

REVIEW–DISCUSSION

AERE PERENNIUS:
WOODMAN ON *ANNALES* V AND VI

A. J. Woodman, *The Annals of Tacitus, Books 5 and 6. Edited with a Commentary*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xxi + 325. Hardback, £89.99/\$140.00. ISBN 978-1-107-15270-0.

The volume under review completes the work on *Annals* 1–6 begun roughly fifty years ago with F. R. D. Goodyear’s text of and commentary on *Annals* 1.1–54.¹ Woodman (hereafter W.) gives us a text that has been rethought in every detail, from the location of the break between Books 5 and 6, which affects the structure of the hexad, down to the breaks between paragraphs, which affect the coherence of Tacitus’ narrative.² The commentary is a richly rewarding repository of notes bearing on Tacitus’ literary achievement and the history of the last years of Tiberius’ principate (29–37 CE). Each year of the narrative has a substantial introduction of its own, and, as we have come to expect from Woodman, the traces of the text’s themes, metaphors, and stylistic special effects are followed *nare sagaci*.³ (For standard Tacitean usage, however, the reader is often referred back to notes in the ‘Orange’ commentaries on *Annals* 1–3 and occasionally forward to the commentary on *Annals* 11 in the same series.⁴ So anyone who wants to get the full benefit of this edition will need to have the other volumes nearby.) Particular attention is devoted here to the sound of Tacitus’ prose, with graphic signs in the lemmata marking alliteration, assonance, patterned word order, and wordplay (101, n. 40). On the historical side, the notes on named individuals regularly include references to the relevant entries in *RE*, *PIR*, and *BNP*. The volume

¹ Goodyear (1972) and (1981); Martin and Woodman (1989); Woodman and Martin (1996).

² Many (but not all) of the new paragraph divisions were implemented in Woodman’s similarly revolutionary translation, *Tacitus: The Annals* (2004). The paragraph numbers are unchanged.

³ ‘Metaphor’ has the longest entry in the General Index, followed closely by ‘tyrant’ and ‘*variatio*’.

⁴ Malloch (2013).

concludes with an Appendix on Tacitus' Tiberius in which the entire hexad is immanent. Altogether, then, a monument of scholarship.⁵

One striking result of the embeddedness of this volume in the overall *Annals* 1–6 project is that its Introduction is entirely devoted to a question relevant only to *Annals* 5–6, namely, the location in time and text of the division between the two books. The location of the break affects our understanding of not only the structure of Book 5 (did it open and close with the politically consequential deaths of Livia and Sejanus?) but also the narrative economy of Tacitus' work (should the beginning of a book coincide with the beginning of a consular year?), to mention only two of the matters at issue.

W. places the break between *Annals* 5 and 6 at the beginning of 32 CE, or in textual terms at 6.1.1 *Cn. Domitius et Camillus Scribonianus consulatum inierant*, a book division proposed by Lipsius in the seventeenth century and defended—against a division in the lacuna before 5.6 proposed by Haase in 1848 and adopted by all subsequent editors—by Ando in 1997.⁶ Lipsius' book division is reflected in the standard numbering of the text and won the approbation of Syme for the prominence it gives to destructive political discord at the end of Book 5 (5.11.2 *odia in perniciem itura*).⁷ Another benefit of Lipsius' division is that Book 6 begins at the start of the consular year, as befits an annalistic narrative. Both Ando and W. maintain that this is Tacitus' standard practice—for the first hexad, and apart from the admittedly anomalous Book 1. But the variation admitted for dramatic effect in Book 3, which opens with Agrippina's journey, not the consuls of 20 CE, and the fact that Books 12, 13, 15, and 16 start mid-year should make us cautious about insisting on Tacitus' adherence to a policy of coincident book and year beginnings. As Haase noted, the transition from Book 11 (which ends with the death of Messalina) to Book 12 (which begins with the end of 48 CE) provides a parallel for the transition he hypothesized for Books 5 and 6.⁸

Paleographical considerations are also relevant. Unlike the other book divisions in the manuscript on which modern editions are based (the so-called 'first Medicean' or 'M'), Lipsius' division is not signaled by a *subscriptio*.⁹ If the

⁵ The present volume is bound to be read alongside the commentary on *Annals* 5–6 produced by Woodman's former co-author, Ronald Martin (2001), in the Aris and Philips series, but the two works are so different in scale and audience that I will only occasionally compare them here.

