Did Suetonius Write in Greek?\(^{1}\)

by D. Wardle

(University of Cape Town)

It is an axiom of modern Suetonian scholarship that C. Suetonius Tranquillus wrote works in both Latin and Greek, but how safe a conclusion is this to be drawn from the meagre extant fragments of the works supposedly written in Greek?\(^{2}\) I shall argue that the evidence of the ancient authors who refer to Suetonius’ works which are extant in fragmentary form only permits the conclusion that one work, on Greek insults, was probably written in Greek. Furthermore, given that the work appears to have been little more than a patchwork of quotations from earlier authors with at most brief connecting passages, Suetonius probably did not use Greek extensively.

There can be no question as to Suetonius’ familiarity with Greek, since he can quote intelligently and accurately from Greek in most of his works;\(^{3}\) most conspicuous is his use of Homer in the *De Vita Caesarum*. While any educated Roman might be expected to have familiarity with Homer, Suetonius’ use suggests more.\(^{4}\) Yet the ability to write Greek fluently, so as to satisfy an audience whose literary standards were very high, is something different from understanding others’ written Greek and being able to quote accurately and intelligently. Two lines of argument have been followed to demonstrate that Suetonius could have written and did write literary works in Greek.

The use of Greek in Suetonius’ secretarial career

Firstly, scholars look to Suetonius’ career in the imperial civil service: in short, for a successful exercise of his posts he must have been able to communicate in Greek. With his final post of *ab epistulis* the question of Suetonius’ ability to write Greek becomes central.\(^{5}\) While the emperor himself played a major role in reading correspondence and writing or dictating his responses, because the citizens of the eastern empire placed great weight on a polished literary style such as the average emperor did not possess, specialists with rhetorical skill were employed to cast the emperors’ decisions into excellent Greek.\(^{6}\) Certainly for the period when Suetonius was *ab epistulis*, that is before A.D. 122, there was no formal division between the languages in the imperial chancery. Moreover his title, as preserved by the Hippo inscription, indicates no division.\(^{7}\) Therefore he was at least notionally responsible for the composition of Greek letters. We do not know,
however, whether he composed the letters himself. Although bilingual education was prized in North Africa, and Suetonius may have enjoyed such an education, his background is different from that of other known ab epistululis Graecis and their equivalents. It is not irrelevant that the reign of Hadrian, that most Hellenophile of emperors, later saw a formal division of responsibilities between the languages (albeit only temporary): he realised that a born Latin speaker could not meet the stylistic standards expected by the communities of the East. Although that is no guide to Suetonius' performance of his task, it may indicate the difficulty of it.

Greek and Suetonius' literary works

The second and major line of argument is based on the existing fragments of Suetonius' works. The whole question of the fragmentary and lost works, particularly in connection with the idea that a collection appeared under the title Pratum has been considered most recently by P.L. Schmidt. While I shall concentrate on two of Suetonius' lost works, it is helpful to set out the evidence for most of them in order to illustrate the problems faced in reconstructing their contents. In the soundest collection of the fragmentary works, Roth lists sixteen titles. Of these seven are known in a Greek form only, five in Latin only, and four in both languages, and the lateness and nature of many of the sources casts some doubt on the exactness of the titles. The general consensus is that two works were written in Greek, Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ἑλλησίᾳ παιδίων and Περὶ δυσφήμων λέξεων ἢτοι βλασφημών καὶ τὸθεν ἐξάστη, but Schmidt now considers the possibility that Περὶ τῆς Κικέρωνος πολιτείας and Περὶ ἐπισήμων πορνῶν also appeared in Greek.

Before examining the arguments relating to the first of these, I will set out the evidence for the titles of the various books on games. The Suda lists two works: one book on Greek games with the title Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ἑλλησίᾳ παιδίων, two books on Roman games, Περὶ τῶν παρὰ Ἄρωματος θεώρων καὶ ἀγώνων; Aulus Gellius mentions a Ludicra Historia consisting of at least one book, and Servius mentions a book De puerorum lusibus. The respective identities of these works is crucial.

