.14 and 1.8.ext.10). In fact, the Indians are presented as the culmination of virtuous external behaviour in funerary practices:

> protrahe in medium Cimbricam audaciam, adice Celtibericam fidem, iunge animosam Thraciae [potential] sapientiam, adnecte Lyciorum in luctibus abiciendis callide quaesitam rationem, Indicio tamen rogo nihil eorum praeferes, quem uxor<ia> pietas in modum genialis tori propinquae mortis secura conscendit. (2.6.14)

Although the Indians are physically distant they are recognised as being culturally/morally excellent, with none of the language of ‘noble savagery’ found in praise of Scythian activities and as previously mentioned, none of the language of extremity employed by Cicero to describe the same customs in the *Tusculan Disputations* (5.77). Valerius has chosen to present the Indians as relatively civilised and sophisticated, despite the bent of Cicero, his probable source. It is after this succession of *exempla* drawn from highly civilised and cultured externals that Valerius states: *Haec e pectoribus altis et eruditis orta sunt, illud tamen non minus admirabile servilis animus cepit*. The next sentence begins *servus barbarus*, and as *servus* stands in contrast to the elevation of the *alta pectora* that occupy the previous

---

51 *Apud Indos vero patientiae meditatio tam obstinate usurpate ut sint qui omne vitae tempus nudi exigant*...

52 5.4.ext.5. The depiction of Scythia is discussed below in chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 222-227.
exempla, barbarus stands in contrast to their erudition and sophistication. The type of patientia manifested here (cheerful endurance of punishment for a ‘justified’ crime of revenge) is much closer to the philosophers of 3.3.ext.2-5 but Valerius has chosen to deliberately isolate the servus barbarus by underlining his status. Valerius then presents him as the culminating external exemplum – an excellent catalyst for the digression on the universal power of virtus that follows. 

Valerius’ use of this anonymous barbarian and the structure of the previous material reveals his interaction with a discourse in which there are gradations of external status in terms of culture and civilisation. The arrangement of exempla reflects this discourse, but it is not a physical progression from inside out. The material moves from the Mediterranean to India and then to an ethnically unidentified figure in Spain. Valerius’ rhetorical comparison of foreign peoples to one another, as well as to Rome, reveals the way in which he uses, and subverts, the imagery of extreme manifestations of cultural and moral externality. Valerius builds chapter 3.3 to a climax of externality, and yet the servus barbarus manifests the same virtus that is visible in the behaviour of certain Romans and available for acquisition throughout the world. Valerius uses his most extreme figures, his barbari, to demonstrate this unity. He creates a progression of externality, places the slave at the very end of this progression and then unifies all the individuals in the chapter by demonstrating the virtus available even to a barbarian slave.

The same technique is deployed in reverse in one of the uses of barbaria in the Facta et Dicta. In 4.6.ext.3 Valerius depicts the extremes of externality by using barbaria as an emblematic term for territories culturally distant from Rome in order to demonstrate the universal quality of conjugal love. When Valerius explains his shift from the queens of Asia Minor to the Minyae of Sparta at 4.6.ext.3 it is noticeable that the former exempla are described with vocabulary associated with external communities in the Facta et Dicta, whereas the language used to describe the Minyae and Sparta is language more closely associated with Rome, although there is no doubt that Valerius regards the Spartans as being an external community. The transition is as follows:

---

53 3.3.ext.7: Non ergo fastidioso aditu virtus... Discussed in depth in chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 238-245.
Verum quid Asiam, quid barbariae immensas solitudines, quid latebras
Pontici sinus scrutor, cum splendidissimum totius Graeciae decus Lacedaemon
praecipuum uxoriae fidei specimen nostris ostentet oculis, plurimis et maximis patriae
suae laudibus admiratione facti comparandum?

Valerius sets up the opposition on either side of the cum clause; prior to it a
series of words reinforce the externality of the territory under discussion. Solitudo, as
I will argue54, is a term that Valerius only uses geographically – a desert or wilderness
– in connection with the territories Asia Minor, Pontus and Scythia. Perhaps more
surprising are the connotations of the term immensus in the rest of the Facta et Dicta.
Immensus is used by Valerius to describe external phenomena on each of the four
occasions when it appears: it describes the serpent that Hannibal sees destroying Italy
at 1.7.ext.1, the deserts of barbaria at 4.6.ext.3, the region of Africa conquered by
Carthage at 5.6.ext.4 and the scale of Socrates’ intellect at 7.2.ext.1. The
immeasurability implied by the term is evidently suitable only outside the ordered
structure of Rome56. The only other occasion on which latebra is used generally and
not to illustrate a specific instance of retreat or concealment takes place in Valerius’
wondering digression on the presence of pietas even amongst the barbaric Scythians
and describes their dwelling in the silvarum latebrae (5.4.ext.6).

After the cum clause is initiated and Valerius introduces the Spartans, the
language becomes more appropriate for Romans than externals, reflecting Valerius’
description of the Spartan civitas at 2.6.1 as proxima maiorum nostrorum gravitati.
Splendidus in the superlative is only elsewhere used to describe Roman behaviour
(6.1.5, 6.9.7 and 7.7.2) and in seventeen of twenty two uses decus describes the glory
and honour of Rome57. Similarly specimen is more usually a term connected to the
exemplary behaviour of Romans58. It is possible to see here a movement inwards in
the sequence of Valerius’ exempla from physically distant and uncivilised lands
termed barbaria towards Rome and its ideals. Nevertheless, Valerius is clearly
making the point that conjugal love can be as easily found in these extreme
wildernesses as in a community much like Rome: the different manifestations of

54 Chapter Seven: ‘Behaving Like a Human Being’, 224-225.
56 Evans, R. ‘Ethnography’s Freak Show: The Grotesques at the Edge of the Roman Earth’ Ramus 28.1
(1999) 56. Evans refers to the idea of Africa being both enormous and un-knowable.
57 Seven often uses are internal: 4.3.5, 5.1.10, 5.2.3, 5.5.3, 5.6.6, 6.9.3 and 8.15.3.
physical and cultural extremity are shown to be part of a landscape that is levelled by
the importance of behaviour before all else.

A named foreigner is invoked in a similar fashion at 6.3.ext.3. In chapter 6.3
De Severitate the external exempla provide increasingly harsh manifestations of
severitas. The external material opens with a fairly moderate exemplum from a
civilised people: the Spartans expel Archilochus and his works from their community
because the poet is seen to threaten the collective morals of the group (6.3.ext.1).
Their justification for such an act is Archilochus’ obscene abuse (obscena maledicta)
of a Spartan family. Valerius then moves from exile to capital punishment to record
the execution of Timagoras by the Athenians because he prostrated himself before
king Darius (6.3.ext.2). This protection of the decus of Athens in the face of Persica
dominatio leads into a final exemplum taken from these very Persians. The Persian
King Cambyses has a corrupt judge killed and, after the execution has been carried
out, has the corpse flayed. The skin of the judge is then used to upholster a chair on
which his son is instructed to sit and give judgement, thus ensuring the incorruptibility
of the second generation judge (6.3.ext.3). Valerius concludes the exemplum and the
chapter by stating:

rex et barbarus atroci ac nova poena iudicis ne quis postea corrupi iudex
posset providit.

Severitas in Valerius’ construction designates difficult but necessary actions
undertaken to enact the law (6.3.pr). Cambyses’ innovation certainly falls within this
framework; his atrox and nova punishment is – Valerius tells us – entirely effective.
Both king and barbarian, he is motivated by the same concern for integrity as his
Spartan and Athenian companions in the section. Valerius certainly recounts external
severitas summatim (there are three external to seventeen internal exempla) but his
description of Cambyses makes it clear that external severitas is all-embracing. It is
demonstrated by the moral Spartans, by the proudly independent Athenians and by a
barbaric Persian king with a particular interest in justice. His punishment is
undeniably unorthodox; he himself is certainly a barbarian but Cambyses represents
universally pertinent ideas.

The comparison of different external groups to reveal the meaninglessness of
internal and external categories is strongly evident in chapter 9.13. Here the use of
barbarus is positioned in a sub-section *Quam Exquisita Custodia Usi Sint Quibus Suspecti Domestici Fuerunt* which contains only external material (9.13.ext.3).

Although, for purposes of cataloguing, these *exempla* are part of chapter 9.13 *De Cupiditate Vitae*, they are separated from the main group, made up of Roman material and one other external *exemplum*, into their own section. This represents a difference in material: the Roman *exempla* and 9.13.ext.1 have a particular angle in that they portray individuals who when presented with death cannot meet the idea with dignity or strength. The subsection — whether or not the current title was originally included — is separated from the preceding material by a conscious transition: *Referam nunc*...

The new section then begins with external *exempla* at 9.13.ext.2 which presents the figure of Masinissa. While he may well be *inter paucos felicissimus*, Masinissa has already been identified at the opening of the *Facta et Dicta* as one whose context is barbaria. This *exemplum* introduces three accounts of external peoples who, under the pressure of their possession of sole power, have sought protection against their own compatriots and families from groups even more external than themselves. By presenting three different examples where outsiders are interpolated into the intimate lives of kings and tyrants, Valerius provides three different demonstrations of the fact that externality is relative and rarely meaningful.

In the first instance, the intruders are not even human. Masinissa, despite his many children and great power — despite even the friendship of Rome — chose to trust in a guard of dogs rather than in *pectora hominum* (9.13.ext.2). Here the external monarch draws his protection from animals rather than any group of human beings; his choice of guard is not only outside of his family or community but actually outside of his species. Valerius draws attention to this twice, initially describing the *custodia canum* and then at the end of the *exemplum* stating with horror that Masinissa saw nothing as more effectual than *canino latratu ac morsu*. Of the two terms qualified by *caninus*, the first is absolutely animalistic, while the second has the potential when used of human beings to underline an inhuman tendency. Valerius’ decision to place

---

59 9.13.2 is a good example of this idea: Gnaeus Carbo attempts to delay his own execution by asking for permission to *alvum levare*. The same essential idea is present in Xerxes’ mourning for the mortality of the armies of Asia, and Valerius finishes this *exemplum* with a line that summarizes his attitude to all four preceding *exempla*: *quis enim mediocriter prudens mortalem se natum flevit?*

60 1.1.ext.2-3: *(is) in media barbaria ortus*...

61 *Morsus* is infrequently used in Valerius (four uses) and when it does appear it is often in a fairly extreme circumstance, thus at 3.3.ext.3 Zeno the Eleatic philosopher having endured extensive torture, tricks his tormentor (the tyrant Nearchus) into coming close and then bites his ear off. This *exemplum* does not show negative behavior but it does refer to behaviour that would be roundly condemned in
Chapter Six

this exemplum first in the section means that the guards of the following figures are read with the lingering overtones of the dogs.

Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse, is so terrified that he substitutes strangers for friends and uses slaves as guards:

\[ \text{summotis amicis, in eorum locum ferocissimarum gentium homines et a familiis locupletiue electos praevalidos servos, quibus latera sua committeret, substituit (9.13.ext.4).} \]

Here, a contrast is explicitly drawn between Syracuse as an external nation, and the people external to that nation who are employed by Dionysius: the people of \textit{ferocissimarum gentium}. There are very obvious similarities between this story and Cicero’s account in the \textit{Tusculan Disputations} (5.58-9) but Valerius has heightened the colour somewhat. In Cicero’s account Dionysius is protected by \textit{feri barbari}, in Valerius’ account he is protected by \textit{ferocissimarum gentium homines}; the positive form of \textit{ferus} is converted to the superlative of \textit{ferox} and Valerius seems to deliberately avoid \textit{barbarus} after its use at 9.13.ext.3, instead making the adjective dependent upon \textit{gens}, a term that is overwhelmingly external in the text\textsuperscript{62}.

In the \textit{Facta et Dicta}, \textit{ferox} is a term associated with foreign peoples in conflict with Rome and with Romans and externals behaving in extreme fashions. The one other instance of the superlative form of \textit{ferox} in Valerius’ work refers to the Spanish and explains (though perhaps does not justify) Q. Fabius Maximus’ use of extraordinary force towards deserters in an attempt to come to terms with the enemy\textsuperscript{63}. Of the seven other uses of \textit{ferox} in the \textit{Facta et Dicta}, four refer to external peoples and two of these four refer to external peoples in conflict with Rome\textsuperscript{64}. In both these cases the foreign people are depicted as successfully defying the Romans: at 3.2.19 the charge of the Nervii is described as \textit{ferox} while they are driving back Julius

\textsuperscript{59} Of the 52 racial uses of \textit{gens} in the \textit{Facta et Dicta} only four refer to Rome. See chapter Four: ‘Gens and Natio: What’s in a Name?’, 141-149.

\textsuperscript{60} 2.7.11, 3.2.19, 3.2.ext.7, 5.3.1, 6.3.6, 9.14.2, 9.2.ext.10 and 9.13.ext.4 are the instances. Those referring to external peoples are 2.7.11, 3.2.19, 3.2.ext.7, 9.2.ext.10 and 9.13.ext.4 and of these 2.7.11, 3.2.19 and 3.2.ext.7 describe external peoples in conflict with Rome. Interestingly, two of the three other exempla (5.3.1 and 9.14.2) refer to Romans opposed to Julius Caesar.
Caesar’s troops and at 3.2.ext.7 Rhoetogenes will not allow the inhabitants of Numantia to be captured by Romans at the end of the siege and directs their mass suicide\textsuperscript{65}. The other two external \textit{exempla} are 9.13.ext.4 (under discussion here) and 9.2.ext.10 which describes a gruesome and elaborate punishment devised by the Etruscans\textsuperscript{66}.

Dionysius of Syracuse then, replaces his friends with people whose whole tribes – not just individual actions or instances – are described with \textit{ferocissimus}. Like Masinissa he goes outside his own people for protection. Likewise, Alexander of Pherae is so afraid for his life that he will not enter his wife’s bedroom without his tattooed barbarian slave preceding him and searching the room: \textit{Alexander...ad eam ex epulis in cubiculum veniens barbarum compunctum notis Thracis stricto gladio iubebat anteire} (9.13.ext.3). The context is already external, but the tattooed slave is more external than the material in which he appears. He stands as an unnatural intruder, symbol of a barrier between Alexander and his wife necessitated by the terrible conjunction of lust and fear. Valerius characterises the situation as a \textit{supplicium irato deorum numine compositum}. The mere presence of the slave is bad enough, but Valerius identifies the guard as a \textit{barbarum compunctum notis Thracis}. The use of \textit{notis Thracis} is loaded. Decorative tattoos in the ancient world were particularly associated with the Thracians and Celts and thus on one level the usage is purely descriptive but as Jones argues, decorative tattooing was also strongly associated in the ancient world with the "lesser breeds of barbarians"\textsuperscript{67}.

The tattooed barbarian slave is an outsider, which is necessary to the point of the \textit{exemplum}, but he is an outsider amongst outsiders and his ultra-externality is

\textsuperscript{65} 3.2.19: \textit{cum innumerabili multitutidine et feroci impetu Nerviorum inclinari aciem suam videret...} and 3.2.ext.7: \textit{Numantino vero Rhoetogeni ad consimilem virtutem capessendam quasi magistra gentis suae ferocitas exstitit...}

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Ac ne Etrusc quidem parum ferox in poena excogitanda, qui vivorum corpora cadaveribus adversa adversis alligata atque consticta...tabescere simul patiebantur, amari vitae pariter ac mortis tortores.}

\textsuperscript{67} Jones, C.P. \textit{‘Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity’} \textit{Journal of Roman Studies} 77 (1987)155. The one other reference to writing on human skin in the \textit{Facta et Dicta} describes a slave \textit{inexpibiabile litterarum nota per summam oris contumeliam inustus...} (6.8.7) There is a significant difference between penal and decorative marking and the methods of inscription seem to be pointedly dissimilar (the Thracian’s markings are described with \textit{compungere} and those of the Roman slave with \textit{inurere}). Jones argues that, in the Roman world, apparent descriptions of branding may actually indicate tattooing (Jones, C.P. \textit{‘Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity’} \textit{Journal of Roman Studies} 77 (1987) 153) but in this case it seems unlikely, as Valerius uses the imagery of actual tattooing elsewhere in the work (9.13.ext.3) but deliberately chooses the verb \textit{inurere} on this occasion. Even in this case it is considered natural that the slave would want to kill his master for giving him such markings.
indicated both by Valerius’ use of *barbarus* and the additional barbarity inherent in the fact that he is tattooed in the Thracian fashion. He is effectively placed in the very outer realms of externality – almost entirely lacking the civilisation and sophistication that characterises many foreign peoples. The corollary of this ultra-external categorisation is, of course, that the community in which the individual barbarian is incongruously present is less barbarous and thus closer to the closer to the ideals and customs of civilisation. Pherae was a community within the Greek region of Thessaly and at no point does Valerius at no point breaks with convention to the extent that he refers to Greeks as *barbari*. The usage is then in line with accepted perceptions of Roman practice and with Valerius’ usage elsewhere in the work, where Greece may treated with the language of superficial contempt but is never actually ‘barbaric’.

