

**Paulus Orosius and Paulus Diaconus: the use of the *Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos* in the *Historia Romana***

Master Thesis for the Research Master Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Studies  
Jan van Doren, 3231488

Supervisor: prof. dr. M.B. de Jong  
Co-supervisor: PD. mag. dr. M. Diesenberger

<b>Table of contents</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter one: Paulus Orosius and the <i>Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos</i></b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter two: Paul the Deacon and the <i>Historia Romana</i></b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter three: The analysis of the use of Orosius' <i>Historiarum Libri Septem</i> in the <i>Historia Romana</i></b>	<b>22</b>
<b>1. A discussion of the <i>verbatim</i> citations from the <i>Historiarum Libri Septem</i></b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2. A discussion of the lightly edited citations from the <i>Historiarum Libri Septem</i></b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3. A discussion of the heavily edited citations from the <i>Historiarum Libri Septem</i></b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Appendix A: Commentary to the table of citations in Appendix B</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Appendix B: Comparison of original passages in the <i>Historia libri septem adversum paganos</i> with their counterparts in the <i>Historia Romana</i></b>	<b>82</b>

## Introduction

*‘Die ganze Wirkungsgeschichte der Werke des Orosius darzulegen, wäre eine –sicher wünschenswerte– Arbeit, die nicht in einem kurzen Ausblick geleistet werden kann.’<sup>1</sup>*

This task Hans-Werner Goetz proposed in 1980 is too large to undertake in its entirety here, but a small step towards its completion will nevertheless be undertaken in this thesis. *‘Der Werke des Orosius’* refers to the *Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos (HLS)*, which was written in the early fifth century by Paulus Orosius (c. 385 – post 418). Orosius was a priest from Spain who was to become a pupil of two of Late Antiquity’s most influential churchmen, St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) and St. Jerome (c. 347-420).<sup>2</sup> The *HLS* were meant to appropriate both pre-Christian and Christian history for use against pagans by Christian apologists like Orosius himself. At the same time a work of history and a work of apologetics, the *HLS* thus presents a very interesting reinterpretation of the history of the world as seen through the eyes of a devout and dutiful Christian. It was written with a clear purpose in mind: to demonstrate the workings of God throughout history and to clearly show that it was God and not the pagan gods, who ordained history. Orosius wished to show that his God, according to a clear and often discernable plan, orchestrated both the great wonders as well as the great disasters of the past, present and, therefore naturally, the future.<sup>3</sup>

This Christianized version of classical history became immensely popular in the Middle Ages, mostly due to ‘[Orosius]’ stress on the constant intervention of Divine Providence in history, with clearly discernible rewards and punishments, his optimism about the future [and] his confidence in the continuance of Rome as a Christian empire —combined with his negative picture of the pagan past.’<sup>4</sup> Hence Goetz’s proposed task. Identifying the uses of the *HLS* in later historiographical works will be a very worthwhile enterprise; for one, it will reveal much about the reception of the *HLS* and the ideas within it by later scholars. Such a study can also throw light upon the later works that incorporated parts of the *HLS*, by contrasting the original work with the way it is transmitted in these newer compilations. We know quite a lot about the themes and arguments in the *HLS*;<sup>5</sup> some other historiographical works that made use of it, however, are far less well studied.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hans-Werner Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie des Orosius*, Impulse der Forschung 32 (Darmstadt, 1980) p. 149, n. 659

<sup>2</sup> Andrew T. Fear (trans./ed.), *Orosius: The Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, Translated Texts for Historians 54 (Liverpool, 2010) p. 1-6

<sup>3</sup> *HLS*, 7.43.16-19

<sup>4</sup> Jocelyn Hillgarth, ‘The *Historiae* of Orosius in the Early Middle Ages’ in: Louis Holtz and Jean-Claude Fredouille (eds.), *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes, II: Antiquité tardive et Christianisme ancien (VIe - IXe siècles). Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine* (Paris, 1992) p. 159

<sup>5</sup> Though written in 1980, Goetz’s *Geschichtstheologie* is perhaps still the most complete and concise study of Orosius’ *HLS*.

One such work is the *Historia Romana (HR)*, written for duchess Adalperga of Benevento sometime around 773 by Paul the Deacon (c. 730 – pre 800).<sup>6</sup> Long regarded as a rather simplistic work of history,<sup>7</sup> in the eyes of modern scholars it has been overshadowed in importance and significance by Paul's later history, the *Historia Langobardorum (HL)*. The *HR* was an adaptation and continuation of another Roman history, Eutropius' (born c. 320) *Breviarum*, which Adalperga had originally deemed too brief and areligious.<sup>8</sup> Besides incorporating the *Breviarum* in its entirety, the *HR* also made ample use of the *HLS*. Due to the relative scarcity of scholarly attention for this history of Rome, there are still a lot of things that can be found out about it and its author through a comparison of its uses of the *HLS* with the original work.

This comparison is warranted on several grounds: for one, except for the *Breviarum*, Orosius was Paul the Deacon's major source of information for the first twelve of the sixteen books of the *HR*. The sheer amount of material taken from Orosius' histories begs the question as to why, instead of trying to incorporate this material into the *HR*, he did not simply suggest the *HLS* to Adalperga to read alongside the *Breviarum*.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, this is not solely a comparison centred on the *HR*: this comparison will also shed light on Orosius' *Wirkungsgeschichte*.

My approach to this comparison will be relatively straightforward: a list of citations and interpolations from Orosius' *HLS* in Paul's *HR* will be composed to provide the basic means of comparison, i.e. textual comparison. How faithfully did Paul use the *HLS* and how much did he adapt the passages from them, either by changing the wording or by changing the context of them? This comparative list of citations, preceded by a short commentary, makes up the appendix to this thesis. The actual analysis of this comparison is what is contained within the thesis itself. The main question that will be asked is: how did Paul the Deacon use passages and citations from the *HLS* in his *HR* and what can this tell us about Paul's views on history, on his own time and on Orosius' opinions? Furthermore, what can this comparison tell us about Paul the Deacon's methods, intentions, specific audience and thus about this eighth century historian from Italy himself? What can it also tell us about the reception of Orosius in eighth century Italy, at least by Paul the Deacon?

In answering these questions, we will gain insights into Paul's editing and selection of passages from the *HLS* and thus we will gain insight into his own purposes in constructing the *HR*. The contrast that will become apparent between the *HLS* in its original form and the way in which Paul the Deacon incorporated it into his own history, will also be revealing of the worth the *HLS* had in the eyes of an

---

<sup>6</sup> Benjamin D. P. Cornford, *The Idea of the Past in Early Medieval Italy: Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, dissertation submitted to Cambridge University (2002) p. 10-12

<sup>7</sup> Ibidem, p. 17-18

<sup>8</sup> *HR* p. 3

<sup>9</sup> Walter Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (AD. 550-600): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede and Paul the Deacon* (paperback edition) (Notre Dame, 2005) p. 347-356

eighth century historian like Paul. Regarding this, Jocelyn Hillgarth, in his introductory survey of Orosius' *Wirkungsgeschichte*, remarked that Paul mostly used Orosius to add flavour to Eutropius' somewhat blander account, in a sense only cherry-picking Orosian elements to expand or underline parts of Eutropius.<sup>10</sup> Benjamin Cornford, in his dissertation on the *HR*, also remarks that Paul chose to omit much of the core Orosian elements of the *HLS*, especially the stress on Divine Providence and the depravity of war.<sup>11</sup> My own more detailed analysis of the uses of the *HLS* in the *HR* will show that these conclusions are a little too hasty and that the link between the *HLS* and the *HR* will prove to be more complex than either of these two authors suggest. While Paul the Deacon was at times critical of several elements of Orosius' *HLS*, he did end up incorporating a lot of material from it into the *HR*. My comparison will prove that there were specific ways in which he either eliminated those elements he did not agree with or that he adapted them in subtle, intelligent ways.

Preceding the analytical chapters which explore this complex link between the two histories, are two chapters providing the necessary historical context for the *HLS* and the *HR* respectively. The life and times of Orosius and of Paul the Deacon will be explored to gain a better picture of each author's specific context and thus the context from which each of their works sprang. I will also examine the medieval and modern receptions of the *HLS* and the *HR*, to generate a better understanding of the medieval and modern historiographical traditions that surround these works.

Following these chapters there will be three analytical chapters that make up the heart of this thesis. I have chosen to split up my analysis of the citations and interpolations from the *HLS* in the *HR* into three parts. The first chapter will deal with citations that have occurred *verbatim* and which were transmitted unaltered by Paul the Deacon. In the second chapter I will analyze citations that have been taken from Orosius in largely *verbatim* form, but which have been altered in small, but not insignificant ways. The third and final analytical chapter, then, will deal with those citations that were heavily altered, abbreviated or adapted. On the one hand, this will clarify Paul the Deacon's methods of incorporation and on the other hand, this will shine a light on when and for what reasons, Paul chose to alter his citations from the *HLS*.

All the findings done in these three analytical chapters will be consolidated and condensed in a final concluding chapter. There I will present my own thoughts on Paul the Deacon's choices of inclusion and exclusion from the *HLS* as well as formulate take-off points for further research into both the *HR* and the *HLS*.

---

<sup>10</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 168

<sup>11</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 49

## Chapter one: Paulus Orosius and the *Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos*

In this chapter I will deal with several aspects of Orosius' life and of his *HLS*; this will provide the historiographical context necessary for the analysis of the uses of Orosius' work in the *HR*. First, Orosius' life and times will be discussed, so we may better understand the mind and the very specific historic context from which the *HLS* sprang. After that, a closer look at the *HLS*, its themes and its structure is warranted, to be followed by some remarks about both its reception and transmission in late antique/early medieval times. I will conclude this chapter by looking at the modern scholarly attention Orosius and his work have received in recent years.

### *The life and times of Orosius*

For all that Orosius was such a well-known late antique author, we know relatively little about his life. It is even unclear whether his *praenomen* was actually Paulus, a fact only attested by later sixth century sources.<sup>12</sup> What we do know about his life, however, is of some significance if we wish to discuss the *HLS*, for his journey across the Mediterranean and his reasons for visiting St. Augustine definitely shine a light on his persona and character.

Given that we only learn of Orosius through written record from 415 onward, which is when Augustine wrote to Jerome to recommend the young priest, any speculation on his earlier years is fraught with uncertainties. While the exact date of Orosius' birth is unknown, it is speculated that he must have been born around 385.<sup>13</sup> It is generally accepted that he stemmed from the Iberian Peninsula, though there is still some debate as to which specific region Orosius would have called home.<sup>14</sup> His work shows clear signs that Orosius must have enjoyed a good education, suggesting that he may have come from a good family.<sup>15</sup> Little else is known of his life until, by all accounts, Orosius left Spain somewhere around 411, either because he was divinely inspired to seek out Augustine, as he attests in his *Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*,<sup>16</sup> or because he was fleeing from barbarian invaders, as he attests in the *HLS*.<sup>17</sup> Both explanations were tailored to the specific context of their works: presenting himself to Augustine with the *Commonitorium*, Orosius had to contend with Augustine's harsh critique of priests leaving their flock.<sup>18</sup> In the *HLS*, however, the ferocity of barbarians –as opposed to the civility of Christian Rome– was often stressed and this reference to his flight is just another case in point.

---

<sup>12</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 1

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 1-2

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 2-3

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 1

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 4, c.f. Orosius, *Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*, in: *Patrologia Latina* 31, 1211-16

<sup>17</sup> *HLS* 3.20.6-7, 5.2.1

<sup>18</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 2

The *Commonitorium* provides us a first glimpse into Orosius' character: it was a memoir attesting to his involvement in doctrinal disputes in Spain, thus showcasing Orosius' skill in rhetorics and polemics. It was these very same doctrinal disputes that were to see Orosius travelling the breadth of the Mediterranean: not being able to answer all of Orosius' questions with regard to the Priscillians, Augustine sent him on to Jerome in Palestine.<sup>19</sup> Once there, Orosius was undoubtedly influenced by Jerome's teachings, as he had been and would later again be influenced by Augustine's.<sup>20</sup> Orosius also became involved in the Pelagian controversy, unsuccessfully trying to argue the case against Pelagius in a synod on 28 July 415 in Jeruzalem. After the discovery of the relics of the proto-martyr Stephen, Orosius was to return to Spain via North Africa to deliver some of these relics to the bishop of Braga. He arrived back in North Africa in 416 with a letter from Jerome to Augustine. In the same year, he also attended the Council of Carthage, before attempting to cross over to Spain unsuccessfully. Leaving the relics of Stephen on Maiorca, he then once again returned to Africa.<sup>21</sup>

This is when Orosius vanishes from the historical record once more, only producing the undated *HLS* somewhere before 418, but otherwise not surfacing again. There is no consensus on when exactly Orosius produced the *HLS*, nor on when he passed away.<sup>22</sup> Andrew Fear reckons Orosius must have died pretty close to 418, believing that such a combative and restless individual like Orosius could not have been content sitting still.<sup>23</sup> While this line of reasoning provides a rather weak argument for dating Orosius' death, Fear's convictions concerning Orosius' character are certainly worth mentioning: Orosius' life shows him to have been a restless individual, almost continually on the move, studying under, as well as working for, some of Late Antiquity's most renowned theologians and scholars. While the praise Augustine lavished on the Spanish priest in his letter to Jerome is somewhat dulled by his later dismissal of Orosius in his *Retractationes*,<sup>24</sup> it is clear that Orosius was certainly considered to have been a worthy individual. Augustine's commission of the *HLS*, though only evidenced by Orosius' claim of this commission in the *HLS* itself, would also speak to the trust Augustine had put in Orosius. His travels and the works he produced, moreover, show him to have been zealous and well versed in rhetorics and doctrine.

The times Orosius lived in are also reflected in his work. He arrived in Carthage in 411, scarcely a year after the sack of Rome by Alaric and his Goths in 410. His was a time of doctrinal

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, p. 4-5

<sup>20</sup> Ibidem, p. 4

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, p. 5

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, p. 6-7

<sup>23</sup> Ibidem, p. 6

<sup>24</sup> Theodor E. Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', in: Ed./Trans. Eugene F. Rice Jr., *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (New York, 1959) p. 347

disputes within the Christian Church and accusations against the Church from without,<sup>25</sup> a time of 'barbarian invasions' and great upheavals.<sup>26</sup> The balance of power was shifting in favour of the Christians now that the emperors had formally taken up Christianity, but there was a challenge to Roman unity lurking on the horizon in the form of barbarian peoples, seeking refuge, employ or wealth in the Roman Empire. Incorporating these disparate peoples into the Roman Empire proved to be a big challenge. Though the late fourth century and the fifth century are no longer looked at in such an unfavourable light as they once were, these were still troubled times, both politically as well as religiously.<sup>27</sup>

Not only did Orosius experience the troubles of these times, first fleeing from Spain because of barbarians incursions and then later being unable to return to Spain because of them, but he also took an active role in the debates that raged around many central topics concerning Christianity, Empire and the Church. As we have seen, he wrote against the Priscillians and argued against the Pelagians, and then finally, with the *HLS*, he argued against the pagans for a new interpretation of Church and Empire, Christianity and history. In short, Orosius was capable of refuting and rebutting the claims of others and of providing proof and arguments to support his own position. He was both an advocate of orthodoxy as well as an apologist on behalf of the entire Church (inasmuch as we can speak of an organized Church in these times).

His writing moreover, is reminiscent of his background: while he was certainly a Christian, Orosius was also a Roman and proud of it. Throughout his work, Orosius makes many references that belie his classical education.<sup>28</sup> While his identification as a Roman and his use of classical Roman historiography were certainly part of his rhetoric strategy, he was obviously well-versed in Roman history and well educated in the Roman classics. Orosius still stood with one leg in the classical Roman world, with the other, in the Christian world: his *HLS*, in some ways, was meant to create a common ground between these two. It was an answer to pagan allegations that the adoption of Christianity had worsened the lot of the Roman Empire and had angered the traditional gods. But it was also an appropriation of Roman and pre-Roman history into a universal, Christian history of the world, providing answers and consolation of a sort to Christians and pagans alike about their then troubled times.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> C.f. Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford etc., 2003) p. 70-92

<sup>26</sup> C.f. Edward James, *Europe's Barbarians AD 200-600* (Harlow, 2009) p. 50-75

<sup>27</sup> Patrick Geary, *The Myth of Nations: the Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, 2003) p. 63-119

<sup>28</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 1, 15-18

<sup>29</sup> Garry W. Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice* (London, 2000) p. 292-309, Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 12-19



*The Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos*

‘The Earth is the Lord’s and all that fills it’

Psalm 24.1

In the *HLS*, Orosius manages a close paraphrase of the sentiment espoused in this psalm.<sup>30</sup> Completed somewhere before 418 and likely written in some haste, the *HLS* were ostensibly composed at the behest of Augustine.<sup>31</sup> For his histories Orosius made use of a lot of classical Roman historiography; influences from Livy, Tacitus, Justin, Caesar, Sallust, Suetonius and Eutropius are all incorporated into the *HLS*.<sup>32</sup> The Spanish priest also made ample use of Jerome’s *Chronicle* and he was thus influenced by the more Eastern Christian historiographical tradition as well. Orosius listed a singular purpose in his preface dedicating the work to Augustine, namely to enumerate the miseries of the pre-Christian past to prove to the pagans how much better the conditions of the Christian present were and to show how all this was part of a Divine plan.<sup>33</sup> The *HLS* were meant to provide a clear, well-reasoned argument against pagan allegations that the Christian faith had declined the fortunes of Rome. Yet such a simple and clear statement belies the complexity of the work: the psalm cited above represents but one of the many additional themes Orosius has incorporated into the *HLS*. The histories Orosius ended up compiling can scarce be said to be a mere enumeration of historical events.

Of course there is quite a bit of enumeration going on regardless, but it has not been included without deeper intent: the often tedious, nigh unrelenting string of disasters and wars that took place in pre-Christian times forms one part of a dual scheme that runs through the *HLS*. They are meant to show the forgetfulness of the pagans, who were apparently ignorant of the woes of the past.<sup>34</sup> These disastrous times are juxtaposed with the *tempora Christiana* in which peace, not war, was the norm and in which disasters were often less severe than they had been in pre-Christian times. The comparison is deliberately skewed in the advantage of the *tempora Christiana*, obviously showing Orosius teleological approach. In his view, history was running its course towards a definite endpoint: first the birth of Christ, then the conversion of the world and finally the end times.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> *HLS* 5.2.7

<sup>31</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 6-7

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 15-16

<sup>33</sup> *HLS* Pre.10

<sup>34</sup> *HLS* Pre.9

<sup>35</sup> *HLS* Pre.14-16; Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 49-57

History was thus, according to Orosius, pre-ordained and God's hand could be seen at work in it, even before the time of Christ. In a similar vein, after the coming of Christ, ungodly people could still serve as instruments of God or suffer His wrath. One did not need to believe in God, to be a pawn, so to speak, in His greater plan. Rome and its history played an important role within this Divine plan, as Orosius was wont to stress.<sup>36</sup> Despite its wretched, disaster ridden past, Rome was pre-ordained to be the fourth Kingdom, as per Nebuchadnezzar's prophecy in the Book of Daniel, which would reign until the end days due to its conversion to Christianity.<sup>37</sup> Rome was to be the vessel that would unite the plenitude of nations in the world under one ruler, namely a Roman emperor, and one faith, namely Christianity. It was also because of this reason that Rome, unlike Babylon, Macedonia and Carthage, the three kingdoms that had come before it, would withstand the test of time and would not fall where the others did. A complex chronological scheme underlies this division of the history, which is partially supported by, but which also partially contradicts, Jerome's *Chronicle*.

Not only chronology, however, supported Orosius' claims, for many miracles and portents underlay his reasoning that Rome was pre-ordained by God to serve the abovementioned role. The clearest example of this was the occasion of Christ's birth, which coincided with the rule of the first Roman emperor, Augustus (63 BC – 14 CE). By being born in the time of Augustus, Christ not only legitimated Augustus' reign and, by extension, the imperial system, but he was also enrolled into the Roman Empire as a citizen, designating the Roman Empire as his vessel.<sup>38</sup> The eventual rise and adoption of Christianity is what separated Imperial Rome from its predecessors, what made Rome's conquests eventually lead to peace and prosperity.<sup>39</sup> But because not yet everyone had become (properly) Christian, there were still wars, there were still disasters, but the harmful effects of both were greatly diminished due to the presence of Christians in the Roman Empire. One need only look, said Orosius, at the relatively mild sack of Rome in 410 as opposed to the terrible sack of Rome in 387 CE, to notice the difference.<sup>40</sup>

What Orosius basically did then, was turn Roman history on its head: the glory days of Rome's great wars and conquests, when Rome was supposedly favoured by the traditional gods, were turned into a cesspit of war, plague and misery. The wars and heroes Rome traditionally glorified, Orosius vilified. Rome's traditional gods, demons in all actuality, had never looked out for Rome and the portents that these demons had sent were either curses in disguise, or misattributed and

---

<sup>36</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 16-18; Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 80-88

<sup>37</sup> Fesr, *Orosius*, p. 19-20; Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 71-79

<sup>38</sup> *HLS* 6.22

<sup>39</sup> Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 88-107

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 29-36

misinterpreted.<sup>41</sup> Orosius therefore took it upon himself to reinterpret history, to reinterpret the ancient signs and to show that Rome's glories lay not in the past, but in the present and the future, and that the Christian God had always had a plan for Rome. While on the one hand damning the ferocity and warmongering of the world's past, he paints a pretty picture of the peaceful and prosperous future that was to come under Christian Imperial rule. Even the barbarians that now flocked to the Roman Empire in great numbers showed signs of improvement: some of them had already converted and submitted themselves to Roman rule. It would not be long, seems to be Orosius' promise, until all the world would be in a state of peace.<sup>42</sup>

For his own time, it was enough for Orosius to note that it was already far better than the past, at least for those already Christian. God's wrath, if it struck, was less severe and struck only those who deserved it, either because of impiety, heresy or crime. Wars were less bloody, plagues exacted a lesser toll, barbarians were more reasonable and times, really, had never been so good. Orosius, as a Christian, could travel the length and breadth of the Mediterranean and be embraced as a Roman and a Christian, by Romans and Christians everywhere he came.<sup>43</sup> Any Christian like him could feel similarly safe and secure. Slowly, but inexorably, the Roman Empire would unify the world and simultaneously unify itself with the Church, eventually leaving war and strife behind.<sup>44</sup> Goetz names this positivistic streak in Orosius' view of history his '*felicitas-Gedanke*'.<sup>45</sup>

#### *The early medieval reception and transmission of the Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos*

This very positivistic '*felicitas-Gedanke*', combined with Orosius' very consoling conceptualization of God's hand in history, and the providential role of the Roman Empire within it, would make his work popular in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.<sup>46</sup> Yet his benefactor, Augustine, did not appear to have been equally enamoured of the *HLS*. Although later scholars apparently mistook Augustine's silence on the *HLS* for approval –perhaps due to Orosius' closing statement in which he said 'if you [, Augustine,] publish them, they must be approved of by you, if you destroy them, you will have disapproved of them'<sup>47</sup>– Theodor Mommsen has argued that there were many points of contention between Orosius and his former master.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography*, p. 295-296

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem, p. 308-309

<sup>43</sup> *HLS* 5.2

<sup>44</sup> Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 107-117

<sup>45</sup> Ibidem, p. 117-121

<sup>46</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 159-160

<sup>47</sup> *HLS* 7.43.20, translation by A. T. Fear: '*qui praecepisti, tibi adjudicanda, si edas: per te iudicata, si deleas*'

<sup>48</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p. 325-348: Augustine did not agree with Orosius' '*do ut des*' approach to Divine Providence in history, nor did he particularly like the pre-ordained role Orosius gave to Augustus. All in all, Mommsen found that Orosius was likely too focussed upon earthly events and rewards, rather than on

Regardless, many early medieval scholars identified Orosius with the teachings of his master, sometimes even praising him alongside Augustine as another of the Church Fathers.<sup>49</sup> Mommsen believes that the difference between the two had escaped most early medieval historians, mostly because the *HLS* was far more accessible and more overt in its goals and convictions than the *De civitate Dei*.<sup>50</sup> Hillgarth stresses that the two obviously differed in their approach to history, Augustine taking a theological tack, whereas Orosius leaned more towards a political approach, which he too deemed to be the more accessible of the two.<sup>51</sup> Hillgarth then goes on to list an astounding amount of early medieval authors that made use of Orosius or gave indications of having read his work; as said, most of these scholars valued Orosius very highly. Not all may have agreed with all of Orosius' thoughts and views, as will also become apparent in this thesis in the case of Paul the Deacon, but he remained an incredibly valuable and authoritative source regardless.<sup>52</sup>

The manuscript evidence points in the same direction: a stunning 249 manuscripts of the *HLS* are extant from the entire Middle Ages, of which 228 are (parts) of the unabbreviated version.<sup>53</sup> From the period up until the year 1000 alone we have 45 manuscripts, an equally astounding number. There can thus be no doubt that the *HLS* were read and likely valued highly for their contents. While there remains a lot of work to be done to see how much Orosius influenced later historiographical traditions, Andrew Merrills has recently shown that, with regard to his geographical introduction, Orosius was somewhat of a trendsetter.<sup>54</sup> Merrills looked at how Jordanes, Isidore of Seville and Bede followed in Orosius' footsteps and used geographical introductions to provide a geographical context and scope to their histories. In this regard, at least, Orosius helped shape a tradition in early medieval historiography and it is likely that his views on Roman history might have had similar effects.<sup>55</sup>

#### *Modern views on Orosius' Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos*

Yet Orosius and his *HLS* have not always been viewed in such a positive light, or been granted such an influential role in the founding of medieval historiographical traditions. In 1955 Eric Hobsbawm even went as far as to say that 'no historian today cares a rap what [he] wrote, or thinks [his] views worth

---

heavenly ones, for Augustine's tastes. Trompf even goes as far as to suggest that Augustine's latter books of the *City of God* directly oppose Orosius' view of history, c.f. Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography*, p. 293

<sup>49</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 162

<sup>50</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p. 347-348

<sup>51</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 158-159

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 157-170

<sup>53</sup> Lars Boje Mortensen, 'The diffusion of Roman histories in the Middle Ages. A list of Orosius, Eutropius, Paulus Diaconus, and Landolfus Sagax manuscripts' in: *Filologia Mediolatina: Rivista della Fondazione Ezio Franceschini* 6-7 (2000) p. 104-105

<sup>54</sup> C.f. Andrew Merrills, *History and Geography in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2008)

<sup>55</sup> Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 159-165

a minute's consideration.<sup>56</sup> It is true that, where medieval scholars apparently missed the discrepancy between Augustine's views on history and those held by Orosius, nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars did not. Up until the seventies and eighties of the last century, Orosius has been categorized as unoriginal in his composition of the *HLS* and as having misunderstood his master's directives.<sup>57</sup> Orosius was judged as either a slavish follower of Augustine, or as a fool who had not grasped the former's intent.

Hillgarth quite helpfully remarks the following with regard to these critiques:

'Judgements such as these are open to criticism from two directions. On the one hand they are based on a view of Orosius as a mere (a very unintelligent) disciple of Augustine, someone whose only ambition was to learn from Augustine's thought and work under the master's control. On the other, they fail to explain why the Middle Ages valued Orosius so highly, why, especially in the earlier centuries, he at times exercised more influence than Augustine himself.'<sup>58</sup>

Thankfully, more recent times have seen a rehabilitation of interest in what made Orosius so intriguing. Mommsen, in the fifties, was already aware that Orosius was far closer to historiographical tradition to Eusebius and Jerome, than to Augustine.<sup>59</sup> While he expressed doubts that this could have been a mere misunderstanding on Orosius' part, Mommsen does not remark upon it further. Trompf and Fear both more overtly express positive views of Orosius' intellect and originality: Trompf cites Orosius' own statements of humility at the end of the *HLS* as evidence for his own recognition of the disparity between the work his master had asked of him and the work he had ended up writing.<sup>60</sup> Fear, too, finds that Orosius was certainly aware that he disagreed with Augustine on several points in his *HLS* and reiterates that this priest from Spain was not afraid to step out from under his benefactor's shadow.<sup>61</sup>

While certainly bound to Augustine in some regards, Orosius' *HLS* need to be viewed separately from the body of work of his one-time master. When looked at according to its own merits, Orosius' work provides a lot of food for thought, as Goetz's contribution to the *Impulse der Forschung*-series quite adequately demonstrates.<sup>62</sup> This short, but insightful study of the *HLS*

---

<sup>56</sup> Eric J. E. Hobsbawm, *Correspondence in the New Statesman and Nation*, 217 (1955), reference taken from Fear, *Orosius*, p. 25

<sup>57</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 157-158

<sup>58</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 158

<sup>59</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p. 345

<sup>60</sup> Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography*, p. 308

<sup>61</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 24

<sup>62</sup> Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 1-7

provides a critical re-examination of the work, its themes and its importance to historians. Written in 1980, I feel that it still provides one of the clearest and astute surveys of the *HLS*. The new *Translated Texts for Historians* edition of the *HLS* by Fear will also hopefully prove remarkably helpful in opening Orosius' universal history up for further examination by a wider audience. Merrills' *History and Geography in Late Antiquity* has already shown the potential for further research into the many uses to which the *HLS* were put by later scholars and historians.

All in all, Orosius' star is on the rise: emancipated from Augustine's shadow, Orosius and his work are being looked at in a new light. The amazing popularity the work enjoyed up until the eighteenth century has led to questions about the aspects of this work that made it so intriguing. To answer such questions, a closer look is required not only at the *HLS* themselves, but also at the ways in which it was put to use in later times. Slowly but surely, more interest is being shown in Orosius' work of history and it is expected to lead to better insights into late antique and early medieval historiographical traditions.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 157; Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 149; Merrills, *History and Geography*, p. 99

## Chapter two: Paul the Deacon and the *Historia Romana*

In a similar vein as the previous chapter, this chapter is meant to establish the context of Paul the Deacon and his *Historia Romana*. Though we know perhaps a little more about Paul the Deacon's life than we do about Orosius', the *Historia Romana* remains a relatively under-studied work and therefore comments about its themes and both its modern and medieval reception can be made with less authority than those about the *HLS*. Nevertheless, here I hope to create a useful picture of Paul's life and times as well as to give a clear and concise introduction into the *Historia Romana* and the scholarly tradition surrounding it.

### *Paul the Deacon's life and times*

Paul the Deacon's life and especially his retreat into the monastery of Monte Cassino have occasioned some debates.<sup>64</sup> I do not believe reiterating those debates here will prove very helpful, so, as with Orosius' life, I will stick to the 'certainties' of Paul the Deacon's life, highlighting those aspects of his life which are pertinent to his composition of the *HR*. Paul the Deacon was born in the late twenties or thirties of the eighth century, likely in Frioul, the northernmost Lombard duchy in Italy.<sup>65</sup> He appears to have been of noble blood and to have been in close proximity to the Lombard court at Pavia in his younger years, attested by his writings about king Ratchis (r. 744-749).<sup>66</sup> Throughout his life, Paul would appear to have sought the patronage of royal and ducal figures; his earliest attested writing is a poem to duchess Adalperga of Benevento in 763. It is believed that, by that time, Paul too was in Benevento. Except for his association with the court of Ratchis and his connection to Adalperga, a fellow Friulan, little is known of his early life and the specific circumstances he lived in. While his name would suggest that he was early on destined for a career in the Church,<sup>67</sup> it is unknown in what ecclesiastical capacity Paul spent his earlier years.<sup>68</sup> What is obvious from his writing is that Paul must have enjoyed a good education: in his *HL* Paul places emphasis on the importance of letters to a ruler and his own work reflects his knowledge and appreciation of historiography.<sup>69</sup>

The *HR* was written at the request of Adalperga and can be dated to somewhere around 773; a work of history itself, it once more shows Paul's appreciation of history as a tool of education.<sup>70</sup> The details of Adalperga's request will be treated a little later, for what matters here is that at this time,

---

<sup>64</sup> C.f. Rosamond McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks' in: *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000), p. 324-326 and Goffart, *Narrators*, p. xxx-xxxiv

<sup>65</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 334

<sup>66</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 335

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 335

<sup>68</sup> McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks', p. 325

<sup>69</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 328, 332

<sup>70</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 324

Paul still sought the patronage of the Benovenan elite.<sup>71</sup> It would not be long, however, until Paul was swept up by the Frankish conquest of Lombardy in 774. Maybe as early as 776, he found himself at the Frankish court,<sup>72</sup> seeking patronage and later pleading for his brother Arichis' release from exile. Paul's stay at Frankish court would appear to have earned him favour: several works were commissioned of him, his teaching was praised and his brother was apparently released.<sup>73</sup> Rosamond McKitterick would even go as far to suggest that Paul became somewhat of an agent for the Carolingians, even writing the *HL* for the Franks and Lombards at the Frankish court.<sup>74</sup>

As the *HL* is not the subject of this thesis, I will merely summarize several of the divergent attitudes to the *HL* and Paul's stay at Frankish court in saying that Paul formed something of a bridge between the Franks and the Lombards. Paul certainly sought and obtained the patronage of Charlemagne and his court and there are good signs pointing towards a possible Frankish audience for the *HL*.<sup>75</sup> Moreover, it is obvious that Paul thought that good relations between the Lombards and the Franks were desirable.<sup>76</sup> Paul was to return to Italy around 784, where he came to reside at Monte Cassino in the Duchy of Benevento and thus his sphere of patronage shifted again; a certain ambiguity, or at least uncertainty, as to his loyalties is thus to be expected.<sup>77</sup> Ambiguity, if anything, seems to plague both the circumstances of Paul's life, as well as the intentions of his two biggest works, the *HR* and the *HL*. Paul the Deacon was hard to pin down, then and now.<sup>78</sup> With regard to the *HL*, Walter Pohl summarizes this adequately, stating that 'Paul's art did not lie in promoting one specific agenda in the guise of a naive and straightforward chronicler, but in integrating the contradictory fragments of a troubled history in which he had been involved throughout his lifetime.'<sup>79</sup>

The end of Paul the Deacon's life is similarly uncertain: internal evidence from the *HL*, which as far as we know was his last work, suggests that Paul must have composed it before Charlemagne's imperial coronation.<sup>80</sup> Due to his belief that the *HL* was left unfinished, Goffart is certain that Paul's death must have been the reason why; therefore he places Paul's death before the end of the eighth

---

<sup>71</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 347-348

<sup>72</sup> McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks', p. 323

<sup>73</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 342-343

<sup>74</sup> McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks', p. 326-327

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 328-331

<sup>76</sup> Goffart, p. xxxi

<sup>77</sup> *Ibidem*, p. xxxi, 342-347, though Goffart is more in favour of Benovenan loyalties for Paul, his account of Paul's latter works shows his shifting spheres of patronage.

<sup>78</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 4

<sup>79</sup> Walter Pohl, 'Paul the Deacon – between *Sacci* and *Marsuppia*' in: Richard Corradini, Matthew Gillis, Rosamond McKitterick, Irene van Renswoude (eds.), *Ego Trouble. Authors and their Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 15 (Wien, 2010) p. 115

<sup>80</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 9



century.<sup>81</sup> While there is no exact date or even a specific year for Paul's death, most scholars do agree with the evaluation that he likely died before the year 800. The uncertainty about the date of composition for *HL* thus means Paul's death could already have happened relatively soon after his return to Italy.<sup>82</sup>

This latter part of Paul's life does not overly concern us, but what we must take away from this brief description is that Paul likely actively sought the patronage of royal and ducal families throughout his life. His *HL*, whether it was written for the Franks or for the Beneventons, could in part be read not merely as a history or a mere *origo gentis*, but also as a model displaying proper kingship. Goffart proposed that this model was of a good Lombard king,<sup>83</sup> whereas McKitterick likens the model of kingship in the *HL* to the Frankish ideal of ruling.<sup>84</sup> In any case, Paul most likely viewed history as a means to teach, in this case as a means of providing examples of what was good and what was bad governance.

Paul, as a man of letters and as a man who knew the past, probably viewed himself as being capable of, perhaps even responsible for, the education of his rulers. He attached himself to royal or ducal courts as a writer, a teacher and likely a counsellor.<sup>85</sup> At the time in which the *HR* was composed, around 773, Paul was still attached to the ducal court of Adalperga and her husband Arichis II (d. 787). Whether he was already at Monte Cassino, or even in Benevento itself, is unclear, but what is clear is that he had access to a large amount of source material to help him compose the *HR*.<sup>86</sup> Under, or still in pursuit of, the patronage of Adalperga and her husband, we ought thus not be surprised if the *HR* shows signs of catering to this ducal couple's tastes and sympathies. On the other hand, we ought not be surprised if we see Paul trying to convey a message or a lesson to them, whether subtly or overtly.

### *The Historia Romana*

Unlike the *HL* and Orosius' *HLS*, the *HR* has not merited much scholarly attention outside of Italy. The paperback edition of Goffart's *Narrators of Barbarian History* and Cornford's unpublished dissertation are the two most recent works in English that deal with the *HR* at any length, Goffart's book being the only of the two that is widely available. Conversely, the *HR* is a relatively untouched work and shrouded in some mystery as to its composition, its themes and its purpose. In total Cornford's analysis of the *HR* is lengthier and more thorough than Goffart's, however, and altogether

---

<sup>81</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 344

<sup>82</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 9

<sup>83</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 347

<sup>84</sup> McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks', p. 328

<sup>85</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 324

<sup>86</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. xxxi, 336, McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks', p. 325

more informative. It is also less focussed upon a possible link between the *HR* and the *HL*: Goffart saw understanding the *HR* as a means to get closer to understanding the *HL*, which was his actual focus. I, like Cornford, am not convinced that the *HL* was the promised continuation of the *HR* and thus prefer to look at the *HR* in its own right and value it on its own merits.<sup>87</sup> Most of the information concerning the *HR* in this thesis therefore stems from Cornford's dissertation and I am greatly indebted to his research.

The current scholarly consensus is that the *HR* was most likely written before the Franks conquered Lombardy, but there is no definitive date.<sup>88</sup> In essence, the *HR* is an adaptation and continuation of an earlier work of Roman historiography, namely Eutropius' *Breviarum*. Eutropius' goal with the *Breviarum* was to write a short, simple and readable account of the history of Rome and its institutions. It had a distinctly imperial tone and, though written by a pagan, was also curiously irreligious in nature. Eutropius, moreover, took great pride in Rome's conquests and success in war.<sup>89</sup> The first ten books of the *HR* are largely a copy of the *Breviarum* with around 200 interpolations from other sources inserted into it.<sup>90</sup> Other than these interpolations, Paul the Deacon transmits the original ten books of the *Breviarum* virtually intact.<sup>91</sup> These books are prefaced by a dedication to Adalperga, which is not extant in all manuscript traditions, and a new historical introduction which expands the history of Rome by 400 years back to its mythological roots.<sup>92</sup> They are then followed up by another six original books, compiled by Paul the Deacon from various other sources, to bring the *HR* up to the Justinian's reconquest of Italy.<sup>93</sup>

The reasons for this extensive adaptation and continuation of the *Breviarum* are somewhat unclear, though in his dedication to Adalperga, Paul the Deacon lists the duchess' complaints about the *Breviarum*: 'rather than excessiveness, brevity in his text was displeasing to you, and because, as he was a pagan, in no place is there mention of divine history and our religion.'<sup>94</sup> Paul had initially deemed the *Breviarum* to be a proper source to introduce Adalperga to Roman history, but she had found it wanting. Other histories, some even Christian, were also available and even used to compile the *HR*, but apparently Paul felt that none of these were fitting enough. In taking on the challenge of adapting and continuing the *Breviarum* to Adalperga's wishes, Paul then promised the duchess of

---

<sup>87</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 31-38

<sup>88</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 10-12

<sup>89</sup> H. W. Bird (trans./ed.), *Eutropius: Breviarum*, Translated Texts for Historians 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Liverpool, 2011) p. xx

<sup>90</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 12-13, p. 102

<sup>91</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 349

<sup>92</sup> Maya Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans? Scripts of Romaness in early medieval Italy', currently unpublished, p. 15

<sup>93</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 12-13

<sup>94</sup> *HR* p. 3, translation by Cornford, p. 40: '*in eius textu praeter immodicam etiam brevitatem displicuit, quia utpote vir gentilis in nullo divinae historiae cultusque nostri fecerit mentionem.*'

Benevento the following changes: 'I have been extending passages and adapting some things from sacred scripture which have clarified the evidence of the narration of the times.'<sup>95</sup>

In doing so, Paul kept the *Breviarum* almost entirely intact, only adding passages about events he apparently felt needed expansion. Goffart remarks astutely that Adalperga, as well as Paul's assumed other readers, were already familiar with sacred history, so Paul only needed to include reference points, mostly via Jerome's *Chronicle*, to place events in the *HR* in their proper relation to sacred scripture.<sup>96</sup> While both Maya Maskarinec and Cornford ascribe slightly more importance to Paul's Christianisation of the *Breviarum*,<sup>97</sup> it is true that this mostly manifests itself in slightly more circumspect ways, and not by including many biblical events into the historical narrative. The Christianity comes from different sources: portents, miracles and the latter parts of the *HR* when the Roman Empire had already become Christian.

