Eos CXII 2025
ISSN 0012-7825
DOI: 10.34616/e.2025.258.266

Jeffrey Murray, David Wardle (eds.), Reading by Example: Valerius Maximus and the Historiography of Exempla, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2022 (Historiography of Rome and Its Empire 11), XII + 352 pp., ISBN 978-90-04-49940-9, €120.84.

This valuable collective volume on the Tiberian author Valerius Maximus and his nine books of historical *exempla*, the *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, is yet another indication of the changing attitude in classical scholarship towards texts which have long been regarded as derivative and deserving our attention only in the context of *Quellenforschung* or as a treasure trove for researchers – but not as literary products worth studying for their own sake.[1] In the case of Valerius, an important turning point is 1992, in which year W. Martin Bloomer published his book-length study of this author, and another monograph on him, by Clive Skidmore, appeared a few years later.[2] Bloomer's book is particularly relevant to the volume here under review, because most of its twelve papers were originally delivered during a conference held at the University of Cape Town in October 2017 under the title "Valerius Maximus: 25 Years After Bloomer" and organised by the editors of this volume, Jeffrey Murray and David Wardle. The papers deal with various topics and they approach Valerius from various angles,[3] but most of them belong, in fact, to this new trend in research and offer new insights into the study of Valerius the author.

Apart from a brief *Introduction* (pp. 1–14) with useful summaries of the ensuing chapters, the book opens with David Wardle's *"Not Putting Roman History in Order?" – Regal, Republican and Imperial Boundaries* (pp. 17–46), arguably one of the most substantial contributions in this volume.[4] At the beginning of his chapter, Wardle recalls a question put to him many years earlier by Fergus Millar: "What would emerge if you placed Valerius Maximus' *exempla* in chronological order?"; the chapter supplies an answer to this question and the results obtained by this rearrangement are noteworthy.

---

[1] Other such works include Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis historia* and Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*. Both have now been increasingly recognised as literary texts in their own right, the former especially since M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder*, Oxford 1992; the latter since L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, London 1988 (revised edition Oxford 2003). For Valerius Maximus in the context of *Quellenforschung* see e.g. C. Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Litteratur der historischen Exempla*, Stuttgart 1929; R. Helm, *Valerius Maximus, Seneca und die 'Exemplasammlung'*, Hermes 74 (1939), pp. 130–154; A. Klotz, *Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla*, München 1942.

[2] W.M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, London–Chapel Hill 1992; C. Skidmore, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*, Exeter 1996. For a sketch of modern scholarship on Valerius see J. Murray's introduction to the volume under review, pp. 1–3.

[3] They are divided into four parts: "Architecture and Order", "Roman History", "Values", "Reception and Tradition".

[4] As a scholar of Valerius, Wardle is best known for his commentary on Book 1 (*Valerius Maximus: Memorable Deeds and Sayings, Book 1*, Oxford 1998).

Out of a total of 707 Roman examples,[5] no more than 20 can be dated to the regal period and as many as 257 belong to the late Republic (133–44 BC); there are 50 *exempla* for the period 43 BC–AD 31, but, interestingly, if we put aside the Sejanus passage (11.11. *ext*. 4), the latest one refers to an event of AD 3.[6] Valerius' regal examples show that his treatment of Roman kings and the Roman monarchy itself is quite favourable: "no king appears as the exemplar of a vice – not even Tarquinius Superbus"; on the contrary, "the kings supplied examples of *religio* and *virtus*" (p. 22).[7] The language used by Valerius to describe the type of power wielded by the kings is also remarkable – the most common word is *imperium* and only once is it denoted as *dominatio*. On the other hand, *libertas* figures prominently in examples referring to the beginning of the republic, but the author eschews "any contentious use of *libertas* that might expose any difference between the 'Republic' and the system of his own day" (p. 28) and he characterises *libertas* as "inter virtutem vitiumque posita" (6.2 *praef*.), thus drawing attention to its ambiguous nature.[8]