The paradigm of graduated externality that Valerius evokes in this chapter is plainly visible.

Valerius constructs these *exempla* with a twist, however; the material in the two stories of Dionysius of Syracuse and Alexander of Pherae shows that Valerius fully understands the decisions of the two men to employ fearsome external bodyguards. Valerius plainly states that Dionysius methods were effective: *qui duodequadraginta annorum dominationem in hunc modum peregit*. Dionysius’ reign lasted for 38 years *because* he did not trust his friends or family; the *ferocissimarum gentium homines* are more reliable and trustworthy than Dionysius’ friends, daughters and wives. The confusion of internal and external categories is such that their significance is called into question; in this case, barbarians are evidently better comfort than family in the comfort of home. The same is true for Alexander of Pherae: Alexander, it results, was quite right to treat his wife Thebe with apprehension – Valerius states that his wife killed him, motivated by anger at his concubinage. Once again, the stranger is a more reliable figure than the spouse; Valerius leads us through gradations of externality to their extreme point then renders the journey meaningless: inside and outside are intertwined and interchangeable.

The third example of an unspecified use of *barbarus* occurs at 9.2.ext.l1 in the chapter *De Crudelitate*:

---

68 For superficially negative material on Greece see 4.7.4 and 2.1.10. These passages are discussed in chapter Four: ‘The Language of Difference’, 121-123, 130-131 and 137-139 and in chapter One: ‘Vindicating Valerius: A Review of Current Literature’, 11-13 and 19-20.
Sicut illi barbari, quos ferunt mactatarum pecudum intestinis et visceribus egestis homines inserere, ita ut capitus tantummodo emineant, quoque diutius poenae sufficiant, cibo et potione infelicem spiritum prorogare, donec intus putrefacti laniatui sint animalibus quae tabidis in corporibus nasci solent.

The only thing known about the people involved in this exemplum is their extreme method of execution. Shackleton Bailey notes that this material is only found in Valerius Maximus\textsuperscript{69}, but there is an equivalent story in Apuleius’ \textit{Metamorphoses} 6.31-2. A gang of robbers and bandits plan to inflict the punishment upon Lucius (as an ass) and Charite. The scene is set in a cave in the countryside where the two unfortunates are being held and, while there is certainly a sense of isolation about the story and a delight in the cruelty to be inflicted, \textit{barbarus} is not used to describe the proposal or its inventors; in fact, \textit{barbarus} does not appear in book Six at all\textsuperscript{70}. It might be tempting to see Valerius’ use of \textit{barbari} in this case as a negative term designed specifically to describe horrific behaviour, as we might use “barbaric” in modern propaganda, but there are important factors telling against this interpretation.

If Valerius’ point here was to use barbarity purely to invoke ideas of horrifically cruel behaviour, one would expect the adjective \textit{barbarus} to appear frequently in the chapter \textit{De Crudelitate}, whereas, in fact, it only appears on one other occasion, in reference to the behaviour of the Carthaginians (9.2.ext.1). Additionally, five territories are represented as \textit{exempla} of \textit{crudelitas} that are nowhere associated with the term \textit{barbarus}\textsuperscript{72}. It would be difficult to argue on these terms that the uses of \textit{barbarus} are in themselves designed to invoke ideas of cruelty. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile expanding this model to see if there is, more generally, a connection between unacceptable behaviour and \textit{barbarus} in the \textit{Facta et Dicta}.

If Valerius associated the use of \textit{barbarus} particularly with bad deeds it would be logical to expect a much higher incidence of the term in the ‘vice’ books (that is,\textsuperscript{69} Valerius Maximus (trans. Shackelton-Bailey, D.R.) \textit{Memorable Doings and Sayings Vol.II} (Cambridge MA, 2000) 321.\
\textsuperscript{69} Hunc igitur iugulare crastino placeat totisque vacuefacto praecordiis per medium alvum nudam virginem, quam praetulit nobis, insuere, ut sola facie praeminente ceterum corpus puellae nexuferino coerceat, tunc super aliqaud saxum scruposum insiciatum et fortilem asinum exponere et soleb vaporibus tradere...ambo sustinebunt, et mortem asinum, quam pridem meruit, et illa morsus ferarum, cum vermes membra laniabunt, et ignis flagrantiam, cum sol nimiis caloribus inflammarit uterum, et patibuli cruciatum, cum canes et vulures intima protrahent viscera...\
\textsuperscript{70} 9.2.ext.3 – Pontus, 9.2.ext.5 – Egypt, 9.2.ext.8 – Athens, 9.2.ext.9 – Agrigentum and 9.2.ext.10 – Etruria.\
\textsuperscript{72} 9.2.ext.3 – Pontus, 9.2.ext.5 – Egypt, 9.2.ext.8 – Athens, 9.2.ext.9 – Agrigentum and 9.2.ext.10 – Etruria.
books 9.1-9.11 which deal exclusively with negative material) than in the rest of the
Facta et Dicta. One of the four uses of barbaria occurs in the ‘vice’ books (9.11.ext.4)
along with two of the thirteen uses of barbarus (9.2.ext.1 and 9.6.2). Three of
seventeen might at first appear to be a relatively significant proportion, but there are
actually the same number of uses of barbarus in book Three, within the two chapters
De Fortitudine and De Patientia, and these concepts are entirely positive in Valerius’
work. Keeping this in mind, it cannot be argued that there is a particular
preponderance of these terms in the ‘vice’ books that would indicate an intrinsic
connection between barbarians and bad behaviour. This is made very clear when one
particularly nasty incident of Roman treachery has barbarians as its victims. At 9.6.2
Ser. Sulpicius Galba (cos. 144) lures a group of Lusitanians together, disarms 8000 of
the best young men (flos iuventutis) and then divides them into those he kills and
those he sells into slavery:

Ser. quoque Galba summae perfidiae: trium enim Lusitaniae civitatum
convocato populo tamquam de commodis eius acturus, octo milia, in quibus flos
iuventutis consistebat, electa et armis exuta partim trucidavit, partim vendidit. Quo
facinore maximum cladem barbarorum magnitudine criminis antecessit.

The Valerian exemplum detailing Galba’s trial for the offence contains the
same hard facts. Valerius states that Galba was prosecuted quod Lusitanorum
magnam manum interposita fide praetor in Hispania interemisset (8.1.abs.2). He
furthermore describes the Roman public as showing itself a plus iusto placidum
iudicem on this occasion by acquitting Galba. When Cicero refers to these events they
are softened by the introduction of doubt. He states that Galba was prosecuted for
killing the Lusitanians in violation ut existimabatur of his fides (Brut. 89). This
provides the Roman a chance of exoneration that is altogether absent in the Facta et
Dicta. The Periochae of Livy also allows Galba to mitigate his actions; in this
account Galba states that the sacrifices made by Lusitanians near his camp had led
him to believe they were about to attack and he therefore took pre-emptive measures
(49). Even Appian, who firmly condemns Galba’s behaviour, explains that he
behaved treacherously in order to repay treachery – the Lusitanians had broken the

73 3.2.12, 3.2.23b and 3.3.ext.7
truce they made with Attilius and inflicted heavy losses on the Roman troops (lb. 150). In contrast, Valerius constructs this incident in the chapter De Perfidia without a trace of exoneration or explanation for Galba's behaviour. It is summa perfidia, a facinus and a crimen of great magnitudo. In this context the description of the Lusitanians as barbari seems slightly ironic; it is the Roman Galba who has behaved barbarically.

There is no significant correlation between the peoples described with barbarus and the peoples that appear in the external exempla of the vice books. Cappadocia, Parthia, Britain and Scythia (all barbari) do not appear at all in the external material of chapters 9.1-9.11. The presence of the other peoples described as barbari who do appear in the vice books cannot be termed remarkable in view of their more numerically-significant representation elsewhere: only one of the eight and a half Spanish exempla is located in the vice books, one of three Thracian exempla and four of thirteen Persian exempla. If Cappadocia is taken as part of Asia Minor as a whole, the vice books contain five and a half of thirty one exempla for Asia and eight and a half of the twenty three and a half Carthaginian external exempla.

While Carthage does provide the majority of external exempla in the vice books, it still only represents twenty-three point six percent of the total figure with one other nation above fifteen percent, one above ten percent, three other nations above eight percent, and a further two nations between five and eight percent. Beyond this a further four countries are represented. The depiction of Carthage is also mitigated by the way in which barbarus is associated with that country; in one of the two cases, barbarus is uniquely attached to a quality – the feritas of the Carthaginians rather than the people themselves. In the other case, sufficient distance seems to be deliberately created between Hannibal the Carthaginian and the use of barbari as a substantive to indicate that barbarus does not refer to the Carthaginians.

The connection between barbarus and Carthage is not as straightforward as the

---

74 Cn. Domitius at 9.6.3 for instance is provided with a motive and the Senate's reaction more or less condones his behaviour.
75 Appian makes this comparison explicit in his account stating that Galba's behaviour was unsuitable for a Roman but closely modelled on barbarians (lb. 150).
76 When two peoples share an exemplum fairly equally I allocate a half presence in the exemplum to each of the peoples involved. For instance, 2.6.11 describes the customs of both the Cimbri and the Celtiberians and thus is divided in the tabulation of exempla into one half exemplum for Germany and one half exemplum for Spain.
77 Asia Minor: 15.3%, Persia: 11.1%, Italy 9.7%, Greece and Egypt: both 8.3%, Syria 6.9% and Macedonia 5.6%.
78 Thrace, Sicily, Spain and an Anonymous People: all at 2.8%.
79 9.2.ext.1 and 5.1.ext.6 - these exempla are discussed in more detail in chapter Seven: 'Behaving Like a Human Being', 229-238 and 245-254.
connections between the term and other peoples. Therefore, based on these figures it
does not appear that peoples described as barbani are represented with particular
frequency in the books that detail extreme examples of various vices. If the term were
being used to describe horrific behaviour, surely more of the barbani would inhabit
these eleven books.

The more likely purpose in the use of barbani as a term to describe the
proponents of the animal carcass torture at 9.2.ext.11 is indicated by a comparison
between the placement of this exemplum and that of 3.3.ext.7 and 9.15.ext.3. The
story of the anonymous barbani who developed such a prolonged and multi-layered
punishment is the final exemplum in the chapter De Crudelitate, followed only by a
rhetorical discourse that juxtaposes the cruelty of human beings to one another with
their complaints regarding mortality. 3.3.ext.7, the story of the barbarus who happily
undergoes his punishment for killing Hasdrubal, is likewise the final exemplum in the
chapter De Patientia and it too is followed by a discourse on the universal availability
of virtus, even to those of lowly status. In both these cases the presence of a final
exemplum that describes anonymous barbarians indicates that Valerius is using an
extreme example of the quality under discussion. The barbarians rather than becoming
less civilised or less human, demonstrate the same quality as all other human-beings,
whether it be cruelty or courage.

9.13.ext.3, the story of the barbarus employed as a bodyguard by Alexander
of Pherae, is the second last exemplum in the chapter De Cupiditate Vitae and the sub-
section Quam Exquisita Custodia Usi Sint Quibus Suspecti Domestici Fuerunt. It is
followed at 9.13.ext.4 by the story of Dionysius of Syracuse who, amongst the
devices which he employed to protect himself, is first described as having employed
ferocissimarum gentium homines in place of his amici. Once again the people are
unnamed and the reader is drawn from the barbani to ferocissimarum gentium
hominres. This association can be seen in reverse in the progression from 9.2.ext.10,
where the Etruscans are described as ferox to 9.2.ext.11 and its anonymous barbarians.

Valerius' point in emphasising the extremity of peoples differs slightly
between chapters 3.3 and 9.2 and chapter 9.13 but, in each case, the choice is
conscious and deliberate. The external material of chapters 3.3 and 9.2 illuminates the
universality of the quality under discussion. In each case the final example is drawn
from an ultra-external people: no cultural contextualisation is possible; these figures
are isolated by their anonymity. In this case extremity is actually a way of
demonstrating the inclusive nature of common behaviours and ideas. On the other hand, the sub-section of chapter 9.13 is focused on the means employed by individuals to protect their own lives – and the means are shown to be extreme. Thus dogs, then barbari, then ferocissimarum gentium homines are employed by a loyal friend of Rome, a Greek King and the notorious Dionysius, tyrannus of Syracuse respectively. Three foreign peoples employ three different methods to preserve their own lives but all these methods have one thing in common – their effective use of extreme externals. Valerius plays with the way in which internality and externality can be demonstrably reversed and confused: beasts and barbarians are more trustworthy than wives and friends. The outside is allowed in, in order to provide necessary protection against insiders.

The progressive gradations of externality in these chapters are not exactly ordered, but they effectively evoke the paradigm that Valerius is aiming to subvert. Valerius creates progressions of increasingly external peoples in line with the traditions of Roman thought and literature and places anonymous barbari at the furthest point. The anonymity of those under discussion emphasises their extremity. These are not named peoples bringing with them associations, known facts and perhaps encounters with slaves; instead they are described with a term that alerts the reader to their placement at the outer-edge of Otherness. They are at the cultural extreme of the world, but are nonetheless very much part of it, as the inclusive discourses that follow them demonstrate.

Extreme peoples in the Facta et Dicta are deployed with self-conscious deliberation to demonstrate that, in Valerius' progression towards extremity, there is little essential difference between the most civilised, and the most savage, inhabitants of the world. Valerius once again demonstrates the insignificance of artificial human borders between internal and external.

80 Discussed below: chapter Seven: 'Behaving Like a Human Being'.
Chapter Seven: Behaving Like a Human Being.

Valerius has so far been seen to use the language of externality in order to incite, and then extinguish, feeling on the necessary and natural division between internal and external. Thus while a clear initial distinction is drawn between Romans and external peoples, the two groups are demonstrably unified by their behaviour. The last use of barbarus that I will discuss develops the theme of unity overtly. In four instances in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia barbarus occurs when Valerius demonstrates the universal power and presence of a particular idea or characteristic. Pietas, crudelitas, virtus and humanitas are present in individuals throughout the world, from the city of Rome itself to barbarian peoples who may otherwise appear to be utterly culturally different.

These passages are rhetorically charged. Valerius' quest for effect is evident in his use of unusual vocabulary: words appear in these sections that are either used only a handful of times in the work or only here. In three out of four cases these exempla leave a striking final image as they are positioned last in their chapter (3.3.ext.7, 5.1.ext.6 and 9.2.ext.11), and in every case Valerius indicates his level of involvement with the text by using the first person in his discussion. The reader is expected to become equally involved with these passages. At 3.3.ext.7, 5.1.ext.6 and 5.4.ext.5 Valerius snatches the attention of his audience with questions and direct address and at 9.2.ext.11 his use of plural first person insists on the reader's involvement with the material on display. In another attention-grabbing device the abstract ideas under discussion are personified. Valerius lends solidity to his philosophical discussion by depicting these figures as interacting with human beings in various ways, even from the moment of birth. At 5.4.ext.5 and 9.2.ext.11 the discussions of pietas and crudelitas are accompanied by personifications of natura — the figure who instils such qualities. Virtus is independently personified at 3.3.ext.7, and so is humanitas at 5.1.ext.6.

Given the over-arching importance of virtus, humanitas, crudelitas and pietas it is valid to ask exactly how these qualities are introduced into human life and behaviour. The point of introduction is important to Valerius as his use of natura

---

1 On the most basic level this distinction manifests itself in the physical structure of the work where internal and external material is presented separately but grouped within unifying chapter topics.
2 3.3.ext.7, 5.1.ext.6, 5.4.ext.5 and 9.2.ext.11.
3 The singular first person occurs at 3.3.ext.7, 5.4.ext.5 and 5.1.ext.6 and the plural at 9.2.ext.11.
4 This in spite of the fact that Valerius Maximus' treatment of crudelitas in the preface to chapter 9.2 actually provides one of the most powerful personifications in the Facta et Dicta.
makes clear. Innate human understanding is a key element of his philosophy. There is however, also room for teaching and learning particularly by following the examples of history. The inclusion of both internal and external material demonstrates the author’s commitment to studying these ideas within the framework of general human life and experience, rather than Roman society alone. His inclusion of the barbari signifies a determination that even those peoples who are culturally extreme should be included. Valerius’ insistence on adopting such a broad scope for his work turns the document into a commentary on the commonality of human experience and the interaction of different peoples on the field of virtue.

Natura: The Basic Materials

In the first two instances that I will discuss pietas and crudelitas are described as innate. As a means of conveying these inborn qualities Valerius Maximus draws the reader’s attention to the role of natura. The term natura in Valerius’ text is used in two fashions, firstly as a personified figure who is the genetrix of humanity and the world that it inhabits, and secondly in connection to certain qualities that are innate in the world at large, both generally and on an individual level.

