



Susan Ballou and
the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*

Brian Croke

HCS

History of Classical Scholarship

Supplementary Volume 9

History of Classical Scholarship

Editors

Lorenzo CALVELLI
(Venezia)

Federico SANTANGELO
(Newcastle)

Editorial Board

Luciano CANFORA
(Bari)

Jo-Marie CLAASSEN
(Stellenbosch)

Massimiliano DI FAZIO
(Pavia)

Patricia FORTINI BROWN
(Princeton)

Helena GIMENO PASCUAL
(Alcalá de Henares)

Anthony GRAFTON
(Princeton)

Judith P. HALLETT
(College Park, Maryland)

Katherine HARLOE
(London)

Jill KRAYE
(London)

Arnaldo MARCONE
(Roma)

Marc MAYER
(Barcelona)

Laura MECELLA
(Milano)

Stefan REBENICH
(Bern)

Ronald RIDLEY
(Melbourne)

Michael SQUIRE
(Cambridge)

William STENHOUSE
(New York)

Christopher STRAY
(Swansea)

Daniela SUMMA
(Berlin)

Ginette VAGENHEIM
(Rouen)

Copy-editing & Design

Thilo RISING (Newcastle)

Susan Ballou and the Scriptores Historiae Augustae

Brian Croke

Cover illustration:

SHA manuscript copied for Lorenzo de Medici, Florence 1479,
State Library of Victoria

Published by *History of Classical Scholarship*
Newcastle upon Tyne and Venice

ISSN: 2632-4091

Posted online at hcsjournal.org in November 2024

The publication of this volume has been co-funded by the
Department of Humanities of the Ca' Foscari University of Venice and the
School of History, Classics and Archaeology of Newcastle University



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence



Any part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in
any form or by any means without permission provided that the source is fully credited.

ISBN 978-1-8380018-8-9

© 2024 Brian Croke

HCS

History of Classical Scholarship

Edited by

Lorenzo Calvelli and Federico Santangelo



SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUMES

1. *Select Correspondence of Ronald Syme, 1927–1939*
Edited by Anthony R. Birley
(2020)
2. Ettore Ciccotti, *La civiltà del mondo antico*
With an Introduction by
Federico Santangelo
(2021)
3. “*Poche righe in stile non epigrafico*”.
Il carteggio fra Theodor Mommsen e Ettore Pais (1881–1903)
a cura di Antonio Cernecca e Gianluca Schingo
(2022)
4. *Corrispondenze archeologiche fra Thomas Ashby e Giuseppe Lugli.*
La testimonianza inedita della documentazione d’archivio
a cura di Andrea Di Rosa e Ilaria Bruni
(2022)
5. *Thucydides in the ‘Age of Extremes’ and Beyond.*
Academia and Politics
Edited by Luca Iori and Ivan Matijašić
(2022)
6. Carlo Sigonio, *L’antico regime giuridico dei cittadini romani*
traduzione italiana e note a cura di Mattia Balbo,
Michele Bellomo, Annarosa Gallo e Federico Santangelo.
introduzione di Federico Santangelo
(2024)

7. *Achilles Staius Lusitanus (1524–1581):
New Research and Perspectives on the Fifth Centenary of His Birth*
Edited by Paolo Garofalo and Riccardo Montalto
(2024)

8. *George Kennedy at Chapel Hill, 1966–76*
Edited by Ward Briggs
(2024)

9. *Susan Ballou and the Scriptores Historiae Augustae*
Brian Croke
(2024)

Informal queries and new proposals may be sent to
lorenzoc@unive.it or federico.santangelo@ncl.ac.uk
Each submission will be independently assessed by two referees.

CONTENTS

Preface	1
1. Becoming a scholar: Chicago and Rome, 1893–1910	2
2. Back and forth to Rome, 1902–10	14
3. Approaching the <i>SHA</i> , 1475–1910	20
4. Engaging with the <i>SHA</i> , 1889–1910	25
5. The Gießen doctorate, 1910–11	31
6. The Teubner partnership: Ballou and Hohl, 1912–14	41
7. From Chicago to Bryn Mawr, 1912–31	58
8. Magie, Ballou and the Loeb edition of the <i>SHA</i> , 1921–32	63
9. Ballou’s impact on study of the <i>SHA</i>	71
10. Summation: A woman scholar in a man’s world	77
Appendices	
A. Letter from Hermann Dessau to Frank Frost Abbott, 1901	83
B. Letters from Susan Ballou to Georg Wissowa, 1910	84
Bibliography	88

Preface

Susan Helen Ballou (1868–1940) was a Latinist and palaeographer with a European reputation, a rarity among American classical scholars of her day and rarer still for a woman. She taught for years in the Latin department at the University of Chicago from which she had graduated in 1897, then for more than a decade at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania (1921–31) where in a small department she was once a contemporary of Lily Ross Taylor (1886–1969) and the young T. R. S. Broughton (1900–93). Meanwhile, Ballou had honed her craft over several years at the American School of Classical Studies in Rome (1901–7), to which she added a German doctorate (1911) that led to an invitation from the distinguished publisher of Latin texts, B. G. Teubner, unprecedented for a woman, to be part of a new edition of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (*SHA*). Yet, today, Susan Ballou is hard to find. Not only is she missing from all the standard reference works and institutional histories, as well as the expanding literature on the neglected contributions of women to American higher education, classics in particular.¹ Above all, she failed to find a place in the *Biographical Dictionary of North American Classicists* and its developing on-line version as Rutgers University's *Database of Classical Scholars*.² Ballou endured the double disadvantage of being a woman and of mastering a text rarely read and studied, let alone taught, in the United States.

Even among the veritable explosion of research in recent decades on the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, nowadays best known as the *Historia Augusta*, she is rarely noticed. In fact, her fundamental research on the text of the *SHA* and her involvement with the Loeb Classical Library translation in the 1920s have been totally overlooked in the recent revised version (2022).³ Not only is she ignored in the introductory discussion of

¹ With the exception of Singer (2003), 82 (derived from Maltby [1929], 21). Ballou earns no mention, for instance, in the early history of the Chicago Latin department (Prescott 1927) or among the American students at German Universities (Werner 2013), nor has anyone discovered Ballou by taking on the desideratum proposed by Calder long ago, namely, 'The Careers of Women in American Classics before 1950' (Calder [1984a], 12).

² Briggs (1994a). As a result, she is also missing from other works dependent on this dictionary, for example, the individuals who were once part of the Bryn Mawr Classics faculty (<https://www.brynmawr.edu/classics/history/notable-former-faculty>). The Rutgers database is at <https://dbcs.rutgers.edu/>. Most surprisingly, she is overlooked by Valentine (1973), 50–1 (although listed among the fellows for 1906–7 in the appendix), and Ascher (1973), but not by Welch (2004), 72. There is no trace of Ballou in the project *The College Women: Documenting the history of Women in Higher Education* (<https://collegewomen.org>).

³ Rohrbacher (2022).

the textual tradition of the *SHA* to which she was a substantial contributor, but she is entirely absent from the bibliography. Clearly, Ballou's reputation and her work as Latinist and palaeographer, especially the fundamental contribution of her research on the *SHA* and its text, need reclamation. The recent efflorescence of interest in the literary techniques and manuscript tradition of the *SHA* provides an essential impetus. Utilising archival material where possible, both published and unpublished, this study aims to explain and evaluate Ballou's work on the *SHA* and its impact down to the present day, in its historical and scholarly context.

1. **Becoming a scholar: Chicago and Rome, 1893–1910**

Dubuque, Iowa, separated from Wisconsin by the Mississippi river, was increasingly populated by German immigrants when Susan Helen Ballou was born there on 28 September 1868, a daughter to George and Martha (née Beam) Ballou. Although her household was not German, growing up in a German-speaking community may well explain her complete proficiency in spoken German before ever setting foot on German soil. When Susan was very young, the family moved to Davenport, Iowa, an equally German and similarly sized town, still on the Mississippi river.⁴ She graduated from the newly opened (1884) St Katharine's School at Davenport where she presumably learnt Latin, and in 1893 (aged 25) she became a student at the new University of Chicago, which had opened just the previous year.⁵ Her years between school and university remain a blank. The following year (1894) she won a university scholarship 'for excellence',⁶ then a senior scholarship (not for Latin but for English⁷), and by 1897 she completed her undergraduate degree having studied a wide

⁴ In the 1910 US Census both Dubuque and Davenport had German-speaking populations comprising more than 30% of their total: Gellenik (2003), 217. It may have been higher still in the 1860s. Settling in such strong German immigrant towns may well suggest German lineage, although her mother was from New Jersey and her father (born Lockport, NY in 1833) had fought with the Iowa Infantry in the Civil War but had now established himself in the local newspaper business, first at Dubuque then Davenport: information courtesy of George Bresnick in the post 'Ballou Genealogy Book' (14 July 2000), on *genealogy.com*. Susan's family does not appear to be related to the Ballous, of French descent, who had been in America since the 17th century (judging by Ballou 1889).

⁵ University of Chicago, *Quarterly Calendar* 3.1 (May 1894), 58. Background in Goodspeed (1973).

⁶ University of Chicago, *Quarterly Calendar* 4.1 (August 1895), 26.

⁷ University of Chicago, *University Record* 1.14 (July 3, 1896), 231.

range of Latin (and Greek) texts, but no writer later than the second century. She had also acquired considerable ancillary textual skills, especially palaeography,⁸ arising from the influence of two expert palaeographers among her teachers in the new university: Professor Frank Frost Abbott (1860–1924) and Professor William Gardner Hale (1849–1928). Abbott was the university's first Classics professor, in fact the university's first ever appointment, and a distinguished scholar of Roman history and literature,⁹ while Hale was known as an expert in Latin syntax and as an extraordinary teacher of fluent Latin.¹⁰

German universities had partly educated both Abbott (Berlin and Bonn, 1888–9) and Hale (Leipzig and Göttingen, 1876–7), so they were well imbued with a modern professional and scientific approach to their own research and teaching.¹¹ This was the very approach being deliberately cultivated by the new university. Moreover, the university was founded with a generous contribution from John. D. Rockefeller which enabled, among other things, the creation of an instant library by buying up the entire stock of a major German bookseller.¹² From the start, students such as Ballou had access to the latest editions plus German monographs for a range of Greek and Latin authors. Ballou's other teachers were the Greek scholar and archaeologist Frank Bigelow Tarbell (1853–1920), the inspiring Frank Justus Miller (1858–1938), a Yale graduate who later spent time at Halle, Munich and Jena, and the versatile Clifford Herschel Moore (1866–1931) with a Munich doctorate (1897) on the fourth-century author Firmicus Maternus.¹³ Since the University of Chicago was then in its formative years, Ballou was among its first female students — another of the university's special features —

⁸ For example, the University of Chicago's *Academic Record* for 1897 shows that students of Latin, such as Ballou was at the time, studied Cicero and Vergil, Horace, Terence and Tacitus. In all, the Chicago syllabus followed by Ballou did not expose her to any Latin beyond the second century.

⁹ On Abbott: McKay (1994). As the first appointment at the University of Chicago (Parker [1916], 213), Abbott was already well known to the inaugural President of the University, William Rainey Harper, a distinguished linguist. They had been contemporaries at Yale.

¹⁰ On Hale: Briggs (1994b). Hale was one of the initiators of the short-lived Chicago *Studies in Classical Philology* in 1895.

¹¹ German universities were the main influence on classics and other ancient world studies in American universities throughout the 19th century and into the 20th: Axtell (2016), 221–75. For the early part: Diehl (1978), 102–17. There appears to be nothing on the study of classical philology and ancient history comparable to Herbst (1965) 99–128 on philosophy, theology and history.

¹² Axtell (2016), 233.

¹³ All these teachers are acknowledged in Ballou (1912), 105.

not to mention female students of Latin. It was an experience she could not then find elsewhere, not at Yale or Princeton for instance.¹⁴ She subsequently became a Chicago University graduate scholar in Latin (1897–8), having embarked on a doctoral program there, taking the seminars of Hale (on Catullus) and George Lincoln Hendrickson (1865–1963) who had only come to Chicago in 1897. Previously, he had spent time in studying Latin at Bonn and Berlin (1888–9).¹⁵ The University then offered her a fellowship that she declined, preferring to become a faculty member as an Assistant in Latin (1898–1900), then Associate in Latin (from 1900). No longer was Ballou a pupil of Hale and Hendrickson, but their teaching colleague. Even so, she still attended their graduate seminars. Being female and without a doctorate, however, she could never become their professorial equal. At that time, in Calder's considered judgment, Chicago had the best graduate seminars in ancient world studies in the United States.¹⁶

The *Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, formed to advance opportunities for academic women, awarded an annual competitive travelling fellowship for research in Europe, which Susan Ballou won for the year 1901/2.¹⁷ As part of his strong recommendation for her on this occasion, Hale wrote: 'She has been in two of my seminaries [graduate seminars]. The seminary in Catullus, in which we dealt with manuscripts and the restoration of corrupted texts was carried through two successive years [1897/8 and 1898/9]. In the second year she was the only woman in the course. The seminary was an unusually good one, but Miss Ballou was by all means the clearest, trustiest and acutest member of it.'¹⁸ It was in Hale's seminar on Catullus that she had the opportunity to develop her palaeographical and critical skills on a manuscript of Catullus which had been only recently (1896) discovered by Hale himself in the Vatican library and labelled R for 'Romanus'.¹⁹ He had a facsimile of the manuscript made for study purposes and doubtless used this in his seminar.

¹⁴ Hallett (2016), 273–4. Before 1920, women of a classical bent tended to be more attracted to archaeology rather than philology (Ascher 1973, 365). Ballou was an exception.

¹⁵ On Hendrickson: Latimer (1994).

¹⁶ Calder (1984*b*), 24–5 (where William Gardner Hale is probably intended by 'Der Syntaktiker William Gardener').

¹⁷ Useful background in Gerda (2004), 237, 322.

¹⁸ Quoted in *Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, ser.3 no.1–6 (1898–1903), 66.

¹⁹ Hale first announced his discovery in Rome on 21 June 1896 (Hale [1896], 272–4), insisting that the manuscript (*Ottobonianus lat.1829*) be labelled 'Roman' and not 'Vatican' (as normal practice) because of his immense love for the 'great, splendid

Abbott, meanwhile, had become the first person allowed to work in the library at Toledo, Spain where he collated a manuscript of Tacitus' *Germania*.²⁰

The travelling scholarship for 1901/2 was taken by Ballou in Italy and Greece, but based at the American School for Classical Studies in Rome where she was one of twenty-five students. Still in its formative phase, the School offered a range of advanced courses and excursions to qualified students enrolled there. In addition, each year, the school sponsored a small number of fellows, elected on the basis of competitive examinations in a range of prescribed topics including palaeography, topography, epigraphy, archaeology, geography and Italian. Fellows were required to pursue a specific research project. That Ballou would take her traveling scholarship as a student of the school at Rome was doubtless steered and facilitated by Abbott, but reinforced by Hale who in 1895/6 had been the school's inaugural director. It was during this period that Hale discovered the Catullus manuscript in the Vatican Library, although he had not been able to devote sufficient attention to it since.

Hale went on to point out in his 1899 Report, as Chairman of the School's Trustees, the difficulty of having only a single year and of putting into print the material collected 'at this great distance from the manuscripts themselves'. Further, 'the problems raised at the first reading of an important manuscript are almost innumerable and they demand return after return to the manuscript itself'.²¹ Hale had doubtless shared all these concerns with his promising pupil, but there were also new opportunities. On the eve of Ballou's departure for Rome, Hale emphasised the exciting new significance of palaeography. Not only may a new manuscript come to light, but the standard of palaeographical work had risen 'to such a point that nearly all of the earlier work needs to be done anew and some important results are sure to follow at many points'.²²

With such an optimistic prospect, Ballou saw herself as focussing during the year on 'epigraphy and palaeography', that is, Latin inscriptions and manuscripts, especially that of Catullus. There are over 120 manuscripts of Catullus's poems but to the textual critic a few of these are older and more important than the rest. Moreover, Hale's Vatican manuscript (R) had not yet been fully evaluated. A black and white facsimile,

eternal city, centre of the world's history and civilisation'. He then produced a series of articles on his find, quickly refining his conclusions: (1896), 314; (1897), liii–lv; (1898), 447–9; (1899), 133–44.

²⁰ Abbott (1904).

²¹ Hale and Peck (1899), 697.

²² Hale and Peck (1899), 698.

aided by a magnifying glass, could only take the manuscript scholar so far. Studying Catullus manuscripts at first hand exposed Ballou to the whole tradition of a Latin text and she was a diligent student. As it turned out, the newly discovered Vatican manuscript of Catullus once belonged to the 14th and early 15th century Florentine statesman and scholar Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) and was in his hand. Hale had already established that fact, but he was interested in the sort of analysis of inks and hands that his protégée Ballou could provide for the other major manuscripts, not only in Rome but also in Venice and Paris in particular. It was important to establish who owned and corrected particular manuscripts of Catullus. Famous scholars and manuscript collectors such as Petrarch (1304–74) formed part of the tradition, as well as Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459). A preoccupation of Hale and all textual scholars at the time was precisely dating particular manuscripts, then working out their relation to each other, especially where it could be established that one was a direct copy of another. Identifying correctors by their hand and ink was therefore considered a secure method for dating them.

While humanist scholars left personal traces in manuscripts, they were not systematically establishing texts for individual authors. Likewise, editors of Catullus between the fifteenth and nineteenth century had not seen their task as unravelling the tradition so much as finding the best manuscript to print. So, when Hale announced that for her travelling fellowship in 1901/2 his colleague and pupil Susan Ballou ‘is engaged upon a very important piece of work’,²³ he meant he had entrusted her with helping him advance the study of the manuscript tradition of Catullus, which she did. Indeed, her work for Hale on Catullus is still recognised by Catullan experts.²⁴ One thing that stood out was her very detailed study of the inks and hands of the key manuscripts, especially the Paris manuscript (G), carefully differentiating hands that looked similar to the naked eye.

Ballou’s former Chicago teacher Abbott was also at the American School in Rome at the same time. Not only did she benefit from him, but also from the School’s young Director, Richard Norton (1872–1918), and the taciturn art historian, Herbert Fletcher De Cou (1868–1911), who later was notoriously ‘killed by Arabs at Cyrene’, as displayed on his memorial plate in the American Academy.²⁵ The fellows and students of

²³ *Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, ser.3 no.1–6 (1898–1903), 70. At this point, perhaps Hale had the goal of a new edition of Catullus.

²⁴ E. g. Thompson (1978), 15.

²⁵ For his epigraph plate at the American Academy: <http://dhc.aarome.org/islandora/object/ARTWORKS%3A1> (accessed 16 February 2020). At the time, De Cou was taking part in American Archaeological Institute and the Boston Museum of Fine

the American School for Classical Studies, including Ballou, also had regular opportunities to visit key sites in and around Rome and be introduced to them by School staff or by local experts in the sites themselves. Some idea of Ballou's experience in 1901/2 can be gleaned from her travel diary from a later trip (October/November 1928) when she was on leave from Bryn Mawr. She regularly joined her former student colleague but now the Director of the American Academy in Rome, as the American School for Classical Studies had become, Albert W. van Buren (1878–1968), and the current students on their excursions.²⁶ Occasionally she reflected on the changes visible since 1902.²⁷ In Rome in 1901/2, she also took the opportunity to attend lectures at the German Archaeological Institute. They were given by Christian Hülsen (1858–1935) and Augustus Mau (1840–1909), mainly lecturing in Italian but sometimes in German. Not only were Hülsen and Mau renowned scholars, but they had both been Berlin students of the foremost student of the Roman world, Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903), and they became his willing collaborators when prevailed upon. At Rome, Hülsen was engaged in 1901/2 in his research on the topography of Rome, as well as preparing a volume of Roman inscriptions, while Mau was already the leading authority on Pompeii and its excavations. It was only the previous year (1900/1) that the annual professor at the School, Francis Kelsey (1858–1927) from Michigan, had forbidden female students from attending Hülsen's lectures.²⁸ As the recent translator of Mau's book on Pompeii, however, Kelsey was probably more positive about Mau. In any event, Mau would normally take the students to Pompeii for several intense days of lectures and first-hand observation at the site.

Arts excavations at Cyrene, led by Norton. The Italian government which then had responsibility for Tripoli paid \$25,000 in compensation to the University of Chicago (*The Michigan Alumnus* 19 1912/13 [Ann Arbor 1913], 321).

²⁶ Ballou accompanied Van Buren and the students to Ostia (*Ballou Diary*, 1928: 25 October, 8 November), the church of SS Francesco e Paola for early Roman tombs (31 October), the Palatine (3 November) Horace's farm at Subiaco (10 November), new excavations in the Forum of Trajan (17 November), plus various places outside Rome where she had been in 1901/2 (13 November). Weather or health prevented her taking up similar invitations to Cerveteri (27 October), and Palestrina (15 November). Ballou's travel diaries are held in the Archives of the *Wisconsin Historical Society* at Madison, and quoted with permission.

²⁷ In 1928 Ballou stayed at the *Pensione Pirri* in the very same room she occupied in June 1906 (*Ballou Diary*, 1928: 8 October), passed by her former apartment in the via Sistina (7 October), consulted the same doctor who remembered her from 1901/2 (17 October), and noted the improvements made by Mussolini as a result of the excavation of the Forum of Augustus (9 October).

²⁸ Welch (2004), 75.

How women fellows and students at the American School for Classical Studies were to be admitted and treated was one of the key challenges raised by Norton with the American School's trustees in New York. Kelsey's approach was not sustainable. Already, in 1897 women were granted only limited privileges to work on inscriptions in the Vatican Museum, while the Germans had already established the precedent that women did not have the same access as men to the Vatican Library.²⁹ They had tried and failed. This challenge therefore continued. As Norton reported in 1902, while it is now much easier for students to access museums and archives 'the Vatican Library ... is open to all properly accredited students, with the exception of women, who are not regarded with favor'.³⁰ Part of the challenge, so Norton went on to complain, was that many women students, particularly from all-women's colleges in America were not properly prepared and were not serious enough about the scholarly work of the School. Rather, they 'think a year at the School would be a pleasant finishing-off process for their studies. Men of a similar class, who merely desire to pass a year straying along the pleasant paths of culture, are extremely rare. The presence of this class of student at the School is a hindrance.' Moreover, if women are mainly involved in archaeological work, they can no longer expect to be chaperoned by a male. Instead, Norton advised, 'they must come to the School prepared to undergo in the same way and in the same degree the same hardships as the men. To expect the men to "personally conduct" them about the town and country is unreasonable and inadvisable.'³¹

The answer to these particular challenges, Norton explained to the trustees, was to apply a more stringent rule than any now on the books governing the eligibility of women to the School. In particular, there ought to be a 'rule that no woman is eligible as a regular student who does not hold or has not held a position as teacher, or who cannot give proof that she is able to do so'. Such a rule, according to Norton, 'would tend to raise the reputation and standards of the School'.³² In fact, the American School was forced to think harder about raising the bar for women altogether. It was therefore proposed in 1902 that in future only women with advanced academic standing should be admitted as students. What was meant is that women needed to be at the standard of two of the current students from Chicago, Susan Ballou and Esther van Deman (1862–1937). Ballou definitely never needed a male chaperone. Although

²⁹ Hale and Smith (1898), 504, 524–5.

³⁰ Merrill and Norton (1900), 37; West and Norton (1902), 28.

³¹ West and Norton (1902), 33.

³² West and Norton (1902), 34.

neither was an official fellow in 1901/2, they were both treated as such. Subsequently, they were both Carnegie Fellows at the School and they remained in contact. Van Deman stayed mainly in Rome and became a very productive scholar. They both met up again in Rome in 1928.

In addition to her studies in Rome, Ballou spent two months of 1902 in Greece and Crete under the tutelage of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, but as part of the group from the American School at Rome. The Grecian expedition had already become an established part of the Roman school's program. Some idea of what she experienced in 1902 can be gained from Kelsey's account of the same group of American School at Rome students in Greece the previous year (1900/1). The travel conditions were inhospitable, and the itinerary adapted to the interests of the students.³³ Ballou was to relive part of this visit on a later trip in 1929. This was her first trip back to Athens since 1902 and she couldn't help but notice how much had changed.³⁴ In addition, while in Rome the previous year she accepted an invitation from the then Director, Albert Van Buren, to join him and the students who were going to Athens as part of their Greek interlude.³⁵ At short notice, she accompanied them to Delphi.³⁶

While Ballou spent most of the 1901/2 academic year collating manuscripts of Catullus at the Vatican, Venice and Paris for Professor Hale, she was prompted by Abbott at Rome to also take a special interest in the Vatican manuscripts of what, without any clear manuscript title, had become known as the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. The *SHA* was not a text she encountered in her Latin degree at Chicago, nor was it studied anywhere else in the US at that time. Indeed, study of the Roman world in the US, as well as Britain (but not Germany), then concentrated on the Roman Republic, with the Roman Empire generally only taught up to the death of the emperor Nero in 68. A half-century later nothing much had changed. The great historian Michael Rostovzeff (1870–1952), as the most reputable scholar of the period, once claimed, with long US experience and probably with the US primarily in mind, that the second and third centuries were 'the most neglected periods in the history of the

³³ Pedley (2012), 67–73.

³⁴ Ballou specifies the buildings of the American School at Athens (*Ballou Diary* 1929: 24 February), the restoration of the Propylaeum and Parthenon (28 February), seeing 'many old friends' in the Acropolis museum (3 March), the additions made to the National Museum (7 March), and her later visit to Nauplion (24 March).

³⁵ *Ballou Diary* 1928: 16 November.

³⁶ *Ballou Diary* 1929: 16–19 April.

Roman empire'.³⁷ This was precisely the era covered by the *SHA*. In fact, the *SHA* was a collection of biographies of Roman emperors from the accession of Hadrian in 117 to the deposition of Carinus in 285. The biographies were attributed to six different authors and dedicated variously to the emperors Diocletian (284–305) and Constantine (306–37), as well as certain private individuals. Hence, they purport to have been written in the late third/early fourth century. For students of the Roman empire in the second and third centuries there had long been questions about the reliability of the information they contained as well as about their genesis, authorial method and especially the various gaps in the text.

By 1901, the Vatican library held a good number of the extant manuscripts of the *SHA*. These were principally the ninth century Palatine manuscript (P), as well as much later ones.³⁸ P was one of the manuscripts transported to the Vatican in 1623 from the captured Palatinate library at Heidelberg,³⁹ although the Vatican Library only became aware of it there in 1861 when it was accidentally discovered by Adolf Kießling (1837–92), an acolyte of Mommsen.⁴⁰ In P, the *SHA* was actually headed 'vitae diversorum principum et tyrannorum a divo Hadriano usque ad Numerianum diversis compositae'. The standard *SHA* text of the day (1884), then sixteen years old when Ballou first read it, was that of Hermann Peter who had originally published his edition in 1865 utilising the newly discovered P and labelling his work *SHA* but only because he found it common usage.⁴¹ Familiarising herself with Peter's edition will only have emphasised to Ballou the editor's inadequate treatment of P, particularly the identification and significance of the manuscript's subsequent correctors and annotators. Further, she will have discovered that Peter had dated P to the eleventh century and had given priority to the ninth-century Bamberg manuscript (B) in his edition. While there was no edition later than that of Peter there had been major developments since 1885 in the study of both the text and its manuscripts.

³⁷ Rostovtzeff (1957), xvi and 435–8 (on the problem of dating and interpreting the *HA* itself). He had been in the US since 1920, first at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, then (from 1925) at Yale.

³⁸ Specifically, *Vat.Lat.* 1899, 1r–141v (14th century); 1900, 1r–116v (15th century); *Vat.Lat.* 1901, 1r–199v (15th century); *Vat.Lat.* 1902, 3r–265r (15th century) and *Vat.Lat.* 1903, 1r–194r (15th century), along with *Vat.Lat.* 5301, 1r–240r (15th century) and the condensed excerpts in *Pal.Lat.* 886, 142r–164r (9th century).

³⁹ Grafton (1993), 14 (with Plate 10).

⁴⁰ Bellezza (1959), 76.

⁴¹ Peter (1865), V: 'Scriptorum historiae Augustae qui uocantur omnes qui quidem mihi cogniti sint libri ...'

In 1890, on the basis of a sample only, Mommsen had effectively proved that P which had attracted the attention of Ballou was in fact the best extant manuscript of the *SHA*.⁴² He had not been able to see P for himself, but he did the next best thing, getting one of his Roman contacts, Eric Bethe (1863–1940), a former pupil of Kießling and Mommsen’s son-in-law Wilamowitz, to go to the Vatican library and do a sample collation for him.⁴³ It was now clear that P was to be dated to the ninth century and B was a copy of P, not the other way around as Peter had always presumed. A new edition based on P was therefore necessary and it was expected to come from Mommsen’s pupil Hermann Dessau (1856–1930), who had spent time in the Vatican library a few years before Ballou, in 1892/3, collating both P and B for the new edition Mommsen had in mind. From his own time in Berlin in 1889, when the *SHA* was becoming a controversial topic for local philologists, Abbott knew not only Mommsen, but also Dessau and especially that he was engaged in the necessary new edition of the *SHA*. While Mommsen still expected Dessau to produce an edition and encouraged him in that direction,⁴⁴ he later wrote to Mommsen that he would not be producing a new edition after all.⁴⁵ Instead, he proceeded to publish in 1894 the results of his investigations into P and B and the overall tradition of the *SHA*,⁴⁶ but his limited coverage of the manuscript tradition only reinforced Ballou’s conviction that the various readers and annotators of P still demanded proper treatment and provided the key to the other extant manuscripts.

With Ballou in mind, and presumably at her suggestion, Abbott now contacted Dessau who replied in December 1901 (*Appendix A*). Abbott had given Dessau the impression that Ballou was working not only on the *SHA* life of the emperor Aurelian (270–5) by Vopiscus, but also on those of Tacitus (275–6) and Probus (276–82). Still, despite the *SHA* being one of the most intensely debated and analysed texts in the previous decade, especially in Germany, Ballou discovered that so far P had lacked the precise analysis and comparison with the other *SHA* manuscripts that she

⁴² The manuscript can now be consulted online at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Pal.lat.899.

