

Given the general similarity of Statius' imitation to its model '*nunc exule ego .../quando alius misero ac melior mihi frater adeptus*' must surely be a deliberate verbal echo of '*nunc misero mihi demum/exilium infelix*'. We may accordingly assume that little more than a century after Virgil's death *exilium* was firmly ensconced in the text of the *Aeneid*.

Christ Church, Oxford

MICHAEL DEWAR

NOTES ON PIGHIUS AND VALERIUS MAXIMUS

(1) *Horace, Janus, and Pighius' Acta*

In *PBSR* 54 (1986), 213–28 Andrew Lintott dusts down the fragments of the *Acta Urbana* published by S. V. Pighius in 1615 and universally supposed today to be a forgery. Lintott himself, after a most learned discussion, concurs, but one senses a wistful longing for the fragments to be genuine. The purpose of this note is to offer another reason why sadly this is unlikely.

In lines 17–19 of the fragment we are informed that there has been *RIXA AD IANUM INFIMUM IN CAUPONA*. Lintott *ad loc.* comments: 'Ianus infimus/imus is only known from Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.54 and Porphyry on *Ep.* 1.20.1. For possible identification with the early Ianus Quadrifons of the Forum Boarium, see L. A. Holland, "Ianus and the Bridge", *Papers and Monogr. Am. Ac. Rome* 25 [actually 21], 1961, 38f.' The passage of Horace referred to is one, as Mrs Holland remarks, 'on which much learning and ingenuity have been spent' (p. 42):

'o cives, cives, quaerenda pecunia primum est
virtus post nummos': haec Ianus summus ab imo
prodocet.

Mrs Holland joins many historians and topographers in believing that there were three *Iani* at Rome. Her view is that as well as the attested *Ianus Medius* near the Basilica Aemilia in the forum, there was a *Ianus Summus* in the Argiletum and *Ianus Imus* in the Velabrum. All three were ancient crossings on the Forum brook, according to Mrs Holland's – incorrect, I think – view of the original nature of Janus.

Literary scholars have known since Bentley that *Iani non sunt multiplicandi praeter necessitatem*. There is no other evidence for a *Ianus Summus* or a *Ianus Imus* beyond Horace's words, and they admit of other interpretations. Indeed, it is doubtful whether *Ianus summus ab imo* could ever mean *a summo Iano ad imum Ianum* in Latin. Here is Bentley's comment on the passage:

Ceterum falluntur, qui *Ianos* tres hinc sibi fingunt, *summum, medium, imum*: cum unus fuerit vicus, *Iani* nomine insignitus. Ovidius *Ibide* v. 181 de Tityo. "*Iugeribusque novem qui summus distat ab imo, Visceraque assiduae debita praebet avi.*" An et tres Tityos hinc comminiscunt? Noster *Serm.* II. 3. v. 308 de seipso: "ab imo Ad summum *totus moduli bipedalis*": et *Art. Poet.* 254 "*Primus ad extremum similis sibi.*" Ergo *Ianus summus ab imo* est *totus, universus. Medius autem Ianus* dicitur, quemadmodum *media mulier* Terentio [*Andr.* 133], et alia sexcenta.

In fact, it is not clear that we need suppose that the whole street was called *Ianus*, as Kiessling and Heinze remark:

Ianus: die *argentarii*, die an und um den *Ianus medius* genannten Bogen ihre Kontore hatten (sat. II 3, 18) und sich selbst offiziell als *a Iano medio* bezeichneten, z. B. unter diesem Namen dem L. Antonius als ihrem Patron eine Statue setzten (Cic. *Phil.* VI 15), die aber in Volksmunde gewiss kurzweg *Ianus medius* hießen, wie denn Cicero an jener Stelle fortfahrt *itane? Ianus medius in L. Antoni clientela est?* Wenn H. statt *medius* sagt *summus ab imo*, so geht dies entweder darauf,

dass die Strasse nach jenem Bogen den Namen *Ianus* führte, oder wahrscheinlicher, da hiervon sonst nichts bekannt ist, handelt es sich nur um eine scherzhafte umfassende Bezeichnung der ganzen Gegend, deren Mittelpunkt der *Ianus medius* war.

Horace is jokingly alluding to the *Ianus medius* – the best paraphrase might be ‘the arch of Janus from top to bottom’ – and appeals to scholastic fantasy or fragmentary passages of Livy should not remove the joke.¹ The wordplay is spoiled if there really was a *Ianus summus* or *Ianus imus*.

It is easy to be deceived by the Horatian passage, however, into supposing that there were these extra arches. Hence the clever detail in Pighius’ *Acta* that the fight took place not *ad Ianum medium* but *ad Ianum infimum* (perhaps with an echo of Livy’s phrase about the *Ianus Geminus*, 1.19.2 *Ianum ad infimum Argiletum indicem pacis bellicae fecit sc. Numa*). Clever, but not clever enough. It is not the first time that Nemesis has allowed herself to be called the Master of Trinity.

(2) *Valerius Maximus* 1 praef.

At the end of his address to Tiberius in the preface to the *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, Valerius Maximus explains why he invokes the emperor:

Te igitur huic coepto, penes quem hominum deorumque consensus maris ac terrae regimen esse voluit, certissima salus patriae, Caesar, invoco, cuius caelesti providentia virtutes, de quibus dicturus sum, benignissime foveantur, vitia severissime vindicantur: nam si prisci oratores ab Iove optimo maximo bene orsi sunt, si excellentissimi vates a numine aliquo principia traxerunt, mea parvitas eo iustius ad favorem tuum decurrerit, quo cetera divinitas opinione colligitur, tua praesenti fide paterno avitque sideri par videtur, quorum eximio fulgore multum caerimoniis nostris inclitae claritatis accessit: reliquos enim deos accepimus, Caesares dedimus.