Using the *Breviarum*, Paul the Deacon presents his readers with a glorious tale of the origins of the Romans, which celebrates Rome's uniqueness, even from its mythical start. A lot of emphasis is placed on the Romans' capacity to unify other peoples into one *populus*,<sup>98</sup> as well as Rome's expansion across the Mediterranean world. At the same time, Paul the Deacon managed to stress the important role of Italy for the Roman Empire, especially in the latter parts of his *HR*, showing that despite the fact that the Roman Empire might have crumbled, it did leave behind a lot of crumbs.<sup>99</sup> Rome and its manifold heritage –of culture, religion, architecture, law– are celebrated by Paul's adaptation and continuation of the *HR*. By thus placing more emphasis on Rome and Italy in general, Paul managed to create a narrative of the fifth and sixth centuries that was focussed more on the West than it was on the East. In some sense, by doing so, he was perhaps the first Western historian to expressly tackle the problem of the 'fall' of the Roman Empire in the West.<sup>100</sup>

Cornford rightly remarks that in reading Paul's history of Rome, we can't assume that he, or his contemporaries, felt very distant from the Roman Empire or its history.<sup>101</sup> Although there were several parties vying for power in Italy at the time the *HR* was written, both the papacy and the Eastern Roman Empire were doing so with the claim that their authority was descended from Roman times. Paul the Deacon's emphasis on Italy in the *HR* and the positive role the papacy played in its politics in the latter books of this work, might be a tentative show of preference.<sup>102</sup> Ending the *HR*

---

<sup>95</sup> *HR* p. 3, translation by Cornford, p. 40: '*in locis extenderem eique aliquid ex sacrae textu scripturae, quo eius narrationis tempora evidentius clarerent, aptarem.*'

<sup>96</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 349

<sup>97</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 120-121, Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', p. 33-48

<sup>98</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', p. 23-24

<sup>99</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 271-272

<sup>100</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 272-273

<sup>101</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 271

<sup>102</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 271-272

after Justinian's successful reconquest of Italy might appear melancholic, but what it in fact was, was hopeful. Other emperors before Justinian, especially those who succeeded in either conquering or reconquering parts of the Roman Empire, are praised throughout the *HR*. Though not necessarily a show of support for the Eastern emperor, the model of a Christian emperor –capable in war, but also capable of maintaining orthodoxy and order– is a recurrent theme throughout the *HR*'s latter books.<sup>103</sup> In a time when Italy did not have one sole ruler, the *HR* seems to project an example for others to follow.

#### *The medieval and modern reception of the Historia Romana*

While the above explanation seems relatively straightforward, the *HR* most certainly is not. Paul the Deacon used a baffling amount of sources, both for his interpolations and for his continuation.<sup>104</sup> In patching all these different sources together, including different origins, narrative structures and intents, Paul the Deacon took on a daunting task. At times the *HR* feels disjointed, at other times, unoriginal, because much of its material was taken from other sources.<sup>105</sup> For a very long time then, at least in modern scholarship, the *HR* has been either neglected or thought of little value because of a certain carelessness that radiated from the work, due to inaccuracies in dating and citing.<sup>106</sup> Only recently has Paul the Deacon's first work of history been somewhat redeemed, catching the attention of modern scholars.

What this attention brought to light, however, is already quite astounding: Paul's originality may not have lain with the content of the *HR*, which mostly came from already existing sources, but it most definitely lay with the direction he took his content in.<sup>107</sup> With this recognition, we can no longer easily ignore the impact Paul's use of sources might have had on the *HR*. His selection of sources, his editing of the material he cited and the narrative structure he created out of these many disparate sources have already revealed much about Paul's ideas. Though ending his dissertation confidently in having found out more about Paul's intentions, Cornford did not have the luxury to go into too much depth regarding Paul's use of individual sources. Goffart, too, contents himself more with a 'broad strokes' approach, although recognizing that a closer look at Paul's own agency in constructing the *HR* is warranted.<sup>108</sup>

Much about the *HR* thus remains somewhat ambiguous and, mostly due to the lack of debate if anything else, no true consensus about this work of Roman history has been reached. There are

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibidem, p. 274-275

<sup>104</sup> Ibidem, p. 60-61, 136-144

<sup>105</sup> Ibidem, p. 272, Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 352

<sup>106</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 17-19

<sup>107</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 352

<sup>108</sup> Ibidem, p. 356

still questions lingering at the back of many scholars' minds about why, and why in this fashion, Paul the Deacon constructed the *HR*. Why did he go to such length and put in so much effort to write a new version of Roman history? Some of the unique aspects of the work mentioned above are valuable leads, but still, compiling a sixteen book history was no mean feat. Riddled with inaccuracies and ambiguities though it might have been, the *HR* is an intriguing work of history. As Cornford puts it, the *HR*, having been constructed at the beginning of the Carolingian Renaissance, was on the verge of continuity and discontinuity with regard to interpretations of the Roman past.<sup>109</sup>

Slowly but surely, the intriguing nature of the *HR* is drawing more scholars in. Maskarinec, for instance, has looked at Roman identity within the *HR* and the *HL*, to find out more about how the eighth-century Italians viewed their past.<sup>110</sup> She found that the *HR* was not unlike a Roman *origo gentis*, finding within it just one of a range of interpretations of the Roman past which circulated in Paul the Deacon's time.<sup>111</sup> Though we know very little about the reception of the *HR* in medieval times, we do know something of its transmission: of the several versions and adaptations of the *Breviarum*, Paul's was the most popular, beating even the original itself in quantity of extant manuscripts.<sup>112</sup> It was also often paired into collections with other works of its kind, like Orosius,<sup>113</sup> and gained in popularity after the turn of the millennium.<sup>114</sup>

Like Orosius' *HLS* then, Paul the Deacon's history was obviously of some worth to his contemporaries and to later scholars. It perhaps suffered from some of the same critiques (its unoriginality and its inaccuracies) but its star, too, is now on the rise. There is still much that is ambiguous about Paul the Deacon's *HR*, so there is still plenty of space for interpretation and research. A close look at how Paul the Deacon utilized, adapted and altered one of his more important sources for the *HR*, namely the *HLS*, will reveal more about his style of editing. It will also reveal more about his views on the *HLS* and history in general.

---

<sup>109</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 275

<sup>110</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', p. 1-2

<sup>111</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 18, 99-100

<sup>112</sup> Mortensen, 'A list of Orosius, Eutropius, Paulus Diaconus, and Landolfus Sagax manuscripts', p. 105

<sup>113</sup> Natalia Lozovsky, 'Roman Geography and Ethnography in the Carolingian Empire' in: *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 81:2 (2006) p. 328-333

<sup>114</sup> Mortensen, 'A list of Orosius, Eutropius, Paulus Diaconus, and Landolfus Sagax manuscripts', p. 107

### Chapter three: The analysis of the use of Orosius' *Historiarum Libri Septem* in the *Historia Romana*

So far we have established the contexts of both the *HLS* as well as the *HR*. Now it's time to get down to the nitty-gritty of this thesis: the analysis of Paul the Deacon's use of the *HLS* in the *HR*. This analysis will create a contrast between the two works which will allow us to both better understand Paul the Deacon's view of Roman history, as well as better understand Paul himself, his intentions and his methods in constructing the *HR*.

Paul the Deacon's uses of Orosius are manifold and varied, which makes it hard to classify them by theme alone. In passing, Cornford notes some aspects of the way in which Paul the Deacon's cites Orosius and other sources besides. Unfortunately, he does not often go into detail, nor does he take much time to compare the differences in detail between Paul and his sources. With regard to Orosius, Cornford mainly concludes that Paul the Deacon was not interested in transmitting much of Orosius' opinions on Divine Providence or the depravity of war.<sup>115</sup> Hillgarth, as already mentioned, is even more brief in treating Paul the Deacon's use of the *HLS*, primarily noting, like Cornford, that Paul used the *HLS* to add some (Christian) flavour and colour to his own account, without adding adopting Orosius' harsher opinions and judgements.<sup>116</sup> Both provide a general sense of the nature of Paul the Deacon's borrowings and of his stance *vis a vis* Orosius, but a more in-depth study remains to be undertaken. This will reveal more about the complex link between the *HLS* in its original form and the way in which it is cited in the *HR*.

An earlier attempt has been undertaken by Ernesto Sestan who attempted to classify all of Paul the Deacon's interpolations and citations in the *HR* by theme.<sup>117</sup> Both Goffart and Cornford come to the conclusion that this method was not as successful as might have been hoped and felt a little forced besides: not all citations could so easily be fit into a certain theme.<sup>118</sup> I have also found that while some themes are recurrent in Paul's citations from the *HLS*, not nearly all of them correspond to a broader theme. I have therefore chosen to only classify Paul the Deacon's citations from the *HLS* according to their morphology. This means that I will classify them by the nature of the citation itself, i.e. whether it was taken verbatim from the *HLS* or whether there were significant alterations (through abbreviation, paraphrasing, omission or addition). Thus, I have chosen to divide my analysis of the uses of the *HLS* in the *HR* into three parts.

First, I will study those citations and interpolations which have been taken from Orosius verbatim, allowing for alterations in tense and conjugation which allowed for the interpolation of the fragment into the main text of the *HR* and allowing for the use of synonyms. This group will also

---

<sup>115</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 49

<sup>116</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 168

<sup>117</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 351, Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 105-106; due to the unavailability of this work in both Utrecht and Vienna, I can say little more about Sestan's work.

<sup>118</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 351, Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 105-106

include those citations which are insignificant in scope, e.g. a date, a number or a name, even though the edition may refer to a larger passage in the *HLS*. These citations show which passages Paul considered wholly appropriate for incorporation into the *HR* and thus show which aspects of Orosius' work he deemed useful as they were, without requiring adaptation.

Secondly, I will analyse those citations and interpolations from Orosius which have only been modified slightly, in which specific words, phrases or names were left out or added by Paul the Deacon. Again, I will allow for changes in tense, conjugation and the use of synonyms. These are often very interesting passages from which only a few words or phrases have been removed or to which only a few words or phrases have been added. Citations of this nature can shed light upon what Paul the Deacon specifically did not wish to include from Orosius' *HLS*, which topics or sentiments he thought were unsuitable to be incorporated into his own designs or which passages required further explanation or addition.

Thirdly, I will consider those citations and interpolations of passages from the *HLS* that have been highly abbreviated, paraphrased or adapted, where Paul the Deacon often condenses long passages from Orosius into much smaller paragraphs with a lot of omissions and sometimes a few additions. These interpolations will further add to our understanding of Paul's use of Orosius in the same way as the second category: they show which notions and facts Paul wished to include but thought he needed to adapt, often in several ways. Thus, they show a great amount of editing, adaptation and selection on Paul's part.

The difference between the second and the third group lies both in their scope and in the methods Paul uses to include them: within the second group, the adaptations are of a much more limited scope and will only pertain to short omissions or additions and rarely to slightly more extensive alterations. Within the third group, the changes made are more extensive and will consist not only of omissions or additions, but also of abbreviations, paraphrasing, adaptations and rewriting on Paul's part.

From the close analysis of examples from these three groups a lot will become apparent about Paul's methods of selection, adaptation and appropriation with regard to passages from the *HLS*. Furthermore, the contrast such an analysis will create between Orosius' views on Christian history and Paul's incorporation, or lack thereof, of these views, will shed light on Paul the Deacon's own perspective on the history of Rome and its relation to Christianity. Moreover, such an analysis can unveil thematic trends, either of inclusion or exclusion of certain passages, without the explicit expectation of specific thematic trends; i.e. not all of the interpolations have to match a thematic group and thus ambiguities and overlaps can be taken into account, without having to be delegated to a separate analytical category.

*A brief note on the editions used*

For the Latin of the *HLS* I have used the online edition of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*.<sup>119</sup> This work does not include the standard reference to books, chapters and passages of chapters. In my notes I nevertheless do refer to this standard reference, which corresponds better with the overall tradition of editions and translations and makes for easier searching throughout these different versions. I would have preferred to work with the revised Karl Zangemeister edition of 1966,<sup>120</sup> but this work was sadly not available for loan, only for inspection, in both Utrecht and Vienna. The online versions of this edition, moreover, did not include Zangemeister's notes, which was why I ended up with the *Patrologia Latina* edition, which did include the editor's notes and was moreover, readily available.<sup>121</sup>

For the *HR*, I first used Hans Droysen's edition,<sup>122</sup> but in comparison to Amadeo Crivellucci's edition<sup>123</sup> it was the weaker of the two. Crivellucci's edition is easier on the eye, with a better lay-out to show the difference between citations and Paul's original text. It also includes many comments and notes on the way in which Paul cited from other sources and was thus by far the more informative edition of the two. As opposed to the *HLS*, references to the *HR* will be done by listing the specific page and the specific lines in the Crivellucci edition. For anyone interested in Paul's use of sources in the *HR*, Crivellucci's edition is the better choice.

---

<sup>119</sup> [pld.chadwyck.co.uk](http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk). For the offline *PL*: Orosius's *HLS* is contained within volume 31, 0663-1174

<sup>120</sup> Karl Zangemeister, *Pauli Orosii Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII: accedit eiusdem liber apologeticus*, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* vol. 5, new edition (New York [etc.], 1966)

<sup>121</sup> Who the editor was, unfortunately, remains obscured.

<sup>122</sup> Hans Droysen (ed.), *Historia Romana*, *MGH, AA*, 2 (Berlin, 1879)

<sup>123</sup> Amadeo Crivellucci (ed.), *Paulo Diaconi. Historia Romana*, *Instituto Storico Italiana* (Rome, 1914)



### 1. *Verbatim citations from the Historiarum Libri Septem*

In this chapter I will consider the additions Paul the Deacon made from Orosius' *HLS* that are included unaltered, *verbatim*, except for changes of tense, word order and the use of synonyms, which may stem from necessity, preference or from Paul's use of a different manuscript of the *HLS* than was used for the *Patrologia Latina* edition on which I rely. Of the 141 interpolations and citations from the *HLS* in the *HR*, 68 fall into this category; the majority of Paul's inclusions then, remained loyal and true to Orosius' own work, if not in spirit, then at least in wording. The truth of this statement will certainly become apparent as this chapter winds on.

Instead of treating all of the 68 examples separately, I have chosen to go over them somewhat more haphazardly, noting the more interesting and the more telling of the interpolations and expanding upon them. If possible, I will connect them to other interpolations of the same theme or gist. I will not be keeping to a strict 'chronological' order as far as the subject of the citations is concerned. Nevertheless, I will aim to structure the treatment of these specific citations in such a way as to make it coherent, as well as to bring out the underlying consequences of Paul the Deacon's use of *verbatim* citations and the hints this use gives of Paul's view of Roman History. This chapter will not only say something about Paul's selection on the basis of inclusion, but also on the basis of exclusion. My analysis will show that many of the passages quoted *verbatim* were preceded or followed by statements that were not included for various reasons. While it would be a stretch to make assumptions based on everything Paul the Deacon did not take from the *HLS*—which is to say, a lot—passages that were closely connected to cited sentences must be taken into account. This is an issue that will crop up most in this chapter, for omissions from the other types of citations and interpolations most often occurred within a larger body of cited or paraphrased text, rather than directly before or after the quoted passage.

#### *Short, factual citations*

It is worthwhile to start off by briefly looking at the more 'straightforward' of Paul the Deacon's citations from the *HLS*. Throughout this chapter as well as the next two chapters, I will be referring to citations and interpolations from the *HLS* into the *HR* by their number in the two tables of the appendix. At times I will quote (parts of) these citations, whether to demonstrate an alteration or to draw attention to an important point. To start off here, I would like to draw attention to a series of citations that are very small in scope and basically represent the inclusion of merely one fact, number or Orosian detail into Paul the Deacon's larger work.<sup>124</sup> These citations mention dates, numbers,

---

<sup>124</sup> C.f. citations nrs. 2, 3, 6, 26, 41, 88, 89, 95, 96, 116, 117, 132

places or events with no background or other narrative elements, they are factual in nature and serve either to add or emend details in Paul's own narrative.

Although Orosius was far from the only source Paul the Deacon used to obtain factual data from, he does appear to have been the prime source for as long as the respective chronologies of the *HR* and the *HLS* matched up up: until the end of Orosius' narrative at the time of Honorius (384-423), the *HLS* was Paul the Deacon's go to source. Sometimes, as was the case with a citation concerning Pompey's sack of Jerusalem,<sup>125</sup> Orosius' information even trumped the information in Eutropius' *Breviarum*. Where Eutropius listed the numbers of Jews slain during Pompey's siege of Jerusalem at twelve thousand, Paul here defers to Orosius and emends the number to thirteen thousand. The very least we can say, then –a conclusion that is of course equally evidenced by the astounding amount of citations and interpolations taken from the *HLS*– is that Orosius must have been considered a valuable and authoritative source.

Perhaps that is why Paul the Deacon, in his dedicatory letter to Adalperga, includes a direct link between his own efforts in compiling the *HR* and those of Orosius in compiling the *HLS*. Himself dedicating his work to Augustine, Orosius conveys his obedience to his master's instructions in writing the *HLS* by saying that he hoped he had written the *HLS* 'as competently as [he] did willingly.'<sup>126</sup> Paul the Deacon chose to dedicate the *HR* to Adalperga by voicing the same sentiment, thereby obviously likening himself to Orosius.<sup>127</sup> Adalperga, whether wittingly or not, was also praised by this connection that compares her with Augustine, though it is unknown if she would have picked up on the reference. It is a subtle, but in my eyes very much intentional, acknowledgement of Orosius' *HLS*' importance to Paul the Deacon and his respect for the work.

#### *The example of the Punic Wars for Paul's overall approach to Rome's history*

Looking at a further citation concerning Hannibal (247 – 183/182 BC), we find what is perhaps the best example of an addition of what Hillgarth calls, in Mommsen's words, Orosian '*lumina et colores*'<sup>128</sup>. In Orosius it reads 'Hannibal, who had been ordered to return to Africa to help the weary Carthaginians, first killed all his Italian soldiers who did not want to follow him and then left Italy in tears.'<sup>129</sup> Paul the Deacon did not take over Hannibal's slaughter of the Italian soldiers, but he did add tiny, emotional detail of Hannibal's tears.<sup>130</sup> While some of the more gruesome details have been

---

<sup>125</sup> Citation 81

<sup>126</sup> *HLS* Pre.1, translation by A.T. Fear: '*atque utinam tam efficaciter quam libenter*'

<sup>127</sup> Citation 1, *HR* p.4 l. 5-6: '*utinam tam efficaciter imperata facturus quam libenter arripui*'

<sup>128</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 164, 168

<sup>129</sup> *HLS*, 4.19.1: '*Annibal redire in Africam jussus, ut fessis Carthaginiensibus subveniret, flens reliquit Italiam omnibus Italici generis militibus, qui sequi nollent, interfectis*'

<sup>130</sup> *HR*, p.51, l.19-20, '*Ipse a Carthaginiensibus redire in Africam iubetur, quam Scipio vastabat. Ita anno septimo decimo ab Annibale Italia liberata est, quam flens dicitur reliquisse.*'

omitted, Paul quite remarkably decided to include Orosius' comment about Hannibal's grief. Such a subtle use of a tiny detail from Orosius ought not to be taken lightly: as part of his scheme to vilify warfare, Orosius makes Hannibal out to be more than merely a one-dimensional villain and Paul the Deacon does the same.

One of the main areas on which Paul frequently consults Orosius is that of the Punic Wars and he includes several passages on Hannibal specifically,<sup>131</sup> which reveal a certain ambiguity of Paul the Deacon's towards Hannibal, a traditional enemy of the Romans. Orosius, in both instances, is more critical of Hannibal and it must be remarked that he is uncharacteristically favourable towards Scipio Africanus (236 – 183 BC), Hannibal's Roman counterpart. Whilst Paul the Deacon can't be said to put Hannibal in a very favourable light, he does in two instances, at least not demonize him as much as Orosius.<sup>132</sup> This is an interesting occurrence, which is highlighted even more by many of the other inclusions concerning the Punic Wars: often times he mentions losses incurred by both the Romans and the Carthaginians, but omits the worst of Orosius' statements about the Romans' fearfulness and losses or about the terrible nature of the Carthaginians.<sup>133</sup> Looking at all these citations together, the balanced and nuanced view of the Punic Wars that emerges from Paul the Deacon's selective use of Orosius is astounding (especially considering the fact that the mentions of losses are not one-sided either, sometimes stressing losses on the Roman side and sometimes stressing them on the Carthaginian side).

The only time when Paul the Deacon was persuaded to convey an equally wretched image of the Carthaginians as Orosius is wont to do is in a passage that relates the legendarily cruel death of Marcus Atilius Regulus (c. 307 – c. 250 BC) at the hands of the Carthaginians.<sup>134</sup> While it is not a direct match with either Orosius' mention of the event, or that of Augustine,<sup>135</sup> it does in equal manner convey the cruelty and horror of the Carthaginians' act. Yet as said, Paul, unlike Orosius, was neither as polemic, nor as belligerent in his recounting of this episode of Roman history: both the Carthaginians and the Romans are portrayed in a less negative and an almost more human way.<sup>136</sup> Paul recognized that there are two sides to the story, as there admittedly were in the *HLS* as well, and that Rome was not necessarily destined to be the victor in this conflict. A passage further into

---

<sup>131</sup> Citations 25-42 are mostly concerned with Hannibal, 25 and 41, specifically cast a rather ambiguous light on his persona

<sup>132</sup> Citation 25, 41

<sup>133</sup> For losses see: 21, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 52, 53, 54; for omitted passages about the disastrous extent of Roman losses/terrible nature of the Carthaginians: 25, 28, 37, 38, 39; exception: 20.

<sup>134</sup> Citation 20

<sup>135</sup> *HR* p. 36 l.8-9: '*circumcisis palpebrisi, ut usque ad mortem cruciatu intolerabili ac dolore vigilaret.*' *HLS* 4.10.1: "*resectis palpebris, illigatum in machina, vigilando necaverunt.*" Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* 1.15: "*Inclusum quippe angusto ligno, ubi stare cogeret, clavisque acutisimis undique confixo, ut se in nullam eius partem sine poenis atrocissimis inclinaret, etiam uigilando peremerunt.*"

<sup>136</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 115, [Goffart, *Narrators*, p...]

the narrative of the Punic War tells us that Hannibal could even have defeated the Romans after he had crushed the consul Varro at the battle of Cannae in 216 BC.<sup>137</sup> In the *HLS* this passage serves, as usual, to stress the horrors of war, the ravages of disaster and the 'luck' (i.e. providence), more than anything else, of Rome. The corresponding passage in the *HR* only serves to further remind the reader that the Romans, like any other people, could be defeated. Another passage, not connected to the Punic Wars, serves the same purpose and reads:

'Today, the Romans, if they had, after their defeat, kept to the conditions of the treaty which they made with the Samnites in the way they now require those defeated by them to keep their treaty obligations, would have either vanished entirely or been the Samnites' slaves.'<sup>138</sup>

With regard to this citation, Cornford draws an interesting parallel with Paul's own eighth century Italy, noting that the territorial scales of Rome and the duchy Benevento, which was recognized to be situated in formerly Samnite lands, were not altogether different from the territorial scales of the Samnite and Roman lands of the fourth century BC. In Cornford's view this occurrence underlines that Rome, especially in Paul's own time, feared destruction at the hands of territorial rivals and could therefore be expected to be weary and aggressive towards powerful territorial entities sprouting on its borders.<sup>139</sup> Maskarinec's ideas on Paul the Deacon's approach to Romans and Romanness in the *Historia Romana* might also prove informative: she believes that to Paul, the Romans were an extraordinarily successful, blessed and exceptional people, but a people nonetheless.<sup>140</sup> Their exceptionality lay in two things: their capacity to coalesce disparate people into one unified people and their eventual adoption of Christianity.<sup>141</sup>

Part of this scheme that Maskarinec develops however, is the notion that Roman success was a capacity that might well be copied or emulated.<sup>142</sup> That Paul thus emphasized the fallibility of the Romans and even their eventual, if temporary defeat in Italy emphasizes not only their luck, but also the prospect for other peoples to become like the Romans through perseverance and perhaps

---

<sup>137</sup> Citation 32, *HLS* 4.16.3-4, translation by A. T. Fear, *HR* p. 45 l.12-15: '*Varro consul cum quinquaginta equitibus Venusiam fugit. Nec dubium est, ultimum illum diem Romani status futurum fuisse, si Annibal mox post victoriam ad pervadendam Urbem contendisset.*'

<sup>138</sup> *HLS* 3.15.7, translation by A. T. Fear: '*Hodie enim Romani aut omnino non essent, aut Samnio dominante servirent, si fidem foederis, quam sibi servari a subjectis volunt, ipsi subjecti Samnitibus servavissent.*' *HR* p. 27 l.21-23: '*si fidem foederis, quam sibi Romani servari a subiectis volunt, ipsi subiecti Samnitibus servavissent, hodie aut omnino non essent aut, Samnio dominante, servirent.*' While the word order changed, the basic meaning remains the same.

<sup>139</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 107

<sup>140</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', throughout, but especially: p. 3-4, 16

<sup>141</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 23-24, 33- 48

<sup>142</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 99-110

conquest.<sup>143</sup> Justinian's reconquest of Italy in the latter books of the *HR*, only goes to show that an orthodox and capable leader is required to maintain the Roman unity. To Orosius too, the Romans were exceptional in that, unlike the three empires that had preceded it, it simply refused to fall. He believed of course that this was due to its divinely pre-ordained role in the Christianization of the world.<sup>144</sup> And while the Christianity of the Roman Empire played an important role in Paul's *HR*, we will see that he views the role of Christianity in a more subtle way than did Orosius, for whom Divine Providence and proving the working of the hand of God in history are central to his historical narrative.

### *Divine Providence*

To highlight this more subtle approach, I will now turn towards some of the citations and interpolations that, even when cited verbatim, give us a few indications of Paul's view of the role of Divine Providence and Christianity in Roman history. His process of selectively including some parts of a portent entirely, whilst completely omitting other parts will prove revealing in this case. By my count, there are eleven *verbatim* citations of portents from the *HLS*.<sup>145</sup> While seemingly a large amount, the number is still dwarfed by the total number of mentions of portents in the *HLS* or the *HR*. Nevertheless, the inclusion of many such portents is a feature of the *HR* that has been noted by scholars; the conclusion tends to be that Paul was interested in portents as a phenomenon but not as a structurally significant part of his narrative.<sup>146</sup>

Cornford and Maskarinec have a more nuanced view of this matter. The first draws attention to the disparity between the amount of portents before and after the birth of Christ. The majority of these portents appears before the birth of Christ, and looks to be leading up to this major event, while the minority appears after this defining moment and appears to be connected to heresy.<sup>147</sup> While Maskarinec focuses less on the portents themselves, she does manage to show how Paul struggled to incorporate Christianity into the *HR*. This was mostly due to the fact that neither in his own times, nor in the times he was writing about, the Roman Empire was perfectly orthodox or Christianized. In Maskarinec's words: 'Throughout Paul's six-book continuation heresy never lurks far away, continually threatening the relationship between God and the Roman Empire.'<sup>148</sup> She furthermore argues that Paul did not dare to marry the Roman Empire and Christianity as strongly as

---

<sup>143</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 353-356

<sup>144</sup> Fear, *Orosius*, p. 18-22

<sup>145</sup> C.f. citations: 18, 24, 31, 50, 57, 59, 60, 71, 91, 92, 98. These are merely the *verbatim* portents and I will return to the non-*verbatim* portents in later chapters.

<sup>146</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 168; Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 48; Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 352

<sup>147</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p.112-113

<sup>148</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?' p. 41.

Orosius had done, even beginning to pull the two apart by the end of the *HR*.<sup>149</sup> Paul's own time reflected the relative failure of the Roman Empire to stay in control in the West and while he ends the *HR* on a high note with Justinian's successful reconquest of Italy, he too knew it was not to last. She cautions that these tensions between Christianity and the Roman Empire need not be exaggerated, at least with regard to the *HR*. How then did Paul use Orosius, who was far more positive about the strength of the bond between Roman Empire and Christianity, to Christianize his *HR*?

Given the relative similarity of their subject matter, it is very easy to forget here that Orosius and Paul the Deacon lived, wrote and died in very different times; not only were their worlds and their experiences likely very different, but so were their audiences. Orosius ostensibly wrote *adversum paganos* –against the pagans– and his *HLS* was aimed to be read by the still pagan Roman educated elite, who had been shocked and shaken by the events of 410. Accusing fingers were being pointed towards the Christians and their God who had failed to protect the City and Orosius' work was a flaming invective against those that dared blame the benevolent God and Church of Christ. Even if one, quite reasonably, doubts that the work would have been read by these pagans, then the work was at least meant to provide Christian readers with not only a rebuttal against these pagan accusations, but also with a completely Christianized universal history. Part of Orosius' task, thus, was to show the omnipresence of the Christian God in history and thus, he could not but appropriate pagan portents and explain them in a new, Christian light. While some of them were already mentioned in Jerome's *Chronicle*, in a work like Orosius' they merited further explanation.

The eleven portents that were taken wholesale from Orosius all serve a similar predictive function in the *HR* as they did in Orosius, as they still preface important events. Among others they preface the Punic Wars, the Third Servile War and, most importantly, the rise of Augustus and the birth of Christ. In Orosius this scheme of 'portent – event' is at times accompanied by overt explanations, for, as if the link between portent and event was not clear enough to begin with, Orosius felt the need to make absolutely certain that these were signs sent by the true God. If we then look at three of the abovementioned eleven citations we can see that, whereas Orosius took these portents as opportunities to reinforce his Divine Providence scheme and reassert the role of God in history, Paul apparently does not feel the need to do so. These three citations warrant a closer look.<sup>150</sup>

The first of these citations concerns several portents that occurred during Rome's wars with the Cisalpine and Insubrian Gauls at around 224 BC. According to Orosius, Rome was at this time beset by enemies from without, namely the Gauls, as well as by enemies from within, the very

---

<sup>149</sup> Ibidem, p. 45-46,.48-70

<sup>150</sup> They are citations 24, 57 and 92

demons they worshipped. Then, a river ran with blood, the Etruscans witnessed the sky being on fire and at Arimium the night sky was disturbed by a bright light as well as by three moons.<sup>151</sup>

This passage is followed by the mention of yet another portent, namely an earthquake that destroyed the famed Colossus, which Paul had decided not to take over. Neither did he copy the passage concerning the three earlier portents in its entirety, for he only took over the actual portents, albeit word for word, omitting Orosius' explanation of the circumstances that caused them to occur. Gone are Orosius' judgements of the 'wretched City' (*miseram Urbem*) and gone are his references to the demons which the Romans turned to in vain before the advent of Christ.

The next citation shows a similar trend, for in Orosius it reads:

'[...] among the other prodigies seen at Rome was a hermaphrodite. It was thrown into the sea by order of the *haruspices*, but the performance of this profane act served no purpose, for so great a plague suddenly arose that at first there were not enough undertakers to conduct funerals, and soon there were none at all. Great houses were left empty of the living, but full of the dead. Within there were great inheritances, but nowhere was an heir to be found.'<sup>152</sup>

This short paragraph is followed up by a longer diatribe against the pagan gods, the *haruspices* and the futility and deceit of their actions. It is thus obviously a part of Orosius' anti-pagan scheme. Paul the Deacon merely copies the first part up until the mention of the *haruspices*, albeit again, word for word.<sup>153</sup> What he does not mention is the plague, for in the *HR* this portent merely foretells a war with the Celtiberians. Neither does Paul strike out against the pagan practices of the *haruspices*.

The final citation that I will mention here reinforces the trend that has been set, suggesting that Paul the Deacon may not have been interested in the explanation of portents, but merely in the occurrence of them, likely viewing them as self-evidently coming from God. It has already been mentioned that the birth of Christ, although treated rather briefly in the *HR*, seems to have been the event towards which the vast majority of portents were leading up to. The following portent occurred just before the birth of Christ in Orosius' *HLS*.

---

<sup>151</sup> *HLS* 4.13.12, translation by A.T. Fear: 'Eo deinde anno, qui huic proximus fuit, dira miseram Urbem terruere prodigia. Miseram utique, quae hinc fremitu hostium, inde nequitia daemonum terrebat, namque in Piceno flumen sanguine effluxit, et apud Tuscos coelum ardere visum est, et Arimini nocte multa lucem claram effulsisse, ac tres lunas distantibus coeli regionibus exortas apparuisse.'

<sup>152</sup> Citation 57, *HLS* 5.4.8, translation by A.T. Fear: 'inter caetera prodigia androgynus Romae visus, iussu aruspicum in mare mersus est: sed nihil impiae expiationis procuratio profecit. Nam tanta subito pestilentia exorta est, ut ministri quoque faciendorum funerum primum non sufficerent, deinde non essent. Itaque etiam magnae domus vacuae vivis, plenae mortuis remanserunt. Largissimae introrsum haereditates, et nulli penitus haeredes.'

<sup>153</sup> *HR* p. 62 l.21-22: 'his diebus androgynus Romae visus iussu aruspicum in mare mersus est.'

'[...] when he [Augustus] entered the City, returning from Apollonia, after his uncle, Gaius Caesar's murder, at around the third hour, a circle of light like a rainbow surrounded the sun in a clear, serene sky as if to mark him as the one, mightiest man in this world and by himself the most glorious man on the earth in whose days would come He Who by Himself made and rules over the sun and the whole world.'<sup>154</sup>

Again, Paul only cites the portent from this passage and omits Orosius' overt explanation of its connection to the birth of Christ. In the *HR* however, this portent is only lines away from the passage in which the birth of Christ is narrated, again hinting at a preference on Paul's behalf to let portents such as these speak for themselves.

To sum up, these examples would seem to support the theory that Paul the Deacon was not interested in Orosius' opinions and views with regard to Divine Providence. But this conclusion is a rather unsatisfactory, especially considering the fact that in Orosius too, portents were often left unexplained and were allowed to be self-explanatory; while it is striking that Paul the Deacon, in all three cases mentioned above, omitted Orosius' explanation of events, we must not forget that he had nonetheless chosen to include the portents themselves and had employed them in a similar predictive vein. Perhaps he was doing exactly as he promised Adalperga: adding Christianity to Eutropius' otherwise areligious narrative and making the presence of God felt through his portents and miracles. Why then didn't Paul the Deacon, like Orosius did, feel the need to explain these portents and to erase any doubt that these portents were sent by the Christian God?

We must remember that Paul the Deacon wrote the *HR* for Adalperga and therefore, by extension, for a relatively well-educated and at the very least literate Lombard elite.<sup>155</sup> While the exact doctrine of their collective Christianity was not always crystal clear,<sup>156</sup> what was clear at least was that Paul was not writing for or against pagans, like Orosius was. I would thus strongly suggest that to some extent Paul could expect these portents to be understood in the 'proper' manner: as signs from the Christian God, their meaning being revealed by the events that occurred after their appearance. When dealing with other more 'mythological' or 'fabulous' aspects of Rome's history, as

---

<sup>154</sup> Citation 92, *HLS* 6.20.5, translation by A.T. Fear: '*Nam cum primum, Caio Caesare avunculo suo interfecto, ex Apollonia rediens Urbem ingrederetur, hora circiter tertia repente, liquido ac puro sereno circulus ad speciem coelestis arcus orbem solis ambiit, quasi eum unum ac potentissimum in hoc mundo solumque clarissimum in orbe monstraret, cujus tempore venturus esset, qui ipsum solem solus, mundumque totum et fecisset et regeret.*'

<sup>155</sup> C.f. Nick Everett, 'Literacy and the Law in Lombard Italy', in: *Early Medieval Europe* 9:1 (2000), p. 93-127, who adequately demonstrates the plausibility of at least a low level of literacy being prevalent among Lombard elites

<sup>156</sup> C.f. Walter Pohl, 'Deliberate ambiguity - the Lombards and Christianity', in: Guyda Armstrong and Ian N. Wood (eds.) *Christianizing Peoples and Converting Individuals* International Medieval Research 7 (Turnhout, 2000) p. 47-58



well as the Lombards' history, Paul would accompany his mentions of these events with statements of his disdain for such ludicrous claims.<sup>157</sup> He does no such thing, however, when considering these portents, which leads me to believe that such 'neutralisation' of the portents, was no longer perceived as necessary.

Paul appears to have been far more greatly concerned with orthodoxy and heresy: as Cornford remarked, Paul the Deacon's 'later' portents were most often connected to instances of heresy.<sup>158</sup> Maskarinec also emphasizes the role of heresy, especially within the latter part of the *HR*.<sup>159</sup> The discrepancy between Orosius' and Paul's use and explanation of portents seems to stem from a difference of context and of purpose. This is emphasized even further when we look at the treatment of the sack of Rome in 410 in both the *HLS* and the *HR*.

### *The sack of Rome*

In the *HLS* the sack of Rome in 410 is one of the defining moments in Roman history, even despite the fact that Orosius seeks to minimize the impact of this event on the fortunes of the Roman Empire. This is of course once again part and parcel of the apologetic and polemic nature of the *HLS*. If all Orosius could have done in the *HLS* was to show the sack of Rome in 410 to have been a historical non-event compared to past disasters, and, what is more, if he could also have made it fit into his providential scheme proving the hand of God at work in history, then the *HLS* would already have been a success. Orosius' treatment of the sack of Rome is exemplary for his view of history. The following passage from the *HLS* does a better job of expressing Orosius' sentiments than I could:

'And so that no one should doubt that the enemy was allowed to do this [i.e. sack Rome] in order to punish the arrogant, debauched, blasphemy of the town, at this same time the most famous buildings in the City which the enemy was unable to set alight were destroyed by lightning.'<sup>160</sup>

Paul, however, doesn't treat the events of 410 as being God's punishment of Rome for allowing pagans to thrive in the midst of the empire still. For him the sack of Rome is all about the treachery of the barbarous Stilicho.<sup>161</sup> It is thus no wonder that Paul omits the first part of the above paragraph

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibidem, p.17-18

<sup>158</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 112-113

<sup>159</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?' p. 41

<sup>160</sup> Citation 159, *HLS* 4.39.18, translation by A.T. Fear: '*Et ne quisquam forte dubitaret ad correptionem superbae lasciviae, et blasphemae civitatis hostibus fuisse permissum, eodem tempore clarissima Urbis loca fulminibus diruta sunt, quae inflammari ab hostibus nequiverunt.*'

<sup>161</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 201-202; the pastiche of events surrounding the sack of Rome in 410 highlights Stilicho's role in allowing the barbarian 'invasion' of the Roman Empire.

and only includes the final miraculous event after narrating Stilicho's and his son's, Eucherius', deaths, as a sort of just conclusion to their disastrous lives.<sup>162</sup>

It can thus be no surprise either, that with regard to the sack of Rome, Paul the Deacon feels no need to include Orosius' chronological scheme, linking the sack of 410 to the sack of 387 BC.<sup>163</sup> This chronological scheme was another part of Orosius' work that appears to have been omitted in its entirety from the *HR* and, interestingly enough, it was also not favoured by Augustine.<sup>164</sup>

### *Just conclusions?*

The above comparisons allow us to come to some preliminary conclusions which foreshadow some themes we must look out for in the next two chapters. Despite the fact that this chapter dealt with unaltered citations from the *HLS* we still find that there are quite a few differences between Orosius' and Paul the Deacon's approaches to Roman history. For one, the treatment of Rome and its wars in the *HR* is not just different from that of Orosius, but also from the way in which Eutropius originally handled them. Though not as severe on all warfare as Orosius was, Paul the Deacon did not adopt Eutropius' account of the glorious rise of Rome as a military power either. Paul's treatment of the Punic War, exemplary of the way passages taken *verbatim* from Orosius were used with regard to warfare, shows a slightly more balanced, nuanced view of warfare emerging in the *HR*. While Paul acknowledged and took over the mentions from the *HLS* of losses on both sides of a given conflict, he did not usually choose to copy Orosius' further demonizing of and polemicizing against warfare or Roman valour.

Another key issue on which Paul the Deacon seems to have disagreed with Orosius, is that of the intervention of Divine Providence or, more precisely, the need to either explain or interpret the intercession of Divine Providence in history. It is already obvious from his handling of portents that Paul the Deacon did not in the least feel the need to explain that any of the portents he mentioned came from the Christian God. Furthermore, the omitting of Orosius' explanations of the links between portents and events could have different causes. On the one hand, Paul may well have thought portents to be self-explanatory and did not feel the need (or deem himself adequately equipped) to expound on the connection between a portent and the events that followed it. On the other hand, Paul could have envisaged a different role for portents within his narrative. His aim was

<sup>162</sup> *HR* p. 174, l.3-5: '*eodem tempore clarissima Urbis loca fulminibus diruta sunt, quae inflammari ab hostibus nequiverunt.*'

<sup>163</sup> Citation 133, *HLS* 7.39.15, translation by A.T. Fear: '*Tertia die Barbari, quam ingressi fuerant Urbem, sponte discedunt, facto quidem aliquantarum aedium incendio, sed ne tanto quidem, quantum septingentesimo conditionis ejus anno casus effecerat.*' Paul the Deacon changes the latter part to connect the damage done to a fire caused by Caesar. *HR* p. 171, l. 19-21: '*sed ne tanto quidem, quantum olim a Caesare factum est.*'

<sup>164</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p. 339

different from Orosius, who wanted to Christianize and universalize (pagan) history in a society which still held strongly divided opinions on such matters, as do modern scholars. This discrepancy in the use of portents between the *HLS* and the *HR* reflects both the different circumstances and times the two authors lived in as well as the different goals they had envisaged for their respective works.

But not all uses Paul made of the *HLS* seem to highlight the contrast between the two works: Orosius' universal history still serves as a veritable well-spring of facts, dates and events that Paul the Deacon is only too keen to include in the *HR*. The category of citations I have just discussed, namely those that were cited *verbatim*, provides perhaps the best example of Orosius' value to later medieval historians like Paul; the *HLS* was a well-written, lengthy and all-encompassing history with a large chronological and geographical scope, which compiled and Christianized a vast amount of pagan and Christian history. Even though Paul the Deacon does not appear to have agreed with all of Orosius' opinions and rhetoric strategies, he did find many things he did like in the *HLS* and which he decided to add to Eutropius' *Breviarum*, to add details and to supplement missing events, Christianity and nuances previously absent from Eutropius' narrative.