⁴³ Mommsen (1890), 228ff. The sample collation in P involved the first twenty pages of the *SHA*’s Life of Alexander Severus. Dessau later reported to Mommsen that Bethe had misread the manuscript in places that he listed (Letter, Dessau to Mommsen, 9 December 1892, in Glock-Schmidt [2009], 217).

⁴⁴ Letter, Mommsen to Dessau, 30 December 1892, in Glock (2009), 66–7; Dessau to Mommsen, 11 January 1893, in Glock-Schmidt (2009), 218–19.

⁴⁵ Letters, Dessau to Mommsen, 9 December 1892, in Glock-Schmidt (2009), 236–8.

⁴⁶ Dessau (1894).

had brought to Catullus. In reply, Dessau explained to Abbott that his work on the *SHA* had stalled so he would be happy for someone else like Ballou to take it up.⁴⁷ Indeed, he was totally preoccupied with the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* and related epigraphic issues which had long been his main interest and his paid position at Berlin. On top of that he was teaching at Berlin each semester.⁴⁸

With this surety that Dessau was no longer working towards an edition of the *SHA*, Ballou was able to proceed with purpose and clarity. Firstly, she would have to establish the relationship between P and the other main manuscript (B at Bamberg) on the basis of the palaeographical techniques she had learnt at Chicago, but informed by Mommsen's own judgment on how they were related and Dessau's recent collation of both of them. She would have found Abbott's exhortation reinforced by another Chicago colleague and graduate program teacher, Hendrickson, who had also been in Berlin with Mommsen in 1889, and probably met Dessau there as well. For the moment, she was concentrated on the Vatican manuscripts but a collation of witnesses to the life of Aurelian attributed in the manuscripts to Vopiscus would have drawn Ballou into the then still unresolved question of the relationship between all the manuscripts. From now on, all her research and publications were focussed on the manuscripts and text of the *SHA*. Understanding the manuscripts and their various correctors was a fundamental prerequisite to any modern edition of the *SHA*. She could now bring to the study of the *SHA* manuscripts the insights she had acquired from dating the Catullus manuscripts and determining the relationship between them.

Ballou was explicit in acknowledging that she had taken on the *SHA* in response to both Mommsen's proposal about the priority of P and the specific exhortation of her mentor, Abbott: 'the need for which was pointed out some years ago [1890] by Mommsen and brought to my notice by Professor Abbott ... during my first stay in Rome [1901/2]'.⁴⁹ Given Mommsen's case that P was in fact older than B, but also Peter's inadequate treatment of the various subsequent hands in P which vitiates his edition altogether, Ballou certainly must have realised then that she possessed the requisite palaeographical and textual skills to improve on Peter's work. By itself, P would have immediately attracted Ballou in 1902 because it was so self-contained. That is, the manuscript incorporated a variety of correctors with different inks and hands over a period of time. Her experience with Catullus manuscripts, and her Chicago training

⁴⁷ *Appendix A*, below

⁴⁸ Wannack (2007), 24–35, 65–75.

⁴⁹ Ballou (1907), 17.

under Hale, may have led her to recognise instantly the association of P with both Petrarch and Salutati, as two of P's correctors, and Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) as its owner at some stage. Having to make sense of the relationship between P and the other Vatican manuscripts exposed her to the whole complex manuscript tradition of the *SHA*. That in 1902 she made a collation of the *SHA* biography of Aurelian suggests a clear interest in looking at the text afresh. For now, however, her time in Rome was up and she would have to leave the rest for another day.

Ballou's dilemma highlights another challenge for the American School of Classical Studies at Rome in its early years, one raised by successive Directors and others, namely the need for fellows to spend more than one year at the School.⁵⁰ Given that fellows were engaged in major research projects it was argued that they needed much longer to become oriented to the range of required knowledge and technical skills. Ballou had spent most of her year at the school deepening her mastery of epigraphy, palaeography and the topography of ancient Rome, as well as working on manuscripts of Catullus for Hale as much as for herself. Only in the latter part of her time did she discover what she really wanted to investigate, namely P and the other manuscripts of the *SHA*. To continue her research on the *SHA* manuscripts at the Vatican and elsewhere she needed to find ways and means of returning to Rome. Meanwhile, no sooner was an extra year for fellows of the American School agreed by the trustees, than the argument was made for a three-year term as the desired length for completing any serious research project.

In his Annual Report of the School's activities for the 1901/2 year to their trustees, the Director, Richard Norton, had this to say:

Miss Ballou, besides general work, collated for Professor Hale various manuscripts of Catullus. She studied Ott. 1829 in the Vatican (the R of Professor Hale), and went to Venice to do similar work for him on M (Cod. Lat. LXXX, Class. XII, in St. Mark's Library), and thence was going to Paris to continue that work with G (Bibliothèque Nationale, 14,139). For herself she made a collation covering the biography of Aurelian in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* of the Vatican on the basis of Peter's text edition of 1884.⁵¹

At the end of her travelling fellowship in 1902 Ballou gave the *Association of Collegiate Alumnae* what they described as 'a most interesting report'. They summarised her work by saying that she had 'devoted much time to

⁵⁰ Hale and Peck (1899), 689.

⁵¹ West and Norton (1902), 32.

work on manuscripts at the Vatican in continuation of her work on Catullus, and partly on a new interest, the Palatine manuscript of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*.⁵² In addition, Ballou commented that ‘it may be interesting to the members of the Alumnae Association to learn that a woman who is in earnest and has a definite piece of work to accomplish receives the most generous and cordial treatment at the Vatican where, as workers, women were once unknown, and still are rare’.⁵³

As Hale had doubtless counselled her, this newly discovered interest in the *SHA* would require several more years of work in the Vatican library, not to mention other European libraries, and involve her in the most complex of academic controversies. During her stay in Athens in 1929 she was forced to reflect once more on the fellowship of 1901/2 and its impact on her life and work since then. In 1929 she was required to compile an overview of her career for the distinguished physicist Margaret Maltby (1860–1944) who was preparing a volume on the history and impact of the *Association of Collegiate Alumnae* fellowships.⁵⁴ Ballou went further and arranged ‘to have the paper-covered version of my monograph on the Manuscript Tradition of the *SHA* [1914] hunted up in my office [at Bryn Mawr] and mailed to Miss Maltby’.⁵⁵ The fellowship had sown the seed that led to the monograph years later, as well as an appointment to Bryn Mawr. She always remained grateful to the *Association of Collegiate Alumnae*.

2. Back and forth to Rome, 1902–10

In 1902/3 Ballou returned to teaching Latin at the University of Chicago, where she had for a colleague Tenney Frank (1876–1939). He was still working under Hale on his doctorate (on the mood in early Latin), which he completed in 1904, then moving onto Bryn Mawr where he later blossomed into the great student of Roman society and economy.⁵⁶ During the following year (1903/4) she spent another seven months in Rome, at her own expense evidently, as a ‘Student in Palaeography’ where

⁵² *Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, ser.3 no.1–6 (1898/1903), 94.

⁵³ *Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, ser.3 no.1–6 (1898/1903), 90.

⁵⁴ Published as Maltby (1929), 21 (the entry on Ballou).

⁵⁵ *Ballou Diary* 1929: 30 March.

⁵⁶ On Tenney Frank: Broughton (1990), 68–76.

she continued the work she had begun in 1901/2 on the Vatican manuscripts of the *SHA*.⁵⁷ By now, assured of support from both Abbott and Dessau, she pressed on with her research into the manuscripts of the *SHA*. Firstly, to obtain access to B, the American Ambassador in Rome was pressed into service, along with the German Prefect of the Vatican library, the brilliant Jesuit Franz Ehrle (1845–1934). They arranged for the German government to have the Bamberg manuscript transferred to the Vatican so Ballou could work on it there.⁵⁸ Mommsen had arranged in 1892 for the Bamberg manuscript to be sent to the Vatican library for Dessau's use, so there was at least a precedent. To have side by side the two most significant and oldest *SHA* manuscripts requiring collation was a clear privilege. Now she was making real progress towards the new edition that Mommsen had advocated, and Dessau had worked towards but had abandoned by now. Ballou was no longer just focussed on certain lives, or a particular biographer such as Vopiscus, but a new edition of the whole *SHA* altogether. Whether or not Mommsen was ever informed about this, he would presumably have approved. It was during this period of Ballou's work in Rome that Mommsen died (1 November 1903).

Again, for the 1904/5 academic year, Ballou returned to teaching Latin at Chicago. Then, during 1905/6, presumably with the continued strong backing of Abbott and Hale, not to mention Hendrickson, and by now Norton the School's director, Ballou spent a third stint in Rome at the American School. This time she was actually a Fellow of the Carnegie Institution in Latin Literature for 'research in Roman archaeology and literature'.⁵⁹ The manuscripts of the *SHA* to be evaluated in 1905/6 were not only those in the Vatican library, and that delivered to her from Bamberg, but also those in Paris and Florence.⁶⁰ In fact, Ballou set out to at least inspect all the known manuscripts including those which the editor of the *SHA*, Hermann Peter, had passed over as recent and redundant, labelling them under the rubric of Σ , their designated archetype.⁶¹ At the end of her year, the report of the School's Director (Norton)

⁵⁷ Her presence at the School in 1903/4 is noted in Norton (1904), 34.

⁵⁸ Letter Ballou to Wissowa, 2 May 1910 (*Appendix B* below). While Ballou and Ehrle could have communicated in German (or Italian), Ehrle was also a fluent English speaker, having spent five years in north-west England completing his Jesuit training and working in a Lancashire parish. He was ordained as a priest in Liverpool in 1876.

⁵⁹ West and Norton (1906), 19; Valentine (1973), 215.

⁶⁰ Paris: *Cod.Par.Lat.* 5816 (written 1356); *Cod.Par.Lat.* 5807 (the 'Regius' manuscript used by Casaubon in his edition of 1603) and *Cod.Par.Lat.* 1750 (excerpts only). Florence: *Cod. Ricc.* 551 and *Cod. Laurent.* 53.31, both from the 15th century.

⁶¹ Peter (1865), XXVIII ('omnes tamen recentioris sunt aetatis, ut verear, ut multum ex eis ad hosce scriptores emendandos redundet'). One manuscript cited by Peter

gave the impression that her ‘careful and capable investigation’ was now complete and would be published in the winter of 1906/7:

Miss Ballou, our first Carnegie Fellow in Roman Literature, took for the subject of her studies the younger manuscripts of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, following out the suggestion that, even if no other tradition exists but that of P, the relation and origin of the minor manuscripts should be established on the correct basis if possible. Miss Ballou believes she has already determined this in regard to the twelve manuscripts in the Vatican. An examination of the two Paris manuscripts, the four in Florence, the two in Milan and manuscript in Bamberg is partly completed. It is hoped that the result of this careful and capable investigation will be ready for publication sometime this winter.⁶²

In the course of investigating the ‘younger manuscripts’ in 1906/7, four of which were in the Vatican library, she noted that in many cases these manuscripts (or some of them) actually had superior readings to P.⁶³ These she attributed to the expert judgment of the 14th and 15th century scholars/scribes in question rather than see them as the product of a path of copying separate from P. Peter had grouped them together in a separate tradition of interpolated manuscripts he labelled Σ.

(*Middlehillanum* 2163, 14th cent.) which eluded Ballou in the summer of 1906 was in Cheltenham (U.K.), although she seems not to realise that the famous Phillipps Library was then at Thirlstaine Hall at Cheltenham and that T. Fitzroy Fenwick was actually the library’s current custodian (Ballou 1914, 2 n.3). Sometime later, in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, she came across a copy of the 1837 catalogue of the Phillipps library (then at Middle Hill, near Broadway, Worcestershire, hence Peter’s ‘Middhillanum’). This was presumably the *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum. Bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps, Bart AD 1837*, which lists the manuscript as ‘15th century’ (p.26), and among manuscripts listed as bought from the London bookseller Thomas Payne. That it was dated to the 15th and not the 14th century, as Peter had assumed for his 1865 edition of the *SHA* (p. XXVIII), meant instantly to Ballou that ‘I had little hope of it being of any especial value’. Incidentally, nowadays Phillipps’ manuscript of the *SHA* is owned by the State Library of Victoria and is one of Australia’s best known and best studied manuscripts. The library bought it from Sotheby’s in London in 1946 for a mere £1000 This handsome manuscript, which is still in its original bound covers, was actually commissioned in Florence by Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1479 (details in Manion and Vines [1984], 89–91 (C. O’Brien), Hudson [2013] and Burrows [2018], 96). So far as I know, the Melbourne manuscript has never been consulted by editors of the *SHA* text. A sample collation suffices to confirm Ballou’s suspicion that it is of negligible textual value for the *SHA* itself. This is not the same Phillipps manuscript of the *SHA* that was sold in New York in 1980 (cf. Stover [2020b], 116).

⁶² West and Norton (1906), 19.

⁶³ Specifically: *Codex Chigianus* H, VII.239; *Cod. Vat.Lat.* 1897, *Cod.Vat.Lat.* 1898.

With all this work completed, but not published, she returned once more to Chicago. Some months later, in the course of 1907, she addressed the *Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, during their meeting at Mandel Hall, University of Chicago. Ballou's address is most illuminating on her *SHA* research activities to date, as well as on the general conditions of research for women in Rome at the time.⁶⁴ She began by reminding her audience that she had been appointed as their travelling fellow in 1901/2 during which she got the 'microbe of foreign study and travel, of which I have not since been able to rid myself'. In emphasising the importance of scholarships like the ones she had won from the *Association of Collegiate Alumnae* (1901/2) and the *Carnegie Foundation* (1905/6) she stated that this kind of work cannot be undertaken successfully in the United States: 'the worker must go where his [*sic*] material is. And naturally that is only in the ancient libraries and monasteries (and occasionally in private possessions) in Europe 'where one lifts one's eyes from the time-old, yellowed, parchment-page, to let them rest on fine old carved or frescoed ceilings or walls hung with rich old paintings or windows of rich-hued stained glass, where the very carven chairs and tables, at which one sits, speak of an unbroken succession of scholars at least since the time when the interest of learned men [*sic*] went back to the "humanities"'.⁶⁵ Leaving aside this heavy sense of scholarly tradition, she then brings her audience to the practical challenges. 'A certain amount of training can and should be obtained at home, through practice with photographs and facsimiles', according to Ballou, but 'a piece of actual work must be done over there'. She went on to explain that while new manuscripts might be discovered, as Hale had done in 1895, there was a need to re-study all manuscripts on a modern basis. The task:

lies in the re-editing of many Latin texts on a scientific palaeographic basis, that is, by return to the examination of the existing manuscripts of a given author or work, as the best and safest basis for the reconstruction of the text. The need for this has been appreciated increasingly by classical scholars and the way pointed, in not a few cases by no less a person than the versatile and indefatigable Mommsen.⁶⁶

Having evoked a lively picture of working in the artistic ambience of a medieval library, with large numbers of other researchers from all over Europe, almost entirely male, Ballou goes on to suggest three particular

⁶⁴ *University Record* 11.3 (January 1907), 109 with text at Ballou (1907), 14–17.

⁶⁵ Ballou (1907), 15.

⁶⁶ Ballou (1907), 16.

'lines of investigation which can be pursued abroad and only there': (1) creating as far as possible an author's original text by working back through the various manuscripts copied over later centuries which involves 'pure palaeography' (handwriting styles, abbreviations, punctuation, correction) and explaining copying errors as the basis for restoring the original word or words; (2) re-editing of many Latin texts on a scientific basis by returning to the manuscripts which earlier, even quite recent, editors either did not have, did not understand, or did not report accurately. The idea of discovering lost texts or manuscripts is dismissed as unlikely 'even though it can happen in such a place as the Vatican library, that a valuable manuscript in the case of the R[oman] Catullus, found by Professor Hale of this university'; (3) the contributions made by the early humanists which can be found in the marginal notes and corrections of manuscripts, by identifying the handwriting of individual scholars and their copying of manuscripts. Ballou singles out here Petrarch, Salutati, Bembo, Bracciolini and others. In general, Ballou expounds, the researcher should bring to the library an already formulated task, in her case the manuscripts of the *SHA*, and not expect the manuscripts to suggest the task: 'I have heard Padre Ehrle, prefect of the manuscript department at the Vatican, say more than once that the Vatican is not the place to find work — one must bring his [*sic*] "job" with him and know what he wants to do with it'.⁶⁷

Although Ballou was still without a doctorate, by 1907 she had already studied the manuscripts of the *SHA* sufficiently to know how she would formulate their relationships and how to go about a new edition of the text to replace that of Peter. These ambitions were exemplified by her first two 'lines of investigation'. As for her third, discerning and explaining the hands and corrections of the various humanist scholars of the 14th and 15th century who had once used the manuscripts themselves, she was well advanced here too. In 1908 she intended publishing a separate study of the humanist correctors of P as the essential foundation of any edition. In any event, Ballou had now largely completed her detailed investigations of the manuscripts of the *SHA*, all of which had been personally inspected, collated and evaluated by her between 1901 and 1906. She had formed clear views about their age and relationship to each other, as well as the various emendations and alternative readings suggested by later scribes, particularly of P. What she had promised as a preliminary study, however, was a full presentation of her reconstruction of the tradition, having by now studied most of the manuscript witnesses and previous editions. What she had learned in her close study of the manuscript

⁶⁷ Ballou (1907), 16.

tradition of Catullus had been subsequently applied to the *SHA*. In 1909 she was reported as continuing 'her work on the manuscripts and constitution of the text' of the *SHA*.⁶⁸

Meanwhile, despite the flurry of recent activity among scholars in Germany, the *SHA* still attracted little direct interest in America. A notable exception was Joseph Drake (1860–1947) who published a detailed article in 1899 on the sources of the *SHA*'s life of the emperor Caracalla by Aelius Spartianus. Drake was then an Instructor in Latin at the University of Michigan, having spent two years (1890–1) studying in Germany (Jena and Munich), and was now on leave in Greifswald.⁶⁹ Like Abbott at Chicago, Drake will have become familiar with the scholarly controversy surrounding the *SHA* during his period in Germany and was perhaps influenced by Mommsen's suggestion that research should focus on individual lives.⁷⁰ Drake had completed his *SHA* research before Ballou even discovered the *SHA*. There is no evidence that in 1902, or later, Ballou ever sought out Drake, her geographically most proximate fellow-student of the *SHA*. In any event, Drake himself became pre-occupied with Roman Law and most of his subsequent long career was in Michigan's Law Faculty.⁷¹ A few years later, while Ballou was deep into the research on the manuscripts of the *SHA*, another young Michigan Latinist, perhaps directly influenced by Drake, produced a doctoral study based on the *SHA*'s life of the emperor Elagabalus. Orma Fitch Butler (1875–1937) had graduated in Latin in the very same year as Ballou (1897) but she spent the following years at Michigan undertaking a Masters degree, then completing her doctorate (1907) on the life and times of Elagabalus, as reflected in the *SHA*. While well informed on the history and controversy in Germany generated by the *SHA*, she evidently did not pursue any interest in the work beyond her doctorate. Nor was there any interest in, or research on, the *SHA* anywhere else in the US at that time. Neither Drake nor Butler were in a position to work on any manuscripts of the *SHA*. They had to rely on the 1884 text of Peter.

By now Ballou not only had the travel and study abroad bug ('microbe' was her word), as she frankly admitted, but she had also reached a point in her research on the manuscripts of the *SHA* where she was ready to formulate an overall position on the relation between all of them. She was now uniquely placed to undertake a new edition of the *SHA* based on her understanding of the manuscript tradition. Of interest too, especially to

⁶⁸ University of Chicago, *President's Report 1909*, 176.

⁶⁹ Drake (1899), 40–58.

⁷⁰ Mommsen (1890), 281.

⁷¹ Briggs (1994c), 143–4, plus obituary by Blythe Stason (1948), 447–9.

her Chicago mentors, was that she had still not completed a doctorate although she continued to be a member of the Latin faculty. By education and instinct, however, Ballou was attracted to carefully discerning the history and use of manuscripts. Becoming acquainted with the *SHA* manuscripts in the Vatican library in 1901/2 connected her immediately to the whole scholarly tradition of the *SHA*, whether she knew it then or not.

3. Approaching the *SHA*, 1475–1910

Re-examining the manuscript tradition of the *SHA* in the light of the current edition was not enough for Ballou. If she were to put the *SHA* on a new footing, she had also to engage with its complex and divergent editorial history. Peter's 1884 edition was just the latest. It is clear from her detailed and systematic work on the *SHA* that Ballou had also bothered to consult most of the earlier editions available to her in the Vatican library. To appreciate Ballou's contribution it is essential to review the main ones briefly. The very first edition of the *SHA*, was provided by a Florentine humanist Bonus Accursius (Accursio) in a welter of activity in 1475 while engaged with the printer Filippo da Lavagna in Milan.⁷² Accursius produced a series of biographies of Roman emperors by stitching together in sequence Suetonius, then the lives of Nerva and Trajan filled in from Eutropius, then the *SHA* followed by Eutropius and Books 1 to 6 of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana*. Accursius' omnibus title therefore included all the emperors from Julius Caesar to Justinian (527–65). The *Historiae Augustae Scriptores* was an invented label covering all the writers of Roman imperial biography. The work known in more recent times as the *SHA* or *HA*, however, covering just the emperors from Hadrian to Numerian (vol. 2, fols. 5r to 142v in Accursius' edition), was only a part of the story. The printing of volume 2 was dated to December 1475. Precisely what manuscript of the *SHA* Accursius printed is unclear. At least he does not bother to state such detail. A combination of *Parisinus Latinus* 5816 commissioned by Petrarch and, copied from it, the current *Vaticanus* 5301 that Accursius then owned, has been identified.⁷³

Not long after (1489/90), a similar collection of Roman biographies from Suetonius onwards was printed in two parts at Venice, again under the title of *Historiae Augustae Scriptores*, the *SHA* part (1490), that is, from Hadrian to Numerian, being the work of Bernadinus Rizus (1434–

⁷² Bellezza (1959), 20.

⁷³ Bellezza (1959), 20, cf. Ballou (1914), 82–9 (*Par.Lat.5816* alone).

1520).⁷⁴ Rizus collated the edition of Accursius with a now lost manuscript separate from P, as Stover has acutely shown, so his edition still has particular value to the textual critic.⁷⁵ Closely allied to this lost manuscript are both the manuscript discovered in Erlangen (Erlangen Universitätsbibliothek MS 647) that contains part of the *SHA* and the manuscript used in the historical works of the Dominican friend of Petrarch, Giovanni Colonna (c.1298–1343).⁷⁶ The next step was also taken at Venice by Gianbattista Egnazio (Egnatius), a friend of the humanist scholar and editor Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536). Egnazio was involved in an edition published by the press of Aldus Manutius (1449–1515) in 1516.⁷⁷ Again, the *SHA* formed just part of a comprehensive and elongated imperial history, or succession of imperial biographies, down to the death of the last Roman emperor (Constantine XI, 1453) and the present Holy Roman Emperor (Maximilian I). Egnazio may have been completing the recently deceased Manutius' intention to publish such an edition. Again too, it seems that Egnazio had satisfied himself with merely reprinting the previous edition, that by Rizus, but separating out senior emperors (*Augusti*) from junior emperors (*Caesares*) and usurpers (*tyranni*).

The other great Renaissance printing establishment was that of Johann Froben (1460–1527) at Basel. By this time, Erasmus had moved to Basel and was working with Froben on new editions of classical texts and other compositions. Among them was an omnibus edition of the lives of the Roman emperors in 1518 that he found instructive for present purposes, beginning with Suetonius. At least they demonstrated how a good man could become an evil emperor or how the responsibility of managing such a far-flung empire was too much for one person. In any event, according to Erasmus, the late third/early fourth century *SHA* were valuable writers of considerable historical merit. Unlike the text of Suetonius for whom he could find a superior old manuscript, with the *SHA* he was less fortunate. Instead, Erasmus says he did the only thing he could do, namely print the *SHA* with fewer mistakes than previously.⁷⁸

⁷⁴ Rizus, Bernardinus (1490) with Johannes Vercellensis, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Venice

⁷⁵ Stover (2020a), 173.

⁷⁶ Stover (2020b), 169–83, cf. Bellezza (1959), 23–4.

⁷⁷ Bellezza (1959), 26–8.

⁷⁸ Letter 586 to Frederick and George, Dukes of Saxony 6 June 1517, in Mynors and Thomson (1977), 376. This letter is actually the preface to the volume published in 1518 by Froben. For Froben's advice to the reader: Stover (2020b), 122–3. The extent of Beatus Rhenanus' involvement with Froben and Erasmus in this volume is unclear but may be considerable (Hirstein 1989).

He had prepared his edition following closely the recent one of his friend Egnazio. The printing was already being prosecuted under the critical eye of Erasmus when a manuscript that Froben (and probably Erasmus) had been seeking from the monastery at Murbach finally turned up. Murbach was one of the original Irish foundations on the Continent in the 7th century and its manuscript of the *SHA* (listed in its catalogue) was always likely to be important.

Given Erasmus' awareness of the differences between manuscripts of any Latin work, the best that could be done at that stage, with half the edition already printed, was to print superior readings from the Murbach manuscript in the margins of the page. With the printing complete, the manuscript was no longer required and was promptly discarded. The Erasmus/Froben edition is still valuable because of its readings which can be attributed to the lost Murbach manuscript (M). Accordingly, the margins contained a series of preferred readings throughout the text. The text, however, unlike P, included the lives of the individual *SHA* authors in chronological sequence, so the volume had the comprehensive title *Ex recognitione Des. Erasmi Roterodami, C. Suetonius Tranquillus. Dion Cassius Nicaeus. Aelius Spartianus. Julius Capitolinus. Aelius Lampridius. Vulcatius Gallicanus. V.C. Trebellius Pollio. Flavius Vopiscus Syracusius. Quibus adiuncti sunt: Sex. Aurelius Victor. Eutropius. Paulus Diaconus. Ammianus Marcellinus. Pomponius Laetus Ro. Jo. Baptista Egnatius Venetus*.⁷⁹ In other words, here was a virtual library of Roman imperial biography and history, from beginning to end. Erasmus' edition was republished by Gottfried Hittorp (1485–1573) at Cologne in 1527. Other versions appeared periodically between the 1520s and 1590s.⁸⁰ As with the Rizus edition of 1490, the Erasmus edition in 1518 needs to be seen in the light of the lost Murbach manuscript of which only a page is preserved in a Nuremberg binding.⁸¹

The first exclusive and critical edition with close attention to the text of the *SHA* and the problems it raises was initiated in 1603 by Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614), a renowned and powerful critic of classical texts, using a Paris manuscript (*Cod.Par.Lat.* 5807). It was Casaubon, for instance, who first suggested that the stylistic affinities across several of the different named authors was so similar they could have all been

⁷⁹ Bellezza (1959), 28–31; Sebastiani (2018), 311–14.

⁸⁰ Details of each in Bellezza (1959), 34–49. It was only in the second volume (published 1590) of the 1588 edition that Zosimus was introduced as covering missing parts of the *SHA*. The manuscript of Zosimus had been discovered in the Vatican library by Sylburg (Bellezza [1959], 46–7).

⁸¹ Stover (2020a), 187; (2020b), 121–4.

written by the same person.⁸² He also considered that, as they stand, the lives are but fragments of earlier works.⁸³ The critical edition of Casaubon, devoted exclusively to the *SHA*, was later supplemented by that of his friend Claudius Salmasius (1588–1653) when he published his version with even more notes and emendations.⁸⁴ Salmasius had access to the manuscript in the Palatine library at Heidelberg (P) but he did not publish his volume until 1620. Meanwhile, in 1611, Jan Gruter (1560–1627), librarian at the Palatine library and another friend of Salmasius, made his own contribution, again based on the manuscript in his care as librarian. He was the first user of P. The most convenient edition, based on the ‘incomparable edition’ of Salmasius, but including the notes of Casaubon, Salmasius and Gruter carefully distinguished and printed at the bottom of the page, was that later assembled by the Dutch schoolmaster Cornelius Schrevelius for the local Leiden publisher Hack in 1661. A decade later the work was reprinted by the same publisher and dedicated to John Meerman (1624–75) by the ‘Hackii fratres tui nominis cultores humillimi’. It was to be almost two centuries (1860s) before this volume was improved, and even then it was not made redundant.⁸⁵ Apart from the text itself, it has really only been the recent Budé edition which has superseded the work of the brothers Hack.

All these editions were familiar to Ballou by 1907. Consequently, she was well aware that certain questions had been evident from the beginning of scholarly interest in the lives: why doesn’t the order of the lives in the main *SHA* manuscripts (i.e. P and B) follow the exact order of the emperors? Why didn’t the series begin with the emperor Nerva in continuation of Suetonius? How are the similarities of style and vocabulary of different authors to be explained? If, as they themselves say, some of these authors wrote many more biographies than the ones in the *SHA*, why were these particular ones selected, when and by whom? The earliest modern research in the 1830s onwards tended to focus on these immediate questions without answering any of them definitively. By 1845, Gottfried Bernhardt (1800–76) was formulating a plan, later abandoned, of preparing a new edition of the *SHA*, building on the work of Casaubon, Salmasius and Gruter.⁸⁶ Perhaps he was discouraged by his futile search in the Vatican library for what he realised would be the best

⁸² Grafton (1991), 148.

⁸³ Grafton (2020), 60–1.

⁸⁴ *Historiae Augustae*: Paschoud (2009)

⁸⁵ Note the comment of Paschoud (2009), 201 on its use for the modern editor of the *HA*.

⁸⁶ Bernhardt (1845).

manuscript (P). Only with the rediscovery of P in the Vatican library in 1861, did modern editions become viable.⁸⁷ The manuscript had been lying unnoticed, and uncatalogued, in the Vatican library since the Palatine collection was deposited there in 1623.

