

ANTHONY J. WOODMAN, (ed., comm.). *Tacitus. The annals of Tacitus book 4*. Cambridge classical texts and commentaries, 58, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018, xxi+349 pp., £84.00, ISBN 978-1-108-41961-1.

“The present book should be read on the assumption that its contents are more or less entirely new” (x). Readers of Tacitus’ *Annals* who make Tony Woodman (henceforth W.) their first port of call for elucidation now have a new resource for guidance on Book 4. The many strengths of this exemplary commentary will be familiar from W.’s earlier volumes in the Cambridge “orange” series, most recently his 2017 commentary on *Annals* 5-6; I will not rehearse them here.¹ Instead, I will focus on W.’s new contributions to the understanding of Tacitus’ work.

That is easier said than done, since the volume does not include even a list of places where this edition’s text of Book 4 differs from that of earlier editions or W.’s 2004 translation. So I begin by listing innovations in the text,² i.e., passages where the present text of *Annals* 4 differs from that of Martin and Woodman 1989 or W.’s 2004 translation³:

4.3.1 *quia ui tot simul corripere intutum et dolus interualla scelerum posebat*. W.’s transposition of *et* produces a more logically coherent sentence than Nipperdey’s earlier excision but implies a less plausible two-step innovation. And few editors have been persuaded that even the simpler emendation is necessary. Brackets in the text—e.g., [*et*] *quia* ... <*et*> *dolus*—would have made the editorial intervention more visible. The logic of *tamen* in the following sentence remains problematic whichever of the readings one adopts, and W. is the only modern editor to flag the problem by reporting repairs in the apparatus; likewise the only editor to report a third approach to the problem of *et*, namely, Fuchs’ insertion of a lacuna after it.

4.12.1 *principium ... fauoris*. With his insertion of a lacuna between *principium* and *fauoris* W. signals a hitherto unnoticed logical problem, namely, the fact that the *fauor* for Germanicus’ family did not begin after the death of Drusus but had long been palpable: “*principium fauoris* therefore makes no sense” (117). The supplement

¹ See my *Histos* review at <https://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/2017RD06DamomonWoodman.pdf>. (accessed 18 January 2019).

² For some passages where the 1989 text differs from that of prior editions see the reviews by Oakley (*Classical Review* 41 [1991] 341-345, esp. 342-343) and Borzák (*Gymnasium* 98 [1991] 281-283).

³ R. H. Martin and A. J. Woodman, *Tacitus: Annals Book IV*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge 1989; A. J. Woodman, *Tacitus: The Annals*, Indianapolis 2004.

suggested in the commentary, <*aucti*>, would have been welcome in the apparatus.

4.12.2 *ferax scelerum*. This emendation to M's syntactically and logically problematic description of Sejanus as *ferox scelerum*, proposed independently by Hartman (1905) and Harrison (1994), was first adopted in the 2004 translation.

4.13.2 *ob atrocitatem temporum*. In this explanation for the deportation of the consular Vibius Serenus to Amorgus W. restores the reading of M to the text; Martin and Woodman, like most modern editors, print Lipsius' emendation *ob atrocitatem morum*. Arguments beyond the implicit dittography are presented in the commentary.

4.14.1 *ea tempestate qua*. W. prints a transposition proposed by Rhenanus instead of excising *ea*, as Rhenanus suggested doing to repair this temporal expression. This transposition, which is more plausible than that of *et* at 4.3.1 since it involves adjacent words, is defended in the commentary by the expression's recurrence at 6.8.1.

4.26.2 *perculsa gens nec culpae nescia*. In this description of the Garamantes, who had sent a delegation to Rome to exculpate themselves for complicity with the now-defeated Tacfarinas, W. prints the text proposed by Ryckius as a repair for M's rather nonsensical *perculsa gens et culpae nescia*. Earlier editors generally preferred Lipsius' emendation *perculsa gens et culpae conscia*. W.'s arguments from Tacitean usage are cogent.

4.26.2 *more <honor>, missusque*. W. defends printing *honor* instead of the more generally accepted *honos* on palaeographical grounds. M has *more omissusque*, corrected by an unknown hand with sub- and suprascript dots to *more missusque*. It would have been useful to indicate that the scholar who suggested *honos* also excised *-que*.⁴

4.31.3 *ut <se iur>e iurando obstringeret*. W. here combines previously proposed emendations so that the passage makes sense and is syntactically complete. Earlier editors sometimes printed *se iurando* or *et iurando* or else *iure iurando* with an inferred *se*. The commentary on this lemma—"M reads *uteiurando*, with a superscript *t* added as if to make three words, *ut et iurando*"—is a bit misleading, since the "t" was clearly added by a later hand.⁵

⁴ Similarly at 4.46.1, where in addition to adding <*in*> before *montium* Bezenberger altered the preceding *qui* to *quae*.

