

H I S T O I R E

Sous la direction de Guy LACHENAUD et Dominique LONGRÉE

Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire

Représentations, récits et idéologie

Volume I

les
PUR
Presses
Universitaires
Rennes

Textual level: Velleius Paterculus' exemplary style

Maria A. SANCHEZ-MANZANO

Approach to Velleius' work

Ever since the last five years, a first glance at the increased number of published papers and books (esp. for Velleius M. Elefante, Watt, Kober and Schmitzer) on the Silver Latinity is great news for all of us. So you wouldn't be probably so surprised if I try to claim for your attention on something that has been forgotten, the author's stylistic qualities.

Velleius Paterculus wasn't very popular among the scholars in the last two hundred years. There is no evidence of even a bit of interest for him among the ancient Romans since A. D. 30. The Historians had condemned him as a forger, an example of inexactitude and a flatterer of Tiberius. A. D. Leeman, p. 250, said: "I know no better example of the abominable Asianistic deviations of the New Style in its most corrupt form." G.V. Sumner criticizes most of his errors, but Hermann Sauppe was very hard before. The critics have told about his extremely barock style (although the literary taste changes so often). The surviving work isn't complete, and it lets us know nothing new but the tales of imperial court propaganda, much better explained by other writers, Greeks or Romans (Tacitus as the best). However, his commentaries about the epochs in Roman and Greek literature were always accepted (Alfonsi, Della Corte, Santini).

But this work lacks speeches. It may be a very significant sign, if one may observe the pragmatic perspective, as the true instrument in the

mass domain of communication: the gesture. The gesture is much more efficient than the speeches which low people cannot understand. Which epoch in the political development of Rome is it then? A new way of politics is being built, it's not the aristocracy but an oligocratic movement, as Aristotle would say. And the link between the ruler class and his people is no more loyalty, a virtue on the aristocratic valuable deserving. The problem of lost loyalty points directly to Tacitus *Annalium* report on army, the crisis of worthy virtues depicts the history of the first century. There is no loyalty, only money and threat. But Velleius tries a softly way, the amazing scene of the gesture.

If we look at the connected acts within a difference as to how central they are to the communicative goals of the language user, we probably discover the ideology that lays beyond. Quite rightly, the Belgian Humanist Justus Lipsius spread so much as he could the voice of Velleius, by his edition of 1607, and so long as the glory of the classical humanism was bright in the education till 1800, his name was not erased from the elenchus of the very much read Roman historians. Lipsius' *Politicorum libri duo* shows a closer ideology to Velleius and to Seneca's *De clementia*. In later times, Hellegouarc'h and Jodry, p. 816, have pointed out the worth of Velleius' contribution: "[sc. il] constitue un document presque unique pour l'histoire de la fin du règne d'Auguste et la première partie de celui de Tibère". And it reveals a concept of power, a bit paternalistic, the positive, fairy, picture of the Augustan regime.

And far from the historical considerations, we can really observe an effort of composition, a dramatically different use of the Roman language, just to express a gesture. Perhaps his aim was less the composition of a specific historical document than a plain literary exercitation. And if we pay attention to the scholars, who have searched about this topic, we shall probably find a way to a better understanding of the message.

One is tempted to assume that personal stylistic preferences may be at play, when somebody makes a commentary on the present author. However, there is also a difference of scope. Some details in the text have usually been examined as a means to undertake to study the outline of his style. The tendency is obviously a method to understand the evolution in Latin. The history of this language is moderated by the influences of Greek rhetoric and philosophy.

In fact, we have really learnt to accept most of the linguistic uses that seemed before as bad Latin. We can now read the classical authors within their political, social and cultural circumstances. About Velleius' lexicon,

a list of neologisms or new sense words and *iuncturae*, the extended list of nouns, mostly abstract nouns, and adverbs that Velleius collects, show a further level of literary acquaintance in view of Cicero's, Sallust's and Livy's register.