Immediately, the potential to prepare a new edition of the *SHA* based on the best manuscript was noticed. Henri Jordan (1833–86), probably prompted by his former teacher Mommsen, travelled to Rome and brought back a collation of P, then set about his edition. To share the work, he co-opted Franz Eyssenhardt (1838–1901) and their edition appeared in 1864. While Jordan had collated P and Eyssenhardt B they shared their collations and divided the lives between them.⁸⁸ Mommsen's key contribution was acknowledged in the preface and his emendations are recorded throughout, especially in the 'addenda'.⁸⁹ The Jordan-Eyssenhardt edition (1864) was immediately superseded, however, by the Teubner edition of Hermann Peter (1865), giving priority to the 9th century Bamberg manuscript (B) and dating P to the 11th century. Yet, there were shortcomings with both P and B. They both began with the emperor Hadrian, so it was taken that the lives of his predecessors Nerva and Trajan were missing from the archetype, that is, assuming the *SHA* represented a continuation of the *vitae* of Suetonius which ended with Domitian. Earlier editions had created lives of Nerva and Trajan from the summary fourth century work of Eutropius, or the Latin translation of Cassius Dio by Giorgio Merula (1430–94) that covered this period. There were other problems with P and B for any editor as well: (1) omitted words and sentences here and there in certain lives, with some denoted by gaps left in the manuscript meaning that the scribe of P (followed by B) could not read the damaged archetype at this point, and others having to be conjectured; (2) misplaced sections amounting to whole folios; (3) a clear gap, or lacuna, in the tradition leading to the omission of certain lives (Philip the Arab, Aemilianus and most of that of Valerian, that is from 244 to 259 or so). In early editions they too had been filled from elsewhere, mainly (since 1590) the fifth-century *New History* of Zosimus. Peter divided all the known manuscripts into three separate classes: genuine witnesses to the original (Π), interpolated ones (Σ) and mixed (partly genuine/partly interpolated) ones (Ψ). Subsequent students of the text of the *SHA*, including Ballou, progressively challenged these classes or sought to redistribute individual manuscripts from one class to another. One class (Ψ) was eventually abandoned.

⁸⁷ Bellezza (1959), 76.

⁸⁸ Jordan and Eyssenhardt (1864), iii and vi; Bellezza (1959), 76.

⁸⁹ Jordan and Eyssenhardt (1864), xxvi.

When Ballou first encountered the *SHA* in 1901/2, she inevitably relied on the latest scholarly edition, namely that of Peter, published by Teubner at Leipzig in 1884. It was the revised version of his 1865 edition, but in the twenty years between them there had been an explosion of interest in the text of the *SHA*, almost entirely in Germany, as the basis for discerning its composition and purpose. For several years, Peter had been engaged in critical study of the *SHA* and had previously published emendations to the received text.⁹⁰ Even so, he still insisted on the priority of the Bamberg manuscript (B), but the ‘conspectus’ of manuscripts was amplified.⁹¹ By 1901 he had established himself as the foremost student of the *SHA* although by now several other scholars, especially stimulated by Mommsen at Berlin, had found themselves dealing with the *SHA* in detail and rethinking the nature and tradition of the entire work. Mommsen may not have seen first-hand either the Bamberg or Vatican manuscripts, but he had formed the view that priority must be given to P not B.⁹²

While P was now in the Vatican library it had previously been part of the imperial library at Heidelberg and, as noted, was accessible there to some of the first modern students of the ancient work, Gruter and Salmasius in particular. The manuscript was originally transcribed in the 9th century, probably at one of the Carolingian monasteries founded from England and Ireland rather than in Italy as once thought.⁹³ Later, however, it formed part of the cathedral library at Verona where it was utilised by Petrarch in the 14th century. Around 1588 it passed from Verona to the Palatinate library at Heidelberg. In 1623 it was sent along with cartloads of other manuscripts to the Vatican library. To conserve weight, its cover was torn off. Later it was rebound and stamped with the motif of the Barberini family.⁹⁴ Given the manifest importance of the Palatine manuscript, if Ballou was to advance present understanding of the *SHA*, she had to take close account of its origins and subsequent use.

4. Engaging with the *SHA*, 1889–1910

When Ballou was in Rome in 1901 and 1902, progressing through what turned out to be her first stint at the American School for Classical

⁹⁰ Notably: Peter (1860), his Bonn dissertation, and Peter (1863).

⁹¹ Peter (1884), XLII.

⁹² Mommsen (1890), 281.

⁹³ Proposed locations have been Fulda (McKitterick [2004], 42) or Lorsch, perhaps Luxeuil or near Murbach (Stover 2020a, 149–150; 2020b, 120 n.53).

⁹⁴ Ballou (1914), 41.

Studies, she was deepening her palaeographical knowledge and experience in the Vatican library. Yet, she could not examine and analyse in isolation the *SHA* manuscripts she discovered there without being aware that the *SHA* had become a controversial and contested topic in recent years especially in Germany, but not America. The leading Roman historians at Berlin, Theodor Mommsen and Otto Hirschfeld (1843–1922), had been involved in not just improving the text of the *SHA* but also in addressing its authorship and reliability, given the widespread agreement that many of the documents it quotes were clearly forgeries. In 1889, as Privatdozent, their pupil Hermann Dessau gave a series of lectures at Berlin in which he proposed that the *SHA* was the work of a single author writing in the late fourth century who passed off his work as that of six separate authors decades earlier. Not only were some documents fakes, as had been realised for some time, but so was the entire work. Dessau was then working on the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (CIL) and its ancillary project, the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (PIR), both founded by his teacher Mommsen who remained an active contributor to both projects. Dessau had joined the PIR only late, compared to his collaborator Elimar Klebs (1852–1918) who had read the *SHA* carefully and compiled PIR slips for the 5000 individuals mentioned in the text. Mommsen, Hirschfeld and Klebs had already published articles on the *SHA* text and related issues.⁹⁵ The nature and reliability of the *SHA* were live topics for all of them.

Having drafted part of his lectures as an article, Dessau sought comments on the draft from Mommsen and Hirschfeld. In suggesting amendments, they both encouraged its publication and the article appeared quickly in the local journal founded and still guided by Mommsen, namely *Hermes*.⁹⁶ Mommsen and Hirschfeld also conceded that there were later fourth-century traces in the text of the *SHA*, but they were not persuaded by Dessau's idea of a single late fourth century hoaxer for the entire *SHA*.⁹⁷ Rather, in their view, the post-Tetrarchic elements were the inadvertent work of a later editor who brought together the

⁹⁵ Mommsen (1878); Klebs (1888) and (1889); Hirschfeld (1869), (1881) and (1884).

⁹⁶ Dessau (1889).

⁹⁷ The crucial summary passage (Dessau [1889], 375) was: 'Es lässt sich dieser Sachverhalt meines Erachtens nicht erklären durch die Annahme, die Sammlung sei im Ausgang des 4. Jahrhunderts interpolirt worden, sondern nur so, dass man annimmt, die einzelnen Stücke der Sammlung seien im Ausgang des 4. Jahrhunderts niedergeschrieben und ihnen von ihren Autoren der Schein einer früheren Entstehung verliehen worden.'

various earlier lives by six different authors.⁹⁸ Other aspects of Dessau's argument, especially what he took to be the anachronistic, that is, later fourth century, geographical, administrative, prosopographical and numismatic traces in the text of the *SHA* were contradicted. Further, the names (e.g. Toxotius, Ragonius) which Dessau indicated could not be individuals from as soon as the third or early fourth century, as portrayed, lead his critics to argue otherwise. Klebs (1890, 1892) and Mommsen (1890) published critiques of Dessau's whole argument which proved decisive at the time. As an expert Latinist, Eduard Wölfflin (1831–1908) at Munich had been asked by Mommsen to investigate the question of style and vocabulary. He concluded that the *SHA* could not be the work of a single author. Rather, it was the work of several distinct authors with the final collection edited by Vopiscus who had written the latest lives.⁹⁹ In addition, words and phrases which Dessau singled out as belonging only to the fourth century could be identified earlier. In the end, Dessau's only immediate convert was another of Mommsen's pupils, Otto Seeck (1850–1921) at Greifswald. While Seeck approved of Dessau's argument for a single author for the whole collection of biographies, he insisted that it could only be dated even later to the time of the Gallic usurper Constantine (407–11). Seeck's case was quickly repudiated, which left him isolated. Finally, in 1892 Peter devoted a long and detailed analysis to reclaiming the place of the *SHA* as the product of distinctive original authors from the time of Diocletian and Constantine, such as Vopiscus, but collected and edited later on.¹⁰⁰ Mommsen encouraged Dessau to respond to his friendly critics which he did,¹⁰¹ but his teacher found Dessau's effort unsatisfactory.¹⁰²

In dealing with the challenge of Dessau's argument about the date and nature of the *SHA*, Mommsen concluded in 1890 that what was now required was a thorough reconsideration of the *SHA*, its nature, construction and credibility above all. This would require: (1) a detailed commentary on each of the lives; and (2) a modern index, or lexicon, of *SHA* words.¹⁰³ More urgent still was a new edition. Improving the text became the immediate responsibility of Dessau himself who was in Rome (1892–3) collating P as well as B. Mommsen had specially arranged for B

⁹⁸ Mommsen (1890), with Croke (1990), 165 (an enthusiastic endorsement of Dessau that now requires tempering).

⁹⁹ Wölfflin (1891).

¹⁰⁰ Peter (1892).

¹⁰¹ Dessau (1892).

¹⁰² Letter, Mommsen to Dessau, 30 December 1892, in Glock (2009), 66–7.

¹⁰³ Mommsen (1890), 281. More detail in Croke (forthcoming).

to be transferred to the Vatican library for Dessau's use. On 9 December 1892 he advised Mommsen that his collations had uncovered several mis-readings by Peter but also by Mommsen's agent, Bethe.¹⁰⁴ In reply, Mommsen recommended that Dessau focus on the manuscripts, especially P, and publish his findings on the manuscripts and on the transmission process for the *SHA* in a journal article:

Since there can no longer be any doubt about the relationship between the two codices, it could become questionable whether the B[ambergensis] should not be eliminated. Critically, this will be the case; but as things stand, you will certainly do well to note all its deviations from P. It goes without saying that wherever changes are made in this, the question must be resolved in detail as to whether the scribe of B had the correction or the early text in front of him. The aim of your work should be to present P.'s reading everywhere in such a way that the tradition can be easily and clearly recognized in each individual case.

Mommsen went on to tell Dessau that a new edition was now required urgently, and he volunteered to assist if necessary:

Actually, the matter can only be settled through an edition, and we also agree that such an edition, with the addition of the necessary parallel passages in extenso, is a necessity, especially for the historian. I don't think the task is particularly arduous, if you don't want to take it too far, and I would suspect that you'll soon be done with it; I may be willing to support you in any way you choose. However, if you can't get around to it now, it will probably be best to put down the result of your collation, which cannot fill very many printed pages, in summary form as a journal article so that the edition can follow it later. The kindness of fate that both manuscripts are available to you at the same time imposes on you, so to speak, the obligation of such work. However, you would then have to prepare for others to reap the harvest ...¹⁰⁵

After completing the collation and publishing his views on the manuscript tradition (Dessau 1894), Dessau did not feel inclined to carry

¹⁰⁴ Letter, Dessau to Mommsen (M 85), 9 December 1892, in Glock-Schmidt (2009), 217.

¹⁰⁵ Letter, Mommsen to Dessau, 30 December 1892, in Glock (2009), 65–7.

on with the editorial work.¹⁰⁶ He much preferred epigraphy and his work for Mommsen on the *CIL*.

When Ballou first set about investigating the Palatine manuscript in the Vatican Library in 1901/2, Dessau's publication (1894) was the most recent relevant item but a modern edition to replace that of Peter seemed no closer. There had been no serious work on the other manuscripts of the *SHA*, neither in the Vatican library nor elsewhere. The fact remained that the unsatisfactory 1884 edition of Peter had not been replaced despite advances in understanding of the *SHA* and its text. The express need for a detailed lexicon of the *SHA*, one of Mommsen's goals, had begun and was progressing in instalments.¹⁰⁷ Otherwise, Ballou was not distracted by the controversial issues that had emerged in the 1880s and 1890s. She would have agreed with Mommsen and Dessau that the priority issue was getting the text straight.

From 1901 to 1907, first at Chicago but mainly at Rome, Ballou developed her mastery of the *SHA* manuscripts. It was an article published in the local Chicago journal *Classical Philology* on 'The Manuscripts of the Historia Augusta' in 1908 that set out the blueprint for Ballou's future work. There she drew attention to the unsatisfactory, at times erroneous, reporting of the readings of P in Peter's current edition. This has led to what she bluntly called the 'waste of time and ingenuity on the part of scholars in emending readings which do not exist'.¹⁰⁸ She was responding to Fritz Rühl (1907) who had proffered a range of textual improvements, based on dubious readings in Peter's edition. By examining the manuscript that she already knew well, and with her acquired knowledge of the various correctors' hands and inks, she was able to demonstrate the shortcomings of the sample collation which Mommsen had to rely on.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, she had determined that it was a complete failure to understand the corrections and correctors which had undermined all previous collations of P:

Furthermore, the matter of correctors' hands in P is one of considerable importance and has never had adequate treatment. Their respective contributions to the history of the text emendation of the Historia Augusta come to be of special interest and value if the most numerous

¹⁰⁶ Letter, Dessau to Mommsen (M 86), 11 January 1893, in Glock-Schmidt (2009), 218.

¹⁰⁷ Lessing (1901–6).

¹⁰⁸ Ballou (1908), 273.

¹⁰⁹ Mommsen (1890), 282. Dessau had earlier found fault with the transcription provided to Mommsen (Letter, Dessau to Mommsen [M85], 9 December 1892, in Glock-Schmidt (2009), 217.

and important can be identified as the work of the great pioneer humanist, Petrarch.

Ballou went on to explain that her identification of Petrarch (1304–74) as a corrector and promoter of the *SHA* would be dealt with in detail in the course of her study of all the correctors' hands and the origin of their corrections:

Having devoted so much time and labor to making a complete and, I trust, accurate collation of P and Bm together with a more or less thorough examination of all the minor MSS to which I could get access ... [including Paris 5816, a copy made for Petrarch] for the first time ... I hope in the near future to publish a full and accurate report of P, together with such information in regard to the minor MSS and their relation to P as shall settle several open questions concerning their value for the text.¹¹⁰

Primarily, Ballou was concerned with the detailed study of the manuscripts and the various Latin bookhands and inks involved in correcting and annotating P. She had realised this would be her distinctive contribution to the textual tradition and to the text itself. Whether or not she pursued her planned edition of the *SHA* lives of Tacitus and Probus (both attributed by the manuscripts to Vopiscus), she did expand her research on the manuscripts. She was aware, of course, that Dessau had himself collated P and B and published his conclusions in 1894. He had not, however, studied all the extant manuscripts, particularly the various scribal additions and corrections contained in them.

Dessau had completed most of the basic work required to prepare a new edition of the *SHA*, at least he had fully collated P and B, and was still expected to do so. In 1909, although an edition of the *SHA* 'in the spirit of Mommsen' might still have been expected from Dessau,¹¹¹ he himself was happy to leave it to others, including Ballou. As time passed, and Ballou herself came to develop a command of the manuscripts and textual challenges involved, she was herself in the best position to prepare a new edition. By 1907, she may have felt her research on the *SHA* manuscripts was complete. All that was required was a suitable publisher. Her 1908 article summarised some of her key conclusions and what must become the basis for a new edition of the *SHA*. Meanwhile, back in

¹¹⁰ Ballou (1908), 276–7.

¹¹¹ Norden (1909), 352.

Chicago she probably did not know that Peter himself was already working on a new edition of the *SHA* for Teubner. This time he would have to accord due priority to P. She may have known, however, that he had recently been at the Vatican library examining P once again and was now convinced of its priority.¹¹² This time Peter was not working by himself but in conjunction with Ernst Kornemann (1868–1946) whose own preference had been to involve his former Berlin teacher Dessau, only to be told by Dessau in 1908 that he was too preoccupied with the *CIL* and other epigraphical interests. Kornemann's invitation was declined.¹¹³ Dessau could give the projected edition his blessing, but Kornemann would have to find his own way forward.

5. The Gießen doctorate, 1910–11

By May 1910, with the more comprehensive publication of her research still languishing, Ballou had resolved to complete her research on the *SHA* at a German university and use it to qualify for a doctorate. In particular, so she told Georg Wissowa (1859–1931) at Halle, she had in mind completing an edition of the *SHA* as her thesis. After all, she had undertaken the most difficult part already, namely the establishment of the manuscript tradition which had given her an intimate knowledge of the whole text. As noted above, Ballou was directed to the manuscripts of the *SHA* by her Chicago teacher Frank Frost Abbott, who was familiar with recent and current research in Germany, where the *SHA* had become a matter of great controversy, and where considerable dissatisfaction was being expressed about the current edition (Peter, 1884). It was probably Abbott who now proposed on 2 May 1910 the idea of a German doctorate for her. Accordingly, she wrote to Wissowa (*Appendix B*, Letter 1, below).

Ballou's letter to Wissowa sought his advice on her proposal to spend her forthcoming leave for the academic year 1910–11 at Halle then using her accumulated research on the manuscripts of the *SHA* to submit for a doctorate at the end of the period. Her letter was a sort of academic autobiography and provided valuable insights to her capacity at this point. She explained to Wissowa that she would not need to spend any time learning the language because she was already a fluent speaker of German (as well as French and Italian). Moreover, she was used to lectures in German, having audited Professors Hülsen and Mau at Rome in 1902 and probably others in subsequent years in Rome.

¹¹² Peter (1906), 35.

¹¹³ Letter: Dessau to Hirschfeld (H 60), 18 September 1908, in Glock-Schmidt (2009), 312.

If Ballou was expecting a quick and decisive reply from Wissowa she was disappointed. Instead, she had to make her own plans. By the time she wrote again to Wissowa later in the year (*Appendix B*, Letter 2, below), she was already a student in the University at Gießen, having spent the summer term of 1910 in Göttingen. While Wissowa's reply is no longer extant, he evidently assumed that Ballou was a male. At least that is the impression he gave her, which she felt needed to be corrected. If it was unusual in America, an issue Chicago was designed to confront, it was even more unusual in Germany for a woman to be so actively involved in the man's world of scholarship and research.¹¹⁴ In fact, the first woman to ever be admitted to a lecture in Classics at the University of Munich was a German-born American, Edith Hamilton (1867–1963), in 1896. As Ascher put it: 'she had a chair on the lecturer's platform where nobody could be contaminated by her'.¹¹⁵

In the summer semester of 1910 Ballou attended lectures at Göttingen from Georg Körte and the Greek historian Georg Busolt (1880–1920). There she also met Friedrich Leo (1851–1914), a former student of Mommsen, now renowned for his study of the literary techniques of Greek and Roman biography, including the *SHA*.¹¹⁶ In fact, Leo had recently published his valuable views on the *SHA* concluding that Mommsen was most likely correct in postulating a later fourth century editor for the whole *SHA*.¹¹⁷ He would have been a very appropriate supervisor for Ballou's planned doctorate had she stayed in Göttingen. Also at Göttingen was the one person who was likely to be able to show Ballou new ways of looking at the *SHA*, namely Wilhelm Meyer (1845–1917), the pioneering student of medieval Latin. For some reason, however, she did not meet him. From Göttingen she moved to the University of Gießen where in November 1911 she completed a doctorate (aged 43) on the *clausulae* in Vopiscus, the author of the *SHA* lives of the emperors Aurelian, Tacitus, Probus, the Four Usurpers and Carus/Carinus/Numerian. The thesis was published by Wagner at Weimar in 1912 as *De clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio*. How and why Ballou was attracted to Gießen at this time is not obvious except, as she confessed to Wissowa (*Appendix B*, Letter 2), she did not feel welcome in

¹¹⁴ Singer (2003), 7–15 for background. Women were rarely welcomed in most German universities at the time, and only recently permitted to enrol fully (Mazón [2003], 115–52).

¹¹⁵ Ascher (1973), 355, based on the testimony of her sister Alice who had accompanied her to Germany. For details: Houseman (2023), 78–80. German universities often made exception for American students (Singer [2003], 11).

¹¹⁶ Leo (1901), 269–315.

¹¹⁷ Leo (1901), 304.

the larger and more prestigious universities. Despite her fluent German, she had the disadvantages of being a foreigner and a woman. This was not an uncommon situation in German universities.¹¹⁸ Unlike Göttingen, however, at Gießen there was no Latin scholar at the time who might be an appropriate supervisor for a thesis on the *SHA*.¹¹⁹ In the customary *vita* attached to the thesis she acknowledged three ‘learned men’ in Gießen: Otto Immisch (1862–1936), Alfred Körte (1866–1946), brother of the man she had met in Göttingen, and the archaeologist and art historian Karl Watzinger (1877–1948).¹²⁰ Of these, she singles out Gießen’s resident expert in Greek philosophy, Immisch, as her *Doktorvater*. Ballou thanked him for sparing no effort or care on her work, as well as for his kindness and learning. Nonetheless, he was no expert on the *SHA* or other relevant Latin literature, or even the relatively new field of research on *clausulae*. She was on her own, in that regard. Still, she could fall back on her maturity and motivation, buttressed by her intimate knowledge of the manuscripts and editions of the *SHA* after a decade-long detailed study.

Interestingly, for her doctorate Ballou did not pursue her ambition for a new edition of the *SHA*, as foreshadowed in 1910 (*Appendix B*, Letter 1), based on her detailed and decisive research in the manuscripts, not even just the lives of Flavius Vopiscus (Aurelian to Numerian). By now, in Germany, she had probably discovered that the ageing Hermann Peter was already engaged by Teubner in a third edition of the *SHA*, this time presumably dealing with P as the prior manuscript and not B. Peter had also been entrusted by the publisher with a helper or supervisor in Ernst Kornemann. So, instead of an edition, she chose for her doctorate to take on a stylistic analysis of the *clausulae*, or clausal endings, of just one of the putative authors, Vopiscus. For a Latinist such as Ballou, a study of *clausulae* was a fashionable and relatively new area of research, even though it was an immensely technical and complex topic. Among other things, it was seen as a new tool to be deployed in the reconstruction of Greek and Latin texts. Ballou had grasped its potential to further correct the text of the *SHA*, by ensuring it meets the author’s internal rhetorical patterns. In addition, by treating in depth the *clausulae* of one of the writers of the *SHA* she would be opening up the possibility of comparing this stylistic feature of the author with the same feature among the other

¹¹⁸ The redoubtable M. Carey Thomas had been stymied at Göttingen (Horowitz [1994], 144–6; Axtell [2016], 251–3.)

¹¹⁹ Gundel (1957), 192–221, at 199.

¹²⁰ On these scholars: Immisch: Becker (1974), 164f. and Hausrath (1937), 1–3; Körte: Thierfelder (1980), 394 and Webster (1949), 179–80; Watzinger at http://cpr.uni-rostock.de//resolve/id/cpr_person_00003375 (accessed 14 February 2020).

five authors. Similarity would obviously point in the direction of a single author, as Dessau had proposed in 1889 but had not convinced his scholarly peers, nor Ballou. Different patterns of *clausulae* among the different authors would tend to reinforce the case for multiple authorship after all.

At Mommsen's request, Wölfflin, at Munich, found that each of the *SHA* authors was distinctive in terms of their narrative method, their grammatical repertoire and linguistic range. Still, there was no serious attention to the *clausulae* of the *SHA* in particular, except for an article by Paul von Winterfeld (1872–1905), published in 1902, that may well have influenced Ballou or at least sparked her interest. Winterfeld's article was much acclaimed and his argument readily conceded, but he had no time to expand on it or reconsider it. Already a medical invalid, he died in 1904 not long after being made extraordinary professor at Berlin. What he had sought to prove was that certain parts of the *SHA* life of Hadrian by Spartianus lack the consistent metrical patterns of the rest of the life. Accordingly, these sections must be the extracts from a different document altogether, which was readily identified as Hadrian's own autobiography that Spartianus claims to have used. If so, then Winterfeld's *clausulae* analysis provided clear new insight into identification of sources within an author. His findings had then been taken further by Kornemann who focussed on separating Hadrian's own words from those of another source whom he dubbed 'Rome's last historian'.¹²¹

Meyer at Göttingen is credited with being the originator of the move to *clausulae* research, but it was the Polish scholar Tadeusz Zielinski (1859–1944) who first demonstrated its power. On the basis of studying the prose rhythm of all Cicero's speeches, he had formed a rule to which the endings of Cicero's various works conformed. Zielinski was clearly a major influence on Ballou's approach to Vopiscus, as he still is on *clausulae* in general. Besides Berlin, Göttingen and Gießen, within a few years and along narrow tracks, there was considerable interest at Chicago and at Yale, with their German connections. At Chicago another of Abbott's students, a close contemporary of Ballou, was John Jacob Schlicher (born 1869) of Austrian descent who was directed into the rhythm of verse.¹²² Confident students of *clausulae* at Yale included

¹²¹ Kornemann (1905).

¹²² Schlicher (1900). During the writing of his thesis he spent part of his time with Meyer at Göttingen. Already, Schlicher was teaching at the Indiana State Normal School (later State Teachers College) at Terre Haute, Indiana. He specialised in the teaching of Latin and once produced a fascinating book of short plays he had written to facilitate student's spoken Latin (Schlicher 1916). In 1918, he was suspended from the Normal School by the Trustees who had come to query his patriotism and support

Charles Upson Clark (1875–1960) who taught an annual graduate course on Ammianus Marcellinus (based on the theory of Meyer who first proposed an accentual clausula as the habit of Ammianus), and his students Austin Harmon (1878–1950), who had worked on the *clausulae* of Ammianus,¹²³ and Henry Bronson Dewing (1882–1956), who had worked on the Greek *clausulae* of Procopius. In particular, Dewing had used the techniques of prose rhythm to prove the disputed authenticity of Procopius' *Secret History* by comparing it to his other extant works (*Wars*, *Buildings*).¹²⁴ For her thesis, Ballou clearly made good use of Clark and Harmon's comparable research on Ammianus, frequently citing it.¹²⁵ She also had the benefit of Clark's edition of Ammianus which had been only recently published (1910) and made reference to other recent studies of *clausulae* in Latin authors, especially that of Schlicher.¹²⁶ Later, she formed a friendship with Dewing and his wife in Athens where he was then principal of Athens College and travelled with them to Constantinople.¹²⁷ Whether Ballou and Dewing ever compared notes on clausulae in Greek and Latin authors is unknown.

Taking no chance of anyone misconstruing her sex in future, Ballou called herself 'Americana' on the title page and dedicated the thesis to the memory of her mother, although both her parents had been dead for some time. To give it the full title, 'De Clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio Scriptore Historiae Augustae adhibitibus', the thesis consisted of six separate chapters covering particular rhythmical patterns, preceded by a preface setting out her method and expectations. Already in the preface, she was fearful that such technical work would induce boredom in both reader and writer.¹²⁸ But she explains that the point of the exercise was to contribute to the *SHA*'s composition and sources. Working her way through different models of clause endings she noticed a divergence between a quantity-based and a stress-based form, with the latter slowly replacing the former.¹²⁹

for America's involvement in the war with Germany. The year of his death remains elusive.

¹²³ Harmon (1910).

¹²⁴ Dewing (1910).

¹²⁵ Ballou (1912), 64 n.5, 74 n.27.

¹²⁶ Schlicher (1900).

¹²⁷ Ballou, *Diary* 1929: 24 February; 1 March; 26 April.

¹²⁸ Ballou (1912), 1.

¹²⁹ Ballou (1912), 10–84. In this, she may have been influenced by her fellow-Chicago student, Schlicher, whose work she utilised here, especially his argument that the verse authors he studied paralleled prose authors in shifting from a metrical to a rhythmic accentuation after about 400 (Schlicher [1900], 83–8).

In the final chapter ('de re critica') Ballou applied her model of the endings deployed by Vopiscus to reconstructing the text. This was her real interest and the purpose of researching the *clausulae* of Vopiscus. Her conclusions began with the observation that there is no longer a need to justify the use of *clausulae* as a critical instrument for texts, nor does anyone now disagree that the Vatican's 9th century Palatine manuscript (P) provides the foundation of the *SHA* text. Her chosen examples may therefore: (1) defend readings in the current text; (2) show attempts to emend corrupt readings as wrong; (3) show how the exigencies of *clausulae* can confirm conjectures already made or which should be made; (4) show how sometimes changing words around solves the problem, sometimes the general meaning or the style of Vopiscus permits corruptions to be healed. Occasionally, all that can be done is to signal a corruption and the need to emend somehow.¹³⁰ She concludes by illustrating each of these approaches with examples.

Ballou may have completed her thesis in only a year (1910/11, it is dated 17 November 1911) but it demonstrated the decade of research which underpinned it and her command of the text in all its manuscript variants. Her treatment of the *clausulae* in Vopiscus required not only an intimate knowledge of the written text but also how it sounded. Spoken Latin was emphasised at Yale by C. U. Clark but especially at Chicago, not only by Abbott but also by Hale and Hendrickson. Its influence is readily apparent in the work of Schlicher and here too in Ballou. Moreover, in order to make judgments as she does about preferring particular textual readings, she needed to have a command not only of the manuscripts but also the previous editions and the various conjectures their editors had decided on from time to time, as well as the many conjectures other scholars had advanced in a range of publications over the previous century.

Few scholars were competent to pass judgment on Ballou's thesis on the *clausulae* of Vopiscus. Indeed, the most serious, but critical, review came from arguably the most competent scholar, namely A. C. Clark (1859–1937) at Oxford, a recent convert to the Zielinski system, having sought to apply it to Sallust and Tacitus among others.¹³¹ Ballou had cited him often and Clark found Ballou's thesis to be a 'substantial work ... and written in good Latin',¹³² a true compliment from a place where Latin prose was still a prized skill. Clark went on to observe that 'the fact that an American lady at a German university has written a dissertation on

¹³⁰ Ballou (1912), 85–6.

¹³¹ Explained in Clark (1905), 164–172.