Natura, as in our modern idea of nature, does encompass the physical world in the Facta et Dicta. Both Zeno of Elea and Anaxarchus in chapter 3.3 De Patientia are described as philosophers involved in the investigation of natura. In Zeno’s case little more than a bare statement is given (qui cum esset in displienda rerum natura maxime prudentiae (3.3.ext.2)) but the field is elaborated two exempla later as Valerius depicts the scope of Anaxarchus’ eloquence and understanding: dum terrae condicionem, habitum maris, siderum motus, totius denique mundi naturam prudentissime et factundissime expromit (3.3.ext.4). Natura in these instances is simply the natural world, as it is when Valerius wonders in utra parte rerum naturae (sea or land) Scaevius is more deserving of praise (3.2.23b), and when at the destruction of Numantia and Carthage Scipio Aemilianus, the younger Africanus, removes them from the rerum natura (5.3.2d).

Natura takes on a more loaded sense when it signifies the normal and accepted state and rules of the physical world: the fact that water will flow through a sieve (8.1.abs.5), that the nature of the stars means that sometimes eclipses will occur (8.11.1) and that trees will assume a certain, natural shape (9.12.ext.9). In two of these cases the association of natura with innate qualities is underlined by the unexpected
and deliberate subversion of these qualities and the significance with which these events are infused. At 8.1.abs.5 Tuccia, a Vestal Virgin accused of infamia, disproves the accusation by praying that Vesta will allow her to collect water in a sieve. Valerius comments audaciter et temere iactis votis sacerdotis Rerum ipsa Natura cessit. The priestess is rash to ask for such a reversal of the laws of nature and the fact that the laws do give way must demonstrate the direct involvement of the gods. A more comic demonstration of the power of natural laws (and in this case the futility of human attempts to resist them) occurs at 9.12.ext.9 when Milo of Croton tests his strength by replacing wedges that hold an oak split in two with his own hands. The tree is immediately in suam naturam revocata and Milo is held at the mercy of passing beasts. Valerius’ conclusion that Milo is lacking in vigor mentis (9.13.ext.10) demonstrates his underlying assumption that an intelligent person would recognise the force with which trees want to follow their natural patterns of growth and avoid interfering with this process.

The same respect for the laws of natura is present when Valerius discusses human biological realities. The most fundamental of these is the connection between mortality and natura. Human mortality is an unavoidable element of the rerum natura; it is the conclusion of an individual life and every life. Valerius comments that the (deserved) fragility of the human constitution at 9.2.ext.11 is entirely determined by the rerum natura. Both Sophocles and Livius Drusus are depicted in competition with Natura as they extend their productivity into old age (8.7.ext.12 and 8.7.4) despite the knowledge that – like Alexander the Great – they will finally have to yield to the demands of natura (5.1.ext.1b). On a lighter note, human beings are not indestructible – they are in need of rest during their working lives. Scaevola’s board games are given as an example of necessary relaxation: ut enim in rebus seriis Scaevolam ita in [scaelus] lusibus hominem agebat, quem Rerum Natura continuui laboris patientem esse non sinit (8.8.2). It is also conceived as a law of nature that individuals should perpetuate the human race by producing children. Valerius speaks approvingly of the punishment of Roman bachelors stating: Natura vobis quemadmodum nascendi ita gignendi legem scribit (2.9.1). Natura’s connection to procreation is reiterated when Valerius assumes that the argument of the consistent inheritance of physical characteristics from parent to child (if accepted) would fall under the heading of a naturae lex (9.14.pr).
As in the case of the natural world, a number of these exempla – at the same time as they express the unavoidable realities of human life – show human beings struggling against their physical constraints. Sophocles and Livius Drusus challenge their inevitable old age with continued study and industry (in Sophocles’ case it is actually described as a certamen with natura) and determined bachelors at Rome resist their duty to procreate. Natura represents the innate state of affairs for human beings and although individuals may successfully hold out against the influence of natura for some time, finally they should yield.

In all these cases the effects of natura are conceived on a universal level. She determines the structure of the stars, the earth and the trees and she sets the rules for the physical limits of the human body. She is – quite simply – omnis bonae malaeque materiae fecunda artifex (1.8.ext.18) and her influence is felt by all. This universal influence is not limited to the physical world; Valerius also constructs a relationship between natura and a number of attitudes that are universally present amongst peoples, nations and even animals: the dulcedo vitae is naturalis omnium animalium (2.6.12). Constantia is decreed by natura as an innate reaction for anyone who experiences criticism of their firmly held convictions\(^5\). Natura is also responsible for the respect felt by human beings towards those who strive for honours and achieve their goals; it is a universally held belief that such things are important\(^6\). Valerius concludes the chapters on pietas of various kinds (5.4-6) with a summation of the lesson to be garnered from his material:

\[ Patet ergo quam benignae quamque profusae pietas erga patriam omnium ordinum, omnis aetatis homines extisterint, sanctissimisque Naturaee legibus mirificorum etiam exemplorum clara mundo subscripsit ubertas (5.6.ext.5). \]

\( ^5 \) 3.8.pr: *Natura enim sic comparatum est ut quisquis se aliquid ordine ac recte mente complexum confidit, vel iam gestum, si obrectetur, acrier tueatur, vel nondum editum, si interpelletur, sine ulla cunctatione ad effectum perducat.*

\( ^6 \) 8.15.pr: *ipsa Natura nobis alacritatem sumministrante, cum honorem industrie appeti et exsolvi grate videmus.*

Natura’s particular role in the powerful universality that provides the foundation of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* can be illuminated by the comparison of two very similar passages in Valerius Maximus and Pliny the Elder.
Quid? illa nonne ludibia Naturae in corporibus humanis fuisse credenda sunt, tolerabilia quidem, quia saevitia caruerunt, ceterum et ipsa miraculis adnumeranda?
(V. Max. 1.8.ext.12)

Haec atque talia ex hominum genere ludibia sibi, nobis miracula, ingeniosa fecit natura. et singulis quidem quae facit in dies ac prope horas, quis enumerare valeat? ad detegendam eius potentiam satis sit inter prodigia posuisse gentes. hinc ad confessam in homine paucam. (Plin. Nat. 7.32)

Pliny lists Valerius Maximus amongst his sources for book Seven of the *Naturae Historia* and even if he had not done so his language is derivative enough to suggest the connection. In Valerius Maximus’ text and that of Pliny the Elder the acts of *natura* are conceived of both as *ludibia* and *miracula*. *Ludibrium* is not a common word in Pliny the Elder’s text – it appears only three times in thirty seven books. It is by no means used frequently in Valerius Maximus’ text, but it does appear seven times in just nine books. Valerius uses the verb *adnumerare*, Pliny uses *enumerare*. The contexts of the remarks are also very similar – both writers are engaged in the discussion of strange physical manifestations amongst human beings. There is however one important difference. Valerius notes the presence of Nature’s jokes in *humana corpora*. He describes the single bone that the son of King Prusias of Bithynia possessed instead of teeth, the unattractive double row of teeth grown by Drypetine daughter of King Mithridates, the extraordinary eyesight of an anonymous individual, the hairy heart of Aristomenes, the regular fevers of Antipater of Sidon and the twin fates of the philosophers Polystratus and Hippoclides. In five out of six cases Valerius is able to precisely identify the individuals involved and their ethnic backgrounds are not unusual. The manifestations of physical freakishness are limited in each case to one individual from a familiar nation.

Pliny on the other hand refers to the jokes of *natura* on *hominum genus*. He uses this imagery of *natura* to discuss the characteristics of mythical tribes – not individuals from peoples well known to Rome. Thus the previous sections of the
Naturalis Historia have detailed a tribe who all have one eye in the centre of their foreheads and wage war with griffins, a tribe whose backwards feet nevertheless allow them to run very quickly, the Androgyni who can live as either gender, the Monocoli who have one leg which is used for jumping from place to place, the Sciapodes who use their oversized feet as umbrellas and the nomads of India with bandy legs and nostrils like snakes. The locations of these tribes are distant or fantastic. The tribe with one eye comes from close to the source of the North wind, the tribe of the reversed feet are beyond the Scythian cannibals in quadam convalle magna in the Himalayas, the Androgyni are in distant Africa, the tribes with remarkable and singular feet are in India and the snake-nostril people are even more remote in that they are nomads in India. In short, the peoples described in Pliny are outside the boundaries of the known world; as Murphy comments, they are monsters.

As was discussed in the previous chapter, the absence of monsters in Valerius Maximus’ Facta et Dicta Memorabilia is striking. There are individual manifestations of strange physical traits but Valerius never mentions a people that differs from the standard human model. Valerius presents isolated incidents from amongst the breadth of humanity but Pliny isolates tribes – cutting them off from ordinary people and places. There may be gradations of civilisation in Valerius’ view of the world, but all the inhabitants of this world are united by certain innate characteristics and are capable of acquiring more civilised qualities. They are connected by natura and capable of even closer association by nurture.

Just as natura underpins those qualities that determine the progression of general human life, she is also responsible for the innate characteristics of individuals. Valerius states that natura is responsible for the allocation of qualities like intelligence and strength. Thus Augustus is described in terms of his naturalis vigor animi, Sertorius enjoys the indulgentia naturae in terms of his robur corporis and consilium animi and natura crafts Cato the Younger together with continentia. Odd physical traits in individuals are the ludibria Naturae.

11 7.10, 7.11, 7.15, 7.23 and 7.25.
12 Hartog details the suspicion with which nomads were viewed in the ancient world and their association with a lack of civilization. Hartog, F. (trans. Lloyd, J.) The Mirror of Herodotus (Berkeley, 1988) 197.
14 Further discussion of the absence of monsters can be found in chapter Five: ‘Bringing the Outside In’, 192-197.
can have no effect on these innate qualities. Valerius describes Demosthenes’ self-training in the physical demands of oratory despite his natural deficiencies in this area. The young Demosthenes is weak, has a reedy, unpleasant voice and a speech impediment on the letter ‘R’ but he trains himself constantly and overcomes these disadvantages:

proeliatus est cum Rerum Natura et quidem victor abiiit, malignitatem eius pertinacissimo animi robore superando. itaque alterum Demosthenen mater, alterum Industria enixa est (8.7.ext.1).

The story of Demosthenes’ struggle with the innate gifts of natura mirrors a general opposition in Valerius’ work between innate qualities and the effects of education. Certainly in the digression on the pietas of the Scythians at 5.4.ext.5 Valerius draws attention to this division when he asks: quid ergo doctrina proficit? And answers his own question: ut politiora scilicet, non ut meliora fiant ingenia, quoniam quidem solida virtus nascitur magis quam fingitur15. Similarly the Thracians are possessed of wisdom that is distinguished as innate rather than learned. Valerius reacts to the Thracian custom of mourning at birthdays and celebrating funerals with the comment: sine ullis doctorum praeceptis verum condicionis nostrae habitum pervidit (2.6.12). The Lusitanians too are credited with admirable behaviour when they refuse Brutus’ offer of money to abandon the siege at Cinginna in the chapter Graviter Dicta aut Facta (6.4.ext.1). Valerius even comments on their statement that their ancestors left them steel to protect their city not gold to buy freedom from a greedy general: melius sine dubio istud nostri sanguinis homines dixissent quam audissent. In the opening to the following exemplum detailing an impressive saying of Socrates, Valerius reveals the source of the Lusitanians’ words: Sed illos quidem Natura in haec gravitatis vestigia deduxit (6.4.ext.2). Socrates, in contrast to the Lusitanians, is described in terms that underline his education and learning: Graecae doctrinae clarissimum columen16. Natura ensures the presence of certain ideas in all

15 A full discussion of Scythian piety follows in this chapter.
16 Here, as with the Scythians at 5.4.ext.5, the demonstration of innate virtue amongst the Lusitanians is contrasted with the possession of doctrina. Doctrina, in fifteen of seventeen uses in the Facta et Dicta, is demonstrated by Greeks or Romans (fourteen of these uses are Greek and one (8.7.2) is Roman). The other two instances speak of doctrina in general terms. Aside from the contrasts between Scythians and Greeks and Lusitanians and Greeks, Valerius also distinguishes at one point between a Greek and a Numantine on the grounds that the Greek draws fortitudo a litteris et doctrina and the Numantine draws similar valour from
peoples, including those without the benefit of education. Education may be able to
craft and refine natura’s products, but the fundamentals are known from birth.

Pliny the Elder provides another striking contrast for Valerius’ views on this
function of natura\textsuperscript{17}. He too sets up an opposition between the qualities inspired by
natura and those that can be acquired by the process of education but in Pliny’ view
natura is decidedly ungenerous – a tristior noverca:

\begin{quote}
Et cetera sentire naturam suam, alia pernicitatem usurpare, alia praepetes
volatus, alia nare: hominem nihil scire nisi doctrina, non fari, non ingredi, non vesci,
breviterque non aliud naturae sponte quam flere! (Plin. Nat. 7.4)
\end{quote}

Pliny then, unlike Valerius Maximus, sees the innate qualities possessed by
human beings as amounting to less than those bestowed on animals; the uneducated
human is helpless and defenceless – hominem tantum nudum et in nuda humo natali
die abicit ad vagitus statim et ploratum (Plin. Nat. 7.2). The only reaction of which
human beings are capable from birth is intense grief\textsuperscript{18}. He specifically states that
human beings know nothing without doctrina. Valerius Maximus on the other hand,
believes that human beings at the moment of birth are gifted with many qualities;
chief amongst these is a philosophical understanding of certain values that can be
polished by education but not fundamentally bettered. For all people virtus is an
instinctive thing.

**Behaviour Bred in the Bone**

Pietas, in Valerius Maximus’ view, is one of these innate qualities. In his
digression on the action of pietas in barbari Valerius, as previously stated, rejects
teaching in favour of natura’s universal provision of virtus:

\begin{quote}
Nec ego Argivam detrecto laudem aut Aetnaei montis gloriâm minuo, verum
obscuriori propter ignorantiam pietati notitiae lumen admoveo, sicut Scythis libenter
pietatis testimonium reddo: Dareo enim, totis regni sui viribus in eorum regionibus
\end{quote}

\textit{gentis suae ferocitas} (3.2. ext. 7), thus again comparing behaviour motivated by innate qualities and that
motivated by learning and education.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Plin. Nat. 1 (vii).

\textsuperscript{18} Pliny at least credits humanity with a seemingly bottomless capacity for grief and mourning. In 7.1-5
he refers to human beings crying or grieving in three out of five sections and in 7.2 he provides four
different terms for the crying of human beings in quick succession: \textit{vagitus, ploratus, lacrima} and \textit{flere}.
subinde impetum facienti, paulatim cedentes ad ultimum iam solitudinis pervenerant. interrogati deinde ab eo per legatos quem finem fugiendi aut quod initium pugnandi facturi essent, responderunt se nec urbes illas nec agros cultos, pro quibus dimicarent, habere: ceterum, cum ad parentium suorum monumenta venisset, sciturum quemadmodum Scythae proeliari solerent. quo quidem uno tam pio dicto immanis et barbaris gens ab omni se feritatis crimine redemit. prima igitur et optima Rerum Natura pietatis est magistra, quae nullo vocis ministerio, nullo usu litterarum indigens propriis ac tacitis viribus caritatem parentium liberorum pectoribus infundit. quid ergo doctrina proficit? ut politiora scilicet, non ut meliora fiant ingenia, quoniam quidem solida virtus nascitur magis quam fingitur (5.4.EXT.5).

Strabo records Ephorus’ identification of two different approaches to the Scythians: many writers describe their primitive savagery because it has shock value but Ephorus argues that one should isolate good customs amongst the Scyths as models for behaviour (Strabo, 7.3.9). Valerius to some extent combines these ideas; Scythians are undoubtedly primitive and it is this very fact that makes their instinctive virtue so impressive. In Valerius’ text the Scythians are not monstrous; they do not consume human flesh as Pliny the Elder and Pomponius Mela assert\(^\text{19}\). Nevertheless, the Scythians are the least civilised and developed people in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia\(^\text{20}\).

At 5.4.EXT.5 Valerius describes the retreat of the Scythians before Darius ad ultimas iam solitudines, then reports the Scythians’ observation that they have no cities or cultivated fields to protect: *nec urbes illas nec agros cultos*. Valerius goes on to describe the Scythians as a people, stating of the *pietas* they demonstrate: *quo quidem uno tam pio dicto immanis et barbaris gens ab omni se feritatis crimine redemit*. He opens the following *exemplum* 5.4.EXT.6 by underlining once again the Scythians’ lack of sophistication or education. He breaks down their barbarity into three elements: *Quis enim planistris vagos et silvarum latebris corpora sua tegentes in 19 Plin. Nat. 7.9. Pomponius Mela’s attitude is outlined in Evans, R. ‘Ethnography’s Freak Show: The Grotesques at the Edges of the Roman Earth’ *Ramus* (28)1 (1999) 59.
20 It is notable that the Scythians remain so resolutely wild as well as wise in Valerius’ text. Anacharsis - the model of Scythian wisdom - is closely associated with Greece by both Herodotus and Diogenes Laertius who state that his assassination came about as a result of his attempts to introduce Greek customs to his compatriots (Herod. 4.76 and Diog. Laert. Anach. 1-4). Valerius' wise Scythians in contrast, are depicted firmly within the context of their wild lifestyle and landscape with not a hint of Greek (or any other cultural) influence.
modumque ferarum laniatu pecudum viventes sic Dareo respondere docuit? Valerius’ use of *fera* in this description associates the Scythians with animalistic eating habits, bringing into question the extent of their human qualities. After all, the Scythians do not adhere to the principles of settled agriculture or society that underline human civilisation and they live in a land that must be described as a *solitudo*.

