2.4 and 2.5, while the comparison of young humans as calves similarly sets 2.5 and 2.8 together.

N. plausibly regards the first three books of the Odes as having pre-publication access to the Aeneid, and makes a number of intertextual connections (summarised 462–3). These are often fairly loose and general (the two Lalages of 1.22 and 2.5 look to Lavinia as a virginal figure, the catalogue of conquered places in 2.9 looks to Aeneid 6, and the Punic foes of 2.12 look to Dido) and not all will believe the link made through the picture of Ganymede at the end of 3.20 to the Aeneid and Actium. Other intertextual possibilities are less stressed: though N. rightly lays considerable emphasis on interaction with elegy in general in the erotic odes, there is no suggestion that the elegist Albius of 1.33 is Tibullus, and not much is made of the potential (lost) elegiac output of the poet Valgius in 2.9, while the skinakes or Persian dagger of 1.27 is not linked with its occurrence in Anacreon (PMG 455) and no allusion is made to the evident Sapphic origin of the jealousy-symptoms of 1.13 (fr. 31 L/P).

In sum, this is a refreshingly independent-minded set of close readings of Horace’s erotic odes. Not all of these are convincing, and the book would gain considerably from more interaction with the scholarly environment created by the work of others and from a tighter and less associative mode of argumentation; but its analyses are often stimulating in their questioning of received interpretations and sometimes offer persuasive new insights. Few readers of the Odes will fail to learn from it.

Oxford

S. J. Harrison


Four years after the publication of Cynthia Damon’s commentary on the Histories 1 (see this journal 77, 2005, 418–421) Cambridge University Press has produced another volume, giving detailed discussion of the next book of this work. Of the four Tacitean volumes which have appeared so far in the ‘green and yellow’ series (the other two are R.H. Martin and A.J. Woodman on Ann. 4 and R. Mayer on Dial.) the present one gives the most extensive commentary, with a Latin text to notes ratio of approx. 1:8,5 as compared to 1:5 in Damon, 1:4,7 in Martin and Woodman and 1:3,8 in Mayer. Its author, Rhiannon Ash [= A.] (currently Fellow and Tutor in Classics at Merton College, Oxford), has been dealing with Tacitus [= T.] for several years, having published, among others, an important book on the Histories (Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus’ Histories, London 1999).

Prefacing the present volume, A. expresses her hope that the commentary «manages to steer a safe path between the Scylla (lack of relevance) and Charybdis (lack of clarity) faced by all commentators» (VII). This mythological (and nautical) image has been used by her before, in the title of her paper Between Scylla and Charybdis? Historiographical Commentaries on Latin Historians (in: The Classical Commentary. Histories, Practices, Theory, ed. by R.K. Gibson and C. Shuttelworth, Leiden 2002, 269–294). She makes there an important distinc-
tion between a historical and historiographical commentary and exemplifies this distinction with G.E.F. Chilver’s avowedly historical notes on Hist. 2,93 and her own on the same chapter (it is instructive to compare her draft commentary of 2002 with the final version of 2007). Her basic assumption is that «the literary and historical elements of an ancient historical text are equally important» (269) and it would be wrong to try and extract one of these elements from the whole. In fact, one of the main characteristics of her commentary on Hist. 2 is the ‘holistic’ approach to the Tacitean text, showing now and again that T. is both a historian and literary artist. To quote once more from her preface, «[t]he goal throughout has been to elucidate how Tacitus’ style and arrangement of material impose meaning on complex historical events» (VII).