¹³² Clark (1914a), 252.

such a subject is a notable sign of the times'. Clark was writing at a time when Oxford still had no doctoral degree at all, and graduate women were unable to have degrees conferred by his own University. While it was fair to query the value of focussing on Vopiscus in isolation from the other *SHA* writers, Clark's characterisation of her approach is faintly condescending: 'Miss Ballou's enthusiasm is however unmistakable and refreshing. She has examined minutely the chief manuscript. She attacks the standard edition — that of Peter — with boldness, and she makes emendations with a light heart.' Some of these emendations he then goes on to query, pointing out that the whole thesis is vitiated by an underestimation of the *cursus mixtus*, the partly metrical and partly accentual ending.

A. C. Clark more or less repeated his assessment in his inaugural lecture as Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford in June 1914. There he sought to explain why textual criticism was now the most modern and most scientific of approaches to classical texts. Among the strands of his argument is the advent of research on *clausulae* that enables the separation of genuine from spurious works attributed to a particular author on the basis of the pattern of their *clausulae*. That is to say, an author such as Cicero is presumed to be consistent in his patterns of prose rhythm across all his works and at different times of his literary life. As part of this argument, lamenting the position surrounding him in Oxford, Clark confesses: 'The German universities are pouring out programmes on the rhythm of different authors. Recently I read a dissertation of 102 pages, written in Latin, by an American lady, Miss Susan Helen Ballou, for the degree of PhD in the University of Gießen on the *clausulae* of Flavius Vopiscus. I hardly think Flavius Vopiscus worthy of such attention but what wonderful enthusiasm! Meanwhile Oxford remains apathetic and prizes are given for compositions which in structure are barbarous.'¹³³ The repeated reference to Ballou's 'wonderful enthusiasm' belies the value of her findings. Yet, she took notice of Clark's critique of her thesis and quickly acknowledged the shortcomings in her analysis of the Vopiscan *clausulae*.¹³⁴

Another qualified reviewer was the Italian priest and school teacher Francesco Di Capua (1879–1957), who had already shown the value of studying prose rhythm for Latin texts. He found Ballou's thesis 'learned and accurate', noting that the thesis was produced under the guidance of Immisch. Di Capua singled out the valuable observations in her concluding chapter and their implications for the text of the *SHA*. In such a

¹³³ Clark (1914*b*), 18.

¹³⁴ Ballou (1915), 162–3.

minute study, however, he felt obliged to confess that in her enthusiasm Ballou has uncovered too many *clausulae*. She cannot accept that at times Vopiscus is just not able, or maybe does not want, to deploy a quantifiable *clausula*. A comparison with the panegyrics might be helpful, suggests Di Capua.¹³⁵ Finally, in reviewing Ballou's thesis on Vopiscan *clausulae*, Paul Vallette complimented the 'American woman' on the above average Latin prose in which her thesis was written. It was only an extremely competent Latinist, with a good sense of the rhythm of the language, who would take on such an investigation, especially since there was now some doubt over the independence of the author calling himself Vopiscus, the reviewer continued. He found it an 'interesting and useful contribution' to the study of the *clausulae* of Vopiscus and of the *HA* more generally, whether or not one accepts the 'Zielinski system' which forms her starting point.¹³⁶ Vallette, one suspects, did not.

The question of the style and vocabulary of the different authors of the *SHA* remains an unsolved problem, so it was asserted. These days there is greater attention to authorial allusion to other texts (e.g. Ammianus, Jerome), mainly with a view to arguing dependence and therefore the date of the *SHA*, but so far such a quest has proved indecisive. At the time Ballou was completing her thesis, De Groot explored the metrical patterns of many Latin prose writers and calculated percentages for each pattern. Three of the *SHA scriptores* (Spartianus, Lampridius and Vopiscus) were included in his table with apparent differences in their patterns.¹³⁷ Vopiscus, for example, shows a higher percentage than Spartianus or Lampridius of the pattern described syllabically and a lower percentage of the stress pattern.

With her Gießen thesis Ballou had demonstrated her command of the text and its tradition. Moreover, she had proved her competence in a most difficult area of research only recently pioneered by German scholars. The reviews of her thesis, especially that of Clark, forced her to rethink the implications of her research and the potential to extend it. In 1915, by now teaching at Western State in Kalamazoo, Michigan, she published an article on 'The *Clausula* and Higher Criticism' which she had delivered at the annual American Philological Association congress on 30 December. It was one of the first articles in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* by a female.¹³⁸ She began by emphasising how recent was this investigative approach:

¹³⁵ Di Capua (1913), 129–31.

¹³⁶ Vallette (1914), 392.

¹³⁷ De Groot (1921), 111.

¹³⁸ Stewart and Machado (2019), 44–5.

Modern interest in the rhythms employed by Greek and Latin writers of prose covers as a whole a period of scarcely more than a score of years. But the subject was quickly recognized as a fruitful ground of investigation, and the metrical clausula was at once welcomed as furnishing a new and a valuable criterion, not only for the uses of textual emendation, but also for the settlement of many questions that come with the scope of the higher criticism.¹³⁹

She then went on to explain that she had now applied the results of her thesis research on the most rhetorically elaborate Vopiscus to the plainer style of Spartianus. What she was hoping to find was a key to unlock the much discussed and disputed questions of the relationships between the different *SHA* authors, in particular whether the whole *SHA* was the work of a single authorial hand:

In this extension of the investigation of the use of rhythm from one individual writer to others of the group, there seemed to be good ground for the hope that a harvest of criteria might be obtained for the settlement of some of the vexed questions of source and composition which have centered about this enigmatical group of writers, and engaged the attention of a very considerable number of scholars for the last two decades. For it is only natural to think that writers whose differences in manner of working and writing have placed beyond a doubt the disputed fact that the biographies did emanate from different individuals, must also show individual differences in their handling of this prevailing rhetorical device of the prose rhythm, and that these differences should prove sufficiently conspicuous to render noteworthy assistance in this particular field of the higher criticism.

This was an optimistic and ambitious goal, but Ballou was better equipped than anyone to prosecute it. In moving on to a metrical analysis of another of the *scriptores* (Spartianus) she found the similarities with Vopiscus were striking.¹⁴⁰ Even so, as a result, she still does not commit herself to the unitary position of Dessau. In extending her research to the lives of Spartianus, applying the results of her recent Gießen thesis, what she showed was that the support for Winterfeld's analysis of the *clausulae* of Spartianus was unjustified. He had sought to demonstrate the metrical difference in those passages of the life which could be attributed to Hadrian's autobiography and those which were the work of the *SHA*

¹³⁹ Ballou (1915), 157.

¹⁴⁰ Ballou (1915).

author, Spartianus. In 1903, this seemed a decisive outcome. Kornemann built on it in 1906. Ballou took it as proven in 1912. Now, however, having examined Spartianus closely, she felt convinced otherwise. The problem with Winterfeld's approach, so Ballou now argued, was that he was reliant on the demonstrable Ciceronian metrical scheme and not the very different one of centuries later, least of all that of the other *SHA* authors. In other words, in Ballou's analysis, one cannot separate out the sources of Spartianus' life of Hadrian into the emperor's own autobiography and others, at least not on the basis of *clausulae*. Accordingly, she rightly claimed that 'one who has made an exhaustive investigation into the usage of even one member of this particular group of writers [*SHA*], is in a better position to understand that of the rest'.¹⁴¹ She did not feel impelled thereby to advocate unity of authorship for the entire *SHA* but she certainly felt confident in challenging Winterfeld's case.

In the decades after Ballou there was little research on the stylistic aspects of the *SHA* or parts of it with a view to drawing more general conclusions about its authorship, except for Zernial who found her work seminal even if she overreached in her conclusions.¹⁴² The study of the *clausulae* had not lived up to expectations. Instead, other questions have preoccupied students of the *SHA*, particularly trying to establish its literary unity, in essence that the *SHA* is the product of a single author masquerading as six different authors, the original argument of Dessau in 1889. As championed by Syme for instance, it was presumed that detailed analysis, especially computer analysis, would establish the *SHA*'s literary unity once and for all. White's 1967 article sought to argue for literary unity but deliberately put aside any discussion of the *clausulae* as too difficult and indecisive:

A Unitarian has little incentive to investigate because a consistent pattern, if he discovered one, would mean nothing unless it diverged markedly from contemporary practice. And the amount of research required to establish the two facts together is prohibitive. On the opposite side, even if there were six *Scriptores*, the pluralist would probably not find their individualism so thorough-going that it affected their treatment of *clausulae*. Prose-rhythm seems too much a matter of convention to allow either side a good basis for argument.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ Ballou (1915), 160.

¹⁴² Zernial (1956), 2–3, 25 n.1; cf. Zernial (1986), (1994), (1995), (1998).

¹⁴³ White (1967), 133. On the other hand, further research on the *SHA*'s vocabulary and style, including the *clausulae*, has been seen to reinforce the likelihood of a single author: Adams (1972), esp.189 n.4.

In the end, at least to date, the hopes of computer analysis of the text of the *SHA* have proved inconclusive. A single author for the *SHA*, adept at inventing sources and individuals, may well be the accepted scholarly norm or ‘consensus’, but certain proof still eludes.¹⁴⁴ Prose rhythm is not the answer after all.

Back in 1912, Ballou’s original Gießen thesis on Vopiscus could only draw admiration from anyone interested in the *SHA*. Certainly, it attracted admiration in Germany. Peter had been pressing on with his new Teubner edition of the *SHA* under the direction of Ernst Kornemann, but it appears he became too ill to continue. He died on 16 February 1914. Faced with the task of replacing Peter whose knowledge of the *SHA* was unrivalled, in 1911/12 Kornemann turned to two eminently qualified individuals, many years apart, both of whom had recently undertaken doctoral research on the *SHA*. They were Ballou and Kornemann’s own pupil Ernst Hohl (1886–1957). Neither Ballou nor Hohl required the close support originally intended for the ageing Peter. On the other hand, nobody knew the *SHA* and the modern literature on it better than Peter. At last, the much-anticipated modern edition of the *SHA* could not be far away.

6. The Teubner partnership: Ballou and Hohl, 1912–14

When Ballou began serious work on the *SHA* in Rome in 1901, Ernst Hohl was still a schoolboy at the Karls-Gymnasium in Stuttgart. Following school, he undertook a year’s military service before commencing university study in Tübingen, progressing then to Munich, Leipzig and Berlin where he encountered Dessau in 1907. While Dessau may have influenced Hohl to pursue an interest in the *SHA* it is unlikely. By then he had himself abandoned work on the *SHA* and was primarily focussed on epigraphy.¹⁴⁵ A more likely influence was a former pupil of Dessau, Kornemann at Tübingen, where Hohl moved on to a doctorate entitled *Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaisers Tacitus* (1910), giving rise immediately to an article of the same name.¹⁴⁶ The *SHA* then dictated Hohl’s work for the remainder of his long life. Hohl finished his doctorate

¹⁴⁴ Stover and Kestemont (2016).

¹⁴⁵ Sehlmeier and Walter (2005), 10, with n.6.

¹⁴⁶ Hohl (1911). Both here, and in his next article on the *SHA* writers Pollio and Vopiscus (Hohl 1912), he was focussed on buttressing Dessau’s 1889 arguments. In later articles (Hohl 1914a, 1920), he advanced what has become a classic thesis, subsequently expanded by others, namely that the *SHA* was a forgery that arose from the pagan senatorial circle of Theodosian Rome and promoted their religious cause.

the year before Ballou although both concentrated on just one of the *SHA*'s stated biographers, Vopiscus. So, Ballou was able to reference Hohl's recent thesis and article in her own. Although Hohl found Ballou's thesis to be 'industrious', he dismissed it as flawed and exaggerated.¹⁴⁷ Any collaboration between the young Hohl and the experienced Ballou would clearly be fraught from the start.

By 1911 Ballou had spent the best part of a decade in close study of the *SHA* and its manuscripts, particularly the Palatine manuscript (P) in the Vatican library. She had inspected and collated all the other manuscripts as well, more than Peter or Dessau had ever done. She had to hand all the requisite materials for a new edition undertaken by herself alone and her 1908 article suggested it would be sooner rather than later. Hohl, on the other hand, had never studied any of the *SHA* manuscripts. Accordingly, in 1912/13 he was sponsored to pass several months in Rome and Paris collating *SHA* manuscripts, the same ones that Ballou had already worked on years before. While there is no evidence that Ballou and Hohl ever met, she did provide for Hohl's use her collations of P, B and *Cod.Par.Lat.* 5816 (Petrarch's copy of P) to facilitate his work. This was, as he confessed himself, 'to check my own comparison of P and to check them against the original of this most important manuscript [P]'.¹⁴⁸ He had also obtained, perhaps courtesy of Ballou, Dessau's own collations of P and B which he had done at the Vatican library in 1892/3. Like Dessau and Ballou earlier, Hohl arranged for the Bamberg manuscript (B) to be transferred to the Vatican library for his use there.¹⁴⁹ Also supplied to him was a photographic reproduction of *Cod.Par.Lat.* 5816.¹⁵⁰ Unlike Ballou, however, he was able to make up his mind relatively quickly about the relationship between the manuscripts and he published the results the next year (Hohl 1913). Ballou had taken years of meticulous study to reach a point Hohl managed to achieve in months. Or so it seemed. Ballou's ready provision to Hohl of both her own collations and those of Dessau surely accelerated the process for him.

The linchpin linking the work of both Ballou and Hohl was Kornemann who had been Hohl's supervisor at Tübingen. Kornemann was born in the same year as Ballou (1868) but their scholarly progression was rather different. He completed his doctorate in 1891 before Ballou had even commenced her undergraduate studies. Kornemann had been a

¹⁴⁷ Hohl (1914a), 711.

¹⁴⁸ Hohl (1913), 258 n.1.

¹⁴⁹ Hohl (1913), 262.

¹⁵⁰ Hohl (1913), 263 n.1.

student in Berlin in 1889 when Dessau was lecturing on the *SHA* and published his famous article on the composition of the *SHA*. He recognised its content as the same he had heard in Dessau's lecture earlier in the year.¹⁵¹ Kornemann was also a private student of Mommsen in 1889 but his *Doktorvater* was Otto Hirschfeld, a former pupil and collaborator of Mommsen. So, he knew immediately of Dessau's thesis and the way it was contested by his Berlin colleagues Mommsen, Hirschfeld and Klebs, particularly Mommsen, who was long engaged with the text of the *SHA* and its associated issues.¹⁵² They were all working together on the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* at the time.

Although Kornemann encountered Dessau at Berlin, his initial interest, obviously influenced by Mommsen and Hirschfeld, was on Roman government with his doctoral thesis on Roman citizens in the provinces (1891: *De civibus Romanis in provinciis imperii consistentibus*). From Berlin, Kornemann passed to Gießen in 1902 where his inaugural lecture was a tribute to Mommsen who was still alive at the time.¹⁵³ In 1905, however, he produced a work on the emperor Hadrian that required him to explore in detail the *SHA*'s life of Hadrian. In the course of unravelling the sources of the life he sought to demonstrate what parts came from Hadrian's own autobiography, following the *clausulae* method of Winterfeld (1903), and what from the dubious Lollius Urbicus whom he dubbed 'the last great historian of Rome'.¹⁵⁴ Shortly after, he inspired Hohl to study the life of the emperor Tacitus (275–6) in the *SHA*. Kornemann's involvement in the *SHA* may have led to the invitation from Teubner by 1907 to work with Peter to produce a new edition. Hence his inquiry to Dessau at that time. By 1912 (written 1910/11) he announced his engagement by Teubner as if it was to be his own task.¹⁵⁵ Whether at his own initiative or that of the publisher, the following year it was announced to be the work of the new *SHA* doctorands, Hohl and Ballou, under the general direction of Kornemann. Ballou soon explained that she and Hohl were collaborating, but Kornemann's precise role was unclear.¹⁵⁶

From his work in Rome and Paris on the manuscripts of the *SHA*, Hohl passed to the university at German Strassburg where he completed

¹⁵¹ Sehlmeier and Walter (2005), 69.

¹⁵² Mommsen (1890), 241.

¹⁵³ Kornemann (1903). On Kornemann: Christ (1982), 133–44.

¹⁵⁴ Kornemann (1905).

¹⁵⁵ Kornemann (1912), 249: 'Eine neue kritische Ausgabe wird unter Leitung E. Kornemann bei Teubner erschienen'.

¹⁵⁶ Ballou (1914), 1.

his habilitation thesis on the credibility of the *SHA* with Karl Johannes Neumann (1857–1917) and the university's then rector, Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940), an eminent student of both Roman historians and the records of church councils.¹⁵⁷ Despite their advertised collaboration, and Ballou's obvious co-operation with Hohl in 1912 and 1913, as he studied the manuscripts in preparation for their edition, the publication in 1913 of his conclusions about the manuscripts was an immediate concern for Ballou. In a long article in two parts Hohl set out his conclusions about the manuscripts and the relationships between them all. The first part was concerned with P and the manuscripts linked to it; the second part was concerned with the other manuscripts independent of P, especially those grouped by Peter into the class labelled Σ .¹⁵⁸ Briefly, Hohl concluded that there were two archetypes, not one as traditionally thought. One was that of P followed by B. The other, however, was only reflected in the later (14th–15th century) manuscripts which Peter had labelled Σ and which had been thought to be derived from P or copies of P, and therefore irrelevant to the textual tradition. Hohl concluded that several aspects of these later (14th/15th century) manuscripts had words and sentences omitted earlier and indicated their derivation from an archetype separate from P although both P and Σ derived from the same Carolingian exemplar. What Ballou had earlier concluded was the superior experience of the later humanists in correcting earlier errors, was now seen by Hohl as the preservation of correct readings from an original exemplar other than P. As for the Murbach manuscript (M) utilised in the Froben/Erasmus edition, Hohl acknowledged its existence at one stage but never took proper account of it when he might have.¹⁵⁹ Thus Hohl.

At this stage, Ballou clearly felt that she needed to produce urgently what she had intended previously, namely, a comprehensive overview and evaluation of the whole manuscript tradition of the *SHA*. Only on this agreed basis could a new edition progress. Her 1914 monograph on *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta* was published by Teubner at Leipzig a few months after Hohl's contribution. She began by explaining that she and Hohl were collaborating on a new edition under the overall management of Kornemann. At least she was taking part in the first volume, but without defining the scope of the volume. Then she went

¹⁵⁷ Sehlmeier-Walter (2005), 10–11. The thesis provided the basis for Hohl (1914a), a comprehensive overview of the *SHA* highlighting the significance of Dessau's contribution to its nature and purpose.

¹⁵⁸ Hohl (1913), 258–88 and 387–423.

¹⁵⁹ Stover (2020b), 129.

on to explain that much of what needed to be said could already be found in Hohl's recent article (1913) so there was no need for repetition. What Hohl had failed to appreciate, however, was how the different corrector hands in P could be identified and dated, then what this meant for subsequent manuscripts.

Ballou was very critical of Hohl in this regard, perhaps too critical for a sensitive young scholar who was staking his future reputation and livelihood on his analysis of the *SHA* manuscripts.¹⁶⁰ However, she could be accused of being tetchy herself when she pointed out that Hohl did not give her due credit for conclusions and observations he implied were his own.¹⁶¹ Ballou was no less critical of Dessau as well. He had expressed the view, at least to Kornemann from whom Ballou presumably learned of it, that the various correctors in P were not of much value in determining the subsequent tradition.¹⁶² Her primary and consistent criticism of Hohl was that his whole methodology was flawed because he failed to acknowledge the implications of the various correctors in P and the dating of them.¹⁶³ Indeed, he disagreed with Ballou's approach and did not accept her attribution of corrections to particular scholars such as Salutati, Manetti and Bembo. She did concede, however, that Dessau had established the preferable nomenclature, compared to the inconsistent and sloppy method of Peter and others, by referring to the original copy as P^a (B^a for the Bamberg manuscript) and the 'technical corrector' (usually the scribe himself) as P^b (B^b for the Bamberg manuscript). Subsequent correctors could be labelled P¹ (B¹), P² and so on.¹⁶⁴

In her very detailed and dense exposition, with clear illustrative photographs of manuscript extracts, Ballou aimed to differentiate and explain the various correctors and annotators of the text in its main manuscript, P. This had not been done at all, or done properly, by Eyssenhardt (1864) or Peter (1865, 1884), nor by Dessau (1894), nor by Hohl (1913) in his recent treatment of the Σ manuscripts. An especially

¹⁶⁰ E.g. Hohl's rejection of her identification of Petrarch 'without the statement of any grounds for so doing' (Ballou 1914, 13 n.2); his 'inaccurate remarks' (47 n.1); Hohl is 'not acquainted with the correctors of P and their work' (57).

¹⁶¹ E.g. Ballou (1914), 24 n.2 'as a result of his use of part of my collation of the latter' [=Par.Lat.5816]; 27 n.1: comparative analysis 'will convince the reader that I am right'; 55: 'he waives the whole question of the identification of P's correctors, beyond warning the reader against putting too much trust in mine'; 49: 'who also discovered (as I already had) ...'

¹⁶² Ballou (1914), 3.

¹⁶³ Ballou (1914), 41–76.

¹⁶⁴ Ballou (1914), 4–5. A more modern evaluation of the correctors can be found in Pecere (1995) and Stover (2020b), 117 n.4.

interesting feature of P is that it contains several (no less than five, possibly six or even seven) different correctors' hands. In other words, it was subsequently corrected/amended by different readers at different times since its copying in the ninth century, each recording on the manuscript itself improvements or suggestions, in the text and in the margin. With her carefully honed palaeographical eye and instinct for different inks and hands, Ballou sought to distinguish and characterise the hand of each later corrector, then identify them, in the course of demonstrating the palaeographical carelessness and imprecision of Peter, Dessau, and Hohl in particular.¹⁶⁵ A concentration on ink and letter formation, led her to define a total of six clearly different correctors reflecting a succession of different owners of the manuscript and different readers: (1) the original 9th century manuscript as corrected by its scribe (P¹); (2) a late 10th/early 11th century scribe who both corrected and added in the margin the titles of the imperial dedicatees (P²); (3) Petrarch, probably working in the Chapter library at Verona where the manuscript then was, but dealing with the manuscript in four different ways she called 'groups' in which she argued for Petrarch's autograph in corrections and annotations, which were then incorporated into the copy he had made (*Par.Lat.5816*) and which he corrected himself apparently without reference to P (P³);¹⁶⁶ (4) the Florentine humanist and chancellor, Coluccio Salutati again through a variety of hands (P⁴);¹⁶⁷ (5) Gionozzo Manetti, with his name on the contents page inserted by himself and who also finished resolving the solution to the misplaced parts of P, as well as numbering the folios and defining the chapters (P⁵);¹⁶⁸ and, (6) a later restorer of P's readings, possibly the humanist Bernardo Bembo (P⁶).¹⁶⁹ Ballou also posits a seventh corrector who belonged before the first printed edition (1475) but only made a few variants to the first biography.¹⁷⁰ Aside from the correctors, there were other aspects of the original 9th century manuscript which required explanation — its misplacement of certain folios, small and large lacunas, and the order of the lives. Having established the sequence and chronology of correctors, Ballou then moved to the later manuscripts. She had always taken the view that the manuscripts later than the 9th century (P and B) needed to

¹⁶⁵ Ballou (1914), 1–10.

¹⁶⁶ Ballou (1914), 20–4.

¹⁶⁷ Ballou (1914), 25–34.

¹⁶⁸ Ballou (1914), 34–5.

¹⁶⁹ Ballou (1914), 35–8.

¹⁷⁰ Ballou (1914), 38.

be examined in the light of later corrections to P. The Bamberg manuscript (B) was easily disposed of because it dated from not long after P and manifestly included none of the corrections made to P not even by the 10th century,¹⁷¹ although it contained later corrections. Certain other manuscripts (*Urbinas* 414, *Vat.Lat.* 1899, *Vat.Lat.* 1902) were directly derived from P. Ballou's principle was that the presence of the copyists' work in the various later manuscripts 'is the only sure and reliable' criterion of dating.¹⁷²

The lineage of other post-9th century manuscripts was not so clear: (1) *Riccardianus* 551 (15th century, Florence) was copied from P by Poggio Bracciolini, but after Manetti (P⁴) had done his work; (2) *Paris Lat.* 5816 (1356) was Petrarch's copy of P and incorporated his corrections to P, which formed the basis of the *editio princeps* of Accursio (1475); (3) *Vat.Lat.* 5301 (15th century) shows evidence of incorporating corrections later than P³ but not after that. It was probably copied from Petrarch's own copy (*Paris Lat.* 5816); *Ambrosianus* A 269 (Milan), was copied from *Vat.Lat.* 5301, while *Vat.Lat.* 1901 was copied from *Riccardianus* 551. The so-called Σ manuscripts were separate again.

The other distinctive aberrations of P — (1) the order of the lives; and (2) the dislocation of individual sections in the Lives of Severus Alexander and elsewhere — were already signalled in the tradition of P, according to Ballou, and dealt with by successive correctors, notably P² and P⁵. By the time of P, two folios of the manuscript had become interchanged and one had strayed out of its correct position. While the problem and its potential solution was evident to P² in the later 10th/early 11th century, it wasn't until Manetti in the 14th century (P⁵) that the solution was finally worked out fully.¹⁷³ The later manuscripts, the 14th and 15th century ones grouped by Peter under the rubric of their archetype (Σ), simply took this a step further and made the required structural alterations in their own copy, on the basis of the marginal instructions in P. Ballou therefore considered that these manuscripts were not only later in time but that they also were ultimately dependent on the tradition of P and its various subsequent correctors and annotators.

Getting behind P to its archetype was a major preoccupation of Ballou. While Hohl now argued that the exemplar of P and the putative Σ derived from the same Carolingian exemplar, there was still an unresolved issue concerning the transmission of the version used by Sedulius Scottus in the 9th century. Mommsen had suggested in 1887 that

¹⁷¹ Ballou (1914), 79–82.

¹⁷² Ballou (1914), 53.

¹⁷³ Ballou (1914), 41–50.

perhaps a tradition separate from, and older than, P could be detected in the use of the *SHA* in a work of Sedulius Scottus at Liège (848–58), as preserved in a 12th century florilegium housed in a hospital at Cues in the Moselle valley.¹⁷⁴ Mommsen had not himself been able to inspect the manuscript directly, relying instead on the published transcription, but he had expressed the hope that more careful attention to the extract might prove rewarding although no scholar evidently took up Mommsen's challenge until Ballou. As she tells the story, 'happening to be in the fall of 1911 in the neighbourhood of Bernkastel–Cues, I devoted a few hours through the courtesy of the present Rector of the hospital to making a complete new transcription of the excerpta from the *SHA*'.¹⁷⁵ On that basis, she was able to conclude that the differences with P could be explained as the 12th century scribe correcting errors in P or filling out 'easily detectable omissions'. So, there was no real difference in the archetypes of P and the Cues extract of Sedulius Scottus after all.¹⁷⁶ For Ballou all the extant manuscripts therefore descended from a single 9th century tradition beginning with P. As for another set of extracts, namely the so-called 'Flores Moraliū Auctoritatum' (1329) at Verona, Ballou found it impossible to determine its archetype because the *SHA* extracts were so short, scattered, random and fragmentary.¹⁷⁷

Hohl, meanwhile, considered the Σ manuscripts owed nothing to the various correctors of P. Rather, they were descended from a time before the structural aberrations and other textual deficiencies in P were present in the tradition, so their archetype must be older, which made them more reliable and more usable than P for a modern edition of the *SHA*, despite their relative recency. Whether he articulated it or not, he was applying a key tenet of textual criticism, namely *recentiores non deteriores*. Not only was Peter's edition (1884) fundamentally flawed by his treatment of the correctors of P, but now Hohl had introduced new complications by failing to understand, or simply ignoring, the import of the different marginal hands and inks, and their relative chronology. Ballou clearly felt Hohl had been unduly hasty and had not paid sufficient attention to her research-based conclusions on the various marginal notes and corrections in P. Otherwise, he would not have given equal priority to the Σ manuscripts. That was the crux of the difference in approach between

¹⁷⁴ Mommsen (1878), 298.

¹⁷⁵ Ballou (1914), 77. Prior to seeing Ballou's account, Hohl (1914*b*) had sought to differentiate the fragments from Sedulius Scottus but he had not inspected the manuscript himself.

¹⁷⁶ Even so, Ballou (1914), 78–9 notes a possibility.

¹⁷⁷ Ballou (1914), 41 with n.1.

Ballou and Hohl to the manuscript tradition. Neither was persuaded of the other's position. Something had to give. Ballou ceded her role in the projected Teubner edition to Hohl. By the end of 1914 Hohl was able to say and act as if he had sole charge of the forthcoming edition.¹⁷⁸ What happened to Kornemann is not known.

The doyen of Italian manuscript studies at the time, Remigio Sabbadini (1850–1934), who was familiar with the earliest editions of the *SHA* and the work of their editors (Accursius, Casaubon, Gruter, Salmasius) declared for Ballou's conclusion against Hohl, although he disagreed with her in some details.¹⁷⁹ Another well-informed palaeographer and textual critic, Charles Upson Clark at Yale, with his edition of Ammianus now behind him, was less certain of Ballou's conclusions, judging her monograph to carry 'admiration and conviction'. There was an element of pure faith in her ascription of certain emendations to Petrarch in particular but, he emphasises, 'one familiar with Renaissance handwriting will feel only scepticism, not disbelief'. Hohl, however, insisted on disbelief. In addition, Clark could tell from the facsimiles that P 'has a Fulda type of writing' and that B 'may also have been written at or near Fulda'. Although Mommsen and Dessau, as well as Ballou, had established that B must have been copied from P, Clark could speculate that B may actually be independent of P, both deriving from a common contemporary archetype, just as two of the manuscripts familiar to him from his study of Ammianus, namely V (Fulda) and M (Hersfeld) had a common contemporary archetype.¹⁸⁰

Perhaps the most penetrating review of Ballou's monograph, certainly the most detailed, came from Alfred Klotz (1874–1956) in German Prague. As a close friend of Immisch, he may have known of Ballou's work at Gießen where Immisch was her supervisor. In addition, Immisch had earlier sent Hohl a postcard expressing his sceptical reaction to the article of Hohl (1912) on Vopiscus and the emperor Tacitus, which had been a detailed discussion of the sources involved, not the text.¹⁸¹ On this occasion, however, Klotz concluded by expressing support for Hohl's interpretation of the Σ manuscripts and hoping that he and Ballou would find a way of working together to produce an edition with a single unified approach to the manuscript tradition.¹⁸² This was not to be. Hohl took complete charge of the edition, so his view of the Σ tradition prevailed.