In his section on the transition from the republic to the principate (pp. 30–42), Wardle generally follows those scholars who think that Valerius does not recognise any break between the former and the latter, insisting rather on the continuity of the Roman state; his aim, however, is to underpin this thesis by analysing Valerius' use of such terms as *res publica*, *status* and *princeps*. There are some very interesting observations about similarities between the language of Valerius and that of official and quasi-official documents of the early principate (is 9.15.1 an allusion to *RGDA* 34.1? – see p. 34); it is a pity, however, that Wardle fails to note the parallel between Val. Max. 8.13 *praef*.: "tranquillitatemque saeculi nostri, qua nulla umquam beatior fuit" and *Senatus consultum de Pisone patre* 13–14: "tranquillitatem praesentis status r(ei) p(ublicae), quo melior optari non potest" – although he quotes both passages separately (p. 38, n. 78 and p. 35, respectively). The chapter as a whole presents a valuable discussion of Valerius' view of Roman history and its constitutional developments; what becomes clear after putting his Roman *exempla* in chronological order is that, for the Tiberian author, the unity of Roman history and constitution is much more important than any divisions or demarcations.[9]

Sarah Lawrence's contribution (under the Monty Python title *And Now for Something Completely Different...*, pp. 47–72) discusses the role and significance of Valerius'

---

[5] All in all, there are 1051 *exempla* in the collection; see p. 18 with n. 7 for a discussion.

[6] No more than 16 *exempla* deal with events of 31 BC or afterwards (p. 31, n. 49).

[7] There is a marked contrast here between Roman and foreign *exempla*: "non-Roman kings do appear as the exemplars of vice" (p. 26).

[8] Of course, in this context *libertas* is closer to *parrhesia* than to constitutional ("republican") freedom, but it would be unwise to sharply differentiate between the two.

[9] Some minor points: in Wardle's paraphrase of 6.2.11, Valerius "condemns his [Galba's] action as meriting his removal as a tribune" (p. 28) – but "ut a tribunali summoveretur meruerat" refers to Galba being removed from the speaker's platform, not from the tribuneship (as a patrician, he had never held this office). For "Ogilvie 1995" read "Ogilvie 1965" (p. 20, n. 11), for "*religio simulate*" read "*religio simulata*" (p. 21, n. 13), for "AD 19" read "AD 20" (p. 35) and insert "(2011)" after "Bloomer, W.M." (p. 43). In the bibliography, "Acera, F.M." is placed between Mallan and Martin – in fact correctly, because his full surname is Martín Acera (p. 45).

external *exempla* (are they in fact substantially different from the Roman ones?; and was Valerius a bigot?), but concentrates on just one chapter which contains, exceptionally for this collection, only non-Roman material (2.6). Her conclusion is that foreign peoples are not viewed by the author as morally inferior to the Romans, that "key virtues and vices are common to all peoples and that exposure to foreign *exempla* can impart valuable lessons as well as warnings" (p. 70). This may be so, but her results should be verified by a close study of Valerius' more typical chapters in which foreign examples are put side by side with their Roman counterparts.[10] Moreover, Lawrence's readings of individual episodes of 2.6, although interesting, are occasionally marred by her misunderstanding of Valerius' Latin. The well-known section on the suicide of a matron from the island of Ceos (2.6.8)[11] provides us with some examples: "Asiam cum Sex. Pompeio petens Iulidem oppidum intravi" is rendered as "I entered Asia with Sex. Pompeius en route to the town of Iulis" (the other way round, in real fact); "mortemque suam Pompei praesentia clariorem fieri magni aestimaret" is for Lawrence, who ignores the genitive of value in this passage, "her death would be more notable through the presence of that great man Pompeius"; and also the matron's crucial death-bed statement "reliquias spiritus mei prospero fine [...] permuto" is bizarrely mistranslated (pp. 55–56). It is a pity that such flaws[12] detract from Lawrence's otherwise, I reiterate, fine analysis of this and other sections; as for the matron episode, I find her observation that "the old woman of Cea has 'out-Romanned' the Romans" (p. 61) particularly accurate.[13]

In *Coriolanus as an Exemplar in Valerius Maximus* (pp. 75–93), John Atkinson has applied the methods of "content analysis", introduced into Valerian scholarship in the sixties of the previous century by T.F. Carney,[14] to discuss the portrayal of Coriolanus.

---

[10] See G. Baroud's contribution to the volume under review for Valerius' prioritising domestic *exempla* on friendship over foreign ones (pp. 205–206).