Fragments of Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ἑλλησίᾳ παιδίων exist in Greek, preserved by Johannes Tzetzes, a Byzantine polymath of the twelfth century A.D., and by Eustathius, who taught rhetoric in the Patriarchal School in Byzantium in the twelfth century, in his commentary on Homer's Odyssey 1.107. The former gives a brief comparison of three varieties of dicing, ἐωλοκρασία, κότταβος and λατάγη; the latter a longer exposition of the differences between κύβοι and πεσσοί, replete with verbatim quotations from several Greek poets. About five years after Roth's edition had been published, Emmanuel Miller discovered a Greek manuscript in a monastery on Mount Athos with Suetonius' name (for Περὶ βλασφημῶν at least) and the titles. This has been taken as containing our first direct testimonia of the works.
and forms the basis of Taillardat’s edition. However a major qualification has to be applied to this statement, as Taillardat admits, in that the manuscript offers only a mutilated, fragmentary, medieval abridgement of Suetonius’ actual works. We must consider whether this has been taken into account sufficiently by those who argue that Suetonius wrote both works in Greek.

Again two arguments are employed to suggest that Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησι παιδίων was written in Greek. The first is essentially negative—that the work was not part of the Ludicra Historia which was undoubtedly written in Latin, as the title preserved by Aulus Gellius suggests. This argument depends primarily on the testimony of the Suda which lists Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησι παιδίων and Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ρωμαίων θεώρων καὶ ἀγώνων separately, as works with one and two books respectively. Taillardat soundly rejects the thesis of Reifferscheid that the Ludicra Historia was a four volume work, two volumes on Greek and Roman spectacula and lusus respectively, the pleasant symmetry of which depends on a supplementing of the Suda’s text, Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησι παιδίων (καὶ ἀγώνων βιβλία β’), and the emendation of the Suda’s ἀγώνων into παιδίων and of Servius’ ‘puerorum’ into ‘Romanorum’. The Suda, then, attests three books on games in two works. Were they part of the work described by Aulus Gellius as Ludicra Historia or was the volume on Greek games separate? Wallace-Hadrill appears to accept one work written in both languages, whereas Taillardat prefers two separate works. The exact words of Aulus Gellius are crucial to the argument:

sed de fidibus rarius dictu et mirabilius est; quam rem et alii docti viri et Suetonius etiam Tranquillus in libro ludicrae historiae primo satis compertam esse ...

If Gellius were referring here to the first book of a two volume work, he should strictly have used prior rather than primus, and so at first sight his words suggest a minimum of three books in the Ludicra Historia. Taillardat, however, argues that the original text of Gellius read ‘in libro Ludicrae Historiae Π’ and that the numeral was incorrectly written out as ‘primo’. Although this error is simple to understand, Taillardat is doing precisely what he criticised Reifferscheid for, namely emending unobjectionable texts to fit an a priori notion. If Gellius wrote primus loosely, his Ludicra Historia could be identified straightforwardly with the Suda’s Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ρωμαίων θεώρων. The accuracy of Gellius’ citations requires examination. In the twenty extant books of the Noctes Atticae Gellius cites prose authors approximately four hundred times, in most instances giving an indication of the work quoted and the book number where appropriate. Because many of the works he cites are lost or exist only in fragments
most of the citations cannot be checked. Of the one hundred and six references that can be checked only five are incorrect. His references to the first book of two volume works are consistent in the use of primus where strictly we would expect prior. Unless we extend Taillardat’s argument, Gellius’ testimony cannot help determine how many books comprised the Ludicra historia, nor, then, whether it contained what the Suda calls Περὶ τῶν παρὰ Ὀμυδαίοις θεώριον και ἀγώνων or whether it was the title of a collection of all Suetonius’ works on games, including also Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι παιδίων.

