

- Hoskins Walbank, M. E. 1989. Marsyas at Corinth. *AJN*, 2d ser. 1:79–87.
- . 1996. Evidence for the Imperial Cult in Julio-Claudian Corinth. In *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*, JRA Suppl. 17, ed. A. Small, 201–13. Ann Arbor.
- Howgego, C. J. 1989. After the Colt has Bolted: A Review of Amandry on Roman Corinth. *NC* 149:199–208.
- Kent, J. H. 1966. *Corinth*. Vol. 8, pt. 3, *The Inscriptions, 1926–1950*. Princeton.
- Lee, H. M. 1988. S.I.G.<sup>3</sup> 802: Did Women Compete against Men in Greek Athletic Festivals? *Nikephoros* 1:103–17.
- Marty, J. 1993. Three Pottery Deposits and the History of Roman Isthmia. In *The Corinthia in the Roman Period*, JRA Suppl. 8, ed. T. E. Gregory, 115–29. Ann Arbor.
- Meritt, B. D. 1931. *Corinth*. Vol. 8, pt. 1, *Greek Inscriptions, 1896–1927*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Moretti, L. 1953. *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*. Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto italiano per la storia antica, 12. Rome.
- Mrozek, S. 1971. *Primus omnium* sur les inscriptions des municipes italiens. *Epigraphica* 33:60–69.
- Oliver, J. H. 1989. *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 178. Philadelphia.
- Price, S. R. F. 1984a. Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult. *JHS* 104:79–95.
- . 1984b. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- Puech, B. 1983. Grand-prêtres et helladarques d'Achaïe. *REA* 85:5–43.
- Robert, L. 1940. *Hellenica: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*. Vol. 1. Paris.
- . 1946. *Hellenica: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*. Vol. 2. Paris.
- . 1966. Inscriptions de l'antiquité et du Bas-Empire à Corinthe. *REG* 79:733–70.
- Rose, C. B. 1997. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge.
- Rothaus, R. M. 2000. *Corinth, the First City of Greece: An Urban History of Late Antique Cult and Religion*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 139. Leiden.
- Spawforth, A. J. S. 1994. Corinth, Argos, and the Imperial Cult. Pseudo-Julian, *Letters* 198. *Hesperia* 63:211–32.
- . 1996. Roman Corinth: the Formation of a Colonial Elite. In *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East: Social and Political Aspects*, Μελετήματα, 21, ed. A. D. Rizakis, 167–82. Athens.
- Tod, M. N. 1949. Greek Record-Keeping and Record-Breaking. *CQ* 43:106–12.
- West, A. B. 1928. Notes on Achaean Prosopography and Chronology. *CP* 23:258–69.
- . 1931. *Corinth*. Vol. 8, pt. 2, *Latin Inscriptions 1896–1926*. Cambridge, Mass.

## VELLEIUS PATERCULUS AND L. MUNATIUS PLANCUS

Lucius Munatius Plancus, traditionally viewed as one of the great scoundrels of Roman politics, has recently been the subject of a major reappraisal. Thomas H. Watkins' detailed and unabashedly speculative monograph on the career of Plancus mounts

This paper developed out of a wider survey of the career of Plancus, delivered at the University of Sydney colloquium *Roman Crossings, Interdisciplinary Approaches to Rome* in September 1999. The writer would like to thank Ms. Léonie Hayne, Dr. Patrick Tansey, Dr. Trevor Evans, and the anonymous readers for *CP* for reading various versions of the paper, and providing much in the way of helpful comment and criticism.

not only a strong case for the rehabilitation of the character and career of Plancus, but also suggests interesting possibilities as to the familial and political relationships that lay behind his success.<sup>1</sup>

One hurdle to acceptance of a more positive assessment of Plancus is the hostile attitude of our ancient sources, especially that of Velleius Paterculus, by far his most persistent and spiteful critic. The unrelenting viciousness displayed in Velleius' depiction of Plancus is striking and somewhat unusual. Allegations of fratricide, cowardice, military incompetence, sycophancy, immorality, improbity, and, above all, an innate and almost pathological tendency toward treachery—*morbo proditor*—have long guided modern perceptions.<sup>2</sup>