Valerius Maximus uses the term *solitudo* only five times in his work and two of these uses are in an emotional sense of loneness (5.9.4 and 7.2.ext.1c). Two more of these references are concerned with Scythia (5.4.ext.5 and 6.4.ext.2). In the fifth case Valerius refers to his account of the conjugal devotion of Queen Artemisia of Caria and that of Hypsicratea (wife of Mithradates of Pontus) with a series of questions: *quid Asiam, quid barbariae immensas solitudines, quid latebras Pontici sinus scrutor...* (4.6.ext.3). Despite the series of rhetorical questions, this comment actually enforces that the power of conjugal love in Asia, the great wildernesses of barbarian lands and the Black Sea region, is as great as in civilised Sparta. Valerius is underlining his deliberate inclusion of *exempla* from these environments: he uses the extreme landscape to emphasise the consistency of human ideas. The second use of the term connected with Scythia occurs in the chapter *Graviter Dicta aut Facta* and captures a similar idea. When Socrates rejects the speech that Lysias has written for him to present at his trial he declares (with a remarkable lack of tact): “*quaeso istam: nam ego, si adduci possem ut eam in ultima Scythiae solitudine perorarem, tum me ipse morte multandum concederem*” (6.4.ext.2).

Cicero records the same story at *De Oratore* 1.231, but the rejection offered by Socrates is markedly different. Rather than the comment that he would not deliver the speech even in the Scythian wilderness, Socrates here states that if Lysias had brought him shoes from Sicyon instead of a speech he would also reject them as comfortable, practical, but *non viriles* and incompatible with *fortis* behaviour. Diogenes Laertius also has Socrates compare the speech of Lysias to fine clothing or shoes that are well made but not suitable for his use (2.40). Both of these accounts show Socrates comparing his rejection of the speech with a rejection of other peoples’ customs – specifically clothing. Valerius Maximus, on the other hand, appears to have deliberately chosen to employ a juxtaposition of the civilisation of Athens and the wilderness of Scythia that is focused on the recognition of a unity of approach. This

21 The construction of the external material in chapter 4.6 is further discussed in chapter Six ‘Bringing the Outside In’, 203-205.
decision reveals the basic assumption that underpins the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia: Scythia while a model for desolation and distance from the social practices of civilisation still adheres to the same essential values as more civilised societies. The emphasis of geographic or cultural extremity with the term solitudo simply serves to confirm the universality of these ideas. Just as loyal wives exist at Sparta and Rome, so do they in Caria and Pontus, and just as Socrates would not present Lysias’ speech in Athens, he would not present it in Scythia. Behaviour appropriate for the civilised centres of the Greek world is also appropriate for the extremes of the Scythian solitudo. Valerius’ Socrates understands that his behaviour must be consistently correct even in a hypothetical alien cultural context because certain values are universal. Valerius’ Scythians, despite their lack of civilised institutions or education, know that pietas must be honoured everywhere.

Valerius’ choice of words in describing the Scythians reinforces the tension between their cultural extremity and their fundamental moral integrity. Valerius does not use the adjective immanis in the same fashion as he uses it to describe the Scythians at any other point in the text22. This is in spite of its associations with a lack of civilisation; it is for instance, a term that Cicero associates with barbarus consistently throughout his works23. Valerius does however use the related noun immanitas on one occasion in the Sejanus passage (9.11.ext.4). Here the Roman Sejanus is accused of being efferatae barbariae immanitate truculentior25. Sejanus has made a conscious decision to embrace immanitas and more than immanitas. He has gone so far as to attack his friend Tiberius – the man whom Valerius describes elsewhere as princeps paresque noster (5.5.3)26. The Scyths in marked contrast are fundamentally immanis not as a matter of choice but as one of cultural level, yet even they recognise the innate power and importance of pietas. The savage integrity of the

---

22 Where the term appears elsewhere (2.7.15, 9.1.2 and 9.1.5), it is used to convey great size.
23 Cicero associates barbarus and immanis or immanitas at: Ver. 2.4.25, Tusc. 2.20, Phil. 5.37, 13.21 and 14.8, Font. 31 and 44, Lig. 11, Vat. 14, Sul. 76, Prov. 33, Dom. 140 and Q. fr.1.1.27.
25 See pg. 162, n. 57.
26 Wardle argues that at 5.5.3 Valerius is coming is deliberately alluding the title of pater patriae refused by Tiberius: Wardle, D. ‘Valerius Maximus on the Domus Augusta, Augustus, and Tiberius’ Classical Quarterly 50.2 (2000) 479-493. This serves to even further darken Sejanus’ impiety against the ‘father of the country’.
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Scythia foreshadows the civilised brutality of a Roman; it seems the innate understanding of virtues can even be more powerful than the influence of *doctrina*.

The Scythians are also open to the charge of *feritas*. *Feritas* in six of the nine cases in which it appears in the *Facta et Dicta* is used to refer to peoples who are elsewhere associated with the term *barbarus* or whose territories are in the realm of *barbaria*. Masinissa’s region, described as *barbaria* at 1.1.ext.3, is then described as *feritas* at 7.2.6.c. Zisemis, a Thracian, is cruel but his cruelty is less surprising in view of the *feritas* of his nation as a whole (9.2.ext.4). Nevertheless, *barbarus* and *feritas* are qualities associated but not intertwined. This is demonstrated when members of other nations, nowhere classified as barbarians, are described with the same term. *Feritas* is applied to the tyrant Phalaris, a Greek, at 3.3.ext.2 and to the inhabitants of Calagurris at 7.6.ext.3. The Carthaginians (who are never described as *barbari* although they are associated once with the word *barbarus*) reach heights of deliberate cruelty that need to be described with *feritas* and *barbarus* at 9.2.ext.1. The usage of both terms reinforces their different applications. Similarly, Campania first pampers *Punica feritas* and then seduces and ruins the same quality (9.1.ext.1).

Even more significantly, at 9.2.1 one of the Roman Sulla’s actions is described as *id quoque inexpleibilis feritatis indicium est*.

*Barbarus* and *barbaria* (as argued above) are used to mark out those peoples who are generally uncivilised: savage in the primitive, rough and undeveloped sense. *Feritas* is largely used by Valerius to indicate extreme brutality and violence.

Barbarity could be seen to describe behaviour that is not so much a matter of choice, but of culture. *Feritas* on the other hand indicates a choice that has been made by...
human beings in favour of beast-like behaviour. At 7.6.ext.3 Valerius accuses the cannibal inhabitants of Calagurris thus: *cum omne serpentum ac ferarum genus comparatione sui titulo feritatis superarit.* In the previous *exemplum* he has made it very clear that such behaviour is a choice: *nam quibus mori licuit, sic vivere necesse non fuit* (7.6.ext.2). Such brutality might be seen in less cultured peoples, but is also clearly evident in peoples who should know better. Hence the distinction in the case of the Scythians who are undeniably *barbari* but who confound any expectation that they will also demonstrate *feritas* because of their un-beast-like recognition of the central value of *pietas* towards one’s parents. Once again Valerius identifies an innate knowledge of fundamental virtues in the culturally distant Scythians which is often lacking in more developed nations like Carthage and Rome.

Certainly there can be no question of the Scythians presenting a sophisticated and rational society, but even those Scythians hiding in the forests without crops, cities or schools recognise the universal power of *pietas*. For Valerius, who consistently constructs alterity only to assert similarity, the Scythians may be the most culturally extreme people in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, but the *pietas* they demonstrate acts to connect them inextricably to the most civilised peoples in the text.

*Pietas* is perhaps most clearly of all the virtues a matter of *natura* not nurture. Valerius makes the connection between *pietas* and *natura* several times in the *Facta et Dicta*. In two of the cases the language used to describe the quality is very similar, firstly when Valerius is describing the *pietas* of a daughter towards her mother, and secondly when he is describing the *pietas* of individuals towards their nations (5.4.7 and 5.6.ext.5). In the former case Valerius states of a daughter who keeps her mother alive in jail by breast-feeding her that *putarit aliquis hoc contra rerum naturam factum, nisi diligere parentes prima Naturae lex esset.* The same universality that embraces the piety of the Scythians applies here. The daughter of a condemned woman can bring the light of *pietas* into a public gaol and the daughter’s virtue can effect her mother’s release from that sordid setting. In the case of *pietas* on a state level Valerius comments:

---

31 A point of comparison for Valerius’ treatment of the Scythians at 5.4.ext.5 is available in Herodotus (4.125-127). Valerius’ commentary on the universality of *pietas* is absent, as is the language evocative of desolation and extremity. Herodotus records effectively the same story, but the references to barbarity or barbarians are absent. He does however describe the Scythians in retreat leading the Persians into the territory of the ‘man-eaters’, thus evoking the clear image of monstrous ‘Otherness’ inherent in cannibalism. Hartog stresses the way that Scythia is used as an Other in Herodotus’ text generally (Hartog, F. (trans. Lloyd, J.) *The Mirror of Herodotus* (Berkeley, 1988) 11.
Patet ergo quam benignae quamque profusae pietatis erga patriam omnium ordinum, omnis aetatis homines exstiterint, sanctissimisque Naturae legibus mirificorum etiam exemplorum clara mundo subscripsit ubertas. (5.6.ext.5)

Pietas is a manifestation of the natural laws of the world as Valerius perceives that world. It is a tenet of human existence and creates an emotional response in all who experience it beyond the mere social structures of approval: ceterae enim virtutes admirationis tantummodo multum, pietas vero etiam amoris plurimum meretur (5.4.ext.2).

The extent to which pietas is a function of natura and not nurture is demonstrated by the case of L. Manlius Capitolinus Imperiosus (dictator 363) (5.4.3). Valerius recounts the charges laid against L. Manlius Capitolinus Imperiosus for his ill-treatment of his son: the father is charged with having kept his son away from the public sphere despite his great natural merits, and furthermore with having subjected the youth to farm labour. Young Manlius hears of the charges and, having made his way to Rome, requests a private audience with the Tribune who accedes assuming that the son wishes to present testimony against his father. Instead young Manlius threatens the Tribune with a sword until he agrees to withdraw all charges against the elder Manlius. Valerius praises the son and states that his pietas is to be more commended than in cases where the parent is loving: quia ad eum diligendum praeter naturalem amorem nullo indulgentiae blandimento invitatus fuerat. Pietas is more admirable or more remarkable in these cases but the important point is that it is still present. Pietas is a natural, innate human response – not one bestowed by the tender loving care of parents.

While the Scythians’ demonstration of pietas may underline the natural and instinctive quality of the feeling, the legal usage of pietas at Rome is also enshrined in terms of natura. It is in line with the ordo naturae that a son should be the heir of his


33 The strong connection between pietas and natura in Valerius’ text may be significant in view of Wardle’s assertion that the work reflects pietas as one of the chief virtues claimed and promoted by Augustus and the imperial family: Wardle, D. ‘The Heroism and Heroisation of Tiberius: Valerius Maximus and his Emperor’ Hommages à Carl Deroux Édités par Pol Defosse. II Prose et Linguistique, Médecine. Collection Latomus Vol. 267. 2000 (Bruxelles, 2002) 435.
natural father, irrespective of the son's behaviour. Thus Valerius approves of Q. Hortensius' decision to make his son his heir despite the youth's demonstrated *impietas* and *nequittia*\(^{34}\). He also records the successful attempt of the son of the *eques* M. Anneius of Carseoli — who has been adopted out to his uncle — to claim the will of his *naturalis pater* (7.7.2). Similarly the connection between *natura* and *pietas* is reiterated when a court refuses to believe that two sons could be discovered sleeping soundly after having killed their father: *iudicatum est enim Rerum Naturam non recipere ut occiso patre supra vulnera et cruorem eius quietem capere potuerint* (8.1.abs.13). The connection between *natura* and *pietas* demonstrates clearly that it is an innate human response. The manifestation of *pietas* connects an individual or group to all the other sections of humanity; it is a virtue that anyone can demonstrate and that everyone should praise. A barbarian nomad in this respect is on an equal footing with the son of a senator at Rome.

In a striking contrast to *pietas*, another quality for which *barbarus* signals the universal inclusiveness of the behaviour is *crudelitas*. Valerius, after describing the form of torture practised by some *barbari* of sewing living human beings inside the carcasses of animals, states that human beings have no right to complain of their own mortality when they can devise such punishments:

\[Sicut illi barbari, quos ferunt mactatarum pecudum intestinis et visceribus egestis homines inserere, ita ut capitibus tantummodo emineant, quoque diutius poenae sufficiant, cibo et potione infelicem spiritum prorogare, donee intus putrefacti laniatui sint animalibus quae tabidis in corporibus nasci solent.\]

*queramur nunc cum Rerum Natura quod nos multis et asperis adversae valetudinis incommodis obnoxios esse voluerit, habitumque caelestis roboris humanae condicioni denegatum moleste feramus, cum tot cruciatus sibimet ipsa mortalitas impulsu crudelitatis excogitaverit* (9.2.ext.11)\(^{35}\).

Valerius makes it clear that *crudelitas* is not simply a perversion of the *barbari* by connecting the specific behaviours of the anonymous *barbari* to his general comments at the end of chapter 9.2 with a first person plural verb — *queramur*.

\(^{34}\) 5.9.2: *tamen, ne Naturae ordinem confunderet, non nepotes sed filium heredem reliquit...*

\(^{35}\) Briscoe's addition of a question mark at the end of the final phrase makes the sense of Valerius obviously intended point far clearer: Valerius Maximus (Briscoe, J. ed.) *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia II* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1998) 585.
This implicates Valerius and his readers in the kind of actions carried out by the people of 9.2.ext.11 and this idea is reinforced with the use of *nos* that follows. *Queramur*— and the anonymous *barbari*— also make it clear that, despite the concentration of kings and ruling figures who demonstrate cruelty in the chapter, the ordinary readers of the *Facta et Dicta* are still capable of *crudelitas*; it is not only a vice of the powerful.

Valerius chooses to make a statement of human unity in crime where it would have been just as easy to condemn these behaviours from a high moral position based on the non-Roman origin of the immediately preceding *exempla*. Instead Valerius positively draws attention to the universal demonstration of *crudelitas*. When he refers to the gods having denied heavenly qualities to the *humana condicio* Valerius employs a phrase that he uses elsewhere when adding a resounding rhetorical flourish. Thus Valerius uses it when he wishes Tiberius the longest span of life allowed to the *humana condicio* (8.13.pr.) and inserts it into a personal denunciation when he wishes the dramatic changes characteristic of the *humana condicio* upon those who have begrudged him his friendship with Sextus Pompeius (4.7.ext.2b). He also opens chapter 9.12 with the statement: *Humanae autem vitae condicionem praecepue primus et ultimus dies continet...* (9.12.pr.) Valerius generally uses this phrase to underline and intensify an idea, and the same is true at 9.2.ext.11. The use of *mortalitas* at this point is also striking; this is the only time that the word is used in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*.

Like *pietas*, *crudelitas* demands the attention of the reader and also evokes an (exactly opposite) emotional response: *ad summam, cum penes illam sit timeri, penes nos sit odisse.* (9.2.pr.)

*Crudelitas* is an active quality; mortals are moved to devise forms of cruelty for one another under the *impulsus* of *crudelitas*. *Impulsus* is a powerful word in the text. It refers to blows that knock opponents to the ground (3.2.23a and 5.1.3), forces that drive individuals to frenzied behaviour (1.8.10 and 8.1.abs.3) and the overwhelming force of arms in war (1.8.6). *Crudelitas* has this kind of influence in the *Facta et Dicta* and all mortals are vulnerable to it, whether Roman or barbarian.

Bloomer discusses the chapter *De Crudelitate* and sees in its structure a protective attitude towards Rome as a nation. Bloomer argues that Valerius is "in..."
considerable difficulty” in chapter 9.2: “he strives to balance the Roman and the foreign and to hold his chapter together without any hint of criticism for the present day.” Bloomer goes on to assert that Valerius limits the criticism to which Rome is exposed by utilising individuals separated from the political context rather than groups, and by providing only exempla of Roman crudelitas in civil war. He also argues that Valerius deliberately moves away from Roman exempla of crudelitas at the end of the chapter and in the external material focuses upon abuses committed by the enemies of Rome in order to mitigate Roman offences: “Thus, the ethnic “flaws” of the Carthaginians and the Greeks are paraded forth.”

