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Editors of ancient Rome’s classical texts might sometimes give the impression of being a rather blinkered lot, with a mission whose precise and exclusive aim – recapturing, so far as possible, an ancient author’s exact words – wholly engrosses their field of vision. (I include myself under this description.) The manuscripts on which we rely can seem to be precious yet inert bearers of meaning, frozen in time and produced (typically) by anonymous figures many centuries dead, whose own experiences are beyond recall. To put it another way, with respect to the medieval scribe or reader through whose hands a given manuscript passed, the question “What was he thinking?” might seem to cross the editor’s mind only in moments of irritation: “What the devil was he thinking when he wrote that?”

Of course I exaggerate,¹ for the sake of making a point: For asking a more neutral version of the question “What was he thinking?” is the purpose of this essay, in which we will consider the approaches that two quite different readers took to the Lives of the Caesars (De vita Caesarum) by Suetonius (ca. 69–130 CE). The question is worth asking of the Caesars because of a trait it shares with many other Latin texts that have come down from antiquity: It must frequently have been so bewildering to the men who copied and read it that the thought of their nonetheless doggedly making the effort is really quite moving, and can only increase our sense of gratitude. In the case of the Caesars, the bewilderment would have had two chief causes, one of them attributable to the nature of this particular text, the other characteristic of all Latin texts transmitted from antiquity. On the one hand, its biographies of the first twelve Roman autocrats – from Julius Caesar (mid-first century BCE) to Domitian (late first century CE) – assume that the reader is acquainted with people, events, and institutions that were unknown and, ¹ As, e.g., a rich collection like Reeve 2011 makes abundantly clear.

My warmest thanks to Tony Grafton and Glenn Most, who organized the Working Group Learned Practices of Canonical Texts, and to the Group’s members, who collaborated in making our time together extraordinarily rewarding. Thanks also gladly go to Rodney Thomson and Michael Winterbottom, for discussing issues raised in the epilogue to this essay, and Ermanno Malapina, for making available a copy of his paper on the textual tradition of Cicero’s Laelius. For the sigla (symbols) that I use to refer to manuscripts in this chapter, see Appendix 1.
frequently, unknowable in the Middle Ages. On the other hand, the text of the Caesars that reached the Middle Ages was corrupt in hundreds of places, and literally unintelligible in many of those hundreds.

Both readers we will meet left their mark on the Caesars in monasteries on one side of the English Channel or the other, roughly nine hundred years ago, in the first or second generation after the Norman Conquest. From a modern editor’s perspective, one of them was a good reader, the other, a wicked reader. Why an editor would make those judgments will, I trust, become clear by the end of this essay. But to understand what those judgments mean, we must first take a step back, so that we can place the readers in two related contexts: the broad context provided by the transmission of classical Latin texts in general and the specific context of the transmission of the Caesars. In that respect the story will follow a somewhat roundabout course. But I will tell you now that there is a surprise at the end.

The tradition to which we owe our knowledge of ancient Latin literature was a manuscript tradition: One copy of a given text was slowly made from another, by hand. None of our texts exists in the author’s autograph, or anything close to it; all are products of uncountable acts of copying. The earliest extant manuscript containing a substantial portion of even the best-preserved Latin classic -- the poetry of Virgil -- was not written until the author was roughly five centuries dead. In most cases, the gap between composition and first surviving copies was twice as long, because those copies were not written until the Middle Ages, in monasteries where the work was regarded as both useful activity and devotional duty. In many cases the gap is larger still: For example, the poet Catullus probably wrote his last verse in the fifties BCE, while the earliest extant manuscripts containing the whole surviving corpus date to the last third of the fourteenth century.

Now in a manuscript culture there are two fundamental truths: First, it is virtually impossible to make an error-free copy of a long text; second, the only way to correct a manuscript book that is unequivocally safe and responsible -- from the modern editor’s perspective -- is to compare it against the book from which it was copied, removing all discrepancies so that the copy matches the model exactly. The reason is obvious: If every manuscript copy were corrected so that its text matched its source exactly, then every copy would be identical, ultimately, to the text that left the author’s possession and went into circulation. In practice, the trouble began -- as it did without fail -- when a copy was not carefully corrected against its source, or when changes were entered from a different source -- a third manuscript, or a reader’s own wits -- or when, very commonly, both of these things happened.
Like clergymen, then, editors of these texts must spend a good deal of their time contemplating the ubiquity of error in a fallen world, and over the past (roughly) five hundred years this contemplation has elaborated a method—the "stemmatic method," from the Latin word, *stemma*, for "family tree"—that is generally agreed to be useful for a sizable proportion of ancient Latin texts. Using this method, editors aim to reconstruct, not directly the original text, but the common ancestor from which all extant manuscripts are derived. Since very many if not most extant Latin texts survive because a single copy happened to reach the Middle Ages and be transcribed before (typically) it was itself lost, we are often able to reconstruct that common ancestor—called the "archetype"—to a high degree of certainty. Once the archetype has been reconstructed, it remains the editor's job to review the text, identify places where it cannot be sound (because, e.g., it has lacunas or is unintelligible) or is unlikely to be sound (because, e.g., the Latin usage departs markedly from the author's well-established patterns), and, if possible, emend the flaws by accepting old corrections or divining new ones. Once the archetype has been reconstructed, in other words, a great deal of work remains; but a major step has nonetheless been taken.

As the metaphors of "family tree" and "common ancestor" suggest, the stemmatic method conceives of textual history as a process that transmits certain traits from "parent" to "offspring." Because transmitting the authentic text is assumed to be the default—just what all manuscripts are supposed to do—the only traits that matter for the method's purposes are errors. This fact obviously leaves the method open to a charge of begging the question: For if it is the editor's goal to establish the correct text, and so set aside errors, how can errors be identified before the correct text has been established? A fair point, and one that shows how crucial it is to think carefully about what counts as an error.

Imagine a cocktail party at which a dozen strangers have been brought together at random (an especially gruesome cocktail party, perhaps, but let it stand for the sake of the example). Were you to find that seven guests have brown hair and five have blond, it would be rash to conclude that the brunettes are all more closely related to each other than any of them is to the blonds, and vice versa. But if you find that two guests not only have six fingers on their left hands but also sport fuzzy nubs of a tail at the bases of their

---

spines, you would be justified in suspecting a close (perhaps even incestuous) family relationship. An editor seeking to use the stemmatic method is on the lookout, above all, for the textual equivalents of extra fingers and nubby tails – indisputable gaps and other gross corruptions – to establish “family” relationships among manuscripts.