Main roles

It is necessary to begin by outlining the rhetorical feature of the text in order to see how can we consider the author's purposes, and the making of the work. Look at the following remarks:

a) The function of these stories as a faithful picture of the increasing political importance of Rome, of the success of Roman people. This rate has been reached as a result of a great amount of single, significant, contributions. So, the composed text takes on biographical information and consequently, Velleius' work exhibits traces of biographic genre.

b) The selection of the men who made a greater powerful state is a bit hard to explain. Firstly, Velleius highlights the members of the provincial administration and specially his own origins, the *ordo equester*, and the Latin, but not the Roman aristocracy. This is the social level that lays the building statements for the new political system in the imperial period. We can easily show that the main goal of the present work is to remember the glory of the heroes, just to pursue the political ambitions of this writer (in this way we can tell call it stile that aims at an official military employment); on the other hand, it is focussed on the men of the most well known Roman families. Their function in the progressing story is to support the expectatives of legitimacy at the imperial court in his times. However, the limitation of scholarly interest to the historical sources was an obstacle to being aware of rhetorical play.

c) The concise, short, feature of thematic topics, the fast sequences of times, nouns, lives, places. It's amazing that Valerius Maximus' work, with less strong links between the examples, was more successful than Velleius' one. It's true that the political tendencies of Velleius were evident, and Valerius' conservative ideas were acceptable in the imperial archaistic mythology of the ancient "severe" Roman Republic. Nevertheless, let us try to find a basic method to understand Velleius' art of writing. It's clear -we all know it- that the paragraphs were put down by the editors much later. But there are certain signs of distribution, apparently shown by the sequential register of personal examples. There are at least two main directions in the temporal line: the generational series, and the annalistic computation. The first outlines the men who are living during the same epoch; the second develops certain episodes, mostly of his own time. We pass over the chronological problems which

arise from the alternative absolute/relative computation, specially due to the rather bad textual transmission. There are also several topics which run under the main narrative surface: Roma *versus* Carthago, the *lex agraria*, the political rights for Latins and allies, so as the antithese *luxuria/seueritas morum*. Among these, the first and the last have their finish at Tibere's worship. Perhaps, we are allowed to admit that the way of access to Roman citizenship leads to a better social status for people like Velleius; and the emperor's family can provide it easier to him. The abstract concepts as fortuna (Cupaiuolo, F. 1984), and the ruler's virtues play their role too.

Let us also bear in mind the basic items from a literary point of view: five fold frame, biographical, *exempla* genre, historical, gnomic, from time to time panegyric. As already stated above, several materials are displaying a wide variety of functions. Each example is announced in advance, later presented, later goes to an end. The gnomic sentences are usually a means of closing the episode, but not always. There are also *gnomae* that bind an episode with another one. Some examples lead us to find other lives and examples. There will be found some instances for exemplary tradition, also compiled by Valerius Maximus. So the episode of Fuluius Flaccus' son in II, 7, 2-3, of L. Aemilius Paulus' children in I, 10, 4-6, also transmitted by Livius and Plutarchus, also about Scipio Africanus' death in II, 4, 5-6, and about C. Hostilio in II, 1, 4-5; but there are not so many as to draw the conclusion that Velleius read the same exemplary collection. The example by itself is in Velleius' work just a short, sharp, illustration of the moral qualities of the men. The regular constituents of the episodes call for a more systematic examination, as to their distribution and artistic exploitation in the structure of the text:

1-The allusion forward, the link set up with a further development of a topic in a specific unit that comes later. When a topic is shown for the first time, it is not fully elaborated, on the contrary, it is sown as a seed.

2-The short description of the man, which takes on the family antecedents, moral virtues or vices (Rossi 1976-77: *industria, ambizione, uirtus bellica, audacia, prodigalità*): as the hellenistic biography, principally the stoic scholarship, points up the social role of the citizens, less on ground of their personal worth, mostly by means of political and military results, every member of a family fulfilling the duty of avoiding any occasion that may lead to the decadence of those values. In so far as they consider these qualities as the genuine character of a family, its property, and consequently it should be reflected in the introduction of a man.

3-The example, which develops the information previously given, and sometimes lets the writer make an allusion to a new episode.

4-The death of this man, frequently filling in for an extension or duplication of the previous example. It is an optional component in the microstructure.

5-The writer's opinion about this man's *curriculum vitae*. We can scarcely find this evaluation as part of the initial information. Sometimes it is utterly missing.

6-A general *gnome* expressed by Velleius that is very little original or creative (II, 102 *semper magnae fortunae comes adest adulatio*); perhaps it wasn't his purpose, to be well known as *paromia*-sayer.