The identity and nature of the De puerorum lusibus quoted by Servius is central to the puzzle. In what language was it written and can it be identified with Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι παιδίων? In his commentary on Virgil’s description of the funeral games for Anchises, in particular on the parade of the Trojan youth which continued up to the poet’s own day

Troiaque nunc, pueri Troianorum dicitur agmen.
Hac celebrata tenus sancto certamina patri.

Servius writes ‘ut ait Suetonius Tranquillus, lusus ipse, quem vulgo PYRRHICAM appellant, TROIA vocatur. Cuius originem expressit in libro de puerorum lusibus’. For Taillardat ‘en ce cas Servius fait simplement allusion au Περὶ τῶν παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι παιδίων’, which he holds was written in Greek, but does this do justice to Servius’ practice in citing his sources and to the kind of sources he quotes?

Servius’ reader encounters a wide range of types of citation, from author, title and book to the plain ‘x dicit’ or its equivalent. In general Servius’ citations of Suetonius’ works preserve a relatively full formula from which the title of the original can be reconstructed. Further, on the analogy of other instances where Servius uses the expression liber de … or liber followed by a genitive for works the titles of which we know from other sources, it would appear that the title of Suetonius’ work was De lusibus puerorum or De puerorum lusibus.

For Taillardat and the rest, Suetonius’ work was written in Greek. Does the range of Greek sources Servius cites suggest that he would have consulted a Greek work of scholarship on the ancestry of a Roman game? Servius cites many Greek authors, principally the classical giants—Homer, Hesiod and Euripides—but also some of the Alexandrian poets, Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus and Euphorion. Other famous authors may have been known only at second hand: for example, Anaxagoras’ doctrines via Lucretius. There is no evidence that he used Greek scholarly literature as opposed to literary works.

Although Servius cites the titles of Greek works very seldom, when he does so he cites them in Greek: ‘Hesiodus etiam περὶ γυναικῶν inducit mul-
tas heroidas' and 'exponit τὸ αὐτῷν: Callimachus scripsit αὐτῷ, in quibus etiam hoc commemorat'.

The largest proportion of Servius' citations for matters other than vocabulary and usage concerns historical or antiquarian/scholarly works written in Latin, most notably Varro, Cato the Elder, Pliny the Elder and Hyginus. Suetoniou's other works cited by Servius fit precisely into these categories, and so De puerorum lusibus should be allowed to take its place among them. Brugnoli has argued that the use of 'vulgo' in connection with 'Pyrrhicham' rather than some periphrasis like ut Graeci aiumt in Servius' quotation suggests a work written in Greek, but Suetonius uses the transliteration 'Pyrrhicha' without interpretation also in the imperial Lives and he was preceded by Pliny the Elder. That there was no need for interpretation suggests that the term was commonly understood, and the result of this argumentation suggests that Suetonius' De puerorum lusibus was written in Latin and that, because Servius does not cite it as, for example, De ludicra historia, it was a separate work.

Can De puerorum lusibus, which was written in Latin, be identified with Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἐλλησί παιδιῶν? There is nothing in the title given by the Suda or any of the Greek testimonia, nor in the known content, which suggests a limitation of Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἐλλησί παιδιῶν to children's games. From its discussion of the lusus Troiae, De puerorum lusibus probably described both Greek and Roman children's games, but Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἐλλησί παιδιῶν from its title would be restricted to Greek games. Beyond this we must consider whether the extant fragments of Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἐλλησί παιδιῶν either preclude that it was written in Latin or suggest that it was written in Greek. On the basis of the citations in Eustathius and Tzetzes and of the text of the codices Taillardat has prepared a possible reconstruction of its contents, labelling the two sources of information indirect and direct respectively. We must test any hypothesis on the language of the original, above all on the so-called direct source. Taillardat's reconstructed text occupies some ten pages of his edition, but the fragments of M, L and P, his direct tradition, represent little more than one tenth of the total.