[11] This is the only *exemplum* in the whole corpus which is based not on Valerius' reading, but on his own experience. "[I]t has been little studied", according to Lawrence (p. 56). But she misses an important paper by F. Römer, *Ein Glanzstück römischer Memorabilienliteratur (Val. Max. 2, 6, 8)*, Wiener Humanistische Blätter 31 (1989), pp. 52–65. When she calls attention to Valerius' "obstupefacti erant" instead of "obstupefacti eramus" (referring to the Roman witnesses' reaction to the woman's suicide) and suggests that "Valerius seems to distance himself to become an observer of both action and audience" (p. 60), she does not consider the possibility that Valerius was not present at the matron's bedside (it is quite likely that he was not, and that only Pompeius and some senior members of his retinue were admitted).

[12] I abstain from drawing up a full list, but her catalogue of Latin verbs used in reference to the matron of Ceos (p. 59, n. 26) must not be passed over without comment. Among them are the un-Latin *cogari* (i.e. *cogere – cogar* in the text) and *cohortator* (i.e. *cohortor – cohortata* in the text); also, *prospero* in the phrase *prospero fine* is evidently taken as a verb (*prosperare*).

[13] Some typos: for "*pallatus*" read "*palliatus*" (p. 62) and for "mines" read "mimes" (p. 68, n. 45). Irritatingly, there are four spelling errors in the only two German-language references cited in the bibliography ("*früehen*" instead of "*frühen*", "Dusseldorf" instead of "Düsseldorf" and "*Zum Zweiten*" instead of "*zum zweiten*") – which shows that at least some parts of the volume have been rather poorly copy-edited.

[14] His 1962 paper on Marius is particularly important: T.F. Carney, *The Picture of Marius in Valerius Maximus*, RhM 105 (1962), pp. 289–337. For "content analysis" as applied to Valerius, see now J. Murray, *Exemplary Biography: Reading Valerius Maximus Writing the Life of Cicero*, Mnemosyne 76 (2023), pp. 287–306 (at p. 290).

This early republican general is, admittedly, "a minor figure in Valerius Maximus' gallery of exemplars" (p. 75), as he is mentioned in only five *exempla* and he appears as the main character in only two of them, but Atkinson believes that he is relevant to the Tiberian context of Valerius' work. In particular, he suggests a link between Tiberius' Rhodian "exile" and that of Coriolanus in the land of the Volsci and perceives the latter's *pietas* towards his mother Veturia (5.4.1) as alluding to Tiberius and Livia. I remain sceptical: it would have been a very risky business for Valerius to associate the princeps with a man whom he describes as "funus ac tenebras Romano imperio minitantem" and whose *nefarium opus* he castigates (see 5.2.1). Be that as it may, by comparing Valerius' account with those of other sources Atkinson makes it clear that the Tiberian writer's choices in moulding his Coriolanus are deliberate; even Coriolanus' removal from an episode in which other texts do mention him (7.3.*ext*. 10) is part of his authorial strategy.[15]

In the next chapter, *Boundary Issues: Valerius Maximus on Rome's Italian Allies* (pp. 94–122), Roman Roth examines those passages which, from the point of view of Valerius' intended readership (i.e. Bloomer's "new nobility" of mainly municipal origin), may have been perceived as problematic, because the picture they draw of the Italian *socii* is not entirely favourable. When they appear together with the Romans, especially in the context of warfare, they may perform deeds of valour, but it is their Roman fellow warriors who usually fare better. The same applies, as a rule, to individuals: "Where it suits him, the lack of the Roman citizenship – however positive a historical figure might be portrayed in other ways – is for Valerius a suitable vehicle for character-assassination" (p. 104, in reference to the M. Perperna passage of 3.4.5).[16] In a separate sub-chapter (pp. 105–109), Roth discusses the *exempla* relating to the Campanians; they stress not only their *superbia* (which is a common topic in Roman literature), but also their *perfidia* (which likens them to the Carthaginians).[17] In this, and in other issues connected with the Italian *socii*, Valerius differs from his contemporary Velleius Paterculus, who is proud of his Campanian origins and speaks favourably of the allies' cause in the Social War (p. 118). There is a useful list of 35 *exempla* dealing with Rome's *socii* (pp. 119–121; one item is missing: 5.2.1b, discussed on p. 108).[18]

---

[15] Also in this chapter, there are some errors and inaccuracies of translation. To take one instance: Coriolanus' statement at 5.4.1 is rendered as: "To her womb I give up this anger though it was so rightly deserved" (p. 84). However, in the sentence: "expugnasti [...] et vicisti iram meam, patria, precibus huius admotis, cuius utero quamvis merito mihi invisam dono", *invisam* refers to *patria*, not to *iram*; Coriolanus has every reason to detest his country, but nonetheless he is bestowing this country as a gift onto his mother's lap.

