

pursuer (intent on slaying him) will now call to mind Juturna herself escaping a male pursuer (intent on having sex with her); and Jupiter's solemn speech at 12.793ff. asking and ordering Juno to put an end to her hatred of the Trojans will now recall his embarrassing appeal to the nymphs to help him perpetrate a rape.

This prequel also functions as a learned gloss, explaining certain things in Virgil. At *Aen.* 12.142ff. Juno addressed Juturna as someone who was very dear to her and her favourite among all Latin females bedded by Jupiter, and then appealed to her to help Turnus in his combat with Aeneas (which, of course, she did). Thanks to Ovid we can now see why Juno was so fond of Juturna (because she eluded Jupiter and made a fool of him for a long time) and one of the reasons why Juno asked Juturna to act in opposition to the will of Jupiter<sup>9</sup> (because she had done so before, and with success), and we can now discern an additional motive for Juturna helping Turnus when he was tracked repeatedly on the battlefield and chased in the actual duel by Aeneas<sup>10</sup> (apart from the fact that he was her brother, she had been tracked repeatedly and chased herself).

A further complication is only revealed late on in the narrative. With a typical tease Ovid here does not give us the prequel that we are led to expect. One naturally assumes that Ovid will tell the full story of Jupiter's rape of Juturna, especially when he seems to set that up at 2.591–8 (where the nymphs agree to help Jupiter). However, at 599ff. another sister nymph (Lara) foils the assault by warning the victim. At this point Juturna is suddenly abandoned, so we do not get the full prequel (including the rape of Juturna), only part of it (or a prequel to the prequel). And what we do get on Juturna is in fact only a preamble to the silencing of and attack on Lara, only an early component of another story (one which itself has a precursory aspect, in its explanation of the origins of Muta and the Lares, and one in which the rape of Lara by a determined god foreshadows the eventual rape of Juturna by another determined god). Actually, even more complex than that, when Lara enters the narrative there seems to be a sombre prefiguring of Turnus' death: here too Juturna abruptly drops out of the story, and a sibling of hers<sup>11</sup> is subjected to violence, makes a futile appeal to a more powerful character and goes down to the Underworld.<sup>12</sup>

McMaster University

P. MURGATROYD  
murgatro@mcmaster.ca

<sup>9</sup> Cf. e.g. *Aen.* 12.793ff.

<sup>10</sup> *Aen.* 12.468ff., 783ff.

<sup>11</sup> The relationship is spelled out in 2.603 with *Iuturnae . . . sororis* (cf. *Iuturna soror* at *Aen.* 12.222).

<sup>12</sup> There may also be *contaminatio*, if 2.586 *multa tulit tanto non patienda deo* is based on Propertius 4.4.30 *vulnera, vicino non patienda Iovi*, as H. Le Bonniec, *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum Liber Secundus* (Paris, 1969), 91 suggests.

#### A LOST ALLUSION RECOVERED: TACITUS, *HISTORIES* 3.37.1 AND HOMER, *ILIAD* 19.301–2

Vitellius addresses the Senate:

mox senatum composita in magnificentiam oratione allocutus, exquisitis patrum adulationibus attollitur. initium atrocis in Caecinam sententiae a L. Vitellio factum; dein ceteri composita indignatione, quod consul rem publicam, dux imperatorem, tantis opibus tot honoribus cumulatus amicum prodidisset, uelut pro Vitellio conquerentes, suum dolorem proferebant.

The senators are reduced to a sort of 'back-up' group for the emperor's brother, Lucius. So subservient are they that they have to use their complaints and carefully orchestrated indignation on behalf of Vitellius as a vehicle for the expression of the annoyance they feel on their own behalf (why hadn't they jumped ship sooner, like Caecina?). This recalls to me (and, as we shall see, to an earlier scholar), the response of the slave women to the lament of Briseis over Patroclus in *Il.* 19.301–2:

“Ὡς ἔφατο κλαίουσ’, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες,  
Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ’ αὐτῶν κήδε’ ἐκάστη.

Tacitus may even have helped one to recall the expression, especially the crucial *πρόφασιν*, by using *pro-* three times in the last part of the sentence.

The *Iliad* lines were famous in antiquity, or at any rate *Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν* became a proverb. According to Diogenianus 7.47, this expression is used of those who through fear are unable to lament their own misfortunes; Eustathius 1185.34–7, however, says that it is taken to refer to insincere or self-interested action, an interpretation borne out by the use Plutarch makes of the proverb at *Moralia* 546F (= *De se ipsum citra invidiam laudando* §19). Chariton parodies the expression in his novel *Chaereas and Callirhoe* at 2.5.12, and 8.5.2; the first time he paraphrases in straightforward prose, the second time he introduces the verse with a change of the proper name. Now here scholarly research became interesting! I learned of these references from Friedrich Jacobs's edition of Achilles Tatius (Leipzig, 1821), another novelist who used the proverb at 2.34.7. Jacobs in a note on that passage (p. 590) draws attention to a further appropriation of the expression in Heliodorus (1.18), and he goes on to say that J. P. Dorvillius, in a note in his edition of Chariton (Amsterdam, 1750), on 8.5.2, p. 690, compared . . . Tacitus, *Historiae* 3.37! This was vastly reassuring, since none of Tacitus' commentators, or any general writers on him known to me, has ever picked up the allusion, and a 'belated' philologist might think therefore that he had discovered a chimera. That Dorvillius believed he saw the allusion over two centuries ago strikes me as confirmatory. Adamantios Koraës too in his commentary on Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* 1.18 cited Tacitus (vol. II.36; Paris, 1805); now he may have picked this up from Dorvillius, but ought not to have drawn attention to a similarity he did not himself recognize. Tacitus, we may now confidently claim, wanted his readers to recall a famous scene in the *Iliad*. The pity is that Dorvillius' observation, bandied about among the editors of Greek novels, never entered the mainstream, it appears, of Tacitean comment.