These are of course merely preliminary conclusions, but in the next two analytical chapters several of these themes will once more emerge, in conjunction with still others, to provide us with a better idea of not only why Paul the Deacon chose the *HLS* as one of his predominant sources for the *HR*, but also how he viewed history and the roles of Christianity and the Roman Empire within it.

## 2. Lightly edited citations from the *Historiarum Libri Septem*

In this chapter I will focus on the twenty citations and interpolations from the *HLS* which have been modified in a significant albeit limited manner. What this means is that the modification is not due to changes in verb tense, conjugation or the use of synonyms, but is caused by either the omission or addition of a slight detail, name or other comparable fact. As mentioned in the introduction to the three analytical chapters, these citations are often very interesting in that they had a specific detail omitted or added to them, which can inform us on the selection and censoring Paul the Deacon applied to his sources and of course the *HLS* in particular. Although this will not be true of all the twenty-one citations, there are still many left that warrant a closer look. Like the preceding one, this chapter will give us a better picture of the passages Paul the Deacon wanted to include from the *HLS*, but also of those details he specifically did not want to take over or those which he thought warranted extra attention.

### *Divine Providence*

As opposed to the previous chapter, the limited amount of citations that fall into this category will allow me to treat most, if not all, of them, albeit not necessarily in the order that they appear in the *HR*. To start off this chapter, I would like to return to one of the themes mentioned earlier, that of Divine Providence and the destined birth of Christ in the time of Augustus. This is what Paul the Deacon had to say about this remarkable convergence of events:

‘During these times, across the Tiber, out of a lodging inn, a spring of oil overflowed from the earth and for the whole day this most enormous river flowed, signifying grace for the people of Christ. Then indeed there appeared to the sight a circular rainbow in the sky around the sun. Therefore during the forty-two years of the most firm and true peace brought by Caesar, the lord Christ was born in Bethlehem, whose arrival that same peace served.’<sup>165</sup>

Compared with the lengthy treatment of this event in the *HLS*, and his many lengthier interpolations on other subjects, Paul the Deacon appears to have been very frugal with his words concerning the birth of Christ. The two portents mentioned in this passage have been taken from Orosius;<sup>166</sup> the

---

<sup>165</sup> *HR* p. 100-101, l.16-3, translation by Benjamin Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 120: ‘*his diebus trans Tiberim de taberna meritoria fons olei e terra exundavit ac per totum diem largissimo rivo fluxit significans ex gentibus gratiam Christi. tunc etiam circulus ad speciem caelestis arcus circa solem apparuit. igitur cum quadragesimo secundo anno firmissimam verissimamque pacem Caesar composuisset Christus dominus in Bethleem natus est, cuius adventui pax ista famulata est.*’

<sup>166</sup> Citations 91 and 92, *HLS* 6.18.34 and 6.20.5

sentence concerning the birth of Christ is a mix of another two citations from the *HLS*<sup>167</sup> and from Jerome's *Chronicle* a.2015. Interestingly enough, the exact passage from which these sentences were taken, runs ever so slightly differently in the *HLS* from how it runs in the *HR*:

‘Therefore during the forty-two years of the most firm and true peace brought by Caesar, through God’s command, the lord Christ was born, whose arrival that same peace served.’<sup>168</sup>

The mention of Bethlehem has arguably been added from Jerome's *Chronicle* and it was a tiny scrap of information that Paul the Deacon felt was missing from Orosius' account. The more interesting change made to this passage however is of course the omission of the words ‘through God’s command’ (*ordinatione Dei*). While Cornford still feels that Paul the Deacon follows strongly in Orosius' footsteps with this passage and therefore links the birth of Christ and the reign of Augustus in an equally certain fashion, my understanding of this passage differs from Cornford's.<sup>169</sup> We have already clearly seen, and will continue to see, proof of Paul's rather strict redaction of Orosius' providential scheme in the *HLS*. In that light, the rather telling omission of the words *ordinatione Dei* from the cited passage can't be ignored. While it is true that Paul the Deacon, through this passage, connects the reign of Augustus and the birth of Christ in a fashion, he does so with far less conviction and far less eloquence than does Orosius, while still leaning on the *HLS* for the composition of his own mention of the event.

Combined with the earlier changes made to Orosius' providential scheme, this example leads me to believe that there is not just a difference in goals and audience that makes Paul the Deacon opt for a less intrusive and less overt providential scheme in his own work, but also a difference in opinion on the role of God in history. Mommsen's earlier mentioned article on the difference between Orosius and Augustine can shed some light on what this difference in opinion might actually entail. Mommsen found that whereas Orosius and several other early Christian historiographers with him considered the birth of Christ in the reign of Augustus to be providential in nature, Augustine accorded no special attention or status to this coincidence.<sup>170</sup> Moreover, Mommsen explained that, with regard to Orosius' progressive scheme of Christianity improving the lot of mankind –which we will find is also mostly absent in Paul the Deacon's work– Augustus was disinclined to set too much

---

<sup>167</sup> Citations 93 and 94, both from *HLS* 6.22.5

<sup>168</sup> *HLS* 6.22.5, translation adapted from Benjamin Cornford's and A.T. Fear's: '*Igitur eo tempore, id est eo anno quo firmissimam verissimamque pacem ordinatione Dei Caesar composuit, natus est Christus, cujus adventui pax ista famulata est.*'

<sup>169</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 120-121

<sup>170</sup> Theodor E. Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', in: Ed./Trans. Eugene F. Rice Jr., *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (New York, 1959) p. 340-341

stock by 'mere human guesswork'<sup>171</sup> when it came to interpreting the hand of God at work in history. On these points and a few others, Mommsen makes clear that Orosius obviously diverged from his master's intellectual and spiritual teachings and veered in a direction that might be seen to be completely at odds with the direction Augustine took in the *De Civitate Dei*.<sup>172</sup>

I believe it plausible that Paul the Deacon had picked up on these deviations, despite Mommsen's conviction that most medieval historians failed to note or understand the difference between Orosius' and Augustine's views of history.<sup>173</sup> Paul had likely read and even used at least one book of the *De Civitate Dei* for the *HR*,<sup>174</sup> which happens to be the book to which Mommsen referred when citing Augustine. What has already become obvious and will become more obvious is that Paul the Deacon quite clearly omitted those very Orosian explanations Augustine apparently took issue with. Moreover, Paul omitted the exact, but very spectacular passage from Orosius concerning his equation of the ten persecutions of the Christians and the ten plagues of Egypt, which Augustine was rather violently opposed to.<sup>175</sup> If Paul the Deacon, as has long been thought, merely had a fascination with portents and miracles, then certainly this rather perplexing and fascinating passage from Orosius could have been fitted into the *HR*? This is a question that can't and won't be answered here, but this indicates that more than mere fancy must have motivated Paul's choice of interpolations and citations and we must consider the possibility that he derived some of his views of history, as well as of Orosius, from Augustine.

### *Barbarians in the Historia Romana*

From Divine Providence then, we turn to another part of the *HR* that has attracted scholarly attention, namely Paul the Deacon's treatment of barbarian and other, non-Roman peoples.<sup>176</sup> Several citations concerned with these barbarians and non-Roman peoples allow us a glimpse into Paul the Deacon's conceptualisation and judgement of those peoples that did not (originally) belong to the Roman Empire. As Cornford notes, 'Paul's attitude to barbarians throughout the *Historia Romana* displays much of the hostility of his late Roman sources.'<sup>177</sup> This is something which warrants further investigation, because, besides arguably being a barbarian himself, Paul the

---

<sup>171</sup> Ibidem, p. 347, translated from Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XVIII, LII, 17-20

<sup>172</sup> Ibidem, p. 345

<sup>173</sup> Ibidem, p. 348

<sup>174</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 95

<sup>175</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p. 347, for the passage, see *HLS* 7.27

<sup>176</sup> C.f. Cornford, 'Paul the Deacon's understanding of identity, his attitude to barbarians, and his "strategies of distinction" in the *Historia Romana*' in: Ed. Richard Corradini, Rob Meens, Christina Pössel and Philip Shaw, *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 12 (Vienna, 2006) p. 47-60 (this is an adaptation of the fourth chapter of his dissertation) and Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 347-370

<sup>177</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 186

Deacon's world differed significantly from that of his late Roman sources.<sup>178</sup> Although some ambivalence sneaks into Paul's treatment of these peoples,<sup>179</sup> it is still remarkable that Paul would nevertheless appear to have deliberately taken up this late Roman ethnographic tradition and its vocabulary.

I will simply begin with the first citations in this category that reflects upon Paul the Deacon's feelings about non-Roman peoples, which in its original form reads as follows:

'Immediately after this [the war of Artaxerxes in Egypt], the Romans waged a war on behalf of the Campanians and Sedicini against the Samnites, a wealthy and well-armed people.'<sup>180</sup>

Remarkably enough, Paul the Deacon removed Orosius appraising statement of the Samnites being 'a wealthy and well-armed people' (*gentes opibus armisque validam*). Cornford has observed that Paul the Deacon was especially interested in the Samnites, as they used to live in the area that was to become the duchy of Benevento,<sup>181</sup> why then did he omit this passage? As we have already seen with regard to the Carthaginians, Paul was wont to be ambiguous in his approach to non-Roman people. He at times tended to blunt the sting of Orosius' invectives, while at other times transmitting the full brunt of his critique. In this case, Paul removes the remarkably positive statement by Orosius, but follows it up by a direct citation from Jordanes' *De origine actibusque gentis Romanorum* detailing the reasons for the Romans invading the Samnites, namely the wealth of the Campanian region.<sup>182</sup>

It would appear that in this case Orosius' own meagre explanation of the event did not suffice. Paul therefore decided to add a better explanation of why the Romans would wage war on behalf of other peoples: the desirability of the Campanian lands. Remember that Paul had dedicated his work to Adalperga, Duchess of Benevento, which includes Campania, and likely meant for other court figures of the Duchy to read his work. This passage would likely appeal to their tastes, glorifying their own region as it does. The Samnites were long gone, but the region remained, so praising Campania instead of the Samnites themselves seems altogether more appropriate for someone seeking the patronage of the current rulers of the region.

---

<sup>178</sup> Ibidem, p. 188

<sup>179</sup> Ibidem, p. 187

<sup>180</sup> Citation 11, *HLS* 3.8.1, translation by A.T. Fear: '*Jam hinc statim a Romanis adversum Samnitas, gentem opibus armisque validam, pro Campanis et Sidicinis bella suscepta sunt.*'

<sup>181</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 107

<sup>182</sup> *HR* p. 26 l. 10-19: '*omnium siquidem non modo Italiae tantum sed poene toto orbe terrarum pulcherrima Campaniae plaga est: nihil hospitalius mari; liic illi nobiles portus Caieta, Misenus, tepentes fontibus Baiiae, Lucrinus et Avernus, quaedam maris hostia; hic amici vitibus montes Caurus, Falernus, Massicus et pulcherrimus cunctorum Vesuvius, urbes ad mare Formiae, Cumae, Puteoli, Herculanium, Pompeia et ipsa caput urbium Capua quondam inter tres maximas Romam Carthaginemque nominata. pro hac urbe, bis regionibus populus Romanus Samnitas invadit*'

To get a fuller picture of Paul's treatment of non-Romans, it is worthwhile to return to the Punic Wars for a bit, to once again confirm that Paul's treatment of the Carthaginians and Romans in this conflict is rather more ambivalent than Orosius'. Paul cites a passage wherein Orosius stresses Hannibal's faithlessness (*infidelissimus*) and his hatred of the Romans by having him swear this very same hatred to his father at his altars.<sup>183</sup> This combination between cruelty, faithlessness and paganism is typical of Orosius' style, for it shows how the altars, whether they were Roman or Carthaginian, could only bring disaster upon those who put their faith in them. Paul rather curiously omitted Orosius' damning statement about Hannibal's faithlessness. We have already seen that Paul the Deacon had taken a relatively ambiguous stance concerning the Carthaginians and it is confirmed here once more: in this case, Hannibal's almost typical ferociousness is slightly lessened. Paul obviously wished to include the sentiment, perhaps as more '*lumina et colores*', but not the harsh condemnations that came with it.

But as can be expected, Cornford's conviction that Paul adopted the ethnographic vocabulary of his Late Antique sources virtually wholesale, did not materialize out of thin air. The original passage from which the following citation has been taken for instance shows a more generic view of barbarians at work:

'[Claudius attempted to drive out] the various tribes who lived around the Rodope mountains and who were at that time laying waste to Macedonia in a horrendous fashion. Among the rest of the tortures that they inflicted on their prisoners, which are terrible both to speak, and listen, about, when they needed a cup, they happily used, as if they were genuine cups and with no sense of repulsion, blood-stained bones that they took from human skulls, with hair still sticking to them and their insides smeared with badly scraped brains.'<sup>184</sup>

Even though Paul mitigates the impact these various tribes had on Macedonia by omitting the passage detailing their laying waste to this province (*ac tunc Macedoniam crudelissime populabantur*), he still conveys the message about their cruel, barbarous nature. Especially the mention of the skull-cups in relation to barbarity is intriguing; a similar type of cup appears in the *HL* in relation to the Lombard king Alboin (c. 530 – 572).<sup>185</sup> And whilst we have seen that Paul the

<sup>183</sup> Citation 25, *HLS* 4.14.3: '*Exinde odio Romani nominis, quod patri Amilcari, cum esset novem annos natus, fidelissime, alias infidelissimus, ante aras juraverat*'

<sup>184</sup> Citation 79, *HLS* 5.23.17-18, translation by A.T. Fear: '*varias gentes, quae Rhodopaeis montibus circumfusae sunt, ac tunc Macedoniam crudelissime populabantur nam inter caetera dictu audituque horrida, quae in captivos agebant, raptis, cum poculo opus esset, humanorum capitum ossibus, cruentis capillatisque adhuc, ac per interiores cavernas male effosso cerebro oblitis, avide ac sine horrore tamquam veris poculis utebantur*'

<sup>185</sup> *HL* 2.28



Deacon may at times take an ambivalent approach to non-Roman peoples, there certainly are traditional, barbarian villains in the *HR*.

Arbogastes' (d. 394) rise to power, for instance, perfectly displays the deceit a barbarian was thought to be capable of. As Orosius tells the tale, Valentinian II (371 – 392) was restored as emperor after the death of Maximus (c. 335 – 388) and Victor (d. 388) and crossed over to Gaul to rule. He was strangled in Vienne, apparently, as men say, by his treacherous count Arbogestas, who sought to make the death look like a suicide.<sup>186</sup> The citation continues in detailing Arbogastes' acts, but the slight change Paul the Deacon made to this part of it is revealing of his opinion of this barbarian count: he leaves out 'men say' (*ut ferunt*) turning Orosius' 'hearsay' and uncertainty about Arbogastes' involvement in Valentinian's death into fact. It must be remarked that Paul was unusually interested in usurpers, be they Romans or barbarians, throughout the *HR*.<sup>187</sup>

A later citation details the rise to power of another usurper, namely Constantine III (d. 411) in 407 in Britain:

'In the British provinces Gratian, a citizen of that island, usurped power and was killed. Constantine, a man from the lowest ranks of the army, lacking in any ability, and whose only appeal was in his name, was chosen in his stead. Immediately after he had usurped power, he invaded the Gallic provinces where he did great harm to the state, frequently being made a fool of by the barbarians, who broke the treaties they made with him.'<sup>188</sup>

Orosius accomplished two things simultaneously here: for one, he managed to discredit Constantine and his persona, but he also managed to show the treacherous nature of the barbarians in Gaul (in this case the Vandals, Alans and Sueves that, under Stilicho, were ransacking Gaul).<sup>189</sup> Paul the Deacon took over this dual sentiment, but leaves out the part about Constantine being harmful to the state (*qui continuo ut invasit imperium*), further depreciating this usurper's worth. More such passages pop up and it appears as if Paul was trying to show the futility of trying to usurp power from a rightful emperor.<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>186</sup> Citation 120, *HLS* 7.35.10, translation by A.T. Fear: '*Igitur Valentinianus junior, regno restitutus, extincto Maximo, ejusque filio Victore, quem imperatorem Gallis Maximus reliquerat, ipse in Galliam transivit: ubi cum tranquilla republica in pace ageret, apud Viennam dolo Arbogastis, comitis sui, ut ferunt, strangulatus, atque ut voluntariam sibi conscivisse mortem putaretur, laqueo suspensus est.*'

<sup>187</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 113

<sup>188</sup> Citation 138, *HLS* 7.40.4, translation by A.T. Fear: '*apud Britannias Gratianus, municeps ejusdem insulae, tyrannus creatur et occiditur. Hujus loco Constantinus, ex infima militia, propter solam spem nominis, sine merito virtutis eligitur, qui continuo ut invasit imperium, in Gallias transiit. Ibi saepe a Barbaris incertis foederibus illusus, detrimento magis reipublicae fuit.*'

<sup>189</sup> *HLS* 7.40.3

<sup>190</sup> Citations 127, 139

The passage in which Theodosius (347 – 395) became emperor highlights the importance of a proper ruler to the Roman Empire. Furthermore, it highlights how, once such a proper ruler had ascended to the throne, the danger usurpers and barbarians posed to the Empire was diminished. Orosius placed great emphasis on Theodosius' Spanish origins, praising Gratian's choice for Theodosius.<sup>191</sup> He also stressed the desperate state the Roman Empire was in at the time of his investment with the purple, for Valens (328 – 378) had left the state close to collapse and vulnerable to the attacks of the Goths.<sup>192</sup> Paul, however, removed just this explanation of the dire state the the Empire was in (*qui cum afflictum ac pene collapsum reipublicae statum videret*) as well as the part explaining its dire need for rescue (*et restituendae reipublicae necessitate*). While maintaining Orosius' praise for both Gratian and Theodosius, Paul the Deacon mitigated the threat the Goths were posing at that time, emphasizing that the Roman Empire certainly was not beyond rescue.

What thus becomes apparent is that Paul the Deacon was quite capable of selecting, omitting and adding passages from the *HLS* to suit his own needs, as well as to subtly change the tone and feel of some of these passages. With regard to the passages about barbarians mentioned above, it is clear that, whilst at times copying Orosius' anti-barbarian sentiments, Paul was also capable of playing with these sentiments to either sharpen or dull them. The next chapter will show how Paul, with even greater alterations in his source material, was still quite capable of incorporating his source's intentions as well as adding his own; that his stance on the barbarians comes across as slightly ambiguous in certain cases, might thus be intentional. Paul was, after all, not writing for a Roman, but a barbarian elite.

#### *The Romans in the Historia Romana*

Now we have looked at the non-Romans, it is only logical that we look at the Romans in the *HR* themselves as well. Earlier we saw that Paul the Deacon, although adding mentions of Roman military defeats, did not take over Orosius' many more depreciating passages concerning the Romans. Having based his *HR* on the *Breviarum*, such passages would be hard to integrate with Eutropius' more glorious account of Roman conquests. Although we have seen that the *HR* provides a slightly more balanced view of the Roman past than either the *HLS* or the *Breviarum* did, I still believe Paul was erring on the side of the Romans, whom he saw as an example to be followed by his contemporaries.

---

<sup>191</sup> Gratian receives little, but favourable treatment, c.f. citation 110

<sup>192</sup> Citation 111, *HLS* 7.34.2, translation by A.T. Fear: '*qui cum afflictum ac pene collapsum reipublicae statum videret, eadem provisione, qua quondam legerat Nerva Hispanum virum Trajanum, per quem respublica reparata est, legit et ipse Theodosium aequae Hispanum virum, et restituendae reipublicae necessitate apud Sirmium purpura induit, Orientisque et Thraciae simul praefecit imperio.*'

That there were lessons to be learned even in pre-Roman times becomes apparent when we look at the following passage, which concludes with a resounding warning for all who would heed it:

‘After destroying Numantia, Scipio made peace with the rest of the Spanish tribes. He asked Thyresus, a Celtic chieftain, how Numantia had at first avoided defeat for so long and how then it had been overthrown. Thyresus replied: ‘Concord made it invincible, discord was its downfall.’<sup>193</sup>

Paul the Deacon omitted the mention of how Scipio made peace with the Spanish tribes (*cum, deleta Numantia, caeteras Hispaniae gentes pace componeret*). Orosius, who himself stemmed from Spain, was inclined to treat the Spanish peoples more kindly than most others. For Paul the Deacon, the important aspect of this passage is obviously Thyresus’ speech, a fact Maskarinec would likely agree with, given that she pointed out how important it was for Paul that the Romans had been able to create *unus populus*, out of disparate peoples.<sup>194</sup> The importance of unity, preferably under a rightful leader such as Theodosius or in this case Scipio Africanus, would thus appear to be paramount in the *HR*. Both barbarians and usurpers posed less of a threat when Rome was unified under proper governance. We have also seen that Paul, even whilst suggesting the Roman Empire could have fallen even before it had begun, attempted to dull the sting of the many blows Orosius delivered at the address of the early Roman Republic and Empire, stressing the strength of its unity.

The role of Scipio Africanus in the above passage becomes even more apparent when we consider a passage connected to this event. Before Scipio Africanus was made consul for a second time and sent to fight the Numantines, this people had often beaten the Romans, managing to resist 40,000 Roman troops with only 4,000 of their own and even forcing a shameful treaty (*pudendisque foederibus*) upon the Romans.<sup>195</sup> Paul omits some of Orosius’ exaggeration of this event of Roman history, removing some of Orosius’ shaming of Rome but maintaining the general gist: the Numantines were a fearsome people, capable of war. It took the interference of the consul Scipio Africanus to finally and resolutely defeat the Numantines. In Eutropius the capabilities of Scipio Africanus were already mentioned, but in this manner they are enhanced and emphasized.<sup>196</sup>

If we contrast the exploits of Scipio with those of Sulla (138 – 78 BC), the importance of a proper leader becomes even more apparent. The *HLS* tells us the following:

<sup>193</sup> Citation 63, *HLS* 5.8.1, translated by A.T. Fear: ‘*Scipio autem, cum, deleta Numantia, caeteras Hispaniae gentes pace componeret, Tiresum quemdam, Celticum principem, consuluit, qua ope res Numantina aut prius invicta durasset, aut post fuisset eversa: Tiresus respondit: Concordia invicta, discordia exitio fuit.*’

<sup>194</sup> Maskarinec, ‘Who were the Romans?’, p. 23-24

<sup>195</sup> Citation 61, *HLS* 5.7.3, translated by A.T. Fear: ‘*Haec per annos quatuordecim cum solis quatuor millibus suorum quadraginta millia Romanorum non solum sustinuit, sed etiam vicit, pudendisque foederibus affectit.*’

<sup>196</sup> *Breviarum*, 4.17

'Finally, Sulla fought the Samnites' general, Camponius, and the remnants of Carrina's troops before the City itself before the Colline Gate at the ninth hour of the day. After a fierce battle, he finally emerged triumphant. 80,000 men are said to have perished there. 12,000 surrendered. The unquenchable wrath of those citizens who had triumphed put an end to the rest after they turned to flee.'<sup>197</sup>

Whereas Paul the Deacon had greatly simplified this statement and had removed the most damning passage towards the end concerning the wrath of the Roman citizens, this victory would not turn out as glorious as the one won by Scipio.<sup>198</sup> With further citations from Orosius, Paul narrates how, after this victory, instead of making peace and setting up honourable treaties as Scipio had done, Sulla slew 3,000 prisoners of war despite the fact that he had guaranteed their safety.<sup>199</sup> When he was confronted by several Romans with his improper behaviour, Sulla began his proscriptions.

Thus follows the tale of Marcus Marius' gruesome death at the hands of Sulla, which even further tarnishes the image of Sulla in the *HR*:

'After Marcus Marius had been dragged from a goat-house, Sulla ordered that he be bound, taken across the Tiber to the tomb of the Lutatii, and be butchered by having his eyes gouged out and his limbs cut off, or rather broken, piece by piece.'<sup>200</sup>

This citation is interesting for another reason besides the light it casts on Sulla's reign. While the story stems from Sallust and Cicero, Orosius is among the first to place the site of Marius' death at the tomb of the Lutatii, a fact which is not part of the earlier tradition.<sup>201</sup> It is precisely this part, ostensibly added by Orosius, that Paul the Deacon omits.<sup>202</sup> Might it be that Paul the Deacon was

<sup>197</sup> Citation 73, *HLS* 5.22.9, translated by A.T. Fear: '*Sulla deinde cum Lamponio Samnitium duce, et Carrinatis reliquis copiis, ante ipsam Urbem portamque Collinam ad horam diei nonam signa contulit, gravissimoque praelio tandem vicit; octoginta millia hominum ibi fusa dicuntur, duodecim millia sese dederunt: reliquam multitudinem in fugam versam, insatiabilis victorum civium ira consumpsit.*'

<sup>198</sup> *HR* p. 77 l.7-9: '*Sylla deinde cum Campanie Samnitium duce et reliquis copiis ad portam Collinam signa contulit, octoginta millia hominum occidit.*'

<sup>199</sup> Citation 74, in the *HR*, p. 77 l.9-13 reads: '*tria milia hominum contra fidem datam inermes peremit cumque magna crudelitate adversus sontes insontesque seviet, Quintus Catulus palam Syllae dixit: "Cum quibus tandem victuri sumus, si in bello armatos, in pace inermes occidimus?"*'

<sup>200</sup> Citation 75, *HLS* 5.21.7, translation by A.T. Fear: '*M. Marium siquidem, de caprili casa extractum, vinciri Sulla iussit; ductumque trans Tiberim ad Lutatorum sepulcrum, effossis oculis, membrisque minutatim desectis, vel etiam fractis, trucidari.*'

<sup>201</sup> Elizabeth Rawson, "Sallust on the Eighties?" in *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987), p. 175–177

<sup>202</sup> *HR* 77 l.13-16 is otherwise very similar and the wording would suggest he used Orosius as his main source for the event: '*Sylla dehinc Marcomarium de caprili casa extractum vinciri iussit ductumque trans Tiberim effossis oculis, membris minutatim exsectis vel fractis trucidari.*'

correcting Orosius in this instance, by reverting, if not verbally then at least spiritually, to an earlier tradition which did not mention the site of the tomb of the Lutatii or was it merely an abbreviation or a fluke in the manuscript of the *HLS* Paul the Deacon had used? I would be inclined to say that the former answer is correct and that Paul the Deacon preferred the earlier tradition to Orosius'. Much of the above evidence has already shown Paul the Deacon to have been a capable and thoughtful editor and that he omitted a detail such as this is likely more than just a coincidence.

The general picture of Paul's treatment of the Romans then remains one of a two-sided approach: on the one hand, he did not shy away from including Roman losses, Roman failures and Roman defeats, but neither did he attempt to embellish or belie these facts. In a sense, one might say Paul is striving for realism in narrating his Roman history, providing the 'full' story as he seems set on doing by adding nuances and losses to Eutropius' glorious account. Furthermore, his emphasis on the success of capable and rightful Roman leaders, as opposed to the failure and cruelty of usurpers and pretenders to power, indicates once more that Paul likely intended for his audience to look for exemplars of good rulers in his *HR*.

#### *What about the East?*

Not all of the Roman themes Paul touches upon are treated with the same 'fulness', however, for in one regard, Paul clearly follows Eutropius and that is his focus upon the Western Roman Empire and his somewhat grudging acknowledgement of the Eastern Roman Empire. While Maskarinec mainly points out Paul's not entirely positive stance towards the Eastern Roman Empire through use of the *HL*, her point still stands: Paul is focussed far more on the Western Roman Empire than on the Eastern part in the *HR*.<sup>203</sup> Cornford regards the role of the Eastern Roman Empire in the *HR* a little differently: to him, Paul clearly envisaged and felt that the Eastern Roman Empire was still Roman. However, its role had changed: no longer did it have sole control over orthodoxy, for instance.<sup>204</sup>

Moreover, Paul wished to stress the centrality of Italy and Rome for the history of the Roman Empire, even in its latter stages.<sup>205</sup> Though Orosius' narrative does not run up to the end of imperial rule in the West, one specific and very early passage taken from his work still gives us a glimpse of Paul's views on the Eastern Roman Empire, namely the founding of Byzantium. Orosius, who appeared to hold no great prejudices against the East, says the following of the event:

---

<sup>203</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', p. 3-4

<sup>204</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 199, 212-275.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 271-272

'This town of Byzantium was founded by Pausanias, the king of the Spartans, and afterwards enlarged by the Christian emperor Constantine and named Constantinople. Now it is the glorious seat of imperial power and the capital of the entire East.'<sup>206</sup>

When Paul is finished revising this passage, it looks quite different though:

'In this time the town of Byzantium was founded, it is afterwards named Constantinople.'<sup>207</sup>

Paul's focus on the Western Roman Empire and Italy in specific has even convinced Goffart that Paul was actually writing a history of Italy.<sup>208</sup> This is supported here by Paul's alteration of this citation. While not necessarily a critique of Constantinople, by deliberately omitting Orosius' praise, Paul did manage to reduce this city's status and appeal, thereby making it stand out less.

### *Conclusion*

The citations which have been dealt with in this chapter have both reaffirmed the presence of certain trends in the *HR* as well as added a few new aspects. For one, Paul the Deacon's handling of the providential scheme in Orosius, as well as his handling of Orosius negative opinion of the Romans remains constant: they are both largely subdued and made to fit within Paul the Deacon's own view of history which may derive in some fashion from Augustine. The major theme which Paul did take over from Orosius, if less overtly, was the coincidence of the birth of Christ with the reign of Augustus. Coupled with Paul's handling of the Romans, this inclusion seems tailored towards creating several Roman exempla for emulation; specifically, Paul seems to contrast good and bad governance throughout his account, connecting the former with success and the latter with cruelty and failure.

Moreover we have noted that Paul's treatment of non-Roman peoples in the *Historia Romana* is slightly more nuanced than some scholars have thus far believed: while he takes on some of the harsh views of Orosius with regard to barbarian peoples, he would appear to have added nuance and ambivalence by not being as overt or as stringent in his derision of these peoples.

Then there is Paul's treatment of the Eastern Roman Empire: though we have only encountered one instance so far in which Paul overtly altered a reference to the East, this example is already quite telling. The Eastern Roman Empire and its lot were clearly not the focus of the *HR*; instead Italy and the western provinces figure largely in Paul's account.

<sup>206</sup> Citation 4, *HLS* 3.13.2, translated by A.T. Fear: '*Haec autem Byzantium, quondam a Pausania rege Spartanorum condita, post autem a Constantino, Christiano principe, in majus aucta et Constantinopolis dicta, gloriosissimi nunc imperii sedes et totius caput Orientis est.*'

<sup>207</sup> *HR* p. p.14 l.4-5, '*his temporibus Bizantium civitas est condita, quae postea Constantinopolis est appellata.*'

<sup>208</sup> Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 356

The main point to be made with regard to this chapter however, is that Paul the Deacon was in no way afraid to alter his prime sources. Eutropius' account is of course greatly lengthened and altered by the many interpolations Paul has made into it. These interpolations themselves didn't escape Paul's critical eye either however, as he clearly altered them as he saw fit. In the case of this chapter, most alterations are restricted to the omission of a few small statements of fact or opinion which Paul apparently deemed inappropriate for his own account of Roman history. This indicates that Paul the Deacon was not nearly as careless or as sloppy with the selection of his sources and the compilation of the *Historia Romana* as was once thought. As if the enormity of the resulting work and the huge amount of sources used in its compilation weren't enough evidence of the effort Paul put into creating the *Historia Romana*, it is quite clear that Paul screened his sources rather well, compared them and sometimes chose to emend or conflate passages from multiple sources to create a more authoritative recounting of an event. Far from carelessly flinging a bunch of passages into a lacklustre pastiche, signs begin to emerge that point towards the fact that Paul must have had a proper reason to structure his work the way that he did and to use the sources he used in the way that he did.

For instance, would the contrast between good and bad rulers, rightful emperors and usurpers have been as clear in the *Breviarum* as it appears to be in the *HR*? Sure, the *Breviarum* presented its fair share of bad apples, but the obvious dichotomy between a rightful ruler and a usurper or pretender would not have been as strong without some of the additions Paul adapted from the *HLS*. It is part of a difference of opinion perhaps, between Paul and Eutropius; the latter placed most of his pride in Rome's capacity at war, whereas Paul was far more interested in Rome's capacity to unite the Mediterranean world.<sup>209</sup> Orosius, too, set much stock by Rome's capacity to unite the disparate peoples and place of the world under one Christian government, so there is an obvious congruence between the two authors on this point.<sup>210</sup>

In the final analytical chapter, we will continue finding proof of this, even whilst we will see Paul taking an even more intrusive hand in the way he cites and takes over passages from Orosius.

---

<sup>209</sup> For Eutropius' stance, see: Bird, *Eutropius*, p. xx, for Paul's stance, see: Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?' p. 23-24

<sup>210</sup> Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 88-107

### 3. A discussion of the heavily edited citations from the *Historiarum Libri Septem*<sup>211</sup>

Within this third and final analytical chapter, I will be looking at those citations and interpolations of passages from the *HLS* that have been highly abbreviated, paraphrased or adapted. As opposed to the previous chapters, in which the citations treated retain, completely or almost completely, the wording and phrasing of Orosius, in this chapter we will see Paul the Deacon's editing hand more firmly and more thoroughly at work. Paul was prone to condensing and abbreviating long and disparate paragraphs from the *HLS* into briefer, more compact passages within his own work. This is evidenced by the fifty-two citations that fall under the purview of this chapter. It has already become obvious that Paul was not hesitant in adapting the passages he took from Orosius' work to suit his own needs and throughout this chapter it will become even more obvious that Paul's use of Orosius was neither lacklustre nor uncritical of Orosius' opinions and views.

At the end of this chapter, there will thus emerge an even better picture of both Paul's methods of approaching Orosius' *HLS* as well as of Paul's own views and opinions *vis a vis* Orosius and Christian history in general. To allow for this to happen, I will be returning to some of the points already made and some of the themes already made apparent, to see what new light the citations treated in this chapter can shed on them.

#### *Portents and other strange or miraculous events*

Portents and other such miraculous events remain an interesting and recurrent part of this analysis, for they show a rather large discrepancy between Orosius' views on the role of God in history and views held on the same subject by Paul the Deacon. Within this chapter, I will be dealing with some of the five remaining such portents and the question whether these support or contradict the trend already set.<sup>212</sup> The first portent I will mention deals with the death of the Roman knight Marcus Curtius who threw himself into a chasm that had opened in the centre of Rome, to sate the earth's hunger for blood.<sup>213</sup> Orosius' retelling of the event from Livy<sup>214</sup> is very dramatic to read and full of negative connotations. It was linked to the preceding passage in the *HLS* in which a plague struck Rome. To alleviate the plague, the very same priests and oracles of the pagan gods that would later

<sup>211</sup> As opposed to the previous chapters, many of the citations I deal with here are rather long in their original form. In an effort to keep my footnotes manageable, I will thus not always incorporate their Latin versions into my footnotes. I refer those that are sufficiently interested in the specific wording, to my appendices.

<sup>212</sup> The citations I will deal with here are numbers 8, 9, 19, 66 and 69.

<sup>213</sup> Citation 8, *HLS* 3.5, *HR* p. 24, l.2-8, in the *HLS* it reads: '*Sequitur hanc miseram luem, miserioremque ejus expiationem proximo anno satis triste prodigium. Repente siquidem medio Urbis terra dissiluit, vastoque praeruptu hiantia subito inferna patuerunt. Manebat diu ad spectaculum terroremque cunctorum patenti voragine impudens specus, nefariamque vivi hominis sepulturam diis interpretibus expetebat. Satisfecit improbis faucibus praecipitio sui Marcus Curtius, eques armatus, injecitque crudeli terrae inopinatam satietatem, cui parum esset, quod ex tanta pestilentia mortuos per sepulcra susciperet, nisi etiam vivos scissa sorberet.*'

<sup>214</sup> Livy 7.6.1-6



advice Marcus Curtius to give his own life to seal the chasm at the heart of Rome, had ordered for plays to be put on all over Rome. Following in Augustine's footsteps, Orosius condemns the plays and, whilst admitting that they drove off the plague, implies that the performance of these plays had tainted the very souls of the Romans.<sup>215</sup> No wonder then that the following year this horrible chasm appeared in the midst of Rome.<sup>216</sup>

Paul the Deacon, as could be expected, treated this miraculous event in a far less judgemental light: though he retained the mention of the plague in Rome a year before,<sup>217</sup> he omitted all mention of the plays and their tainted nature. The events surrounding the chasm are also far less dramatic and far more straightforward in the *HR*, showing no sign of Orosius' hostility towards the *aruspices* that sent Marcus Curtius to his death. Again it becomes clear that Paul the Deacon did not see pagan practices as much of a threat in his own time and saw no need to copy Orosius' dramatization and condemnation of Marcus Curtius' traditionally heroic display of Roman virtue.

These events are closely followed by another portent, involving stones raining from the sky, which announced the birth of Alexander the Great.<sup>218</sup> Orosius referred to Alexander as 'truly a whirlpool of sufferings and an ill-wind for the entire East,'<sup>219</sup> in his attempts to minimize the heroic fame that Romans classically accorded to brave and successful warlords of the past. Paul the Deacon, on the other hand, retained the connection between the portent and Alexander the Great's birth, but omitted Orosius' negative judgement of the man. This fits with Paul the Deacon's use of Eutropius' *Breviarum* as the basis for the *HR*, which shows a lot of respect and praise for Roman bravery and skill at war, as opposed to Orosius' intentional revocation of such a theme.<sup>220</sup>

While thus not directly connected to the workings of God's hand in history, this small citation can still tell us something about Paul the Deacon's views on history as a whole and on the great men within it. Where Eutropius chose to mention Alexander the Great only once, in a small remark regarding the founding of Alexandria,<sup>221</sup> Paul the Deacon added several more references to Alexander's reign and family,<sup>222</sup> not necessarily retelling anything of the man's life, but obviously appealing to the concept and tradition of Alexander the Great as a great warlord and conqueror. Not only would that imply that Alexander the Great's name still meant something, if only to such a well-

---

<sup>215</sup> *HLS* 3.4

<sup>216</sup> *HLS* 3.5.1: '*Sequitur hanc miseram luem, miserioremque ejus expiationem proximo anno satis triste prodigium.*'

<sup>217</sup> Citation 7

<sup>218</sup> Citation 9, *HLS* 3.7.4-5, *HR* p. 25, l.8-11

<sup>219</sup> *HLS* 3.7.5, translation by A.T. Fear: '*magnus vere ille gurges miseriarum, atque atrocissimus turbo totius Orientis*'

<sup>220</sup> It is thus also no wonder that Paul the Deacon includes citation 16, which is one of the few instances in which Orosius *does* praise a Roman's skill of war and then in comparison to Alexander the Great.

<sup>221</sup> Eutropius, *Breviarum* 3.7

<sup>222</sup> Citations 10, 16 and 112

educated individual as Paul the Deacon, but also that Paul the Deacon thought it necessary to add more references to him to the *HR*. This might be due to Paul's attempts to place the events of the *HR* in a larger historical framework, largely in reference to Jerome's *Chronicle*,<sup>223</sup> or just to add some padding to Eutropius' admittedly brief and concise *Breviarum*.<sup>224</sup> Nevertheless, in this case it was precisely references to Alexander the Great, which Paul added to the *HR* to achieve his goals; the selection of these references was thus a conscious decision on his part. It is furthermore worth noting that he chose Orosius as his source for these matters, given Orosius' negativity towards Alexander the Great. Only through careful selection and adaptation, did Paul extract his more neutral references from the *HLS*, providing further evidence for Paul's active editing hand in this instance. Furthermore, he cited two of these passages referring to Alexander the Great with the explicit intent of shining a favourable light on successful Roman leaders.<sup>225</sup>

That every citation Paul the Deacon used and every interpolation that he made deserves the question of 'why did Paul the Deacon include this passage?' becomes ever more obvious and pertinent. The answers to this question are not always as straightforward, however. With regard to another portent, concerning a Roman girl returning from Rome being struck dead by lightning, the reason for its inclusion is not directly clear.<sup>226</sup> While heavily abbreviated, little of the details of the portent have changed and Orosius gave no explanation of the portent for Paul the Deacon to omit. In the *HLS* the portent is part of the Jugurthine wars and precedes the sexual pollution of three Vestal Virgins. In the *HR* the interpolation is similarly positioned within the Jugurthine wars but does not seem to lead up to any particularly disastrous event due to it being positioned at the very end of book four.

Yet in the same way as the disgrace of the Vestal Virgins was foretold by this portent in Orosius, it also led up to an episode of female disgrace in the *HR*: only a few paragraphs into his fifth book, Paul the Deacon elaborated on the defeat of the Teutones and Cimbri at the hands of Gaius Marius in 102 BC. After their men had been defeated, the Teutonic and Cimbrian women also put up a fierce fight, in the end slaying their own children before committing suicide *en masse* rather than

---

<sup>223</sup> Cornford shows this 'anchoring' at work, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 95-96

<sup>224</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 99.