Some of the Greek fragments are too brief to be of any help in deciding whether the original was written in Latin, for example Ψίττα ἄγα παρ' Κυνδαλός: ὁ πάσσαλος. All they would require is equivalent Latin words for the games described or, better, that the key word remained in Greek and was glossed in Latin. The largest extract concerns πασσαλός and contains a quotation of some fifty words in oratio recta from Plato's Phaedrus. Such quotations need not preclude a work principally in Latin—Suetonius' Lives abound in quotations of Greek verse, and Aulus Gellius several times presents extended extracts of Greek prose. Moreover some passages in the Lives are larded with Greek technical terms transliterated into Latin, most notably the descriptions of Nero's artistic
endeavours. One line of objection to having a Latin text with sizeable Greek quotations might be that the proportion of Greek to Latin required to make the games intelligible to the Roman reader was too high and that the work would not qualify as Kunstprosa. However, none of Suetonius’ works employs the high style, as the inclusion of Greek and the verbatim citation of documents show; rather he writes as the ancient scholar. The fuller account of Eustathius preserves a series of quotations from Greek poets and prose writers with interlinking narrative, in which the narrative still predominates by a large element. If these proportions were observed in the Suetonian work, it could conceivably have been written in Latin. Moreover, although the explanatory narrative contains technical Greek terms for the various kinds of dicing, it is far from impossible that the original was written in Latin, as Latin also has a rich, technical vocabulary for dicing.

Internal evidence cannot determine whether Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησ. παιδιῶν was written in Greek and was not identical with De puerorum lusibus, but the suspicion exists that scholars have hitherto operated with too strict an economy in seeking to make the Suda, Aulus Gellius and Servius refer to the same work. As none of the lists of Suetonius’ work is complete, such economy may be unnecessary. De puerorum lusibus was written in Latin, and it is probably not to be identified with either of the Suda’s works on games.

Περὶ δυσφήμων λέξεων ἦτοι βλασφημημάων καὶ πόθεν ἐκάστη

The second work of Suetonius generally considered to have been written in Greek, Περὶ δυσφήμων λέξεων ἦτοι βλασφημημάων καὶ πόθεν ἐκάστη, poses greater problems, both because the earliest testimonies to its existence are found in a Greek etymological work dating from the ninth century and in the Suda from the tenth century, and because the size of Suetonius’ academic contribution is disputed. Because of the first point there can be no arguments from any extant Latin, even of the title alone, as to the language of the original. We depend on the relatively extensive fragments discovered by Emmanuel Miller which, when combined with augmentation from Eustathius, occupy sixteen pages of Taillardat’s edition. As with Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλησ. παιδιῶν, Miller’s fragments are a Byzantine abridgement of Suetonius’ work. That the original had a structure is clear from the survival of fourteen chapter headings, but what proportion this was of the original work cannot be recovered and whether there were clear principles of organisation within chapters is uncertain. For Taillardat, Suetonius has merely compiled Περὶ βλασφημημάων from the works of previous scholars, notably that of Didymus Chalcenterus via Pamphilus of Alexandria who wrote a twenty-four volume work entitled Περὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ὄνοματων. If the fact of twenty-four books can suggest that each of Pamphilus’ books
contained words beginning with a different letter of the alphabet, Suetonius' role will have been restricted to a selection of βλασφημίαι and to organising his material by topic in the chapters.

Because Pamphilus' work was written in Greek and because the subject matter of Suetonius' Περί βλασφημίων, as it has been preserved, was Greek insults, Taillardat argues that Suetonius must have written it in Greek. Certainly the case appears strong: although the work was more than a dictionary and illustrated the origin of each word, it would by its nature, and in contrast to Περί τῶν παρ' Ἃλλησι παιδίων, have required little comment to link the illustrative quotations. The work of Nonius Marcellus, in which the author's contribution is little more than glossing the word he is discussing and introducing the quotations which support the definition, would seem a better parallel for the form than Aulus Gellius. We need to ask, however, whether the scope of Περί βλασφημίων extended to Latin insults. Because the direct and indirect traditions are purely Greek, Taillardat assumes not, but this may be an accident of transmission. The weightiest evidence may come from the opening words of Περί βλασφημίων 'Τῶν τῶν βλασφημίων τρόπων κατέθεσε μὲν ἀρχὴθεν ὁ Ομήρος καὶ οἱ συνεγγύς τῷ χρόνῳ ποιηταὶ, ἐπισύνεσιν δὲ ὅστερον καὶ τιμίατο τοι καὶ ὑπεροχεῖς', which on the most obvious interpretation relate to Greek literature only.46 Περί βλασφημίων, then, was probably restricted to Greek subject matter and written in Greek.