Textual shape

So we can start searching for the formal keys. As a matter of fact, the *ornatus*, the rhetorical figures with the frames quoted above, extend to a certain distribution of words in the sentence. Dangel, p. 8, pointed out that "l'ordre linguistique relève d'une *consuetudo* langagière; l'ordre stylistique ressortit aux particularismes et intentions d'un styliste." We can hardly test the *consuetudo litteraria*, nor the colloquial and sloppy style, and we probably prefer a better coherent style, that fulfils most of the syntactical sentence types, than the concision that Velleius selects.

It is within the realm of rhetoric in Roman society in the last times of the republic that we situate fluctuations of this kind: increasing use of participles and non-personal verb form clauses, parataxe, fewer binds of syntactic dependence. But the reduction of means of syntactic expression didn't prevail as an exclusive exponent of rhetorical play. On the contrary, this is the result of new resources: the possibilities of adjective and adverbs are multiplied, the synonymy, parallelism, and antitheses play the role that the utterance syntax plays in other texts, if a part grows on, the other diminishes. It is an exercise that should not be kept apart from ulterior developments in sentence shape during the imperial period. All these were gradual processes, some wavering is discernible in the first hundred years of our era.

Still some information is based upon the *nam/quippe* phrase, as in Cornelius Nepos' work. In fact, we are dealing with an artistic prose style, that depends on the rules of the *oratio numerosa*. We cannot find a clear cut *comma* inasmuch the clauses are often the same as at the end of the *cola*. Consequently, we may understand otherwise this structure, in which the episode is broken in small pieces, as an effort of rhetorical diction, a *circuitus* of reference. The reader would be rather surprised, because this movement is unexpectedly fast and shortly formulated. The narrative economy can just provide a short episode by cutting the circumstances off, but it cannot be so significant without all of them; so

the writer uses to apply *quippe* or *nam* for a feedback. However, it is sometimes necessary to provide the repetition effect of synonymy as an amplification's task. Not without weight in the inventory of Silver Latin resources, the topics structure may have been strengthened by metrical issues, whose main function was a limitative one.

Aili solved the first difficulty, that of fixing the formal issues to check up the clauses, by testing several works, both metrical and ametrical. The crux of the problem is that we have as yet no means of knowing a clear and plain general theory about clause arrangements. After the great, well known previous theories, Aili arrived at a pragmatic method, checking the last six syllables, without reference to the poetic metrical units. As a result and also a test of his method, Aili yielded some typology of works, that was shown in schemes at the back of his essay. One of them was made by applying to Velleius' *Historia Romana*. It is mere a computation of every kind of metrical distribution in the last six syllables of a sentence, but no qualitative analysis. However, it is beyond doubt that there were certain regularity in the distribution. Aumont (1996) following J. Dangel shows the clause structure of Latin prose. But he sums up the extant theoretical discussion of the general method he advises, and some applications of the results, dressing up the statistical survey.

By comparing different parts of the work, data gathered from the inside structure of episodes are setting the limit of every unit, but it goes further on. We set aside the instances of clauses, where an elision or sinalepha is found, so as the *loca disputata* and sentences with a *lacuna* or uncertain textual transmission.

Structure and *oratio numerosa*

It is our objective to try to see whether the metrical arrangements are bound to the thematic and the syntactic shape or not; if they are, in which level or rate. The last two contents in the composition may be guided by the *periodon*, *comma*, *colon* distribution. From the various criteria which had been applied with regard to distinguish *colon/comma*, a clear norm may be inferred. The sentence is usually rather long in the *exemplum*; however the introduction and the conclusion are quite short. The relative clause is the most common component extending the sentence.

So, in the book one, the episode of L. *Aemilius Paulus* (I, 9) depends on the purpose of introducing *Cn. Octavius* and *Scipio Africanus*. Apart from the great importance of these men, it marks a first step, the end of which is the emperor's family worship. The mention of *Perse* by occasion of *Paulus*, leads us to understand the nexus between *Paulus* and

Metellus example in I, 11. At the end of I, 10, *Paulus'* episode is closed by one of the most applied clauses, spondaeus + dactylus or creticus, which has only a short syllable before the last (Aili n°16) *-res amisit dies*. And there is a new mention of *Metellus* just to introduce *Mummius* and *Africanus* a new antithesis, that runs through I, 12-13. When composing this figure, the metrical relationship follows another way. It is linked to *Scipio* and *Paulus*, so ends with their partaking: *eius clementiae* (n° 16 too). The antithesis goes further and has its parallel in *Carthago/Roma* rivalry, the theme, that will be taken again at the beginning of the second book.