And so, Caesar, I invoke your aid for this my undertaking: you whom men and gods together have wished to be lord of sea and earth, you the surest safeguard of the fatherland, by whose heavenly providence virtues – the subject of my work – are fostered with geneous good-will but vices punished with exemplary severity. For if the orators of old were right to commence with Jupiter Best and Greatest, if the most distinguished poets have taken their beginnings from some divinity, my own humble person with all the more justice is here to seek your favour, in that while the divinity of others is deduced from belief, yours is seen in present warrant as equal to the stars of your father and grandfather, from whose exceptional effulgence much renowned brightness was added to our rites: for we have taken the other gods, but given the Caesars.

So, at any rate, the text of Kempf (Leipzig, 1898). In the fourth of the theses attached to his Halle dissertation of 1861 entitled *Lucretianae Quaestiones grammaticae et criticae*, R. Bouterwek proposed to read at the end *videmus* for *dedimus*. I suggest that he was at least as correct in this as in the sixth thesis he defended, that *ars gymnastica necessaria est et ad pueros recte educandos et per virilem aetatem ad valetudinem corporis bene tuendam eiusque vires excolendas*.

The epigrammatic contrast of *accepimus* and *dedimus* at first seems attractive, and *accipere* and *dare* are of course often found together. But reflection suggests that the collocation usually suggests *exchange*, which is inappropriate here – ‘we took the other gods and gave the Caesars in return.’ More importantly, the logic of the passage makes *dedimus* difficult. The passage begins with a contrast between *cetera divinitas* and that of Julius Caesar, Augustus, and Tiberius. The former are the *reliquos...deos* of the final phrase: since Tiberius is a Caesar and a god, it is difficult to take the

¹ The important passages in the ancient scholia are pseudo-Acron on *Epist.* 1.1.54 and *Serm.* 2.3.18: they are clearly guesswork. I can see nothing helpful in Porphyry on *Epist.* 1.20.1. Livy 41.27.12, on the activities of Q. Fulvius Flaccus as censor in 174 B.C., mentions contracts for works in some provincial town or towns, including *Ianos tres faciendos*. We do not even know that these three arches were to be constructed in the same town.

Caesares as referring only to Julius Caesar and Augustus. But Tiberius cannot really be said to have been 'given' while he is still alive.² Moreover the *enim* is awkward: what is the connection it is supposed to suggest between the final epiphonema and the rest of the sentence? *Because* we 'gave' the Caesars to heaven, they were able to preside over our celebrations? This seems very weak.

Bouterwek's *videmus* solves the problems. *Caesares* refers to Julius, Augustus, and Tiberius: we believe in the other gods because we have accepted the traditional accounts of them (*accepimus* = *opinione colligitur*), but we see the Caesars before us – the stars of Julius and Augustus (cf. S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* [Oxford, 1971], 387–9), Tiberius in person. Valerius alludes of course to the famous celebration of Demetrius Poliorcetes by Hermocles, Athen. 6.253d = Duris, *FGrHist* 76 F 13 = p. 174 Powell *CA*, 15–18:

ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσιν θεοί,
ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὤτα,
ἢ οὐκ εἶσιν, ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἔν,
σε δὲ παρόνθ' ὀρώμεν.

That Tiberius' predecessors are now stars enables Valerius to go further than Hermocles, but the point in relation to Tiberius himself is the same.³

Jesus College, Oxford

D. P. FOWLER

² P. Constant in the Garnier edition (Paris, 1935) translates, 'les autres dieux, nous les avons reçus de la tradition; mais les Césars, c'est nous qui les avons faits dieux': so R. Faranda in his useful Italian edition (Turin, 1971), 'gli altri dei li abbiamo accettati da altri, i Cesari li creiamo noi.' It is hard to think of anything less flattering to say to Tiberius.

³ I am grateful for comments to Gian Biagio Conte, Peta Fowler, Robin Nisbet, and anon.

JUVENAL 1.142–4*

poena tamen praesens, cum tu deponis amictus
turgidus et crudum paunem in balnea portas.
hinc subitae mortes atque tristestata senectus.

143 crudum VΦ Phocas G.L.K. v, p. 426, schol. Persii 3.98, crudus PRH

For a defence of 'crudum' against Courtney's strictures,¹ see the reviews by Goodyear² and Reeve.³ I am presently concerned not with the unresolved crux in verse 144, but with the medical reason for the death of the glutton. Galen (xix. 692–3 K), quoted by Mayor,⁴ warned that one should not bathe after eating *ἵνα μὴ ἐμφραξίς κατὰ νεφροὺς καὶ ἡπαρ γένηται*. More recently, Courtney *ad loc.* has quoted Persius 3.98ff. and has attributed the death to 'apoplexy', which in more modern parlance is called a 'stroke' or a 'cerebral haemorrhage'. What Persius and Juvenal are actually describing is not a stroke but what was formerly known as 'acute indigestion' and is now called a 'heart attack', as indeed ought to have been obvious from 'nescio quid trepidat mihi pectus' at Persius 3.88, and 'tange, miser, uenas et pone in pectore dextram' at 3.107. As Duff⁵ says, 'the natural and ordinary time for

* I am grateful to Dr Joseph Kirschvink for helping me track down ref. 9, and to Dr Edward Goldberg for his hospitality while I was using the Widener Library.

¹ E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London, 1980), *ad loc.*

² F. R. D. Goodyear, *PACA* 16 (1982), 53.

³ M. D. Reeve, *CR* 33 (1983), 32.

⁴ J. E. B. Mayor (ed.), *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*⁴ (London, 1886), i.154, *ad* 1.143.

⁵ J. D. Duff (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae XIV* (Cambridge, 1898), 131, *ad* 1.142.