Sections 3 and 4 are concerned with civil matters. Regarding these, Tacitus makes two statements about how Tiberius proceeded. The first, *cuncta per consules incipiebat* does not refer to the motion of the consuls but is general and all-embracing: 'he initiated all business through the agency of the consuls'. Any natural reading of *miles in curiam comitabatur* (5) implies that Tiberius visited the senate more than once before 17 September. Nor is there any counter-evidence to suggest that there was only one meeting before that date. The second is specific: even when he did summon the senate himself (perhaps on more than one occasion if *uocabat* too is frequentative), he did so only by means of his tribunician power. To the first he adds the comment *tamquam uetere re publica et ambiguus imperandi*. The first part of this observation is appropriate only to what precedes: the initiation of business by the consuls is an outwardly republican phenomenon, the tribunician power of a princeps or his chosen associates is not. The second could apply equally well to what follows. Both by initiating business through the consuls and by preferring to use his tribunician power when initiating business himself, Tiberius could be said to be behaving 'as if he were in two minds about using his *imperium*'.

But it is only in Section 5, with its powerfully adversative opening, that the full force of *tamquam* becomes apparent. In the civil sphere it might have looked as if Tiberius was hesitant about using his *imperium*, but in military matters he showed no such vacillation, issuing orders as a holder of *imperium* and surrounding himself with a military escort when he entered the forum or the senate. Only when he spoke in the senate (not necessarily only once, since *loqueretur* too may be frequentative) did he show himself hesitant.

The advantages of this reading are that it allows the entire passage to refer to the period between Augustus' death and Tiberius' accession and absolves Tacitus of accusing Tiberius of hypocrisy here, which he does not do, as Woodman has convincingly shown, in his account of the accession debate itself. It does not undermine Woodman's overall reinterpretation but rather reinforces it. With his conclusion, that Tacitus presents the 'portrait of a man whose sense of responsibility was in perpetual conflict with his desire for withdrawal, of a man who was truly *ambiguus imperandi*',[14] I am wholeheartedly in agreement.

University of Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER
rseager@liv.ac.uk

[14] Woodman (n. 1), 69.

NOT A FUNERAL NOTE: TACITUS, *ANNALS* 1.8.5–6*

populumque edicto monuit [sc. Tiberius] ne, ut quondam nimiis studiis funus diui Iulii turbassent, ita Augustum in foro potius quam in Campo Martis, sede destinata, cremari uellent.
Die funeris milites uelut praesidio stetere, multum 6
inridentibus qui ipsi uiderant quique a parentibus acceperant diem illum crudi adhuc seruitii et libertatis improspere repetitae, cum occisus dictator Caesar aliis pessimum, aliis pulcherrimum facinus uideretur: nunc senem principem, longa potentia, prouisis etiam heredum in rem publicam opibus, auxilio scilicet militari tuendum ut sepultura eius quieta foret.

* For their comments on earlier drafts of this note I am extremely grateful to A. R. Birley, M. T. Griffin, D. S. Levene, C. S. Kraus, R. H. Martin, and C. B. R. Pelling.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.629 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To what day does the phrase *diem illum* at 1.8.6 refer? Although the answer may well seem obvious to many readers, which would explain why there is no relevant comment in many of the commentaries,[1] a different answer has been given—or seems to have been given—by three influential scholars.

(1) When Walker refers to 'the comparison between Augustus' funeral and that of Julius Caesar—"dies ille crudi adhuc servitii et libertatis improspere repetitae" ', she unequivocally identifies *diem illum* with the day of Julius Caesar's funeral.[2] (2) The remarks of Syme are predictably less straightforward:[3]

> Soldiers to keep order while the obsequies of Augustus are being conducted, that was enough to excite general mockery, for the pretext only underlined the contrast between a monarch's orderly passing and that other scene which men knew by recollection or hearsay—Caesar the Dictator tumultuously cremated in the Roman Forum, and the loud acclamation of liberty.

Among the many elements to unravel here,[4] two are particularly relevant. [a] Since 'that other scene which men knew by recollection or hearsay' is a clear rendering of *qui ipsi uiderant quique . . . acceperant diem illum* at 1.8.6, and since Syme's use of the dash clearly has the epexegetic function of identifying 'that other scene' as 'Caesar the Dictator tumultuously cremated in the Roman Forum', it follows that 'the contrast' which he sees in 1.8.6 is that between the funerals of Augustus and Caesar.[5] [b] Syme also implies that Caesar's funeral was accompanied by a spontaneous popular outburst in favour of liberty, something for which there is no evidence in any of the sources.[6] (3) When Goodyear in his note on 1.8.6 mentions 'the contrast between the funerals of Augustus and Julius',[7] the precedents of Walker and Syme make it highly likely that he too is to be understood as referring *diem illum* to the day of Caesar's funeral.