⁶ Haase (1848) esp. 152–3; Ando (1997).

⁷ Syme (1958) 267, quoted here on p. 9.

⁸ Haase (1848) 153.

⁹ There are *subscriptiones* after Books 1, 2, 3, and 4 in M; the bottom of the last folio of *Annals* 6 has been cut off after the final word of the text, *utebatur*, so it is impossible to say whether this division was marked by a *subscriptio*.

subscriptio originally existed, as seems likely, Tacitus' text of Books 5 and 6 suffered significant losses at three different points in its transmission: in the lacuna that deprives us of Tacitus' account of the dismissal and execution of Sejanus (before 5.6.1 *quattuor et quadraginta orationes*), in the lacuna between this reference to *orationes* and the *oratio* that picks up *in medias res* at 5.6.2 *mihi pudorem ... censui*, and at the transition between Books 5 and 6, where only the *subscriptio* was lost.¹⁰ Woodman does not take into account the fact that the third omission is different in kind from the first two, which left ragged edges in the text, when he suggests that 'Lipsius' assumption of a third omission does not seem unduly extravagant' (8). In my view the third omission is a significant obstacle to accepting Lipsius' division.

Haase based his argument on the relative brevity of Lipsius' Book 6 and the desirability of making Book 5 end with the political earthquake of Sejanus' downfall. As Woodman points out (7), Haase's Book 5 covers a relatively small number of years—2.75 years, by contrast with four for Book 2, three for Book 3, six for Book 4, and approximately six for Book 6—but the magnitude of Sejanus' fall might well have deformed the temporal economy of the narrative.¹¹

Woodman adds as a new point in favor of Lipsius' division the correspondence between the phases of Tiberius' life outlined in the obituary notice at 6.51.3 and the books of the Tiberian hexad. Noting (7) that 'the beginnings of the third and fourth stages are marked more or less explicitly at the beginnings of Books 4 and 5 respectively (cf. 4.1.1, 4.6.1; 5.3.1)', he suggests that the beginning of Book 6 should be likewise visible in the obituary's *in scelera ... ac dedecora prorupit* (sc. *Tiberius*). As he observes, Tiberius' sexual crimes are indeed prominent at the beginning of Lipsius' Book 6 (6.1.1 *scelerum et libidinum*). However, the alignment between obituary notice and books is imperfect: there is no obvious connection between the first two stages of the obituary outline and Books 1–3, and even the connection posited for Book 4 is rather loose, as the double reference above suggests, while for neither Book 4 nor Book 5 does the obituary notice point exclusively to the *first* chapter of the book.

¹⁰ The first two omissions must have occurred in a stage prior to M, since M's text (on f. 117r, pictured on p. 3) continues smoothly across them. The third could have occurred when M was being written.

¹¹ One might compare the effect of the Pisonian conspiracy on *Annals* 15, which covers two full years and parts of two others and ends with the conspiracy, not with the calendar year 65. For Tacitus' quantification of the downfall of the powerful see *Ann.* 4.18.1, where the reason imputed for the attack on the man who won the war against Sacrovir is *quod, ... quanto maiore mole procideret* (sc. *C. Silius*), *plus formidinis in alios dispergebatur*, with the fine notes *ad loc.* by Martin and Woodman (1989).

On balance, Haase's division still seems preferable, giving us a transition between Books 5 and 6 that reflects the tension between the annalistic framework and political time measured by the life-span of emperors and their closest associates.

Innovations in the text and apparatus are numerous. One particularly helpful feature of the layout is the marginal indication of the folios of M that underlie the text; the folio numbers assist the reader in aligning the text with the page images of M available online.¹² Woodman restores the text of M on three occasions,¹³ prints a new emendation (or obelus) of his own in fourteen spots,¹⁴ and emendations by other hands in nineteen;¹⁵ most of the latter have not achieved notice even in the apparatus of recent editions, let alone in the text. In the apparatus there are an additional two dozen or so emendations—proposed by Woodman and others—that are new or newly restored to consideration after a long stay in textual purgatory.