I will begin by addressing the first quotation I have taken from Bloomer’s analysis of the chapter De Crudelitate: is Valerius “in considerable difficulty” in chapter 9.2? Bloomer states that the two main problems facing Valerius are his attempts to balance foreign and Roman material and to avoid the inclusion of any criticism of the present day. De Crudelitate is not a particularly unbalanced chapter in the context of the Facta et Dicta; it contains 4 internal exempla and 11 external exempla. The preponderance of external material is unusual but by no means the most dramatic example of this tendency. Carter finds material for his customary vitriol towards Valerius in the imbalance between internal and external material in chapters 8.11 and 8.12, but the largest example of this kind is chapter 7.2, Sapienter Dicta Aut Facta, where there are eight internal exempla and 23 external exempla. In this case Valerius actually underlines the discrepancy between the two sections of the chapter with an ironic rhetorical flourish. It is also significant that the length of the internal exempla almost balances the chapter at 9.2; thus although there are eleven external exempla to four internal exempla there is only a difference in length of a little

38 ibid. 48-9.
39 Ibid. 49-50.
40 Carter, C. J. ‘Valerius Maximus’ in Dorey, T. A. (ed.) Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II (London, 1975) 28-9: “then two meagre sections follow on the Arts - meagre because the foreigners begin to seriously outnumber the Romans, so that the topics are dropped in favour of depressingly familiar matter...” In chapter 8.11 there are two internal and seven external exempla and in chapter 8.12 there is one internal exemplum and three external exempla.
41 This disparity has spawned attempts at explanation on the part of authors who see Valerius as essentially patriotic and parochial e.g. Skidmore, C. Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen (Exeter, 1996) 45, and Bloomer, W.M. Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility (Chapel Hill, 1992) 24.
42 7.2.ext.1a. Tempus deficiet domestica narrantem, quoniam imperium nostrum non tam robore corporum quam animorum vigore incrementum ac tutelam sui comprehendit. maiore itaque ex parte Romana prudentia in admiratione tacita reponatur, alienigenisque huius generis exemplis detur aditus.
Chapter Seven

over a hundred words\textsuperscript{43}. The transition line in chapter 9.2 certainly recognises the uncomfortable nature of the internal material but Valerius obviously felt no need to take satisfaction in the disproportionate presence of external material. There is absolutely no attempt to draw attention to the greater number of external \textit{exempla} he has included.

Bloomer’s assertion that Valerius is having great difficulty at this particular point in maintaining the separation of the acts he portrays from any potential criticism of the present day is strange given the general selection of material in the \textit{Facta et Dicta}. One of the distinctive elements of Valerius Maximus’ selection of material is the extent to which he does not draw on contemporary material. By my analysis less than four percent of the \textit{exempla} date from 42 BCE or after\textsuperscript{44}, and less than one percent are CE rather than BCE\textsuperscript{45}. There are only two \textit{exempla} in the \textit{Facta et Dicta} that Valerius claims to draw from his own experiences\textsuperscript{46}. It is then, hardly unusual for Valerius to avoid material that directly concerns the present day. In fact, in the context of the \textit{Facta et Dicta} as a whole the internal events described in chapter 9.2 are actually surprising for their uniform proximity to the present: they range only from 82-45 BCE. The four \textit{exempla} do not detail the violence of the most recent civil war but they do culminate with the war between Caesar and Pompey (9.2.4). Certainly Valerius does not create in this chapter anything like the recoil from civil war material witnessed at 3.3.2 or the regretful retreat from the brutal punishment of Roman traitors at 2.7.12. Valerius states simply that he will move on to material that contains no \textit{rubor} for the Roman community. It does not appear that Valerius is presenting his material in a particularly unusual fashion here. He indicates, as elsewhere, his sadness at \textit{exempla} of Roman misbehaviour and leans towards more comprehensive treatment of external material, but it cannot be said that chapter 9.2 is a particularly extreme example of either of these tendencies.

While it is certainly true that Valerius presents a selection of the acts of four Roman individuals in civil war contexts to demonstrate \textit{crudelitas}, I would argue that

\textsuperscript{43} Cf. Chapter 7.2 where the external word count (1269) is more than twice that of the internal material (608).

\textsuperscript{44} Approximately 43 \textit{exempla} of a total 1091 stories. Bellemore has previously argued that the vast majority of the \textit{exempla} date from prior to 42 BCE: Bellemore, J. ‘When Did Valerius Maximus Write the Dicta et Facta Memorabilia?’ \textit{Antichthon} 23 (1989) 68-70.

\textsuperscript{45} Approximately 9 \textit{exempla} (generously considered) of 1091.

\textsuperscript{46} 2.6.8 and 4.7.ext.2b. Further personal references may be implied at 5.5.pr. and 4.4.11 or these comments may be rhetorical.
this is designed to have the opposite effect to that which Bloomer proposes. Far from mitigating the *crudelitas* of the Romans, Valerius chooses those *exempla*, both in the internal and the external sections, which can be assumed to have the greatest emotional impact on his readers. In order to ensure this he consistently underlines the emotional response that he intends the reader to experience.

Valerius concludes the preface to the chapter *De Crudelitate* with a note on the appropriate reaction towards such a personified quality: *ad summam, cum penes illam sit timeri, penes nos sit odisse* (9.2.pr). This sentiment is reinforced throughout the chapter. No one can blame *(vituperare)* Sulla as much as he deserves, and the *invidia* one feels towards him is mitigated only by Marius’ beastliness (9.2.1 and 9.2.2). The memory of L. Iunius Brutus Damasippus (pr. 82) should be abused with a *licentiore accusatione* even than that of Sulla or Marius, and although L. Munatius Flaccus does not actually kill Roman citizens, his cruelty in a civil war context is *auditu etiam intolerabilia* (9.2.3 and 9.2.4). Every internal *exemplum* is underlined with a statement of the strongly negative emotional response that a reader should feel towards the material. The external material reiterates that the appropriate response to *crudelitas* is hatred and disgust—whether it be committed by internals or externals.

Far from taking smug delight in the faults of externals, Valerius reminds the reader in the first external exemplum that although this material contains no *rubor* for a Roman reader, the incidents described are *par dolor* (9.2.ext.1). Hannibal’s actions are shown through the lens of the *odium* that they create in the Roman senate (9.2.ext.2); Ptolemy Physcon renders himself *invisus* by his treatment of his family (9.2.ext.5); Valerius expresses his horror at the decree of the Athenians (9.2.ext.8.) and underlines the unnatural mindset of the inventor of the bronze bull by stressing the appropriate response to the plight of the victims—and the way in which this was creatively subverted by the inventor (9.2.ext.9).

The selection of civil war material for the internal *exempla* has a very different result from the exoneration of Rome that Bloomer suggests. Rather than displaying Rome as a nation which demonstrates lesser *crudelitas* by sparing its enemies and subjects and attacking only itself, the *exempla* show in civil conflict that situation which is most unnatural: the suicide of a great nation in a string of events that shatter taboo after taboo. Sulla doesn’t just kill Romans—he breaks his word to soldiers who

---

48 The screams of the victims should elicit *misericordia* but the construction of the bull renders their protests useless.
have surrendered in good faith. He kills women who represent no threat, he pollutes
the city spaces and the Tiber with blood, he wants to practice cannibalism, he
effectively practises human sacrifice and he goes beyond the denial of burial to
disrupt burials already in place (9.2.1). Marius too apes human sacrifice and pollutes
the mensae sacra with human blood – dangerously mixing the separate categories of
food and death (9.2.2). Damasippus and Munatius Flaccus both dishonour their
victims by turning their deaths into public spectacles and mutilating the bodies.\textsuperscript{49}
Munatius Flaccus not only kills women but also children, and the deaths of the
children are carried out \textit{in conspectu parentum} (9.2.4). If you want an emotional
response from a Roman audience at the very beginning of the first century CE, civil
conflict will provide the most recent and powerful reaction.\textsuperscript{50} The Carthaginians are
ancient history; the civil war between Pompey and Caesar is potentially within living
memory.\textsuperscript{51}

The selection of the external \textit{exempla} is also geared towards the material that
will have the strongest emotional impact upon the Roman reader. Thus the first three
\textit{exempla} describe demonstrations of \textit{crudelitas} enacted against Romans: the torture of
Roman prisoners and especially Regulus by Carthaginians, the inventive cruelty of
Hannibal towards captured Romans and the wholesale slaughter of Romans initiated
by Mithridates (9.2.ext.1, 9.2.ext.2 and 9.2.ext.3). Once again Valerius layers his
description of events with emphasis upon defilement and disruption. The fleets used
to crush Roman prisoners are \textit{pollutae} and their presence in the sea will result in its
violation (\textit{violare} 9.2.ext.1). Valerius then states that Hannibal’s bridge of Roman
dead has a similar effect on the land as that of the ships on the sea (9.2.ext.2). He also
stresses that in matching pairs of prisoners to fight, Hannibal deliberately chose to
oppose members of the same family\textsuperscript{52} – a detail missing from Pliny the Elder’s

\textsuperscript{49} Damasippus mutilates and displays the corpse of Carbo Arvina at 9.2.3 and Munatius Flaccus makes an
exhibition of the execution of the families of Caesarean partisans at 9.2.4.
\textsuperscript{50} Possibly however, depicting the most recent manifestations of civil war here risked too great a
response. Valerius does not reference the most recent civil war between Antony and Octavian but
rather the two civil wars before it. Valerius’ depiction of the conflict between Antony and Octavian in
the \textit{Facta et Dicta} is a topic that requires further study in its own right.
\textsuperscript{51} We see Valerius elsewhere build up to a climatic mention of the ultimate, far worse disaster
embodied in civil conflict with a string of external wars at 9.11.ext.4: \textit{urbem a Gallis captam, a trecentorum incitae gentis virorum strage foedatum <annem Cremeram et> Alliensem diem, et oppressos in Hispania Scipiones et Trasumennum lacum et Cannas, bellorumque civilium domestico
sanguine manantes munrones amenitus propositis furoris tui represensaire et vincere voluisti.}
\textsuperscript{52} 9.2.ext.2: \textit{paria fere fratrum et propinquorum iungens ferro decernere cogebat}...
account. In Mithridates’ case it is the gods of hospitality that are polluted by the King’s actions: *tantaque provinciae hospitales deos iniusto sed non inulto cruore respersit* (9.2.ext.3). In the remainder of the external material Valerius presents inventive murder of family members and those protected by oath, as well as murder remarkable for its scale and viciousness. Ptolemy Physcon violates taboos in both categories; not only does he kill his own son and then present his head and hands to the boy’s mother but he then responds to the hatred that this act inspires by killing large numbers of the populace (9.2.ext.5). The marital customs of eastern kings provide opportunities for multiple violations of family links at one stroke: Ptolemy’s wife is also his sister. Likewise Artaxerxes buries a woman alive and upside down who is both his sister and his mother-in-law (9.2.ext.7).

In the final three *exempla* of the chapter where little emphasis is put upon the identity of the torturers and their victims, Valerius maintains the emotional connection of the reader by emphasising the physical ramifications of the creative tortures described. Thus Valerius describes the length of the victim’s suffering in each *exemplum*; those in the bronze bull suffer a *longus et abditus cruciatus* (9.2.ext.9). The Etruscans leave the living connected to the dead long enough that they rot (9.2.ext.10), and those sewn into the bellies of dead animals have their lives extended (*prorogare*) with sustenance (9.2.ext.11). Once again these *exempla* lead to the violent confusion of important boundaries: 9.2.ext.10 and 9.2.ext.11 forcefully mingle the living and the dead and mock the rights of burial, and 9.2.ext.9 and 9.2.ext.11 confuse human and animal status. Thus the screams of victims in the bronze bull are transformed into the lowing of the animal as a *humanus sonus* is denied to them and the bodies of the victims sewn inside carcasses are effectively incorporated into those of dead animals. Valerius, by the violation of taboos and the evocation of terrible physical pain, does not allow his readers to relax in the chapter *De Crudelitate* as he leads them through the brutal civil conflicts of the Romans and the tortures of nameless *barbari* to the final conclusion that *crudelitas* is a universal force for humankind.

---

53 Pliny *Nat.* 8.18. Pliny is much more interested in the unusual pairing of a Roman soldier and an elephant.

54 When Valerius Maximus tells this story he removes the (slender) motive that Diodorus Siculus provides for Physcon - Cleopatra’s estrangement from him (34/35.14) - and instead presents the man as acting without any reason or rational explanation. Justin also credits Physcon with motives (Justin. 38.8) and even if these motives are based mainly in the desire to revenge past slights, there is still a hint of disputed succession to explain his behavior.
Finally, Bloomer’s statement that Valerius Maximus finds shelter from dangerous Roman material by taking the opportunity in the external *exempla* to highlight “the ethnic “flaws” of the Carthaginians and the Greeks” cannot be sustained from a close reading of the text. Certainly, as he states, we do see the *Carthaginenses* in the first external *exemplum* as opposed to the Roman individuals of the internal material but the language that is used to describe their behaviour is not substantially different from that which describes Roman deeds. There is little difference in language between internal and external here at all. There is only one term that is notable for its use to describe the externals and that is *taeter*. Outside of Chapter 9.2 this term is overwhelmingly used for internal material and it is possible that Valerius deploys it here to strengthen the emotional impact of external events. Aside from the initial usage at 9.2.ext.1 where *taeter* describes the execution of Roman prisoners, the term is used in depictions of *crudelitas* that involve the internal affairs of foreign countries and it is here that a reader could be tempted to distance themself from the *dolor* of events. A Roman reader may feel less outrage at the crimes perpetrated by Ptolemy Physcon against his family (9.2.ext.5), or Artaxerxes against his (9.2.ext.7), or the cunning construction of the bronze bull (9.2.ext.9), and so Valerius uses *taeter* to underline the basic vileness and moral offensiveness of the actions involved. The disgust and horror that *crudelitas* creates in a viewer should be the same whether occasioned by internal or external material. The only emotion that external *exempla* of *crudelitas* need not create in the reader is *rubor* for the Roman community.

In fact Valerius constructs a parallel between the first *exemplum* of the internal material and that of the external material in his description of the two facets of Sulla’s career: *quia, dum quaerit victorias, Scipionem [se] populo Romano, dum exercet, Hannibalem repraesentavit* (9.2.1). Thereafter the behaviour of both the Roman and the Carthaginians is characterised with *feritas*. Similarly in both of the *exempla* Valerius draws attention to natural water polluted by the blood of the slain—the Tiber in Sulla’s case and the sea for the Carthaginians. This technique has two connected results; firstly it suggests a commonality between Roman and Carthaginian

---

55 In chapter 9.2 taeter appears four times in the external material (9.2.ext.1, 9.2.ext.5, 9.2.ext.7 and 9.2.ext.9) and not at all in the internal material.

56 Outside of chapter 9.2 only three of eighteen uses of taeter are used to describe external peoples or events.

57 In the first and last instance, Valerius uses the superlative form of the adjective, and the middle usage is comparative - all take the emotion up another notch from the basic reaction of disgust.

58 Sulla at 9.2.1 and the Carthaginians at 9.2.ext.1.
Chapter Seven

behaviour (this of course finds its full expression at the end of the chapter in the digression on the universal force of crudelitas) and secondly it underlines the horrific nature of Sulla’s behaviour in the opening exemplum of the chapter. As Valerius has stated he is a successful Roman general but Sulla is behaving like one of the most notorious enemies of Rome 59.

The treatment of the Greeks is even less effective as an example of Valerius’ presentation of peoples’ ‘ethnic “flaws”’. Valerius himself makes it clear that the decree requiring the thumbs of the captured Aeginetans to be cut off is totally contrary to his perceptions and expectations of the Athenians: non agnosco Athenas timori remedy a crudelitate mutantes (9.2.ext.8) 60. Valerius’ point is that such behaviour is unrecognisable as an act of the Athenian state, not that it is a characteristic flaw of that state and the people. The idea has already been voiced when he introduces the exemplum by describing the decree of the Athenians as indignum gloriae suae. Like Sulla who can be both Scipio and Hannibal, the Athenians are an otherwise glorious people who have turned to cruelty. Crudelitas is an unfortunate, but universal, characteristic of human behaviour in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia which Valerius depicts with an eye to creating the most powerful emotional response possible in his reader.

Interestingly, Cicero discusses the decree of the Athenians in a section that deals with the interplay of utility and moral right and after condemning it, makes the following statement: Sed nihil, quod crudele, utile; est enim hominum naturae, quam sequi debemus, maxime inimica crudelitas (Cic. Off. 3.46). Both authors envisage crudelitas as something with a universal aspect in humanity, but Cicero’s belief in the general opposition of human nature and cruelty is at odds with Valerius who sees crudelitas as such a constant feature of human interaction that it is justification enough for the gods’ limitation of the human life-span (9.2.ext.11). Crudelitas is a human flaw, not the flaw of one particular ethnic group.