¹⁷⁸ Hohl (1914a), 708.

¹⁷⁹ Sabbadini (1914).

¹⁸⁰ Clark (1916), 357–8, with Kelly and Stover (2016).

¹⁸¹ Sehlmeier and Walter (2005), 117 (as recorded by J. Fündling).

¹⁸² Klotz (1915), 497.

Hohl's own copy of Ballou's monograph (Ballou 1914) has survived and contains much annotation (black) and underlining (red), along with the various reviews or relevant extracts of the reviews. He received it, as a gift from the author, on 5 March 1914 and completed reading it on 27 March.¹⁸³ Immediately, he took exception to Ballou's criticisms, in terms of both methodology and conclusions.¹⁸⁴ He wrote that Ballou's case 'against my proof that Σ does not depend on P, does not hold water in the least, no matter how much her fallacies may blind the uninitiated'. Hohl continued, by saying that 'Despite all recognition of the excellent hard work of the author, who went about her work with great zeal, the content of her publication must be described as completely inaccurate. I have long since completed a detailed refutation of their errors', so Hohl explained. He continued 'Unfortunately, their appearance in *Klio* is delayed by the war. I now refer to my article 'Who is Robertus a Poria, Bononiensis?' in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 1915, No. 7, Col. 221 ff. There, the existence of the Σ class which, according to Ballou only appeared in the third quarter of the 15th century on the basis of the P and its correctors, is proven by absolutely reliable literary evidence for the second third of the 14th century', according to Hohl.¹⁸⁵ In the course of identifying Robert of Bologna (referred to by Peter as the source of a reading in the Life of Hadrian), Hohl establishes that Robert is merely a scribe. The author of the work utilising a Σ manuscript of the *SHA* was Benvenuto and his *Romuleon* was written in the mid 14th century. Given the 'absolutely reliable literary evidence' Hohl is able to assert that Ballou's method was faulty and she was mistaken in thinking that there is no Σ manuscript before 1457:

I myself have claimed the existence of the Σ -Tradition for the 14th century. But now an objection has just been raised against my entire treatment of the Σ class and the 'proof' has been attempted that the Σ class was only formed in the 15th century, after 1457 and before 1475, on the basis of the P and its annotation. I will speak about this in another context; all that matters to me here is ... to establish the fact that already in the second to third quarter of the 14th century, this Benvenuto came to know the *Historia Augusta* in the Σ -tradition, which therefore cannot have been created in the third quarter of the 15th century, as is now being argued against my approach.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ Sehlmeier and Walter (2005), 116 (inventory by J. Fündling).

¹⁸⁴ Set out in Hohl (1914), (1915) and (1916). He treated separately the Cues extract of Sedulius Scottus (1914a) and the role of Petrarch (1916a).

¹⁸⁵ Hohl (1915a), 475 n.1.

¹⁸⁶ Hohl (1915c), 224.

Hohl also criticised Ballou's identification of the correctors of P and the relationships between them. Specifically, he argued that Petrarch did not own P at Verona so could not have passed it on to the next corrector whom she identified as Coluccio Salutati, whereas Bracciolini copied one manuscript (*Ricc.551*, Florence) in his own hand but all this needs to be considered in a wider review of the 'work of the American'.¹⁸⁷

Hohl's promised refutation of Ballou finally appeared in 1918. Although not published until then, his reply was composed and sent to the journal in 1914 so it was fresh in his mind on reading Ballou. It is dated to March 1914. Whether Ballou herself saw a copy before it was published is unlikely. Conscious of Ballou's co-operation with her younger collaborator, and her generosity in providing her working materials, Hohl duly acknowledges her 'meticulous care' and accuracy, as well as her thoroughness and diligence, in collating the *SHA* manuscripts and particularly her unravelling of the various correctors' hands in P, but explains:

It was by no means my intention to comment again on the history of the text before the publication of the new edition, which was intended to justify itself, as I believe I have said everything essential. But a very energetic attack, such as the one that an American lady, Susan H. Ballou, has just directed against the most important result of my investigation in a special work (Ballou 1914) on the basis of a study of the tradition that began more than a decade ago, forces me to take a stand. For my proof of the independence of the Σ class alongside P is contrasted by Ballou with a hypothesis that Σ claims to be able to derive from P itself. If my proof is wrong, but Ballou's hypothesis is viable, then the text may only be based on P, not, as I want, on P and Σ . So this is a very important matter for the edition.¹⁸⁸

Although she had not published her conclusions at the time Hohl was using her materials himself in Rome (late 1912), he explains that he immediately grew uneasy with her treatment of the correctors and her approach to the Σ manuscripts, but he felt it would be impolite of him to draw attention to this in his 1913 article. 'How could I have taken a public stance against unpublished opinions, which were, moreover, brought to my attention in confidence!', so Hohl explains, going on to say that he 'exercised as much restraint as possible in my presentation of these

¹⁸⁷ Hohl (1916), 158–9.

¹⁸⁸ Hohl (1918), 79.

things'.¹⁸⁹ Now that Ballou's conclusions were published, he felt free to voice his disagreement. So, he stated that her attention to the detail of each manuscript had 'clouded and weakened' her overall perspective. 'It's as if', Hohl argued in a curious, arguably sexist, analogy, 'when doing embroidery you forgot the outline of the object over counting the stitches'.¹⁹⁰ Her working papers included her unpublished conclusions about the correctors of P which forced Hohl, so he says, to 'keep an eye on these things all the time' but 'in contrast to her, I ultimately expected little benefit from it'.¹⁹¹ Consequently, he goes on to explain that he took a different view of almost all the correctors identified by Ballou. This led him to his view of the independence (from P) of the Σ manuscripts. He did not agree with Ballou that, for example, the scribes of later manuscripts followed the annotations of earlier correctors and were therefore able to overcome the textual displacements in P. Hohl appears to devote most space to dissecting Ballou's arguments for attributing corrections to Petrarch across a range of different writing styles that she attributes to him. These are mainly not by Petrarch, so he argues, and some may be earlier in the 14th century. Equally, Hohl dismisses Ballou's identification of *Salutati* and *Bembo* as correctors. Separately, he diverged from Ballou's conclusions concerning both Petrarch's contribution and that of *Sedulius Scottus* as reflected in the *Cues florilegium*.¹⁹²

Clearly, with such divergent understandings of the manuscript tradition, the American and the German could not easily work together let alone produce a critical edition. Then war intervened. By then it seems the editorial partnership was already under strain, if not irretrievable. Hohl was expecting to 'dedicate myself to my edition of the text that has grown so dear to me without any further hindrance'.¹⁹³ So, he stuck to his position on the manuscript tradition. His principle that the Σ archetype, which he defined as the textual agreement of two or more of specified 14th and 15th century manuscripts (*Admontensis* 297, *Chigianus* H. VII.239; *Par.Lat.* 5807; *Vat.Lat.* 1897, *Vat Lat.* 1898), could be used to inform the text because they derived from a separate earlier tradition to P, prevailed. This operational principle was embedded in his text and as a result became the accepted scholarly norm.¹⁹⁴ Ballou's claim, by contrast, that

¹⁸⁹ Hohl (1918), 80

¹⁹⁰ Hohl (1918), 80.

¹⁹¹ Hohl (1918), 81

¹⁹² Hohl (1916) — limiting the scope of Petrarch's work on P in response to Ballou (1914), 55–76; Hohl (1914) on the *Cues* extracts.

¹⁹³ Hohl (1918), 97.

¹⁹⁴ Followed, most recently, by Rohrbacher (2022), xx.

all the Σ manuscripts could be traced back to P, and so were of only secondary textual significance, was therefore dismissed as misguided or superseded. Even so, Hohl did not have full support from those who had looked further into the characteristics of the various manuscripts, as he discovered when his edition was finally published in two volumes in 1927. Others have expressed the same doubt since.¹⁹⁵ By 1927, Ballou was at Bryn Mawr, but she never commented on the edition as far as is known.

Hohl's edition was dedicated to Dessau, a sure sign that the editor was operating on the assumption of a single fourth century author although he never says so and calls his work *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. The preface to the work laid out, as expected, Hohl's rationale for his text and how he had evaluated and reconstructed the relationships between the extant manuscripts. Since he had long made up his mind about the manuscripts themselves it was no surprise to find that he gave weight to the latest manuscripts (the Σ group) as stemming from an original dating from the same time as both the Palatine manuscript and the Bamberg manuscript, that is, the 9th century. While Hohl posited at least two early traditions (P and Σ) separately reflected in the manuscripts, confusedly he still printed in his edition (1927) his 1913 stemma that showed all manuscripts as deriving from the same archetype, namely P. For whatever reason, he failed to depict the Σ manuscripts altogether or discuss them in his introduction.¹⁹⁶ What may have surprised, however, was the complete absence in Hohl's preface of any mention of either Ballou or any of her published work on the manuscript tradition.¹⁹⁷ Indeed, her complete absence from Hohl's preface has probably exacerbated her disappearance altogether from the historical record and the pioneering research she had undertaken before Hohl on the manuscripts themselves. Nor is Kornemann ever mentioned either.

Hohl's edition received mixed reviews. While Henry Stuart Jones (1867–1939) at Oxford agreed with Hohl's reconstruction of the manuscript tradition, he commented that Hohl actually was responsible himself for very few emendations. Moreover, he was troubled by many of

¹⁹⁵ E.g. Marshall (1983), 355: 'This question [i.e. whether priority should be given to the Σ tradition] still remains to be answered definitively. Recent decades have seen such refinement in our understanding of the methods and abilities of the early Italian humanists that it seems possible that Ballou's verdict (with suitable modifications) may yet be maintained: that the Σ manuscripts nowhere provide readings which are beyond humanists active at the time.'

¹⁹⁶ Hohl (1913), 288, (1927), VII–VIII. They are more clearly depicted in Callu and Desbordes (1989), 274–5.

¹⁹⁷ The solitary emendation attributed to Ballou is taken from Ballou (1914), 78 ('reduxisit' in *Max. et Balb.* 17.2 – Hohl [1927a], 71).

Hohl's emendations and his propensity to include uncritically the proposals of others in filling textual lacunae. For example, he found Hohl allowed himself too much latitude 'or rather he had permitted his collaborator Rudolf Helm to exercise his ingenuity pretty freely in such cases'.¹⁹⁸ Another reviewer was Berthold Ullman (1882–1965) who, like Ballou, had been a student of Hale at Chicago, concentrating on Catullus, and had spent time at Munich but was now a well-reputed palaeographer. While welcoming Hohl's edition he pointed out the inexplicable absence of any mention of Ballou's work on the text and her alternative approach to the independence of the Σ manuscripts. Along with Stuart Jones, he criticised the presentation as making difficult reading and accusing Hohl of 'going to absurd lengths' and of showing 'a lack of understanding of palaeographic matters'.¹⁹⁹ While Stuart Jones and Ullman were competent judges of an editor's work, neither could claim to be a student of the *SHA* and to know the text well.

Klotz, however, was different. Having reviewed Ballou's monograph in 1915 he well understood the background to Hohl's new edition, the difference between Ballou and Hohl over the Σ manuscripts from 1912 onwards and the various textual and other problems investigated by students of the *SHA*. His hope for reconciliation of the approaches to the text of Ballou and Hohl never occurred. By this stage, Klotz was also an experienced editor. He could therefore be more pointed and detailed in his lengthy review for Berlin's *Philologische Wochenschrift*. Although he makes explicit mention of Ballou's approach to the Σ manuscripts he clearly prefers Hohl's interpretation of them, except that he expresses surprise that Hohl does not argue his case in the preface, while some of the individual readings are questionable. These he goes on to itemise. Further, the critical apparatus does not always report the Σ reading and sometimes it is merely redundant. What Hohl fails to do at all is report the readings of Sedulius Scottus and the Verona florilegium (*Flores moralium antiquitatum*) that certainly do derive from the same tradition as P, although they are listed separately with the manuscripts. All in all, Klotz found Hohl to be a conservative editor whose edition did not live up to expectations.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁸ Stuart Jones (1928), 151: 'Hohl is in the main a very conservative editor, which is praiseworthy where emendation is so tempting; but he allows himself a good deal of latitude in filling up lacunae, or, rather, he has permitted his collaborator, Rudolf Helm, to exercise his imagination pretty freely in such cases ...'.

¹⁹⁹ Ullman (1928), 311.

²⁰⁰ Klotz (1928), 453–66.

Hohl was clearly taken aback and replied immediately, denouncing the reviewer as misguided and ill-informed. Sarcastic in tone, Hohl's response to Klotz's review took particular exception to his interpretation of the manuscript tradition which 'Miss Ballou who was trained in Germany, tried in vain to refute with fantastic arguments'.²⁰¹ Leaving aside his dismissal of Ballou's palaeographical education in Chicago and Rome, Hohl suggested that Klotz may like to take up the 'costly sport' of researching the Σ manuscripts, that is, spend hours and hours poring over the detail of their script and relation to each other, without hinting that he saved time himself by having access to the collations of Ballou and Dessau. Hohl believed he had already proved his point so he expressed incomprehension that someone like Klotz could have any doubts about it. He clearly felt that nobody should be allowed express a view about the *SHA* unless they were familiar with all his articles.²⁰² It was a challenge Klotz took up immediately, again with reference to Ballou and her different interpretation of the Σ tradition.²⁰³ Despite the new edition being dedicated to him, Dessau too experienced Hohl's wrath. Although his own priority at the time was epigraphy, including his own classes at Berlin, Dessau was very much involved with the new edition of the *PIR*.²⁰⁴ Asked to comment on Hohl's new edition he said it was 'completely unusable due to a perverse, demanding type of explanatio'.²⁰⁵ Hohl did not take kindly to Dessau's verdict. Finally, there was the more sympathetic appraisal of Wilhelm Ensslin (1885–1965), glad that an historian had taken on this philological task, and glad to report that Hohl had taken full account of all the manuscripts. In passing, he noted how Hohl had 'justifiably' rejected the argument of Ballou that the Σ manuscripts were later and dependent on P and had reduced her case 'to absurdity'.²⁰⁶

Hohl was to live through the German empire and the Weimar republic, but also the National Socialist regime which succeeded until the end of the Second World War, and then the regime of the German Democratic Republic. Through all these different political backdrops and the personal challenges that came with them he continued his research and publication on the *SHA*. In addition, at the end of the First World War Strasbourg returned to French dominion, and a new home had to be

²⁰¹ Hohl (1928), 1116.

²⁰² Hohl (1928), 1118.

²⁰³ Klotz (1929).

²⁰⁴ Hohl may well have been among Dessau's epigraphy students at Berlin when he was there in 1907–8: Sehlmeier and Walter (2005), 10 n.6, with Wannack (2007), 175.

²⁰⁵ Quoted in Wannack (2007), 89 n.391.

²⁰⁶ Ensslin (1930), 112.

found for the German faculty there, including Hohl. In 1919 he agreed to go to Rostock, where he remained for the next thirty years (1919–39) before spending the end of his career (1950–3) in Mommsen's and Hirschfeld's chair of Ancient History in what was then East Berlin. An earlier attempt to replace his mentor Kornemann at Breslau had been thwarted by the Nazi regime. Hohl was not considered committed enough to the national socialist cause.²⁰⁷ In 1965 his *SHA* edition was lightly revised and reissued, following the obliteration of the stocks of the Teubner edition two decades earlier in an allied air raid.²⁰⁸ It remains the standard complete edition. Following Hohl's death in 1957, the manuscript of his German translation was entrusted by his wife to Johannes Straub at Bonn, then the capital of West Germany. It appeared in two volumes in 1976 and 1985 with an introduction from Straub.²⁰⁹ This was the period when Ronald Syme's influence was paramount. He considered Hohl not only a champion, like himself, of the *SHA* as the work of a single late fourth century author, although he wrote little about it other than the reconstruction of the text. As for the text of the *SHA*, however, Hohl still prevails.

Hohl was not a natural collaborator, as Kornemann and Ballou presumably discovered. To his dying day, he had the reputation of being a sensitive individual and fearless attack dog. Rostovzeff noted that Hohl 'violently attacks' some *SHA* scholars and 'in no field of ancient history is so much animosity displayed in scientific problems as in the investigation of the *Scr.Hist.Aug.* Hohl's reports are one of many examples',²¹⁰ while Momigliano singled out what he called Hohl's 'bad tempered criticisms' of another scholar in 1919.²¹¹ More recently, an eminent student of German ancient historians put it thus: 'With a ruthless sharpness and irony ..., he passionately attacked the weaknesses of the productions of even the most distinguished colleagues. Those who were not affected read these attacks with relish — a literary genre rarely seen these days ...'.²¹² Perhaps Ballou had herself experienced some of this sort of hostility

²⁰⁷ On his later career and work: Sehlmeier and Walter (2005), Christ (1982), 145–8.

²⁰⁸ Menge, Marx and Garton (1969), 209; Garzya (1983), 36: '... fra le conseguenze più funeste dell'ultima guerra'.

²⁰⁹ Hohl (1976), (1985).

²¹⁰ Rostovtzeff (1957), 729 n.2. He was referring to the survey reports ('Berichte') prepared by Hohl for the periods 1906–15 (Hohl 1915*b*), 1916–23 (Hohl 1924) and 1924–35 (Hohl 1937).

²¹¹ Momigliano (1966), 176, n.12.

²¹² Christ (2006), 55

directed against her personally, as well as in print, despite her generosity to Hohl in the course of his research on the manuscripts of the *SHA*.

More decisive refinement of Hohl's position came eventually from another Chicago Latinist and palaeographer, Blanche Boyer (1896–1984). Her main research interest was the insular script and its use by early English and Irish scribes. Naturally, her research extended to use of insular script in European manuscripts that could be traced to an English or Irish foundation, places like Fulda, Lorsch and Murbach. It was this quest which led her to the *SHA*, and to P and B, as well as the other manuscripts in the tradition. As a result, Boyer was able to point out that the manuscripts of the Σ tradition represented an early branch because they included several readings which are necessarily linked to an insular original. These occur throughout the Σ manuscripts. In summary, Boyer's argument was that not only was P a 9th century manuscript written in Caroline minuscule (probably at Lorsch), thereby confirming Mommsen and Dessau against Peter, but it was related to B, also 9th century and written in Anglo-Saxon minuscule (probably at or near Fulda),²¹³ and the extracts contained in the Vatican Library's *Cod.Pal.Lat.* 886 that contain correct readings, which can definitely be attributed to Lorsch.²¹⁴ To all of these is related the Σ tradition which also originated in the insular environment of Lorsch, Fulda and Murbach. In fact, the lost Murbach manuscript of the *SHA* used by Erasmus (1518) may have been the source of Sedulius Scottus' use of the *SHA* in his *Collectaneum*, the Cues extract.²¹⁵

For Boyer, then, the *SHA* constitutes 'a striking example of insular transmission' but one in which 'the clue of an actual Anglo-Saxon manuscript is illusory'.²¹⁶ Although there is no extant insular manuscript of the *SHA*, so Boyer concluded, the key witnesses (P, B, *Exc.Pal.* and Σ) are to an archetype of the 9th century or so with identifiable insular traces that suggest they were all copied originally in an insular foundation. Whether Boyer ever came to these conclusions in Ballou's lifetime (i.e. before 1940) is unknown, but the combative Hohl was still alive in 1948, although he appears not to have commented on Boyer's finding about his

²¹³ McKitterick (2004), 190, followed by Wood (2014), 287.

²¹⁴ That P was composed at Lorsch, then extracted (*Exc.Pal.*, *Vat.Lat.* 899 is clarified by McKitterick (2004), 201 with n.65. It is possible that these *SHA* extracts were present at Verona (McKitterick [2004], 205). Certainly, there were other *SHA* extracts in manuscripts at Verona (Reynolds and Wilson [1991], 155), such as those contained in the *Flores moralium auctoritatum* (Verona CLXVIII, 155)

²¹⁵ Boyer (1948), 33–9. *Paris Lat.* 1750, f.127v–129v is an extract From Sedulius (c.10/11) see Marshall (1983), 354–6.

²¹⁶ Boyer (1948), 33.

approach to the Σ tradition. Ballou, meanwhile, had evidently pursued her own edition according to her own reconstruction of the manuscript tradition and was to make her version available to the new Loeb Classical Library project for a translation of the *SHA*.

7. From Chicago to Bryn Mawr, 1912–31

Back in America in 1912 Susan returned to her position as Instructor in Latin at Chicago.²¹⁷ With her new German doctorate she was part of the departmental group which attended the American Philological Association meeting in Washington, DC in December 1912.²¹⁸ She spent three further years as Instructor in the Latin department at Chicago, during which her monograph was published (Leipzig 1914) and her erstwhile collaborator Hohl contradicted much of it so that, war aside, her involvement in the Teubner edition of the *SHA* lapsed. Still, there was no permanent position for Ballou at Chicago. Instead, she took up a position in 1915 at Western Michigan State Normal School (now Western Michigan University) at Kalamazoo where she was the sole Latinist but adapted quickly to the institution.²¹⁹ She wasted no time in setting up a ‘Classical Club’ and gave its first talk on 8 December 1915 ‘illustrated with stereopticon views of Rome’.²²⁰ The following year she established a new training course to meet the needs of prospective teachers now in their sixth year of Latin.²²¹ After two years at Western Michigan, she took up a position teaching ancient and medieval history in the history department of the University of Wisconsin (1917–20) at Madison, just before Rostovtzeff arrived there and unleashed his productivity.²²²

From Wisconsin she secured a position as Associate Professor in the Latin department at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. She was probably recruited to Bryn Mawr by the then head of the Latin department, Arthur Wheeler (1871–1932).²²³ Their common interest in Catullus may have

²¹⁷ *University of Chicago, Cap and Gown* 17 (1912), 27; *Cap and Gown* 18 (1913), 24; *Cap and Gown* 19 (1914), 29.

²¹⁸ *University of Chicago Magazine* 5.4 (1913), 123.

²¹⁹ *University of Chicago Magazine* 7.9 (July 1915), 293 and 8.1 (January 1916), 27. Her appointment to the ‘headship of the Latin Department’ was reported as front-page news in the *Daily Maroon* 14.1 (5 October 1915), 1.

²²⁰ *The Kalamazoo Normal Record* 6.3 (December 1915), ‘The Classical Club’. She had done similar talks in Chicago over the years.

²²¹ *The Kalamazoo Normal Record* 7.1 (November 1916), ‘New Training Course in Latin’.

²²² As illuminated by Bowersock (1986).

²²³ Briggs (1994*d*) 691–2.

helped. When she joined the Latin Department it consisted of a Professor (Wheeler), two associate professors (Ballou and Mary Swindler), and a lecturer. In her final year (1930/1) the Latin department consisted of a Professor (Lily Ross Taylor), three Associate Professors (Ballou, T. R. S. Broughton and Swindler) and two instructors. Taylor had eventually replaced Wheeler as professor on his retirement but not before the College President, Marion Park, had stepped into the role of Professor of Latin for a year (1926/7).²²⁴

At Bryn Mawr Ballou taught undergraduate courses on a range of authors in the Latin Department as well as ancient history in the History Department.²²⁵ However, there was never any opportunity to take advantage of her knowledge of the *SHA*, to which she had devoted so much of her scholarly energy and acumen, or any Latin literature after Tacitus and Suetonius, except for her inclusion of Ammianus Marcellinus in a graduate seminar in Roman Historiography in 1923/4.²²⁶ She also taught a graduate course in 'Medieval Latin' in 1925/6 and 1927/8.²²⁷ In 1921 she was teaching Cicero's letters, Livy, Vergil and Horace, as well as the history of Latin literature.²²⁸ Then the following schedule was set out for her: 1921/2 palaeography and textual criticism; 1922/3 letters of Cicero; 1923/4 Roman epic. At the graduate level she was to teach courses in 1921–2 (and 1923–4, 1925–6) on *Lucretius and Catullus* (three hours/week, semester 1), *Caesar and Cicero* (3 hours week, semester 2) and *Latin Prose Composition* (2 hours/week, all year). For alternate years (1922–3, 1924–5, 1926/7) she offered *The Life and Works of Vergil* (Semester 1) and *Roman Prose of the Empire* (semester 2), with *Latin Prose Composition* (all year).²²⁹ These were largely courses inherited from her predecessor Horace Wetherill Wright.²³⁰

Although she had always taught ancient history courses at Bryn Mawr annually or in cycle, the courses she taught in 1930/1, her final year, would have been well informed by her travels and museum study across the ancient world in 1928/9. These were an elective course on 'the social, economic and administrative history' of the Roman Empire, and one on 'Civilisation of the Ancient World' in which 'special attention is paid to

²²⁴ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1926–1927* (1926), 59.

²²⁵ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1921*, 14 with courses taught at 53.

²²⁶ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1923*, 59.

²²⁷ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1926–1927* (1926), 60. *Bryn Mawr College Calendar, 1928–1929* (1928), 47.

²²⁸ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1922*, 61–3.

²²⁹ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1924–1925* (1924), 60.

²³⁰ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1921*, 58–9.

Greece and Rome; but extended consideration is also given to the subject of pre-history, to the early civilizations of western Asia, Egypt and the Aegean region, and to the influence of environment, race, and culture upon human development. The evolution of civilisation as a whole, from earliest times to the fourth century AD is presented in a single synthesis.²³¹ This course actually predated Ballou at Bryn Mawr but she soon made it her own. It was a very wide-ranging, modern and sophisticated course for its day, reminiscent of the broad outlook demonstrated by Rostovtzeff at Wisconsin and Yale. Her graduate seminars, meanwhile, included one devoted to inscriptions and palaeography, to which she brought an enormous depth of knowledge and experience. On top of that she belonged, with the head of Bryn Mawr, Marion Park, Lily Ross Taylor and the two instructors, to the 'Latin Journal Club' at which students and instructors shared their knowledge of recent book and journal publications.²³² Despite all her years with the manuscripts of the *SHA*, Catullus returned as the palaeographical exemplar for teaching purposes at Bryn Mawr.²³³ In addition, she also had a fine knowledge of papyri, both published and unpublished, as demonstrated in her article on the careers of the Egyptian prefects and senior officials.²³⁴

One of her outstanding graduate students at Bryn Mawr was Irene Rosenzweig (1903–97). It is very plausible that Ballou, along with Taylor, encouraged her to apply successfully for a fellowship to the American Academy in Rome for 1930/1. After all, it was the American School of Classical Studies, as it then was, that was such a formative influence in Ballou's own academic development. She wrote a detailed and positive reference for Rosenzweig. Included, almost as an afterthought, was a warning to the all-male panel of Trustees in New York, that they should not be tempted to reject Rosenzweig because of her obviously Jewish name.²³⁵ The fellowship enabled her to progress her research on the

²³¹ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1930*, 14 (Roman Empire) and 67–8 (Civilisation of the Ancient World).

²³² *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1930*, 72.

²³³ *Bryn Mawr College Calendar 1930*, 71: 'During the first semester the facsimiles in the collections of Chatelain, Zangemeister and Wattenbach, and Arndt will be used to furnish acquaintance with the more important Roman and Medieval Literary Hands and photographic reproductions are used for practical exercises in collation and text emendation. During the second semester the poems of Catullus form the basis of the application of palaeographical principles to textual criticism.'

²³⁴ Ballou (1921), 96–110.

²³⁵ Irene was the daughter of a successful Lithuanian immigrant and store-owner in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. The letter is published in full, from the American Academy Archives, in Hallett (2021), 22–3 (n.43), the telling sentences being 'I should like if possible to counteract any unfavorable impressions that may arise from her last name

Iguvine tablets, an interest ignited by Taylor. As Taylor explained, Rosenzweig represented ‘the type of person that the Academy would like to send out into college teaching’ and she predicted that ‘she has enough real interest to make it probable that she will continue to do research work’. However, perhaps because of both her name and her sex, Rosenzweig never achieved an academic post.²³⁶ Instead, she became a teacher at the prestigious Madeira School in Virginia, then tutor to the family of a US President (F. D. Roosevelt).²³⁷

Whether Ballou was herself antisemitic, as alleged much later, is difficult to determine. She may have been, even though she had personally experienced discrimination both as a female and a foreigner in Germany in 1910, as she confessed to Wissowa (*Appendix B*, Letter 2). Certainly, in Rosenzweig’s case Ballou was fully supportive of her research and potential career even though Rosenzweig was not her pupil primarily. In addition, the shadow of overt racism and anti-semitism displayed by the recent and formative President of Bryn Mawr, Martha Carey Thomas (1837–1935), may still have hung over the institution. She was still President when Ballou arrived in 1921 and was succeeded the following year by Marion Park. Thomas may have been a libertarian in matters of sexuality and women’s suffrage, but she would not tolerate any ‘African blood’ or Jewish student, nor faculty member, at Bryn Mawr during her tenure.²³⁸

Be that as it may, the lingering picture of Ballou during her decade at Bryn Mawr is that she was a ‘sad’ figure who had suffered a series of setbacks that thwarted her potential. While this was repeated by those who never knew her decades later, the original source is not clear. Possibly, it was Anna Johnson Pell, Professor of Mathematics at Bryn Mawr and wife of the man who recruited Ballou in 1920, since Pell

and evident nationality, by saying that she is absolutely devoid of the sometimes unpleasant characteristics of her race. She is personally unusually attractive, has quiet good manners and unvarying amiability. She is one of the most pleasant and most satisfactory students I have ever worked with. I am very much interested in her future career and recommend her unreservedly’ (Hallett [2021], 23). The head of the Latin Department, before Taylor arrived the previous year, was Arthur Wheeler whose testimonial is more explicit about Irene’s Jewishness (‘a Jewess, but she has none of the characteristics which are so often called Hebraic’), as is the testimonial of her original mentor, Eugene Taverner at University of Washington (‘a Jewess from Arkansas’).

