

Thus Book 4 begins with an exquisitely subtle and telling comment on the status of the consulate in imperial Rome. The book opens with a traditional dating formula for A.D. 23, *C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus*. But Tacitus' choice of the ablative absolute construction serves to isolate the consuls from the main action of the sentence and also to subordinate these republican magistrates to Tiberius' quite untraditional *perennial* power: *C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus nonus Tiberio annus erat compositae rei publicae . . . , cum repente . . .*, 'In the consulship of Gaius Asinius and Gaius Antistius Tiberius' ninth year was one of political stability . . . , when suddenly . . .' (1.1).⁷ In effect two methods of dating are juxtaposed, the traditional consular formula of republican government and annalistic historiography, and an untraditional 'imperial' system which, in contrast to the naming of consuls, reflects the actual nature of imperial Rome. As in the reality of Tiberian Rome, so in Tacitus' historical record republican forms persist but are an irrelevance and a sham. Janus, god of new consuls, god of the regular republican *annus* on which annalistic historiography was predicated, god of Roman time itself, is no more. Better, perhaps, Janus *is* there but grotesquely distorted by the imperial system: it is not Janus who oversees the consulate but Sejanus (cf. 68.2),⁸ appropriate patron deity⁹ of the malign and corrupt regime which Tacitus is chronicling, one that *looks like* the traditional system but is in fact its negation. Sabinus' pun thus perfectly exemplifies Tacitus' annalistic trope: 'The annalistic form was traditionally associated with the Republican past, and Tacitus wanted to evoke that past, if only to deny its application to the present'.¹⁰

Brasenose College, Oxford

LLEWELYN MORGAN

llewelyn.morgan@brasenose.ox.ac.uk

⁷ Martin and Woodman (n. 2), *ad loc.*; J. Ginsburg, *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus* (Salem, 1981), p. 11.

⁸ With the privative *se* 'Sejanus' is almost literally 'lacking in Janus'.

⁹ For Sejanus' pseudo-divine status cf. Martin and Woodman (n. 2), at 4.2.3, 74.2, and 74.4. Cf. 4.1.1, *initium et causa penes Aelium Seianum*, 'the beginning and cause were Aelius Sejanus' responsibility'.

¹⁰ Ginsburg (n. 7), p. 100. In retrospect Tacitus' comment that there was no *access* to the consulate except through Sejanus, *ad quem non nisi per Seianum aditus*, may seem to gain special point. Janus was above all the deity of entrances.

MORE FALSA GELLIANA

Continuing previous studies of medieval and modern false quotations from Gellius,¹ I present two more misascriptions, one by an early modern editor, the other by a medieval author.

1. Hertz, in his *editio maior* of Gellius (vol. ii, p. xxvii), cites from Peter Damian (1007–72), *Opusculum tricesimum tertium, de bono suffragiorum et variis miraculis, praesertim B. Virginis, caput primum Quod somniis non sit credendum*, in *Opera*, ed. C(onstantinus) Cajetanus [= Gaetani] (Bassano del Grappa, 1783), iii.573–4,² the words:

¹ See *LCM* 9.10 (December 1984), 151; 10.1 (January 1985), 16; 15.10 (December 1990), 150–1, 18.8 (October 1993), 126–7; *CQ* 44 (1994), 486.

² Reprinted from *Opera* (Paris, 1642), iii.251; in Gaetani's first edition, *Opera* (Rome, 1606–15), i.103–4 and the separate edition of Peter's letters (Paris, 1610) this was *epist.* 2.14.

Hic ad memoriam redit, quod, sicut Gellius ait, Alexander somniavit, ne somniis crederet. Vbi quidquid eligat Alexander, hoc disceptatio fine concluditur: ut illi, quod viderat, somnio non credatur. Nam si somniis iure creditur, somnium illud, quod asserit, non credendum esse mentitur. Quod si nequaquam debet somniis credi, consequitur etiam, ut nec illi fides debeat adhiberi.

The *opusculum* is in fact a letter written in the spring of 1064 to Abbot Desiderius of Montecassino; it has now been critically edited by Kurt Reindel,³ who reveals the name to be not *Gellius* but *Grillius*.⁴ The editor asserts: 'Bei Grillius, Commentum in Ciceronis rhetorica, einem Grammatiker des 4. Jh., läßt sich dieses Zitat nicht nachweisen';⁵ to be sure, the passage is not among the extracts printed in Carolus Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 596–606, but in the full text as edited by Josef Martin, *Grillius: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 14/2–3 [Paderborn, 1927])*, p. 7, ll. 14–18 we read, as the eighth and last of the faults that deprive a *controversia* of coherence:⁶

Ἀπορον: inops, qui quid agat non invenit, sed etiam contrarium facit quam cupit, ut illud est: 'Alexander somnio monitus est, ne somniis crederet. Deliberat, quid agat.' Quicquid enim persuaseris, in contrarium venit; si ut non credat somniis, huic credit; si ut credat, huic ergo non credit.

The example is repeated at p. 53, ll. 25–7:

Ἀπορον, id est inops, cum dissuasione favente laborat persuasio, ut puta Alexander somniavit, ne somniis crederet; deliberat credere.⁷

The eight vices, in a different order, had already appeared at Hermogenes, *περὶ στάσεων*, I, this case being no. 4 (p. 33, ll. 3–7 Rabe): *Τέταρτον κατὰ τὸ ἄπορον, οὐ μὴ ἔστι λύσιν λαβεῖν μηδὲ πέρας, οἷον Ἀλέξανδρος ὄναρ εἶδεν ὀνείροις μὴ πιστεύειν καὶ βουλεύεται· ὃ τι γὰρ ἂν συμβουλευῇ τις ἐνταῦθα, τὸ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ περανεῖ.*

2. In 1193 or shortly afterwards, Gerald of Wales, in an invective against William Longchamp, bishop of Ely, papal legate and virtual viceroy of England, declared:⁸

Necesse est ut multos timeat quem multi timent, et qui multos offendit a multis exosus habeatur. Quoniam ut ait Agellius cunctorum meretur odium qui omnium in commune se approbat inimicum.