For a very simple illustration of the method’s principles, imagine for a moment that Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address chanced to survive in only four handwritten copies – A, B, C, and D – each plainly written by a different hand, none of them the distinctive hand of Lincoln himself. If we found that each ended with the words “… shall not,” we would have to choose from among three possible explanations: Either Lincoln left the speech unfinished (we are reliably informed that is not the case), or exactly the same disastrous error was repeatedly committed by coincidence (the odds in favor of which are vanishingly slim), or all four copies derive this error from a defective common ancestor, or archetype. If, further, we found that A and D ended with the words “… government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not,” but B and C closed with “… government of the pebble, by the pebble, for the pebble shall not,” we might begin to suspect that B and C are more closely related to each other than either is to A or D, having been derived from a more proximate common source, an “offspring” of the archetype that had received the textual sixth finger bequeathed by its “parent” and added a nubby tail of its own.

Now suppose that further comparison tends to bear out this initial impression. B and C share not only that distinctive error at the end but also a number of other readings that, because they seriously distort the sense or produce mere gibberish, cannot be what Lincoln intended: So they both begin with the phrase “Seven score and four years ago …,” and halfway through they have Lincoln assert that “we cannot hold this ground.” Not only that, but A and D similarly share different readings that can only count as errors: Toward the beginning we find “testing whether that nation, or any nation so, can long endure,” and toward the end, “… these dead shall have died in vain.” We would then be justified in supposing that our four manuscripts constitute two distinct branches, each descending separately from the defective archetype.

---

3 Recognizing one such deformity in the text of Cicero’s correspondence allowed Poliziano to make a fundamental contribution to the method’s development: Timpurano 2005, pp. 47–48.
4 For the text: www.ourdocuments.gov.
5 Note, however, that if all four ended with the words “… shall not perish,” we might never suspect corruption and certainly could never prove it.
The next question needing an answer is this: If the members of one branch (AD or BC) are more closely related to each other than they are to the remaining copies, what is the nature of that relationship? Here again the shared errors of each pair are the key, as we consider which of two patterns these agreements follow. I say "which of two" because in fact when any two manuscripts share a number of errors, there are only two patterns that are likely to emerge:

- If in any given pair of manuscripts – A and D, say – the two share a number of significant errors and each has further significant errors of its own, then in all likelihood they descend, independently of each other, from a common source: Their shared errors are owed to that source, and the peculiar errors of each are the tokens of their mutual independence;
- on the other hand, if in any given pair of manuscripts – B and C, now – C has all the significant errors of B and differs from B only in having further significant errors of its own, then in all likelihood C is a copy (or a copy of a copy) of B.

The discussion of these last three paragraphs, then, can be summarized in the "family tree" shown as Figure 6.1, the graphic device that expresses our theory of the text, how we think all our copies’ data can best be organized and interpreted.

Here ω is the defective archetype of our hypothetical Gettysburg Address, α the source of A and D’s shared errors that distinguish them from B and C, and β the source of B and C’s shared errors that distinguish them from A and D. In using this stemma to reconstruct the archetype, we first discard C, which has no value for this purpose, since the only thing it can be presumed to offer that is not already found in B is more error. From that point

---

6 Discarding C as useless for reconstructing the archetype does not necessarily mean discarding it entirely. It might, for example, include a scribe or reader’s conjectural corrections (good guesses) that repair inherited defects, and of course the editor would choose to print the corrections, not the defects. But in stemmatic terms any such correction is as much an error – a failure to reproduce the source exactly – as the worst sort of gibberish: We will see a number of such errors later in the discussion.
on, we can infer that we have the text of \( \omega \) whenever we find one of three patterns of agreement: when the texts of A, D, and B all agree, of course, but also when AB agree against D or DB agree against A. In each of the latter two cases, the text shared by the two independent manuscripts is presumptively derived from the archetype, while the text of the third is presumptively a departure from the archetype. But where A and D stand together and apart from B, the archetype's text cannot, strictly, be determined, and we are left to decide which of the two readings, AD's or B's, Lincoln himself is more likely to have written: Here the decision is based (for example) on our knowledge of how Lincoln used English ("people," not "pebble"), or on our knowledge of the occasion on which he spoke (November 1863, therefore "Four score and seven years"), or our sense of what he is likely to have said on that occasion ("these dead shall not have died in vain").

So much, then, for the stemmatic method's principles. Before we press on, however, we should be clear that the method is not a panacea, for there are several more or less common circumstances in which the method will not be pertinent or the data will not yield to it. Most obviously, using the stemmatic method to reconstruct the archetype is beside the point when the archetype itself survives: So all extant manuscripts that preserve an important portion of the historian Tacitus' works (Annals books 11–16 and the surviving remnant of his Histories) descend from an eleventh-century manuscript written at Monte Cassino, now in Florence. Then there are texts - Virgil's Aeneid is a prime example - for which no archetype more recent than the author's original can be securely reconstructed, because (among other reasons) the work was widely dispersed in antiquity and multiple unrelated copies reached the Middle Ages. In some cases, the transmission is not entirely "vertical," as it was in the hypothetical case of the Gettysburg Address, where the line of descent ran directly (for example) from \( \omega \) to \( \alpha \) to A: Had there also been "horizontal" transmission – if, say, a lost intermediary between \( \alpha \) and D had been corrected against a manuscript derived from \( \beta \) – we would say that "contamination" between the two main branches had occurred, and a heavily contaminated tradition is unlikely to yield a usable stemma.\(^7\) And then there are works to which even the idea of "the author's original" - a single, determinate text produced at a determinate time by a specific individual - is not simply applicable, or not applicable at all: In some cases, such as marginal commentaries on classical Latin texts or some forms of medieval literature, every copy is in essence a new creation,

\(^7\) On contamination in the tradition of Suetonius' Caesars: n. 14 later in this chapter; on a method for dealing with a heavily contaminated tradition: West 1973, pp. 37–47.
comparable to the way in which every jazz performance (ideally) is a new composition, while in some cultural traditions — for example, that of the Rigveda, discussed in this volume — canonicity and multiplicity coexist in ways that are alien to the concept of an archetype. In short, I have offered a simplified version of a complex and, in some details, still controversial matter. I do so with a clear conscience largely because the text of Suetonius in fact responds to the version I have offered.