The clause trochaeus + creticus (n°12 Aili's) is repeated in I, 16; likewise, the inverse, creticus + trochaeus or spondaeus (n°28 Aili's) and n°16 Aili's. Their function is to connect the excursus about Greek literature with the Roman one (I, 16 and 17) So n° 16 has got a strategic location in the introductory sentence (*perductam signem stilo*) the *nexus* by itself (*Neque hoc in Graecis quam in Romanis evenit magis*) and the conclusion (*inter quas has maxime*). N° 12 repeated as an echo effect, *aliis separauerunt/inlustravit tragoediam* at the end of two sentences without any break and *oratoribus fuit/uideri nequieverint* at the end of the commentary on the Greeks. N° 28 is linked to the reference to poetry: *imitandam reliquerel/citeriusue processit ubertas*.

The second book begins with Scipiones. Velleius uses them to introduce the Gracchus family, and through this, the provincial nobility's claim for full political rights. In this process, the clause of double creticus (n°14 Aili's) is preferred. Fulvius Flaccus is underlined in relationship with the Gracchus revolution. The n° 16 is found from time to time in the last part of II, 6 paragraph (*replebat prouincias/triumphelem uirum/repensurum proposuit/ Euporo seruo praebuit*) and at the end of the episode (*publicae uindictae data*). We can find out also 16 at the conclusion of the whole Gracchus epoch (II,9 *operis commendabilem*).

So you can see the method, where the mention of someone appears as an opportunity to introduce someone else, and so on till Tiberius. The big units are as a step to show *Caesar*, *Octavius* and *Tiberius*, but they include several other names. So *Drusus*, *Cato*, *Pompeius*, *Antonius*, and emperor's rivals.

After that, the frame for *Marius/Sulla* rivalry comes (II, 11 onwards). It has been prepared by the mention of the *Metellus* family (II, 8, 2) and the war against *Cimbri* and *Teutoni* (II, 8, 3). The activity of *Marius* is almost as largely explained as *Liuius Drusus'*, an imperial family's ancestor. This episode follows the typology:

1-Temporal reference, which is very frequent in that text: *Deinde, interiectis paucis annis*.

2-Introduction: *Liuius Drusus, uir nobilissimus, eloquentissimus, sanctissimus, meliore in omnia ingenio animoque quam fortuna usus.*

3-Exemplum: *Qui cum senatui priscum restituere cuperet decus et iudicia ab equitibus...* It finishes with a n°14 *maiora permitteret.*

4-The end: *Denique ea fortuna Drusi fuit ut malefacta collegarum eius...*

But Velleius is not yet satisfied, and makes a double fold: he tells how *Drusus* was killed (double end) and another *exemplum*: the *Palatina* house, which leads us to get a first mention of *Cicero*, and that of a contemporaneous man at the emperor's court, *Statilus Sisenna*, too.

Nor *M. Cato Uticensis* (II, 35) had the expectable first class hero character, but he is an instrument to underline *Pompeius*, who depends on *Caesar's* majestic presence. *Cato* has got a great introduction:

1-Time nexus: *Ille senatus dies, quo haec acta sunt, uirtutem M. Catonis iam multis in rebus conspicuam atque praenitentem in altissimo illuminauit* (it is quite different from the usual *Per id tempus, deinde, mox, dum, per ea tempora, eodem tractu temporum*).

2-The introduction following the rules of biography: *hic genitus proauo M. Catone, principe illo familiae Porciae, homo uirtuti simillimus et per omnia ingenio diis quam hominibus propior...* Till this point, he has filled the formulary, but he goes further as an extra description: *qui nunquam recte fecit, ut facere uideretur, sed quia aliter facere non potuerat, cuique id solum uisum est rationem habere, quod haberet iustitiae, omnibus humanis uitiis immunis semper fortunam in sua potestate habuit.* This part is a mixed kind among opinion-exemplum-conclusion.

3-The example: *hic, tribunus pl. designatus et adhuc admodum adulescens, cum alii suaderent...* (II, 35).

4-The end, is postposed; in II, 45 *P. Clodius...M. Catonem a re publica relegauit*, as stairhead example of *Caesar/Pompeius* episode.

5-He makes a sentence about *Milo* in II,47.