<sup>225</sup> Citation 16 and 112

<sup>226</sup> Citation 69, *HLS* 5.15.20-21, *HR* p. 70 l. 11-16, in the *HLS* it reads: '*lisdem diebus obscenum prodigium ac triste visum est. L. Helvius, eques Romanus, cum uxore et filia, de Roma in Apuliam rediens, tempestate correptus, cum filiam consternatam videret, ut citius propioribus tectis succederent, relictis vehiculis arreptisque equis, filiam virginem, equo insidentem, in medium agmen accepit. Puella continuo ictu fulminis exanimata est. Sed omnibus sine scissura aliqua vestimentis ademptis, ac pectoris pedumque vinculis dissolutis, monilibus etiam annulisque discussis, ipso quoque corpore illaeso, nisi quod obscenum in modum nuda, et lingua paululum exserta jacuit, equus quoque ipse, quo utebatur, straturis, frenis et cingulis dissolutis passim ac dispersis, exanimis procul jacuit.*'

being captured by the Romans.<sup>227</sup> The scene, taken from Orosius, is rather gruesome and detailed, but this is not the only interesting aspect of this interpolation. Orosius praised these women for possessing ‘a women’s frenzy, but a man’s strength.’<sup>228</sup> In this way, Orosius sought to draw an implicit parallel between the horrors of the past and the horrors of his own times, emphasizing through the courage of these women that before the birth of Christ, people suffered terrible horrors bravely and without complaint, because they were used to nothing but suffering.<sup>229</sup> This event also fits with Orosius’ many lamentations of the disastrous effect the Roman lust for dominance had on the people that were conquered: ‘I need not ask what the countless nations of diverse peoples, previously long free, but then conquered in war, [...] would have preferred for themselves at that time, what they thought of the Romans, or what was their verdict on this period of history.’<sup>230</sup>

Paul the Deacon however, left out the latter part of this praise (*‘vi autem virili’*), not going for the same effect as Orosius sought to have on his audience. Though more of the passage had been abbreviated, it is this tiny omission that drives home the difference between Orosius’ use of this event and that of Paul the Deacon. Paul’s *HR* certainly provided a rather thorough history of the Roman Empire up until Justinian’s time, but it also offered an example of a once successful people that others ought to emulate. If he praised these Teutonic and Cimbrian women for their bravery in seeking death, rather than domination by the Romans, this would weaken his overall point that the Romans were worthy either of emulation or of amalgamation, i.e. worthy enough for other people to also become Roman. Rather than making this out to be a heroic event of resistance to Roman conquest, Paul makes this out to be a tragic event of barbarian folly.

### *Speaking of barbarian folly*

The above brings me to the next theme I would like to discuss once again, namely the treatment of barbarians in the *HR*. Paul’s rather ambiguous stance on the barbarians has thus far been unveiled, for I have shown that in several cases, Paul changed or adapted Orosius’ rather harsher opinions of the barbarians to suit his own ends, often alleviating, if not completely removing, his source’s condemnation. The more thorough changes Paul the Deacon made to passages from the *HLS* pertaining to barbarians will hopefully shed more light on this ambiguity.

Above we have seen how Paul disapproved of the Teutonic and Cimbrian women’s last stand against the Romans, how then, were they supposed to act in defeat? The victory of Theodosius the Great in Scythia at the beginning of his reign proves enlightening. The first passage concerning this

<sup>227</sup> Citation 70, *HLS* 5.16.17-19, 21, *HR* p. 72 l. 6-20

<sup>228</sup> *HLS* 5.16.21, translation A.T. Fear: *‘femineo furore, vi autem virili’*

<sup>229</sup> For a clear expression of this sentiment, see *HLS* 5.1

<sup>230</sup> *HLS* 5.1.8, translation by A.T. Fear: *‘Non requiro de innumeris diversarum gentium populis, diu antea liberis, tunc bello victis, [...] quid tunc sibi maluerint, quid de Romanis opinati sint, quid de temporibus judicant.’*

war Theodosius waged in Scythia depicts the emperor realizing that the Romans' peril stemmed from the wrath of God (*ira Dei*) and could thus only be alleviated through the mercy of God (*miser cordia Dei*).<sup>231</sup> Having placed his full faith in the Lord, Theodosius obtained an astounding amount of victories over various barbarian peoples and arrived triumphant in Constantinople, upon which he struck a treaty with Athanaric, the king of the Goths, who then promptly died upon arriving in Constantinople.<sup>232</sup>

Up until this point, except for several abbreviations, Paul the Deacon followed closely in Orosius' footsteps, but upon describing what happened next, he greatly deviates from Orosius' tale. Orosius narrated how the Goths sought peace upon the death of their leader and how even the Persians, despite their disdain for the Romans, were moved to seek a strong and long lasting peace in the East, which lasted up until the time of his writing.<sup>233</sup> Paul took over the first part about the Goths submitting themselves to the power of Rome, but then completely omitted all mention of the Persians and their disdain, instead substituting 'the Parthians and the barbarian nations who had up to then been enemies of the Roman name'<sup>234</sup> as the ones sending legates to beg for peace. This is a rather far-reaching alteration in several regards. For one, it amplifies Theodosius' exemplary status, which was already present in the *HLS* and which remained intact in the citations Paul the Deacon took from it. This substitution also draws attention away from the East, skipping over Orosius' mention of the Persians, their duplicitous nature and the Eastern peace that would not last up until Paul's own time. This is even more apparent considering that Paul did cite the passage that follows the above in the *HLS* word for word, wherein the focus is explicitly shifted to the West once more.<sup>235</sup> The most important alteration to this citation is however clearly the behaviour of the barbarians: they all submitted to the Roman Empire and its emperor.

It is important to note that the barbarians were not meant to submit to just any old emperor: Theodosius was a righteous and god-fearing ruler, who sought to restore both the divine as well as the political order within his empire, and he was therefore worthy of allegiance. That things could turn out very differently is shown by the narration, which is again mostly borrowed from Orosius, of emperor Valens' death.<sup>236</sup> Valens had been an adherent of the Arian doctrine and therefore received a bitter treatment in both the *HLS* as well as the *HR*. On top of that, Valens had been petitioned by the Goths to send them bishops to teach them about Christianity, a request Valens answered by

---

<sup>231</sup> Citation 112, *HLS* 7.34.6-7, *HR* p. 158-159 l. 12-4

<sup>232</sup> Citation 113, *HLS* 7.34.7, *HR* p. 159 l. 5-14; most of this citation is not decidedly Orosian in style and content, but Crivelluci could only derive this specific detail from Orosius.

<sup>233</sup> Citation 114, *HLS* 7.34.7-8

<sup>234</sup> *HR* p. 159 l. 16-17, translation by Maraskinec, '*Parthi coeteraque barbarae nationes Romano prius nomini inimicae*'

<sup>235</sup> *HLS* 5.34.9

<sup>236</sup> See citation 107, *HLS* 7.33.12-15, *HR* p. 156 l. 5-10 and citation 108, *HLS* 7.33.19, *HR* p. 156 l. 13-17

sending them Arian priests.<sup>237</sup> Instead of submitting to this emperor, the Goths ended up slaying him, in what both Paul the Deacon and Orosius judged to be an instance of Divine Wrath at work. In ironic fashion, the Goths burned to death the very same emperor that had doomed them to burning in Hell. In truly Orosian fashion, then, here we suddenly find the Goths serving as a tool of Divine Wrath even within the *HR*.<sup>238</sup>

It is within these citations stemming from the very end of Orosius' *HLS* that we suddenly and clearly see a Divine Hand at work in Paul the Deacon's work as well. The events winding down from the sack of Rome in 410 are perhaps the most exemplary of this scheme in both the *HLS* and the *HR*. While Orosius' overt providential scheme had been removed from the events of 410, the political consequences of these events bear the mark of God's good will. For during the sack of Rome, Alaric took Placidia, Theodosius' daughter, as his hostage and married her off to his kinsman Athaulf. It was Placidia, with her piety and good advice, who was to be the linchpin of the subsequent marriage between the Goths and the Roman state as well.<sup>239</sup> Hers is one of the few positive female presences added to the *HR*, but, like Athaulf and Wallia who served as male rolemodels, it is hard to not see Paul's inclusion of her as an exemplification of good female behaviour.

Placidia's marriage with Athaulf was described as 'of great use to the state'<sup>240</sup> (*multo reipublicae commodo fuit*) and when Athaulf had succeeded Alaric after his death, she was praised for having influenced him to seek peace with the Roman state.<sup>241</sup> While it is true that Paul the Deacon omitted Orosius' mention of Divine Providence in this particular instance, what happened next was certainly ordained by God (*a Deo ordinatus*).<sup>242</sup> For when Athaulf died, his successor, Segeric was slain by his own people when he proved determined to maintain the peace Athaulf had brokered. Segeric's successor, Wallia, was then chosen to break the peace, but it was Wallia who, through God's will, managed to keep it intact.<sup>243</sup> He returned Placidia to her brother Honorius, who by that time had become emperor, and proceeded to fight on the Romans' behalf, travelling to Spain to battle those barbarian tribes, the Alans, Vandals and the Sueves, that had invaded it. Wallia's success was so great that the kings of these peoples sent envoys to Honorius to broker a peace in similar fashion to Wallia. The words they used according to Orosius are worth citing here:

---

<sup>237</sup> Citation 108, *HLS* 7.33.19, *HR* p. 156 l. 13-17

<sup>238</sup> See citations 100, 104, 106, 107, 108. Another such instance occurs in citation 129

<sup>239</sup> See citations 134, 135, 141

<sup>240</sup> Citation 134, *HLS* 7.40.2, *HR* p. 172-173 l. 14-1, translation A.T. Fear

<sup>241</sup> Citation 135, *HLS* 7.43.7, *HR* p. 173 l. 1-2

<sup>242</sup> Citation 135, *HLS* 7.43.10, *HR* p. 173 l. 7

<sup>243</sup> Citations 135 and 141. Wallia's divinely ordained kingship is mentioned in both instances!

“Make peace with us all, and take hostages from us all. We ourselves will fight and perish, but we will conquer for you, it would be an everlasting boon for your state, if we were to perish, one and all.”<sup>244</sup>

Even though Paul the Deacon, probably with the benefit of hindsight, removed the implication that such would be an everlasting boon for the Roman state (*immortalis vero quaestus*) he retains the sentiment that this was proper barbarian behaviour. Combine this with the fact that the role of Divine Providence in this instance was perhaps even more stressed than it had been in the *HLS*, we can here see how barbarians should relate themselves to the proper Roman, but more importantly, properly Christian authority.<sup>245</sup>

Athaulf and Wallia also provide an intriguing and intentional contrast when compared with Radagaisus, Stilicho and Eucherius, other high-ranking barbarians, who are treated in the same book of the *HR*. The latter three were the obvious stereotypes of pagan and barbarian wickedness, seeking to persecute Christians and hungering after the blood of Romans.<sup>246</sup> Athaulf and Wallia, having submitted to a proper Roman and Christian emperor, are shining examples of proper barbarian behaviour in comparison.

It would thus appear that the barbarians are relegated to a subsidiary role in this relation, especially as their complete annihilation is made out to be a good thing not only on this, but also on another occasion, when ten thousand Goths die in the service of Theodosius.<sup>247</sup> Yet when the barbarians allow themselves to be cast in a role of either submission or conversion (and preferably both), the harsh language with which they were otherwise treated disappears. Maskarinec picks up on this with regard to the Vandals<sup>248</sup> and Paul the Deacon’s treatment of the appearance of the Burgundians is another case in point.<sup>249</sup> Whereas Orosius called them ‘a new enemy with a new name’<sup>250</sup> (*novorum hostium, novum nomen*), Paul omitted this judgement and conflates Orosius’ longer treatment of their lot by simply saying that they were quickly converted to Christianity. Though perhaps not treated with a great amount of enthusiasm either, the lack of negativity itself is telling in this case.

---

<sup>244</sup> Citation 141, *HLS* 7.43.14, translation A.T. Fear: “*Tu cum omnibus pacem habe, omniumque obsides accipe; nos nobis conflagimus, nobis perimus, tibi vincimus: immortalis vero quaestus erit reipublicae tuae, si utriusque pereamus.*”

<sup>245</sup> Honorius comes off quite well in both the *HLS* and the *HR*, see citation 140 for instance, where his faith is praised

<sup>246</sup> See citations 128, 129 and 136

<sup>247</sup> See citation 123

<sup>248</sup> Maskarinec, ‘Who were the Romans?’ p. 39

<sup>249</sup> Citation 100, *HLS* 7.32.6, 9-13, *HR* p. 152-153 l. 12-6

<sup>250</sup> *HLS* 7.32.11, translation by A.T. Fear

Altogether, the image we thus set of the barbarians is not so much a positive one, as it is a positivistic one: through proper relations with the Roman Empire and with proper Christians, the barbarians themselves could evolve into, or at least become part of, a better people. This very same hope is espoused by both Orosius and Paul the Deacon and it is thus no surprise that we find them seeing eye to eye, so to speak, in this regard. Paul's reflections on the barbarians reinforce the idea that he offered his own barbarian benefactors an image of the Romans and an image of past barbarian magnates, which they ought to seek to emulate.

### *The Roman image*

In the *HR*, the Romans are frequently described with a slight touch of ambiguity: treading the middle ground between Orosius and Eutropius, Paul the Deacon treated them less severely than the former, but more critically than the latter. By allowing for more room for Roman defeats and tragedies, Paul the Deacon tempered the glorious account in Eutropius, without copying much of Orosius' anti-war polemics. We have also found that Paul the Deacon took over Orosius' argument of the providential nature of the coincidence of Augustus' reign with the birth of Christ, albeit in a far more nuanced manner. For Paul the Deacon, the Roman Empire and Christianity were intertwined, but not inseparably so: we must not forget that by his own time, in the late eighth century, the Western Roman Empire was long gone and what influence from Constantinople remained was not uncontroversial or unopposed, both in the political as well as in the religious sense. Even though the *HR* ends on a high note with Justinian's reign, the reality of the eighth century did not allow for too strong a bond between the Roman Empire and Christianity. Why then was the bond included in the first place?

The answer to this question can already be found in the preceding section: the Romans were an example of an unusually successful people and their connection with proper Christianity was a huge part of their success. When the orthodoxy of the Romans waxed, so too did their prosperity, as can be seen from the reign and death of Valens, discussed above. Theodosius the Great, on the other hand, remains the shining example of a Roman emperor and it no wonder that Paul the Deacon has taken so many facts from Orosius' *HLS* concerning Theodosius' life.<sup>251</sup> Placidia, his daughter, was also mentioned as a paragon of Roman virtue, as we have already seen.

This exemplary nature of the Romans, *vis a vis* the barbarians, becomes even more pronounced if we consider closely a few citations pertaining to the Romans; especially from the rise of the Principate and its predecessor, Caesar, onwards, the Romans got into their stride. Fittingly, I

---

<sup>251</sup> Citations 105, 111-126 all deal with Theodosius and his reign in some manner

will therefore start off discussing Caesar himself and two citations concerning his wars in Gaul.<sup>252</sup> In Orosius, these wars are described in a far more extensive fashion, but besides abbreviating these passages, Paul the Deacon chose, unsurprisingly, to leave out many mentions concerning Roman fearfulness and the trouble the barbarians had caused them. The only mention of Roman trouble, at the end of the first passage concerning these wars, serves to glorify Caesar, not to depreciate him, for in it he manages to turn the tide of battle with his force of personality.<sup>253</sup> The second citation then shows Caesar striking fear in the hearts of everyone living in Germany, by crossing over into their lands.<sup>254</sup>

These accounts are also remarkably one-sided, compared to Paul the Deacon's earlier tendencies to at least include casualty numbers on the Roman side as well. Though these casualty numbers are lacking in Orosius as well, he included, perhaps in lieu of these numbers, many instances of narrow Roman victory and managed to at least keep the threat posed by the Gauls present in the account. In the *HR* these passages serve to further glorify Caesar, whose conquests of so many peoples served to further Paul's purpose of showing how the Romans were able to both conquer and assimilate other peoples. But while Caesar was a good example of a Roman warlord, he was no Roman emperor.

The praise heaped on Augustus is therefore perhaps even greater. In one instance, Paul the Deacon took a passage from Orosius, who too was very kind towards the first emperor, and added to it. This addition of praise for Augustus' expansion of the Roman Empire (*eo quod rempublicam auxerit*) clearly shows Paul's different opinion from Orosius' concerning the condemnation of the Roman lust for conquest. It concerns the first time that Augustus was named thus and in effect became a monarch.<sup>255</sup> Paul omitted Orosius' mention that Augustus had shut the gates of Janus and thus brought peace to Rome –an important event for Orosius– and instead adds that Augustus received this honour because he had enlarged the Roman state.<sup>256</sup> For Paul, as opposed to Orosius, the expansion of the Roman Empire was not just a necessary, but also a praiseworthy enterprise, the closing of the gates of Janus, apparently not so much.

Yet even Augustus, with his reign coinciding with the birth of Christ, was not yet the pinnacle of Romanness. Brief mention has already been made to a passage wherein ten thousand Goths gave

---

<sup>252</sup> Citation 83, *HLS* 6.7.5-16, *HR* p. 89-90, l. 14-12 and citation 84, *HLS* 6.8.18-19, 22-23 and 6.9.1, *HR* 90-91, l.12-1

<sup>253</sup> Citation 83, *HLS* 6.7.16, *HR* p. 90, l. 10-12: '*His repente silva erumpentibus, exercitus Caesaris perturbatus atque in fugam actus, plurimis suorum amissis, tandem hortatu ducis restitit, victoresque aggressus, usque ad internecionem pene delevit.*'

<sup>254</sup> Citation 84, *HLS* 6.9.1, *HR* p. 90-91, 21-1: '*totamque Germaniam adventu suo terret.*'

<sup>255</sup> Citation 90, *HLS* 6.20.1-2, *HR* 100, l. 12-15

<sup>256</sup> Citation 90, *HR* 100, l. 13-14: '*eo quod rempublicam auxerit.*'



their life to deliver Theodosius the Great an otherwise bloodless victory.<sup>257</sup> It is this passage, along with the one preceding it,<sup>258</sup> that perhaps best exemplify the need for an emperor to not only be a great warlord, but also to be a devout Christian. Despite the fact that Paul the Deacon toned down some of Orosius' overt references to God's hand in these events, he retains many of the mentions and references to Theodosius' piety. The passage I am concerned with here narrates how, after having been deserted by his own army and having subsequently and unknowingly been surrounded by his opponents', Eugenius' en Arbogastes', forces, Theodosius spent a night in prayer. In the morning he took up his arms, made the sign of the cross and because of his faith in God, harboured no doubt that he would defeat his enemy.<sup>259</sup> Arbogastes was so impressed indeed, that he switched sides and made to fight for the emperor. Theodosius was then also aided by a miraculous whirlwind, which made the lances of his own soldiers strike true, whilst simultaneously inconveniencing his enemies. In the end, ten thousand Gothic troops that had fought for Theodosius had died, Arbogastes committed suicide and Eugenius had been captured and executed. Mostly because of his piety, Theodosius had won the day, at no cost to the Empire.<sup>260</sup>

These two passages were altered in a number of ways. For one, as mentioned, Paul the Deacon removed some, but not all of Orosius' mentions of the hand of God at work in this instance, once more preferring to let the events speak for themselves. Secondly, he omits Orosius' rather optimistic mention that, by aiding Theodosius, Arbogastes had set his first steps on the way to salvation (*'prima salutis via exstitit'*). This was probably because Arbogastes had earlier on been typified as a Frank and a pagan, besides, and because there was no mention of him also converting.<sup>261</sup> Then, Paul the Deacon also slightly adapted the mention of the deaths of the ten thousand Goths, turning it from 'to lose them was a gain and their defeat was a victory,'<sup>262</sup> in Orosius, to 'that they have died was a greater gain than it was a loss.'<sup>263</sup> Comparing that sentiment to the already mentioned speech given by the barbarian delegates coming to submit to Honorius, which appears at the beginning of the following book of the *HR*, we can see a recurrent theme here: as warriors, the barbarians can serve the Romans by submitting to them and subsequently by fighting in the name of a greater cause.

To make this clear, I will discuss a final citation appearing at the very end of the twelfth book of the *HR*. This passage deals with the invasion of Gaul from Britain by Constantine III and the way in

---

<sup>257</sup> Citation 123

<sup>258</sup> Citation 122

<sup>259</sup> Citation 122, *HLS* 7.35.13-15, *HR* p. 164, l. 1-6

<sup>260</sup> Citation 123, *HLS* 7.35.16-21, *HR* p. 164, l. 8-23

<sup>261</sup> Citation 121

<sup>262</sup> *HLS* 7.35.21, translation by A.T. Fear: '*quos utique perdidisse lucrum et vinci vincere fuit.*'

<sup>263</sup> *HR* p. 164 l. 18-19: '*quos utique Theodosio perdidisse magis lucrum quam detrimentum fuit.*'

which it was defeated.<sup>264</sup> At the very end of these events, Paul the Deacon cites from a most intriguing passage from Orosius, which deserves to be cited here as well:

‘However, immediately after these events, the barbarians foreswore their swords and turned to the plough, and cherished the remaining Romans as allies of a kind and friends, with the result that some Romans who prefer freedom in poverty to trouble and taxation under Rome can be found among them.’<sup>265</sup>

Not only do we find the way in which barbarians could submit peacefully to Roman rule represented in this passage but we also find a stunning omission. Whereas Orosius mentions Romans going to live amongst the barbarians, Paul the Deacon purposefully omits the latter part of this passage. It would appear that barbarians should submit to the proper Roman authority, but that the Romans should never condescend to live with the barbarians, for such would be the reversal of Paul the Deacon’s scheme.

### *Conclusion*

This final analytical chapter has served to underline some of the themes and arguments that had already been uncovered in Paul the Deacon’s use of the *HLS*. Once again we see Paul the Deacon’s subtle, but still purposeful use of portents and miracles return: they hint at events to come, but Paul the Deacon used them for this purpose without being too explicit about the link between portent and subsequent disaster. The portents discussed here have also brought to light, in combination with Paul’s treatment of Caesar and Augustus, his lack of disdain for the Roman penchant for conquest. If anything, Paul the Deacon praised the Romans for bringing together disparate regions and peoples under their rule.

Similarly, we can see how Paul the Deacon envisioned barbarians submitting to the proper, righteous and religious rule by orthodox Roman Emperors. If they would lay down their swords, they could live under the Romans, considering the Romans friends and allies of sorts. Yet if the barbarians could not overcome their ferocious and warlike nature, they could still be of benefit to the Roman Empire, as long as they fought, conquered and died in its name. Here we can again detect a certain agreement between Orosius and Paul the Deacon: while Orosius was more staunchly opposed to warfare, he too could see the benefits of Roman rule spreading across the world and Christianity

<sup>264</sup> Citation 139, *HLS* 7.40.5-9, 7.41.7, *HR* p. 174-175, l. 10-3

<sup>265</sup> *HLS* 7.41.7, translation by A.T. Fear: ‘*Quamquam et post hoc quoque continuo Barbari, exsecrati gladios suos, ad aratra conversi sunt, residuosque Romanos ut socios modo et amicos fovent, ut inveniantur jam inter eos quidam Romani, qui malint inter Barbaros pauperem libertatem, quam inter Romanos tributariam sollicitudinem sustinere.*’

with it. The role of proper Christianity is the redeeming factor, both in the *HLS* as well as in the *HR*, for it was what separated Theodosius and Honorius from Valens: being emperor of the Roman Empire was not enough, for when an emperor, in the case of Valens, fell into heresy, his fortunes and those of his Empire fell with him.

It is the combination of Rome's unifying conquests with Rome's orthodoxy that would appear to have made Rome great in the eyes of Paul the Deacon. Orosius put more stress on Rome's Christianity as the defining feature of its success, but he was remarkably hopeful and positive about Rome's future prospects. Paul the Deacon had the benefit of hindsight and could thus not afford to marry the Roman Empire and Christianity too strongly: otherwise, why would it have fallen in the West? He is thus more subtle with his inferences with regard to Divine Grace on account of the Roman Empire. Yet Paul did write a history of Rome up until its final heyday in the reign of Justinian. Perhaps his decision to end his *Historia Romana* there was more deliberate than often thought? Up until that time, he could espouse the unique strengths of the Roman Empire, namely its ability to unify a large territorial region through the strength and piety of its rulers, without too much difficulty. The quick decline of Roman power in the West after this period and the many subsequent controversies in the Eastern Roman Empire did not make for an equally appealing example for emulation or appropriation.

## Conclusion

What has a close analysis of the citations which Paul the Deacon took from the *HLS* and used for his *HR* revealed? The first, major conclusion is that Paul the Deacon would appear to have valued the *HLS* quite highly; despite altering more than half of the citations he took from the *HLS*, sometimes in ways that proved that he did not always agree with Orosius' work, he did make use of Orosius in numerous and extensive ways. To some extent, Hillgarth was correct: Paul often used Orosius to add '*lumina et colores*' to the far briefer and more matter-of-factly account he inherited from the *Breviarum*.<sup>266</sup> But this was certainly not the only reason for Paul to adopt the *HLS* as his preferred source other than the *Breviarum* for the history of the Roman Empire up until the reign of Honorius.

One of the major themes within this analysis has been provided by the range of portents and miracles Paul the Deacon incorporated from the *HLS*. These portents have brought to light several things: for one, Paul the Deacon seemed to have felt that it was either not his place or that it was not necessary altogether, to expound upon the meaning of the many portents that occurred throughout Roman history. Orosius, who was trying to prove that God was omnipresent in history, did not have that luxury. It is possible, though not certain, that Paul had taken his view of portents in history from Augustine, who, rather scathingly at that, disapproved of Orosius' explanation of them in the *HLS*.<sup>267</sup> This is not to say that these portents were solely incorporated into the *HR* as mere interesting tidbits. The vast majority of these portents occurred before the birth of Christ and appear to be leading up towards this major historical event.<sup>268</sup> The portents were furthermore signs of events yet to come in later parts of the *HR*, sometimes even forming a bridge between two of its books.<sup>269</sup> In that sense, they may not have served exactly the same purpose in the *HR* as they did in the *HLS* but they were nonetheless a valuable structural element of Paul the Deacon's work. Moreover, these portents, understood as self-evidently coming from the Christian God in Paul's time, served to add a small but not unimportant amount of Christianity to Eutropius' areligious *Breviarum*.

Most of this added Christianity undoubtedly comes from two portents that are connected to the birth of Christ.<sup>270</sup> While Paul admittedly omitted Orosius' far more extensive discussion and explanation of this event, the passage in which he treated the remarkable coincidence between Augustus' reign and the birth of Christ is still indicative of his basic agreement with Orosius' scheme. That Christ was born in the time of Augustus 'signif[ied] grace for the people of Christ'<sup>271</sup> and showed

---

<sup>266</sup> Hillgarth, 'Orosius in the Early Middle Ages', p. 164, 168

<sup>267</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p. 347, who refers to Augustine's comment in: *De Civitate Dei*, XVIII, LII, 17-20

<sup>268</sup> Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p.112-113

<sup>269</sup> As in the case of citation 69

<sup>270</sup> Citations 91 and 92

<sup>271</sup> *HR* p. 100, l. 17-18, translation by Benjamin Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, p. 120: '*significans ex gentibus gratiam Christi.*'

the first coming together of Christianity and the Roman Empire. Though it would be a long while yet, from this event onwards, until there would be a Christian emperor at the helm, this passage signified the importance of the imperial title's bond with Christianity to both Orosius and Paul the Deacon.

It is also this connection between the fortunes of an emperor and his faith that would become important later on in the *HR*: Valens fares poorly due to his dabbling in the Arian heresy, but both Theodosius and Honorius are praised for their faith as well as for their successful reunification of the Roman Empire –all three appraisals are supported by citations from Orosius.<sup>272</sup> It would appear then, that there was an ideal to be found for rulers to live up to. Unlike the *HLS*, Paul the Deacon's *HR* did not depict this ideal as entirely the prerogative of Christian times. Orosius may have defamed and vilified the pre-Christian period, but Paul, like Augustine,<sup>273</sup> still found some proper models of behaviour in this era. Scipio Africanus for example meets with Paul the Deacon's approval and so do several other successful Roman leaders and generals.<sup>274</sup> The additions of favourable allusions to Alexander the Great, who was originally treated with remarkable aversion by Orosius, only serve to highlight this point.<sup>275</sup>

Coupled with their less than illustrious counterparts, the tyrants, usurpers and pretenders of Rome's history, these examples of good and bad leadership in my opinion form one of the major lines of the *HR* that can be better grasped after having had a look at the *HLS*. Through a series of well thought-out and sometimes subtly altered citations, Paul the Deacon managed to use Orosius's *HLS* to bring nuance to the more warlike text of the *Breviarum* on which he had based the *HR*. The trappings of generals and the glorious business of war are tempered by many inclusions of Roman losses and near defeats. While being successful at war remains a laudable characteristic of a good leader in the *HR*, Paul the Deacon focuses more strongly on another aspect of a leader's characteristics: his capacity to not only conquer, but also to incorporate. From the beginnings of the *HR*, starting with its new introduction, Paul places remarkable emphasis on the Roman capacity to shape *unus populus* out of disparate peoples.<sup>276</sup> Many peoples could invade or conquer Italy, but at the end of the *HR* it is once more the Roman Empire that managed to unify it. By that time, orthodoxy, as we have already mentioned, had become part of a successful leader's repertoire. While this unification of Christianity and the Roman Empire is far more subtle than Orosius' rather heavy-handed coupling of the two, it is certainly reminiscent of his ideas. Orosius may have abhorred the wars of the past, but he recognized the necessity of war and strong leadership to spread

---

<sup>272</sup> Citations 107, 113 and 140, for other instances of Divine Providence, see citations: 110, 127

<sup>273</sup> Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', p.337-338

<sup>274</sup> For Scipio Africanus, see citation: 63, for another example see citation: 16, wherein Papirius (fl. 4<sup>th</sup> century BC) is praised.

<sup>275</sup> See citations 16 and 112

<sup>276</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', p. 23-24

Christianity all over the world. His hope was that, as Christianity expanded, war would become less and less common, but he still recognized skill at war as important for a leader to maintain order and safety in his realm.<sup>277</sup> Orosius' hopes had not yet been fulfilled in Paul's times, but his ideas about the role of rulers and their personal piety in the governance of a realm most certainly had become an integral part of political thinking.

There was also a role in Paul's *HR* for the multitude of barbarian peoples that appear throughout Roman History. Though to some extent, Paul may have copied his sources' vocabulary with regard to describing these peoples, his judgement of these peoples appears to have been less severe than modern historians have argued. Again there is some agreement between Paul and Orosius on this topic and Paul may be said to have been even a bit more optimistic than Orosius: both took not so much a positive as much as a positivistic approach to barbarians. When barbarians decided to submit to the proper authority, which in both works obviously meant an orthodox Roman emperor, they could redeem themselves –earn honour and fame even– in the service of the Christian Roman Empire. The other option was seeking a peaceful coexistence with Rome. It is also implied that conversion to the proper Christian doctrine could not hurt the barbarians' chances. In short, barbarians could improve their condition by seeking proper relations with the Roman Empire and *mutatis mutandis* the Church.

Truly stereotypical, villainous barbarians mostly appear as a foil for this exemplary image of good barbarians: these bad barbarians are meant to demonstrate the misfortunes of those that refused to recognize their allotted place within the Roman order. For instance Stilicho, Eucherius and Radagasius show the misfortunes caused by their deplorable resistance to the Roman Empire.<sup>278</sup> The lessons that Paul the Deacon's audience could take away from this contrast are twofold: on the one hand, Paul the Deacon may be perceived as saying that everyone should submit to the Roman Empire, or an equally orthodox, equally authoritative substitute. But then again, his account did not run up to his own time and deliberately ended in the reign of Justinian, the last Roman Emperor to succeed in reuniting the Roman East and West.

Yet there is another and more likely explanation for Paul's approach. We must take into account the complete history he presented and especially his new introduction which, more than anything else highlights the Romans 'ordinary' beginnings as one among a number of people inhabiting Italy.<sup>279</sup> By presenting the Romans' not as infallible, but even at times as close to defeat, moreover, Paul narrated a more balanced Roman history, underlining what the dangers to Rome's

---

<sup>277</sup> Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie*, p. 110

<sup>278</sup> See citations 128, 129 and 136. Radagasius is even directly opposed by God himself, who summons other Roman enemies to drive him off, citation 129.

<sup>279</sup> Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?', p. 32-33

success had been and what could be done to avoid them. Rome history was a lesson, filled to the brim with examples of both good and bad governance, both good and bad phases in Rome's history.

The *HLS* also contained a lesson with regard to Rome's history, but it was markedly different: by presenting Rome's development as preordained and its miraculous survival as only made possible through the grace of God's plan, Orosius presented a history that did not lend itself to Paul's intentions, namely to serve as a model for emulation, without substantial alteration. No wonder therefore, that Paul played down the role of God's hand in history, especially in the early phases of Rome's development. For him, some manner of personal agency was required to enable future emulation of his exemplary rulers. Only towards the thirteenth book of the *HR* did Paul the Deacon begin to include one of Orosius' providential schemes, but then mostly to stress the importance of orthodoxy for Rome's later successes. This was the difference between Valens' reign and that of Theodosius, why the Goths burned Valens alive, but bent their knee to Theodosius: the proper piety of a ruler.

All in all, the investigation of Paul's use of Orosius has proven worthwhile: this comparison between the two authors has highlighted several sides of Paul's approach which went unnoticed or unappreciated in earlier, broader studies. What it has also reaffirmed is that Paul worked quite diligently when compiling the *HR*: while not all citations and interpolations from the *HLS* served a specific function or theme, those that did were carefully selected and edited to fit Paul's overarching plan for the *HR*. Far from being a careless editor then, Paul's focus was apparently not just on chronology,<sup>280</sup> instead, it was shaped by his ulterior motives in narrating Rome's history. With regard to both the sheer amount of information contained in the *HR* and the message it expounds, Paul was intent on educating his audience, both schooling them on their past as well as on their proper role in governing their realms. Given Paul's dedication of the *HR* to Adalperga, some of the elements referring to women, especially to Placidia, may have even been meant for her.<sup>281</sup>

Where Orosius had been pessimistic about Rome's pre-Christian past, but remarkably optimistic about its Christian future, a certain nostalgia resonates outwards from Paul the Deacon's account of Roman history, harkening back to a time in which the Roman Empire and, more specifically, Italy, was still one. Yet as we have now seen, the *HR* is not devoid of optimism for the future either, provided, at least, that the lessons contained within it were picked up.

---

<sup>280</sup> Which was the main complaint with regards to inaccuracies made against Paul the Deacon

<sup>281</sup> I disagree with Goffart and Cornford on this point. They stress many of the other, more violent accounts of female involvement in history, but they skip over Placidia's role whilst she is pivotal in bringing the Goths into the service of the Roman Empire, which is an important event in the *HR*. Her life contrasts marvellously with that of the other mentioned women. C.f. Cornford, *Paul the Deacon's Historia Roman*, p. 105-106; Goffart, *Narrators*, p. 351

What, in summary, can we then say of Paul's use of Orosius? There were certainly some elements of the *HLS* which Paul either did not agree with or did not seek to incorporate into the *HR*. Yet Paul the Deacon still found much that he could use to shape his own narrative of the history of Rome. A lot of the differences between Orosius and Paul the Deacon stemmed from a difference in both purpose and in historical context: what was important to Orosius' apologetic *HLS*, namely the Christianization of the world's history, was basically a moot point by Paul's time, for there were no longer any pagans to convert in Italy. Several of the complex apologetic themes prevalent in the *HLS* thus had no place in the *HR*. Yet other themes and traditions sparked by Orosius return in Paul's selection, such as the coincidence of the birth of Christ with the reign of Augustus, or the possibility for barbarians to better their lot in service to the Roman Empire. Orosius' picture of a proper, Roman and Christian ruler is also prominent in the *HR* and one of Orosius' underappreciated themes, namely that of the unifying role of the Roman Empire, is perhaps even more important. It is fair to say that without the example of the *HLS*, several of the *HR*'s dominant themes would likely not have come to their full fruition. Paul's use of the work is intelligent and subtle; it shows that this author possessed a definite talent for editing and compiling disparate sources into a unified work.

In light of this, a more detailed study of the contrast between Paul's other sources and his use of them will in all likelihood reveal even more about the *HR*. Attempts have already been made to find the 'Paul' in the *HR* through his use of words like '*noster*'; in a similar manner, by an analysis of words such as '*gens*' and '*barbarus*', his views of identity and of barbarians have already been partially distilled.<sup>282</sup> I believe that a broader investigation of the way in which Paul used his sources could reveal even more about his intents and purposes and thus about who he was. Already, the contrast between Paul and Orosius discussed in this thesis has revealed significant differences in purposes and circumstances between the two authors. Paul's approach to history is indicative of his ambitions as a court scholar: several additions he made to the *Breviarum* could be seen as catering to his audience. Moreover, his attempt to educate Adalperga and his other readers in Roman history and proper governance, as well as his extensive efforts in adapting and continuing Eutropius' *Breviarum*, show that the history of Rome was valuable to Paul the Deacon. I believe that Paul saw the history of Rome as an exemplary history from which much could be learned that might still be applicable in his own time.

There is also clear evidence presented in this thesis, that Orosius' *HLS* and the ideas contained therein must have influenced Paul the Deacon's own views of history in several ways. Though at times adapting these ideas to his own circumstances, Paul was certainly indebted to Orosius' legacy. Paul's own recognition of this is most clearly illustrated by the citation he has taken from Orosius'

---

<sup>282</sup> Cornford, 'Paul the Deacon's understanding of identity' p. 47-60



dedication of the *HLS*. Though we do not have Adalperga's answer to Paul's hopes that he had completed the *Historia Romana* 'as competently as [he] had willingly'<sup>283</sup>, I believe it is fair to say that he has. All I can hope for myself, like Orosius and Paul before me, is that I too have displayed competence in compiling my thesis.

---

<sup>283</sup> Citation 1, *HR* p.4 l. 5-6: '*utinam tam efficaciter imperata facturus quam libenter arripui*'

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

Eutropius, *Breviarum*, in: J. Hellegoarch (ed.), *Eutrope: Abrégé d'histoire romaine* (Paris, 1999) and H. W. Bird (trans./ed.), *Eutropius: Breviarum*, Translated Texts for Historians 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Liverpool, 2011)

Paulus Diacones, *Historia Langobardorum*, in: Ludwig Bethmann and George Waitz, *MGH Script. rer. Lang.* (Hanover, 1878)  
-*Historia Romana*, in: Amadeo Crivellucci (ed.), *Paulo Diaconi. Historia Romana, Istituto Storico Italiana* (Rome, 1914)

Paulus Orosius, *Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*, in: *Patrologia Latina* 31 (Paris, 1844) 1211-1216  
-*Historiarum libri septem adversum paganos*, in: *Patrologia Latina* 31 (Paris, 1844) 0663-1174 and Andrew T. Fear (trans./ed.), *Orosius: The Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, Translated Texts for Historians 54 (Liverpool, 2010)

### Secondary sources

Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford etc., 2003)

Benjamin Cornford, *The Idea of the Past in Early Medieval Italy: Paul the Deacon's Historia Romana*, dissertation submitted to Cambridge University (Cambridge, 2002)  
- 'Paul the Deacon's understanding of identity, his attitude to barbarians, and his "strategies of distinction" in the *Historia Romana*' in: Richard Corradinil, Rob Meens, Christina Pössel and Philip Shaw (eds.), *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 12 (Vienna, 2006) p. 47-60

Nick Everett, 'Literacy and the Law in Lombard Italy', in: *Early Medieval Europe* 9:1 (2000), p. 93-127

Patrick Geary, *The Myth of Nations: the Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, 2003)

Hans-Werner Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie des Orosius*, *Impulse der Forschung* 32 (Darmstadt, 1980)

Walter Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (AD. 550-600): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede and Paul the Deacon* (paperback edition) (Notre Dame, 2005)

Jocelyn Hillgarth, 'The *Historiae* of Orosius in the Early Middle Ages' in: Louis Holtz and Jean-Claude Fredouille (eds.), *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes, II: Antiquité tardive et Christianisme ancien (VIe - IXe siècles). Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine* (Paris, 1992)

Edward James, *Europe's Barbarians AD 200-600* (Harlow, 2009)

Natalia Lozovsky, 'Roman Geography and Ethnography in the Carolingian Empire' in: *Speculum: A journal of Medieval Studies* 81:2 (2006) p. 325-364

Maya Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans? Scripts of Romaness in early medieval Italy', currently unpublished

Rosamund McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks' in: *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000) p. 319-339

- Theodor E. Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine', in: Eugene F. Rice Jr. (Trans./Ed.), *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (New York, 1959) p. 325-348
- Lars Boje Mortensen, 'The diffusion of Roman histories in the Middle Ages. A list of Orosius, Eutropius, Paulus Diaconus, and Landolfus Sagax manuscripts' in: *Filologia Mediolatina: Rivista della Fondazione Ezio Franceschini* 6-7 (2000) p. 101-200
- Walter Pohl, 'Deliberate ambiguity - the Lombards and Christianity', in: Guyda Armstrong and Ian N. Wood (eds.) *Christianizing Peoples and Converting Individuals* International Medieval Research 7 (Turnhout, 2000) p. 47-58  
- 'Paul the Deacon – between *Sacci* and *Marsuppia*' in: Richard Corradini, Matthew Gillis, Rosamond McKitterick, Irene van Renswoude (eds.), *Ego Trouble. Authors and their Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 15 (Wien, 2010) p. 111-124
- Elizabeth Rawson, "Sallust on the Eighties?" in *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987), p. 163-180
- Garry W. Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice* (London, 2000)

### Appendix A: Commentary to the table of citations in Appendix B

This table provides a short and concise commentary to all of the citations of and references to Orosius' *HLS* in Paulus the Deacon's *HR*. It is meant to complement the table following it, which gives us the text of the original passage in the *HLS* as well as the text of the citation in the *HR*. This commentary serves the purpose of briefly introducing the subject of the citation as well of the relevance of each citation to my thesis. The column labelled 'Translated comments' provides the comments translated from Italian which were made by Crivellucci in his edition of the *HR*.

#	Pages	Lines	Reference to Orosius	Other references	Translated comments from Crivellucci	Author's comments
1	4	5-6	<i>Or.Praef.1</i>			Reference to Orosius humble dedication to Augustine
2	7	1	<i>Or.2.4.1</i>			Orosian date connected to the founding of Rome
3	10	13-14	<i>Or.2.4.1</i>			Orosian date connected to the founding of Rome
4	14	4-5	<i>Or.3.13.2</i>	Hier. a. 1358k		Reference to the founding of Byzantium, reflects on Paul's opinion of the Eastern Empire
5	20	10-12	<i>Or.2.12.8</i>			Cincinnatus' victory over the Aequi, displays pride in Rome's victories
6	21	19	<i>Or.2.19.9</i>			Factual citation of the amount of gold Rome paid for the Gaul to leave them alone in c. 399 BC.
7	24	1-2	<i>Or.3.4.1, 3</i>		abbreviated	Mention of a plague in Rome.