If we turn, then, to the *Caesars*' medieval tradition, we find that it is largely congruent with the case of our hypothetical Gettysburg Address. The work survives at all because a single manuscript emerged in north-central France in the late eighth century or very early in the ninth, some seven hundred years after Suetonius’s time, to be copied and thus serve as the archetype of all extant manuscripts. Given what we owe that book — the value of the *Caesars* as a source for Roman imperial history cannot be overstated — it seems ungracious to stress that it was a book of at best undistinguished quality, which passed along many gross defects to all its descendants: Not only was the beginning of the work missing, including an authorial preface and a substantial segment of Julius Caesar’s biography, but the standard edition by Maximilian Ihm — which marks certain passages as irretrievably unintelligible and incorporates in other passages corrections made by medieval, humanist, and modern readers — also implies that the archetype was corrupt in nearly five hundred other places. The great chain of copying that began with this book ultimately produced hundreds of descendants, of which more than two hundred still survive in the libraries of Europe and North America, all but nineteen dating to the fourteenth century and later; Though these later books here and there contain some good conjectural corrections of the archetype’s errors, they contribute nothing to a systematic reconstruction of the archetype.

That history can be elaborated from the nineteen earlier books, and the story they tell has been broadly uncontroversial since systematic study of the text began in the nineteenth century. The manuscripts descend from

---

4 On the stemmatic method’s limitations: Pasquali 1971 (which originated as a review of Maas 1958); on the issues posed by marginal commentaries: Zetzel 2005; on why the method is simply wrong, at least for medieval vernacular texts: Cerquiglini 1999 (my thanks to András Németh for this reference) and cf. Trovato 2014.

5 The preface was known to the Byzantine scholar John Lydus as late as the sixth century.

6 I refer throughout to Ihm 1907.


8 On the history: briefly Tibbetts 1983, and esp. Preud’homme 1902 and 1903–04, and Bridge 1930; I rely on my own collations of eighteen of the books that survive from the ninth through thirteenth centuries (I did not examine London, British Library, Egerton 3055 [s. XII][13]), which is a copy of S. Dunstan 1952). What follows implies a view of the stemma different from
Figure 6.2 Stemma of the family $\gamma$

the archetype in two largely distinct branches, like $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in the hypothetical stemma given earlier, with each branch accounting for roughly the same number of books.\textsuperscript{13} Though it will not concern us here, the first branch ($\alpha$) offers a purer version of the text, and its nine manuscripts include the oldest surviving witness, $M$, copied at St. Martin's (Tours) during the first half of the ninth century.\textsuperscript{14} With one important exception — $G$, written in Bavaria in the third quarter of the eleventh century — this part of the tradition was centered in northern France.\textsuperscript{15} By contrast, the ten manuscripts of the second branch ($\beta$), which survive from the end of the eleventh century on, are evenly divided between the Norman lands of northern France and England.

The manuscripts of this second branch sort themselves into two families. On the one hand, there are three books of English origin: $R$, written at St. Paul's (London) at the start of the twelfth century; $C$, dating to the third quarter of the twelfth century; and $H$, of the thirteenth century. $RCH$ all had a common ancestor ($\gamma$) standing between themselves and $\beta$, while $CH$ are further distinguished as "twins" more closely related to each other than either is to $R$; in graphic terms, see Figure 6.2.

There are three chief representatives of the second family, too: The oldest of these is $D$ (late eleventh–early twelfth century), either copied in England or copied on the Continent and brought soon to England; the other two are $Q$ (mid-twelfth century), written on the Continent, and $K$ (after 1150), written in England. Like $RCH$, which descended from $\beta$ by way of an intermediary ($\gamma$), these three manuscripts had a common ancestor ($\epsilon$) standing earlier investigations (Kaster 2014, p. 170; cf. Preud'homme 1903–04, p. 61; Bridge 1930, p. 5), but that view is of only secondary importance here, where I am chiefly concerned with the behavior of two individual medieval readers.

\textsuperscript{13} The qualification "largely distinct" is necessary because manuscripts in a subfamily of the first branch were contaminated from the second, while readings found in another manuscript of the first branch spread to members of the second: Kaster 2014, pp. 159–70.

\textsuperscript{14} Thus roughly contemporary with the other great Carolingian witness to the Caesars' rediscovery, Einhard's Life of Charlemagne, which was strongly influenced by Suetonius's Life of Augustus.

\textsuperscript{15} MG form one family in this branch, LPONS another; $V$ (lost after the beginning of the Caligula) appears to be independent of both.
between themselves and β; also like RCH, two of the three (KQ) are more closely related to each other than either is to the third. The family tree of this branch of the tradition, then, looks like Figure 6.3.

Here we meet our two readers, one in each family, who left the traces of their grappling with Suetonius in their texts and margins. These traces, found in C and H on the one hand and in D and K on the other, reveal the very different responses of men faced with the text's curious features, whether the curiosities are due to the lost world that the text conjures up or to the legacy of textual deformation that the readers inherited. It is to those responses that we turn for the balance of this essay.

The margins of D and K contain hundreds of brief notes, which fall into two categories (see Figure 6.4): on the one hand, jottings introduced by the abbreviation “NT” (= Nota), used to draw attention to noteworthy matters in the text; and on the other hand, the abbreviation “rq” (= “require”), typically unaccompanied by further annotation but often keyed by reference signs to a specific word or phrase in the text and used to call out items that the reader reminded himself to “check into.” In both books these marginal notes are in hands certainly contemporary with, and probably identical to, the main text's scribal hand; and because over 90 percent of the notes are identical in form, content, and placement in both books, it is clear that they were not produced independently but were derived, along with the text, from the common source of D and K – an inference that is only strengthened when we see the same notes duplicated, in turn, in one of D's descendants (F) and in a manuscript that is K's younger sibling (A). In other words, we have the responses to the text already found in ε, a record left by a reader who had the text in his hands no later than the very end of the eleventh century.

---

16 The remaining four books belonging to this family are stemmatically negligible: K's younger sibling, A, is not needed to reconstruct ε; the other three – F, B, and E – are all derived from a copy of D made after the latter had been corrected.