6-But he has played an important role in the civil war, and so comes into sight in II, 49 shortly after the rhetorical expression of bellicism: *Pompeium senatus auctoritas, Caesarem militum armauit fiducia.*

In view of *Cato's* partaking, *Caesar's* introduction in II, 41 should be more artificial (it was prepared long before):

1- *Nexus* (*Secutus est deinde consulatus C. Caesaris*) seems to be not so trivial, when the reader expects talking about him, since there were previously occasional mentions: in II, 30 Velleius goes by him *C. Caesaris absentis...* II, 36 joined with the literary generation, II,39 *sed fulgentissimum C. Caesaris opus in his (sc. Galliis) conspicitur, quippe eius ductu auspiciisque infractae paene idem...*

2- A rhetorical *ornatus*: *scribenti manum iniicit et quamlibet festinantem in se morari cogit.*

3- Introduction: *Hic nobilissima Iuliorum genitus familia et, quod inter omnis antiquitatis studiosos constabat, ab Anchise ac Venere deducens genus, forma omnium civium excellentissimus, uigore animi acerrimus, munificentia effusissimus, animo super humanam et naturam et fidem euectus, magnitudine cogitationum, celeritate bellandi, patientia periculorum Magno illi Alexandro, sed sobrio neque iracundo simillimus* (moral qualities and body care, alexandrian symbolism, as usual in sculpture).

4- A detail of Velleius's own: *qui denique semper et cibo et somno in uitam, non in uoluptatem uteretur* (probably an allusion to *temperantia* as standard and propaganda item, worship of emperor's family, and inasmuch, it is a supporting detail in Tiberius' first period of moralistic campaign).

5- *Exemplum*: Caesar's flight from Rome threatened by Sulla.

6- A couple of *exempla*, as an extension of the precedent. In the last one, Velleius makes reference to Marius/Sulla unit, and to Q. Catulus' one, as a step to come back to Pompeius/Caesar rivalry.

Octavius' introduction is made through Caesar in II, 59.

1- Nexus: *Deinde*.

2- Introduction: C. Octavius, *nepotem sororis suae Iuliae... De cuius origine, etiamsi praeinitet, pauca dicenda sunt. Fuit C. Octavius ut non patricia, ita admodum speciosa equestri genitus familia, grauis, sanctus, innocens, diues. Hic praetor...*

3- *Exemplum*: The relationship Caesar-Octavius.

4- Prophecy: as Verg. *Aen.* VIII, 680.

5- The immediate Antonius/Octavius antipathy in II, 60, whose climax is shown by the plastic expression *Torpebat oppressa dominatione Antonii ciuitas* (n° 14).

6- Cicero is still useful as a counterpart ready to make Antonius burst, turned into pieces. This manoeuvre is taking over from paragraph II, 58 (*Et illud decreti Atheniensium celeberrimi exemplum, relatum a Cicerone...*) II, 62 (*Omnia ante quam fugaretur Antonius honorifice a senatu in Caesarem exercitumque eius decreta sunt maxime auctore Cicerone* closed up to an ironical commentary *hoc est tempus, quo Cicero insito amore Pompeianarum partium Caesarem laudandum et tollendum censebat, cum aliud diceret, aliud intelligi uellet*) runs up to II, 66 *Furente deinde Antonius...* where Cicero's eulogium is a small pretty homage to the great author, as a contrast Antonius' *repulsio* (*nihil tamen egisti... nihil, inquam, egisti mercedem caelestissimi oris et clarissimi capitis abscisi numerando auctoramentoque funebri ad conseruatoris quondam rei publicae tantique consulis inritando necem*). Then Plancus is also used as a battering ram against Antonius mainly in II, 83.

7- *Brutus-Cassius* episode (II, 62-74). The end of both lives is expressed by the same clause: n° 16 *liberto praebuit/expiravit protinus*. The judgement about them is delayed to 72: *fuit autem dux Cassius melior, quanto uir Brutus; e quibus Brutum amicum habere malles, inimicum magis timeres Cassium; in altero maior uis, in altero uirtus*. The key for understanding the narrative function linked to *Octavius* is next behind: *qui si uicissent, quantum rei publicae interfuit Caesarem (sc. Octavius) potius habere quam Antonium principem, tantum retulisset habere Brutum quam Cassium*. This closing expression is marked by the use of n° 16.