The role of natura in this exemplum is slightly more complex than her role in Valerius’ discussion of Scythian pietas, but once again she ultimately acts to confirm the innate presence of crudelitas in humanity. Valerius dislodges the personified

59 Further discussion of the connection between Sulla and the Carthaginians is included in chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’, 174-175.

60 This is the only occasion on which Valerius uses the verb agnoscre in the first person in addition to being one of only five uses of the word in the text. Agnoscre appears at 3.1.2, 5.1.3, 9.2.ext.8, 9.11.5 and 9.15.3.
figure of *crudelitas* – painted in such vivid terms in the preface of chapter 9.2 – in this final digression and instead focuses on *natura*. *Natura*, he implies, has decreed that human beings will be mortal in part because of their cruelties. The *crudelitas* that the author has depicted throughout the chapter removes any basis for argument that humanity should be gifted with immortality. The *tot cruciatus* enacted by human beings against other human beings are aligned to the *multis et asperis adversae valetudinis* that *natura* sets in the way of mortals. In this way human cruelty comes to take a similarly innate position in human life as does the mortality that is so closely connected to *natura* by Valerius. *Crudelitas*, it seems, is as much a part of the innate nature of each human as is their vulnerability to illness and their eventual demise.

The next exemplum that aligns *barbarus* with the universality of a quality is positioned at the end of the chapter *De Fortitudine* (3.3). In this case *natura* is not so instrumental; instead *virtus* herself interacts directly with human-beings.

Haec e pectoribus altis et eruditis orta sunt, illud tamen non minus admirabile servilis animus cepit. servus barbarus Hasdrubalem, quod dominum suum occidisset graviter ferens, subito adgressus interemit, cumque comprehensus omni modo cruciaretur, laetitiam tamen, quam ex vindicta ceperat, in ore constantissime retinuit.

Non ergo fastidioso aditu virtus: excitata vivida ingenia ad se penetrare patitur, neque haustum sui cum aliquo personarum discrimine largum malignumve praebet, sed omnibus aequaliter exposita quid cupiditatis potius quam quid dignitatis attuleris aestimat, inque captu bonorum suorum tibi ipsi pondus examinandum relinquit, ut quantum subire animo sustineris, tantum tecum auferas (3.3.ext.7).

In this instance *barbarus* certainly emphasises the cultural extremity of the slave and it does this to show the power of *virtus* to overwhelm any such distinctions. Valerius’ description of *virtus* underlines the universal accessibility of the quality; she is not *fastidiosa* – a term that is used in the *Facta et Dicta* both for the disdain of those who perceive themselves to be morally or socially superior to others and for the potential disdain of representatives of one nation to those of another (2.2.5

---

61 Skidmore conceives of this universality as a tool of exhortation, closely related to rhetorical technique of argument from unlike: Skidmore, C. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen* (Exeter, 1996) 87-9.

62 As at 2.3.1, 4.3.7, 6.9.6 7.6.1 and 9.5.ext.1.
In both these last cases virtus is involved. At 2.2.5 the Tarentines look down on the horrida virtus of Rome. In contrast, at 2.6.8 Valerius' patron Sextus Pompeius does not disdain to observe the state sanctioned suicide of a woman of Cea because he possesses all virtutes. Virtus — even when herself disdained — does not recognise distinctions within or between societies. This is consistent with her presence in an individual who is both a barbarus to the external peoples he dwells amongst and a servus within this community. The term which Valerius uses to describe virtus — exposita — is a loaded one. While it means ‘open’ and ‘available’, on two of the five occasions on which expositus is used in the Facta et Dicta it actually refers to things which are ‘vulnerable’ and ‘exposed’ (5.9.1 and 7.1.2). The term can also be used to give a sense of triteness or commonness, vulgarity and frankness. Virtus, it seems, is utterly available to all levels of society and practices no concealment. In fact, she is almost a prostituted quality. A lady of easy virtue who excitata vivida ingenia ad se penetrare patitur and is omnibus aequaliter exposita in response to the cupiditas of those who seek her — a strange, sly image for the quintessential manly quality that is here associated with both men and women. Virtus is not universally active but universally available.

The universal availability of virtus is still further underlined in Valerius' language. He states that virtus offers herself with no personarum discrimen. There is only one other occasion in the Facta et Dicta where discrimen is used to mean a distinction or division. Valerius uses a term that is fairly rare in his text in a way that is not in keeping with his general usage of that term: the reader is informed that the material he offers at this point is significant.

63 Valerius uses it of his own potential behaviour when he posits an attitude towards the external material at one point: Ceterum etsi Romanae severitatis exemplis totus terrarum orbis instrui potest, tamen externa summam in cognosse fastidio non sit (6.3.ext.1).


65 Both men and women are mentioned in the preface to chapter 3.3 although specifically in reference to fortitudo: Egregis virorum pariter ac feminarum operibus Fortitudo se oculis hominum subject, Patientiamque in medium procedere hortata est. Kaster describes the ambiguous passivity of patientia: Kaster, R. ‘The Taxonomy of Patience, Or When is Patience Not a Virtue?’ Classical Philology Apr. 2002 Vol.92.2.133-45.

66 In that instance the distinction is a sign of high status as Roman women are allowed the discrimen of gold earrings (5.2.1). On every other occasion at which discrimen is used it represents danger in either a physical sense (1.8.1, 2.10.6, 3.8.2) or a legal sense (6.5.2, 7.3.ext.6, 8.1.amb1).

67 There are eight uses of discrimen in the Facta et Dicta: 1.8.10, 2.10.6, 3.3.ext.7, 3.8.2, 5.2.1, 6.5.2, 7.3.ext.6 and 8.1.amb.1.
an exemplum or an abstract quality such as amicitia\(^{68}\). The only other occasion on which the addressee is not specified is the ‘Sejanus’ exemplum at 9.11.ext.4 and here there is no question that the rhetoric of outrage is directed to a specific person, although the identity of that person may be open to question\(^{69}\). Valerius’ witty description of virtus’ availability leads gently into the address to the reader at 3.3.ext.7. The humour of the tone does not disguise an evangelical fervour in Valerius Maximus’ assertions of the universal quality of virtus. This is a quality both powerful and available throughout the entire Roman world, from the Roman reader of his text to the barbari in foreign lands. Valerius makes it very clear that the quality demonstrated by the servus barbarus is one of universal significance and application.

The power and importance of virtus as a practice common to all people is made clear in the chapter that follows Valerius’ depiction of the servus barbarus. Two external men in the internal material of chapter 3.4 rise from their humble beginnings to positions of power and prestige and their contrasting experiences play-out Valerius’ argument. Both the King L. Tarquinius Priscus and the consul M. Perperna (cos. 130) are clearly identified as not in fact being Roman (3.4.2 and 3.4.5). The rise to power of the initially alien Tarquinius is detailed in terms that connect him closely to the discourse on virtus at 3.3.ext.7. Valerius remarks among the challenges facing Tarquinius that he was fastidiendum quod mercatore genitum (3.4.2). This echoes the opening of the description of virtus: Non ergo fastidioso aditu virtus. Despite the disdain directed at Tarquinius as a result of his lowly and foreign origins he is celebrated as a king of Rome:

\[
\text{quaeque laudum eius consummatio est, praeclaris virtutibus effecit ne haec civitas paenitentiam ageret quod regem a finitimis potius mutaet quam de suis legisset (3.4.2)}^{70}.
\]
Tarquinius brought it about with his outstanding *virtus* that the Roman *civitas* did not regret having chosen a king *afinitimis* rather than *de suis*. *Virtus*, unlike the public, has evidently not disdained to grant Tarquinius access to herself. Like the *servus barbarus* of 3.3.ext.7 Tarquinius is undoubtedly an outsider: *alienum quod ex Etruria, alieniorem quod ortum Corintho* but the demonstration of his *virtutes* cancels out the circumstances of his birth both in terms of externality and status. Valerius shows us his ideology in action; a despised outsider at Rome extends the empire, fosters religion and increases the size of the senate and the number of *equites*. Valerius tells us that these achievements rendered the borders between inside and outside unimportant to the *civitas*. Tarquinius’ externality is insignificant when compared with his individual behaviour and the *virtutes* that make him a successful, accepted king.

In contrast M. Perperna, whose career is described in the same chapter as Tarquinius, is never actually a Roman citizen (3.4.5). Valerius’ *exemplum* is heavy with the language of shame and deception underlining the central irony of the case. The glorious achievements of the man are compared throughout with acknowledgements of his shameful externality and there is little question that – for Valerius – the former outweigh the latter. Perperna’s consulship is *non parvus rubor* because he lacks the citizenship and yet as an *imperator* he is far more useful than the Roman citizen Varro. He is *triumphator* in life but *damnatus* in death; although he has captured a foreign king and avenged past Roman defeats he is guilty of breaching the Papian law. The final phrases lay on the irony more thickly:

*ita M. Perpernae nomen adumbratum, falsus consulatus, caliginis simile imperium, caducus triumphus aliena in urbe improbe peregrinatus est.*

Perperna’s very real achievements are described with exaggerated emphasis on the language of falsehood. *Improbe* is the last touch; there is nothing shameful in Perperna’s *res gestae* but the insistence on technicalities of citizen status that results in his father’s exile could perhaps be considered in these terms. Valerius uses the

---

71 Despite the emphasis on *virtus* for the next chapter in 3.3.ext.7 this is one of only two uses of *virtus* in chapter 3.4. The other occurs in the external material at 3.4.ext.1 and describes the *virtus* of Socrates.

72 Valerius elsewhere shows the Roman recognition of external *virtus* when Marius gives citizenship to two cohorts of Camertes for their *virtus* in resisting the attacking Cimbrians (5.2.8): *(Marius) duas enim Camertiun cohortes, mira virtute vim Cimbrorum sustinentes, in ipsa acie adversus condicionem foederis civitate donavit.*
example of Perperna to show just how ridiculous the construction of barriers between internal and external really is. Valerius doesn’t use the word *virtus* in this case and his deliberate avoidance sharpens the point; Perperna’s achievements are indicative of *virtus* in every way but as a ‘shameful’ figure he cannot be described with this term73. Perperna does everything that an internal Roman *exemplum* of success should and yet is punished by those who place far too much importance in the distinctions of ethnicity. To pay attention to anything other than the behaviour of the individual in this case is ridiculous. Excellence does not respect the boundaries imposed by human beings and law. It is a universal quality that should always be recognised as it was in Tarquinius’ case. Valerius’ selection of the *servus barbarus*, an individual at the extreme edges of civilisation (as well as the lowest rung of that social structure due to his servile condition), uncompromisingly underlines this universal accessibility and demonstration of *virtus* at 3.3.ext.7.

The same universality is evident in the internal material; Valerius reiterates on a number of occasions in the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* that the virtues of individuals of lowly status are as deserving of praise as those of the famous generals and politicians of Roman history. This idea is explicitly encapsulated in the chapter *De Constantia* (3.8)

> Non indignabuntur lumina nostrae urbis si inter eorum eximium fulgorem centurionum quoque virtus spectandam se obtulerit: nam ut humilitas amplitudinem venerari debet ita nobilitati fovenenda magis quam spennenda bonae indolis novitas est. an abigi debet Titius ab horum exemplorum contextu? Qui pro Caesaris partibus excubans Scipionis praesidio interceptus, cum uno modo salus ab eo daretur, si se futurum Cn. Pompeii generi ipsius militem adfirmasset, ita respondere non dubitavit: ‘tibi quidem, Scipio, gratias ago, sed mihi uti ista condicione vitae non est opus.’ Sine ullis imaginibus nobilem animum! (3.8.7)

The centurion, whose lowly status is emphasised here, deserves to be commemorated for his *virtus* and his *bona indoles*. The final line of the *exemplum*

---

73 Although the term *virtus* is not explicitly used in this *exemplum* the emphasis upon Perperna’s military achievements as an *imperator* is deliberately constructed in terms of the primary force of *virtus*. According to the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* *virtus* is: “1 The qualities typical of a true man, manly spirit, resolution, valor, steadfastness, or sim. b (esp. as displayed in war and other contests): Glare, P. G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996) 2073.
recalls Seneca the Younger’s comment: *animus facit nobilem, cui ex quacumque condicione supra fortunam licet surgere* in his letter on the connection (or lack thereof) between birth and virtue (Sen. *Ep.* 44.5). The similarity of the language reveals that the two writers are working within the same ideology: *Non facit nobilem atrium plenum fumosis imaginibus* (ibid.). Similar comments punctuate other *exempla* that describe those from the less respectable sections of society. Roscius the actor is given credit for his *studium* and *industria* in chapter 8.7 and Valerius concludes the story with a comment that seems to deliberately reference the *imaginines* that the actor does not possess. He states *haec sunt attenti et anxii et numquam cessantis studii praemia, propter quae tantorum virorum laudibus non impudenter se persona histrionis inserit.* Roscius’ own mask – his *persona* – is rightfully included amongst *tanti viri* (8.7.7). Valerius is entirely confident too in the validity of the *exemplum* at 8.14.5: he opens the story by noting that he is joining the appetite for glory of a *miles* to that of *imperatores* and in the course of events reveals that the man is an ex-slave (*...qui paulo ante servisset...*). The *exemplum* ends with another affirmation of universality: *nulla est ergo tanta humilitas quae dulcedine gloriae non tangatur.*

Just as *virtus* can lead to the elevation of externals amongst the Romans so too can it promote the success of internals of lowly status. Valerius records T. Aufidius’ progress from minor-player in Asian tax contracts to the position of proconsul of the province at 6.9.7. He notes that the allies were not indignant at obeying the *fasces* of he who they had seen kow-towing at the tribunals of other men because T. Aufidius’ behaviour was beyond reproach: *gessit enim se integerrime atque splendidissime. Quo quidem modo demonstravit pristinum quaestum suum Fortunae, praesens vero dignitatis incrementum moribus ipsius imputari debere.*

Once again the behaviour of individuals is far more important than the circumstances of their birth. Here the inhabitants of Asia recognise the virtue of the man, as did those Romans who were responsible for his elevation. Valerius underlines Aufidius’ achievement by describing it with the adverb *splendidissime*; despite his
lowly beginnings he has conducted himself in a truly illustrious fashion. Lowly internals and externals alike value, as well as demonstrate, praise-worthy behaviour.

Argument from unlike is, of course, a well recognised phenomenon in rhetoric; Skidmore argues that the exempla provided by those of lowly status or (sometimes) from external backgrounds are designed to fill this purpose. In Valerius’ comments however, there does not seem to be a sense of the exhortation of nobles with the deeds of their inferiors, but rather a desire to recognise and praise positive behaviours wherever they occur. Thus while Skidmore interprets the comment Egregiis virorum pariter ac feminarum operibus Fortitudo se oculis hominum subiecit, Patientiamque in medium procedere hortata est (3.3.pr.) as an instance of argument from unlike in terms of gender, there is really no justification for that view. The bravery of men and women is presented in exactly equal terms (pariter) and female fortitudo is in no way highlighted as containing shock-value. This is a deliberate attempt to enforce the universality of fortitudo and it is this universality that exhorts the presence of patientia. On one occasion Valerius does employ explicit argument from unlike; there it is used to criticise a man of high status whose behaviour has been found wanting. Valerius argues that Philocrates’ suicide is much more admirable than the death of his master Gaius Gracchus who asks his slave to kill him: cuius si praesentiam animi generosus iuvenis imitatus foret, suo non servi beneficio imminentia supplicia vitasset (6.8.3). This example suggests that we can trust Valerius to tell us when he is using lowly figures for argument from unlike. Generally, however, the inclusion both of external material and lowly Romans has the effect of demonstrating that great virtue can be found everywhere. The behaviours that tie together human beings are of much greater importance than the accidents of geography or birth that divide them.

The universality of a quality does not always necessitate neutrality in Valerius’ handling. Virtus when seized by both barbari and Romans of any status

---

74 The superlative of splendidus occurs on only three other occasions; at 6.1.5 it describes the behaviour of Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (cos. 142) and at 6.9.7 M. Anneii Carcelani is described as a splendidissimus eques Romanus. The only external usage registers Sparta’s position as the ornament of Greece (4.6.ext.3).
75 Quint. Inst. 5.11.10. Quintilian at this point focuses specifically on dissimilarity constructed around gender - he provides the examples of the woman who killed Pyrrhus and Lucretia’s suicide.
77 Ibid. 88.
78 Valerius’ text here fits neatly together with Seneca the Younger’s question and response: Quis est generosus? Ad virtutem bene a natura compositus. (Epist. 44.5).
empowers and elevates and that empowerment often takes the form of acceptance at Rome, thus effectively making the Roman people to some extent the judges of success. The importance of Rome’s position as the current imperial power seems especially clear in the treatment of *humanitas*: an active force with a particular power to influence both allies and enemies. Yet here too Valerius focuses the reader’s attention closely on the universal significance of *humanitas* and Rome’s power is balanced with reminders of her vulnerability.