[16] Roth fails to note that Perperna's father, whose son reached consulship in 130 BC, could not have been condemned under the *lex Papia de peregrinis exterminandis* of 65 BC; "the testimony of Valerius Maximus is a tissue of falsehoods" (thus P.A. Brunt, *The Legal Issue in Cicero, Pro Balbo*, CQ 32 (1982), pp. 136–147, at p. 145).

[17] When examining the episode of Badius (5.1.3), Roth says that, according to Livy, he was killed by Crispinus (p. 109, n. 37). No, he was defeated by him, but he fled from the battlefield afterwards (Liv. 25.18.14).

[18] Numerous misprints, especially in Latin, are irritating: for "passis" read "passus" (p. 97), for "Papiria" read "Papia" (p. 102), for "*nobililissimum*" read "*nobilissimum*" (p. 103), insert "saeviendi" between "materiem" and "non" (p. 107), for "senator" read "senatore" (p. 111), for "opera" read "opere"

The quotation in the title of Simon Lentzsch's chapter (*"Others Took Money from That Victory, but He Took the Glory": Spoils of War in the 'Facta et dicta memorabilia'*, pp. 123–148) comes from the Valerian passage on Aemilius Paullus' *abstinentia* after his victory in the Third Macedonian War (4.3.8). Notwithstanding the imperator's personal continence, the Romans benefitted greatly in material terms from this and other victories and the chapter attempts to assess Valerius' treatment of such episodes, especially those in which heavy and savage looting (as we know from other sources) was involved. It appears that he has very little to say about this darker side of Roman victories; for example, in sharp contrast to Livy, he makes no mention of "the infamous spoils of Syracuse", although he dwells upon Marcellus' tears shed after the capture of the town (5.1.4, in the chapter on *humanitas et clementia*). A lack of final revision and careful copy-editing is visible also in this chapter. Many notes contain extensive translations from Latin which have already been given, in part or in full, in the main text (p. 124, n. 3; p. 125, n. 6; p. 126, n. 7 *et saepius*). A Latin quotation lacks the subject (p. 137, n. 51: *senatus*); in another one a word is cut off at the beginning which makes the meaning of the sentence unclear (p. 142, n. 70: *ad*); "Wardle 1998" (p. 143, n. 75) is not listed in the bibliography.

As Alain Gowing finely shows in his chapter (*Forgetting Germanicus: Reading Valerius Maximus through Tacitus' Tiberian Books*, pp. 148–164), using Tacitus "as a measuring rod" (p. 149) may be profitable in assessing what Valerius tends to "forget" rather than to "remember", especially from contemporary history. Despite appearances, these two authors have much in common; in particular they "both deploy '*facta et dicta*' explicitly in the service of exemplarity" (p. 151) and their ethical standards are also similar. However, whereas for Tacitus Germanicus' exemplarity is beyond question[19] and he plays a very prominent part in *Annals* 1–2, Valerius studiously avoids any reference, or even any allusion, to him (although he does mention Germanicus' father more than once). Gowing surveys four conceptual areas in the context of which Germanicus might have been introduced;[20] particularly revealing is his discussion (pp. 158–159) of the *exemplum* depicting Scipio Africanus' stay in Sicily in 204 BC (3.6.1), which calls to mind Germanicus' Egyptian journey (as Tacitus tells us in *Ann*. 2.59.1, he was walking there "pedibus intectis et pari cum Graecis amictu", in direct imitation of Scipio – and he was reproached by Tiberius for abandoning native custom).[21]

The following four chapters belong to the section on "Values" (see note 3 above). The first, by Rebecca Langlands, is devoted to Valerius' treatment of *patientia* (*Valerius Maximus' Engagement with Cicero's Tusculan Disputations on Virtue and the Endurance*

---

and for "municipia" read "municipii" (both p. 114). There are also some typos in English, which I leave aside. A reference to Val. Max. "6.6.6" should be corrected to "6.9.6" (p. 105).

[19] "Although Tacitus embellishes him with some histrionics, Germanicus nonetheless proves to be skilled and savvy in dealing with a mutiny on multiple fronts" (p. 155). Few Tacitists, I suspect, would share this view.

[20] They are analysed in the following sections: "Military Discipline", "Triumph", "Religion" and "*Amicitia* and Alexander the Great".