17 Implied by the date of ε's oldest offspring, D; it cannot be assumed, of course, that ε's annotation was original to it. Q, the third book directly descended from ε, has relatively few marginalia,
Making sense of Suetonius

Figure 6.4 Durham, Cathedral Library C.III.18 (D) fol. 52v
Figure 6.4 (cont.)
To convey the flavor of the notes and the interests of the man who left them, I present a brief selection from the margins in the longest Life, that of Augustus. The nota jottings, it must be said, are the less revealing, since they draw attention only to the odd and miscellaneous data that caught the reader’s attention – and Suetonius being Suetonius, these can be odd and miscellaneous indeed. For example:

- “note” the unlovely treatment Augustus gave the head of Caesar’s murderer Brutus (Augustus 13.1);
- “note” Augustus’s boast that he had inherited a city of brick and was leaving behind a city of marble (Augustus 28.3);
- “note” the philosopher Sperareus (Augustus 89.1) – a name that will be found in no canon of ancient sages, because it is owed to a corruption in the archetype (sperarei) that would not be diagnosed and remedied for centuries.\footnote{The correction of sperarei to per Arei both names a known philosopher from Augustus's circle (cf. Seneca Consolation to Marcia 6.1, Plutarch Life of Antony 81.4–5, Cassius Dio 51.16.4) and repairs the deficient syntax of the archetype’s text: it was made independently by a late correcting hand in L and by Salmianus (Claude Saumaise).}

Where annotation of this sort merely records the nuggets of information that appealed to the reader’s antiquarian bent, the notes that remind the reader to “check into” show him responding to a question or problem and imply an intention to follow up with further research – though in some of these cases further research would only have brought the reader up against a blank wall. For example,

- “check into” the custom of ambassadors from free and allied peoples sitting in the orchestra at the theater (viz., with Roman senators: Augustus 44.1);
- “check into the books,” that is, the books on theological matters (Theologumenon libri) by Asclepiades of Mendes (Augustus 94.4), mentioned only here in antiquity;
- “check more carefully into the custom of wills and their parts” (in connection with the institution of three degrees of heirs in Augustus’s will: Augustus 101.2).

Seeing that last note, especially, the modern scholar might sense that he is in contact with a kindred soul, stirred by the spirit of inquiry and wanting to know more, and that sense is only strengthened by notes responding to difficulties of language that the text throws up. For example, there are items and those few are in a hand much later than the main text: Evidently the inherited notes were judged dispensable.
of vocabulary derived from Greek, a language that readers of the time in Norman lands are not likely to have known:

- “check into” the term autographa (Augustus 71.1);
- “check into” the adverb Augustus used to characterize his dice playing, geronticós (“in the manner of old men”: Augustus 71.2);

then there are items that give pause just because they are rare or technical:

- “check into” the term petasatus, “wearing a petasus” (the broad-brimmed hat Augustus favored: Augustus 82.1) – a search unlikely to succeed, since petasatus is otherwise extremely rare;
- “check into” the phrase sacrificio ... litante, where the verb litare is used technically to denote a sacrifice that gives favorable results (Augustus 96.2).

Finally, there are the passages that cry out for a “check” because the corrupt text is unintelligible:

- “check into” “your mother’s flour si from the basest bakeshop of Aricia” (Augustus 4.2), where the slur upon Augustus’s mother, suggesting she had been a common (and probably servile) laborer, would have been difficult enough to understand even if si (if) had not ousted the verb est (is);
- “check into” “[Augustus] decided to attack Brutus and Cassius, while they were unsuspecting, both vim and by means of the law” (Augustus 10.1), where vim (in place of vi [by means of force, parallel with by means of the law]) destroys the sentence’s structure.

All of these examples are thoroughly characteristic of this reader and thoroughly consistent in their nature. They are the products of attentive reading. They attach themselves to points of real difficulty. And they are very, very cautious and wholly noninterventionist. In the last of these respects, especially, they are a world removed from the traits of the other reader to whom we now turn.

Those traits do not stand revealed in a manuscript’s margins but like strands of DNA are embedded (see Figure 6.5) in the text that C and H inherited from their common ancestor (8), a book probably produced no later than the first half of the twelfth century (implied by C’s date), very likely in England (the home of both C and H). This difference makes the record somewhat trickier, methodologically, to read; for in principle these traits could be the leavings of a scribe rather than, or in addition to, the interventions of a reader, and they could be the remnant, not of one man’s work, but of a succession of scribes and readers, the cumulative record of the marks left from one textual generation to the next. And no doubt there are traces both of casual error and of accretion over time in the record that C
Figure 6.5 Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. d. 39 (C) fol. 5v
and H jointly give us. But it seems to me wildly unlikely that such traces can account for more than a small fraction of that record.

For one thing, although medieval scribes – the men doing the actual copying – did now and again intervene to make a corrupt or difficult text more readily intelligible, they tended in general to work mechanically, trying to reproduce what was in front of their eyes (or in their ears, from dictation) word by word or phrase by phrase, and the ways in which they deviated from their source texts tended to be mechanical too: for example, reversing letters within a word; substituting one verbal or nominal ending for another by recalling a word recently copied or anticipating a word soon to come; transposing adjacent words; omitting syllables, or words, or sometimes whole lines, when their eyes jumped from the end of one word to the similar ending of another word farther along in the text, or when they just skipped a line in their model – and indeed such mechanical errors are thoroughly characteristic of the Caesars’ other medieval manuscripts (only G shows much evidence of freehand textual tinkering in its background). By contrast, the most salient traits of the text shared by C and H are, as we shall see, anything but mechanical. For another thing, those traits are not the varied and random accumulation of tics and hiccupps that a succession of different scribes and readers would leave behind: They are so strikingly consistent in their kinds and aims that they can only reflect the work of a single mind with some very clear notions of how a text should make sense. Finally, and perhaps paradoxically, these traits are so numerous that they could not be the product of even the most blindingly incompetent scribe or succession of scribes. Recall that there are nearly five hundred places where Maximilian Ihm judged the archetype’s text to be corrupt (in most cases, I believe, correctly), and that seems unexceptional for a middling-to-poor copy of a text the length of the Caesars, 334 modern printed pages. C and H, however, uniquely share nearly two thousand readings that depart from the inherited text. Combined with the other traits already noted and on display in what follows, that staggering number can, I think, be attributed only to the work of a reader – let’s call him Impiger (Latin for “busy”) – who was as aggressive in his approach to the text as the marginal annotator just considered was restrained.

Take, first, the very active responses we can see in places where Impiger perceived – correctly – that something was awry in the text he had inherited.