²³⁶ Rosenzweig’s research culminated in her book (Rosenzweig 1937), in which she duly acknowledged its genesis in a seminar paper for Taylor.

²³⁷ Information from the *Encyclopedia of Arkansas* at <https://encyclopediaofarkansas.net/entries/irene-rosenzweig-9203/>.

²³⁸ Horowitz (1994) 226, 230–2, 340–3, 381–2, 428–9, 449–51.

continued to socialise with members of the Latin Department including the current undergraduate students.²³⁹ She would have known Ballou along with the estimation of her husband, Arthur Wheeler. Apart from any unknown difficulties in her personal life, by the 1920s Ballou may well have been weighed down by her falling out with Ernst Hohl a decade earlier and knowing that his edition of the *SHA* had still not appeared. Hers never would. She may have been looking back on a wasted decade or more for herself.²⁴⁰ She had invested her career and skill in producing a superior modern version of a text that was well outside the mainstream curriculum of American classics. What is clear, however, is that for the academic year 1928/9 Ballou was on a year's leave in Europe. Her travel diary from this year has been preserved so we have an insightful idea of her movements, her reading and eating habits and intellectual interests in this year.²⁴¹ Striking is the breadth of her interests and her long periods in museums as an inquisitive student, not just another visiting tourist, as well as her social life. Although she protected her privacy, she was definitely no recluse.

Having turned 60 years of age on 28 September 1928 Ballou had already reached a potential retiring point, but that was her decision.²⁴² Before even embarking on her leave, perhaps, the President of Bryn Mawr, and fellow-Latinist Marion Park, had raised with Ballou the question of her retirement. It's also possible that the current head of her own Department of Latin, Lily Ross Taylor, was also looking to her retirement, especially since it was Taylor's scholarly friend and promising Bryn Mawr doctoral graduate, Louise Adams Holland (1893–1990), who was taking Ballou's place while she was on approved leave, although by early 1929 Holland was pregnant.²⁴³ Taylor may have been thinking that if Ballou decided to retire rather than return to Bryn Mawr then Holland

²³⁹ The source for this information is the recollection of Katherine Geffcken from 1950s Bryn Mawr reported to Judith Hallett. See Hallett (2021), 44: 'Miss Ballou was incidentally a promising scholar who suffered many misfortunes, and was characterized by this time as "sad."'

²⁴⁰ Apart from her research and teaching, in her decade at Bryn Mawr Susan was no shrinking violet. One summer she confessed to the local student newsheet that she spent her summer 'armed with knickers and an axe, cleared pine forests in the White Mountain', presumably alluding to the White Mountains in New Hampshire ('Faculty Notes' in *The College News*, 4 October 1923, 2).

²⁴¹ *Ballou Diary 1929* (Wisconsin Historical Society Library and Archives).

²⁴² Ballou records spending her 60th birthday in the archaeological museum at Naples (*Ballou Diary*, 28 September 1928).

²⁴³ Information from the useful biographical sketch by her daughter Marion H. Macalister, 'Louise Adams Holland 1893–1990', at https://www.brown.edu/Research/Breaking_Ground/bios/Holland_Louise.pdf. See also Broughton (1994), 287–9.

could take her place permanently. On 19 March 1929 Ballou despatched letters from Athens to both Park and Taylor but their contents are unknown. Almost two months later, again from Athens, she confided to her diary that she ‘wrote Mrs Manning giving possible reason for uncertainty about my retirement time and also giving the time of return’.²⁴⁴ This ‘Mrs Manning’ was Helen Taft Manning (1891–1987) who was then Dean and Professor of History at Bryn Mawr. Only later did Ballou discover that Manning was in fact Acting President while Park was recuperating from an operation. At the end of her leave, she returned to Bryn Mawr and carried on her duties.²⁴⁵ These had been laid down in a previous letter from Park informing Ballou that the salary for 1930/1 would be the same (\$3,500) she was already earning as an Associate Professor of Latin.²⁴⁶ She was obviously hoping for a salary rise but salaries were already a contentious issue at Bryn Mawr. As the Depression bit deeper into the College finances by 1933/4 President Park was forced to reduce all salaries above \$2,000 by 10%.²⁴⁷ Luckily for Ballou, she had retired by then to Madison, Wisconsin where she presumably kept active at least enough to undertake another trip to Europe in June 1935.²⁴⁸ Perhaps for financial reasons, she was not replaced at Bryn Mawr, and the Latin department shrank to just Taylor and Broughton (plus two instructors) until Louise Adams Holland was appointed in 1934. Ballou, meanwhile, continued to attend the annual APA congress in 1933, 1934 and 1936, but she seems to have fallen inactive after that. Unless something else turns up, and it may, the last trace of Ballou alive is in 1940.²⁴⁹ She died on 29 May 1940, aged 71. There do not appear to be any published obituaries.

8. Magie, Ballou and the Loeb edition of the *SHA*, 1921–32

While Ballou may have been considered at Bryn Mawr in the 1920s as having failed to achieve her potential, as far as her extensive research on

²⁴⁴ *Ballou Diary*, 6 May 1929

²⁴⁵ As reported in the *Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin* 1929, 267.

²⁴⁶ *Ballou Diary* 1928, 28 February 1929.

²⁴⁷ Meigs (1956), 149–51, 156.

²⁴⁸ Her travel diary only survives to 8 July 1935 when she was in Spain (Wisconsin Historical Society Archives).

²⁴⁹ As recorded in a volume published the following year: *Phi Beta Kappa* (1941), 69. Her final address was ‘Twin Gables’, 2530 Kendall Avenue, Madison. ‘Twin Gables’ was an impressive Tudor-Style apartment block built in 1929 and close to the university. The building as it stands today is the same one inhabited by Ballou after leaving Bryn Mawr for Madison in 1931.

the *SHA* was concerned all was not lost in this period. Indeed, at Chicago she was still considered the most knowledgeable person on the *SHA* and was therefore invited to review three relevant books, two in quick succession. First, in 1925 she commended the author of a dissertation on the connecting particles in the *SHA* except where the author had mistakenly followed the Peter text.²⁵⁰ She certainly had the time for reviewing the other two because she was on leave for the year 1928/9 and evidently managed her reviews while on the road. Indeed, at the very beginning of her trip when travelling by train from Madison to Chicago, she was coming to grips with the monograph of the London barrister turned professor, Norman H. Baynes (1877–1961), associating the *SHA* with the emperor Julian rather than later.²⁵¹ Hohl was totally convinced by Baynes. Ballou was not. She found the whole argument ‘extremely fantastic and chimerical’,²⁵² taking particular exception to Baynes’ defence that he was a mere historian and so could ignore what seemed purely philological questions: ‘Upon the stylistic differences ... I confess that I do not feel qualified to express a judgment. I write as a student of history and not as a literary critic.’²⁵³ But the literary criteria, Ballou insisted, do form an essential basis for analysing the *SHA* and any theory that disregards them is inadequate.²⁵⁴ By the time her review appeared Baynes had already responded to certain critics.²⁵⁵ To the sharp critique of Ballou, however, he never responded. In the course of her travels in Italy and Egypt, she managed the other review finally posting the proofs of both reviews together from Asyut on the Nile in December 1928.²⁵⁶ All three reviews highlight her own position on the *SHA* at that point, namely: (1) no credibility could be placed on Dessau’s idea of a single late fourth century ‘forger’ for the entire *SHA*;²⁵⁷ (2) only by analysis of individual *vitae* can a final decision be reached on ‘the vexed questions of source and authorship’;²⁵⁸ (3) literary criteria are fundamental to understanding the *SHA*.²⁵⁹ Essentially, she was echoing the position of Mommsen and others in the 1890s. In the meantime, neither Ballou, nor

²⁵⁰ Ballou (1925), 88–9.

²⁵¹ *Ballou Diary* 1928: 11 September.

²⁵² Ballou (1928a), 410.

²⁵³ Baynes (1926), 75.

²⁵⁴ Ballou (1928a) 410–11.

²⁵⁵ Baynes (1928).

²⁵⁶ *Ballou Diary* 1928: 1 December.

²⁵⁷ Ballou (1928b), 409.

²⁵⁸ Ballou (1928b), 409.

²⁵⁹ Ballou (1928a), 410–11.

anyone else for the most part, had been persuaded by Dessau that the work entitled in P 'vitae diversorum principum et tyrannorum a divo Hadriano usque ad Numerianum diversis compositae' was from the pen of a single late fourth century hoaxer; let alone that its proper title was *Historia Augusta*.

Before the Teubner project with Hohl ran aground, or perhaps soon thereafter, Ballou had actually gone on to produce a text of her own, at least for the first few lives. They were deployed by David Magie (1877–1957), a distinguished Princeton professor from a distinguished Princeton family and almost a decade younger than Ballou. Unlike Ballou, he had succeeded in becoming a doctoral student of Wissowa at Halle.²⁶⁰ As early as 1912 he had been entrusted with producing a new Loeb Classical Library edition and translation of the *SHA*, but had made little progress by 1915 when it's likely that Magie and Ballou first met and discussed the possibility of her contributing to the Loeb *SHA*. It was the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Magie's Princeton in December 1915, when Ballou was teaching Latin at Kalamazoo. Ballou would be hard to miss. Of the 146 delegates registered she was one of only a handful of women.²⁶¹ With her German doctorate (1911), her engagement with Teubner for a new edition of the *SHA* (1912) and her recent monograph on the manuscript tradition published by Teubner (1914), she was an obvious potential contributor to any American project on the *SHA*. Moreover, one of her chief patrons, F. F. Abbott from Chicago, was also there, and could speak on her behalf. In any event, she was actually one of the speakers, delivering her paper on the 'Clausula and Higher Criticism' on 30 December. While Magie was already committed to producing the first volume of his Loeb edition of the *SHA*, and progressing the two subsequent volumes, until well into 1919 he was particularly busy as a key player in the World War I peace settlement and post-war developments in the Middle East. The first volume could only be published in reasonable time if the bulk of the work was done by others. Accordingly, Magie acknowledged (in his preface dated 15 June 1921) that the translation of most of the lives (Antoninus Pius to Pescennius Niger, that is all except the first two — Hadrian and Aelius — which he had

²⁶⁰ On Magie: Champlin (1994), 393–4. Magie is described as 'perhaps not so well known at the time of his *Historia Augusta* volumes', in Horsley (2012), 45. He was certainly well-known, however, to Edward Capps (1866–1950), the Princeton based editor of the Loeb Classical Library who would have been instrumental in commissioning the volumes from Magie almost certainly before he became involved in the peace negotiations in 1918. Under Wissowa in Halle, Magie completed a doctorate on Greek terms in Roman public and sacral law (1904).

²⁶¹ List of delegates in American Philological Association (1915), i.

already done himself, presumably), was provided by ‘my friend Mr. Ainsworth O’Brien Moore’. In fact, O’Brien Moore (1897–1936) was a precocious pupil of Magie’s and was still working on his doctoral dissertation on madness at the time he was translating the *SHA* for his mentor. He also contributed to translations of the other lives drafted by Magie who boldly affirms ‘but for the promise of his collaboration the task of preparing this edition had not been undertaken’.²⁶² As the minor contributor to a volume bearing his name, Magie had spoken truthfully.

The other reason Magie was able to accomplish his Loeb volume at such a busy time for him is that he had the benefit of a new text prepared by Susan Ballou which formed the basis of the translation by Magie and O’Brien Moore. Both Magie and Ballou were probably expecting that the whole of the Loeb translation would have the benefit of being based on this new edition. For various reasons this turned out not to be possible. Ballou’s original collaborator Ernst Hohl had made it clear that his solo Teubner edition was about to appear, although that was not to happen until 1927, between Magie’s second and third volumes. Magie and his associates could not keep waiting. As Magie explained in the preface to volume 1 (published 1922): the text for the lives from Hadrian to the usurper Avidius Cassius was provided by Ballou. In other words, the completed edition of these lives was not wasted. He says:

The Latin text of the first six biographies has been supplied by Miss Susan H. Ballou of Bryn Mawr College, who had in mind the preparation of a new text of the biographies, based on her study of the manuscripts. Unfortunately, however, other interests have claimed her time and her efforts and she has been unable to complete the work for this edition. It is to be earnestly hoped that she will yet publish a critical text of the entire series. In the lack of Miss Ballou’s text, I have been forced to base this edition, from the Commodus onward, on the text of Hermann Peter, for the long promised edition by Dr Ernst Hohl has not yet appeared. It would have been invaluable.²⁶³

The net result of being obliged to use Peter’s 1884 text, as Magie goes on to confess, is that he was not able to change many readings except that he could take advantage of those who had previously published agreed improvements to Peter’s text. In explaining the basis of the text of the *SHA*, Magie sided with Ballou on the key issue that had divided her from

²⁶² Magie (1922), vii.

²⁶³ Magie (1922), vii.

Hohl, namely the Σ tradition and its relationship to the Palatine manuscript (P). He fairly sets down Hohl's case: the chronological order of the lives, the correct arrangement of the pages (folios) transposed in P; missing paragraphs in the lives of Severus Alexander and Aurelian in P and the P tradition excised for religious (anti-pagan) reasons.²⁶⁴ However, he then proceeds to explain Ballou's case against Hohl: the differences between P and the Σ manuscripts are best explained by a later redactor with the ability to take advantage of all the corrections brought to P across several centuries and owners. It was this redactor who put the lives in chronological order, smoothed over the lacunas marked in P, restored certain transpositions of the manuscript in transmission, and added sentences apparently favourable to pagans in the lives of Severus Alexander and Aurelian.²⁶⁵ In conclusion, Magie repeats that any text of the *SHA* has to be based on P. As for Hohl's contrary position, Magie notes that 'with only the present evidence available the problem of the value of the manuscripts of Class Σ must be regarded as still unsolved'. He goes on to say that 'the arguments advanced by Dr Hohl are not altogether convincing and it has not yet been fully demonstrated that this tradition of the Σ manuscripts is independent of those of Class P'.²⁶⁶ In other words, Magie was siding here with Ballou.

Ballou's edition of the lives from Hadrian to Avidius Cassius in the first Loeb volume is the only remnant of her projected full edition which never eventuated. It was, however, a contribution which cannot be ignored even today. It suffices to provide an insight into what a complete Ballou edition of the *SHA* would look like and of her approach to finalising the text on the basis of her extensive manuscript studies. For example, she considered the merits of every suggested emendation and, by 1915, they ran into the thousands. Occasionally, therefore, she favours a single emendation made by an earlier scholar usually as part of a more wide-ranging article,²⁶⁷ but she made few emendations of her own volition. At times, despite her dissatisfaction with the revised 1884 edition of Peter ('Peter2' for short), she preferred a reading of Peter against that of others and the manuscripts.²⁶⁸ As an editor, she had great respect for the Palatine manuscript (P) but was happy to allow certain suggestions for a lacuna, an intrusive marginal gloss, or a transposition of sentences in the manuscript. Sometimes she corrects P or reinstates the reading of P

²⁶⁴ Magie (1921), xxxv

²⁶⁵ Magie (1921), xxxvi.

²⁶⁶ Magie (1921), xxxvi.

²⁶⁷ E.g. *Aelius*, 2.2.

²⁶⁸ E.g. *Hadrian*, 23.2, 23.12, 24.1; *Ael.* 3.1.

against subsequent emendation by others.²⁶⁹ On the other hand, she never gave preference to a reading in the Σ tradition of the manuscripts. She considered them to be derived from P rather than a separate tradition stemming from a separate archetype. For textual purposes, therefore, the later manuscripts were superfluous in Ballou's view.

Despite her active involvement in the first Loeb volume, Ballou reviewed it at length for *Classical Philology*, commenting that there is 'perhaps no single work in ancient literature which presents so many problems as to authorship, date, historical sources and textual emendation'. As for the volume under review, 'for the first six *Vitae* new collations of the Palatine codex were furnished by the reviewer, but at that point her collaboration was interrupted'. 'For the rest', Ballou continues, 'Peter's edition had to be used, and this was unfortunate since it involved perpetuating in the latter part of the volume a number of errors in Peter's report of P such as were eliminated in the earlier part'. Ballou does not explain whether the interruption to her collaboration with Magie was the same interruption that stalled her work on the Teubner text in 1914, namely the fundamental disagreement with Hohl on the manuscript tradition, or whether it was something more contemporary such as the evident level of commitment involved in her movement to Bryn Mawr (1921).

In the second volume of the Loeb text and translation (1924), as well as the third (1932), Ballou clearly played no direct role, at least not something corresponding to her textual contribution to the first volume. Nor did Ainsworth O'Brien Moore, except for translating the lives of the Maximini (235–8), the Gordiani (238–444) and Pupienus and Balbinus (238) which was still a very significant contribution. He had remained at Princeton after 1921 but had taken up a position at Yale by 1925. Again, Magie had to rely on Peter's text for the second volume but by the third volume he had the long-awaited text by Hohl (1927) to work from. Ballou also reviewed the second volume. She noted how Magie had taken on board the various suggested improvements to Peter's text made by her and others, and had made many emendations of his own, although she was able to point out from her intimate knowledge of the manuscripts that some of these were faulty.

The second volume, perhaps in response to criticism of the first, included a comprehensive introduction to the 'problem' of the *SHA*'s authorship and the current state of research. Interestingly, in her review Ballou confirms Magie's approach, originating with Mommsen and Hirschfeld, namely that the *SHA* consist of layers and the scholarly

²⁶⁹ E.g. *Hadrian*. 27.2, *Ael.*1.3, 8.3.

challenge is to define the boundaries of the layers. She is quite clear that ‘this plain statement of a very difficult problem and summarizing of its various phases are real contributions and help excellently to clear the air amid the confusion of much discussion for a fresh start along lines which, in the opinion of the reviewer also, will lead to the true solution’.²⁷⁰ Others found Magie’s approach to the *SHA* less acceptable. On the question of authorship, Magie carefully traced successive arguments then pronounced that ‘it has become clear that the radical theory that the vitae are all the work of a “forger” who lived at the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth is untenable’.²⁷¹ He went on to conclude that ‘at the present stage of our knowledge no definite statement as to authorship can be made’.²⁷²

As was likely anticipated, Hohl did not respond immediately to Magie’s first volume, but reviewed the first and second volumes together five years later in 1926 with his edition in press.²⁷³ Even then, he concentrated on expounding at length his particular view of the manuscript tradition which Magie had found wanting. Starting from the premise that he was naturally interested in the Loeb edition of the *SHA* because he had been working on a critical edition himself for years, Hohl confidently predicted that his forthcoming work would finally lay to rest the controversial issues engendered by the text. ‘Through war and inflation’, so he said, his edition was now near and would supersede the long-inadequate and outdated 1884 edition of Hermann Peter. Whereas Peter had operated on an erroneous assumption that the two main manuscripts (P and B) were of equal value, Hohl’s research had confirmed that B was merely a copy of P, as Mommsen (1890) and Dessau (1894) had previously proposed. He did not mention that Ballou had also come to the same conclusion as early as 1901. Further, Dessau had concluded that the cluster of much younger manuscripts also derived from P, so that P was really the only adequate basis for any modern text of the *SHA*. That was the line followed by Magie. Instead, Hohl explained that from 1912 his own research in Rome, Florence, and Milan, augmented by facsimile copies of manuscripts from Paris (*Par.Lat.* 5816, 5817) and London (British Museum, Add. MSS, 102015), had partly, but only partly, confirmed Dessau’s proposal. Again, this was a conclusion reached by Ballou after more detailed research than Dessau was able to accomplish, but her contribution was not mentioned. On the other hand, in Hohl’s

²⁷⁰ Ballou (1928), 406.

²⁷¹ Magie (1924), xxx.

²⁷² Magie (1924), xxxi.

²⁷³ Hohl (1926), 546–50.

view, as he had long held, the younger manuscripts were all related to each other, yet they did not derive from P. Instead, they originated in a different archetype altogether.

For his third volume, Magie provided no further discussion of the *SHA* except to include a brief bibliography (from 1919 to 1930), but now he had the text of Hohl (1927) to include. In reviewing the third and final volume of Magie's Loeb edition and annotated translation, the third century expert C. E. van Sickle congratulated Magie for completing his task 'without succumbing to the temptation to indulge in wild hypotheses regarding the date, authorship, and purpose of the *Historia Augusta* — a temptation which led so many otherwise competent scholars into methods of interpretation akin to the famous anagrammatic method described by Lemuel Gulliver'.²⁷⁴ Van Sickle had been inescapably obliged to deal with the issues at the core of the *SHA* by focussing on events in the 230s and had written a series of detailed articles on their chronology.

The Loeb translation has done solid service for the best part of a century as it was designed to do, that is, as the gateway for students into the complexities of the *SHA* and the information contained therein. It has also facilitated study of the previously neglected period of the Roman empire from 117 to 285. The enormous amount of scholarship on the *SHA* in the meantime has revealed new aspects and new approaches, along with the entrenchment of Dessau's thesis, still contested in the 1920s, that it was a work of a single writer in the late 4th century (*HA*) masquerading as an authorial multiplicity from decades earlier (*SHA*).²⁷⁵ The three Loeb volumes of the *SHA* were a collaborative work published over 11 years (1921–32). In addition to Magie, its text was the work of three different editors: Ballou (vol. 1), Peter (vols. 1 and 2) and Hohl (vol. 3), while the translation was mainly the work of Ainsworth-O'Brien and Magie. The revised version has the merit of providing not only a single text (Hohl, as revised) but also the consistency of a single reviser/translator (Rohrbacher). It appeared in three simultaneous volumes (2022) under the now conventional title of *HA*.

²⁷⁴ Van Sickle (1935), 184. The obscure reference is to Jonathan Swift's famous satire, *Gulliver's Travels* (Part 3, chapter 6): 'So, for example, if I should say, in a letter to a friend, "Our brother Tom has just got the piles," a skilful decipherer would discover, that the same letters which compose that sentence, may be analysed into the following words, "Resist -, a plot is brought home--The tour." And this is the anagrammatic method.'

²⁷⁵ Paschoud (2009), 204.

9. Ballou's impact on study of the *SHA*

In 1954, as professor of Ancient History in London (University College), Arnaldo Momigliano could honestly claim in his famous contribution to a series of lectures on historical forgeries, that the *SHA* was a forgery too, at least that is what is assumed for it. He could also claim that before reaching his verdict of 'unsolved' he had read through the whole of the modern literature on the *SHA* twice, the first time aged 27, as a new professor in Turin in 1936 leading a series of seminars on the *SHA*.²⁷⁶ Ballou was still alive at the time and could have done the same. Nowadays, it would be extremely difficult for any scholar to realistically claim to have covered even once all the literature on the *SHA*, a total of over 1,500 items (since 1929) in the *L'Année philologique*, of which only 132 (plus those prior to 1929) were published up to 1954. Nor would Momigliano receive much credit today for returning an 'unsolved' verdict. He would be expected to demonstrate a clear preference for at least a single author and a date around the 380s or 390s, or to set out in detail a justifiable dissent. Instead, he insisted that, as yet, no scholar had succeeded in proving that the *SHA* was not written by five (or six) different named authors in the late third/early fourth century as claimed in the text. The best argument for a late fourth century author, or authors, so Momigliano conceded, was that originally made by Dessau that the *SHA*'s life of Septimius Severus had utilised directly the imperial history, arranged biographically, of Aurelius Victor written around 360. The recent proposal that what has always been considered the complete work of Aurelius Victor, the *Caesares*, is really only an abbreviated version of the original, especially the argument that the *SHA* made far more extensive use of it than previously recognised, will require close and expert scrutiny.²⁷⁷ It may, or may not, turn out to be decisive for the date and therefore the nature of the *SHA*.

Since 1954, research on all aspects of the *SHA* has only accelerated, but not so much research on the manuscripts, at least not until quite recently. New digital tools not available then have been deployed to address the question of singular/unitary authorship and the use of earlier writers identified in the text. Even so, while detailed computer analysis of the style and vocabulary of the text have pointed to a single author, doubts still remain about both their method and conclusions.²⁷⁸ Momigliano's 'unsolved' has not yet been decisively solved as expected. Likewise, traces

²⁷⁶ Momigliano (1954) with Croke (2023), 165–6.

²⁷⁷ Stover and Woudhysen (2023), 265–334.

²⁷⁸ The method was criticised more recently by Stover and Kestemont (2016), cf. Adams (1972) by sheer philological knowledge and instinct.

in the *SHA* of datable authors such as Claudian and Jerome have long been claimed as decisive for its date, but just as comprehensively challenged.²⁷⁹ As for Ammianus Marcellinus in particular, Ronald Syme (1903–89) led the way in arguing that the *SHA* shows the influence of Ammianus.²⁸⁰ Again, question ‘unsolved’, not least because Momigliano was not persuaded.²⁸¹ For those coming to the *SHA* for the first time, orientation has become more complex, detailed and difficult.²⁸²

Besides the sources, the other aspect of defining the *SHA*’s nature and date lies in its very purpose and characteristics. Even assuming Dessau’s thesis of a single late fourth century author, here too controversy abounds. Once the *SHA* was thought to be an anti-Christian treatise, or an overtly pagan propaganda piece, or at least an appeal to religious tolerance. This was a view championed by Andreas Alföldi (1895–1981) in the 1920s to 1940s.²⁸³ Most famously, in 1926, Norman Baynes made a case for dating the *SHA* to the time of the emperor Julian (361–3) and linked its production with Julian’s overtly anti-Christian agenda. He convinced some well-informed students of the *SHA* such as Hohl and Wilhelm Ensslin but not most,²⁸⁴ certainly not Ballou. Hohl and Ensslin had both been students of Kornemann, himself a student of Mommsen and Dessau. Baynes’ case resonated with them. Still, the quest for uncovering the purpose and character of the *SHA*, as a unitary late fourth century creation, continued, with the anti-Christian purpose promoted by Johannes Straub (1912–96), dating it to the period after the history of Orosius in 415, while Werner Hartke (1907–93) proposed a political message, namely a critique of the child emperors, by which he meant Arcadius and Honorius after 395.

In the 1960s and 1970s Syme, as Dessau’s modern champion and buttressed by the example of Hohl, sought to emphasise the literary nature of the *HA* (as he always thereafter called it) by setting out a simple proposal with elaborate and sustained analysis. It was futile to look for special meanings or purpose in the *HA*, so he argued. The writer was an

²⁷⁹ Cameron (2011a), 743–82 and (2014), 159–60. Aurelius Victor may be quite another matter.

²⁸⁰ Syme (1968).

²⁸¹ Momigliano (1969).

²⁸² Paschoud (2015), conveniently sets out the essential bibliography under a range of headings, but ‘text’ is not one of them. In English, there is Rohrbacher (2022), vol. 1, complemented by the introductions to the original Magie volumes 1 and 2. More incisive, each in his own way, are Paschoud (2002), IX–LXI, Cameron (2011a), 743–82 and Chastagnol (1994). Still of value, despite its vintage, is Lécivain (1903).

²⁸³ Birley (2015).

²⁸⁴ Hohl (1927b), 83; Ensslin (1930), 111.

educated prankster, the whole of the *HA*, was a literary spoof. If it has a real purpose at all, according to Syme, it is simply parody and ‘imposture’, as he insisted on calling it. No more and no less. While Syme’s thesis was very influential in promoting the notion of a single author masquerading under six different authorial personas, it only encouraged others to look even harder for a more serious motive and literary purpose for that author. In recent decades, more attention has been paid to the literary construction of the *SHA* but especially to its date once more. A gap has opened up between those (spearheaded by François Paschoud [1938–2022]) who situate the work in the context of what they consider to be intense conflict between Christians and pagans in the 390s and those (spearheaded by Alan Cameron [1938–2017]) who see it as a separate literary work, earlier or later, but without a specifically religious purpose.²⁸⁵ One scholar (Stéphane Ratti) has gone so far as to argue that the whole work was conceived and written by the Roman aristocrat Nicomachus Flavianus, partially in the period 392–4 precisely, while at that time he was Praetorian Prefect of Italy and western consul for 394. It thereby represents ‘the final flames of pagan resistance’ before his suicide in the wake of finding himself on the losing side after the battle at the Frigidus river on 5 September 394. Moreover, Ratti insists, the pro-pagan and anti-Christian *HA* is nothing other than the lost *Annales* of Nicomachus referred to on a later inscription.²⁸⁶ Although the case for Nicomachus as the single author of the *SHA* is highly contestable, Ratti has parried every attempt at raising objections.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁵ Cameron’s final foray was in the Momigliano commemoration (Cameron 2014), but he had set out his case with characteristic forensic analysis and clarity in the *Last Pagans of Rome* (Cameron 2011a), cf. Birley (2015), 232–6.

²⁸⁶ Ratti’s arguments are set out in Ratti (2010), (2012), 105–89; and with his 2008 reply to critics in Ratti (2016).

²⁸⁷ Against Ratti, see Paschoud (2008) and (2018), Janniard (2011) Kahlos (2011), Cameron (2011b) and (2014). To these may be added the simple chronological observation that Flavianus was appointed as Praetorian Prefect of Italy on entering Italy with the usurping emperor Eugenius (392–4) in the spring of 393, and left Rome in July 394 as part of the expedition confronting the army of emperor Theodosius (379–95) that had departed Constantinople in early May. If Flavianus had time in these months, apart from his duties as Prefect, and in 394 as consul, to write even part of a complex work such as the *SHA*, it does not necessarily betray the hallmarks of a rushed spare-time work. In any event, why at this point would he dedicate it to the emperor Theodosius, the one certain fact known about Nicomachus’s work? In response, Ratti would argue (2016, 202) that Rossini wrote the *Barber of Seville* in barely 15 days and Stendhal his *Chartreuse de Parma* in just three weeks. Ratti has particularly responded to the critiques of Cameron (Ratti 2012, 179–87; 2016, 277–301; 2016a) and Paschoud (Ratti 2016, 184–90; 206–45). All of this is put into perspective in Kulikowski (2021).