The traditional explanation, standard in studies of Plancus going back to the nineteenth century, is that Velleius was simply transmitting the official hostility directed in his own time against Munatia Plancina, the daughter or granddaughter of Plancus, the wife of Cn. Calpurnius Piso, and, in popular imagination, the poisoner of Germanicus.<sup>3</sup> Ronald Syme, who never had much time for the notion of Velleius as a historian, consistently propounded it, and Watkins' recent work accepts that it is at least one of the probable causes of Velleius' attitude.<sup>4</sup>

However, as A. B. Bosworth long ago demonstrated, this is not particularly satisfactory.<sup>5</sup> Plancina was not prosecuted until 33 C.E., well after Velleius ceased writing.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, it was at the time he was writing—in 29 C.E.—that Plancina's great rival, Agrippina the Elder, was exiled. True, Suetonius records that the persecution of the friends and intimates of Livia Augusta had begun *intra breve tempus* of her death in the same year.<sup>7</sup> However, nothing indicates that Plancina was the target of open

1. T. H. Watkins, *L. Munatius Plancus: Serving and Surviving in the Roman Revolution*, ICS Suppl. 7 (Atlanta, 1994).

2. Vell. Pat. 2.63.3, 67.3–4, 74.3, 76.2, 83.1–3, 95.3. Wholesale acceptance of the Velleian portrait of Plancus as historical fact is common: see, for instance, R. Hanslik, "Munatius (30)," *RE* 16.1 (1933): 550–51. It has been suggested to me that Plancus' association with the bestowal of the name "Augustus" in early 27 B.C.E. (2.91.1: "quod cognomen illi <divino> Planci sententia consensus universi senatus populi que Romani indidit") represents an exception to this hostility. Yet the involvement of Plancus was a well-known historical fact (see Suet. *Aug.* 7.2, Censorinus *DN* 21.8), and the significance, if any, in the brief mention here of Plancus is surely only to highlight the reconciliation of a former enemy by Augustus, as contrasted with the examples of Murena and Caepio that immediately follow.

3. E. Jullien, *Le Fondateur de Lyon: Histoire de L. Munatius Plancus* (Paris, 1892), 200–210. For the classic exposition of this view, see I. Lana, *Velleio Patercolo o della propaganda* (Turin, 1952), 144–46. Gerold Walser also suggests that hostility arose from the memory of another descendent of our Plancus, the consul of 13 C.E., L. Munatius Plancus (generally assumed to be the brother of Plancina), due to his role in the senatorial embassy sent during the German mutiny (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.14, 39): *Der Briefwechsel des L. Munatius Plancus mit Cicero* (Basel, 1957), 39–40.

4. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), p. 512, n. 1, and *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 429; Watkins, *Plancus* (note 1 above), 7, 144–58. While tentatively accepting the traditional view, Watkins also suggests that Velleius' portrait partly reflects both "the propaganda of the 30s B.C." and "the world after Actium, in which the Augustan victors blackened the reputation of the Antonian losers." The problem is that, as Watkins has so admirably demonstrated, Plancus was one of the winners. Doubts as to the importance of Plancina as the predominant cause of Velleius' hostility have been expressed by C. Kuntze, *Zur Darstellung des Kaisers Tiberius* (Frankfurt am Main, 1985), 279–80, see also 288–89. However, her suggested additional cause—"eine persönliche Animosität des Velleius . . . deren Ursachen allerdings unklar sind und auch kaum mehr erschlossen werden können"—is vague and unsatisfactory.

5. A. B. Bosworth, "Asinius Pollio and Augustus," *Historia* 21 (1972): 441–73, at 449–50.

6. Velleius had concluded the writing of his work no later than the latter half of 30 C.E., and probably by the end of 29: see A. J. Woodman, "Questions of Date, Genre, and Style in Velleius: Some Literary Answers," *CQ* 25 (1975): 272–306, at p. 276, n. 3; G. V. Sumner, "The Truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena," *HSCP* 74 (1970): 257–97, at 285–86.