[21] In this chapter, I have noticed only a few lapses. Tiberius died in AD 37, not 36 (p. 150). The correct reference to Germanicus' first mutiny speech is *Ann*. 1.34.4–35.1 (p. 156). "For" has to be inserted between "importance" and "Valerius" in the second sentence on p. 161.

of Pain, in 3.3 De patientia, pp. 167–196). In her view, the Tiberian author deserves recognition not only as a writer, but also as an ethical thinker.[22] Although his debt to Cicero is evident, it would be wrong to regard him as a mere rewriter of Cicero's ideas; in particular, his chapter *De patientia* "constitutes philosophical response to Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*" (p. 167): he recognises some weak points and contradictions in his predecessor's opinions (e.g. is philosophy really useful if even uneducated people can endure pain bravely; should strong emotions be wholly discarded as a motivation for virtuous acts) and puts forward his own solutions. And these may not only be clear-cut solutions, but also "food for thought" for his audience: "what this sequence of *exempla* does is to open up the debate by providing provocative material on which the reader may reflect" (p. 194). This is an insightful and well-argued chapter but, once again, it suffers from the lack of careful proofreading. The following list is by no means exhaustive: for "inutile" read "inutili" (p. 168), insert "*Torquatum*" between "*ne*" and "*quidem*" (p. 184; *ne ... quidem* must always be separated), for "*inhonestum et inutile adfectum*" read "*inhonestus atque inutilis adfectus*" (p. 186; the noun's gender is masculine, not neutral), for "*studiossimi*" read "*studiosissimi*" (p. 187), for "*delectate*" read "*delectet*" (p. 188).

The "provocative" aspect of Valerius' treatment of *exempla* plays a major role in George Baroud's *Amicitia and the Politics of Friendship in Valerius Maximus* (pp. 196–232); in his opinion, the stories selected by the Roman author to illustrate the working of friendship (4.7) "contain contradictory, troubling, extreme, or morally ambiguous *exempla* deliberately to provoke" (p. 219).[23] Should we, for instance, really regard Blossius' steadfast loyalty to Tiberius Gracchus as commendable? On the face of it, Valerius' position appears to be at odds with that of Cicero (cf. Val. Max. 4.7.2 with Cic. *Amic*. 37), but a critical reading leads us to quite different conclusions (p. 220). Baroud also makes an intriguing point about the (hidden) presence of Sejanus in the chapter on friendship: "it is impossible to talk about *amicitia* under Tiberius without raising the spectre of Sejanus" (p. 224). Once again, he thinks that the Tiberian author offers us no easy answers and that, consequently, we should not be tempted by the notion of either "the subversive Valerius" or "Valerius the loyalist". Valerius, instead, leaves it to his readers to reflect on whether the tension between public and private loyalty (of which he has spoken at length in his domestic section, adducing examples that have been exclusively taken from the late republican period of civil unrest) is still present in the time of imperial peace. But perhaps Baroud pays too little attention to the Laelius and Agrippa passage (4.7.7): in their case, there was no such tension and it appears that, in Valerius' eyes, it is Laelius and Agrippa who may be offered as examples worth imitating under the rule of the princeps.[24]

Valerius' work also deals with negative values: according to the statistics provided by Jeffrey Murray in his chapter (*Valerius Maximus on Vice*, pp. 233–260), there are 145

---

[22] For this view, see also R. Langlands, *Roman Exempla and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero 'de Officiis'*, JRS 101 (2011), pp. 100–122.

[23] Also: "Roman *exempla* [...] do not tell readers *what* to think, but set out to teach them *how* to think" (p. 219, original emphases).

[24] In this chapter, I have found only a few misspelt Latin words: read "adulatione", not "adulationi" (p. 202); "*deseruerun*t", not "*deserverunt*" (p. 207); "*fidelius*", not "*fidielius*" (p. 211); "*mutua*", not "*mutual*" (p. 215, n. 46).

vicious examples (some 13.8% of the total number) and among them 94 episodes are Roman and 51 are foreign;[25] most of them may be found in Book 9 (p. 234).[26] One of the topics discussed by Murray is the possible contemporary relevance of Valerius' catalogue of vices: many of them (e.g. *superbia*, *libido* and *crudelitas*) belong to the rhetorical tradition of characterising tyrants and have been applied to Tiberius by post-Tiberian authors. However, Valerius seems to be very careful in his choice of specific *exempla*; none of them may be construed as containing hidden criticism of the emperor. Two vices are examined in this chapter in more detail, namely avarice and revenge (which is also mentioned elsewhere than in Book 9 and, interestingly, is presented there in a positive or neutral light). Valerius' treatment of revenge may have some contemporary relevance (Piso in AD 20 and Sejanus in AD 31).[27]