Given these assumptions we have a Roman scholar writing on Greek insults in Greek, aiming to reach a Greek audience with little more than an abbreviation or reorganisation of Pamphilus' Greek work. One must question whether this scenario is plausible, at least when compared to the alternative of a Roman scholar abridging a work on Greek insults for a Roman audience. But any scenario must account for the survival of the work in Byzantium and its repeated use over three hundred years. The two standard manuals on Greek literature stress that Greek translations of pagan Latin works were rare—early examples were of Virgil, Sallust and Eutropius.47 In the late thirteenth century, however, Maximus Planudes was responsible for the translation of works by Cato, Ovid, Cicero Macrobius and Caesar.48 Apart from the Rhetorica ad Herennium none of these works was either technical or scholarly in the fashion of Suetonius. This suggests that a Greek translation of Suetonius' work is unlikely, and if there was one it must predate the ninth century Etymologicum Magnum and the renewed interest in translation. However, given the probable format of the Περί βλασφημίων, with its similarity to Nonius, the notion of translation is perhaps unnecessary: the Byzantine scholar could have utilised Suetonius' Greek lemmata and their supporting Greek quotations without difficulty. Their failure to use Pamphilus, Suetonius' putative major source, can be explained either by the failure of his work to survive or rather to the greater convenience of Suetonius' abridgement or reorganisa-
tion of the earlier work. The arguments are necessarily inconclusive, but nothing precludes Suetonius’ having written Περὶ βλασφημίων wholly in Greek or Byzantine scholars’ being able to use a work in Latin which of necessity contained much Greek.

Schmidt considers whether there was a Greek Fassung of some of Suetonius’ works. Fassung of course conceals whether Suetonius himself wrote the works first in Latin and then translated them himself or whether someone else did the translation later. Schmidt’s argument in essence is that citation of some works on themes of interest to Greeks survive only in Greek sources, and that they were thus probably written in Greek to meet that audience. As the evidence of the citations themselves does not help,49 argument must centre on the ability of individual Byzantine authors to cope with Latin. A case by case approach is necessary.

Our knowledge of Suetonius’ Περὶ ἐπιστήμων πορνῶν comes only from Johannes Lydus’ De Magistratibus where it is cited for a detail on dress. Hercules had once been draped by the prostitute Omphale with a diaphanous garment called a sandyx, on account of which Hercules was named Σανναδών.50 Johannes gives his sources as Ἀπολλείτος ὁ Ρωμαῖος φιλόσοφος ἐν τῷ ἔπιγραφομένῳ Ἐρωτικῷ καὶ Τραγκυλλὸς δὲ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ περὶ ἐπιστήμων πορνῶν. Schanz suggested that Apuleius translated Suetonius, but for our argument here the fact cannot be avoided that Johannes has cited from a Latin work written after Suetonius’. Although Johannes’ knowledge of Latin has been questioned because of the errors he makes, the most recent scholarship credits him with fluency.51 As far as Suetonius is concerned the case for direct use would seem strong, as there is a close correspondence between the subject matter of Johannes’ works and Suetonius’52. Roth’s collection of the fragments of Suetonius’ works features Johannes more than any other Byzantine author: he tells us that the Caesares were dedicated to Septicius Clarus,53 provides material from the missing first quaternion on Caesar’s birth,54 and shows knowledge of Divus Augustus 40.55 The reference to τὸ τῶν ἔργων σφρίνων56 may be to Divus Augustus or, as Roth suggests, to De Institutione Officiorum. In either case the work was in Latin.57 Johannes Lydus’ reading of Latin at first hand should not be doubted, and so his citations of Suetonius should not be used to argue that any of the works were written in Greek.