7. Suet. *Tib.* 51. 2.

hostility by the regime before 33 C.E.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, if Plancina was, as seems probable, the granddaughter rather than the daughter of Plancus, the familial tie seems a somewhat tenuous one on which to hang what is an extremely bitter and comprehensive *damnatio*.<sup>9</sup>

Bosworth continues to assume that Velleius' portrayal is the result of imperial disapproval, this time from Augustus, citing Plancus' censorship of 22 B.C.E., which comes in for heavy criticism by Velleius.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, he argues that the appointment of Plancus and Paullus Aemilius Lepidus was, from the very start, a deliberate attempt to humiliate the censors and discredit further nonimperial occupation of the office.<sup>11</sup> Re-establishment of the censorship for the first time in twenty years is consistent with the move towards traditionalism that had seen the *princeps*' resignation of the consulship in 23 B.C.E., and his appointment of men to that office with a past reputation of independence.<sup>12</sup> However, Bosworth's theory fits neatly with the notion that Augustus' "withdrawal" from consular office, and subsequently from Rome in the period 22–19 B.C.E., was partly designed to teach a restless Senate a lesson as to why they needed him.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, it certainly appears that Plancus and Paullus failed to complete any of the traditional duties of their office: no evidence survives that a *census*, let alone a *lustrum*, was performed in that year; nor that the censors conducted a *lectio senatus*.<sup>14</sup>

However, preconceived malice on the part of the *princeps* towards these two individuals does not quite ring true. Deliberate humiliation of Paullus, already linked by marriage to the imperial house by his marriage to Cornelia, the half-sister to Julia, and subsequently to marry the younger Marcella, niece of Augustus, seems very strange.<sup>15</sup> Certainly our other sources do not suggest that the two men were utterly disgraced by their tenure in the office.<sup>16</sup> Given that, according to Dio, Augustus had resisted the popular clamour at the beginning of 22 B.C.E. for his appointment as censor for life

8. It is notable that Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.26.2) states that Plancina's downfall occurred at a time *ut odium et gratia desiere*.

9. Chronological considerations make it much more likely that Plancina and her presumed brother, the consul of 13 C.E., are grandchildren of the censor: Watkins, *Plancus*, 145, 148; J. Morris, "Munatius Plancus Paulinus," *BJ* 165 (1965): 88–96, at p. 89, n. 5. Syme consistently refers to Plancina as granddaughter, but refers to the consul of 13 C.E. as son, of our Plancus: see *Roman Revolution* (n. 4 above), p. 512, n. 1, *Augustan Aristocracy* (n. 4 above), 58, 343, 369, 429.

10. Vell. Pat. 2.95.3.

11. Bosworth, "Asinius Pollio" (n. 5 above), 450; see also M. Elefante, ed., *Velleius Paterculus: Ad M. Vinicium consulum libri duo*, Bibliotheca Wiedmanniana III (Hildesheim, 1997), 444.

12. Thus, L. Sestius Quirinalis Albinianus and Cn. Calpurnius Piso in 23 B.C.E., and L. Arruntius and M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus in 22 B.C.E.

13. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 371–72, and *Augustan Aristocracy*, 41–42.

14. Thus, the putative reconstruction of the *fasti Colotiani* in A. Degraffi, ed., *Inscriptiones Italiae*, vol. 13:1 (Rome, 1947), at 274: "L. Munatius, Paul. Aemilius [cens(ores) lustr(um) n(on) f(ecerunt)]." Dio's account (54.2.3–5) further suggests that the censors' other traditional duties as moral guardians were largely performed by the *princeps*. Some caution is required, given late Republican precedents, in inferring total inactivity of censors from their failure to conduct either the *lectio* or *lustrum*: see P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.–A.D. 14* (Oxford, 1971), 104–6, 702–3. However, it would not be surprising if the inability of Plancus and Paullus to conduct a *lectio* (see n. 17) may have hamstrung their term in the office.

15. R. Syme, "Paullus the Censor," *Athenaeum* 65 (1987): 7–26, "Marriage Ages for Roman Senators," *Historia* 36 (1987): 318–32, at 329, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 147–48, 150–51, 166, 429, "Neglected Children on the Ara Pacis," *AJA* 88 (1984): 583–89, at 588–89. Predictably, Syme suggests that Velleius' criticisms may reflect the waning influence of Paullus' son M. Aemilius Lepidus, consul of 6 C.E., around the time Velleius was writing.