The chapter by Emma Brobeck (*Efficacior Pictura: Morality and the Arts in Valerius Maximus*, pp. 261–284), which begins by emphasising the crucial role played in Valerius' narrative by *enargeia* or vividness, consists of two parts which, in my opinion at least, stand somewhat apart. The first examines two Valerian chapters which deal with artwork, 3.7 and 8.11; Valerius' idea of *artes* is a broad one, so only some of his *exempla* refer to the visual arts, which is Brobeck's focus here. One of her points concerns the relation between literary and visual arts; it appears that the former takes precedence over the latter. The second part of this chapter discusses two *exempla* that feature a young daughter breastfeeding her imprisoned parent (5.4.7–*ext*. 1) – an anonymous Roman mother in the first case (cf. Plin. *HN* 7.121) and a certain Cimon in the second (his daughter's name is Pero). Importantly, when presenting the Pero and Cimon story, Valerius refers to a painting illustrating this event and, in the conclusion to this section, he approaches the question of whether visual or literary representation is more effective (here we have the *efficacior pictura* from the chapter's title). Valerius' Latin here is unclear, but, in Brobeck's view, he portrays the impact made on the audience by "the painting of letters" (*pictura litterarum*) as more profound.[28] She concludes that it is literature alone (including, or even especially, Valerius' own work) that is not only able to reproduce an image, but also to teach a (moral) lesson; thus the final sentence of the Pero and Cimon episode should be viewed "as a guide for reading the *Facta et dicta* as a whole" (p. 282).

The last two contributions in the volume concern "Reception and Tradition". Diederik Burgersdijk argues in his chapter (*Valerius Maximus' 'Facta et dicta memorabilia' and the Roman Biographical Tradition*, pp. 287–315) that it would be profitable to look upon

---

[25] "Roman examples consistently outnumber foreign ones – Romans behave just as badly as their Greek, Persian, Carthaginian, and Egyptian counterparts" (p. 244).

[26] Murray's Cape Town doctoral dissertation of 2016 is a commentary on the first eleven chapters of this book.

[27] This chapter has been carefully proofread, but correct "*occultam*" to "*occultum*" (p. 240) and "*acceptem*" to "*acceptum*" (p. 255). Both "Stevenson 1992" (p. 246, n. 49) and "Jonca 2004" (p. 253, n. 75) are missing from the bibliography; the latter paper is M. Jońca, *Blood-Revenge and Murder Trial in the Early Roman Law*, Eos 91 (2004), pp. 44–51.

[28] "Quod necesse est animo quoque evenire, aliquanto efficaciore pictura litterarum vetera pro recentibus admonito recordari". But the text may be corrupt. In his Loeb edition, D.R. Shackleton Bailey identifies a lacuna between *litterarum* and *vetera* and inserts *monumentis*; on this reading painting is more powerful than literature. Brobeck discusses the issue on p. 279.

Valerius' literary undertaking in the context of biography, and especially the Roman variety portraying *viri illustres*. Thus he discusses some similarities between Valerius and Nepos but, curiously, only after devoting some five pages to this topic does he remind us (and himself) that Nepos' literary output includes not only the *De viris illustribus*, but also the lost *Exempla*.[29] The second part of Burgersdijk's chapter examines Valerius' presence in the biographical tradition of Late Antiquity, especially in the *Historia Augusta*. Among the issues he tackles there is the possible influence of Valerius on the *HA*'s programmatic statements (such instances are tabulated on p. 303 and quoted in full in the Appendix on pp. 305–313; *HA Max*. 31.4: "longum est omnia persequi", which Burgersdijk connects with Val. Max. 6.2 *praef*.: "persequi propositum est", has a much closer parallel in Nep. *Att*. 11.2: "difficile est omnia persequi"). Also, following Jacques Schwartz, he regards it as probable that *HA Cc*. 6.2–3 imitates Val. Max. 9.2.*ext*. 5 (p. 300). But note that Valerius names his Egyptian king "Ptolomaeus Physcon", whereas the *HA* passage has "Ptolomaei Euergetis, qui octavus hoc nomine appellatus est"; either the author of the *HA* drew from another source or he correctly identified this Ptolemy as Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II Physcon – which I find less likely.[30]