If it is the case that these three scholars have all interpreted the phrase *diem illum* in the same way, why have they done so? Caesar's funeral is mentioned in Tiberius' edict at the end of the preceding paragraph, where it is used as a comparison with the forthcoming funeral of Augustus (1.8.5 *ut quondam . . . funus diui Iulii . . .,ita Augustum . . .*); and verbal repetitions encourage the notion that this comparison is sustained in the following paragraph: after the sequence *funus diui Iulii* ~ *Die funeris*, it seems *prima facie* likely that, in the next sequence (*diem illum* ~ *dictator Caesar*), *diem illum* will mean 'that day', that is, the aforementioned day of Caesar's funeral (*OLD ille* 2a). This seems the most likely explanation for the readings of Walker, Syme, and Goodyear.

Yet this notion cannot be right. The words *diem illum* are qualified by two genitival phrases, and, whatever interpretation is given to the first of them (*crudi adhuc seruitii*),[8]

[1] See e.g. those of Walther (1831), Ritter (1848), Orelli (1859), Pfitzner (1892), Furneaux (1896), Nipperdey and Andresen (1915), Draeger and Heraeus (1917), Miller (1959), and Koestermann (1963).

[2] B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus* (Manchester, 1952), 69. (The change from accusative to nominative is hers.)

[3] R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 315.

[4] Such as his strange use of the word 'passing' as a synonym for what he previously called 'obsequies'.

[5] It is perhaps possible that Syme was here influenced by Walker, who in the preface to her book acknowledges his having read her work (p. v).

[6] Syme in a footnote (n. 2) first refers to 1.8.6 itself, as if that were his evidence, but of course Tacitus mentions no acclamation; Syme then refers to Dio 57.2.2, but this passage, confusingly, relates to Tacitus' *previous* statement at 1.8.5, where, as in Dio, there is again no acclamation.

[7] F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus* (Cambridge, 1972), 1.151.

[8] I propose to discuss this phrase further elsewhere.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.629 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the expression *diem illum . . . libertatis improspere repetitae* clearly evokes a sympathy for *libertas* which is utterly at odds with the unanimous tradition that on Caesar's funeral day popular sympathy had swung away from the liberators and rested wholeheartedly with the murdered dictator.[9] Since the latter sympathy is made the basis for the comparison in the preceding paragraph (1.8.5 *ut quondam nimiis studiis funus diui Iulii turbassent*), it is impossible to hold that the same comparison is sustained in the present paragraph (1.8.6) but that it expresses an otherwise unattested popular sympathy for *libertas* which is completely contradictory.[10] As we shall see below, the people have no thoughts at all of Caesar's funeral.

The expression *diem illum . . . libertatis improspere repetitae* can refer only to 'that well known day' of Caesar's assassination (*OLD ille* 4), the day when, as Cicero famously proclaimed, 'freedom was recovered' (*Phil.* 2.28 *recuperatam libertatem*). This reference is surely confirmed when *diem illum* is further defined by a *cum*-clause which begins with the words *occisus dictator Caesar* (cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.29 *Caesarem occiderunt*). The comparison is not between one funeral and another, as each of the above scholars seems to have assumed, but between a funeral and a death.[11]

What is the connection between Augustus' funeral and Caesar's death which prompts the bystanders at the former to think of the latter? The paragraph begins with the statement that, on the day of the funeral, 'soldiers took up position like a bodyguard' (1.8.6 *milites uelut praesidio stetere*). Yet, since Augustus was already dead, the soldiers could not function as an *actual* bodyguard at all (this is the force of *uelut*). The scene is risible, and the bystanders' derision (*inridentibus*) takes the form of their thinking back to a famous occasion when the circumstances were precisely reversed: the Ides of March. All our sources record the notorious fact that, shortly before he died, Caesar dismissed his bodyguard and declined to take on another; and several of the sources make the additional point that, if he had remained protected, he would not have died as and when he did.[12] Thus the ostentatious presence of a quite unnecessary 'bodyguard' in A.D. 14 prompts thoughts of 'that day' (*diem illum*) in 44 B.C. when a very necessary and real bodyguard was crucially absent.

That this is the connection of thought in the bystanders' minds is confirmed when Augustus' protection by a bodyguard constitutes the derisory climax of their reported speech: *auxilio scilicet militari tuendum* (~ *milites uelut praesidio stetere*). It will be noticed, however, that the bystanders here refer to Augustus as if he were still alive and capable of being protected (*senem . . . tuendum*); and the reason is that, in the two statements which constitute the build-up to this climax, the bystanders continue an implicit contrast between Caesar and Augustus on the basis of their respective circumstances at death. Thus: Caesar was fifty-six years of age when he died, and he had been perpetual sole ruler (*dictator perpetuus*, cf. *dictator Caesar*) for perhaps little more than a month;[13] but Augustus was twenty years older and had been perpetual sole ruler for over forty years (*senem principem, longa potentia*). Physical robustness and constitutional immaturity (good reasons for requiring a bodyguard) are contrasted with

[9] See Suet. *DJ* 84–5, Plut. *Caes.* 68, App. *BCiv.* 2.143–8, Dio 44.36–50.