The consequences of one category of W.'s editorial decisions for our understanding of Tacitus' style can be seen clearly in the first of his emendations, in the first sentence of the text: 5.1.1 *Rubellio et Fufio consulibus, quorum utrique Geminus cognomentum erat, Iulia Augusta mortem obiit aetate extrema, <femina> nobilitatis per Claudiam familiam et adoptione Liuiorum Iuliorumque clarissimae*. The addition of <femina> clarifies the construction of the genitive *nobilitatis ... clarissimae*. The 'awkwardness' caused by its juxtaposition with the ablative *aetate extrema* deserves notice, but does it need to be fixed? Other editors and commentators pass over the spot in silence, and I would have welcomed explicit consideration

¹² <http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=TECA0000806171&keywords=tacitus> (accessed 8 October 2017).

¹³ W. prints the text of M where other editors adopt an emendation at 6.5.1 (W. uses dashes around *C. Caesarem ... cenam* to make M's text acceptable; editors often add <in>), 6.7.3 (proinde *M* : perinde *Rhenanus*), and 6.16.2 (plebis scitis *M* : plebi scitis *Nipperdey*).

¹⁴ Emendations by W. himself are printed at: 5.1.1; 6.1.2, 6.2, 10.1, 12.2, 20.1, 21.1, 26.1, 30.3, 35.1, 38.1, 38.2, 49.2. At 5.4.1 W. obelizes †germanicis titium paenitentiae senis†, noting three possible repairs in the apparatus; he gives an informative discussion of the spot's problems in the commentary. Obelization is a reasonable approach here—none of the complicated repairs proposed so far has won general acceptance—but W.'s crux may contain more than it needs to: both *paenitentiae* and *senis* are appropriate to the context, even if their syntax is at present obscure (for *paenitentia* with subjective genitive cf. *H.* 1.32.2 *daret malorum paenitentiae ... spatium*, *Ann.* 6.44.1 *praeueniens ... amicorum paenitentiam*). It would have been helpful to include in the apparatus the doubt (expressed in n. 11) about the reading of M (germanicis ti- or germanici fa-? at 116v.24).

¹⁵ For emendations by other scholars see n. 21 below.

in this connection of the degree to which Tacitus' Latin is designedly disconcerting.¹⁶ As was mentioned above, *variatio* comes up frequently in the commentary's notes, as do other types of challenging expression (ellipse, syllepsis, zeugma, etc.). Another emendation that streamlines the syntax can be found at 6.1.2 (minae *Woodman* : minas *M*), where the nominative *minae* does away with either an ellipse or a zeugma.¹⁷ The emendation printed at 6.6.2 (male *Woodman* : malis *M*) substitutes a common expression for an anomalous one. At 6.10.1, where W. says that it is 'impossible to know what Tacitus wrote', he opts for a connecting relative pronoun (qu<ae qui>a *Woodman* : qua *M* : quia *Muretus* : quae *Huet* : alii *alia*) that sounds more Ciceronian than Tacitean. Further smoothing is effected at 6.12.2 (neu quae *Woodman* : neque *M* : neue *Ernesti*) and 6.38.2 (eo <in> metu *Woodman* : eo |metu *M* : eo metu *vulg.*). The latter emendation is plausible, but perhaps not necessary: the phrase *eo metu* expresses Trio's motivation for suicide, not (as W. suggests) for what he wrote in his will. True, Tacitus omits to mention the suicide, but it is implicit in the context.¹⁸