8- *Sextus Pompeius's* episode. The first mention in II, 72 is next to the introduction in 73 (with the repeated rule of moral description, but at present, in rather negative sense: *Hic adulescens erat studiis rudis, sermone barbarus, impetu strenuus, manu promptus, cogitatu celer, fide patri dissimillimus*. This is shaped with the clause n° 10 Aili's (dactylus+creticus) *pareret humillimis*. The three power masters in those times, *Antonius*, *Octavius* and *Sextus*, are joined up in II, 77, and then the alliance with Octavia as hostage. *Sextus* death in II, 79 is expressed by the same clause 10 *a Titio iugulatus est*.

9- The short episode *Octavius/Lepidus*, closed in II, 80 by a paradoxical end: *ingressus castra Lepidi, euitatis quae iussu hominis prauissimi tela in eum iacta erant, cum lacerna eius perforata esset lancea, aquilam legionis rapere ausus est. Scires quid interest inter duces: armati inermem secuti sunt decimoque anno quam ad indignissimam uita sua potentiam peruenerat, Lepidus et a militibus et a fortuna desertus pulloque uelatus amiculo inter ultimam confluentium ad Caesarem turbam latens genibus eius aduolutus est*. This image is worthily reached.

10- Actium battle (II, 85).

C. Maecenas has got also a kind of short episode, just to express an extension of Actium by the way of M. *Lepidus iuuenis's* attack (II, 88).

1- *Tempus*: *Erat tunc*.

2- Introduction: *equestri, sed splendido genere natus, uir ubi res uigiliam exigeret, sane exsomnia, prouidens atque agendi sciens, simul uero aliquid ex negotio remitti posset, otio ac mollitis paene ultra feminam fluens*.

3- *Exemplum*: M. *Lepidi iuuenis coniuratio*.

Travelling structure

The period from Caesar's death onwards seems to show a better constructed narrative style, where there is a quite regular motion in progress till II, 71. However, we can find several stages along the way.

The *Marius/Sulla* rivalry runs through the Italic war, but *Sulla* is not formally introduced till II, 17. This episode is not so plain as others,

while the antithesis is developed. The structure is made compatible with this artistic rhetorical figure. We read the end of the episode in II, 19 with a rhetorical artifice joined to the n° 14: *cum Marius aspiciens Carthaginem, illa intuens Marium, alter alteri possent esse solacio*. Short before there took place the Marius' *exemplum*.

The link to a new structural unit is the *Cinna* and *Merula* couple. The next is *Pompeius/Caesar* alternance, but it seems to have found slightly higher level, and more complex development. *Cinna* is *Marius'* agent (rather surprisingly, he is not introduced in advance) and he is *Caesar's* father in law too. *Merula* provides a pathetic *exemplum* to underline *Cinna*. From II, 23 onwards, *Sulla* is the star, but *Cinna's* death closes the episode in II, 24. If the *Marius/Sulla* component began with the Italic war, the end comes with *Marius'* son's death caused by the same war. This couple *Cinna/Merula* lays in a second level of importance and interest; likewise *Lucullus* is a shadowy man behind *Pompeius Magnus* and *Q. Metellus*. There may be also an antithesis *Lucullus/Pompeius* through *Mithridates* (II, 33-34 and then in 37). After introducing *Caesar* (II, 39) the reader is reminded of the antithesis *Lucullus/Pompeius* in II, 40, but it was a necessary excursus just to make the summary of the precedent part of the work and at the same time, to leave a mark for the conspicuous Augustus about the *stipendiariae prouinciae*. In this excursus, we can realize that the Aili's 10 (dactylus + creticus) is repeated (but not later, in the following paragraphs): *imperii iugum/uirtutis monumenta sunt /reuertamur ad ordinem*. It may be a real coincidence, but the same clause employed in II, 37, talking about *Lucullus* and *Pompeius* is found at the end of II, 40, when the writer goes back to this couple: *omnis (plu. acc.) extulisset* (n° 24 Aili's) and *descripta litteris* (n° 12 Aili's) in 37, and then *uictoriae suae* (n° 12) and at last *eius persoluerentur* (n°24) in 40.

In II, 40 we find *Caesar*, *Octavius* and *Tiberius* joined, the hard core of the work. And especially of this second book. Thereafter, *Octavius'* focal point is getting attractive. From II, 72 to the end of *Sextus Pompeius* episode. But nearly at the same time, in 75 comes the information about *Tiberius'* father. But *Tiberius* comes finally in 94, and shadows the last part of the work, till 130. The enumeration is a frequent resource, that breaks in the exemplary structure and the metrical periods, with short phonic groups.