Hist. 2 is «arguably the most complex book of an already complex narrative» (12), giving an account, in its first half, of the war between the Vitellians and Othonians culminating in the battle of Bedriacum and the suicide of Otho (but the first seven chapters deal, significantly, with Vespasian), and, in the second half, of the beginning of Vitellius’ principate (here, T.’s Vitellian narrative is divided into two sections with the description of the Flavian challenge placed in between). A.’s introduction (1–36) serves as a good guide through the complexities of T.’s subject and presentation and her discussions of the historian’s style (14–21) and ‘moralising allusions’ (24–26) are particularly valuable. Inevitably, the question of T.’s sources and parallel tradition (esp. Plutarch’s biography of Otho, but also Suetonius, Cassius Dio and Flavius Josephus) has to be tackled; A. illustrates the issue by comparing T.’s and Plutarch’s accounts of Otho’s suicide (30f). And of course, any discussion of Hist. 2, a book ending with the famous censure of scriptores temporum, qui potiente rerum Flavia domo monimenta belli huiusce composuerunt (101,1), must contain some discussion of T.’s attitude to the Flavian historiography; according to A., «T. uses a range of techniques to demonstrate to his readers that he is no tame Flavian puppet» (33). Finally, there is a short explanation of the textual tradition. A. uses the Teubner text of Heinz Heubner with a few departures listed on p. 36; the text (37–72) has no apparatus, but many textual problems are discussed in the commentary. A. usually draws our attention to passages where the Medicean is evidently corrupt and supplies information about to whom a given emendation is owed, but sometimes she tacitly accepts a standard conjecture without indicating the manuscript reading (and without pointing out that this is, in fact, a conjecture); thus e.g. 8,2 erecti Weissborn (erectis M); 11,3 pedes ire Madvig (pedestre M).

The commentary (73–381) is divided into 21 units, each given its own title (e.g. 1–7: Titus, Vespasian and a bid for power; 46–51: Farewell to Otho: final speeches, suicide, and obituary), and each preceded by a general introduction; all this helps the reader to better grasp the structure and meaning of the book. The 21 introductions differ significantly from Vorbemerkungen to particular narrative units in the commentary of Heubner (Heidelberg 1968): they are much

1 Most important are 7,1 discordiam his ignaviam luxuriem; et suismet vitiis; 100,3 legiones ·pars Cremonam, pars Hostiliam petere iussae. At 40, «the worst crux in T.» (186), she obelizes Padi et Aduae but in the commentary inclines to accept Nipperdey’s proposal (recently recalled by M.G. Morgan) to treat these words as a gloss on confluentes fluminum.
shorter, much less concerned with detail and the history of research, and they concentrate on evaluating T.’s methods in shaping a given episode (on Otho’s suicide A. has one page, Heubner nine pages). On the other hand, A.’s commentary proper is more extensive than Heubner’s and, most importantly, much more differentiated (Heubner deals there especially with T.’s language), covering some of the material treated by the German scholar in his introductory remarks. As has been said, the characteristic trait of A.’s commentary is its taking into account various aspects of the text and, what is particularly significant, not treating them separately. A good illustration of this approach may be found in notes on T.’s language and style (esp. syntax), showing how certain stylistic features of his Latin (such as ‘appendix sentences’) serve as vehicles to bring home messages not explicitly stated in the text (thus e.g. 268 on 69,1: «the syntax reinforces the prevailing power structure. The senators are relegated to an abl. absolute...»; 310 on 80,1: «the elaborate syntax reflects the confusion and excitement of the proclamation...»; 356 on 92,1: «[t]he appended abl. absolute...subordinates the mercu-rial Vitellius to his powerful generals, who should be courting him»). A. pays especial attention to T.’s vocabulary, so different from that of Cicero or Caesar. This aspect of her commentary links it with that of Heubner, but the differences are more significant than the similarities. Heubner’s and A.’s notes on ducto at 100,2 (scriptit Fabius Valens exercitui, quem ipse ductaverat) may serve as a case in point. H. says only that «exercitum ductare ist sallustianische Wendung» and cites some examples from that historian, together with Quint. Inst. 8,3,44 (who criticizes this usage on the grounds that it may evoke obscene associations, because the verb’s usual meaning is ‘to take home a prostitute’). A., on the other hand, wants to interpret T.’s use of ducto in this particular passage (rather than simply stating the Sallustian provenance of the phrase); according to her, T. deliberately exploits the obscene connotations of the verb in order to implicitly upbraid Valens whose «propensity for sexual misdemeanours» was well known (376f).