Several of W.'s emendations alert readers to hitherto unseen problems in the text. At 6.20.1, for example, W. prints *Capreis* for M's *capreas* and provides a useful note in the commentary on the chronological and syntactical difficulties in the phrase *discedenti Capreas*. However, his repair reduces the association between Caligula and his grandfather here to a joint journey from Capri to Antium, despite the fact that the rest of the sentence pertains to Caligula's relationship with Tiberius on Capri (6.20.1 *animum ... tegens, ... non ... rupta uoce ... pari habitu haud multum distantibus uerbis*); the suggestion that Caligula's prolonged stay with Tiberius on Capri was mentioned not here but perhaps 'in the lost part of Book 5' does not remove all of the obstacles to accepting *Capreis*. Another chronological problem is highlighted by the repair printed at 6.21.1 (super ta<cito> *Woodman* : superta *M* : super ta<nto> *Ruperti* : super ta *Pichena*). The commentary's crisp rejection of Pichena's frequently printed emendation—'quite out of place'—puts perhaps undue weight on the chronological inversion mentioned by W.: even if Tiberius' prediction about Galba

¹⁶ By contrast, the repair printed at 6.30.3 (*cetera [adverb.] Woodman* : *ceterarum M, secl. Krömer*), where editors usually follow M, creates an awkward adverbial *cetera*; neither of the Tacitean parallels cited in the commentary is a particularly good comparandum. Krömer's repair-by-excision, usefully revived in W.'s apparatus, makes some sense, since the adjective, which is anomalous in the formula *rerum potiri*, might have been supplied to fix a perceived logical inconcinnity in the proposed 'deal' between Gaetulicus and Tiberius: *firmarent uelut foedus quo princeps [ceterarum] rerum poteretur, ipse prouinciam retineret*.

¹⁷ At 6.1.2 W. also reports (for the first time in a modern edition) Heinsius' more complicated repair: *dono* (for *dona*) *in promptos, minis aduersum abnuentes*.

¹⁸ This is one of many spots that shows how carefully W. has gone over the text for this edition, since it represents a change of mind from his 2004 translation.

occurs some forty years after his consultation of Thrasyllus, the prediction precedes the consultation in the text (6.20.2) and can therefore serve as a point of reference for the demonstrative *tali*.

At 6.38.1 W. attends to a chronological problem that has been seen but not fixed (*quamquam* <qua>*driennio* Woodman post Nipperdey : *quamquam triennio* M): as W. explains, the correct number of consular years (four: 32, 33, 34, 35 CE) can be restored to the text by assuming that *qua* fell out after *quamquam* and that the orthography of what remained was ‘corrected’ to *trienio*. At 6.49.2 W. offers a textual solution to a historical problem (*patris* <eius> Woodman : *patris* M : *patrum* Rhenanus). The context is a meeting of the senate in which a mother, name unknown, is accused of driving her son to suicide. According to M, she grovels before the *genua patris*. In the commentary W. argues that *patris* alone is ambiguous (her father? her son’s father?) and that the son’s father, having been consul the previous year, was probably in attendance at the meeting. The addition of <eius> to clarify the reference is a more persuasive emendation than Rhenanus’ *patrum*, referring to the assembled senators.¹⁹ But it might have been better to put <eius> in the apparatus as a diagnostic repair, since the mother’s divorce, which is mentioned as the starting point of the alleged crime (6.49.1 *pridem repudiata*), together with her appeal to ‘shared grief’ (6.49.2 *luctum ... communem*), may suffice to evoke her ex-husband, the victim’s father.

The last two of W.’s emendations to be discussed again address problems of Latinity. At 6.35.1 W. proposes a transposition to clarify a stylized description of a battle between Parthians and Sarmatians: *ut conserta acies* M (*ut transpos. ante corporibus* Woodman). Most editors retain the paradosis by assuming that the *cum*-clause runs to *pellerentur*; with W.’s repair, which creates an independent sentence, it is necessary to take *ut ... pellerentur* as an uncued consecutive clause.²⁰ The productivity of W.’s attention to the text is manifest at 6.26.1, where by adding <comitatu> after *continuus* W. creates an apt and stylish expression in this much emended description of Cocceius Nerva, thereby suggesting an entirely new approach to an old problem.

Most of the other emendations printed here reduce the abruptness of Tacitus’ Latin.²¹ (An exception is E. Courtney’s correction, based on new epigraphic evidence for the name of one of Sejanus’ cronies, at 6.3.4 *Sexti**um*

¹⁹ Lenchantin’s *patribus*, accepted by Koestermann and Heubner, is rejected by both Martin (2001) *ad loc.* and W. as ‘impossible’ and therefore ejected from the apparatus.