---

19 See Kaster 2014, pp. 137–38.
20 Here and in what follows the evidence is so abundant that I can cite only a tiny sampling to illustrate each point: A full collation of C and H, along with collations of all the other manuscripts I have used, will eventually be made available online.
While discussing Julius Caesar’s literary attainments, Suetonius quotes from the preface to book 8 of the *Gallic War*, written by Caesar’s lieutenant Aulus Hirtius, in which Hirtius remarks on Caesar’s facility (*Iulius* 56.2):21

"[These books] are so universally admired that he seems not to have provided other writers with the opportunity [scil. for writing a history of the war] but to have snatched it away. I also know how easily and swiftly he wrote them up." If the join between those two sentences appears less than seamless, it is because fifteen words that Hirtius wrote to link them are missing — “Yet my wonder at this accomplishment exceeds all others: For while everyone else knows how well and how faultlessly he wrote them up, I also know how easily ...” — and editors regularly supply them from the text of *Gallic War* 8. According to Ihm’s critical apparatus, the supplement first appears in one or more of the fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscripts that he cited using the symbol s.22 Impiger, too, clearly thought a supplement was needed but either did not have a text of *Gallic War* 8 at hand or thought a paraphrase sufficient: For he inserted in his text the words “for others know with what refinement ...,” which nicely captures the sense that is wanted, though not Hirtius’ exact wording:23

- concerning Augustus’s attendance at games and shows, Suetonius reported (*Augustus* 45.1) that “he was absent (aberat) from the spectacle for very many hours, and sometimes whole days, though he begged [the people’s] indulgence and commended to them those who would preside in his place” — except that the archetype had, not *aberat*, but a cognate verb with the ruinously opposite sense, *aderat* (was present). So obvious an error should have caught more than one reader’s eye, but the easy correction to *aberat* was not made for centuries (Ihm ascribes it to s) — except that Impiger saw what was meant and inserted et *tunc discederebat* after *aderat* (he was present and then departed), correct in sense if clumsy in execution;

- Augustus was so kindly, Suetonius tells us (*Augustus* 53.3), that when “Cerrinius Gallus, a senator not among his intimates, suddenly became blind and for that reason decided to die by stabbing himself to death” (*ob id inedia mori destinament*), Augustus “consoled him in person and summoned him back to life” — except that again the archetype’s text has it

---

21 The quotation’s first sentence alludes to Caesar’s decision to call his work *commentarii* (notebooks), as though they were merely raw material for a proper history.
22 The supplement is also made by a humanist hand in the margin of O and by Petrarch’s hand in the margin of Oxford Exeter College MS 186.
23 That Impiger did have a text of Caesar at hand is suggested by another of his interventions: See n. 26 later in this chapter.
wrong, offering “and decided to die on account of starvation” (ob inediam mori destinantem). The correction wanted, ob id inedia, first appeared in the edition of the Caesars printed at Bologna in 1488 – though Impiger’s ob hoc inedia (“for this reason … by starving himself”) is the next best thing:

- among the items of business that the emperor Tiberius left to the senate’s discretion, Suetonius included (Tiberius 30) “what reply should be made to the letters of foreign kings, and in what form” (et qua forma). Here the archetype had et quam formam, which cannot be construed as Latin in this context: Ihm printed et qua forma (ascribed again to $s$), while two great scholars of the text, Isaac Casaubon and Richard Bentley, preferred a version of “and according to what form” (et ad quam formam and et quam ad formam, respectively) – and in this they were anticipated by Impiger, who wrote ad quam formam;

Now interventions like these – and the examples given are far from exhausting the instances found just in the lives of Augustus and Tiberius – obviously have two preconditions. There must be the perception that the text has gone off the rails; and there must be the will to do something about it. Those preconditions were obviously set firmly in place for Impiger. But now put yourself in his shoes. You have in front of you a text that does not go off the rails just here and there, while otherwise presenting a fundamentally stable appearance, like a modern book with the occasional typo. No: The derailments are beyond number and of many different kinds, as some bits of text fail to make anything like satisfactory sense, other bits of text go missing, and still other bits have plainly become dislodged from their proper mooring, ending up where they do not belong. At what point, then, do you rein in your willingness to correct error and say, “This far and no farther”? The answer is, if you are Impiger, you do not, at all.

To survey a small corner of that evidence, we can begin with instances in which Suetonius’s idiomatic use of Latin caused Impiger to think that something had fallen out and spurred him to provide a supplement. (In the examples that follow, the archetype’s reading, which I take to be correct, stands to the left of the square bracket, Impiger’s reading to the right.)

---

24 The Bolognese correction is preferable because the error it assumes – a scribe’s eye skipping id before in- with inedia subsequently changed to inediam (accusative case, needed after ob) – is slightly more likely to have occurred than the omission of hoc before in- (with the same accommodation of inediam to ob).

25 I.e., Impiger replaced the archetypal et with ad instead of adding ad as Casaubon and Bentley did. Ihm knew and cited Impiger’s reading from H (his $p$).

---

26 This startling uncommon Epiteome (1.45)

27 Unnecessarily horam and un

28 In this and this offers a samp

29 Megan McNab alterations in the order in medieval Latin
For example, when Suetonius mentions the quartan fever from which Julius Caesar suffered, he refers to it (as do any number of other Roman writers) as simply "quartan," while Impiger inserts "fever" (Iulius 1.2 quartana] quartana febris); or in referring to the first fourteen rows of the theater where only certain members of the aristocracy were permitted to sit, Suetonius is content to refer idiomatically just to the "fourteen," but Impiger spells it out "rows" (Iulius 39.2 quattuordecim] quattuordecim gradibus; similarly Augustus 40.1). For other apparent instances of the same impulse, consider the following: Iulius 25.2 Aurunculeio] Aurunculeio Cotta,26 88 undecimam horam] horam undecimam diei;27 Augustus 49 numerum] numerum militum (number of soldiers, clear from context); Tiberius 62.3 nepotibus] nepotibus suis (his own grandsons, clear from context; cf. Caligula 3.3, 10.1).

Or again, since Impiger knew that bits of text often went on a walkabout, ending up where they did not belong, he did not hesitate to bring the text into alignment with the normal tendencies of Latin word order, treating those tendencies as rules.28 For example, when adjectival information is merely attributive in meaning ("The red ball/Jack's ball" vs. "The ball is red/is Jack's"), it should follow the noun it modifies – and so it is made to do scores upon scores of times, whether or not that was Suetonius' intention. On the other hand, adverbial information should precede the word or phrase it modifies – and so again it is made to do. More generally, since Impiger knew that words that "go together" – words to be construed in relation to one another according to the norms of Latin syntax – generally stand together, he commonly eliminated instances of hyperbaton ("transgressive" word order).29

From Impiger's point of view, then, the text's plainly unreliable character would have seemed to invite such interventions, even if, from an editor's point of view, those interventions move us far beyond an attempt to solve a patent problem and well into territory where the behavior could be described as fussy meddling. Such places probably account for the large majority of the singular readings that Impiger's efforts produced. Yet he did...