But the formal introduction to *Tiberius'* nucleus is rather like some other before:

1- *Tempus: Hoc tractu temporum.*

2- Introduction: *Ti. Claudius Nero, quo trimo, ut praediximus, Livia, Drusi Claudiani filia, despondente Ti. Nerone, cui ante nupta fuerat,*

Caesari nupserat, innutritus caelestium praeceptorum disciplinis, iuuenis genere, forma, celsitudine corporis, optimis studiis maximoque ingenio instructissimus, qui protinus quantus est, sperari potuerat uisumque praetulerat principem.

3- *Exemplum: quaestura.*

And it is surprising to find a quite similar structure in Maroboduus' episode (II, 108):

1- *Tempus/locus: nihil erat in Germania.*

2- Introduction: *genere nobilis, corpore praeualens, animo ferox, natione magis quam ratione barbarus.*

3- *Exemplum.*

In fact, from II, 104 onwards, the structure focuses on Tiberius. We can call it "travelling structure" because the narrator moves the camera along several geographic screens to point out Tiberius' virtues. The rhythm underlines this change, and makes alternance between spondaeus+creticus and creticus+spondaeus, the first appears more often (specially 110-116) but runs till the end of the work; the *dissolutiones* of either scheme are a bit more frequent in the episodes rather than as a period clause. We sometimes find trochaeus+creticus, dicreticus, dichoreus or dispondaeus (as J. Aumont 1997 is accustomed to remark as a typology). The *exemplum* is no longer the main element; however, there are still three units: the barbarus' one, the Maroboduus' and the Varus' episode (II, 117-120). The *barbarus'* attitude constitutes an abusive praise. Varus' figure is refined mostly by the clause creticus + trochaeus or spondaeus. *Seianus'* praise in II, 128 is underlined by the clause paeon primus+trochaeus (*esse tribuendum*) between two of dichoreus+creticus (*quod optimum sit, esse nobilissimum/securitatis suae libenter aduocet*); Velleius makes here a back reference within the work, as he mentions other figures from the past (*Coruncanium, Carvilius, Catonem, Marius, Pollionem*). There is still a backward reference following the method of stairs to the *Agrippa Postumus'* death, a terrible sign of Tiberius' cruelty; this is written shortly in the middle of Tiberius' *gesta*. The writer should have avoided this mention, but he didn't. Agrippa was the last of Tiberius' contenders.

Conclusion

-As a factual argument in favour of Velleius reputation, we can apply the efficacy of the communication structure, as expressive means of his purpose, underlining a conviction or strengthening a persuasion by a sort of stile or chain of examples. This aim is attempted by the prose rhythm resources, and by a selection of representative gestures, as a mean of transformation of the formal frame for literary biography patterns.

-Significative function of clause, that follows the sense and sets up the borders for the units of logical thinking.

-No more speeches: in those times of emperor's regime, the ruler's gesture is the best way of mass communication.

-The rhetorical perspective is the right one, just to express personal interests, power ideology and Roman nationalism. But he doesn't flatly follow his historical sources (as far as we can check them). He handles his data in a quite personal way.

-Although, theoretically speaking, the *elocution* is not so fortunate selected (due to an abusive search for new, but odd words, sentence forms, and pathetic effects) that strong way of persuasion may be considered as an essay of the literary grounds building the Silver Latin period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALFONSI (L.) 1966 : « La dottrina dell'aemulatio in Velleio Patercolo (I, 16-17) », *Aevum* 40, p. 375-378.
- AUMONT (J.) 1996 : *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine. De Cicéron à Pline le Jeune et de César à Florus*, Paris.
- BARDON (H.) 1968 : *Les empereurs et les lettres latines: D'Auguste à Hadrien*, Paris.
- BURMEISTER (F.) 1894 : « De fontibus Vellei Paterculi », *Berliner Studien für Class. Philol. Und Archaeol.* Berlin, 15, 1, p. 1-83.
- CAVALLARO (M.) 1972 : « Il linguaggio metaforico di Velleio Patercolo », *R.C.C.M.* 14, p. 269-279.
- CHAUSSERIE-LAPREE (J.P.) 1969 : *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latines*, Paris.
- CIZEK (E.) 1972 : *L'époque de Néron et ses controverses idéologiques*, Leiden.
- DANGEL (J.) 1998 : « *Oratio soluta et numerosa*: cohésion linguistique et cohérence stylistique », in *Actes des huitièmes Rencontres Scientifiques de Luxembourg*, p. 8-21.
- CUPAILO (F.) 1984 : « Caso, fato e fortuna nel pensiero di alcuni storici latini: spunti e appunti », *B. Stud. Lat* 14, p. 33-48.
- DELLA CORTE (F.) 1937 : « I giudizi letterari di Velleio Patercolo », *R.F.I.C.* 15, p. 154-159.
- ELEFANTE (M.) 1997 : *Velleius Paterculus. Ad M. Vinicium consulem libri duo*, Hildesheim.
- GEORGES (H.) 1877 : *De elocutione M. Velleii Paterculi*, Diss. Inaug. Leipzig.
- GOAR (R.) 1976 : « Horace, Velleius Paterculus and Tiberius Caesar », *Latomus* 35, p. 43-54.
- HELLEGOUAR^{CH} (J.) 1964 : « Les buts de l'œuvre historique de Velleius Paterculus », *Latomus* 23, p. 669-684.