8	24	2-8	Or.3.5		in abbreviated and sober form	Marcus Curtius' death. Displays less aversion to the <i>aruspices</i>
9	25	8-11	Or.3.7.4-5		abbreviated	Birth of Alexander the Great, accompanied by a portent. Displays less aversion to Alexander.
10	26	5-8	Or.3.11.1-2		abbreviated and in the active	Death of Alexander of Epirus. Reference to Alexander the Great is made.
11	26	9-10	Or.3.8.1		abbreviated	Reference to the Samnites, positive remarks about them repressed. Compensated by the passage following it praising Campania.
12	27	9	Or.3.15.2-3			Reference to the Roman defeat to the Samnites at the Caudine Forks
13	27	10-13	Or.3.15.3-4			Reference to the Roman defeat to the Samnites at the Caudine Forks. More positive towards the Romans
14	27	13-20	Or.3.15.5			Reference to the Roman defeat to the Samnites at the Caudine Forks
15	27	21-23	Or.3.15.7		literally cited, just the sentence order switched around	Romans breaking their treaty with the Samnites to prevent extinction.
16	28	3-6	Or.3.15.10		semi literally and abbreviated	Reference to Papirius and Alexander the Great

17	31	17-22	Or.4.3.1-2		semi literally and abbreviated	Start of the troubles with Carthage
18	32	8-9	Or.4.5.1		with unnecessary words scrapped	Portent
19	34	2-5	Or.4.8.10, 15		abbreviated	Reference to the giant snake slain and skinned during the Punic Wars. <i>'lumina et colores'</i> ?
20	36	8-9	Or.4.10.1		distorted	Reference to the cruel death of Atilius Regulus at the hands of the Carthaginians
21	36	16-17	Or.4.10.4			Destruction wreaked by the Punic fleet. Addition of Roman losses
22	37	14-16	Or.4.11.2		abbreviated	Peace with the Carthaginians is made on favourable terms
23	39	11-14	Or.4.13.11		" <i>Gallis</i> " left out after " <i>Insubribus</i> ", " <i>et Liguribus</i> " added from Eutropius. In Orosius, " <i>primi</i> " refers to the consulate of Manlius Torquatus and Fulvius Flaccus	Reference to a Roman skirmish with the Insubrian and Ligurian Gauls. Roman victory
24	39	14-17	Or.4.13.12		Orosius has after " <i>multa</i> ": " <i>lucam claram obfulsisse ac tres lunas distantibus coeli regionibus exortas apparuisse</i> ". Again Orosius refers to the consuls in the years that follow Torquatus Manlius and Fulvius Flaccus and not those following Cornelius	Portent, Orosian explanation removed.

					Lentulus and Fulvius Flaccus	
25	42	4-6	Or.4.14.3	Liv.21.1.4	freely adapted	Hannibal's hatred for Rome displayed, Orosian critique somewhat dulled
26	43	9	Or.4.14.6			Small detail
27	43	10-11	Ibid.			Scipio Africanus saves his father Scipio from death
28	43	12-13	Or.4.14.7			Roman defeat, the extent of the defeat slightly diminished
29	43	14-16	Ibid.			Scipio lost his army, Hannibal was wounded.
30	43	16-20	Or.4.14.8			Hannibal crosses over into Etruria. Detail of his hardships in winter
31	44	1-5	Or.4.15.1		Paul left out unnecessary words and put the verbs in the indicativus	Portent
32	45	12-15	Or.4.16.3			Escape of Varra, almost the end of Rome
33	46	9-13	Or.4.16.12			Hannibal is put to flight
34	46	19-22	Or.4.16.16-17			Hannibal defeats several Roman legions
35	46/47	23-1	Or.4.18.3			Hannibal defeats the Romans

36	47	1-5	Or.4.18.4			Hannibal is again put to flight
37	47/48	24-2	Or.4.17.2			Hannibal moves along the <i>Via Latina</i> , some of Rome's fearfulness is repressed
38	48/49	23-4	Or.4.16.6-7		very freely adapted and shortened/fused together	Nearly the end of Rome, yet some of Orosius' more negative comments are repressed
39	50	14-16	Or.4.18.14			Rome defeats Hasdrubal, retrieves some captives. Mention of Roman losses repressed.
40	50	17-20	Or.4.18.15			The Romans deliver Hasdrubal's head to Hannibal, who flees. ' <i>lumina et colores</i> '?
41	51	20	Or.4.19.1			Orosian detail of Hannibal leaving Italy in tears
42	53/54	15-1	Or.4.20.3-4			Rome recovers captives sold into slavery, the Boii, Cenomanni and the Insubrian Gauls unite under Hamilcar
43	54	2-5	Or.4.20.4			Ibidem. Rome's battle with Hamilcar was difficult.
44	54	5-9	Or.4.20.11			After a defeat, the Romans annihilate the Boii, cruelty of war displayed.



45	54	18-21	Or.4.20.15			Scipio Africanus battles the Gauls, losses on both sides.
46	54	21-23	Or.4.20.17			Romans nearly lose. Mention of Numantines as good warriors.
47	55/56	19-1	Or.4.20.24			Romans slaughtered by the Ligurians
48	56	1-2	Or.4.20.26			Roman loss to the Ligurians, extent of the loss mitigated by Paul
49	56	8-10	Or.4.20.29			Death of Scipio Africanus
50	56	10-11	Or.4.20.30			Volcano erupts, creates island
51	58/59	20-9	Or.4.21.1-3			Another Scipio suppresses the Celtiberians, his personal valour is on display
52	59/60	17-4	Or.4.22.2-4		with limited omissions and modifications	Romans obtain weapons from Carthage, then make further demands. Carthaginians are desperate and chose to die in their city, fighting with silver and golden arms. Orosian detail. Displays desperate nature of the Carthaginians
53	60	4-7	Or.4.22.7		literally, with a few parts changed or omitted	Romans at first suffer a defeat, Scipio defends their retreat.
54	60/61	21-9	Or.4.23.2-7		with a few changes in time and a few	End of the Punic Wars, Orosius'

					propositions shifted around or omitted	chronological scheme repressed.
55	61	9-18	Or.4.22.4-6		with small differences inherent to different codices	Detailed description of Carthage before is destruction
56	62	1-2	Or.4.23.7		Transposed and with a few omissions	Definite end of the Punic Wars
57	62	21-22	Or.5.4.8			Portent, Orosian explanation removed
58	63	9-12	Or.5.4.2-4		abbreviated	Roman defeat
59	63	15-17	Or.5.6.1		Paul changed the phrase " <i>natura virilli duplex</i> "	Portent
60	63	17-18	Or.5.6.2			Portent
61	64	2-4	Or.5.7.3		" <i>continuos</i> " was added, the rest was condensed	Roman defeat at the hands of the Numantines
62	64/65	9-9	Or.5.7.6-18		simplified and summarized, with details and concepts left out	Scipio Africanus' battle against the Numantines. Orosian anti-Roman elements removed
63	65	9-12	Or.5.8.1		improved with small modifications	Scipio's questioning of the Numantine chieftain, stress on unity.
64	66	3-7	Or.5.9.4, Or.5.9.6-7		simplified and with reference to the names of " <i>Fulvium</i> " and " <i>Rutilium</i> " who are mentioned in Or.5.9.6	Servile wars in Sicily. Many slaves slain
65	66	15-18	Or.5.10.3		abbreviated	Brave death of Crassus, Roman valour

						on display
66	67	6-15	Or.5.11.2-4		simplified and made more sober	Great plague of locusts in Africa, portent perhaps. In Orosius followed by an explanation of how such plagues no longer occur. Not so in Paul
67	68	3-8	Or.5.14.1-4		abbreviated and fused together	Romans defeat the Arverni
68	69	16-17	Or.5.15.18			Addition of Orosian detail: numbers slain on the side of Rome's enemies
69	70	11-16	Or.5.15.20-21		semi literally with a few modification and omissions	Portent of a Roman girl being struck by lightning. Refers forward to the death of the women of the Teutones and Cimbri
70	72	6-20	Or.5.16.17-19, 21		Paul removed a few unnecessary pieces	Gruesome death of the women of the Teutones and Cimbri. Orosian praise of these women removed. Display of barbarian folly.
71	73/74	18-4	Or.5.18.3-5		like above	Portent
72	74	5-9	Or.5.18.9		like above	Portent
73	77	7-9	Or.5.20.9		Omitted a few details. Paul narrates this part twice, because Eutropius only mentions it later	Sulla defeats the Samnites, cruelty of Rome's citizens removed

74	77	9-13	Or.5.21.1-2		Effectively summarized	Sulla slays prisoners of war against his earlier promises. Shows cruelty of Sulla
75	77	13-16	Or.5.21.7		" <i>dehinc</i> " replaced with " <i>siquidem</i> " and a few details omitted	Sulla has Marcus Marius killed, shows his cruelty. Paul the Deacon omits an Orosian detail which may have been recognized as being false.
76	78/79	21-5	Or.5.22.16-17		Summarized less metaphorically, but also with a changed meaning. Orosius had " <i>ubi tunc Scipio, Lepidi filius, captus atque occisus est</i> " instead of " <i>pro eo quod</i> " and further.	Civil war upon Sulla's death. Paul's explanation of these events is a little less harsh than Orosius'. The events are also not named civil war, just war.
77	82/83	18-2	Or.5.24.1-2			Spartacus attacks from Mount Vesuvius. Matter-of-factly addition
78	83	3-5	Or.5.24.3		Orosius speaks of only one case of " <i>captivae matronae, quae se dolore violati pudoris necaverat</i> ", Paul of " <i>multae</i> "	Spartacus and the other rebels are portrayed in a very bad light
79	85	2-7	Or.5.23.17-18			Reference to barbarians using skulls as cups. Classical ethnographic reference
80	86	7-19	Or.6.5.3-6		Semi literally cited with a few words inverted or left out. Also " <i>quibus se praemunierat</i> " has been substituted for " <i>quibus vitalia adversus noxios sucos</i> "	Mithridates goes mad, kills his family. Mention of parricide, a very important sin in Orosius' accounts is

					<i>saepe obstruxerat</i> "	suppressed.
81	88	3-5	Or.6.6.3			Pompey's siege of Jeruzalem. Orosius' numbers of the Jews slain here supersedes Eutropius'.
82	88	7-12	Or.6.6.4		Almost literally with a few suppressions and the addition of " <i>cuius-fuisse</i> " from an unknown source	Pompey's destruction of Jeruzalem's walls. Addition made to Orosius' account.
83	89/90	14-12	Or.6.7.5-16		some summarizing and omission, and the substitution of " <i>coetera diffugerunt</i> " for " <i>cetera in terras proprias remissa sunt</i> "	Caesar's Gallic wars. Heavily abbreviated, slightly more favourable towards the Romans.
84	90/91	12-1	Or.6.8.18-19, 22-23 and Or.6.9.1		abbreviated like above	Gallic wars continued.
85	92	3-5	Or.6.15.1			Added detail about Pompey going to Luceria
86	93	4-8	Or.6.15.26			Caesar defeats Pompey, shines a favourable light on Caesar
87	93/94	16-8	Or.6.15.34 and Or.6.16.1-2			Caesar beats the Egyptians, makes Cleopatra queen.
88	95	4-5	Or.6.16.6			Mention of Caesar's four-fold triumph, again enhances his status
89	97	13	Or.6.18.3			Small Orosian detail

90	100	12-15	Or.6.20.1-2		abbreviated, but with the addition of " <i>eo quod rempublicam auxerit</i> " from Isid. <i>Etym.</i> 9.3.16	The day Augustus became emperor. Paul added a sentence from Isidore to enhance Augustus' status
91	100	16-17	Or.6.18.34			Portent connected to Augustus' ascension to the throne and to Christ's birth
92	100	18-19	Or.6.20.5			Ibidem
93	100/101	19-2	Or.6.22.5		the date was derived from Hier. a. 2015	Christ's birth coincides with Augustus' reign, the two events are connected
94	101	2-3	Or.6.22.5			Ibidem
95	133	10-11	Or.7.24.2			Small detail
96	151	2-3	Or.7.32.1			Valentinian's ascension to the throne, using Orosius' dates
97	151	11-17	Or.7.32.2-4, 8		abbreviated and simplified, with the addition of " <i>ut dictum est</i> "	Tells of Valentinian's piety, some of Orosius' more heavy-handed allusions to Christ's hand in this event are removed
98	152	3-4	Or.7.32.8			Portent
99	152	5-11	Oros.7.32.4-5	Hier. a. 2383 b e a	Paul takes the correlative " <i>ita-ut</i> " and the words " <i>concussae et subrutae</i> " from Orosius. " <i>Ruinis</i> " does not appear in either Hier. or in Oros. so Paul must have	Defeat of Procopius accompanied by an earthquake/portent likely connected to Valentinian picking Valens as his co-ruler.

					added it	
100	152/153	12-6	Or.7.32.6, 9-13		abbreviated and simplified	Explains Valens' connection to the Arian heresy. Also explains how Athanaric of the Goths persecuted Christians. Then narrates Valentinian's defeat of the Saxons and the conversion of the Burgundians, who are treated kindly. Still, some of Orosius' moralizing is repressed.
101	153	8-10	Or.7.32.14		Paul substituted " <i>vero</i> " for " <i>autem</i> " and added " <i>dum</i> "	Valentinian's death
102	153	11-12	Or.7.32.14			Ibidem
103	154	9-13	Or.7.32.15 and Or.7.33.1		Or.7.32.15 freely integrated/adapted	Gratian and Valens succeed to the imperial sees
104	155	1-7	Or.7.32.6 and Or.7.33.1		paraphrased and integrated with Hier. a. 2391 l m	Valens' cruelty as an Arian on display
105	155	8-16	Or.7.33.5-7		with the added bit " <i>a Valente</i> "	Theodosius, father of Theodosius the Great defeat a rebellion in Africa, is sentenced to death out of jealousy, is baptized before he dies. Interesting passage detailing the piety/capacity of Theodosius' father.

106	155/56	17-4	Or.7.33.10-12			The Goths are driven into the Empire by the Huns, mistreated by Duke Maximus they revolt. Desperate, Valens realizes his error and recalls orthodox priests and bishops from exile.
107	156	5-10	Or.7.33.13-15		very freely adapted	Too late apparently, for Valens is slain by the Goths
108	156	13-17	Or.7.33.19		Freely adapted	Deservedly, Valens burns for having sent the wrong (Arian) priests to the Goths. Paul takes over Orosius' judgement that this was just desserts.
109	157	1-4	Or.7.34.1			Gratian becomes emperor. Orosian dating.
110	157	4-11	Or.7.33.8			Placing his faith in God, Gratian wins an astounding victory.
111	158	6-8	Or.7.34.2			Theodosius becomes emperor. Praise for Gratian maintained
112	158/159	12-4	Or.7.34.5-7		Only a few alterations and the omission of the referral of " <i>sicut Pompeius Corneliusque testati sunt</i> " after " <i>Magno</i> "	Theodosius correctly determines that Rome's misfortune is currently due to God's anger. Places faith in God and wins many victories.
113	159	5-14	Or.7.34.7?	lord. <i>Get.</i> 142-144	reordered and formed into a more sober and elegant whole, the substitution of	Athararic the King of the Goths dies. It is unclear whether the link



					" <i>nec mora</i> " for " <i>paucis mensibus interiectis</i> " could have taken place on authority of Or.7.34.7 which has " <i>continuo ut Constantinopolim venit, morbo periit</i> ", of Prosp.Tir.c.1177 " <i>quinto decimo die quam fuerat susceptus occiditur</i> " and of Marcellinus, a. 381 " <i>Constantinopolim mense ianuario venit eodemque mense morbo periit</i> "	Crivellucci makes between the <i>HLS</i> and the <i>HR</i> here is correct.
114	159/160	14-6	Or.7.34.7-9		" <i>Parthi</i> " replaces " <i>Persae</i> " , which no known codex of Orosius has; there are also several omissions	Important passage: all hostile barbarian nations submit to Theodosius, not just the Persians (who are switched for the Parthians). Indicates Paul's idea of 'proper' barbarian behaviour.
115	160	11-17	Or.7.34.10	Aur. Vict. <i>Epit.47.7</i>	fused together with small modifications	Maximus, a usurper, defeats Gratian and Valentinian, kills Gratian. Detail about Gratian's age added from elsewhere.
116	162	2-3	Or.7.35.1			Orosian dates added
117	162	3	Or.7.33.6	Aur. Vict. <i>Epit.48.1</i>	" <i>Honorio</i> " is replaced with Or.7.33.6 " <i>Theodosio</i> "	Theodosius' heritage is explained
118	162/163	3-5	Or.7.35.1-4		Paul added: " <i>imperatorum</i> " (l.4) after " <i>primus</i> ", " <i>solus</i> " (l.5) after " <i>orbis</i> ", and	Theodosius goes to war against Maximus. Wins mostly due to 'luck'.

					removed: " <i>posuit in Deo spem suam</i> " after " <i>procurarert (oraret)</i> " (l.9) and " <i>ineffabili iudicio dei</i> " after " <i>communisset</i> " (l.14)	Some of the overt references to Theodosius' reliance on God have been removed, but given the rest of the treatment he receives, it is obvious that Theodosius' luck should be interpreted as a godsent.
119	163	6-9	Or.7.35.5			Valentinian reconquers Italy after Theodosius' success.
120	163	9-20	Or.7.35.10-11		very freely adapted in the beginning, Paul added " <i>infantili aetate</i> " from <i>Aur.Vict.Epit.48.6 "intra infantiae annos"</i>	Valentinian's death at the hands of Arbogastes. Paul the Deacon removes any doubt about Arbogastes' guilt.
121	163	20-21	Or.7.35.12		attains its own, brief, form from the concept and addition of " <i>genere Francus</i> " as illustration	Allusions to Arbogastes' descent and the paganism of the Franks. Interesting passage linking the Franks very clearly to paganism (as opposed to Orosius, who linked the paganism to Arbogastes alone.
122	164	1-6	Or.7.35.13-15		Very brief and efficient as opposed to Orosius	Theodosius is trapped by Arbogastes and Eugenius. Is in a hopeless situation and prepares for battle with praying and the sign of the cross. Piety displayed
123	164	8-23	Or.7.35.16-21		Much shorter and almost entirely phrased in Paul's own words, with exaggerations and absurdities removed.	Theodosius defeats Eugenius and Arbogastes against all odds. 10,000 Goths die on his behalf, which is

					Paul adds the expressions " <i>a parte Theodosii</i> ", " <i>denique prius</i> ", " <i>auxiliatorum</i> ", " <i>ad cuius laudem</i> " which are suggested by Orosius' text	portrayed as being good for the Empire. Divine aid is somewhat repressed, but still present.
124	168	1-4	Or.7.36.1		Paul adds " <i>in Oriente</i> " and " <i>in Occidente</i> " but in the context of Orosius	Orosian explanation of who rules where/at what date
125	168	4-6	Or.7.37.1		Orosius has " <i>cum a Theodosio imperatore seniore singulis potissimis infantum cura et disciplina utriusque palatii commissa esset, hoc est</i> " the rest is as it is in Paul	Introduction to Rufinus and Stilicho
126	168	6-8	Or.7.36.1			Arcadius makes his young son emperor, Orosian detail
127	168/169	9-11	Or.7.36.2-8, 10-11, 13		in short, with a lot of omissions and modifications to the form	Gildo revolts in Africa, Theodosius' children escape death thanks to the grace of God. Mascezil, Gildo's brother, follows Theodosius' example, places his faith in God and seeks to drive out his brother. St. Ambrose appears to him and shows him the way to victory. Mascezil himself then revolts, loses his faith and is punished by God. Some overt reference to Orosius' divine providence scheme is removed, but piety and placing your faith in God

						remains important.
128	169	12-20	Or.7.37.1-2 and Or.7.38.1		As above with the addition of " <i>socer-Honorii</i> " from <i>lord.Get.154</i>	Rufinus, but especially Stilicho and his son Eucherius are explained to be detrimental to the Roman Empire.
129	169/170	20-21	Or.7.37.4-7, 12-16		at times literally copied, at times liberally redone, suppressing long descriptions and consideration and by adding words that are not suggested by the context: " <i>rex Gothorum</i> " and " <i>invadit ilico Romani pavor infinitus</i> "	Radaigasius rises up, shakes the Roman faith in God. God then drives out Radaigasius using the Goths as his instrument. While some of Orosius' providential scheme is removed, the core of it is transmitted.
130	170/171	22-13	Or.7.37.2	<i>lord. Get.152-156</i>	A summing up in the style of <i>lordanes</i> , which only takes Orosius' " <i>belli-Paschae</i> " and " <i>propter religionem</i> " into account. No one knows where " <i>ob recuperationem iumentorum</i> " comes from, perhaps local tradition?	There is very little of Orosius in this introductory passage of Alaric. The Goths are however depicted as having respect for Easter and for the faith.
131	171	13-17	Oros.7.39.1			Alaric shows respect for Rome and the Church during his sack of Rome in 410
132	171	17-18	Or.7.40.1		In Paul's own words, using Orosius' date	Date of the sack of Rome taken from Orosius
133	171	19-21	Or.7.39.15		Almost cited literally, with the addition of the word " <i>sane</i> " and the words " <i>olim a Caesare factum est</i> " substituted for " <i>a septingentesimo conditionis suae anno</i> "	The anticlimactic end of the sack of Rome.

					<p><i>casus effecerat</i>". Paul, or the codex from which he derived this part, wrote "<i>casus</i>" with an open 'a' like an e and with the 's' looking similar to the 'r', which lends it to be read as "<i>casar</i>" or "<i>Caesar</i>", hence the substitution. Orosius speaks about the fire in Caesar's time in Or.6.14.4-5 "<i>inter haec</i> [i.e. at the outbreak of civil war between Pompei and Caesar] <i>Roma ipso repentino correpta incendio concrematur. Anno siquidem ab Urbe condita .DCC., incertum unde concretus, plurimam Urbis partem ignis invasit</i>". It seem difficult that Paul has taken "<i>incertum unde concretus</i>" from Orosius, but it seems even more difficult that he thought of "<i>Caesarianum istud incendium ex annorum ab Urbe condita numero</i>" by himself, just because he has "<i>Caesaris res gestas inter annos</i></p> <p>« <i>.DCXCIII. et .DCCVIII. narraverat</i>" as Droysen thought in his introduction to "editio maior", p. 51</p>	
134	172/173	12-11	Or.7.40.2	lord. <i>Get.</i> 160	Or.7.40.2 was cited semi-literally. Paul corrects lordanes' " <i>in Foro Iuli Aemiliae civitate</i> " which never existed (cf.	The introduction of Placidia, whose piety and nobility was paramount for the good relations between the Goths

					Mommsen on the geographical index of Iordanes under "Forum Iulii), into " <i>apud Cornelii Forum</i> " from the <i>Catalogus provinciarum Italiae</i> which he also uses in <i>Hist.Lang.2.18</i> .	and the Romans
135	173	1-8	Or.7.43.7-10		Abbreviated, very freely and colourfully put in his own words " <i>subtilibus blandimentis</i> ", he leaves out " <i>ut fertur</i> " before " <i>occisus est</i> " and adds " <i>ad Gallias proficiscens</i> " from <i>Prosp. Tir. Epit.Chron.a.412</i>	The Gothic succession, with the role of God in this succession acknowledged.
136	173/174	9-3	Or.7.38.1, Or.7.40.3 and Or.7.38.3-6		Paul synthesizes these parts in almost the same words and eliminates unnecessary parts. Remarkably Paul uses only the last two of the four words (" <i>imbellis, avarae, et perfidae dolosae</i> ") Orosius uses to describe the Vandals	Cruelty of Stilicho is espoused. Stilicho's and Eucherius' downfall was deemed rightful punishment for their attempt at usurpation and their pagan intents.
137	174	3-5	Or.7.39.18			Lightning strikes and destroys a part of Rome
138	174	6-10	Or.7.40.4		With a few omissions and Paul follows up " <i>detrimento reipublicae magis fuit</i> " with " <i>quam augmento</i> " which it does not say in Orosius	The rise of another usurper, Constantine
139	174/175	10-3	Or.7.40.5-7, 10 and Or.7.41.7		Abbreviated and with exaggerations omitted and concepts refined. Among	Fall of Constantine, explains the entry of many barbarian tribes into the

					others after "Foverre" (Or.: "fovent") the noteworthy phrase " <i>ut invenientur iam inter eos quidam Romani qui malint inter barbaros pauperem libertatem, quam inter Romanos tributariam sollicitudinem sustinere</i> " was removed.	Roman Empire. Also explains there good and peaceful relations of these barbarians with the Romans.
140	176/177	2-7	Or.7.42.1-16		Abbreviated, nothing substantial has been added except for two things, the integration of " <i>obiit</i> ", cf. note (1). Cf. also lord. <i>Get.</i> 164, for the words " <i>virum industria militari pollentem multisque proellis gloriosum</i> " which could have suggested the descriptions " <i>strenuum et bellicosum</i> " (Cf. G. Calligaris, <i>Saggio di studi Paolo Diacono in Miscellanea della R. Dep. Ven. Di st. patr.</i> XI, 77 sg.) They also appear in the text of Orosius.	Lists the successes of Honorius' reign in defeating many usurpers. Praises Honorius' piety and Constantine, his count's, great skill at war. Highly abbreviated but still remarkably positive of Honorius.
141	177	10-18	Or.7.43.10-14		Abbreviated, sometimes in his own words, from lord. <i>Get.</i> 326 which has " <i>qui eam revocaverat</i> " , Paul deduces the expression " <i>exigente Constantio</i> "	Details how Wallia submitted to the Roman Empire and with force persuaded many other barbarian peoples to submit to the Romans. Displays perfectly Paul's desired relations between warlike barbarians and the Romans: the former are in the service of the latter. While omitting Orosius' remarkable positivism, this passage is still very

						telling.
--	--	--	--	--	--	----------



**Appendix B: Comparison of original passages in the *Historia libri septem adversum paganos* with their counterparts in the *Historia Romana***

#	Orosius	Text	Paulus	Text
1	Or.Praef.1	Praeceptis tuis parui, beatissime pater Augustine: <b>atque utinam tam efficaciter quam libenter!</b> Quamquam ego in utramvis partem parum de explicito movear, rectene an secus egerim	p.4 l.5-6	utinam tam efficaciter imperata facturus quam libenter arripui
2	Or.2.4.1	Anno post eversionem Trojae <b>CCCCXIV</b> , olympiade autem VI, quae quinto demum anno, quatuor in medio expletis, apud Elidem, Graeciae civitatem, agone et ludis exerceri solet, urbs Roma in Italia a Romulo et Remo, geminis auctoribus, condita est	p.7 l.1	ante Urbem autem conditam annis .ccciii.
3	Or.2.4.1	Anno post eversionem Trojae <b>CCCCXIV</b> , olympiade autem VI, quae quinto demum anno, quatuor in medio expletis, apud Elidem, Graeciae civitatem, agone et ludis exerceri solet, urbs Roma in Italia a Romulo et Remo, geminis auctoribus, condita est	p.10 l.13-14	sive, ut placet Orosio, .ccciii.
4	Or.3.13.2	<b>Haec autem Byzantium</b> , quondam a Pausania rege Spartanorum <b>condita, post autem</b> a Constantino, Christiano principe, in majus aucta et <b>Constantinopolis dicta</b> , gloriosissimi nunc imperii sedes et totius caput Orientis est	p.14 l.4-5	his temporibus Bizantium civitas est condita, quae postea Constantinopolis est appellata.
5	Or.2.12.8	qui repertus ruri, ab aratro arcessitus ad fascas, sumpto honore, instructoque exercitu, mox victor effectus, <b>jugum boum Aequis imposuit, victoriamque quasi stivam tenens, subjugatos hostes prae se primus egit.</b>	p.20 l.10-12	iugumque boum Aequis imposuit victoriamque quasi stivam tenens subjugatos hostes prae se primus egit.

6	Or.2.19.9	nam <b>mille libris</b> auri discessionis pretium paciscuntur: non quod apud Gallos Roma parvi nominis fuerit, sed quod illam sic jam ante detriverint, ut amplius tunc valere non posset	p.21 l.19	mille librarum
7	Or.3.4.1, 3	Anno ab Urbe condita CCCLXXXIV L. Genucio, et Q. Servilio consulibus, <b>ingens</b> universam <b>Romam pestilentia corripuit</b>  sed gravis diuturnaue in nullo dispar sexu, in nulla aetate dissimilis, generali cunctos <b>per biennium jugiter</b> tabe confecit: ut etiam quos non egit in mortem, turpi macie exinanitos afflictosque dimiserit	p.24 l.1-2	inmensa per continuum biennium Romanos pestis afflxit
8	Or.3.5	<b>Sequitur</b> hanc miseram luem, miserioremque ejus expiationem proximo anno <b>satis triste prodigium</b> . Repente <b>siquidem medio Urbis terra dissiluit, vastoque praeruptu hiantia subito inferna patuerunt. Manebat diu ad</b> spectaculum <b>terroremque cunctorum</b> patienti voragine impudens specus, <b>nefariamque vivi hominis sepulturam diis interpretibus expetebat</b> . Satisfecit improbis faucibus praecipitio sui <b>Marcus Curtius, eques armatus, iniecitque</b> crudeli terrae inopinatam satietatem, cui parum esset, quod ex tanta pestilentia mortuos per sepulcra susciperet, nisi etiam vivos scissa sorberet.	p.24 l.2-8	secutum est satis triste prodigium, siquidem in medio Urbis terra dissiluit vastoque praerupto hiantia subito inferna patuerunt. quod dum diutius ita maneret cunctisque terrorem inferret, tandem interpretantibus aruspibus, quod vivi hominis sepulturam expeteret, Marcus Curtius eques Romanus se in id baratrum armatus iniecit sicque conclusum est.
9	Or.3.7.4-5	<b>Tunc etiam nox usque ad plurimam diei partem tendi</b>	p.25 l.8-11	tunc siquidem dilatata nox usque ad plurimam diei

		<b>visa est: et saxea de nubibus grando descendens</b> , veris terram lapidibus verberavit. <b>Quibus diebus etiam Alexander Magnus</b> , magnus vere ille gurges miseriarum, atque atrocissimus turbo totius Orientis <b>est natus</b>		partem tendi visa est. tunc etiam saxa de nubibus cecidere eodemque tempore Magnus Alexander natus est.
10	Or.3.11.1-2	Anno ab Urbe condita CCCXXII <b>Alexander, rex Epirotarum, Alexandri illius Magni avunculus, trajectis in Italiam copiis, cum bellum adversus Romanos pararet</b> , et circa finitimas Romae urbes firmare vires exercitus sui, auxiliaque vel sibi acquirere vel hostibus subtrahere studens, bellis exerceretur, a Samnitibus, <b>qui Lucanae genti suffragabantur, maximo bello in Lucania victus atque occisus est</b> . Sed, quoniam aliquantum Romanas clades recensendo progressus sum, vel Alexandri istius mentione commonitus, de Philippo Macedonum rege, qui <b>Olympiadem hujus Alexandri Epirotae sororem uxorem habuit</b> , ex qua Alexandrum Magnum genuit, paucissimis annis retro repetitis, magna parvis, in quantum potero, colligam.	p.26 l.5-8	Alexandrum regem Epirotarum germanum Olympiae matris Alexandri Magni, qui traiecit in Italiam copiis bellum adversus Romanos parabat Lucanis suffragium ferentes, maximo bello in Lucania vicere, in quo et ipse Alexander Epirota extinctus est.
11	Or.3.8.1	<b>Jam hinc statim a Romanis adversum Samnitas</b> , gentem opibus armisque validam, <b>pro Campanis et Sidicinis bella suscepta sunt</b> . Samniticum bellum ancipiti statu gestum, Pyrrhus, vel maximus Romani nominis hostis, excepit. Pyrrhi bellum mox Punicum consecutum est	p.26 l.9-10	Romani igitur adversus Samnitas pro Campanis et Sidicinis bellum susceperunt
12	Or.3.15.2-3	Anno ab Urbe condita CCCXXVI Caudinas furculas satis celebres et famosas, insignis Romanorum fecit infamia.	p.27 l.9	apud Caudinas furculas angustiis locorum conclusos

		Nam cum superiore bello viginti millia Samnitium, Fabio magistro equitum pugnam conserente, cecidissent, circumspectiore cura Samnites ac magis instructo apparatu <b>apud Caudinas furculas</b> consederunt, ubi cum Veturium et Postumium consules, omnesque copias Romanorum <b>angustiis locorum</b> armisque <b>clausissent</b> , Pontius, dux eorum, in tantum abusus est victoriae securitate, ut Herennium patrem consulendum putaret, utrum occideret clausos, an parceret subjugatis: ut vivos tamen dedecori reservaret, elegit.		
13	Or.3.15.3-4	Ubi cum Veturium et Postumium consules, omnesque copias Romanorum angustiis locorum armisque clausissent, <b>Pontius, dux eorum, in tantum abusus est victoriae securitate, ut Herennium patrem consulendum putaret, utrum occideret clausos, an parceret subjugatis: ut vivos tamen dedecori reservaret, elegit.</b> Romanos enim antea saepissime vinci et occidi, numquam autem capi, aut ad deditionem cogi potuisse constabat	p.27 l.10-13	dux Pontius in tantu usus est victoriae securitate, ut Herennium patrem consulendum putaret, utrum clausos occideret an parceret subiugatis. ut vivos tamen dedecori servaret, elegit
14	Or.3.15.5-6	Ita Samnites, victoria potiti, <b>universum exercitum Romanum turpiter captum armis etiam vestimentisque nudatum, tantum singulis vilioribus operimentis ob verecunda corporum tegenda concessis, sub jugum missum servitioque subjectum, longum agere pompae ordinem praeceperunt. Sexcentis autem equitibus Romanis in obsidatum receptis, oneratos ignominia, caeteris rebus vacuos,</b>	p.27 l.13-20	universum Romanum exercitum turpiter captum armis etiam vestimentisque nudatum, tantum singulis vilioribus operimentis ob verecundiam corporum tegendam concessis, sub iugo missum servitioque subiectum longum agere pompae ordinem praeceperunt. sexcentis autem equitibus Romanis in obsidatum receptis, oneratos ignominia, caeteris rebus vacuos, consules remiserunt,

		<b>consules remiserunt.</b>		
15	Or.3.15.7	Quid de exaggeranda hujus <i>foedissimi foederis</i> macula verbis laborem, qui tacere maluissem? <b>Hodie enim Romani aut omnino non essent, aut Samnio dominante servirent, si fidem foederis, quam sibi servari a subjectis volunt, ipsi subjecti Samnitibus servavissent.</b>	p.27 l.21-23	si fidem foederis, quam sibi Romani servari a subiectis volunt, ipsi subiecti Samnitibus servavissent, hodie aut omnino non essent aut, Samnio dominante, servirent.
16	Or.3.15.10	Idem deinde Papyrius Satricum, expulso inde Samnitico praesidio, expugnavit, et cepit. Hic autem Papyrius <b>adeo tunc apud Romanos bellicosissimus ac strenuissimus habebatur, ut cum Alexander Magnus disponere diceretur</b> ab Oriente descendens obtinere viribus Africam, atque inde <b>in Italiam transvehi, Romani inter caeteros duces</b> tunc in republica sua optimos, <b>hunc praecipuum fore, qui Alexandri impetum sustinere posset</b> , meditarentur.	p.28 l.3-6	adeo tunc apud Romanos bellicosissimus habebatur, ut cum diceretur Alexander in Italiam transgredi, Romani inter caeteros duces hunc praecipue eligerent, qui Alexandri impetum sustineret.
17	Or.4.3.1-2	Anno ab Urbe condita CCCCLXXV, <b>Tarentini, Pyrrhi morte comperta, iterum nova adversum Romanos arma sollicitant, Carthaginiensium auxilia per legatos poscunt, atque accipiunt. Conserto praelio, vicere Romani: ubi jam tunc Carthaginienses, quamvis nondum hostes adjudicati, vinci tamen a Romanis se posse senserunt</b>	p.31 l.17-22	Tarentini, Pyrrhi morte comperta, iterum nova arma adversum Romanos sollicitant. Carthaginiensium auxilia per legatos poscunt atque accipiunt. Carthaginienses a Romanis vincuntur; quamvis nondum hostes indicati, senserunt tamen se posse a Romanis superari.
18	Or.4.5.1	Anno ab Urbe condita CCCCLXXX inter multa prodigia, sanguis e terra, lac visum est manare de coelo. Nam et <b>plurimis locis scaturiens e fontibus cruor fluxit, et de</b>	p.32 l.8-9	pluribus locis e fontibus cruor fluxit et de nubibus in specie pluviae lac descendit.

		nubibus guttatim in speciem pluviae lacte demisso, diri, ut ipsis visum est, terram imbres irrigaverunt		
19	Or.4.8.10, 15	Regulus, bellum Carthaginense sortitus, iter cum exercitu faciens, haud procul a flumine <b>Bagrada</b> castra constituit, ubi cum plurimos militum, aquandi necessitate ad flumen descendentes, <b>serpens mirae magnitudinis</b> devoraret, <b>Regulus ad expugnandam bestiam cum exercitu profectus est</b>  <b>Corium autem ejus Romam devectum (quod fuisse centum viginti pedum spatio ferunt) aliquamdiu cunctis miraculo fuit</b>	p.34 l.2-5	apud fluvium Bagrada Regulus serpentem mirae magnitudinis occidit, cuius corium centum viginti pedum longitudinem habuit, Romamque delatum aliquandiu cunctis miraculo fuit.
20	Or.4.10.1	Post haec, fessi tot malis Carthaginenses, petendam esse a Romanis pacem decreverunt. Ad quam rem Atilium Regulum antea duces Romanum, quem jam per quinque annos captivum detinebant, inter caeteros legatos praecipue mittendum putaverunt: <b>quem, non impetrata pace, ab Italia reversum, resectis palpebris, illigatum in machina, vigilando necaverunt.</b>	p.36 l.8-9	circumcisis palpebrisi, ut usque ad mortem cruciatu intolerabili ac dolore vigilaret
21	Or.4.10.4	<b>Anno etiam consequenti, classis Punica in Italiam transiit, ejusque plurimas partes longe lateque vastavit</b>	p.36 l.16-17	anno etiam consequenti classis Punica in Italiam transiit eiusque plurimas partes longe lateque vastavit.
22	Or.4.11.1-2	<b>Tunc Carthaginenses praecipiti festinatione ad Lutatium consulem, ac deinde Romam mittunt, orant pacem:</b> quam conditionibus ante propositis illico	p.37 l.14-16	Carthaginenses sane sub hac conditione cum Romanis pacem fecerunt, ut eis per continuos .xx. annos

		consequuntur. Conditiones autem erant, ut Sicilia Sardiniaque decederent, proque impensis bellicis <b>puri argenti tria millia talentorum</b> Euboicorum, aequis pensionibus, <b>per annos viginti penderent</b>		persolverent argenti puri tria millia talentorum.
23	Or.4.13.11	Sequenti anno Manlius Torquatus et Fulvius Flaccus consules, <b>primi trans Padum Romanas duxere legiones. Pugnatum est ibi cum Insubribus Gallis, quorum interfecta sunt viginti tria millia, quinque millia capta sunt</b>	p.39 l.11-14	primi trans Padum Romanas duxere legiones. pugnatum est ibi cum Insubribus et Liguribus, quorum interfecta sunt .xxiii. millia, .v. millia capta sunt,
24	Or.4.13.12	Eo deinde anno, qui huic proximus fuit, dira miseram Urbem terruere prodigia. Miseram utique, quae hinc fremitu hostium, inde nequitia daemonum terrebat, namque <b>in Piceno flumen sanguine effluxit, et apud Tuscos coelum ardere visum est, et Arimini nocte multa lucem claram effulsisse, ac tres lunas distantibus coeli regionibus exortas apparuisse.</b>	39 l.14-17	sequenti anno in Piceno flumen sanguine effluxit et apud Tuscos caelum ardere visum est et Arimini nocte multa luce fulgente tres simul lunae apparuere.
25	Or.4.14.3	<b>Exinde odio Romani nominis, quod patri Amilcari, cum esset novem annos natus,</b> fidelissime, alias infidelissimus, <b>ante aras juraverat,</b> P. Cornelio Scipione, et Ti. Sempronio Longo consulibus, Pyrenaeos montes transgressus, inter ferocissimas Gallorum gentes ferro viam aperuit, et nono demum die a Pyrenaeo ad Alpes pervenit	42 l.4-6	Amilcari patri ad aras iuraverat, cum adhuc novem esset annorum, se, ut primum posset, adversus Romanos pugnaturum.
26	Or.4.14.6	Scipio consul Annibali primus occurrit, commissoque praelio <b>apud Ticinum,</b> ipse graviter vulneratus per Scipionem filium, admodum praetextatum, qui post	43 l.9	apud Ticinum

		Africanus cognominatus est, ab ipsa morte liberatus evasit. Caesus est ibi pene omnis Romanus exercitus.		
27	Ibid.	Scipio consul Annibali primus occurrit, commissoque praelio apud Ticinum, ipse graviter vulneratus <b>per Scipionem filium</b> , admodum praetextatum, qui post Africanus cognominatus est, <b>ab ipsa morte liberatus evasit. Caesus est ibi pene omnis Romanus exercitus.</b>	43 l.10-11	poene omnibus extinctis ipse a filio Scipione liberatus, saucius.
28	Or.4.14.7	<b>Pugnatum deinde eodem consule ad flumen Trebiam, iterumque Romani pari clade superati sunt.</b> Sempronius consul, cognito collegae casu, a Sicilia cum exercitu rediit, qui similiter apud eundem fluvium congressus, amisso exercitu, pene solus evasit. In eo tamen bello etiam Annibal sauciatus est	43 l.12-13	pugnatum deinde est eodem consule ad Treviam fluvium iterumque Romani superati sunt.
29	Ibid.	Pugnatum deinde eodem consule ad flumen Trebiam, iterumque Romani pari clade superati sunt. Sempronius consul, cognito collegae casu, a Sicilia cum exercitu rediit, qui similiter apud eundem fluvium congressus, <b>amisso exercitu, pene solus evasit. In eo tamen bello etiam Annibal sauciatus est</b>	43 l.14-16	amissoque exercitu poene solus evasit. in eo tamen bello etiam Annibal sauciatus est.
30	Or.4.14.8	<b>qui postea cum in Etruriam primo vere transiret, in summo Apennino tempestate correptus, biduo continuo immobiliter cum exercitu nivibus conclusus et onustus, obrigit: ubi magnus hominum numerus, iumenta complurima, elephantum pene omnes frigoris acerbitate perierunt.</b>	43 l.16-20	qui posteaquam in Etruriam primo vere transiret, in summo Appennino tempestate correptus biduo continuo immobiliter stetit nivibus cum exercitu conclusus, ubi magnus hominum numerus, iumenta quam plurima, elephantum poene omnes frigore perierunt.