---

26 This startlingly learned supplement correctly matches up the man's "nickname," Cotta, with his uncommon clan name, Aurunculeius: Unless the combination is derived from Annius Florus' Epitome (1.45), it must come from Caesar himself (Gallic War 2.11, 4.22, 5.24).
27 Unnecessarily adding "of the day" to "eleventh hour"; with the reversal of noun and adjective, horam and undecimam, compare the category of readings discussed just subsequently.
28 In this and the next paragraph I sketch Impiger's habits only in general terms: Appendix 2 offers a sampling of specific instances.
29 Megan McNamee attractively suggests (personal communication) that at least some of these alterations might reflect the habit of putting letters of the alphabet above the line to indicate the order in which words should be understood: This kind of notation, often found in medieval Latin manuscripts, could point to the text's use in teaching.
not stop there; quite the opposite, he took the last step – into acts of willful tampering – on literally hundreds of occasions. Words are replaced by synonyms in a way that could be thought of as "glossing," save that in most cases the word replaced could not have caused serious difficulty or required explanation. Thoughts expressed in the active voice are recast in the passive voice, and vice versa. Finite verbs – verbs with person and number ("he is eating") – are replaced by participles, and vice versa. Thoughts are variously expanded or contracted. And then there is the line Impiger takes with Latin's three common ways of saying "and": et (arma et vir = "arms and the man"), ac or (before a vowel) atque (arma ac vir = vir atque arma), and –que (a particle attached to the end of the word being added: arma virque). The three are not quite interchangeable, and the differences among their uses are subtle. But in more than one hundred places Impiger replaces one of them with another, for no apparent reason; in all but nine of those places, the change is in the direction of et.

It is not difficult to see why, when faced with such a record, an editor might recoil and decide that it is the work of a "wicked reader," quite unlike the "good reader" whose reserved marginal annotations we surveyed earlier. And yet, as I said at the outset, there is a surprise at the end of the story, which I can best present by drawing your attention to three brief textual episodes:

- Early in his career Julius Caesar spent time at the court of King Nicomedes of Bithynia, which caused tongues to wag with allegations that he had played the catamite. Among the scraps of such gossip that Suetonius records is a brief excerpt from an epigram by the poet Licinius Calvus, which runs like this in the archetype's text (Julius 49.1):

  ... whatever Bithynia

  and Caesar's publicizer (praedicator) ever possessed.

  The word praedicator (publicizer, crier), is hardly what the context calls for, and editors of both Suetonius and the fragments of Latin poetry have long accepted the reading pedicator (bugger) (< pedicare = "to penetrate anally"), which Ihm attributes to an unnamed "corrector of the fifteenth century," adding in his critical apparatus, "I first read it in the anonymous edition of 1472 (?) and the Milan edition of 1475" (the question mark is Ihm's; in fact pedicator appears already in the first printed edition, Rome 1470, which Ihm was unable to consult). The emendation is learned, in so far as the verb pedicare was not in common use; it is also bold, since the

  30 Essentially confined to the Priapea and the poetry of Catullus and Martial; of these only Martial was much known before the Renaissance.

- After the death of Lucullus Cinnicus, Helvius Cinna was killed in a riot by a mob of people who were threatening to overwhelm priests of Jupiter. A classic synonym for "priest" (or helas, as Galen calls him) in first-century Rome, Helvius was an "oracle and prophet" (so made by an editor of Suetonius), who

  31 Sh话剧

  Plata
agent-noun *pedicator* is attested nowhere else in Latin. But it is unquestionably correct.

- After Caesar’s assassination the distraught and angry plebs went on a rampage, with a gruesome outcome (*Iulius* 85):

Immediately after the funeral the commons made for the house of Brutus and Cassius, and after they had been beaten back they ran into *heilium* Cinna and killed him, mistaking his name – as though he were the Cornelius [scil. Cinna] who the day before raised serious questions about Caesar in an assembly of the people – and carried around his head stuck to the end of a spear.

Obviously, someone in the crowd yelled, “Look – there’s Cinna!” using the nickname (*cognomen*) especially associated with the noble Cornelii Cinnae, and they attacked the wrong man. But which wrong man? A clan name is plainly wanted before “Cinna,” but the archetype’s *heilium* (or *heilum*: the manuscripts are divided) is no clan name that any Roman ever bore. The correction should not have been difficult, since Helvius Cinna, a tribune allied with Caesar, is mentioned earlier in the same life (52.3). But according to Ihm’s apparatus, the correction was not made until Johannes Baptista Egnatius prepared the Aldine edition published in 1516.

- Finally, there is the crisis that Augustus faced soon after he defeated Antony and Cleopatra in the Battle of Actium (*Augustus* 17.3):

When he had retired from Actium into winter quarters on Samus, he was alarmed by news of an insurrection of [the troops] he had sent ahead to Brundisium, who were demanding their rewards and discharge, he [*repetit alia*] was twice pounded by a storm in the crossing, first between the promontories of the Peloponnesse and Aetolia, and again around the Acroceraunian mountains [in Epirus] …

Once again the archetype’s text, *repetit alia*, is incoherent, whether one tries to construe *alia* as the object of *repetit* (he again seeks/asks for the return of other things) or as an adjective modifying *tempestate* (he again seeks/asks for [?] having been twice pounded by another storm – though no previous storm has been mentioned). But accept the reading *repetit<al>alia*, attributed in Ihm’s apparatus to the manuscript p and (independently) to the seventeenth-century humanist Johannes Scheffer, and all makes sense: “When he set his course back to Italy he was twice pounded ….” The error assumed by the correction – a skip of the eye

---

31 Shakespeare elaborated the scene in *Iulius Caesar* Act III, scene iii, following the version in Plutarch’s *Life of Brutus* 20.8–11 (where the clan name is not given).
from a after it in repetita to a after it in Italia – involves just the sort of mechanical error scribes were apt to make.