As may be expected from the author of Ordering Anarchy. Armies and Leaders in Tacitus’ Histories, A. makes ample use of ancient military writers (esp. Vegetius) to illustrate points in T.’s civil war narrative (see 141. 145. 153, etc.). It is a pity, though, that we look in vain in the index (399–408; there is also an index of Latin words, 409–415) for entries such as ‘Frontinus’, ‘Vegetius’ or even ‘military handbooks’. Her parallels and examples (also referring to non-military topics) are not limited to antiquity; it is a fine feature of her commentary that she provides references to both modern literature (ranging from Shakespeare and Racine to Orwell and Dylan Thomas) and modern history (e.g. 96 on «the extraordinary Prussian clockmaker, Karl Wilhelm Naundorff, who, from 1831 onwards, successfully convinced many people that he was Louis XVII, who died in 1793», an intriguing parallel to the false Nero of ch. 8). Occasionally, A. makes use of contemporary language in order to say something more pointedly, such as when she calls Galerius Trachalus «Otho’s ‘spin-doctor’» (243. 256, cf. 351) or when she describes one of Vitellius’ financial measures as «a shrewd public relations gambit» (363), but she manages to keep such anachronistic idiom within reasonable limits.
A. is fair in acknowledging her debt to fellow scholars (notably to E.J. Kenney), as well as to fellow commentators: she refers esp. to Woodman and Martin on *Ann.* 3, Martin and Woodman on *Ann.* 4 and S.P. Oakley on Livy 6–10 (but less often to Heubner and Chilver). Her bibliography (382–398) is vast but, quite understandably, selective; as she herself admits in her 2002 paper, she has decided to omit some references to secondary literature «on the grounds that those using the commentary are unlikely to have access to such material» (288). Even so, it is a pity that she does not include Heubner’s highly important dissertation from 1913 (Studien zur Darstellungskunst des Tacitus, Würzburg) and the fundamental work by Einar Löfstedt, still valuable for any discussion of T.’s style (Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins, vol. 2, Lund 1913).

There are some misprints and slips of the pen; most irritating are those on p. 25 (read *Cat.* for *Jug.* thrice), 35 (read Beraldo for Beraldo), 124 (read Bannon for Damon: the reference is to the former’s The Brothers of Romulus, not to the latter’s The Mask of the Parasite; cf. the curious entry in the bibliography on p. 385), 219 (read Pansa for Pansus), 270 (read res stat for stat res), 320 (read Agriola’s for Agrippa’s), 329 (read *magistri* for unlatin *magistribus*), 339 (read Fuscus for Friscus), 366 (read Patrobius for Polybius). There are also several discrepancies between the text and lemmata in the commentary (e.g. 239. 268. 379).