²⁰ With both readings one has to assume an ellipse after *uices*, either of *erant* (thus Woodman) or *essent* (thus, e.g., Martin (2001) *ad loc.*).

²¹ Particularly happy repairs are marked with an asterisk in the following list: *6.1.2 *qui requirent* *Weissenborn* : *qui conquirerent* *Ritter*; 6.1.2 *retinuerant* *Ritter* : *retinuerent* M : *retinerēt* *Beroaldus*; 6.2.5 *ne quid Madvig* : *neque* M : *neque* <ut> *Doederlein* : *neue Nipperdey* (*neque ... suadere Beroaldus*); 6.3.1 <nisi> *imperatoris Rhenanus* : *imperatoris* M, *secl.*

Courtney ... : extium *M* : Sextium *Lipsius*; and 6.39.1 Sexti *Courtney*.)²² A particularly interesting example is Pfitzner's *absistere* at 5.7.1 (*adsistere M*), which not only removes a 'clunking ellipse' but also produces a 'chiastic "double zeugma"'. As W. notes, no edition from the past century or so reports this repair. Even where he follows the *paradosis* W. is more generous than other recent editors in reporting emendations that identify problematic aspects of the lemma and show how they might be removed. Such notes alert the reader efficiently—and on almost every page—to the roughness of the text that has come down to us. On the other hand, W. also excises material that other editors include in the apparatus, most notably the arguments from parallel passages that support emendations and the explanatory comments such as *ut gloss-ema*. For example, at 6.12.3 Borzsák includes Lipsius' argument for emending *sociali* to *ciuili*, namely, the fact that Tacitus associates the burning of the Capitoline temple (correctly) with the civil war at *H.* 3.72.1 ('*Lips. coll. III 72, 1*'). Woodman points to the relevance of the *Histories* passage in the commentary but not in the apparatus, which is therefore less helpful than it might be. And at 6.28.3 both Heubner and Borzsák report the justification for Gronovius' repair *Sesoside* ('*coll. Diod. 1, 53, 2*'), a parallel that W. mentions in the commentary without connecting it to the repair.²³ The division of labor between apparatus and commentary, while reasonable and occasionally very helpful, is perhaps overly strict.²⁴

It is impossible within the confines of a review to do justice to the main part of the work under consideration, the commentary itself (49–301). W.'s notes will be the basis of all future work on *Annals* 5–6 and will eventually, by their repeated citation, accumulate the acclaim they deserve. I simply point to

Lipsius; 6.5.2 *eaque Pichena* : *neque M* : *quae Jac. Gronovius*; 6.7.4 <cuius> *uetus codex quidam teste Ursino*; 6.9.2 *uulnus Friis Johansen* : *uenas M*; 6.9.3 *et quidem Becher* : *et quidam M* : *atque idem Nipperdey*; 6.14.2 *sane Muretus* : *sanus M* : *sane is Mercerus* : *naue is Lenchantin*; *6.15.2 <sus> *ceptas Muretus* : *coeptas M*; 6.17.1 *post conlocaret lacunam statuit Nipperdey, quam suppleuit e Suet. Tib. 48.1*; 6.18.1 <alia> *Oakley*; *6.19.1 <aerarias> *que Bezzenberger* : <argentarias> *que Weissenborn*; 6.22.1 *sectas Wurm* : *-am M*; 6.28.4 *iis Ritter* : *his M*; 6.30.4 *haec mira, quamquam fidem e.q.s. Bach* : *haec, mira quamquam, fidem e.q.s. alii*.

²² W. ascribes the garbling to scribal rather than authorial error, citing a similar corruption at 6.48.4 (*Pontius von Rohden, Fuchs* : *Pontius M*); a similar point seems implied by W.'s report of Walther's repair at 6.29.4 (*hortante Sextia Lipsius* : *hortantes exitia M* : *hortante Sextilia Walther*) despite Syme's verdict "'Sextia" is certain' (Syme (1949) 12).

²³ One also has to read the commentary with an eye on the apparatus at, e.g., 6.28.2, where the fact that *effinxere* is an emendation is not mentioned in the note; likewise at 6.48.4 on *Carsidius*.