The case of John Malalas is more difficult to assess, certainly as far as Suetonius is concerned. He cites Suetonius for the detail that Numa forbade access to the palace for those who did not wear a χλαμύς, καθὼς ὁ σοφότατος Σουητήνιος Τράγκυλλος ὁ Ρωμαῖος ἱστοριογράφος συνεγράφατο.58 Roth and Reifferscheid reasonably derive this reference from De genere vestium. More widely it has been argued that Malalas was familiar with Servius’ commentary on Virgil,50 so knowledge of scholarly works such as those of Suetonius is not improbable.
Conclusion

I have argued that Suetonius’ *De puerorum lusibus*, which should probably be distinguished from Περὶ τῶν παιδῶν, *’Ελληνικα παιδῶν, was written in Latin and have concurred with Taillardat that Περὶ βλασφήμων was probably written in Greek, but with a minimal individual contribution by Suetonius. The evidence that other works were written in Greek by Suetonius is inconclusive—the Byzantine authors who cite them seem to have possessed the necessary competence in Latin to have used the original. There is no evidence for a later translation of (some of) Suetonius’ works into Greek, nor of similar works of Latin scholarship.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank Mrs M.T. Griffin, Dr. M.R. Mezzabotta and Prof. J.E. Atkinson, who have read this article in draft and improved it by their suggestions. The comments of the referees were also valuable.

2. C.L. Roth, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig 1858, lxxiv., was the first modern scholar to raise the possibility of Suetonius’ writing in Greek. The fundamental volume by A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone*, Paris 1900, 269f, ‘fort probable’; Funaioli, *RE* 4A, 625f; and of the recent works flowing from a revival of interest in Suetonius, A.F. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius: the Scholar and his Caesars*, London 1983, in passing, 20, and in discussion of the fragments (41f). The most detailed arguments, which this article attempts to evaluate, are found in J. Taillardat, Περὶ βλασφήμων, Περὶ Παιδῶν, *extraits Byzantins*, Paris 1967, 2f. The works cited in this note are referred to subsequently by the author’s name only.

3. For *De Vita Caesarum* and *De Illustribus Viris*, see most conveniently for all quotations of more than one word, A.A. Howard/C.N. Jackson, *Index verborum C. Suetonii Tranquilli*, Cambridge Mass. 1922, 271f.


7. A temporary division of responsibilities occurred late in Hadrian’s reign (see G.B. Townend, *Historia* 10 [1961] 375f): Suetonius, L. Julius Vestinus (*OGIS* 679) and C. Avidius Heliodorus (*PIR*² A 1405) all appear in epigraphic records as *ab epistulis*; Eudaemon was the first known Hadriacan *ab epistulis Graecis* (*CIL* 3.431), and his appointment may have been specially occasioned by Hadrian’s lengthy Eastern peregrination in 128. Permanent division of responsibilities dates from A.D. 166.


9. E.g. Nero’s Chaeremon or the later Dionysius of Alexandria (*Suda* 1173 s.v. Διονυσίους), or L. Julius Vestinus. In the third century A.D. Greek sophists such as Aelius Antipater were regular. See Millar (above, n. 6), 86f.

10. ‘Suetons Pratum seit Wessner (1917)’, *ANRW* 2.3.5, Berlin 1991, 3794–3825.