[10] This is nevertheless what Syme, by implication, does hold.

[11] So e.g. Ruperti (1834), ad loc. (whose note on *libertatis improspere repetitae* is 'occiso Caesare') and B. Williams, 'Reading Tacitus' Tiberian Annals', in A. J. Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse: Flavian Epicist to Claudian* (Victoria, 1990), 140. Given the silence of many scholars (see e.g. above, n. 1), it is impossible to know how common this view is.

[12] Vell. 57.1, Suet. *DJ* 86.1, Plut. *Caes.* 57.7, App. *BCiv.* 2.107, 109, Dio 44.7.4, 15.2.

[13] Caesar's title of *dictator perpetuus* is not attested before mid-February (for which see Cic. *Phil.* 2.87): see *CAH*^{2} 9.463.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.629 Published online by Cambridge University Press

physical decrepitude and constitutional strength (reasons why a bodyguard is less of a requirement). Again, Caesar had seemed to have no heir at all at the time of his death and therefore appeared to be inviting trouble (the eighteen-year-old Octavian was adopted posthumously in a will which had been drawn up only six months before);[14] but Augustus had ceremoniously adopted the forty-four-year-old Tiberius a full ten years previously in A.D. 4 and as a precautionary measure had obliged him in his turn to adopt the young Germanicus at the same time (*prouisis etiam heredum in rem publicam opibus*, which means 'having provided for the state resources *consisting of* his heirs').[15]

In these two statements, Augustus' need for a bodyguard before his death is minimized by the bystanders so that in the climax of their speech they can emphasize the absurdity of his requiring protection after his death;[16] and, since in that climax they initially continue to refer to Augustus as still alive (as we have seen), their introduction of this absurdity, which depends upon a final implicit contrast with Caesar, is delayed as late as possible in the interests of cynicism and suspense. Thus: Caesar's lack of a bodyguard ensured that he enjoyed no more than a mere five months of the *quies* which a *princeps* was entitled to expect;[17] but the presence of Augustus' bodyguard was intended to ensure *quies* for his . . . burial (*ut sepultura eius quieta foret*).

University of Durham A. J. WOODMAN

[14] Suet. *DJ* 83.1–2.

[15] In other words, *heredum* is not a possessive genitive, as it is invariably taken (e.g. '. . . had provided his heirs with abundant means to coerce the state' [Church and Brodribb], '. . . not even his heirs should lack for means to coerce their country' [J. Jackson, Loeb]), but a defining genitive: the construction has Sallustian precedent (*Hist.* 4.69.16 *scio . . . tibi magnas opes uirorum . . . esse*). I am not the first to suggest this interpretation: see L. Du Toit, 'A note on Tacitus, *Annals* 1.8.6', *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) 156–7.

Since the announcement of Octavian's adoption seems to have come as a surprise even to the young man himself, it is tempting to ask whether Tacitus' *prouisis* means, not 'provided <by Augustus>', but 'long foreseen <by everyone>' (for the expression, cf. *Ann.* 14.59.1 *nullam opem prouidebat*), thereby emphasizing the contrast still further.

[16] The bystanders' articulation resembles that of an *exemplum ex minoribus ad maius ductum* (for which cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, Eng. trans. [Leiden, 1998], 199, §420).

[17] Cf. Vell. 56.3 of Caesar: *neque illi tanto uiro . . . plus quinque mensium principalis quies contigit.*

A QUOTATION FROM LATIN IN PLUTARCH?

Compared with his immense reading in Greek literature, quotations of Latin authors in Plutarch are few and far between.[1] Although he referred to Latin historical sources when required,[2] recently it has been shown in one case at least that, no doubt due to linguistic difficulties, he tended to minimize his reading of Latin literature to the

[1] See W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations*, *Philol. Monogr*. 19, *APA* (1959) and add C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 83, n. 12.

[2] For Plutarch's Latin see e.g. H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford, 1924 = New York, 1975), 11–19; K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart, 1964[2]), 289–90; A. Zadorojnyi, 'The Roman poets in Plutarch's stories', in C. Schrader, V. Ramón, and J. Vela (edd.), *Plutarco y la historia (Actas del V Simposio Español sobre Plutarco, Zaragoza 20–22 de Junio de 1966*) (1977), 497–506.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.629 Published online by Cambridge University Press