16. See Suet. *Ner.* 4; Dio 54.2.1–3. Dio's account of the ill-omened collapse of the censorial dais on their first day of office presages that Plancus and Paullus will be the last two ἰδιῶται to hold the office together, nothing more. Velleius' account of quarrels between Plancus and Paullus may not be unfounded, as it is highly probable that the haughty aedile of that year, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, who in Suetonius' account

as well as dictator, one must question whether Augustus was especially keen at the time to exercise the wide-ranging and potentially dangerous responsibilities of censor.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, even if we assume that the *princeps* foresaw at this time the need for future censorial activity on his part, it is far from clear why he would have needed to resurrect and then discredit the virtually moribund senatorial censorship in order to achieve his ends.<sup>18</sup>

Despite the revisionist tendency in the study of Velleius over the last three decades, the assumption that his attitudes towards any historical event are nothing but a mirror of later imperial politics is still common. Such an approach ignores the potential importance of Velleius' own literary and ethical concerns as a historian. Velleius' interest in, and strong censure of, a man he perceived as the virtual embodiment of treachery and duplicity should certainly cause no surprise given the significance of the themes of loyalty and duty throughout his work, not the least in his narration of the triumviral period. The assassination of Caesar, the relationship of the Senate to the young Octavian, the fate of the proscribed, and the shifting alliances of the thirties are just some of the events that provide Velleius with fertile ground for employment of such concepts as *fides*, *pietas*, and *gratia* and their opposites.<sup>19</sup> Yet given the peculiar virulence of the characterization of Plancus, this in itself raises a further question: What was the raw material that formed the basis for Velleius' perception of the man? Let us take a different tack. For, arguably, there is a much more plausible foundation than contemporary politics for Velleius' view of Plancus: namely, his sources.

Three passages in Velleius dealing with Plancus are of particular significance in this context. At 2.63.3, we are confronted with the *dubia fides* of Plancus towards D. Brutus and the Senate. In the very next sentence, we find Asinius Pollio, *firmus proposito et Iulianis partibus fidus*. At 2.76.3, Octavian allows Fulvia to depart Italy after the fall of Perugia, with Plancus (who had characteristically given the Antonian cause only the appearance of aid) as the *comes* of the *muliebris fugae*.<sup>20</sup> Again in the following sentence, we observe Pollio with his seven legions maintaining Venetia for the Antonian cause, accomplishing great and spectacular deeds around Altinum, and winning Domitius Ahenobarbus to the Antonian cause. At 2.83.1–3, we have Velleius' famous account of Plancus' Alexandrian frolics, followed by his betrayal and desertion of Antony. In stark contrast, Pollio is singled out for his noble refusal to fight against Antony on account of long-past *beneficia*, and his determination to be *praeda victoris* (2.86.3). Interestingly, however, Velleius fails to juxtapose Pollio with Plancus in the context of the proscriptions, where Plancus is accused of adding his brother,

insults Plancus, was the nephew of Paullus: Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 166, "Paullus the Censor" (n. 15 above), 19, "Neglected Children" (n. 15 above), 588. However, the issue is further complicated by Morris' suggestion from *CIL* 6.734 that the father of Plancus, the consul of 13 C.E., was married to a daughter of Paullus.

17. Dio 54.1. Conduct of the *lectio senatus*, as events in 18 B.C.E. proved, could be particularly arduous and hazardous: see Suet. *Aug.* 35 and Dio 54.13–15.

18. Even if, as seems probable, Dio is correct in his assertion (54.10.5; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 27.5) that Augustus, on his return to Rome in 19 B.C.E., received the position of supervisor of morals and censorial powers for five years, it is unclear, given the wording of *Res gestae* 6, whether many of his subsequent "censorial" activities were conducted pursuant to such a position: see P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore, eds., *Res gestae Divi Augusti* (Oxford, 1967), 45–48.

19. Symptomatic of Velleius' general attitude in this respect is the prominence given to the *fides* and *pietas* of his ancestors in their service for Rome or notable Romans: 2.16.2–3, 76.1.