12. This table presupposes my later conclusion that Περὶ τῶν παρ "Ελληνικά παιδίων is not identical with De pueros lusibis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (given in Latin where known)</th>
<th>Greek Source</th>
<th>Latin Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ludicra Historia</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td>Aulus Gellius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν παρ &quot;Ελληνικά παιδίων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἡρωιδίου ἑναυτοῦ</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις σημείων</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῆς Κυκέρωνος πολιτείας</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De genere vestium</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td>Servius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ δισερήμων λέξεων ἣτοι βλασφημῶν καὶ πόθεν ἐκάστη</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ Ὀμής καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῆς νομίμων καὶ ἐκαθό</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vita Caesarum</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De viris illustribus</td>
<td>Suda</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ ἑπιστήμων πορών</td>
<td>Johannes Lydus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vitis corporalibus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Servius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De institutione officiorum</td>
<td>Priscian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Regibus</td>
<td>Ausonius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De rebus variis</td>
<td>Julius Romanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratum (a)</td>
<td>Isidore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


15. Taillardat, 4f.

16. Taillardat, 27f. Gellius uses two main formulae when citing the title of works: liber followed either by a genitive (e.g. 6.18.11—'in libro exemplorum' or by de (e.g. 1.24.3—'in libro de poetis'). In this instance the genitive Ludicrae Historiae may indicate that the original title was Ludicra Historia rather than de ludicra historia.


18. 41, 47; Taillardat, 30f.


20. 30f, following P.J. Meier, De gladiatura Romana quaestiones selectae, Bonn 1881, 7.

21. There are four errors concerning the citation of book numbers—1.2.6: ‘disserationum Epicteti digestorum ab Arriano primum librum’ should refer to the second book (2.19); 1.22.8: ‘in libro De Republica secundo’ to book 3 (3.32); 10.21.2: ‘Varro- nis ex libro De Lingua Latina ... sexto’ to book 7 (7.59); and 12.7.8: ‘in libro Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium nono’ to book 8 (8.1. Amb.
2). There appears to be one error concerning the work quoted—13.19.2: ‘Plato in Theataetos' should refer to the Theages (125B).

22. At 4.11.3 and 15.13.7 he refers to the primus liber of Cicero’s De Divinatione and at 1.10.4 and 19.8.3 to Julius Caesar’s De Analoga ad M. Tullium Ciceronem. Suetonius (Jul. 56.5) and Fronto (1.29[Haines]) attest that this latter work comprised two books. In fact it seems that Cicero (Brutus 252) and Macrobius (Sat. 1.5.2) could be as lax as Gellius in using primus for prior.

23. Aeneid 5.602–3; Servius, Comm. in Aen, ad loc: text as cited by Taillardat, 28.

24. None of the examples cited below is taken from the augmented text of Servius lest that misrepresent the breadth of his learning. (It would not appear to do so). All examples come from Servius’ Commentary on Virgil’s Aeneid (text edited by G. Thilo and H. Hagen, Leipzig 1881). (i) Citation by author, title and book number (complete references): ‘de qua re etiam Varro in primo divinarum plenissime tractavit’ (6.708), and ‘quod dicit Cicero in primo rhetoricorum’ (8.321). (ii) citation by author and work (passim): ‘in naturali historia Plinii (1.174 etc.), ‘Cicero in libris de natura deorum’ (1.297 cf. 4.379), ‘quod etiam Varro docet in libris quos de familiis Trojanis scripsit’ (5.704), ‘Cato in originibus’ (5.564). (iii) Direct quotation by author alone (passim): ‘Varro dicit’ (1.531 etc.), ‘sicut ait Suetonius (8.680; cf. 12.185). (iv) ‘secundum x’ etc: ‘Aristotellem’ (1.372), Hyginum (3.553).

25. ‘ut ait Suetonius Tranquillus ... in libro de puerorum lusibus’ (5.602) ‘nam et Suetonius ait in Vita Caesarum’ (6.798), ‘Suetonius in libro de genere vestium dicit’ (7.612), ‘secundum Suetonium in libro de vitis corporalibus’ (7.627). Less specific are ‘sicut ait Suetonius’ (8.680) which is a reference to the information in Divus Augustus 79 that the emperor was delighted if anyone looked down rather than into his eyes, but without direct quotation and with mention of a particular eques who finds no place in the Life, and ‘sic Suetonius’ (12.185) on the use of words: ‘homo “rebellis” dicitur, res ipsa “rebellio”, non “rebellatio” ’. The source of this last is obscure, although Roth (304.) attributes it to De variis rebus and Reifferscheid (148) to Prata.