Tacitus is not simply reworking a well-known tag, however. In the larger context of the narrative he has systematically evoked heroic epos, chiefly the *Aeneid*, in the just preceding description of the sack of Cremona. Commentators point to about four borrowings within §§33 and 34 alone, for example, *Aen.* 3.464, 6.269, 2.624, and 554: the latter are especially telling, since the sack of Troy provides epic colour and pathos for the ruin of Cremona (it will be clear that I here part company with F. R. D. Goodyear's view of how Tacitus appropriated Virgil, set out in his note on *Ann.* 1.53.2, p. 325). It seems to me not unlikely that Tacitus would continue to appropriate epic colour where it suited the narrative context. Here, however, the allusion works for irony. In the *Iliad* the slave women weep for Patroclus, following Briseis' lead; that is an 'occasion' rather than a 'pretext' for lamenting their own condition. That situation is altered in the *Historiae*: the senators are indeed slavish, and must take their lead from another, but they have no real feeling for Vitellius. This harmonizes with the general picture of untrustworthiness and perfidy that all the élite display towards their various emperors

at this time. If we push the supposed allusion a little harder, we might take the senators' lament proleptically: this meeting occurred on the 31st October, and in under two months, on the 20th December, Vitellius will be dead. But the Senate will by then already have paid him such homage of grief as it was capable of.

King's College London

ROLAND MAYER  
roland.mayer@kcl.ac.uk

### DRUSILLA REGINA

Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.9) tells us that Felix, a freedman of the emperor Claudius and governor of Judea, had married Drusilla, a granddaughter of Antony and Cleopatra, thereby becoming the grandson-in-law of Antony, as Claudius was his grandson (*Drusilla Cleopatrae et Antonii nepte in matrimonium accepta, ut eiusdem Antonii Felix progener, Claudius nepos esset*).

This statement is the only direct mention we have of Drusilla. But Suetonius says that 'he [Felix] became the husband of three queens' (*Claud.* 28: *trium reginarum maritum*).<sup>1</sup> Josephus describes how in A.D. 53 or 54 Felix seduced and married Drusilla, a Jewish princess and the wife of Azizus, king of Emesa (Joseph. *AJ* 20.7.2). Clearly, this Drusilla is one of Felix's queens. Since Tacitus and Josephus give the same name, we might infer that they were discussing the same woman, even though Tacitus places the marriage of his Drusilla before Felix's appointment. However, the only person in the first three generations of the ancestry of the Jewish Drusilla whose name is unknown is the mother of her maternal grandfather Phasael.<sup>2</sup> Hence this Drusilla was not descended from Antony.

There are well-known difficulties with Tacitus' account. The first is chronological. Tacitus does not name either of Drusilla's parents. Antony and Cleopatra had three children: Alexander Helios and Cleopatra Selene, born in 40 B.C., and Ptolemy Philadelphus, born in 36 (Plut. *Vit. Ant.* 54). It is conceivable that Drusilla was the daughter of one of the sons, who were released into their sister's care at the time of her marriage to Juba II of Mauretania (Dio Cass. 51.15), although an argument against this hypothesis will be presented below. A descent through Selene is more usually assumed. Juba is known, from at least one Athenian inscription, to have had a daughter. It has been proposed to identify this daughter as Drusilla,<sup>3</sup> but a granddaughter of Antony and Cleopatra by any route is very unlikely to have been born after the last decade B.C. This would make her considerably older than Felix, who is

<sup>1</sup> F. E. Brenk and F. Canali de Rossi, 'The "Notorious" Felix, Procurator of Judea, and his many wives (Acts 23–24)', *Biblica* 82 (2001), 410–417 at 414, suggested that Felix was the model for Petronius' Trimalchio, who began his career 'as a frog but is now a king'.

<sup>2</sup> N. Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty* (Sheffield, 1998), 176, 205, 245, 340.

<sup>3</sup> *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 3439, *IG III*<sup>1</sup> 1309. Drusilla is seen in the former by N. Kokkinos, 'Re-assembling the inscription of Glaphyra from Athens', *ZPE* 68 (1987), 288–90 at 289. The latter is an epitaph erected by a king's daughter from Libya. A. Wilhelm, 'Ein Grabgedicht aus Athen', *Mélanges Bidez* (Brussels, 1934), 2.1007–20, proposed that she was Cleopatra VII, visiting Athens with Ptolemy XII during his exile c. 57 B.C., cf. M. Grant, *Cleopatra* (London, 1972), 5. The term 'Libyan' is explained as a loose Greek reference to North Africa. But it is highly unlikely that the daughter of a Ptolemy would be so described, especially once Libya proper was firmly under Roman rule. It makes more sense to identify her as the daughter of king Juba, who we know from Pausanias 1.17.2 was known in Athens as 'the Libyan'.