What follows are some more detailed observations on A.’s notes on particular passages: 2.1: curiously, A. gives no comment on *su quum patrii ingenio moderatus*; one might expect at least a reference to Suet. Tit. 1 and 7. 5.1: to the references cited on con-silium...manus add a fine dictum by Scipio the Elder (quoted by Front. *Strat.* 4.7.4): *Imperatorem me mater, non bellatorem peperit*; 7.1: at 1150,1 ignavia (and laxaria, for that matter) is attributed to both Otho and Vitellius, not just to the latter. 8.1: on *fingentes creditibus* A. notes the parallel with *Ann.* 5.10.2 but does not discuss the paradoxical juxtaposition of these two words (apparently, the same people concocted rumours about Nero and believed them); cf. 325.3 *factum esse scelus loquantur factuntque*; *Ann.* 14.9.3 *cредerat Agrippina contemperantque*. 13.4: T.’s remark on Bedriacum (*duabus iam Romanis cladibus notus infaustusque*) deserves more detailed commentary. This is a striking passage in which T. quite unexpectedly shifts from AD 69 to his own day (note *iam*, not e.g. *mox*: the reader may at first think that these battles have already been fought before the starting point of the historical narrative); moreover, *clades*, frequently used to denote great military disasters inflicted on the Roman people by foreign enemies (*clades Alliensis, Cannensis*, etc., cf. ThLL III 12444.26) appears here in the civil war context, so these disasters are inflicted on the Romans by their fellow countrymen. More generally, T.’s method of introducing the highly important place in an episode not particularly important on its own (one of Otho’s commanders happens to encamp in Bedriacum) resembles his technique of bringing in significant characters: many of them are introduced at an early stage, in episodes devoid of intrinsic historical significance (*Ann.* 1.32.2, Cassius Chaerea, 12.4.3: Eprius Marcellus; 11.72.1: Nerva). 18.1: dealing with *adjectives* beginning with *praee-*. A. mentions as «especially unusual» *praecauditus, praegaculis and praefervidus*: while the first two are probably coined by T., the third is attested as early as Accius (and appears also in Livy). 34.1: to avoid confusion, it should have been explained that Vitellius who crossed the Euphrates using a boat bridge is not the emperor Vitellius but his father. 35.2: commenting on *in oculis utriusque exercitus* A. says that «the presence of gladiators and their polarisation with the Germans suggests spectatorship for entertainment’s sake». Not quite, I think, because these spectators all the same engage emotionally in what is happening before their eyes (note *laetiora* and *acris...detestabantur*) and thus differ markedly from
those totally indifferent audiences which are watching the end of Galba (1, 32, 1) and the fighting in Rome in December 69 (3, 83, 1). Perhaps they are half way between the internal audience of Thuc. 7, 71 (a passage rightly adduced by A.) and the spectatror populus of Histories 1 and 3. 37–38: A’s introductory discussion of these famous chapters is brief but illuminating. She focuses, on the one hand, on a comparison with Plut. Otho 9 (ch. 37) and, on the other, on Sallust as T’s intertext in ch. 38. However, something might have been said also about the interesting structure of ch. 37 in which the sequence exercitus – duces Otthoniani – Paulus introduced in the first half is picked up in the second by Paulinus – exercitus – legatos ac duces. Also, it would have been useful to compare this chapter with Ann. 4, 10f. 43: speaking about legio XXI Rapax. A. notes that [a]lthough the legion has already featured...T. postpones its name until now, perhaps for paronomasia (83, 2). 91, 1: «T. joined the priestly quin-