- 1974 : « L'impérialisme romain d'après l'oeuvre de Velleius Paterculus », in *L'idéologie de l'impérialisme romain. Colloque Dijon*, Paris, p. 69-90.
- 1980 : « La figure de Tibère chez Tacite et Velleius Paterculus », *Mélanges de littérature et d'épigraphie latines, d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie. Hommages à la mémoire de Pierre Wuilleumier*, Paris, p. 167-183.
- HELLEGOUARC'H (J.)-JODRY (C.) 1980 : « Les Res Gestae d'Auguste et l'Historia Romana de Velleius Paterculus », *Latomus* 39, p. 803-16.
- KOBER (M.) 2000 : *Die politischen Anfänge Octavians in der Darstellung des Velleius und dessen Verhältnis zu historiographischen Tradition: ein philologischer Quellen-vergleich: Nikolaus von Damaskus, Appianus von Alexandria, Velleius Paterculus*, Würzburg.
- LANA (I.) : *Velleio Patercolo o della propaganda*, Torino.
- LEEMAN (A. D.) 1963 : *Orationis ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers*, Amsterdam.
- LEO (F.) 1901 : *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*, Leipzig.
- MICHELS (M.) 1949 : *De Vellei Paterculi arte biographica quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Bonn.
- MÜNZER (F.) 1907 : *Zur Komposition des Velleius Paterculus*, Basilea.
- PALADINI (M.L.) 1953 : « Studi su Velleio Patercolo », *Acme* 6, p. 447-478
- 1957 : « Rapporti tra Velleio Patercolo e Valerio Massimo », *Latomus* 16, p. 232-251.
- PORTALUPI (F.) 1991 : « Progresso e decadenza : analisi dei luoghi velleiani » in *Studi G. Monaco III*, Palermo.
- RAMBAUD (M.) 1970 : *Recherches sur le portrait dans l'historiographie romaine*, *L.E.C* 38, p. 417-447.
- ROSSI (E.) 1976-77 : « La tecnica ritrattistica in Velleio Patercolo », *A.F.L.C* 1, p. 97-116.
- SANTINI (P.) 1970 : « Caratteri del linguaggio critico-letterario di Velleio Patercolo » in *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi oblata*, Roma, p. 383-391.
- SAUPPE (H.) 1896 : *Ausgewählte Schriften*, Berlin, 39-72.
- SCHMITZER (U.) 2000 : *Velleius Paterculus und das Interesse an der Geschichte im Zeitalter des Tiberius*, Heidelberg.
- STARR (R.J.) 1980 : « Velleius' Literary Techniques in the Organization of his History », *T.A.Ph. A* 110, p. 287-301.
- 1981 : « The Scope and Genre of Velleius' History », *C. Q* 31, p. 162-174.
- SUMNER (G.V.) 1970 : *The Truth about Velleius Paterculus. Prolegomena*, *H.S.Ph* 74, p. 257-297.
- WATT (W.S.) 1998 : *Velleius Paterculus. Historiarum libri duo*, Stuttgart-Leipzig (editio correctior editionis primae 1988).
- WOODMAN (A.J.) 1968 : « Sallustian influence in Velleius Paterculus », in *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, I, éd. J. Bibauw, Brussels, p. 785-799.
- 1975 : « Questions of Date, Genre and Style in Velleius: Some Literary Answers », *C. Q* 25, p. 272-306.
- 1975 : « Velleius Paterculus » in *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*, éd. T.A.Dorey, p. 1-25. □