20. For Plancus' "service" in the Perusine War, see 2.75.3.

L. Plotius Plancus, to the lists (2.67.4).<sup>21</sup> In this regard, close comparison may have been problematic, given Pollio's own conduct during the proscriptions.<sup>22</sup>

Given that renewed interest in Velleius has largely coincided with the fall into disrepute of traditional *Quellenforschung*, it is not surprising that little has been written recently on the sources of Velleius for the late Republic and the triumviral and early Augustan periods.<sup>23</sup> Emilio Gabba, noting affinities between Velleius and Appian in subject matter and outlook concerning the Gracchi and the Social War, argued for Pollio as a common source.<sup>24</sup> Bosworth, who in the context of Velleius also discerned the consistent hostility towards Plancus in Appian's narrative, raised the *Historiae* of Pollio as a possible source.<sup>25</sup> A. J. Woodman, noting Gabba's comments and Velleius' laudatory remarks concerning Pollio at 2.76.1 and elsewhere, also tentatively suggested that Velleius utilized the *Historiae*.<sup>26</sup> Maria Elefante's recent commentary, highlighting the contradistinction of Plancus with Pollio, has also taken up these suggestions.<sup>27</sup>

Surely, there must be a strong probability that Velleius' portrait of Plancus ultimately derives from his study of the writings of Pollio. However, are the *Historiae* the works in question? A vital additional piece of evidence needs to be taken into account. An isolated reference in the preface of the Elder Pliny's *Natural History* (praef. 31) speaks of a posthumous attack on Plancus by Pollio:

Nec Plancus inlepidus, cum diceretur Asinius Pollio orationes in eum parare quae ab ipso aut liberis post mortem Planci ederentur, ne respondere posset: "cum mortuis non nisi larvas luctari." Quo dicto sic repercussit illas, ut apud eruditos nihil impudentius iudicaretur.<sup>28</sup>

In the context of Velleius the reference is significant. As both Woodman and Elefante have noted, Velleius' remarks concerning Plancus are invariably tinged with a vicious irony and sarcasm otherwise untypical of his writing.<sup>29</sup> As both further remark in relation to Plancus' infamous performance before Cleopatra as Glaucus the Nereid,

21. Velleius is our only source directly to accuse Plancus of responsibility for the proscription of his brother.

22. Namely the proscription of his father-in-law, L. Quinctius: App. *B Civ.* 4.12 and 27. Indeed, Quinctius may not have been the only skeleton in Pollio's closet: see Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 193. It is noteworthy that even such a fulsome admirer of Pollio as Syme suggests that Pollio may have not been personally disinterested in the choice of some of the proscribed. Interestingly, Appian does link Plancus and Pollio in this context, although it is made clear that the inclusion of both Plotius Plancus and Quinctius resulted not from personal enmity but the general policy of the triumvirs.

23. General surveys are found in Elefante, *Velleius Paterculus* (n. 11 above), 29–32, and J. Hellegouarc'h, ed., *Velleius Paterculus: "Histoire Romaine,"* vol. 1 (Paris, 1982), xxx–xl.

24. "Italia e Roma nella Storia di Velleio Patercolo," *Critica Storica* 1 (1962), 1–9.

25. "Asinius Pollio," 450–51.

26. *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative*, 2.41–93 (Cambridge, 1983), 186 (also p. 177 in relation to 2.73.2 and Velleius' glowing, and thoroughly misleading, account of Pollio's campaign against Sextus Pompeius in 44 B.C.E.); see also J. Moles' review of this work, *JRS* 74 (1984): 242–44.

27. *Velleius Paterculus*, 362, 384–85, 390–91.

28. Pliny's final remarks certainly tend to suggest that the *orationes* were further disseminated in written form: see G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 85. Mayhoff's 1906 Teubner text (followed by Beaujeu's, and König and Winkler's editions) has *libertis*, preferring the text in *cod. Parisinus lat.* 6795. All other manuscripts have *liberis*, and this was preferred earlier in Detlefsen's edition, and is applied by the two most recent English translations of Pliny—those of Rackham and Healy—despite their use of Mayhoff.

29. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus* (n. 26 above), 137 and 181, and *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative*, 2. 94–131 (Cambridge, 1977), 104; Elefante, *Velleius Paterculus*, 361–62, 371, 387, 390–91, 408–9, 444.

accusations concerning dance and mime were stock fare in Roman political invective.<sup>30</sup> It is also noteworthy that Velleius' condemnation of Plancus and praise of Pollio is paralleled, although with far less intensity and directness, by his contrasting treatment of M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus and Q. Dellius.<sup>31</sup> We know that Messalla had attacked Dellius as *desultor bellorum civilium*, as well as launching a literary attack on his former leader Antony.<sup>32</sup> Like Pollio, Messalla could be said to have profited from his political adaptability during the revolutionary age, and was no doubt just as keen to distance himself from those whom he regarded as morally inferior in their change of political allegiance.<sup>33</sup> Velleius' recognition of Pollio and Messalla as the preeminent orators of the Augustan age may merely reflect received opinion, given the ubiquity of this judgment in later writers (2.36.2). However, it can hardly be a complete coincidence that Velleius reflects both men's viewpoint in such similar circumstances.

Is it not more likely, then, that the definitive brushstrokes of the portrayal of Plancus ultimately derive not from the *Historiae*, but rather from the *orationes* mentioned by Pliny the Elder? Certainly, such speeches as are described by Pliny seem the most appropriate genre for the origin of much of the material supplied by Velleius. Whatever the true relationship between Books 4 and 5 of the *Bella civilia* and Pollio's *Historiae*, Appian's characterization lacks not only the consistency and intensity of hostility displayed by Velleius, but also the artistic playfulness with which it is delivered.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, the consistency of the portrayal of Plancus in Velleius suggests a source with a chronological range extending far beyond the most optimistic estimates for the *Historiae*.<sup>35</sup> The suggestion is not entirely new: Gordon Williams made the vital connection in his analysis of Horace *Odes* 1.7 and the oft-made association of this ode with Velleius' allegation that Plancus added his brother to the proscription lists.<sup>36</sup>

30. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus*, 216; Elefante, *Velleius Paterculus*, 409.

31. Vell. Pat. 2.84.1–2 (Dellius); cf. the treatment of Messalla in 2.71.1.

32. Sen. *Suas.* 1.7: his description of Dellius. For his attack of Antony, note his *contra Antonii litteras* mentioned by Charisius (Keil, *Gramm. Lat.*, 1:129.7). A possible fragment of this work, suggestive as to its tenor, is found in Plin. *HN* 33.49. Other works mentioned by Charisius—*De statu Antonii* and *de vexitigal Asiae constitutione*—may have been along similar lines: Keil, *Gramm. Lat.*, 1:104.18 and 146.34.

33. Tac. *Ann.* 11.7 (on Pollio and Messalla); Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 512.

34. Despite Bosworth's remarks to the contrary (see n. 25 above), only Appian's account of the Perusine War and its immediate aftermath can be said to exhibit clear and unequivocal hostility toward Plancus and some resemblance to the Velleian account: *B Civ.* 5.35, 50, 55; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.74.3, 76.2. Appian's description of Plancus' activities in the period 44–43 is notably nonpartisan: 3.46, 72, 81, 90, 96, and 97. He also fails to mention Plancus' alleged failure as proconsul of Asia to confront the incursions of Pacorus and Q. Labienus in 40; cf. Dio 48.26.3. His analysis of the historians, who argued Plancus' responsibility for the death of Sextus Pompeius (*B Civ.* 5.144), does not attack Plancus.

35. It is commonly assumed that Pollio's *Historiae* only dealt with events down to Philippi: see J. André, *La Vie et l'œuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (Paris, 1949), 44–61; E. Badian, "Appian and Asinius Pollio" (Review of E. Gabba, *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili*), *CR* 8 (1958): 159–62. However, given the miserable number of certain ancient citations of the *Historiae* available to us in the first place (Peter, *HRRel.* 2.67–70; André, *Asinius Pollion*, 57–61), the lack of references to events after 42 is hardly decisive. Moreover, in the light of Woodman's analysis of Pollio's Balkan command in the early thirties, and the possible reasons for the absence of this command from Velleius and Appian, a critical objection to the extension of the work into the thirties can now be questioned: Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus*, 192–96. Surely, however, it is highly unlikely that the work extended to the Actium campaign, and hardly on into the twenties.