The modern *SHA/HA* industry has certainly burgeoned worldwide in recent decades, combined with the explosion in late antique studies. Yet, in the century since Ballou and Magie, American scholars have largely been absent from the *SHA* field, with the notable exceptions of Alan Cameron, that is, counting him as he saw himself (British before, and American after, 1977), and to a lesser extent Mike (F. M.) Clover (1940–2019). More recently, David Rohrbacher especially as the producer of a new Loeb translation, and Michael Kulikowski have established themselves as the leading American scholars of the *SHA*, while Justin Stover stands peerless among students of the *SHA* manuscripts and text. Not only have American scholars largely steered away from detailed commitment to the *SHA*, so too have British scholars, with the notable exception of Syme (Oxford) and his students, Timothy Barnes (Toronto, and Edinburgh) and Anthony Birley (Manchester, Düsseldorf, Durham). All three were part of the ‘Bonn gang’ at some stage. Instead, since the 1960s, research into the *SHA* (usually called *HA*) has been more or less dominated by scholars from western Europe (Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland, Spain), amplified by the regular conferences on the work that have been running for decades in Europe: first in Bonn, under the auspices of Alföldi and Johannes Straub, then in Geneva and elsewhere, with the link between them being Paschoud. Their published proceedings (24 volumes to date) constitute a library in themselves. That they all go under some version of the title *Historia Augusta* implies their unquestioned proposition that, despite its inconsistencies and the various objections made at the time (1890s), the text attributed in the manuscripts to six named authors is the product of a single authorial pen of the later fourth century.²⁸⁸

As long as opinions continue to differ, however, the *SHA/HA* will remain an enigma. Perhaps it always will. Paschoud certainly thought so.²⁸⁹ Through all this increasingly detailed attention to the *SHA*’s date and purpose, as well as attempts to identify the author and establish the reliability of its statements, study of the text itself has receded. One wonders what Susan Ballou would have made of all this when she was immersed in her study of the *SHA*, in Chicago, Rome, Paris, Göttingen,

²⁸⁸ Paschoud (2009), 204: ‘Mais par ailleurs il serait tout aussi excessif de nier que certains révisionnistes montrent la couleur par le choix de la formule HA. C’est le cas notamment pour Hohl, Baynes et Straub, et il n’est évidemment pas fortuit que les Colloques de Bonn se soient intitulés *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*. Depuis le milieu du 20^es., HA l’emporte toujours davantage sur SHA, et c’est un signe évident du triomphe de plus en plus total des thèses de Dessau ... Le combat est en train de cesser, faute de combattants.’

²⁸⁹ Paschoud (1993), 718–19, with Croke (2023), 180–1.

Gießen, Bryn Mawr, and elsewhere from the 1890s to the 1930s. Certainly, she may be surprised to find the name of Dessau being used so frequently to justify the claim of a single author, and surprised to find that Hohl's edition (in which she participated for a period) has lasted so long, and that it has been so revered by the restricted group of senior scholars who gathered at Bonn and elsewhere since 1962 to finally solve the various puzzles of the *SHA*. Above all, what may now surprise Ballou is that her focus on P and her emphasis on the dating of its correctors' hands in order to date later manuscripts has been shown to be risky, if not faulty.²⁹⁰

While all this attention has been accorded to the *SHA/HA* over the years, Susan Ballou has slipped slowly from view. She is now on the edge of academic oblivion. What might rescue her scholarly reputation and work, however, is the very recent analysis of aspects of the manuscripts and early editions. In calling for a new edition of the work in 1983, Marshall cited discomfort with Hohl's treatment of the Σ manuscripts as a key driving factor.²⁹¹ At that time, however, the attention of the growing band of *SHA* scholars was focussed elsewhere. In the more than forty years since Marshall's plea the momentum for a new edition has been building and a new clarity has emerged around the method necessarily involved, not least because of the fulsome Budé edition by various hands, but principally Paschoud.²⁹²

What may not have surprised Ballou by now is the fact that the issues she tried to address regarding the textual tradition are once more being researched and discussed, taking advantage of tools she could never envisage. The methodology and technology of textual criticism have continued to advance and improve. Nowadays, Ballou could access P and B at home on her desktop, or anywhere else for that matter, and be able to study and magnify them on screen. Other *SHA* manuscripts will likewise become accessible online. More than a century ago, Ballou could not have envisaged all this scholarly convenience when travelling slowly by rail and sea from Chicago to European libraries to work on the manuscripts of the *SHA*. She was right to forecast in 1907 the unlikelihood of new manuscripts of the *SHA* being discovered in future. There have not been any. However, the text of the *SHA* has been illuminated directly by certain remnants of lost manuscripts, and indirectly by later works that

²⁹⁰ Pecere (1995).

²⁹¹ Marshall (1983), 354: 'Hohl's work is not careful enough however and does not give the reader the information he requires, especially about the various hands in P. A new text is badly needed'. This was at least partly achieved by Callu (1992), XCII–CII.

²⁹² Callu (1992), Turcan (1993), Molinier d'Arbo (2014), Paschoud (1996), (2000), (2002), (2011), (2018).

utilised other, at times earlier and better, manuscripts than P. These are, in summary: (1) the lost Murbach manuscript (M), listed in the 9th century Murbach catalogue and used in the Froben edition (1518), a folio of which is preserved in a book binding found at Nuremberg;²⁹³ (2) another lost manuscript, perhaps a copy or descendant of M, that is reflected in both the Venice edition (1489) that deployed it and, as Modonutti discovered, an unpublished history by the humanist scholar Giovanni Colonna who also used it, combined with (3) a 15th century manuscript at Erlangen that includes some lives of the *SHA*.²⁹⁴ Again, this manuscript is not directly related to M.²⁹⁵

Precisely how these lost manuscripts relate to the extant 9th century base manuscript first studied in all its palaeographical detail by Ballou, namely the Vatican's *Pal.Lat.* 899 (P), as well as the later summaries and much later manuscripts (Σ), remains the key question. M may represent the same tradition as P, while the Σ manuscripts may descend from P (Ballou) or a different archetype (Hohl), even one much earlier and of insular origin (Boyer).²⁹⁶ Then there is the manuscript which was utilised by the Venetian edition and the later extracts contained in various manuscripts, principally: (1) *Pal.Lat.* 866; (2) the extracts from Sedulius Scottus; (3) the Verona fragments. Both Ballou and Hohl considered these later excerpts as being derived from the tradition of P, although they too may derive from a separate, but more or less contemporaneous, archetype. The grouping of certain later manuscripts as Σ first appears in Peter (1865) and was elevated textually by Hohl into what has become a 'contemporary consensus'.²⁹⁷ This was the very issue that led to the rupture between Ballou and Hohl. It is still a matter of scholarly controversy and difference but needs to be fully reconsidered, as advocated by Valentini.²⁹⁸ This task will also involve, as Ballou herself would have advocated, a thorough reconsideration of the works of Petrarch and the other humanist scholars who may have used some manuscript of the *SHA* in the 14th and 15th centuries.²⁹⁹ The next edition of the *SHA* will therefore need to take account of all the modern conjectural activity for individual

²⁹³ Dorfbauer (2020); Stover (2020a). Froben's use of M, is set out in detail in Stover (2020b), 121–8.

²⁹⁴ Stover 2020a).

²⁹⁵ Stover (2020a), 188; (2020b), 146.

²⁹⁶ Stover (2020b), 149–50.

²⁹⁷ The summary phrase of Rohrbacher (2022), vol. 1, xxx–xxxi.

²⁹⁸ Valentini (2021), cf. Stover (2020a), 168–9.

²⁹⁹ Bertrand, Desbordes and Callu (1984–5); Callu and Desbordes (1989); Desbordes (2019).

words and phrases in the *SHA*, not always with due reference to extant manuscripts.³⁰⁰ It will also need to pay attention, in so far as it can, to discerning the transmission of the *SHA* text and paratext in the four centuries between the work's composition and the copying of P.³⁰¹

As a result of all these developments and renewed scholarly interest, as reflected in the analysis of Modonutti, Stover and Valentini in particular, each of whom cites Ballou, a fresh edition to replace that of Hohl is now overdue.³⁰² Any new edition will also need to take account once more of the conclusions and views of Ballou, even if only to discard them eventually, particularly those related to the clausulae in each of the lives and the reconstruction of the manuscript tradition as a whole. After being effectively ignored by Hohl's edition, then marginalised in the voluminous scholarly literature on the *SHA* ever since, Ballou is now on the cusp of rediscovery as a fresh appreciation arises of her contribution to the study of the *SHA*, one of the most challenging and mysterious of any ancient text. As Stover has succinctly summed it up: 'Even with spotless transmission, the *Historia Augusta* would still be a work of many mysteries. The problems with the transmission have further mystified this curious text. The way forward is a renewed attention to what has actually been transmitted.'³⁰³ Ballou could not have agreed more.

10. Summation: A woman scholar in a man's world

Susan Ballou's personality and personal life are obscure. There appears to be no extant photograph of her either, so her appearance is likewise a mystery. Very little remains of her own correspondence except for that with Wissowa, although it remains possible that other letters will come to light in due course. What is known, however, is that she never married, as was the case with most women scholars of her day and later still.³⁰⁴ Her closest friend, with whom she shared a house in Madison, was another female pioneer in a man's field. She was the forestry scientist Eloise Gerry (1885–1970). Ballou brought considerable maturity to her studies at Chicago, then to her research in Europe. She was 25 when she completed her undergraduate degree, 43 when she finished her doctorate and just over 50 when she arrived at Bryn Mawr. Her career further suggests that she was a resolute sort of person and totally undeterred by the obstacles

³⁰⁰ Soverini (1981), (1983), 66–119; Lucarini (2012) and the Budé volumes, *passim*.

³⁰¹ Shedd (2020).

³⁰² Called for explicitly by Stover (2020a), 150 (cf. Valentini, 2021).

³⁰³ Stover (2020b), 150.

³⁰⁴ Ascher (1973), 365.

young women scholars too often found in her day. Perhaps it was Ballou's own maturity that made her particularly conscious of being a female scholar who expected to be treated as an equal. Indeed, her role as a woman scholar in what was still a man's world between 1890 and 1940 is worth more extensive consideration.

Certainly, Ballou was fortunate to be a student in the very early days of a new university committed to education of young women as much as men. While her university was a co-educational institution, her classmates in the study of Latin, Greek and the ancient world at both undergraduate and graduate level, were mainly male. In Hale's graduate seminars in 1898 and 1899, for instance, she was the only female. While an undergraduate at Chicago and throughout Ballou's subsequent career, there are glimpses of her role in women's organisations at a time when such organisations were relatively new and particularly active on behalf of women's interests. Advancing the status of women in higher education was a deliberate goal. As an undergraduate, she made time to be a member of the university women's club that called itself 'The Idlers'.³⁰⁵ It was the *Association of Collegiate Women* that awarded Ballou a travelling scholarship in 1901/2 that gave her the crucial opportunity to spend a year in Rome at the American School of Classical Studies where she was exposed to the depth and breadth of European research on Latin and Roman civilisation. More importantly, her familiarity with the Vatican library enabled her to deepen her prior interest in manuscripts and texts. It also enabled her to discover what became her special interest — the text of the *SHA*, triggered initially by the key Vatican manuscript (P) and the knowledge that the present edition, namely that of Hermann Peter, was inadequate and that its planned replacement by Hermann Dessau had stalled.

Undoubtedly, her Chicago teachers who were all well aware of her scholarly potential, especially Abbott, endorsed her intention to pursue her research on the *SHA* manuscripts, possibly leading to a new edition of the controversial work little known in the US. She returned to Rome, and the Vatican library in 1903/4 and then won herself a Carnegie Fellowship to complete her work on the manuscripts there and elsewhere (Paris, Florence, Milan) in 1905/6. In between, she was teaching Latin at Chicago. All the time, however, it appears Ballou was conscious of her sex and the obligations she was incurring. In 1902/3 she acted as President of the Women's Union of the University,³⁰⁶ and in the winter of 1903/4 she addressed the Chicago Woman's Club on 'European Classical

³⁰⁵ *University of Chicago, Cap and Gown* 2 (1896), 177.

³⁰⁶ *The Daily Maroon* vol. 1.198 (30 June 1903).

Schools', along with Emma Shorey, wife of the Professor of Greek, Paul Shorey.³⁰⁷ The Chicago Woman's Club (formed 1876) was very involved in local education, social justice and women's causes and was mainly composed of local female professionals and the wives of professionals including university professors and teachers, after the University of Chicago was established. Their education arm frequently organised talks for members such as that given by Ballou. It was a similar address to a female audience in 1907, this time the local Chicago branch of the *Association of Collegiate Alumnae* that Ballou retailed her recent European experience as a woman.³⁰⁸ She pointed out that her chosen field of palaeography was no arcane matter, but a field of research in which women can particularly flourish. As she explained, 'it does not make any great draft on physical strength or endurance — unless it be the long hours of sitting in absolutely unheated rooms in a damp climate in winter, in Italy for example — it does require patience and a discriminating eye, and a good critical sense, all of which are peculiarly feminine qualifications'. At least they were criteria for which she could claim currency in 1907. Overall, she concludes that 'A woman seriously engaged in scientific work is no longer an object of suspicion in Europe'.

Ballou then went on to explain that she had always been treated courteously by librarians in Italy and accorded every privilege, noting the special case of the monastery at Monte Cassino where no woman was ever allowed to enter the library, and where no manuscript could be taken out of it. 'But', so she clarifies, 'the white-haired abbot himself came to meet me and offer a concession — he is an American by-the-way — by which he sent the manuscript to the porter's room at the gate for my use, which might be said to be neither in nor out!'.³⁰⁹ She does not confess here, but does elsewhere, that the manuscript she was after at Monte Cassino was one of Persius, a collation she had agreed to make for her former teacher Frank Frost Abbott who was then at the Roman school.³¹⁰ Most of her time in Rome was spent in the Vatican library where, as she noted, she always received the 'most generous and cordial treatment' and where 'as workers, women were once unknown, and still are rare'. In fact, until Ballou's time women were not permitted access to the Vatican library at all.

³⁰⁷ *University of Chicago, University Record* 8.10 (February 1904) 341. Shorey, incidentally, also came from Davenport, Iowa.

³⁰⁸ *University of Chicago, University Record* 11.3 (January 1907), 109 with text at Ballou (1907), 14–17.

³⁰⁹ Ballou (1907), 19.

³¹⁰ Abbott (1907), 332

With much of her research complete by 1908/9 and having formulated the intention of spending some time in Germany and using her research on the *SHA* to achieve a doctorate, she would have been advised that in Germany her chosen field was not considered an appropriate one for women. She clearly sensed this herself, to judge from her second letter to Georg Wissowa at Halle on 17 October 1910 (*Appendix B*, Letter 2, below). Wissowa, not understating the import of the name Susan, replied to ‘Herr Ballou’. In the course of correcting the impression that his Chicago correspondent was male, she confesses that, having spent a term in Göttingen, a woman, let alone a foreign woman, would find the going tough in a major university, presumably meaning places like Berlin or Tübingen, or even Göttingen where she should rightly have been. Dessau at Berlin was the obvious choice of mentor for the sort of thesis she had in mind on the *SHA*, or perhaps Kornemann at Tübingen. Although her Chicago mentors and colleagues had studied at Bonn (Abbott, Hendrickson), Berlin (Abbott, Hendrickson), Leipzig (Hale), Munich (Miller, Moore), Göttingen (Hale) and Halle (Miller), she may well have canvassed these options locally but rejected them all. Her reticence explains her conscious decision to choose what she considered a smaller university, where a female Latin scholar might feel more comfortable about securing her doctorate, even though she would not get such expert supervision.³¹¹ Hence her choice of Gießen.

Further, she still felt a need to make her point by printing on the cover and title page of her thesis, beneath her name, ‘an American woman’ (‘Americana’) as a sort of self-justification.³¹² Reviewers could express surprise at the nature and quality of work from ‘an American woman’ but they could still be dismissive in a way that looks today like condescension. A. C. Clark’s comment on Ballou’s ‘enthusiasm’ is a case in point.³¹³ Her subsequent engagement in the Teubner edition of the *SHA* led by Kornemann, was among the first, if not the very first, by a woman for the prestigious Teubner series of Greek and Latin texts. In the end, Ballou’s collaboration with the much younger Ernst Hohl on the Teubner edition broke down. Circumstances doubtless played their role, as did their fundamental disagreement on how to reconstruct the manuscript tradition. It may be too that Hohl was not disposed to collaborating with a female. While he was a difficult personality, evidently, Ballou was a resolute woman too. She was frank and fearless with Hohl in print, and he reciprocated.

³¹¹ Cf. Singer (1963), 7.

³¹² Ballou (1912), front cover, title page.

³¹³ Clark (1914*b*), 18.

Despite her Gießen doctorate and a considerable scholarly reputation in Germany, there was no room for her on the permanent faculty at the University of Chicago when she returned, although she was able to resume her teaching assistantship in Latin. It was not a secure pathway. Women scholars at the time never became assistant professors, no matter how qualified.³¹⁴ Nor did Ballou. Instead, in 1915 she ended up teaching Latin to future school teachers at Western State Normal School in Kalamazoo, Michigan. From Kalamazoo, she moved to the history (not classics) department of the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1917. It was only in 1921 at Bryn Mawr, a leading women's university, that she found the sort of position which befitted her reputation and abilities, not to mention her sex. Much the same experience had befallen her contemporary, Orma Fitch Butler who had graduated in Latin in the University of Michigan (1897), then went on to complete a doctorate (1907) on the *SHA*'s life of the emperor Elagabalus.³¹⁵ While she stayed at Michigan for her doctorate, one informed German reviewer was suspicious of an American woman even daring to take on the complexities of the *SHA*.³¹⁶ This judgment was not only a salutary warning to Ballou, but also may be one reason why Butler did not pursue any interest in the *SHA* beyond her doctorate.³¹⁷ Butler was never made a full professor. Instead, she spent her whole career at Michigan, mainly as a loyal assistant to the Curator of the Michigan museum, Francis Kelsey, whose own attitude to women was suspect by modern standards. He it was who advised at Rome that women students at the American School should not attend lectures by Hülsen at the German Institute.

Curiously enough, more than a century later, the *SHA* remains a male-dominated field. Few females have contributed at all, let alone become one of the major contributors of their day. For example, the succession of regular international colloquia on the *HA* at Bonn and elsewhere since the early 1960s has featured only a handful of women among the invited contributors who subsequently had their papers published in the conference volume. Between 1962 and 2015, that is, across three academic generations, the regular *HA* conferences have produced 27 volumes including 395 papers. Of these only 27 (or 7.4%)

³¹⁴ Ascher (1973), 365.

³¹⁵ Butler (1910).

³¹⁶ Hönn (1910), 1195.

³¹⁷ Butler is another of the pioneering women scholars whose contribution requires fuller elucidation. She too deserves a place in the Rutgers Database. Questionable, then, is the claim of Calder (1994, xxxvii) that 'surely the encouragement of women is a proud part of the American achievement'.

were by 15 separate women.³¹⁸ All 15 women were European. None was American, or from another Anglophone nation. Moreover, of the 15 women involved only two (Cécile Bertrand-Dagenbach, Agnès Molinier Arbo) could claim to have a sustained research interest in the *HA*.³¹⁹

Scholarship marches on. Only very recently has the question of the manuscripts of the *SHA* and their basis for a modern critical edition been reopened. Once again, Ballou's work is being noticed and appreciated. However, the person and the story behind her scholarly contribution have remained hidden or suppressed. While the person still remains rather elusive, the scholarly contribution was substantial. Ballou's work and career as Latinist and palaeographer deserve to be better known.³²⁰

Brian Croke

University of Sydney

brian.croke@gmail.com

³¹⁸ Calculations made on the content of: <http://diederikburgersdijk.com/projects/historia-augusta/colloquia-per-colloquium/#1525345495711-3208308a-b290>

³¹⁹ This may be a more general issue. Only two women (Jane Harrison and Lily Ross Taylor) make the cut among the top 50 scholars included in Briggs and Calder (1990).

³²⁰ I am grateful to the journal's readers for several improvements and bibliographical leads.

APPENDIX A**Letter from Hermann Dessau to Frank Frost Abbott, 1901**

Letter Dessau to Abbott, 11 November 1901 (quoted in S. H. Ballou, 'The MSS of the *Historia Augusta*', *Classical Philology* 3 (1908), 277, n.1)

Ich habe allerdings im Winter 1892/3 die beiden ältesten Handschriften der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* mit der Absicht verglichen, einmal eine Ausgabe dieser Schriftsteller zu veranstalten. Ich bin aber im Folge vieler anderer Beschäftigungen bis jetzt nicht dazu gekommen, und glaube auch nicht dass ich in den nächsten Jahren dazu kommen werde. Unter diesen Umständen wäre es durchaus unzulässig, wenn ich gegen die Herausgabe der *Scriptores* durch irgend einen anderen Einspruch erheben wollte. Im Gegenteil ich begrüße Ihren Entschluss die Biographien der Kaiser Tacitus und Probus herauszugeben oder durch einen Ihrer Schuler bearbeiten zu lassen, mit Freuden, und bitte Sie, sich dabei nicht zu kümmern um das was ich hätte schreiben können oder etwa noch schreiben werde, sondern nur um das was ich geschrieben habe.

APPENDIX B

Letters from Susan Ballou to Georg Wissowa, 1910

Letter 1 [typewritten]

The University of Chicago [letterhead]
Chicago, May 2nd, 1910

To Prof DR. G. Wissowa,³²¹
Professor Ord.d.Klass.Philol.
In the University of Halle

Sehr Geehrter Herr Professor:

Having obtained leave of absence from this University, where I am an Instructor in Latin,³²² I wish to spend the time I am free, that is from June of this year to the beginning of October, 1911, in study in a German University, asking the privilege at the end of that period of residence to present myself for examination as a candidate for the Doctor's degree. May I give you a brief account of myself and my work up to this time. I took my bachelor's degree at this University in June, 1897, and was appointed graduate scholar for the next year,³²³ which I then spent in graduate work under Professors Hale, Abbott, and Hendrickson.³²⁴ The next year I was appointed to a Fellowship in Latin,³²⁵ but resigned to accept a position on the Faculty.³²⁶ I have since that time taught Latin here, giving courses in the authors prescribed for the Freshman and Sophomore years and also later a few courses in the Senior college, and an occasional course in Latin Paleography. In the earlier years of my

³²¹ Georg Wissowa (1859–1931) was an eminent philologist, famous for his history of Roman religion but also for his updating of Pauly's encyclopedia, hence its common name 'Pauly-Wissowa'. The two letters to Wissowa from Ballou published here are reproduced with permission from the Wissowa Nachlass (Yi 20 I B 183–4) at the Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg. Among the extensive list of those who wrote to Wissowa, Ballou seems to be the only female.

³²² *University of Chicago, Cap and Gown* 14 (1909), 26; 15 (1910), 20.

³²³ As a candidate for the Ph.D.: *University Record* 2.44 (January 28, 1898), 2.

³²⁴ Ballou was one of twenty graduate students in Latin in the two seminars held for them (*University Record* 4.12 [June 23, 1899]. p.71). Ballou attended the seminar of Hale on Catullus and one other.

³²⁵ *University Record* 3.2 (8 April 1898), p.16.

³²⁶ As an Assistant in Latin: *University of Chicago, Cap and Gown* 4 (1899), 25; 5 (1900), 23; promoted to Associate in 1900: *University of Chicago, University Record* 5.1 (April 6, 1900), 16; *University of Chicago, Cap and Gown* 6 (1901), 25 — Associate.

teaching, I continued to work in the Seminars of Prof. Hale and Prof. Hendrickson, but of later years I have studied privately without formal registration.³²⁷

In the year 1901–2 I was appointed to a travelling fellowship by the Association of Collegiate Alumnae of America, and spent the year as member of the American School of Classical Studies at Rome. There I took work in Roman Topography, Epigraphy, Paleography and Greek and Roman antiquities. I had many lectures by Prof. Huelsen and Prof. Mau, and travelled in Greek lands for six weeks under [*handwritten above: direction of*] a trained archaeologist from the American School at Rome.³²⁸ I also did a piece of work on MSS of Catullus in the Vatican, in Venice and in Paris, for which I had been prepared by training under Prof. Hale at home. In 1903–4 I spent seven months in work, on the oldest MSS of the *Historia Augusta* in the Vatican library, the Bamberg codex being most generously loaned for my use. Again in 1905–6, having been appointed to the Carnegie Research Fellowship in Latin Literature the School at Rome, I was enabled to complete my study of the MSS of the S.H.A and to include in it all of the minor MSS which are accessible in Rome, Florence, Milan and Paris. Since my return, I have used what leisure I could command from my duties as Instructor here, in the preparation of my material for publication. An advance note appeared in the journal, *Classical Philology*, July, 1908, a reprint from which I am sending you under separate cover. An article, descriptive of the correctors of the Palatine codex, will probably be published by the Carnegie institute.³²⁹ The collation I have practically [p.2] complete, and that I should like to offer as a thesis in candidacy for the Doctor's degree. Will you kindly inform me whether I shall be permitted to count my years of work here and in Rome in addition to the term of residence which I have specified, spent in your University and come up at the end of that time for examination for the doctorate? While most of my work has been done in Latin and all of my teaching, I should of course present both languages [*handwritten above: Latin and Greek*] for examination. My practical years in teaching in this University have of course given me a kind of independent ability which

³²⁷ University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 9 (1904), 12 — Associate in Latin; 11 (1906), 55 — Associate in Latin; 12 (1907), 30 — Instructor in Latin; on leave 1901–1902 (University of Chicago, *University Record* 6.40 (January 1902), 308; 6.51 (April 1902), 385, University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 17 (1912), 27; *University of Chicago, Cap and Gown* 18 (1913), 24 — Instructor in Latin

³²⁸ Similar to the Greek tour for the Rome school the previous year, led by Kelsey: Pedley (2011), 67–74.

³²⁹ Not forthcoming under the auspices of the Carnegie Institute, but published as a monograph by BG Teubner (Ballou 1914).

no mere student could obtain, and warrant me I trust in asking for consideration. As I shall have but short time in which to make preparations, since I sail in the middle of June, I shall be very grateful if I may have an early response. I shall of course be able to furnish the proper documents to substantiate the account of myself which I have given.

I read and speak German (as also French and Italian) with entire ease and am accustomed to taking lectures in German, so that I shall not have to waste any time in acquiring that language. I have written in English for the sake of greater ease in expression and [*handwritten above: on*] the machine for the sake of clearness, I trust you will pardon both.

Very respectfully yours

[handwritten]

Susan H. Ballou

Instructor in Latin

The University of Chicago

Letter 2

Giessen, 17 October 1910

Prof Dr G. Wissowa —

Halle

Sehr geehrter Herr Professor:

Your very kind and friendly reply to my inquiries from Chicago last spring in regard to the possibilities of my visiting the University of Halle this year and coming up for the Doctor's examination at the end of it, was very gratefully received, but since you did not understand that it was a woman who was writing — you addressed me as Herr! — I feared to take advantage of your kindness, lest you should feel differently when you knew my sex. Since, I have found during my summer's stay in Germany, especially an *Ausländerin*, is actually — though not confessedly by all — not altogether *persona grata* in the larger universities, I have thought I might perhaps carry through my plans more comfortably in one of the smaller universities. I hope I may at some future visit, have the pleasure and profit of listening to your lectures, but for the present year I shall probably remain in Giessen.

With many thanks for your consideration

I remain

Very respectfully yours

Susan H Ballou

Instructor in Latin in the University of Chicago

I trust you will pardon the tardiness of this response to your letter but I have only recently made my decision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, F. F. (1904) *The Toledo Manuscript of the Germania of Tacitus, with Notes on a Pliny manuscript*. University of Chicago Decennial Publications ser. 1.6. Chicago.
- Abbott, F. F. (1907) 'Notes upon MSS Containing Persius and Petrus Diaconus', *Classical Philology* 2, 331–3.
- Adams, J. N. (1972) 'On the Authorship of the Historia Augusta', *Classical Quarterly* 22, 186–94.
- American Philological Association (1915) 'Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association Held at Princeton, N. J., December 1915', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 46, i–lxxxii.
- Ascher, L. (1973) 'Women in Classical Studies: Victorian and Modern', *Classical Journal* 68, 354–65.
- Axtell, J. (2016) *Wisdom's Workshop. The Rise of the Modern University*. Princeton.
- Ballou, A. (1889) *An Elaborate History and Genealogy of the Ballous in America*. Providence, R.I.
- Ballou, S. (1907) 'Addresses by Alumnae', *Journal of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae* 3, 14–17.
- Ballou, S. (1908) 'The Manuscripts of the Historia Augusta', *Classical Philology* 3, 273–8.
- Ballou, S. (1912) *De Clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio Scriptore Historiae Augustae adhibititis*. Weimar.
- Ballou, S. (1914) *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta*. Leipzig.
- Ballou, S. (1915) 'The Clausula and the Higher Criticism', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 46, 151–71.
- Ballou, S. (1921) 'The Carrière of the Higher Roman Officials in Egypt in the Second Century', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 52, 96–110.
- Ballou, S. (1925) review of Tidner (1922), *Classical Philology* 20, 88–9.
- Ballou, S. (1928a) review of Schwendemann (1923), *Classical Philology* 23, 408–9.
- Ballou, S. (1928b) review of Baynes (1926), *Classical Philology* 23, 409–11.
- Baynes, N. H. (1926) *The Historia Augusta Its Date and Purpose*. London.
- Baynes, N. H. (1928) 'The Historia Augusta. Its Date and Purpose: A Reply to Criticism', *Classical Quarterly* 22, 166–71.
- Becker, C. (1974) 'Immisch, Otto', *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 10, 164–5.
- Bellezza, A. (1959) *Historia Augusta 1: Le Edizioni*. Genoa.
- Bernhardy, G. (1845) *Proemii de Scriptoribus Historiae Augustae P. I.* Halle.
- Bertrand, C., Desbordes, O. and Callu, J.-P. (1984–5) 'L'Histoire Auguste et l'historiographie médiévale', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 14/15, 97–130.