Valerius is inspired by the acts of Hannibal, the *acerrimus hostis* of Rome, to provide a digression on the power of *humanitas* throughout the entire Roman world:

*Facta mentione acerrimi hostis, mansuetudinis eius operibus, quam Romano nomini praestitit, locum qui inter manus est finiam: Hannibal enim Aemilii Paulli apud Cannas trucidati quaesitum corpus, quantum in ipso fuit, inhumatum iacere passus non est. Hannibal Ti. Gracchum Lucanorum circumventum insidiis cum summo honore sepulturea mandavit, et ossa eius in patriam portanda militibus nostris traditit. Hannibal M. Marcellum in agro Bruttio, dum conatus Poenorum cupidius quam consideratius speculatur, interemptum legitimo funere extulit, Punicoque sagulo et corona donatum laurea rogo imposuit. ergo humanitatis dulcedo etiam in efferata barbarorum ingenia penetrat, torvosque et truces hostium molit oculos ac victoriae insolentissimos spiritus flectit. nec illi arduum ac difficile est inter arma contraria inter dextra comminus mucrones placidum iter reperire. vincit iram, prosternit odium, hostilemque sanguinem hostilibus lacrimis miscet. quae etiam Hannibalis admirabilem vocem pro funeribus Romanorum ducum arbitria statuentis expressit.... quin aliquanto ei plus gloriae Paullus et Gracchus et Marcellus sepulti quam oppressi attulerunt, si quidem illos Punico astu decepit, Romana mansuetudine honoravit. vos quoque, fortes ac piae umbrae, non paenitendas sortitae estis exsequias: nam ut optabilius in patria ita speciosius pro patria collapsae suprmi officii deus infelicitate amissum virtute recuperastis (5.1.ext.6).*

Valerius has already underlined the universal relevance of *humanitas* at the opening of the chapter as he justifies the leading position of this subject in book Five. He states that the quality: *nomen ex ipso homine quaesitum est* (5.1.pr). After the specific detail of Hannibal’s honourable burial of various Roman generals, Valerius opens his digression at 5.1.ext.6 on the power and influence of the sweetness of
humanitas. Humanitas is initially established as having power over the efferata barbarorum ingenia before Valerius goes on to describe its ability to intercede between warring parties and the two statements are both connected and firmly separated by the enclitic -que attached to torvos.

Immediately it is obvious that unlike virtus, who allows herself to be penetrated by any who seek her (penetrare patitur)\(^79\), the dulcedo humanitatis has the power to penetrate in all regions of life (penetrat). Penetrare on two other occasions is associated with the influence of certain qualities\(^80\). Valerius describes the power of pietas to penetrate into all areas of human life using the afore-mentioned example in which a girl breastfeeds her mother in prison to keep her alive (5.4.7). In contrast he uses the same verb in the active voice to describe the dire effects of avaritia and libido when they have penetrated penates, civitas or regnum (4.3.pr.). The active quality of humanitas indicated with penetrat at 5.1.ext.6 is reiterated in a series of third person singular verbs: mollit, flectit, vincit, prosterit, miscet and expressit are used in close proximity and form very concise clauses. It is interesting in view of the almost unavoidable sexual imagery of the portrait of virtus that the power of humanitas is conveyed with mollire that elsewhere in the text appears only as a verb describing the emasculating power of eastern luxury (2.6.1). Four of the active verbs associated with humanitas are unusual in the Facta et Dicta; both mollire and miscere appear on only one other occasion in the text\(^81\). Flectere appears on seven other occasions and exprimere on just four\(^82\). Once again the attention and significance that Valerius is lavishing on this passage draws him into unaccustomed language.

The global relevance of humanitas is also signified by the word upon which Valerius makes it dependent at the opening of the digression: dulcedo humanitatis. Dulcedo in six of the nine cases in which it is used in the Facta et Dicta is associated with qualities that Valerius underscores as common to all living individuals\(^83\). On two occasions in the chapter De Cupiditate Gloriae he refers to the dulcedo gloriae, and in the first case his point in the exemplum is precisely to demonstrate the appeal of gloria to all ranks in the army: nulla est ergo tanta humilitas quae dulcedine gloriae

\(^79\) See pages 198-203 for discussion.

\(^80\) These two uses, together with two already under discussion (3.3.ext.7 and 5.1.ext.6) make up a third of the total number of uses of penetrare in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia.

\(^81\) Mollire appears also at 2.6.1 and miscere at 2.3.2.

\(^82\) Flectere at 3.8.3, 6.3.5, 7.3.6, 2.10.7, 7.7.5, 8.1.abs.1 and 8.7.ext.10. Exprimere at: 3.1.2, 4.3.ext.3, 8.9.3 and 9.2.ext.9.

\(^83\) All references: 1.8.ext.2, 2.6.12, 4.3.11, 4.7.ext.1, 5.1.ext.6, 7.2.ext.18, 8.14.5, 8.14.ext.1 and 9.13.3.
non tangat ur (8.14.5). In three of the other uses of dulcedo, the sweetness in question is the sweetness of life itself, a concept that Valerius describes as general, if not necessarily admirable: removeatur itaque naturalis omnium animalium dulcedo vitae (2.6.12)\(^{84}\).

*Humanitas* is not simply a quality that is remarkable and noteworthy in its operation, but it is particularly a quality that has remarkable results. In this final passage of the chapter *De Humanitate* the quality is portrayed in a military context. In the military *exempla* Valerius frequently highlights the effect of *humanitas* on the part of the conqueror upon the conquered peoples. This together with the extremely active presentation of the virtue and its ability to ‘penetrate’, ‘soften’, ‘bend’ and ‘lay low’ – all actions that align it with the behaviour of the victor – suggests that this digression is more about the results of the victor’s acts of *humanitas* on the conquered, than it is about the influence of *humanitas* on the victor.

This interpretation is only strengthened by the general usage of one of these relatively rare verbs in the rest of the text. With a single exception\(^{85}\), every time that Valerius uses the verb he is describing an attempt (successful or not) to change somebody’s mind. At 3.8.3 C. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 67) is unmoved by the attempts of the crowd to make him support a bid for the consulship of M. Lollius Palicanus and at 7.3.6 Q. Sertorius is not initially able to convince the Lusitanians of their inability to defeat Rome in a massed attack. Cato the Younger has more success when he forces Caesar to change his mind by demonstrating his popularity with the Senate at 2.10.7\(^{86}\). *Flectere* is so firmly wedded to the influencing of opinion in the *Facta et Dicta* that Valerius uses it when he wants to indicate that a proposition could be argued either way: *disputatione enim utroque flecti potest* (6.3.5). In this chapter we do not see victors hesitate over their actions – there is no debate of possible alternatives or lengthy surrender to conscience amongst those who extend *humanitas*, but rather swift and confident responses. As argued above it is the minds of those who receive or observe *humanitas* in action that are changed and influenced. Valerius seems to be using these verbs to describe the effects upon the conquered of *humanitas* not its influence on the victor.

---

\(^{84}\) The other two references are at 4.7.ext.1 and 9.13.3. Both of the latter *exempla* actually reiterate the idea that this sweetness of life should be despised.

\(^{85}\) Where *flectere* is associated with the turning post of a race-track (8.7.ext.10).

\(^{86}\) Similarly complaints of an unjust disinheritance move C. Calpurnius Piso (cos. 67) forcibly to reinstate an heir at 7.7.5 and Tullus Hostilius is initially decided in favour of prosecuting M. Horatius by the impact of his crime at 8.1.abs.1.
This explains the slightly jarring juxtaposition of *barbarus* with the Carthaginians; *barbarus* does not refer specifically to the Carthaginians but describes any conquered foreign enemy who, despite their distance from civilisation, could still be moved and wooed by demonstrations of *humanitas* from their conquerors. *Humanitas*, like *pietas*, penetrates even amongst the *barbarae gentes* and its voice is louder than the distinctions imposed between friend and enemy in war. The effect that *humanitas* is able to have despite the separations and oppositions of war is a clear indicator of the connection that remains between human beings despite the names and categorisations used to divide them.

Nevertheless, there is a strong association between the dominant power of Rome and the exercise of *humanitas* in the text. Outside the chapter *De Humanitate*, *humanitas* is only once manifested by a community or individual outside Rome and in this instance the external community is Caere—a town that received Roman citizenship in the fourth century BCE, but did not hold it at the time of the incident described (1.1.10). Here Caere acts to assist Rome at a moment of great vulnerability by receiving its sacred objects with honour. In the internal *exempla* that use *humanitas* outside of chapter 5.1 *humanitas* is a quality manifested by Romans towards other Romans on all but one occasion. *Humanitas* in this entirely internal material describes the willingness of lawyers to defend those who have offended them (4.2.4 and 4.2.7), the reasonable behaviour of the Senate towards its faithful members (4.3.9 and 4.4.10) and the familial customs of old Rome (2.5.5). In these cases *humanitas* represents a sense of good will, a tendency to act compassionately to members of one’s own society.

*De Humanitate et Clementia* (5.1) turns the focus onto interactions between Rome and externals. In the sixteen Roman *exempla* that Valerius presents in chapter 5.1, fourteen of the cases describe Roman acts of *humanitas* towards foreign peoples.

---

87 This particular use of *barbarus* is elaborated in chapter Five: ‘Barbarism Begins at Home’, 180-182. On close inspection, *barbarus* does not appear to be a term that Valerius naturally associates with the Carthaginians as the specific use of language at 5.1.ext.6 and 9.2.ext.1 reveals.

88 The fact that the passage opens with the impact that *humanitas* has upon *barbari* and yet in the chapter no representative of a people who Valerius elsewhere describes with *barbarus* manifests *humanitas* is also telling. On the other hand the Numidians and Centobrigians do receive *humanitas* (Numidia: 5.1.1b, 5.1.1d, 5.1.7 and Centobrigia: 5.1.5) and both Numidians and Spaniards are associated with barbarity elsewhere in the *Facta et Dicta* (1.1.ext.3 and 7.3.6).

89 Caere received citizenship in 390 BCE.

90 *grata memoria ad hoc usque tempus hospitalem humanitatem testatur*.

91 This *exemplum* (2.6.8) is one of six internal *exempla* which feature *humanitas* outside of the chapter *De Humanitate*. The others are: 2.5.5, 4.2.4, 4.2.7, 4.3.9 and 4.4.10.
that are allowed by the superior power of the Romans. Even when Valerius describes single combat between a Roman and a Campanian he stresses the Romans’ superiority: *et viribus corporis et animi virtute aliquanto esset superior* (5.1.3). Thus, for example, defeated and captive kings are given honourable burial (5.1.1b and 5.1.1c), hospitality is offered to less powerful foreigners (5.1.1d, 5.1.1e and 5.1.1f), and respect is proffered to those captured in war (5.1.4, 5.1.7, 5.1.8 and 5.1.9). The two internal *exempla* that do not involve foreign powers are drawn from the civil wars and here victorious generals show *humanitas* towards defeated members of the opposition

In the internal material then, *humanitas* is the quality which characterises benevolent Roman victory and Rome as a nation. Valerius consistently extends demonstrations of *humanitas* on the part of individuals or bodies to include Rome as a whole. Although the Senate is the subject of the *exemplum* that describes the reception of King Prusias, Valerius refers to the activity of the *tota urbs* (5.1.1e). Similarly at the reception of Ptolemy the displaced king is welcomed by the *populus Romanus* (5.1.1f). T. Quinctius Crispinus (cos. 208) also, in his reprimand to the Campanian guest-friend who has challenged him in battle, structures his complaints in terms of the difference between the two peoples as a whole (5.1.3).

Similarly the incidents described in the internal material are routinely tweaked to ensure that Rome appears in the best possible terms. At 5.1.1f Valerius describes Ptolemy VI Philometor (expelled from his kingdom and discovered living poorly in Rome) as being treated as a king by the Senate and given all honours and facilities suitable to this position. In the account of Diodorus Siculus (31.18), however, Ptolemy, son of Seleucus is offered regal hospitality at some distance from Rome by Demetrius (to be Demetrius I Soter of Syria) and warned that he must dress in the manner of a king because he will be treated as a no-one at Rome in his current state. Ptolemy ignores this advice and its validity is proven by the conclusion of the story. Ptolemy is left living with an artist and trapped in a shabby garret by the high cost of rent at Rome. So too when Valerius describes the visit of Carthaginian envoys to Rome in order to ransom prisoners in 201 BCE. He does this using details that certainly set Rome to good advantage, and that in this respect are substantially

---

92 Thus Caesar to Pompey at 5.1.10 and Antony to Brutus at 5.1.11.
94 Despite the fact that technically the Campanians are Romans at this point - they possess Roman citizenship - Valerius chooses to portray a difference of *sanguis*. Further discussion of this *exemplum* is included in chapter Three, ii): ‘Who’s Got the Blood?’, 106-109.
different from those in Livy’s version (30.43). After stating that Rome released 2743 prisoners to the Carthaginians immediately and without charge, Valerius seems almost to acknowledge this discrepancy when he defiantly ends the sentence: *si vis verum* (5.1.1a).

Rome’s demonstrations of *humanitas* restore and safeguard social structures; a Centobrigian father allied with the Romans may be willing to destroy his sons in order to break a siege but the Roman general will not allow it (5.1.5). Carthaginian conquerors may have stripped temples of ornaments; Roman victors return them (5.1.6). A Campanian may disregard the bonds of guest-friendship in war but a Roman will refuse to break them (5.1.3)95. A Roman victor in civil war will mourn the death of a fellow Roman, thus Caesar for Pompey and Antony for Brutus, although he was an enemy and insist that his body be treated with honour (5.1.10 and 5.1.11). *Humanitas* here is the preservation of respect for social structures where Roman conquerors have the power to disregard them: *nam si egregium est hostem abicere, non minus tamen laudabile infelicis scire misereri* (5.1.8).

These actions have definite results. In ten of the sixteen internal exempla Valerius makes a specific comment on the repercussions of Roman acts of *humanitas*, commenting on the positive human or divine response to such behaviour96. Demonstrations of Roman *humanitas* foster the trust and the goodwill of those who are at the mercy of Rome and guarantee the approval of the gods: *eam demum victoriam et apud deos et apud homines minimum invidiae habituram credens qu<ae qu>am plurimum humanitatis habuisset* (5.1.2)97. The power of *humanitas* to influence and persuade is particularly in evidence when Valerius comments on the reaction of those governed by figures who show *humanitas*; when Rome receives King Prusias with respect and honour Valerius notes that the king had been well disposed towards Rome at his arrival, but that: *duplicata erga nos benivolentia in regnum suum reversus est* (5.1.1e). *Humanitas* strengthens the loyalty of its allies and it also secures the willing surrender of enemies. Thus Metellus’ refusal to allow the son of a Centobrigian deserter to Rome to be battered to death by siege engines in the

---

95 Interestingly in Livy’s account Crispinus, after much goading, does take on Badius the Campanian in battle and defeats him (25.18.4-15) but in Valerius’ account Crispinus refuses to enter into any combat and asserts that even if he should have accidentally encountered his guest friend in battle he would have done him no harm.

96 5.1.1a, 5.1.1d, 5.1.1e, 5.1.1f, 5.1.2, 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5, 5.1.6 and 5.1.10.

97 The resulting good will of human beings is described at 5.1.1a, 5.1.1e, 5.1.1f, 5.1.5. The favour of the gods features at 5.1.3 and 5.1.6.
sight of his father – a move that lets slip a chance at victory – becomes the general’s victory: *quo quidem tam clementi facto etsi non unius civitatis moenia, omnium tamen Celtiberarum urbium animos cepit, effecitque ut ad redigendas eas in dicionem populi Romani non multis sibi obsidionibus opus esset* (5.1.5). *Humanitas* inspires a language of gestures that cut through the divisions of internal and external, and even the opposition between enemies.

There are more Roman than external *exempla* in this title as is usual in the *Facta et Dicta*. Given the almost total association of *humanitas* with Rome outside the chapter, however, the inclusion of externals is in itself significant. Valerius is reinforcing that Rome has no monopoly on *humanitas*. The material in the internal *exempla* reflects acts of Roman *humanitas* outside of chapter 5.1. It also echoes the final internal images of mercy extended to Romans in civil war with less troubling domestic *humanitas* (5.1.10 and 5.1.11). Thus the first five external *exempla* show foreign leaders acting with *humanitas* towards their own people. Alexander displays kindness to one of his soldiers (5.1.ext.1a) and general politeness even on his death bed (5.1.ext.1b), Pisistratus of Athens forgives the impertinence of a youth besotted with his daughter (5.1.ext.2a) as well as the outspokenness of a drunken friend (5.1.ext.2b) and Pyrrhus of Epirus overlooks the free talk of dinner party guests (5.1.ext.3a). The concern over proper protection of a daughter at 5.1.ext.2a chimes with the Senate’s humane provision of a dowry at 4.4.10, and the forgiveness demonstrated by both Pisistratus and Pyrrhus (5.1.ext.2b and 5.1.ext.3a) recalls Cicero’s demonstrated *humanitas* in defending his past enemies A. Gabinius (cos. 58) and P. Vatinius (cos. 47) at 4.2.4, as well as M. Caelius Rufus’ (pr. 48) intervention on behalf of his past opponent Q. Pompeius Rufus (tr. pl. 52) at 4.2.7.