⁵ Similarly, ee.g., at 4.67.1 *abdidit] addidit* (*suprascr.* b) M; 4.70.3 *adis] adisset* (*sed t deletum*) M; 4.73.2 *pellunt] pelluntur* (*ur deletum*) M; 4.73.4 *confectos] confelctos* (*suprascr.* c) M. A reference to Goodyear's discussion of Beroaldus' annotations to M in first volume of the "orange" *Annals* (F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus: Volume I (Annals 1.1-54)*, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 15, Cambridge 1972) would have made the implications of such apparatus notes clearer, although even here the reader will not find anything specific about corrections in the text bloc: "In its (*sc.* M's) margins we find numerous annotations; they are usually attributable to the first editor of *Annals* 1-6, Beroaldus the younger" (3). For further particulars the reader should have recourse to the works cited by Goodyear ad loc., especially Rostagno's introduction to the facsimile edition: "in codice ipso

4.33.1 [*haud*] *diuturna esse potest* (*sc. rei publicae forma*). In this comment on the mixed constitution W. is the first modern editor to implement Madvig's excision of a word "mistakenly added" by someone who did not grasp the elegant but elliptical sentence structure.

4.33.2 *neque alia <fiducia> rerum quam si unus imperitet*. The addition of *fiducia* is a new intervention in a sentence that seems to contain the clearest (if corrupt) expression of Tacitus' views on the principate. A key sentence, in other words. The widely divergent repairs are listed in the apparatus and discussed in the commentary; as W. notes, the omission of *fiducia* is easier to explain (homoeoteleuton) than the innovations implicit in other repairs (e.g., *rerum <salute> or re Rom<ana>*).

4.33.4 *Tum <adnotatum> quod*. Homoeoteleuton also explains the omission of the supplement placed in the text here; in the apparatus W. also suggests *adnotandum*, which makes somewhat better sense. Other editors accept the rather casual expression transmitted by M (which I translated as "Plus this," and W. as "Then there is the fact that"), or excise or emend *quod*.⁶

4.35.5 *neque aliud [externi reges aut] qui eadem saevitia usi sunt*. W. banishes "foreign kings" from Tacitus' famous comment on bookburning, extending the excision of *aut* proposed earlier by Hartman and rightly critiqued by W. (204 n. 84). Why does M have kings? The answer is not very satisfactory: "wrongly added for some unknown reason" (204). Readers of Tacitus now have a new motivation for taking a good look at the historian's uncharacteristic outburst.

4.40.5 *qui <ad> te inuitum perrumpunt omnibusque de rebus consulunt*. In this excerpt from the letter in which Tiberius denies Sejanus' request for Livilla's hand W. uses a Livian expression and a Horatian parallel—the pest taking aim at Maecenas (S. 1.9.54–56)—to get rid of the peculiar transitive construction of *perrumpunt* transmitted by M. But given that *inuitum* is itself an emendation for M's *inuite* (Heinsius'; Beroaldus proposed *inuito*), it may be that work remains to be done here; the parallel passage in Dio quoted in the note would be a good place to start (57.21.4).

4.41.1 *non tam de matrimonio sed altius metuens*. Arguing against Muretus' widely accepted *iam* on logical grounds—"there was no hint that Sejanus was 'afraid' when he wrote to Tib."—W. restores M's *tam* to the text. Muretus probably thought that it didn't make a lot of sense for Sejanus to be worried about a marriage that Tiberius was unlikely to permit, but *tam ... metuens* may reflect the anxious state of mind produced by dealing with an emperor who clearly opposes the proposed alliance but says "*ceterum neque tuis neque Liiviae destinatis aduersabor*" (4.40.7).

loca corrupta ac mendosa non solum parvis crucibus adpositis indicavit (*sc. Beroaldus*) ... verum etiam modo in textu corripit modo in margine emendavit." (H. Rostagno, *Tacitus: Codex Laurentianus Mediceus 68.I phototypice editus* [Leiden1902] XIV).

⁶ C. Damon, *Tacitus, Annals*, London 2013, ad loc.; Woodman 2004: ad loc.

4.44.1 *dein magnae opes innocenter paratae et modeste habitae*. In printing *paratae* W. (like Borzsák) restores the reading of M to the text, displacing Lipsius' widely accepted *partae*, which Heubner pronounced a "correction," as though the extra letter was just a slip of the pen. W. cites parallels for both verbs.

4.45.3 *sed Piso Termestinatorum dolo caesus habe<ba>tur, qui pecunias e publico interceptas acrius ... cogebat*. Interrelated textual problems in adjacent words are at issue here: W. replaces M's surprising present tense with the imperfect proposed by Pluygers and accepts M's relative pronoun where other editors emend, to either *quippe* (following Bezenberger) or *quia* (following Pichena). With W.'s text the reason for Piso's murder was an object of speculation in the narrative present; with the present tense verb and an explanatory clause it is an object of speculation in the author's present. Both historical context and M's habit of omitting medial syllables are cited in defense of the text printed here.