36. Williams, *Tradition and Originality* (n. 28 above), 83–85. Julien (*Le Fondateur de Lyon* [n. 3 above], 184–85 and 208) notes the Plinian passage and suggests that Pollio's *Orationes* added passion to Velleius' essentially political attack. Intermediate studies failed to note the possible use of the works referred to by Pliny. André, who discusses the passage at length, simply uses Velleius to attest to the justice of Pollio's attacks: *Asinius Pollion* (n. 35 above), 83–84. The Plinian passage is not even mentioned by Hanslik.

However, Williams' hypothesis has failed to make a mark in subsequent Velleian scholarship.<sup>37</sup> Given this circumstance, the point is worth restating.

In this context, it may also be useful to consider Pollio's treatment of Cicero. The elder Seneca records an instance where Pollio failed to use one of his more sensational allegations against Cicero in his *Historiae*, producing it only in the published version of one of his speeches.<sup>38</sup> A more general tendency on the part of Pollio to exclude from his *Historiae* his more scurrilous accusations against Cicero, and their use in works of a less exalted nature, may perhaps be discerned.<sup>39</sup> If Pollio feared the critical reaction to attacks on the long-dead Cicero, what chance that such considerations may have played a part in the composition of the *Historiae*, with Plancus then very much alive?

Obviously, we are not in a position to comprehend fully the way in which Velleius may have utilized Pollio's writings. The *Historiae* and the *orationes* referred to by Pliny no doubt intersected often in their treatment of Plancus, and may have been used by Velleius in conjunction with each other.<sup>40</sup> Velleius' portrait of Pollio may have been formed by reference to other works, whether written by Pollio or others, which may have also influenced his depiction of Plancus.<sup>41</sup> Nor, as stated previously, can it be denied that Velleius' laceration of Plancus' "versatility" fits perfectly with his moral concerns in narrating this period of Roman history. However, legitimate caution as to the limitations of our evidence and Velleius' interaction with his sources should not obscure two important points: that the works of Asinius Pollio constitute an altogether more plausible basis for Velleius' conception of Plancus the man than an ill-fitting story of imperial disfavor, and that the *orationes* mentioned by the elder Pliny constitute our prime candidate among those works.

ANDREW WRIGHT  
University of Sydney

37. Pliny's anecdote is mentioned in passing by Bosworth, "Asinius Pollio," 451. It is not mentioned by either Woodman or Elefante.

38. Namely, the allegation that Cicero promised Antony that he would speak in favor of Antony in return for his life: Sen. *Suas.* 6.15.

39. Thus, Gabba, comparing the tenor of the speech of Fufius Calenus in Dio (46.1–28) with that of Piso Caesoninus in Appian (*B Civ.* 3.54–60), suggests that the vicious attacks on Cicero's private and family life found in the Calenus speech ultimately derive from material not included by Pollio in his *Historiae*: "Note sulla polemica anticiceroniana di Asinio Pollione," *RSI* 69 (1957): 317–39, esp. 324 and 336; see also Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912), 11–14, 279–88. As Fergus Millar rightly stresses, caution is required given Gabba's assumption that Appian is reproducing Pollio's *Historiae* here. Yet Millar accepts Zielinski's suggestion that Pollio was the ultimate source for the "Cicero-karikatur": "Some Speeches in Cassius Dio," *MH* 18 (1961): 11–22, at p. 21, n. 91.

40. See n. 34.

41. For instance, the *contra maledicta Antonii* mentioned by Charisius (*Gramm. Lat.* 1.80.2 Keil). A number of scholars have suggested a collection similar to that of Valerius Maximus as the source of Pollio's famous *recusatio* in 2.86.3: Lana, *Velleio Patercolo* (n. 3 above), p. 90, n. 129; Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus*, p. 232, n. 1; Elefante, *Velleius Paterculus*, 417.