A. rightly points to the reversal of roles after the battle of Bedriacum with Otho’s soldiers encouraging their defeated commander rather than vice versa; it may be added that this role reversal is further emphasized by T.’s use of the verb iubebat in reference to the soldiers (Otho is called imperator shortly before). 49, 2: T. omits the detail about Otho placidly snoring on his last night, preserved by Plut. Otho 17, 3. A. parallels the whole with Plutarch’s own description of the end of Cato the Younger. Interestingly, Pliny the Younger makes a similar observation about his uncle’s last sleep (Epist. 6, 16, 13). 49, 4: according to A., Otho «killed himself on the early morning of 17 Apr. 69» (also on 50, 2 and 54, 2). If we take (as A. does) 14 Apr. as the date of the battle of Bedriacum, the day of his suicide should be 16 Apr. For one thing, it is evident from T.’s narrative that only one day intervened between the battle and the suicide. For another, if the emperor had killed himself on 17 Apr., the news about his death could not have reached Rome by the evening of 18 Apr. (2, 55, 1; cf. C.L. Marison, Suetonius: Galba, Otho, Vitellius. Edited with Introduction and Notes, London 1992, p. 127). 54, 2: the distance from Andematunnum to Rome is stated as at least 600 miles; in fact some 900 miles. 55, 1: on Vitellio plausere A. limits herself to cross-refer to her comment on 3, 1 ipsa...cessere. This case, however, is unusual, because immediately before we have a verb with the ending -erunt (ut...attulerunt, Vitellio plausere): T. resorts to variatio in order to avoid the homoioteleuton. 63, 1: it might have been useful to point out that the case of Dolabella and his ‘friend’ Varus is a fine illustration of the theme signalized in T.’s preface where he sarcastically remarks that quibus debeat inimicus per amicos oppressis (1, 2.) with Damon ad loc. 63, 2: commenting on Vitellius’ wife Triaria, characterized as ultras femmam ferox, A. does not explain how to understand this phrase. There are two options: (1) Tr. was more fierce than other women (who are also fierce, but not to such a degree); (2) her fierceness situated her outside her sex (which means that fierceness and womanhood do not go together). A.’s two quotations from Velleius offer little help: the Fulvia passage (2, 74, 3) points to the second possibility, but the Maccenas passage (2, 88, 2) to the first. 69, 1: A. assumes that the senate’s envoys received by Vitellius in Ticinum are the senators who had left Rome with Otho in March and were mentioned for the last time in ch. 54 as staying in Bononia. But these senators had probably already returned to Rome and surely were not nominated as the senate’s envoy; senatus legatio refers to the embassy sent from Rome after the senatorial meeting of 19 Apr. (2, 62, 2). Dealing with T.’s account of sending back the Batavian cohorts to Germany A. rightly notes the proleptic dimension of his final comment, but oddly pays no attention to the tragic irony of ne qua dies tricen
tius audeverit, given as the reason for this move. 76, 2: contrary to her standard practice, A. does not comment on the noun sapor, a predominantly poetic word used only here in T. 84, 2: Muretus’ conjecture is certainly earlier than 1789; he died in 1583. 86, 1: commenting on vi praecipua Primi Antonii A. cross-refer to her note on inverted names at 53, 1, but omits to point out that here the inversion serves to juxtapose two adjectives of similar meaning. Also, it should have been remarked that haud cunctanter picks up cunctansbus from 83, 2. 87, 1: curiously, A. pays no attention to the ambiguity of petebat in T.’s description of Vitellius’ march towards Rome (gravi agmine urbem petebat), although she notes the verb’s ambiguity in another context (83, 2). 91, 1: «T. joined the priestly quin-
decimviral college in 88». In fact, by 88, a frequently committed inaccuracy. (On 95.1 A. says: «T., a former priest himself: why former?) 98.2: haec illave defensurus, prout invalescent is translated as «intending to use in his defence one set of exchanges or the other, depending on which strengthened his position» (although A. acknowledges that most scholars interpret these words differently). It is difficult to accept her reading. Yes, it is possible that haec illave refer to Valerius Festus’ proclamations and messages and defendo can mean ‘to use in one’s defence’ (ThLL V 1,304,29ff), but invalesco is obviously intransitive (‘to grow strong, become more powerful’) and it would be absurd to take haec illave, understood as Festus’ communications, as the subject of this verb. 99.2: on the syntax of the last sentence of this chapter A. notes only that admonebatur governs the genitives. But here the syntax is more complex in that we have first the genitives and then the objective clause with at; moreover, there is a slight shift in the meaning of the verb from ‘to remind sb of sth’ to ‘to urge sb to do sth’ (see Heubner ad loc.).

All these criticisms are, however, minor ones and they certainly do not detract from the value of the book. This is a splendid commentary, a fine embellishment to the Cambridge series. The voyage between the Scylla and Charybdis has ended successfully and A. deserves high praise for the competence of her steersmanship.

Wroclaw

Jakub Pigoń


La mole del commento di B. è imponente (circa 600 pagine). Vorrei anticipare, come valutazione generale, che in esso sono indagate tutte le questioni rilevanti, testuali ed esegetiche, poste dai testi, davvero nessuna esclusa, come negli auspici di ogni lettore, in particolare specialista. Siamo qui – ma la stessa cosa si può dire