4.47.2 *montem ... angusto et aequali dorso continuum*. W. prints Courtney's emendation for M's *angustum*, arguing that ridges, not mountains, are narrow in Latin historiography. It is easy to see how the corruption might have arisen.

4.52.3 *correptamque Graeco uersu admonuit* (sc. *Agrippinam*). In his translation W. rendered *arreptamque* rather than the more violent term of the transmitted text. Here he relegates it to the apparatus and explains its merits in a note.

4.57.1 *Caesar <proficiscitur> in Campaniam*. In this announcement of the first phase of Tiberius' Campanian retirement, where editors have often been content to infer a verb, W. supplies one (*alii alia*). The text is smoother, but it may not be better. The pros and cons are well laid out in the commentary.

4.59.3 *adsimulabatque uindicis partes*. W. follows Borzsák in adopting Shackleton Bailey's emendation of M's *iudicis* and defends it with a good note.

4.64.2 *actaeque ei grates apud senatum <et> ab illustribus*. This emendation, proposed by Stein on the grounds that "nowhere else in Latin are senators described as *illustres*" (297) will be of interest to historians. W. suggests that the omission may also have deprived us of the noun modified by *illustribus*.

4.67.3 †*nominibus et molibus*†. W. retains the cruxes applied in 1989, relegating to the apparatus *amoenitatibus*, the emendation for *nominibus* adopted in his translation.

The changes to this fairly stable—if by no means problem-free—text are modest in number and scope: W. restores the text of M on four occasions, prints a new emendation of his own in nine spots, and emendations by other hands in eight. The emendation numbers are smaller than those I reported for W.'s 2017 commentary on *Annals* 5-6, a shorter text (fourteen and nineteen

respectively). The difference probably reflects the fact that some of the work that went into the constitution of the text was done for the 1989 Martin and Woodman edition. Be that as it may, the text offered here is manifestly the result of a thorough reconsideration of every word, sentence, paragraph, and punctuation mark.⁷ The innovations in the apparatus suggest the extent of W.'s rethinking. About twenty-five diagnostic emendations proposed by W. and others are reported in the apparatus, many of them either new or newly restored to consideration.⁸ Another indication of W.'s scrutiny is the new punctuation, which is most visible in the addition,⁹ repositioning,¹⁰ and subtraction¹¹ of the round brackets and dashes that mark parentheses.

It is impossible to do justice to the 280 pages of commentary in the space of a review, even limiting the purview to new material. The scale of this commentary is obviously different from that of the 1989 edition with its 187 smaller-format pages. A comparison of the two sets of notes for 4.32-35 will suffice to indicate how W. has used the extra space.

Broadly speaking, in the new notes for the historiographic digression and the trial of Cremutius Cordus there is both new interpretation and more detailed discussion of parallel passages, particularly Greek and poetic parallels. For example, W. proposes a new analysis of the structure of the digression (concentric rings instead of triads), and a rich discussion of the literary tradition of second prefaces that supplements the earlier material

⁷ However, the manuscript evidence, such as it is, could have been reported more precisely. Many corrections in M go unreported, leaving the reader to infer that a correction is the original reading. (This is a fault common to many modern editions of *Annals* 1-6.) Examples from the first five chapters include: 4.3.1 *corripere* (M has *corpipere*; the suprascript correction by a later hand noted only by Wuilleumier and Borzsák), 4.3.2 *Seiano* (M has *sese |iano*; the deletion of the extra syllable is noted only by Wuilleumier and Borzsák), 4.3.4 *foedabat* (M has *foedebat*; noted only by Borzsák), 4.4.1 *senatus* (M has *senatu*; the suprascript correction by a later hand is noted only by Wuilleumier and Borzsák), 4.5.1 *remige* (M has *remite*; the suprascript correction by a later hand is noted only by Wuilleumier and Borzsák), 4.5.2 *cum ex usu temporis huc* (the fact that both *ex* and *huc* are corrections is noted only by Wuilleumier and Borzsák).

⁸ A list of useful new apparatus material for the final third of the book will give a sense of the types and frequency: 4.55.3 [in Graeciam] in Graecia<e regione>m *Fuchs*; 4.59.3 [adsimulabatque] dissimulabatque *Kritz*; 4.60. uultu *secl. Ritter*; 4.62.1 [celebraret] celebraretur *Wex*; 4.62.3 <felices> ut tali sorte *Wex, alii alia*; 4.62.3 noscebant] poscebant *Neue*; 4.69.2 quanto] quando *Manutius*; 4.74.2 *fort. <ut> uisendi*. The attentive reader will find further suggestions for textual repairs in the commentary. See above on 4.12.1, plus, e.g., 4.11.2 *Tiberio <hoc uel haec uel scelus> obiectaret*.