Finally, Kyle Conrau-Lewis picks up two case studies from the late mediaeval reception of Valerius, an author whose importance in the Middle Ages can hardly be overestimated (*Preaching Ancient History: Valerius Maximus and His Manuscript Reception*, pp. 316–342). In the first part of her chapter, she discusses some 14th- and 15th-century manuscript indexes to the *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, in which Valerius' *virtutes* and *vitia* are, for the benefit of preachers, listed alphabetically (from *Abstinencia* to *Ypocritas*) and sometimes also reinterpreted.[31] Her second case study deals with the commentary on Valerius by Conrad von Waldhausen, a 14th-century Augustinian friar active in Vienna and Prague. Conrad's favourite method is that of *allegare* or *applicare*, that is to say to

---

[29] Thus his claim that Nepos' "influence has not been properly assessed in modern research on Valerius" (p. 288) needs to be modified. On p. 292 he says: "Unlike Nepos [...], Valerius Maximus gives greater weight to Roman examples..." (than to Greek ones). Yet, for one thing, we do not know how these two groups were represented in the *Exempla* and, for another, we should not be misguided in our judgement by the randomness of survival (the only whole book of Nepos' biographical collection that we possess is about foreign generals).

[30] Seneca the Elder never mentions Valerius and, what is more, a dictum allegedly referring to him (which, in fact, has a general character) is not by Seneca but by an orator whom he quotes, Votienus Montanus (p. 290, n. 7). Ammianus' books 14–25 do not treat "the years up to Julian's emperorship in AD 361" but up to his death in AD 363 (p. 295). Insert "*quae*" between "*digna*" and "*apud*" (p. 291), read "*quoque*" instead of "*quodque*" (p. 292, n. 12), insert "the character" between "particulars" and "can" (p. 297, n. 29), read "Schwartz" instead of "Schwarz" (p. 300), "*ne ... quidem tacendum est*" instead of "*ne tacendum est*" (p. 303) and "conspicuus" instead of "conspicuous" (p. 308, one of many spelling errors in this volume which stem from not checking the abuses of English-language AutoCorrect. "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?").

[31] The mediaeval reinterpretation of Valerius is sometimes amusing. The Augustinian monk Michael de Massa Marittima adduced Valerius' story about Dionysius I not allowing even his adult daughters to shave him (9.13.*ext*. 4, from the chapter *De cupiditate vitae*) in order to point out that Christians should also be suspicious of men and trust only in God (p. 322). For the connection between preaching and alphabetical indexing in the Middle Ages, see D. Duncan, *Index, A History of the: A Bookish Adventure from Medieval Manuscripts to the Digital Age*, London 2022, ch. 2.

point to similarities between Roman and Christian themes and to "apply" the former to the latter – "however tenuous, incongruous or disturbing the juxtaposition may seem" (p. 334).[32]

As with many such volumes, the quality of the papers is uneven but, on the whole, high – and each of them offers at least a few interesting insights into Valerius Maximus' work and thought (my top five are, in alphabetical order, Baroud, Gowing, Langlands, Murray and Wardle). The book's most noticeable shortcoming is its rather miserable copy-editing, numerous instances of which I have registered while discussing individual chapters. But this, of course, is not as serious a *vitium* as to merit being included among the vices castigated by Valerius himself in Book 9 (he has no chapter *De neglegentia*).

To conclude: now thirty-three years after Bloomer, Valerius Maximus is no longer "Mr. Footnote"[33] – and the collection here under review makes this fact patently clear. As Jeffrey Murray informs me *per litteras*, another Valerian volume is underway (also in Brill), a product of a conference held at the University of Fribourg in December 2022.[34] More light on this long neglected author is most desirable.

Jakub Pigoń
University of Wrocław
jakub.pigon@uwr.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-9272-7490

[32] To take a funny example: commenting on the story of how Gaius Gracchus, while delivering speeches, modulated his voice in accordance with a melody played on an ivory flute by a slave (8.10.1), Conrad says: "Applica ad auxilium beate Virginis Marie, que est ebur candens castitatis" (p. 335).

[33] This designation comes from R. Langland's unpublished doctoral dissertation of 2000. I quote after Murray's introduction to the volume under review (p. 5, n. 13).

[34] For the conference programme, see: www.academia.edu/90175088 (accessed on 3/3/2025).