

Interea medium Aeneas iam classe tenebatl certus iter; 10.1: *Panditur interea domus omnipotentis Olympi*; 11.1: *Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit*; and the Ovidian imitation of this formula at *Met.* 15.1: *Quaeritur interea*. . . . The close of Book C would appear to be lost in the lacuna marked in editions since Bücheler's after 78.8: *nos occasionem opportunissimam nacti Agamemnoni verba dedimus raptimque tam plane quam ex incendio fugimus*. However, the swift excuses and departure of the guests at the chaotic end of the dinner is very likely to have been the last event in the *Cena* proper, and again the physical departure of narrator or protagonist is a common form of poetic closure found in epic:¹³ here we might compare the end of *Aeneid* 2, where Aeneas leaves Troy in flames with his father on his back (804), a departure from a real *incendium*, or the end of *Aeneid* 6, where Aeneas leaves the underworld, to which Trimalchio's house has been interestingly compared,¹⁴ to return to his fleet (899–901). Once again, there is an amusing generic difference: the contrast between the flight of three spongers from a comic near-riot and the dignified departure of a hero brings this mode of epic closure down to an appropriately lower level.

In sum, I hope to have shown that the extant *Cena Trimalchionis* is not a single ancient book but a continuous conflation with some lacunae of three ancient books, both on the general ground of the length of books in similar ancient texts, and on the particular ground of intratextual signals for the beginning and endings of books, signals which imitate and appropriately modify for a lower genre known epic modes of book opening and book closure.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON

stephen.harrison@ccc.ox.ac.uk

¹³ Cf. also P. G. Fowler in Roberts (n. 12), pp. 114–5, 128–9.

¹⁴ Cf. J. Bodel, 'Trimalchio's underworld', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994), pp. 237–59.

TACITUS, *ANNALS* 4.70: AN UNAPPRECIATED PUN*

Chapter 68 begins the account of the last year covered by Tacitus in *Annals* 4: A.D. 28, when Junius Silanus and Silius Nerva were *consules ordinarii*. The new year, Tacitus informs us, was marked by a disgraceful event, the arrest (postponed since A.D. 24, cf. 19.1) of Titius Sabinus, loyal friend to Germanicus and his family. After the naming of the consuls at 68.1 and the brief preliminary account of Sabinus' arrest, 68.2–69.3 revert to the period *before* the beginning of A.D. 28 and describe Sabinus' entrapment by a group of ambitious praetors wishing to gratify Sejanus and so secure the consulship, an office *ad quem non nisi per Seianum aditus*, 'to which the only access was through Sejanus' (68.2).

Chapter 70 resumes the narrative of A.D. 28 and describes the events which occurred at the beginning of the year in greater detail. On 1 January a letter from Tiberius was read out containing (a distortion, because couched in a letter, of) the conventional prayers associated with the new year, the *uota pro salute rei publicae*: traditionally, the new consuls 'entering office on 1 January offered a sacrifice to Iuppiter on the Capitol in fulfilment of the vow of the past year and renewed the vow for the current year'.¹ These formalities completed, however, the emperor's letter abruptly changed tack, attacking Sabinus for treachery and demanding retribution in no uncertain terms. The

* I am grateful to *CQ*'s editors and referee for their comments on this note.

¹ S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford, 1971), p. 217.

senate acquiesced, and as Sabinus was dragged off to execution Tacitus attributes a final remark to him. Sabinus cried, as loudly as he could with a hood on his head and a noose round his neck, *sic inchoari annum, has Seiano uictimas cadere*, 'that this was how the new year was being marked, these the victims being sacrificed to Sejanus'. The remainder of ch. 70 continues the emphasis on calendrical date. Onlookers feared for their own safety in circumstances when violence intruded even into the religious ceremonies of the new year; and the new magistrates' reopening of the prison seemed a ghastly parody of the reinauguration of the temples and altars traditionally undertaken on the Kalends of January. Chapter 71 begins in similar vein, with Tacitus' famous (self-subverting) statement of commitment to annalistic convention: *ni mihi destinatum foret suum quaeque in annum referre . . .*, 'Had I not determined to assign each event to its proper year . . .'.

Martin and Woodman interpret *has Seiano uictimas cadere* as implying an equation of Sejanus with the deity to whom bulls were sacrificed by the consuls on 1 January, Jupiter Optimus Maximus: 'Sabinus' cry indicates that the real power lay with the "divine" Sejanus'.² But although the remark unquestionably serves to equate Sejanus with a deity, it is not Jupiter who should be foremost in the readers' minds. Taylor and Holland have attempted to explain the original location of the Capitoline *Fasti*, the chronological list of consuls, in the lateral openings of the Arch of Augustus by reference to 'the interpretation of the god Janus'—the *numen* of entrances, arches, and of beginnings in general—as the god in charge of the consular records—indeed as a god of time'.³ That Janus was closely associated with the new consuls, and the *record* of the consuls, is clear from Martial 8.8.3–4, a passage which states that Janus was the first to be 'petitioned by the pious incense' which accompanied prayer, and first also to be 'saluted by vows' and worshipped by consuls and lesser magistrates (*te primum pia tura rogent, te uota saluent, purpura te felix, te colat omnis honos*), and Martial 8.66.9–12, which sees in Janus the source of the glory gained by Pompey the Great and M. Agrippa in their triple consulships. As Taylor and Holland point out (p. 138), a connection between Janus and the consuls was easily made. 'The consuls celebrated the formal ceremony of entry upon office on Janus' day, the Kalends, of Janus' month,⁴ and in their sacrifice, as in most state sacrifices, Janus received the first offering.' That Janus was addressed first in such ceremonies, 'coming even before Jupiter',⁵ is proved by (amongst other evidence) Martial's apostrophe of the god at 10.28.2, *publica quem primum uota precesque uocant*, 'you whom public vows and prayers invoke first'. The association with the new consuls cannot have been of very great antiquity but was certainly recognized in the Augustan period and must presumably date from the period post-153 B.C., when the opening of the consular year was transferred from 15 March to 1 January.⁶

The remark which Tacitus attributes to Sabinus as he is dragged away is thus a bitter pun. It was a token of the smooth and proper running of the Roman state that sacrificial victims fell in honour of *Ianus* on 1 January, but in the corrupt circumstances of A.D. 28 the sacrifice, of Sabinus, is to *Se-ianus*.

Tacitus' *Annals* are of course preoccupied with the structuring of time, and particularly in the first six books, which (superficially) conform to annalistic convention.

² R. H. Martin and A. J. Woodman, *Tacitus, Annals Book IV* (Cambridge, 1989), *ad loc.*

³ L. R. Taylor and L. A. Holland, 'Janus and the *Fasti*', *CPh* 47 (1952), 137–42, at 137.

⁴ Cf. Lucan 5.5–6.

⁵ H. H. Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (London, 1981), p. 61.

⁶ Taylor and Holland (n. 3), 139–40.

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.