Now you will probably have begun to suspect that the link connecting these three episodes is Ihm's apparatus, and in that you are exactly correct. In only one of the three, the last, does Ihm's report get the matter right, and then only partly. The correct repetita Italia does indeed appear in p, Ihm's symbol for the manuscript we have been calling H; but so too do the other two good corrections just discussed, and all three also appear in C – which is to say, all three are the legacy of Impiger and the book that reflected his efforts, C and H's common ancestor, 8, the earliest identifiable source in which they stood. Furthermore, 8 is the earliest source not just of these three readings, or of these and a few others: There are fifty good corrections of this sort that we owe to Impiger, though Ihm's apparatus acknowledges barely a quarter of them, usually attributing them instead to sources more recent by three hundred years or more. How astonishing is this aspect of Impiger's achievement? Let me suggest that to gauge its full import, we need only remark that his fifty good corrections are half a dozen more than the contributions, recorded in Ihm's apparatus, of Erasmus, Claude Saumaise, Adrien Turnèbe, Justus Lipsius, Isaac Casaubon, and Richard Bentley – six of the greatest names in the history of classical scholarship – combined.

In short, the most prodigiously fertile corrector that the text of Suetonius has known was also its most willful and aggressive reader. One can suggest that great success of the sort seen here requires the great boldness (to use no stronger term) we have also seen, that these are two sides of the same coin – but that suggestion will surprise no one familiar with the work of (say) Richard Bentley. Beyond that, I have no clear moral or lesson to offer. Instead, I close with two questions. First: where would we be if an earlier reader had wrought the same kinds of changes – often very intelligent and learned, yet far more often entirely irresponsible from a modern point of view – and thereby shaped, not a third-generation descendant of the archetype, but the archetype itself? Second: how do we know that one did not?

33 These good corrections are obviously of a piece with the many other instances in which Impiger correctly diagnosed a corruption but devised an imperfect solution: See the discussion that begins at n. 21 in this chapter. For a list of Impiger's good corrections: Kaster 2014, pp. 178-80 (where 8 = 8 here).
34 Erasmus can claim five, Salmassius eight, Turnebus six, Lipsius eleven, Casaubon six, and Bentley eight.
35 Surveyed by T.
Epilogue

That is where this essay ended when I finished my initial revisions in September 2012, after the summer’s collaboration in Berlin. But then, two months later, I happened to discover the identity of the reader whom I had playfully named “Impiger.”

I was finishing the footnotes for another essay on the text’s history when I came upon a discussion I had not seen before of the Bodleian manuscript called C above. It is an interesting book, in that it contains not just classical material – Suetonius and some extracts from Aulus Gellius – but also an account of a vision of Charles the Fat, three rare genealogies of Frankish kings, and Einhard’s Life of Charlemagne, modeled on Suetonius’s Augustus, with its text quite significantly shaped by the same sort of freewheeling treatment as that visited on the Caesars. As I discovered, the medievalist Rodney Thomson had noticed that the writings of a certain English Benedictine monk, active in the first quarter of the twelfth century, made it clear that he had known all the texts contained in the Bodleian book, including the uncommon ones. Not only that, but the same monk could be shown, to a very high degree of probability, to have assembled one of the Frankish genealogies included in that book, which also contains some marginal notes, in the text of Suetonius and elsewhere, that are characteristic of this monk’s style, interests, and learning, including quotations from a rare letter of Alcuin that the monk also excerpts in his own writings. The connection could hardly be coincidental, but since the monk was active half a century before the Bodleian book was written, he plainly cannot have used it: Rather, Thomson argued, the Bodleian book was copied from a manuscript, containing the same works, that had been written for and annotated by the Benedictine – and of course it was the thought of annotations that most piqued my interest. In any case, the argument seemed to me completely cogent – certainly cogent enough to merit the further investigation that Rodney Thomson suggested when I contacted him.

I therefore examined the quotations and reminiscences of Suetonius – just over two dozen of them – that are found in the monk’s greatest work. The two most striking discoveries that I took away from the examination are the following (once again, $\delta$ is the common source of C and H):

- Suetonius’s description of the emperor Vespasian as (literally) “minimally mindful of offenses and enmity” (Vespianus 14, offensarum

Sources for this epilogue are grouped in n. 36.

Surveyed by Tischler 2001, pp. 1402–09 (my thanks to Helmut Reimitz for this reference).
inimicitiarumque minime memor) is transformed in § so that it reads “unmindful of offenses and enmity” (offensarum inimicitiarumque immemor), and when that description is adopted by the monk in his own work, he writes, “He was therefore unmindful of offenses” (offensarum igitur erat immemor);

- in the biography of the emperor Titus, Suetonius’s remark that “in his reign certain chance and baleful events occurred” (Titus 8.3 quaedam sub eo fortuita ac tristia acciderunt) becomes, in §, “in his reign certain sudden and baleful events occurred” (quaedam sub eo subita ac tristia acciderunt), and when that remark is adopted by the monk in his own work, he writes, “in his reign quite a number of sudden and baleful events occurred” (plura sub eo subita et tristia acciderunt).

Not only does §’s text of Suetonius contain in each case a unique error that reappears in the monk’s work, but in the second example the change of sense that the error involves reduces the likelihood of coincidence to roughly zero. It looks to me, in fact, very much like the textual equivalent of a smoking gun.

Nor is that all. We have seen that the text of § contained not just an extraordinary number of acute corrections, in cases of certain error, but a much larger number of places where the text was altered in a way that strikes a modern eye as willful: A small but representative sampling of these changes is gathered in Appendix 2. The point relevant here is this: The sorts of changes collected in this appendix very closely resemble the sorts of changes that appear in the text of Alcuin’s letters when the monk quotes them in his magnum opus, where (as Rodney Thomson has shown) he “attempt[ed] to achieve three goals: increased conformity to the [stylistic] ideal of his own time ..., a closer approximation to classical canons as he understood them, and greater clarity and simplicity.” Furthermore, Ermanno Malaspina has also shown that the very same patterns of alteration appear in two fifteenth-century manuscripts of Cicero’s Lucullus (Saint-Omer Bibliothèque municipale 652 and Cambridge University Library Dd.XIII.2), textual “twins” that – a subscription expressly tells us – descend from a copy annotated by the same monk. In other words, whether reading and correcting a text like the Caesars or quoting a text for inclusion in his own writings, our Benedictine unmistakably displayed the same sensibility and the same habits.

To sum up: Since the Bodleian manuscript (C), one of §’s offspring, descends from a complex manuscript produced for and annotated by a learned Benedictine monk in the first quarter of the twelfth century, it seems highly likely that the two of them crossed when the textually maddeningly manifested in that same Regum Anglorum, the greatest habitually regarded as a certain thing.