²⁴ For notes in which material has usefully been removed from the apparatus (where it appears in the editions of Heubner and/or Borzsák) to the commentary see, e.g., 6.46.5 on *in patientia*, 6.47.1 on *exitium*, 6.48.3 on *documento*, 6.48.4 on *Pontius*, 6.49.2 on *patris*.

some characteristically Woodmanian *types* of note before concluding with a few remarks on W.'s analysis of Tacitus' Tiberius.

Commentaries are generically predisposed to atomism, but W. tracks the broadly unifying themes of *Annals* 5–6, among them the increasingly tyrannical character of the emperor now ruling the Roman world from Capri. W.'s exemplary introduction to the 'Domestic affairs' of 32 CE, for example, stresses the tyrannical implications of Tiberius' government *per litteras* in this depressing sequence of chauvinism, accusation, and death (*ad* 6.2–14). But Capri itself, the topographical expression of the tyrant's isolation, is also considered within the broader frameworks of islands in ancient thought and the 'sympathetic correspondence between external nature and the events for which it provides the setting' (all *ad* 6.1.1 *saxa rursum et solitudinem maris repetit*). Within the above-mentioned note on domestic affairs W. points out, with his characteristic attention to the structure, that the 'noble speech by M. Terentius ... forms the centre-piece of the year'. More boldly, he explains the presence of the phoenix story in 34 CE (instead of 36 CE, where Pliny and Dio put it) by its contribution to the structure of that year (*ad* 6.28.1). The episode, he argues, forms a ring with the strange story of Gaetulicus' 'deal' with Tiberius (30.3–4): 'like that of the phoenix, [the deal] defied belief, yet it was true'. Illuminating intertexts are adduced in dozens of notes: Sallust tops the list in the General Index with thirty-two mentions, followed by Livy (twenty-five), Cicero (nineteen, many of them pertaining to Tiberius' language), Seneca (eleven), Velleius (seven), Virgil (five), Thucydides, Plato, and Silius Italicus (four each), Valerius Flaccus, Statius, and Lucan (one each). Precious observations about Tacitean usage feature in almost every note, often paired with contrasting details for other authors and occasionally with commendable openness to competing explanations of syntax and imagery. Historical and bibliographic orientation is provided on topics as divergent as Livia's role as a *perfugium* against Tiberius' wrath (*ad* 5.3.1), the financial crisis of 33 CE (*ad* 6.16–17), the family tree of Pompeia Macrina (*ad* 6.18.2), attitudes towards divination (*ad* 6.20.2–22.4) and determinism (*ad* 6.22.1–3), and Tiberius' (limited) building program (*ad* 6.45.1).

Finally, there are notes that offer substantive reinterpretations of passages explained otherwise by W. (elsewhere) and others. At 6.29.3, for example, in the note on *additis uersibus qui in Tiberium flecterentur*, W. argues that the implied 'subject' of *additis* is Macro—'adding to his denunciation the relevant lines of the play as supporting evidence'—rather than the playwright, a widely accepted view adopted in W.'s 2004 translation ('with additional verses'). In the note on 6.51.3 W. reasserts and defends his unconventional interpretation of the last clause of Book 6, *suo tantum ingenio utebatur*, emphasizing the flexibility of the expression *ingenio uti*, which 'depends on the context in which it is used'.²⁵

²⁵ The interpretation was first presented in Woodman (1989).

As befits the unusual style and thematic importance of this obituary, W. has made it more salient by introducing it with a paragraph break. He also prepares the way for the self-contained unity of this paragraph by suggesting that the book-opening summary of Tiberius' libidinous life on Capri (6.1.1–2) is 'matched at the end by the complementary obituary notice on the tyrant's death' (6.51.3).²⁶ However, his description of the obituary's content —'Tib. ... was deprived successively of the four individuals who are attested as his helpers' (300–1)—will not convince everyone that he is right to render Tacitus' last words on Tiberius as 'had only himself to rely on' (Woodman (2004); cf. 'Tib. was obliged to use "only his own *ingenium*"', id. (2017) 301), since, as Martin notes (in an appendix devoted to the obituary, Martin (2001) 199–200), the piece says nothing about the helpfulness of Augustus, Germanicus, Drusus, Livia, or Sejanus. Even if not convinced on this point, however, the reader will draw much profit from W.'s wide-ranging, detailed, and sensitive interpretation of Tacitus' lapidary envoi to his most fascinating creation (290–301).