31	Or.4.15.1	<b>Diris tunc etiam Romani prodigiis territi sunt. Nam et solis orbis minui visus est, et apud Arpos parmae in coelo visae, sol quoque pugnasse cum luna, apud Carpenas interdiu duas lunas ortas, in Sardinia sanguine duo scuta sudasse, Faliscis coelum scindi velut magno hiatu visum, apud Antium metentibus cruentas spicas in corbem decidisse</b>	44 l.1-5	diris tunc etiam Romani prodigiis territi sunt; nam et solis orbis inminui visus est et apud Arpos palmae in caelo visae, sol quoque cum luna pugnasse, apud Capenas duae lunae ortae sunt, in Sardinia sanguine duo scuta sudarunt, Faliscis caelum scindi visum est, apud Antium cruentae spicae in corbem cecidere.
32	Or.4.16.3-4	Periit enim in eo consul Aemilius Paulus, consulares aut praetorii viri viginti interfecti sunt, senatores vel capti vel occisi sunt triginta, nobiles viri trecenti, pedestrium militum quadraginta millia, equitum tria millia quingenti. <b>Varro consul cum quinquaginta equitibus Venusiam fugit. Nec dubium est, ultimum illum diem Romani status futurum fuisse, si Annibal mox post victoriam ad pervadendam Urbem contendisset</b>	45 l.12-15	Varro consul cum quinquaginta equitibus Venusium fugit. nec dubium est ultimum illum diem Romani status futurum fuisse, si Annibal mox post victoriam ad pervadendam Urbem contendisset.
33	Or.4.16.12	<b>Deinde Sempronio Graccho, Q. Fabio Maximo consulibus, Claudius Marcellus ex praetore proconsule designatus, Annibalis exercitum proelio fudit, primusque post tantas Reipublicae ruinas spem fecit, Annibalem posse superari.</b>	46 l.9-13	deinde Sempronio Graccho Quinto Favio Maximo consulibus Claudius Marcellus ex praetore pro consule designatus Annibalis exercitum proelio fudit primusque post tantas rei publicae ruinas spem fecit Annibalem posse superari.
34	Or.4.16.16-17	<b>Centenius Penula, centurio, decerni sibi ultro bellum adversum Annibalem petiit: a quo cum octo millibus militum, quos in aciem eduxerat, caesus est. Post hunc Cn. Fulvius, praetor, ab Annibale victus, amisso exercitu, vix evasit.</b>	46 l.19-22	Centenius Paenula centurio decerni sibi ultro bellum adversum Annibalem petiit, a quo cum octo milibus militum, quos in acie eduxerat, caesus est. post hunc Gneus Fulvius praetor ab Annibale victus amisso exercitu vix evasit.

35	Or.4.18.3	Annibal in Italia <b>Cn. Fulvium proconsulem, undecim praeterea tribunos, decem et septem millia militum interfecit.</b>	46/47 l.23-1	Gneum Fulvium proconsulem, undecim praeterea tribunos et .xvii. milia militum interfecit.
36	Or.4.18.4	Marcellus consul <b>cum Annibale triduum continuum dimicavit. Primo die pari pugna discessum est, sequenti victus consul, tertio victor octo millia hostium interfecit, ipsumque Annibalem cum reliquis fugere in castra compulit.</b>	47 l.1-5	cum Annibale apud Nolani triduum continuum dimicavit; primo die pari pugna discessum est, sequenti victus consul tertio Victor .viii. milia hostium interfecit, ipsum Annibalem cum reliquis fugere in castra compulit.
37	Or.4.17.2	Decimo anno postquam Annibal in Italiam venerat, Cn. Fulvio, P. Sulpitio consulibus, Annibal <b>de Campania movit exercitum: et cum ingenti clade omnium per Sidicinum Suessanumque agrum via Latina</b> profectus, ad Anienem fluvium tribus millibus ab Urbe consedit, incredibili totius Civitatis metu	47/48 l. 24-2	de Campania movit exercitum et cum ingenti clade omnium per Sedecinum Suessanumque agrum via Latina
38	Or.4.16.6-7	Usque adeo autem ultima desperatio Reipublicae apud residuos Romanos fuit <b>ut senatores de relinquenda Italia</b> , sedibusque quaerendis consilium ineundum <b>putarint.</b> Quod auctore Caecilio Metello confirmatum fuisset, nisi Cornelius Scipio <b>tribunus tunc militum</b> , idem qui postea Africanus, <b>districto gladio deterrisset, ac potius pro patriae defensione in sua verba jurare coegisset. Romani ad spem vitae, quasi ab inferis respirare ausi</b> , dictatorem Decimum Junium creant: qui, delectu habito ab annis decem et septem, immaturae inordinataeque militiae quatuor legiones undecunque contraxit.	48/49 l.23-4	dum senatores ob metum Annibalis Italiani relinquere deliberarent, cum tribunus militum esset, districto gladio id fieri vetuit, primusque iurans ut patriae defensor existeret, universos similiter iurare coegit Romanosque ad spem vitae quasi ab inferis reduxit.

39	Or.4.18.14	nam <b>quingenta et octo millia de exercitu Asdrubalis ibi occisa sunt, capta sunt quinque millia quadringenti. Quatuor millia civium Romanorum inter eos reperta atque revocata sunt</b> , quod victoribus consulibus solatio fuit. Nam et ab exercitu eorum octo millia ceciderunt	50 l.14-16	.LViii. milia de eius exercitu perempta, .v. milia capta sunt .ccciiii. milia civium Romanorum inter eos reperta et revocata sunt.
40	Or.4.18.15	<b>Annibali caput fratris sui Asdrubalis, ante castra projectum est. Quo viso et simul clade Poenorum cognita, anno decimo tertio quam in Italiam venerat, refugit in Bruttios.</b>	50 l.17-20	Annibali caput fratris sui Hasdrubalis ante castra proiectum est, quo viso et simul clade Poenorum cognita, anno tertio decimo quam in Italiam venerat, refugit in Britiam.
41	Or.4.19.1	Annibal redire in Africam iussus, ut fessis Carthaginensibus subveniret, <b>flens reliquit</b> Italiam, omnibus Italici generis militibus, qui sequi nollent, interfectis, cui ad Africanum littus propinquant, iussus quidam e nauticis ascendere in arborem navis, atque inde speculari, quam regionem teneret, sepulcrum dirutum se prospexisse respondit. Abominatus dictum Annibal, deflexo cursu ad Leptim oppidum copias exposuit.	51 l.20	flens dicitur reliquisse.
42	Or.4.20.3-4	<b>Romani captivi, qui sub Annibale per Graeciam venditi fuerant, universi recepti, capitibus rasis ob detersam servitatem, currum triumphantis secuti sunt. Eodem tempore Insubres, Boii</b> atque Caenomani, contractis in unum viribus, Amilcare Poeno duce, qui in Italia remanserat, Cremonam Placentiamque vastantes, difficillimo bello a L. Furio praetore superati sunt.	53/54 l.15-1	Romani captivi, qui sub Annibale per Greciam venditi fuerant, universi recepti capitibus rasis ob detersam servitatem currum triumphantis secuti sunt. eodem tempore Insubres Boii

43	Or.4.20.4	Eodem tempore Insubres, Boii <b>atque Caenomani, contractis in unum viribus, Amilcare Poeno duce, qui in Italia remanserat, Cremonam Placentiamque vastantes, difficillimo bello a L. Furio praetore superati sunt.</b>	54 l.2-5	atque Cenomanni contractis in unum viribus Amilcare Poenerum duce, qui in Italia remanserat Cremonam Placentiamque vastantes difficillimo bello a Lucio Fulvio praetore superati sunt.
44	Or.4.20.11	<b>consul Marcellus in Etruria a Boiis oppressus, magnam partem exercitus perdidit, cui postea Furius alter consul auxilio accessit: atque ita universam Boiorum gentem igni ferroque vastantes, propemodum usque ad nihilum deleverunt.</b>	54 l.5-9	consul Marcellus in Etruria a Boiis oppressus magnam partem exercitu perdidit; cui postea Furius alter consul auxilio accessit atque ita universam Boiorum gentem igni ferroque vastantes propemodum usque ad nihilum deleverunt.
45	Or.4.20.15	<b>P. Scipione Africano iterum, Ti. Sempronio Longo consulibus, apud Mediolanum decem millia Gallorum caesa: sequenti autem praelio undecim millia Gallorum, Romanorum vero quinque millia, occisa sunt.</b>	54 l.18-21	Publio Scipione Africano iterum Tito Sempronio Longo consulibus apud Mediolanium decem milia Gallorum caesa, sequenti autem proelio undecim milia Gallorum, Romanorum vero quinque milia occisa sunt.
46	Or.4.20.17	<b>Minucius a Liguribus in extremum periculi adductus, et insidiis hostium circumventus, vix Numidarum equitum industria liberatus est.</b>	54 l.21-23	Minucius a Liguribus in extremum periculi adductus et insidiis hostium circumventus vix Numidarum equitum industria liberatus est.
47	Or.4.20.24	<b>L. Baebius in Hispaniam proficiscens, a Liguribus circumventus, cum universo exercitu occisus est: unde adeo ne nuntium quidem superfuisse constat, ut interneconem ipsam Romae Massilienses nuntiare curaverint.</b>	55/56 l.19-1	Lucius Bebius in Hispaniam proficiscens a Liguribus circumventus cum universo exercitu occisus est, unde adeo ne nuntium quidem superfuisse constat, ut internitionem ipsam Romae Massilienses nuntiare curaverint.
48	Or.4.20.26	<b>Marcus consul adversus Ligures profectus, superatusque, quatuor millia militum amisit: et nisi</b>	56 l.1-2	Marcus consul adversus Ligures profectus superatusque quattuor milia militum amisit.

		victus, celeriter refugisset in castra, eamdem internecionis cladem, quam Baebius dudum ab eisdem hostibus acceperat, pertulisset.		
49	Or.4.20.29	<b>Eodem anno Scipio Africanus ab ingrata sibi Urbe diu exsulans, apud Liternum oppidum morbo periit.</b> lisdem etiam diebus Annibal apud Prusiam Bithyniae regem, cum a Romanis reposceretur, veneno sese necavit. Philopoemen, dux Achivorum, a Messeniis captus, occisusque est.	56 l.8-10	eodem anno Scipio Africanus ab ingrata sibi Urbe diu exulans apud Amiternum morbo periit.
50	Or.4.20.30	In Sicilia <b>tunc Vulcani insula, quae ante non fuerat, repente mari edita</b> cum miraculo omnium, usque ad nunc manet.	56 l.10-11	tunc Vulcani insula, quae ante non fuerat, repente io mari est edita.
51	Or.4.21.1-3	<b>Anno ab Urbe condita DC, L. Licinio Lucullo et A. Postumio Albino consulibus, cum omnes Romanos ingens Celtiberorum metus invasisset, et ex omnibus non esset, qui ire in Hispaniam vel miles vel legatus auderet, P. Scipio, qui postea Africanus est dictus, ultro sese militaturum in Hispaniam obtulit, cum tamen in Macedoniam sorte jam deputatus esset. Itaque profectus in Hispaniam magnas strages gentium dedit, saepius etiam militis quam ducis usus officio. Nam et barbarum provocantem singulariter congressus occidit. Ser. autem Galba praetor, a Lusitanis magno praelio victus est: universoque exercitu amisso, ipse cum paucis vix elapsus evasit</b>	58/59 l.20-9	Anno ab Urbe condita sexcentesimo Lucio Licinio Lucullo Postumio Aitino consulibus, cum omnes Romanos ingens Celtiberorum metus invasisset et ex omnibus non esset qui ire in Hispaniam vel miles vel legatus auderet, Publius Scipio, qui post Africanus erit ultro se militaturum in Hispaniam optulit, cum tamen in Macedoniam sorte iam deputatus esset. itaque profectus in Hispaniam magnas strages gentium dedit, saepius etiam militis quam ducis usus officio; nam et barbarum provocantem singulariter congressus occidit. Sergius autem Galba praetor a Lusitanis magno proelio victus est universoque exercitu amisso ipse cum paucis vix elapsus evasit.

52	Or.4.22.2-4	Ibi <b>Carthaginiensibus evocatis, jussisque ut arma et naves traderent, nec moratis, tanta vis armorum repente tradita est, ut facile tota ex his Africa potuisset armari. Sed Carthaginienses postquam arma tradiderunt, et relicta urbe recedere procul a mari decem millibus passuum jussi sunt, dolorem ad desperationem contulerunt, aut defensuri civitatem, aut cum ipsa per ipsam sepeliendi: ducesque sibi duos Asdrubales creaverunt. Arma primum facere aggressi, aeris ferrique inopiam, auri argentique metallis suppleverunt.</b> Consules oppugnare Carthaginem statuunt, cujus situs fuisse hujusmodi dicitur:	59/60 l.17-4	Carthaginiensibus evocatis iussisque, ut arma et naves traderent, tanta vis armorum repente tradita est, ut facile  ex ea tota Africa potuisset armari. qui postquam arma Romanis tradiderunt, relicta urbe recedere procul a mari decem milibus passuum iussi sunt. Carthaginienses dolorem ad desperationem contulerunt aut defensuri civitatem aut cum ipsa per ipsam sepeliendi moxque sibi duos Hasdrubales duces creaverunt armaque facere adgressi postquam aes ferrumque defecit, aurea argenteaque fecere.
53	Or.4.22.7	<b>Consules igitur quamvis aliquantam muri partem quassatam machinis diruissent, tamen a Carthaginiensibus victi ac repulsi sunt: quos fugientes Scipio repulso intra muros hoste defendit.</b> Censorinus in Urbem rediit. Manilius omnia Carthagine ad Asdrubalem arma convertit.	60 l.4-7	consules cum aliquantam muri partem machinis diruissent a Carthaginiensibus victi sunt atque repulsi, quos fugientes Scipio tunc tribunus militum repulso intra muros hoste defendit.
54	Or.4.23.2-7	ubi <b>dum sex continuis diebus noctibusque pugnatur, ultima Carthaginienses desperatio ad deditionem traxit, petentes, ut quos belli clades reliquos fecit, saltem servire liceat. Primum agmen mulierum satis miserabile, virorum post magis deforme descendit. Nam fuisse mulierum viginti quinque millia, virorum triginta millia, memoriae traditum est. Rex Asdrubal se ultro dedit. Transfugae, qui Aesculapii templum occupaverant, voluntario praecipitio dati, igne</b>	60/61 l.21-9	dum sex continuis diebus noctibusque pugnasset, ultima Carthaginienses desperatio ad deditionem traxit, petentes ut, quos belli clades reliquos fecisset, saltem servire liceret; ac primum agmen mulierum satis miserabile, post virorum descendit; nam fuisse mulierum viginti quinque milia, virorum triginta milia traditum est. rex Hasdrubal se ultro dedit, transfugae qui Escolapii templum occupaverant, voluntario praecipitio dati, igne consumpti sunt. uxor Hasdrubalis

		<p><b>consumpti sunt. Uxor Asdrubalis se duosque filios secum virili dolore et furore femineo in medium jecit incendium:</b> eundem nunc mortis exitum faciens novissima regina Carthagini, quem quondam prima fecisset. <b>Ipsa autem civitas decem et septem continuis diebus arsit, miserumque spectaculum de varietate conditionis humanae victoribus suis praebuit. Diruta est autem Carthago, omni murali lapide in pulverem comminuto,</b> septingentesimo post anno quam condita erat. <b>Multitudo omnis captivorum, exceptis paucis principibus, venundata est.</b> Ita quarto quam incoeptum fuit anno, bellum Punicum tertium terminatum est.</p>		<p>se suosque filios secum femineo furore in medium iecit incendium. ipsa autem civitas sedecim diebus continuis arsit miserumque spectaculum suis victoribus praebuit; multitudo omnis captivorum exceptis paucis principibus venundata est. diruta est autem Carthago omni murali lapide in pulverem comminuto.</p>
55	Or.4.22.4-6	<p>Arma primum facere aggressi, aeris ferrique inopiam, auri argentique metallis suppleverunt. Consules oppugnare Carthaginem statuunt, <b>cujus situs fuisse huiusmodi dicitur: Viginti millia passuum muro amplexa, tota pene mari cingebatur, absque faucibus, quae tribus millibus passuum aperiebantur. Is locus murum triginta pedes latum habuit, saxo quadrato, in altitudinem cubitorum quadraginta. Arx, cui Byrsae nomen erat, paulo amplius quam duo millia passuum tenebat. Ex una parte murus communis erat urbis et Byrsae imminens mari, quod mare stagnum vocabant, quoniam objectu protentae linguae tranquillatur.</b></p>	61 l.9-18	<p>cuius fuisse situs huiusmodi dicitur: .xxii. milia passuum muro amplexa tota pene mari cingebatur absque faucibus, quae tribus milibus passuum aperiebantur; is locus murum triginta pedes latum habuit saxo quadrato in altitudine cubitorum quadraginta, a saxo cui Byrsae nomen erat, paulo amplius quam duo milia passuum tenebat; ex una parte murus communis urbis et Byrsae imminens mari, quod mare stagnum dicitur, quoniam objectu protentae linguae strangulatur.</p>
56	Or.4.23.7	<p>Multitudo omnis captivorum, exceptis paucis principibus, venundata est. <b>Ita quarto quam</b></p>	62 l.1-2	<p>ita quarto, quam coeptum fuit, bellum tertium terminatum est.</p>

		<b>incoeptum fuit anno, bellum Punicum tertium terminatum est.</b>		
57	Or.5.4.8	L. Caecilio Metello, Q. Fabio Maximo Serviliano consulibus, inter caetera prodigia <b>androgynus Romae visus, jussu aruspicum in mare mersus est:</b> sed nihil impiae expiationis procuratio profecit. Nam tanta subito pestilentia exorta est, ut ministri quoque faciendorum funerum primum non sufficerent, deinde non essent. Itaque etiam magnae domus vacuae vivis, plenae mortuis remanserunt. Largissimae introrsum haereditates, et nulli penitus haeredes.	62 l.21-22	his diebus androgynus Romae visus iussu aruspicum in mare mersus est.
58	Or.5.4.2-4	siquidem Iberum et Tagum, maxima et diversissimorum locorum flumina, late transgredienti et pervaganti <b>C. Vetilius praetor occurrit: qui continuo, caeso</b> usque ad interneconem pene <b>omni exercitu suo, vix</b> ipse praetor cum paucis <b>fuga lapsus, evasit. Deinde C. Plautium praetorem idem Viriathus, multis praeliis fractum, fugavit. Post etiam Claudius Unimanus cum magno instructu belli contra Viriathum missus,</b> quasi pro abolenda superiore macula, turpiorem ipse auxit infamiam. Nam congressus cum Viriatho, universas, quas secum deduxerat, copias, maximasque vires Romani exercitus amisit. Viriathus trabeas, fasces, caeteraque insignia Romana in montibus suis tropaea praefixit.	63 l.9-12	Vecilius praetor occurrit, qui toto exercitu caeso vix fuga lapsus evasit; deinde Gaium Plautium praetorem idem Viriathus multis proeliis fractum fugavit; post haec Claudium Unimammium cum omni exercitu superavit
59	Or.5.6.1	Sex. Fulvio Flacco, Q. Calpurnio Pisone consulibus, Romae <b>puer ex ancilla natus est quadrimanus, oculis</b>	63 l.15-17	Romae puer ex ancilla natus est quadrupes quadrimanus, oculis quattuor, auribus totidem,



		<b>quatuor, auribus totidem, natura virili duplex.</b>		naturam virilem duplicem habens.
60	Or.5.6.2	In Sicilia mons Aetna vastos ignes eructavit, ac fudit: qui torrentum modo per prona praecipites, proxima quaeque corripientibus exussere flammis; longinquiora autem favillis calidis, cum vapore gravi late volitantibus, torruerunt; quod Siciliae semper vernaculum genus monstri, non portendere malum assolet, sed inferre. <b>In Bononiensi agro fruges in arboribus enatae sunt.</b>	63 l.17-18	in Bononiensi agro fruges in arboribus natae sunt.
61	Or.5.7.3	Haec <b>per annos quatuordecim cum solis quatuor millibus suorum quadraginta millia Romanorum</b> non solum sustinuit, <b>sed etiam vicit</b> , pudendisque foederibus affectit.	64 l.2-4	per continuos annos quatuordecim cum solis quatuor milibus quadraginta milia Romanorum protrivissent,
62	Or.5.7.6-18	<b>Namque ubi copia pugnandi facta est, exercitus Romanus, oppressus impetu Numantinorum, terga convertit: sed increpatione et minis objectantis sese consulis</b> , manuque retinentis, <b>tandem indignatus in hostem rediit: et quem fugiebat, fugere compulit.</b> Difficilis tunc in relatu fides, Numantinos et fugavere, et fugientes videre Romani. <b>Unde quamvis Scipio</b> , quia praeter spem acciderat, <b>laetatus</b> et gloriatus <b>esset, tamen ultra bellum adversus eos audendum non esse, professus est. Itaque</b> Scipio insistendum inopinatis proventibus censuit, <b>urbem ipsam obsidione conclusit, fossa etiam circumdedit:</b> cujus latitudo pedibus decem, altitudo viginti fuit. Ipsum deinde vallum, sudibus praestructum, crebris turribus communivit: ut si qua ab erumpente hoste in eum tentaretur irruptio; jam non	64/65 l.9-9	mox pugna cum Numantinis commissa exercitus Romanus oppressus impetu Numantinorum terga convertit; sed increpatione et minis objectantis sese consulis tandem indignatus in hostem rediit et quem fugiebat fugere compulit; unde quamvis Scipio laetatus sit, tamen ultra bello adversus eos audendum non esse professus est. itaque urbem obsidione conclusit, vallo circumdedit; cumque diu conclusi fame laborarent pugnaeque facultatem exposcerent, ut mori eis quasi viris liceret, novissime larga prius portione calefacti, quae madefactis frugibus confici solet, subito super Romanos inrupere atrox diu certamen et usque ad periculum Romanorum fuit, iterumque Romani pugnare se adversum Numantinos fugiendo probassent, nisi sub Scipione pugnassero. Numantini

	<p>quasi obsessor cum obsesso, sed versa vice obsessus cum obsessore pugnaret. Numantia autem in tumulo sita, haud procula flumine Durio, tria millia passuum ambitu muri amplexabatur; quamvis aliqui asserant eam et parvo situ et sine muro fuisse. Unde credibile est, quod hoc spatii cura alendorum custodiendorumque pecorum, vel etiam exercendi ruris commodo cum bello premerentur, incluserint, ipsi arcem parvam natura munitam obtinentes. Alioqui tantam paucitatem hominum, tam amplum urbis spatium non munire magis, quam prodere videbatur. <b>Igitur conclusi diu Numantini, et fame trucidati, deditionem sui obtulerunt, si tolerabilia juberentur, saepe etiam orantes justae pugnae facultatem, ut tamquam viris mori liceret.</b> Ultimo omnes duabus subito portis <b>eruperunt, larga prius potione usi</b>, non vini, cujus ferax is locus non est, sed succo tritici per artem confecto, quem succum a <b>calefaciendo</b> Celiam vocant. Suscitatur enim igne illa vis germinis <b>madefactae frugis</b>, ac deinde siccatur et post in farinam redacta, molli succo admiscetur, quo fermento sapor austeritatis et calor ebrietatis adjicitur. Hac igitur potione post longam famem recalescentes, bello sese obtulerunt. <b>Atrox diu certamen et usque ad periculum Romanorum fuit: iterumque Romani pugnare se adversum Numantinos, fugiendo probavissent, nisi sub Scipione pugnassent. Numantini, interfectis suorum fortissimis, bello cedunt: compositis tamen ordinibus, nec sicut fugientes in urbem revertuntur, corpora</b></p>	<p>interfectis suis fortissimis bello cedunt, compositis tamen ordinibus nec sicut fugientes in urbem revertuntur corpora interfectorum ad sepulturam oblata accipere noluerunt clausaque urbe cuncti pariter ferro, veneno atque igne consumpti sunt. Romani ex his nihil aliud quam securitatem adepti sunt seque magis evasisse Numantinos quam vicisse dixerunt. unum Numantinum victoris catena non tenuit; quicquid suppellectilis fuit, ignis consumpsit.</p>
--	--	--

		interfectorum ad sepulturam oblata, accipere noluerunt. Novissime spe desperationis in mortem omnes destinati, clausam urbem introrsum succenderunt, cunctique pariter ferro, veneno, atque igne consumpti sunt. Romani nihil ex his penitus habuere victis, praeter securitatem suam. Neque enim eversa Numantia vicisse se magis Numantinos, quam evasisse dixerunt. Unum Numantinum victoris catena non tenuit; unde triumphum dederit, Roma non vidit; aurum vel argentum, quod igni superesse potuisset, apud pauperes non fuit; arma et vestem ignis absumpsit.		
63	Or.5.8.1	Igitur ea tempestate cum haec apud Numantiam gesta sunt, apud Romam Gracchorum seditiones agitabantur. <b>Scipio</b> autem, cum, deleta Numantia, caeteras Hispaniae gentes pace componeret, <b>Tiresum quemdam, Celticum principem, consuluit, qua ope res Numantina aut prius invicta durasset, aut post fuisset eversa: Tiresus respondit: Concordia invicta, discordia exitio fuit</b>	65 l.9-12	Scipio Tyresum quendam Celticum principem consuluit, qua de causa Numantia aut prius invicta aut post eversa fuisset; Tyresus respondit: "Concordia victoriam, discordia exitium praebuit."
64	Or.5.9.4	Orta praeterea in Sicilia belli servilis contagio multas late infecit provincias. <b>Nam et Minturnis quadringenti et quinquaginta servi in crucem acti, et Sinuessae ad quatuor millia servorum a Q. Metello et Cn. Servilio Caepione oppressa</b> sunt. In metallis quoque Atheniensium idem tumultus servilis ab Heraclito praetore discussus est. Apud Delon etiam servi novo	66 l.3-7	in Sicilia bellum est servile exortum ac per Fulvium et Rutilium amplius quam viginti milia tunc servorum trucidata sunt; Minturnis .ccccl. servi in cruce suspensi sunt, apud Sinuessam vero .lIII. milia servorum a Quinto Metello et Gneo Servilio oppressa

		motu intumescences, oppidanis praevenientibus, oppressi sunt		
65	Or.5.10.3	et cum, exercitu post plurimam caedem in fugam acto, ipse jam circumventus <b>ab hostibus</b> , et pene <b>captus esset</b> , <i>virgam, qua erat usus ad equum, in oculum Thracis impegit, Barbarus autem, cum ira et dolore exarsisset, latus Crassi gladio transverberavit. Ita ille, excogitato genere mortis, effugit et dedecus et servitatem.</i>	66 l.15-18	ab hostibus captus est; qui magis mori eligens quam a barbaro abduci virgam qua equum agebat, in oculum se tenentis iniecit moxque ab eo confossus est.
66	Or.5.11.2-4	Namque cum <b>per totam Africam immensae locustarum multitudines coaluissent</b> , et non modo jam cunctam spem <b>frugum</b> abrasissent, <b>herbasque</b> omnes cum parte radicum, <b>et folia arborum</b> cum teneritudine ramorum consumpsissent, verum etiam amaros <b>cortices</b> atque arida ligna perrosissent, repentino abreptae vento, atque in globos coactae, portataeque diu per aerem, <b>Africano pelago immersae sunt</b> . Harum cum immensos acervos, longe undis urgentibus <b>fluctus per extenta late littora propulissent</b> , tetrum nimis atque ultra opinionem <b>pestiferum odorem</b> , tabida et <b>putrefacta congeries exhalavit, unde omnium pariter animantium tanta pestilentia consecuta est, ut avium, pecudum ac bestiarum</b> corruptione aeris dissolutarum, putrefacta passim cadavera, vitium corruptionis auferent. At vero quanta fuerit hominum lues, ego ipse dum refero, toto corpore perhorresco: siquidem <b>in Numidia</b> , in qua tunc Micipsa rex erat, <b>octingenta millia</b> hominum: circa	67 l.6-15	per totam Africam lucustarum multitudo convaluit ut simul fruges, herbas, arborum folia corticesque conroderent; quae repentino vento sublevatae in Africano sunt pelago demersae sed cum earum acervos fluctus per extenta litora pertulissent, pestiferum odorem putrefacta congeries exhalavit unde omnium animantium, avium, pecudumque ac bestiarum pestis existens vitium corruptionis ampliavit; qua pestilentia in Numidia .dccc. milia hominum, circa Carthaginem vero plus quam .cc. milia perierunt, Romanorum vero militum, quae ibi ad praesidium erant, .ccc. milia extincta sunt.

		oram <b>vero</b> maritimam, quae maxime <b>Carthaginiensi</b> atque Uticensi littori adjacet, <b>plus quam ducenta millia periisse traditum est. Apud ipsam vero Uticam civitatem triginta millia militum</b> , quae ad praesidium totius Africae ordinata fuerant, <b>extincta</b> atque abrasa <b>sunt:</b>		
67	Or.5.14.1-4	Anno ab Urbe condita DCXXVIII, Fabius consul Bituito, regi Arvernorum, Galliae civitatis, bellum maximo instructu comparanti, adeo cum parvo exercitu occurrit, ut <b>Bituitus paucitatem Romanorum vix ad escam canibus, quos in agmine habebat, sufficere posse jactaret.</b> Qui cum sibi ad transferendas copias, unum pontem Rhodani fluminis parum esse intelligeret, alium compactis lintribus catenisque connexum, superstratis confixisque tabulis instruxit. Conserta pugna, et diu graviter agitata, victi Galli, conversique in fugam, dum quisque sibi timet, coacervatis inconsulte agminibus, <b>et praepropero transitu pontis vincula ruperunt, ac mox cum ipsis lintribus mersi sunt. Centum octoginta millia armatorum in exercitu</b> Bituiti fuisse traduntur, <b>ex quibus centum quinquaginta millia vel caesa vel mersa sunt.</b>	68 l.3-8	Vituitus paucitatem Romanorum vix ad escam canibus quos in agmine habebat, sufficere posse iactaret et ipse .clxxx.  milia armatorum haberet, conserta pugna a Romanis superatus est; ex cuius exercitu partim in bello partim submersi cum ponte, quem sibi iunctis navibus supra Rodanum extruxerant, .CL. milia perierunt.
68	Or.5.15.18	Post hoc <b>nonaginta millia armatorum</b> novissimo bello ab iisdem regibus objecta; haec quoque usque <b>ad interneccionem</b> , Romanis vincentibus, <b>caesa referuntur.</b> Ex eo Bocchus spem belli abjiciens, pacem petivit: atque in pretium pacis Jugurtham, dolo captum catenisque	69 l.16-17	.xc. milia armatorum ad internitionem cecidit,

		obrutum, per Sullam legatum misit ad Marium		
69	Or.5.15.20-21	<p>lisdem diebus obscenum prodigium ac triste visum est. L. Helvius, eques Romanus, cum uxore et <b>filia, de Roma in Apuliam rediens</b>, tempestate correptus, cum filiam consternatam videret, ut citius propioribus tectis succederent, relictis vehiculis arreptisque equis, <b>filiam virginem</b>, equo insidentem, in medium agmen accepit. <b>Puella continuo ictu fulminis exanimata est. Sed omnibus sine scissura aliqua vestimentis ademptis, ac pectoris pedumque vinculis dissolutis, monilibus etiam annulisque discussis, ipso quoque corpore illaeso, nisi quod obscenum in modum nuda</b>, et lingua paululum exserta <b>jacuit, equus quoque ipse</b>, quo utebatur, straturis, <b>frenis et cingulis dissolutis passim ac dispersis, exanimis procul jacuit.</b></p>	70 l.11-16	<p>virgo de Roma in Apuliam pergens ictu fulminis exanimata est</p> <p>omnibus sine scissura aliqua vestimentis ademptis ac pectoris pedumque vinculis dissolutis, monilibus etiam annulisque discussis illeso corpore nuda iacuit; equus quoque eius pari modo frenis et cingulis peremptus iacuit dissolutis.</p>
70	Or.5.16.17-19, 21	<p><b>Mulieres graviorem pene excitavere pugnam, quae plaustris in modum castrorum circumstructis, ipsae autem desuper propugnantes, diu repulere Romanos. Sed cum ab his novo caedis genere terrerentur (abscissis enim cum crine verticibus, inhonesto satis vulnere turpes relinquebantur) ferrum quod in hostes sumpserant, in se suosque verterunt. Namque aliae concursu mutuo jugulatae, aliae apprehensis invicem faucibus strangulatae, aliae funibus per equorum crura consertis</b>, ipsisque continuo equis extimulatis, postquam suas iisdem funibus, quibus equorum crura nexuerant, indidere cervices, <b>protractae</b> atque</p>	72 l.6-20	<p>ab eorum mulieribus graviorem poene quam ab ipsis pugnam Romani experti sunt; hae etenim plaustris in modum castrorum dispositis ipsae desuper propugnantes diu obstitere Romanis. sed cum ab eis novo caedis genere terrerentur, abscissis enim cum crine verticibus inhonesto satis vulnere turpes relinquebantur, ferrum, quod in hostes sumpserant, in se suosque verterunt. namque aliae concursu mutuo iugulatae, aliae adprehensis invicem faucibus strangulatae aliae funibus ad sua colla ligatis equorumque cruribus protractae interierunt, aliae laqueo de subrectis plaustrorum temonibus</p>

		<p>exanimatae sunt, <b>aliae laqueo de subrectis plaustrorum temonibus pependerit.</b> Inventa est etiam quaedam, <b>quae duos filios, trajectis per colla eorum laqueis, ad suos pedes vinxerit:</b> et cum se ipsam suspendio morituram dimisisset, secum traxerit occidendos.</p> <p><b>Ita in his duobus praeliis trecenta quadraginta millia Gallorum occisa, et centum quadraginta millia capta sunt, absque innumera mulierum multitudine, quae se suosque parvulos femineo furore, vi autem virili necaverunt.</b></p>		<p>pependerit; quaedam dum se suspenderet, duos filios traiecit per colla eorum laqueis ad suos pedes vinxit. ita his duobus proeliis .cccxl. milia Gallorum occisa, .cxl. milia capta sunt absque innumera multitudine mulierum, quae femineo furore se suosque parvulos necaverunt.</p>
71	Or.5.18.3-5	<p>Eo accessit, ut moestam Urbem <b>prodigia dira terrerent. Nam sub ortu solis globus ignis a regione septentrionis cum maximo coeli fragore emicuit. Apud Arretinos cum panes per convivia frangerentur, cruor e mediis panibus, quasi e vulneribus corporum fluxit.</b> Praeterea <b>per septem continuos dies grando lapidum, immixtis etiam testarum fragmentis, terram latissime verberavit. In Samnitibus vastissimo hiatu terrae, flamma prorupit, et usque in coelum extendi visa est.</b></p>	73/74 l.18-4	<p>dira prodigia visa sunt: nam sub ortu solis globus ignis a regione septentrionis cum maximo caeli fragore emicuit; apud Arretinos in convivio cruor e panibus quasi e vulneribus corporum fluxit; per septem continuos dies grando lapidum inmixtis etiam testarum fragmentis terram latissime verberavit; in Samnitibus e vastissimo terrae hiatu flamma prorupit et usque in caelum extendi visa est.</p>
72	Or.5.18.9	<p>Continuo atrocissimam perniciem infamissima praecessere prodigia. Namque <b>omnium generum animalia</b>, quae manus hominum blande perpeti, <b>atque inter homines vivere solita erant, relictis stabulis pascuisque, cum balatu, hinnitu, mugituque miserabili,</b></p>	74 l.5-9	<p>omnium generum animalia, quae inter homines vivere solita erant, relictis stabulis pascuisque cum balatu, hinnitu mugituque miserabili ad silvas montesque fugerunt; canes quoque, quorum natura est extra homines esse non posse, lacrimosis ululatus vagi</p>

		ad sylvas montesque fugerunt. Canes quoque, quorum naturae est extra homines esse non posse, lacrimosis ululatibus vagi luporum ritu oberrarunt.		luporum ritu oberrarunt
73	Or.5.20.9	Sulla deinde cum Lamponio Samnitium duce, et Carrinatis reliquis copiis, ante ipsam Urbem portamque Collinam ad horam diei nonam signa contulit, gravissimoque praelio tandem vicit; octoginta millia hominum ibi fusa dicuntur, duodecim millia sese dederunt: reliquam multitudinem in fugam versam, insatiabilis victorum civium ira consumpsit.	77 l.7-9	Sylla deinde cum Campanie Samnitium duce et reliquis copiis ad portam Collinam signa contulit, octoginta millia hominum occidit.
74	Or.5.21.1-2	Sulla mox atque Urbem victor intravit, tria millia hominum qui se per legatos dederant, contra fas contraque fidem datam inermes securosque interfecit. <i>Plurimi tunc quoque, ut non dicam innocentes, sed etiam ipsius Sullanae partis occisi sunt, quos fuisse plus quam novem millia ferunt. Ita liberae per Urbem caedes, percussoribus passim vagantibus, ut quemque vel ira vel praeda sollicitabat, agitabantur. Igitur cunctis jam quod singuli timebant aperte frementibus, Q. Catulus palam Sullae dixit: "Cum quibus tandem victuri sumus, si in bello armatos, in pace inermes occidimus?"</i>	77 l.9-13	tria milia hominum contra fidem datam inermes peremit cumque magna crudelitate adversus sontes insontesque seviret, Quintus Catulus palam Syllae dixit: "Cum quibus tandem victuri sumus, si in bello armatos, in pace inermes occidimus?"
75	Or.5.21.7	M. Marium siquidem, de caprili casa extractum, vinciri Sulla iussit; ductumque trans Tiberim ad Lutatorum sepulcrum, effossis oculis, membrisque minutatim desectis, vel etiam fractis, trucidari.	77 l.13-16	Sylla dehinc Marcomarium de caprili casa extractum vinciri iussit ductumque trans Tiberim effossis oculis, membris minutatim exsectis vel fractis trucidari.