Appendix 2

Cambridge, University Library
Durham, Cathedral Library
Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Bibliothèque Laurenziana
London, British Library
Montpellier, Bibliothèque de l’Université
Oxford, Bodleian Library
Paris, Bibliothèques de la Sorbonne
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne
San Marino, Huntington Library
Soissons, Bibliothèque municipale
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek

On the Bodleian manuscript, changes made above, it is
The two pages, and 4.321, 4.321
Malaspina
likely that $s$ itself was that manuscript, or was copied from it; furthermore, two of the singular alterations that stood in $s$'s text of Suetonius reappear when the monk adopts the relevant passages in his own great work; finally, the textual changes that appear by the hundreds in $s$'s text of Suetonius strikingly match the sorts of changes reflected both in the text of Alcuin quoted in that same work and in the text of Cicero annotated and corrected by the same monk. The work in question is the *Deeds of the English Kings* (*Gesta Regum Anglorum*); the Benedictine monk was William of Malmesbury, the greatest historian of medieval England after Bede and the person generally regarded as the most learned man in the Europe of his day. It now seems certain that he was also Suetonius's greatest and wildest reader.\(^5\)

### Appendix 1: Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Kk.5.24 (s. XII/2)</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, Cathedral Library, C.III.18 (s. XIex.)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 64.8 (s. XII/2)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 66.39 (s. XIImed.)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 68.7 (s. XII/2)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 15 C. iii (s. XIIin.)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Royal 15 C. iv (s. XIII)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier, Faculté de médecine, 117 (s. XIImed.)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. class. d. 39 (s. XII3/4)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5801 (s. XI/XII)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 5802 (s. XIImed.)</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 6115 (s. IX/2)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 6116 (s. XIImed.)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino (CA), Huntington Library, HM 45717 (s. XIIex.)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soissons, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 (s. XIII)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 833 (s. XII/2)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Lat. 1904 (s. XII/2)</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek, 4573 (s. XII/2)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) On the Bodleian manuscript and William's sources: Thomson 2003, pp. 138–50; on the changes made in the quotations of Alcuin: Thomson 2003, p. 162; with reference to n. 27 above, it is worth remarking that William did know the works of Caesar: Thomson 2003, p. 57. The two passages cited for William's use of Suetonius are *Deeds of the English Kings* 4.389.8 and 4.321, respectively. On William's copy of the *Lucullus* and the manuscripts derived from it: Malaspina forthcoming.
Appendix 2: William at Work

I gather here a very small sampling of some of the more aggressive interventions made by the reader called "Impiger" in the body of this chapter, who now appears to have been William of Malmesbury. The examples are organized according to the categories noted in the discussion on pages 127–28; in each case the correct archetypal reading stands to the left of the square bracket:

• Adjectival information with a merely attributive meaning is made to follow the noun it modifies (selections from the Life of Julius Caesar only): \textit{Iul.} 7.2 terrarum orbis\textit{[} orbis terrarum, 30.5 tertio libro\textit{]} libro iii\textit{[}, 42.3 dimidia parte\textit{[} parte dimidia, 58.2 obvoluto capite\textit{]} capite obvoluto, 63 rostratis navibus\textit{[} navibus rostratis, 68.3 Pompeii legiones\textit{]} legiones Pompeii;

• adverbial information is made to precede the word or phrase it modifies (selections, again, from the Life of Caesar only): \textit{Iul.} 4.1 clarissimo tunc\textit{[} tunc clarissimo, 19.2 displicuisset ulli e tribus\textit{[} ulli e tribus displicuisset, 22.2 paucos post dies\textit{[} post paucos dies, 41.3 instituit quotannis in locum\textit{]} quotannis in locum instituit, 64 eruptione hostium subita conspulsus in scapham\textit{[} eruptione subita hostium in scapham conspulsus, 71 apud se diu\textit{[} diu apud se, 81.1 conscripta litteris verbisque Graecis\textit{]} litteris Graecis verbisque conscripta, 87 mandasse quaedam de funere suo\textit{] de funere suo quaedam mandasse;\textsuperscript{37}

• words that "go together" are made to stand together, and instances of hyperbaton are eliminated: \textit{Iul.} 24.3 plurium quam quisquam unquam dierum\textit{[} plurium dierum quam quisquam unquam, \textit{Cal.} 26.1 quo propinquos amicosque pacto tractaverit\textit{] quo pacto propinquos amicosque tractaverit, \textit{Claud.} 44.3 statim hausto veneno obmutuisse\textit{[} hausto veneno statim obmutuisse, \textit{Nero} 5.1 siquidem comes ad Orientem C. Caesaris iuvenis\textit{]} siquidem delegatus comes C. Caesaris ad orientem, \textit{Otho} 6.3 obvio quoque non aliter ac si conscious et particeps foret adhaerente\textit{[} obvio quoque non aliter adhaerente ac si conscious et particeps foret;

• changes that can only strike the modern eye as willful tampering (I cite just one example from each Life; the list could be multiplied thirtyfold, and more):

\textit{Iul.} 19.2 opera ab optimatibus data est\textit{[} Optimates operam dederunt, \textit{Aug.} 33.1 reum ne culleo\textit{[} reum sed negantem et orantem ne culleo (the

\textsuperscript{37} In both of these categories, contrary alterations are found, but far less frequently: e.g., \textit{Iul.} 35.2 genere hostium\textit{[} hostium genere, 43.2 praecepue sumptuarum\textit{]} sumptuarium praecepue, 72 amicos \textit{facilitate indulgentiaque tractavit}\textit{[} amicos \textit{facilitate tractavit indulgentiaque.}
result of taking reum here to mean “guilty culprit” rather than “defendant”), Tib. 17.1 periti, nemine dubitante] deletus est. nec dubium erat, Cal. 29.2 numerum puniendorum ex custodia subscribens] ex numero puniendorum subscriben, Claud. 10.2 ad genua sibi accidentem] sibi ad genua cadere conantem, Nero 9 signum excubanti tribuno dedit] tribuno excubanti signum petenti dedit, Galb. 8.2 in Cantaberiae lacum fulmen decidit] in Cantaberiae partibus fulmen in lacum decidit, Otho 7.1 dein vergente iam die] deinde iam vergente vespere, Vit. 15.2 pro foribus] pro gradibus, Vesp. 13 appellare] nominare, Tit. 5.2 propugnatores] propugnatores adversi agminis, Dom. 8.3 more veteri] more maiorum.
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