In the Appendix on the Tacitean Tiberius W. analyses this creation—the figure who emerges from the *Annales*, not the historical *princeps*—and is primarily concerned to rebut the idea that the narrative of Books 1–6 is at odds with the periodization of the obituary (6.51.3). He stresses here, as in his interpretation of the obituary, the role of Tiberius' helpers; he also reiterates his interpretation of the accession debate as showing not hypocrisy in Tiberius, but a real dread of sole power.²⁷ Another key piece of the analysis pertains to the end of the assessment of Tiberius as a prospective *princeps* by contemporaries looking ahead to the death of Augustus (1.4.5 *seruiendum feminae duobusque insuper adolescentibus*), which is paraphrased as 'he would become enslaved to his mother and two sons'.²⁸ (The prospective enslavement is usually taken to be the contemporaries' own.) W.'s paraphrase underplays the force of the gerundive, and the interpretation itself does not sit very well with the worry about the effect of Livia, Germanicus, and Drusus on the state (... *qui rem publicam interim premant quandoque distrahant*) that completes the sentence and the assessment as a whole. Overall, the Tiberius who emerges from this synthesis of W.'s readings is strangely sympathetic: 'it is therefore the bitterest of ironies that, despite his best efforts, Tiberius spent the last period of his life in the solitariness which he had dreaded from the start' (315).

²⁶ This argument, of course, requires Lipsius' division between Books 5 and 6, on which see above. For another passage complementary to Tiberius' obituary one might point to his mother's obituary at 5.1.1–3.

²⁷ For the full version of the argument see 'Tacitus on Tiberius' accession', in Woodman (1998) 40–69.

²⁸ Thus on 303; similarly 308, 312, 314 ('a chronic obedience towards his mother'), Woodman (2004) *ad loc.* ('his enslavement to the female would be compulsory, and to two juveniles as well'), and in 'Epilogue: *Lectorum Incuria?*', in Woodman (1998), esp. 237–42.

The peculiar combination of broad-brush praise and detailed criticism characteristic of the scholarly review needs particular glossing here. I have learned something from every page of this book. If I have been given cause to rue my own interpretations more often than I would have liked, I am nevertheless grateful for the illumination provided by W.'s meticulous scrutiny of *Annals* 5–6, and the disagreements expressed above are offered with profound respect for W.'s contribution to the understanding of antiquity's most enigmatic historian.

University of Pennsylvania

CYNTHIA DAMON
cdamon@sas.upenn.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ando, C. (1997) 'Tacitus, *Annales* VI: Beginning and End', *AJP* 118: 285–303.
- Goodyear, F. R. D. (1972) *The Annals of Tacitus: Volume I (Annals 1.1–54)* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 15; Cambridge).
- (1981) *The Annals of Tacitus: Volume II (Annals 1.55–81 and Annals 2)* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 23; Cambridge).
- Haase, F. (1848) 'Tacitea', *Philologus* 3: 152–9.
- Malloch, S. J. V. (2013) *The Annals of Tacitus: Book 11* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 51; Cambridge).
- Martin, R. H. (2001) *Tacitus: Annals V & VI* (Warminster).
- and A. J. Woodman (1989) *Tacitus: Annals Book IV* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics; Cambridge).
- Syme, R. (1949) 'Personal Names in *Annals* I–VI', *JRS* 39: 6–18.
- (1958) *Tacitus* (Oxford).
- Woodman, A. J. (1989) 'Tacitus' Obituary of Tiberius', *CQ* 39: 197–205 [repr. in id. (1998) 155–67].
- (1998) *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford and New York).
- (2004) *Tacitus: The Annals* (Indianapolis).
- and R. H. Martin (1996) *The Annals of Tacitus: Book 3* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 32; Cambridge).