The foreign *exempla* constitute a strong argument for the universality of *humanitas* because those who display the quality are often unlikely champions. Valerius makes this explicit when he describes the *humanitas* of Pisistratus who is introduced as *Atheniensium tyrannus*. Pisistratus allows a youth who has kissed his daughter to go free, despite his wife’s objection, with the question *‘si eos qui nos amant interficiemus, quid iis faciemus quibus odio sumus?’* The conclusion of the *exemplum* re-emphasises the strange conjunction of tyranny and mercy as Valerius describes Pisistratus’ question: *minime digna vox cui adiciatur eam ex tyranni ore [de humanitate] manasse*. In the next *exemplum* (5.1.ext.2b) Valerius reiterates the idea as he comments on the abuse that Pisistratus’ friend Thrasippus was allowed to inflict
upon him: *ita et animum et vocem ab ira cohibuit ut putares sate !litem a tyranno male audire.* The attempts of Pisistratus’ family to secure revenge for these slights (his wife at 5.1.ext.2a and his sons at 5.1.ext.2b) further emphasise the tyrant’s restraint. Such is the influence of *humanitas* that even the conduct of tyrants reflects its importance.

The last four external *exempla* deal with the expressions of *humanitas* given by one nation to another. Once again acts of *humanitas* speak across national boundaries and inspire like response. King Antigonus’ respectful treatment of Pyrrhus when the latter fell in battle against the Argives is related at 5.1.ext.4. The reciprocal network created by *humanitas* is very clear; the honourable cremation of Pyrrhus’ body is depicted by Valerius as a direct result of the general’s *humanitas* towards others. The immediately previous *exemplum* shows Pyrrhus treating Roman legati, who have come to ransom prisoners, with respect and consideration (5.1.ext.3b). Similarly, at 5.1.ext.3a Valerius comments that the king’s decision to spare a group of young men from Tarentum after they had abused his name while drunk: *adsecutus est ut et sobrii sibi Tarentini gratias agerent et ebrii bene precarentur.* This emphasis upon the results of *humanitas* also appears when Valerius describes Alexander’s care for his own soldiers. He ends the *exemplum* by asking: *quid ergo mirum est si sub eo duce tot annis militare iucundum ducebant cui gregarii militis incolumitas proprio fastigio carior erat*? (5.1.ext.1a). Both within and across societies *humanitas* creates, and expresses, a reciprocal community of good-will and it is by no means the exclusive possession of Rome.

The final two *exempla* of the chapter refer back to the internal material to demonstrate both of these ideas in action. At 5.1.3 the Roman Quinctius Crispinus delivers a withering reprimand to Badius a Campanian who – despite his debt of hospitality to the Roman – deliberately seeks him out in battle and challenges him to single-combat. Quinctius criticises Badius for his people’s total failure to honour *amicitia* and *hospitium* and argues that even if he had encountered Badius in a position of total vulnerability in battle (*prostratus*) he would have stayed his hand to protect his guest-friend (5.1.3). At 5.1.ext.5 the Campanians receive the utterly vulnerable (*etiam nudus*) Roman army into their city with kindness and respect. They demonstrate their friendship with superlative hospitality that almost compensates for the initial defeat: *militibus vestem arma equos commeatum benignissime praestando*.

98 5.1.ext.4: *Cuius tam mitis ingenii debitum fructum ultimo fati sui tempore cepit.*
et inopiam et deformitatem Romanae cladis mutarunt. The reader is shown an image of Campanian humanitas to balance the accusations that Quinctius levels at a Campanian; the presence of the two exempla even suggests a reciprocity of humanitas between Rome and Campania although the chronology has been reversed\(^99\). Despite the Campanians’ occasional lapses of judgement when it comes to their alliance with Rome, they are capable of demonstrating remarkable humanitas\(^100\).

A similar parallel is created in the two exempla that deal with Carthage. In the opening exemplum of chapter 5.1 the Carthaginian envoys at Rome declare that: ‘...quod beneficium numquam dedissemus accepimus’ as they wonderingly praise the munificentia gentis Romanae. The final exemplum demonstrates that such gestures are, however, familiar to the Carthaginians. 5.1.ext.6 describes the humanitas of Hannibal, the acerrimus hostis of Rome and, of course, a Carthaginian\(^101\). He is depicted ensuring that Roman generals receive honourable burial in a series of conflicts with Carthage. The three Roman generals are treated with respect and more by the Carthaginian who arranges for the remains of Ti. Gracchus to be sent home and dignifies M. Marcellus’ funeral with gifts of a Punic cloak and a laurea corona. The Carthaginian general demonstrates humanitas towards Romans just as the Romans did towards Carthage at the opening of the chapter. Reading the chapter through, the humanitas of the gens Romana displayed at 5.1.1a is reciprocated by the Carthaginians\(^102\). The Romans are shown in a powerless position and Carthage wields its power with sensitivity. Valerius states that the burials of the men brought Hannibal more gloria than their killings and then comments: si quidem illos Punico astu decepit, Romana mansuetudine honoravit. This Romana mansuetudo is actually equally recognised and practised by the most bitter enemy of Rome. Despite Rome’s position as the dominant power of the age, the sweetness of humanitas is a language internationally understood. As Valerius states in the preface to the chapter, humanitas is – after all – the quality nomen ex ipso homine quaesitum est.

\(^99\) The reception of the Roman troops occurred in 321 BCE while the encounter between Quinctius and Badius took place in 212 BCE.

\(^100\) Valerius explicitly addresses the mutability of the relationship at 5.1.ext.5: quo animo si pro imperio nostro adversus Hannibalem quoque usi fuissent, truculentis securibus materiem saeviendi non praebuissent.

\(^101\) See pages 158-163 and 180-182 for further discussion.

\(^102\) Once again Hannibal’s burials of Roman generals (in 216, 212 and 208 BCE) precede the incident at 5.1.1a (201 BCE).
Natura is a generous – if sometimes ill-advised – giver of gifts in Valerius’ view. Pietas and crudelitas are innate qualities that require no education or instruction; rather they are common to humanity in all contexts from the moment of birth. These universal qualities, unconnected to a people’s proximity to civilisation, provide an essential link between human beings in the text. This ensures that even those as wild as the Scythians are still bound together with all other peoples and that no monsters inhabit the territory on the edges of the map. Both the most beloved and most hated characteristics of human beings are common to all. Similarly, Virtus offers herself to all those who seek her out be they Roman or Barbarian, Senator or Slave. People from all ethnic backgrounds and social strata demonstrate virtus and so create facta et dicta memorabilia. Despite Rome’s proficiency in the field of humanitas, Valerius is also careful to demonstrate the universality of this impulse. Humanitas has potency throughout the world and the recognition of its importance cuts through the divisions between peoples. Yet another quality is rhetorically underlined as truly cosmopolitan.

Valerius Maximus only uses the language of externality to show us how inclusive the universality of behaviour actually is. Despite the divisions present in the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia in terms of structure and language, Valerius constantly asserts that an individual’s behaviour is far more important than their nationality or language. The importance of behaviour creates a community of virtues and vices that extends far beyond geographical boundaries and, for Valerius, human beings from their varied cities and landscapes are first and foremost citizens of this world.
Conclusion: Inside Out

What we know about the purpose and intention of Valerius Maximus' *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* is not only what he chooses to tell us in the preface but also what he shows us in the text itself. The preface states that Valerius has excerpted stories of the memorable deeds and words of both Romans and externals from well-known authors and brought them together for the convenience of the reader. The construction of individual chapters tells us that he has carefully crafted this collection not as a sterile reference work but as a thought-out expression of his own ideas and attitudes. When a Roman reader came to the *Facta et Dicta* he was would usually be looking for *exempla* to convince or enlighten. Valerius Maximus provides these *exempla* but he also utilises them in his own on-going process of persuasion and enlightenment. From chapter to chapter certain motifs recur. Valerius' usage of language provides a key to these connections; another key is supplied by comparison with versions of similar stories in other authors.

We have seen that foreigners do not merely provide a foil to Romans. The 'divisive' structure is a technique for inclusion and the point is reinforced by careful interpretation of the lines of transition.

Traces of the formal division are present in Valerius' repeated, unusual use of *sanguis* as a racial determiner and his use of adjectives that designate externality in the *Facta et Dicta*. This rhetoric has led readers on occasion into the assumption that he is fiercely protective of Roman prestige and, at best, condescendingly tolerant of foreign *exempla*. Closer inspection has revealed the careful way in which the pointlessness of jingoism is exposed by the context and content of the *exempla*. Like a subversive magician, Valerius conjures up the spirit of Roman superiority and ethnic prejudice and then reveals the strings and sticky tape that hold the 'ghost' together. All the while, however, his technique is subtle and ironic enough to keep the audience from angrily storming the stage.

Valerius wrote in a period of apparent calm; nevertheless memories of civil war were uncomfortably close, and the downfall of Sejanus must have reminded many of the fragility of peace. Using the Roman civil conflict, Valerius deconstructs the easy division into internal and external by showing the way that internal war

---

1. *Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna, quae apud alios latius diffusa sunt quam ut breviter cognosci possint, ab illustribus electa auctoris digerere constitui, ut documenta sumere voluntibus longae inquisitionis labor absit.*
ruptures internality as a concept. More generally, the large division of the exempla into Roman and foreign is undercut at the content level of the individual chapter. Within the chapters internals and externals are firmly united around a series of themes that are equally relevant to both. Valerius goes out of his way to promote the universality of certain behaviours and ideas — both bad and good. Romans and foreigners similarly demonstrate, for instance, conjugal love (4.6), amicitia (4.7), outrageous behaviour (9.11) and perfidia (9.6).

This philosophical unity is supported by the insignificance of physical and cultural difference. In Valerius Maximus’ Facta et Dicta Memorabilia human beings do not appear in the text with unalterable, physical markings of ethnicity. Skin colour and somatic features are invisible. The only visual trace of nationality is clothing — and this can be removed or exchanged without difficulty. Furthermore, when distinctive ethnic clothing is mentioned Valerius often highlights the difference only to show the shared beliefs of different groups: thus Gauls in their trousers, like Greeks in their cloaks, believe that loans can be repaid in the afterlife (2.6.10). Similarly, environmental factors are seen to be unimportant in the determination of an individual’s physical, moral or intellectual condition. The seductive effects of lush landscapes are invoked only to undermine their effects: Metellus Pius is corrupted not in Asia or Greece but in the horrida et bellica province of Spain (9.1.5).

Despite this rejection of the physical factors of ethnicity, alarm bells initially ring when Valerius’ use of the noun sanguis is examined. Valerius uses sanguis as an ethnic distinguisher with a precision of meaning and frequency unprecedented in his predecessors and contemporaries. This very physical manifestation of group membership with a term often indistinguishable from familial descent in Roman authors looks like racism to a modern reader. It is intriguingly clear, however, that Valerius’ use of this term referring to an unchangeable idea of ethnic grouping, shows how much more important conduct is. In almost every case references to blood reveal individuals behaving, or being treated, in a manner inconsistent with the possession of that blood. Valerius constructs a very particular and individual physical ethnicity in order to show that it doesn’t matter. The straightforward bigotry that Watts diagnoses
when he accuses Valerius of "constant and insidious" racial stereotyping is the reverse of the true message\(^2\).

Valerius demonstrates the pre-eminence of behaviour especially for Rome itself. Despite the presence of barbaric external enemies there can be no easy separation into Roman/friend, foreigner/enemy, as long as Romans are so focused upon abusing one another. This denial of internal unity is balanced by the on-going assertion of a wider harmony. Valerius signals his intention to provide a universal treatment in the opening words of the Preface and fulfils his promise. There are no grotesques or monsters in the text that differ from the human norm and \textit{Natura} models all peoples on the same basic physical and psychological blueprint. Nomadic Scyths, Roman senators and Indian sages are all members of the same moral community.

Valerius is an author who has been valued (when this has occurred) precisely because he has nothing of his own to say\(^3\). The manner in which he handles externality in the \textit{Facta et Dicta Memorabilia}, however, suggests that Valerius does have a particular, personal programme. Valerius Maximus has here been taken seriously as a figure of early imperial literature and ideas because inspection has compelled this response. This is not to make him a fully-fledged philosopher, but we can no longer see him as a determinedly "middle-brow" and strictly conventional parrot of received ideas\(^4\). It is in the context of this thesis, then, that Valerius Maximus demonstrates the nature of his world with words and deeds worthy of memory.

\(^{2}\) Watts, W.J. ‘Race Prejudice in the Satires of Juvenal’ \textit{Acta Classica} 19 (1976) 92: “I refer specifically to Valerius Maximus’ dull but informative and neglected collation of \textit{exempla} in which we shall now see a constant and insidious stereotyping of one race or another.”


Appendix: Geographical Breakdown of the External Material

| 1.1.ext.1 | Epirus (Greece) |
| 1.1.ext.2 | Carthage |
| 1.1.ext.3 | Syracuse (Sicily) |
| 1.1.ext.4 | Lipara (Aeolian Islands) |
| 1.1.ext.5 | Macedonia |
| 1.1.ext.6 | Persia |
| 1.1.ext.7 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.1.ext.8 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.1.ext.9 | Gaul |
| 1.2.ext.1 | Crete (Greece) |
| 1.2.ext.2 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.2.ext.3 | Sparta (Greece) |
| 1.2.ext.4 | Locri (Italy) |
| 1.4.ext.1 | Macedonia / Egypt |
| 1.4.ext.2 | Galatia (Asia Minor) |
| 1.5.ext.1 | Samos / Priene (Asia Minor) |
| 1.5.ext.2 | Apollonia (Greece) |
| 1.6.ext.1a | Persia |
| 1.6.ext.1b | Persia |
| 1.6.ext.2 | Phrygia (Asia Minor) |
| 1.6.ext.3 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.7.ext.1 | Carthage |
| 1.7.ext.2 | Macedonia |
| 1.7.ext.3 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.7.ext.4 | Lydia (Asia Minor) |
| 1.7.ext.5 | Persia |
| 1.7.ext.6 | Syracuse (Sicily) |
| 1.7.ext.7 | Syracuse (Sicily) |
| 1.7.ext.8 | Carthage |
| 1.7.ext.9 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.7.ext.10 | Arcadia (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.1 | Pamphylia (Asia Minor) |
| 1.8.ext.2 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.3 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.4 | Samos (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.5 | Epirus (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.6 | Phere (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.7 | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.8 | Greece |
| 1.8.ext.9 | Macedonia |
| 1.8.ext.10 | Macedonia |
| 1.8.ext.11 | Tyre (Phoenicia) |
| 1.8.ext.12 | Bithynia (Asia Minor) |
| 1.8.ext.13 | Pontus (Asia Minor) |
| 1.8.ext.14 | Lilybaeum (Sicily) |
| 1.8.ext.15 | Messene (Greece) |
| 1.8.ext.16 | Sidon (Judaea) |
| 1.8.ext.17 | Athens (Greece) |

| 1.1 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.2 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.3 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.4 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.5 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.6 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.7 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.8 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.9 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.10 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.11 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.12 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.13 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.14 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.15 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.16 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.17 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.18 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.19 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.20 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.21 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.22 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.23 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.24 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.25 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.26 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.27 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.28 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.29 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.30 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.31 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.32 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.33 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.34 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.35 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.36 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.37 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.38 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.39 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.40 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.41 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.42 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.43 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.44 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.45 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.46 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.47 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.48 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.49 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.50 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.51 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.52 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.53 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.54 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.55 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.56 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.57 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.58 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.59 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.60 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.61 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.62 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.63 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.64 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.65 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.66 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.67 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.68 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.69 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.70 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.71 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.72 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.73 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.74 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.75 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.76 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.77 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.78 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.79 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.80 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.81 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.82 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.83 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.84 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.85 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.86 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.87 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.88 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.89 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.90 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.91 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.92 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.93 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.94 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.95 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.96 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.97 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.98 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.99 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 1.100 ext. | Athens (Greece) |

| 2.1 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.2 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.3 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.4 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.5 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.6 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.7 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.8 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 2.9 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.1 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.2 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.3 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.4 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.5 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.6 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
| 3.7 ext. | Athens (Greece) |
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The research in this thesis is partially based on the card indices of the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Munich, Germany.
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