76	Or.5.22.16-17	Igitur, <b>Sulla mortuo, Lepidus, Marianae partis assertor, adversus Catulum Sullanum ducem surgens, redivivos bellorum</b> civilium <b>cineres suscitavit. Bis tunc acie certatum est. Plurimi Romanorum</b> , jam ipsa paucitate miserorum, et adhuc illo furore insanientium, <b>caesi sunt. Albanorum civitas</b> , obsidione oppugnata atque excruciatam fame ultima, miserabilium reliquiarum deditio servata est. Ubi tunc <b>Scipio, Lepidi filius, captus atque occisus est. Brutus in Cisalpinam Galliam fugiens</b> , persequente Pompeio, <b>apud Rhegium interfectus est.</b>	78/79 l.21-5	Sylla mortuo Lepidus Marianae partis adversus Catulum Syllanum ducem consurgens bellum reparavit; bis tunc acie certatum est, plurimi Romanorum extincti. Albanorum civitas, pro eo quod illuc Scipio Lepidi filius confugisset expugnata et capta est. Brutus in Cisalpinam Galliam fugiens apud Regium interfectus est.
77	Or.5.24.1-2	Anno ab Urbe condita sexcentesimo LXXIX, Lucullo et Cassio consulibus, gladiatores septuaginta et quatuor Capuae a ludo Cn. Lentuli diffugerunt: qui continuo, ducibus Crixo et Oenomaos Gallis, et Spartaco Thrace, <b>Vesuvium montem occupaverunt; unde erumpentes, Clodii praetoris, qui eos obsidione cinxerat, castra expugnaverunt: ipsoque in fugam acto, cuncta in praedam verterunt. Inde per Consentiam et Metapontum circumducti, ingentia brevi agmina collegerunt.</b> Nam Crixo decem millium multitudo, Spartaco autem triplex tunc numerus fuisse refertur. Oenomaos enim jam in superiore bello fuerat occisus.	82/83 l.18-2	Vesubium montem occupaverunt; unde erumpentes Clodii praetoris, qui eos obsidione cinxerat, castra expugnaverunt ipsoque in fugam acto cuncta in praedam averterunt. inde per Consentiam et Metapontum circumducti ingentia brevi agmina colligerunt
78	Or.5.24.3	<b>Itaque cum caedibus, incendiis, rapinis, stuprisque omnia miscerent, in exsequiis captivae matronae, quae se dolore violati pudoris necaverat,</b> munus gladiatorum ex quadringentis captivis, scilicet, qui	83 l.3-5	itaque cum caedibus, incendiis, rapinis stuprisque omnia miscerent multaeque se matronae ob dolorem pudoris violati necassent

		spectandi fuerant, spectaturi, utpote lanistae, gladiatorum potius quam militum principes, ediderunt.		
79	Or.5.23.17-18	Interea Macedonicum bellum Claudius sortitus, varias <b>gentes, quae Rhodopaeis montibus circumfusae sunt</b> , ac tunc Macedoniam crudelissime populabantur (nam inter <b>caetera dictu audituque horrida, quae in captivos agebant, raptis, cum poculo opus esset, humanorum capitum ossibus, cruentis capillatisque adhuc, ac per interiores cavernas male effosso cerebro oblitis, avide ac sine horrore tamquam veris poculis utebantur</b> , quarum cruentissimi atque immanissimi Scordisci erant)	85 l.2-7	gentes quae Rodopeis montibus circumfusae coetera dictu audituque horrida quae in captivos agebant, raptis, cum poculo opus esset, humanorum capitum ossibus cruentis capillatisque adhuc ac per interiores cavernas male effosso cerebro oblitis avide ac sine orrore tamquam veris poculis utebantur.
80	Or.6.5.3-6	Mithridates, accensus ira, in scelera exarsit. Nam <b>complures tunc amicos suos, et Exipodram filium suum</b> interfecit, cum antea jam alium, <b>Macharem nomine</b> , parricidio <b>trucidasset: Pharnaces, alter filius ejus, exemplo fratrum territus, exercitum, ad persequendum se missum, sibi conciliavit, et mox adversus patrem duxit. Mithridates, diu ex altissimo muro filium frustra precatus, ubi inexorabilem vidit, moriturus exclamasse fertur: "Quoniam Pharnaces," inquit, "mori iubet, vos, si estis, dii patrii, precor, ut quandoque et ipse hanc vocem a liberis suis audiat." Statimque descendens ad uxores, pellices ac filias suas, venenum omnibus dedit. Quod cum ipse novissimus hausisset, nec tamen, propter remedia, quibus vitalia sua adversus noxios succos saepe obstruxerat, veneno confici posset, frustra</b>	86 l.7-19	complures amicos suos nec non Exipodram Magareque filios suos trucidasset, Farnaces alter filius eius exemplo fratrum territus exercitum ad persequendum se missum sibi conciliavit et mox io adversus patrem duxit. Mitridates diu ex altissimo muro filium frustra praecatus W, ubi inexorabilem vidit, ita fertur exclamasse "Quoniam Farnaces", inquit, "mori iubet, vos, si estis dii patrii, praecor, ut quandocumque hanc vocem ipse audiat a liberis suis," statimque descendens ad uxores, pelices ac filias suas venenum omnibus dedit ; quod cum ipse novissimus hausisset nec tamen propter remedia quibus se praemunierat, veneno confici possit Gallum quendam militem invitavit eique iugulum praebuit.

		spatiaretur, si quo tandem modo infusa pestis per venas vegetatione corporis acta discurreret, <b>Gallum quemdam militem</b> , jam fracto muro discurrentem, <b>invitavit, eique jugulum praebuit.</b>		
81	Or.6.6.3	Id <b>non solum natura loci, verum etiam ingenti muro, fossaque maxima munitum, cum alias aliis legiones, dies noctesque succedere sine requie cogeret, vix tertio mense expugnavit.</b> Tredecim ibi millia Judaeorum caesa narrantur, caetera multitudo in fidem venit.	88 l.3-6	non solum natura loci verum etiam ingenti muro fossaque maxima munitam. cum alias aliis legiones die nocteque succedere sine requie cogeret, vix tertio mense expugnavit .XIII. milibus Iudaeorum occisis, coeteris in fidem acceptis,
82	Or.6.6.4	Pompeius <b>muros civitatis, everti aequarique solo imperavit: et cum aliquantos principes Judaeorum securi percussisset, Hyrcanum sacerdotio restituit, Aristobulum captivum Romam duxit. Hoc bellum Orientis cum viginti et duobus regibus sese gessisse ipse Pompeius pro concione narravit.</b>	88 l.7-12	muros civitatis everti aequarique solo imperavit, cuius circuitus quattuor milium passuum dicitur fuisse. cumque aliquantos principes Iudaeorum securi percussisset, Hyrcano sacerdotium restituit, Aristobolum captivum Romam duxit. hoc bellum Orientis cum viginti et duobus regibus sese gessisse ipse Pompeius narravit.
83	Or.6.7.5-16	Quos cum apud Rhodanum flumen obvios Caesar habuisset, magno difficilique bello bis vicit, victosque ad deditionem coegit. Horum fuit, cum primum progressa est, omnis multitudo <b>Helvetiorum, Tulingorum, Latobrogiorum, Rauracorum et Boiorum</b> , utriusque sexus ad centum quinquaginta et septem millia hominum. <b>Ex his quadraginta et septem millia in bello ceciderunt: caetera in terras proprias remissa sunt. Postea Caesar Ariovistum regem</b> , excitantem invehentemque secum incredibiles Germanorum	89/90 l.14-12	Helvities, Tulingos, Latobolos, Rauracos et Boios, ex quibus .XLVII. milia perempta sunt, coetera diffugerunt. dein Ariovistum regem, cui auxiliabantur Arudes, Marcomones, Triboci, Wangiones, Nemetes, Eduses et Suebi, fugere compulit duasque uxores eius totidemque filias coepit omnemque exercitum per quinquaginta milia passuum insatiabiliter cecidit. post haec gentem Belgarum cui adhaeserant Bellovagus cum sexaginta milibus armatorum, Suessones cum quinquaginta milibus, Nervii praeterea, quorum adeo

	<p>copias, quibus nuper universos Galliarum populos se subegisse jactabat, apud Sequanos vicit; cum diu exercitus Caesaris, Germanorum multitudine et virtute perterritus, pugnam detrectasset. Ariovistus in Germaniam, arrepta navicula Rhenum transvectus, <b>effugit, uxores ejus duae totidemque filiae captae sunt. Fuerunt autem in exercitu Ariovisti, Arudes, Marcomani, Triboci, Vangiones, Nemetes, Edures, et Suevi.</b> Pugna maxime gravis ex phalange Germanorum fuit, quam coacto in unum agmine, scutisque supra capita contextis, ad irrumpendam Romanorum aciem tuti undique praestruxerant. Sed postquam aliqui Romanorum militum, agilitate audaciaque insignes, supra obductam saliere testudinem, scutisque singillatim, velut squammis revulsis, desuper nudos deprehensorum detectorumque humeros perfoderunt, territi hostes novo mortis periculo, terribilem dissolvere compagem. <b>Exinde in fugam versi, per quinquaginta millia passuum insatiabiliter caesi sunt,</b> neque conjici potuit numerus Germanorum, vel quantus pugnae adfuerit, vel quantus fuerit occisorum. <b>Post haec Belgarum gens,</b> quae tertia pars Galliarum est, adversus Caesarem exarsit. Quorum distributim copia haec fuit. <b>Bellovaci,</b> qui caeteris numero et virtute praestare viderentur, <b>habuere lectissima sexaginta millia armatorum;</b> <b>Suessiones</b> ex duodecim oppidis <b>quinquaginta millia;</b> <b>Nervii, quorum adeo indomita feritas</b> praedicabatur, <b>ut numquam in id temporis mercatores ad se admiserint</b> vina caeteraque venalia</p>	<p>indomita feritas erat ut numquam ad se mercatores accedere sinerent, hi nihilominus quinquaginta milia armatorum habentes, Atrepates et Ambiani, Menappi, Caleti, Velocases, Velomandi, Atuatici, Condurses, Eburones, Cerosi, Cemani, qui uno nomine Germani vocantur, quorum omnium cum his, quos supra diximus, ducenta septuaginta duo milia fuisse referuntur. hi cum repente e silvis erumpentes exercitum Caesaris perterritum in fugam vertissent, tandem hortatu Caesaris exercitus restitit eosque usque ad internitionem poene delevit.</p> <p>post haec gentem Belgarum cui adhaeserant Bellovagai cum sexaginta milibus armatorum, Suessiones cum quinquaginta milibus, Nervii praeterea, quorum adeo indomita feritas erat ut numquam ad se mercatores accedere sinerent, hi nihilominus quinquaginta milia armatorum habentes, Atrepates et Ambiani, Menappi, Caleti, Velocases, Velomandi, Atuatici, Condurses, Eburones, Cerosi, Cemani, qui uno nomine Germani vocantur, quorum</p>
--	---	--

		<p>deferre, quibus inducta jucunditas torporem virtutis afferret, <b>habuerunt similiter quinquaginta millia: Atrebates et Ambiani</b> decem millia, Morini viginti quinque millia, <b>Menapii</b> novem millia, <b>Caleti</b> decem millia, <b>Velocasses</b> et <b>Veromandui</b> aequae decem millia, <b>Aduatici</b> octodecim millia: <b>Condrusi, Eburones, Caeresi, Caemani, qui uno nomine Germani vocantur,</b> quadraginta millia. <b>Et ita fuisse referuntur ducenta septuaginta et duo millia armatorum lectissima. His repente silva erumpentibus, exercitus Caesaris perturbatus atque in fugam actus, plurimis suorum amissis, tandem hortatu ducis restitit, victoresque aggressus, usque ad internicionem pene delevit.</b></p>		<p>omnium cum his, quos supra diximus, ducenta septuaginta duo milia fuisse referuntur. hi cum repente e silvis erumpentes exercitum Caesaris perterritum in fugam vertissent, tandem hortatu Caesaris exercitus restitit eosque usque ad internicionem pene delevit.</p>
84	Or.6.8.18-19, 22-23 and Or.6.9.1	<p>lisdem diebus <b>Titurius Sabinus Aulercos, Eburonices, Lexoviosque,</b> qui primates suos, cur auctores belli resuscitandi esse nollent, interfecerant, eruptione facta, <b>incredibili caede delevit. Publius vero Crassus</b> cum in Aquitaniam pervenisset, bello exceptus est. Namque Sontiates magno equitatu pedestribusque copiis praevalidis Romanos adorti, diu graviter turbaverunt</p> <p>Hi omnes dum obsidionem Crasso parant, in castris suis, Crasso obruente, deleti sunt. Nam <b>ex Aquitanis et Cantabris,</b> quorum quinquaginta millia tunc in auxilium venerant, <b>triginta et octo millia caesa referuntur. Caesar Germanos, qui Rhenum</b> cum immensis copiis <b>transmiserant, simul et totas Gallias subicere sibi</b></p>	90/91 l.12-1	<p>Titurius Albinus legatus Caesaris Alvercos Ebuovices Lixoviosque incredibili caede delevit. Publius Crassus alter legatus ex Aquitanis et Cantabris triginta et octo milia interfecit. Caesar rursus Germanos, qui Renum transierant et totas Gallias sibi subicere parabant, bello adhortus usque ad internicionem cecidit, quorum feruntur quadringenta quadraginta milia fuisse; deinde facto ponte Renum transgressus, Suevos maximam et ferocissimam gentem, quarum esse centum pagos multi prodidere totamque Germaniam perterrituit, mox in Galliam se recepit</p>

		<p>parabant, bello adortus usque ad interneccionem cecidit. Quorum fuisse numerum ad CCCCXL millia ferunt.</p> <p>Tunc Caesar in Germaniam <b>facto ponte transgreditur</b>, Sicambros et Ubios obsidione liberat. <b>Suevos, maximam et ferocissimam gentem, quorum esse centum pagos et populos, multi prodidere, totamque Germaniam adventu suo terret: mox in Galliam, rescisso ponte, concedit</b></p>		
85	Or.6.15.1	<p>Nam rediens Caesar victor ex Gallia, decerni sibi absentibus alterum consulatum poposcit. Contradictum est a Marcello consule, adnitente Pompeio, deinde decretum est a senatu, ut in Urbem Caesar non nisi dimisso exercitu veniret, <b>et ex Marcelli consulis auctoritate ad legiones, quae apud Luceriam erant, Pompeius cum imperio missus est.</b></p>	92 l.3-5	<p>et ex Marcelli consulis auctoritate ad legiones, quae apud Luceriam erant, Pompeius cum imperio missus est.</p>
86	Or.6.15.26	<p>Prima congressione equitatus Pompeii pulsus, sinistra latera nudavit. <b>Deinde cum diu utrimque dubia sorte caederentur, atque ex alia parte Pompeius inter hortandum diceret: "Parce civibus," nec tamen faceret; ex alia vero Caesar hoc faceret, quod urgeret, dicens: "Miles, faciem feri," tandem universus Pompeii fugit exercitus, castraque direpta sunt.</b></p>	93 l.4-8	<p>cumque diu utrimque dubia sorte cederentur atque ex alia parte Pompeius inter hortandum diceret: "Parce civibus", nec tamen faceret, ex alia vero Caesar hoc faceret quod urgeret, dicens: "Miles, faciem feri," tandem universus Pompeii fugit exercitus</p>
87	Or.6.15.34 and	<b>Caesar vi insistentium hostium pressus, scapham</b>	93/94 l.16-	Caesar vi insistentium hostium pressus scapham

	Or.6.16.1-2	<p><b>ascendit; qua mox pondere subsequantium gravata ac mersa, per CC passus ad navem una manu elevata, qua chartas tenebat, natando pervenit, mox navali certamine pulsatus, magna felicitate classem regiam aut depressit aut cepit.</b></p> <p><b>Alexandrinis petentibus regem reddidit, monitum, ut magis amicitiam Romanam, quam arma experiri studeret. Qui tamen illico ut liber fuit, bellum intulit, sed continuo cum toto exercitu suo et ipse deletus est. Nam viginti millia hominum in eo bello caesa referuntur, duodecim millia cum septuaginta longis navibus dedita, quingenti ex victoribus cecidisse dicuntur. Rex ipse adolescens scapha exceptus ut fugeret, multis insilentibus mersus, necatusque est. Corpus ejus ad littus devolutum, indicio loricae aureae cognitum fuit.</b> Qua Caesar Alexandriam praemissa, Alexandrinos omnes ad deditonem desperatione compulit, regnumque Aegypti Cleopatrae dedit.</p>	8	ascendit qua mox pondere subsequantium gravata ac mersa per ducentos passus ad navem una manu elevata, qua chartas tenebat, natando pervenit. mox navali certamine pulsatus magna facilitate classem regiam aut depressit aut coepit. Alexandrinis petentibus regem reddidit, monitum ut amicitiam magis Romanam quam arma experiri studeret; qui tamen, illico ut liber fuit, bellum intulit, sed continuo cum toto exercitu suo et ipse deletus est; nam viginti milia hominum in eo bello caesa referuntur; duodecim milia cum septuaginta longis navibus dedita, quingenti ex victoribus cecidisse dicuntur. rex ipse adolescens scapha exceptus, ut fugeret, multis insilentibus mersus necatusque est, corpus eius ad litus devolutum indicio loricae aureae cognitum fuit
88	Or.6.16.6	Inde <b>quattuor triumphis</b> Urbem <b>ingressus</b> , disposito recuperatae reip. statu; continuo in Hispanias contra Pompeios Pompeii filios profectus, septimo decimo quam egressus ab Urbe fuerat die, Saguntum pervenit, statimque adversus Pompeios duos, et Labienum atque Attium Varum, multa bella et varia sorte gessit.	95 l.4-5	quattuor triumphis ingressus
89	Or.6.18.3	Antonius a senatu hostis pronuntiatus, D. Brutum <b>ad</b>	97 l.13	apud Mutinam

		<b>Mutinam</b> obsidione concluderat. Consules Hirtius et Pansa, et cum his Caesar, ad liberandum Brutum, expugnandumque Antonium missi.		
90	Or.6.20.1-2	Anno ab Urbe condita DCCXXV, ipso imperatore Caesare Augusto quinquies, et L. Apuleio consulibus, <b>Caesar Victor ab Oriente rediens</b> , octavo idus Januarias <b>urbem triplici triumpho ingressus est</b> : ac tum primum ipse Jani portas, sopitis finitisque omnibus bellis civilibus, clausit. Hoc die <b>primum Augustus consalutatus est</b> . Quod nomen cunctis antea inviolatum, et usque ad nunc caeteris inausum dominis, tantum orbis licite usurpatum, apicem declarat imperii: atque <b>ex eodem die summa rerum ac potestatum penes unum esse coepit et mansit, quod Graeci monarchiam vocant</b> .	100 l.12-15	cum de Oriente victor reversus esset. Urbemque triplici triumpho ingressus esset tunc primum Augustus, eo quod rempublicam auxerit consalutatus est atque ex tunc summam rerum potestatem, quam Graeci monarchiam vocant, adeptus est
91	Or.6.18.34	Ovans Urbem ingressus, ut in perpetuum tribunitiae potestatis esset, a senatu decretum est. <b>His diebus trans Tiberim e taberna meritoria fons olei terra exundavit, ac per totum diem largissimo rivo fluxit</b> .	100 l.16-17	his diebus trans Tiberim de taberna meritoria fons olei e terra exundavit ac per totum diem largissimo rivo fluxit
92	Or.6.20.5	Nam cum primum, Caio Caesare avunculo suo interfecto, ex Apollonia rediens Urbem ingrederetur, hora circiter tertia repente, liquido ac puro sereno <b>circulus ad speciem coelestis arcus orbem solis ambiit</b> , quasi eum unum ac potentissimum in hoc mundo solumque clarissimum in orbe monstraret, cujus tempore venturus esset, qui ipsum solem solus, mundumque totum et fecisset et regeret.	100 l.18-19	circulus ad speciem caelestis arcus circa solem apparuit



93	Or.6.22.5	<p><b>Igitur eo tempore, id est eo anno quo firmissimam verissimamque pacem</b> ordinatione Dei <b>Caesar composuit</b>, natus est Christus, cujus adventui pax ista famulata est, in cuius ortu audientibus hominibus exsultantes angeli cecinerunt: Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis. Eodemque tempore hic, ad quem rerum omnium summa concesserat, dominum se hominum appellari non passus est; immo non ausus, quo verus dominus totius generis humani inter homines natus est.</p>	100/101 l.19-2	igitur cum quadragesimo secundo anno firmissimam verissimamque pacem Caesar composuisset
94	Or.6.22.5	<p>Igitur eo tempore, id est eo anno quo firmissimam verissimamque pacem ordinatione Dei Caesar composuit, natus est Christus, <b>cujus adventui pax ista famulata est</b>, in cuius ortu audientibus hominibus exsultantes angeli cecinerunt: Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis. Eodemque tempore hic, ad quem rerum omnium summa concesserat, dominum se hominum appellari non passus est; immo non ausus, quo verus dominus totius generis humani inter homines natus est.</p>	101 l.2-3	cuius adventui pax ista famulata est.
95	Or.7.24.2	<p>Anno ab Urbe condita MXXXIII, Probus, trigesimus primus regnum sortitus, obtinuit annis sex et <b>mensibus quatuor</b>. Gallias jamdudum a Barbaris occupatas per multa et gravia praelia, deletis tandem hostibus, ad perfectum liberavit.</p>	133 l.10-11	menses quattuor
96	Or.7.32.1	<p><b>Anno ab Urbe condita MCXVIII, Valentinianus, octavus et trigesimus</b>, apud Nicaeam consensu militum</p>	151 l.2-3	Anno ab Urbe condita millesimo centesimo octavo

		imperator creatus est, mansitque in eo annis undecim		decimo Valentinianus tricesimus octavus
97	Or.7.32.2-4, 8	<p><b>qui cum Christianus integra fide sacramentum militiae gereret, et sub Juliano Augusto tribunus scutariorum, jussus ab imperatore sacrilego aut immolare idolis, aut militia excedere, fideliter sciens et graviora Dei esse judicia, et meliora promissa, sponte discessit.</b> Ita, parva interjecta <b>mora, Juliano interfecto, ac mox Joviano mortuo, qui pro nomine Christi amiserat tribunatum, retribuente Christo, in locum persecutoris sui accepit imperium:</b> qui postea <b>fratrem</b> suum <b>Valentem</b> participem fecit imperii, et Procopium tyrannum pluresque postea satellites ejus occidit.</p> <p>Horum <b>anno imperii tertio</b>, Gratianus Valentiniani filius, imperator est factus. Eodem anno apud Atrebatas vera lana de nubibus pluviae mixta defluxit.</p>	151 l.11-17	qui cum sub Iuliano Augusto christianitatis integram fidem generet, cum, ut dictum est, scutariorum tribunus esset, iussus ab imperatore sacrilego aut immolare idolis aut militia excedere, sponte discessit; nec mora Iuliano interfecto Iovianoque mortuo, qui pro nomine Christi amiserat tribunatum, in locum persecutoris sui accepit imperium. qui cum iam anno tertio imperii cum Valente fratre ageret
98	Or.7.32.8	Horum anno imperii tertio, Gratianus Valentiniani filius, imperator est factus. <b>Eodem anno apud Atrebatas vera lana de nubibus pluviae mixta defluxit.</b>	152 l.3-4	Eodem anno apud Atrebatas vera lana de nubibus pluviae mixta defluxit
99	Oros.7.32.4-5	qui postea fratrem suum Valentem participem fecit imperii, et <b>Procopium tyrannum</b> pluresque postea satellites ejus occidit. <b>Terraemotus per totum orbem factus, ita</b> turbatum quoque pelagus excussit, <b>ut</b> per vicinas terrarum campestrium partes refuso mari, <b>plurimae insularum urbes, concussae et subrutae,</b>	152 l.5-11	Procopius apud Constantinopolim tyrannidem invadens apud Frigiam Salutarem extinctus est plurimique eius partis caesi atque proscripti sunt. circa haec tempora terraemotu per totum orbem facto ita mare litus egressum est ut Siciliae multarumque insularum urbes concussae et subrutae innumerabiles

		periisse referantur.		populos ruinis oppresserint
100	Or.7.32.6, 9-13	<p><b>Valens ab Eudoxio episcopo, Ariani dogmatis assertore, et baptizatus et persuasus, in saevissimam haeresim declinavit: sed malignam insectationem diu textit, nec voluntati potestatem admiscuit, quoad viventis fratris auctoritate compressus est.</b></p> <p><b>Praeterea Athanaricus, rex Gothorum, Christianos in gente sua crudelissime persecutus, plurimos barbarorum ob fidem interfectos, ad coronam martyrii sublimavit,</b> quorum tamen plurimi in Romanum solum non trepidi, velut ad hostes, sed certi, quod ad fratres, pro Christi confessione, fugerunt. <b>Valentinianus Saxones, gentem in Oceani littoribus et paludibus inviis sitam, virtute atque agilitate terribilem, periculosam Romanis finibus, eruptionem magna mole meditates, in ipsis Francorum finibus oppressit. Burgundionum quoque, novorum hostium, novum nomen, qui plusquam octoginta millia (ut ferunt) armatorum, ripae Rheni fluminis insederunt.</b> Hos quondam subacta interiore Germania, a Druso et Tiberio, adoptivis filiis Caesaris, per castra dispositos, in magnam coaluisse gentem: atque ita etiam nomen ex opere praesumpsisse, quia crebra per litem habitacula constituta, Burgos vulgo vocant: eorumque esse praevalidam et perniciosam manum, Galliae hodieque testes sunt, in quibus praesumpta</p>	152/153 l.12-6	<p>Valens interea ab Eodoxio Arrianae hereseos episcopo baptizatus in saevissimam heresim dilapsus est conatusque catholicos persequi fratris auctoritate compressus est. ea tempestate Athanaricus rex Gothorum Christianos in gente sua crudelis sime persecutus ad coronam martyrii sublimavit.</p> <p>Valentinianus Saxones gentem in oceani litoribus et paludibus inviis sitam virtute atque agilitate terribilem, Romanis</p> <p>finibus eruptionem meditantem, in Francorum finibus oppressit. Burgundionum quoque plus quam octoginta milia armatorum ripae Rheni fluminis insederunt, qui tamen non multo post tempore Christiani effecti sunt.</p>

		possessione consistunt, <i>quamvis providentia Dei omnes Christiani modo facti, catholica fide, nostrisque clericis quibus obedirent receptis, blande, mansuete, innocenterque vivant, non quasi cum subjectis Gallis, sed vere cum fratribus Christianis.</i>		
101	Or.7.32.14	<b>Anno autem undecimo imperii sui, Valentinianus, cum Sarmatae sese per Pannonias diffudissent, easque vastarent, bellum in eos parans, apud Brigitionem oppidum</b> subita effusione sanguinis, quod Graece apoplexis vocatur, suffocatus et mortuus est.	153 l.8-10	Valentinianus vero anno imperii sui undecimo, cum Sarmatae sese per Pannonias diffudissent easque vastarent, bellum in eos parans, dum apud Brigitionem oppidum
102	Or.7.32.14	Anno autem undecimo imperii sui, Valentinianus, cum Sarmatae sese per Pannonias diffudissent, easque vastarent, bellum in eos parans, apud Brigitionem oppidum <b>subita effusione sanguinis, quod Graece apoplexis vocatur</b> , suffocatus et mortuus est.	153 l.11-12	subita effusione sanguinis, quae grece apoplexis vocatur
103	Or.7.32.15 and Or.7.33.1	Post quem <b>Gratianus, filius ejus, Occidentis imperium tenuit.</b> Valente patruo in <b>Orientis</b> partibus constituto, <b>Valentinianum</b> etiam, <b>fratrem suum, parvum admodum, socium creavit imperii.</b>  <b>Anno ab Urbe condita MCXXVIII, Valens, nonus et trigesimus, imperium quatuor annis Valentiniano mortuo tenuit</b> , cui soli, cum impie ageret, et potuisset erubescere, illico velut effrenata libertatis audacia legem dedit: ut monachi, hoc est, Christiani, qui ad	154 l.9-13	Anno ab Urbe condita millesimo centesimo vicesimo octavo Valens tricesimus nonus imperium Orientis quattuor annis Valentiniano mortuo tenuit, Gratiano Valentiniani filio in Occidentali parte regnante, qui sibi Valentinianum fratrem parvulum admodum socium creavit imperii.

		unum fidei opus, dimissa saecularium rerum multimoda actione, se redigunt, ad militiam cogerentur.		
104	Or.7.32.6 and Or.7.33.1-2	<p><i>Valens ab Eudoxio episcopo, Ariani dogmatis assertore, et baptizatus et persuasus, in saevissimam haeresim declinavit: sed malignam insectationem diu texit, nec voluntati potestatem admiscuit, quoad viventis fratris auctoritate compressus est.</i></p> <p>Anno ab Urbe condita MCXXVIII, Valens, nonus et trigesimus, imperium quatuor annis Valentiniano mortuo tenuit, cui soli, cum impie ageret, et potuisset erubescere, illico velut effrenata libertatis audacia legem dedit: <i>ut monachi, hoc est, Christiani, qui ad unum fidei opus, dimissa saecularium rerum multimoda actione, se redigunt, ad militiam cogerentur. Vastas illas tunc Aegypti solitudines</i>, arenasque diffusas, quas propter sitim ac sterilitatem periculosissimamque serpentum abundantiam conversatio humana non nosset, magna habitantium monachorum multitudo compleverat</p>	155 l.1-7	Valens igitur impietatem, quam dudum meditatus fuerat, operibus explens, lege data ut monachi militarent, nolentes per tribunos et milites fustibus iussit interfici; quorum innumera multitudo per vastas tunc Aegypti solitudines effusa praecipueque apud Nitriam martyrii consecuta est palmam. ac per singulas ubique provincias adversus catholicas ecclesias et rectae fidei populos diversa sunt inlata incommoda.
105	Or.7.33.5-7	<p><b>Interea in Africae partibus Firmus sese, excitatis Maurorum gentibus, regem constituens, Africam Mauritaniamque vastavit.</b> Caesaream, urbem nobilissimam Mauritaniae, dolo captam, deinde caedibus incendiisque completam, barbaris in praedam dedit. <b>Igitur comes Theodosius, Theodosii, qui post</b></p>	155 l.8-16	Interea in Africae partibus Firmus sese excitatis Maurorum gentibus regem constituens, Africam Mauritaniamque vastavit. contra quem Theodosius, Theodosii qui post imperio praefuit pater, a Valentiniano missus effusas Maurorum gentes multis proeliis fregit, ipsum Firmum afflictum et oppressum

		<p><b>imperio praefuit, pater, a Valentiniano missus, effusas Maurorum gentes multis praeliis fregit, ipsum Firmum afflictum et oppressum coegit ad mortem. Post cum experientissima providentia totam cum Mauritania Africam meliorem pristinis legibus reddidisset, instimulante et obrepente invidia, jussus interfici, apud Carthaginem baptizari in remissionem peccatorum praeoptavit:</b> ac postquam sacramentum Christi, quod quaesierat, assecutus est, <b>post gloriosam saeculi vitam,</b> etiam de vitae aeternitate securus, <b>percussori jugulum ultro praebuit.</b></p>		<p>ad mortem coegit; qui postquam experientissima providentia Africam composuisset, stimulante invidia iussus a Valente interfici, apud Carthaginem baptizari in remissionem peccatorum praeoptavit ac demum gloriosa morte occumbens percussori iugulum ultro praebuit.</p>
106	Or.7.33.10-12	<p>siquidem <b>gens Hunnorum, diu inaccessis seclusa montibus, repentina rabie percita, exarsit in Gothos: eosque sparsim conturbatos ab antiquis sedibus expulit. Gothi transito Danubio fugientes, a Valente sine ulla foederis pactione suscepti,</b> ne arma quidem, quo tutius barbaris crederetur, tradidere Romanis. <b>Deinde propter intolerabilem avaritiam Maximi ducis, fame et injuriis adacti, in arma surgentes, victo Valentis exercitu, per Thraciam sese miscentes, simul omnia caedibus, incendiis, rapinisque foedarunt. Valens egressus de Antiochia: cum ultima infelicis belli sorte traheretur, sera peccati maximi poenitentia stimulatus, episcopos caeterosque sanctos revocari de exsiliis imperavit.</b></p>	155/56 l.17-4	<p>gens Hunnorum diu inaccessis seclusa montibus repentina rabie percita exarsit in Gothos eosque conturbatos ab antiquis sedibus expulit. Gothi transito Danubio fugientes, a Valente sine ulla foederis pactione suscepti sunt. deinde propter intolerabilem avaritiam Maximi ducis fame compulsi in arma surgentes, victo Valentis exercitu, sese per Trachias infudere omnia caedibus incendiisque vastantes. quibus cognitis Valens Antiochia egressus, cum adversus Gothos exercitum aptaret, sera peccati poenitentia stimulatus episcopos ceterosque sanctos revocari de exiliis imperavit.</p>
107	Or.7.33.13-15	<p>Itaque decimo quinto imperii sui anno lacrymabile illud bellum in Thracia cum Gothis, jam tunc exercitatione</p>	156 l.5-10	<p>ad primum Gothorum impetum perturbatae Romanorum equitum turmae nudatos pedites</p>

		virium rerumque abundantia instructissimis, gessit. Ubi <b>primo statim impetu Gothorum perturbatae Romanorum equitum turmae, nuda peditum deseruere praesidia.</b> <i>Mox legiones peditum undique equitatu hostium cinctae, ac primum nubibus sagittarum obrutae, deinde, cum amentes metu sparsim per devia cogentur, funditus caesae, gladiis insequentium contisque perierunt. Ipse imperator, cum sagitta saucius, versusque in fugam, aegre in cujusdam villulae casam deportatus lateret, ab insequentibus hostibus deprehensus, subjecto igne, consumptus est: et quo magis testimonium punishmentis ejus et divinae indignationis terribili posteris esset exemplo, etiam communi caruit sepultura.</i>		deservere. qui mox equitatu hostium septi ac sagittarum nubibus obruti, cum amentes metu bue illucque fugitarent, funditus interiire. ipse imperator cum, sagitta saucius versusque
108	Or.7.33.19	<b>Gothi antea per legatos supplices poposcerunt, ut illis episcopi, a quibus regulam Christianae fidei discerent, mitterentur. Valens imperator exitiabili pravitate doctores Ariani dogmatis misit. Gothi primae fidei rudimentum quod accepere, tenuerunt. Itaque justo Dei iudicio ipsi eum vivum incenderunt, qui propter eum etiam mortui, vitio erroris arsurus sunt.</b>	156 l.13-17	petentibus Gothis ut eis episcopos mitteret, a quibus fidei rudimenta susciperent, Valens doctores ad eos Arriani dogmatis misit, sicque universa illa gens Arriana effecta est. insto itaque Dei iudicio ab illis igne crematus est, quos ipse perfidiae succenderat igni.
109	Or.7.34.1	<b>Anno ab Urbe condita, Gratianus, quadragesimus ab Augusto, post mortem Valentis sex annis imperium tenuit, quamvis iam dudum antea cum patruo Valente et cum Valentiniano fratre regnaret</b>	157 l.1-4	Anno ab Urbe condita millesimo centesimo tricesimo secundo Gratianus quadragesimus ab Augusto post mortem Valentis sex annis imperium tenuit, quamvis iam dudum antea cum patruo Valente et cum Valentiniano fratre regnaret

110	Or.7.33.8	<b>Gratianus</b> interea imperator, <b>admodum juvenis, cum inaestimabilem multitudinem hostium Romanis infusam finibus cerneret, fretus CHRISTI potentia, longe impari militum numero sese in hostem dedit, et continuo apud Argentariam, oppidum Galliarum, formidolosissimum bellum incredibili felicitate confecit: Nam plus quam triginta millia Alamannorum, minimo Romanorum detrimento in eo praelio interfecta narrantur.</b>	157 l.4-11	Gratianus admodum iuvenis cum inaestimabilem multitudinem hostium Romanis infusam finibus cerneret, fretus Christi potentia longe impari militum numero sese in hostem dedit et continuo apud Argentariam oppidum Galliarum formidolosissimum bellum incredibili felicitate confecit; nam plus quam triginta milia Alamannorum minimo Romanorum detrimento in eo proelio interfecta narrantur
111	Or.7.34.2	qui cum afflictum ac pene collapsum reipublicae statum videret, <b>eadem provisione, qua quondam legerat Nerva Hispanum virum Trajanum, per quem respublica reparata est</b> , legit et ipse Theodosium aequae Hispanum virum, et restituendae reipublicae necessitate apud Sirmium purpura induit, Orientisque et Thraciae simul praefecit imperio	158 l.6-8	eadem provisione qua quondam legerat Nerva Hispanum virum Traianum, per quem respublica reparata est
112	Or.7.34.5-7	<b>Itaque ut Theodosius afflictam Rempublicam ira Dei reparandam credidit misericordia illius, omnem fiduciam sui ad opem Christi conferens, maximas illas Scythicas gentes, formidatasque cunctis maioribus, Alexandro quoque illi Magno, sicut Pompeius Corneliusque testati sunt, evitatas, nunc autem, extincto Romano exercitu, Romanis equis armisque instructissimas, hoc est, Alanos, Hunnos et Gothos, incunctanter aggressus, magnis multisque praeliis vicit. Urbem Constantinopolim victor intravit: et ne parvam ipsam Romani exercitus manum assidue</b>	158/159 l.12-4	Itaque Theodosius afflictam rempublicam ira Dei reparandam credidit misericordia Dei; omnem fiduciam sui ad opem Christi conferens, maximas illas Scythicas gentes formidatasque cunctis maioribus, Alexandro quoque illi Magno evitatas, ac tunc extincto Romano exercitu Romanis equis armisque structissimas, hoc est Alanos, Hunnos et Gothos, incunctanter adgressus magnis multisque proeliis vicit. urbem Constantinopolim victor intravit et ne parvam ipsam Romani exercitus manum assidue bellando deterreret foedus cum Athanarico rege Gothorum



		<b>bellando detereret, foedus cum Athanarico, rege Gothorum, percussit. Athanaricus autem continuo ut Constantinopolim venit,</b> diem obiit. Universae Gothorum gentes, rege defuncto, aspicientes virtutem benignitatemque Theodosii, Romano sese imperio dederunt.		percussit. Athanaricus Constantinopolim ad Theodosium venit
113	Or.7.34.7?	Athanaricus autem continuo ut Constantinopolim <b>venit, diem obiit.</b> Universae Gothorum gentes, rege defuncto, aspicientes virtutem benignitatemque Theodosii, Romano sese imperio dederunt.	159 l.5-14	quem ille mira animi iocunditate et affectione suscepit. denique cum urbem Athanaricus intrasset et tam aedificia civitatis quamque exornati quasi ad diem festum populi frequentiam cerneret ac per singula mente inhaereret, cumque deinceps imperatoris regiam ingressus obsequia officiaque diversa conspiceret: "Sine dubio", inquit "deus terrenus est imperator, contra quem quicumque manum levare nisus fuerit, ipse sui sanguinis reus existit." <b>nec mora</b> tamen superveniente valitudine rebus excessit humanis; cuius exequias imperator ipse praecedens dignae eum tradidit sepulturae.
114	Or.7.34.7-9	Athanaricus autem continuo ut Constantinopolim venit, diem obiit. <b>Universae Gothorum gentes, rege defuncto, aspicientes virtutem benignitatemque Theodosii, Romano sese imperio dederunt. In iisdem etiam diebus</b> Persae, qui, Juliano interfecto, aliisque imperatoribus saepe victis, nunc etiam Valente in fugam acto, recentissimae victoriae satietatem cruda insultatione ructabant, <b>ultra Constantinopolim ad Theodosium misere legatos, pacemque supplices</b>	159/160 l.14-6	universae Gothorum gentes rege defuncto aspicientes virtutem benignitatemque Theodosii Romano sese imperio dederunt in hisdem etiam diebus Parthi coeteraque barbarae nationes Romano prius nomini inimicae ultro Constantinopolim ad Theodosium misere legatos pacemque supplices poposcerunt iunctumque cum eis foedus est.  Interea cum Theodosius in Oriente subactis barbarorum gentibus Trachias tandem liberab ab hoste

		<b>poposcerunt: ictumque tum foedus est</b> , quo universus Oriens usque ad nunc tranquillissime fruitur. <b>Interea cum Theodosius, in Oriente subactis barbarorum gentibus, Thracias tandem ab hoste liberas reddidisset, et Arcadium, filium suum, consortem fecisset imperii, Maximus, vir quidem strenuus et probus, atque Augusto dignus, nisi contra sacramenti fidem per tyrannidem emersisset, in Britannia invitus propemodum ab exercitu imperator creatus, in Galliam transiit</b>		reddidisset et Archadium filium suum consortem fecisset imperii, Maximus vir quidem strenuus et probus atque Augusto dignus, nisi contra sacramenti fidem per tyrannidem emersisset in Brittania invitus ab exercitu imperator creatus in Galliam transiit.
115	Or.7.34.10	ubi Gratianum Augustum <b>subita incursione perterritum, atque in Italiam transire meditantem, dolis circumventum interfecit, fratremque ejus Valentinianum Augustum Italia expulit. Valentinianus in Orientem refugiens, a Theodosio paterna pietate susceptus, mox etiam imperio restitutus est.</b>	160 l.11-17	Maximus ergo ab infensis Gratiano legionibus exceptus eundem subita incursione perterritum atque in Italiam transire meditantem dolis circumventum interfecit aetatis novem et viginti annos habentem fratremque eius Valentinianum Augustum Italia expulit. Valentinianus in Orientem refugiens a Theodosio paterna pietate susceptus mox etiam imperio restitutus est.
116	Or.7.35.1	<b>Anno ab Urbe condita MCXXXVIII, Theodosius</b> quadragesimus primus, interfecto per Maximum Gratiano, imperium Romani orbis solus obtinuit, mansitque in eo annis undecim, cum jam in Orientis partibus sex annis Gratiano vivente regnasset	162 l.2-3	Anno ab Urbe condita millesimo centesimo tricesimo octavo Theodosius
117	Or.7.33.6	<b>Igitur comes Theodosius, Theodosii</b> , qui post imperio praefuit, pater, a Valentiniano missus, effusas Maurorum gentes multis praeliis fregit, ipsum Firmum	162 l.3	genitus patre Theodosio, matre Termantia

		afflictum et oppressum coegit ad mortem.		
118	Or.7.35.1-4	Anno ab Urbe condita MCXXXVIII, Theodosius <b>quadragesimus primus, interfecto per Maximum Gratiano, imperium Romani orbis solus obtinuit, mansitque in eo annis undecim, cum jam in Orientis partibus sex annis Gratiano vivente regnasset. Itaque justis necessariisque causis ad bellum civile permotus, cum e duobus Augustis fratribus, et ultionem unius interfecti</b> sanguis exigeret, et <b>restitutionem</b> miseria <b>alterius exsulantis oraret, posuit in Deo spem suam, seseque adversus Maximum tyrannum, sola fide major (nam longe minor erat universa apparatus bellici comparatione) proripuit. Aquileiae tunc Maximus victoriae suae spectator insederat. Andragathius comes ejus summam belli administrabat: qui cum largissimis militum copiis,</b> ipsaque magnarum copiarum fortitudine, <b>praecellente consilio, omnes incredibiliter Alpium ac fluminum aditus communisset,</b> ineffabili iudicio Dei, <b>dum navali expeditione incautum hostem praevenire et obruere parat, sponte eadem, quae obstruxerat, claustra deseruit. Ita Theodosius nemine sentiente, ut non dicam repugnante, vacuas transmisit Alpes, atque Aquileiam improvisus adveniens, hostem illum magnum, Maximum trucem, et ab immanissimis quoque Germanorum gentibus tributa ac stipendia solo terrore nominis exigentem, sine dolo et sine controversia clausit, cepit, occidit</b>	162/163 l.3-5	quadragesimus primus imperatorum, interfecto per Maximum Gratiano imperium Romani orbis solus optinuit mansitque in eo annis undecim, cum iam in Orientis partibus sex annis Gratiano vivente regnasset. itaque iustis necessariisque causis ad bellum civile permotus, cum e duobus Augustis fratribus unius interfecti ultionem alterius restitutionem procuraret sese adversus Maximum tyrannum sola fide maior, nam longe minor universi apparatus bellici conparatione, proripuit. Aquileiae tunc Maximus insederat, Andragathius comes eius summam belli administrabat; qui cum largissimis militum copiis astuto consilio omnes Alpium ac fluminum aditus communisset, dum navali expeditione incautum hostem praevenire parat et obruere sponte eadem quae obstruxerat claustra deseruit.  Ita Theodosius nemine sentiente vacuasi Alpes intravit atque Aquileiam improvisus adveniens magnum hostem Maximum ac trucem et ab inmanissimis quoque Germanorum gentibus tributa ac stipendia solo terrore nominis exigentem sine controversia clausit, coepit, occidit.