- Birley, A. (2015) 'Andreas Alföldi and the Historia Augusta', in eds. J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, *Andreas Alföldi in the Twenty-First Century*. Stuttgart, 219–46.
- Blythe Stason, E. (1948) 'Joseph H. Drake', *Michigan Law Review* 46, 447–9.
- Bowersock, G. W. (1986), 'Rostovtzeff in Madison', *American Scholar* 55, 391–400.
- Boyer, B. (1948) 'Insular Contribution to Medieval Literary Tradition on the Continent (Concluded)', *Classical Philology* 43, 31–9.
- Brandt, H. (2009) 'Dessau, Mommsen und Klebs. Zur Frühgeschichte der Historia Augusta Forschung', in ed. M. G. Schmidt, *Hermann Dessau (1856–1931)*. Berlin and New York, 47–60.
- Briggs, W. W. (1994a) *Biographical Dictionary of North American Classicists*. Westport, CT.
- Briggs, W. W. (1994b) 'Hale, William Gardner', in Briggs (1994a), 251–2.
- Briggs, W. W. (1994c) 'Drake, Joseph Horace', in Briggs (1994a), 143–4.
- Briggs, W. W. (1994d) 'Wheeler, Arthur Leslie', in Briggs (1994a), 691–2.
- Briggs, W. W. and W. M. Calder III (1990) eds., *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia*. New York and London.
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1990) 'Tenney Frank', in Briggs and Calder (1990), 68–76.
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1994) 'Holland, Louise Elizabeth Whetenhall Adams', in Briggs (1994a), 287–9.
- Bryn Mawr, Faculty in Classics (<https://www.brynmawr.edu/classics/history/notable-former-faculty>).
- Bryn Mawr College Calendar* (1921). Bryn Mawr.
- Bryn Mawr College Calendar* (1930). Bryn Mawr.
- Buonocore, M. (2003) *Theodor Mommsen e gli studi sul mondo antico, dalle sue lettere conservate nella Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Naples.
- Burrows, T. (2018) 'The Legacy of Sir Thomas Phillipps in Australia and New Zealand', *Script and Print* 42, 96.
- Butler, O. F. (1910) *Studies in the Life of Heliogabalus*, in *Roman History and Mythology*, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series iv. New York, 1–169.
- Calder, W. M. III (1984a) 'Research Opportunities in the Modern History of Classical Scholarship', in *Studies in the Modern History of Classical Scholarship*. Naples, 3–13.
- Calder, W. M. III (1984b) 'Die Geschichte der klassischen Philologie in den Vereinigten Staaten', in *Studies in the Modern History of Classical Scholarship*. Naples, 15–42.
- Calder, W. M. III (1994) 'Classical Scholarship in the United States: An Introductory Essay', in Briggs (1994a), xix–xxxix.
- Calder, W. M. III and Hallett, J. P. (1996) 'Introduction: Six North American Women Classicists', *Classical World* 90, 83–96.
- Callu, J.-P. (1985) 'La première diffusion de l'Histoire Auguste (VI^e–IX^{es})', *Historia Augusta Colloquium 1982–1983*. Bonn, 89–129.

- Callu, J.-P. (1992) with A. Gaden and O. Desbordes, *Histoire Auguste. Introduction Générale. Vies d'Hadrien, Aelius, Antonin*. Paris.
- Callu, J.-P. and Desbordes, O. (1989) 'Le Quattrocento de l'Histoire Auguste', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 19, 253–75.
- Cameron, Alan (2011a) *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford.
- Cameron, Alan (2011b) 'Antiquus error/novus error: the *Historia Augusta* Nicomachus Flavianus and the "Pagan Resistance"', *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 24, 835–46.
- Cameron, Alan (2014) 'Momigliano and the *Historia Augusta*', in eds. T. Cornell and O. Murray, *The Legacy of Arnaldo Momigliano*. London and Turin, 147–64.
- Champlin, E. (1994) 'Magie, David', in Briggs (1994a), 393–4.
- Chastagnol, A. (1994) *Histoire Auguste: les empereurs romains des II et III siècles. Édition bilingue latin-français*. Paris.
- Christ, K. (1982) *Römische Geschichte und deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft*. Munich.
- Christ, K. (2006) *Klios Wandlungen. Die Deutsche Althistorie vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich.
- Clark, A. C. (1905) review of Zielinski's law ('Zielinski's Clausalgesetz') in *Classical Review* 19, 164–72.
- Clark, A. C. (1914a) review of Ballou (1912), *Classical Review* 28, 251–2.
- Clark, A. C. (1914b) *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism*. Oxford.
- Clark, C. U. (1916) review of Ballou (1914), *Classical Philology* 11, 357–8.
- Croke, B. (1990) 'Theodor Mommsen and the Later Roman Empire', *Chiron* 20, 155–89.
- Croke, B. (forthcoming) 'Theodor Mommsen, Ronald Syme and the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*'.
- De Groot, A. W. (1921) *Der lateinische Prosarhythmus*. Groningen and The Hague.
- Desbordes, O. (2019) 'Pétrarque correcteur du ms. Vatican Palatin latin 899. Grammatici certant ...', *Kentron* 35, 219–34.
- Dessau, H. (1889) 'Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Hermes* 24, 337–92.
- Dessau, H. (1892) 'Über die *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Hermes* 27, 591–605.
- Dessau, H. (1894) 'Die Überlieferung der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Hermes* 29, 393–416.
- Dewing, H. B. (1910) *The accentual cursus in Byzantine Greek prose with especial reference to Procopius of Caesarea*. New Haven.
- Di Capua, F. (1913) review of Ballou (1912) in *Bollettino di filologia classica* 20, 129–31.
- Diehl, C. (1978) *Americans and German Scholarship 1770–1870*. New Haven.
- Dorfbauer, L. (2020) 'Das Nürnberger Fragment und die karolingischer Überlieferung der *Historia Augusta*', *Hermes* 148, 346–77.
- Drake, J. H. (1899) 'Studies in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *American Journal of Philology* 20, 40–58.

- Ensslin, W. (1930) 'Die Hohlsche Ausgabe der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Klio* 23, 110–12.
- Garzya, A. (1983) 'Il contributo della casa editrice Teubner alla scienza dell'antichità', in eds. A. Garzya, M. Gigante and G. Polara, *Omaggio a B. G. Teubner*. Naples, 15–39.
- Gellenik, C. (2003) *Going Dutch — Gone American. Germans Settling North America*. Muenster.
- Gerda, J. J. (2004) *A History of the Conferences of Deans of Women, 1903–1922* (PhD. Diss. Bowling Green).
- Glock, A. (2009) 'Anhang: Drei Briefe zur "Historia Augusta"', in ed. M. G. Schmidt, *Hermann Dessau (1856–1931)*. Berlin and New York, 61–72.
- Glock, A. and Schmidt, M. G. 'Die Briefe Hermann Dessaus aus der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin und dem Archiv der Berliner Akademie', in ed. M. G. Schmidt, *Hermann Dessau (1856–1931)*. Berlin and New York, 157–368.
- Goodspeed, T. W. (1973) *A History of the University of Chicago, Founded by John D. Rockefeller: The First Quarter-Century*. Chicago.
- Grafton, A. (1991) *Defenders of the Text. The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800*. Cambridge, MA.
- Grafton, A. (1993) 'The Vatican and its Library', in ed. A. Grafton, *Rome Reborn. The Vatican Library and Renaissance Culture*. New Haven.
- Grafton, A. (2020) *Inky Fingers*. Cambridge, MA.
- Grant, J. N. (2017) *Aldus Manutius. Humanism and the Latin Classics*. Cambridge, MA.
- Gundel, H. G. (1957) 'Die klassische Philologie an der Universität Gießen im 20. Jahrhundert', in *Ludwigs-Universität, Justus-Liebig-Hochschule: 1607–1957. Festschrift zur 350-Jahrfeier*. Gießen, 192–221.
- Hale, W. G. (1896a), 'Un nuovo manoscritto di Catullo', *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 5-5, 272–4.
- Hale, W. G. (1896b) 'A New manuscript of Catullus', *Classical Review* 10, 314.
- Hale, W. G. (1897) 'A New Manuscript of Catullus', *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 28, liii–lv.
- Hale, W. G. (1898) 'The Codex Romanus of Catullus', *Classical Review* 12, 447–9.
- Hale, W. G. (1899) 'Der Codex Romanus des Catullus', *Hermes* 34, 133–44.
- Hale, W. G. (1906) 'Catullus Once More', *Classical Review* 20, 160–4.
- Hale, W. G. (1908) 'The Manuscripts of Catullus', *Classical Philology* 3, 233–56.
- Hale, W. G. (1923) 'Faculty Notes', in *The College News* (4 October 1923), 2.
- Hale, W. G. and Smith, C. L. (1898) 'Third Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 2, 504–29.
- Hale, W. G. and Peck, T. (1899) 'Fourth Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 3, 687–713.

- Hallett, J. P. (1996–7) ‘Edith Hamilton (1867–1963)’, *Classical World* 90, 107–47.
- Hallett, J. P. (2016) ‘Eli’s Daughters: Female Classics Graduates at Yale, 1892–1941’, in eds. R. Wyles and E. Hall, *Women Classical Scholars. Unsealing the Fountain from the Renaissance to Jacqueline de Romilly*. Oxford, 260–74.
- Hallett, J. P. (2021) ‘Lily Ross Taylor Beyond Bryn Mawr College’, *History of Classical Scholarship* 3, 1–53.
- Harmon, A. (1910) *The Clausula in Ammianus Marcellinus*. New Haven.
- Hausrath, A. (1937) ‘Otto Immisch’, *Das Gymnasium* 48 (1937), 1–3.
- Herbst, J. (1965), *The German Historical School in American Scholarship*. Ithaca.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1869) ‘Bemerkungen zu den Scriptoribus Historiae Augustae’, *Hermes* 3, 230–2.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1881) ‘Scriptores Historiae Augustae’, *Wiener Studien* 3, 108–17, 275–6.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1884) ‘Bemerkungen zu der Biographie des Septimius Severus’, *Wiener Studien* 6, 121–7.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1889) ‘Scriptores Historiae Augustae’, *Hermes* 24, 101–7.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1897) ‘Decimus Clodius Albinus’, *Historische Zeitschrift* 43, 452–84 = *Kleine Schriften*, 411–37.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1913) ‘Die Abfassungszeit der Sammlung der Scriptoribus Historiae Augustae’, *Kleine Schriften*, 887–91.
- Hirstein, J. (1989) ‘Beatus Rhenanus et les “avis aux lecteurs” signés “Jean Froben” sur l’Histoire d’Ammien Marcellin et sur l’Histoire Auguste dans l’édition bâloise de juin 1518’, *Annuaire des amis de la Bibliothèque Humaniste de Sélestat* 39, 27–50.
- Hohl, E. (1911) ‘Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaisers Tacitus’, *Klio* 11, 178–229; 284–324.
- Hohl, E. (1912) ‘Vopiscus und Pollio’, *Klio* 12, 474–82.
- Hohl, E. (1913a) ‘Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der Historia Augusta’, *Klio* 13, 258–88, and 387–423.
- Hohl, E. (1913b) ‘Zur Historia Augusta (Vita Severi, xvii.6)’, *Rheinisches Museum* 68, 316–19.
- Hohl, E. (1914a) ‘Das Problem der Historia Augusta’, *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum* 33, 698–712.
- Hohl, E. (1914b) ‘Reste einer Handschrift des Kollektaneums des Sedulius Scottus in Paris’, *Rheinisches Museum* 69, 580–4.
- Hohl, E. (1915a) ‘Textkritisches zur Historia Augusta’, *Rheinisches Museum* 70, 474–9.
- Hohl, E. (1915b) ‘Bericht 1906–1915’, *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 171, 95–146.
- Hohl, E. (1915c) ‘Wer ist Robertus a Porcia, Bononiensis?’ *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 1915, No. 7 (13 February), 221–4.
- Hohl, E. (1916) ‘Petronius und der Palatinus 899 der Historia Augusta’, *Hermes* 51, 154–9.

- Hohl, E. (1918) 'Zur Textgeschichte der Historia Augusta (Ein kritisches Nachwort)', *Klio* 15, 78–98.
- Hohl, E. (1920) 'Über den Ursprung der Historia Augusta', *Hermes* 55, 296–310.
- Hohl, E. (1924) 'Bericht 1916–23', *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 200, 167–210.
- Hohl, E. (1926) review of Magie (1921–32), *Gnomon* 2, 546–50.
- Hohl, E. (1927a) *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Hohl, E. (1927b) Review of Baynes, *Historia Augusta*, *Classical Review* 41, 82–3.
- Hohl, E. (1928) 'Grundsätzliches zur Textgestaltung der Historia Augusta', *Philologische Wochenschrift* 48.36 (8 September), 1115–18.
- Hohl, E. (1934) 'Zur Historia Augusta Forschung', *Klio* 27, 149–64.
- Hohl, E. (1937) 'Bericht 1924–1935', *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 256, 127–56.
- Hohl, E. (1955) 'Die *Historia Augusta* und die *Caesares* des Aurelius Victor', *Historia* 4, 220–8.
- Hohl, E. (1965) *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, reprint with additions by Ch. Samburger and W. Seyfarth (Leipzig).
- Hohl, E. (1976) *Historia Augusta. Römische Heerschergestalten* (eds. E. Merten and A. Roesger) vol. 1. Munich and Zurich.
- Hohl, E. (1985) *Historia Augusta. Römische Heerschergestalten* (eds. E. Merten, A. Roesger and N. Ziegler) vol. 2. Munich and Zurich.
- Hönn, K. (1910) review of Fitch (1910), *Deutsche Literaturzeitung für Kritik der internationalen Wissenschaft* 31, 1194–5.
- Horowitz, H. (1994) *The Power and Passion of M. Carey Thomas*. New York.
- Horsley, G. H. R. (2012) 'A Hundred Years of the Loeb Classical Library', *Buried History* 47, 35–58.
- Houseman, V. (2023) *American Classicist: The Life and Loves of Edith Hamilton*. Princeton.
- Hudson, H. (2013) 'Solidarity, Betrayal, and Opportunism in the Commissioning of Two Florentine Renaissance Manuscripts', *Parergon* 30, 91–119.
- Jordan, H. and Eyssenhardt, F. (1864) *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 2 vols. Berlin.
- Kelly, G. and Stover, J. (2016) 'The Hersfeldensis and Fuldensis of Ammianus Marcellinus: A Reconsideration', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 62, 108–29.
- Klebs, E. (1892) 'Die Sammlung der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Rheinisches Museum* 42, 1–52, 515–49.
- Klein, I. (1882) 'Kritische Bemerkungen zu den *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Rheinisches Museum* 37, 274–91.
- Klotz, A. (1915) review of Ballou (1914), *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 35.16 (17 April), 490–6.
- Klotz, A. (1928) review of Hohl (1927a), *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 48.15 (14 April), 453–66.
- Klotz, A. (1929) 'Beiträge zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik der SHA', *Rheinisches Museum* 78, 268–314.

- Kornemann, E. (1903) 'Theodor Mommsen. Vorlesung zum Antritt der etatsmäßigen außerordentlichen Professur für alte Geschichte an der Universität Tübingen gehalten am 3. Dezember 1903', in *Gestalten und Reiche. Essays zur alten Geschichte*. Wiesbaden, 35–56.
- Kornemann, E. (1905) *Kaiser Hadrian und der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom*. Leipzig.
- Kornemann, E. (1912) 'Die römische Kaiserzeit', in eds. E. Gerke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*. Berlin.
- Kulikowski, M. (2021) 'The Historia Augusta: Minimalism and the adequacy of evidence', *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition* 60, 23–40.
- Latimer, J. F. (1994) 'Hendrickson, George Lincoln', in Briggs (1994a), 278–80.
- Leo, F. (1901) *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*. Leipzig.
- Lessing, K (1901–6) *Scriptorum Historiae Augustae Lexicon*. Leipzig.
- Lucarini, C. (2012) 'Per il testo degli Scrittori Historiae Augustae', *Hyperboreus* 12, 325–52.
- Magie, D. (1921–32) ed. and trans., *The Scrittores Historiae Augustae* 3 vols. Cambridge MA and London.
- Maltby, M. E. (1929) *History of the Fellowships awarded by the American Association of University Women 1888–1929*. New York.
- Manion, M. and Vines, V. (1984) eds., *Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts in Australian Collections*. London.
- Marshall, P. K. (1983) 'Scrittores Historiae Augustae', in eds. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford, 354–6.
- Mazón, P. (2003) *Gender and the Modern Research University. The Admission of Women to German Higher Education, 1865–1914*. Stanford.
- McKay, A. G. (1994) 'Abbott, Frank Frost', in Briggs (1994a), 3–4.
- McKitterick, R. (2004) *History and Memory in the Carolingian World*. Cambridge.
- Meigs, C. (1956). *What Makes A College? A History of Bryn Mawr*. New York.
- Menge, E., Marx, H. and C. Garton (1969) 'The Firm of B. G. Teubner and its connection with Classical Learning', *Arethusa* 2, 203–11.
- Merrill, E. and Norton, R. (1900) 'Fifth Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 4, 28–44.
- Modonutti, R. (2013a) *Fra Giovanni Colonna e la storia antica da Adriano ai Severi*. Padua.
- Modonutti, R. (2013b) "In quadam antiquissima historia": l'Historia Augusta nel Mare historiarum di fra Giovanni Colonna', in eds. G. Albanese et al. *Il ritorno dei classici nell'Umanesimo: studi in memoria di Gianvito Resta*. Florence, 449–74.
- Modonutti, R. (2016) 'I consiliarii di Severo Alessandro e la tradizione dell'Historia Augusta nel Trecento', *Segno e testo* 14, 381–410.

- Molinier Arbo, A. (2014) *Histoire Auguste III.2. Vie de Alexandre Sevère*. Paris.
- Momigliano, A. (1954) 'An Unsolved Problem of Historical Forgery: The "Scriptores Historiae Augustae"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17, 22–46, rp. in A. Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography*. London (1966), 143–80.
- Momigliano, A. (1969) 'Review: *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* by Ronald Syme', *English Historical Review* 84, 566–9.
- Mommsen, T. (1878) 'Zu den Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 13, 298–301.
- Mommsen, T. (1890) 'Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *Hermes* 25, 228–92.
- Mynors, R. A. B. and Thomson, D. F. S. (1977) *Erasmus Correspondence. Letters 456–553. 1516 to 1517*. Toronto.
- Parker, A. K. (1916) 'The First Year: 1 October 1892 to 1 October 1893', *University of Chicago. University Record* n.s. 2.4 (October 1916), 213.
- Paschoud, F. (1993) 'Storia e geografia della cultura tardoantica', in eds. A. Momigliano, A. Schiavone, A. Caradini et al., *Storia di Roma*, vol. III. Turin, 703–30.
- Paschoud, F. (1996) *Histoire Auguste V.1 Vie d'Aurélien et de Tacite*. Paris.
- Paschoud, F. (2000) *Histoire Auguste IV.2 Vies de Valerien et des deux Galliens*. Paris.
- Paschoud, F. (2002) *Histoire Auguste V.2 Vies de Probus, Firmus, Saturnin, Proculus et Bonose, Carus, Numérien et Carin*. Paris.
- Paschoud, F. (2009) 'De *Historiae Romanae scriptores Latini minores à Historia Augusta*', *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 61, 197–204.
- Paschoud, F. (2011) *Histoire Auguste IV.3 Vies de Tacite, Tyrans et Claude*. Paris.
- Paschoud, F. (2013) review of M. Thomson, *Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Brussels 2012), *Histos* 7, 1–12.
- Paschoud, F. (2015) 'Historia Augusta', *Oxford Bibliographies on Line*, at <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780195389661/obo-9780195389661-0046.xml>, last access 04.07.24.
- Paschoud, F. (2018) *Histoire Auguste IV.1 Vies de Maximins, des trois Gordiens, de Maxime et Balbin*. Paris.
- Pecere, O. (1995) 'Il codice Palatino dell'*Historia Augusta* come "edizione" continua', in O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve, eds. *Formative Stages of Classical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Spoleto, 326–69.
- Pedley, J. G. (2012) *The Life and Work of Francis Willey Kelsey: Archaeology, Antiquity, and the Arts*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Peter, H. (1860) *Historia Critica SHA*. Leipzig.
- Peter, H. (1863) *Exercitationes criticae in SHA*. Posen.
- Peter, H. (1865) (ed.), *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Peter, H. (1884) (ed.), *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (2nd edn.), 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Peter, H. (1892) *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Sechs litterar-geschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.

- Peter, H. (1893) 'Bericht über die Litteratur zu *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 1883–92', *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 76, 119–61.
- Peter, H. (1906) 'Bericht über die Litteratur zu *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 1893–1905', *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 130, 1–40.
- Peter, H. (1908) 'Zur Textesgeschichte der *Scriptores historiae Augustae*', *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* 15, 23–9.
- Phi Beta Kappa (1941) *Phi Beta Kappa Directory, 1776–1941*. New York.
- Prescott, H. W. (1927) 'The Department of Latin Language and Literature', *University Record* n.s. 13.4, 318–22.
- Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, ser.3 no.1–6 (1898/1903).
- Ratti, S. (2010) *Antiquus error. Les ultimes feux de la résistance païenne. Scripta varia augmentés de cinq études inédites. Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité tardive* 14. Turnhout.
- Ratti, S. (2012) *Polémiques entre païens et chrétiens*. Paris.
- Ratti, S. (2016) *L'Histoire Auguste. Les païens et les chrétiens dans l'Antiquité tardive*. Paris.
- Reynolds, L. and Wilson, N. (1991) *Scribes and Scholars*, 3rd edn. Oxford.
- Rohrbacher, D. (2016) *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta*. Madison, WI.
- Rohrbacher, D. (2022) *Historia Augusta*, 3 vols., translated by D. Magie, revised by D. Rohrbacher, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Rosenzweig, I. (1937) *Ritual and Cults of Pre-Roman Iguvium: With an Appendix Giving the Text of the Iguvine Tablets*. Baltimore.
- Rostovtzeff, M. I. (1957) *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 2nd edn. Oxford.
- Rühl, F. (1907) 'Zu den *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 62, 1–8.
- Rutgers University, database of American classical scholars at <https://dbcs.rutgers.edu/>.
- Sabbadini, R. (1914), review of Ballou (1914), in *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 42, 619–21.
- Schlicher, J. J. (1900) *The origin of rhythmical verse in late Latin*. Chicago.
- Schlicher, J. J. (1916) *Latin Plays for Student Performances and Reading*. Boston.
- Schmidt, M. G. (2009) ed. *Hermann Dessau (1856–1931)*. Berlin and New York.
- Schwendemann, J. (1923) *Der historische Wert der Vita Marci bei den Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Heidelberg.
- Sebastiani, V. (2018) *Johann Froben, Printer of Basel: A Biographical Profile and Catalogue of His Editions*. Leiden.
- Sehmeyer, M. and Walter, U. (2005) *Unberuht von jedem Umbruch? Der Althistoriker Ernst Hohl Zwischen Kaiserreich und früherer DDR*. Frankfurt a. M.

- Singer, S. L. (2003) *Adventures Abroad: North American Women at German-speaking Universities*. Westport, CT.
- Soverini, P. (1981) *Problemi di critica testuale nella Historia Augusta*. Bologna.
- Soverini, P. (1983) *Scrittori dell'età augustea*. Milan.
- Stewart, R. and Machado, D. (2019) 'Progress and Precarity: 150 years of TAPA', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 149, 39–60.
- Storr, R. J. (1966) *Harper's University: The Beginnings. A History of the University of Chicago*. Chicago.
- Stover, J. A. (2020a) 'New light on the *Historia Augusta*', *Journal of Roman Studies* 110, 167–98.
- Stover, J. A. (2020b) 'The Murbach Manuscript of the *Historia Augusta*', *Exemplaria Classica. Journal of Classical Philology* 24, 115–50.
- Stover, J. A. and Kestemont, M. (2016) 'The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*: Two New Computational Studies', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 59, 140–57.
- Stover, J. A. and Woudhuysen, G. (2023) *The Lost History of Aurelius Victor*. Edinburgh.
- Straub, J. (1952) *Studien zur Historia Augusta*. Bern.
- Straub, J. (1963) *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik in der christlichen Spätantike: Untersuchungen über Zeit und Tendenz der Historia Augusta*. Bonn.
- Syme, R. (1968) *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*. Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1971a) *The Historia Augusta. A Call of Clarity*. Bonn.
- Syme, R. (1971b) *Emperors and Biography Studies in the Historia Augusta*. Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1983) *Historia Augusta Papers*. Oxford.
- The Kalamazoo Normal Record* 6.3 (December 1915).
- The Kalamazoo Normal Record* 7.1 (November 1916).
- The Michigan Alumnus* 19 (1912/13) (Ann Arbor 1913).
- Thierfelder, A. (1980) 'Körte, Alfred', *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 12, 394.
- Tidner, E. (1922) *De Particulis Copulativis apud Scriptores Historiae Augustae Quaestiones Selectae*. Uppsala.
- Turcan, R. (1993) *Histoire Auguste III.1 Vies de Macrin, Diaduménien, Héliogabal*. Paris.
- University of Chicago Magazine* 5.4. (1913), 123.
- University of Chicago Magazine* 7.9 (July 1915), 293.
- University of Chicago Magazine* 8.1 (January 1916), 27.
- University of Chicago, *Academic Record* for 1897.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 2 (1896), 177.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 4 (1899), 25.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 5 (1900), 23.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 6 (1901), 25.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 9 (1904), 12.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 11 (1906), 55.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 12 (1907), 30.

- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 14 (1909), 26.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 15 (1910), 20.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 17 (1912), 27.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 18 (1913), 24.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 19 (1914), 29.
- University of Chicago, *Cap and Gown* 20 (1915), 27.
- University of Chicago, *Quarterly Calendar* 3.1 (May 1894), 58.
- University of Chicago, *Quarterly Calendar* 4.1 (August 1895), 26.
- University of Chicago, *The Daily Maroon* 14 (5 October 1915), 1.
- University of Chicago, *The Daily Maroon* 1.175 (30 June 1903).
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 1.14 (July 3, 1896), 231.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 2.44 (January 28, 1898), 2.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 3.2 (8 April 1898), 16.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 4.12 (23 June 1899), 71.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 5.1 (April 6, 1900), 16.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 6.40 (January 1902), 308.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 6.51 (April 1902), 385.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 8.10 (February 1904) 341.
- University of Chicago, *University Record* 11.3 (January 1907), 109.
- University of Chicago, *University Record*, available at <http://campub.lib.uchicago.edu/>.
- Valentine, L. and Valentine, A. (1973) *The American Academy in Rome 1894–1949*. Charlottesville.
- Valentini, G. (2021) ‘Per le future edizioni del testo della *Historia Augusta*’, in eds. M. Manca and M. Venuti, *Paulo maiora canamus. Raccolta di studi per Paolo Mastandrea*. Venice, 209–28.
- Valette, J. (1914) review of Ballou (1914), *Revue des études anciennes* 16, 392.
- Velaza, J. (1998) ‘Le *Collectaneum* de Sedulius Scotus et l’Histoire Auguste’, in eds. G. Bonamente, F. Heim, J. P. Callu, *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Argentoratense*. Bari, 339–47.
- Watzinger, Carl at http://cpr.uni-rostock.de//resolve/id/cpr_person_00003375 (accessed 14 February 2020).
- Webster, T. B. L. (1949) ‘Alfred Körte’, *Gnomon* 21, 179–80.
- Welch, K. (2004) ‘Ester B. van Deman, 1862–1927’, in eds. G. M. Cohen and M. S. Joukowsky, *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*. Ann Arbor, 68–108.
- Werner, A. (2013) *The Transatlantic World of Higher Education. Americans at German Universities, 1776–1914*. New York and Oxford.
- West, A. F. and Norton, R. (1902) ‘Seventh Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome’, *American Journal of Archaeology* 6, Supplement: *Annual Reports 1901–1902*, 24–38.
- West, A. F. and Norton, R. (1906) ‘Eleventh Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome’, *American Journal of Archaeology* 10, Supplement: *Annual Reports 1905–1906*, 18–26.

- West, A. F. and Norton, R. (1907) 'Twelfth Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 11, Supplement: Annual Reports 1906–1907, 22–35.
- White, P. (1967) 'The authorship of the *Historia Augusta*', *Journal of Roman Studies* 57, 115–33.
- Winterfeld, von, P. (1902) 'Satzschlussstudien zur *Historia Augusta*', *Rheinisches Museum* 57, 549–58.
- Wannack, K. (2007) *Hermann Dessau. Der fast vergessene Schuler Mommsens und die Grossunternehmen der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Hamburg.
- Wölfflin, E. (1891) *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Munich.
- Wood, J. (2014) 'Suetonius and the *De uita Caesarum* in the Carolingian Empire', in eds. T. Power and R. Gibson, *Suetonius the Biographer: Studies in Roman Lives*. Oxford, 273–91.
- Zernial, H. L. (1956) *Über den Satzschluss in der Historia Augusta*. Berlin.
- Zernial, H. L. (1986) *Akzentklausel und Textkritik in der Historia Augusta*. Bonn.
- Zernial, H. L. (1994) 'Akzentklausel und Textkritik in der *Historia Augusta*', in eds. G. Bonamente and F. Paschoud, *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense (Atti del convegno sulla Historia Augusta II)*. Bari, 229–53.
- Zernial, H. L. (1995) 'Weitere Akzentklauseln im Text der *Historia Augusta*', in eds. G. Bonamente and G. Paci, *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Maceratese (Atti del convegno sulla Historia Augusta III)*. Bari, 311–23.
- Zernial, H. L. (1998) 'Weitere Akzentklauseln im Text der *Historia Augusta* und Index der bisher gefundenen Stellen', in eds. G. Bonamente, F. Heim and J. Callu, *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Argentoratense (Atti del convegno sulla Historia Augusta VI)*. Bari, 359–76.