Gellius says nothing of the kind; but at Jordanes, *Getica* 187, Valentinian III, seeking the support of the Visigothic king Theuderid of Toulouse against Attila in 451, urges the argument:

cunctorum etenim meretur hic odium, qui in commune omnium se adprobat inimicum.

³ Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae 2: Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 4: *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, iii (Munich, 1989), no. 106, pp. 168–85. Our passage appears on p. 169.

⁴ For another instance of *Grillius* wrongly emended to *Gellius* see Hertz, loc. cit.

⁵ P. 169 n. 3; the statement is not corrected in the supplementary note at vol. iv (Munich, 1993), p. 547.

⁶ *Quorum si aliquid inciderit, manifestum est controversiam stare non posse*; that is to say, it is *ἀσύστατος* (*parum consistens* Gell. 9.15.6), a term for which there is no recognized English equivalent. Malcolm Heath, in his translation of Hermogenes, *On Issues* (Oxford, 1995), p. 30, makes such questions 'lack issue'.

⁷ Read *deliberat* <an debeat> *credere*?

⁸ *De vita Galfridi archiepiscopi Eboracensis* 2.19 ('Descriptio beluae multiformis'), J. S. Brewer (ed.), *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* iv (London, 1873), p. 425.

How Gerald came to know Jordanes I leave for others to determine;⁹ but the ascription to Gellius admits instructive explanation. The verse 'necesse est multos timeat quem multi timent' (Laberius 126 R² ap. Sen. *De ira* 2.11.3) is appended—with intrusive *ut*—by John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 8.14,¹⁰ to a sequence of *sententiae* ascribed to Publius Clodius; they are in fact the *sententiae* of Publilius Syrus recorded by Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 2.7.10, who himself had them from Gellius 17.14.¹¹ Gerald, recognizing them from the Gellian section of the *Florilegium Angelicum*,¹² associated 'Agellius' with the extra verse he had found in John, but assigned his name to the next quotation instead.¹³

Such confusions are not exclusive to medieval authors, but were facilitated, on the one hand by the use of florilegia,¹⁴ on the other by the ascription of authority rather to antiquity (especially as preserved in such anthologies) rather than to individual ancients, which made the anxious assignment of *suum cuique* seem less important than it does to us. The point is not to rebuke them, but to learn from their dealings with known texts how little to trust them on unknown ones.

67 St Bernard's Road, Oxford

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS

holfordl@oup.co.uk

aulus@gellius.demon.co.uk

⁹ The same passage of the *Getica* was exploited soon afterwards in a letter ostensibly written to Philip of Dreux, bishop of Beauvais, who had been taken prisoner by Richard's brother and subsequent successor John on 19 May 1196, by Pope Celestine III (d. 8 January 1198), reproduced in Roger of Howden (d. 1201?), W. Stubbs (ed.), *Chronica*, s.a. 1197, iv (London, 1871), 23: 'Sinistre licet tibi euenit, nec mirum: cunctorum enim meretur odium qui omnium se in commune approbat inimicum.' In a footnote, Stubbs observes 'It is hardly necessary to remark that this letter is a fabrication'.

¹⁰ Ed. C. C. J. Webb (Oxford, 1909), ii.335.

¹¹ Publilius is *Publius* in most MSS of Macrobius as of Gellius; P. Clodius has just been mentioned at *Sat.* 2.6.6. That Macrobius, not Gellius, is John's source appears from the most cursory comparison.

¹² On which he largely relied for his classical authorities: see A. A. Goddu and R. H. Rouse, 'Gerald of Wales and the *Florilegium Angelicum*', *Speculum* 52 (1977), 488–521.

¹³ One may envisage a commonplace book in which Gerald, having ascribed the verse to *Agellius* in the margin, followed it with the unattributed passage from Jordanes.

¹⁴ As when Gerald assigns to Gellius a passage of Ennodius also known to him from the *Florilegium Angelicum* (Goddu and Rouse, art. cit., pp. 512–13) or Petrus Cantor a passage of Valerius Maximus from the Valerio-Gellian florilegium (Holford-Strevens, *CQ* 44 [1994], 486).

TWO PASSAGES OF JUSTIN

In one of his latest papers, published the year before his death, Sir Ronald Syme surveyed the modern scholarly literature on 'The date of Justin and the discovery of Trogus' and argued that Justin's abbreviated version of the *Historiae Philippicae* of the Augustan historian Pompeius Trogus (not an epitome in the strict sense of that word) was composed in the later fourth century, specifically in 'the vicinity of 390'—not in the Antonine or Severan period, as so many have contended.¹ Syme's central argument was lexicographical: he drew attention to a number of words in

¹ R. Syme, *Historia* 37 (1988), 358–71 = *Roman Papers* 6 (Oxford, 1991), 358–71, reiterated in 'Trogus and the H.A., some consequences,' *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'Empire romain au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C. Actes de la table ronde autour de l'oeuvre d'André Chastagnol* (Paris, 20–21 janvier 1989) (Rome, 1992), pp. 11–20. There is also a survey of modern opinions in