119	Or.7.35.5	<b>Valentinianus, recepta Italia, potitus imperio est. Andragatius comes, cognita Maximi nece, praecipitem sese e navi in undas dedit, ac suffocatus est. Theodosius incruentam victoriam Deo procurante suscepit.</b>	163 l.6-9	Valentinianus recepto Italiae potitus imperio est; Andragatius comes cognita Maximi nece praecipitem sese e navi in undas dedit ac suffocatus est. Theodosius incruentam victoriam Deo procurante suscepit
120	Or.7.35.10-11	<b>Igitur Valentinianus junior, regno restitutus, extincto Maximo, ejusque filio Victore, quem imperatorem Gallis Maximus reliquerat, ipse in Galliam transivit: ubi cum tranquilla republica in pace ageret, apud Viennam dolo Arbogastis, comitis sui, ut ferunt, strangulatus, atque ut voluntariam sibi conscivisse mortem putaretur, laqueo suspensus est. Mortuo Valentiniano Augusto, Arbogastes Eugenium tyrannum mox creare ausus est, legitque hominem, cui titulum imperatoris imponeret, ipse acturus imperium: vir barbarus animo, consilio, manu, audacia, potentiaque nimius contraxit innumeras undique, invictasque copias, vel Romanorum praesidiis vel auxiliis barbarorum, alibi potestate, alibi cognatione subnixus.</b>	163 l.9-20	Victorem quoque Maximi filium, quem imperatorem pater Gallis infantili aetate reliquerat, extinxit.  Igitur Valentinianus iunior, cum in Galliamo transisset ibique tranquilla republica in pace ageret, apud Viennam dolo Arbogastis comitis sui strangulatus atque, ut voluntariam sibi conscivisse mortem putaretur, laqueo suspensus est; quo extincto Arbogastes tyrannum creavit Eugenium, eligens hominem cui titulum imperatoris imponeret, ipse aucturus imperium; vir barbarus animo, Consilio, manu, audacia potentiaque nimius, contraxit undique innumeras invictasque copias vel Romanorum praesidiis vel auxiliis barbarorum, aliis potestate, aliis cognatione subnixus
121	Or.7.35.12	Historiam notam etiam oculis plurimorum, quam melius qui spectavere noverunt, dilatari verbis non opus est. Potentia Dei, non fiducia hominis, victorem semper exstitisse Theodosium, Arbogastes iste praecipuum in utroque documentum est: qui et tunc, cum Theodosio paruit, tantis instructum praesidiis Maximum ipse minimus cepit: <i>et nunc, cum adversus eumdem Theodosium, collectis Gallorum Francorumque viribus,</i>	163 l.20-21	denique extabat genere Francus cultorque sordidissimus idolorum.

		<i>exundavit, nixus etiam praecipuo cultu idolorum, magna tamen facilitate succubuit.</i>		
122	Or.7.35.13-15	<b>Eugenius atque Arbogastes instructas acies</b> campis expedierant, arta <b>Alpium</b> latera atque inevitabiles <b>transitus</b> , praemissis callide insidiis, <b>occuparant</b> : ut, etiamsi numero ac viribus impares forent, sola tamen belli dispositione victores. At vero <b>Theodosius</b> in summis Alpibus constitutus, <b>expers cibi ac somni, sciens, quod destitutus suis, nesciens quod clausus alienis</b> , Dominum Christum solus solum qui posset omnia, corpore humi fusus, mente coelo fixus, orabat. <b>Dehinc postquam insomnem noctem precum continuatione transegit</b> , et testes propemodum, quas in pretium praesidii coelestis appenderat, lacrymarum lacunas reliquit, <b>fiducialiter arma corripuit, solus</b> , sciens se esse non solum. <b>Signo crucis signum praelio dedit, ac se in bellum, etiam si nemo sequeretur, victor futurus immisit.</b>	164 l.1-6	Eugenius atque Arbogastes cum instructa acie Alpium transitus tenerent, Theodosius expers cibi ac somni orationi incumbens totani noctem pervigil exegit; cum tamen se esse a suis destitutum sciret, ab hostibus circumseptum nesciret, fiducialiter arma corripuens signoque crucis signum proelio dedit ac se in bellum, etiam si nemo sequeretur, victor futurus immisit
123	Or.7.35.16-21	Prima salutis via exstitit <b>Arbitrio, hostilium partium comes: qui cum ignarum imperatorem circumpositis excepisset insidiis, conversus ad reverentiam praesentis Augusti, non solum periculo liberavit, verum etiam instruxit auxilio.</b> <i>At ubi ad contigua miscendae pugnae spatia perventum est, continuo magnus ille et ineffabilis turbo ventorum in ora hostium ruit. Ferebantur per aera spicula missa nostrorum manu, atque ultra mensuram humani jactus per</i>	164 l.8-23	quem cum Arbitrio hostilium partium comes ignarum circumpositis excepisset insidiis, conversus mox ad reverentiam Augusti eum non solum periculo liberavit, verum etiam auxilio instruxit; cumque ad congressionem ventum esset, vehemens turbo ventorum a parte Theodosii in ora hostium ruit, qui et ab eius parte spicula missa valenter hosti infigeret et hostili manu missa repelleret. nec mora, parva suorum data strage, victori se Theodosio hostilis exercitus

	<p><i>magnum inane portata, nusquam propemodum cadere, priusquam impingerent, sinebantur. Porro autem turbo continuus ora pectoraque hostium nunc illis graviter scutis everberabat, nunc impressis pertinaciter obstructa claudebat, nunc avulsis violenter destituta nudabat, nunc oppositis jugiter in terga trudebat: tela etiam, quae ipsi vehementer intorserant, excepta ventis impetu supinata, ac retrorsum coacta ipsos infeliciter configebant. Prospexit sibi humanae conscientiae pavor: nam continuo sese, parva suorum manu fusa, <b>victori Theodosio hostilis prostravit exercitus. Eugenius captus atque interfectus est. Arbogastes sua se manu perculit.</b> Ita et hic duorum sanguine bellum civile restinctum est, absque illis <b>decem millibus Gothorum, quos, praemissos a Theodosio, Arbogastes delesse funditus fertur, quos utique perdidisse lucrum et vinci vincere fuit.</b> Non insulto obtrectatoribus nostris. Unum aliquod ab initio Urbis conditae bellum proferant, tam pia necessitate susceptum, tam divina felicitate confectum, tam clementi benignitate sopitum, ubi nec pugna gravem caedem, nec victoria cruentam exegerit ultionem: et fortasse concedam, ut non haec fidei Christiani ducis concessa videantur, <i>quamvis ego hoc testimonio non laborem, quando unus ex ipsis, poeta quidem eximius, sed paganus pervicacissimus, huiusmodi versibus et Deo et homini testimonium tulit, quibus ait:</i></i></p> <p><b>“O nimium dilecte Deo! tibi militat aether,</b></p>	<p>prostravit. Eugenius captus atque interfectus est; Arbogastes sua se manu percussit. praemiserat denique prius Theodosius decem milia auxiliatorum Gothorum, quae ab Arbogaste comite funditus deleta sunt; quos utique Theodosio perdidisse magis lucrum quam detrimentum fuit. ad cuius laudem ob insignem victoriam poeta quidam eximius sed infidelis inter coetera hos versiculos cecinit:</p> <p><i>o nimium dilecte Dei, tibi militat aether</i></p> <p><i>et coniurati veniunt ad classica venti.</i></p>
--	--	--

		<b>Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti.”</b>		
124	Or.7.36.1	<b>Anno ab Urbe condita MCXLIX, Arcadius Augustus, cujus nunc filius Theodosius Orientem regit, et Honorius Augustus, frater ejus, cui nunc Respublica innitur, quadragesimo et secundo loco, commune imperium, divisus tantum sedibus tenere coeperunt:</b> vixitque Arcadius post patris excessum annis duodecim, imperiique summam Theodosio filio suo parvo admodum, moriens tradidit.	168 l.1-4	Anno ab Urbe condita millesimo centesimo quadragesimo nono Archadius Augustus in Oriente, Honorius frater eius in Occidente quadragesimo secundo loco commune imperium, divisus tantum sedibus, tenere coeperunt.
125	Or.7.37.1	<i>Interea cum a Theodosio imperatore seniore, singulis potissimis infantum cura et disciplina utriusque palatii commissa esset, hoc est, Rufino Orientalis aulae, Stiliconi Occidentalis imperii, quid uterque egerit; quidve agere conatus sit, exitus utriusque docuit: cum alius sibi, alius filio suo affectans regale fastigium, ut rebus repente turbatis, necessitas reipublicae scelus ambitus tegetet, barbaras gentes ille immisit, hic fovit.</i>	168 l.4-6	quorum pater curam viris potentissimis mandaratum habere, id est Rufino Orientalis aulae, Stiliconi Occidentalis imperii.
126	Or.7.36.1	Anno ab Urbe condita MCXLIX, Arcadius Augustus, cujus nunc filius Theodosius Orientem regit, et Honorius Augustus, frater ejus, cui nunc Respublica innitur, quadragesimo et secundo loco, commune imperium, divisus tantum sedibus tenere coeperunt: <b>vixitque Arcadius post patris excessum annis duodecim, imperiique summam Theodosio filio suo parvo admodum, moriens tradidit.</b>	168 l.6-8	vixitque Archadius post patris excessum annis duodecim imperiique summam Theodosio filio parvo admodum moriens tradidit.

127	Or.7.36.2-8, 10-11, 13	<p><b>Interea Gildo comes</b>, qui in initio regni eorum <b>Africae</b> praeerat, <b>simul ut defunctum Theodosium comperit</b>, sive, ut quidam ferunt, quadam permotus invidia, <i>Africam Orientalis imperii partibus jungere molitus est: sive, ut alia tradit opinio, minimam in parvulis spem fore arbitratus, praesertim cum absque his non facile antea quisquam pusillus in imperio relictus, ad maturitatem virilis aetatis evaserit: istique propemodum soli inveniantur, quos, ob egregiam patris ac suam fidem, et divisos et destitutos Christi tutela provexerit. Africam, excerptam a societate reipublicae, sibi usurpare ausus est</i>, gentili magis licentia contentus quam ambitu regiae affectationis inflatus. <b>Huic Mascezil frater</b> fuit, qui novarum rerum in fratre molitiones <b>perhorrescens</b>, relictis apud Africanam militiam <b>duobus filiis</b> adolescentibus, <b>in Italiam rediit. Gildo, et absentiam fratris</b> et praesentiam filiorum ejus suspectam habens, adolescentes <b>dolo circumventos interfecit. Ad hunc jam, ut hostem, bello insequendum Mascezil frater missus est</b>, quem idoneum procurandae reipublicae fore propriae orbitatis recens dolor pollicebatur. Igitur <b>Mascezil jam inde a Theodosio sciens, quantum in rebus desperatissimis oratio hominis per fidem Christi a Clementia Dei impetraret, Caprariam insulam adiit, unde secum sanctos servos Dei</b> aliquot permotos precibus suis sumpsit: <b>cum his orationibus, jejuniis, psalmis dies et noctes continuans, sine bello victoriam meruit, ac sine caede vindictam.</b> Ardalio fluminis nomen est, quod fluit inter Thebastem et Metrideram</p>	168/169 l.9-11	<p>Interea Gildo comes Africae, cognita Theodosii morte, arbitratus minimam in parvulis spem fore, Africam iuri proprio coepit usurpare. huius frater Mascelzer germani perfidiam perhorrescens in Italiam rediit; Gildo duos eius filios, quos pater reliquerat, dolo circumventos occidit. ad hunc iam hostem bello insequendum Mascelzer frater missus est. Mascelzer iam a Theodosio sciens quantum in rebus desperatissimis oratio hominis per fidem Christi clementiam Dei impetraret, Caprariam insulam adiit; inde secum sanctos viros abducens, cum quibus orationibus ac ieiuniis dies aliquod continuavit et noctes; ante triduum quoque quam hosti contiguus fieret, cernit noctu beatum Ambrosium paulo ante defunctum, quo vel quando victoriam caperet diem sibi indicantem et locum. ac tertio demum die post noctem orationibus hymnisque pervigilem cum quinque solummodo milibus adversus .lxxx. hostium pergens eos Dei nutu sine bello in deditionem accepit; quo viso auxiliarii Gildonis barbari ilico terga dedere; Gildo et ipse fugam arripiens ascensa navi, cum in Africam redisset, post aliquot dies strangulatus interiit. sane idem Mascelzer rerum secundarum insolentia tumens ecclesiam Dei temerare ausus est atque ex ea quosdam non dubitavit extrahere. secuta mox poena sacrilegium est, nani post aliquantum temporis ipse punitus est.</p>
-----	------------------------	--	-------------------	--



		<p>civitates: ubi cum parva manu, hoc est, <b>cum quinque millibus (ut aiunt) militum, contra septuaginta millia hostium</b> castra metatus, cum interjecta mora excedere loco, oppositasque praejacentis vallis angustias transgredi vellet, <b>intercurrente nocte, beatum Ambrosium episcopum, Mediolani paulo ante defunctum</b>, per somnium sibi videre visus est, significantem manu, et impacto ad humum ter baculo dicentem: Hic, hic, hic. <b>Quod ille prudenti conjectura intellexit merito annuntiantis fidem victoriae, verbo locum, numero diem significari.</b> Substitit, <b>ac tertio demum die, post noctem orationibus hymnisque pervigilem</b>, ab ipsis coelestium sacramentorum mysteriis, in hostem circumfusum processit</p> <p><b>Quo viso</b>, reliquae cohortes deditionem jam fieri priorum existimantes, certatim sese ad Mascezilem signis tradidere conversis. <b>Barbari, quorum magnam multitudinem Gildo ad bellum deduxerat, defectu militum destituti, in diversa fugerunt. Gildo et ipse fugam molitus arrepta navi ut in altum provectus, ac deinde revocatus in Africam, post aliquot dies strangulatus, interiit.</b></p> <p><b>Sane idem Mascezil</b>, elatus <b>rerum secundarum insolentia</b>, posthabito sanctorum consortio, cum quibus</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>antea <b>Deo</b> militans vicerat, etiam <b>ecclesiam temerare ausus est, atque ex ea quosdam non dubitavit extrahere. Secuta est poena sacrilegum. Nam</b> iisdem superstitibus atque insultantibus, quos ab ecclesia ad poenam protraxerat, <b>post aliquantum tempus et ipse solus punitus est:</b> probavitque in se uno, ad utrumque semper divinum vigilare iudicium: quando et cum speravit, adjutus, et cum contempsit, occisus est.</p>		
128	Or.7.37.1-2 and Or.7.38.1	<p><b>Interea</b> cum a <b>Theodosio</b> imperatore seniore, singulis potissimis infantum cura et disciplina utriusque palatii <b>commissa esset</b>, hoc est, <b>Rufino Orientalis aulae, Stiliconi Occidentalis imperii</b>, quid uterque egerit; <b>quidve agere conatus sit, exitus utriusque docuit:</b> cum alius sibi, alius filio suo affectans regale fastigium, ut rebus repente turbatis, necessitas <b>reipublicae scelus ambitus tegeret, barbaras gentes ille immisit, hic fovit.</b> Taceo de <b>Alarico rege cum Gothis suis saepe victo, saepe concluso, semperque dimisso.</b> Taceo de infelicibus bellis apud Pollentiam gestis, <b>cum barbaro</b> et pagano duci, hoc est, Sauli, belli summa commissa est: cuius improbitate reverendissimi dies et sanctum Pascha violatum est, cedentique hosti propter religionem, ut pugnaret extortum est: cum quidem ostendente in brevi iudicio Dei, et quid favor ejus posset, et quid ultio exigeret, pugnantibus vicimus, victores victi sumus.</p>	169 l.12-20	<p>Interea Rufinus, cui a Theodosio Orientalis aulae cura commissae est, malo perfidiae depravatus, cum barbarorum solaciis regnum temptaret invadere, morte iustissima poenas luit. Stilico quoque Occidentis tutor imperii, in memor conlatorum beneficiorum, in memor adfinitatis, nam socer extabat Honorii, regnum et ipse Eucherio filio affectans ingentia reipublicae intulit mala; nam saepe cum delere possit barbaros, fovit, saepe Alaricum cum Gothis suis vicit, saepe conclusit, semperque dimisit.</p>

		Interea comes Stilico, Vandalorum imbellis, avarae, <b>perfidae</b> et dolosae gentis genere editus, parvipendens quod sub imperatore imperabat; <b>Eucherium, filium</b> suum, sicut a plerisque traditur, jam inde Christianorum persecutionem a puero privatoque meditantem, in imperium quoquo modo sustinere nitebatur		
129	Or.7.37.4-7, 12-16	<p><b>Rhadagaisus, omnium antiquorum praesentiumque hostium longe immanissimus, repentino impetu totam inundavit Italiam. Nam fuisse in populo ejus plus quam ducenta millia Gothorum ferunt. Hic supra hanc incredibilem multitudinem indomitamque virtutem paganus et Scythia erat: qui, ut mos est barbaris hujusmodi gentibus, omnem Romani generis sanguinem diis suis propinare devoverat. Hoc igitur Romanis arcibus imminente, fit omnium paganorum in Urbe concursus, Hostem adesse cum utique virium copia, tum maxime praesidio deorum potentem: Urbem autem ideo destitutam et mature perituram, quia deos et sacra perdiderit. Magnis querelis ubique agitur, et continuo de repetendis sacris celebrandisque tractatur. Fervent tota Urbe blasphemiae, vulgo nomen Christi tamquam lues aliqua praesentium temporum opprobriis gravatur</b></p> <p><b>Conceduntur quidem adversus</b> immanissimum illum hostem <b>Rhadagaisum</b>, aliorum hostium cum copiis suis inclinati ad auxilium animi. Adsunt <b>Uldin et Sarus,</b></p>	169/170 l.21-21	omnium antiquorum praesentiumque hostium longe immanissimus Radagaisus rex Gothorum totam repentino inundavit Italiam impetu. nam fuisse in eius populo plus quam ducenta milia Gothorum ferunt. hic supra hanc incredibilem multitudinem indomitamque virtutem barbarus erat et Scythia, qui omnem Romani generis sanguinem diis suis propinare devoverat. invadit ilico Romam pavor infinitus, fit omnium Paganorum in Urbe concursus; adclamatur a cunctis se haec ideo perpeti, quod neglecta fuerint magnorum sacra deorum. magnis querelisi ubique agitur et continuo de repetendis sacris celebrandisque tractatur; fervent tota Urbe blasphemiae, nomen Christi tamquam lues aliqua probris ingravatur. conducuntur a Romanis adversus Radagaisum duo pagani duces, Gothorum Sarus, Uldin Hunnorum. sed non sinit Deus rem suae potentiae infidelium virtutem videri; conterritus namque divinitus Radagaisus in aspero Fesulani montis iugo urgente undique timore concluditur agminaque, quibus angusta dudum videbatur Italia, latendi spe in unum ac parvum verticem truduntur; quo cum fame et siti

	<p><b>Hunorum et Gothorum duces</b>, praesidio Romanorum: <b>sed non sinit Deus rem potentiae suae, virtutem hominum</b> et maxime hostium <b>videri. Conterritum divinitus Rhadagaisum in Faesulanos montes cogit:</b> ejusque (secundum eos qui parcissime referunt) ducenta millia hominum, inopum consilii et cibi, in arido et aspero montis <b>jugo, urgente undique timore concludit: agminaque, quibus dudum angusta videbatur Italia, latendi spe in unum ac parvum verticem trudit.</b> Quid multis morer? Non disposita in bellum acies fuit, non furor, timorque incerta pugnae praetulit, non caedes acta, non sanguis effusus est, non postremo (quod felicitatis loco deputari solet) damna pugnae eventu compensata victoriae; edentibus, bibentibus, ludentibusque nostris, <i>tanti illi tamque immanes hostes, esurientes et sitientes languentesque confecti sunt.</i> Parum hoc est, nisi captum et catenatum ac subjugatum sciant: quem timuere Romani: illumque idololatram suum, cujus sacrificia se magis pertimescere quam arma fingeant, sine praelio victum ac vinctum sub jugo catenisque despiciant. <b>Igitur rex Rhadagaisus, solus spem fugae sumens,</b> clam suos deseruit, atque in nostros incidit, <b>a quibus captus, ac paulisper retentus, deinde interfectus est. Tanta vero multitudo captivorum Gothorum fuisse fertur, ut, vilissimarum pecudum modo, singulis aureis passim greges hominum venderentur.</b> Sed nihil superesse Deus de eodem populo sinit. Nam illico cunctis qui emebantur morientibus, quod improbi emptores eorum</p>	<p>conficerentur, rex Radagaisus solus spem fugae sumens captus a Romanis in vincla coicitur ac paulisper retentus vita privatur. tanta vero multitudo captivorum Gothorum fuisse fertur, ut vilissimorum pecudum modo singulis aureis passim greges hominum venderentur..</p>
--	---	--

		non impenderunt turpiter pretiis, expenderunt misericorditer sepulturis.		
130	Or.7.37.2	<i>Taceo de Alarico rege cum Gothis suis saepe victo, saepe concluso, semperque dimisso. Taceo de infelicibus bellis apud Pollentiam gestis, cum barbaro et pagano duci, hoc est, Sauli, belli summa commissa est: cujus improbitate reverendissimi dies et sanctum Pascha violatum est, cedentique hosti propter religionem, ut pugnaret extortum est: cum quidem ostendente in brevi iudicio Dei, et quid favor ejus posset, et quid ultio exigeret, pugnantem vicimus, victores victi sumus.</i>	170/171 l.22-13	Interea Alaricus Italiani ingressus, cum ab Honorio sedes quo cum suo exercitu consistere possit expeteret, Honorius deliberato consilio ei Gallias concessit; qui dum ad Galliam pergens recuperationem iumentorum apud Pollentiam aliquantulum resedisset Stilico comes in perniciem reipublicae Gothos pertemptans, dum eos insidiis adgredi cuperet, belli summam Sauli pagano duci commisit. qui ipso sacratissimo die Paschae Gothis nil tale suspicantibus super eos inruit magnamque eorum partem prostravit; nam primum perturbati Gothi ac propter religionem cedentes, demum arma corripunt, more se solito cobortantur victoremque virtute potiori prosternunt exercitum. hinc in rabiem furoris excitati coeptum iter deserentes Romam contendunt petere, cuncta per quae ierant igni ferroque vastantes. nec mora, venientes Urbem capiunt, devastante, incendunt
131	Oros.7.39.1	Adest Alaricus, trepidam Romam obsidet, turbat, irrumpit. <b>Dato tamen praecepto prius, ut si qui in sancta loca praecipueque in sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli basilicas confugissent, hos imprimis inviolatos securosque esse sinerent. Tum deinde, in quantum possent praedae inhiantes, a sanguine temperarent.</b>	171 l.13-17	dato tamen prius praecepto, ut si qui in sancta loca praecipueque sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli basilicas confugissent, hos in primis inviolatos securosque esse sinerent deinde in quantum possint praedae inhiantes a sanguine temperarent.

132	Or.7.40.1	Anno <b>itaque ab Urbe condita MCLXIV</b> , irruptio Urbis per Alaricum facta est: cuius rei quamvis recens memoria sit, tum si quis ipsius populi Romani et multitudinem videat, et vocem audiat, nihil factum, sicut etiam ipsi fatentur, arbitrabitur, nisi aliquantis adhuc exsistentibus ex incendio ruinis forte doceatur.	171 l.17-18	capta itaque Roma est anno millesimo centesimo sexagesimo quarto conditionis suae.
133	Or.7.39.15	<b>Tertia die Barbari, quam ingressi fuerant Urbem, sponte discedunt, facto quidem aliquantarum aedium incendio, sed ne tanto quidem,</b> quantum septingentesimo conditionis ejus anno casus effecerat.	171 l.19-21	die sane tertia sponte Gothi Urbe discedunt, facto aliquantarum aedium incendio sed ne tanto quidem, quantum olim a Caesare factum est.
134	Or.7.40.2	In ea irruptione <b>Placidia, Theodosii principis filia,</b> Arcadii et <b>Honorii</b> imperatorum <b>soror, ab Ataulpho,</b> Alarici propinquo, capta est, <b>atque in uxorem assumpta,</b> quasi eam divino iudicio velut speciale pignus obsidem Roma tradiderit, ita juncta potentissimo Barbari regis conjugio, <b>multo reipublicae commodo fuit.</b>	172/173 l.12-1	Placidiam Theodosii principisi filiam, sororem Honorii, quam sibi Athaulfus apud Forum Cornelii coniugio sociavit. quae multo post reipublicae commodo fuit.
135	Or.7.43.7-10	<i>Ob hoc abstinere a bello, ob hoc inhiare paci nitebatur, praecipue Placidiae uxoris suae, feminae sane ingenio acerrimae et religionis satis probae, ad omnia bonarum ordinationum opera persuasu et consilio temperatus. Cumque eidem paci petendae atque offerendae studiosissime insisteret, apud Barcinonem, Hispaniae urbem, dolo suorum, ut fertur, occisus est. Post hunc Segericus rex a Gothis creatus, cum itidem iudicio Dei ad pacem pronus esset, nihilominus et a suis interfectus est. Deinde Vallia successit in regnum, ad</i>	173 l.1-8	nam ad hoc mariti animum acerrimo ingenio subtilibus blandimentis inflexit, ut ultro a Romanis pacem expeteret. qui ad Gallias proficiscens dein apud Barchilonem fraude suorum occisus est. post quem Segericus regnum capiens, dum pacem Romanis servare disponit, et ipse a suis peremptus est. deinde Wallia regnandi iura suscepit ad hoc electus a Gothis, ut pacem infringeret, ad hoc a Deo ordinatus, ut confirmaret.

		<b>hoc electus a Gothis, ut pacem infringeret; ad hoc ordinatus a Deo, ut pacem confirmaret.</b>		
136	Or.7.38.1, Or.7.40.3 and Or.7.38.3-6	<p><b>Interea comes Stilico, Vandalorum</b> imbellis, avarae, <b>perfidae et dolosae gentis genere editus</b>, parvipendens quod sub imperatore imperabat; <b>Eucherium, filium suum</b>, sicut a plerisque traditur, <b>jam</b> inde <b>Christianorum persecutionem</b> a puero privatoque <b>meditantem, in imperium</b> quoquo modo <b>sustinere</b> nitebatur.</p> <p>Interea <b>ante biennium Romanae irruptionis, excitatae</b> per Stiliconem <b>gentes Alanorum</b>, ut dixi, <b>Suevorum, Vandalorum</b>, multaeque cum his aliae, Francos proterunt, Rhenum transeunt, <b>Gallias invadunt</b>, directoque impetu Pyrenaeum usque perveniunt: cujus obice ad tempus repulsae, per circumjacentes provincias refunduntur.</p> <p>Praeterea gentes alias copiis viribusque intolerabiles, quibus nunc Galliarum Hispaniarumque provinciae premuntur, hoc est, <b>Alanorum, Suevorum, Vandalorum</b>, ipsoque simul motu impulsorum <b>Burgundionum, ultro in arma sollicitans</b>, deterso semel Romani nominis metu, suscitavit. Eas interim ripas Rheni quater, <b>et pulsare Gallias voluit</b>, sperans miser <b>sub hac necessitatis</b> circumstantia, quod et <b>extorquere</b></p>	173/174 l.9-3	Interea comes Stilico Wandalorum perfidae et dolosae gentis genere editus, Eucherium, ut dictum est, filium iam a puero Christianorum persecutionem meditantem, ut in imperio substitueret, ante biennium Romanae irruptionis gentes copiis viribusque intollerabiles, hoc est Alanorum, Suevorum, Wandalorum, Burgundionum, ultro in arma suscitavit easque pulsare Gallias voluit, ut sub hac necessitate a genero in filium extorquere imperium possiti, tandem ubi imperatori Honorio exercituique Romano haec tam ingentia damna patefacta sunt, commoto iustissime exercitu occisus est Stilico, qui ut unum puerum purpuram indueret, totius generis humani sanguinem dedit occisus Eucherius eius filius paucique cum isdem satellites tantarum molitionum puniti sunt.

		<p><b>imperium genero posset in filium</b>, et barbarae gentes tam facile comprimi quam commoveri valerent. <b>Itaque ubi imperatori Honorio exercituique Romano haec tantorum scelerum scena patefacta est, commoto justissime exercitu, occisus est Stilico; qui, ut unum puerum purpura indueret, totius generis humani sanguinem dedit. Occisus est et Eucherius</b>, qui, ad conciliandum sibi favorem paganorum, restitutione templorum et eversione ecclesiarum imbuturum se regni primordia minabatur, paucique <b>cum iisdem satellites tantarum molitionum puniti sunt</b>. Ita minimo negotio paucorumque poena, ecclesiae Christi cum imperatore religioso et liberatae sunt et vindicatae.</p>		
137	Or.7.39.18	<p>Et ne quisquam forte dubitaret ad correptionem superbae lasciviae, et blasphemae civitatis hostibus fuisse permissum, <b>eodem tempore clarissima Urbis loca fulminibus diruta sunt, quae inflammari ab hostibus nequiverunt</b>.</p>	174 l.3-5	eodem tempore clarissima Urbis loca fulminibus diruta sunt, quae inflammari ab hostibus nequiverunt.
138	Or.7.40.4	<p>His per Gallias bacchantibus, <b>apud Britannias Gratianus</b>, municeps ejusdem insulae, <b>tyrannus creatur et occiditur. Hujus loco Constantinus, ex infima militia, propter solam spem nominis, sine merito virtutis eligitur, qui</b> continuo ut invasit imperium, <b>in Gallias transiit. Ibi saepe a Barbaris incertis foederibus illusus, detrimento magis reipublicae fuit</b>.</p>	174 l.6-10	Inter haec apud Britannias Gratianus tyrannus mox creatus occiditur. huius in loco Constantinus ex infima militia propter solam spem nominis sine merito virtutis eligitur. qui ad Gallias transiens saepe a barbaris incerto foedere inlusus detrimento magis reipublicae fuit quam augmento.
139	Or.7.40.5-7, 9 and	<p>Misit in Hispanias iudices, quos cum provinciae obediens accepissent, <b>duo fratres juvenes</b> nobiles et</p>	174/175	tunc duo iuvenes locupletes, Didimus et Viridianus, adsumptis propriis servulis ac vernaculis sese



	Or.7.41.7	<p><b>locupletes, Didymus et Verinianus non assumpserunt;</b> ne adversus tyrannum quidem tyrannidem, sed imperatori <b>justo adversus tyrannum et Barbaros</b> tueri <b>sese patriamque suam moliti sunt.</b> Quod ipso rei gestae ordine patuit. Nam tyrannidem nemo nisi celeriter maturatam secreto invadit, et publice armat, cujus summa est, assumpto diademate ac purpura, videri antequam sciri. Hi vero plurimo tempore servulos tantum suos ex propriis praediis colligentes ac vernaculis alentes sumptibus, nec dissimulato proposito, absque cujusquam inquietudine ad Pyrenaei claustra tendebant. <b>Adversus hos Constantinus Constantem filium suum,</b> proh dolor! <b>ex monacho Caesarem factum, cum Barbaris quibusdam,</b> qui quondam in <b>foedus</b> recepti atque in militiam allecti, Honoriaci vocabantur, <b>in Hispanias misit.</b> Hinc apud Hispanias prima mali labes; <i>nam interfectis illis fratribus, qui tutari privato praesidio Pyrenaei Alpes moliebantur, his Barbaris quasi in pretium victoriae, primum praedandi in Palatinis campis licentia data;</i> <b>dehinc supradicti montis claustrorumque ejus cura permissa est,</b> remota rusticanorum fideli et utili custodia. Igitur Honoriaci, imbuti praeda et illecti abundantia, quo magis scelus impunitum foret, atque ipsi sceleri plus liceret, <b>prodita Pyrenaei custodia claustrisque patefactis, cunctas gentes quae per Gallias vagabantur, Hispaniarum provinciis immittunt</b></p>	l.10-3	<p>patriamque a barbaris et tyranno defensare moliti sunt. adversus hos Constantinus Constantem filium ex monacho Caesarem factum cum quibusdam foederatis barbaris in Hispanias misit. Constans barbarorum fultus auxilio eos primo proelio peremit. quibus barbaris dum claustra Pyrinei montis commissa fuissent, ab eis tota illa, quae per Gallias bachabatur, ferocitas gentium Hispaniarum provinciis intronmissa est. itaque post multas strages, incendia et rapinas tandem divisus sedibus barbari ad aratra conversi Romanorum residuos coeperunt ut socios amicosque fovere.</p>
--	-----------	--	--------	--

		<p><b>Quamquam et post hoc quoque continuo Barbari, exsecrati gladios suos, ad aratra conversi sunt, residuosque Romanos ut socios modo et amicos fovent,</b> ut inveniatur jam inter eos quidam Romani, qui malint inter Barbaros pauperem libertatem, quam inter Romanos tributariam sollicitudinem sustinere.</p>		
140	Or.7.42.1-16	<p>Anno ab Urbe condita MCLXV, <b>Honorius imperator</b> videns, tot oppositis tyrannis, nihil adversum Barbaros agi posse, ipsos prius tyrannos deleri jubet. Constantio comiti hujus belli summa commissa est. Sensit tunc demum respublica et quam utilitatem in Romano tandem duce receperit, et quam eatenus perniciem per longa tempora Barbaris comitibus subjecta tolerarit. <b>Igitur Constantius comes in Galliam cum exercitu profectus,</b> Constantinum imperatorem <b>apud Arelatem</b> civitatem clausit, cepit et <b>occidit.</b> Jam hinc, ut de catalogo tyrannorum quam brevissime loquar, <b>Constantem Constantini filium, Gerontius comes suus,</b> vir nequam ac improbus, <b>apud Viennam interfecit,</b> atque in ejus locum <b>Maximum quemdam substituit.</b> <b>Ipsa vero Gerontius a suis militibus occisus est. Maximus, exutus purpura,</b> destitutusque a militibus Gallicanis, qui in Africam trajecti, deinde in Italiam revocati sunt, nunc inter Barbaros <b>in Hispania egens exsulat. Jovinus postea,</b> vir <b>Galliarum</b> nobilissimus, in tyrannidem <b>mox ut assurrexit, cecidit. Sebastianus frater ejusdem,</b> hoc solum, ut <b>tyrannus</b> moreretur, elegit. Nam continuo, <b>ut creatus, occisus est.</b> Quid de</p>	176/177 l.2-7	<p>imperator Honorius, dum vires reipublicae cotidianis cerneret labefactari incommodis, virum strenuum et bellicosum Constantium comitem ad Gallias cum exercitu mittit. is mox Galliam ingressus est, continuo Constantinum tyrannum apud Arelatem extinxit, Constans vero eius filius a Gerontio suo comite Viennae peremptus est. in cuius locum Gerontius Maximum quendam substituens, ipse a suis militibus iugulatus est. Maximus deinde purpura exutus in Hispania exulans egens obiit exinde lobinus apud Gallias mox adsurrexit, cecidit. Sebastianus tyrannus frater eius continuo creatus occisus est. Tertullus consul, qui se futurum principem in senatu gloriatus est, pari nihilominus exitu periit. Attalus a Gothis imperator effectus, postmodum captus a Constantio missusque Honorio truncata manu vitae relictus est. Heraclianus quoque cum Sabino genero cum tribus milibus ac septingentis navibus ex Africa Romam tendens, occursu comitis Marini territus et in fugam versus, arrepta navi solus Carthaginem rediit ibique peremptus est. hos omnes Honorius optima religione magnaue Constantii industria superavit, merito sane,</p>

	<p>infelicissimo Attalo loquar, cui occidi inter tyrannos honor et mori lucrum fuit? In hoc Alaricus imperatore facto, infecto, refecto ac defecto, citius his omnibus actis pene quam dictis, mimum risit, et ludum spectavit imperii, nec mirum, si jure hac pompa miser lusus est, cujus ille <b>umbratilis consul Tertullus ausus est in curia dicere: Loquar vobis, Patres conscripti, consul et pontifex, quorum alterum teneo, alterum spero, sperans ab eo qui spem non habebat, et maledictus utique quia spem suam posuerat in homine. Attalus</b> itaque tamquam inane <b>imperii</b> simulacrum <b>cum Gothis</b> usque ad Hispanias portatus est; unde discedens navi, incerta moliens, in mari <b>captus et ad Constantium</b> comitem deductus, deinde imperatori <b>Honorio exhibitus, truncata manu, vitae relictus est. Heraclianus</b> interea Africae comes missus, cum idem Attalus umbram gestaret imperii, Africam strenue adversum iudices ab eo missos tutatus, consulatum assecutus est; quo elatus supercilio, <b>Sabinum domesticum suum</b>, virum ingenio callidum, industriaque solertem et sapientem nominandum, si animi vires tranquillis studiis accommodavisset, generum allegit: cum quo quorundam periculorum suspiciones dum patitur, fecit, atque aliquamdiu <b>Africana</b> annona extra ordinem <b>detenta</b>, ipse tandem cum immensa, certe temporibus nostris satis incredibili classe navium, <b>Romam contendit</b>. Nam habuisse tunc <b>tria millia septingentas naves</b> dicitur: quem numerum ne apud Xerxem quidem, praeclarum illum Persarum regem, nec Alexandrum</p>	<p>nam his diebus praecipiente Honorio, favente Constantio, sopitis apud Africani haereticis pax Ecclesiae redditur.</p> <p>Tertullus consul, qui se futurum principem in senatu gloriatus est, pari nihilominus exitu periit. Attalus a Gothis imperator effectus, postmodum captus a Constantio missusque Honorio truncata manu vitae relictus est. Heraclianus quoque cum Sabino genero cum tribus milibus ac septingentis navibus ex Africa Romam tendens, occursu comitis Marini territus et in fugam versus, arrepta navi solus Carthaginem rediit ibique peremptus est. hos omnes Honorius optima religione magnaue Constantii industria superavit, merito sane, nam his diebus praecipiente Honorio, favente Constantio, sopitis apud Africani haereticis pax Ecclesiae redditur.</p>
--	---	---

		Magnum, vel quemquam alium fuisse regum, historiae ferunt. Is simul ut cum agmine militum ad Urbem pergens littore egressus est, <b>occursu comitis Marini territus et in fugam versus, arrepta navi, Carthaginem solus rediit, atque ibi continuo militari manu interfectus est. Sabinus, gener ejus,</b> Constantinopolim fugit, unde post aliquantum temporis retractus, exsilioque damnatus est. <b>Hunc omnem</b> catalogum, ut dixi, vel manifestorum tyrannorum, vel inobedientium ducum <b>optima Honorius</b> imperator <b>religione</b> et felicitate occidi meruit, <b>magna Constantius comes industria</b> et celeritate <b>confecit: merito sane, quia in his diebus praecipiente Honorio, et adjuvante Constantio, pax et unitas per universam Africam Ecclesiae catholicae reddita est:</b> et corpus Christi, quod nos sumus, redintegrata discissione sanatum est; imposita executione sancti praecepti Marcellino tribuno, viro in primis prudenti et industrio, omniumque bonorum studiorum appetentissimo		
141	Or.7.43.10-14	Deinde <b>Vallia successit in regnum, ad hoc electus a Gothis,</b> ut pacem infringeret; ad hoc ordinatus a Deo, ut pacem confirmaret. Hic igitur <b>territus maxime iudicio Dei,</b> quia cum magna superiore abhinc anno Gothorum manus, instructa armis navigiisque, transire in Africam moliretur, in duodecim millibus passuum Gaditani freti tempestate correpta, miserabili exitu perierat: memor etiam illius acceptae sub Alarico cladis, cum in Siciliam Gothi transire conati, in conspectu suorum miserabiliter	177	Wallia Gothorum rex Dei iudicio territus Placidiam apud se honeste habitam, exigente Constantio, fratri Honorio reddidit <b>pacemque cum eo datis lectissimis obsidibus pepigit seque pro Romanis adversus barbaros, qui Hispanias invaserant, pugnaturum spondit.</b> mittunt e contrario Wandalorum, Alanorum Suevorumque reges principi Honorio legationem in his verbis: "Tu cum omnibus pacem habe, omnium obsides accipe. nos nobis conflagimus,

		<p>arrepti et demersi sunt, <b>pacem optimam cum Honorio imperatore, datis lectissimis obsidibus pepigit. Placidiam</b>, imperatoris sororem, honorifice <b>apud se honesteque habitam, fratri reddidit.</b> <i>Romanae securitati periculum suum obtulit, ut adversum caeteras gentes, quae per Hispanias consedissent, sibi pugnaret, et Romanis vinceret: quamvis et caeteri Alanorum, Vandalorum Suevorumque reges, eodem nobiscum placito depacti forent, mandantes imperatori Honorio: Tu cum omnibus pacem habe, omniumque obsides accipe; nos nobis conflagimus, nobis perimus, tibi vincimus: immortalis vero quaestus erit reipublicae tuae, si utrique pereamus.</i></p>		<p>nobis perimus, tibi vincimus, tuae erit quaestus reipublicae si utrique pereamus."</p>
--	--	---	--	---