28. 4.625; cf. Heraclitus, 6.265. Cf. the very general references to Plato (6.434, 444) and Aristotle (1.372).

29. 7.268 (On the variety of titles for this, see M.L. West, The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women, Oxford 1985, 1), 778. The reference to Plato’s Symposium at 6.444 and Hesiod’s Theogonia at 8.314 are the only counter-examples. The former because of its general nature is not a specific quotation; moreover both symposium and theogonia were loan words used in Latin from Cicero onwards.


32. H.N. 7.204, 8.5—pyrrhiche; Iul. 39.1, Ner. 12.1—pyrrhicha.

33. The evidence of Pseudo-Acron, scholia on Horace’s Ars Poetica 417, ‘scabies ludus puerorum est, ut habes in Suetonio Tranquillo’, adds nothing to this question. Acron’s citations are far less precise than Servius’, he does not give the titles of works and can refer to Suetonius by his cognomen alone (ad Ars. P. 354) or by both nomen and cognomen.

P. Schmidt (n.10, above, 3811) has recently adduced a further argument for De puerorum lusibus being written in Latin. He argues that Isidore of Seville in his encyclopaedic work Etymologiae (or Origines) drew on Suetonius’ works as a ‘Strukturmodell und partielle Materialquelle’; and, as in Book 18 his brief descriptions of children’s games follow directly from those of the various public ludi without any indication that he is using a Greek source, that section of Suetonius’ work was written in Latin. This approach has basic problems, firstly in that Schmidt recognises that Suetonius was not Isidore’s only, or even major source (3798); secondly Suetonius is not cited as the source of anything in Book 18 after chapter 6, on the derivation of sica; thirdly the excerpting and abbreviating methods of Isidore make it particularly dangerous to infer a source from proximity.

34. Taillardat, 41f.

35. The quotation is verbatim apart from changing Plato’s πετετας and κυβελας to the singular and omitting a και.


39. Best seen from Roth, 276f, where the verse quotations are separated (otherwise, Taillardat, 104f).


42. Etymologicum Magnum (Roth, 282); Suda s.v. Τράγανος (Adler 4: 581). Not even Reifferscheid (273) could unearth more fragments.


44. Cf. Taillardat, 3f. For suggestions of ordering by the date of the author quoted in one chapter, Taillardat, 4 n. 1.

45. 22f. Wallace-Hadrill (45 n. 23) poses the valid question of what there was for Suetonius to do if Pamphilus had already arranged the material by topic.

46. Taillardat’s failure to comment on the introduction to Περὶ βλασφημίων is remarkable, given that it comprises the only section of continuous prose in the work and, on Taillardat’s view, Suetonius’ only personal contribution. Moreover Suetonius sets out the four ways in which Homer (and other authors) employed the insults.


49. Because there are no fragments to aid discussion, the question of Περί τῆς Κυβέρνους πόλεως is particularly intractable. Suetonius responded to the criticism by a Didymus of Cicero’s *De Republica*. On the basis of Ammianus Marcellinus (22.16.16) Didymus is usually identified with the prolific Didymus Chalcenterus of the first century B.C., although von Christ (434) prefers a Claudius Didymus of the first century A.D. That Didymus’ work was in Greek has suggested a response by Suetonius in the same language (e.g. Schmidt, 3817).

50. 3.64.


52. As recognised by Macé, 418.


54. *Mens.* 4 p. 95 (Bonn).

55. *Mag.* 1.12. The slight confusion over the context, whether the incident occurred *pro contione* or in the Hippodrome, is not important, especially since the hippodrome took over from the *contio* as the major forum for the meeting of emperor and people.

56. *Mag.* 1.34.

57. The citation of *De Institutione Officiorum* by Priscian (*GL* 2. 231) for the philosophical point of the ancient use of *puerus/a puellus/a* shows that it was a Latin work.

58. P. 33f (Bonn).
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