⁹ New parentheses include: 4.3.4 —*cui auunculus Augustus, socer Tiberius, ex Druso liberi*—; 4.35.1 (*Non attingo Graecos, quorum non modo libertas, etiam libido impunita; aut si quis aduertit, dictis dicta ultus est.*); 4.40.6 (*hercule!*); 4.61—*quoad uixit*—; 4.73.4 (*quem Baduhennae uocant*).

¹⁰ New boundaries for parentheses include: 4.57.2 (*quippe ... instincta*); 4.65x (*nam ... dissentiunt*).

¹¹ Passages no longer marked as parenthetical by brackets or dashes: 4.4.1, 4.6.2, 4.20.2-3, 4.34.3, 4.35.2, 4.56.1, 4.56.3, 4.64.1.

on digressions.¹² On *leuia* at 4.32.1 he cites Pliny the younger, a Horatian epistle, a Senecan tragedy, and Juvenal as well as Livy, and in the new note on 4.32.2 *immota ... pax* he quotes Philo. As one would expect, textual problems are more salient; for example in the note on 4.33.1 the defence of *conflata* is much more robust than it was in 1989 and W. has opted for a new reading, Madvig's excision of *haud*.¹³ The reader is welcomed into the editor's workshop by new notes about punctuation, such as that on 4.34.3 *in primis*. The literary critic comes to the fore in the exciting new note on 4.34.2 *uerba mea*, which begins "This is a brilliant opening." Likewise in the many notes about Tacitean usage, metaphors, irony, word play, metrical patterns, and sound effects, all more detailed than their predecessors, and occasionally less dogmatic: the label "commonplace" is applied to 4.32.2 *ex quis ... motus oriuntur* in both commentaries, but the query about the meaning of *motus* is new.¹⁴ Rhetorical theory, although present in both commentaries, gets more play here: in the first five pages of the discussion of the digression W. mentions *insinuatio* (172), *oppositio in imitatione*, ἀντίθεσις, *amplificatio*, and *litotes* (174), *syncretis* and *aemulatio* (175); only *aemulatio* appeared in the comparable section of the earlier commentary. More historical context is provided, as well, for example in the note on 4.34.2 *in principem ... amplectitur*, where W. draws attention to and resolves a historical conundrum concerning the charge under which Cassius Severus was convicted and banished, and in the note on 4.32.1 *fusos captosque reges*, where some relevant *reges* are identified.¹⁵ Scholarly *akribeia* is visible in notes such as that on 4.32.1 *si ... praeuerterent*, where W. critiques the *TLL* entry on *praeuerto*; in the earlier edition a gloss sufficed.¹⁶ Visible too is scholarly *aequitas*, as in the note on 4.35.2 *num ... incendio*, in which W. registers a variety of interpretations in addition to the one he himself favors.

As was the case with the commentary on *Annals* 5–6, the brief introduction to this volume (3–12) assumes the reader's access to other volumes in the "orange" series; for once the 1989 commentary is substantially fuller, as befits its stand-alone nature. The present introduction focuses on structure and the pervasive Sallustianism of Tacitus' account of Sejanus' rise to power and Book 4 more generally. Sallust also receives distinctive attention in the General Index, where by contrast with the entries on Livian and Seneca

¹² For another revision to a structural analysis see the introduction to 4.34–45 (188).

¹³ Other textual notes in these chapters pertain to 4.32.1 *composuere*, 4.33.2 *euentis*, 4.33.2 <*fiducia*>, 4.33.3 *exitii*, 4.33.4 <*adnotatum*>, 4.33.4 *Romanasne*, 4.34.4 *opibus*, 4.35.5 [*externi reges aut*].

¹⁴ Cf. on 4.33.3 *obuia*: "but the adj. perhaps suggests also ...".

¹⁵ Also new are scholarly citations such as the references to *MRR* in the otherwise nearly identical notes on 4.32.1 *discordias ... certamina*. For *FRHist* W. uses the abbreviation *FRH* (xiii).

¹⁶ Even glosses are rethought, as at 4.33.4 *arguens*: "exposing/indicting" in 1989, "demonstrating/criticising" here.

“expressions” and Ciceronian “phraseology” there are headings for “Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* alluded to” and “other allusions,” which between them garner forty-five references. Given its scale and embeddedness in the host series, this volume will not displace the 1989 commentary from its well deserved place in Latin literature classes, but it will fill the last gap in the “orange” *Annals* 1-6 with a bountiful cornucopia of new ideas about Tacitus. *Plaudite!*

Cynthia Damon
University of Pennsylvania
cdamon@sas.upenn.edu.

